UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 101—PART 8

JULY 1, 1955, TO JULY 19, 1955
(PAGES 9697 TO 11002)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1955

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1955

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Canon Charles Martin, headmaster, St. Albans National Cathedral School for Boys, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the high and mighty ruler of the universe, lift us by the might of Thy power into Thy presence, that we may be still and know that Thou art God. Quiet us, refresh and renew us. Bless the Members of the Senate with the wisdom to know and the strength to do Thy will. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness, and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve our country in Thy fear. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C. July 1, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 30, 1955, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 30, 1955,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on June 30, 1955, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 6871. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1956; and

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, providing for increased pay costs for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 29, 1955:

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger;

S. 35. An act to provide for the transmission in the mails of live scorpions;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek;

S. 131. An act for the relief of Bohumil Suran;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Thomas Kunhyuk Kim;

S. 412. An act for the relief of Jan Hajdukiewicz;

S. 587. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller;

S. 644. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp;

S. 892. An act for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic;

S. 2078. An act to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions; and

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

On June 30, 1955:

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes;

S. 1718. An act to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954;

S. 2266. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, extended, until July 1, 1956;

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950.

GIUSEPPE MINARDI—RETURN OF BILL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying bill, was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith S. 195, an act for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1955.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the Secretary will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Regular Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour, in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, there be the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 245. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322) (Rept. No. 697); and

H. R. 3636. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 3990. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska (Rept. No. 699).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6766. A bill making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 700).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 2398. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to permit the State of Pennsylvania to repay to the Federal Government amounts expended on certain Federal-aid road construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2399. A bill for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2400. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. Mundt):

S. 2401. A bill to provide that the likenesses of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Abraham Lincoln as produced on the Mount Rushmore National Memorial appear on $1 bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2402. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 2403. A bill to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston of South Carolina when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Neely, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Case of New Jersey, Mr. Payne, and Mr. Beall):

S. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO RETIRED PAYMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. At this time we find that the retirement payments of many of our retired employees are not sufficient to take care of their wants and their dire needs. This bill, if enacted, will do a little to relieve that situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2402) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, introduced by Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 18, after line 16, insert:

"Sec. 206. The Secretary hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Director, Division of Budget and Finance, in grade GS–17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

On page 21, line 14, after "Project", insert "and $100,000 shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans for the Bruces Eddy project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho, recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, contained in Senate Document 51, 84th Congress, 1st session, and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized."

On page 22, line 10, after "litigation", insert: "*Provided further,* That not to exceed $210,000 of funds appropriated herein may be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for relocation of those permanent resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled within the project area on May 17, 1950, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary therefor on the condition that the Secretary of the Interior transfer to the control of the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Dalles Dam project, Oregon, an irregular shaped parcel of land containing in the aggregate approximately five and five-tenths acres located in lot 1 of section 17 and in lots 1 and 2 of section 20, township 2 north, range 15 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, being a portion of the land previously transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the act approved February 9, 1929 (45 Stat. 1158). Title to the lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior for the above stated purpose shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian for whose benefit it is acquired; and such trust may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior by conveyance of a fee simple title to the Indian or his heirs or devisees, without application therefor, when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the Indian or his heirs or devisees are capable of managing their own affairs. In carrying out such relocations, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into a contract or contracts with any State or political subdivision thereof."

On page 23, line 17, after "appropriated" insert "*Provided further,* That the funds appropriated herein for the replacement of the Soo Line Railroad bridge over the South Canal at St. Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., shall be available for the replacement of said bridge under the terms of the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended (54 Stat. 499, as amended), in lieu of the replacement of said bridge, as a part of the project for the removal of Bridge Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945."

On page 23, line 17, after "appropriated," insert "*Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, not to exceed $2,050,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and not to exceed $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein: *Provided, however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the land-owners, on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount provided for such land acquisition."

On page 23, line 17, after "appropriated," insert "*Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, not to exceed $1,750,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project: *Provided, however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the landowners on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount provided for such land acquistion: *Provided further,* That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost to the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District the construction charge obligation as set forth in a proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, assignable to such remaining lands shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

On page 23, line 17, after "appropriated," insert "*Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the port of Tacoma for such work as they may have done within the limits of the Federal portion of the Tacoma Harbor project, over and above the work required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the authorized modification adopted in the 1954 River and Harbor Act: *Provided further,* That such payment shall not exceed the sum of $373,216."

On page 26, line 7, after "Wisconsin", insert "*Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds hertofore made available for the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River, shall be available to cooperate with the State of South Dakota in restoring a reasonable water level to a portion of McCook Lake, Union County, S. Dak., which water level has been impaired and surrounding residential properties damaged by the reduced flow of the Missouri River due to the construction of the Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dam projects: *Provided,* That the cost of the United States shall not exceed $150,000: *Provided further,* That the State or local agencies shall contribute an equal amount to the cost of the restoration works which restoration shall be accomplished by agreement between the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission of the State of South Dakota and the Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers."

On page 29, after line 19, insert: "The Chief of Engineers hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Chief of the Programs Branch, Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in the grade GS-17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6766 making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECTS ON DOMESTIC TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF TEXTILE IMPORTS FROM JAPAN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would direct the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of the effects of the tariff agreements entered into at the GATT Conference at Geneva.

On Tuesday I announced my intention to offer this resolution because of my deep concern in the probable effects of the agreements entered into between this country and other nations with reference to the American textile industry and its employees. My information from a reliable source is that the tariff reductions agreed to in the GATT Conference will run as high as 27 to 48 percent on the basic products of the textile industry.

Although the agreements entered into were under provisions of the old trade law—the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951—and not the new law as enacted this year by the Congress; and, also, although these cuts will not go into effect until September 10 of this year, I do not believe we should wait until actual damage is done our great textile industry before we take steps to prevent such damage.

Mr. President, I believe the resolution which I am submitting on behalf of myself and 48 of my colleagues should be approved by the Senate as a preventive measure against disaster to a vital industry of this Nation. As I pointed out Tuesday, if the Tariff Commission should determine that no injury has been caused or threatened by the reduction of tariffs agreed to at Geneva, then no harm has been done. But, if serious damage or the threat of serious damage is found by the Commission, time will have been saved by the passage of this resolution. That time saved could well mean the difference between continued operation and curtailment of many of our textile plants.

I might add, Mr. President, that I am very happy that 48 of my Senate colleagues have joined in submitting the resolution. They are Senators GEORGE, AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BRICKER, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CHAVEZ, COTTON, DANIEL, DUFF, DWORSHAK, ELLENDER, ERVIN, FLANDERS, GOLDWATER, GREEN, HICKENLOOPER, HILL, HOLLAND, IVES, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KENNEDY, LONG, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MCCLELLAN, MCNAMARA, PASTORE, PAYNE, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SPARKMAN, SMITH of Maine, THYE, SCHOEPPEL, CASE of South Dakota, CURTIS, MUNDT, MANSFIELD, SYMINGTON, MONRONEY, NEUBERGER, KERR, and KILGORE. I regret that I have been unable to contact every Member of the Senate in regard to becoming associated as a cosponsor of the resolution. Should any other Senators desire to become associated in sponsoring the resolution I shall be happy to have them join today.

I now submit the resolution for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 121) was received and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the tariff reductions on basic textile products agreed to at the recent negotiations in Geneva amount to as much as 27 to 48 percent of the present tariff rates; and

Whereas more than a million persons are employed in the textile industry of the United States and more than another million are employed in allied industries; and

Whereas in many sections of the Nation the entire economy of a community is tied directly to the healthy operation of the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry of this Nation is vital to defense production, and

Whereas the tariff reduction agreements entered into with other nations are scheduled to become effective September 10, 1955, and possibly will damage or pose the threat of damage to the textile industry of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to make an investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any textile product is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting concessions granted by the United States under the agreement for the accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva on June 8, 1955, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities (either actual or relative) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic textile industry producing like or directly competitive products. The investigation required by this resolution shall be commenced with respect to any particular product on the date on which the concessions granted by the United States by the Geneva agreement become effective with respect to such product.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 119) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address delivered by him at the conference on margarine at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 24, 1955.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address delivered by Senator MAGNUSON before the International Lutheran Laymen's League, at Seattle, Wash., on June 29, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held by the subcommittee on S. 6 and S. 1823, bills authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes. The hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, July 13, and continue through July 14 and 15.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify the staff of the Committee on Public Works, room 412, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE CONCERNING SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the following nominations to file with the committee on or before Friday, July 8, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled:

Luman N. Nevels, Jr., of Hawaii, to be judge, third circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, for 4-year term, vice Maurice Sapienza, term expired.

Mary H. Donlon, of New York, to be judge of United States Customs Court, vice Genevieve R. Cline, retired.

Thurmond Clarke, of California, to be United States district judge, southern district of California, to fill a new position.

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit, vice Harold M. Stephens, deceased.

Henry J. Cook, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney, for 4-year term, eastern district of Kentucky, vice Edwin R. Denney, resigned.

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for district of Puerto Rico, 4-year term, vice Donald A. Draughon, term expired.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Federal Reserve Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 1427, a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and any other such bills as may be pending before the subcommittee. These hearings will be held beginning July 11, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 301, or another room to be designated, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, Chief Clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865.

Because of the pressure of time, the committee feels justified in asking witnesses who desire to be heard to conform to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which permit witnesses to file extended statements, but also provide that such statements may be summarized in oral testimony. The committee reserves the right to limit oral testimony to such periods of time as it may determine, in addition to such time as may be required for questioning of witnesses by committee members, unless the chairman, for good cause, grants additional time.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT, AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I note by this morning's newspaper that the President of the United States has asked that the Dixon-Yates contract be once again studied. I noted also that yesterday the Senate passed the bill raising temporarily, and again, the debt ceiling of the United States, from $275 billion to $281 billion.

It occurs to me that the administration made a promise in the 1952 campaign that it would balance the budget and reduce the debt limit, and that just 2 days ago, the President emphasized the value and the need of the Dixon-Yates project, when he was "taking out" after the majority leader. It appears that now he has changed his mind.

Mr. President, I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and others who spoke on the floor yesterday outlining the outstanding accomplishments of our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas. Had I been on the floor, I would have joined them at that time, but due to the fact that I was a member of a conference committee on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, and the Judiciary, I was unable to be present.

I do want the RECORD to show, though that, in my opinion, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is establishing a record of cooperation and accomplishments which is setting a fine mark for all to see. There has been no cold war between the administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress, but there has been a real understanding on the part of our distinguished majority leader and the Democratic Members of the Congress. We have recognized our responsibilities as a political party; we have subordinated politics to the greatest possible degree; and we have acted on the basis that what is good for the country should always come first. The Democratic Party and the people of the United States are proud of the accomplishments of our distinguished majority leader and we anticipate that what he has done is only a start toward greater accomplishments. He has served his State, his country, and the free world well, and he is entitled to the gratitude and thanks of the President of the United States for the spirit of cooperation and the high statesmanship he has shown.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Montana for his fine statement, and I wish to associate myself with every word and the spirit of every line of what he said. The position of majority floor leader of the Senate is one of the biggest and most difficult assignments, as I see it, in our entire Government. With the studied purpose of staying away from flattery and unusual commendation, I reflect no more than what I think is the unanimous opinion of the Members of the entire Senate when I say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has labored long, ably, and effectively to carry out what I call a patriotic program, without any label on it of party or partisanship. One attribute which has attracted me to him is his selflessness. He is one of the most selfless men I have ever known in virtually every responsibility he is called upon to meet, but particularly so when working at a very high level of Government.

I am not making any comparisons, but, as I see it, I do not know of any other person to whom the country is more indebted for the fine work which has been done in this legislative body and the way it has been done. A large contributing factor has been the attitude of the minority leader in working out problems, and there is due to him a great part of the credit.

I am glad to have heard what the Senator from Montana has said. I agree with him heartily. I believe the RECORD sustains his statement, and that the people generally will realize its soundness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would not be human if I did not deeply appreciate the confidence expressed by my longtime, devoted friends, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. They have always dealt extremely generously with me, and their faith and their confidence in me give me the strength I need each day in my work.

The Senate is presented today with a somewhat unexpected problem.

Last night the President of the United States decided to take another look at the Dixon-Yates contract. It is difficult to determine just how another look can mean anything except the cancellation of the contract.

This is a graceful way out of a very unpleasant situation.

The Dixon-Yates contract has been troublesome from the very beginning. It has disturbed thoughtful men who have studied all its implications. It was approved only with the greatest reluctance by a very closely divided Congress. It has always been unwanted by the people it was supposed to serve.

Now the city of Memphis has exercised the initiative and boldness that make the undesirability of the whole project crystal clear. The city's decision to build its own powerplant should put an end to the controversy.

We, however, as legislators, are confronted with a problem. The contract has not been cancelled. We have been requested to appropriate money to build transmission lines to carry the power from the steam plant to the city of Memphis.

This amounts to asking the Congress to lay out money—the taxpayers' money—to carry power from a plant that probably will not be built to a city that does not want it anyway.

I do not think this is a very sound or prudent course. I do not believe that is the way in which the people of this country want their public business conducted.

Personally, I believe this is an instance in which we can follow the example of the President. If he can take another look, Congress can take another look. If he can lay the basis for cancellation, the Congress ought to lay the basis for cancellation. Speaking for myself alone, as the senior Senator from Texas, I think it would be better if the item for the transmission line were dropped altogether from the appropriation bill.

But, Mr. President, under no circumstances do I think the Congress should appropriate the money without strings—strings which will yank it right back into the Treasury, where it belongs. We could do this simply by providing that no money could be spent for the transmission lines so long as it is apparent that Memphis is going ahead with its own steam plant.

This morning I talked with the distinguished and able chairman of the full Appropriations Committee of the Senate, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Last evening, following the announcement made when the President returned to the White House and issued his statement, I talked to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. This morning, I had a brief opportunity to confer with the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Last evening, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget made his position very clear: He is not going to press for the appropriation, nor is he going to ask that it be withdrawn. In other words, insofar as he is concerned, it is in limbo. But, Mr. President, it seems to me that this is ample notice that the Congress should take a prudent second look at the whole situation.

It seems somewhat strange, to me, that it took so long for some persons to realize that the city of Memphis was going to build its own powerplant. It is unfortunate that that decision was not considered "official" by our Federal authorities until we were on the very threshhold of making the appropriation—yes, after the sun had gone down on the night before the committee was to meet and report the appropriation bill to the Senate itself.

As I understand the situation, the Memphis authorities announced their stand on February 17 of this year. It would have saved the executive agencies and the Congress considerable embarrassment had there been a reasonable reaction to that decision at that time by executive authorities.

Mr. President, it is not too late to act. We can move now to protect the Treasury and to prevent future embarrassment. Each passing day increases the cost of contract cancellation. Each passing day raises new and more disturbing questions, few of which have been answered to the satisfaction of anyone.

Few will mourn the end of the Dixon-Yates contract. We ourselves cannot issue the necessary orders to cancel this project; we in the Senate do not have that power. We can only hope that the President will save the taxpayers some money by suspending the work while he is taking his "new look."

But, Mr. President, the Senate can act to hasten the end, and to be certain that we protect our people, when and if the end comes. I hope that before the Senate considers final action on the public-works appropriation bill, the Senate will act accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following this statement, the White House statement of the President, issued late last evening; a letter from the Chairman of the Board of the TVA, Mr. Herbert D. Vogel, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and the completion resolution by the TVA.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT

At the direction of the President the White House today made public the following letter from Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The administration has consistently advocated the development of power facilities through local initiative and operation wherever possible.

The President many months ago recommended that the city of Memphis develop its own powerplant to supply the needs of the people of the area for electric energy. In the absence of any action by the city to accept this responsibility, the Federal Government made the necessary plans to provide adequate power facilities for the Memphis area.

In the light of the notification by the city of Memphis to the Tennesese Valley Authority, the President has requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to confer promptly with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority to determine whether it is in the interest of the people of the area to continue or cancel the Dixon-Yates contract.

LETTER FROM TVA

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
KNOXVILLE, TENN., *June 30, 1955.*

The Honorable ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: By letter of June 28 we transmitted to you copies of a telegram and confirming letters, both dated June 23, 1955, from Thomas H. Allen, president of the Memphis Light, Gas & Water Division, and of our reply of June 28, 1955. In his telegram and letter Major Allen advised TVA of the decision of the Memphis Board of City Commissioners to proceed with construction of a generating plant of sufficient capacity to serve the needs of the city of Memphis. We replied to Major Allen that in the light of this decision, TVA's power planning would proceed on the assumption that Memphis would handle its own load when the present contract between the city and TVA expires in 1958.

In response to my letter Major Allen and Mayor Frank T. Tobey have advised that TVA has correctly construed Major Allen's letter and telegram of June 23 and that it is Memphis' intent to provide the generating facilities needed to meet the power requirements of the Memphis distribution system, that they are proceeding to that end and that the city will not seek a renewal of its present power supply contract with TVA when the contract expire in June 1958.

Because of the decision of the city it will no longer be necessary for TVA to plan capacity installations to meet the load requirements of the Memphis area. Since the Dixon-Yates plant was proposed as a source of supply for the Memphis load, the city's action eliminates the possibility of using its output in the Memphis area, and the transmission costs involved and other factors would make it impracticable for TVA to utilize MVGC power elsewhere on the TVA system. We believe, therefore, that no arrangements between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. should any longer be predicated on the use of the MVGC plant as a source of supply to TVA. A formal resolution with regard to this matter was adopted by the TVA Board today, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
Chairman of the Board.

RESOLUTION BY TVA

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, ADOPTED JUNE 30, 1955

Whereas the budget program for fiscal year 1955 which was submitted by TVA to the Bureau of the Budget included provision for the construction of a 450,000 kilowatt steam plant on the Mississippi River near Fulton, Tenn.; and

Whereas the size and location of the proposed Fulton plant were determined primarily by the power requirements of the electric distribution system of the city of Memphis in Shelby County, Tenn.; and

Whereas the arrangements between the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (MVGC) and the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) were subsequently proposed instead, whereby power purchased by the AEC would be delivered to TVA near Memphis; and

Whereas the city of Memphis has advised TVA that it will not accept power generated at the MVGC plant and therefore will proceed with its own generating plant to supply the requirements of the Memphis distribution system in Shelby County and that upon the expiration of its present power supply contract with TVA in June 1958, it will not seek a renewal thereof; and

Whereas in planning future additions of generating capacity it will no longer be necessary for TVA to make provision for the power requirements of the Memphis area; and

Whereas the locations of both the proposed TVA plant at Fulton and the MVGC plant were determined on the basis of the requirements of the Memphis load and neither plant could now be used for that purpose; and

Whereas it would be impracticable because of the transmission distances involved and for other reasons to utilize MVGC power elsewhere on the TVA system; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission be advised of the facts and conclusions set forth above.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I seek recognition at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the majority leader has said regarding the President's position on the so-called Dixon-Yates contract.

I am sure the President does not need to have any Member on the floor of this body make any excuses for him. There is one thing about the President that all of us understand: He is not interested in anything that is "smelly," nor is he interested in special privilege for any interest or any individual.

The President acts on information which he receives. Not only does he act on the orders he gets from within, but he consults expert advice from all segments of the country, and he listens to advice.

Regarding this particular Dixon-Yates contract and the President's position on matters of this kind, certainly this administration recognizes that many projects are of such great magnitude that only the Federal Government can finance them, but even in the case of such projects the Federal Government should not assume primary responsibility for supplying the power needs of an area. That responsibility rests with the local people. The Department of the Interior is encouraging the construction of projects by local interests. That is the record of this administration. The trend toward Federal monopoly is being halted. The Eisenhower administration wants local agencies, public or private, to produce as much power as they can. Where flood control, reclamation, and so forth, enter into the picture, the Federal Government wishes to participate as a partner.

The Priest Rapids, Wash.; Markham Ferry, Okla.; and Coosa River, Ala., authorized projects are samples of the working of the new partnership plan.

Public power is here to stay, and this administration has no intention of selling it out. Also recognized, however, is the fact that the Federal Government has no divine or exclusive right to provide power.

This administration supports current TVA programs and the construction of powerplants now in process. It is not going to sell the TVA. But before providing money for more TVA steam plants, private firms which pay taxes, will be given a chance to offer to provide power, particularly on the edge of the TVA area. That is exactly what the President has had in mind.

Mr. President, the facts regarding the TVA-Dixon-Yates contract are these: The TVA area needs approximately half a million more kilowatts of power by 1957 for civilian and atomic-energy purposes. Congress has rejected the proposal for a TVA plant at Fulton, Tenn. So the administration decided that the Atomic Energy Commission should contract for private power to replace, in the Memphis area—where it is needed—TVA power used by the Atomic Energy Commission at Paducah, Ky.

The administration had two proposals from private groups to provide power for the Atomic Energy Commission, by building a plant near Memphis. The Dixon-Yates bid was accepted because it was a firm offer with a limit on costs, whereas the Von Tresckow plan—cost-plus without cost limit—was very likely to cost the Government more in the long run, with no risk to the sponsors.

Those are the facts concerning this contract. I do not know why some persons are trying to inject this matter as a political wedge of some kind, and to infer that the President is doing something that is not right. The President is acting on what he believes, in the case of this area, to be the best interests of the taxpayers of the country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator from Ohio that the Senate is still proceeding under the 2-minute rule, in connection with the morning hour.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute more.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BENDER. I am sorry that I am not familiar with all the rules.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will point out that the Senate is now in the morning hour.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate that, Mr. President; and I appreciate the Chair's admonition.

In closing, I wish to say that there is nothing the President has done in this instance regarding which he has not taken Congress into his complete confidence and has not taken the people of the country into his complete confidence.

Insofar as this contract is concerned, nothing has happened as yet. If the city of Memphis chooses to supply its own power, that changes the picture entirely. The President is not receding from any position he has taken. He is taking another look, as he should do.

Certainly the President should not be criticized here, nor should any innuendo be permitted to stand. I did not know this matter was to be discussed in the Senate this morning; but since I am here, I cannot help but say a word about the administration. The administration is acting in good faith; and today the administration has the complete confidence—more so than has any other administration in our lifetime—of the American people. They believe in the honesty and integrity of Dwight Eisenhower. Dwight Eisenhower is not interested in anyone who is interested in some crooked or "smelly" deal, whether such persons be little or big.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BENDER. If I have time to yield, I am glad to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio will not have time unless he obtains an extension.

Without objection, the time of the Senator is extended for 1 minute.

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who has just said that the administration had the complete confidence of the American people——

Mr. BENDER. I think the last poll showed 69 percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I judge elections by the returns at the ballot box, and not by straw polls.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he can tell us of any other President in recent times whose party lost control of both Houses of Congress in the first by-election after he took over at the White House.

Mr. BENDER. My answer to the Senator is that so many of us here were elected by landslide votes that it ill behooves any of us to ask questions of that kind. Obviously, in my home State, as in many other States, Republicans assumed that they did not have to work, and that is the reason for the falling off in votes. But too many elections were won or lost by only a few votes. In my case, and in the case of the Senator from Oregon, that was true. Certainly, there was no reflection on the President of the United States at any time, in any election, in any State—in my State or in the Senator's State. All I can say regarding the Senator's opponent, who was one of the greatest men ever to sit in the Congress, is that he failed to work as hard as he might have worked, and the Republican organization, not only in that State, but throughout the country, went to sleep.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. How has he become such an authority on elections in the State of Oregon?

Mr. BENDER. All I can tell is what the election results show. There was a difference of only 2,000 or 3,000 votes. I am no authority. However, I do know what people who look at Oregon say. They say that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who now occupies such an important place, was elected because he worked harder, and because he covered the State, and got people out to vote. My good friend, the former Senator from Oregon, did not spend as much time in the State as he might have spent. He spent too much time in Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to comment, if I may, on some of the substantive remarks made by the Senator from Ohio on my own time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "United States Power Policy Change: Tale Unfolds," written by Richard L. Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 7, 1955. This article from a great newspaper describes how certain regulations of the Department of the Interior in this administration—regulations governing power in the Pacific Northwest—were mysteriously taken from the recommendations of a private power lobbyist calling at the Interior Department.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES POWER POLICY CHANGE: TALE UNFOLDS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The curious story of how a major change in Federal power policy was instituted by a process which included the submission of an "anonymous document" to the Department of the Interior and the call of a registered power lobbyist on a department official is being unfolded here before a House subcommittee.

Witness before the House Government Operations Subcommittee under Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, committee chairman, was James D. Geissinger, former special assistant to the Solicitor of the Interior Department and now regional solicitor to the Department at Denver.

Mr. Geissinger testified that he made recommendations for changes in Federal power procedure, April 9, 1954, reversing one major innovation by the Truman administration following study of the "anonymous document," and after a call by Herman Kruse, director of public relations of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. Geissinger testified that he regarded Mr. Kruse's call, made in April 1954, as disinterested, but that he subsequently has learned that Mr. Kruse misinformed him on one important particular bearing on a recommendation for policy change which he submitted to his superior. The recommendation was accepted.

Mr. Geissinger said he had not met Mr. Kruse previously, and still did not know the latter's precise connection with Pacific Gas & Electric. The Christian Science Monitor reporter was told by the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives that Mr. Kruse is a registered lobbyist, required by law to list his affiliation, and has been registered each year since 1947.

At the time of Mr. Kruse's call, seven cases were on appeal from the Bureau of Land Management denying to P. G. & E. easements for electric transmission lines across public lands because the company refused to enter stipulations required of all public utilities which crossed public lands. The stipulation was embodied in an order of 1948 by the Truman administration.

Mr. Geissinger said Mr. Kruse told him that other public utilities were resisting these stipulations. Mr. Geissinger wrote a memorandum to the then Solicitor General of the Department, Clarence A. Davis, now Undersecretary, stating this for a fact.

CHECKED AFTER CHANGE MADE

"At that time I was under the impression it was true of the others," he told the subcommittee here. "I would say after this check that it was not correct."

"But your check was not made till after the regulation was changed," objected committee counsel.

"I had no reason to doubt Mr. Kruse," the witness replied. "I knew he had an interest, yes, but I had no reason to believe that he was not telling me the truth, or would tell me a lie."

"Did it not occur to you to check with the other power agencies of the department?"

Mr. Geissinger said that no, it had not.

Among various United States regulations to which the P. G. & E. objected was "section 244.24D," or the "wheeling" stipulation.

LIKE COMMON CARRIERS

In 1948 the Truman administration issued this order providing that public utilities building transmission lines across public lands must agree to rent the Government the use of the lines in their spare time (or extracapacity periods) to transmit Government or other power, the object being to make it unnecessary to build duplicating lines. The lines thus had some of the nature of common carriers.

In many Western States a substantial part of the territory is public land, for example Utah 71 percent, so that Government consent was almost essential for building the lines.

The Idaho Power Co. tested the ruling in the courts and lost the case.

Former Democratic officials of the Interior Department, who testified earlier before the Chudoff committee, said that the wheeling regulation was quietly dropped by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, August 11, 1954.

They charge that this and other changes of procedure were taken without consultation with public power agencies or power cooperatives to which, under law, the Interior Department is required to give privileged status.

MISTAKE ACKNOWLEDGED

Regarding this specific regulation, Mr. Geissinger wrote, in his April 9, 1954, memoranda to the Solicitor, that "the utilities have sought to have this regulation eliminated ever since the adoption of the first regulation."

"Most of the utilities have at considerable extra expense built such lines across non-Government lands because of their objections to this regulation."

It was the above sentence which Mr. Geissinger acknowledged was a mistake, and that it had come from Mr. Kruse.

His memorandum added: "It would appear that the regulation is not in harmony with the present power policy, and in view of the fact it is being avoided anyway, I would recommend its deletion."

Mr. Geissinger's memorandum to his superior April 9, 1954, recommended some 10 changes in procedure. The existence of the memorandum was disclosed in the Christian Science Monitor in a dispatch of May 13.

Before making his recommendations, Mr. Geissinger had seen a somewhat mysterious memorandum, entitled simply "Suggested Changes in Bureau of Land Management Right-of-Way Regulations" and carrying no identifying title of authorship.

DOCUMENT IDENTIFIED

Mr. Geissinger identified this as "the anonymous document." He said it was sent to him for analysis.

"It was handed to me," he testified. "I don't know where it came from."

This document made a series of 13 power recommendations, including the deletion of the "wheeling" arrangement. Mr. Geissinger said he studied it, and then wrote his own longer recommendation to his superior, taking up each recommendation in turn. He adopted 10 of the 13 recommendations in toto.

Committee counsel asked if he did not know that the anonymous document came from the public utilities. The witness said he could not be sure. In his own study of April 9, 1954, however, he wrote "specific suggestions have been made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. attorneys, and I am advised these suggestions have the approval of attorneys representing other of the Western States utilities."

Mr. Geissinger, a lawyer, testified he had no experience with power problems prior to coming to the Interior Department.

Committee counsel repeatedly asked whether the witness or anyone else connected with the matter, had consulted the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, public groups buying Government power, or cooperatives, before making his recommendations.

"Not to my knowledge," the witness replied.

"You consulted with no power agency, even of the Department itself?" counsel asked.

The witness said he felt that his superior, Mr. Davis, would deal with such matters. Mr. Davis has been called to testify shortly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] stated that this administration was not going to allow any "Federal power monopoly" to take over in this country. I think the arithmetic of this administration is quite interesting. At the present time in the United States, 6 percent of all the electricity used is generated by municipal systems; 13 percent by the Federal Government; and 81 percent by private power companies. Yet this administration, and its distinguished spokesmen, like the Senator from Ohio, constantly refer to a "Federal power monopoly." I am not very good at arithmetic, and I have never been very good at it, but I know that 81 percent comes nearer to being a monopoly than 13 percent.

I am not as familiar with the Dixon-Yates contract as are some other Senators. However, I am familiar with what has happened in my own part of the United States. One of the reasons why I am here, as the first member of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate from my State in 40 years, is the fact that this national administration, under President Eisenhower, has completely wrecked the great public power regional resource program which was nonpartisan and bipartisan until this administration took office.

The distinguished occupant of the chair today [Mr. BARKLEY] well remembers one of his former colleagues, the late Senator Charles L. McNary, whose seat in the Senate I ultimately came to occupy. Senator McNary was a leading sponsor of our public-power program in Oregon and Washington on the Columbia River where lurks 42 percent of all the undeveloped kilowatts in our country. Senator McNary was the Republican minority leader, as Senators well know. He worked closely with Franklin D. Roosevelt to bring about the great public-power projects which electrified our farms and brought new payrolls to the Northwest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yet today, under this administration, that program has been ruined. The great Hells Canyon power site, the finest site for hydroelectric development remaining on the North American continent, is to be turned over to the Idaho Power Co. if the President of the United States and this administration have their way.

The Senator from Ohio talks about local interests. The Idaho Power Co. is incorporated in Augusta, Maine. This is the first time I ever knew that Augusta, Maine, was in the State of Idaho.

Furthermore, the Idaho Power Co. would develop only a fraction of the energy of the Snake River within Hells Canyon. It would not be full development, and it would be high-cost development, because the Idaho Power Co. charges the highest rates of any company in the Northwest.

Inasmuch as the President of the United States has wisely and fairly said that he is going to take a second look at the Dixon-Yates contract, I should like to add this thought:

It seems to me that it would be a very appropriate and propitious time for the President also to take a good long second look at his administration's policies, which have wrecked the public-power program, which was epitomized by Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, and by great progress in the Pacific Northwest, up until the time this administration took office.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was delighted to hear the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] state that this administration had no idea of selling out TVA. I hope that this administration and the Hoover Commission do not get their wires crossed.

I am delighted that, at long last—and the time is long overdue—the President is taking a second look—or is it a 10th look—at the Dixon-Yates contract, and that another study of it has been ordered by this administration.

I should like to ask one question. After all the promises this administration made in the Northwest, in the States of Oregon and Washington, in my State of Montana, and in Idaho, about what it was going to do to develop our resources, has this administration, anywhere in the country, undertaken to start, or has it started any new project in 2½ years?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The question of the distinguished Senator answers itself. This administration has started no new projects. The only multiple-purpose projects it is recommending are those in which the power facilities, the revenue producing facilities, would be turned over, horse, foot, and dragoon, to private power interests.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We talk about campaign promises. The administration made them, and the people are going to remember them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. They certainly will. The distinguished Senator from Montana will recall that when the then President, Harry Truman—now ex-President—stood at the Hungry Horse Dam, a great project which the Senator from Montana helped to sponsor during the Truman administration, he said, "Folks, take a good look at it, because if the Republicans win the election in 1952, you will not see any more like it."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Truer words were never spoken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished members of the Senate conference committee on defense appropriations for their successful efforts which resulted in the preservation of funds for the Marine Corps.

It means that the Marine Corps will be able to keep itself in trim shape and be ready, as it has in the past, to defend our Nation in time of emergency.

I feel that this is a major victory for national defense, and, while my feelings on this matter are well known, I wish again to thank the distinguished members of the conference committee, and especially the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I believe this action will prove in the future to be very beneficial to our national defense.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. VORYS, and Mr. JUDD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida; and

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 6829.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a complete substitute for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the so-called military construction bill for the budget year 1956.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize construction by the military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency in a total amount of $2,357,313,300. This authorization is distributed $527,027,000 for the Army; $571,620,300 for the Navy; $1,205,170,000 for the Air Force; and $53,500,000 for the Central Intelligence Agency. I invite attention of Senators to the fact that the committee report contains a breakdown by States and by military department of the authorizations contained in this bill. The bill as introduced at the request of the Department of Defense totalled $2,354,352,300. However, subsequent to the bill's introduction, the Department requested amendments increasing the authorization by some $41 million. These amendments were for the purposes of providing additional facilities to accommodate the increased production of B–52's recently approved by the Congress, and to provide facilities for a new technique in air defense. Thus, despite the fact that the committee has made changes in the bill, our reductions unfortunately have been largely obscured by the addition of the authorizations requested after the bill was introduced.

In round figures, the pending bill as now presented is $28 million under the total budget estimate submitted, and $11 million, in round figures, under the bill as it passed the House.

The reductions and additions made by the committee are set forth in the committee report in summary form at the end of the title to which they pertain. At the conclusion of my statement, I shall be glad to discuss any item in which any Senator is particularly interested.

In the Army title, $160 million, or 30 percent of the program, is for continuing the antiaircraft facilities commonly known as nike sites. Sixty-four million dollars is for troop housing and troop support facilities. Eighty-eight million dollars is for family housing, $38 million is for land acquisition. Twenty-six million dollars is to continue construction in Alaska and Okinawa, two of our most important strategic areas today. The remaining authorization, approximately 30 percent of the total, is intended to provide facilities for research and development, training, community facilities, medical facilities, and other miscellaneous requirements.

The Navy title, which totals $571 million, constitutes another step in the program to keep the Navy's shore establishment adequate to service its ships, aircraft, and weapons. Approximately $345 million of the Navy authorization is for operational facilities. Troop housing, which means barracks and bachelor officers quarters, constitutes about $71 million. Family housing makes up $56 million of the total. The remainder of the Navy program is for land acquisitions, research and development, training facilities, the acquisition of avigation easements around naval air stations, a pollution abatement program, and for welfare and recreational facilities.

The Air Force authorization is greater than that of the Army and the Navy combined. As Senators know, we are striving for a 137-wing Air Force in 1957. This Air Force construction program is intended to provide the additional facilities to support that force level. The Air Force construction is spread among 255 bases—151 are in the United States and 104 overseas. There are two new bases in the Air Force program. One at the Buckingham Weapons Center in Florida and the other a new Air Defense base in the Milwaukee, Wis., area. As has been true in recent years, the Strategic Air Command gets a lion's share of the Air Force authorization. Viewing the program from categories of construction, airfield pavements is by far the largest item.

Title IV of the bill authorizes the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it is widely recognized, in Congress at least, that the Central Intelligence Agency is scattered among several temporary buildings in Washington, and that it could operate more effectively and economically in buildings designed to suit its requirements.

There is local opposition to some of the items in this bill, principally those pertaining to land acquisition. The committee has afforded everyone who advised us of his desire to do so, an opportunity to testify. Committee action on the more controversial items is summarized in the committee report on page 11. Some of our decisions were difficult ones and we claim no infallibility. We have, however, exercised our best judgment, bearing in mind the requirements of national defense and the views of the persons most directly affected by our actions.

Of special significance, I think, is the housing authorization contained in this bill. Scattered throughout titles I, II, and III are authorizations for the construction of almost 17,000 units of military family housing. In the realization that this request constitutes only a small part of the requirements for family housing, these authorizations have been left virtually intact. In approving this authorization, we have not been unmindful of the military housing authorization contained in the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee which later passed the Senate. That bill would provide $1,350,000,000 in authority to guarantee mortgages on housing for military personnel. This authority could be used over the next 3 years and, if fully utilized, could provide 100,000 units. It is reported that this title has been eliminated from the bill in the House and we are unable to estimate what will emerge from conference.

There is no questioning the fact that the need for additional family housing is one of the most serious problems of the Department of Defense. The Department has considered various methods, including deferred payment through annual appropriations, lease purchase contracts, working-capital funds utilizing unexpended balances of prior appropriations, creation of a military housing corporation with authority to issue bonds, and direct appropriations. The Department assured the committee that the simplest method, and the cheapest one in the long run, involved the providing of public quarters through the traditional use of funds directly appropriated for that purpose. I invite the attention of Senators to the charts appearing on pages 26 and 27 of the committee hearings. These charts illustrate that after 20 years these houses have paid for themselves, including interest and the cost of maintenance and operation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to add one thought in connection with the housing matter.

Mr. President, the full committee report points out the problem with reference to a housing program for the military authorities, put into one pattern. We do not know what provision, if any, for military family housing will be included in the so-called housing bill as it finally passes the Congress. There is need for more housing than is carried in the bill which is now under consideration. But the Armed Services Committee thinks there should be a complete restudy of the entire program, and it has directed a subcommittee to continue such a study until next January. We hope that by next year a definite centralized program and authority can be established, without duplication, without conflict, and without competition. Many Government agencies have provided family housing for military families. The committee thinks, as does the Secretary of the Department of Defense, that after all is said and done, the best thing in the long run for the Government is to appropriate the funds, build the houses, and then charge rent to the servicemen to be paid from their family allowances, so that in the course of events the Government gets its money back and still has the family housing.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend from Mississippi will yield for a brief statement in connection with the committee report, on page 13 there is a comment regarding the Air Force authorization request, referring to an item for air research and development, specifically, the decision of the Air Force to move this divison from its present location back to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio.

The construction authorization, as I understand, has been removed from Baltimore Air Field, but left in the bill is a provision for a location to be determined.

I was glad to see the comment, not because I am narrow and provincial, but because I feel that the location near Baltimore is undesirable. This facility was formerly at Wright-Patterson Airfield. We made no objection at the time it was moved, because we felt that, as Members of Congress, certainly we could trust the leadership of the Air Force in selecting the site which for their purposes would be in order. They selected the present site, and now they find it is not suitable and are asking that the facility be returned to the place where it should be, at Wright-Patterson Airfield. The fact that I come from Ohio is not important, but it is important that this facility be located at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base at Dayton, Ohio. If it were in Mississippi I would feel exactly the same way. If it were in Missouri I would feel exactly as I do now. But I think it is a mistake to move the facility. If it were in the State of Texas I would feel good about it, too.

If the Senator from Mississippi will bear with me for a moment, I should like to state the reasons why we feel the facility should be returned to its former location.

Ohio is the cradle of aviation. It would be a tribute to Dayton to have the facility located in that area. As I stated before, we did not object when the Air Research and Development Headquarters were moved away several years ago, because we had confidence in the good judgment of the Air Force officials, and we were sure they were doing what seemed best to them.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, is requesting Congress to appropriate money to do the thing which he feels is best for the Air Force. I am sure there is nothing personal about it. I am sure that as a result of his great experience he is suggesting what he feels is essential to the efficiency of the Air Force.

I feel certain that the committee will take a second look. We have been talking about taking second looks. So I trust the committee will take a second look regarding this matter and will consider the value and the need for this facility to be where the Air Force wants it.

Mr. STENNIS. I assure the Senator from Ohio that I think the point he makes is well taken. I am glad he entered into the debate on the question. The committee's action is no refutation of the recommendation which was made by the Secretary of the Air Force. The committee proposes to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and to leave the question to a decision by the Air Force.

But, in view of the Cook report and the recommendations made to the committee as to the bill, we think the matter should be reexamined, or examined somewhat further. We indicate a willingness to provide a site, the present one being inadequate, but we do not feel like chopping it off at this moment, in spite of the conflict of testimony. So this is our proposal. Since we could not be sufficiently positive, we left the question open.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his cooperation in the matter. I am certain his committee was animated and activated by the best motives in the interest of the Air Force.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Ohio; I sincerely appreciate his comment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to make an observation. About 2½ years ago, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, I made a tour of all the principal producing centers of airframes and air engines throughout the country. At that time the manufacturers of airframes and engines were unanimous in their belief that the facility should be located at Wright Field or near Wright Field. They said it would be a cause of continuing confusion to have it separated from Wright Field.

I was sorry to see that the Cook report raised the question adversely. I believe that the experience of the industry and the present judgment of the Air Force should be taken into consideration. I hope the matter will be looked at from all sides before a decision is made.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the contribution to the discussion which has been made by the Senator from Vermont. He is unusually well qualified to speak on the subject, both from a technical standpoint and also as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. His contribution in this field has been valuable.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to congratulate my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi, and all other members of the committee, for the consideration which they gave the bill to the building of what I understand will be 17,000 family-housing units for the personnel of the Armed Services. I am especially interested because I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which had very substantial testimony, extending over several days, from those who are interested in the problem. I am particularly interested in the statement which was made by Gen. Curtis LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command, with reference to the serious shortage which exists in satisfactory housing for military personnel as it pertains to his command, and the fact that something must be done, definitely, to retain in the service well-qualified, trained personnel of a type which can carry out its mission in any event.

Would the Senator from Mississippi be good enough to advise me as to whether in the course of the testimony before his committee—because I have not had an opportunity to go through the entire report—the shortage which was estimated to exist at present, as it pertains to the armed services, is somewhere in the vicinity of 300,000 family housing units. Certainly it is necessary to bring up the number of housing units to a point where we can retain our personnel, and adequate housing will be a very real advantage to them.

Mr. STENNIS. About 180,000 family type units are needed in the United States. In addition, there is a deficit of 11,000 in the Territories and possessions, and 56,000 in foreign countries. Thus, the total worldwide deficit is now estimated to be 247,000 units.

Mr. PAYNE. That is somewhere near the figure I mentioned. We were told by Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete, when he appeared, that approximately 300,000 units were needed.

It is true that under the direct appropriation it may be possible to continue on the same basis as we are proceeding this year, which is a step forward. It would take approximately 20 years to be able to bring housing up to the point where the shortage can be entirely relieved. That, of course, is the very reason why a provision was included in the housing bill for the construction of military housing by the Department of Defense by the issuance of bonds.

I sincerely hope that there may be both types of housing, in order that the job may be finished as quickly as possible.

Mr. STENNIS. The housing program as a part of the military program is just beginning to get under way, because there were other items which necessarily had to be given preference during the past 3 or 4 years. Almost all the runways had to be extended, and hangars had to be enlarged and, in some cases, replaced by new ones. Everything had to be done with reference to the operational end of the airbases.

Now we are getting around to the housekeeping, and family housing is one of the major items.

I hope the Senator from Maine will agree that since the program is beginning to develop and will have to be sustained over the years, a definite, unified policy should be adopted, and should then move forward on that front.

To that extent, the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from Maine is a member, has provided this year that housing which will be built as a result of authorization by that committee must be under the jurisdiction of Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a step in the right direction.

Mr. PAYNE. The reason for my making these remarks is that I am familiar with the situation. I happened to enjoy the privilege of being with the first group which was activated in the 20th Air Force under Gen. Curtis E. LeMay. Only last week I had occasion to be with two enlisted Air Force personnel—sergeants, as a matter of fact—who are being transferred from one base to another.

During the course of my conversation with them, because they happened to serve with me, I asked them whether they were going to make the Air Force their career. They had been in the service for some time.

The fact that they are being transferred to an area where there is not proper housing available is leading those men, who have been trained to perform important duties and who are giving their great experience to the Air Force, to come to the definite conclusion that probably they will not reenlist again, because their wives will not join them at the location to which they are to be sent, since adequate housing is not available.

I think such a situation must be remedied.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Maine has made a fine summary of the situation which the committee also found to exist.

We found that the bill, which carries more than $2.3 billion, had exceptionally fine backing from the service, especially from Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete and his staff. They had combed the bill thoroughly. The necessities and requirements were reduced to a minimum. The committee promptly approved every item in the bill, after a particular examination of it, line by line, and after receiving the advice of a civilian construction engineer who had been on our staff for many months, and who went into the entire matter, checked the unit costs for the various items, gave a final recommendation, and virtually approved the bill.

We wish especially to thank Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete and his excellent staff, as well as those in the service who worked on the bill.

The other members of the subcommittee are the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who made excellent contributions to the long and sometimes rather laborious hearings which were held in the consideration of the bill.

I feel especially indebted to all the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their earnest attention and outstanding work on the bill. I hope each of them will have something to say about it. I wish especially to thank them, as well as our excellent staff member who has been particularly charged with responsibility in this matter, Mr. William Darden, who rendered outstanding service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator from Mississippi inform the Senate whether or not H. R. 6829 has already passed the House? It is my impression that it has passed the House, but I should like to have that point clarified. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The bill under consideration today has already passed the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi anticipate that there will be any difficulty getting an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the measure, once a conference report has been agreed on?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Appropriations Committee will have before it an appropriation for a major part of these authorizations, and, in addition, for authorizations from the previous year.

I cannot speak for the committee, of course, but as a member of the committee, and as one who is familiar with what will come before it, I think the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On page 23 of the report there appears an item of $1,350,000 for housing at the Glasgow site in Montana. That means that $1,350,000 of the $4,706,000 would be allocated specifically to housing at the Glasgow site, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have any idea how many housing units would be built for that amount of money?

Mr. STENNIS. In round numbers, 100. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I am not certain that item in its entirety will be asked for in the appropriation bill, but I think most of the item will be asked for. The appropriation bill will follow the authorization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is an amendment which has been agreed to by the subcommittee, but which came in late and therefore was not before the full committee. The subcommittee has unanimously agreed to its adoption. It has to do with housing with reference to the Nike sites, and would permit the Secretary to rent or lease housing at the Nike sites rather than build them. We think the matter ought to be further developed in testimony, but we feel the amendment is worthy and that it should be taken to conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator speaking of an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. It is an amendment to the bill, which is really a committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

> SEC. —. During the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations: *Provided*, That not more than 1,000 housing units may be so leased and the rental cost to the Government for any housing unit may not exceed $150 per month.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be happy to yield, or I can yield the floor, if the Senator wishes the floor in his own right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Particularly with respect to the pending amendment, I should like to have the RECORD show that I believe the amendment should be taken to conference, but before the conference is held there should be a hearing so that testimony can be taken on it. The amendment as drawn provides that the housing, if leased, may be assigned as military quarters. That implies forfeiture of military allowances to which military personnel are entitled when housing is not provided. At the same time, the amendment provides that the housing may cost as much as $150 a month, which would be in excess of the average quarters allowances.

There may be some special urgency for such housing in connection with the Nike program, and provision for housing where the Nike installations have been authorized, but before we make the exception and provide for what amounts to a raising of military quarters allowances, it seems to me some testimony should be taken, before the matter is finally acted on in conference. In order that the amendment may be taken to conference, however, I have no objection to its adoption at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily concur in the recommendations and sentiments of the Senator from South Dakota.

One of the general provisions of the bill is section 507, which amends section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress, by increasing from $25 million to $100 million the authority to provide housing through use of the proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The revised section amends the provision with respect to the reimbursement of Commodity Credit Corporation and provides that the limitation of $100 million shall apply to the amount of the expenditure of foreign currencies rather than to the value of the houses. This will enable the Department of Defense, in appropriate cases, to utilize troop labor without a reduction in the total of the authority to use proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities.

We feel that carrying out the program should be encouraged by the reflection that although $100 million is a relatively very small amount, the authorization certainly indicates that a start is being made. I think the Secretary should be commended for his attitude and action.

> Section 510 of the bill will cancel $602 million in authorizations no longer required that have already been identified, as well as an additional authorization totaling at least $300 million more. The section will cancel, as of July 1, 1956, all authorizations enacted prior to October 1, 1951.

Those authorizations were made during the early stages of the Korean war. Many of them were carried out. In others we found that changes were necessary. The provision does not cancel any authorizations where work is under construction or is felt to be needed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two with respect to expansion of facilities at Fort Sill, Okla., for the cannon-firing range which is contemplated in the program for the Military Establishment.

First, I should like to preface my question by stating that, as I understand, Fort Sill is to have its jurisdiction or territory expanded considerably under the particular authorization now under consideration. The purpose of that expansion is to make possible a firing range for modern weapons, so as to be able to accommodate the weapons.

Will the Senator tell me how many acres are contemplated in the expansion, and where the expansion is to come from?

Mr. STENNIS. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] answer those questions. He was the one who took the testimony on this matter. I ask that he be permitted to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the total acquisition will be approximately 30,000 acres or, to be exact, 31,020 acres of land. Of this total, 10,700 acres are a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. The remainder—20,320 acres—private land. Roughly, that is the total amount of acreage involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the 10,700 acres be taken from private lands?

Mr. JACKSON. That acreage is a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge, which is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it a part of the national park system?

Mr. JACKSON. No; it is part of the Fish and Wildlife system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is used for the propagation of wildlife, is it?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me at this point, let me say that the part to be taken by this requirement has been on lease to the military for a number of years; it is not the part of the refuge which is used for wildlife propagation. In fact, the wildlife area is quite a number of miles removed from the portion being requested in connection with this measure.

Mr. JACKSON. It is my further understanding, I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, that the area where the public participates is farther north. The area we are proposing to take is not, for the most part, enjoyed by the public as a whole.

We had the problem of trying to make it possible for the Army to utilize its latest and newest field-artillery weapons—including the "Honest John," which has a very long range, and the 280-millimeter gun. I may say that the "Honest John" is still unreliable, according to the testimony presented before the committee; in other words, it is impossible to be sure just where the shells from that gun will land.

The committee heard testimony from representatives of the wildlife societies and from the private-property owners.

We asked the representatives of those groups what they would do in this situation, in light of the military requirements. Roughly, the answer was, of course, that those who had private land would like to have the Army leave them alone, and go farther into the wildlife refuge. And of course the representatives of the wilderness societies, and so forth, would like to have more private land taken.

What we did was, first of all, try to meet the public interest by insisting that the private owners adjacent to the area be required to give up their land.

I think the arrangement which has been worked out is the only practical one unless Fort Sill is to be abandoned. That is what this situation really boils down to, because at Fort Sill the conventional type artillery is still in use, as well as the new types of artillery. The same troops cannot be properly trained in all these weapons, if a part of their training is given to them half way across the country, and a part is given to them at Fort Sill.

At first I felt about this matter just as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota does, I am sure—in that I looked with great apprehension upon the acquisition of the lands involved. We have this problem in my State and all the other western States. Frankly, when we look at all the cold, hard facts, there is no alternative but to do what the Army has requested in this case.

I say frankly that this matter has been reviewed and rereviewed by all those in the executive branch. Finally, we asked all those who were involved to come in and sit around the table and listen to the statements by the Army representatives. Those who attended that meeting had to admit there was no alternative.

They did suggest the working out of an arrangement whereby the firing might be over the town of Fort Sill and over one of the main U. S. highways.

In terms of simple dimensions and mathematics, the question is just this: Where are we going to end?

I feel that every effort should be made to prevent this sort of thing; but when we are confronted with an actual situation, for which there appears to be no alternate approach, I do not see what else we could do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the acquisition of the 10,700 acres of the wildlife refuge in any way make unusable the other areas of the refuge which are set aside for purposes of wildlife propagation, and also for park and public use?

Mr. JACKSON. To my knowledge, it will not. It will preserve the integrity of the refuge.

Mr. MONRONEY. It will preserve the integrity of the refuge. The part to be taken is the most inaccessible part and the part which is used neither by the public nor for game propagation.

But it so happens that this particular plot lies in the only direction in which Fort Sill can expand. We are faced with a hard choice. Abandonment of investment of $200 million or $300 million in the finest artillery center the world has ever known, where artillerymen from all friendly nations are today being trained, or expansion of the firing range to accommodate newly-developed artillery weapons. Anyone who visits Fort Sill today will see classes from our friendly allies being trained there. But the weapons of today have outgrown the firing range we now have. The entire area of the reservation is only about 74,000 acres in total size. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that the Army has reduced its proposal for land acquisition to the bare minimum for purpose of a firing range; the Army is not asking for more ground for maneuvers or for building or housing sites but is asking only for land for a target range, so modern artillery weapons—which, of course, have been greatly increased in range—can be accommodated. Either we must close the center, which is dedicated to artillery training, and in closing it waste hundreds of millions of dollars and cause years of delay in setting up a new artillery center; or else we must have second-rate artillery, unless the additional land is acquired.

I am sure we do not want our field artillerymen and officers who are trained there to use anything less than the most modern weapons, developed and used to their full capacity. Unless we obtain this additional land, it will be absolutely impossible to maintain the artillery center at the proficiency at which it must be maintained, in view of the developments of today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator said the integrity of the game refuge will be protected. I assume he means that the jurisdictional boundaries will be protected. I wish to ascertain—and I should like to have a frank answer—whether, after the 10,700 acres are added to the artillery-target area, the remainder of the refuge will be made unusable?

Mr. JACKSON. No; not at all. Not all the remaining areas can be used by the public, and wildlife will still abound there, although perhaps not to the extent that it would if artillery firing were not going on. But the remainder will be tremendous in size. As a matter of fact, the highway will remain as it is, and people can enter the area as they did before.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there any other area adjacent to Fort Sill which could meet the requirements of a modern artillery range? I certainly wish to say that we want the best we can have in this area of our defense. But is there any other area in the immediate vicinity, adjacent and contiguous to the existing property of Fort Sill, which could be used?

Mr. JACKSON. There are other areas which could be used, if the committee wished to take the risk of jeopardizing human life. We would have to extend the range in such a way as to have the guns fire across the main highway; and if that were done, a stray shot could kill people on the highway or in the town of Fort Sill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Instructions have been issued for the minimum firing of these heavy guns. If the full range were now to be used, the guns would be firing not only over one United States highway, but firing over two United States highways and over the town of Fort Sill. Unless a more satisfactory situation can be obtained—and this land is the only land in the direction in which the range can be expanded—then either the use of the best artillery must be sacrifiCed, or second-rate artillery instruction must be given.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me point out to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. President, that the question now before the Senate is whether the taking of the land shall be authorized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. In just a moment. First, let me say that the same proposition will come before the same subcommittee, for there must be agreement with the Armed Services Committee regarding the final taking and use of the land.

If at that time there are any reasonable restrictions which can be imposed as a safeguard of the wildlife land, the subcommittee will certainly seriously consider them, and everyone interested will have an opportunity to be heard. I am sure that such restrictions will be imposed as are considered consistent with the necessary purposes for which the land is to be used.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to supplement what the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee has said with respect to the careful consideration which will be given when the actual proposal for acquisition of this land comes before the subcommittee. There will be an effort to reach an agreement with the Committee on Armed Services with respect to land acquisition.

I hope the Defense Department will be on due notice that, at the time it makes its presentation it will be expected to show, if it is to justify this acquisition, that it is impracticable to consider the use of some alternate range in some other part of the country for the firing of the long-range pieces which are here involved.

As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has well stated, there are only two practical alternatives to using Fort Sill for artillery-firing purposes, namely, either to obtain some additional range or to abandon the post.

I recognize that the tremendous investment the Government has at Fort Sill raises some very grave questions. At the same time, I am not insensible to the fact that we would be destroying a wildlife area which cannot be re-created, as one of the witnesses said, in a thousand years, if it is once destroyed. It may not be destroyed by the proposed operation. At the same time, its value as a wildlife refuge would be greatly impaired. Let there be no mistake about that.

Consequently, I feel that when the Defense Department comes before the subcommittee to make its presentation for the actual acquisition, and to discuss the terms of acquisition, it must be prepared to defend against an alternate proposal that the firing of the very long-range guns be transferred to a field exercise to be conducted in some other part of the country, where a long range—as much as 5 miles, or 25,000 yards—could be provided without the involvement threatened in this case.

I think the committee could take no other action than it took on the evidence before it as to the military necessity. At the same time, this is not final action. The proposal will have to come before the committee again, and the alternative which I have mentioned can be considered at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to thank very much the Senator from South Dakota. I have a great regard for his judgment in these matters, as I have for that of the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators.

The thing about which I am concerned, and with respect to which I wish to express my concern, is that while we may be taking, or considering an authorization for taking, some 10,700 acres from the wildlife refuge area, it is somewhat questionable whether or not this will be adequate in the days to come. I gather that this is an almost irreducible minimum for the cannon and heavy artillery we now have. If that be the case, of course, we shall have to go out farther and farther.

It seems peculiar to be arguing the merits of a wildlife refuge, on the one hand, as against a great military installation, on the other; but I think the point is well made that there are not too many of the areas known as wildlife refuges left in the country. There is plenty of wasteland which would furnish a suitable place for the shooting of big cannon. In those areas such missiles are the only things which will arise from the earth or travel over the earth.

So, I hope if the authorization is completed in this bill that the responsible committees which will have to consider the question further will look into the long-range needs of the United States Army, particularly with respect to artillery, and see whether or not Fort Sill, as proposed to be expanded under the contemplated authorization, will be adequate.

I hesitate to try to pose in the role of a prophet, but, knowing a little about this subject from some of the information which has come to my attention, I am of the opinion that what we are doing is authorizing only enough now to get us over the hump momentarily. I predict that before long, in order to maintain Fort Sill as a going Military Establishment, it will be necessary to ask for additional land. I hope that will not be the case, but we appreciate the views of those in the Wildlife Service and in the great conservation organizations to the effect that that is what will happen.

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. Has there been in the hearings any evidence from the military which would indicate to members of the committee that the expansion of Fort Sill, under the contemplated increase of some 30,000 acres, will be adequate for the foreseeable future? Or is this, as I have indicated to be my opinion, only enough to get us by temporarily?

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that this is the minimum. I will ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I asked that question in connection with the hearings. The answer was that, based upon the present requirements, this proposed acquisition would meet the need. That includes provision for the "Honest John" and the 280 millimeter gun. I assume that it should meet the needs for some time. However, if we are to engage in the test-firing of long-range rockets, obviously that will have to be conducted in another part of the United States. These weapons, the "Honest John" and the 280 millimeter, are essential to the immediate support of the ground forces, and are extensions of what might be called conventional artillery. I am sure that if we undertake the test-firing of rockets, which involves a very substantial range, the test firing must occur in some other part of the country, because the Defense Department could not possibly find enough land in Oklahoma to meet the requirements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington.

I conclude by saying that I think there are times when we must make so-called valued judgment choices. In this instance the taking of a section of a wildlife refuge might be justified because of the great investment already made in Fort Sill. But I invite attention to the fact that in the past the Army has not shown any reluctance to move in and take over highways, villages, towns, and communities when it saw the necessity for purposes of defense.

I hope that the limited area remaining in this country which can be devoted to wildlife refuges will be carefully protected. At times there seems to be the feeling that somehow or other this activity is not particularly important. However, with growing population, and with more and more people seeking opportunity for the enjoyment of outdoor activity, it seems to me that we ought to be doing our best to try to protect wildlife refuge areas.

I shall not offer any amendment. I know that the Senator from Washington has dedicated his entire life to conservation programs and the preservation of areas of recreation and wildlife refuge. I am deeply concerned about this question. I would be less than candid if I did not say that practically every conservation group in America has written to Members of Congress, including the Senator from Washington and myself. They are deeply concerned over what this authorization provides.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I share the Senator's concern, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will probably recall our earlier colloquy about the Fort Sill project. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject matter be printed at the point in the RECORD where the discussion about the acquisition of additional land for Fort Sill was had.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I am constrained to call attention to one item in this bill, S. 1765, which would authorize the acquisition of certain lands to be added to the Fort Sill Military Reservation near Lawton, Okla., including about 10,000 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge. This attempt on the part of the Army to gain control of a large segment of this important and urgently needed national wildlife refuge is one of the principal reasons for the introduction of my refuge bill, S. 2101. I earnestly believe that the Congress should give much more attention to this or any other attempt to break down the wildlife refuge system that has been built up with painstaking care over a period of many years.

The Wichita Mountains area, which is one of the oldest refuges, was established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. For many years it was administered by the United States Forest Service, but in 1935, it was transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. It is a unique and magnificent wildlife area, and it is used heavily as a public recreation area. Three generations of Oklahomans and Texans are dependent upon the splendid facilities that are available for wholesome relaxation. Last year over 850,000 people used the recreational facilities, the better part of which are concentrated in the area that the Army proposes to take.

There is no real justification for this acquisition. Fort Sill has, for many years, had a close working relationship with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service whereby the Army has used portions of the refuge for gun emplacement positions for the firing of the heaviest artillery that they have. The shells have been landing on the present reservation. They also have used the refuge for firing some of the heavier rockets and there seems to be no reason why the present needs cannot be met by a continuation of this cooperative agreement. The taking over of this refuge land will not extend the length of the range unless they have additional acquisitions in mind which have not been made known. I would be the last one that would delay action on any measure that was needed for national defense. But, so far as I can determine, the needs at Fort Sill can be met just as well by a cooperative arrangement similar to that under which the Army has operated for many years. If that can be accomplished, the public still can have use of those outstanding recreational facilities, and that essential wildlife refuge can be preserved.

The Army presently seems to be conducting all of the operations at the Fort Sill Artillery School for which it claims that the additional land is needed. I have not had an opportunity to investigate all of the facts; however, it is believed that the so-called "atomic cannon," for which the Army says that it needs additional land to practice with at Fort Sill, already is considered obsolete and is no longer in production. These are some of the questions that should be explored more fully by the Members of the

Senate before authorizing any such expansion of the installation in Oklahoma. Then again, I am wondering if that type of long-range firing should be practiced in such a populated area. Other such military operations have been performed in the more remote sections of Arizona and Nevada.

This appropriation calls for the purchase of more than 20,000 acres of good agricultural and ranch lands from protesting private owners. Representatives of the landowner associations and national conservation organizations registered vigorous protests before the House Armed Services Committee. There is widespread public opposition to any reduction in the meager amount of land that has been reserved by the Federal Government for wildlife purposes. The opposition that has been registered by such organizations as the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, and the Outdoor Writers Association of America, is ample testimony of the public sentiment toward the repeated attempts to whittle away at the wildlife refuges, the national parks and national monuments, and the like.

The Army has been trying to get control of the Cabeza Prieta Game Range and the Kofa Refuge in Arizona, and of additional wildlife lands in Alaska, and I think that these efforts should be scrutinized more carefully. It is hoped that my colleagues will give prompt consideration to my refuge bill, S. 2101. We simply cannot, in the face of the constantly increasing need for outdoor recreational facilities for a growing human population, sacrifice any of the pitiful amount of refuge lands that are needed to preserve the valuable wildlife resources.

The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. John L. Farley, stated before a House subcommittee last July that the Federal Government should acquire and develop 4 million acres of the remaining refuge goal, and that the States collectively should acquire and develop a minimum of 5 million acres, if the wildlife resources are to be maintained at somewhere near their existing level. In other words, it is clear that we should not permit the Army to take over and close to public use 10,000 acres of the best recreational land in the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge. Aside from the good, clear-water lakes that provide public fishing, and several much-used picnic areas, the Army would close the door to Mount Lincoln, one of the spectacular mountains of the region. As it is, both the people of Oklahoma and Texas, and of Fort Sill, have free access to the scenic drives, the lakes and streams, the camping and picnic sites, and to the extraordinary wildlife and geological attractions of the rugged terrain that rises far above the Oklahoma prairies.

The Wichita Mountains are the blissful retreat of a vast horde of persons that annually seek a respite from the sweltering sun of the great semiarid Southwest.

The Wichita Refuge is the one remaining place in the United States where the present day Americans can get some concept of the waving grasses of the pioneer prairies. It is about the only place that the botanists, ecologists, and other scientists can study the original flora and fauna in somewhere near its original state. Nearly 1,000 buffalo (American bison) roam the vast expanses, along with deer and elk. America's biggest herd of longhorn cattle, more than 350 prized specimens, can be seen at close range. Many of the steers have horns as long as 7 feet. The present-day Davy Crocketts can see some of the few remaining towns of prairie dogs, which formerly were common throughout the West. Pronghorn antelope and most of the other forms of original inhabitants of the plains add to the enjoyment of those that are privileged to visit the area.

The Wichita refuge has been the source of many animals that have been provided to public zoos. The surplus big-game animals are disposed of annually to keep the herds within the carrying capacity of the range. It is no wonder that the Army or anyone else would want to gain control of this fabulous wonderland that presents such a singular example of the kind of rangeland that can be maintained under a sound management program.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Interior has given his consent to the transfer of the 10,000 acres of refuge lands to the Department of Defense. Evidently he is reluctant to take a stand against any kind of an appeal based on theoretical national-defense needs. Perhaps he is not aware that those at Fort Sill have been after the refuge lands for a long time. This is merely a renewed attempt by the Army, as is evident by the letter that C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the Natural Resources Council of America, sent to all council members on April 12, 1955. His enclosure, which I also would like to have entered in the Record, is from Bud Jackson, the field representative of the National Wildlife Federation. Mr. Jackson indicated quite well why there is local public support for this move, when he said, "This time, business interests in Lawton are being softsoaped with the story that expansion will build a better Lawton, double Fort Sill's personnel, increase business and raise Lawton's dollar income. It would be quite interesting to know exactly how many tourists' dollars the city would lose with the loss of the refuge. The good burghers of the Oklahoma town may not have considered that angle."

Now then, in connection with H. R. 5306, which was introduced by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, and which is a companion bill to my S. 2101, here is a letter that Chairman Herbert C. Bonner, of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, received from Mr. John L. Farley, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Chairman Bonner had informed Director Farley that the House would not be able to take action on H. R. 5306 during this session, and requested that no action be taken by the Fish and Wildlife Service on the disposition of refuge lands without consulting his committee and without holding public hearings. From this you can see that Director Farley, under date of June 24, 1955, indicated that no such action was contemplated, and that the committee's request would be honored. It is difficult to reconcile this letter with the supposed consent that was given by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two communications which I received, one from the Natural Resources Council of America, and an exchange of correspondence involving the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Natural Resources
Council of America,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1955.

To All Council Members:

The renewed attempt by the Army to take over the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, and described quite poignantly in the enclosed copy of a letter by Bud Jackson in the last issue of Outdoors Unlimited, merits prompt attention.

Your secretary endeavored to ascertain whether or not an appropriation is being requested by the Department of Defense for the acquiring of additional land at Fort Sill, but to no avail. While the subject obviously is under consideration, the appropriation bill has not been formulated and is not available.

It is clear, however, that the defense appropriations will have to be considered by the House committee before long, and when this money bill starts through the hopper, there will be little time for amendments or changes.

Sincerely,
C. R. Gutermuth,
Secretary.

Wichita Wildlife Refuge Again in Danger

Springfield, Mo.

Mr. J. Hammond Brown,
President, Outdoor Writers Association of America, Baltimore, Md.

Dear Mr. Brown: From a high Government official, I learn the disquieting news that the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge in southwest Oklahoma is again in great jeopardy, this time from a bold, open move by the Army Artillery School at Fort Sill, near Lawton, Okla., to absorb the refuge into the military reservation.

The military's recently announced budget reveals $40 million for expansion of existing facilities. It was revealed simultaneously in Washington and in Lawton that $2.7 million of it is needed to purchase lands around the Wichita refuge so that the refuge may be taken into the military reservation as a "paper transfer." Thus finally unmasked is the same group which so blandly spread its hands and insisted, "No savvy," when confronted last year with what it had thought were its "secret" plans for invading the Wichitas. The mnemonic abilities of the Army are startlingly poor.

New strategy apparently calls for adopting the open approach. We who've dealt with the Army in the past aren't unaware of the chamber-of-commerce techniques occasionally invoked by the military (and brought to their highest state of polish by the Corps of Engineers). This time, business interests in Lawton are being softsoaped with the story that expansion will "build a better Lawton" (familiar?), double Fort Sill's personnel, increase business and raise Lawton's dollar income. It would be interesting to know exactly how many tourist dollars the city would lose with loss of the refuge. The good burghers of the Oklahoma town may not have considered that angle.

Actually, however, whether the refuge is economically more important than a double-in-size artillery school isn't the question. There are questions which suggest themselves, as follows:

1. Is there actual need for expanding Fort Sill's facilities to the degree that an area as large as the refuge need be taken over?

2. If so, cannot this expansion move in other directions than into the refuge?

3. Is it possible that this great yen for expansion into the refuge has its origins in the hunting and fishing instincts of the high brass, a not inconsiderable possibility from past experience?

4. Is national defense better served by turning a wildlife refuge over to the Army for playground purposes or by reserving it for the whole people?

For one, I am sick to the death of this sort of thing. It seems to me that we who are seeking to teach conservation fight most of our battles against instruments of the people who spend the people's money in planning coups against the people. The military spends too much of our money fighting us and too darned little fighting the enemy. Let's let our Congressmen in on the battle of the Wichitas.

Bud Jackson.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Merchant
Marine and Fisheries,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1955.

Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Lee: In view of the heavy schedule of hearings by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it is probable that there will be no opportunity to consider your bill, H. R. 5306, to protect and preserve the national wildlife refuges. Inasmuch as I share your concern for the future of the wildlife refuge program, I wrote the Director of Fish and Wildlife Service suggesting that notice be given to the committee before disposing of any refuge. The attached letter is his reply to my proposal.

In my opinion, the information contained in Mr. Farley's letter indicates that there is no urgency in connection with your bill and accordingly it is my intention to defer consideration until the next session.

Sincerely yours,
Herbert C. Bonner,
Chairman.

United States
Department of the Interior,
Fish and Wildlife Service,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955.

Hon. Herbert C. Bonner,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Bonner: I am more than pleased to assure you that this Service has no plan to dispose of any wildlife refuge at this time. Should any proposals for the disposal of any refuge be presented to the Service, I shall be glad to so inform you. No action would be taken on such proposals without a thorough review of the proposal, including appropriate public hearings, all of which would require more than the 30 days which you have suggested in your letter.

It would appear that you had received some information indicating that the Service has some definite plan of disposing of wildlife refuges, and I assure that no such plan or program exists.

Sincerely yours,
John L. Farley,
Director.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I share the feeling of alarm which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota over the diminution of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

I think it would be useful and appropriate if, at this point in the Record, there should appear, for the information of Members of Congress, the executive department, and the country, some of the letters which I have received from the National Wildlife Federation and various other conservation groups regarding the reduction in size of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Wildlife Federation,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C., June 23, 1955.

Hon. Richard L. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: I appreciate your taking the time to study the proposed expansion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation in Oklahoma into the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. This is one of the items in S. 1765, the military public works bill presently under consideration by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

May I request, Senator Neuberger, that in considering this particular item you keep these facts in mind:

(1) Wichita Mountains is one of the most historic and valuable of the national wildlife refuges. It was established by Executive order of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. It provides recreation for more than one million visitors annually.

(2) The Army presently is conducting all operations at the Fort Sill Artillery School for which it says it needs this additional land. We are reliably informed that the so-called atomic cannon, which the Army says it needs to practice with at Fort Sill, already is considered obsolete and is no longer under production. While we do not pretend to pose as military experts, we question the adequacy of even the proposed expanded Fort Sill Reservation to keep pace with modern military developments. These questions, of course, will be explored most thoroughly by the Senator.

(3) The conservation organizations of the United States are inclined to look upon this proposal as an unnecessary invasion of the limited areas that have been reserved by the Federal Government for wildlife conservation purposes.

Again thanking you for your time and courtesy, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
National Wildlife Federation,
Charles H. Callison,
Conservation Director.

National Parks Association,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

The Honorable Carl Vinson,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Vinson: H. R. 5700 includes an item authorizing extension of facilities at Fort Sill, Okla., amounting to $3,053,000, of which $2,500,000 is for land acquisition, according to testimony presented to your committee by representatives of the Army. The National Parks Association urges as strongly as possible that this land acquisition request be denied by your committee.

Army witnesses stated this money was to be used to acquire 20,300 acres of privately owned land adjacent to the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, and 10,000 acres within the refuge itself. Although they asserted this would not affect recreational or wildlife values significantly, they had been advised this land is of critical importance for these purposes. Within the refuge, the area includes its most beautiful mountains and three lakes essential to wildlife. The private lands to the south have considerable importance with respect to recreation and wildlife.

This refuge receives greater recreational use than any other in the refuge system, and is the most valuable recreational property in that part of Oklahoma and Texas, a region otherwise almost devoid of such facilities. It supports great number of bison, deer, and other mammals, and the only representative herd of long-horn cattle extant, all of which use the areas proposed to be acquired as an essential part of their range.

We understand it is intended to use this land as an atomic artillery range. A more catastrophic misuse of this refuge and its environs could hardly be conceived, and the activity would inevitably spread destruction beyond the lands directly involved. Safety and security precautions would almost certainly prevent any significant recreational use of the area in any event.

In 1953, Army authorities made a direct attempt to gain jurisdiction over the whole refuge, and it is not unreasonable to presume their ambition has not changed. The military now controls hundreds of square miles of desert where such activities can be conducted with minimum damage; if there is some slight inconvenience involved, that is a small price to pay for preservation of one of the best recreational and wildlife reserves in the United States.

In the reply to our protest to the Secretary of the Army of April 6, 1953, we were advised studies following the deletion of the similar land acquisition item from the 1954 budget demonstrated this acquisition was not necessary.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army have long had sound working agreements that permit use of some refuge lands for nondestructive military purposes, and these have been functioning without disadvantage to either department.

The last paragraph of the Secretary of the Army's letter reads:

"The Army has decided to endeavor to carry out its mission at Fort Sill without acquiring additional land, either privately owned or in the refuge, for an indefinite period in an effort to determine if the problem of range requirements can be resolved short of acquisition. Accordingly, there are no plans for expansion into the wildlife refuge in the immediate future."

We accepted this reassurance in good faith, and asumed the Secretary was honest in his statement. His letter has not been canceled, and the conditions promoting it do not appear to have been changed. There appears to be no justification whatever for the revival of this proposal, and we urge it be denied, and that your committee advise the Army authorities such acquisition will not be allowed unless and until a national emergency arises that is so serious as to make it essential to the national security.

It is requested this letter be made a part of the official record.

Yours sincerely,
Fred M. Packard,
Executive Secretary.

Whereas the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., has been informed that an attempt is being made to include in an appropriation bill the amount of $2,300,000 to be used for the purchase of land adjoining the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and to transfer a portion of the wildlife refuge to the military; and

Whereas the said wildlife refuge is one of the few remaining untouched areas of our country abounding in buffalo, deer, elk, antelope, wild turkey, and other forms of wildlife including the only remaining herd of longhorn cattle; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is important as an education and scientific area and its wildlife and recreational values cannot be replaced; and

Whereas we believe that the invasion of this refuge by the military places in jeopardy all of the area of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and all such national parks and monuments; and

Whereas we believe that the preservation of the natural beauty of our country and the protection of its disappearing wildlife is important to the American way of life; and

Whereas, acreage in less populated and unused areas is available and offers less danger to the lives of many people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., assembled in its annual State meeting at Craterville Park, expresses its disapproval of the efforts being made to acquire the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to be used for military purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the permanent records of the Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Inc., and that copies be sent to the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to other interested persons.

J. E. MARTIN,
President.

Attest:

HELEN BANGS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE TULSA, OKLA., AUDUBON SOCIETY

Whereas the Tulsa Audubon Society has been informed by the press that an attempt is being made to include in an appropriation bill the amount of $2,300,000 to be used for the purchase of land adjoining the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and to transfer a portion of the wildlife refuge to the military; and

Whereas the said wildlife refuge is one of the few remaining untouched areas of our country abounding in buffalo, deer, elk, antelope, wild turkey, and other forms of wildlife, including the only remaining herd of longhorn cattle; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is important as an educational and scientific area and its wildlife and recreational values cannot be replaced; and

Whereas, we believe that the invasion of this refuge by the military places in jeopardy all of the area of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge and all such national parks and monuments; and

Whereas we believe that the preservation of the natural beauty of our country and the protection of its disappearing wildlife is important to the American way of life; and

Whereas acreage in less populated and unused areas is available and offers less danger to the lives of many people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tulsa Audubon Society, assembled in a general meeting in Tulsa expresses its disapproval of the efforts being made to acquire the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to be used for military purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the permanent records of the Tulsa Audubon Society, and that copies be sent to the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States and to other influential persons.

Approved April 29, 1955.

ALFRED STEITZ, JR.,
Vice President.
MRS. RALPH KELTING,
Secretary.

PRESERVATION OF THE WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Whereas America's wildlife refuges are relatively small, strategically located areas of particular importance to the conservation of native plants and animals; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge is an outstanding and historical refuge, possessing scientific, educational, and recreational values; and

Whereas the United States Army desires to acquire this area by transfer and the surrounding lands by purchase for an artillery range, thereby obliterating the refuge and destroying its unique collection of fauna and native grassland; and

Whereas such an act would jeopardize other refuges which might be desired by other or the same agencies; and

Whereas the Oklahoma Federation of Garden Clubs is strongly opposed to an unnecessary abandonment of a refuge as adequate alternate sites are available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Council of State Garden Clubs, assembled in Chicago, Ill., on the 25th day of May 1955, urges that Congress withhold sanction and funds for the purchase of the lands around the refuge for military use; further

Resolved, That the Department of the Army withdraw plans for the acquisition of the refuge lands; further

Resolved, That the National Council expresses its opposition to the reduction or abandonment of wildlife refuges so long as the resources which they preserve are dependent upon such protection for their continued existence; further

Resolved, That this resolution appear in a forthcoming issue of the National Gardener.

Presented by Paul Shepard, conservation chairman.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to point out to the Senator from Mississippi, to the Senator from Washington, and to the Senator from South Dakota, who have worked so hard on the pending bill, that the reason why I share the misgivings of the Senator from Minnesota is that all over the country there is a great deal of pressure to reduce the size of the national parks and the national forests and the wildlife refuges. In my own State there is a great deal of pressure to cut down the size of the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge in northern California and southeastern Oregon. There is also a great deal of pressure to reduce the size of the Hart Mountain Refuge.

In the State of Washington, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows, certain lumber companies would like to reduce the size of the Olympic National Park. I feel none of the situations can be separated one from the other.

Furthermore, as the Senator from South Dakota has so frankly admitted, taking 10,700 acres from the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge will not help the refuge, of course. Anyone as candid as the Senator from Mississippi will admit that once the 10,700 acres have been taken for other purposes, the value of the wildlife refuge will be impaired. Of course the next reduction will be much easier to make. Certainly there can be no doubt about that.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] knows, the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is one of the most historic wildlife refuges in the United States. I believe it was established as long ago as 1905 by President Theodore Roosevelt, who was one of the most illustrious conservationists.

I know the distinguished members of the subcommittee will scrutinize very carefully the whole situation before an appropriation is made and before the Army is authorized to go ahead with the project and take land from the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

The Senator from Oklahoma knows that thousands of people in his own State have had the privilege of enjoying wholesome recreation in this area, and that once it is seriously breached and destroyed, its usefulness as a recreation facility will be gone. I thank the members of the committee for their careful consideration of this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator's sentiments and remarks. I assure him that the members of the subcommittee will do all they can, when the matter comes before the subcommittee again to preserve the wildlife refuge, with all its functions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to express my apprehension with regard to the naval magazine installation at Port Chicago, Calif., which is provided for on page 96 of the bill, in lines 22 and 23, as follows:

> Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,929,000.

The committee, in its report, at page 12, states:

> While the land acquisition at Port Chicago has been approved, the committee is seriously disturbed that entire towns, including Port Chicago, will be left within the danger zone. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should restudy the safety problem at Port Chicago and submit to the Congress a program that will comply with the Department's own regulations on safety distances at this location.

I have been informed that the House committee, in considering the request of the Navy Department for money with which to purchase additional properties, was greatly concerned with the problem involved at Port Chicago, particularly with respect to the town itself, and for that reason declined to approve the request of the Navy Department.

My colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is not in the Chamber at the moment, and I do not desire to speak for him, but I do wish most urgently to remind my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, that the city of Port Chiago, which is in the San Francisco Bay area, was almost completely destroyed during World War II by a tragic explosion of ammunition, which had been stored there.

I believe the Navy Department, in its desire to purchase additional land, has been influenced in part by considerations of safety. My point is that the decision of the Navy Department should be so provably correct that no one would be able to quarrel with it. By reason of the concern felt by the people of that community, I am not in a position to accept the recommendation of the Navy Department.

In view of the fact that the House committee declined to approve the item, I wonder whether I may ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if, during the conference on the bill, the position which the Members of the House committee took will be thoroughly explored.

Mr. STENNIS. I can certainly assure the Senator from California that that situation will be thoroughly explored, and that the reasoning of the Members of the House committee will be carefully considered. It is one of the most serious problems that came before the committee in its consideration of the bill. We tried to effect a consolidation of the two ammunition bases in that area, but that proved to be impracticable. We therefore authorized the acquisition of the land at Port Chicago. However, we still had great concern, even after doing it. We were greatly concerned by the entire problem. The problem will remain with us even if the land is acquired. There is no absolute solution to it. The matter will be brought back to the committee, and we will consider any suggestion which may be made to us.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is personally familiar with the location and with its history. I shall be glad to yield to him for a statement, if he desires to make one.

Mr. JACKSON. The only comment I wish to make is that I believe the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made an excellent statement on the situation. As the chairman has indicated, the committee was in a terrible dilemma on this matter. $30 million has been invested at Port Chicago. The replacement cost is $70 million. We were confronted with a land acquisition program which was entirely inadequate to provide even the security established by the Defense Department.

I certainly share the concern of the members of the subcommittee and the concern expressed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I shall keep an open mind—as I know the other members of the committee will also—in trying to find a solution to the problem. I believe it requires further explanation. It is certainly a very bad situation at the moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Washington, particularly because there is a continuing hazard at Port Chicago, Calif. I appreciate the fact that we are considering an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill, and the Senator's statement relative to the required justification, which the committee will require the Defense Department to produce before any moneys will be made available, is satisfactory. On the other hand, if there is any reasonable ground upon which the present decision of the Department of Defense is based, I would urge the conference committee to go slowly. If I understand the statement of the Senator from Washington, the whole matter will be completely re-explored in the conference committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to assure the Senator that we shall look into it very carefully. I might add that, as the Senator probably knows from the record, we spent considerable time listening to outside witnesses and we went into the whole question thoroughly. I hope that a better solution may be reached than that which has been proposed by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am most grateful to the Senator from Washington.

I should like to make this brief statement in connection with the problem.

The authorization for land acquisition, if followed by an appropriation, would effectively remove approximately 5 percent of the taxable real property of the county involved. If I correctly understand, the Defense Department would not utilize this land by way of any improvement until M-day. If that be true, it constitutes another reason for proceeding slowly, and I think that is something which the conference might well consider.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice that in the bill as reported by the committee the Fort Jackson, S. C., medical facility has been stricken from the bill. The House had included the sum of $8 million for that item in the bill as it came to the Senate. I wish to assure the Senator from Mississippi that there is a dire need for that facility at the present time, and I should like to know the attitude of Senators so far as concerns giving the item due consideration when it comes before the conference.

Mr. STENNIS. It is an open question. We did not hear, consider, and then reject the item of the hospital for Ft. Jackson. We have an open mind on the question, and have in mind very distinctly and definitely the idea of giving it every consideration in the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wanted to bring it to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee at this time. I imagine the House will want the item to be retained. I wished to ascertain, if I could, the attitude of the Senate conferees.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I certainly shall give it most sympathetic consideration in the conference. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, we did not have an opportunity in the committee to consider the matter on a formal basis. The question, of course, will be taken up in its entirety in the conference, and I wish to assure the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina that I shall give it most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice that the bill has been changed with reference to the Charleston, S. C., Air Force base in several particulars. When we speak of air defense we realize that we must keep prepared in the air to meet all opposition which might come in case of another war. I, for one, feel that this item is very important and that it should be retained. I should like to get the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee on that particular item.

Mr. STENNIS. We appreciate the interest and the comment of the Senator from South Carolina, and I assure him that the item to which he now refers is in the same category as the one previously explained.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I feel the same way about it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I should like to invite his attention and the attention of the other members of the committee to the importance of the hospital at Fort Jackson. During World War II no other camp trained more soldiers than did Fort Jackson. It is an installation containing more than 200,000 acres of land, with hundreds and hundreds of buildings, and it is one of the finest training grounds to be found anywhere. The nature of the soil is such that shortly after a rain the soldiers can resume training. There is an absence of mud and other deterrent factors.

We must preserve this splendid training camp for the Defense Department. For a long time there has been a vital need for a permanent hospital there. The hospital existing at the present time is a frame building which is not in good repair and is not adequate to meet the situation. I am sure the Defense Department feels that there is a great need for a modern hospital. The people of Fort Jackson and Columbia also realize the need for it.

We are anxious to have the item retained, but for reasons which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other members of the subcommittee have told me, my distinguished colleague and I have decided not to offer an amendment at this time. We appreciate the attitude of the members of the committee with reference to taking the matter to conference. It is a worthwhile authorization, and we shall appreciate every consideration that can be given to the matter in conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina has spoken to me about the matter several times, and there is considerable merit in his statement. There seems to be some question as to whether Camp Jackson as a whole is in the category of what is called a permanent installation, or whether it is in the category of a wartime training camp. Naturally, whether it is in one or the other of those categories, has some bearing on the question.

As I have said, there is some question as to whether the camp is of a permanent character or is more of a wartime training installation. I think some evidence on that point might be presented to the members of the committee with profit before the conference takes place.

Another point is that the $8 million suggested is a larger allocation for a hospital than was presented, so far as I can remember, for any other hospital in the entire bill. Most hospital units have carried a smaller amount.

I think there should be some showing as to why an $8 million hospital should be proposed, when for most installations, even when they are of a permanent nature, a lesser figure has been provided.

I say that in all candor and because I think evidence on those points would be proper for the conference committee to consider.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the two Senators from South Carolina have certainly impressed the subcommittee with their interest and with the need for this hospital. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina has conferred with me many times on the floor about it, and Senator THURMOND has written to me about it and has explained and repeatedly urged the merits of the matter in conferences. I wish to assure them that the matter will have full consideration, but we cannot make any commitment as to what we can agree to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to say, in answer to the junior Senator from South Dakota, that my information is that there has never been a formal order contravening the order of General Marshall, placing Fort Jackson on a permanent basis. Several years ago, for some reason, Fort Jackson was omitted from the permanent list, but there has not been a formal order striking it from the permanent list of stations. I am quite certain the records of the Department of Defense will bear out my information on that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I may supplement the statement by the Senator from South Carolina by observing that I think it would be helpful if we had some information as to the nature of the other buildings on the post—that is, other new construction of a permanent, temporary, or mobilization type. I am not expecting an answer to my suggestion now; but in the very finest spirit of friendship and candor I mention this, because I think when specific information of that sort is available, it helps a committee in conference.

I may say that I have admired greatly the interest of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] in all matters pertaining to national defense. He has come before the Committee on Armed Services on many occasions, particularly at times when the committee was considering the subject of the Reserve components of the Defense Establishment. His experience in this field is always helpful, I can assure him. Therefore, his presentation in connection with this matter will receive very serious consideration.

Mr. THURMOND. The kinds words of the Senator from South Dakota are highly appreciated. Although there are no brick buildings that I know of on the base, there are some very fine buildings, nevertheless. Since there has been no formal order striking Fort Jackson from the permanent list of stations—as a matter of fact, it should still be on the list—consideration of the item by the committee will be appreciated.

The Charleston Air Force base is one of the finest to be found anywhere. The people of Charleston and Columbia have been most cooperative with the service personnel. It is my sincere hope that the appropriation for the Charleston Air Force base will be restored by the committee of conference.

We are living today in a very dangerous age, an age in which a plane, in 22 minutes' time, can bomb New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington. It is an age in which aircraft can fly from Moscow to Los Angeles in 10½ hours, from Moscow to Chicago in 7½ hours, and from Moscow to Washington in 8½ hours.

I feel that the defense appropriations for the air bases are most essential. It is my earnest hope that the appropriation for the Charleston Air Force base will be retained.

Again, I express my deep appreciation to the able junior Senator from Mississippi and his distinguished colleagues for their encouragement and their sincere consideration of these appropriations.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. What I am about to say is intended more to help the committee in the future than to be of any assistance in connection with what the Senate is considering this morning. I assume the Senator from Mississippi, in considering the appropriations, has given much attention to the consolidation of stations and posts throughout the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. The committee certainly gave consideration to that subject. I do not know if we have made much progress, but we have urged the consideration of the matter, and I think something was accomplished along that line before the bill came to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I realize that it is a most difficut problem. In my own State, we feel that our installations probably are the most important from a national defense standpoint. However, since there has been a consolidation of the land, sea, and air forces in one department, it seems to me that a great number of posts and stations throughout the United States could be eliminated. That would apply probably particularly to the service side of the Armed Forces. Every post or station requires a commander, a certain amount of staff, and protection. Personnel are being used for servicing the posts who probably should be a part of the combat forces.

The time has come when the cost of defense in this country must be reduced. I think much could be done to accomplish that end.

I know that in Pennsylvania we will strongly object to the removal of any post or station. I do not remember now the number of establishments that are located in Pennsylvania. However, I merely say this to encourage the Senator's excellent committee to study the matter further. It will be up to all of us to assist in every possible way to eliminate obsolete military, naval, and Air Force installations.

Much more ground is needed now for the training of troops than was formerly the case, even at the close of World War I. Instead of 15,000 or 20,000 acres, 250,000 acres are now needed in order properly to train the ground forces. In like manner, air bases having much longer runways are now necessary.

I think the time has come when all of us must assist the Committee on Armed Services in every way possible in order to bring out the facts and to assist in effecting greater economy.

Mr. STENNIS. The members of the committee appreciate the sentiments and the excellent contribution to the discussion which has been made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add a few words in reference to what the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has said. Emphasis or attention is generally devoted to the items which are contained in a bill. Of course, the bill under consideration deals partially with new authorizations; but one of the important jobs of the subcommittee is to pass upon real estate disposal proposals for the selling or liquidation of excess land areas. That is done in sessions of the committee which are held on call of the committee; no special publicity is given to those sessions.

However, I think that in view of the remarks by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, it would be helpful if the clerk of the committee were to compile, for the RECORD, a summary of the disposal projects which have been considered by the subcommittee during the past year. I myself have been impressed by the increasing number of projects which have come before the committee. A tract of land may consist of a fraction of an acre, or in some instances several acres. But I dare say, as a guess, that the committee at this session of Congress has approved not less than 20 or 30 disposal projects, comprising land which has been declared excess to the needs of some branch of the Defense Establishment. It would be enlightening for all Members of the Senate to know what has been and is taking place in this respect.

Mr. STENNIS. We appreciate the recommendation made by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First let me compliment the Senator from Mississippi, and his subcommittee, and the whole committee, for what I consider a very excellent job done in presenting this most important bill.

I wished to ask a few questions relating to family housing. The Senator is, of course familiar with the provision for housing for military personnel under an insured mortgage plan, which was contained in the overall housing bill recently passed by the Senate. Does this bill in any way replace, displace, or supplant such housing, or is it supplemental to it?

Mr. STENNIS. The committee does not have the idea that the bill displaces the program of housing contained in the bill presented by the Banking and Currency Committee. We think the pending bill represents the primary military-housing program, and that the program to which the Senator from Alabam referred is a supplemental program; but in my opinion there is no conflict between the two, under present conditions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I noticed there was a discussion with reference to Wherry housing. Might I assume that the committee had in mind such housing, even though the bill does not specifically refer to Wherry housing?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Reference was made to so-called Wherry housing or a similar plan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I take it from the statements in the report that the great deficiency which exists in military housing is recognized, and that over a period of a number of years it will be necessary to use all possible means in order to attain our goal. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, the effort will continue for some time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been complaints which I wish particularly to call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi. With reference to housing bills authorizing direct appropriations for different branches of the armed services, oftentimes housing will be built at a particular installation without taking adequately into consideration the housing needs of the community as a whole, or the ability of the community as a whole to supply housing. For example, we have heard of a number of instances of private industry having gone into an area and built houses which were being rented at reasonable figures, and then the military establishment building houses on its own. As a result there was created a surplus of housing in the particular area. Is there any provision in this bill to make certain that an analysis of the situation prevailing in a certain area will be made before housing is built?

Mr. STENNIS. The justification sheets presented to the subcommittee represented that consideration had been given to each line item. Consideration had been given to civilian housing, to so-called Wherry housing, and other so-called insured housing. In addition to that, it was shown that there was a need for the particular line item of housing indicated.

Let me say that the housing bill which is now before the Congress requires that military housing shall be cleared through the Secretary of Defense. We have been assured by Assistant Secretary Floete, who is the representative of the Secretary of Defense in these matters, that there will be coordination and planning. Based on his successful consideration of like matters in other fields, I think that so far as the point the Senator is making is concerned, we may expect improvement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under this bill is each branch of the armed services simply authorized to build so many units, and then must it come back to Congress for an appropriation?

Mr. STENNIS. These are specific authorizations for particular bases. Unless land has to be acquired, the Department does not have to come back to the committee, but it does have to get an appropriation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committee has studied each of these locations with reference to the availability of private housing, and has been satisfied that there is a deficit and that the housing provided for by the bill is needed. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The armed services will not be authorized to build other projects without coming back to the committee and asking for them. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator mean additional authorizations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. We have had an understanding that even though the Banking and Currency Committee bill, if it should become law, will not require express approval by the subcommittee, at the same time the subcommittee will be taking appropriate matters into consideration, and will make reports available, and advise and counsel as to the progress of the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that an amendment to the bill along that line was accepted.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one other phase, that of cost, about which I should like to inquire. I notice that the average cost for buildings in the continental United States is $13,480. That is very close to the figure provided in the other bill, which I think was $13,750, including utilities and site preparation. The site preparation does not include the value of the land, does it?

Mr. STENNIS. It does not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It includes making the land ready for the builder, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may recall that our late beloved colleague, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator Maybank, who was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, used to object to the high cost of housing built by the Armed Forces under direct authorization. Does the Senator feel that situation will be pretty well controlled by the pending bill?

Mr. STENNIS. It is our opinion that that problem has been met, and that a reasonable unit cost basis has been arrived at.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the amendment offered by me, let me say that I was not assuming the other bill would become law. Even if it does not become law, the Secretary of Defense has promised that the programs involving housing will be at least cleared by our subcommittee. I think the Senator from Alabama has raised a good point, and I commend him for his contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have studied with gratification the very important report submitted on Thursday by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizing construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations.

The significant place my own State of Texas occupies in the national-defense picture is evidenced by the long list of construction projects authorized for military installations located there. Texans always have been proud, and with reason, of their contributions in peace and war to our national security.

These construction projects are important and necessary, in keeping our physical defenses up to date, in providing training facilities second to none in the world, and in building the morale of our men in uniform.

Speaking for the Texas communities which will be affected by these projects, I can say with assurance that they will continue to offer the fullest cooperation to our armed services and to welcome the military personnel manning these installations.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and members of the Armed Services Subcommittee deserve high praise for doing, and doing well, a hard and painstaking—and eminently necessary—job. They have made a noteworthy contribution to our national defense, and I wish to express my personal appreciation for their fine work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will remember, I called his attention to a project located in the southern part of my State, but I took no part in the committee's consideration of the project, except to point out to the Senator from Mississippi the Appropriation Committee's policy of insisting upon the selection of the best possible place, at the least cost to the taxpayers, for any military training facility including naval training.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Navy basic training.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, New Iberia, where the new naval airbase is to be built, is within 100 miles of Houma, the site of a naval air facility which was built during World War II. Has the Senator from Mississippi satisfied himself that the land and other facilities at Houma are not suitable for this new air facility, and that it will be more economical to have the Navy build at the site selected near New Iberia?

Mr. STENNIS. I can say to the Senator from Louisiana that after the most careful as well as the fullest consideration, the entire 3-member subcommittee reached the conclusion, on the facts, that the New Iberia location, for the purposes needed and required, was the one we would have to authorize. We did that over considerable personal inclination in favor of the landowners at New Iberia and in favor of utilizing, if possible, the land already owned by the Government. But in the final analysis, the military necessity had to prevail; and the proof on that point was very pronounced. So we reached that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, the Appropriations Committee, of which we are both members, has always taken the position that whenever possible existing Government-owned facilities should be utilitzed before a new facility is erected.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct, and that is the attitude of our subcommittee, also.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been the extent of my interest in this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. My interest in the location of this new facility stems from the fact that the Navy spent from $17 million to $18 million on the now-deactivated facility near Houma. It was my feeling that the existing facility there should be used if possible in order to recapture, to some extent at least, some of the money previously expended by the Navy.

The committee has taken all of these factors into consideration, I understand, and has concluded that by selecting the New Iberia site, not only will the Government obtain a better and more effective site, but the entire cost of erecting the new facilities at New Iberia, including land purchases, will be less than the cost of renovating or reconstructing the facility at Houma. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it will be more advantageous to the taxpayers, despite the fact that the Government already owns land at Houma.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the land at New Iberia is in a potential oil-producing area, and at the present time an oil company is exploring there for oil. Has the committee considered the additional amount of money which will have to be spent to acquire that site, in contrast to other possible sites for this project. The Senator from Mississippi well knows that if oil is discovered there before the Navy purchases the land in question, that factor will inevitably increase considerably the cost of the land to the United States Government. Did the committee take into consideraion that fact, namely, that the area is in a potential oil field, and that a company is now in the process of exploring for oil there?

Mr. STENNIS. That was included in the proof we took, and the subcommittee definitely considered that fact. Of course, we could not have before us any actual figures of a valuation on that basis.

The Senator from Louisiana will understand that the same land project will come back before our subcommittee, not only in connection with this project, but also in connection with others; and at that time we hope to work out an arrangement for the highest possible utilization of those mineral rights, despite the use to which the land will have to be put.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Senator from Mississippi knows that before final action is taken on this matter, the proposal will have to come before the Appropriations Committee, where the amount proposed to be spent must be justified.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; at that time it must be finally justified and finally determined.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say that the committee was greatly impressed by the testimony submitted by Vice Adm. A. K. Doyle, Chief of Naval Air Training. He testified on several occasions before the committee. In particular, I refer to his testimony which begins on page 738 of the hearings, where Senators will find that Admiral Doyle testified that in September 1954 he received a directive to make a special study of the matter of a site. He said he examined, by means of their airway charts, all possible sites in the United States; and then he said:

> It is an amazing thing that there is no spot in the United States that has access to the gulf that has not already been preempted by the Air Force, Navy, or Army except down from New Orleans toward Lake Charles.

Then, following considerable discussion and considerable questioning by the committee regarding the several sites—New Iberia, Houma, and others, Admiral Doyle finally said, as appears on page 746 of the hearings:

> New Iberia was the only one where the taxpayer will get a safe return on his investment in our opinion. The others are not a good second best.

After he had reviewed the soil conditions, the price, the elevations, and all other factors, that statement by him was such a categorical one—and I emphasize that it was the testimony of the Chief of Naval Air Training—that, to me, it was quite persuasive. I repeat it:

> New Iberia was the only one where the taxpayer will get a safe return on his investment in our opinion. The others are not a good second best.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not also a fact that testimony was produced showing that although the facility at Houma was erected several years ago by the Navy, yet, because of the additional weight of the aircraft which will use this new facility, the present runways at Houma are inadequate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and the problem of extending the airways raised many complicating factors.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also understand that the housing facilities at Houma are for the most part unusable, and also that because of soil conditions at Houma, the additional cost of pilings for buildings, and so forth, will be substantial. As a matter of fact, I went into the matter with our naval officials quite carefully. As I have said, my sole interest in it was to see to it that the Navy got the site it needed in order to carry out its training program, and at the same time that it selected the site which would cost the least to erect and maintain.

Speaking frankly, it has always been my policy as a United States Senator to confine my influence in matters such as this to determine whether the Government agency involved is making the most efficient use of the facilities it already has available. I have not favored any proposed site over another, since I feel it is my duty to represent all the people of my State. I merely wish to see that the Navy has the facilities it needs, at the place they are needed and where they can be best utilized at the least possible cost to our taxpayers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we greatly appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Louisiana on that matter. His views certainly were helpful to us; and that certainly was his position all the way through, quite consistently.

We were concerned about this matter—so much so, Mr. President, that after we heard all the other proof, we had Admiral Doyle return before the subcommittee, along with Admiral Perry, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and Admiral Clark; and Admiral Russell, who is Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics; and at that time we had a very thorough hearing, with testimony from them, in order to obtain their opinion and their judgment as to the possible alternatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I desire to speak briefly on the bill, and with a special emphasis on two or three of its features.

Mr. President, this is the third of the military works authorization bills with which it has been my privilege to be associated. On the basis of that experience, I would say that the representations made to us, this time, by the representatives of the Defense Establishment were in the best shape of any that have been submitted to the committee in connection with any of the three bills. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, Mr. Floete, and his assistant in charge of construction, Mr. Fulling, and the members of their staffs, and the other representatives of the services, have done an excellent job. The careful presentation of the proposed appropriations is ample justification, in my opinion, for the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations. Before that position was created, the committees necessarily had been confronted with presentations by interested witnesses—that is to say, representatives of the particular branches of the service which were involved.

Here we had the benefit of an overall look, and the overall look was presented by men who were qualified to look at the proposals and the various projects from the standpoint of the total defense needs. On other occasions I have referred to the fact that General Marshall used to say that his problem as Chief of Staff was to overcome the "localitis" which often crept into presentations from a particular field when allocations of materiel or personnel were requested. The same situation, of course, exists when we are dealing with the three main services. Each one sees the problem or the mission from its point of view. It is necessary and helpful to have someone review the projects from the standpoint of the needs of the Defense Department as a whole and the budgetary questions which are involved.

It was a great privilege to serve on this subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I have been associated with him in many activities—in the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Armed Services, and this particular subcommittee for 3 years. He brings to the position of chairman the benefit of great experience, the tact and diplomacy which are characteristic of his personality, and the ability which is the outgrowth of the fact that he is a great student, a great lawyer, with great ability for analyzing evidence. I pay tribute to his excellent leadership in this chairmanship.

It was also a privilege to work with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Senator from Washington brought to this committee a particular quality growing out of his long association with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and his experience on appropriations in the House of Representatives. Many of the projects which are proposed to this committee deal with facilities for the housing or utilization of nuclear weapons. The background of the Senator from Washington in that field was invaluable to the committee in its consideration of those particular projects.

There has already been considerable discussion on the floor with reference to the housing program. I should like to supplement what has been said by mentioning two things.

First, the committee is continuing its study of the housing program. The committee has issued a specific directive to the Defense Department which will result in the submission of additional figures and data to the committee between now and January. The report calls attention to the fact that the committee will continue its study of housing.

We recognize that housing is an important factor in the strength of the Military Establishment. Reference has already been made by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], to the testimony by General LeMay as to the value of good housing in obtaining reenlistment of trained personnel. That factor has always had a great deal of importance, but never so much as in the present day, when we have such a high requirement for training in the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force. If we lose a man who has spent 6 or 10 years in training, it requires a long time and the expenditure of a great deal of money to replace him adequately. Consequently, the subject of housing has greater importance in the efficiency of the Military Establishment than ever before.

As a collateral of the longer period of training required for technicians and for pilots in the modern Military Establishment, we have the natural fact that some men reach the age where they become married and have families. So family housing has a much greater part to play in maintaining the efficiency of the Military Establishment than ever before. That is why, in this bill, the committee has provided as much as $250 million or more for military housing.

The second aspect of the matter is that raised by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in asking the question as to whether or not the committee had carefully considered the existence of other housing, rental housing in the community, Wherry-type housing, or other housing, in approving the allocations here requested. For the record, I invite attention to the table which appears at page 11 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that that table may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of family housing requirements at installations with existing Wherry projects and for which housing would be authorized by the bill

Name and location of installation	Family housing requirements	Existing Wherry	Existing government	Community support	Net deficit	Authorized in bill	Unsatisfied deficit
ARMY							
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	1,442	796	73	200	373	36	337
Fort Lee, Va	1,297	300	8	493	496	150	346
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	495	400	30	0	65	16	49
Fort Belvoir, Va	1,814	450	608	350	406	114	292
Fort Devens, Mass	2,182	202	111	594	1,275	400	875
Fort Dix, N. J	2,841	800	35	985	1,021	400	621
Fort Knox, Ky	3,815	1,700	422	600	1,093	360	733
Fort Benning, Ga	6,627	1,000	935	1,232	3,460	150	3,310
Fort Bragg, N. C	8,074	2,000	243	2,500	3,331	490	2,841
Fort Campbell, Ky	8,476	1,200	336	3,390	3,550	401	3,149
Fort McClellan, Ala	964	140	49	400	375	150	225
Fort Hood, Tex	7,367	568	1,372	2,963	2,464	400	2,064
Fort Riley, Kans	2,932	400	298	1,543	691	200	491
Fort Sheridan, Ill	414	100	121	40	153	100	53
Sandia Base, N. Mex	1,428	300	322	300	506	90	416
NAVY							
Camp Pendleton (MC), Calif	6,894	1,562	760	1,119	3,453	332	3,121
Twentynine Palms (MCTC), Calif	931	493	0	148	290	2	288
AIR FORCE							
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J	2,238	200	10	895	1,133	270	863
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho	1,192	500	124	55	513	150	363
Shaw Air Force Base, S. C	1,979	500	152	487	840	300	540
Total	63,402	13,611	6,009	18,294	25,488	4,511	20,977

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall not read the table, but I invite attention to the fact that it represents an analysis of the major housing proposals, where Wherry projects exist, in relation to the authorizations carried in the bill.

The first column cites the family housing requirements. The second column shows the existing Wherry units. The third column shows the existing Government units. The fourth column shows the community support in the way of family housing. The fifth column shows the net deficit. The sixth column shows the authorization in the bill. The final column shows the unsatisfied deficit. I think the fact that the final column shows an unsatisfied deficit, even after all the existing housing is listed, plus that proposed by the bill, is a complete answer to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Even with the housing proposed in the bill, even with the community housing, even with the existing Government housing and the existing Wherry housing, there still remains an unsatisfied deficit. I think that provides an answer to anyone who may have any fears on that score.

This bill and the two prior bills in this field clear up some old existing authorizations. In the bill 2 years ago the committee rescinded authorizations totaling approximately half a billion dollars. We made re-application in that bill of approximately $290 million of prior authorizations. That was whittling away at the $80 billion authorizations outstanding, which the Defense Department inherited when the Eisenhower administration took over.

In this bill we cancel the old authorizations in this field prior to 1951, with the exception of those with respect to which a start has been made, or with respect to which appropriations and commitments have been made. We continue the authorizations only to the extent of completing the projects with respect to which starts have been made. That helps to put us on an even keel.

When the subcommittee was overseas, I for one, was astounded at the antiquity of the authorizations under which construction was proceeding. We found that, 7 or 8 years prior to the fall of 1953, authorizations had been made under which construction was then proceeding. Obviously, when that same situation exists both abroad and at home, we have authorizations outstanding which are antiquated, which do not bear a realistic relationship to current missions or stations, and which need review. The committee reviewed many of them and decided that the authorizations which were made prior to 1951 should now be extinguished unless they were in process of liquidation by construction. I think that is a constructive result which this committee accomplishes by the annual review of military authorizations.

The chairman of the subcommittee has already alluded to the progress now being recorded in utilizing surplus commodities for the acquisition of overseas housing. Overseas housing presents one of the most difficult questions which confront the committee from time to time.

We have several programs for providing housing overseas. One means, of course, is rental. Another is the payment of allowances, with a special allowance for the cost of living at any particular station, under which military personnel can rent housing if it is available. But many times it is not available in any satisfactory degree or quality, or proximity to the military station. Consequently, the committee is under a great deal of pressure to provide housing either by direct appropriation of funds or by a guaranty of occupancy for rental projects. That has caused a great deal of concern to the committee.

Some years ago Congress authorized a commitment of $100 million for guaranteeing the rental for 95 percent occupancy of projects built overseas. The projects have to be submitted to the committee as they come up. The committee has been very reluctant to guarantee that kind of occupancy anywhere except where there is a substantial number of United States personnel, and also the committee has been reluctant to approve any project where a rental guarantee would extend beyond 5 years. In a few instances during the past few months the committee has approved some 7-year guarantees, in and around Paris and at some other centers, where it appears that such a long guarantee could be made without, in effect, providing that we would supply the money and someone else would build the projects at a substantial profit to the builder.

A proposal for the use of some surplus agricultural commodities was placed in the public works bill a year ago. We are pleased to have a report from Assistant Secretary Floete that the program is beginning to produce some results. He cited 3 or 4 instances of acquisition of some military housing projects through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for local currencies. We are assured that procedures have been worked out to extend that activity. There is in the bill a provision for the acquisition of military quarters in a more direct fashion where the housing is available by the use of funds derived from the liquidation of loans extended by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the purchase funds which it may have invested in the surplus commodities. This will give assurance of the extension of that approach to the problem of overseas military housing.

There is very little further to be said on the bill so far as the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services are concerned. The bill was presented to the full committee yesterday. In the committee there was full discussion of it by both the majority and minority members. The questions raised in committee were the kind of questions which have been raised today in debate on the floor. The bill was unanimously endorsed by the full committee. There was no dissenting vote. Therefore the bill comes to the Senate with the unanimous support of the Committee on Armed Services. I hope it will be passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before a vote is had on the bill I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. First, I wish to thank especially Mr. George Vinzant, of Vicksburg, Miss. He is a civilian engineer with the Corps of Engineers. He was on loan to the subcommittee for about 60 days, at personal sacrifice to himself. He rendered very able service to the subcommittee in the capacity of a practical construction engineer. His review of all the work was quite helpful to us. He approved the bill as to unit cost and as to need in virtually every item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks which the Senator from Mississippi has made with reference to the beneficial service record by George Vinzant. The Senator from Mississippi has already alluded to our staff. I should like to associate myself with those remarks also. We believe, too, that the services of William Darden, the clerk of the subcommittee, have been invaluable. He has been indefatigable in his efforts to further the work of the committee. He has always been a source of information to us and has always been ready to supply it. He was always on call whenever we wanted to ask for information. He has certainly done a good job, and I should therefore like the record to show my appreciation of his good work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. The provisions in the bill reflect only in part his very fine knowledge of the subject matter. There is no way to calculate or estimate the extent of the valuable services of the Senator from South Dakota not only this year, but also in the previous years when he acted as chairman of the subcommittee. He has carried a heavy load, and he has certainly made a fine contribution.

I should like to point to a proviso in the bill which has not been mentioned. It reads:

> *Provided further,* That at such time as the Central Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation authorized by this title, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to accomplish the demolition and removal of temporary Government building space in the District of Columbia of equivalent occupancy to that relinquished by the Central Intelligence Agency.

If this provision is carried out it will lead to the demolition of at least a part of the temporary buildings on the Mall and on Constitution Avenue, which are now occupied by the Central Intelligence Agency. They will be demolished without displacing anyone, because the present occupants will be moving out of them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6829) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], for the very excellent work they have done on the bill which the Senate has just passed. There are few measures which are more tedious and which require more exacting work than does one of these comprehensive military construction authorization bills. The subcommittee has rendered a real service to the Senate and to the country by the very careful attention they have given to this measure.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 697, Senate Resolution 120.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 120) providing for the manner of the appointment of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 120) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the chairman and members of the Select Committee on Small Business, created by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, 2d session, shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairmen and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 12, 13, 27, 35, 37, and 46 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 49 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probt);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer;

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 1, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to register my opposition to the action of the conferees in agreeing to the cut of $4 million under the budget request for the international exchange activities. The budget request was for $22 million, and the Senate approved that amount. The House originally voted for only $12 million, but in the conference the sum of $18 million was agreed to. The $18 million figure represents an actual cut of $577,000 below the 1955 appropriation.

Such action takes no account of the recommendations which have been made over the past years by Members of the Congress, disinterested officials at the highest level of Government, and leading private citizens, in countless fields of activity throughout the country who through close observation of the program have become convinced of its efficacy in achieving the country's aims in world affairs and strengthening free-world solidarity.

The execution of the program in past years has built a strong basis for greatly increasing the effectiveness of this vital instrument in our foreign relations through a modest increase in the scope and level of operations. The proposed budget represented sound, careful, and realistic planning based on up-to-minute requests from the United States missions overseas. It would have permitted a strengthening of the program in the critical areas of the Far East, the Near East, south Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where educational exchange might well throw the deciding weight in determining the direction which people and governments will take in world affairs.

I call attention also to the fact that as the report puts it, "None of the funds made available in this item shall be used to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a foreign university of another foreign country."

It is my understanding that the budget request of the Department did not include any proposal to use funds for such a purpose. As the record of the hearings clearly indicates, the Department proposed to spend $35,154 for grants to 222 foreign nationals to attend, not a "foreign university of another foreign country," as the conference report limitation reads, but to attend American-sponsored schools or institutes of American studies—for example, the Salzburg Seminar in Austria, or Roberts College in Istanbul—in other foreign countries. I assume that since foreign currency grants of this type are clearly authorized in Public Law 584, the limitation stated in the report will not cripple this activity. I also assume that the fact that, in some cases, foreign governments and universities—the University of Oslo, for example—are so receptive to the program that they offer the use of their physical facilities for these purposes, will not militate against the continuance of this activity, which is very modest in scale and very effective in reaching key groups overseas who cannot come to the United States.

Mr. President, the effort to restrict the program by this provision is but another example, in my view, of the usurpation by the Committee on Appropriations of a legislative function. Public Law 584 specifically authorizes the sending of foreign students to American institutions abroad; and the meaning of "American institutions" has been, by a long course of action, developed to include institutions such as Roberts College in Istanbul and the Salzburg Seminar in Austria. I think this is either an effort directly to override the specific legislative authorization, or is a misconception of what actually has been taking place under the program. I think this is a provision which should not be included in any appropriation bill, report, or act. I am glad to say that the Senate did not include such a provision; it was placed in the report at the insistence of the House.

The limitation of $3,300,000 for administration is not adequate to carry out a program of $18 million with probable private contributions of an additional $8 million to $9 million. The cost of administration in 1955 was $3,899,015 for a program of the same level. To cut back approximately $600,000 will seriously cripple the program and the Department's effort in encouraging private contributions to supplement the grant program paid with appropriated funds. I have seen or heard nothing in the conference report or elsewhere that would justify this apparently arbitrary limitation.

Of course, the administration of the program is a very complex and difficult matter. I suppose it is difficult for members of the committee to realize that individuals, human beings, cannot be handled in the same way as guns, bags of wheat, or sacks of cement. A large proportion of the total amount is for administration; but the key to the success of the program is an intelligent administration, especially the wise and careful selection of the individuals who participate.

The success of the program hinges completely upon the wisdom of the procedure of selection, and that procedure, of course, accounts for the chief cost of the administration of the program. The binational commissions which are created and set up in each of the participating countries cost some money, but they are essential to the success of the program. If they are eliminated, the program will fail.

It is interesting to note, also, that one of the principal criticisms of the opposition in the other body is that the program is not administered efficiently. Can they really believe that a drastic cut will improve the administration of the program? Obviously it will only injure it.

Finally, the report reflects what I consider to be an extremely shortsighted policy which has not been justified in any way by the evidence presented. Such action is even more astonishing today, when we are spending billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries.

Certainly military and economic aid are important and necessary. Their primary aims, however, are specific, and are geared to short-range objectives. They are in no sense a substitute for the solid basis of mutual understanding which is achieved by the educational-exchange program.

This program has proved that it is one of the most effective means at our disposal to influence those foreign nationals who are directly or indirectly responsible for the formulation of national policy and molding public opinion in their respective countries. It seems to me particularly unfortunate that we should even consider retrenchment at this time, when it is evident to anyone that our antagonists are beginning to emphasize the use of cultural activities in their efforts to win the cold war.

I believe the action of the conferees is not in the best interests of the country. We profess in this country an interest in peace. We seek to enlighten the free world so that it may settle its differences by reason and by peaceful procedures. I believe the majority of the people of the United States deeply desire to follow such a course of action.

But, Mr. President, the action of Congress, especially of the other body, negates such a policy. The Members, as is evident everyday on the floor, are eager to appropriate vast sums for guns and for military bases throughout the world. It is notable that on one base in North Africa, according to a report we had last year, more was wasted than the total cost of the program I am discussing since its beginning. But the Members are eager to appropriate money for bases and for guns. Recently, only a day or two ago, with scarcely any question, and certainly no criticism, almost $32 billion was appropriated for such purposes.

The small program now under consideration, for which $22 million was requested, has now been cut $4 million, nearly 20 percent. I think that is somewhere in the neighborhood of one-twentieth of 1 percent of the amount which was appropriated in one bill for guns and armament.

I cannot help feeling very sorrowful, and in a sense I am humiliated, as a citizen of the United States, that every year this one program, sponsored by the Government, which can be said to be cultural, which seeks to reach the hearts and minds of people throughout the world, in order to inspire their respect and cooperation, is so drastically cut. Vast sums are appropriated to demonstrate our power and might, but only a pittance is grudgingly made available to help us understand and maybe even to respect one another.

It is most unfortunate—it is tragic, Mr. President—that this Nation, which I truly believe desires to achieve a civilized, peaceful way of life, should appear to be so materialistic and so devoted to the use of force in its international relations. I say "appear to be" because I do not believe the majority of our people favor such a policy.

I very much regret that I shall have to vote against the report. I realize that the representatives of the Senate on the committee of conference were faced with an extremely difficult situation. I am proud that the Senate itself, and especially the committee, voted for the entire amount of the budget request, in the previous action. I deeply regret that it was found to be necessary to cut the sum 20 percent, and thus, I believe, substantially to cripple the program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think it is a great pity that the request for $22 million was reduced by $4 million. I know that the representatives of the Senate on the committee of conference did their utmost in support of the full amount, and I think they deserve great credit and praise.

We are faced with the situation that this program is going to be less effective than it should be. I have had the opportunity and privilege of observing the effectiveness of the Fulbright scholarship program. I think there have been few activities on the part of this country in recent years which have been more useful in winning the confidence and the approval of the free countries of the world.

In my opinion, the exchange program has been of almost indescribably great benefit in our continuing the struggle to bring about peace and security in the world. Like the Senator from Arkansas, I greatly regret that the program will have to be conducted with an appropriation less than that recommended by the report of the Senate committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I should like to add one further word. Of course, the cut does not affect alone the program sponsored by myself, but also the Smith-Mundt program, sponsored by the senior Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Jersey, is an integral part of the program. Scholarship awards, of course, are authorized by that program. Mr. President, it is incredible that such a relatively small sum should be each year the source of such controversy. I am told by the conferees that for the last 3 or 4 years this item has been one of the most controversial items. I cannot understand it. I have yet to see any reasonable basis for a cut expressed on the floor of either House. I may say that I know of no opposition in the Senate to the program, although in the House several speeches have been made against it. At the time of the passage of the bill in the House, speeches were made which were highly critical of the program. There was one made by a Representative from Missouri, who professed to be for the objective of the program, but was against the procedure. He was against the Government being involved in the program. He thought it would be better if it were sponsored by private sources.

There has been very little opposition to the program, however. I know of none in the Senate. On the contrary, witnesses, such as the Vice President of the United States, came before the committee and stated that, instead of the amount being cut, the amount provided was too modest, and that it should be expanded. I too think it should be expanded. Ambassador Bunker, who was our Ambassador to Italy during a very critical period, and who has the highest respect of all who know him, thought the program should be expanded, not cut. The present Ambassador to Italy has made statements recently in this country in favor of the program. The officials who are in the field have stated it is a program which is of great importance to the relations of this country with other countries. Only yesterday, at a luncheon with the Prime Minister of Burma, he expressed similar sentiments about this type of activity and about the effectiveness of it in his country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In criticizing the very substantial reduction of $4 million from the total appropriation, I think it is proper that we give praise and an expression of appreciation to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] who is chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, and the other members of the committee. I know the yeoman service he rendered in having the bill passed with an appropriation for this item of as much as $22 million, and the fight he made against the unreasonable cut.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I said a while ago I was very proud of the action of the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from West Virginia. In spite of that, I regret the action which apparently was necessary.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their complimentary remarks. I may say to them that the Senate conferees gradually got the amount up to $18 million. The conference then reached the point where there could be no further compromise. In spite of the efforts of the Senate conferees, the opposition was solid on the part of the House conferees. The Senator well knows what action was taken on the bill before the conference acted. The situation was that we were interested in getting the bill acted on. In the item for administrative funds we were successful in getting $900,000 more. That was as far as the House conferees would go.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in supplementation of what was said by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in connection with the cut in the amount of money made available for the international exchange program, because I share with him every degree of his sadness about the fact that we were not able to sustain the full amounts approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee on my motion at the time it was first approved. It was not easy to get the $18 million which we did get for that item. We came very near having to settle for $15 million or $16 million. Within one vote, we almost had to settle for $17 million. So at least we were able to get the $18 million by consistent, persistent, and persuasive effort. I appreciate the kind support on the part of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] in being as successful as we were.

For some time I have been wanting to ascertain why the House committee has been an insistent as it has each year in getting this appropriation reduced. This year, for the first time at least we got an inkling of what the House Members had in mind. While I disagree completely with the findings and conclusions of the House committee and with the amount they agreed to make available, I must admit that they have made a searching analysis of the program and have done a tremendous amount of research and work. Their diligence merits commendation. Whether that information is going to prove to be factual or fictional, I do not know, but they set up four arguments while we were trying to get them to agree to an appropriation of $22 million.

I wish to mention those arguments so that they can be in the record. I want to mention those because, if these programs alleged to be engaged in under the Smith-Mundt Act are defensible, we should make those defenses known, so we can answer the charges more adequately. If they are not being engaged in, we should get the record straightened so next year we will get the full amount.

The first argument is that a large amount of the money—and we were not prepared to challenge the statement, because we had taken no testimony on it—was not used to send Americans to foreign countries and make them available for foreign educational institutions, as was proposed in the basic legislation, and to bring students from all over the world to study in this country, as was anticipated in the basic legislation. The allegation made was that a large amount of money was being made available to students selected in Iran, Iraq, Germany, and England—as well as other countries—and then sending them to other foreign countries to be educated in institutions in Norway, Spain, Rome, and many other foreign places.

So, as one of the concessions we made, one of the provisions we wrote in, in our effort—and a successful effort, I may say—to increase the amount to $18 million, was to the effect that if that be true, no funds made available in this appropriation shall be used for purposes of this type.

If such things are being done—although no illumination upon the matter was given us—we in the committee did not know they were being done; and, frankly, we are doubtful about the wisdom of such procedure. If they are being done, the original purpose of the act is thus being perverted. But, I repeat, I am not sure that such things are being done at all. However, the House conferees insisted the program was being thus perverted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to join in supporting the statements made by the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the committee of conference, and by the Senator from South Dakota; and also I desire to express my complete agreement with the Senator from Arkansas, because I myself am very much devoted to this program. I was not one of its originators; but I have studied it a great deal, and am very much in favor of it.

I am sorry we could not get the entire amount restored.

However, in connection with what the Senator from South Dakota has been saying, I wish to suggest that on the conference committee we were confronted with statistical data we could not refute. I hesitate to quote exact figures; but it seems to me that it was stated that between 1,200 and 1,300 students were being taken from one country abroad and were being sent to institutions in another country abroad, but were not brought to the United States. So they were not involved in an exchange program handled in such a way that they would get an idea of our institutions, or anything of that kind. The witnesses stated the numbers of students from each country, the percentages as to each country, and so forth.

Mr. MUNDT. And specific institutions were named.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We were not in a position to refute that evidence. To me, it was rather shocking, because I thought that, indeed, was a perversion of my conception of the very fine purposes of the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield, to permit me to make an observation on that point.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Iowa has said is entirely correct. In short, out of the blue came pages of statistics and designations of foreign institutions which have no place, part, or being in the original context or purpose or program of the act.

Being confronted with this new information, I endeavored, first, to say, "Why, of course this is what we intended in the Smith-Mundt Act, namely, that some of these students should go to the American University in Beirut and to Roberts College in Turkey, and so forth." They replied, "Yes, but what about the other institutions, which have no basis for United States support?"

Mr. President, if the records which were presented to us are correct, there is no reason for such a perversion of these funds. Neither is there authority for it. If the facts alleged are not correct, those in charge of the administration of the act should answer by stating what use is being made of the funds. Our committee needs these facts.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on that point, let me say that the Senator from South Dakota knows, I am sure, as he has just said, that Public Law 584 specifically authorizes the sending of foreign students to American institutions abroad. That in itself is not a perversion of the purpose of the act.

The difficulty arises, I believe, over what the House Members think is an American institution abroad. The Board of Foreign Scholarships some time ago—3 years ago, I believe—authorized what they call seminars as being within the meaning of that language.

I attended one of them once. They are very modest in scope. Ten American professors—some of the best in the United States—went to Oxford University 1 year; and in a subsequent year they went to Cambridge University. There, during the summer, they conducted a seminar for professors from various English universities. That was considered to be within the spirit and the letter of the provision in regard to American institutions abroad. Those doing the teaching were Americans.

The reason for that situation is that it is so much more efficient, from a monetary point of view, to send such persons to a central place, in such a country as England, to attend a seminar where they will be taught by American professors, than it would be to send them to the United States.

The same is true of the Salzburg seminar. I think 220 of the 1,200 the Senator has mentioned were to be sent there. But the teachers there were Americans, who were brought there for this purpose—and for other purposes, I may say.

It cost, I believe, only about $100, each, to bring the students there. In that case, I think they came primarily from Norway, the other Scandinavian countries, and Germany, to participate in the program. There was nothing secret about it; it was set out in the Budget request—in that case, for a total of $35,000, or a little more, as I read a moment ago.

Mr. MUNDT. At all events, I think the Senator from Arkansas probably has put his finger on the thing to which the House objects, namely, the decision by some board to classify these foreign seminars in foreign universities as parts of an American institution. It may well be that that is the thing about which they were quoting the statistics.

At all events, and be that as it may, as a result of the conference report, regardless of the definition attached by the Board, during the next fiscal year those institutions will not be considered to be American institutions abroad; and the conference report specifically forbids the expenditure of any funds whatsoever for purposes of this type.

I think a much better legislative procedure, anyway, would be, not to have some outside board try to decide or dictate what is an American institution abroad, but to have the United States Congress decide what is an American institution abroad. Certainly no congressional legislation classifies a seminar in a foreign institution, in a foreign city—one which may be conducted in part by American professors—as an American institution in the same category as the American University in Beirut or Roberts College. Congress must decide what is meant by an American university abroad. No outside agency or board has this authority and none should seek to exercise it.

So I think the position taken by the House of Representatives, at least on that particular point, has validity. It certainly now has finality as it is embodied in the mandatory language of the conference report. As one of the authors of the basic legislation, I can say that during the long and tortuous procedure by which the act was first passed by the House of Representatives and then by the Senate, it was not only thought desirable to spend several hundred dollars to permit a foreign student to come into contact with American institutions, but the basic concept was that some students should live on American campuses, should live with American families, and should see the American scene. I think it is a basic and unauthorized change of that concept to ask American taxpayers to pay for visits to foreign institutions by foreign students, even though taught there by American professors. So, on that point I think I would agree with the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think everyone will agree that it is preferable to bring them to the United States, as the Senator from South Dakota suggests. But he will also agree that it is relatively very expensive to do so.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Arkansas should not permit the RECORD to remain in such a way as to imply that the expense is not justified. I think one of the best expenditures of money we make is when we have these foreigners brought to America and have them visit some of our campuses. Although it is somewhat expensive, I think the program is worth every dime we spend on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I do not think it would be maintained that such a college as Roberts College does not come clearly within the intent.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Roberts College and the American University at Beirut are American institutions within the purview of the Smith-Mundt Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And if we go one step further, we may say it is what we call an American institution.

If Senators feel that the geographical location or the ownership of the physical buildings is the determining factor, or whether the determining factor is the faculty and the others who participate—in short, whether that is the element which determines whether the institution is an American one or a foreign one—then perhaps some confusion may ensue.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I can say that I am not in the least in doubt as to what is an American institution, in my opinion. An American institution is one—located wherever it may be—under the direct administration of Americans, and supported and run by Americans, regardless of whether part of the teachers may be from Europe and part of the teachers may be from America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are some borderline cases, however. I think the Academy in Rome is rather a borderline case. It is primarily supported by American money, but there is certainly a very large participation in the institution by Italians, and I think properly so. But I believe that is the difference. I agree with the Senator that if this is an objectionable activity, and it is an important one, the program can certainly get along without the Salzburg seminar, and I would be the last to insist upon its being carried on if it is really an objectionable program.

Mr. MUNDT. That was the reason why I was bringing it out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad the Senator is clarifying the situation.

Mr. MUNDT. The question was raised as to why the appropriation was being reduced. These are undoubtedly the objections of the House, whether they are good or bad.

One reason we did not get $22 million, and had to settle for $18 million, is that there was a very definite attitude on this point on the part of the House. I suspect—though I could not prove—that the amount of money involved is small. I believe that the amount spent for sending foreign students from one foreign city to another foreign city, without coming into contact with America, is very small. However, we had no figures. The House conferees had a great many statistics.

I quite agree that the question should be ironed out in a legislative committee, and that that particular venture, whether it is desirable or not, should not be permitted to cripple the entire program as it has done in the current appropriations bill. After all, the best place for a foreign student to learn to know America is in America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I could not agree with the Senator more fully. I am delighted to have him clarify the situation. I hope he does not think I am criticizing him.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand.

The second point of criticism by the House conferees was something of which none of the Senate conferees had ever heard. I am inclined to doubt whether the House has accurate information, but the House conferees were very emphatic on the subject. They seemed to feel that they had accurate information.

They said that a large part of these funds was being used to construct housing—dormitories and barracks—in America, in which to house the foreign people who come here on a visit. To me that was entirely a bolt out of the blue. We immediately responded and said, "If that is being done we are against it. If those in charge of the program are thinking about doing it, we shall oppose it, and if they are even making blueprints on the subject, they are being fuzzy minded about it. But we do not believe they are."

I am sure the Senator from Arkansas would never agree that it would even remotely occur to us to build dormitories over here to keep foreign students away from Americans, instead of putting them in American homes or American rooming houses, where they can become acquainted with Americans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am as sure as that I am standing here that there is no truth in the allegation that money has been spent for such a purpose either under the Smith-Mundt Act or under Public Law 584. I think that allegation is clearly in error. I have never heard of such a thing; and I am sure we would have heard of it if there had been such a practice.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator. We agreed with the House conferees that if such a thing was being done it should be stopped, and we were thus able to move closer to the $18 million decision instead of a lesser figure.

A third point is one which is still in abeyance. I was appointed by the conferees, along with the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. ROONEY, of New York, to draft language on the four points which were under discussion. We wrote language relative to foreign students and universities, and we wrote language disapproving any new construction. We wrote language disapproving duplicating programs by FOA.

There was a fourth element. I expressed my views to Mr. ROONEY in our two-man conference. When we reached the point where there had to be unanimous agreement he finally relinquished what he thought was the language which should be written into the report. However, this brings up the next point of opposition.

The House conferees say that a large amount of this money is being improperly or unwisely used because, they allege, the same persons are being brought back to the country time after time. They are repeaters. It is said that a group of visitors is brought into the country and taken on a tour of the country. They enjoy being here; and, instead of other people being given this privilege and opportunity next time, instead of the privilege being spread among as many persons as possible, the same ones are brought back time after time. I do not know whether that is true or not. The House conferees wanted to insert language which would positively prohibit bringing anyone back for a second time. I argued that I thought such language would be unwise.

I agree it would be unwise, under this program, to bring back a great number of repeaters, as a matter of practice. However, I can see how it might be desirable to bring back some unusually attractive individual or some unusually persuasive person from abroad. He may have begun a study of some kind here, and may desire to complete it. It would be quite a handicap to efficient administration to erect a legislative barrier and say, "If you have been here once you can never come back under the program."

Finally, Mr. ROONEY said, "All right; we will do nothing about it at this time." However, it is something to think about for next year. There may be good reason and frequently ample justification and valid reasons why people should have this opportunity more than once. But if the opportunity is afforded to any individuals more than once, let it be done openly. There is nothing secret about it. Let us determine the number and percentage of cases in which that situation occurs, what the reasons are, and so forth, so that next year when we seek adequate funds for this program we shall not again be fighting some kind of windmill which may cripple the entire program.

Does the Senator from Arkansas have anything to say on that subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the last point which the Senator has mentioned, I have heard of cases of American professors who have been invited to return. I know of 1 particular case in the Philippines, and 1 in Greece. Both cases involved individuals with very specialized training. There were very few such cases. The particular individuals had made a great impression, and the Board felt that it was in the best interests of the United States that those outstanding professors should be permitted to return. I have never heard of a student having been brought here, sent home, and then brought back again.

In a limited number of cases a student has spent a year in the United States, has done extremely well, and has been given the opportunity to spend a second year here. It seems to me that is a policy which is entirely justified. As a matter of fact, there is some criticism of the program because those in charge of it are tōo aribtrary in limiting the period to 1 year. I have heard people from Great Britain say that it is a shame that some of our outstanding students who go there and do very well for a year must return home. It is felt that some of them should be permitted to remain a second year, and that it is better to allow a second year in certain cases than to increase the number of students.

I agree with the Senator that the number of such cases should be kept to a minimum. However, in cases in which a person has demonstrated unusual ability the authorities in charge of the program should have the right to extend the visit for an extra year, because of peculiar circumstances. I think that is the practice.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly agree that the number should be kept at a minimum, but I do not believe that we should enact a mandatory legislative prohibition against the practice.

Suppose some very able foreign instructor comes here and studies on an American campus, so that he can return to his country and teach American history, American economics, and American Government. He can study on only one campus at a time. This is a pretty big country. Things are different in New York City from what they are in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., or in Little Rock, Ark. If a person did a good job during the first time, the second trip he could go to some other part of the country and round out his program. If he proved to be a good person with whom to work, we might wish to cultivate him by giving him a broader opportunity.

The fourth objection which the House makes is that, according to the House statisticians on the conference committee, more than $20 million additional is being spent by FOA alone, or was being spent last year on student and personnel exchange programs, in an exchange type of program which should be more properly handled through this committee, and more properly be handled as a part of the program under the two laws we have been discussing, namely, the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act. Duplication of effort and of administrative expenses was clearly indicated.

The House conferees had a great many figures on that subject. So we wrote into the conference report the language contained in the Senate committee report, which calls specifically upon the State Department, which will now have the administration, directly or indirectly, of all three of these programs, because FOA now goes to the State Department for certain information. We all agree that the three programs should be handled in one place, the idea being that a program being conducted in 3 or 4 different places is fair neither to the Congress, the country, nor the program itself.

Therefore, we asked the State Department to make a complete report to us and to channelize the programs, and in that way tell us who is doing what and why, so that the House will have all the facts and the Senate will have all the facts. I hope next year we will appropriate not $22 million, but twice as much for a program which is so meritorious as this one, but we must centralize the functions and eliminate the confusions which have, up to now, caused the House to cut these needed funds so sharply.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5502, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 1, 1955.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 12, 13, 27, 35, 37, and 46 to the bill (H. R. 5502) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$600,000", named in said amendment, insert "$300,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 49, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and of which appropriation not less than $200,000 shall be available for contracts with one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designated to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 30 and 49.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the appropriations included in the conference report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, for the period ending June 30, 1956

Appropriation	1955 appropriations	Budget estimates, 1956	House allowance, 1956	Senate allowance, 1956	Conference allowance
State	$129, 610, 000	$147, 267, 197	$126, 769, 977	$147, 549, 608	$137, 450, 905
Justice	186, 772, 767	201, 485, 000	197, 525, 000	200, 445, 000	198, 735, 000
The Judiciary	28, 944, 375	30, 279, 715	29, 603, 250	30, 640, 810	30, 116, 510
U. S. Information Agency	77, 114, 000	88, 500, 000	80, 500, 000	88, 350, 000	85, 000, 000
Funds appropriated to the President (refugee relief)	8, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	15, 000, 000
Total	430, 441, 142	483, 531, 912	450, 398, 227	481, 985, 418	466, 302, 415

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, for the period ending June 30, 1956 —Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Appropriation	1955 appropriations	Budget estimates, 1956	House allowance, 1956	Senate allowance, 1956	Conference allowance
Salaries and expenses, Department of State	[1] $62,050,000	$69,550,000	$63,760,000	$68,700,000	$66,760,000
Representation allowances, Foreign Service	475,000	700,000	475,000	700,000	575,000
Acquisition of buildings abroad	[2] 4,000,000	9,200,000	7,000,000	12,201,000	8,500,000
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Contributions to international organizations	[3] 28,237,500	28,287,297	28,079,977	28,247,608	28,115,905
Missions to international organizations	[4] 1,062,500	1,100,000	1,075,000	1,075,000	1,075,000
International contingencies	[5] 1,100,000	1,500,000	1,075,000	1,500,000	1,300,000
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	450,000	450,000	435,000	435,000	435,000
Construction	300,000	------	------	------	------
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,474,900	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Rio Grande emergency flood protection	------	20,000	------	------	------
American sections, international commissions, salaries and expenses	245,000	260,000	245,000	286,000	285,000
International fisheries commissions	310,000	425,000	425,000	455,000	455,000
International educational exchange activities	15,000,000	22,000,000	12,000,000	22,000,000	18,000,000
Government in occupied areas	[6] 13,250,000	8,300,000	8,000,000	7,750,000	7,750,000
Rama Road	[7] 1,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
International Claims Commission	130,000	------	------	------	------
Total, title I	129,610,000	147,267,197	126,769,977	147,549,608	137,450,905
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
Legal activities and general administration:					
General administration, salaries and expenses	$2,472,500	$2,615,000	$2,525,000	$2,615,000	$2,570,000
General legal activities, salaries and expenses	9,750,000	9,600,000	9,000,000	9,600,000	9,300,000
Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses	[8] 15,450,000	17,480,000	17,000,000	17,480,000	17,240,000
Special temporary attorneys and assistants	------	------	------	600,000	300,000
Fees and expenses of witness	[9] 1,710,000	1,500,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses	[10] 1,268,267	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total legal activities and general administration	33,750,767	34,495,000	33,175,000	------	------
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	[11] 79,382,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	[12] 43,250,000	44,990,000	44,000,000	44,500,000	44,000,000
Federal prison system:					
Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses	[13] 27,315,000	29,000,000	28,600,000	29,000,000	28,800,000
Buildings and facilities	------	1,000,000	750,000	1,000,000	875,000
Support of United States prisoners	[14] 3,075,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Federal prison system	30,390,000	34,000,000	32,350,000	------	------
Office of Alien Property	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,800,000)	(2,800,000)
Total, title II	186,772,767	201,485,000	197,525,000	200,445,000	198,735,000
TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court:					
Salaries	$1,016,000	$1,022,400	$1,022,400	$1,022,400	$1,022,400
Printing and binding reports	91,200	91,200	91,200	91,200	91,200
Miscellaneous expense	52,650	49,950	49,950	49,950	49,950
Care of buildings and grounds	[15] 350,800	367,400	367,400	367,400	367,400
Automobile for the Chief Justice	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835
Preparation of Rules for Civil Procedure	4,300	------	(16)	(2)	(2)
Total, Supreme Court	1,520,785	1,536,785	1,536,785	1,536,785	1,536,785
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	[17] 223,460	285,460	235,755	235,755	235,755
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	495,630	598,270	598,270	598,270	598,290
Court of Claims:					
Salaries and expenses	618,000	622,700	622,700	622,700	622,700
Repairs and improvements	8,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Total, Court of Claims	626,000	634,700	634,700	634,700	634,700
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:					
Salaries of judges	[18] 6,372,500	5,728,000	5,728,000	5,728,000	5,728,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	[19] 12,936,000	13,825,000	13,593,240	14,417,800	14,000,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	[20] 4,330,000	4,745,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	[21] 1,845,000	2,320,250	2,170,250	2,383,250	2,276,750
Administrative office, salaries and expenses	595,000	606,250	606,250	606,250	606,250
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	26,078,500	27,224,500	26,597,740	27,635,300	27,111,000
Referees in bankruptcy:					
Salaries of referees	[22] (1,123,000)	(1,151,400)	(1,151,400)	(1,151,400)	(1,151,400)
Expenses of referees	[23] (1,478,125)	(1,750,500)	(1,650,500)	(1,650,500)	(1,650,500)
Total referees in bankruptcy	(2,601,125)	(2,901,900)	(2,801,900)	(2,801,900)	(2,801,900)
Total, title III	28,944,375	30,279,715	29,603,250	30,640,810	30,116,510

---

[1] Includes $200,000 reappropriated, and $750,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955; excludes $1,400,000 transferred to Department of Agriculture.

[2] Includes $1 million transferred from "Government in occupied areas."

[3] Excludes $12,500 transferred to "Missions to international organizations" pursuant to authority contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[4] Includes $12,500 transferred from "Contributions to international organizations" pursuant to authority contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[5] Includes $100,000 transferred from "Educational aid to China and Korea" pursuant to authority contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[6] Excludes $750,000 transferred to "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to authority contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 and $1 million transferred to "Acquisition of buildings abroad."

[7] Previously contained in Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

[8] Includes $500,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[9] Includes $710,000 contained in H. J. Res. 252.

[10] Includes $1,068,267 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[11] Includes $1,100,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[12] Includes $1,250,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[13] Includes $180,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[14] Includes $600,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[15] Includes $12,500 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[16] Unobligated balance continued available.

[17] Includes $13,300 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[18] Includes $900,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[19] Includes $86,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[20] Includes $380,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[21] Includes $45,000 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[22] Includes $20,800 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

[23] Includes $34,575 contained in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Authorization	1955 authorization	Budget estimate, 1956	House allowance, 1956	Senate allowance, 1956	Conference allowance
Salaries and expenses	[24] $77, 114, 000	$88, 500, 000	$80, 500, 000	$88, 350, 000	$85, 000, 000
TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Refugee relief	$8, 000, 000	$16, 000, 000	$16, 000, 000	$15, 000, 000	$15, 000, 000
Grand total appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, and V, Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies	430, 441, 142	483, 531, 912	450, 398, 227		
TITLE VI—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED (ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION)					
Federal Prison Industries, Inc	($850, 000)	($850, 000)	($850, 000)	($850, 000)	($850, 000)

---

[24] Includes $3,200,000 transferred from "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities" and $710,890 nonrecurring costs in connection with moving radio broadcasting activities from New York to Washington. Excludes $2 million allocated by the President to meet emergency needs in the Far East area, and $300,000 pending allocation for program in near eastern area.

DELEGATION TO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 698, House Concurrent Resolution 109.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, so that it may be made the unfinished business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6766, the public works appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

THE PROPOSED ATOMIC POWERED VESSEL AND THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune yesterday published an editorial which was critical of the Senate action in denying the President his atomic showboat.

The editorial starts by claiming that the Democrats made a party issue of the showboat. That is not true. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy refused to make an authorization for it but the vote was not strictly a partisan vote in that members of the President's own party, such as the former chairman of the joint committee, Representative STERLING COLE, of New York, had been critical of the President's proposal and merely voted present when the issue was before the committee.

The Republicans decided to attempt to provide the money for this project by an amendment to legislation pending on the floor of the Senate. Presumably Mr. COLE declined to do so on the floor of the House, and when the Republicans tried it on the floor of the Senate, they made it a party issue and the Democrats did not. In fact, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] specifically pleaded with the Republicans not to make it a party issue.

Then the editorial suggests that the $21 million item was a plan for a ship "that would lace the seven seas without refueling." Actually, the testimony before our committee revealed there was no plan and there is not now any plan for such a ship. All that existed was a request for an appropriation. If it had been authorized there would have been a wild scramble to get something built. Everyone knows that building something in a hurry without a plan is costly and always wastes money.

The testimony before our committee showed that such a scramble would also have siphoned off the brains, the laboratory facilities, and the testing devices which should have been employed in preparing for the construction of a feasible nuclear-powered surface ship. The joint committee did not think such a diversion was wise. The committee heeded the advice of experts, such as Admiral Rickover, whose genius built the first nuclear-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*.

The editorial suggests "the Democrats behaved like the skeptical men who have hesitated before every mechanical advance." Nothing could be a greater distortion of our point of view. We have been pushing for a nuclear submarine. We are pushing now for a nuclear-powered surface ship and a nuclear-powered airplane and we do not want to spoil those possibilities by an unimaginative approach which would put the wrong kind of powerplant in the wrong type of hull and call the product something that the great industrial Nation of America would show off to the world.

We do not intend to shovel away $21 million on a foolish venture. We want a proposal for a surface ship studied and developed in a scientific and skillful fashion, as the *Nautilus* was built. We want it studied in the same spirit that we pleaded with this Congress to study the Dixon-Yates contract months ago. We sought to review that contract before a democratically controlled Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but our Republican friends jammed through a waiver because they had the votes in November that they would not have in January. We rescinded that waiver in January, but Dixon-Yates went right ahead. Now the President orders a new Dixon-Yates review, preparatory to final abandonment. We think it is better to have the review before millions of dollars are wasted, and that is why we were unwilling to shovel away $21 million on the atomic showboat, but wanted it studied instead.

I am sure I can speak for the Democrats on the joint committee, when I say we will not take just any plan that is shoved at us, but that, on the contrary, we will take our responsibilities seriously and will examine all proposals, supporting the good suggestions of the President, such as that for the supplying of reactors to friendly nations before he even sends us a budget estimate, and declining those like the showboat for which neither he nor the Maritime Commission nor the Atomic Energy Commission had or have any semblance of a plan.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether in the study made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in November of last year, to which the Senator has referred, it was stated at that time by the mayor of Memphis and also by the head of the Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, Maj. Thomas Allen, that Memphis would build its own plant before it would accept Dixon-Yates power, and if the administration had pursued the matter at that time and had advised with the officials of Memphis, there would have been no contract, and all the money which will be squandered and which has been squandered already would have been saved to the Government of the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is true. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee on the fact that his subcommittee brought to light some very important information on that subject.

I hope the money will not be squandered. In that connection, I have addressed a letter to the Honorable Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General, pointing out that one section of the Dixon-Yates contract contains a clause which would permit the cancellation of that contract if the financing arrangement and certain other arrangements had not been completed by February 15.

Those arrangements were not completed by February 15. If the Government of the United States will now have a little spine it can get out of the awful Dixon-Yates contract without cost, and it will let the institutions that have planted their officials in the Bureau of the Budget and elsewhere around the capital learn that such infiltration is no way to do business in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the letter which I sent to the Comptroller General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1955.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Now that the termination of the Dixon-Yates contract is under consideration, I want to bring to your attention again two legal points in connection with that contract under either of which the United States would be under no obligation to the Dixon-Yates Co.

The first point I desire to reiterate is that the Dixon-Yates contract never became effective since the financing agreements were only recently concluded and the regulatory approvals were obtained by the summer of 1955, but the contract was never thereafter submitted to the Joint Committee as required by section 164 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. My reasoning on this point has been completely set forth at length in the statement which I filed with the Securities Exchange Commission on February 7, 1955.

The second point I desire to make is that under the terms of the contract, and especially the amendment providing for termination if certain conditions shall not have occurred by February 15, 1955, the contract is presently terminable without cost to either party. The conditions giving rise to this right of termination have not been met since the contract never became effective before February 15, 1955.

You will recall that during the hearings before the Joint Committee the question of the time within which this right of termination could be exercised was specifically raised. There is no limitation in the contract on this ability to terminate. Therefore, this right to terminate can be and should be exercised at this time. Any termination payments to the Dixon-Yates Co. therefore should be questioned in the light of this ability to terminate the contract without liability.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with the financing, is it not correct to say that the equity financing, while it was approved by the Securities and Exchange Commission, is now on appeal in the courts, and the so-called bond financing is still in the "examiner" stage? Therefore, under the terms of the contract it has never actually come into operation. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct. I wish to say also to the Senator from Tennessee that a most unusual thing took place as the result of his appearance on the floor of the Senate the other day.

Reference was made to a portion of the hearing before the Securities and Exchange Commission of April 27. In it a point was raised with reference to the bond-purchase agreement and the financing agreement. I said to the Senator from Tennessee I wondered why I had never been able to get a copy of the agreement and that I would appreciate it if he would use his offices to try to get me a copy of it.

The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] looked into his papers and came up with a copy of the agreement, which he supplied to me. I took it immediately to a clerk of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and said to him, "I wish you would find out if there is a copy of this agreement in the files of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy."

He went downstairs and made a complete check of the files of the Joint Committee. We did not have in the committee, regardless of the plain admonition of the law that we must be kept current and fully advised, a copy of either one of those documents. We did not have a copy of them, although we had asked for them repeatedly. I have copies of them with me on the floor, and Senators may examine them. They are stamped at the top "Received June 29, 12:45 p. m., 1955. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy."

We received it the next day as a result of the colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee and as a result of the courtesy of the junior Senator from Wyoming in giving me his copy. How he got it, I do not know, and I do not intend to ask. I merely point out that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy did not have a copy in its files, even though we had repeatedly asked for it. Not one member of the Joint Committee had ever seen it until the Senator from Wyoming handed a copy to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought that under the law the Atomic Energy Commission was required to file with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy contracts before they became effective. Is not the bonding agreement a part of the overall contract?

Mr. ANDERSON. The requirement that we be kept fully advised on everything would have required that it be presented to us. The Atomic Energy Commission gave us items which they said were complete reports on the progress of the Dixon-Yates contract. It is strange that these items were not included, because if they are not important, I do not know what is important.

The newspapers this morning carried the Dixon-Yates text which was released from the White House in connection with the statement. The item which I have seen in one newspaper, and I assume it is the same as the release which the Senator from Wyoming showed me, cites a letter from Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, dated June 30, 1955, and a resolution by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senator from Tennessee is aware that there may be some names missing from the chronology records furnished to us. I suggest that one of the most important letters is that of June 28, 1955, written by Herbert D. Vogel, chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to Maj. Thomas H. Allen, president of the Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Division of Memphis.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee has seen that letter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had not seen it until a few minutes ago when the Senator showed it to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this letter the chairman of the board says:

This is to acknowledge your telegram and letter of June 23, 1955, informing us of the decision reached by the Board of City Commissioners, city of Memphis, to authorize the Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Division to proceed to do all things necessary to provide generating and other facilities of sufficient capacity to serve the city of Memphis adequately. We appreciate your giving us this information so promptly.

I invite attention to this part of the letter:

In view of this decision we will proceed with our planning on the assumption that you will be in position to handle your load after the expiration of our contract in 1958. No doubt there will be a number of questions involved in the transition from the present arrangements to the operation of your new plant. Our staff will be glad to meet with you to discuss such questions at your convenience.

And then, this final parting of the ways:

The Tennessee Valley Authority has enjoyed the relationship which has existed these many years with the city of Memphis and the people of your community. The termination of our present contract is a matter of deep regret to us. We extend best wishes for success in your new enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
Chairman of the Board.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee if that does not sound as if they felt they were permanently severing their ties as soon as the contract expired?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. It is really a reconfirmation of what the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and others have known since November 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. There has not been the slightest change in the position of the city of Memphis. They said they were not going to take Dixon-Yates power then, and they now say the same thing. That is why I suggest to the Members of the Senate that when they come to consider a bill to provide $6½ million to build a transmission line extension they had better ask themselves for what they are voting the money. The request for a line can be hedged about with all sorts of qualifications. The TVA has told the city of Memphis that it is allowing it to cancel the contract. Now the White House circulates the story that the Dixon-Yates contract is going to be reexamined, in view of the Memphis decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the light of what was said by the city of Memphis in 1954 and in the light of what was said last night in the release from the White House, the appropriation of $6½ million is an appropriation to build a transmission line from a nonexistent plant to a nonexistent market. I think the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Senate itself should hesitate a long time before approving any such appropriation as that, particularly when it is clear upon the record that the appropriation is $1 million greater than the entire capital stock of the proposed generating company.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Mexico has made very emphatic and clear that even in 1954, back last fall, the city of Memphis made it definite and positive in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that it would not accept any power from Dixon-Yates. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that even on May 18 last, in a letter to Herbert D. Vogel, chairman of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the mayor of Memphis had this to say:

> For the reasons we have indicated, including those relating to pending litigation, it is our position that under no circumstances would the city of Memphis ever become a market for Dixon-Yates power.

Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. I think when such a thing happens it gives rise to all sorts of questions. If the city of Memphis is not going to be the purchaser of that power, then we question why the Government is guaranteeing the issuance of the bonds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the unchallenged and definite statement of the Mayor of Memphis before the Joint Committee last November, and the subsequent sworn testimony of one or both of the witnesses, Mr. Allen and Mr. Tobey, before the Securities and Exchange Commission several months ago, that under no circumstances would they become a partner with Dixon-Yates and accept their power, does the Senator have any explanation of why the administration has allowed this thing to run on all this time? It will be recalled that there was a big barbecue and that they had some golden shovels. All those things cost a great deal of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. Those shovels can be paid for on a cost-plus basis out of the Treasury.

I should like to say that I have tremendous faith in Mr. Campbell. I think he is a fine, capable man, and I hope that he personally will handle the transaction, because I believe he will realize that a cancellation clause was put into the contract, possibly for the benefit of Dixon-Yates, but which has now turned out to be for the benefit of the Government, since the contract can be canceled without cost.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When did the city of Memphis make its decision to build its own plant?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know, but I know it made a decision that it would not have anything to do with the Dixon-Yates plant. It made that decision at least 8 months ago, and has now announced the decision to build a plant. That decision was made possibly 4 months ago. At that time I prepared a letter which I intended to send to the President of the United States, suggesting to him that in view of the decision of Memphis, he should now cancel the contract. We were involved in so many squabbles at the Atomic Energy Commission that my colleague said, "Let us try to get a little of our work done, because every time we have a meeting it is tied up by Dixon-Yates." It has been a millstone around our necks for months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a fact that the city of Memphis originally announced its plan on November 17, 1954?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The question has had all sorts of ramifications. I have tried to intervene as a private citizen. I wrote to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I realize that the joint committee had no particular standing before that body, but I said I wished to point out that I thought the financing was improper, and that it is wrong for insurance companies to agree to put up $94 million to finance a plant which could cost as little as $90 million. In other words, in the building and construction of the plant there might be a windfall, such as we have been hearing about in other cases. I asked, "How can they do that?"

We exchanged correspondence, but the superintendent of insurance for the State of New York filed a paper before the Securities and Exchange Commission just prior to the time I was to testify. I was to testify that this was an improper investment, and the Commission got the superintendent of insurance of the State of New York to give his ruling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of his ruling dealing with the legality of the investment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the ruling was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legality of Investment

Unlike the statutory limitation with respect to investments in mortgage loans which may not exceed 66⅔ percent of the value of the real estate securing the loan, the investment standards and restrictions applicable to investments in corporate obligations contain no comparable limitation but rather paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of subdivision 2 of section 81 prescribe applicable standards, such as earnings' tests and, as an alternative, that such corporate holdings "are adequately secured and have investment qualities and characteristics wherein the speculative elements are not predominant."

Satisfactory opinions regarding the validity of the power contract have been received by the Metropolitan from the General Counsel of the AEC and the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Attorney General of the United States. Special counsel of the insurance companies have indicated that they will render opinions to the effect that the lien under the mortgage, the power contract and the intercompany agreement are valid enforceable instruments. It is the opinion of counsel for the insurance companies that the proposed purchase qualifies as a legal investment under the provisions of section 81 (2-a) of the New York insurance law as an obligation of a solvent corporation "adequately secured and having investment qualities and characteristics wherein the speculative elements are not predominant."

INSURANCE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

The examiners of the New York insurance department have reviewed the pertinent records of the proposed investment in the offices of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. It is their judgment that the investment qualifies as legal under the provisions of section 81 (2–a) of the New York insurance law. This view is predicated on opinion by counsel that the loans are valid and enforceable against the respective companies. There appears to be every indication that the proposed investment is free of speculation insofar as such determination can be made from an examination of the proposed financial arrangements; also, the contemplated income to be derived from the production of power generated by the MVG plant. The examiners point out that the proposed financing does not differ in any material respect from similar financing and holdings by Metropolitan of first mortgage bonds of the Electric Energy, Inc., and the Ohio Valley Electric Co. As in the case of MVG, these companies supply power to AEC installations. They were financed in a manner identical with the financing of MVG. These holdings of Metropolitan are listed by the Committee on Valuation of Securities of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners as amortizable public utility bonds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in his ruling, the superintendent of insurance of the State of New York says that this investment, in the opinion of his department, qualifies under section 81

(2–a) of the New York insurance law. That section reads:

> (a) Obligations which are secured by adequate collateral security and bear fixed interest and if during each of any 3, including either of the last 2, of the 5 fiscal years next preceding the date of acquisition by such insurer, the net earnings of the issuing, assuming, or guaranteeing institution available for its fixed charges, as hereinafter defined, shall have been not less than 1¼ times the total of its fixed charges for such year, or obligations which, at the date of acquisition by such insurer, are adequately secured and have investment qualities and characteristics wherein the speculative elements are not predominant. In determining the adequacy of collateral security, not more than one-third of the total value of such required collateral shall consist of stock other than stock meeting the requirements of subdivision 3.

Everyone knows that the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. could not possibly qualify under that section. So there had to be an affirmative showing as to each of the sponsoring companies. So far as I can ascertain, nothing of that nature was done.

But the insurance commissioner of the State of New York said:

> The examiners point out that the proposed financing does not differ in any material respect from similar financing and holdings by Metropolitan of first-mortgage bonds of the Electric Energy, Inc., and the Ohio Valley Electric Co.

I am quoting directly from the opinion of the superintendent of insurance of New York State. He said:

> As in the case of MVG, these companies supply power to AEC installations.

Consider the information he must have had. Somebody went to him and told him this plant was to supply power to an atomic energy installation. Now the White House says that in view of the fact that Memphis is not going to buy the power, the situation had better be reexamined, because the whole load was to have gone to Memphis.

Yet the insurance commissioner of New York approved the investment on the ground that the plant was to be a defense installation and was to supply an atomic energy installation. An application was made to the Securities and Exchange Commission for special clearance, because the contract was for a defense project to supply power to the city of Memphis, which Memphis does not want.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am deeply appreciative of the splendid leadership by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. Hill and Mr. Sparkman], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'Mahoney], and others, which has directed attention to the Dixon-Yates deal. But I cannot help recalling that during the past 2 or 3 years I have been interested in a transmission line being brought into Minnesota to connect with the great Missouri Valley power projects at the dams along the Missouri River.

Those projects, or transmission lines, would not have been very expensive. Yet each and every time we have had a running fight with the Bureau of the Budget in order to get any kind of adequate appropriation to bring in, not power which will be in being in the future, not something which is nonexistent, but power which is being generated at Garrison Dam, or power which is being generated at different projects up and down the Missouri River.

I recall our efforts to bring a transmission line into the northern part of our State, to connect with all the REA generating facilities.

I recall the efforts to bring a transmission line from Sioux Falls at the southeastern corner of South Dakota, into southern Minnesota, but to no avail, because the Bureau of the Budget simply could not see its way clear to do so.

So we ended by having a spur transmission line come into the central part of the State from Watertown, S. Dak., to Granite Falls, to connect with the Northern States Power Co. facilities.

I am not complaining about the fact that we did not get more, even though I think we were entitled to it on the basis of construction costs and on the basis of need.

But what I am concerned about is why there is such tremendous pressure and great dedication to bringing a transmission line, as the junior Senator from New Mexico has so well pointed out, from a nonexistent facility to a nonexistent market. There is an almost pathological dedication to this particular $6,500,000 transmission line facility.

I notice in the afternoon edition of today's Washington Evening Star that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after having appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], indicates that he intends to make a new study of the whole Dixon-Yates deal. I hesitate to call it a contract because "contract" is an honorable word. The Director intends to make a new study of the whole Dixon-Yates deal.

I hope my good friend from Tennessee will make certain who is helping the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make that study, because the last I read and the last I heard about the matter was that someone attached to the Bureau of the Budget, whose name was carefully expunged from the record, was doing business with private firms relating to Dixon-Yates, on the one hand, and was doing some of the work for the Bureau of the Budget, on the other hand.

Of course, very frankly, if this had happened in the previous administration, the headlines would be screaming, "Corruption Near the White House." And the Bureau of the Budget is near the White House.

Whether this is corruption or not, it is a most unusual practice. So if Mr. Hughes is going to make a new study, I suggest that he get into a closet by himself and study, and not bring in some of the very fine consultants who are working, apparently, or at least allegedly, for the good of the Nation, when they consult with the Bureau, but who are working also for the good of the bondholders and the Dixon-Yates Co., when they consult with them.

If there has ever been an example which approximated the dimensions of the old Teapot Dome case, it is the Dixon-Yates deal; and it is a fouled-up deal from beginning to end. The Dixon-Yates deal certainly comes as close to approximating what happened in the old Teapot Dome case as anything ever has. I do not know what new evidence, which he did not know of before, has been brought out to get the President's attention, but I think it is interesting that the President has not had time to look into the matter. If the President has been too busy on his trips and other activities, he ought to say so. There is nothing new about this matter.

As the Senator from New Mexico has revealed, even the city of Memphis has given Congress a month's notice. Surely we knew about the financing. It was debated for days in the Senate.

I recall the Senator from New Mexico stating that it was impossible for the Senate to get a copy of the contract.

Mr. ANDERSON. I point out to the Senator from Minnesota that he ought to bear in mind that it is interesting that Mr. Hughes plans to consult with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Tennessee Valley Authority; but he does not intend to come close to the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Tennessee, or to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has some very interesting facts, if he will come around.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will be Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I listened to the statement by the Senator from Minnesota. I noticed he made reference to the Teapot Dome. I wish to make this difference between the two affairs. Teapot Dome was a stealing as it went along. Dixon-Yates is a premeditated, planned-for-the-future steal. The participants have not quite gotten to it yet. That is the only difference between the two.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the Senator's amendment to my interpretation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned the investigator who had been working up the information in the Bureau of the Budget. Information has already been brought out about Mr. Wenzell and another man working inside the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Wenzell working for his employer and for the Government at the same time.

Last night we ended on a pretty happy note before the subcommittee of the Committee in the Judiciary. We decided to have our hearing later. But several of the employees of the Bureau of the Budget were present last night, and the subcommittee endeavored to get information from them, because the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had refused to let the subcommittee see the reports which pertain to the matter.

I have been advised this morning that even though the employees were present, they had been instructed not to talk or to give any information.

Originally it was our understanding that the President's order applied to documents and records in the Bureau's files.

Now it appears that the order covers personnel in the Bureau of the Budget, as well as documents and records.

As matters now stand, the President's order prohibits us from seeing any of the Budget Bureau's records or talking to any of its personnel except Mr. Hughes, or anyone whom he may designate.

I fail to see how this is anything but a direct contradiction of the President's statement that he is willing to have light shed on the whole affair.

I want the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Minnesota and the Bureau of the Budget to know that we expect to pursue our inquiry and find out the full story about the situation; about employees who worked both for their companies and for the Government at the same time, and also about employees from the outside who sat in on secret meetings at the Atomic Energy Commission and at the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator that I believe what he refers to will be very useful information when it is disclosed. I hope he will develop it. If he continues to have difficulty getting the interested persons to talk, I hope he will examine carefully the Atomic Energy Act, because the counsel for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy believes the act confers on the Joint Committee power to require from executive agencies information which may not be possessed by other agencies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a brief comment, to which the Senator from New Mexico may close his ears, because I am talking for the record and not to the Senator from New Mexico, but I shall talk about the Senator from New Mexico, because I have been in the Senate 10 years, and I know how seldom Members of the Senate receive due credit for a great piece of work and great statesmanship, but they always receive plenty of criticism from those who disagree with them about something.

I wish to say for the record that someone ought to point out that the Dixon-Yates deal unquestionably would now have been an accomplished fact had it not been for the Senator from New Mexico. Most of his colleagues in the Senate were doing nothing about it, because there were only a few of us at one time who really felt this was a matter which should be brought to the attention of the American people, and that we should never let go of this unconscionable deal which the President of the United States, in the first instance, not only authorized, but, I think the record will show, has to take the primary responsibility for. The Senator from New Mexico, however, has never let his interest flag, because he recognized that in fighting to bring out the facts about the Dixon-Yates deal, he was fighting to protect good and decent government.

Let the record be clear that it was the President of the United States who directed the contract, in the first instance, and he directed it in the first instance when he did not even know that two members of the Board of Directors of the TVA and a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission were on written record against it, and had filed memorandum opinions pointing out the unsoundness of the proposal. Some weeks or some months later, when the President of the United States was accosted with that fact in a press conference, what did he say? He did not know that his TVA directors and that a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission were on record against it.

Mr. President, that is all we need to know as to the amount of investigation and analysis and attention the President of the United States gave this matter in the first instance. He merely carried out what somebody told him ought to be done. Let us be frank about it. The President of the United States used the great prestige of the office of the Presidency to direct an administrative board to enter into this contract.

I am satisfied in my own mind that the President of the United States had very little knowledge of the implications that were involved. That does not excuse him, either. In fact, the attempt to rationalize, and apologize for the gentleman in the White House, on the basis of the comments one hears so often from his alibiers, do not have any validity with me. What they ought to point out is that he does not know better. He simply did not know better. Of course, he had not taken the time to study what was involved.

I want the record to show that I highly commend the Senator from New Mexico for his tenacity and for the dedicated spirit of public service which has motivated him from the beginning with regard to the Dixon-Yates contract. I think, in this instance, he has built on his record in the Senate a fine monument of statesmanship. I hope he will never let go of it. I know he will not let go of it until we have let the people of this country know of the horrendous mistake which the President of the United States has made in this regard.

I give the President the benefit of all doubt when I refer to it as a horrendous mistake, because I think there is plenty in the record which would justify an interpretation which would not let the President off the hook on the ground that he has made a mistake. I think the President's conduct from the beginning has been inexcusable. I think it is high time, now that the facts have been brought out by the Senator from New Mexico, that the President sees to it that the Dixon-Yates deal gets buried by bringing it to a complete end.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind comments.

Mr. President, the statement has frequently been made that those who were in this fight against Dixon-Yates were interested in the fight because they were against private power and for public power. I have stated time after time, and I wish to repeat it, that my interest in this question has not been especially in the preservation of TVA, or especially in defense of TVA, or especially in public versus private power.

There are those who are deeply concerned about TVA. I have voted for appropriations for TVA time after time. But in this particular instance my interest was arrested by the terms of the contract, which we tried to improve, but our efforts to do so were rejected. All the way through, we have tried to preserve the pattern most of us felt was desirable to follow, namely, the pattern adopted in the contracts with the Ohio Valley Electric Co. and the Electric Energy, Inc., in their operations at Portsmouth and Paducah.

On June 16, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission sent to me a letter pointing out the savings which were obtained in the OVEC contract, because the contract contained provisions which permitted the cost to be reduced, and did not burden us with the problem of selling power to a customer other than the United States. The OVEC and EEI sell power directly to atomic energy installations.

Without wishing to bother the Senate with a reading of the letter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a letter dated June 16, 1955, addressed to me by the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Atomic
Energy Commission,
Washington D. C., June 16, 1955.

Hon Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

Dear Senator Anderson: Arrangements have been completed with our power suppliers which will result in significant reductions in the cost of power to the Commission at the Portsmouth and Paducah installations. These economies as they affect each of these installations are presented below.

OHIO VALLEY ELECTRIC CORPORATION CONTRACT

As a result of negotiations with OVEC which began in the fall of 1954, the energy component of the charges for interim power has been reduced from 6 mills per kilowatt-hour to 4.25 mills per kilowatt-hour, effective as of May 1, 1955. Based on our present schedules of requirements for interim power, it is estimated that this rate reduction will result in savings to the Commission of approximately $5,200,000.

Power supplied to AEC under the interim rate is purchased by OVEC from 15 sponsoring companies. The revised rate covering these deliveries to OVEC was filed with the Federal Power Commission and was approved by that Commission on May 25, 1955, to become effective as of May 1, 1955.

In addition to this savings in interim power costs, OVEC has based its billings for demand charges on the basis of averaging the maximum daily demands for the month instead of using the maximum demand of the month. Resultant actual savings to AEC through March 31, 1955, through this method of computing demand charges, have amounted to more than $900,000.

OVEC has also affected economies in its financing cost which will reduce the rate for permanent power to AEC delivered from the generating plants now under construction. These are:

(a) Reduction in commitment fee:

As a result of efforts made during the past year to determine as early and as accurately as possible the definitive final cost of the project, OVEC has reduced its present commitments for notes and bonds by $42 million. The resulting reduction in commitment fees will reduce the cost of facilities by an estimated $315,000.

(b) Reduction in interest rate from 4 percent to 3⅝ percent on bank notes and sponsors' notes:

By order issued December 21, 1954, the Securities and Exchange Commission approved the application of OVEC in connection with the reduction in interest rates on notes issued under the bank-credit agreement. As approved, the interest rate is (1) 4 percent prior to January 1, 1955, (2) 4 percent on and after the AEC power-agreement termination date, and (3) 3⅝ percent on and after January 1, 1955, and prior to the AEC termination date, except that in certain circumstances the rate may be increased not to exceed 4 percent in the event AEC reduces its contract demand or OVEC releases AEC from the liability for charges for specified quantities of power and energy under the power agreement.

The effect of this refinancing will result in savings to the AEC in permanent power costs estimated at $66,000 per year.

(c) Revision of equity financing:

The Securities and Exchange Commission on May 25, 1955, approved the request of OVEC for a revision in the plan of corporate financing wherein additional bank loans would be secured not exceeding $10 million at the prime commercial loan interest rate per 90-day maturities (presently 3 percent per annum). Without relieving the participating companies of their obligation to provide the additional $10 million equity capital now pledged, the equity contribution will be deferred so long as this amount will have been loaned to OVEC as interim debt. The 12 banking institutions, a part of the 14 underwriters of the existing unsecured notes, have agreed to provide up to this sum, from time to time, evidenced by 90-day notes and the pledging by OVEC of stock subscriptions of the participating companies. It is estimated that under this new plan AEC will save approximately $1,200,000 per year in its permanent power cost so long as this interim debt is available at the above interest rate.

Based on the latest estimate of capital requirements of the project (cost of facilities plus working and other capital) of $388,419,000 and taking into account the savings in permanent power costs, noted above, the estimated increase in net capability of the stations and fuel as presently estimated at 19.39 cents per million B. t. u., the present estimated cost to AEC for permanent power at 98 percent load factor is 3.79 mills per kilowatt-hour. This compares with the initial estimated cost of 3.83 mills per kilowatt-hour or an annual difference estimated at $640,000.

ELECTRIC ENERGY INCORPORATED CONTRACT

The energy component of the interim power rate for power supplied from Joppa units Nos. 1 to 4, inclusive, during the period prior to operation of unit No. 6, has been reduced effective March 1, 1955, from 6 mills per kilowatt-hour to a charge equivalent to the costs per kilowatt-hour payable by the sponsoring companies for such power. This reduction in rate will result in savings in interim power costs to AEC estimated at $1,100,000.

Sincerely yours,

K. E. Fields,
General Manager.
R. W. Cook,
Deputy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the letter refers to savings of $5,200,000 in one instance and $900,000 in another instance. In all, there will be a saving of several millions of dollars, which I think is well worth our notice.

Mr. President, I do not intend to continue further than to say that the two contracts which we have now received are interesting. I intend to study them to try to find out what they provide. I think they indicate that the purchasers have done a pretty good job of protecting themselves. Several matters have not been ironed out.

The Government is in court. The matter is in court. Under those circumstances, all of these contracts can be canceled without cost, and I hope the Attorney General will have that done.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have read in the newspapers press reports of statements attributed to President Eisenhower in which he has charged Congress with "dawdling," and in which he refers disparagingly to the legislative record of this Congress, thereby reflecting on our majority leadership.

Mr. President, quite frankly, the remarks of President Eisenhower remind me of the complaints of a spoiled child. He has spoken unjustly and without forethought—that is, forethought on his own part. I do not know who prompted his remarks, but they certainly sound like those of the White House advisers who are more interested in a controversial candidate for President than they are in the splendid record of cooperation the Democratic-controlled Congress has given the administration.

The President, instead of listening to political pratings of White House advisers, should thank the high heavens for this Congress, which has done more in constructive legislation this year than his Republican colleagues did for him during his first 2 years in office. Let that thought sink in, I say, Mr. President.

Under the great leadership of our distinguished majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, in the Senate, and of the most able Speaker, Sam Rayburn, in the House, we have been able to accomplish the almost impossible, and to do it in record time.

We are planning to adjourn on schedule, with an unsurpassed record of major legislative achievements behind us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a long list of some of the legislative achievements of this Congress—made possible by a considerate and cooperative Democratic majority more interested in good government than in partisan politics.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The character of a Congress can best be determined by the bills that are passed which affect the daily lives of our citizens. These measures do not always command headlines. But they must all be considered for any realistic appraisal.

Here is a list of the important actions of this Senate:

1. Upper Colorado River Basin project: This measure, which has been the subject of controversy for 4 decades, was approved by the Senate. It is vital to the development of one of the largest undeveloped stretches of land in the world—the western Mountain States.

2. Highway program: The Senate faced squarely up to the problem of modernizing America's highway system with one of the most important bills passed in many years.

3. Mutual security: For the first time, the Senate approved mutual-security authorization without cutting 1 cent from the request. The importance of this action, in view of the present delicate state of world affairs, cannot be underestimated.

4. Minimum wages: The Senate passed a bill raising the minimum wage to $1 an hour, thus bringing it more nearly in line with present economic realities.

5. Rejection of the McCarthy resolution: The 77-to-4 vote that rejected Senator McCarthy's resolution to dictate procedures for the Big Four conference was a history-making precedent that the Senate floor will not be an arena for a harassing the President and his Secretary of State on the eve of an important international conference.

6. Formosa resolution: By its quick action on the Formosa resolution, the Senate served notice on the world that the American people were united in their opposition to communism and aggression and that partisanship would not interfere with that unity.

7. Paris pacts: Approval in a few hours of these two treaties—which ordinarily would have been debated for many weeks—strengthened the hand of the free world.

8. Austrian treaty: Speedy approval of this treaty cleared the way for the Big Four conference.

9. Public housing: The Senate passed one of the most forward-looking housing bills since 1949.

10. Farm disaster: The Senate passed a bill holding interest rates on farm loans to 3 percent a year despite the administration's attempt to raise the rate to 5 percent a year.

11. Government reorganization: The Senate passed a 2-year extension of the President's authority to reorganize the Government in the interest of efficiency and economy.

12. Veterans' homes: The Senate extended for one year the Veterans' Administration program for direct loans for buying or building homes.

13. Drought relief: The Senate extended for 2 years emergency loan provisions for farmers and stockmen hit by the great drought which has caused so much havoc in the Southwest and other parts of the country.

14. Protection of commodity exchanges: The Senate passed legislation strengthening the investigating provisions of the Commodities Exchange Act, thus affording greater protection against market manipulations.

15. Pay of Government employees: Congress approved an increase of 7.5 percent for classified Government workers—thus bringing their salaries more nearly in line with those of private industry.

16. Postal workers: The Congress approved an 8 percent pay raise for postal workers.

17. Small business: The Senate not only extended the Small Business Administration but improved it by increasing the amount of loans and extending the provisions of the act to small businesses in drought areas which have been hard hit by the decline in economic activity.

18. Destitute farmers: The Senate passed legislation providing relief to farmers unemployed or destitute as a result of crop losses from natural causes.

19. Tax legislation: The Senate passed and sent to the President legislation closing a tax loophole which could have cost the Treasury at least $1 billion and possibly more.

20. Rural electrification: The Senate passed legislation expanding and improving rural electrification by removing barriers against expansion in States with progressive programs.

21. Incentive pay increases: Congress provided incentive pay increases ranging from 6 to 25 percent for members of the Armed Forces.

22. Housing mortgages: The Senate increased by $1.5 billion the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages.

23. Water pollution: The Senate passed legislation strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act and providing additional authority for research into this basic problem.

24. Water conversion: The Senate approved legislation extending and strengthening laws covering research into the vital problem of converting sea water to meet the growing pressure of industry and agriculture upon our water resources.

25. Latin America: The Senate authorized funds to complete the Inter-American Highway, a vital link in our communications with our southern neighbors.

26. GI educational benefits: The Senate passed legislation extending the time during which persons who were in the Armed Forces prior to January 31, 1955, could accumulate educational benefits under the GI bill.

27. Selective service: The Senate extended for 4 additional years selective service and the authority to provide assistance to dependents of servicemen.

28. Health: The Senate increased most of the funds provided for medical research over the appropriations requested by the administration.

29. Military manpower: The Senate approved appropriations to hold the Marine Corps at its present level and rejected the administration's request for a cut in manpower.

30. Antitrust: The Senate passed legislation increasing the penalties for violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act—the first increase in the penalties in 64 years.

31. Antitrust: The Senate passed legislation authorizing the United States to sue for damages resulting from antitrust violations.

32. Security program: The Senate passed legislation establishing a nonpartisan commission to investigate the whole security program from the standpoint of effectiveness and maintenance of individual rights.

33. Extension of free enterprises in undeveloped areas: The Senate approved legislation providing for American participation in the International Finance Corporation, intended to increase the flow of private capital into undeveloped areas.

34. Excessive defense profits: The Senate approved legislation extending for 2 years the Renegotiation Act under which excessive profits in defense contracts can be recaptured.

35. Import duties: The Senate extended for 1 year the suspension of import duties on metal scrap.

36. Low-income farmers: The Senate approved legislation increasing extension service appropriations for low-income farm families.

37. Use of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes: The Senate approved legislation removing legal barriers to the use of surplus Federal property for educational and public-health purposes.

38. Housing: The Senate approved legislation which would permit lenders to sell housing mortgages to FNMA (the so-called Fannie Mae program) even though they had failed to comply with some highly technical provisions which caused abnormal delays in the housing program. As a result, a bottleneck in the housing program would be broken.

39. Desert-land homesteading: The Senate passed legislation improving the prospects for homesteading on desert land which is subject to reclamation.

40. Air service to small communities: The Senate approved legislation which would remove legal barriers impeding or preventing airline service to small communities.

41. Disabled veterans: The Senate approved legislation easing the requirements for Federal aid to disabled veterans purchasing automobiles—disabled veterans who have been prevented from taking advantage of previous law because of technical requirements.

42. Foreign service: The Senate approved legislation correcting inequities in retirement benefits for foreign-service employees and thus proving to those in that service that Congress keeps faith with the public servants performing this important function.

43. Relief for those still missing in Korea: The Senate extended for 1 year legislation authorizing a continuance of pay of American service personnel who have been captured or who are missing in action in Korea.

44. Alaska: The Senate approved legislation which would authorize Alaska to obtain advances from the Treasury Unemployment Trust Fund and thus ward off suffering and economic disaster in the Territory.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

45. Teachers' salaries: The Senate approved legislation increasing teachers' salaries and the salaries of educational employees of the Board of Education and improving the conditions under which they are set.

46. Family court system: The Senate approved legislation establishing a family court system for the District of Columbia.

47. Civic auditorium: The Senate approved legislation authorizing a Federal commission to form plans for constructing a civic auditorium.

48. Antivandalism: The Senate approved legislation authorizing employees of the District of Columbia to protect life and property on property owned by the District outside of the District limits.

49. Judicial salaries: The Senate approved legislation authorizing an increase in the salaries of District of Columbia judges in order to bring them into line with present-day realities.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, no cold-war Congress has this been—as the President predicted last year when he was campaigning for his Republican supporters—and I use the term "supporters" loosely with considerable justification. The President, instead of being grateful for what his Congress has done, has taken it upon himself to chastise our splendid work and to criticize our leadership and to imply that because we did not do everything he wanted, we are now "dawdling."

Mr. President, I cannot sing enough praise of our great majority leader, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas. Quietly and without show or pretense, he has gone about the legislative chores of his office with leadership, great ability, diligence, and deep insight into the needs of the country. He has placated dissension and smoothed what otherwise might have become troublesome questions, and he has done so in such a manner as not only to keep the Democrats unified, but also to win the respect and admiration of many Senators on the opposite side of the aisle.

During the years I have been a Member of this body, the Senate has had several able leaders. With no thought of disparaging the others, I point out that we are in considerable accord that our present majority leader ranks among the greatest of those who have held the high honor of that office. He is by nature a kind and considerate man. By experience he is trained and efficient in taking his proper part in the functioning of our distinctive form of government.

I wish to read into the Record at this point excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, June 30. It says, among other things:

> It was a queer combination of shortsightedness and irritation that led President Eisenhower yesterday to make such an unwarranted slur on the cooperation of the Democratic majority leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson. * * *
>
> There has been precious little evidence of a political cold war, and Mr. Eisenhower's annoyance ought not to blind him to the substantial record of Senate legislative accomplishment made possible with Mr. Johnson's help. Let no one forget the Formosa defense resolution on which the Democrats rushed in to support the President, without reading the fine print. * * *
>
> On several occasions in the past this newspaper has been critical of Senator Johnson's leadership. We are happy to say that in this session of Congress he has exhibited a remarkable amount of finesse, understanding, and restraint in getting through important legislation quietly and with a minimum of controversy. Despite Mr. Eisenhower's tart comment, it is only fair to acknowledge that on many occasions Mr. Johnson has served the national interest more effectively than has the leadership of the President's own party.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that criticism of the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas is politically inspired and unfounded.

Senator Lyndon Johnson will be recorded in history as one of the great leaders of our Congress; and I wish to extend to him, for myself and my colleagues, heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 30, 1955, printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAJORITY LEADER

It was a queer combination of shortsightedness and irritation that led President Eisenhower yesterday to make such an unwarranted slur on the cooperation of the Democratic majority leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson. Understandably the Chief Executive is impatient about some of the pending legislation he wants passed, particularly the Military Reserve bill. Understandably, too, he may have been nettled by Senator Johnson's reference to the Eisenhower prediction last fall of a political cold war if the country did not return a Republican Congress. All political leaders are guilty of such silly extravagances at one time or another, and the best thing to do is to swallow them gracefully.

In any event, there has been precious little evidence of a political cold war, and Mr. Eisenhower's annoyance ought not to blind him to the substantial record of Senate legislative accomplishment made possible with Mr. JOHNSON's help. Let no one forget the Formosa defense resolution on which the Democrats rushed in to support the President without reading the fine print; the full foreign aid authorization; the various treaties; the housing bill; the reciprocal trade bill; the confirmation of John von Neumann as an Atomic Energy Commissioner; the squelching of Senator MCCARTHY in a demonstration of solidarity behind the President for the Big Four negotiations. If not all of these items have emerged in precisely the form the President wanted, and if much remains to be done, the record still reflects an unusual degree of cooperation by the opposition party on major legislation.

On several occasions in the past this newspaper has been critical of Senator JOHNSON's leadership. We are happy to say that in this session of Congress he has exhibited a remarkable amount of finesse, understanding and restraint in getting through important legislation quietly and with a minimum of controversy. Despite Mr. Eisenhower's tart comment, it is only fair to acknowledge that on many occasions Mr. JOHNSON has served the national interest more effectively than the leadership of the President's own party.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 2, strike out "$1,278,000,000" and insert "$1,133,000,000"; on page 2, after line 3, insert:

(b) In section 103 (b), after the word "chapter", insert "and of section 124."

On page 2, line 4, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; on page 2, line 12, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; on page 2, line 24, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; on page 3, line 3, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; on page 3, line 7, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)"; on page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "by adding, after section 123, the following new section:" and insert "as follows:

"(a) In section 121, which relates to southeast Asia and the western Pacific, strike out the fourth word of the third sentence, 'section', and insert 'title.'

"(b) Add after section 123 the following new section:."

On page 4, line 6, strike out "$70 million" and insert "$92 million"; on page 4, line 7, after "(Turkey)", insert "not less than $50 million of the funds made available under the authority of this subsection shall be used for assistance to Spain in accordance with the provisions of this section;"; on page 4, line 9, after "Africa", insert "*Provided,* That the amount made available for Greece for fiscal year 1956 shall not be less than that made available for such country for fiscal year 1955;"; on page 5, line 7, after "follows:" insert "After 'SEC. 142. Agreements.—' insert '(a)';"; on page 5, line 7, after "follows:" insert "in paragraph 10 strike out the comma and the word 'or' where they appear after the phrase 'any such assistance', and insert in lieu thereof 'and';"; on page 5, line 8, strike out "subsection" and insert "paragraph"; on page 5, line 9, after "period;" insert "and"; on page 5, line 10, strike out "subsection" and insert "paragraph"; on page 5, line 10, strike out "paragraph" and insert "subparagraph"; on page 5, line 12, strike out " " '(11)" " and insert "(b)"; on page 6, line 1, strike out all after "area';" down to and including "sentence." in line 3, and insert "Such assistance may be furnished on such terms and conditions as the President may specify and shall emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible."; on page 7, strike out line 25 over through line 3 on page 8, and insert:

(b) In section 402, which relates to the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, strike out "$350 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$600 million."

On page 8, strike out lines 16 through 20; on page 8, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; on page 9, line 1, strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; on page 9, strike out line 21 over through line 2 on page 10; on page 10, line 21, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)"; on page 10, line 23, strike out "1,300,000" and insert "$1,330,000"; on page 11, line 1, strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)"; on page 11, line 10, strike out "1" where it appears the second time, and insert "I"; on page 12, line 1, strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)"; on page 12, line 1, strike out "section" and insert "sections"; on page 13, line 6, after "any" insert "friendly"; on page 13, line 7, after "of" insert "friendly"; on page 13, line 8, after "That" insert "such assistance shall emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible, and"; on page 13, line 18, strike out "area"" and insert "area."; on page 13, after line 18, insert:

SEC. 419. World Health Organization: Section 3 (a) of Public Law 643, 80th Congress, approved June 14, 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization as apportioned by the Health Assembly in accordance with article 56 of the constitution of the Organization, except that payments by the United States for any fiscal year of the Organization after 1958 shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessments of active members of the Organization for such fiscal year; and."

SEC. 420. Joint Commission on Rural Development:

(a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Director, is hereby authorized to conclude an agreement with the Republic of the Philippines establishing a Joint Commission on Rural Development in the Philippines, to be composed of two citizens of the United States appointed by the President of the United States and three citizens of the Philippines appointed by the President of the Republic of the Philippines. Such Commission shall, subject to the general direction and control of the Director, formulate and carry out a program for development of the rural areas of the Philippines, which shall include such research and training activities as may be necessary or appropriate for such development: *Provided,* That assistance furnished under this section shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for making any further contributions to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) Insofar as practicable, an amount equal to not more than 10 percent of the funds programed in any fiscal year for the Republic of the Philippines under title I, chapter 3, and title III of this act shall be used to carry out the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

On page 13, strike out lines 22 through 25; on page 14, line 1, strike out "(b)" and insert "(a)"; on page 14, line 8, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 14, line 10, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; on page 14, after line 11, insert:

(2) Amend section 505 (a) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and shall emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible."

On page 14, line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; on page 14, strike out lines 21 through 22, and insert:

(d) In section 509, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, add the following sentence at the end thereof:.

On page 17, line 10, after "549" insert "(a)"; on page 18, line 1, after "States" insert "to a greater extent"; on page 18, line 3, strike out "act."" and insert "act."; on page 18, after line 3, insert:

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this act shall be administered so as to assist other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

And on page 18, after line 3, insert:

SEC. 12. It is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Secretary of the Senate was authorized to receive messages from the House during the adjournment of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Vice

President or the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. Barkley] was authorized, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF CHARTER AND FRANCHISE OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, Mr. Neely, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Case of New Jersey, Mr. Payne, and Mr. Beall, a joint resolution reading as follows:

> The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, as amended (47 Stat. 752), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:
>
> "Sec. 14. The charter and all rights of franchise of the Capital Transit Co. created by this resolution are hereby repealed in accordance with the terms of section 13 hereof."

Mr. President, what this joint resolution means is that the Congress of the United States is asked to lift the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. and deny it, under the terms of section 13 of the 1933 law, the privilege and the right to operate a transit company on the streets of Washington, D. C., following the termination date provided for in the joint resolution, which is 1 year from the date the franchise is lifted.

The sponsors of this joint resolution have given very careful consideration to the seriousness of all its implications. It will be noted that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] were members of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee which last year, over a period of several weeks, conducted hearings on the Capital Transit problems in the District of Columbia. It was my honor and privilege to serve with them on that subcommittee.

Yesterday in the debate, reference was made to the report which we filed. The report, as Members of the Senate know, received very favorable comment not only from our colleagues in the Senate, but from District of Columbia officials as well.

On the basis of our hearings last year and our fears last year—about which we forewarned the Senate—that if the Capital Transit Co. did not mend its ways, there would occur just such a crisis as that with which we are faced today, we, as sponsors of this joint resolution, have come to the conclusion that the Capital Transit Co. has so completely failed in its responsibilities to the public and the District of Columbia, in failing to give the District of Columbia the quality of service to which the people are entitled under the franchise, that there is only one thing we can do to protect the public interest, and that is to bring to an end the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. in this District.

Prior to introducing this joint resolution, those of us who are lawyers have consulted with experts in the municipal law field. We are aware that this joint resolution has some legal implications, and involves some problems, but they are not serious, and they are not intricate. Precedents are many in which municipalities, finding that a company has failed to give the service to which the municipality is entitled, have canceled franchises. What I wish to make very clear is that the Capital Transit strike actually is a strike by management, because management has been so adamant in failing to cooperate with the District of Columbia, with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and with the Mediation Service, in reaching an agreement for peaceful procedures for the settlement of this dispute, that it is difficult for us to reach any other conclusion than that the Capital Transit Co. has no real intention to cooperate with the authorities, but rather has stiff-neckedly decided that it is going to try to bull its way through, and throw the entire system into such chaos that it thinks the Congress will either have to give it a fat, juicy plum by way of a Government subsidy to operate the company, or take the company over through some form of public ownership.

As I stated yesterday, the sponsors of this joint resolution are completely opposed to public ownership. Lifting a franchise does not lead to public ownership. On the contrary, lifting a franchise leads to providing an opportunity to another private concern, or other private concerns, to enter into an arrangement with the District Commissioners for taking a new franchise under a license granted to them, and operating a transit system in the District which will give the people of the District the service to which they are entitled.

Today the Federal Government in Washington, D. C., has been slowed down as a result of this strike. The situation is one which cannot be tolerated, merely because a franchise exists in favor of a company which has followed the course of action this company has followed.

Our situation today, as we tried to forewarn the Congress last year in our transit-hearings report, comes about because the syndicate headed by Louis E. Wolfson was permitted to purchase a public utility and to exploit it to the hilt. Despite continued pleas of poverty, the firm has continued to pay out dividends higher than the old management ever paid, and during a time when its volume of business has been declining.

The company showed a net income of more than $900,000 for the 12 months ending March 31, 1955, yet it tells its employees and the community at large that it cannot offer the workers anything—not one thin dime.

However, the sponsors of the joint resolution do not want to prejudge this organization. We realize that the franchise is an important property right. We wish to grant to the company all possible opportunity to prove that it is entitled to continue to enjoy the monopoly and rate protections granted to it under the franchise.

We are therefore inviting Louis E. Wolfson to testify at a subcommittee hearing next Thursday morning at 10 o'clock a. m. If he does not respond to our invitation voluntarily, it is only fair for us to announce that we shall issue a subpena for a meeting on a subsequent date.

Mr. Wolfson has been gaining national publicity as an expanding business leader. He should welcome the opportunity to show what he considers to be his responsibilities in operating a public utility in the Nation's capital, a place where the only large industry is the conduct of the Government's business itself.

In no small measure the Government business depends for its effective administration upon the public transit system operated by Mr. Wolfson.

I wish to explain to the Senate the significance of the removal of this franchise. It was granted by Congress to give a public utility an opportunity to operate on public streets without competition and with the assurance that rates would be set so as to provide a fair rate of return.

The Wolfson syndicate, with its 243 percent return on its investment—we are dealing here, I repeat, with a company which has received 243 percent return on its investment—can have little complaint about its rate of return. The Wolfson syndicate has been dealt with fairly not only by the District government, but by the community at large. The Wolfson syndicate has had an opportunity which few transit companies in the United States have ever had. It has had the opportunity to get a fair return; and along with the opportunity should go the responsibility of giving the people of the District fair service.

In the revocation of the franchise the company assumes the clear obligation to remove all its streetcar tracks and turnarounds, and to repave the streets in their former condition. This, I am informed, would involve an expenditure on the part of the company of about $5 million.

I wish to make it very clear that the lifting of this franchise would not leave the company without any obligations, because when they assumed their obligations under the franchise they assumed the duty, and became liable for the expense, of removing their tracks and turn-arounds if and when the franchise was brought to an end by way of legal action. As I have said, I am told that that would involve a cost of about $5 million.

How Mr. Wolfson's shareholders will feel about holding his stock is something for him to ask himself. It is late, but not too late, for him to show that he understands the American tradition that those who devote themselves to public service must put public service above private profit.

From studies of the manipulations of the Capital Transit Co., and from the testimony of Mr. Wolfson on the stand more than a year ago, when our committee was holding its investigation of the transit system, it must be apparent that Mr. Wolfson never has appreciated the fact that public service comes first in the operation of a public utility and that private profit comes second. Any one who assumes the benefits granted to a public utility under a franchise must automatically consider himself pledged to place public service first. He accepts the obligations of the franchise, because he is satisfied that he can place the public interest first and still find it to be a good business proposition in view of the protection he has under the franchise against competition, and in view of the fact that under the franchise he is automatically guaranteed, for example, consideration from a public utility commission, which under the law must fix rates which will give to the public utility a fair return.

However, Mr. President, we can no longer tolerate the financial abuses of the Capital Transit Co.; we can no longer continue to tolerate the fiscal policies of the company, and we can no longer tolerate the exceedingly bad service which the company is supplying the streetcar and bus riders of the District of Columbia.

Again I take Senators back to the hearings of last year. I ask them to read the testimony of the witnesses and to note the opposition the company invariably puts up when community and citizens' associations file their petitions to have service extended to a new area, in which new housing has gone up and to which sizable populations have moved.

The record shows that the company does not give the people living in such new areas bus service until, finally, so much pressure is put on, and the District officials make repeated representations, that usually months later there is provided the bus service which ought to have been provided from the beginning after the population had moved in.

I have had a good many telephone calls today with regard to the legal effects of the joint resolution. Some people seem to be laboring under the misapprehension that the joint resolution is a step toward public ownership. Not at all.

Every sponsor of the joint resolution is opposed to public ownership. The present speaker will take the lead, if necessary, in opposition to any proposal for public ownership. We do not need public ownership in the District of Columbia to provide the riders in the District the good service to which they are entitled.

It is true, as was pointed out to me by several people this morning, that the whole trend during the past 10 years in connection with transit systems in the United States has been a trend in the direction of public ownership. But it does not follow that we need public ownership in the District of Columbia. It can be very easily shown and quickly developed that there are private companies which would be very glad to come into the District and operate under a franchise to be granted to them after the Wolfson franchise has been lifted.

Therefore I say to the people of the District of Columbia that, in spite of the propaganda they will probably be reading in the next few days with regard to the joint resolution I have introduced, and regardless of the interpretation some will give to it, namely, that it is a joint resolution for the establishment of public ownership, the direct contrary is the truth. It is not a public ownership joint resolution. It is a joint resolution which merely states that we will no longer give the privileges of a franchise to a company, known as the Wolfson syndicate, which has violated and abused the privileges granted to it under that franchise. What the joint resolution says, in effect, is that we are fed up with the Wolfson operation of the Capital Transit system in the District of Columbia and we will have some other private company given the opportunity to show that private enterprise really can work on a basis of serving the public, and that the private enterprise system should not be used, as the Wolfson syndicate has used it, to exploit the people of the District of Columbia. That is what the joint resolution means.

Some persons seem to be alarmed today that if the franchise is lifted the city may go for a year without any transit system, because the Wolfson Co. will not liquidate its holdings.

Let me point out that all that the lifting of the franchise means is that the company will have to liquidate its holdings. Anyone who has the idea that lifting the franchise means that the company can take the District of Columbia into court, so to speak, and get payment for its property because the franchise has been lifted, has another thought coming to him.

What the joint resolution means is that when we lift the franchise the Wolfson syndicate will have to look to other sources for disposal of its property. It will have to junk its rolling stock. It will have to find someone who wants to buy the already outdated streetcars. It will have to find someone who will buy the buses.

Let me make very clear that the legal effect of the lifting of the franchise in no way creates any legal obligation or liability on the part of the District of Columbia to pay the company for anything. The city would not have to buy a yard of track or a trolley or any of the antiquated rolling stock. It would be up to Mr. Wolfson to do the best he could to have that stock purchased by someone else.

Let me whisper into the ears of the stockholders that if Mr. Wolfson's experience is the experience of other transit companies in the past 10 years, he will get junk prices for his rolling stock. I say that because once the franchise is lifted the District Commissioners will be in a position to enter into franchise arrangements with any other concern in the country, and such other company will be in a position to come into the city with its own rolling stock, or go anywhere it pleases to buy its rolling stock. So far as the new company is concerned, it is a matter of tabula rasa. A new company need not have any dealings with the Wolfson syndicate. What the lifting of the franchise means, in effect, is that we find the Wolfson syndicate to be undesirable renters. In other words, they have torn the wallpaper off the walls and have destroyed the faucets and punched holes in the plaster and torn up the floors, and we feel, therefore, that the time has come to eject them. The joint resolution is a resolution of rejection. We are merely saying to the Wolfson syndicate, "We are fed up with you, and we are kicking you out. We don't want any more of you. We will do business with people who can come into the city and protect our property." That is what the joint resolution means.

For the benefit of those who seem to be concerned about how they will get to work, let me call their attention to a situation which existed in Detroit a few years ago. The city of Detroit had difficulty with an adamant transit company, and it decided to get along without that transit company.

Accordingly, the city fathers decided they would work out an arrangement with the employees of the transit union which had been subjected to the same kind of treatment to which the Capital Transit Co. is subjecting its worker. The city fathers entered into an arrangement with the transit workers for the setting up of a jitney service in the city of Detroit.

It was such a great success, Mr. President, and the people of Detroit became so satisfied with it that it took some years to get rid of the jitney service; and there is still some question as to whether it would not have been better to continue the jitney service transportation in Detroit.

I mention that, Mr. President, only to dispel any notion that if we follow this course of action there will not be any transportation system in the District of Columbia for the next year. The lifting of the franchise does not take away from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the power to proceed to supply the people of the District of Columbia with transportation service.

I throw out as a little suggestion the delight which I am sure many used-car dealers in the city of Washington would have in that situation. The District of Columbia fathers can work out an arrangement that will cover the insurance situation so that when we ride in that kind of a vehicle there will be insurance compensation. Can we not imagine how the used-car dealers would like that? Of course, Mr. President, the service could not be any worse than that which has been furnished by the Capital Transit Co.

Mr. President, I shall have some other suggestions to make as the days go by, because we are in this fight to the finish. After all, we have been patient and tolerant with the company. The time has now come for the Congress, in view of the fact that it has continued to assume governmental powers over the District rather than for the District of Columbia to govern itself, to take on the Wolfson syndicate. We are not going to tolerate any longer the inexcusably poor service which the company has furnished.

So I wish to say, in closing, that we introduce the joint resolution. We mean it, and we are going to vote for it.

We are going to give Mr. Wolfson and his associates a fair hearing where they can demonstrate to us that a course of action will be followed in the future which will justify our giving them further consideration, under very ironclad conditions to which they will have to subscribe if they desire to continue in business. We will give them a hearing but we wish to make it very clear to them that, so far as the sponsors of the joint resolution are concerned, the burden of proof is now on the syndicate. We think the evidence is so overwhelmingly against the syndicate that the final result will be the passage of the resolution, thus providing an opportunity to a private enterprise in this community which will recognize that the public service comes first and profit dollars second in the field of public utilities. We shall afford such private enterprise an opportunity to give the people of the District of Columbia the kind of service to which they are entitled and which they have not received from the Wolfson syndicate.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple of points along the lines of those so ably made by the Senator from Oregon.

First, I desire to reiterate what the Senator from Oregon stated, that those who have joined in sponsoring the joint resolution and are interested in seeing it carried through have determined that it shall not be the beginning of a move toward public ownership. In fact, what we are doing is preventing a drifting of affairs which, if left to themselves, would inevitably lead to Government ownership. Our goal is precisely the reverse of that.

Second, Mr. President, what we are doing is initiating a proceeding which does look toward lifting the franchise; but it looks toward lifting the franchise, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, after ample opportunity for hearing, so that no question can be raised that the Congress has acted whimsically or arbitrarily. No such intention is involved in any sense. Our purpose is to give all parties in interest an opportunity to appear and testify. Only after that is done will action be taken by the committee and, later, by the Congress.

I say that because I believe that kind of proceeding is in accord with the traditions of our country.

Mr. President, I wish it to be very clear that the people of the District of Columbia will never at any time be faced with arbitrary action on the part of the United States, and that those who undertake to render service may do so with full confidence that they will be given every proper consideration in undertaking to establish public transportation service.

I wish to second what the Senator from Oregon so ably has stated, and I am very happy to join with him and my other colleagues in sponsoring this joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I think he has said more ably and concisely than I have that we assure a fair hearing.

Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, as amended, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, July 5, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Caleb M. Wright, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware, to fill a new position.

IN THE NAVY

Barton LeR. Smith (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Thomas E. Froehlke
Chester J. Schultz, Jr.
William R. Shiller
James S. Smith

Milton T. Shoffeitt, Warrant Officer, USN, to be appointed a temporary chief warrant officer in the Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William E. Ball, Jr.
Donald G. Mason

The following-named enlisted aviation pilots for temporary appointment to the grade indicated in the Line in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Carl G. W. Axberg
Joseph W. Bagby
Clifford F. Blecha
Richard Bruce
James A. Clark
Charles McC. Dill
Herbert C. Dorn
Norman K. Edwards
Albert B. Fite
Lafayette F. Jensen, Jr.
William H. Johnson
John D. Loeffler
LeRoy McArthur
Ben D. Mann
Calvin W. Martin
William C. Potts
Robert "E" Sigman
Hubert Smolsnik
Joseph M. Sousa
Harley E. Talkington
Fred "E" Tankersley, Jr.
Clarence B. Vaughn
Rowland E. Walker
Albert G. Wallace
Frederick T. Walsh, Jr.
John T. Williss
George R. Wrigley

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Fred J. Albrecht
Edward O. Anderson, Jr.
Ernest J. Anderson
William R. Bailey, Jr.
Ralph S. Barnett
Leroy L. Barton
Bill J. Beard
Stanley A. Bloom
Irwin G. Bonner
James D. Breedlove
Edward M. Brodhead
Oscar W. Butner, Jr.
David H. Chantler
William G. Christie
William K. Clingenpeel
Benjamin F. Collins
Ernest J. Coppola
Eugene Crouch
Charles H. Davidson
John D. Davis, Jr.
William L. Drake
Albert L. Evans
Charles E. Folz
Frank P. Foster
Hollis V. Garver
Russell P. Granger
John L. Grassi
Donald L. Hall
Van C. Hardin
Marion A. Higdon
Franklin M. Howell
George A. Hughes
Clifford V. Jensen
Harlie Johnson
Wesley A. Johnson
Michael G. Kane
Carl W. Killebrew
Daniel J. Kirtley
Cleo J. Kube
Steve T. Kuklinski
Vincent G. Law
Earl C. Lee
Ura B. Lemen
Lawrence J. Logan
Mason G. Maddox
Donald F. Martin
John R. Matheny
Richard E. Meyer
John R. Nation
Robert M. Ogilvie
Benjamin D. Pennington, Jr.
Malcolm C. Peterson
Frank J. Price
William J. Price
Clinton P. Randle
Garland McB. Renegar
Joseph D. Richards
Joseph E. Ross
August J. Sereno
George W. Shockey
Donald E. Smith
Maurice Sprague, Jr.
George R. Stewart
Robert F. Strickland
Benjamin R. Strong
Charles C. Witkowski
Jack W. Zinn

ENSIGN

Curtis R. Allen
Royce E. Allen, Jr.
Arnold S. Althouse
Leo A. Ambrosini
Howard R. Anderson
Gerald G. Aulick
Robert B. Bailey
Earl R. Baker
Floyd O. Baker
John W. Ball
Francis W. Balsley
Harold C. Barton
Joseph F. Baszak
Morris R. Baudouin
John M. Beaton
Richard J. Beck
Brewer Bell
John E. Bennett, Jr.
Raymond E. Berger
Paul J. Bezilla
Howard W. Bledsoe
Deward C. Blevins
William T. Boegel
Robert E. Brink
Thomas E. Brogan
Harold W. Brown
Jere F. Brown
Louis Burghardt, Jr.
Nicholas Calamaras
Robert W. Camp
Henry Cardoza
Leamon F. Carpenter
John T. Carroll
Robert J. Carroll
Lyle H. Caselton
Phillip N. Cedercrans
Stanley Chemacki
Wesley T. Christensen
Joseph E. Clark
Leroy A. Clement
Duane L. Click
Ernest E. Coffee
Frederick W. Collom, Jr.
George E. Cothran
Francis X. Cotton
Walter E. Coupe
Kenneth J. Cozine
Stephnos D. Craig
Elwood A. Crosby
Billy Crowder
Guy T. Crowe
Nelson M. Daniels
Jack R. Davidson
Eugene L. Davies
Milton W. Davis
Allan F. deWitt
Olan LeR. Dockery
Samuel W. Doran
Leon L. Drake
William D. Dugan, Jr.
James L. Dwyer
Harry L. Earman
Thomas E. Eason
John H. Elliott
Charles F. Ervin
Fredrick L. Eversole
Donald P. Fauth
Fred R. Fehrle
Clayton J. Fenton, Jr.
Arthur T. Folds
Harold E. Fox
Wallace LeR. Franchini
Paul R. Francis
Charles W. Frey
Elmer H. Frokjer
Fred R. Fuller
Vincent E. Gallagher
Norman D. Garsoe
Gilbert H. Geer
George W. Gilpin
Charles R. Goetz
Louis G. Gomez
Kenneth L. Gormley
Jack M. Gougar
Claude A. Grant
Albert M. Grisham
Paul J. Gurnon
Wesley E. Guthrie
Harold F. Haff
Donald E. Hamilton
Lawrence W. Hansen
George S. Harney
Homer D. Harris
Owen P. Hartshorn
Irving W. Hastings, Jr.
Willis G. Hatfield
Edwin J. Hegar
Frank E. Heggood
Milton H. Heitman
Ralph M. Helm
Lloyd A. Higgins
Edward L. Hogeboom, Jr.
Richard F. Howell
Milford M. Hubbell
James H. Huckaby
Walter C. Huff, Jr.
Lloyd H. Hunt
Wilmer M. Hurst
Charles H. Hutto
Carle L. Jackson
Arthur G. Jacobs
Frank D. James
Bobbie D. Johnson
Harrison A. Johnson
William F. Kennedy
Ira N. Kilpatrick
Clarence R. Kincade
Frederick J. Kindsvater, Jr.
Archie R. Kouns
Earl L. Lackey
George E. Lamm
Mervin H. Law
Ervin J. Lawler
Roman R. Lewinski
Harold C. Lohr
William N. Longley
Francis E. McBride
Harry E. McCoy
"J" "P" McCullough
William E. McGowan
William G. McIntire, Jr.
Frank R. McKee
William E. McKinzie
Dale A. McNeil

Edward W. McPherson
Roy L. Magarity
Reginald T. Marrion
Vincent F. Martensen
Charles G. Martin
Harding W. W. May
Robert V. Mayer
William S. Mikeal
Donald R. Miller
James R. Miller
John Mizerak
Vernon D. Moffitt
Arthur E. Molloy
Edward P. Monahan
Robert E. Moore
Darrell Murray
Robert P. Nielsen
Francis J. Novarra
Arthur A. Nowak
John H. Ogden
Wayne J. Orchard
Carl R. Parrick
Homer W. Pate
James W. Patterson, Jr.
Ray A. Patterson
Edward A. Perez
Falvey C. Powell, Jr.
Francis L. Powell
Robert C. Proctor
Edward E. Riley, Jr.
William Riley
Theodore L. Rivenburg
Gerard J. Rodrigue
Robert R. Roehren
Charles P. Roemer
Joseph A. Rogers
Scott K. Ross
Frederick F. Schneider, Jr.
August O. Schwatka, Jr.
Robert J. Shanley
Woodrow W. Shelton
Augustine J. Smith, Jr.
Warren R. Smith
Wayne H. Smith
Arthur W. Snively
Fred Sorenson, Jr.
Edward F. Souza
Raymond S. Spindler
Franklin L. Spivey
Bruce E. Sponie
Bert C. Spray
Virgil K. Starbuck
William N. Straughan
James E. Thompson
Duane W. Thorin
Hugh Tiernay
Hugh G. Truax
Richard L. Tugwell
Vernon K. Turner
Eugene M. Tyler
John P. Ussher
Wrencie Vickers
Walter M. Voorhees
Maurice L. Walleen
James E. Walters
Lloyd C. Watson
Arch T. West
Donald R. Westendorf, Jr.
Paul G. Wheeler
Jimmie Whitten
Max W. Widen
Clayton B. Willis
William E. Wilson
James Yarber
John G. Yates
Aubrey B. Zaner
Howard Ziemer
Joseph W. Ziskovsky

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1, 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Lieutenant colonel to colonel

AIR FORCE

Beckwith, James Orrin, 1316A.
Knox, Omar Ellsworth, 1420A.
Wells, Joseph Breece, 1453A.
Reid, William Mason, 1518A.
Rueter, Chris Henry William, 1536A.
Schmitt, Arthur William, Jr., 1573A.
Kiehle, Edward George, 1580A.
Smith, Sydney Thomas, 1626A.
Wynne, Prentiss Davis, Jr., 1699A.
McKeever, Matthew James, Jr., 1710A.
Webb, Byron Benjiman, 1716A.
Brannon, Dale Donald, 1718A.
Seim, Howard Bayzand, Jr., 1724A.
Overing, Glendon Philip, 1739A.
Slayden, Van Hatton, 1769A.
Sluder, Chester Lee, 1780A.
French, Donald James, 1781A.
Bleyer, Julian Marian, 1782A.
Kime, Duane Louis, 1787A.
Mason, Robert Julian, 1798A.
Kellond, Arthur William, 1832A.
Taylor, Broadus Beene, 1833A.
Endress, Albert Vandenburgh, 1843A.
Barksdale, William Sydnor, Jr., 1844A.
Bailey, J. C., 1862A.
Greenfield, William Dumont, 1899A.
Vaughn, Harley Camden, 1915A.
Dittman, Henry, 1922A.
Loberg, Edwin Andrew, 1923A.
Mace, Wallace Packard, 1929A.
Witty, Robert William, 1932A.
Frontczak, Arthur Theodore, 2017A.
Harper, Bryan Brand, 2036A.
Boyd, William Ellsworth, 2050A.
Graves, Frank Norton, 2064A.
O'Keefe, Keefe, 2087A.
Todd, Harold Elworthy, 2096A.
Hawley, Ray Matthew, 2105A.
Larson, Carl Henry, 19669A.
Sweeney, Henry Morrow, 2210A.
Estes, Murl, 2213A.
Dreier, Wendell Carl, 2226A.
Gibson, William Louis, 2359A.
Lange, Harry Alfred, 2390A.
Churchill, Randolph Emerson, 2496A.
Kerbel, Walter, 2507A.
Gallagher, Robert Emmett, 2575A.
Nay, Paul Franklin, 2584A.
de Tolly, Nicholas Semigradov, 2623A.
Hedleston, Robert Webb, 2625A.
Wickland, Daniel William, 2628A.
Long, Lewis Rex, 2638A.
Wolters, Delevan Edward, 2652A.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, 2764A.
Hope, John Warren, 2778A.
King, Herbert Thompson, 2855A.
Olson, Harry Armand, 2858A.
Hotmann, William August, 2863A.
Hreha, Joseph Albert, 2865A.
Parrot, Kent Kane, Jr., 2930A.
Holland, Thomas Elbridge, 2933A.
Caples, James Stephen, 2943A.
Krieger, George Hubert, 2953A.
Lindstrand, Carl Barber, 2962A.
Woodward, Lester Lee, 2964A.
Waddell, James Marion, 2973A.
Humphreys, Lloyd Ronald, 2989A.
McKnight, David Thomas, 2998A.
Fischer, Milton, 3002A.
Hahn, Clarence William, 3003A.
Leonhard, William Edward, 18095A.
Trotter, John Turner, 3012A.
Smith, William Hightower, 3013A.
Sladek, Robert Frederick, Sr., 3014A.
Bechtel, Howard John, 3015A.
Houghton, Edwin Gordon, 3031A.
Lay, Dent Leroy, 5264A.
Holdiman, Thomas Alexander, 3049A.
Blaha, Elmer Carl, 3051A.
Rizon, Robert Lewis, 3074A.
Rowden, Burton Houston, 3076A.
Peck, Ben Jackson, 2844A.
Impson, Ivan Hurst, 3077A.
Bell, Leon Edwin, Jr., 3091A.
Gillis, Charles Francis, 3097A.
Robinson, Raymond Edward, 3106A.
Lee, James Lyle, 3112A.
Pinson, Ernest Alexander, 3117A.
Loomis, Oliver DeMond, 3118A.
Seeley, John Milton, 3132A.
Neuendorf, Charles William, 3139A.
Carson, Charles Edgar, 3140A.
O'Connell, James Francis Xavier, 3142A.
Johnson, James McLean, 3160A.
Jackson, Jerome William, 3168A.
Dishuck, John Joseph, 3189A.
Hylton, John Thomas, Jr., 3203A.
Morgan, Chester Harvey, 3210A.
Reed, Elliott Hartley, 3224A.
Hampton, Thomas Kerns, 3228A.
Hight, Fred Thomson, 3233A.
Donley, John Bland, 3241A.
Gauss, William Henry, 3243A.
Drysdale, Taylor, 3276A.
Richard, Septime Severous, Jr., 3312A.
Johnston, Ronald Alexander, 3315A.
McConnell, Landon Edward, 3316A.
Bonawitz, Norval C., 3320A.
Belville, Robert Edward, 3323A.
Peterson, David Allen, 3325A.
Hosken, Robert Thomas, 3330A.
Braddock, Joel Quinn, 3331A.
Thackara, Paul Nelson, 3332A.
Edmonds, Melvin Thornton, 3339A.
Lindgren, Richard Wendell, 3343A.
Christensen, John Albert, 3347A.
Murray, John Edward, 3351A.
Long, Charles James, 3d, 3354A.
Foerster, Frederick Henry, Jr., 3355A.
Maxwell, Ernest Beverly, 3356A.
Hall, Leonard Roger, 3364A.
Knierim, Charles Frederick, 3378A.
Felton, George Boyd, 3380A.
McCrery, Robert Riley, 3381A.
Andersen, Milo Peter, 3386A.
Forsyth, Allen Peter, 3393A.
Proctor, John Peebles, 3405A.
Smith, Weldon Halliwell, 3407A.
Lawrence, Reesor Mott, 3408A.
McNeal, Thomas Carl, 3410A.
Fletcher, Thomas, Jr., 3414A.
Casey, Edward Richard, 3415A.
Walker, Arthur James, 3421A.
Clark, William Coombs, 3422A.
Terhune, Charles Houston, Jr., 3424A.
Bridges, John DeGraff, 3425A.
Healy, John Patrick, 3429A.
Dechaene, Andre Jacques, 3442A.
Sharp, Frank Douglas, 3444A.
Gurnett, Thomas Edward, 3446A.
Beightol, Willis Eugene, 3448A.
Meng, Lewis Bruno, 3449A.
Longino, Houston Walker, Jr., 3452A.
Bane, Edwin Ronald, 3454A.
Clausen, Leslie Conway, 3459A.
Barrere, Robert Andrew, 3460A.
McCants, Leland Stanford, Jr., 3473A.
Cox, Albert Lyman, Jr., 3475A.
Andrews, Charles Comer, 3476A.
Wood, Harold Lee, 3479A.

MEDICAL

Myers, Harold Allen, 19098A.
Ferris, Donald Lockhart, 19110A.
White, Claude Benjamin, 19632A.
McCarroll, William Harroll, 19111A.

DENTAL

Gillinger, Clarence Wayne, 18825A.

VETERINARY

Robinson, Charles Edwin, 18980A.
Miller, Robert Ransome, 18981A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Crow, Allen Randolph, 19398A.
Zagelow, Leonard Paul, 19579A.

CHAPLAIN

Taylor, Robert Preston, 18737A.

First lieutenant to captain

AIR FORCE

Ray, Colonel Scudder, Jr., 26755A.

DENTAL

Adkisson, Sam Robert, 26749A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 415 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned duties of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 415 in ranks as follows:

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Christian F. Schilt, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in our prayer at this morning hour we would thank Thee for the independence of our beloved country and invoke the blessings of Thy grace and favor upon our democracy with its ideals and principles of freedom and fraternity.

Grant that we may have the faith and courage to believe that worldwide democracy is inevitable and Thy divinely ordained purpose for all mankind and that nothing can impede its progress and its triumph.

We beseech Thee that democracy here in these United States may always be of the very finest and noblest kind. May it be a democracy whose freedom is coordinated with discipline and spiritual vision and a lofty conception of the sanctity of law and order and the rights of others.

Help us daily to put forth a more heroic effort in behalf of peace and a social order wherein the happiness and welfare of all the members of the human family are our deepest concern.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1044. An act for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 184. An act to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Asher Ezrachi;

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders;

S. 476. An act for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Hedi Gertrude Spiecker;

S. 987. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary;

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga;

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Luca Saltarelli;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas;

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1220. An act for the relief of Josephine Ray;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil; and

S. 1577. An act to amend the acts granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate toll bridges across the Connecticut River.

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from New York propose to explain this bill or to explain what the conferees did on this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from New York will endeavor to answer any questions that the gentleman from Iowa may ask, I assure the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1043)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 9, 11, 17, 23, 24, 25, 34, 40, 43, 44, 45, 48, 51, and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, 22, 32, 33, 39, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$66,760,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10; and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,115,905"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "fence or demarcation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided,* That not to exceed $3,300,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,570,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred and seventy"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,276,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: in lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$85,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 12, 13, 27, 30, 35, 37, 46, and 49.

John J. Rooney,
Prince H. Preston,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
Don Magnuson,
Clarence Cannon,
F. R. Coudert, Jr.,
Frank T. Bow,
Cliff Clevenger,
John Taber,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Harley M. Kilgore,
Allen J. Ellender,
John J. McClellan,
Warren G. Magnuson,
Carl Hayden,
Spessard L. Holland,
Earle C. Clements,
Theodore Francis Green,
Mike Mansfield,
Styles Bridges,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Joseph McCarthy,
Karl E. Mundt,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Everett McKinley Dirksen,
Bourke B. Hickenlooper,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $66,760,000 instead of $63,760,000 as proposed by the House and $68,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended includes $1,822,304 above the House allowance for the personnel improvement program and $1,177,696 for staff strengthening and operating expenses. No funds are included for the trade commissioners and supporting staff or for expansion of the Foreign Service economic reporting activities.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Representation allowances

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Restore language as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $575,000 instead of $475,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Acquisition of buildings abroad

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $8,500,000 instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,201,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Provides that $7,500,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury instead of $6,250,000 as proposed by the House and $10,036,257 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Allocates not to exceed $900,000 for administrative expenses instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Contributions to international organizations

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $28,115,905 instead of $28,079,977 as proposed by the House and $28,247,608 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

International contingencies

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,300,000 instead of $1,075,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico

Amendment No. 15: Inserts the words "fence or demarcation" instead of language proposed by the House and Senate.

American Sections, International Commissions

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $285,000 instead of $245,000 as proposed by the House and $286,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International Fisheries Commissions

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $455,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $425,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

International Educational Exchange activities

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $18,000,000 instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the House and $22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Restricts administrative expenses to not to exceed $3,300,000 instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House and no restrictions as proposed by the Senate.

None of the funds made available in this item shall be used to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a foreign university of another foreign country. No funds made available in this item are to be used for construction. The conferees are in full agreement as to the making of the study and report as directed in the Senate report numbered 378.

Government in occupied areas

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $7,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

General provisions—Department of State

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, and 25: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Salaries and Expenses, General Administration

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $2,570,000 instead of $2,525,000 as proposed by the House and $2,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $9,300,000 instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $17,240,000 instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House and $17,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special Temporary Attorneys and Assistants

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 31: Allows purchase of not to exceed 170 passenger motor vehicles instead of 150 as proposed by the House and 197 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Allows purchase of not to exceed 7 aircraft as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $44,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $44,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Federal prison system

Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $28,800,000 instead of $28,600,000 as proposed by the House and $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Buildings and Facilities

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $875,000 instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Alien Property

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 39: Allows $2,800,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

General provisions—Department of Justice

Amendment No. 40: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services

Salaries of Supporting Personnel

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $14,000,000 instead of $13,593,240 as proposed by the House and $14,417,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $2,276,750 instead of $2,170,250 as proposed by the House and $2,383,250 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $85,000,000 instead of $80,500,000 as proposed by the House and $88,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 50: Provides not to exceed $50,000 for representation allowances instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Inserts language proposed by the House and deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Refugee relief

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
FRANK T. BOW,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the total of the budget estimates for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Judiciary, and the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year which begins today were in the amount of $483,531,912. As the bill passed the House it carried appropriations of $450,398,227. This figure was raised in the other body to the amount of $481,985,418. The conference report now before the House for consideration carries the amount $466,302,415, which would be $17,229,497 below the total of the budget estimates and $15,683,003 below the amount appropriated by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 4, line 20, insert ": *Provided further,* That hereafter the position of Budget Officer of the Department shall be in GS-18 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 8, line 6, strike out all after the semicolon in lines 6 and 7, and insert "travel expenses."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if we cannot boil this down to some figures that we can all understand. The other body raised this bill by about $31½ million; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. That is approximately correct. The exact figure was $31,587,191.

Mr. GROSS. What is the specific difference between the bill as originally passed by the House and the money increase as proposed by the other body?

Mr. ROONEY. The gross figure recommended in this conference report is in the amount of $15,904,198 above the House figure, but it is $15,683,003 below the Senate figure.

Mr. GROSS. Then the managers split the difference as between the Senate increase over the House figure. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. ROONEY. In effect, that is about what it amounts to moneywise. The gentleman, I am sure, realizes that in the conference—and there were 16 appointed conferees on the part of the other body—we did what we thought was the best we could under all the circumstances. All the conferees on the part of the House were in agreement as to the amounts incorporated in this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. So it is approximately $15 million higher than the bill reported by the House.

Mr. ROONEY. It is.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say where those increases went?

Mr. ROONEY. In the International Educational Exchange program; in the foreign buildings program; in the USIA; in a number of items for the Department of Justice, and in some substantial increases in connection with the Federal Judiciary.

Mr. GROSS. The language with respect to Representation Allowances, as I understand it, the other body changed that to Operations Allowance.

Mr. ROONEY. No. The House insisted on keeping the well-known title "Representation Allowances." We succeeded in doing that. However, we did have to raise the House figure for Representation Allowances from $475,000 to $575,000. The amount inserted in the bill by the other body for this activity was $700,000.

Mr. GROSS. How much did you say is in this bill for entertainment, otherwise known as Representation Allowance?

Mr. ROONEY. $575,000, an increase of $100,000 over the amount allowed by the House.

Mr. GROSS. $575,000.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. For entertainment purposes?

Mr. ROONEY. It is for Representation Allowances, and the gentleman from Iowa well understands that they include some wreaths for ceremonies and funds in connection with the celebration of the Fourth of July at our Embassies and Consulates all over the world. The gentleman well understands what the $575,000 is used for.

Mr. GROSS. And it might include a case of two of Haig & Haig?

Mr. ROONEY. I would imagine there might be 3 or 4 or more.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Can the gentleman tell me how much is in the bill for the International Educational Exchange? Is it the same as was in the House bill?

Mr. ROONEY. $18 million. The House appropriated $12 million, the Senate $22 million. The conferees unanimously agreed upon $18 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman that I think the figures in the appropriation bill as it left the House were more than adequate. I want the RECORD to show I am opposed to the increase; I am opposed to this conference report.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa as chairman of the committee that it was my feeling that everything the House did in connection with this bill was correct. Unfortunately, the House point of view does not always prevail in an appropriations conference. The other body increased the House figures to the tune of $31,587,191. In conference with the other body the House managers must make a compromise in order to get the bill down to the President so that the departments and courts may function and the employees may be paid on time.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for having gotten a $15 million reduction in the Senate figure, but I am still opposed, and I think it is shocking that more than a half-million dollars is earmarked for so-called entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. I think we did a pretty fair job in representing the House position on this conference. I felt $475,000 was ample for representation allowances; that the Senate figure of $700,000 was grossly extravagant. I think my able and learned colleagues in the House who served on the conference committee should be commended for their work. I feel confident the House will carry out every recommendation now proposed.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the membership the following is a summary table with regard to the House-Senate conference on this bill:

	State	Justice	Judiciary	U. S. Information Agency	Refugee relief	Total
Fiscal year 1955	$129,610,000	$186,772,767	$28,944,375	$77,114,000	$8,000,000	$430,441,142
Budget estimate, 1956	147,267,197	201,485,000	30,279,715	88,500,000	16,000,000	483,531,912
Passed House	126,769,977	197,525,000	29,603,250	80,500,000	16,000,000	450,398,227
Passed Senate	147,549,608	200,445,000	30,640,810	88,350,000	15,000,000	481,985,418
Conference	137,450,905	198,735,000	30,116,510	85,000,000	15,000,000	466,302,415

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 13: Page 8, line 9, insert "not in excess of those authorized for regular officers and employees traveling under this appropriation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 27: Page 19, line 17, insert ": *Provided,* That hereafter the compensation of the Administrative Assistant Attorney General shall be $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 30: Page 21, line 1, insert:
>
> "SPECIAL TEMPORARY ATTORNEYS AND ASSISTANTS
>
> "For compensation and expenses of special temporary attorneys and assistants to the Attorney General, and to the United States attorneys and other miscellaneous employees not otherwise provided for, employed by the Attorney General and with his approval by the United States attorneys, in special matters and cases without regard to civil service and classification laws, $600,000: *Provided,* That the amount paid as compensation out of the funds herein appropriated to any person employed hereunder shall not exceed $15,000 per annum."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$600,000" named in the said amendment insert "$300,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 35: Page 24, line 21, insert ": *Provided further,* That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed $50,000 may be used for the emergency replacement of aircraft upon certificate of the Attorney General."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 37: Page 26, line 7, insert ": *Provided further,* That hereafter the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 46: Page 37, line 7, insert: "travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 49: Page 38, line 4, insert: "and of which sum not less than $350,000 shall be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and of which appropriation not less than $200,000 shall be available for contracts with one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

THE PRESIDENT GOES FISHING

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I take it that we are one of the most deliberative assemblies of the world and that what we do here is important. Yet I am going to draw your attention to a startling revelation of inattention, laxity, and disregard of what we do here.

At the last President's press conference the President was asked the following question:

> Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Theis' question, the House passed last week, 367 to nothing, a resolution of Democratic Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, expressing sympathy with the satellites, condemning colonialism of all kinds, and asking that the United Nations and any organization in which we participated to do what they could to release them.
>
> Did you favor that resolution? Did you know about that?
>
> Answer: "As a matter of fact, I did not know about that. Maybe I was fishing that day. I do not know."

A motto should be placed over the White House: "If pleasure and fun interfere with work to be done—drop the work."

FISHING SEASON

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if this is the fishing season, I would like to suggest that our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle continue to fish and fish and fish, because up to now they have not caught any issues yet.

DEMOCRATS SOCK THE TAXPAYERS

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to one of the most important bills that will be considered at this session of Congress—the bill for an expanded highway program.

Public hearings on proposed highway legislation were completed June 1. Usually when hearings on a bill are completed all the members of a committee, including both Democrats and Republicans, go into a session and prepare or mark up, as it is called, a bill for presentation to the House.

This did not happen when the highway bill hearings ended. The Democratic members of the committee went into 4 weeks of secret session to which no Republican members of the Public Works Committee were invited. During the period the Democratic members of the committee agreed upon a highway bill, without advice or consultation with any Republican committee members. This bill, H. R. 7072, was introduced last Tuesday. Since no Republican was consulted this bill, H. R. 7072, is wholly, exclusively and entirely a Democratic bill.

Here is what it proposes to do:

Farmers who use gasoline in farm equipment, fishermen who use gasoline in motorboats and airplane operators all will have to pay the increased gas tax under this Democratic bill just as highway users will.

This bill proposes to impose $875 million in new and additional taxes on the American automobile and truck owners by increasing the present Federal gasoline tax by 50 percent; the tax on diesel fuel by 200 percent and the present tax on truck tires by 1,000 percent. No hearings on these proposed tax increases have been held.

In fact when one witness representing the Nation's 120,000 service stations started to testify against increasing gasoline taxes this witness was shutoff by committee members who said there were no tax increases proposed in the bill.

Under this Democratic bill, H. R. 7072, some owners of trucks will be confronted with an added tax of $700 to $1,000 every time a truck requires a new set of 16 to 22 tires. Trucks not used on the public highways and those that operate on city streets or rural roads which will receive very little additional road money will, under the Democratic bill, pay just as high a gas and tire tax as the big long distance truckers who operate entirely on the interstate system of roads on which nearly all the money in the Democratic bill will be spent.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCormack) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on July 21 and also on July 29, following any special orders heretofore entered.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 106]

Anfuso
Barden
Bentley
Blitch
Bolton, Oliver P.
Boykin
Buchanan
Canfield
Chatham
Christopher
Cole
Dies
Dingell
Doyle
Eberharter
Fjare
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Jackson
James
Kearney
Kearns
McConnell
McDowell
McGregor
Mack, Ill.
Morrison
Mumma
Perkins
Polk
Preston
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Robsion, Ky.
Scherer
Van Pelt
Williams, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 291 provides for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 7000, the so-called Military Reserve bill under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. The House has previously granted a rule on and debated a similar bill, therefore at this time I simply urge the adoption of the rule so that the merits of the bill may be considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use. I do want to ask one question of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services. Does this bill compel anyone who has served, for instance in the Marine Corps for 4 years, to go under training or to take any correspondence courses or anything like that as the other bill did?

Mr. VINSON. In response to the question propounded by the gentleman from Illinois, as I understand it, under this bill any inductee who has finished 2 years of service then has a Ready Reserves obligation of 3 years and 1 year in the Standby. He is required to meet his Reserve obligations which is spelled out in the bill. That applies to any man who has enlisted for a 4-year period. If he has enlisted for a 4-year period he would have 1 year in the Ready Reserves and 1 year in the Standby Reserves and he, too, has to meet his Reserves obligation as spelled out in the bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What is the difference between the bill now before us and the draft bill that we have already passed?

Mr. VINSON. Just as soon as we go into the Committee of the Whole, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana will explain every feature of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6 weeks there have been many untruths printed in the press of this Nation concerning the gentleman from New York. I would like to just read 2 sentences from 2 separate editorials of the Scripps-Howard press which are indicative of most of the editorials that have been written in the past 6 weeks.

The first sentence comes from a Scripps-Howard paper, the issue of June 28, printed in the Washington Daily News and also in other papers of that press throughout the country:

> Representative Adam Clayton Powell hardly can escape the charge that he is playing low-grade politics.

The other comes in the press of Monday, June 20, at which time the editor again writes:

> Representative Powell clearly has a part in wrecking the country's defense.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this violates my honor and integrity. I hand them to the Speaker for his consideration and ask his indulgence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the editorials indicate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] is trying to wreck the defense program and entitles him to the floor on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering whether to present this point of personal privilege for the past few days, because I have actually no feeling against the press, particularly the Scripps-Howard press, but I think that some things should be said by me to protect my honor, because honor is not something that you can buy and sell in the public mart, it is of intrinsic value. The deft hands of some maligners can at times seem to lift it from you but basically honor remains within you as long as God lives and as long as you follow the dictates of your conscience. So, what I say today I say in absolute calmness, without any rancor or bitterness, and I say it from my soul, from my conscience. I hold nothing against the various newspapers, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the San Francisco Chronicle, all across the country, papers which for the past 6 weeks have been editorializing against me. The editorials that have been written have been written based on ignorance, and there are some things I hope to say in these minutes granted me under a special privilege which I hope will correct them.

Is it not amazing that the same papers which praised me at Bandung, condemn me for wanting a full democratic Army.

My colleagues, I have just come from the Prayer Room of our Congress. There before the picture of George Washington praying at Valley Forge, before the ancient books of the Old Testament and the New Testament, I communed with my conscience. I come here knowing that I am right. When one is right, no one needs to tell him because God still speaks with the still small voice.

I come knowing that you have been placed under tremendous pressure, because I have. All the party whips, leaders, White House, Pentagon, newspaper editorials, all have descended upon you. It is an avalanche aimed at you not being able to stand up and think and talk and vote like independent, free human beings. During the past weeks I have been subjected to terrific abuse by the public press and to strong letters from the executive branch of the Government. In all fairness, I would like to say that not a single member of the legislative branch of the Government has spoken to me or written me and told me that I was wrong. Not even our distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, in conversations with him has told me that I was wrong. I want to publicly say that Mr. VINSON did his best to bring before us a bill which would meet the great traditions of our American way of life and meet the wishes of this body. I happen to be the only Member of the Congress present the morning that the hearing was held on the Vinson bill. I think that you ladies and gentlemen should know that Mr. VINSON with absolute sincerity tried to uphold his bill which was called a compromise bill, but was not. It was an American bill—a bill to minimize as much as possible a Prussianizing of our American way of life.

The most shocking thing is the revelation to me today that individually you have been approached by various leaders in Congress and outside with the following proposal: If you cannot vote against the Powell amendment, if you cannot vote against democracy, fair play, civil liberties, and the rights of man, then when the time comes to vote just walk off the floor or at least do not rise.

I do not believe that the voice of conscience can be stifled by the hand of man. And I do not believe today that you my colleagues are going to let yourselves become nothing but rubberstamps and puppets. I have faith in you more than that. The American people have faith in you; the American people who have sent us here, the people from your districts. And you know and I know that they are watching every single thing that that we do here and say here today.

Now on May 18 and 19, just 6 weeks ago, great and mighty blows were struck for freedom. The voice of conscience rose up and spoke here, and you men and women gave a mighty witness for right, and for truth.

Has the voice of conscience changed?
Has God's way been altered?
Has the Bill of Rights been rewritten?
Has the democratic concept been redefined?

No and a thousand times no.

Today we are faced with exactly the same situation as we were faced with on May 18. The fact that the National Guard is not mentioned in this particular amendment, for that is all H. R. 7000 is, does not change the fact that H. R. 7000 amends the 1952 Reserve Act in which very specifically the National Guard is stated as the No. 1 branch of our Armed Forces.

Therefore, now let me make this unmistakably clear, if H. R. 7000 is passed in its present form without my amendment, the National Guard will still be an escape hatch for those boys who refuse to serve in a United States of America democratic, integrated Army. There will still be upon our statute books an Army based upon class, so that not only just white boys will be able to serve in a lilywhite branch of the Armed Forces, but even among white boys only a privileged few. Out of this act will come 4,900,000 men in the Reserves and our National Guard is limited to only a few hundred thousand. Stripping it of all of the overtones and undertones of segregation, if you fail to vote for my amendment, you will then be voting for class legislation. On June 29, 1955, before the Rules Committee, Congressman BROWN of Ohio asked Congressman BROOKS of Louisiana:

> Can a boy be assigned to the National Guard after he has served 6 months in the Reserves?

The answer was "Yes."

Mr. BROWN again asked:

> If he volunteers could he be compelled to stay in the Reserves? Could he be permitted to take training in the Guard in his home town?

Congressman BROOKS said, "Yes."

This is the most shocking revelation.

Congressman BROWN:

> Can a man join the National Guard and escape his obligation.

Congressman VINSON:

> A man can joint the National Guard under age and meet his obligation there up to age 28 and is not subject to the draft and is subject only to the obligations of the Guard and the Guard courtmartial and training by the Guard.

Now under H. R. 7000 a colored youth who insisted on his constitutional right to serve in the National Guard units, let us say in Georgia or in any other Southern State where this training is for whites only, he will be forced by the United States Government to give up this right or go to jail. Do you call that the democratic way of life?

You talk about the National Guard being the first arm of defense, let us cross the District line into Maryland. Do you know that the only unit of the Maryland National Guard which served in the Korean conflict were the members of the Jim-Crow, segregated, all-Negro battalion? They served with distinction in the Korean conflict while their white comrades of the Maryland National Guard never went over. Some of them were killed. I ask you today, are they and their brothers throughout the United States unfit to associate with their white comrades in arms? Is this America or is it Hitler's Germany? Further may I say that in Korea and in battle members of Maryland's all-Negro unit served with or commanded mixed units. Today the six Negro officers who served in the Maryland National Guard have petitioned Governor McKeldin of Maryland as follows: "Facilities offered Negroes in the Maryland National Guard are clearly and measurably inferior to those available to whites. The single unit for all the Negroes in all of Maryland is located only in Baltimore. But white persons throughout the State may participate in National Guard activities in more than a dozen armories in other sections of the State. In fact, Negroes may join only a transportation battalion. White persons may join infantry, artillery, engineers, fighter squadron, medical unit, and an armored tank company."

I think it's entirely befitting that I point right now, whereas H. R. 7000 omits mention of the National Guard yet right now there are more men in the Army National Guard and Air National Guard than there are in our Reserves and more Federal money was appropriated for State National Guards and their components than was appropriated for the Regular Reserves. On page 2261 of the hearings of the National Reserve Plan, the figures are as follows: 437,000 in the National Guard, 365,000 in the Reserves; $437 million appropriated for the National Guard in 1955 and $213,980,000 appropriated for the other Reserve components.

As the Chicago Tribune said editorially on April 30, this year:

> What Congress should be working toward is a volunteer professional army. We now have a volunteer Air Force and Navy, defending the United States itself and for carrying the war to the enemy. The plan for a huge Army Reserve makes sense only if this country is going to send great expeditionary forces abroad and if atomic weapons prove of no great importance.

My colleagues when an H-bomb falls on Georgia everything is going to go. Not only the National Guard, the Reserves, but even States' rights. What then has happened? A great and good man, President of the United States, General Eisenhower, has been and is now being used by a distinct minority who if they themselves tried to present this plan before us would be laughed out of this room. General Eisenhower believes in progress and has done his best to give a witness to it. Behind the scenes there are many of President Eisenhower's closest friends, associates, Government leaders, cabinet members, secretaries, who do not believe one whit in President Eisenhower's ideals.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from New York is not talking to his question of personal privilege. He is making a political speech or something of that kind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I raised a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to raise a point of order and has directed the gentleman from New York to proceed in order. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from New York would like to state that he is proceeding in order, because all he is doing is clearing up the untruths published in the press, on the basis of which recognition on the question of personal privilege was granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York of course must proceed in defense of the charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. A moment ago the gentleman said the Air Force and the Navy did not want this bill. I sat through all of the hearings and I am of the distinct impression that they both said that this bill was satisfactory and a good bill.

Mr. POWELL. I will bring that up later in the debate. I will give the exact quotations. I have them with me.

May 4, at 3:10 in the afternoon, the following conversation took place between Mr. Norman, of the Chicago Tribune, and Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson:

> Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Wilson, what solution to the problems do you have on the question of having reservists, the National Guardsmen, going into segregated National Guard units which was one of the issues raised in the House?
>
> Secretary WILSON. We had a very simple solution for the matter, this is a voluntary system, the men can elect to go into the National Guard and then they were going to be sent to a Regular Army camp to get 6 months' basic training, and they were going to let the same qualifications apply that now apply in the National Guard. As far as Mr. Burgess and I were concerned, and some of the rest of us, we didn't figure that we ought to try to make the country over overnight, you know, and we accepted what was going on now and put no new problems in it as far as we were concerned.

Mr. Wilson evidently does not know he is living in a changing world. He also does not know the letters written and statements made by our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower. Let me inform Mr. Wilson now and refresh our memories. June 6, 1953, President Dwight David Eisenhower wrote me a letter and the following are excerpts:

> We have not taken and we shall not take a single backward step. There must be no second-class citizens in this country.
>
> The spirit of these objectives cannot be achieved as the result of the actions of any one person no matter with how much authority and forthrightness he acts. To achieve our purpose we must plan and work together to win the victories one by one, and not to be content until we have gained our goal.

On March 19, 1953, at a White House press conference President Eisenhower said:

> I will repeat it again and again, whenever Federal funds are expended I do not see how any American can justify legally, logically, or morally discrimination in the expenditure of these funds.

On August 5, 1954, the New York Times carried this version of what the President said at his press conference:

> He had tried as hard as he knew how to have accepted this idea—that where Federal funds and Federal authority were involved, that there should be no discrimination based on any reason that was not recognized by our Constitution, and he would continue to do that.

Are not these statements from President Eisenhower diametrically opposite to Secretary of Defense Wilson's statement:

> We accept what is going on and that we ought not to try to make the country over, overnight.

How absolutely shocking it must be to the American people as a whole, and we in particular, Members of the Congress, that this great and good man can be used by people to attempt to accomplish their own selfish objectives even at the expense of having Mr. Eisenhower sign a letter that was so patently the opposite of what he had written to me before. On June 21, 1955, President Eisenhower wrote me a letter containing such unbelievable phrases as:

> The Senate will not favorably consider nonsegregation clauses, hence, they will never become law. It is a fact of history that no legislation, however meritorious, containing such a provision has ever passed the Senate. Reserve legislation with a nonsegregation provision affecting the National Guard cannot now become law. From your own experience in Congress you realize that progress in ending segregation is difficult, if not impossible, if we are to depend upon incorporating nonsegregation clauses in legislation that the Senate will not favorably consider.

Finally, this statement:

> I shall, of course, continue to seek progress in ending segregation.

This is a far cry from telling me that the problem cannot be solved by any one person regardless of his position and his power and that we must work together and cooperate and that we shall not take a single backward step and we must go forward.

I charge today that the President of the United States has been deliberately misinformed, misled, and falsely maneuvered into a position which will ultimately do harm to our country.

I believe therefore it is incumbent upon this body, on both sides of the aisle, to assist the President of the United States, by breaking through the palace guard which surrounds him. To do this we must let the truth be told now and support it by our actions here today.

In the first place, the President and the people of the United States should know that there is a Reserve Act of 1952 on our books now. If there is anyone that has endangered our Nation's defense I charge today that the saboteur of our defense is the Defense Department itself who although they have had this law for 3 years in their hands have refused to make it work and although we authorized them to build up a Reserve component of 1,500,000 men that today after 3 years we only have 750,000 men in the Reserves. It is the Pentagon and the Defense Department who are the saboteurs, if there are any saboteurs, of our Nation's security.

In the second place, the President of the United States and the American people should know that if we pass this bill here today we will have branded ourselves as hypocrites of the first degree. On March 4, 1955, the United States submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission's subcommittee meeting in London, and made public in the New York Times on Saturday, May 14, a proposal, and I quote:

> Overall military manpower shall be limited to levels existing on December 31, 1954, or such other date as may be agreed at the World Disarmament Conference. The overall military expenditure both atomic and nonatomic shall be limited to amounts spent in the year ending December 31, 1954.

Here we are today in direct violation of our stated pledge at the Disarmament Conference, being asked to pass a Reserve bill that will quadruple our Armed Forces as prior to December 31, 1954, and triple our expenditures. Is this honesty? How can we dare to ask from Soviet Russia that which we are not willing to give ourselves—the truth?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. First I would like to express my own confidence in the gentleman's integrity and great patriotism. It is absurd for a newspaper to assert or imply that he does not love his country. His notable contribution at Bandung has been acclaimed in the House and we all appreciate his fight for he believes he is right. Let me say, too, that the Prayer Room is being used by men and women of all faiths in increasing numbers. I am wondering, on the question of procedure, if it would be helpful to follow the pattern that the House approved with reference to the Bow, or the Budge amendment on yesterday, since, as the gentleman recognizes, the issues are somewhat confused. Many of us would like to hear the content of the gentleman's argument on the question of the National Guard, but we strongly favor the purposes of the legislation that the Committee on Armed Services has submitted. I argued yesterday, that the Budge amendment to the mutual aid legislation would involve vital questions of policy unrelated to the principal proposal and that it ought to be reserved for a procedure that the gentleman from

South Carolina [Mr. Richards] could authorize; that is, to give an independent hearing on that measure. This situation is similar. If this appeals to the gentleman, it seems to me it would greatly simplify the matter and would enable us to do what he contemplates; namely, to consider this matter from the standpoint of Federal and State responsibilities, since basic principles of Government are involved, as well as great principles of human relations and simple justice. I know the gentleman's thinking along these lines, and if I could convince him on that, as he convinced me on his motion on the reserves bill in its original form, I think it could be a great step toward correct procedural standards. The gentleman's logic on his amendment about the National Guard was irrefutable. I refer to his contention that a forced transfer from a reserve unit to a segregated National Guard unit would violate established Federal policy on integration. When the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] moved next day to delete the National Guard paragraph, I think it was a sort of concession of the point. Now we have a bill with no such provision and the gentleman is proposing, as I understand it, for the Federal Government rather than the States to fix the policy. That ought to be considered as a separate proposition it seems to me. I simply appeal to the gentleman to comment on that procedure. If the Committee on Armed Services could have an independent hearing on what we ought to do about the National Guard, that would be good.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York is not talking on the question of personal privilege; that he is asking the House to vote on some amendment or some bill that is coming up later.

I raised the point earlier, Mr. Speaker, when the Speaker pro tempore was in the chair, and he ruled that the gentleman from New York should proceed in order, but the gentleman certainly is not speaking in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine himself to the subject upon which he sought and received the privilege of addressing the House, the point of personal privilege.

Mr. POWELL. The point of personal privilege is contained in these two sentences, Mr. Speaker:

> Representative Powell has a part in the wrecking of the country's defense program, as the above letter demonstrates.

And:

> Representative Adam Clayton Powell can hardly escape the charge that he is playing low grade politics if he insists on including the antisegregation amendment in the national Reserve plan when it comes to a House vote.

Thirdly, the President of the United States must know and the people must be told that this is a Government composed of the executive, the judicial, and the legislative and that no one branch of the Government must be minimized nor be secondary to the other. No one should ever say that the Senate will not do thus and so, nor should he ever say that the Congress cannot pass such a law. The Senate must never become the "second lieutenants of the White House" and I am determined that the House of Representatives shall not become the rookies.

Fourthly, the President should be told and the American people that his letter contains a grave error of historical fact known to every college student in American history. The United States Congress did pass in 1940 a civil rights amendment which was proposed by a Republican Congressman from New York, Representative Hamilton Fish, on September 6, and agreed to on the same date by a teller vote of 121 to 99. It was proposed in the Senate by Senator Barbour, Republican, of New Jersey, on August 26, then withheld in support of a similar amendment offered by Senator Wagner, Democrat, of New York. The amendment was agreed to by a record vote of 53 to 21 with 22 not voting. This was an amendment to section 4–A, Public Law No. 783, 76th Congress, in which the legislative branch of the Government distinctly instructed the President, and may I quote, "The selection of men for training in service shall be made in an impartial manner under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe—provided that in the selection and training of men under this act and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act there shall be no discrimination against any persons on account of race or color." That was a crisis, and we rose to meet it as Americans. We are told that this is a crisis today and I say the legislative branch has a clear duty to perform. When this vote was taken in the Senate, 22 Southern Senators knew that the amendment was germane, knew that it was proper, knew that it was needed; but because of their sectional views could not support it, but at least they had the courage of their convictions and recorded themselves as not voting.

And, finally, the President and the people of the United States should definitely and clearly know that what we do here on the floor and in committee in amending bills cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called riders. If you will look in Cannon's Rules and Procedures that govern the House, a rider is an extraneous matter attached to an appropriation bill. Hundreds of amendments are voted on here year after year, they are not extraneous, they are not riders; in short, this bill before us today, H. R. 7000, is an amendment. The American people need to know that when an amendment is a rider the Parliamentarian rules it out of order.

Here is the second one:

> Representative Powell clearly has a part in the wrecking of the country's defense program through the introduction of the antisegregation amendment.

I am trying to speak about that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to ask, What has changed since May 18 and May 19? The American way? The voice of conscience? Nothing has changed. The same minority that wants to get its stranglehold on the young people of our Nation and degrade them by taking them away from our homes in the tender years of their lives, the same minority that is against a democratic Army and still wants segregation in the Armed Forces, that minority has not changed, that minority has used the President, that minority is pressuring you. I stand today to tell you that the American people are in back of what I am doing. I challenge you, Mr. Martin, the Republican leader, and Mr. McCormack, the Democratic leader, to send a page over to your office now and bring here now your mail which you have received during the past 6 weeks bearing on this problem. You know and I know and God knows that your mail is running about 100 to 1 in favor of my views. I know after making this statement the pressure organizations will pour in solicited mail, but I am talking about the unsolicited mail that has come so far. Each one of you here search your hearts, tell the truth to your conscience. Is it not true that the American people are against this bill? Is it not true that the American people are in favor of my amendment? Is it not true the odds are 100 to 1? I will put into the Record a sampling of the 4,000 letters that I have received.

Out of over 4,000 letters I have received 7 have come from people who are against my amendment. What a tremendous vote of confidence in the American way of life. My mail has been about 95 percent from white people and about 15 percent from the South. It begins with every single Negro newspaper in this country supporting front-page editorially the position that I present here today. Even that great and good Republican newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest papers in this Nation, is in back of me. The 46th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People meeting in Atlantic City, thousands of delegates voted unanimously on June 23 to back me completely. Lester B. Granger, the executive secretary of the National Urban League, has publicly praised my position. From all over the country led by great organizations such as: The National Grange, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United Christian Youth Movement, the National Women's Temperance Union, the Board of Peace of the Methodist Church, the Department of Social Welfare of the International Missionary Society of the Disciples of Christ, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Farmers' Union, the National Council of Churches, the National Temperance League, the Mennonite Central Committee, the National Association of Evangelicals, the Church of the Brethren, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the National Council Against Conscription, the National Conference of Methodist Youth, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Board of Missions of the United

Lutheran Church of America. Across the country they have come in an ever-swelling tide of America speaks. Objective military analysts like Hanson Baldwin, the April issue of the Army Combat Forces Journal, they have spoken up against this bill. Women's American Baptist Home Mission Society, Division of Christian Life of the Council of Churches, Baptist Fellowship, Mothers of the World, great leaders like Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, humble American men like a white southerner from Athens, Ga., all pouring into my office day after day—"Don't budge, don't retreat, stand up and fight for the best for America."

So I come back and ask the question again, What has changed since May 18 and 19? Has the timeless, the immortal, and the divine changed? Has truth, integrity, and your own self-respect? Has the fortress of your soul disintegrated and the ramparts of your conscience been invaded by the untruths of propaganda and the high citadel of our ethical witness succumbed to the cheap political pressures of the few?

Where stand you therefore in the American dream today?

Have you decided to squander the birthright of America for a mess of Pentagon pottage and partisan patronage?

All this I do not believe. I believe you are the same American men and women who stood here on May 18 and 19 and gave a great witness to the power of God and your individual conscience. I do not believe that we here in this Congress are nothing more than cheap counterparts of the enslaved, the voiceless, the unregarded, and the Godless puppets in the Soviet Union.

This is a surging world and it demands soaring spirits.

This is a hopeless world unless the voice of prophecy is heard in the land.

This is a crass world, turning ever more into the paths of the material and the shoddy unless here today and every day we continue to hold higher and ever higher the American dream.

Who therefore is for this amendment? The people. Abe Lincoln once said the only government that "would not perish from the earth" would be a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." So here today let us restore integrity to this House. Let us lift the arms of our President, arms that are being so weighed down by the whispered confidences of men who would not let America be America.

Let us send the President of the United States to Geneva to the Big Four Conference with God on his side. Let him go to the summit talk with right and righteousness and truth. We are told that he must go there to negotiate from strength. What strength is the Pentagon talking about? Do they mean a Prussianized army and a hypocrital America of loud pretenses? The greatest strength that an American has is the strength of God on his side and the strength of the idea of democracy pure and undefiled. The Soviet masters will laugh at the United States in Geneva this summer if we come waving the flag of a free world when they know we are being backed up by a Jim Crow Army, whose core is a Jim Crow National Guard. Let us send General Eisenhower to Geneva as a spearhead for peace, backed up by the mighty phalanxes of the American people, black and white and brown and yellow and undergirded with the strength of the idea of democracy, the moral fiber of our Founding Fathers, the spirit of God incarnate.

This weekend marks another anniversary in the freedom of America, the Fourth of July. The first man to die, to lay down his life that America might be free was a black man, Crispus Attucks, walking across Boston Common in defiance of the British redcoats. How shall you pass that statue as you walk down Beacon Street this weekend, Mr. MARTIN and Mr. MCCORMACK? Will you turn your head as you go by because you know that here today you have let down everything that Attucks died for? Or will you be able to go by proud that you are an American, proud that here today you have struck a great blow for equality and for freedom for all the American people?

When Paul Revere rode forth in the deathless silence of the midnight of a New England countryside there came "A knock on the door, a whisper in the night, a cry in the dark, forevermore." And who answered that call to arms? Not slaves of Army brass, not conscripts, not a lily white army. Facing them stood the paid Hessians, representatives of the universal military training system of England. But the men who defeated them and established this great America were "embattled farmers" who stood at the "rude arching bridge" of Lexington and Concord and fired the "shot heard round the world."

So today let America be America.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 23, 1955.*

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington D. C.:

The delegates to the 46th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in convention assembled today, June 23, in Atlantic City, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urges Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to stand firm on his antisegregation amendment to the Armed Forces Reserve bill; and

Whereas we condemn all efforts to force withdrawal or to circumvent this amendment, whether by President Eisenhower, in his denunciation of this so-called rider, or by Congressman VINSON in his efforts to substitute a new bill, or the efforts of any other Congressman or administrative official;

We the delegates to the 46th annual convention of the NAACP desire to go on record endorsing the amendment to end segregation in all National Guard units and call upon President Eisenhower and Members of Congress to support such amendment.

It is the will of the convention that this resolution be sent to the President, the House majority leader, the House minority leader, Chairman VINSON, and Congressman POWELL immediately.

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

JUNE 29, 1955.

Organizations that have sent messages to the House within the last few days against the Reserve bill, H. R. 7000, or key parts of it:

The Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church

Department of Social Welfare of the International Missionary Society, Disciples of Christ

The National Association of Secondary School Principals

The Congress of Industrial Organizations

The National Grange

The National Farmers Union

Other organizations which testified against H. R. 2967, or parts of it, February and March 1955:

National Council of Churches: Against UMT

National Temperance League: Welfare provisions in the bill

Mennonite Central Committee

United Christian Youth Movement

National Association of Evangelicals: Welfare provisions

Informal citizens committee of Wayne County, Ohio

Jewish Peace Fellowship

Greater Boston Committee Opposing Military Training

Church of the Brethren

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: Segregation provisions

National Woman's Christian Temperance Union

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

National Council Against Conscription

National Conference of Methodist Youth

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Board of Social Missions of the United Lutheran Church of America

Division of Christian Life and Work, Indiana Council of Churches

Statements filed:

Council on Christian Social Progress, American Baptist Convention

National Temperance and Prohibition Council

Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955.

To All Members of the House:

A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has approved a military Reserve bill which, in only slightly altered form, revives provisions in earlier proposals which would inaugurate the first steps toward universal military training, and would authorize the President to call to active duty up to 1 million ready reservists without the approval of Congress. It would also make about 3 million youths liable to from 6 to 10 years of military indoctrination. The Congress of Industrial Organizations strongly opposes the proposed legislation and urges you to vote against it.

There is no question but that a Ready and Mobile Reserve would strengthen the Armed Forces, but there are governing doubts that the current proposals would, in practice, add to our posture of national strength.

1. Is a period of up to 10 years under the jurisdiction of the military, in training that would not in any adequate sense be a preparation for effective military duty, a positive factor in our national strength?

The CIO believes that such first steps toward universal military training actually weaken our national vitality by imposing arbitrary military jurisdiction on young men during a period in their lives when they should be awakening with their maturity to the fuller dimensions of American life with its freedoms and opportunities.

We also urge that a legislative step-by-step approach to a universal military training program is fully as undesirable as its full-fledged enactment at once.

We doubt the value of relatively nontechnical one-night-a-week Reserve training for 4 years for those reservists who will have had 2 years of highly specialized active-duty training.

2. The present legislative proposals represent an approach to national military security characterized by emphasis on the quantity of Reserves under military jurisdiction rather than on the quality of technical or specialized training. Several months of additional training, over and above Reserve programs, would be necessary to bring the reservists to combat readiness. Is such a program worth the long-term commitment of our young men to the military? Does it warrant the estimated expenditure by 1959 of three times our current outlay for the Reserve program?

3. Serious problems in industrial relations will also arise under the proposed legislation. Will night shift workers who have to take one night of training a week be penalized financially or otherwise? Will a Reserve member who is an industrial worker have to use his vacation to serve his annual military field duty? Will men who are liable to call to active duty be discriminated against in employment or promotion? What will happen to the mobility of a man with a Reserve training obligation who may want to change jobs, or move as a result of marriage, schooling, or other personal factors?

Such questions are indicative of the extent of the influence of the proposed legislation into our national life.

4. Even though some of the specific features of these proposals may be altered by amendment, the fundamental nature of the program is one of prolonged compulsory military control and indoctrination of our youth. It is control in the name of training which will not be adequate. It is control in the name of balancing-off reductions in our active forces in prime stages of readiness by increasing the Reserve forces, yet the total effect is weakened military posture. It is a pervasion of the compulsory military influence into our national life in a manner which we of the CIO cannot see justified either by disputed claims of military preparedness or by fairness to the young men who would be affected. We support selective service and a truly voluntary Reserve system. We believe that there are deeper values involved in the compulsory proposals, however, than technical procedural differences in military Reserve training, and that is why we so strongly urge you to vote against the compulsory military Reserve legislation.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. BURKE,
Chief of Congressional Liaison.

THE UNITED CHRISTIAN YOUTH
MOVEMENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., January 28, 1955.

The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The United Christian Youth Movement, which serves as the youth arm of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, has traditionally opposed the passage of any legislation that would create a system of peacetime universal military training under whatever name.

This conviction has been repeatedly reaffirmed whenever the subject has been studied by successive meetings of our general council and is stated once more in the form of the enclosed resolution which was overwhelmingly adopted at the most recent session of that general council. I trust that you will understand that we are sensitive to the perplexities of the issue involved, but that we remain unshaken in our basic conviction that universal military training is neither a democratic nor a Christian answer to the problems confronting our Nation in the present world.

The General Council of the United Christian Youth Movement is a representative assembly of officially appointed delegates from the cooperating national denominational youth organizations, State Christian youth councils, and national youth-serving agencies.

The young people wanted you to be aware of their convictions and concerns on this vital matter and requested that I convey this action to you. Now that the Congress is about to consider the current proposals put forward by the President and Defense Department I am certain you will be interested in the thinking of so representative a grouping of the Nation's youth.

We shall look forward to an expression of your opinion and welcome any pertinent information you feel we should consider relative to this issue.

Very truly yours,

RODERICK S. FRENCH.

GENERAL COUNCIL ACTION

ACTION OF THE 1954 GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT REGARDING UMT

Whereas the General Council of the United Christian Youth Movement met in the interest of Christ and His Church, which holds as basic tenets the way of love and brotherhood in all our relations with men; and

Whereas the principles involved in universal military training under any name or in any guise are diametrically opposed to these basic tenets; and

Whereas it is the firm conviction of this body that war is an instrument of man and not of God: Be it

Resolved, That we stand in opposition to any legislation which would provide for the type of compulsory military training being proposed to the 84th session of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas we feel a responsibility for the physical and spiritual welfare of the citizens of our country and of other nations of our world: Be it

Resolved, That our Government substitute positive action for world peace for the present proposals for military training and that these actions should include increased participation in the student exchange program; technical assistance to underdeveloped and needy areas of our world; distribution of our Government surpluses to those areas that are in need of them; and financial and personnel support to the United Nations specialized agencies.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN
TEMPERANCE UNION,
Washington 2, D. C., March 3, 1955.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: You are soon going to vote on H. R. 2967. This bill contains a disguised form of UMT.

This is contained in an amendment to section 6 (c) (2) (A) (p. 4). On page 5 you will find a provision permitting the Director of Selective Service to draft persons under 19 to fill quotas to be fixed by the President (no ceiling specified) if these are not filled by voluntary enlistment. This would permit drafting of 17-year-old boys and disregard the provision written by Congress into the law of 1951 that all persons available 19 or over must be exhausted within the jurisdiction of any local draft board before those under 19 may be taken.

Enlistees and draftees must either serve on active duty for training and service in the Armed Forces (time not specified) and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years, or perform active duty for training for a period of 6 months and go into the Reserve for 9½ years. If this is adopted you will have approved a program of universal military training and waived the requirements which you wrote into the Draft Act that before any such program is approved the National Security Training Commission must submit to both Houses of Congress a program for such training which shall include measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the National Security Training Corps.

You have obligingly written the words "universal military training" into the title of the law in passing H. R. 3005. By passing this bill you will give it the substance—and substance without safeguards.

In 1951 trainees would have gone into branches of the armed services whose announced policy on alcoholic beverages was to encourage abstinence, enforce moderation, and punish overindulgence. I enclose a copy of a letter from the Adjutant General stating the revised policy of the Department of Defense under the new regulations. The public has protested these regulations violently, but so far has obtained only the removal of package stores from bases that are not more than 10 miles from the nearest package-liquor store.

In view of the fact that States like New York are seriously considering raising the age of purchase and consumption to 21 to combat a serious problem of juvenile delinquency, and a State like New Mexico is memorializing Congress to do away with Federal tax receipts for illegally sold liquor to help it curb a problem of youth drinking and juvenile delinquency, do you think that Congress ought to pass a training program for teen-age youth without requiring and carefully examining into proper safeguards for them under such circumstances?

The House has refused again and again to pass any program for, or looking toward, universal-military training because you know, in spite of polls and carefully slanted publicity and spokesmen for youth who are so sure youth wants this training, that the American people do not want it. The people in your district do not want it.

The armed services do not want it. I have sat among their representatives at the hearings and heard them say among themselves, of the proposed trainees, "We do not want them." You may jeopardize enlistments in the National Guard and Reserve by requiring 6 months of active duty for training of all enlistees.

The country does not need it. You have safeguarded it by passing the extension of the draft. It has been brought out time and again in the questionings at the hearings that such a program would seriously hamper the Armed Forces in any period of emergency by taking the time of officers urgently needed elsewhere.

May we urgently urge you to vote down this program.

Very respectfully,

ELIZABETH A. SMART.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1953.

DEAR ———: Your recent communication addressed to the President concerning the establishment of liquor outlets on military installations has been referred to the Department of the Army for reply.

The traditional policy of the Department of Defense is to provide morale, welfare, and recreational activities to the extent possible at all Department of Defense installations. The maintenance of messes and clubs is a part of these activities. These messes and clubs are important centers of military community life and they provide service personnel and families with facilities similar to those enjoyed by other citizens of the United States. The sale of alcoholic beverages is one of the normal functions of the activities of such messes and clubs.

The American people in general have indicated their attitude toward the consumption of alcoholic beverages by repealing the 18th amendment. Conditions of military service necessitate certain restrictive legislation and regulations to govern conduct of its members. The Department of Defense is opposed, however, to restrictive legislation and regulations which discriminate unnecessarily against the members of the Armed Forces and which result in the denial or curtailment of privileges enjoyed by other citizens. We acknowledge the fact that members of the Armed Forces, like other citizens, will occasionally desire to partake of alcoholic beverages. We prefer to make these privileges available and to control their dispensation in established officers' and noncommissioned officers' messes in an atmosphere where moderation is enforced and overindulgence is punished.

The Secretary of Defense has statutory authority to make such regulations as he may deem appropriate governing the sale, consumption and possession of alcoholic beverages to or by members of the Armed Forces at or near any military installations. A recent Department of Defense directive established the policy in this regard for the services. Within the framework of this directive the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have issued uniform regulations governing the control of alcoholic beverages throughout the armed services. The regulations include a provision for the sale of packaged liquors by officers' and noncommissioned officers' messes to bona fide members over 21 years of age. These regulations are adequate and their enforcement is effective. Alcoholic liquors are not obtainable through any other sources on military installations.

I hope that the foregoing will tend to clarify the position of the Department of the Army in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WM. E. BERGIN,
Major General, United States Army,
The Adjutant General.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: It is the hope of the National Grange that you will find it possible to vote against the pending compulsory universal Reserve bill when it reaches the floor of the House.

The opposition of our people to this type of measure is based upon the fact that, to them, it violates a fundamental characteristic that has made this Nation the envy of the world. It substitutes compulsion for adequate incentives. We believe the American way is the incentive way. Government should encourage, not discourage this system. The nature of even this era, in our opinion, is not such that we feel a substitution is currently necessary.

The bill is a part of a proposed total universal military training program. Is our present position so serious that we can afford, for the first time in our history, to adopt the principle of universality in this field?

You are unquestionably familiar with the basic arguments put forth by our forefathers who successfully fought matters of this nature, just as you are familiar with today's arguments against what we consider a very dangerous threatened action. Suffice it to say that such a system of universal compulsion has heretofore been foreign to our American way of life. We cannot now willingly accept a system that will both weaken and lower the total moral, economic, and political potential of the United States, and at the same time tend to undermine the real quality and effectiveness of the Organized Reserve Forces.

In the event of a tragic national emergency brought on by an attack from a foreign power, we would urge that a system of civilian defense quickly be substituted for any martial law that might be initially instituted. The American people, I am sure, would respond to such a civilian operation in a surge of patriotism that would prove far more effective than any system of long-term military police control. In other words, we reject the argument that a large compulsory universal Reserve is needed for civilian defense.

Then, too, I doubt if I need remind you of the special hardship that would be inflicted upon our youth who live in rural areas. Long weekly trips would be required for their training. In some areas this would be expensive and time-consuming. There is also the possibility of camp duty occurring at critical periods on the land.

These and many other reasons impel us to come to you with the plea that you reject this type system as being foreign to our national posture, and as being certain to weaken rather than strengthen our national well-being. The greatest possible United States potential is to be found in the direction of expanded rather than impaired freedom and opportuntiy for our young people to plan and order their lives at an early age. Let us, therefore, determine the incentive needed to maintain the Reserve structure which is appropriate or required, and at the same time restore the principle of selectivity to the drafting of young men for the active forces.

We must be thoroughly aware that the world of today and the future of human beings everywhere demand more than simple American military might.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM, *Master.*

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.

Concerning the Military Reserve bill, H. R. 7000.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The high-school principals of the country, who have the responsibility for the educational program for all youth of secondary-school age—7,300,000—the boys soon to enter military age, request your consideration of certain provisions in the Reserve bill, H. R. 7000.

Please eliminate the 6-month training volunteer group of 250,000 for youth under 18½ years of age because—

(a) It will offer some boys a strong inducement to leave high school before graduation to avoid serving 24 months through selective service, which in itself creates an inequity of military obligation; (b) it is the first step to universal military training which the American people do not want; and (c) it is not consistent with President Eisenhower's repeated proposals for world peace. Increasing armaments and taking steps toward universal military training are inimical to the procurement of world peace.

If you cannot accept the above proposal, then restrict the entry of youth to the 6-month training group to boys who have been graduated from high school or are age 19, whichever comes first; also reduce the Ready Reserve period to 4½ years or less because—

(a) We do not believe it is the intent of Congress in any military Reserve bill to offer an inducement to boys to interrupt their high-school education before graduation; (b) it is not in keeping with the established "stay-in-school-until-graduation" policy of all branches of the Armed Forces; and (c) youth at a changing stage for starting a life career will rebel at a Ready Reserve obligation for a long period such as 7½ years.

These proposals represent the considered opinions of the high-school principals throughout the country. They appeal to you not to sabotage the education of school youth by a hasty military Reserve provision for the 17–19 age group as it now stands in the Reserves bill, H. R. 7000.

LELAND N. DRAKE,
President and Chairman, Legislative Committee.

PAUL E. ELICKER,
Executive Secretary and Secretary, Legislative Committee.

AVC URGES ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENT TO RESERVE BILL IN BEST INTERESTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The following telegram was sent by the American Veterans Committee (AVC) today to Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee:

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Washington, D. C.:

The American Veterans Committee (AVC) strongly deplores the endangering of our national security posed by a Reserve program which does not fully reject segregation in the Armed Forces.

No group is more concerned about the security of this Nation than AVC, whose members have fought in three wars against totalitarianism in all forms. But it would be a false security indeed to enact a Reserve program which would weaken our fighting forces and handicap our position as the leader of the free world. Why give the Communists another weapon in their ideological warfare? In its present form the Reserve bill, H. R. 7000, uncommitted to a disavowal of segregation, would be the most vulnerable link in our security.

AVC, on the deepest and most compelling moral grounds, has consistently fought segregation in all aspects of national life. We are proud of the role we have played in opposing the basically un-American practice of segregation in the armed services. We see no moral or legal sanction for opening the way again for segregation in our military defense.

Experience has shown, and most pointedly in the recent Korean conflict, that integrated units are more effective fighting forces than segregated ones. It is essential for the future security of this Nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without reference to regional prejudices.

It is AVC's contention that those who inject the irrelevant factor of race before the best interests of the Nation in holding up a Reserve program seriously jeopardize our existence as a free nation.

AVC therefore urges you, as chairman of the key Armed Forces Committee, to support an antisegregation amendment when the Reserve bill comes before the House, and also urges that a rollcall vote be requested so that the American people will know who places the national security first.

KENNETH BIRKHEAD,
Executive Director,
American Veterans Committee.

[From the New York Times of June 16, 1955]

ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENTS NECESSARY—SEGREGATION IN RESERVES—CONCERN OVER BILL SAID TO BE WITH A VITAL PHASE OF MILITARY SERVICE

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your editorial of June 10 on the military Reserves bill it is a source of some little gratification that you grant that the antisegregation amendment proposed "was not entirely extraneous." In this small and passing delineation you differ—and soundly—from Arthur Krock's assumption in his column of the same date, and from President Eisenhower's sweeping characterization in his press conference of June 8.

It seems to us that Mr. Eisenhower, the New York Times and others have confused the public on a legislative technique and have placed an undeserved onus on the antisegregationists. We all know that hundreds of amendments to bills are presented to the Congress each session, debated and adopted or rejected. In the vast majority of cases these are legitimate, germane proposals in tune with the substantive matter of the bills and helpful in effectuating the general goal. The term "rider" is seldom applied to the great bulk of such proposals. However, this label is reserved for those proposals which have little or no relation to the substantive matter under consideration.

ESTABLISHED POLICY

As you have conceded, the question of segregation of men in uniform is related to a military Reserves bill. An established Federal policy of nonsegregation is now in effect and functioning in all the Federal armed services. Indeed, the Eisenhower administration has made much of this in its claim that it has a good record on the segretion question.

Are we now to set up a military Reserve plan for the training of men to defend the country, closing our eyes to the glaring repudiation of existing policy involved in permissive segregation in such a plan? Are 2 brothers, 1 in Korea and 1 in the homeland Reserves to be treated differently as they defend or prepare to defend their country? How can it be denied, logically, that a proposal to eliminate this probility is not germane to a military Reserves bill?

If certain groups were seeking to solve the gamut of problems of racial segregation in American life by advocating this amendment they would be fairly subject to the charge of using the rider technique; but here the only concern is with a vital phase of military service.

We take issue with the implication that we, as antisegregationists, are making "the defense of our country dependent upon all of us getting our own ways here." The prosegregationists in the Congress who have served notice that they will sacrifice the defense of our country (by burying the bill) if their segregation formula is disturbed are the culprits deserving this rebuke. Let it be addressed to them.

IMPLICATIONS SEEN

We are equally distressed that the New York Times should imply, as it does in its editorial, that the real purpose of the amendment was to block the original measure, rather than to defeat segregation.

We consider that both these implications unfairly and unjustifiably impugn the patriotism of antisegregationists, while setting scot-free (and enshrining with patriotism) those who have used their power in congressional committees to veto this measure until it meets their obsolete concept of race.

We feel similarly about the bill to aid the States in school construction. The Supreme Court has ruled public school segregation unconstitutional, but some governors, legislatures, and United States Senators have vowed defiance. In such circumstances an amendment to insure that Federal moneys are not used to subsidize noncompliance with the Supreme Court ruling seems to us eminently fitting, proper and germane—far from being extraneous.

We believe the President was ill-advised in his June 8 remarks.

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

NEW YORK, *June 10, 1955.*

INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORK,
Mexico, Ind., June 10, 1955.
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I want to express my appreciation for the splendid job you did on the compulsory Reserve bill.

I hope that, come what may, you will be able to make your amendment stick when the Senate acts and the conference report comes if they succeed in combining the extension of the draft with the compulsory Reserve plan.

Can you get several other men to support your amendment and make sure that it sticks? If the Senate combines the two, that is due pro that the draft is not necessary. Millions of Americans look to you for leadership on the issue of integration.

You did a wonderful job the last time. If it comes up again, I hope that you can pick up more votes by getting more northern Congressmen to see that they should support the amendment. It is not extraneous. If the Congress should draft boys into segregated guard units and Reserve units the clock would be set back. With every good wish to you in these days when decisions are so important, I am.

Sincerely yours,
E. PAUL WEAVER.

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN,
GENERAL BROTHERHOOD BOARD,
Elgin, Ill., June 16, 1955.
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I want to congratulate you for the amendment which you introduced to bill H. R. 5297 recently, which would end racial segregation in the National Guard in 27 States.

This amendment, which placed the desegregation issue squarely in the military matter, helped materially to point up the bill to which it was attached was not essential to the national defense at all, but was simply a move on the part of our militarists to fasten upon us a program of on-going compulsory military training and service.

I'm deeply grateful to you therefore, as there are many others of us, for the introduction of the amendment which in its final outcome helped to shelve the bill for the present. Thank you for your courageous efforts.

Sincerely,
CHARLES E. ZUNKEL,
Executive Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA CONFERENCE OF THE
EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 18, 1955.
Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: I want to commend you for the fine statement that you attached to the Reserves bill, H. R. 5297.

I hope that you will stand firm in your position and not compromise in any way on this issue of complete integration in the armed services.

Personally, I am very much opposed to the Reserves bill. Universal military training is contrary to our democratic traditions. This bill would be a serious threat to our democracy.

Sincerely yours,
F. A. SPONG.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
AMERICAN BAPTIST WOMEN,
Columbus, Ohio, June 1, 1955.
The Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: About 6,000 delegates were meeting in Atlantic City for the American Baptist convention when the bill, H. R. 5297, came up. We were much concerned, as it was against our stand. We have stood against peacetime conscription year after year. We were thankful for your amendment and for your fine spirit. I do wish you to know that we appreciated your stand and your reasons for it.

Very few left our convention not aware of your excellent position in this critical matter. Many sent wires to their Congressmen urging them to support your amendment.

Please know that our prayers are with you and may our Lord bless and guide you.

Sincerely,
RUTH MATHENY,
Mrs. Clyde Matheny.

COUNCIL ON CHRISTIAN PROGRESS,
THE AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
New York, N. Y., June 10, 1955.
The Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Since the President's press conference this week the pressure may be on you to withdraw your amendment to the House measure, 5297. I hope you will be able to resist it for the segregation pattern must be broken by legislation as well as by education.

Moreover, should a national Reserve plan be debated in the Senate I hope your example will cause a colleague to introduce a similar amendment there.

Respectfully yours,
DONALD B. CLOWARD,
Executive Secretary.

MISSOURI ASSOCIATION OF
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH,
Parkville, June 20, 1955.
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We have admired your strong stand against segregation in connection with the Army Reserve bill. It appears now that the administration is trying to revive the bill with a coverup concerning the segregation matter—but I trust you will not be misled, but will continue to fight against passage of this Army-Reserve-UMT bill.

Even as revised, the bill is un-Christian, futile, out of date in the modern military situation, and is an entering wedge toward further military dominance of our youth, black or white. The revision, incidentally, has not cut out the compulsory nature of the bill—it still is regimentation.

You will please me and my friends by continuing your strong opposition to the present bill.

(Letterhead is for identification only, as I am writing to you as a private citizen.)

Sincerely yours,
BEN W. FUSON.

NATIONAL COUNCIL
AGAINST CONSCRIPTION,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.
Representative ADAM POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: Do you believe there is any reason for haste in passing what Hanson Baldwin calls "a hybrid about which nobody, not even the Pentagon, was really happy"?

Certainly international tensions have been eased enough that a poorly drawn bill is no longer rush legislation.

For example, shouldn't there be a clear-cut reason for a large compulsory Reserve? The Pentagon is trying to sell it as needed for military expansion in time of emergency. Such a World War II approach is hardly valid in the atomic age.

The President, seeing the country's reluctance to lengthen the conscript term for veterans, spoke of it as a civil-defense measure.

Which is it? If civil defense, then why not disaster, traffic direction, first aid, and other training instead of military drill and rifle squads. Or is it for martial law to force Americans to remain in threatened cities?

The enclosed reprint from the Combat Forces Journal is worth your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. SWOMLEY, Jr.

[From the Army Combat Forces Journal of April 1955]

AN EX-DRAFTEE SPEAKS UP—HERE'S WHY I'M NOT AN ACTIVE RESERVIST

(By Cpl. Jack Stanley)

In my wallet I carry a small red identification card that states I am a corporal in the Army of the United States, and will remain one until November 1959. That card is my one and only connection with the Army. I have not worn a uniform for a year and a half, when I was separated from active duty after 2 years of service. I am one of America's millions of sleeping reservists, according to figures I have seen.

I cannot speak for anyone but myself, but I believe my reasons for being indifferent to my Reserve obligations are shared by many of my fellow ex-draftees. I know I am not unpatriotic. Although I didn't find military life especially fascinating, I am glad I had a chance to be a soldier for a couple of years, and I know I am as willing as anyone to do my part when my services become necessary to the defense of my country.

Why, then, am I not fulfilling my legal Reserve obligations? The most important reason is that I am unconvinced that such service would enhance the military security of my country. Even if I concede that Reserve service would make me a more proficient soldier—and I don't altogether concede that—I still have doubts whether I would ever be called upon to put whatever proficiency I might attain to the test.

I am familiar with the argument that an atomic or nuclear war will require even bigger armies, but to me that means bigger armies in being—ready for quick and decisive action. I don't honestly see how a big force of reservists could do any good in a war that will be over before it is ready to fight.

I could be wrong about this, but the arguments I have heard don't seem very strong. When I am convinced that trained reserve soldiers will really be needed I'll be one of the first to report at the Armory every Wednesday night.

When I was separated I was given several pamphlets about the Army Reserve. They gave a lot of information, but they didn't answer some questions I had on my mind. How much of my freedom would I give up by joining? If I wanted to move to another State, could the Army prevent me or make it difficult for me? If I decided to take a month's trip to Canada, would I have to get permission? I think the Army has these things worked out, but I'm not going to join anything until I'm good and sure. At first glance they may seem unimportant, but I don't think the average American likes to take any chances on losing his freedom to change jobs or just move about.

I cannot accuse the Army of not making an effort to get me to become an active reservist. I have received and read at least a dozen pamphlets on the subject. The only trouble is that this literature is much more likely to appeal to a man of 45 than to one of 25. The opportunities for promotion do not mean much to anyone unless he has already decided to take the plunge. Retirement benefits are comforting to know about, but they aren't the kind of thing that will stir up the blood of a young man, especially if he is unmarried and more interested in opportunity than security.

The other big argument that the Army uses for persuasion is historical. The Reserve is compared to the militia that defended American liberty in the early days. This is an appealing argument, but I think most Americans of my age secretly believe that it is absurd. We know very well that if we are attacked we can't do much good by pulling a rifle off the wall and rushing into the street. We will go to a camp in South Carolina or Kansas or California, where we will most likely receive a 6-week refresher course; then we will probably wait around for a few months while someone decides where to send us. By then the war will be over, or so most of us think. And anyway, nonreservists will also be training and will be just as prepared as the modern minutemen.

I'm not saying that this is what will happen. I have no way of knowing. But it is what many reservists (in name only) believe, and that is why we are not doing what Congress and the Army say is our duty. Let the country give us some idea of how we might be used and why we are essential to national defense; let the men who represent that picture of Uncle Sam pointing his finger at me put some reality into that militia idea (I'm not at all sure it can't be brought up to date), and reservists will be flocking to the colors.

I think Reserve units should get more publicity. Maybe even a few colorful parades and demonstrations of their special techniques and equipment for civilians and potential reservists to see. There's a good chance the civilians will begin to take the reservists to their hearts—to feel that they belong to them and not to a distant and forbidding Army.

I read in the papers the other day that only 4 out of every 100 draftees join the Active Reserve after their 2 years of active service. A lot of people will say, "Why not make them join?" The answer is that a Reserve of unwilling men wouldn't be as dependable as one composed of eager volunteers. If you want a closely knit and well-trained force composed of men who are civilians for all but a few hours a week, they've got to be men who want to do what they're doing.

Most Americans are patriotic and will do an unpleasant job if they see some meaning in their efforts. So the problem is for the Government to make it clear why Reserve service is necessary.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1955.

To Members of the United States House of Representatives.

From James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

As an organization of farm families whose livelihood and general welfare are dependent upon conditions conducive to the successful and efficient operation of their farms, National Farmers Union respectfully requests that you oppose H. R. 7000.

Operators of family farms would be severely handicapped under the mandatory or compulsory reserve provisions of H. R. 7000: 48 drill periods coupled with active duty training for 17 days annually would seriously interfere with farmwork and responsibility, some of which are of an emergency nature. In a great many instances farm operators reside on farms which are beyond the bounds of reasonable commuting distance to points designated for weekly drill of reserve components. We should like to direct your attention also to the problem of the dairy farmer who under the provisions of H. R. 7000 would be subjected to weekly drill meetings and summer active duty when his farming operations require attention morning and night each day of each week in the year.

Whatever the type of farming operation conducted, successful farm operators have little time off for off-farm activity during summer and fall seasons when active duty training periods are normally scheduled.

Food and fiber are weapons. Proponents of mandatory Reserve and pilot UMT programs do not place due emphasis on the contribution of family-sized farmers who accomplished the impossible in increasing production of food and fiber during World War II. Our food and fiber safety reserves are invaluable in maintaining defense strength. It means adequate agricultural supplies for the free world. Iron Curtain countries are crippled by severe shortages, while Secretary Benson is severely critical of important United States food reserves.

Highly trained and skilled manpower of family sized farms and in industry and that engaged in scientific, technological or medical study and research can best be utilized to serve United States interests if selectivity is practiced by local boards. It is in recognition of this fact that National Farmers Union supported enactment of legislation extending the selective service system which was recently approved on the same day by the Senate and House. Local boards have handled with comparative ease, selective drafting during World Wars I and II and the United Nations' police action in Korea.

We are convinced that a Volunteer Reserve and National Guard with adequate incentive and an attractive program is better designed than compulsion to fulfill national-security objectives. Our recommendations have been and are now:

1. Strong voluntary regular Armed Forces buttressed when required by selective service.

2. Adequate, highly trained voluntary Ready Reserves with program strengthened in ways which will increase interest and lend importance such as expanded and most effective Reserve programs, improved training facilities, and increased pay for volunteer duty.

3. A program of vocational education expanded and broadened to make possible an even more highly skilled United States citizenry both in and out of the Armed Forces. Public expenditure for vocational education both in the United States and in the free nations will, we are convinced, result in a stronger defense for the free world.

4. Balance of power between President and Congress over control of active Armed Forces and reservists should not be changed.

INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORK,
Mexico, Ind., April 29, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: I know that Mr. POWELL is at Bandung, and heartily approve of his being there.

If he were in Washington I know that he would be interested in one angle on the UMT-compulsory Reserve bill. From a southern Congressman, who favors UMT, I learned that many southern Congressmen are looking at the bill carefully to see whether their lily white boys will be put into unsegregated units. Since Mr. POWELL is gone, would someone in the office be able to get in touch with some other Congressman who opposes both UMT and segregation? If someone would wave the red handkerchief before the southern Congressmen by suggesting that the bill contain the assurance that all training units be unsegregated, you can see how many southerners who favor UMT may draw away from this bill.

We have every hope in keeping America free from this totalitarian measure. It appears to me that we shall need every vote that we can muster.

When you write to Mr. Powell tell him that many folks over America are glad that he is at Bandung.

Sincerely,

E. Paul Weaver.

Woman's American Baptist
Home Mission Society,
New York, N. Y., May 3, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Powell: You may not know that there are enough American Baptists of pacifist persuasion to get out a release and to hold an annual breakfast at national convention time.

Now that the House Armed Services Committee has reported out a bill that is a combination uniform military training and Reserve bill, and compulsory—I turn to you as a leader from our Baptist fellowship to represent the most enlightened point of view that is held—the point of view of our Lord.

Your experiences at Bandung will prepare you for a worldwide parish point of view, which must come along with adequate safeguards. But surely we don't need to take on the compulsory military feature of our twice-defeated fellow nation, Germany.

My department of Christian friendliness is busy sending food and clothing to European Baptists who were bombed out and resettling refugees from political coercion.

May God continue to use you,

Bernice Cofer.

Baptist Pacifist Fellowship

ACTION MEMO

Now: Immediate action of a most urgent sort is needed.

Who? By all persons who do not want to see the Congress permanently fasten upon America the Hitler, Stalin type of militarism known as universal military training and conscription.

Why: Congress is this moment in the final stages of legislation which seeks to put over the old UMT under a new name and with new gimmick features which bind trainees far longer.

For the first time in our long battle against UMT, a majority of Congressmen personally have apparently given up the struggle against it, and this legislation has a better-than-ever likelihood of being passed.

You can stop it, but only if you act at once. Final consideration and action will be taken by Congress next week, April 18, and following.

Here's what we must do to stop it:

1. Go to Washington. Organize a caravan, or go alone. (It will cost you something, but remember what Germany paid for not opposing permanent universal military training and service.) Go even if it is 1 day. Report to Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C. They will tell you how to "buttonhole" your own Senators and Representatives, and give you names of others whom you should talk to while there. You are there to tell as many Congressmen as possible that you oppose permanent, compulsory military training and service whatever its name or its other features. Your visit is worth the equivalent of 5,000 letters received by a Congressman.

Take along a number of people; share the expense by auto. Cheap lodging is available. Ask the Friends Committee for particulars when you get there.

2. Write—if you can't go—to your own Congressmen and Senators. This is something everyone can do and has done. But it must be done again now, for almost no opposition letters are going in now. And American Legion newsletter reports that next week all Legion posts will simultaneously deluge their Congressmen, with a goal of 5,000 letters per Congressman all in favor of permanent conscription.

If you need up-to-date information on names of your congressional Representatives, call your city or county offices, or your local newspaper or Western Union.

For literature on conscription as now being presented, write today to National Council on Conscription, same address as Friends Committee.

Remember the Pentagon never sleeps on this issue.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

Hon. Adam C. Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: The Congress of Industrial Organizations continues its unequivocal opposition to the establishment of 8 years of compulsory military and Reserve training for the Armed Forces as established in H. R. 5297.

We oppose this measure and we urge you to vote against it for two main reasons:

1. It permits the advocates of universal military training to get their foot in the door.

2. It makes participation in the Armed Forces Reserve compulsory.

The original proposal submitted to the Congress by the administration provided for 6 months of training for a minimum of 100,000 youths. This 6-month training program was in addition to the regular operation of the Selective Service System. It is true that the revised bill, H. R. 5297, no longer authorizes the drafting of individuals for the 6-month service, but provides only for the voluntary fulfillment of the quota for 6-month trainees. However, even with this revision, there is still provision for the simultaneous operation of the Selective Service System and a voluntary 6-month trainee system. To permit this is not only to sacrifice the effectiveness of selective service and the soundness of our Armed Forces, but to permit the advocates of universal military training to initiate first on a voluntary basis for a limited number of people a program that could eventually become a universal military training program.

It is also true that H. R. 5297 has removed, in part, the compulsory aspect of the reserve training program from the original administration proposal which suggested that individuals who had served either a 6-month training period or a 2-year period under selective service were subject to other than honorable discharge for failing to participate in a reserve training program. This form of compulsion is abhorrent, and we are glad to see that the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee rejected it.

But there is retained in H. R. 5297 compulsion to participate in reserve training, compulsion brought about by requiring that an individual be called back to active duty for 45 days if he fails to participate in the specified reserve training program. If he fails to report for the 45 days of active duty, he then becomes subject to court-martial. Thus, while a form of compulsion—discharge other than honorable—was removed from the original administration bill, there is still a degree of compulsion retained in H. R. 5297.

The adoption of this bill would impose upon the youth of this country, for the first time in our history, 8 years of compulsory military service either on active duty or in Reserve status.

Our committee testified before the House Armed Services Committee and proposed that a sincere and honest effort be made by the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense to develop a voluntary reserve training program. This has not really been done up to now. Instead the Armed Forces have insisted that only through compulsion can an adequate Reserve force be established.

We are convinced that with the establishment of proper incentives and inducements a far more effective Reserve force could be developed than the one which would result from the imposition of the compulsory features of the bill, H. R. 5297.

We urge you, therefore, to vote against H. R. 5297 because there is need for neither a compulsory Reserve program nor the initiation of a partial universal military training system. The Armed Forces of the United States can be maintained by the continuation of our selective service program and the development of a voluntary reserve training program.

Sincerely yours,

L. S. Buckmaster, *Chairman.*

April 30, 1955.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: You probably are as concerned as I am about the pending compulsory Reserve bill. As you know, 8 years is a long time for Americans to be under military control.

When General Smuts said: "Conscription is the taproot of militarism," I believe he meant that you can't train the boys of the Nation physically for war without also training their minds for war.

The European experience with such a program was so disastrous that I am sure we ought to think twice before adopting, in the atomic age, a program that may gradually make our people rely primarily on military solutions to world problems.

Is it not true that Reserve groups have testified in the public hearings in favor of the voluntary system, and that the Navy and Air Force were especially vocal against this compulsory plan? They are apparently confident that they can meet required goals without this bill.

Why, then, should we tamper with our precious freedom to impose an 8-year draft on every boy?

Very sincerely,

Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Women's International League
for Peace and Freedom,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: This is to follow up my conversation with your secretary on April 19. I am enclosing some material on the UMT and compulsory Reserve bill, which I believe you will find useful in studying the proposed bill.

We surely hope that ample time will be given for the Members of Congress to study the hearings before the bill is brought to the floor for action.

Sincerely yours,

Annalee Stewart,
Mrs. Alexander Stewart,
Legislative Secretary.

Mothers of the World, Inc.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., April 25, 1955.

Dear Friend: We realize that the universal military training bill may soon come up for your consideration and we want you to know that we are absolutely opposed to this bill.

We will never be in favor of peacetime conscription and want to again go on record, as mothers and women of America, as opposed to any plan that would tie up the lives of our youth for 8 to 10 years, as well as seriously affect our economic structure and American way of life.

We are again submitting the attached copy of an alternate plan to universal military training which we trust will receive your careful consideration.

We are constantly praying for the leaders in our Government and for world peace.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. HENRY A. KRUEGER,
President.
Mrs. JOHN JORDAN,
Chairman of the Board.

MOTHERS OF THE WORLD,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

A PROGRAM OF PREPAREDNESS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

All loyal thinking Americans want adequate national defense. Many of us disagree as to the best method for achieving it. All of us have difficulty in discussing it because the terms are not clearly defined and there has been no one specific plan which has been generally accepted or given in detail as the universal military training plan.

We are hereby proposing a plan which we believe will be more effective, more economical, and more fitting in our democracy than any UMT plan which has been proposed. We acknowledge the fear of a military hierachy. We acknowledge the fear of the estimated cost of any UMT plan which has been proposed. We acknowledge the fear of a plan which seriously disrupts the educational, the professional, and the skill development of our youth.

We believe that history has proven that universal military training has never won a war or prevented a war. We believe that the strength of our society is in the scientific ingenuity, the productive capacity, and the individual initiative of our people. We believe that any of the proposed plans for UMT neglect to use these factors and actually hinder the development and growth of these phases of our society.

OBJECTIVE I. TO DEVELOP PHYSICALLY FIT YOUTH

Proposed method: To place in the public schools of the United States a program of physical examination and a program of physical training, for all children from grade 1 through the senior high school.

1. This program to be under the direction of a trained and qualified person in each school.

2. Physical examination by competent local physicians.

3. The physical training to develop proper physical development and to correct deficiencies detected in the medical examinations.

4. Programs to be developed under general, nationwide policies within the framework of the United States Office of Education and operated under a board representing local medical, educational, and lay persons.

5. To be financed completely by Federal funds.

Advantages: This would allow local control; would recognize that it is a national problem and therefore financed by Federal funds; and would allow a 12-year period to detect and correct physical deficiencies.

No 6-month or 1-year program of UMT will develop physically fit youth. It will physically toughen or harden youth. But the youth must be physically fit to start and the resulting physical toughness, while necessary for battle performance, cannot be maintained but for a few months after rigorous training is stopped. Physical toughening will always have to be done in a period immediately before battle assignment.

OBJECTIVE II. TO DEVELOP MECHANICALLY AND ELECTRICALLY SKILLED PERSONS TO MAINTAIN A HIGH PRODUCTIVE LEVEL AND HAVE THE BASIC SKILLS FOR OPERATING WEAPONS OF WARFARE

Proposed method: To place in every public high school in the United States an expanded vocational training program in the basic skills needed for national defense production and for operation of warfare equipment.

1. The instructors to be highly trained and experienced persons.

2. The basic skill areas to be determined by qualified military and industrial personnel.

3. To be operated under the general direction of the Vocational Division of the United States Office of Education and to be financed completely from Federal funds, similar to the program of vocational education for national defense of 1942–46.

4. To develop a program of aptitude testing and prevocational training beginning in grade 7 in order to increase the efficiency of instruction.

5. To correlate this training program with manpower needs in the United States and State employment agencies.

Advantages: The efficient skill training of our youth would raise the productive capacity of our country and would provide the basic skills for operating the machinery of warfare.

OBJECTIVE III. TO HAVE TRAINED MILITARY LEADERS

Proposed method: A. To maintain, expand, or develop additional service schools and college ROTC units.

B. To continue or expand State and National Guard units.

1. To provide extensive, rigorous leadership training in service schools for persons with these special interests or aptitudes.

2. To provide leadership training for military careers for college students and thus detect, train, and interest students with military and leadership qualities.

3. This to be financed and directed as at present or under new regulations as experience indicates better methods.

Advantages: This is a proven method of leadership training and conforms with our democratic processes of allowing the individual to choose and the military to train and select.

OBJECTIVE IV. TO MAINTAIN AN ADEQUATE SIZE STANDING ARMY

Proposed method: A. To maintain a program of enlistments.

B. To maintain a program of selective service to draft men up to the number needed at any specific time for any specific need.

1. To allow and encourage enlistments in the services and areas of a person's choice.

2. To maintain a national board of military government, industrial, and general public leaders to determine the size of the standing Army at any particular time and for any particular emergency.

3. To maintain a selective service system of drafting personnel up to the Army size as determined above.

Advantages: These are methods which have proven satisfactory in our society and are flexible enough to provide for changing conditions. They have also proven acceptable to our Nation as a whole.

We believe that as more persons consider this plan additional details will be added and improvements made. This plan uses existing agencies in our society and recognizes the inherent potential power of education of our youth over a 12-year period. It recognizes the importance of industrial production and the human democratic spirit of our people. It can be done at much less cost than estimates of UMT.

MARION, IND., *March 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Before you vote on the UMT Reserve bill, I wish that you would look at the enclosed statement made by some of America's great organizations on this bill. If you doubt the intention to make this UMT, read the excerpt from the Defense Department's own pamphlet.

I wish that you would have time to read the testimonies of the churches and the church organizations that testified on this measure. Rev. E. Paul Weaver testified for the Indiana Council of Churches. As you may know the National Council of Churches and many other State councils of churches voted against this attempt to start UMT.

We hope that enough Members of Congress will see through this attempt to start UMT in addition to the draft. The good of America should be above politics. As you read the statements of these organizations before the Armed Services Committees, you will see that this attempt to start UMT cannot be for the good of our country.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. J. RALPH WINGER.

APRIL 28, 1955.

Mrs. J. RALPH WINGER,
Marion, Ind.

DEAR MRS. WINGER: Thank you for sending to me the background information and sharing your views on UMT with which I agree.

You may be assured of my continued vigorous opposition to this legislation.

Very truly yours,

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

WHAT THEY SAID ABOUT THE UMT-RESERVE BILL

IS H. R. 2967 INTENDED TO START UMT?

Department of Defense National Reserve Plan (proposed) February 3, 1955: "In addition, direct procurement for the Reserve Forces provides a means of insuring that the manpower pool does not increase to a point where some men might escape military service by passing the age of military liability without being called upon to serve."

James H. Straubel, executive director, Air Force Association, before the House Armed Services Committee, March 3, 1955: "The question of equity is a huge one and can be easily oversimplified. Certainly, there is an equity of obligation to help defend this Nation on the part of every citizen, but it need not follow that this means equity of service. The first is inherent in our way of life. The second—the equity of service—should be dependent upon the military requirement. If, for example, it is possible to deter aggression and defend the Nation without running every qualified male citizen through the military mill, it would be inefficient and wasteful to do so.

"One major proponent of the National Reserve plan, during testimony, in questioning the stated Air Force requirements, noted that the First World War 'was won by men who had not been in 2 years, because it did not last that long.' The significance of the analogy escapes me. I cite it only as a warning that there appears to be more than a little World War I thinking behind this legislation.

"The National Reserve plan, with its provision for a 6-month training program, is a potential danger in the voluntary enlistment program of the Air Force.

"As a result of this experience and our studies of the military manpower problems, we strongly urge that this committee consider a National Reserve plan based on inducements for voluntary enlistment rather than compulsory service.

"We believe that with the joint effort of the Congress, the executive branch, the Nation's industry and its civic agencies—that voluntary enlistments in all services can be vastly increased. We think voluntary enlistment is more democratic, more in tune with public desire, than compulsory service.

"We suggest that the Reserve obligation for voluntary enlistees in all services be omitted entirely, with 4 years the minimum enlistment period.

"Both the Air Force and Navy are on record that they desire a Voluntary Reserve. Thus, this change should not affect them. It could, however, be an important inducement for a man to volunteer for Army service rather than wait to be drafted.

"We do not find that the concept of equity of service, as advanced to support the bill, is compatible with the military requirement."

Frank S. Pohanka, Jr., national secretary, Naval Reserve Association, before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, March 3, 1955: "There has to be a lot of give and take in this operation. Forcing a person to do something simply cannot give maximum results. Rather, it is a matter of leadership, patriotic motivation, appealing to the best in the individual, and achieving voluntary and full cooperation.

"How will a draft board explain that it chose one boy from one side of the street to serve for 2 years in the armed services and chose his friend on the other side of the street to 6 months' service?

"It has been possible for a man to enlist for 2 years of active duty as a reservist for many years. Likewise, he has been given a chance to enlist for 4 years in the Regular Navy. We of the Naval Reserve Association resent the implication that these patriotic young men who enlist for 4 years in the Regular Navy are doing so to avoid the draft for a 2-year period. Any man who is motivated as alleged would be to stupid to pass the intelligence test, because if he regards 2 years in the Army as unpalatable, obviously he would be foolish to sign up for 4 years in another service, which might be equally or more unpalatable for 2 additional years. We do not believe the young men think in this fashion.

"We request most sincerely that you do not require the Navy to utilize the 6 months' program for the following reasons:

"(a) It is not suitable to Navy training.

"(b) It will cost a great deal more than the 2-year program.

"(c) It will result in a paper Reserve which is not genuinely ready for mobilization.

"(d) It will seriously hamper the Reserve training program, which even now has too many untrained men in it."

Congress of Industrial Organizations, March 1, 1955: "We believe that the National Reserve plan, which purports 'to provide maximum equity in military obligations for all qualified individuals,' actually contains many built-in inequities.

"We unequivocally oppose the use of compulsion in the development of a Reserve program.

"We thoroughly support the development of a Reserve force which is maintained on a voluntary basis.

"H. R. 2967 permits the advocates of universal military training to accomplish their first step toward instituting UMT. For the first time in our Nation's history, America's youth would be saddled with 8 to 10 years of military service."

Thomas R. Reid, director of office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co., for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the House Armed Services Subcommittee, March 4, 1955: "H. R. 2967 places no ceiling whatever on the size of the Reserve. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence to support the Defense Department position that some form of active military service by every able-bodied young man of draft age is in the national interest or even feasible under the proposed National Reserve plan.

"We are opposed to the Defense Department proposal to attain a 3 million member Ready Reserve force in just 4 years, on the grounds that this goal is completely unrealistic. Instead, the chamber recommends that the 1,500,000 ceiling that the Armed Forces Reserve Act placed on the Ready Reserve be retained as the 1959 target strength of this Reserve category. After developing a 1,500,000-member Ready Reserve of quality, Congress should take another look at the program to determine whether a larger Ready Reserve is necessary and, if necessary, feasible.

"By restricting the size of the Ready Reserve to 1,500,000 until the need for and feasibility of a larger force can be shown: The Armed Forces should be able to obtain close to that required level of participation in Reserve training on a voluntary basis.

"* * * we strongly oppose the concept that equity demands service for the sake of service by those able-bodied young men who may be available in excess of actual military requirements."

John A. Baker, assistant to the president, National Farmers Union, presented to the House Armed Services Committee February 28, 1955: "National Farmers Union is opposed to H. R. 2967 because it embodies the principle of universal military training.

"UMT is not consistent with our democratic process under which individual freedom is inherent.

"We are convinced that a much stronger national defense and personnel preparedness can be provided for the Nation through an overall program composed of the following phases:

"1. Strong voluntary Regular Armed Forces buttressed when required by selective service.

"2. Adequate, highly trained voluntary Ready Reserves with programs strengthened in ways which will increase interest and lend importance such as expanded and most effective Reserve programs, improved training facilities, and increased pay for volunteer duty."

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, presented to the House Armed Services Committee February 28, 1955: "Enactment of peacetime military conscription would violate the traditional American concept of democracy. Our Founding Fathers had uppermost in their thinking the establishment of a form of government weighted in favor of civil control, not military domination. This was accomplished primarily because many of our ancestors sought asylum in this country to escape tyrannical military systems.

"I strongly urge this committee to pay heed to the farm, labor, church, educational, and civic organizations who have opposed the enactment of the universal military training principle and that other equally effective measures be instituted to maintain our Armed Forces."

McEwen, Tenn., *June 28, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: We appreciate very much all you are doing to prevent bill H. R. 6900, compulsory Reserve plan. We sincerely hope you continue to do all you can to help defeat this un-American, unconstitutional, and unnecessary legislation.

Please do not compromise in any way. Stand firm against the compulsory Reserve plan. In doing so you will be helping to preserve our freedom, our most precious heritage.

Hoping compulsory Reserve plan will be defeated.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Edwards.

Ferndale, Calif., *June 27, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: You are to be congratulated for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of the bill H. R. 5297. It proves that the bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of Southern militarists like Vinson.

Now compulsory training is being again considered in a Reserve bill. We hope you will continue to oppose the bill. America does not need and should not have compulsory military training.

Sincerely,
Dorothy W. Anderson.

Portland, Oreg., *June 28, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Thank you for your letter of the 16th. This week I am interested in the revised Reserve bill coming up. I trust that there will be no discrimination in the National Guard and other Reserve units. I have written Congressman Ellsworth, who is on your Rules Committee, urging that there be no limitation in the rule which would handicap you in offering protecting amendments. Let me know if there are others in Congress to whom it would be helpful if I should write.

I am with the Bonneville Power Administration, and we have had, on the whole, a fine attitude between members of different racial groups.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
Wm. C. Spencer.

First Baptist Church,
Burlington Flats, N. Y., June 28, 1955.

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Representative: The H. R. 6900 bill contains the objectionable features of the former bill and therefore should be defeated also, for:

1. It provides for compulsory Reserve training in peacetime which, as you know, has disrupted the life of our young people and brought about so much unrest among them.

2. It quadruples the size of the Reserve force at the very time our country should be leading the others in cutting down.

3. It raises doubt in the minds of other countries as to the sincerity of our President and of our country wanting peace.

4. It ignores your amendment, and it's time my people give equal rights to their brothers.

Sincerely yours,
B. Bailey Hathaway.

Alum Rock Methodist Church,
San Jose, Calif., June 28, 1955.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: A bit belatedly I would like to commend you for your action in introducing the antisegregation amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill.

I have been opposed to the compulsory Reserve bill on several counts and am particularly opposed to any national service legislation which continues Jim Crowism. It is my understanding that this legislation is coming up in slightly different form. I urge you and will urge my own Representative, Charles S. Gubser, to oppose any attempt at further segregation in the Armed Forces.

Very truly yours,
Wayne M. Kessel, *Pastor.*

Washington and
United Nations Seminars,
New York, N. Y., June 29, 1955.

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing to express my opposition to H. R. 7000, which I understand will be discussed in the House very soon. While certainly an improvement over the old proposed universal military training program, it still seems to some of us to leave the door open to a permanent peacetime conscription type of program.

Our country must have adequate defense, but it would not seem that this compulsory Reserve bill is the answer. It also might be interpreted by some other countries as a lack of confidence in the efforts toward easing of tensions and disarmament discussions in which we have given leadership.

I recognize that there are many issues involved in this subject, but I did want you to know that there are those strongly opposed to this new bill.

Yours sincerely,

Miriam R. Corbett.
Miss Miriam R. Corbett.

Deane Stockton Stevens,
Strong, Maine, June 27, 1955.

The Honorable Clayton Powell,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Today the President of the United States of America passes through my town in Maine. I wish it were you instead. For, like you, I was shocked at Mr. Eisenhower's recent letter to you dealing with segregation. I am delighted to read that you are more than ever determined to carry on your battle to rid our Nation of Jim Crowism.

Mr. Powell, on matters of principle there can be no compromise. With the background of the 1954 and 1955 Supreme Court decisions against racial segregation we must avail ourselves of every opportunity to make those decisions living realities, not just high sounding literary victories.

I sincerely hope you will use your influence and vote to defeat the Prussianization of our youth through involuntary labor, better known as UMT, but politely termed the "Reserve program." In yester century a good many of our fellow citizens were slaves. Let us not have any civilian or military slaves. Courageous Congressmen like you can save us all.

More power to you in your battle against racial segregation.

Most sincerely,

Deane S. Stevens.

Rocky Mount NAACP Chapter,
Rocky Mount, N. C., June 26, 1955.

Re H. R. 5297 and Powell amendment.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senators Richard B. Russell and Lyndon Johnson; Representatives McCormack and Rayburn,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. President and Honorable Congressmen: It is noted that this has been declared as the probable week for final action on H. R. 5297 and the Powell amendment thereto, which amendment is aimed at the prevention of continued discriminatory practices in the maintenance of our Armed Forces by withholding Federal funds from States or units which practice racial or religious discrimination in the enlistment of recruits for National Guard duty.

Be it here known that liberal-minded Americans of all races (which group is growing by the thousands, yea, millions daily) greatly deplore the apparent tendency of the Congress of the United States of America to ignore this very worthy demonstration of real Americanism and to sidestep the issue through the substitution of legislation which would circumvent the Powell amendment.

It is the hope and prayers of all minority-group citizens that they will not longer be denied the right to enlist to defend their beloved America on a par with every other citizen.

We pray to our Eternal God, the Father of all mankind, that ye who sit in the seats of power will let the spirit of Christian brotherhood guide you in your decisions and deliberations so that further injustices may not be heaped upon a minority whose voice is yet small in the halls of our legislative bodies of their State and Nation.

We beg of you, Mr. President, Honorable Senators and Representatives, that you, individually and collectively, continue to hold high the lamp of freedom and justice for all Americans for all the world to see; that other nations, whose lands may be more benighted than ours, may see our true expression of democracy and be constrained to accept us as friend and neighbor.

We hope that this administration will continue the wonderful progress thus far made in the realm of human relations for all Americans, yea, all citizens of the world.

Very sincerely,

Charlie Jones, *President,*
J. B. Harren, *Acting Secretary.*

Kentuucky Conference of
NAACP Branches,
Louisville, Ky., June 22, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: I am very much impressed with the stand you are taking relative to the antisegregation clause in the Reserve bill. I am rather surprised at President Eisenhower requesting that the clause be stricken from the bill. If we are to have a democracy in the world, we must first prove to the world that democracy can work at home. Otherwise, we will continue, as we now are, to be a laughing stock among the nations for attempting to preach something that we ourselves do not practice. So stand your ground, and if there are any suggestions as to the way that this branch of the State conference might help we will appreciate having them. Congratulations to you for this great stand in the cause of freedom.

Sincerely yours,

Osceola A. Dawson, *Secretary.*

Bakersfield, Calif., *June 22, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: I have thanked God for you daily since you caused the compulsory Reserve bill to be tabled by your amendments. I mentioned this in a sermon and was asked to tell about what you had done and said at the local NAACP meeting.

Now we hear the bill is to come up again in new form and without your amendment. Keep up your good work.

I am the pastor of a church (Methodist) of almost 1,000 members here.

Sincerely,

Charles Edwin Lord.

Athens, Ga., *June 27, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I note that, spurred by White House and Pentagon pressure, Mr. Vinson has introduced a new Reserve bill. I had thought that the various older versions of UMT were sick to death. But intensive artificial respiration has restored a spark of life to the old bill, even though nobody seems to be happy over this hybrid compromising subterfuge, not even the Pentagon or the Reserve groups. Why not give the whole business a decent burial and get on to some constructive legislation more in keeping with military and international realities in an atomic age?

There are many objections to any such legislation. In the first place, I am on principle opposed to universal compulsory military training—especially in peacetime. And despite all the sugar-coating, this new Vinson bill, H. R. 6900, contains a deceptive UMT feature of compulsory Reserve training. The cost would become tremendous. It would provide a militia organization of "weekend warriors" when what we need is a professional army and professional civil-defense reserve with highly specialized training. Any such Reserve is not worth the trouble and expense; and it would be of no use, anyway, if we were subject to attack. It does not provide "equity" of service for all which is claimed for the bill. And it raises serious doubts as to our sincerity in asking for disarmament and serious peace proposals. Its only purpose and result would be to militarize our Nation and put it on a war footing.

Surely this is no time for military expansion and big military talk, just when the Big Four are to hold conversations at the summit. We need a new kind of creative thinking and acting for peace, not more planning for war in which mutual annihilation will be the result.

Cordially yours,

Paul E. Pfuetze.

P. S.—Here is one southerner who hopes you will not yield on your point of nonsegregation in the Armed Forces and the Reserves.

Cleveland, Ohio, *June 22, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I want to congratulate you upon the vision, patriotism, and courage, showing real statesmanship, as a thoroughly American Congressman, as evinced by your attitude with reference to our relations, as liberty-loving Americans, to the very important events transpiring in the world in the upsurge of the masses in Asia and Africa, and their irresistible march toward political and economic freedom and well-being.

I regret, exceedingly, that my country refrained—deliberately refrained—from having an active and affirmative participation in the Bandung Conference, helping to direct it in its deliberations and actions, looking to wider liberty and a more lasting and complete peace in the world, among men of good will. It seems to me that as leaders of the free world, we should have been active and urgent and persistent in that conference in calling the attention of all the world to the fact that black and white man fought and suffered and sacrificed and died to make freedom in the world a reality, and that a black man was the first to die, that American liberty might live.

Now you are insisting upon a course of duty, as I see it, in legislation, which will further the unquestioned American ideal and the unquestioned demand of the American Constitution that the color bar be permanently and actually removed, and not further operate to repress the colored American as he seeks to enlist his best efforts in contributing to our national leadership of a really free world, including all men everywhere.

The conduct of many of the former slave States, since the Court's decision against segregation in the schools, discloses the unfortunate fact that wide differences on essential principles of equality still afflict our Nation to a hurtful degree as they did in the time of Lincoln.

So, you are to be congratulated, my dear sir, for the fight which you are making, and I only trust that every American lover of his kind and of his Nation and of liberty will make their support of your action speedily known and felt in the councils of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

Alexander H. Martin.

The Tieszen Clinic, Inc.,
Tieszen Chiropractic Hospital,
Marion, S. Dak., June 21, 1955.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: I am writing you to express my appreciation for your part in temporarily holding up the passage of H. R. 5297, known as the UMT or compulsory Reserve bill. I want to congratulate you on the stand you have taken against this un-American bill, and I hope you can keep up the good fight until this bill dies a natural death.

We boast about being a free Nation. I hope we can keep it free—free from military control as well as from other types of despotism.

Very truly yours,

ISAAC P. TIESZEN, D. C.

RICHMOND, VA., *June 24, 1955.*

Congressman ADAM POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This morning's Times-Dispatch of Richmond is indeed brilliant on page 10—NAACP—Congress highlights.

Fight on, little David against Goliath. Our God lives.

Sincerely,

ALBERTA HENLEY.

P. S.—God send the day when I can complete my life membership in NAACP.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations on your stand on the Eisenhower letter.

Many, many people are unimpressed with the "go slow" policy which has obstructed progress toward equality for so long. Democratic rights are not assured by simply waiting for the good in the white man to triumph—it won't without vigorous prodding.

Housing, schools, and Army service are essential aspects of American life, as Presidential messages and congressional action testify. Here then are the places to force Congressmen and the President to stand up in public and be counted. A failure here is a failure in democracy—not just solely in civil rights—and it affects white and Negro alike. In fact, in the long, long view of our world, it may affect the white man most of all.

As Marshall said in Atlantic City the other day, "We Negro Americans will continue with unrelenting determination to save the souls of the white Western world. We will not stop, we will not pause until this is accomplished." There are white Americans who acknowledge the deep truth of these words and who support all efforts as a matter of conscience, not of politics.

I would also like to thank you for your courage and insight re the Bandung Conference. It must be a bitter thing to be so prescient and have to fight the opposition and apathy of Government bureaucrats as you did, to say nothing of the attitude of the white press.

Sincerely yours,

BETTE V. REED.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.:

DEAR SIR: Keep up your fight against bias and bigotry.

The Eisenhower administration is the most anitcolored and anti-Semitic we ever had.

I lost my job for filing charges of antisemitism against a supervisor in the New York, N. Y., post office.

If you are interested, I can tell you plenty about bias here. Can I tell you my story?

Respectfully,

LOUIS TRAURIG.

GENERAL BROADCASTING CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 24, 1955.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Carry on your antisegregation work; don't quit.

Sincerely,

DAVE ROLONTY.

PLYMOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Utica, N. Y., June 25, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Let me commend you with the forthright stand you have taken with regard to the antisegregation issue as it relates to the military Reserve bill.

I am sure that at the present time you are under heavy pressure from administration sources to discontinue your fight over the antisegregation issue when the military Reserve legislation comes to the floor of the House. I simply want to say, however, that there are many of us in agreement with your stand that under present world conditions we simply cannot proclaim freedom with our lips, and then fail to back it up in concrete form.

May I urge you to continue your fight with regard to this particular piece of legislation (H. R. 6900).

Sincerely,

HAROLD R. FRAY, Jr.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 25, 1955.*

Hon. A. C. POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

I am writing you as one of my Representatives to urge that you put a rider on the military training bill (which I believe comes up this next week) for antisegregation. I understand you have favored this stand.

Very truly,

(Miss) SARAH P. MAYBURY.

ALTOONA, PA., *June 24, 1955.*

Congressman A. C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Thank God, and I do not say it lightly, for our Congressmen and Senators who labor so long and so untiringly for the good of our national interests and for the people they represent. Their praises so often go unsung—we feel that there are some of this number who would not have it otherwise.

But even the most astute and the most conscientious need to be on guard against enacting legislation which will restrict the fullest of progress and which will only serve to satisfy the selfish interests of a group or groups who seek undue advantages.

Many of your constituents are confused at times by the furious debates which take place in your halls over proposed measures and the way in which they are proposed. We are concerned over the recurrence of the proposed military Reserve bill. Those who are proponents of this measure advance the contention that it is not a UMT legislation. To this we cannot agree, since the provisions make it compulsory that all either enlist for a short training period or are subject to a longer term of active training and service. The first would be subject to long membership in the Reserves with periodic training over several years, or, failing this, be put into active service. The second group would still be in the Reserves for a long period, making very uncertain a man's planning of his life's work. Again, we would avoid any questioning of the proponents' integrity when on one hand they claim world tension is lessening and the increasing need for limitations of armaments while on the other hand they insist that such a measure as this is the answer. Would not the passage of this make enemies of our potential and would-be friends? And then, how can we use advantageously such an enlarged group when we fail so miserably in the handling of our present Reserves? Are we altogether wrong when we feel that this measure is pushed by those who stand to receive great monetary profits and by those who seek to preserve their jobs and to insure positions for their ever-increasing numbers?

Such a measure seems to me illogical, unneeded, and lacking in Christian principles.

We do desire and do hereby urge you to oppose in an active manner this bill which would be the sowing of dragons' teeth were it to pass.

Very sincerely yours,

C. H. CAMERON.

JUNE 23, 1955.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I am writing this letter for the sole purpose of encouraging you in your stand on the issue of segregation in the National Guard. Your fight is of special importance since it follows the Supreme Court decision to abolish segregation in the public schools. It represents an opportune chance to strike another blow against racial discrimination.

The National Guard is symbolic in that it embodies our belief that freemen will rise to defend their liberties. The Guard can hardly be a pure symbol if it is tainted with racial prejudice. We, a Nation that claims loudly to be the freest people on earth, are only a hypocrisy instead of a democracy so long as we permit a national institution to remain steeped in segregation.

You speak not only for your race, but for all Americans who would like to see this country realize the goal of universal freedom which it had long ago claimed to have achieved.

Respectfully,

BERNARD WEINSTEIN.

NORTHVILLE, MICH., *June 23, 1955.*

Hon. Representative CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLAYTON POWELL: Congratulations for introducing the amendment which prevented the passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

Respectfully,

ALTA POWERS.

CHILLICOTHE, MO., *June 7, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are watching the UMT-compulsory Reserve bill with great interest and are grateful to you for your antisegregation amendment. We urge you not to accept any compromise to this amendment. We feel that the whole bill is wrong.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE SEIBERLING.

ATCHISON, KANS., *June 22, 1955.*

Representative ADAM POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We thank you for authoring the bill on antisegregation which operated to hamper passage of the military Reserve bill. Anything which can help prevent passage of such a bill is a service to the people, not only at present but in generations to come.

Please stick to your position. Giving control of youth, colored or white, to the military for 8 years of their lives would be a surrender of freedom for all.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. MORRIS NIELSON.

P. S.—Please do not feed that this requires a reply.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *June 22, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK: I have been following your work on the draft question.

Keep up the good work regarding antisegregation.

Am a member of St. Petersburg Peace and Civic Committee in our Friends Meeting.

Have been active in antiwar work since 1912.

Am a member of the Council of Human Relations and the Children Interracial Organization.

Enclosed find a poem by my wife opposing war and injustice.

Mrs. Krahl passed away November 28 last.

We must have that discontent if we expect to accomplish anything.

Respectfully,

Louis O. Krahl.

AM I CONTENT?

Am I content? No, oh no.
Thank God, He does not make me so.
While poverty and wrong exist
Should I stay in a rosy mist
Of peaceful lethargy: not know
Of things that hurt my brothers so,
While men will crush and twist and grind
The weaker members of their kind?
Must I say, "Soul, close thou mine eyes?"
Must I say, "Mind, be not too wise?"
Nay, I would make my discontent.
As surgeon's steel, to probe the rent
And find the cause, and then to heal.
Oh, to my discontent add zeal.
And though my part be dull and small
God grant I do my best, my all.
And then, when I am old and spent
I'll view the past
And I know my soul will find content.
I'll know my soul can be content.

Ada B. Krahl (beloved life partner of Louis O. Krahl, who, together, devoted their lives to the noble cause of peace on earth).

SEPTEMBER 1, 1927.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not one of your constituents, I wish to heartily commend your stand concerning President Eisenhower's request that antisegregation riders not be attached to essential legislative programs.

I feel that these essential programs should only become law with the necessary safeguards to enable all of our citizens to participate in them equally.

Yours truly,

Doris Wilbur Williams.

JUNE 23, 1955.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: Inasmuch as you have announced your intention to stick by your antisegregation amendment to the military Reserve bill and to seek to add it to any substitute which may be introduced, I suppose this note is superfluous, in any event. However, I imagine that you've been subjected to considerable pressure to drop this plan and therefore an occasional word from a supporter may be welcome.

I think you have struck the first really telling legislative blow against discrimination that Congress has seen in many years. Undoubtedly if you recede from the amendment plan in exchange for a promise to introduce separate legislation, the latter will die for precisely the same reason that your amendment is so telling; southerners will block it. Moreover, you have succeeded in putting the shoe on the proper foot by showing that it is really that group which places discrimination above other national interests, rather than Congressmen such as yourself who seek to end discrimination.

It really is time to insure that Federal funds are not used to support segregation. Your amendment to the Reserve bill is, I hope, only the first of many such which in sum will clearly pose the issue. Does the Southern bloc place bigotry above national welfare? If the attack is pressed I think ultimately they will not continue to do so.

Congratulations and best wishes, then.

James H. Heller,
Barbara S. Heller.

MODESTO CALIF., *June 23, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was heartened by your opposition to the compulsory Reserve bill recently brought up before the House. It has come to my attention that another bill of similar intent is being pushed through Congress. I trust you will continue your fight to defeat all aspects of Jim Crow in our national life, and further, any compulsory form of conscription for Army Reserve.

Sincerely yours,

Rudy Potockink.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Columbus, Ohio, June 24, 1955.

CONGRESSMAN ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have just read today's New York Times regarding your reaction to the President's request that you not attach antibias riders to bills on Reserves, schools, and health.

I write commending you for your valiant stand and urge your continued insistence on the adoption of your riders. Please feel free to call upon this branch to help in any way possible. I am writing Congressman VORYS urging him to support your measures, and to the President urging him to put the finger on those who practice racial discrimination and segregation rather than on those who oppose such practice.

Most sincerely,

Barbee Wm. Durham.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 24, 1955.*

The Honorable Mr. POWELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I am writing you to encourage you to continue to make your stand for the inclusion of antisegregation clauses in any forthcoming legislation, now especially, the military Reserve and the school construction bills. We are in danger of undoing the antisegregation developments in the armed services during the last war and/or the spirit of the September 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation ruling if such new legislation, minus the amendments, were allowed to pass. This is a new era demanding new concepts of law.

We are vacationing in the Midwest and thought you might be interested in the news clipping.

Sincerely,

Phyllis L. Warren.

[From Kansas City Times of June 24, 1955]

REJECTS IKE PLEA—ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENTS WILL NOT BE WITHDRAWN BY POWELL—SHOCKED BY A LETTER—PRESIDENT'S APPEAL ONLY INCREASES HIS DETERMINATION, SAYS REPRESENTATIVE

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, today turned down a personal appeal by President Eisenhower to withdraw antisegregation amendments which the President said would kill essential military Reserve and school-construction legislation.

POWELL told a news conference that the dangerous and shocking letter from the President, delivered today, had made him more determined to carry on an antisegregation fight.

The New Yorker, 1 of 3 Negroes in the House, said he has definitely decided on an antisegregation amendment to the pending school bill and is only awaiting legal advice before deciding on a similar proposal for a compromise Reserve bill coming up soon.

The President wrote, in a letter dated Tuesday, that "progress in ending segregation is difficult if not impossible if we are to depend upon incorporating nonsegregation clauses in legislation that the Senate will not favorably consider and hence will never become law."

"And it is a fact of history," the President continued, "that no legislation, however meritorious, containing such a provision has ever passed the Senate.

"* * * Reserve legislation with a nonsegregation provision affecting the National Guard cannot now become law. School-construction legislation containing a nonsegregation provision cannot now become the law."

ANTIAIRCRAFT ARTILLERY
REPLACEMENT TRAINING CENTER,
Fort Bliss, Tex., June 24, 1955.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Recently I have been reading in the newspapers the account of your action with regard to the Reserve plan which is being supported by the President.

I wish to highly commend your action in putting in an amendment to bar segregation in the Reserve units.

I have served with quite a few colored people, and I find most of them better soldiers than some of my own people.

Please keep up the fight. If another Reserve bill is introduced, please make sure that an antisegregation amendment is put in so our National Guard units will not be segregated.

Wishing you the best of luck in your fight for a free and equal America, I am

Cordially yours,

Pfc. John M. Hanley.

CHRIST CHURCH,
Kilauea, Kauai, T. H., June 22, 1955.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: At this time when there are indications on several fronts that peace is breaking out in our world, you are to be commended for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of the recent UMT bill.

Today our country and the world needs a program that is geared to a hope for peace, not a fear of war. May UMT (under whatever name) be forever banished from our land.

May God forever bless and guide you in your labors.

Most respectfully yours,

S. N. McCain, Jr.

KEW GARDENS, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I hope you will stand firm against CARL VINSON's latest undemocratic onslaught for a compulsory Reserve.

In an H-bomb era this man is not concerned with defense, but the satisfaction of his own ego with its blind fury. He dares anyone to challenge him with his prestige and power.

His compulsory Reserve correspondence course is a desperate joke to sell his plan. It's time to call him on it.

Sincerely,

John B. Pettengill.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *June 24, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: I have read in the Providence Journal this day parts of letter received by you from the President, and I am unable to understand how anyone could mistake a secondary for a primary concern when the security for the continuance of a democratic form of government is under consideration.

This error in thinking has, lately, received considerable attention and adverse decisions from the Supreme and appeals courts and must abroad be a source of considerable ironic laughter.

As a white citizen I earnestly hope that you will attach your amendment on every bill.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. BARLOW.

BOARD OF WORLD PEACE
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Chicago, Ill., June 25, 1955.

To the Members of the House and Senate of the United States:

This letter is to call your attention again to the continuing stubborn opposition of the Methodist Church and our leaders to the current efforts to enact legislation for a voluntary Reserve.

The confusion of thinking revealed in prevailing miscellaneous proposals to create a 250,000-a-year manpower pool is a sufficient argument in itself for the House to reject all of these current proposals. They are based on the diminishing hope that something may be adopted to satisfy the President's request. The confusion itself between the Army, Navy, Air Corps, American Veterans of World War II, the American Legion, and in Congress itself is convincing evidence that there is no clear basis or need for this legislation.

The entire youth of America constitute the reserve pool from which man can and would be selected in the event of an emergency. The idea that a brief period of months of training followed by 1 night a week study and drill can form a Reserve adequate in training its members to permit a quick general mobilization of all our military strength is absurd. This is what the President stated, in his address of January 13, should be the third part of "three elements * * * to this military posture."

Why are the church and so many civilian organizations opposed? Perhaps it is because we do not believe that the goal of America is this proper military posture—in peacetime. We do not believe a proper military posture is the American dream. * * * Men fled from European countries to this country to get away from this kind of dream. Congress recognizes this. It has throughout the 150 years of its existence rejected every proposal for universal military training which would have established this proper military posture. The confusion in the objectives and plans of the defense agencies of the Government itself makes the proposals for the youth Reserve unrealistic, inane, ineffective. They constitute a lure (as in CARL VINSON's compromise bill) designed to permit youth under 19 to escape draft duty by offering a plan which is merely an option in a compulsory setup, a plan which lacks the confidence of Congress itself. Such a Reserve could not possibly be mobilized, organized, trained, hardened for duty to meet the President's objective, to permit a quick general mobilization of all our military strength. Congress should also hesitate long before adopting measures giving the President authority to call into active service up to 1 million active reservists without reference to Congress in a Presidentially declared emergency. If the emergency is real, Congress will know it and will act.

We believe Congress should let the Reserve recommendations expire without action. We cannot overcome the conviction that the deceptive so-called Voluntary Reserve is patently an effort to get the UMT camel's nose under the tent.

In the next session of Congress, the House and Senate committees could startle the world by challenging the nations with positive proposals for a totally new approach to the problems of defense. This should be done.

In appreciation to all Congresses of the past which have maintained a level head in keeping the civilian life of America above its military structure, I am

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. BOSS, JR.,
Executive Secretary.

BRIGHT HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1955.
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REVEREND POWELL: I commend you on the courageous stand you are taking in your effort to have our Government do the right and moral thing by abolishing segregation and discrimination in every phase of our national life.

May God continue to bless you and keep you in the service of our race and our Nation.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,
WILLIAM H. GRAY, JR.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *June 24, 1955.*
Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Congratulations on your stand on the Armed Forces Reserve bill and the impending bill to grant Federal aid for school construction. Unconstitutional practices such as racial discrimination and segregation can never be eliminated if they are supported by Federal legislation which encourages their continuance. The amendments you propose will go far toward achieving constitutional use of Federal funds and agencies. The more essential the legislation (and both of these bills certainly are of utmost importance to the Nation), the more reason that it should be so written as to preclude any possibility of its being used to continue unconstitutional and undemocratic practices.

I am encouraged to know that you will remain firm on this issue.

Sincerely yours,
GERALD D. BERREMAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 23, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: I am writing you to urge you to stand firmly against any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

I am opposed to UMT under any disguise, but I am equally as much opposed to segregation anywhere.

Am a member of both the Urban League and NAACP.

May we win both causes.

Very truly yours,
KATHERINE M. SEILER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 25, 1955.*
Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your fight to keep the antisegregation amendment tacked onto the compulsory military Reserve bill. The American public thanks you and is behind you.

Sincerely,
MARCEL L. HERBERT.

DUNSMUIR, CALIF., *June 20, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to urge you earnestly not to accept any compromise on your amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill. I am sending a copy of this message to the President.

Sincerely yours,
D. E. ERICKSON.

RICHMOND, IND., *June 26, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We are with you in your stand against segregated compulsory Reserves. The ostensible purpose of military preparedness is the protection of civil liberties for all Americans.

Respectfully.
H. DUVAL SMITH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose any compulsory Reserve bill, and endorse your amendment to eliminate segregation in the Reserves. We urge you to hold steadfast.

POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE PEACE
COMMITTEE OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETY
OF FRIENDS (QUAKERS).

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 28, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We have been following with interest your objections to the UMT bill.

We are behind you and your legitimate objections. There should be no first-, second-, or third-class citizens in any democratic country; as to us we view segregation in that respect when we are trying to convince the world how Christian we are. I believe the action at home is hitting our own people below the beltline with such undemocratic acts of some of the leaders of this country.

I would like also to impose upon you to point out that primarily we are positively against UMT for the following reasons:

First. It has unbalanced the stability of our youth and their urge for independence and self-reliance when they know that their family lives and education will be disrupted in order to be regimented in a military camp—not under the care of loving parents who can teach them a Christian way of life but under tutorship of an Army noncom whose primary job is to toughen these God's children to make killers out of them.

2. The above conditions have also helped in the rise of delinquent teenagers and will be more so without proper guidance from church and home.

May we pray that you will have the courage and strength to carry your Christian convictions to see that such a bill is not enacted.

Only fools would believe that military conscription could make a country great when they have to resort to such demoralizing acts as UMT will do and this being borrowed from ruined and bankrupt countries who are trying to be democratic and eliminate conscription themselves.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. RALPH GORDON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1955.*
Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, JR.,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I want to express to you my heartfelt thanks for the great effort you are showing in your drive to eliminate segregation as a principle of our National Government.

Please be assured that there are many like me who hope earnestly that those responsible for our Government will not be hesitant to guard it against traditions that must be discarded.

William Faulkner, the novelist, has said what now needs to be repeated to President Eisenhower and his advisers: "* * * no man can cause more grief than that one clinging blindly to the vices of his ancestors."—From Intruder in the Dust.

Thank you, Mr. Powell, for continuing in your efforts to make America benefit all her people.

Sincerely yours,
Edward Shepherd, Jr.

Cleveland, Ohio, *June 26, 1955.*

Congressman Powell.

Sir: Just want to thank you for your great stand that you have taken for us, your people, on the segregation issue. I am so glad that you have made Mr. Eisenhower come out and show his true spirit. Now all of us Negroes know that Eisenhower is a Negro baiter. Eisenhower did not get my vote before when he runned for President, and Eisenhower will not get my vote this time if he runs. Dirty as Jenner and McCarthy are, they are better than Eisenhower, at least they are honest. That's as sure as hell more than we can say for Eisenhower. Please Congressman Powell keep giving old Eisenhower hell, as we Negroes will love you for it.

Jack Todd.

New York, N. Y., *June 26.*

Dear Congressman: Please continue your pressing fight for first-class citizenship. We black people are blessed that we have such a dynamic leader. Keep fighting.

Sincerely,
Mark Hough.

Mexico, Ind., *June 26, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: We respectfully urge you to continue your effective opposition to a compulsory Reserve plan. We believe that this is a vicious threat to the freedom of America, and we needn't remind you of the destruction which militarism has brought to many other countries.

The thousands of letters received from citizens such as us in past months, protesting such a bill or plan, surely are positive evidence of just how the freedom-loving people of America feel about this matter. We do not wish to see such a vital subject secreted and, above all, do not want to have a compulsory plan of any type forced upon us.

Let's keep America free from militarism. We want to see our children walk in freedom, not march in units.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Galbraith.

Columbia University in
the City of New York,
New York, N. Y., June 26, 1955.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Your courage and vigor in opposing segregation in the National Guard and in opposing defense legislation which may open the door to further militarization of our country by the introduction of a variant of compulsory universal military training has been heartening indeed.

Please stand firm and do not compromise. I am confident that this represents the wishes and prayers of most of the religious and labor people of all groups.

Isidor B. Hoffman.

New Windsor, Md., *June 28, 1955.*

Our Dear Congressman: Just came from a meeting where I heard you thanked and praised highly for your stand against segregation and UMT.

I would say it was the topnotch intelligence of our county professors and their wives from our seminary. We were so thankful for your card and did the writing you told us to. Eisenhower is under the control of the Pentagon, for he promised when he was campaigning for the Presidency that he wouldn't work for UMT while we have selective service. The American people should remind him of his pledge. He certainly is not using his intelligence. You are. Stick to it.

What account are masses of men in this guided-missile and cobalt-bomb age? Military minds are always getting ready for postwars. Remember France's Maginot line?

While that waste of money was terrific, it would be no comparison to this.

America must come to her senses. What Europe had 100 years ago is no good now.

Gratefully yours,
Dr. and Mrs. Edward C. Bixler.

Philadelphia, Pa., *June 27, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose any compulsory Reserve bill and endorse your amendment to eliminate segregation in the Reserves. We urge you to hold steadfast.

Policy Subcommittee of the Peace
Committee of Religious Society of
Friends (Quakers) in a Four State
Area.

Whittier, Calif., *June 26, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman Powell: We have followed with great approval your work in trying to take the segregation out of the compulsory military training bills. We do not approve of segregation, and do not think that compulsory military training, by whatever name it is called, is right or necessary for our country.

I understand that a new bill H. R. 6900 is being hurriedly introduced at this time, to try to put through a slightly changed version of the same old thing. It seems most unwise that such a measure should be reintroduced at this time when such heartening signs of lessening tensions are apparent in the world.

I hope you will oppose this new measure, both with your antisegregation amendment, and because it is not in keeping with our traditions, and would give us a military dictatorship.

Sincerely yours,
Laural M. Lane,
Mrs. Walter A. Lane.

Berkeley, Calif., *June 22, 1955.*

My Dear Congressman Powell: We thank you for the amendment you introduced to H. R. 5297. We urge you now to use your best efforts to defeat the peacetime Reserve bill just another UMT measure, to which we are unalterably opposed.

Great leaders agree that military force cannot establish peace. Moreover it bleeds us white with taxes. Our goal must be universal disarmament. Please work tirelessly for that.

Respectfully,
Lillie V. Tabler.

San Diego, Calif., *June 24, 1955.*

My Dear Mr. Powell: Let me congratulate you on the part that you have been taking to see that UMT does not have racial segregation.

We are fully behind you in your latest resolve not to give in to the President and others demanding that you give up your fight.

UMT is not needed at this time and would actually be very detrimental to our country. To have UMT with racial segregation would be doubly bad.

UMT would be a tremendous waste of both manpower and money.

Sincerely yours,
Edwin A. Robinson.

Omaha Nebr., *June 23, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: Here's hoping that you will continue to press for the antisegregation amendment being included in any Reserve legislation. I also hope you will do all in your power to bring about outright defeat for this legislation which is so truly un-American in every respect.

Very truly yours,
Dale D. Dorman, Jr.

Washington, D. C., *June 24, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Today's Washington Daily News said that the President appealed to you personally to give up your fight for civil rights in the Armed Forces. Your answer was in the full spirit of American democracy. Thank you for upholding the rights of minority groups. A democratic army, an unsegregated school system, and adequate and nonsegregated housing are God given. He has given us on this earth the means with which to provide everyone regardless of his color a good, happy, prosperous life. Keep up your efforts to equalize opportunity here and abroad.

Yours truly,
Harold Bramson.

New York City, N. Y., *June 25, 1955.*

Dear Congressman Powell: You are absolutely right about the segregation issue in schools, housing, and the Armed Forces. Stand pat—don't budge an inch—we are solidly behind you. Ninety years is certainly enough time to abolish segregation. (More patience? What are we supposed to be made of, steel?)

Yours very sincerely,
Alzonia I. Bryant.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *June 23, 1955.*

Dear Sir: We (my friends and I) are well aware of the momentous stand you are making on the antisegregation amendment attached to the new Federal Reserve Act, presently coming before the House floor. We want to urge support of this amendment, and hope you will not give up this civil-rights fight.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Don Bravenar.

Columbus, Ohio, *June 28, 1955.*

Honorable Sir: I am thankful to you and to God that you introduced the nonsegregation amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, and that it was temporarily defeated. If we do not prepare to get along with others by violence we are more likely to negotiate. Point 4 and UNICEF are enduring ways to peace.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Lucille Grumley.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Dear Congressman: Please use your vote and influence to see to it that the House acts on the minimum-wage bill. It will help us and the country as it will go right back in circulation, because we need it for food and clothing. Thank you.

J. Klein.

Massilon, Ohio, *June 23, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Appreciate your introducing amendment to H. R. 5297.

I am opposed to draft extension and forced UMT when our country is not at war.

It is my humble opinion that voluntary enlistments would be made if pay and other conditions in Army service would equal or exceed those of the average American workingman. I feel confident that if the great minds in our Government were turned in that direction the problem would be solved.

I am in favor of the United Nations and turning national disputes over to them for settlement (such as Formosa).

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. R. R. Millar.

New York, *June 26, 1955*.

Sir: I would like to commend you for your stand against the hypocrisy of those who fear or despise the desegragation in progress in the United States.

To maintain their childish superstitions they will wreck what they claim is the only program to save the country and its Armed Forces.

Respectfully,

Samuel H. Wiler.

Presently United States Army, Europe.

Pasadena, Calif., *June 20, 1955*.

Dear Representative Powell: May I praise you for the strong civil-rights stand you took on Reserve training bill?

Please do not accept any compromise that would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Yours,

Irving M. Garrison.

Mexico, Ind., *June 26, 1955*.

Dear Mr. Powell: I hope that in the days ahead that you will be able to turn back again the forces that would fasten UMT under one guise or another upon the American people. You know that the churches support you in this struggle to keep America free. God bless you.

Sincerely,

E. Paul Weaver,
Chairman, Commission on National Legislation, Indiana Council of Churches.

Hibbing, Minn., *June 28, 1955*.

Dear Mr. Powell: Thanks for your amendment to Reserve bill on segregation. Draft extension and compulsory Reserve pilot UMT bill, H. R. 5297 must be defeated. Militarism and democracy cannot both win. If the first does, the second is doomed and moral standards debased. The second can win by backing our faith in democracy by positive attitudes and actions, courtesy, and humility recognizing that we are not all wise and are likewise tempted as others are to abuse our power—honest effort on world disarmament—economic, and technical cooperation, fuller support for the U. N.—continued efforts for negotiation.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Margaretta Reynolds.

Washington, D. C., *June 23, 1955*.

Dear Sir: Thank you very much for reversing your position on the segregation issue relative to the Active Reserve bill. Sir you have many followers who support you in your fight to make the National Guard fully integrated. The Supreme Court has made its decision which actually was first stated in the Old Testament. Let us make sure that the bigots take heed and realize that there is an ever-rising tide of equality and democracy sweeping the Nation. Let us make them know that man is finally beginning to realize just what it means to say "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Harold Benson.

Madison, Wis., *June 20, 1955*.

Dear Representative Powell: Thanks for your card. Glad you will not retreat 1 inch. How about the new bill, being rushed through for Reserve training? Let's make it specifically forbid segregation. Why have an Army, half slave and half free?

Sincerely,

Francis D. Hole.

Washington, D. C., *June 22, 1955*.

Dear Sir: I do not want to serve in a segregated Reserve after I'm released from active duty. The administration is slickly trying to avoid the issue in the new Reserve bill.

Please, do not be taken in by a change of mere words. Fight for civil rights as you so courageously did last time.

Sincerely,

Walter C. Shake.

Washington, D. C., *June 22, 1955*.

Dear Mr. Powell: Today's Washington Star said that you blasted the compromise Active Reserve bill. Congratulations on your fight for civil rights. I am against the Reserve bill entirely because I feel that 2 years is enough to ask of me. Is it fair that I should go into the Active Reserves after I finish my 2 years in the Army. That means that after I finish my 2 years in the Army, I will have to go to Reserve meetings once a week for 2 years as well as go to summer camp for 2 weeks each year for 4 years. I am against the Reserve bill however if I must serve in the Reserves I want to serve in a nonsegregated Reserve.

Thank you again.

Harold Bramson.

Philadelphia, Pa., *June 23, 1955*.

Dear Adam Clayton Powell: The papers have been saying you plan to support the new Reserves bill introduced by Representative Carl Vinson. I hope these stories are inaccurate. It is curious to hear some say you prefer nonsegregation to "defense" when it could as logically be said many others prefer segregation. But then this Reserves bill is not really for defense anyway, as I see it, but a step toward enlarging military control of our Nation.

Sincerely,

Charles Walker.

Detroit, Mich., *June 22, 1955*.

"Washington.—House military leaders sought Monday to rescue President Eisenhower's Reserve plan by introducing a new bill which sidesteps the race rights issue and scraps any semblance of universal military training.

"Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat of New York, whose antisegregation fight forced the House to abandon an earlier measure, said he probably would support the bill. He called the measure 'a clean-cut victory for me.'"

Traitor Ike gains more traitors' support to slaughter betrayed defenseless youth for world military police. In this insane military age. It's for United States fate now in Britain's pit U. N. rebel. Ike's pledge to Britain U. N. should draw impeachment. United States was before four, Britons bring in agents in President's chair.

M. S. Bliss.

Evansville, Ind., *June 20, 1955*.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I admire the work you have done to oppose the adoption of UMT by our country and I wish to urge you to work against any move to eliminate the provision from the compulsory Reserve bill regarding segregation. The rest of the world is watching to find out whether we consider all people of all colors equal. We must prove that we are a Christian Nation.

Sincerely,

Quentin Stahl.

Dear Sir: Do not accept any compromise on your amendment on segregation in the Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. There is no reason why we should have segregation in our Armed Forces. If this legislation is so important to our well-being, your amendment will not interfere with the passage of the bill. We should be striving to do away with militarism, not increase militarism. We criticize the Reds because they are building up their forces and yet we are doing the same as they are.

Oppose the following bills as they are not in the interest of the United States: Bricker amendment and use of wiretap evidence.

Yours very truly,

Henry A. Watson.

Lutherville, Md., *June 17*.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Thank you for introducing the amendment which prevented passage of H. R. 5297. I hope you will accept no compromise on the segregation question.

Truly yours,

(Mrs.) Marion Robinson.

Conway, Ark., *June 15, 1955*.

Dear Mr. Powell: By all means hold your ground on your amendment to prohibit segregation among the Reserves. The Reserves program is very vicious, undemocratic, dangerous in time of peace. It is entirely unfair to keep all our boys under the military for 8 years. And it has been proved that segregation is not necessary in the Armed Forces. The other way has worked well.

Yours very truly,

Ethel Millar.

Oakland, Calif., *June 17, 1955*.

Hon. Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: I strongly urge you to vote "No" on the President's military Reserve plan. I feel this is UMT. Please vote "No." Thank you kindly.

Hazel M. Linton.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *June 13, 1955*.

Please do not give in on antisegregation amendment to Reserve bill. Please also vote for nonsegregated housing bills. Now is the time. I am a Quaker and recognize only one race—the Human Race. Anyone born in America is entitled to full citizenship and to all the benefits of our free country. Please help to keep us free by opposing Pentagon rule by any form of draft, compulsory military training or Reserve bills. One hundred and fifty years in Europe of forced military training has had a sorry effect.

Mina Wheeler,
St. Petersburg W. I. L. P. F.

Brooklyn, *June 8, 1955*.

Dear Congressman Powell: I wish to congratulate you on the amendment you offered to H. R. 5297, which was such an important factor in the shelving of this dangerous bill. I hope you will continue working against racial and other discrimination and in favor of steps toward durable peace through meeting human needs and world cooperation. We need to hear more about the Bandung conference.

Very sincerly yours,

Mary S. McDowell.

New York, N. Y., *June 10, 1955*.

My Dear Congressman Powell: Please continue to support your antisegregation amendment to the military Reserve bill. It is the opinion of the undersigned that the majority of the American people want you to do so.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas White Jr.

Evansville, Ind., *June 10, 1955*.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Your efforts in behalf of the people in accomplishing the shelving of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, are appreciated. May I urge you not to accept any compromise should the bill be reintroduced?

Sincerely yours,

ALAN STAHL.

EVANSVILLE, IND., *June 9, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I would like to encourage you to stand firmly against any compromise on the compulsory Reserve bill which would permit men to be in any units where there would be segregation.

Many thanks for what you have done to keep our country from adopting such a measure as H. R. 5297.

Yours truly,

ALVADI BUYDOF.

ELIZABETHTOWN, PA., *June 13, 1955.*

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I congratulate you for the brave and forthright stand you took in regards to a segregated Reserve. Don't let the President or others prevent you from adding a rider to any bill that does not provide for equality.

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. GRAY, Jr.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 13, 1955.*

Followed with interest your mission to Bandung. However, I now desire to congratulate you on the introduction of an amendment to end segregation and thus shelve the un-American compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. Good Americans want peace and disarmament and are not interested in UMT in any form.

Mr. and Mrs. S. M. GROSS.

MADISON, WIS., *June 11, 1955.*

DEAR FRIEND: I urge you to accept no compromise on the segregation issue in the National Guard units.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS D. HOLE.

GENESEO, ILL., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Thanks for your splendid fight to defeat the military Reserve bill because it provided for segregation. We are opposed to it, too.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. TIFFANY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR MR. POWELL: Thank you for your good work. Please accept no compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

PEARL A. LAFORCE.

NEW YORK 26, N. Y., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your courageous stand on the school construction and Reserve program issues.

Yours truly,

JAMES HART.

EVANSVILLE, IND., *June 9, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: According to recent news President Eisenhower has asked House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN to revise the compulsory reserve bill. May I respectfully urge you to not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation?

Sincerely,

Mrs. RUTH L. STAHL.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Newspapers quote you as saying "my amendment is not erroneous or extraneous, but it is mandatory" also "I will not retreat."

You are right. Hold fast.

I'll admit I'm prejudiced against UMT but I am also a member of the Interracial Children's Committee, at St. Petersburg, Fla. Looks like you are killing two birds with one stone.

I'll admit I'm a member of the Quaker Peace and Civic Commission at St. Petersburg, Fla., so I oppose UMT.

No reply is necessary.

We were glad you decided to go overseas. We knew you could be helpful. Your courage gives us courage.

Yours sincerely,

DALE BROTHINGTON.

NEW YORK CITY, *June 11, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations and thanks for your fine work in introducing the amendment that stopped the UMT Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. We hope you will keep up the fight. It must be stopped.

Sincerely,

B. E. ROCKWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 7, 1955.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Thank you for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. As a Christian and as an American citizen I am against these compulsory military bills and I praise you for your efforts against militarism and in behalf of peace. I agree with your efforts against racial discrimination and I praise you for working against segregation. Continue your fight against segregation and continue your fight against the compulsory Reserve UMT bill. Continue to oppose the militarism of Eisenhower.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. REED.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 6, 1955.*

DEAR FRIEND: I was gratified to read in the New York Times today that you are insisting that your amendment to the national Reserve bill is intrinsic and not extraneous. I approve your amendment. I want you to know that I support your effort to eliminate discrimination in the National Guard.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MANICE.

MATTAPOISETT, MASS., *June 7, 1955.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: Congratulations for introducing an amendment to H. R. 5297 which kept it from passing.

We are most thankful for a few honest and courageous Congressmen.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. HILLER.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *June 13, 1955.*

DEAR MR. POWELL: I am impressed and pleased with your integrity and leadership. May you continue to oppose stumbling blocks to world justice and peace—oppose continued draft—promote more appropriations for schools, libraries, and colleges.

Yours truly,

I. MAY COYTE.

LANGHORNE, PA., *June 9, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: We commend you for insisting that there be no segregation in the military camps. We trust the military-training bill has been killed, at least for this year.

We are opposed to any military-training bill. We should take the lead in arms and military reduction. We must think and reason our way instead of shouting every time some one disagrees with us.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER AND ALICE L. PICKETT.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *June 8, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of bill H. R. 5297.

Your amendment proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like VINSON, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

Very truly,

Miss VENETTE M. SITES,
(Retired Teacher).

NEW YORK, *June 9, 1955.*

DEAR MR. POWELL: I trust that your efforts to defeat the dangerous compulsory Reserve bill by introducing the question of segregation prove successful. Do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Very truly,

BEN DEUTSCH.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 13, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: Your devoted leadership against UMT deserves recognition. Only active peace building can unseat war. We must back U. N. universal membership, all war funds to technical-economic aid, all boys and bucks back home to build national assets—road, home, factory, dam, forest, canal, school, hospital. What a foundation for world peace we could build in 1 year with our 19 million new warworking fellow citizens with that 80 percent of each tax dollar now being tied up in nonasset, war provoking armament, plus the fourth of our national income going to interest on our war debt. Now is the time.

Sincerely,

A. HEINLETT.

PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE, *June 7, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. POWELL: Congratulations to you for introducing an amendment on bill 5927 of the House, which temporarily at least was the means of defeating the bill. If it is reintroduced, may you, with others, be successful in again defeating this universal military conscription bill which would hamstring all the able bodied young men of the country for 8 years.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. C. C.) G. W. HARVEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 12, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: We like to congratulate you on the stand you take on the segregation in National Guard. * * * You look at things much more realistic and will sponsor in the long run more in the real interest of Negro and hued people than the contemporary Marshall of Thurgood name. * * * Unless Negroes and hues become a standard of their own out of which they can work themselves and develop in we will never have peace-on-earth standards of any kind on this earth. * * * We must consider the overwhelming majority on earth is colored or hued and it is on the basis we keep them in chains that future generations will be judged to have a standard or not. So far they are worked to a hopeless twist. What ye do unto the least of My brethren, that ye do unto Me. So far they do not nice unto their least, nor their biggest, of brethren, and we are far from civilized or on the road to peace. Perhaps we should stop pretended privileges everywhere and institute real values for the folks instead. Something they can tell that they really develop, not just being paid off in tokens only. If we cannot do this honestly, then we cannot say we do them a favor.

Evansville, Ind., *June 3, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Surely the thinking people of our country are glad that you introduced the amendment which prevented passage of H. R. 5297. Those who were pushing this bill know that it was not essential for defense. We can only hope none like it will ever be brought up again.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. George Hessenauer.

Crescent City, Calif., *June 5, 1955.*

I appreciate your good work re the military Reserve bill.

Don M. Chase.

Schenectady, N. Y., *June 7, 1955.*

Hon. A. Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: I wish to send you hearty congratulations for introducing the amendment which defeated the passage of compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

Very truly,

M. G. Coffin.

Chicago, Ill., *June 3, 1955.*

Dear Sir: You are to be congratulated for the introduction of your amendment to H. R. 5297 and the resulting defeat of the whole measure.

It is obvious that those who are supporting this bill wish to place the United States of America on a military way of life. Both segregation and UMT are undemocratic. We hope you will continue to oppose both.

Very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. R. Mostek.

Syracuse, Ind., *June 6, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: We are still opposed to UMT-URP in every cloak.

Hope you will oppose it, too, for future generations that can only thus be born free from military dictatorship. Let's stop draft extension now.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Geo. D. Weybright.

San Francisco, *June 1, 1955.*

Mr. Powell: Call attention, for your careful perusal, to the columns of Mr. Drew Pearson, Washington Merry-Go-Round, and Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, Scripps-Howard publications, dated May 30 (both) exposing the political trickery and cowardice of the Senate on the fair-labor amendment to the so-called highway bill.

It is to be hoped that, as in the recent case of Army segregation, you and real representatives may be able to block this senatorial swindle if and when it reaches the House, or kill the entire bill if the treachery cannot be overcome.

Pearson also wrote of your defeat of Vinson.

Ed Guerin.

Evansville, Ind., *May 30, 1955.*

Dear Sir: I read Drew Pearson's column yesterday telling how you helped defeat the UMT or Reserve Act.

I certainly want to thank you for what you did. The people do not want UMT.

I congratulate you on what you did at the Bandung Conference in defending our country. We know conditions here are far from perfect, but they are improving and we love our Negro friends and enjoy their company.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. Lehmann.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *May 27, 1955.*

Honorable Sir: I congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented the passage of H. R. 5297, which would end segregation in the National Guard. It is delightful to know how alert some of our Congressmen are to the people's interests.

Respectfully,

J. M. Atkins.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *May 26, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Your amendment on H. R. 5297 supported the kind of peace and disarmament our President says he wanted.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Louis O. Krahl.

Urbana, Ohio, *May 24, 1955.*

Dear Sir: I am very grateful to you for your part in halting passage of the UMT Reserve bill, for even with your fine amendment, the bill would still be a threat to civil liberties. Upon induction a man loses his American citizenship whether he belongs to a minority or not. He cannot vote; he cannot think. He cannot choose his course of action. All this is just the opposite of what we need in the face of the new weapons and the complex problems of today, and especially if we are going to use the tremendous opportunities for richer life and world brotherhood that exist. More power to you.

Yours,

Mrs. Mildred Harvey.

Lansdowne, Pa., *May 24, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: We wish to thank you for your opposition to the Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, and your insistence about elimination of segregation in this aspect of national life. It seems to us that the extension of military control over our young people is unsound, at a time when we should be striving to eliminate militarism. We hope you will find strength to continue your work in this field.

Mr. and Mrs. George Loft.

Washington, D. C., *May 24, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Today the Washington Post had an editorial in which it said that having a Reserve bill without an antidiscrimination clause is more important than not having one at all. I disagree with this idea as I am sure you do. The whole idea of a Reserve was formulated with the idea of protecting our precious liberties. A segregated Reserve is not consistent with the basic concepts of American democracy. I know that you will continue your great fight to protect and widen our freedoms. Your stand is greatly appreciated here at Walter Reed. However, I do feel that the 2 years I am now serving in the Army is enough to ask. If the proposed bill would have passed I would have been required to attend weekly meetings and 2 weeks in the summer. I am for no Reserve bill at all but if we are to have one, keep it American. Keep it nonsegregated.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Bramson.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *May 23, 1955.*

Dear Congressman Powell: I congratulate you for introducing the amendment that stopped the Reserve plan. I am opposed to conscription. I'm a Quaker.

However, I hasten to add that I am on the Interracial Kindergarten Committee at St. Petersburg, Fla., and you know how I feel about your amendment. Can say a dozen churches were admitted to United Churches (60 Protestant) a year ago, or more. First time in Southeastern United States. Last winter a dozen pastors admitted to Ministerial Association. It is a slow job. Quakers phoned 60 persons to write governor about the Walter Lee Irvins case. His death sentence has excellent chance of being commuted to life. St. Petersburg Times did fine work on it as did a delegation of ministers. Thought I would mention these items.

Dale Brothington.

May 20, 1955.

Dear Sir: A note of thanks for your wide-awake work in proposing an antisegregation amendment to the national military reserve plan. Without the alert attention of men such as yourself, discrimination will continue to be preserved.

As an American and a voter I am proud and grateful that you are representing the people of your district.

Sincerely,

L. Williams.

Washington, D. C., *May 23, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Congratulations on your antidiscrimination amendment to the proposed Reserve bill. Americans who value their civil liberties are extremely grateful to you.

I am writing this card both to congratulate you and also to take issue with you. I am a drafted soldier who has 8 months of his 2-year induction to serve. If the Reserve plan would have passed, I would have been required to attend Reserve meetings 1 night a week and to attend camp in the summertime for 17 days. This would continue for 3 years after I was separated from the Army, after serving full time for 2 years in the Army. I feel that the 2 years I am serving is enough to ask. Do you want my life to be regimented after I have served my 2 years? Help protect our freedom.

Harold Bramson.

Madison, Wis., *June 3, 1955.*

Congressman Powell: Would you be so kind as to send me a copy of your great speech on the universal military service or Reserve act? Also do you have a copy of your Bandung speech?

Thank you.

Lucile Miller.

West Nyack, N. Y., *June 5, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Congratulations to you for proposing the amendment which prevented the passage of H. R. 5297.

The fact that your amendment prevented passage seems to prove, does it not, that the bill cannot be essential to the national safety.

Cordially yours,

May Cavin.

Los Angeles, Calif., *June 2, 1955.*

Sir: I wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment to H. R. 5297. This was a very well-placed action and I surely hope that it will help to hack away at segregation in and out of the Armed Forces.

Thank you, sir.

Sincerely,

A. Lesiam.

Los Angeles, Calif., *June 3, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I want to congratulate you on your amendment bill against segregation in the National Guard.

Yours truly,

Anna Weiss.

Los Angeles, Calif., *June 2, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing to express my commendation of your introduction of the antisegregation amendment to H. R. 5297 and would also urge your opposition to the bill itself.

Yours truly,

Juliet Green.

New Haven, Conn., *May 19, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: You have my deepest and most heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for your excellent amendment to the national reserve plan, H. R. 5297, which was sent back to committee today. I know that you were opposed to the bill. Your amendment was not only good in itself but also served to defeat a very dangerous bill.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edward A. Manice.

Carmel, Calif., *June 11, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: Congratulations on your May 18 bill. We urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Sincerely,

G. Cotton.

Portsmouth, Ohio, *June 16, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I trust you will keep up the fight against the compulsory military service bill—not only from a point of view of segregation, which is bad, but as a bill even without segregation. Also please vote to let the draft die, when the bill on that question comes back from the Senate. To say the least, it is incongruous to force men into military service in a free country. I am an anti-Communist, and was one when our militarists were hobnobbing, as now, with Communist scoundrels. These simulated-attack war scares and the like are all designed by the militarists to scare Congress into continuing them in power—and they are in power. No draft, no compulsory military service of any kind.

J. T. Dunn.

Orosi, Calif., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I have read with much interest your brief interview datelined Bandung in the April 29 issue of U. S. News & World Report.

I am convinced that you did a wonderful piece of diplomatic service for the entire Western World while at Bandung.

Unless I am in error, it had been suggested prior to your departure that you be accorded some sort of official status; but political considerations whether real or imagined prevented.

In any case I congratulate you on having gone to Bandung and not having permitted any narrow partisan prejudices to prevent you from being of great service to our country.

Our Congress can use more men of your caliber—and may I add, as well, of your race.

I would remain sincerely,

Rev. R. L. Kortkamp,
St. James Presbyterian Church.

Elgin, Ill., *June 30, 1955.*

Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe administration of Reserve bill 7000 would inevitably reintroduce segregation among the proposed 2 million Reserves. Urge you insist on absolutely no segregation in Reserves.

Ralph E. Snetzer.

Delta Alpha Lambda,
Cleveland, Ohio, *June 27, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: At our June meeting Delta Alpha Lambda Chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., voted unanimously to send you a letter of encouragement on your amendment to the Reserve training bill and promised to do whatever we can to support you in your efforts to get it passed.

Sincerely yours,

Henry C. Crawford,
Corresponding Secretary.

New York, N. Y., *June 24, 1955.*

Dear Representative Davidson: It is most unfortunate that the President's advisers misinformed him so that he could make a statement saying that civil-rights safeguards have never been enacted in a bill when everyone knows that they were in 1940 when our need for military forces were far, far greater than they now are.

I hope that you will fight to the last ditch to see that the nondiscriminatory clauses are kept in the National Guard bill, the school-construction bill (it is only enforcing the Supreme Court decision), and the housing bill. This latter is as much needed here as it is in the South.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Carey D. Eldridge.

Silver Spring, Md., *June 28, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell.

Dear Mr. Powell: Keep up the good work. I am deeply sympathetic with your efforts to insure the removal of all vestiges of second-class citizenship from the status and treatment of your compatriots.

As regards your stand on the National Reserve setup more power to you. Nonpassage of that bill will reduce infinitesimally the appallingly high expenditures we are making for war purposes, paying for the last and preparing for the next.

(I'm a member of the Society of Friends and a pacifist. I was a successful conscientious objector in World War II.)

As regards the aid bill to education for construction of badly needed schools—as a parent, taxpayer, and educator—I believe that nonpassage of that construction-aid bill will be detrimental to hundreds of thousands of children and not in the best interests of the United States. May I urge you to reexamine your stated intention to attach an integration rider to this bill, if, as it would appear at this stage in our national development, it insures the defeat of that necessary legislation for education and our schools?

Cordially,

John Withall.

New York City, N. Y., *June 29, 1955.*

Representative Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: I understand there is a good chance that the Senate will reintroduce the National Guard provisions in the Reserve bill if the no-segregation clause is left out of the House version.

May God give you strength to get this feature back in. I am on the board of a human-relations council of Bucks County and can safely say the leaders of our community are deeply concerned about this strengthening pattern of segregation.

Power to you,

Frank Larrabee.

Chicago, Ill., *June 27, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: You are to be commended for your work in opposing universal military training Reserve bill H. R. 2967, and trying to keep segregation out of the Armed Forces. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Frieda B. Koch.
E. H. Koch.
Mr. and Mrs. Erwin H. Koch.

Utica, N. Y., *June 26, 1955.*

The Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: It is good to learn from the New York Times that you intend to continue your fight against the further spread of segregation through passage of a military Reserve bill.

Apparently our President, who has a good record with regard to breaking down segregation and discrimination, is so obsessed with the idea of getting more men under military indoctrination that he will sacrifice antisegregation gains if necessary to achieve that end.

I pray that our Eternal Father will grant you strength, wisdom, and courage in this fight for freedom and brotherhood in our own land.

Yours sincerely,

Gelston McNeil.

Towson, Md., *June 27, 1955.*

Representative A. C. Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: We wish to encourage you in your efforts to remove from all military branches, racial discrimination. We wish, further, that you recognize the infringements on our basic American freedoms in the entire conscription proposals. We feel that a volunteer Reserve and recruitment is not only more effective—witness the Navy, Air Force, Marines, etc.—less expensive, but more importantly, more American. As we read the hearings we cannot help but feel that such a system can be made to work.

We hope you will work toward all the basic freedoms of our American democracy, which includes freedom from military conscription in peacetime.

Sincerely yours,

Bill and Eleanor Brainard.
W. E. Brainards.

P. S.: We think you may be interested in our letter to President Eisenhower.

Towson, Md., *June 28, 1955.*

The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. President: My husband and I have written you at other times of our support of your efforts for peace, justice, and freedom.

Right now, frankly, we cannot understand your support of the national Reserve plan. We ask two questions.

1. You have declared your support of world disarmament, and of the United States cooperating in programs of world development; you made history in your proposal of atoms for peace; you have indicated that "there is no alternative to peace," that every effort should be made toward peaceful settlements of disputes; and that you are willing to discuss in high-level talks issues causing tensions in the world.

How can you at the same time support a 3-million compulsory Reserve plan, and convince anybody in the world of your and America's sincerity? You have asked the Russians to submit evidences of sincerity in their talk of peace. It seems to us that we should be willing to do the same, or don't we mean what we say?

Where should our emphasis be: On world reconstruction and development, with disarmament, or on increasing armaments, with resulting tensions?

2. The national Reserve plan presents many reasons for concern to those citizens who have read the reports of the hearings in the House Armed Services Committee. We feel that the Army can and should maintain sufficient strength by the volunteer method. We do not feel that the hearings indicated the need or the desirability of conscription.

For example, the testimony before the House Armed Services Committee indicated that the trouble with the present Reserve system lies not in the lack of compulsory attendance, but in the lack of program, leadership, and facilities; that the Navy, Air Force, Marines, etc.—all but the Army—know how to utilize volunteers; that the Army has resisted efforts of the National Guard and Organized Reserves to increase their strength through voluntary enlistments.

Does this not indicate a desire of the Army to be more interested in unlimited power of control than in an efficient Reserve? We feel that the Army has sufficient power.

We feel earnestly that in a United States sincerely interested in meeting the problems of our world by constructive, creative measures, the national Reserve plan should be opposed as contrary to our stated purposes.

Young men should be trained and utilized, instead, for constructive work, as our contribution to a peaceful world.

Respectfully yours,
The W. E. Brainards.

P. S.: We cannot reconcile, either, your criticism of Representative Powell's proposals with your recognition that in the United States there should be no racial discrimination.

If the national Reserve plan is of utmost importance, why not appeal to the southern Representatives to put national interest above their prejudices?

Brooklyn, N. Y., *June 26, 1955.*
Hon. A. C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Congratulations on your stand regarding the inclusion of antisegregation amendments in the military Reserve and school construction bills.

I wonder where we would be today if we did not fight for our nationhood with all we had. Incidentally, you might ask our President if he would endorse limited taxation for the Negro people, in line with the limited rights they have in many States.

Good luck to you always.

Yours very truly,
Silvia Friedman.

Topeka, Kans., *June 24, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: You are so right. Stand up and fight. I am for you. You are fighting for your people. I think the President has made a big mistake in coming out against your bill. He has lost my vote. You stand up fight. I am for you.

Yours truly,
Willie Jackson.

Portsmouth, Va., *June 28, 1955.*
Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Congressman Powell: I wish to commend you on your stand against the policy of segregation practiced by the Southern States in the Nationa Guard. Please stick to your guns.

Most sincerely,
Dr. Hugo A. Owens.

Oakland, Calif., *June 27, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: I have been reading of your gallant fight for antisegregation in the UMT bill. Please accept my sincere appreciation, although not much (if any at all) appears in the local commercial press. This morning I read (not in the commercial press, of course) of President Eisenhower's letter to you in regard to the antisegregation issue. I am utterly disgusted. I hope the Negro people can see where he stands. Keep up the good fight. It is men like you in high office who can serve your people best. It is surely time(and now is the time) for the race you represent to assert itself. I see segregation all around me. It is inhuman and cruel, and I detest it with all my heart.

Sincerely,
Rose Brown.

New York, N. Y., *June 27, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: Thank you, again, for your work against compulsory Reserve. I have just written to 10 Congressmen, again. President seems to want to designate for civil defense (as if there were such a thing against the H-bomb), just military dictatorship.

Pearl A. LaForce.

Berkeley, Calif., *June 13, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I think you are absolutely right that it is of first importance that we show the world that we mean what we say about equality and liberty and justice for all.

I hope you will persist in your effort to retain the antisegregation clause in the UMT bill and will succeed.

You did our country a good turn at Bandung and are doing another one for us now.

Sincerely,
Alice Wood.

Farmington, Pa., *June 10, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing to you to urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

I don't see how President Eisenhower can stand up and talk peace and still urge military training of any kind. Surely there are enough youth who do care to serve in the armed services without taking boys who don't care to serve.

Yours truly,
Mrs. Jesse R. Stair.

Santa Cruz, Calif., *June 15, 1955.*
Congressman A. C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: We were deeply moved by your report in Nation magazine concerning your great contribution at Bandung in the face of discouragement from our State Department. Such bigotry in high places and such utter stupidity makes us blush. Both the President and the Secretary of State allow subordinates to make decisions where strong leadership is needed. They should have been the first to see that your's could be the Voice of America speaking where most needed. We regret the military outlook today which will never combat communism.

Please accept our humble thanks.

Respectfully,
Ethel and Lewis Shanley.

New York City, *June 16, 1955.*

My Dear Reverend Powell: Just a few lines to let you know that I am with you at all times and praying to God to keep you in good health so that you can do your work. For if ever we need you is now. I know you get upset sometimes, but please don't work too hard and get a nervous breakdown, for I have it and I know what it is, for you are right, and for that God will take care of you. If you were not they would not fight you so much. I don't say much but I pray for you and your family every day of my life and in my weak way, anything you want me to do in helping out, please feel free to call on me, for we must stand together now. You know how we stood together in the thirties; we will have to do the same thing now.

Sincerely yours,
Sister in Christ,
Mrs. Ida Benjamin.

American Council on Human Rights,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1955.
Hon. Adam C. Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: For the first time in several decades the House of Representatives has the opportunity to pass on civil-rights legislation. The amendments of Mr. Powell, of New York, to H. R. 5297 and H. R. 5827 are of vital importance to the rights of millions of Americans and the welfare of our Nation. You and your fellow Members of Congress now have it within your power to add legislative sanction to the obliteration of second-class citizenship. The American people expect it of you, the ideals of American democracy demand it of you.

The American Council on Human Rights urges your active support of the above amendments. The basic principles involved in each must not be sacrificed for the sake of expediency. The rights of no group of American citizens can be jeopardized without irreparable damage to the rights of all citizens and the principles of democracy.

We have confidence in your sense of duty and your concern for the future of our Nation. We firmly believe they embrace support of the above amendments.

Very truly yours,
Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr.,
Director.

Pennsville, Ohio, *June 14, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: May I encourage you to accept no compromise in Congress to permit men to be assigned to National Guard units where there is segregation.

Respectfully,
Paul Wells.

San Francisco, Calif., *June 14, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Your amendment to H. R. 5297 is not extraneous to the subject of the bill. Whether the proponents of this bill consider the training it would provide educational or a part of our defense system or both, our national policy on segregation has been clearly stated and cannot legitimately be violated. The need for clear-cut provision on this point in the bill is evidenced by the furor which your amendment has raised. Unless the Reserve program had been recognized as another opportunity to thwart desegregation there would have been no occasion for the present excitement over your amendment.

So far as defense of our Nation in a hostile world is concerned, there is no other single point at which we are more seriously compromised in the eyes of two-thirds of mankind than in this matter of segregation and racial discrimination. Any defense built on the false premise of white supremacy can only add to the number of our potential enemies and therefore to ever greater demands for defense.

We urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to segregated National Guard units, either State or National.

Respectfully yours,
Andrew Bachels.
Isabel G. Bachels.

Oakland, Calif., *June 14, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I wish to cheer and support your latest effort to get desegregation in the Armed Forces. I firmly bebelieve all citizens will benefit immensely when the artificially created color bars are smashed.

I am against any form or shape of UMT as being un-American and not nearly as effective as sincere peace negotiations. At first I hoped your rider was to kill the bill (wishful thinking).

I hope you will make every effort to get support for your amendment.

Yours truly,
B. Linton.

Oakland, Calif., *June 14, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: This is in reference to your amendment to the compulsory reserve bill which bars assignment or enlistment of men in any National Guard unit practicing racial segregation.

In the first place, I am very much opposed to any form of UMT (and regardless of what this bill is called, let no one be deceived that it is not a UMT bill).

In the second place, I would strongly oppose removal of your antisegregation amendment even if I were in favor of the rest of the bill.

Hence, I urge you to do all in your power to prevent removal of this amendment.

Your truly,

Ed Linton.

St. John's Methodist Church,
Edwardsville, Ill., June 13, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want to compliment you on the stand you have taken on the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, relative to ending racial segregation. I hope you will not compromise on this important issue.

Sincerely yours,

Clyde Funkhouser.

Oakland, Calif., *June 11, 1955.*

Re H. R. 5297.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I hope you will not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation. In my opinion, H. R. 5297 is a compulsory bill and should not be considered at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Ethel Cohen.

Harren's Sales Agency,
Rocky Mount, N. C., June 14, 1955.

Re: Amendment prohibiting segregated National Guard.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Congressman from New York,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: On behalf of the Rocky Mount chapter of the NAACP, we, the undersigned, take this method of commending you for your forthright espousal of the cause minority-group citizens in your efforts in getting the so-called Powell amendment passed the House of Representatives even though it has been pigeonholed by Representative Vinson, of Georgia.

We have previously written to Representative L. H. Fountain, of our district, and Senator W. Kerr Scott, asking them to support this measure. We have received a declaration of their intention to "give it careful study" when it comes up. Of course, we do not really expect them to support it because our region has long practiced the matter of segregated National Guard units and we do not—we regret to admit—have sufficient race voters to cause our Congressmen to worry about us.

But, in view of press reports which interpret the administration as blaming you with holding up the 2,900,000-man national defense program with the amendment which would give all men an equal right to belong to the guard, we strongly urge you to stick by your guns and don't give in. We hope that your colleagues, Representatives Dawson and Diggs, will help to run the interference, along with other liberals, while you continue to carry the ball for true Americanism.

Very sincerely,

Charlie Jones, president, Rocky Mount, N. C., NAACP; J. B. Harren, acting secretary; Mrs. Emma Leonard, treasurer; Louis Pippen; Jasper Braswell; John H. Joyner; Elmar Braswell; Chester William; Rev. E. D. Joyner.

Berkeley, Calif., *June 13, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: I am all behind you in your insistence against racial segregation in the compulsory Reserve bill. I hope also that you will not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

I disagree with President Eisenhower when he says your amendment is extraneous to the Reserve bill and that your amendment should not be used to kill the Reserve bill. In our present international relations it is vital that we maintain and promote the principle of racial equality in all our legislation and practices. I am opposed to any such bill as the proposed compulsory Reserve bill which does not make our declaration for racial equality crystal clear.

I am also opposed to the Reserve bill because of the compulsory feature, and because I am still opposed in our traditionally free country to the imposition on our youth of universal military training of any sort in a permanent form. It goes against all our traditions and I do not believe such compromise with our basic principles is justified by the present world situation. In fact, I think compulsory military training, even sugarcoated by the device of Reserves, is more of a danger than a help to the peace of the world.

Very sincerely,

Allen P. Lovejoy.

East Cleveland, Ohio, *June 12, 1955.*

Representative Adam Powell.

Dear Sir: We want to let you know how glad we are that you had the courage to add the amendment against segregation to the UMT bill. It is time this country treated all citizens in the same way.

We can't get rid of wars in the world until we get rid of injustice and discrimination in our own country.

Sincerely,

Bertha McDonald.

Dear Mr. Powell: We are grateful for your stand in this issue and wish to thank you for your firm conviction and clear voice.

Sincerely,

E. Quackenbush.

Red Hook, N. Y., *June 14, 1955.*

The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. President: My husband and I are pleased with your continual efforts for peace. We do not feel, however, that you are acting consistently in supporting the Reserve bill.

First, let us suppose that the United States still faces a real military threat: Do you not feel that this Reserve plan will require a great deal of money (I have read estimates from $2 to $3 billion yearly) to train very insufficiently a large number of men in a system producing low morale? Do you really feel that this kind of Reserve will serve our national defense? Is not the requirement for our national defense one of top order professional soldiers of considerable technical skill and high morale? What do you think of Major General Hobson's statement that the Air Force does not need or want this kind of military machinery to obtain its quotas at its standards—that the Air Force would hire civilians rather than use the draft?

Second, let's face the problem of building peace, which to us is an even more important subject. I wish to remind you of the document which the United States representatives presented at the United Nations Disarmament Commission (published in the May 16 New York Times): We said, "All states * * * should pledge themselves as a first step toward the reduction of armaments and armed forces not to increase their armaments and armed forces above the level of appropriations for those purposes in 1955." I feel that the United States Congress and President would be showing a lack of good faith and good judgment to legislate the present Reserve bill while we talk thus at disarmament conferences. I feel that as a nation we are showing a lack of faith in the way of peace by our very expenditure of many, many dollars per capita per year for preparation of protection and less than a dollar per capita per year on the United Nations and peace agencies.

The Reserve plan looks to us at its best like one more try at scare-technique diplomacy and at its worst like greed for power at any price by the Pentagon. It is time we learned that the scare techniques are not diplomacy and that we will be caught in our own snares if we don't learn. One of the worst snares will be the increased bureaucracy and power of the Pentagon, should the Reserve plan be enacted. Further, we can't talk peace and live rearmament and expect to gain peace or respect from any nation, large or small, friend or foe.

We do feel that the administration has a fine record in civil rights. The Powell amendment is important to us, not only for the civil rights involved, but because it gives time for continued consideration of the Reserve plan.

Our prayers are with you as you make tremendous decisions and influence others to make them. We urge you to reconsider prayerfully the Reserve plan in the light of your call to be influential in the world's search for peace on earth.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Boyd Quackenbush.

Rochester, N. Y., *June 10, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: We want to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which prevented the passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

Your amendment which would end racial segregation in the National Guard in 27 States, proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

We don't need this bill. Please defeat it.

Very sincerely,

Ralph A. Milligan,
Mrs. Ralph Milligan.

Oxford Mills, Ontario, *June 11, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am very much opposed to any laws that make for compulsory military training, even for 6 months. We want our country to be a Nation of freemen, not tools and subjects of military power. Thousands of Europeans, and the best of stock, fled to America in the past to get away from the military training and Army life, of those European countries, who had military training, which was compulsory, and for at least

3 years. Well, with all their military training, they did not prevent war, on the contrary these ready and well-trained helped the dictators and others as bad to wage wars of aggression, like Germany and Japan. Let us run our country in the American way, not copying the ways of Europe. I always think that the Hitlerites and the Nazis were the finished product of generations of enforced military training.

Democracy and militarism can never live together in any country, one or the other will dominate. Let us make sure that any form of American militarism never gets its stranglehold on our country.

Yours very truly,

E. K. BARNARD,
American living in Canada.

SENECA, KANS., *June 16, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are much opposed to the compulsory Reserve bill. Please do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. F. B. ROOTS.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANS., *June 16, 1955.*
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation. Please hold firm on this.

Very sincerely,

MRS. OMAR JOYCE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 19, 1955.*
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washigton, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am very happy about your rider on the military reserve bill. I have just 2 months more of active duty as a draftee, and object to segregation.

Let's keep in touch with each other.

DAVID H. MILBAUER.

AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSEMBLY,
Green Lake, Wis., June 19, 1955.

DEAR DR. POWELL: I just want to express my gratitude to you for your brilliant leadership in the House of Representatives in demanding racial justice especially by insisting on riders on those appropriations that protect our rights. I especially want to thank you for your victory in stopping the latest military training measure which permits racial discrimination in our National Guard units.

We are mighty proud that we have men of your stature in the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL D. PROCTOR,
Virginia Union University.

WOLVERINE BUILDING SERVICE, INC.,
Modesto, Calif., June 17, 1955.
ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I appreciate the stand you have taken against racial segregation in the compulsory Reserve bill.

I hope you will continue to stand your ground on this issue and will not make any compromise whatsoever. Thank you for the good job you are doing.

Yours very truly,

GALE NUTSON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 19, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I write to beg you to stand firm and not retreat one inch from your amendment barring segregation in the Reserve program. You may save our country from growing militarism.

Yours sincerely,

ANNA COPE EVANS.

BOWBELLS, N. DAK., *June 18, 1955.*
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment regarding segregation to the compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. I believe this bill is highly militaristic and undemocratic and should remain shelved.

Yours truly,

M. B. STOKES.

ELK CITY, OKLA., *June 19, 1955.*
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: I want to commend you heartily on your courage and statesmanship in inserting the antisegregation amendment into the proposed Reserve bill. If our assertions concerning democracy are to mean anything, we must make them a reality now. As you so well know, the other nations are watching to see how our actions measure up to our assertions. You are doing our Nation a real service in making us develop a democracy which does not include second-class citizens.

I hope you will continue your courageous stand against segregation despite the tremendous pressures being applied by the administration forces. My prayers will continue that you will do all within your power to defeat such segregation attempts.

Once again, thanks for the fine work you are doing.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD S. LEHMAN, M. D.

WARMINSTER, PA., *June 19, 1955.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: We congratulate you for introducting the amendment that prevented the passage of H. R. 5297 in the House a few weeks ago. You prove that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like VINSON, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS and ETHEL COLLINS.

GENERAL BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION,
OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.,
Raleigh, N. C., June 18, 1955.
Hon. A. CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have taken a courageous stand relative to the National Guard unit. Please accept my heartiest congratulations.

Yours truly,

O. L. SHERRILL.

THE COMMUNITY METHODIST CHURCH,
San Bruno, Calif, June 14, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I hope that you will not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to segregated National Guard units. I admire the stand you have taken and sincerely hope you stand by it.

Cordially yours,

ANDREW JUVINALL.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *June 17, 1955.*
Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: First of all I want to congratulate you for introducing the antisegregation amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, and then for having the courage to stand by it in the face of unfair criticism and opposition. It is so absolutely in line with the recent Supreme Court decision, that its rightness cannot be questioned by any fairminded citizen.

Secondly, it has brought great satisfaction to those who are opposed to the bill because of its military implications. It has proved that even those who formerly supported the bill do not really feel that it is essential to the security of the United States, otherwise they would not have so easily shelved the bill. To pass such a bill at a time when our President goes to the meeting of the Big Four in order to find steps toward peace is not only inconsistent but unrealistic. We cannot make protestations for peace and then at the same time pass legislation to increase enormously our military forces.

Sincerely,

MISS EDNA C. HAVILAND.

FRIENDS MEMORIAL CHURCH,
Berkeley, Calif., June 15, 1955.
Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: We of the peace committee of Friends Memorial Church wish to thank you for your fine efforts in fighting the militarization of our traditionally peace-loving Nation, specifically your recent effort to prevent the passage of H. R. 5297.

We know and appreciate the tremendous pressures under which you labor. Especially pressing are the forces pushing for military expenditures and military control of the Nation. In the minds of those who advocate UMT, mass retaliation, peacetime conscription, and atomic development for defense, is the realization that ultimately the answer to world tensions cannot be war, for modern warfare would mean the annihilation of mankind.

From your commendable efforts in this area, one would feel assured that you realize that "where all men prepare for war, war becomes inevitable," and that, instead of more soldiers and bigger bombs, we need to take advantage of what little time we have to build constructively and generously for peace through:

1. Our activities in the U. N. and its many agencies.
2. A bigger point 4 in Asia without military strings.
3. Banning of mass destruction weapons.
4. Sincere efforts for disarmament.

Your job is not easy, but affords a great challenge. We pray that God's infinite wisdom may be your guide, and His power your aid.

We wish to thank and congratulate you for your stand on this vital subject.

Yours in His fellowship,

LUTHER S. DISTLER,
Chairman, Peace Committee.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of June 18, 1955]

SECURITY AND SEGREGATION

President Eisenhower urged, with obvious feeling, last Wednesday that the Powell amendment to the manpower reserve bill be removed. It was clear from what the President said that he did not think it fair, even patriotic, to attach an antisegregation rider to the bill.

What the President said is so important that we quote him in part:

"It is entirely erroneous to try to get legislation of this character through by tacking it on to something that is so vital to the security of the United States. * * *

"I just don't believe that it is the place to have any kind of extraneous legislation."

The President truthfully said that the record of his administration on carrying out its pledges in this whole field of segregation is a good one.

However, we seriously disagree with the President and his resentment toward the Powell resolution, particularly to the language which implies that segregation is an extraneous issue and to the suggestion that those who support such an amendment are carelessly and recklessly jeopardizing the security of the United States.

Referring to the controversial rider, the President says: "Why not put these things on their own and decide them?"

Well, that is exactly what was done when the Nation adopted the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution, what was done when the United States Supreme Court outlawed racial segregated public schools and colleges, and what was done when the President ended segregation and discrimination because of race or color in the Armed Forces.

Bluntly, the President would characterize the Powell amendment as racially selfish and inimical to the best interests of the country as a whole.

From this position he would place blame for the precarious position of the bill, and whatever it might mean to national security, on Mr. POWELL or the racial group to which Mr. POWELL belongs.

That is a false impression to spread from the White House.

Mr. POWELL's amendment simply prohibits the assignment or enlistment of men in any National Guard or Reserve unit practicing racial segregation.

How ridiculous and paradoxial it would be for the Federal Government to outlaw Jim Crowism in the regular Armed Forces and then turn around and subsidize it in the various States in deference to ideas of racial separatism and white supremacy.

The amendment was voted through in the House of Representatives 126–87. When Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, asked the House to throw out the Powell amendment, he lost 167–143.

The segregationists then got together. They said they would kill the bill rather than pass it with the Powell amendment.

Actually, it is these segregationists, mostly from Southern States, who are holding up the bill and creating the risk of national security, if any, about which the President is so much concerned.

Why does not the President ask these men to face up to the facts of life so far as national security is concerned?

Standing pat by his amendment, Congressman POWELL said:

"When the colored peoples are being wooed by communism, we cannot afford to do anything to suggest that we are going backward."

We agree. There is nothing more vital to the security of the United States than the manner in which we can make the democracy we talk about work at home.

No manpower reserve, regardless of size, nor atom nor hydrogen bombs, will make us secure if we do not succeed in convincing the rest of the world, mostly colored, that we are not hypocrites on this matter of democracy.

Instead of being extraneous, we believe the Powell amendment to be essential to the manpower reserve bill.

We believe the President should train his guns on the foes of the Powell amendment, those who would keep America from being a living demonstration of the concept that here equality of opportunity for any one citizen is far more valuable for our internal and external strength than a carload of hydrogen bombs.

This is our position and the President can scarcely expect us to blow hot and cold with the same breath, as it were, on matters so vital to our future progress.

[From the Afro-American of June 14, 1955]

WE'RE DISAPPOINTED, MR. PRESIDENT

All Americans who believe in justice and fair play must have been sorely disappointed in President Eisenhower's remarks at his press conference last week.

In one breath the President says that trained National Guard units are vital to our defense program and that men in every hamlet who may be called upon to defend their country should have advantage of this prior training.

And in the next breath, he insists that the 21 States which have Jim Crow units or forbid colored men to enlist in the National Guard should be permitted the use of Federal funds to continue to do so.

We say that for President Eisenhower to link these two statements is shocking. It is unworthy of him.

Segregation in the Nation's Armed Forces has been abolished by the President's order.

Segregation as enforced by the various States has been outlawed by the United States Supreme Court.

Enforced public segregation is a lawless procedure, and has no connection with what the President benignly calls social progress.

Neither is it merely a question of individuals having their way as Mr. Eisenhower puts it.

It is a question of the Government, State and Federal, and, above all, the Nation's Chief Executive, acknowledging the United States Constitution and enforcing it.

The President's Reserve and National Guard bill is not being held up by ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, whose antisegregation amendment was approved by a majority in the House of Representatives.

Mr. POWELL is not the culprit as the President so unfairly implies.

The blame should be laid squarely at the doorstep of CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Placing prejudice above patriotism, Mr. VINSON, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has pigeonholed the measure because he doesn't want Georgia's National Guard to accept all qualified citizens as required by law.

Mr. VINSON knows, even if Mr. Eisenhower doesn't, that if allowed to come to a vote, the bill, POWELL's amendment included, would pass overwhelmingly.

We submit it's time the President stood up to the lawless southern minority rather than ask millions of patriotic American citizens to postpone once again full enjoyment of their constitutional rights.

If he doesn't, we hope Congress never passes the measure.

[From the Washington Afro-American of June 11, 1955]

UNTRUE AND UNFAIR

The persistent attempt of politicians and daily newspapers to blame Representative POWELL for congressional inaction on the military Reserve bill is both unfair and untrue.

Mr. POWELL's action in offering an amendment which would prevent States hostile to equal citizenship from using Federal funds to promote this discrimination and their viewpoint was right and fully justified.

Mr. Eisenhower was illadvised to refer to the Powell amendment as extraneous and erroneous. It was neither of these.

The truth is that Mr. POWELL was merely following the principle outlined by the President himself on numerous occasions.

At his press conference on March 19, 1953, in reply to a question, Mr. Eisenhower permitted himself to be quoted as saying:

"I will repeat it again and again, whenever Federal funds are expended I do not see how any American can justify, legally, logically, or morally discrimination in the expediture of these funds. If there are any benefits to be derived from them all should share, regardless of such inconsequential factors as race or religion."

And on April 7, 1954, the President reaffirmed his position, "That where Federal funds are involved there should be no discrimination based on any reason."

Mr. Eisenhower was either right on those dates or wrong last week when he was sharply critical of Mr. POWELL for winning the House approval of an amendment which puts teeth in the President's oft-repeated philosophy.

It's a certainty that Mr. Eisenhower can't have it both ways.

We submit that any Congressman who votes for a military Reserve bill, Federal aid to school legislation, or housing measures which does not contain amendments like Mr. POWELL's is not only voting against civil rights, he's voting against the very Constitution he has sworn to uphold and defend.

We ask what is the objection to the Powell amendment?

Would anyone at this late date argue that a Jim Crow National Guard is good for the country?

If so, he would foolishly be flying in the face of the professional opinion of every military expert in the United States, who knows that the superiority of an integrated Army is a battle-tested fact.

The Baltimore Evening Sun, speaking from its usual paternalistic heights, says that segregation is for the best interest of colored people.

That is an unmitigated lie.

Moreover, we deeply resent the audicity of anybody, including the Sun, telling us what is for our best interests.

We know, better than anyone else, where our best interests lie.

We oppose segregation wherever it raises its ugly head.

For we know far better than anyone who has ever suffered its galling and frustrating indignities that it is neither in our best interest nor those of our country.

MANHATTAN AND BEYOND

(By Lester B. Granger)

Last week President Eisenhower made a strong statement denouncing the practice of rider legislation. In this the President was right. But he included in his denunciation the antisegregation amendment proposed by Representative POWELL to the bill creating a national military Reserve. In this the President was wrong.

A rider is a last-minute addition to a bill which seeks to do something opposed to the bill's true objective or apart from its original purpose. Mr. POWELL's offered amendment is neither opposed to, nor apart from the purpose of establishing a national military Reserve. If it is, then everything that Presidents Eisenhower and Truman authorized in desegregation of our Armed Forces had no military importance.

The fact, of course, is that military integration was literally a lifesaver for the American people. It meant no more race riots in the Army or Navy; it meant maximum use of all manpower; it meant improved morale for white and colored servicemen alike. And all of these added up to greater efficiency in our fighting forces and lives saved in the 3 years of fighting in Korea.

There is no difference between a military Regular and a Reserve when the shooting starts. Members of Reserve outfits get transferred to Regular regiments, and vice versa. An officer who gets his promotion the Reserve way is apt to find himself among a bunch of 90-day wonders with bars or stripes—or among hard-bitten fellow-officers who came up the hard way. In either case he's expected to produce the goods, and the same thing goes for noncoms and petty officers and the men in the ranks.

Thus, it's important now, when we're planning an extension and improvement of our military Reserve system, to plan it the right way. There is only one right way, and that's the democratic way, as our Supreme Court pointed out regard public-school education. If there are Southern Congressmen and Senators who'd rather have no military Reserve system than have a democratic one, the answer is not to stop trying for democracy. The answer is to level all the guns of public opinion at the recalcitrants until they are forced to surrender—or until fresh reinforcements come up to run right over them. That's the way General Ike would have done on the military battlefield in case of being confronted with such a problem. It's also the way for President Ike to handle this problem, which has such strong battle potentials for the future.

We've seen the democratic interest betrayed too often for political or other expediency in the past. Senator Wagner refused amendments protecting the Negroes' job interests when he introduced his Labor Relations Act nearly 20 years ago. Result, Negro workers suffered seniority losses, which have not yet been recaptured, President Roosevelt brushed off appeals to protect FHA and public housing against Jim Crow planning and administration. Result, we have Jim Crow housing on a scale never before reached.

President Eisenhower should be warned by the fatal errors of his Democratic predecessors. He ought to retract on segregation in our national military Reserve by exempting the Powell amendment from his denunciation of rider legislation.

Washington, D. C., *June 24, 1955.*

Just wanted to congratulate you on the wonderful work on the UMT bill.

J. Franklyn Bourne,
Attorney at Law.

Tacoma, Wash., *June 15, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: May I congratulate you for introducing the amendment against segregation in the UMT Ready Reserve bill. I have been very much concerned about this bill because I have 2 boys, one 12 years old and another 18 years. I believe that UMT and compulsory Reserve systems will lead us further along the road to militarism and away from peace, and I know that talking boys out of college and away from home influences is bad for them. I also believe that racial discrimination is un-American. Furthermore, the fact that Representative Vinson was willing to sidetrack the UMT Ready Reserve bill after adoption of your amendment shows that the bill is not necessary for national defense.

Thank you for the fine work you are doing in the interests of world brotherhood. I believe that the newspapers reported your attendance at the conference of anticolonial countries sponsored by India. I shall be interested in learning more about your activities and hope the press will give good coverage.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. G. H. Hess.

Salem, Oreg., *June 14, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Congratulations and thanks for introducing the amendment which has held up passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. It has seemed that we were in imminent danger of the bill passing and the United States going further along the road of militarism. It would certainly be a service to our citizens to have all racial segregation abolished, but it will be an even greater service to not have any form of UMT.

Sincerely yours,
Robert H. Miller.

June 18, 1955.

Hon. Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Permit me to congratulate you on your firm stand regarding any compromise on segregation in the compulsory Reserve bill.

As a citizen who believes strongly in no segregation, I urge you not to accept any conditions which would permit segregation in our Armed Forces.

Sincerely yours,
Miriam Nicholas.

Castro Valley, Calif., *June 16, 1955.*

Representative Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: Some of us in this Nation are glad you are taking the stand on nonsegregation in the Reserves planned for the military training program. It deserves standing by it securely, and even blocking the military-conscription program as outlined. A bunch of us here are Quakers and are much against the military having any more hold over our boys than it now does. Thank you for your part.

Very truly yours,
Virgil K. Williams.

Cincinnati, Ohio., *June 21, 1955.*

Hon. Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on stand against proposed Reserve bill. I hope and pray you will stand firm in your position against segregation.

Rev. Maurice McCrackin.

Brookline, Mass., *June 15, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: May I express my sincere appreciation of the very fine stand you have taken with your valuable and timely amendment barring segregation in the Reserve program (and, I hope, wherever segregation appears).

I am also very thankful that you exposed the Senate plan to circumvent the democratic processes by tying the President's Reserve program without the antisegregation amendment to the draft bill approved by the House. We count greatly on your efforts and your leadership in abolishing this undemocratic compulsory Reserve bill.

I must also congratulate you on your speech at Bandung. It was magnificent. I read it with great admiration for your generous patriotism.

With kind regards,
Yours sincerely,
M. B. Malone.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *June 18, 1955.*

Hon. Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: May I commend you heartily for your efforts not to allow the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297 to be passed by the Armed Services Committee of the House and will you continue in your good work to secure equal rights for all citizens. Please do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation. You will have my wholehearted support and that of all citizens who are fighting for equal rights.

Yours very sincerely,
Margaret Von Selle.

Walton, Ind., *June 19, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I was glad to hear that you had introduced an amendment to the UMT bill which would end segregation in the National Guard. It was something which we as a Christian Nation should always have had. Also, I realize that this amendment was responsible for shelving the UMT bill, for which I am most thankful.

I feel that UMT is undemocratic in action and that to work for peace effectively we cannot have compulsory military training at home. I favor a strong defense, but one on a volunteer basis and one which will not topple our national economy. I hope you will continue to work to preserve our freedom with the courage which you showed in this instance.

Sincerely yours,
Richard J. Martin.

An Open Letter

IS IT WRONG TO DO RIGHT?

To the Members of both Houses of Congress:

Gentlemen: The position you have taken on the housing bill and the Powell amendment to it has almost staggered the world. To take Government money and give one group of people a front street community and exclude another is a sin.

You have run head on with the truth and it is going to expose your nakedness before this generation. This bill is going to prove whether you the President, and the whole Government mean to do the right thing or to just pretend to do right. The day of finding or offering excuses for righteousness is gone. If a parent put one child in a nice room and in charge of the guarding of the house and put the other child in the basement without any responsibility, the latter could not respect them as parents. So it is with government. The manner in which you cater to blind segregationalists, whose racial attitudes were warped in the cradle following the Civil War—will cause the colored people all over the world to lose respect for your integrity.

Peope of the South are almost innocent of the inherent prejudices and cannot be listened to by sane leadership of our day and age. You must not and cannot afford to legislate segregated law in a world where man is right now trembling before the "bar of God" condemned for breaking the Golden Rule.

We will never make this a Christian society until we become Christians. A Christian is not necessarily a churchgoer, or a sacred speechmaker, but one who has the steel courage to sacrifice wrong for right.

It is not a question of Mr. Powell's war with anyone; it is a question of, "Do you want our respect by being a Christian human being, our confidence, fidelity, or our hope for righteous sacrament?" If so, gentlemen, "the ax is laid unto the root of the trees." Therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

Sirs, give us fair, impartial, and unadulterated leadership immediately. This is the way to remove hatred and malice from the world. In doing this you prevent the atomic bombs dropping on your housetops. You make it easier for your children to live among other people and unborn generations will love you for doing right; historians will smile as they thumb through the pages of your biography as they do Lincoln and others.

However, if you bow to the idol of injustice, legislate another curse on this society, which looks like spit dripping from the Golden Rule, then I shall go on my knees and tell the God which I serve that you are no more worthy to be spared from His wrath; that you are neither hot nor cold, and He will spew you out of His mouth.

Rev. Theodore Allen,
Director of the New World Church
of All Faiths, Washington, D. C.

San Jose, Calif., *June 14, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Would like to urge you not to accept any compromise which permits men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Thanks for your stand in helping we the human race to better understand our brothers and sisters, with kindness and courage, to sit down as a group and apply our Christian precepts to all.

May the spirit of the Great Creator guide the people of America and all other peoples of different countries.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Lulu A. Mateo.

Santa Cruz, Calif., *June 14, 1955.*

Representative Adam C. Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: Through the Friends' News Letter I learned of your amendment to the Reserve bill. I urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

This compulsory Reserve bill gives too much power to the military in any case.

Respectfully,

Ethel I. Shanley.

New Haven, Conn., *June 16, 1955.*

Representative Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I want to congratulate you for your sense of democracy and your expression of it in the antisegregation amendment to the National Services Training Act. I hope you will stand firm on this and that you have equally as alert and concerned colleagues in the Senate who will take appropriate action if that body attempts to get through a bill without protective amendments.

Sincerely yours,

(Miss) Marion L. Campbell.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 15, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We are deeply appreciative of your sponsoring the antisegregation amendments in connection with the Military Reserve bill, Federal aid to school construction, and housing measures. We are contacting all Pennsylvanians on these three committees and strongly urging their support.

We find it difficult to believe, in the light of the Supreme Court decision, that our duly elected representatives so flagrantly ignore the spirit and the letter of that decision.

We agree with your position that only by practicing democracy here at home, will we be able to influence the thinking of those throughout the world, whose support we sorely need.

Again we wish to commend you for your efforts and assure you that we will do everything possible to influence our representatives.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Marion B. Jordon.
Executive Secretary.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 14, 1955.

Rabbi Meyer M. Abramowitz,
Tempel Beth Israel, Sharon, Pa.

Dear Sir: We are vitally concerned with the Federal aid to school constructoin bill and the antisegregation amendment, prepared by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York City. We believe you will agree that any allocation of funds to States currently practicing segregation in schools would violate both the spirit and the letter of the Supreme Court decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955.

We urge that you write or wire Representative Augustine B. Kelley, of Greensburg, chairman of the House Labor Subcommittee, to which has been assigned the job of drafting the school-construction bill; Representatives Carroll Kearns, of Farrell, Pa., and Samuel K. McConnell, of Wynnwood, Pa., members of the subcommittee.

Those of us who have suffered as a result of segregation and discrimination can anticipate what will happen in certain sections of this country in the allocation of moneys for aid-to-school construction, unless safeguards are provided.

Russell Bradley, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, has suggested your name. We will be most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Marion B. Jordon,
Executive Secretary.

(Also sent to Rabbi Joseph Levine, 114 Alexander Ave., Greensburg, Pa.)

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 13, 1955.

Hon. Augustine B. Kelley,
Chairman, House Labor Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: The Pittsburgh branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is the official spokesman for close to 4,000 western Pennsylvanians. It is an accurate and truthful reflection of the prevailing attitudes of these members to say that we are vitally concerned with the passage of the Federal aid to school construction bill with the antisegregation amendment, proposed by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York City.

It is extremely difficult for us to understand, in the light of the Supreme Court decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, how any of our duly elected representatives would not vote for this all-important safeguard. We believe that unless participation in Federal funds, allotted to States, is based on a policy of nonsegregation, and nondiscrimination, it is a grave violation of the spirit and letter of the Supreme Court decision.

We urge you as chairman of the House Labor Subcommittee to vote for this legislation with the antisegregation amendment.

Thank you for cooperating.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Marion B. Jordon,
Executive Secretary.

(Also sent to the Honorable Samuel K. McConnell and the Honorable Carroll Kearns.)

Trinity Evangelical and Reformed Church,
Mount Vernon, Ind., June 15, 1955.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I want to commend you for your action in seeking that any proposed national Reserves military program be racially nonsegregated and hope that regardless of the actions of other Members of Congress that you continue your stand.

My deeper hope is that the proposed national Reserve plan be definitely defeated on its own grounds regardless of segregation policies, for I believe it contradictory to our best national welfare and the cause of genuine peace, being more a tool of the Pentagon to control American youth and to eventually so indoctrinate the thinking of our people that we shall never be able to see peace but always the prospects of war. I also hold it to be in violation of the principles of our national foundations in regard to military compulsions as a free people in a free nation.

Accept my thanks for whatever you may do to defeat such proposals.

Sincerely yours,

August E. Binder.

APO 164, New York, N. Y., *June 14, 1955.*

Hon. Clayton Powell,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am writing to show my greatest appreciation and compliments on recent actions taken on the compulsory Reserve bill. I am stationed in Karlsruhe, Germany, being a potential attorney at law in the future. I would like you to know you are not alone in your segregation and equal-rights bill. If the NAACP accomplishes as much in future years as was accomplished in the past years it will be a milestone for the colored race. Many years I have wondered when someone would bring up the fact that Americans are dying on battlefields, colored and white, and no one mentions the color of skin. Good enough to die together but not good enough to live under equal conditions. After reading the outcome of the Reserve bill many rejoiced that the bill was shelved. I rejoice on the fact that why it was shelved, not the verdict but the circumstances. I close now.

Yours very truly,

Albert Jefferson.

San Francisco, Calif., *June 13, 1955.*

Representative Adam Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want to congratulate you on your success in blocking the compulsory Reserve bill and for bringing out in the open the discrimination in our Army. I believe if we proclaim we are building up an Army to defend democracy in the world we should start it right at home by granting it to our Negro citizens in all phases of life.

I hope you will continue your firm stand for this amendment despite strong forces in the Government who want to pass this bill over the opposition of countless Americans.

Respectfully,

Mathilda Seliger.

Central Methodist Church,
Detroit, Mich., June 14, 1955.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir: I write to thank you on behalf of this great metropolitan congregation for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

It was your amendment which really prevented passing of this bill. We are against racial segregation, of course, in any form.

However, all this seems to prove to us that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Mr. Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

We really think that the bill is a mistake; that it is a concealed and hidden universal military training program to give us a mind-conditioning that will make us into a militaristic Nation.

Sincerely yours,

E. Shurley Johnson.

New York, N. Y., *June 14, 1955.*

Rev. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Reverend Powell: I have been meaning to write you for some time to express my appreciation for your stand on the Reserve bill in general, and on your amendment in particular. If all of us who attended our anti-UMT meeting had done as much and remained as firm as you have, we would be even better off today.

The only purpose of this letter is to express my respect for your position and the hope that your firm stand against segregation and conscription can be maintained.

Sincerely,

ROBERT GILMORE.

P. S. I was very interested in Bandung. I think you did a most remarkable job.

JENKINTOWN, PA., *June 22, 1955.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your opposition to the Reserve bill and I hope you will continue to oppose this new version of it.

I had thought that this measure had been shelved at least for this session of Congress, but now I see they are trying to push it through in another form.

In one form or another it is all the same thing, universal military training, and this is completely incompatible with our concept of democracy.

We urge you to continue to fight this legislation. We are thankful that there are men in Washington such as yourself who are stanchly opposing it.

Sincerely,

MARGARET LONGSHORE.

CINCINNATI 20, OHIO, *June 22, 1955.*

The Honorable A. CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Just to encourage you in your stand concerning segregation in the Reserve bill. We trust you will hold on to your original views.

Sincerely,

MRS. H. F. STURM.

FONTAINBLEAU, FRANCE, *June 20, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to congratulate you on your stand on the Army Reserve bill. May you continue on your views and continued to fight for our people.

I hope that I will be able to join you and others to get those rights which are due to us.

Sincerely yours,

Pvt. HARRY L. PARKER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 22, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you not to withdraw the antisegregation clause in the Army Reserve legislation, before Congress at the present time. Stand firmly for your amendment as you originally introduced it.

We read that in many sections of the country the public school authorities are quietly accepting the Supreme Court decision regarding integration. Let's do what we can to move forward in all areas of our national life.

Yours sincerely,

LYDIA SIEHL.
LOUISE K. SIEHL.
CLARA T. SIEHL.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 21, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was very much surprised to read of the introduction into the House of a new military Reserve bill after H. R. 5297 was beaten so soundly. I was even more astonished to read the following in the Detroit Free Press of June 21: "Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, whose antisegregation fight forced the House to abandon an earlier measure, said he probably would support the bill. He called the measure 'a clean-cut victory for me'."

How, by any standard, could this be described as a clean-cut victory for you? There is no indication whatever that the proposed new bill will not become the tool of Jim Crow segregationists. How in the name of justice can you desert the people whose rights you defended so well in the fight against H. R. 5297? It is my belief that unless you make an honest, wholehearted attempt to place an antisegregation clause in the new bill, that the people of this country will say that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was not sincere in his fight against H. R. 5297; that his amendment was for selfish reasons.

Millions of people in this country are depending on you and fine citizens like you to end segregation and other abridgements of freedom that we are fighting against. Please don't let them down.

Sincerely yours,

CARROL K. RAMSEY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 21, 1955.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL, JR.: I received your postcard yesterday afternoon. Consequently I have written to Senators RUSSELL and JOHNSON, and Congressmen MCCORMACK and RAYBURN. This is to let you know that I am behind you in your fight for desegregation in Reserve units. May God give you a zeal equal to that of the Apostles.

Sincerely,

A. J. THOMAS, Jr.

NORTH MANKATO, MINN., *June 20, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for introducing the amendment about racial segregation to H. R. 5297. The fact that this probably prevented the bill from passing shows that the southerners don't think it important enough to our safety to give up their discrimination.

If this bill is revived I hope you will oppose it.

Yours truly,

MRS. CLARENCE R. PERISHO.

MT. OLIVET TABERNACLE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 9, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR ADAM: I regret that I did not hear your speech on Tuesday evening as I had to be in Memphis attending a special meeting of the Board of the National Baptist Convention.

All that I hear is that your speech caused a lot of serious thinking by high-placed persons in our community and was all to the good.

May I commend you for your stand on the segregation issue in the military training bill now before Congress. I am praying that God may give you strength to stand firm and unyielding. America and the Eisenhower administration must make a decision as to whether it loves its race prejudice more than it does righteousness, justice and fair play. Your amendment gives them an opportunity to make that choice.

Keep up the good work. Regards to family and friends.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL L. SHEPARD.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *June 22, 1955.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to commend you for your decision to oppose the compromise compulsory Reserve bill. Compulsory Reserve legislation must not really be necessary if men like Vinson would prefer no legislation to that outlawing segregation. It would be tragic to force men into such long-term service in light of recent reduction in world tensions. Millions of us hope you defeat compromise bill.

JOHN SCHUDER.

Congressman A. CLAYTON POWELL,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.:

"This brings congratulations
And a world of wishes, too,
That future years will always bring
The best of luck to you."

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE ROLLINS JACKSON.

I, Gertrude, speak to you with the voice of Christ. Please read with understanding and give to the world.

Proverbs 3: 1–35.
Proverbs 4: 1–27.
Ecclesiastes 3: 1–22.
Ecclesiastes 4: 1–16.
St. Matthew 23: 1–38.
St. Matthew 24: 1–51.
St. Matthew 25: 1–46.

May God bless you and your beloved family and heaven smile upon you. I hope to meet you someday face to face.

G. R. J.

SEYMOUR, WIS., *June 17, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: We want to thank you for introducing an amendment forbidding racial segregation to the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. We thoroughly approve your action. We urge you not to accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Sincerely yours.

MRS. LEONARD MONTIE,
LEONARD MONTIE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 18, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to express my approval of the amendment regarding racial segregation which you added to the compulsory Reserve bill. The amendment is good as it serves to reenforce the recent trend to abolish segregation of the races.

The amendment is important from another standpoint too. Certain leaders of the Congress who appear well informed in military matters voted to shelve this bill after the amendment had been added. This is evidence to me that a compulsory Reserve bill is not necessary to this Nation's defense.

I oppose the extensive compulsory Reserve program for three reasons:

1. Forced participation in the Reserve program in the local community would tend to accentuate the importance of militarism. The proposed plan resembles in too close a degree the youth programs in nations where militarism and oppression exist rather than democracy.

2. Such a large reserve would do little to defend the Nation in an atomic war. Actually the effort that building such a reserve would require should be spent in preventing a war and in the relocation of industry and peoples so the Nation's vulnerability would be reduced. Participation of every youth in an infantry style of reserve training would be a waste of time.

3. A program of compulsion will destroy the enthusiasm which presently exists in some units of the military Reserve, just as compulsion has already had its effect on the Armed Forces. It is high time that service in the Armed Forces was returned to a voluntary basis. If the Army can't be an army of volunteers in peacetime, something is wrong.

I urge you not to withdraw the amendment which you introduced regarding racial segregation in Reserve units. I am glad that the particular bill in question was shelved.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. SWARM.

PARADISE, CALIF., *June 16, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: May I add my congratulations to many others, I am sure, for your good service to the American people by getting your amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 2597, passed. It is first of all quite in keeping with the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court and it showed how unimportant the bill itself is when it was defeated because of your amendment.

Now may I urge you to stand fast and not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to National Guard units where there is segregation. Both the antisegregation and the un-American bill itself are very important. The bill itself must be defeated.

I am also writing my Representative, CLAIR ENGLE, to support you in this.

Sincerely yours,

STANHOPE R. PIER.

ROYAL OAK, MICH, *June 15, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I hope you will remain adamant and not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Sincerely,

WALTER ALLMENDINGER.

WELLESLEY, MASS., *June 16, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing, in behalf of my wife and myself, to express to you our very hearty congratulation for the part you played in the recent House debate on the Compulsory Reserve bill. You introduced the amendment to the bill, a very important one, since it would end segregation on race grounds in the National Guard in more than half of the States, which now have it, and in the outcome, this was the amendment which prevented the passage of that bill at this time. What a mixture. Anyhow, I should say the procedure proved that the bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of many Members of the House.

We do not know, Sir, your views on the UMT—compulsory—voluntary—reserve proposals in general. We are against them, any that we have seen. This is no time in the world to build up our armament, compulsorily. Besides, what effectiveness would these thousands of reservists have, in a modern atomic war? From which God save us.

We are also whole-heartedly against race segregation—in the National Guard and everywhere else.

The compulsory reserve propositions will surely come up again. And I suppose there will be pressure to drop your amendment, or else to amend it in such fashion that it will be palatable to Southern Congressmen. Please, Sir, do not give in. Hold on to this vital point.

With sincere good wishes,

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT E. CHANDLER.

OAK HILL, W. VA., *June 21, 1955.*

MR. A. CLAYTON POWELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Accept my congratulation on the noble fight you are making for rights for all American citizens. You are a chip off the old block.

Your father and I were school mates in Wayland Seminary. He always fought for what he believed right.

Again congratulating you.

Yours most hopefully,

J. M. ELLIS,
Attorney at Law.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: Despite President Eisenhower's objections to riders on appropriations, this practice has a long tradition in American history as one means—and an effective one in securing changes desired by the people.

We must not abandon this principle now—especially when so much of Federal funds are going into the southern States for vocational education, for health services, and for school-lunch programs.

Will you kindly let me know how much was allocated in 1954 to the southern States for (a) school-lunch programs; (b) health services in schools (public); (c) vocational education in secondary schools; (d) emergency school construction; (e) distribution of surplus food for school lunches; (f) distribution of surplus food for direct giving to students—mainly apples and fruits?

Very truly yours,

MRS. LAYLE LANE.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *June 11, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Please do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPHINE N. LOVELAND.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 13, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: You are dead right that no Reserve bill should be passed which does not contain an antisegregation provision.

But it is even more important that no compulsory Reserve bill be passed. To any lover of freedom this bill is just as objectionable whether or not it contains such a provision. Being enslaved on an unsegregated basis does not make being enslaved any more palatable.

I hope that you will continue your fight to include in any bill presented an antisegregation provision. But having won that fight, I hope that you will go on to oppose the passage of any such bill with all your might. Do not let anyone tell you that simply because your amendment is adopted you must vote for the bill itself. That is false logic, indeed.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. FINCH.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 11, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: It was thrilling to hear of your fine speech against H. R. 5297 or the UMT bill. Please advise us if there is anything that we can do here at the grassroots of our Government. For years I have worked against such enslavement of our youth. I have seen firsthand what the UMT did to France, for instance. I have met scores of mothers who have come to live just to escape the UMT for this is what it is no matter by what other name it is called.

The H-bomb has made this the day of complete disarmament. The Pentagon realizes that MacArthur was right when he declared that war was a thing of the past—the Pentagon, a terrible name, is fighting now for its life.

All honor to you, Mr. Powell, in what you are doing.

Hopefully yours,

LEILA A. PETCH.

EL MONTE, CALIF., *June 9, 1955.*

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: My wife and I wish to express our appreciation to you for your amendment to H. R. 5297. Frankly, we appreciate the fact that it caused the shelving of the bill as well as the fact that it insists on a nonsegregated National Guard.

Apparently this compulsory reserve plan is not essential to national defense if militarists like Representative VINSON are willing to sidetrack it because of this one amendment.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FARLEY.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having just read a summary of the House's consideration of the compulsory reserve bill, H. R. 5297, I would like to express my appreciation of your determined sponsorship of the amendment which would prevent the use of segregated National Guard units in connection with the reserve plan. Not another dollar of Federal money should go to any kind of segregated enterprise, and it is good to know that you will keep up the fight to this end.

If the Reserve bill should again come under active consideration and you are in a position to suggest means whereby the citizen can support your efforts at that time, I hope I may be on your mailing list to receive any material you may send out.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH F. FUCHS.

NEW WINDSOR, MD., *June 10, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Great gratitude to you for helping to send that UMT bill back to committee. When it reappears accept no compromise. America must not burden her people with the thing that has put Germany where she is now.

There is no consistency in appointing Harold Stassen for disarmament and pushing for this compulsory Reserve bill.

War is the enemy and we have got to face the fact and quit playing at this game of extinction.

Russia and China have five times the men we have. What would our handful of men be besides theirs? It's stupid.

And masses of men are no longer usable or transportable. You Congressmen must live in 1955. Military men are always ages behind in their thinking. Remember France's Maginot Line.

Thanking you,

Dr. and Mrs. EDWARD C. BIXLER.

ROME, N. Y., *June 8, 1955.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Your American amendment to H. R. 5297—and its defeat proved that the compulsory Reserve service in the military is not essential to the welfare of our country.

As a Quaker, however, it does not please me to have had this bill defeated for the wrong reason—but it does help defeat the extreme militarists from taking over all our young men to indoctrinate them in the art of killing.

Sincerely,

LILLIAN BURTON.

MIDDLETOWN, OHIO, *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I believe the amendment you introduced to H. R. 5297 shows that the bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of militarists like Mr. VINSON. I believe that we should have integration in all branches of the Armed Forces. I also believe that we do not need a compulsory Reserve system, but that we should put more effort into work for peace.

Sincerely yours,

PAULINE M. STALKER.

JACKSONVILLE, ILL., *June 10, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM POWELL,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Illinois conference of the Methodist Church, representing 700 churches and now meeting in Jacksonville, Ill., states its continued opposition to any and all forms of Universal Military Training. We believe that H. R. 5297 ought to be permanently shelved.

J. DEWEY MUIR,
Secretary, Illinois Annual Conference.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 10, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We congratulate you on your stand on antisegregation amendments and have sent telegrams to Colorado Congressmen and Senators urging their support.

MRS. MAYOLA B. MARSH,
President, Colorado N. A. A. C. P. Branch.

ROXBURY, MASS., *June 6, 1955.*

Rev. A. C. POWELL.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was so disgusted when I read this article that I wanted you to see it. Of course, this probably won't mean anything to you as you are used to adverse reactions, but I think that the editor has his nerve. Why not object to our boys being thrown off trains and having their eyes beaten out when they are wearing a United States uniform. I should like to answer him but good. May God give you strength to continue putting them where they belong and always where it hurts them most. Look at the cartoon. He is certainly trying to make people angry by your, as he wants someone to think, audacious act of not wanting our boys sent to the southern slaughter.

Yours for your continued blastings.

(Mrs.) LILLIAN D. WILLIAMS.

P. S.—The Defense Department knows that segregation is unconstitutional, but why let it continue?

SECURITY AT STAKE

At a time when the Nation acutely needs a strong military reserve, the necessary legislation has hit a Congressional sidetrack.

It has been shunted there by a sharp disagreement on a topic of racial discrimination. Thus national security is being penalized because of a needless squabble over isolated cases of segregation.

Congress will be muffing its responsibilities unless it acts swiftly to correct this situation.

The national Reserve plan, as it came up for debate in the House, was the product of many months of thoughtful work on the part of men who understand our Reserve problem.

It contained a provision stating that if the National Guard could not fill its quota through voluntary enlistment, the Army and the Air Force would transfer reservists with obligated service to various Guard units, with consent of the State governor concerned.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL didn't like that provision. He proposed an amendment to bar such transfers in States where segregation is practiced. The amendment passed the House, but it kindled enough disagreement to bring about the withdrawal of the whole NRP bill from the House floor.

POWELL's action is understandable, but we do not believe it was necessary. The Defense Department is sharply aware of the segregation problem in the Deep South. It would have handled assignments with that problem in mind, while at the same time furthering the overall national program of eliminating segregation in the military.

Now we're stuck with a stalled piece of legislation. Without the NRP, an emergency recall would find the burden of defense still sitting on the shoulders of the veterans of World War II and Korea. Without the NRP we'll continue to pay the cost of a big active-duty military force. And we'll still have the draft.

This is a knot that Congress should untangle without delay. National security demands the passage of a good Reserve bill.

LAUNDRY WORKERS JOINT BOARD OF
GREATER NEW YORK, AMALGAMATED
CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., June 10, 1955.

Congressman ADAM C. POWELL,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR ADAM: I was reading in this morning's New York Times about your statement concerning the position that was taken by the President on the Reserve bill program.

Allow me to congratulate you again on your forthright stand.

Yours truly,

ODELL CLARK.

HEADQUARTERS 40TH AAA BN.
(GUN 90 MM)
OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN,
New York, N. Y., June 7, 1955.

Dr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Pastor, Abyssinian Baptist Church,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR DR. POWELL: The available overseas newspapers carry excerpts of congressional actions. Consequently, I have followed with deep interest your gallant stand in regards to the recent proposed Reserve program.

I am a chaplain in the United States Army, representing the National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc. To my fellow Baptist minister of the Gospel of Christ, I send this letter to encourage you to stand for truth and the actual practice of the high ideals found in the supreme law of the land, our United States Constitution.

I feel it is my Christian duty to further state that your actions seem to be for unadulterated truth and for the actual practice of democracy in a democratic country. The Stars and Stripes, an overseas newspaper, in its May 31, 1955, issue, page 11, carried the article, Has Racial Integration Worked in the Army? The survey indicated success of program for uniting Americans in all aspects of military life. If the program had never been initiated, such authentic information could never have been ascertained.

I pray God's blessings upon you in all your endeavors. In His name, I am,

Yours in Christ,

THEODORE R. DEADWYLER,
Chaplain (1st Lt.), USA.

LAKIN STATE HOSPITAL,
Lakin, W. Va., May 30, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I have read with interest, reports of your most recent effective debates with Congressman VINSON on a cause in which we are all vitally interested.

You are to be congratulated upon the forthrightness, fearlessness, and logical approach which are so characteristic of you.

There is no reason to doubt but that this successful effort will prove invaluable to the whole cause of integration.

Sincerely yours,

S. O. JOHNSON, *M. D.,*
Superintendent.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 31, 1955.*

Hon. A. C. POWELL

DEAR SIR: Enclosed article by Drew Pearson, which you no doubt have seen and want to congratulate you on your fearless stand on issues which are just.

You might of added the time during World War II when colored boys were moving Nazi prisoners in the South that they had to eat in kitchens while the Nazis ate in dining rooms.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Very sincerely,

SAM DAVIDSON.

Please do not bother to answer as no doubt you are very busy.

Pearson has had several other complimentary articles about you lately.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *June 4, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: Just a line to congratulate you on your amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. Whether segregation should be ended completely or not is neither here nor there. You have proven that it is not necessary to keep our youth in the armed services for long periods of time had it been necessary. The 27 State Representatives would have voted for your bill in spite of your amendment had this long service for youth been necessary. Tax at its source spends most of our dollar in taxes before it is ever stamped on the printing press. Five billion dollars 1932 × 17 = $85 billion dollars, year 1950. 5 × 17 = $85 billion. The country was bonded for the war debt. The bureaucracies had not yet collected their salaries in 1950. A carpenter received 7½ cents per hour on the railroad in year 1900 to year 1910. 7½ cents × 34 = $2.45, the scale is $2.71 per hour, a greater multiple than 34. Yet 34 times 3 cents equals $1.02. Two-thirds of the banks assets are in Government bonds. We owe it to ourselves. Six dollars per thousand lumber, 1900; $6 × 34 = $204, we now pay $225 for No. 2 white pine per thousand feet; 34 × $300 for the best home in town in year 1900 equals $10,200 now. We can't get the best for $10,200.

Respectfully,

GEORGE H. DOANE.

P. S.—The difference between $5 billion in year 1932 cost of government and 1950, $85 billion. The debt along with the interest saved by putting the cost of government back to year 1932 would pay off the entire Federal debt in 4 years, leaving a balance on hand of $25 billion.

HOLLIS, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., *May 31, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After having read an excerpt of your debate with Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, I would certainly appreciate your sending me a copy or copies of your highly successful and informative debate with the astute and capable but narrow-minded Representative VINSON.

We Negroes need more men of your caliber in office. May God bless you and keep you in office for many years to come.

Sir, if you have a mailing list for questions and proposals concerning the Negro, I appreciate being included.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. COLLINS.

LANSDALE, PA., *June 4, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: It was gratifying to see your opposition to the compulsory Reserve bill by the introduction of your amendment. We hope you will continue your opposition even though the papers indicate the President may put on pressure to have it passed.

Sincerely yours,

William P. Nyce.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *May 24, 1955.*

Hon. A. Clayton Powell.

Dear Mr. Powell: I want you to know that we are very grateful to you for representing us at the Asian conference. Wasn't that a heart-warming conference? If only our diplomats do not spoil it!

Cannot tell you how happy we are that the Reserve bill was not passed and sincerely thank you for your stand on human rights and its results in blocking the bill which would have given the Pentagon a Hitlerite mortgage on the lives and minds of all our young men.

Is there anything we can do to keep Senator Knowland from ruining any chance we have for a peace conference? We cannot understand his placing the China lobby of that power-mad Chiang over the chance for peace that may save this crazed world.

Nina Wheeler,
Legislative Chairman, St. Petersburg W. J. L. P. F.

Carlsbad, Calif., *May 20, 1955.*

Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Friend: This is sent in spirit of sincere gratitude and congratulation for your courageous stand on the imperative value of integrated National Guard units. Being a Quaker, I and many others have been opposing the UMT bill, because of our peace testimony. To have leaders with your viewpoint work along with us is most heartening.

Sincerely yours,

Gretchen Tuthill.

Pilot Mountain, N. C., *May 25, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I wish to express my appreciation for your action against the Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

My personal feeling is one of opposition to the whole bill in any form but at the same time I heartily approve of your amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Pansy D. Shore.
Mrs. Marvin H. Shore.

Peoria, Ill., *May 20, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I was reading about your stand for men to be barred from segregated reservist and I think that you should stick to that idea. For if a man has to die for a country there's no reason why he has to be segregated by it. You see I am a Korean veteran. I was wounded in Korea during the time I was fighting in Korea. I was under the impression that I was fighting for the rights and ideals of all men. I was not fighting for segregation and discrimination. If you stick to your decision the dark people from all over the world will laud your name some day as the first man to ever strike a blow for freedom and liberation of the colored people of the world. I am a Negro and we need men like you to speak up for our rights and fight segregation in every way possible. This country is always talking of the Russian treatment to people of other countries, why don't they look at their own treatment to the Negro first and then make careful comparisons. Also remind them of what is happening to the colored people of South Africa. Nothing is being said about that. Let's face fact; the time is growing short; some changes have to be made and made soon. Tell the gentlemen of Congress to read Daniel and the Revelation in the Bible, then they'll get a better understanding of what must be done in order to obtain peace in the world. Read the part especially about the lamb, dragon, and goat. The beasts signify nations in mortal conflict.

Yours truly,

Dallas L. Williams.

Belmont, Mass., *May 24, 1955.*

Representative Adam C. Powell.

Dear Sir: This is to assure you that I feel you have written an important amendment to the House bill on Reserve military training. The men who volunteer to serve their country deserve equal treatment side by side with other reservists. If it "kills" the bill that will be a wonderful thing—as it is just an opening wedge for UMT which is certainly most un-American.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. C. C.) Gertrude F. Smith.

McEwen, Tenn., *May 31, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.

Dear Congressman: Words cannot express our sincere thanks to you and all the other Representatives in Congress, who led the opposition to bill H. R. 5297—UMT—compulsory national reserve plan.

We are indeed grateful that you all could see the danger that lies ahead for our country should such a law be adopted.

We certainly appreciate your patriotic action in opposing this un-American legislation. Please continue to do all you can against UMT—compulsory national Reserve plan. In doing so you will be helping to preserve our freedom, our most precious heritage.

Thanking you again for your good work.

We are, sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Edwards.

KEEP AMERICA FREE FROM MILITARY REGIMENTATION—A WARNING TO AMERICA

(By E. Paul Weaver, chairman, Commission on National Legislation, Indiana Council of Churches)

THE PRESENT SITUATION, MILITARY REGIMENTATION

For a century and a half America got along nicely without military regimentation. With the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948 and its continuance as a form of compulsory universal military service and training, a generation is growing up that cannot remember when America was free from military regimentation. Now is the time for all who believe in freedom to speak out against this growing cancer of military regimentation.

Military regimentation will not prevent war: The history of Europe and Japan testifies to the fact that huge conscript armies do not prevent war.

Military regimentation will not give security: France, with many years of military regimentation proved that peacetime conscription does not make a nation strong. In modern war other factors are more important than mass pools of manpower—stockpiled bodies. In this day, training boys to win past wars can be fatal to national security.

Military regimentation does not prevent casualties: Most of the pressure for military regimentation comes from those whose ideas were fixed prior to the atomic age. Preparation for defense against hydrogen bombs is to be far, far away. With weapons of extermination, most old concepts are antiquated.

Military regimentation hinders the Air Force: Study carefully the article by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers in the magazine Air Force for February 1953, or in the January 11, 1954 Congressional Record. This proposed regimentation cannot help the Air Force. They need men with many years of highly technical training. Investing billions in regimented masses of manpower actually cripples the Air Force.

Military regimentation does not help the Navy: The Navy needs men for several years before they become most useful. A 2-year program of military regimentation will not develop a strong peacetime Navy. Like the Air Force, the Navy wants career men who will take the time to develop the technical skills required by modern weapons.

The danger to labor: Organized labor knows what happens to labor unions in states enslaved by military regimentation. When military regimentation reaches its ultimate, conscription of labor follows.

The danger to free enterprise: If we permit regimentation of life, we cannot hold back when the military demands regimentation of labor and regimentation of capital. Those who plan military regimentation of young men have not forgotten regimentation of industry and capital. In the name of defending ourselves from Communist regimentation it would be the rankest folly to set up the same system here.

The danger to personal morals: Careful observers know what happens to morals under military regimentation. High-school boys say "What's the use. The Army will get you anyway." Moral fiber snaps. Note the alarming rate of delinquency among high-school-age boys and girls—the drunkeness, the venereal disease, the upset personalities. All the world knows that military life is not generally conducive to good morals.

The danger to farmers: Good farmers know that the boy should be learning farming at the very time that military regimentation would take him from his home. Breaking up a father-son partnership and putting a boy in an army camp, where soldiering becomes a verb, does not produce farmers. Farmers recognize the evils of military regimentation.

The danger to freedom: Americans should read these lines:

"Therefore we stand for compulsory military service for every man. If a State is not worth that, then away with it.

"The army educates men only to be reliable, decent members of the community, men who in the hour of need and danger feel themselves united in loyalty with the nation; and should fate confront them with the sternest ordeal, will defend the freedom of their people with bravery and honor." (Adolph Hitler in Mein Kampf.)

The folly of military regimentation: The November 8, 1952, issue of Collier's magazine carried the article Why Half Our Combat Soldiers Fail to Shoot. The writer points out that during World War II only 12 to 25 percent of all combat soldiers who were armed and in a position to fire their weapons at the enemy were able to pull the trigger.

By intensive effort in Korea, the average was not raised to above 50 percent. If from 4 to 7 out of each 8 men sent into combat fail to shoot even when their own lives depend upon it, think of the folly of sending them to the front for that express purpose. Remember that in supply lines or behind desks there are nine soldiers for each soldier who goes to the front.

The real strength of America: The real strength of America is in its citizens who have been trained to think for themselves. Military regimentation is just the opposite of what our American schools have been trying to do in training youth to think independently and for themselves. Our inventions, our industrial genius, our moral fiber—these were not forged in a slave state. They are the product of a people who have been free—free from military regimentation.

The threat to our economy: We dare not waste billions of dollars preparing for "past wars." There is a limit to how many billions the United States Government can waste. A bankrupt nation is ripe for communism.

The hazard of military regimentation: History brings the record of the fact that large professional armies take away the liberties of the countries they profess to defend. "Vast armies decay imperceptibly while sapping the strength of the nations supporting them," said a recent Chief of Staff, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. General Marshall warned that a large professional army "has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state based upon the conception of government by the people."

Justice of the Supreme Court Douglas has pointed out that our Nation has already become the victim of the military mind. Many other careful analysts have noted this evil. With the rise of militarism freedom decays.

Woodrow Wilson called peacetime conscription "the root-evil of Prussianism."

On September 6, 1919, in Kansas City Woodrow Wilson warned against the growth of militarism. He said:

"You know, my fellow citizens, what armaments mean: great standing armies, great stores of war materials. They do not mean burdensome taxation merely, they do not mean merely compulsory military sevice which saps the economic strength of the nations, but they mean also the building up of a military class. Again and again, my fellow citizens, in the conference at Paris, we were face to face with this circumstance, that in dealing with a particular civil government we found that they would not dare to promise what their general staff was not willing that they should promise; that they were dominated by the military machine which they had created, nominally for their own defense, but really, whether they willed it or not, for the provocation of war.

"So soon as you have a military class, it does not make any difference what your form of government is; if you are determined to be armed to the teeth, you must obey the orders and directions of the only men who can control the great machinery of war. Elections are of minor importance, because they determine the political policy, and back of the political policy is the constant pressure of the men trained to arms, enormous bodies of disciplined men, wondering if they are never going to be allowed to use their education and their skill and ravage some great people with the force of arms. That is the meaning of armaments. It is not merely the cost of it, though that is overwhelming, but it is the spirit of it, and America has never and I hope, in the providence of God, never will have that spirit."

In 1814 Daniel Webster pronounced a conscription act unconstitutional. In 1819 Henry Clay denounced Andrew Jackson's invasion of Florida. He warned that if our American form of government "is to be preserved we must hold to a strict accountability the military branch of the public force."

One wonders what the fathers of our country might say if they could see how the military now attempt to dominate the life of our Government and the American people.

The danger to world peace: Some say, "If you want peace, prepare for war." In the cool light of history that is a lie. Armament races have led to war. France and Germany demonstrate the truth of the real axiom, "To be prepared for war is to be predisposed to war." If we want peace, we must prepare for peace. Military regimentation of a people is not preparation for peace.

Keep America free from compulsory military regimentation: Permanent compulsory UMT has been opposed by most of the leading churches of America, many of the outstanding educators and historians, most of the labor organizations, the three leading farm organizations, many millions of Americans who love freedom.

THE PRESENT DANGER

America faces the danger that the present international tensions will be used to enact permanent military regimentation under the name of UMT, UMST, NST, or selective service.

A positive alternative: 1. Repudiate as abhorrent to freedom-loving Americans any form of military regimentation.

2. Through the United Nations attempt to have all nations agree to discontinue all forms or military regimentation.

3. Support the President of the United States in his plea for world-wide universal disarmament with adequate inspection.

4. Support the President in his desire to use atomic energy to bless rather than destroy mankind.

5. Share our abundance with the world's needy.

6. Encourage the peaceful development of freedom in every land.

7. Inform all mankind that in a war with modern weapons of devastation, there is no defense. There will be no victors—only victims.

REUKA PARK, N. Y., *June 5, 1955.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: May I write you re two of the things I have recently read?

One was your article in the Nation (or was it the Progressive?); read them both and then passed them on. I prefer the Nation to the Progressive; that is, if it had to be one or the other for me, I would take the former. But I support every kind of protest publication so far as my limited income permits.

I was extremely indignant at the way you as a Congressman were slighted. Our military authorities do seem to be ruling not only our State Department but Congress as well. At least I have been terrified at the votes in Congress, so nearly unanimous. That is, one feels that a military Fascist dictatorship could be in the offing. And racism or fascism and militarism are true triplets. Personally I am 100 percent for Nehru and the independence of the Asian-African bloc in this world. I was reared in India, have traveled and observed in China, in Indonesia, in French Algeria, etc., while they were colonies. I was in Bandung myself. (Is it not beautiful, the ride there?) I was simply burned up with the way the Dutch treated the Javanese. So I am against the foreign policy of Mr. Dulles. (I really think he must be dull.) I think we shall have to get off our swagger, swagger all over the world, and humbly live up to our democratic and Christian professions. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him"; is what I would do with Russians or Chinese or any other human beings. If we only actually believed Jesus instead of using His name in vain. All each one of us has to do is to start. One's behavior is not dependent on anyone else's.

I will have to add that I was as opposed to Mr. Truman's cold war as I am to its continuation under Mr. Dulles.

The second point has reference to the compulsory Reserve bill. I note by the press that your amendment blocked its passage temporarily. We can only pray and pray and pray that it will block it permanently.

As a young girl, I saw conscription operating in France. Much later I saw fascism operating in Italy. Poor France; how I loved it, and pitied it, and have ever since. I wish to enclose part of a leaflet I sent for.

Yours respectfully,
MRS. FRANKIE GRIFFIN MERSON.

I take Spotlight on Africa also. Dr. Du Bois has been one of my admirations ever since I started my college teaching in sociology and political science (now retired). I have introduced him to many hundreds of students, I am proud to say.

Also, I take the National Guardian, and am receiving one of the shocks of my life in the threat of the deportation of its editor, Cedric Belfrage. Its literary quality, as well as its careful documentation, is a pleasure to a person who has pursued scholarship all her life. That McCarran-Walter Act is a vicious kind of racism. No one is free unless all are free.

Again respectfully,
FRANKIE GRIFFIN.

CONSCRIPTION'S UNHOLY TWINS: INDOCTRINATION AND REGIMENTATION

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE READY RESERVE

The case for the current UMT-Reserve plan made by its supporters is that it will make available for immediate action a "ready reserve" of 3 million combat-trained men in the event of war. There are many reasons why this case is weak, of which three are most important:

1. In modern war there can be no such thing as a genuine ready reserve. The men would have to be recalled on a selective basis if the recall were not to disrupt the vital industrial and scientific strength of the country. They would then have to be retrained for at least 4 months—almost as long as new recruits would require.

2. Large-scale invasions across water will be impossible in a new war, since one atomic bomb could wreck an entire invasion fleet. Even if this were not so, transportation and equipment of troops takes far longer than training. Small wars, as in Korea, do not require large masses of men.

3. A war fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs, as another major war will be fought, would make mass armies themselves obsolete in the process of destroying the whole fabric of western civilization.

In the face of such facts, supporters of the new UMT-Reserve plan continue to support compulsory peacetime military service because such service helps to indoctrinate the youth of the country with the military virtues, and hence eventually to regiment the thinking of the Nation as a whole. This is the real case for UMTS.

Point: "The theory behind this proposal (for compulsory military training and service in peacetime), with which we do not disagree, is that a period of military training for every young man is of intrinsic benefit to the Nation, even if a percentage of those trained cannot qualify for the Reserves."—(Report of the National Security Training Commission.)

And counterpoint: "When the civilian-trained-soldier has adjusted his personality to the demands of the military machine, he has thereby lost some of his ability to adjust to the demands of civilian society. * * * Accustomed to receiving and giving orders, he can no longer comprehend that vast and alien civilian world where everything depends upon consent, where one must persuade, not order or forbid. In a world where externals are everything, where outward conformity is the sum of one's duty and one's whole life is devoted to the husk of things, he has had no opportunity to cultivate familiarity with the still small voice of conscience, has had, in fact, no right to have a conscience because he had no right to regulate his behavior by his own inner standards." (Prof. Willard Waller, in the Veteran Comes Back.)

"We in education saw at first hand the difficulties of the GI's, in some cases requiring months to solve, in readjusting to a world where they made their own decisions and exercised their own initiative, in returning from the military world where initiative often brought disciplinary penalties, and where doing what one was told so easily was translated into the habitual policy of doing as little as possible." (President Deane W. Mallott, Cornell University, Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal, December 26, 1953.)

CIVILIANS INTO SOLDIERS

American parents and educators try to raise children who are independent, self-respecting, imaginative, and free. These are the essence of democracy. Human progress is made possible only by men and women who have enough respect for their own worth and intelligence to be willing to question old ways of doing things.

Armies, of any nationality, do their best to instill just the opposite attitudes in the young men under their control. Orders must be obeyed, good or bad, right or wrong, drunk or sober, in combat or in a peacetime training camp.

Such an attitude of unquestioning obedience to authority, carried over into civilian life by men still under Army control for 9½ years, will undermine the very basis of democratic life.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANS., *June 6, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We do thank you most warmly for introducing the amendment that prevented the passage of the UMT compulsory Reserve bill. There are few things in this life that I have been as thankful for as that, if any, because I cannot entertain the thought of my country becoming so highly militarized as that. There is no possible need of it, and it just must never happen here.

I think your action was an answer to many prayers. I did everything possible I knew to do to oppose it—then I lifted my hands to Heaven and said, "God, now you will have to take over," and I knew that unless He did, we would lose, for I had been told there were not enough votes in Congress to defeat it—and there were not. I knew it would take a miracle to defeat it, and it did. It was like a bolt out of the blue, and we do thank you from the depths of our hearts.

I wonder what is next? I have never been able to learn what they did with the 4-year draft bill—it was in the Senate the last I knew of it. The old draft bill expired June 1 and something must have been done. Surely it wasn't just let die, though I have prayed that it would be, but I didn't think it could come so soon.

Again, thanks a million.

Sincerely,

MRS. OMAR JOYCE.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
South Gate, Calif., May 27, 1955.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: We are delighted to know that the compulsory Reserve UMT bill has been stopped and that the means of stopping it was your amendment to ban assignments to National Guard units that are segregated. It is a double victory.

Congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN W. TAYLOR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 26, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.

ESTEEMED SIR: I am glad to read that we have one man in Congress that isn't afraid to say what everyone in the United States thinks, about KNOWLAND. People in his home State are sick of his warmongering, and strutting around on his hairy hindlegs.

How dumb can a political party get? We just finished throwing Truman out for getting us into the Korean disgrace. The people are sick of war and warmakers. We are the laughing stock of the world. What are we doing to get that enormous Chinese market—shooting at them—smart, isn't it? KNOWLAND and NIXON in the lead, followed closely by the semipatriotic flag-waving American Legion leaders, crying, "Drop the bomb. Drop the bomb."

Mr. NIXON, at least, has the sense to know he is greatly disliked, and has kept his mouth shut. For your information, the union men in his home State have less than no use for him. For one thing, the word is around that NIXON's father did a job of "scabbing" during the Los Angeles streetcar strike in 1920, and they don't forget that so easily.

For your information I heard Adlai Stevenson talk at Los Angeles—as I heard it—young ROOSEVELT got more applause than he did. The people are looking desperately for a leader. One who will come out and say he is for peace. One who is not afraid to act like an American instead of like a KNOWLAND.

Very truly and admiringly yours,

JOHN H. PROLL.

BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS,
New York, N. Y., May 27, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Just a word of remembrance and to congratulate you for the splendid job you did at Bandung, and your important fight against reintroduction and the perpetuation of Jim Crow in the Armed Forces through the Reserve military measure.

Sincerely yours,

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
International President.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *May 27, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Out here in California we hear that you did an excellent job against segregation in the National Guard proposal, which is much appreciated.

While this Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, is temporarily shelved, let us urge a more constructive foreign policy directed toward disarmament, and support of the United Nations with negotiation and cooperation as our goal, thereby building for peaceful solutions to our problems, rather than war preparedness.

We want you to know that we appreciate your efforts thus far.

Most sincerely,

I. D. WARREN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 20, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building:

The American Council on Human Rights, on behalf of its thousands of members, heartily endorses your stand against segregation in National Guard and Federal Reserve units. The welfare and defense of our Nation can best be served by the elimination of all distinctions based on race. Continue the fight, and please advise immediately how we can assist to have the pending legislation reconsidered and your amendment approved.

AUBREY E. ROBINSON,
Director, American Council on Human Rights.

ROSELLE, N. J., *May 19, 1955.*

Hon. A. CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: It is indeed gratifying to note that you never fail to strike a blow at bigotry and racial prejudice when the opportunity presents itself.

I know that thousands of our racial group appreciates your efforts in our behalf despite the fact they never take the time to write to you or let you know otherwise.

My wife and I follow with keen interest your actions through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers. We hope that your resolution to bar personnel under the Reserve program from being assigned to military units that enforced segregation of race, will prevail.

We hope that someday the "lily white" clique in the United States postal inspection service will be broken down. When we apply for admission the excuse is somewhat like the one used in New York City some years ago when Negroes applied for positions on the subways as motormen and conductors—"he cannot qualify—he has not had the necessary experience, etc." It is well known to you that once given the opportunity we can and do succeed in almost any field.

We believe that at least two of your colleagues—Representatives DOLLINGER of New York and HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey can be counted on where the rights of minorities are jeopardized.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL T. SIMMONS.

SHELBYVILLE, TENN., *May 30, 1955.*

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just finished reading Drew Pearson's accounts of the drubbing you gave Congressman CARL VINSON of Georgia, on the universal military service or Reserve Act, and your brilliant defense of United States racial relations at the Bandung conference, and as a white southerner, and a Democrat, I wish to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart, and to tell you if I were financially able I would come all the way to Washington to shake your hand and tell you I am proud of you and that I would be happy to be your friend.

From some of the things Pearson quoted you as saying, you are evidently richly endowed with good common horse sense. This you do not get from a college or university, only from God Almighty, and it is indeed refreshing to see you use this God-given gift so well.

Contrary to what some of your northern brethren think, there is no spot on earth where there is more natural love and affection between the races than in the South. And let me tell you that the way you have been conducting yourself in Congress does more to elevate your race in the eyes of the South than any amount of associations or delegations with high-sounding names. And I am happy to tell you that in the South, to some extent, the Negro race is lifting itself, so to speak, by its own bootstraps, in that they are taking excellent advantage of their educational opportunities and, by becoming better educated, have acquired a better understanding of the problems between the races, their causes, and the rank and file are endeavoring to solve our problems in the American way by using commonsense, Christian fellowship, and a sincere desire to succeed, and I am certainly proud of the progress we have and are making, and again to you I say, I am certainly proud of the contribution you are and have been making to this cause; in the service you are rendering to and for your people and the Nation, and I consider it a privilege to say if I may, I am, I hope, and can remain, your sincere friend, and it is my honest, earnest, sincere prayer that you will continue to so conduct yourself, that you will ever be a credit and inspiration to your race and Nation, this America, we took by force from the "reds," and made great by oppression, of the blacks, must no more be black or white but Americans. For if we allow ourselves to be duped and divided by communism, we deserve to be destroyed. Hoping someday to have the honor of your personal acquaintence, I am,

Your sincerely,

T. W. NOBLITT.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *May 29, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: It was my singular good fortune to recently note a report by Drew Pearson appearing in one of our westcoast dailies wherein he gave an account of your House debate with Representative CARL

Vinson. I understand that the House applauded you as a body; I want you to know that Negro America applauds you also.

Those of us who stand on the sidelines know the tremendous responsibility which you take upon your shoulders; the weight of 16 million must seem an awful burden at times. But it is with unhidden pride and deep admiration that we view your achievements.

Anxiously, all of us are awaiting the completion of the superhighway to the city called equality. Those of you who have been, and still continue to be, the workmen, must be commended for the quality of your work, the expertness with which you have performed your tasks and, above all, that never-say-die determination.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Powell, first, for being a man; secondly, for going to Congress; and, thirdly, for being a Negro.

With sincere hope for continued success, I remain,

Yours truly,

Richard E. Ranger.

Wadsworth, Ohio, *June 10, 1955.*

Hon. Mr. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We profoundly appreciate your standing out against the attempt to push the compulsory Reserve program through the House. The stalling against the antisegregation feature on the part of the southern militarists, who would like to persuade us that permanent peacetime conscription in these various and sometimes disguised forms is really a necessity, gives it away how flimsy this bill is when it comes to actual defense or emergency.

We are glad you have had this opportunity to show the public that this measure is dangerous and unnecessary and we encourage you to stand against all pressures to be stampeded into such an un-American system. You are doing our country and future generations a real service in the maintenance of our democratic freedoms and procedures.

Respectfully yours,

Leonard and Rachel Kreider.

Claremont, Calif., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to congratulate you upon introducing the amendment to H. R. 5297, the compulsory Reserve bill.

I wish to urge you to do all in your power to defeat this bill and all similar bills.

I consider this bill a UMT bill by another name, and I do not believe it is essential to national defense.

Respectfully,

Cornelia Underwood.

Woolman House,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 8, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I am extremely grateful for the shelving of H. R. 5297. Thank you for your fine stand against segregation. Please continue to oppose any and all Reserve plans if and when this or a substitute bill is presented. We do not want our youth trained in a pattern of life that takes military control for granted, or subjected to the idea that military service is synonymous with patriotism and that only military methods can deal with serious international conflict. Disarmament and a swing away from militarism are essential if our world is to be saved from a holocaust of war and moral and spiritual values are to be preserved.

Sincerely,

Margaret T. Simkin
Mrs. Robert L. Simkin.

New York, N. Y., *May 19, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative: Let me thank you for your wonderful stand against racial segregation in our National Guard units.

We should have no Reserves at all if we cannot have them the true democratic way. Your actions will surely be applauded by real Americans regardless of their race, creed or color.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

Ronald Schwartz.

Meadville, Pa., *May 22, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: This is to thank you for sponsoring desegregation in connection with H. R. 5297.

My appreciation also for your services to the country at the Bandung Conference.

Sincerely yours,

Jens P. H. Jensen,
Research Director, Keystone View Co.

Headquarters, 928th Engineer,
Aviation Group,
New York, N. Y., May 24, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I would like to express my sincere appreciation for your vigorous and democratic fight with reference to the military Reserve bill now before the Congress.

The expressed interest you have shown by the introduction of an amendment to the bill outlawing racial segregation in all Reserve and National Guard units is outstanding.

As a veteran of more than 15 years active service including service in two wars, hail your bold and determined efforts as an asset to the cause we are serving, and I want you to know that we who are serving in our many outposts for the protection of our democratic way of life, do appreciate the great efforts you are undertaking back home from the floors of our Congress.

Enclosed herewith, is a release from the Army Stars and Stripes, of an extract of your speech in the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C., on May 20, 1955.

Sincerely,

Lucius L. Eaton,
SFC., United States Army.

[From the Stars and Stripes of May 21, 1955]

DISPUTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS SHELVES RESERVE BILL

Washington, May 20.—The House yesterday dealt a possible deathblow to President Eisenhower's military Reserve program. It postponed indefinitely further action because of a civil-rights dispute.

After 3 days of discussion, Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, in charge of the bill, asked the House, in effect, to lay the measure aside.

His request was approved by a 161–124 vote. This meant the legislation could be called up again at any time. However, it appeared unlikely the House would consider the program again this year unless a compromise was worked out in advance.

Whether a compromise could be reached that would satisfy southern Democrats and pro-civil-rights members was highly problematical. Representative Overton Brooks, Democrat, of Louisiana, the bill's sponsor, said an effort would be made.

The bill came to an inglorious end, at least for the time being, despite a plea by the President only Wednesday that it be enacted. He has been quoted in the House as having stated the program was "dear to my heart."

The program is designed to establish a trained, organized Reserve of 2,900,000 ground troops. At present, there are about 700,000 effective Army reserves. Youths of 17 and 18 would be permitted to enlist for 6 months' training, followed by 7½ years in the Reserve.

The civil-rights dispute was over a provision which would bar the assignment of Reserve personnel to National Guard units which practice racial segregation.

This provision, an amendment sponsored by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat, of New York, was tentatively tacked onto the bill yesterday by a vote of 126–87. Today the House defeated, 167–143, a motion by Vinson to knock this provision out of the bill.

At his news conference Wednesday, Mr. Eisenhower delivered a strong plea for congressional passage of the Reserve program. He said it may not be perfect, but any mistakes can be rectified as experience dictates.

Under the proposed legislation, a governor can request the assignment of Reserve personnel to his State's National Guard unit.

Powell said there are now 27 States which either have separate white and Negro divisions or do not permit Negroes in the National Guard.

Before the vote to shelve the measure, Powell, 1 of the 3 Negro House Members, said White House aids had been in touch with him, UP reported.

He indicated they tried to persuade him to withdraw his controversial antisegregation amendment.

But Powell said his own amendment, if enacted, would strike a blow for freedom that would be heard by enslaved peoples around the world.

Powell's speech was received with a burst of applause from both sides of the aisle that divides the two parties.

Powell said American Negroes have fought and died for their country in Jim Crow military units since Revolutionary War days and "their patriotism has never been questioned."

Davidson, Okla., *May 21, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell.

Dear Sir: I'm not for the H. R. 2967 law that you folks plan to vote on. On this coming Thursday. Please do vote "no." Its a very cunningly devised trap. I thank God for your delay of the bill. Then I can write my Representative and Senator.

We don't even need the draft. We ought let it all die. We don't need to have huge armies.

I'm the mother of a 14-year-old boy and I don't want 10 years of his life wasted or given to the Army. It's all right for the President to be a soldier all his life. But it's not right to force all our boys from now on into the Army.

Our country will go down with all the expenses of a huge Army, and all the other parts of the world.

Lets have the Bricker amendment, lets curb our President's powers so we wont be sold down the river to the United Nations.

Let's get out of the United Nations. Let's not renew the United Nations Charter. Let's not have anything to do with it. Let's not extend or amend or have anything to do with it. Let's protest old Molotov coming to San Francisco. Please I pray. Why don't you pray about all I've written to you and you will feel as I do.

I'm a white woman from the South. We like our peace in the South. And you people who represent the people should do so. And not listen to the lobbyists of the country.

Thanks so much for reading my letter, hope you can please see it my way.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Walter Withrow,
Davidson, Okla.

P. S.—I'm a Baptist, not something under cover.

Berea College,
Department of Sociology,
Berea, Ky., May 23, 1955.

Dear Representative Powell: I am glad that your effort to have segregation banned in National Guard assignments was sustained by the House last week.

On grounds only of civil rights this was a desirable amendment. The Federal Government must be continually kept from giving support to segregation.

As one who has vigorously opposed such military legislation as was involved in H. R. 5297, I was glad to see its passage blocked. I certainly hope it can be permanently shelved.

Yours sincerely,

Roscoe Giffin,
Professor of Sociology.

Pulaski, N. Y., *June 5, 1955.*

Mr. Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: I wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which would end racial segregation in the National Guard in several States. The southern militarists would not have sidetracked this bill if it was really essential just over this one amendment. May I ask your support in defeating the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5397.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Fred White.

Heigh-Ho Lodge,
Cresco, Pa., June 3, 1955.

Representative A. C. Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: Thanks from a parent who values the life of his sons for your amendment to H. R. 5297 (compulsory Reserve bill), which evidently turned out to be all-important in its present shelving.

Most important to many people will be the proof-positive, that this form of Prussian militarism demanding 8 years of every able-bodied young man was totally unnecessary. I have known this right along, since the Air Force, Navy, and Marines will take the front in any future war and they all meet quotas by volunteering—the all-American way.

I hope you will not let down in your efforts to see fairness done all around—Negroes, whites—or freedom of choice when it comes to military servitude in a land where the powers for war are already full to overflowing with men who chose to so train.

Yours for health, truth, and a free America.

Paul Brenn.

Glen Ellyn, Ill., *June 5, 1955.*

Hon. Representative Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: My wife and I take this opportunity to congratulate you for introducing the amendment to end racial segregation in the National Guard, thereby preventing the passage of the national Reserve plan.

The national Reserve plan is nothing more than universal military training in disguise. It was given this new name in the hope it would be more placating and palatable to our citizens.

What is the reason for a compulsory Reserve of 2,900,000 men when we have had, for some years, a volunteer Reserve of 2,500,000? Why should we give the Army a compulsory Reserve when the Army has consistently refused to properly train and equip its volunteer Reserve?

And furthermore, why should we establish the first compulsory Reserve in our history when the Naval Reserve, Air Force Association, and National Guard have all asked for a voluntary system?

We hope and pray, Representative Powell, that you will continue to press for the end of racial segregation in the Armed Forces, Regulars, and Reserves alike. The only way to put an end to this evil practice is to bring it out into the open and expose it for what it really is: an immoral and unethical practice.

With every kind wish, I am always,

Yours in friendship,

Joseph A. Prachar.

Granville, Ohio, *June 5, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations are due to you on two scores: First, that you introduced an amendment to H. R. 5297 that would end racial segregation in the National Guard. It is high time that racial segregation is ended everywhere, but especially in our services and the schools. Second, that your proposed amendment helped to shelve H. R. 5297. I hope it stays on the shelf. I do not approve of using compulsion for military purposes, except in emergencies. I believe our manpower for defense can be and should be raised by voluntary means.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Esther W. Josif.

Evansville, Ind., *June 4, 1955.*

Dear Sir: Thank you for your attendance and influence at the Bandung Conference. Also, I appreciate your interest in the military Reserve training. While I am opposed to any form of UMT, I congratulate you on your insistence upon nonsegregation.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) Gertrude R. Kerr.

May 29, 1955.

From the NAACP, San Pedro and Wilmington Branch.

Dear Sir: The San Pedro and Wilmington branch as a whole ask your loyal support in trying to keep the amendment in H. R. 5297.

Very sincerely,

Ranie A. Lewis,
President.
Robert Chaytor,
Secretary.

Pompano Beach, Fla., *May 38, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I have read with deep admiration parts of your debate with Congressman Vinson on the Universal Military Training Act, as delivered on the House floor. The report I read was only a partial one as given in Drew Pearson's column.

I would appreciate having a copy of the full text of your remarks in this connection.

Would you have any other material relating to the race problem that might be helpful to me in writing a book on the subject? If so, would you be willing to send it to the undersigned at the above address?

Could you suggest any organizations dealing with this problem which would be able to furnish me with additional resource material?

Deeply in your debt, I am,

Very sincerely,

William N. Elliott.

Seneca, Kans., *June 4, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We certainly appreciate your introducing the amendment which prevented passage of H. R. 5297 in the House. Its being shelved because of the question of racial segregation alone, proves that even the militarists know H. R. 5297 is not necessary for our national defense.

Thanking you.

Mrs. F. B. Roots.

Kalamazoo, Mich., *June 8, 1955.*

My Dear Mr. Powell: I had thought that the bill, H. R. 5297, was defeated in the House.

At least, thanks for your reasonable amendment, it was shelved for a while.

Now, our daily paper tells us that Mr. Eisenhower is still pressing for passage of this (or a) Reserve bill. I urge you to do all you can to defeat any legislation that will in any way increase the power of the military in our Government.

We have too much control by military-minded men as it is already.

Sincerely yours,

J. Howard Bowman.

Bluffton, Ohio, *May 10, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: We are thankful to you for your part in preventing the passage of H. R. 5297 by introducing the racial segregation amendment. I hope it will not be brought up too soon again. Surely it was not too vital to national defense if such an amendment could stall it.

We are thankful for such men who realize sinister and far-reaching consequences of such a bill. It would also add to the military control and to the wasteful spending that the military are noted for.

The Air Force and the Navy will continue to rely on volunteers. A professional army of volunteers would be more efficient than a conscript army or reserve. We must insist that the military give volunteer army and reserve a fair chance to work out and not insist on conscription whether needed or not.

By defeating H. R. 5297 we will be in effect helping the President to procure the peace that he wants. Peace can not be brought about by military methods. It will be a detriment to the peaceful coexistence of the Nations.

You have our wholeheartd support in opposing any such measures.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Gordon Bixel.

Evansville, Ind., *June 19, 1955.*

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I would like to express to you my approval of the stand you took on the UMT bill, H. R. 5297, and my thankfulness that this bill has now been shelved. I'm praying that it will not be brought up again in any form. To my way of thinking, for our country to adopt such a policy would be a great tragedy. Such a policy has never benefited a nation, and has undoubtedly contributed to the run of several.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Helen B. Woods.

Mocksville, N. C., *June 10, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Thank you for attending the Bandung Conference and for your subsequent report to the President.

Also, congratulations on your insistence on racial equality in the Armed Forces, although we in this household cannot approve of militarism, and hope that the President's National Reserves program—or UMT by whatsoever name—will, in the interests of American freedom and world peace, be roundly defeated.

There is no excuse, even militarily, for conscript hordes in this H-bomb era. Their existence requires, for its justification, the maintenance of hostility instead of the seeking of peace (which is well nigh impossible under such circumstances); they are, therefore, dangerous, provocative, and useless.

In our internal affairs the proposed military program would, of course, spell fascism. Neither the draft nor UMT has any meaning in this H-bomb era; conscript armies became obsolete as far back as Hiroshima, as General Fuller (I believe) then pointed out.

Let us use our resources for life, not death, thus, incidentally, choosing the only road to safety.

And let us have a brotherhood of racial equality of life, not of murder. Race prejudices and war are twin evils and as closely related as twins.

My husband and family join me in thanking you and in sending you our hopes for peace and brotherhood, both here and the world over.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY D. BUSIEK.

Just how important and vital the Reserves program is for our defense was demonstrated when Mr. VINSON dropped it (for the time being, anyhow) rather than allow racial equality.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 9, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to congratulate you upon helping to defeat bill H. R. 5297.

This country needs an effective defense but not one that puts the country into the hands of the militarists.

Sincerely yours,
GLENN FLINN.

PHILADELPHIA, *June 10, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: May I thank you and congratulate you on your amendment to H. R. 5297 which prevented the vote. You have really put the spotlight on the question of how much we mean when we talk of no segregation in the Armed Forces. And in addition, you have proved that this UMT bill is not essential to national defense (or VINSON would not have sidetracked it), but is fundamentally a plan of the Pentagon to increase its control over American life. I hope you will continue your opposition to any such bill in all its features.

Sincerely yours,
EMILY C. JOHNSON.

FELLOWSHIP CHURCH,
San Francisco, Calif., June 11, 1955.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: We strongly urge that you not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

This is relevant to the morale of our Armed Forces.

Respectfully yours,
DRYDEN L. PHELPS, *Minister.*

MORGAN HILL, CALIF., *June 9, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives Office Building
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: We heartily congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented the passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, No. 5297.

We fully agree that racial segregation must be ended and also that our Government must work more consistently for peace and disarmament instead of placing so much emphasis on militarism.

May your opposition forces stand firm and keep this bill, which is so contrary to the real American tradition, from passing.

Sincerely yours,
A. W. BILLING,
MABEL S. BILLING.

ALBION COLLEGE,
Albion, Mich., June 10, 1955.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Congratulations on your courageous attack on the President's Reserve plan.

I thought you might be interested in the letter which I am sending to President Eisenhower. Enclosed find a carbon copy.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR W. MUNK, PH. D.,
Associate Professor of Philosophy.

JUNE 10, 1955.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Your new endeavor to force a sugar-coated UMT program on the American people is most unfortunate for three reasons: (1) it will lead toward the prussianization of America; (2) it will promote racial discrimination; and (3) it will convince the rest of the world that we are warlike. In a time like this when even the Russians are making peace gestures which may be sincere, we cannot afford to give this kind of impression.

As a churchman you undoubtedly are aware of the fact that most church groups are strongly opposed to your Reserve program; and as an educator you must also be aware of the opposition of many of our most thoughtful educators.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR W. MUNK, PH. D.

BARROW CO.,
Austin, Tex., June 9, 1955.

Mr. ADAM C. POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I am happy that H. R. 5297 has been tabled because of your amendment to end segregation. I feel that your amendment was a good one—though I am heartily against the bill, as it seems to be a dishonest and un-American attempt to foist UMT on us, and especially our young men.

Sincerely yours,
ETHEL G. BARROW.

MADISON, WIS., *June 10, 1955.*

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been very much interested in your opposition to the Reserve bill on the grounds of segregation. I hope that you will continue to oppose all bills which directly or indirectly recognize segregation.

I hope that you will come also to the point of opposing compulsory military training on principle. To my mind, compulsory armies are bad both from a democratic and a military point of view because of the enforced regimentation of thinking and acting upon young men at a formative age. The stultifying influence may in the end make us weaker rather than stronger.

I trust that you will not weaken in your opposition to the bills.

Sincerely yours,
ANNA MAE DAVIS.

ROLETTE, N. DAK., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: You really stopped a flood of iniquity with your amendment to end racial segregation in the compulsory UMT Reserve bill legislation. This amendment really prevented the nefarious H. R. 5297 bill from becoming law. I most heartily commend and thank you for stopping this Niagara of liberty and peace destroying flood, which had its source in the Pentagon labyrinth. Thank you.

If the militarists think they have any chance to pass this compulsory UMT Reserve bill they will try again. Please fight this bill again with all the strength and ability which God has so richly given to you.

This proposed legislation is compulsory and whoever says it is not, is either incapable of understanding what is in the bill, or false and deceitful.

Let racial segregation be abolished and let the American way with liberty and personal dignity be revived.

We must be eternally vigilant and alert. We must not let the militarists steal our liberty to make more jobs and more power to military officers.

Let the spirit of Daniel Webster sway the minds and the hearts of all Members of Congress—let Webster's penetrating searchlight be focused on our beloved Constitution and may all who care to see, learn that all compulsory military conscription laws are, and should be unconstitutional.

Sincerely,
ALFRED THOMPSON.

THE WORRY CLINIC

(By George W. Crane)

Uncle Sam has undermined the authority of all parents of teen-agers, as well as their schoolteachers. That is the chief underlying cause of the rising juvenile delinquency and vandalism nowadays. It is also unfair to the Army and Navy to continue 14 years of the draft.

Case L–345: Clark J., 31, is a popular clergyman.

"Dr. Crane, why are vandalism and juvenile delinquency so pronounced nowadays?" he inquired at a ministerial meeting I recently addressed.

"Actually, statistics show that more people are members of churches today than ever before, and the percentages are rising steadily.

"So what is the underlying cause? Is it the long-drawn-out period of war? We clergymen would like to have your opinion as a practical psychologist."

TEEN-AGE UNREST

There are several causes underlying delinquency, but Clark has put his finger on a major one when he mentions the war.

If you adult readers are not in close touch with teen-agers, you may fail to realize the mental turmoil in which the boys find themselves.

F. D. Roosevelt started drafting American youth in October, 1940, and we have had the threat of draft over the heads of all young males ever since.

Please remember, too, that the draft is in its 14th year. Never in our entire previous history have American boys been under such a prolonged sword of Damocles.

Even the Revolutionary War lasted but 8 years. The Civil War ran for 4, and World War I was a 2-year affair.

This continual 14-year threat of being jerked out of school or from a good job by an omnipotent Uncle Sam and thrust into a fox-hole in some foreign land is very bad for youth.

UNCLE SAM VERSUS PARENTS

For the teen-ager begins to realize, even before he is well launched into high school, that Uncle Sam's power transcends that of dad and mother. Thus, the boy begins to disregard his parents' authority prematurely.

For he knows they are powerless over him, or at least soon will be.

By the same token, when Uncle Sam's power is flaunted above that of his high-school teachers and vocational advisers, then the influence of those same teachers also becomes less.

I am not generalizing, for I've had tens of thousands of letters from young people about this matter. And I have personally counseled with hundreds of high schoolers and college men.

The young men nowadays can't make plans for the future, for they don't know when Washington, D. C., may change their draft status.

Employers will not hire them, either, when they learn they are subject to induction at any moment.

Even those in college begin to fall in their grades, because of their uncertainty over the future.

Others drop out of college, even in their senior year, because they can't take this continual threat which prevents their making any serious plans even 6 months ahead.

ATTENTION, CONGRESS

One of the quickest ways to lower vandalism and juvenile delinquency will be for our Congress to terminate the draft and get our military forces back on a voluntary enlistment basis.

Military training can be made an attractive career if it is "sold" properly, as per our American business methods.

But to let the draft drag on into its 14th year simply demoralizes youth, promotes delinquency and mental breakdowns (ask any psychiatrist), and creates further distaste for the Army and Navy and Air Corps.

For "compulsion" arouses animosity, and it is really unfair to the military forces for them to be incurring the growing ill will because of "forced labor," even under the guise of military defense.

Compulsion is necessary in time of active war, but it becomes a grave psychological danger in peace time.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 9, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: This is to express my satisfaction in your amendment to H. R. 5297. Not only has it revealed that human equality is an "extraneous" matter in the eyes of the President, relatively speaking, but it also shows that the arch-militarists in Congress are even more arch-inequality. Keep up the good fight.

Very truly yours,
(Miss.) EDITH J. COGGINS.

PENN YAN, N. Y., *June 5, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM POWELL.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for introducing the amendment ending segregation in the National Guard in 27 States, into the compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. I most sincerely hope this bill (the conscription section) will not pass as I believe it to be un-Christian and un-American.

Sincerely,
MONA G. BARRUS.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON
CIVIL RIGHTS,
NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 13, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADAM: I thought that you would be interested and possibly find some use for the enclosed release. I think it is somewhat ironical, in view of the President's remarks, that the Pentagon is trying to attach the military Reserve bill to the Selective Service Act—as a rider.

Best personal regards.

Cordially,
ARNOLD ARONSON, *Secretary.*

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1955.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I have enclosed herewith a blind copy of my letter to President Eisenhower for your information. I sincerely hope that you will continue your efforts to have integration in the Reserve in the South.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. THOMPSON.

APOLLO, PA., *June 12, 1955.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

Hello. We have heard the President is asking revival of the compulsory Reserve bill.

We hope you will not compromise on this segregation in National Guard units.

If our Nation's security is so much in jeopardy anyone should do what is necessary even if he must work or fight alongside another whose color may not be the same shade as his own.

A lot of this scare stuff will not stand the light of day.

I thank you.

H. CLAIR GEORGE.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 12, 1955.*

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I urge you not to accept any compromise that would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard or Reserve units where there is any segregation.

If we renounce democracy to fight communism, what have we gained? Stick to your guns.

Respectfully yours,
SUZANNE REICHARD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 13, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read press reports of attempts by President Eisenhower and others to dissuade you from pressing for the inclusion of your antisegregation amendment to the manpower Reserve bill in the House of Representatives.

I applaud your refusal to yield this point. Is segregation so sweet or Jim Crowism so dear as to be purchased at the price of military preparedness. This is the issue, I think, Congress must decide.

Very truly yours,
GWENDOLYN YOUNG.

TROY, N. Y., *June 12, 1955.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: May I thank you sincerely for the amendment which you proposed to H. R. 5297?

I am a public teacher of nonsegregated—thank God—teenagers. I know I should not be comfortable earning my living anywhere where segregation is practiced.

In addition, I am opposed to any form of military compulsion. My ancestors came from Germany and though I teach their language, I draw the line at any hint of militarism.

So I have double reason to rejoice in the defeat, if only temporary, of this bill.

Very truly yours,
HELEN OTT.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 13, 1955.*

Representative A. CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some good things come from New York and you are one of the best. Not that you are a thing, however.

I want to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really presented the passage of horrible H. R. 5297. Certainly your amendment proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of your one amendment.

How I wish that this bill would be shelved permanently. It is utterly ridiculous in so many ways.

I cannot understand Eisenhower's position. How can he be so strongly in favor of this bill and yet come out for the kind of peace and disarmament program which he says he wants. The two just don't go hand in hand. It reminds me of the Bible passage: "No man can serve two masters."

Have you seen a copy of the Quaker booklet "Speak Truth to Power." There is so much insanity among the militarists. Please help to clear the air and gather the sense of the people you are trying to lead. We want peace and not in sheep's clothing of huge military preparedness and every 16-year-old militarized and desensitized that killing is "the thing."

Sincerely yours,
DOROTHY TROUTMAN.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 11, 1955.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let me be among the many to congratulate you on your amendment to end racial segregation in the National Guard. I am a white but I belong to some organizations that are working toward the end of segregation.

I also wish to say thanks, because your amendment obviously caused the House to temporarily sidetrack H. R. 5297, which I consider against the best interests of the United States of America, the peace of the world and also everyone involved, unless it's the beer and armament makers. We have always superior soldiers in America, because they went of their own volition, instead of being forced to go. Also the guns that we buy today are obsolete tomorrow, so we throw them away and buy some new ones.

Against the guided missiles and H-bombs, foot soldiers, 1 million or 1 hundred times that many, would be useless and the costs are staggering to contemplate.

Gratefully,
HOMER C. NOCE.

PARIS, FRANCE, *June 7, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: This letter is to urge you to fight, as strongly as is within your means, any cut in the appropriations for USIA in Europe. My last letter, unintentionally, of course, as I have no connection with USIA, or obligation to it personally, was to point out to you the fine job they are doing for the people of the United States here in Europe on such pitifully insufficient funds.

Any further cuts could have terrible effects here. Many long, hard, sometimes disappointing, hours are spent by a few thousand devoted Americans to build a reputation for the United States as having a cultural level worthy of respect.

Thank you for your deep interest in me, and I hope you find also interesting my observations from here in the middle of the scene.

Yours sincerely,
GREGORY SIMMS.

Walcott Memorial
Presbyterian Church,
New York Mills, N. Y., June 9, 1955.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
United States Representative from New York, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: This is a note to commend and thank you for introducing the amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill, that would have ended racial segregation in the National Guard. I hope that if the bill is brought in again, as the President wishes, the same provision will be attached to it. Certainly, if the southern Representatives believed that the security of the Nation required the adoption of such a law as this Reserve bill provides, they would not allow the matter of ending segregation in the services to stand in the way of its adoption.

I have long been an admirer of yours, and am glad that you were able in an unofficial capacity to represent our country at the recent Bandung Conference of the Asian and African peoples.

Very sincerely,
Howard Worthen Wylie.

Hamden, Conn., *June 9, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: You are to be congratulated on your amendment to the Reserve training bill to eliminate racial segregation in the Reserves. In view of the Supreme Court's decision in regard to segregation in education, it would certainly seem that it should be eliminated everywhere.

We can be faced with no emergency so great at the present time that would warrant sidestepping this issue. If the bill is debated, I hope your amendment stands.

Yours truly,
Orpah S. Blazier.

Chicago, Ill., *June 11, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Please use your influence to prevent any compromise on your amendment on segregation.

This Reserve bill is a phony anyway. It is UMT in disguise. It doesn't give us defense, but military control of our youth by the Pentagon.

Keep up the good fight.

Yours very truly,
Erling H. Lunde.

Grace Cathedral,
Topeka, Kans., June 6, 1955.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Let me congratulate you upon introducing the amendment that prevented the passage of the compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. It is quite obvious that in the minds of southern militarists like Mr. Vinson this bill is not essential to national defense. If they had thought it was essential to national defense they would not have sidetracked it because of your amendment.

I greatly appreciate your wisdom and political insight.

With every good wish, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
John Warren Day,
Dean, Grace Cathedral.

Heigh-Ho Lodge,
Cresco, Pa., June 10, 1955.
Re H. R. 5297, compulsory Reserve bill.
Representative A. C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: Please know that all free-thinking Americans are behind you to stand firm and accept no compromise on the segregation matter as regards National Guard.

You will be doing the Nation as a whole, a double service in a badly needed lesson in personal freedoms. In the first place if we ask a man to fight, he deserves equal status across the board. In the second place no one should be compelled to serve against his will and this bill is loaded with compulsion.

Compulsion is not freedom and we should fight it. Godspeed and good success in your stand. If there is anything I can do to help, please let me know.

Yours for health, truth (which is freedom from the monopoly of medicine).

Paul Brenn.

Columbia University,
in the City of New York,
New York, N. Y., June 9, 1955.
Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I want to commend you for your stand against segregation in the proposed defense and Reserve legislation. You have been most helpful also in averting this measure which might mean an entering wedge for universal military training and further militarization of our country. Please do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

Faithfully yours,
Isidor B. Hoffman.

Rochester, N. Y., *June 8, 1955.*
Re UMT.
Hon. Clayton Powell,
United States Representative,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: Congratulations on your continued fight against universal military training. Keep it up.

Very truly yours,
Lester H. Rappaport.

First Church of the Brethren,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 8, 1955.
Hon. Adam Powell, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: We want to congratulate you for your introducing the amendment to shelve racial segregation in the National Guard which was added to the UMT Ready Reserve bill. We are in opposition to racial segregation and the UMT bill itself and are happy that your good amendment helped to kill a bad bill.

Cordially yours,
Robert and Myrna Gemmer.

Morris, N. Y., *June 6, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: This is a short note to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which prevented the passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

This amendment exposed the bill for what it really is; namely, an instrument to give the militarists a stronger grip on our country rather than a means of national defense. Or if it were a means of defense, it exposed the southern militarists as giving higher priority to their own immature hatred of the Negroes than to the safety and protection of their own country and thereby being unfit for the high office that they hold as Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Congratulations. Millions of people are backing you up. Do not retreat from your stand.

Yours truly,
Leigh H. Barrus.

June 10, 1955.

Dear Mr. Powell: Though I'm from California (not your State) I'm moved to congratulate you on the splendid work you are doing in your attempts and efforts to end segregation in all components of our military.

Presently, I am in the Armed Forces, the Army. The military is doing well with the lack of segregation. However, the civilian population is socially behind (in time) the military. In Baltimore I was more than once discouraged by the local refusal of places of entertainment, etc., to treat our servicemen like fellow citizens in good standing. This was specially disagreeable since one of my friends was a colored boy from San Bernardino, Calif.

It would not be out of step with our professed democratic ideals to introduce a bill prohibiting refusal of service to anybody in uniform. After all, these boys are serving the country.

At least, further demands for personal rights might encourage those opposed to your present proposals to your present demands and still point out to their folks (southern or otherwise) that more drastic measures were defeated.

Sincerely,
Cruz Reynoso,
Washington, D. C., and Whittier, Calif.

Belleville, Ill., *June 3, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I want to thank you for the amendment which defeated H. R. 5297. The people who do not oppose segregation have showed us they do not value this defense measure very highly if they would see it defeated on these grounds. I don't think our country deserves to be defended on a policy of segregation. It is high time in this troubled world to be sure we are on the side of what is right and fair to everyone and trust God somewhat to help us defend that right rather than doing what seems most expedient in the minds of selfish people. This time you were in the right, and the measure which was defeated must have been wrong. Thank you.

Yours very truly,
Elsie Swarm.

Charleston, S. C., *June 8, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I want to express my personal thanks to you for introducing the amendment which prevented passage of 5297 on its previous consideration on the floor of the House. Although I am largely opposed to the bill itself, I also think that segregation, racial or otherwise, is un-Christian; and I admire your courage in backing that stand.

To me, as to others I have talked with, the fact that this amendment sidetracked the bill for the time being proves that it is not essential even in the minds of such men as Representative Vinson.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,
David M. Hadley.

First Methodist Church,
Redding, Calif., June 9, 1955.

Dear Mr. Powell: Congratulations to you on your courageous, American, and Christian amendment to H. R. 5297. The people of this Nation, and all peace-loving citizens, are with you in great majority, I am confident.

I feel that this bill is not essential to the national defense, is un-American in its compulsory aspects, and should be defeated.

If it is to be enacted, you are perfectly right that one of the changes must be the end of racial segregation in the National Guard.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Rev. Ernest J. Troutner.

Rayne Memorial Methodist Church,
New Orleans, La., June 10, 1955.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: May I take a brief moment of your time to send my sincerest congratulations to you for introducing the amendment to end segregation in the National Guard in 27 States. It is an indication that the southerners do not believe that military preparedness is the most important thing for our Nation.

I hope that the bill will stay shelved and will not be brought up again. Many people have been misled into thinking that the bill, H. R. 5297, was a voluntary bill. Thank you for your alertness in representing those of us who do not want to see militarism settled on the American people.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

George W. Pool III.

Marin Junior College,
Kentfield, Calif., June 9, 1955.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations on the intelligent manner in which you opposed H. R. 5297.

I am of the opinion that we need to be prepared for any situation that may develop, but H. R. 5297 is not the way to do it.

Sincerely,

Ward H. Austin.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *June 11, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: In your efforts as a Representative of the people of Manhattan, you are doing a creditable job. I appreciate your efforts in combating segregation. The rider that you attached to the Reserve bill was quite timely. However, I do not hold your principle of not assigning troops of Negro extraction to bias Reserve units.

If we are going to win complete liberty we must do so in the area in which antisegregation is practiced. The history of our people is one of struggle and sacrifice. Therefore, let us continue the fight for equality, but based upon love and sacrifice. May God give you the grace to execute your office, as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

A. F. Thomas, Jr.

Modesto, Calif., *June 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I know little of you except that you are apparently a sincere Negro. Your amendment to end segregation in the National Guard was a worthy idea. Let me say I hope you will always, as a fair man, be able to stand for equal rights for all men.

The fact that a militarist like Vinson feels that segregation is more important than the bill indicates to me that the bill is not essential to national defense. I hope that you will oppose the compulsory reserve bill, H. R. 5297, both for racial inequities and other injustices, such as veterans of 2 years' training having to come back for periods of 45 days each year.

Sincerely,

John Downing.

White Plains, N. Y., *June 9, 1955.*
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am exceedingly gratified at the success of your recent motion in the House so to amend the UMT and Reserve legislation as to forbid racial segregation in any of the groups affected by that legislation.

You have thus helped us to take one more step forward in our efforts to erase the disgrace of racial segregation from our body politic, and to establish official recognition of the equality of all human beings regardless of race or color. It is especially gratifying that one of your race was able to take the initiative in this matter, and that so many of our white brethren joined forces with you. A long struggle lies before you, and I wish you all strength of body, mind, and spirit to carry it forward.

I also rejoice in your success because it places another barrier in the way of the proposed UMT and compulsory Reserve legislation. I do not know your personal attitude on this matter. The problems it poses are many, complex, and baffling. But I am definitely and strongly opposed to it. War, a big military buildup, preparedness for war, especially modern all-out war, will not protect our country nor will it bring in or maintain peace, as I see it. Our enemy will build up his own forces, defensively, as we do, just as much as we do. It is like two huge giants bullying each other, until something trips them up and they crash together into world war III, especially as there are so many persons on each side who constantly make remarks that arouse fear, hate, defiance, and hostility, in the Government, the Armed Forces, Congress, the politicians, even the church, on radio, and in the press, even in the commercial advertising. This UMT legislation would give each successive generation of our young men intensive training, practice, and indoctrination in the belief that military power works for peace, which I believe is not true. On the other hand, it weakens the efforts of those who believe, as I do, that sincere peaceful negotiations of disputes, efforts to understand and get along with our adversaries, efforts to remove causes of war, hate, friction (like the arms race), and not, least of all, the efforts to relieve the miseries and needs and discontent of the underprivileged 75 percent of the human race, at home here and abroad—it weakens the efforts of those who are trying to bring these things about, and tends to make our young men (and us adults also) regard such people as crackpots and fools and cowards—but the real point is not that people revile them and persecute them and speak all manner of evil against them, falsely, but that the whole human race suffers—for the evil of war is not so much the loss of life and health and essential human resources. It is the terrible disruption of human life, social, moral, spiritual—the family life, especially the lives of little children; the disrupting of the life of the human family; the whole crop of misunderstandings, and lies and hate and ruinous propaganda that is bred—especially that mixture of truth and falseness, of partial truth with half-truth, of straight truth with perverted truth—and, of course, the whole concept of human brotherhood, which, as we are each and all, God's children, can never be broken except in our mistaken thinking.

I hope you will pardon me for breaking loose in this way; but I believe you will understand me. I do feel that somehow we must see and aim at our goal, and press ahead, with wisdom and understanding as God gives us to see the right at any given moment, even though we can not answer all the questions.

Yours for peace and good will among all men everywhere.

Sincerely,

Harwood Hoadley.

The Methodist Board of Temperance,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1955.
Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: This is just a brief note to express to you my appreciation for your keen sense of judgment exhibited in your amendment to the Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

Your continued leadership in fundamental principles involving civil rights will be appreciated by not only your constituents but also a number of citizens at large.

Thank you again.

Sincerely yours,

Donald Kuhn.

Evansville, Ind., *May 30, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I feel quite sure that many people over our country are grateful to you for your efforts to defeat the national Reserve plan. May our Nation never be burdened with such a military program.

I also agree with you that there must be no segregation in our country if we wish to show the world the way to permanent peace. We are regarded as a Christian Nation. We should practice equality before we lose face in the sight of non-Christian nations.

May you continue to receive wisdom and courage to keep on with your good work.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) Ruth L. Stahl.

The Green Door,
House of Gifts and Books,
Rock Hill, S. C., May 30, 1955.
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I congratulate you for introducing the amendment which unmasked the southern militarists. The bill in favor of UMT is evidently not essential to defense in the minds of the southern militarists. I thank you.

Yours sincerely,

J. R. Walker,
Retired Methodist Minister and Teacher.

First Methodist Church
of Los Gatos, Calif,
June 4, 1955.
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Just this note to let you know that many of us out this way are heartened with the postponement of H. R. 5297, not only for the cause you were defending, but because we oppose the bill. We are looking to you and others like you to lead us in a creative attempt for peace, not war.

We believe that America should lead in working through the U. N. organization and in disarmament rather than the extension of armaments.

Let's find another way than war.

Sincerely,

Romain A. Swedenburg.

North Liberty, Ind., *June 7, 1955.*
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Thank you so much for introducing the amendment which really prevented the passage of H. R. 5297. I was glad to read also in the Congressional Record your courageous statements against this un-Christian, undemocratic, and, therefore, un-American bill.

It is ironical that a nation as fine as ours where freedom is our heritage still has racial segregation. I am ashamed this is so. It is also ironical for America to choose the path the pagan nations have chosen. Surely we must be aware that the road can lead to only one end.

May God bless you in your efforts to repel and finally conquer this ugly demon of militarism every time it rears its insidious head. I am confident in the knowledge that right will triumph; we don't know how soon, but it will. All that matters is whether we are on the side helping to usher in this kingdom of love, or whether we are opposing it. What most people are fearing these days is going to be quite inconsequential when the final day comes. If we are working to promote the way of the Prince of Peace, all these other things will fall in line. General MacArthur has come to this conclusion after spending a life of trying militarism.

Thank you again for opposing this bill.

This Nation, under God, has been blessed lavishly. Can we dare refuse to live His laws? I am praying for your guidance in action against this evil bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Robert D. Clark.

Quarryville, Pa., *June 7, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: You have performed a great service to our country in introducing the amendment to H. R. 5297, that has sidetracked this bill. Anything you can do to prevent the enactment of this measure into law will be worth while. This measure is an injustice to the youth of our land in peacetime. It is unnecessary, costly, and un-American. There is no need for us to get into war and we will not if we do not submit to the militarists of our country.

I want you to know I appreciate your good work and I know you have to have courage. May you be given strength and courage to aid further in defeating this compulsory draft measure.

Truly yours,

Howard Reynolds.

First Methodist Church,
Dunkirk, N. Y., June 4, 1955.

The Honorable Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Thank you for introducing the amendment which has delayed, at least temporarily, the passage of compulsory Reserve training.

I sincerely hope this measure will not become legislation and that our American democracy will be able to deal, as it has in the past, with the matter of military training on a voluntary basis except in wartime.

I appreciate your leadership in this crucial matter.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur M. Crawford.

Church of the Brethren,
North Manchester, Ind., June 6, 1955.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Accept my congratulations for introducing the amendment on segregation which prevented passage of H. R. 5297, the compulsory Reserve bill.

It is my hope that this bill has been permanently killed for this session for we see no justification for it whatsoever. It would only serve to further militarize our Nation without giving us any practical help in the way of defense. It is our hope that you will keep up the good work and use your high office to this end.

Very sincerely,

Galen T. Lehman.

Russiaville, Ind., *June 6, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Representative Powell: Am writing to thank you for introducing the amendment which really prevented passing of the bill H. R. 5297.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Mildred Zell.

Lancaster, Pa., *June 7, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: We congratulate you for introducing the amendment which prevented passage of bill H. R. 5297.

Sincerely,

S. E. Yoder, D. O.
(Mrs. S. E.) Helen B. Yoder.

New York, N. Y., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want to tell you how greatly we appreciate your successful efforts which helped so vitally to defeat the compulsory Reserve bill. I am particularly grateful because it seems to me that the defeat of this bill is an important step toward peace and away from the totalitarianism that at times seems to be threatening us. I hear with keen interest your brilliant career in the House.

Respectfully,

Florence M. Wray.

Palmyra, Pa., *June 6, 1955.*

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Too often we write our Congressmen letters of complaint. I am happy to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. Your amendment, which would end racial segregation in the National Guard in 27 States, proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Representative Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment. It was a pleasure writing you.

Yours sincerely,

Raleigh B. Hughes.

Milton, Wis., *June 6, 1955.*

Congressman A. C. Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I am happy indeed to commend you for introducing the amendment barring segregation in connection with H. R. 5297. I am not only opposed to segregation but am equally opposed to any sort of universal military training legislation or the enhancing of the Pentagon vested interests in our country's policies. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Wm. A. Cornell.

Kew Gardens, N. Y., *June 6, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I want to congratulate you for introducing the amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297, which really prevented passage of this bill.

Your amendment proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of the southern militarists like Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of your one amendment.

In opposing this bill by President Eisenhower, the real sponsor, you are supporting the kind of peace and disarmament program which the President says he wants.

Sincerely,

John B. Pettengill.

Newington, Conn., *June 6, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I think the enlightened people of this county—and the whole country, for that matter—owe you a great debt for your introduction of the amendment which brought about the shelving of H. R. 5297; and I wish to express to you my admiration and gratitude.

If militarists like Representative Vinson thought that the passage of the bill were really necessary to our national defense, it seems unlikely that he would have sidetracked it for your amendment.

I hope the bill is permanently shelved; the majority of our people do not, I am sure, realize its full implications and there has been every effort made to hide the case from them. Indeed, I seriously doubt whether President Eisenhower himself has ever had the full opposition arguments presented to him; he is too surrounded by men of military mind to make it possible.

To take this moment when we proclaim to the world our peaceful intentions, to introduce, for the first time, compulsory military training, is fantastically stupid, I think.

Keep up the fight, Mr. Powell; you have a huge backing in the country whether you hear from them all or not.

Yours sincerely,

Marion Brinley.

P. S.—I've read many, many adverse opinions of military authorities themselves.

Trinity Methodist Church,
Des Moines, Iowa, June 6, 1955.

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: You are to be commended for introducing the amendment which prevented passing of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

I am sure that this country does not need, or do the people, generally, desire a compulsory Reserve manpower program. Rather, if John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, is correct when he advocates complete and universal disarmament, then we should be expending our efforts and our intelligence in that direction.

My rather close association with people leads me to agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Cowles. Thanks for your leadership.

Sincerely yours,

M. E. Dorr.

P. S.—You might like to see this reprint in our city Tribune. We discussed this in our adult class Sunday. What a shame. Thanks for writing it.

College Heights, Ark., *June 6, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Please accept my congratulations for introducing the amendment calling for the end of racial segregation in the National Guard. This amendment is commendable, it seems to me, for two reasons. In the first place, there is no justification for segregation in the armed services or anywhere else. In the second place, the amendment had the salutary effect of shelving the compulsory Reserve bill. This bill is peacetime conscription on a permanent basis, if I understand it.

I think it is clear that this bill is not essential to national defense. If it were, the House would not have turned down your amendment.

Cordially,

J. Theodore Hefley.

North Manchester, Ind., *June 7, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell: I wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which prevented passage of the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. Your amendment proves that this bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

Please continue to work against any form of UMT or compulsory military training. How can we hope to have peace on earth if we continue to plan for war? We continue to pray that God may guide our Congressmen in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

George A. Hunn.

West Hartford, Conn., *June 8, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: You are to be congratulated on offering an amendment which brought out clearly how little our country needed compulsory Reserve bill H. R. 5297. Southern militarists like Mr. Vinson always stand on the side of a huge military organization and heavy armaments, demonstrating their attitude of fear toward the rest of the world, but the threat of desegregation appears to make them look at things quite differently.

Surely racial segregation is one of the sorriest and most shameful failures in our democracy, and we cannot make haste enough to correct it.

I trust this measure (compulsory military training) is permanently shelved and will not again be brought up. It is proven nonessential to national defense and would be a great disservice to our country.

Very truly yours,

Catherine D. Jervey.

Rochester, N. Y.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Powell: We Quakers and others who oppose the UMT bill congratulate you for the amendment which turned the whole bill back to committee.

We hope you will keep up the fight against UMT, slavery by another name.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Somers.

Fall River, Mass., *June 7, 1955.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: May I congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented the passage of the Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. Evidently this bill is not essential in the eyes and minds of southern militarists like Vinson—is not essential to national defense—or they would not have sidetracked it because of one amendment. More power to you—if they drag the bill "off the shelf" before Congress adjourns.

Very sincerely,

Ruth N. Dow.

Lycoming College,
Williamsport, Pa., June 7, 1955.

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I want to congratulate you for introducing the amendment against racial segregation in the compulsory Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. That amendment really prevented, at least for a while, the passage of the bill. If we must have a compulsory Reserve, it certainly should be free from the evil of racial segregation. But in the judgment of many of us there is actually no need for a compulsory Reserve at all, or any other form of compulsory military training. Your amendment proves that this Reserve bill is not essential to national defense in the minds of southern militarists like Mr. Vinson, or they would not have sidetracked it because of this one amendment.

Cordially yours,

W. Arthur Faus.

Chicago, Ill., *June 8, 1955.*

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Thanks and congratulations to you for introducing the amendment to end racial segregation in the Reserve. I understand that this prevented the passage of H. R. 5297.

If so many Congressmen feel that segregation is that important, is it not clear that they do not really find the bill necessary to our defense?

Respectfully yours,

Ivy G. Myers.

Toledo, Ohio, *June 7, 1955.*

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I am so glad you introduced the amendment regarding segregation into the bill for the compulsory reserve, H. R. 5297.

I understand that amendment prevented the passage of the bill at this time.

As I believe the bill to be a serious mistake, I wish to congratulate you on your contribution that delayed action upon it.

The fact that various southern Congressmen voted to sidetrack the bill indicates that they did not consider it essential to public safety.

Yours truly,

Aleck D. Dodd.

West Union, Iowa, *June 7, 1955.*

The Honorable Adam C. Powell,
Washington, D. C.

We wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment to bill H. R. 5297 which really prevented the passage of the bill.

We certainly don't want to make an armed camp out of America. Why we should go on wanting to follow the blunders of Hitler and war-torn Europe I don't understand.

MacArthur urges that we abolish war and all the nations will be glad to bury the hatchet.

The atom has simply outlawed war. It's peace or oblivion.

Thank you for all that you do to obtain peace in America and the world.

Sincerely,

Marion L. Gee.

Chicago, Ill., *June 7, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Thanks for your help in defeating this un-American bill that would militarize our country without adding a bit to our defense.

Yours very truly,

Erling H. Lunde.

[From the Oregon Journal of June 15, 1955]

Reserve System Without Segregation

The letter of the law in the year-old United States Supreme Court decision against segregation applies only to the public schools.

But the spirit of the law ought to apply to other institutions. The spectacle in Congress of the blocking of the all-important military Reserve bill over the segregation issue is not pretty to watch.

Southern House Members were for the bill, but an amendment by Representative Clayton Powell, Democrat, New York, which would forbid assignment of reservists to segregated National Guard units has turned them against it.

Strategy now is for the Senate to pass the bill without the antisegregation amendment in the hope that it can be steered through the House, minus the amendment.

The bill is important to the Nation's defense. Its aim is to put some backbone in the present flabby Reserve setup. It would make possible a realistic training program with modern equipment and techniques.

Segregation has been ended in all the active military services. The effort by southern Congressmen to preserve it in the Reserve program, even to the point of blocking legislation essential to the strengthening of our defense, is against the trend of the times.

It is all the more shocking in view of the encouragement it lends to those forces in the South now using all the means at their command to defy the United States Supreme Court on desegregation in the schools.

Manchester, Conn., *June 8, 1955.*

The Honorable Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: Congratulations to you for your amendment to H. R. 5297. If the bill with that amendment cannot be passed, it is certainly added proof that the bill is not really believed to be essential to national defense—which we who strenuously oppose it, sincerely believe.

With all good wishes.

Yours truly,

Margaret H. Rich.
Mrs. R. G. Rich.

June 8, 1955.

Representative Powell.

Dear Sir: I wish to congratulate you on your most outstanding service to this Nation at the Bandung Conference.

It is a little late coming, but I had hoped to see you in person and am still looking forward to do so some day.

Now this month can be a sad blackletter day for the United States of America. So all I can do is to ask folks to call off this June 15 maneuver, am trying to accomplish.

Am working nights and part of days to pay expenses, which makes it difficult to see as many as I should like to. So please accept this for the present—called your office today to give an explanation, but did not get the opportunity to speak to you.

We need real Americans today more than ever before—not one in any hearing (and so far I have been in all the public ones) has asked, "What tests have been made on talk, what other effects can this dangerous poison produce," etc.

God bless you.

Mrs. P. P. Schmidt.

Adelanto, Calif., *June 12, 1955.*

Dear Congressman Powell: Congratulations on the opposition success against General Eisenhower's militarism in, this time, conscription (H. R. 5297).

Keep up the good fight.

"A draft * * * is the last of all oppressions" (Jefferson, 1777).

Carl K. Frost.

Slaterville Springs, N. Y., *June 14, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: May I commend you for your courageous stand against segregation in the Armed Forces, particularly as pertaining to the proposed military Reserve plan. I hope nothing will weaken your stand in this issue. The act itself would, it seems to me, put too much power over our youth in the hands of the military, for too long.

Yours sincerely,

Hazel Roob Brill.

San Francisco, Calif., *June 11, 1955.*

Dear Sir: I hope you get plenty of public approval of your amendment to the compulsory Reserve bill. Lots of people are not good at expressing themselves, so believe there are many who are silent but wish to be otherwise.

I have written to the White House about it, too.

Yours,

Mrs. Genevieve Oliver.

Mooresville, Ind., *June 12, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: We wish to congratulate you for introducing the amendment which really prevented passage of H. R. 5397. The fact that those who sidetracked this bill because of this one amendment admits the bill is not essential to national defense.

We hope this Nation can be delivered from militarism and the conscription of its youth.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. John K. Arnot.

Minneapolis, Minn., *June 15, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: We were tremendously interested in your amendment to the Reserve bill and proof that the Army is not ready for true American equality. We hope you will not accept any compromise in the bill if it is brought back to the House.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. H. K. Stephens.

Dearborn, Mich., *June 13, 1955.*

Dear Representative Powell: We support you in your stand against segregation in the proposed military Reserve bill.

Further we feel this bill is unnecessary if its backers are unwilling to practice the democracy we preach.

We cannot see how peace is promoted by this measure.

Sincerely,

Paul Kerber.

Winter Park, Fla., *June 14, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing to congratulate you for acumen in introducing the shrewd amendment that stopped passage of the UMT bill, H. R. 5297. It looks to me that militarists like Mr. Vinson proved that this bill is not essential as they claimed, if this one amendment blocked it. Your wit forced them to show their hands. Good for you.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. T. W.) Carol Burnham.

Newburgh, Ind., *June 12, 1955.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I wish to thank you for what you have done in shelving the compulsory Reserve bill and I trust that you will accept no compromise which would permit men to be assigned to any units where there would be segregation. We must have freedom from segregation as well as freedom from UMT.

Sincerely yours,

Adam Stahl.

Richmond, Calif., *June 13, 1955.*

My Dear Mr. Powell: I hope that you will continue to fight against segregation in the Armed Forces Reserve bill, H. R. 5297. Your leadership in this field is appreciated. As a Caucasian, I find the burden of the guilt for discrimination not very palatable.

Sincerely,

Robert McInnes.

Presque Isle, Maine, *June 14, 1955.*

Hon. Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: I trust you will not accept any compromise which would permit young men to be assigned to the National Guard in any of the 27 States where segregation is permitted. More power to you.

Yours truly,

(Mrs. C. E.) G. E. Hussey.

Mocksville, N. C., *June 14, 1955.*

My Dear Mr. Powell: Please do not accept any compromise which would permit men to be assigned to State National Guard units where there is any segregation.

This card is being mailed in Boston, Mass. And the North Carolina address is our regular one. Please stand firm.

Yours very truly,

Dorothy D. Busiek
Mrs. Kurt Busiek.

Whittier, Calif., *May 14, 1955.*

Dear Mr. Powell: I wish to commend you for your fine stand against segregation in the Armed Forces resulting in the setting aside of the Reserve bill.

It is to be hoped that we can defeat this Reserve bill and really work for peace constructively. Arming our country to the teeth would only antogonize and cause others to fear us and our motive.

Technical assistance and world disarmament is a better way to peace.

Sincerely,

Marion H. Schley.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Stennis, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Byrd, Mr. Case of South Dakota, and Mr. Saltonstall to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) entitled "An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. George, Mr. Green, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Wiley, and Mr. Smith of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5502) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to Senate amendments Nos. 30 and 49 to the above entitled bill.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7000, with Mr. Engle in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 7000 is to provide the machinery by which our Reserve Forces may be so organized and trained that, in the event of war, they can be mobilized quickly to augment the Active Forces in combat and to carry out internal security missions here at home.

This can be accomplished if this legislation is enacted because this bill will provide authority to increase the size and to strengthen the Reserve Forces and will insure participation in Reserve training.

I would like to take a moment to review what has happened in the last few years insofar as our attempt to build up our Reserve Forces is concerned.

As you all know, today we have a strictly voluntary Reserve. As a matter of fact, it was not until 1952 that the Congress placed legislation on the statute books concerning the size and composition of the Reserve Forces.

In that year, we passed the Armed Forces Reserve Act which established a Ready and Standby Reserve. The Ready Reserve was limited to 1,500,000 persons and was to contain units and individuals ready for active service, first, in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President, subject to a determination by the Congress as to the numbers to be called; or second, in an expansion of the Armed Forces in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

A primary consideration in establishing the Ready Reserve was to provide a Reserve Force for implementation in a Korean type situation.

The Standby Reserve was to contain units and individuals available for active duty only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. Thus, the Reserve mobilization base for a general emergency or war was divided between these two categories.

Now, in actual practice the Ready Reserve, while increasing in size, has not attained the degree of organization or training required for its mobilization role.

During the entire period of about 3 years that the Armed Forces Reserve Act has been in effect the Ready Reserve has exceeded the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. As a matter of fact, the Ready Reserve today totals about 2,800,000 persons.

But this number is in no wise a measure of the military strength of the Ready Reserve. Over 300,000 of that number are part of the Active Forces and thus are not actually in reserve.

Of the 2,500,000 ready reservists not on active duty only a little over 700,000 are voluntarily participating in paid training, and this number does not represent a balanced and organized military force.

The Standby Reserve has not attained the composition originally contemplated. Today there are only about 200,000 members, of whom 140,000, or 67 percent, are on the inactive status list. Consequently it has not been practicable to produce an organized force in this category.

In the development of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, it was anticipated that the Ready Reserve would become a well-organized and trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was firmly believed when the bill was considered in committee that men with a statutory obligation in the Ready Reserve would participate in voluntary training in order to establish eligibility for transfer to the less vulnerable Standby Reserve.

Such has not been the case; this incentive provision alone has not produced the desired result.

Thus, we find our Reserve today made up of relatively small groups of volunteers and a large pool of persons having a Ready Reserve obligation, but who are not participating in Reserve training.

The security and best interests of the Nation require that this condition be changed.

It is absolutely essential that our Reserve forces be built up and strengthened so that they can be effectively utilized if an emergency is declared.

I believe this bill will accomplish that purpose, and at this time I would like to go through the bill so the Members can be advised of its provisions.

Before doing so, let me point out that this bill contains no reference to the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard. Neither does any of its provisions repeal, amend, or modify existing law concerning the National Guard. This is a bill which deals only with the Reserve components of the military services.

The National Guard, insofar as this bill is concerned, is left in the exact position it occupies today. Now, as to the provisions of the bill.

The law today provides that every person who entered, or enters the Armed Forces after June 19, 1951, incurs an eight year military obligation. The committee felt that this obligation was too long, and could be lowered to 6 years without impairing the effectiveness of the reserve components.

Consequently, the bill amends existing law and fixes the reserve obligation for any person entering the armed services after July 27, 1953, at a total of six years.

Please note that date, which is the date of the truce in Korea.

The bill provides that any person who entered the armed services prior to that date will not be required to participate in active duty for training or inactive duty training. Thus, we protect the veterans who fought in Korea and who would otherwise be required under the provisions of the bill to participate in Reserve training.

We lowered this Reserve obligation because, in the opinion of the committee, the 8-year obligation could not be fully justified from a military standpoint, and it was felt that 6 years is a long enough time to take out of a young man's life, and is an adequate time to train a man on active duty and in the Reserve components.

Next, the bill permits individuals subject to a Reserve obligation who become duly ordained ministers of religion to be discharged upon their request and it also permits such individuals who become divinity students to be relieved of the requirement to participate in Reserve training programs while in such status.

I find it hard to believe that anyone would argue with this provision of the bill.

The bill next provides for a direct enlistment program for individuals to be enlisted in the Reserve of any military service for a 6-year obligation, provided they agree to perform 2 years of active duty.

The next provision of the bill provides that, until July 1, 1959, persons prior to reaching the age of 18½ years may enlist directly into the Reserve of any Military Service under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe and thereafter be deferred from the draft, so long as they satisfactorily participate in training.

The only conditions prevailing would be that the President would have to make a finding that he deemed the strengths of the Reserve components to be insufficient and that their authorized strengths could not be met. Under this program, the bill provides that no more than 250,000 such enlistments could be authorized annually. Under this program, persons who enlist and perform no active duty for training—aside from the annual 17 days' field encampment—are to be draft-deferred until age 28, so long as they satisfactorily participate in training. After that, however, they would be eligible for release, having completed their military obligation.

Inasmuch as this program is subject to the rules and regulations which will be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary could require that any person volunteering for the program would have to accept 6 months of active duty for training, following his enlistment.

The bill provides that if such a volunteer performs 6 months of active duty for training, he would thereby incur an 8-year obligation and after his 6 months of training, he would be required to participate with the Reserve unit in which he enlisted for an additional 7½ years. If he failed to do so, his draft deferment could be canceled, and he would be subject to induction.

The next subsection of the bill provides that all qualified ROTC students and members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders' course shall be commissioned upon satisfactory completion of the ROTC course, and upon their graduation from college.

If it was found that there were no billets available in the active forces, after they had been commissioned, they could be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 6 months following which they would be required to serve in an appropriate Reserve unit for the remainder of their military obligation. If they failed to satisfy their Reserve obligation, their commission could be revoked.

The bill also provides that the National Security Training Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the President and to the Secretary of Defense and is required to report annually to the Congress with respect to the welfare of persons undergoing the 6 months of active duty for training.

However, the Commission would have no control over the military training offered.

The bill provides that persons with critical skills, engaged in critical defense supporting industries and research could be allowed to fulfill their military obligation, after a specific finding by the President, by serving in the program involving the 6 months of active duty for training, regardless of the age they entered the program.

Speaking again of the 6 months' trainees, I should point out that the bill provides they will be paid at the rate of $50 per month and will receive disability benefits, and other benefits such as national service life insurance and servicemen's indemnity coverage.

These trainees reemployment rights are guarded by a provision of the bill so that they may apply for reinstatement in their position within 60 days of their release from active duty for training and enjoy protection from discharge without cause within 6 months after their restoration.

All persons who enter upon active duty after July 27, 1953, upon release from active service will become members of the Ready Reserve. These persons will be required to attend 48 assemblies for drill annually, or other equivalent periods of instruction and will also be required to perform active duty for training for a period not to exceed 17 days each year.

If the reservist does not choose to engage in this type of inactive duty training, he may select an alternative and perform active duty for training for 30 days annually, but in the event that he fails or refuses to participate in either of these training programs in the Ready Reserve, he may be ordered to active duty for training for not to exceed 45 days annually.

One of the most important provisions in the bill is that portion which provides for the screening process.

Under these provisions, persons in the Ready Reserve will be continuously screened by the military service concerned. The objective of this is to insure that there will be no significant attrition upon mobilization; there will be a proper distribution of critical civilian skills between the military services and essential civilian activities; and persons may be transferred to the Standby Reserve in the case of extreme hardship.

What we are aiming at in this bill is to have a Ready Reserve that is in truth and in fact "ready."

We have accomplished little if we have many persons in the Ready Reserves whom we are counting on to call to active duty in the case of an emergency if a good number of such Reserves cannot be properly utilized on active duty or should, for some other reason, not be able to be called unless there is a general and full-scale mobilization.

The purpose of the screening process is to insure that such type persons will be screened into the Standby Reserve and then will only be called to active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress and then only after their availability has been determined by the Director of Selective Service.

The bill sets the size of the Ready Reserve at 2,900,000. This number is necessary in order that the mission of the Ready Reserves can be carried out as is necessary to mobilize the Reserve.

This mission provides that the Ready Reserve will, first, augment the active forces; second, replace attrition and combat losses in the active force; third, to provide for building up combat and support forces and the expansion of the training program.

I should say a few words concerning participation in training in the Ready Reserve. In this respect, the bill does not change existing law, with the exception of the fact that the total overall obligation has been lowered from 8 to 6 years, but such lowering of the obligation does not change the period of service required in the Ready Reserve, but rather decreases the service necessary to be spent in the Standby Reserve.

Let me give you two or three examples:

The person who has been drafted for 2 years will be required to spend 3 years in the Ready Reserve and if he satisfactorily participates he will be automatically transferred to the Standby Reserve at the conclusion of his 3 years of participation in training, for a period of 1 year. Thus, he spends 2 years in the Active Service, 3 years in the Ready Reserve, and 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

Next, a 3-year enlistee will be required to spend 2 years in the Ready Reserve and if he satisfactorily participates in training, he will be automatically transferred at the end of that time to the Standby Reserve to complete his 1 year of remaining obligation.

The 4-year enlistee will be required to spend 1 year in the Ready Reserve and 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

Any person with 5 years of active duty will immediately be transferred to the Standby Reserve for 1 year.

I should also make mention of the authority of the President to recall members of the Ready Reserve to active duty.

The bill provides that the President will have the authority, after he has proclaimed a national emergency, to order 1 million Ready reservists to active duty. If it is necessary to order more than this number to active duty, the number of such reservists to be ordered will have to be determined by the Congress.

This is an important provision of the bill because it is recognized that because our potential enemies possess weapons of mass destruction, and the means for their delivery on this country, we are placed face to face with instantaneous peril. Should an emergency arise when the Congress was not in session, there should be some authorization for the President to call up members of the Ready Reserve.

Finally, the bill provides that the Secretary of Defense must report to the President and to the Congress annually as to the progress in strengthening of the Reserve forces. In this way, the Congress, and particularly the committee, can keep close check on how this program is progressing.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important legislative items to come before this House during this session.

We have delayed long enough. This legislation must be enacted. The President has repeatedly urged the Congress to enact legislation which would strengthen the Reserve.

The Secretary of Defense and each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of each military service and many other heads of Government departments and agencies appeared before our committee and urged that legislation to strengthen the Reserve be speedily and favorably reported by the committee.

In this perilous age, time may well be running out. We cannot delay longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield for a question to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The fact that they have fallen so low has nothing to do with any action of Congress. The people across the river who were supposed to implement, stir up the Reserves, and get them organized, simply did not take care of their job.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They may not take care of their job, but they come to us and tell us that they need more legislation to do the job.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am not trying to defend the Pentagon, but in all fairness may I say that in the State of Pennsylvania we conducted a recruiting campaign known as "Occupation Penntest" and every community in Pennsylvania conducted a campaign to attract young men to the Reserves, former veterans of our Armed Services. The overall campaign has been a complete failure, or a complete flop, in plain words.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Nobody in the House has a more distinguished record as an active participant in the Reserve forces than my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. When he makes that statement I say that I join with him. I think our voluntary program even in the Reserves has failed in its objectives, and some element of compulsion is necessary if we are going to build up a strong, virile, Active Reserve force.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Suppose a young man, 17 years of age, volunteers for the 6 months' training. Would he, under this bill, necessarily be required to serve until he is 28?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Under this bill, he does not volunteer for the 6 months' training. He volunteers for the category established by the President under the rules and regulations of the Department of Defense. As the bill is drawn now, he comes in just like a guardsman would enter in the State from which the gentleman comes, for example, if he enlisted in the guard, and he would enlist in that category. He would be obligated to remain on active duty doing satisfactory service in the Reserves until he ceases to be of draft age.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. That would be until the age of 28; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. That would make it 11 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. Now, if that man takes the 6 months' training, the obligation is reduced to 8 years; and after 8 years, because of his 6 months' active training, he would then cease to be subject to the draft law.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield briefly.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask a question about the National Guard. As I understand it, if a man enlists in the National Guard prior to the age of 18½ years, he is not subject to draft. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As long as he continues his active interest in the guard.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. My question is this: If, subsequent to the age 18½ years, a man enlists in the National Guard, he is subject to the draft and can be drafted. Is that not correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If he enlists under the national Reserve plan and performs satisfactory service, he would not be drafted?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. But under this program we are talking about, he would be 18½ years.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It seems to me that under the terms of this act it would become very difficult for the National Guard to get recruits.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should not say that. We merely adopt the program the guard already had for recruiting its personnel. There is no change in what we are discussing now from the program which the guard itself has. If it is a good program for the guard, why would it not be a good program for the Reserve?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In imposing this other plan which would make an individual draftproof, it does away with any advantage which he might have previously had in joining the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, the guard has a peculiar advantage over any other branch of the service, in that it is one organization that has this program. If a man is below 18½, and did not want to join the Reserve he could enlist in the guard. The reason why we have the program set up as it is now is that the enlistment in the guard varies in length. It is enlistment for 3 years, and then a guardsman must reenlist. So the guard program says the man must continue that way until he reaches the age of 28 if he is to avoid the draft. We simply provide in this bill a similar type of program. If this works well with the guard, it should work well with the Reserves. It should not hurt the guard. If it is a good program, the Reserves ought to have it. Secondly, the program is limited not to exceed 250,000, and the quotas are set by the President of the United States. I am assured in my own mind that the President does not intend to hurt the guard. I am further assured in my own mind that the enlistment up to 250,000 a year in the Reserves will not hurt the guard.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I ask one more question: Under the bill as it is written, could a man satisfy his military obligations by 6 years' service in the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman repeat that question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Under the bill as it is now written, could a man satisfy his military obligation to the United States by 6 years' service in the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No. If he went into the Guard he would have a longer obligation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How long an obligation?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The 6-year provision merely applies to those who come in for active service in the regular establishment. There is a big difference between service and training. If a man comes in as a draftee, he comes in for 2 years' service, not training. He then has a total overall obligation of 6 years. He has 4 years in the Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I certainly yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Simply to answer the gentleman who propounds the inquiry: His obligation will cease when he reaches his 28th birthday in the National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. GROSS. How many officers are being turned out each year through the various training programs—the ROTC and all the others? How many officers are being turned out each year?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I had the figure on the ROTC program. I would not want to trust my memory without looking again at my manuscript. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will give him the figure later.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be in the neighborhood of 50,000 a year?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would be more than that.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty-five thousand or sixty thousand?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. More than that.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact, then, that this bill is necessary because we are getting too many chiefs and too few Indians in the Military Establishment?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is truth to that statement of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I thought.

Why are these 6 months' trainees paid $50 a month?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Because it was thought that was a fair and equitable payment. Personally I favor paying them more, to be candid with the gentleman; but we have to weigh one element against another. Here is a man who takes advantage of a program and goes in for 6 months, at the end of which time he goes back to his home, his family, and his business or occupation. The committee felt—and I am not prepared to say it was wrong—that the $50 as against the higher pay when they agree to enlist, was a fair arrangement.

Mr. GROSS. Do we contribute anything to the salaries or training emoluments of any of the foreign troops who are trained in this country?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We do not under the terms of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Ah, but do we under any bill or under any appropriation or any legislation?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not know of any, unless it be the very few who go to West Point, and that is such a minor matter it does not cut any figure.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect, if the truth were known, we pay them more than $50 a month.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Proceeding with my statement, I want to say that under H. R. 7000 any person inducted or enlisted in the active forces after July 7, 1953, shall be a member of the Ready Reserve.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. For a clarifying statement. The gentleman referred to a man being ordered to not less than 45 days of field training. Do the Army authorities have the privilege of court-martialing a man in the event he does not serve the 45 days?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If after volunteering to train, the man refuses to take any part in the program, refuses to obey the order sending him to active duty for 45 days, he can then be subject to a proceeding in the Federal district courts as is, for instance, a draftee who refuses to comply with the draft board order, or any other person who refuses after volunteering, to obey an order of the military commander.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Further answering the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, he has reference to this bill. The gentleman, of course, stated he would be subject to prosecution. That is the law today. We are modifying that by this 45-day provision. If he fails to comply with that order he would probably be subject to a court-martial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say further to the gentleman that this bill does not go as far as does existing law.

Mr. BAILEY. What does this legislation do toward providing and setting up Reserve units at well-distributed points over the country so as to avoid inconvenience in meeting their obligation to attend the meetings? Right now your proposal would not be workable because there are places in my district where you would have to travel 200 miles to find a National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have here the figures which show the distance between points where reservists can train in the Guard, the Army Reserves and the Navy Reserves. I had hoped that later on in the course of the debate to cover that specifically at which time I will be glad to give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. BAILEY. I will defer until that time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We are going to work toward a program so that no reservist will be more than 25 to 30 miles from a unit.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Will the gentleman advise the House as to what the pay of these enlisted men is going to be after 6 months' training? You are cutting it down to $50 a month. When he takes his 2 hours' drill each week, what is the pay of a private for those 2 hours?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is grade E-1. The pay under this bill would be $50 a month. That is what his pay will be.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman means he gets $50?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. While on active duty.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. For 8 hours of active duty; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. When I was in the service it might be 8 hours. It might be much more or much less.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I mean after he is in the Reserve part of the program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Then he follows the Reserve schedule. There is no distinction in the pay schedule between a 6-month trainee and any other reservist when in the Reserve.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is what I was getting at. I understood that, but I wondered what the pay was. I was not familiar with it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The pay will be raised according to his promotion. He goes from E-1 to E-2.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. What would a Grade E-1 draw for 2 hours of drill per week?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, an E-1 will draw $78 a month, and for attending drill, which is 2 hours, he would receive one-thirtieth of the $78 monthly pay.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is true. There is a slight increase under the recently passed Kilday bill, but that is approximately it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. One other question. Would the gentleman give us an estimate of the cost of this program?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It will run about, in 1960, $1.9 million.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7000, is not half as good a bill as its proponents think it is, nor is it half as bad a bill as its opponents believe. It is more or less of an innocuous thing, and if kept as it is, I can see that it certainly would not do any harm and, if properly administered, I think it could materially strengthen our Reserves and increase the security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, for almost a quarter of a century I have sat through almost endless hearings on UMT, peacetime conscription, draft bills, and similar allied legislation as a member of the old House Committee on Military Affairs. I was a member of the special committee set up that was headed by our former colleague from Virginia, Mr. Woodrum, and on which the distinguished former Senator from New York, Mr. Wadsworth, served, and then on our present Committee on Armed Services. For 24 years I have devoted much earnest study and given prayerful consideration to this baffling and difficult problem. Always I have opposed universal military training. I oppose it now, and I shall continue to oppose it to my dying day. When we fasten permanent peacetime conscription onto this country, America will be dead and there will be no incentive for living. I shall be the last person to militarize this country and adopt a foreign system which has inevitably failed wherever it has been tried.

This is not a new problem. It is an old issue and it will be with us always, perhaps. I think we will all agree regardless of our views on legislation of this kind, that this Nation, rich as it is, cannot forever continue to carry the backbreaking load of taxation in order to maintain our vast complex and expensive Military Establishment.

In fiscal year 1953 we spent $52 billion on our national defense—in that single year; which was twice as much money as the entire national debt was at the end of World War I, when it was $26 billion. We reduced that expenditure from $52 billion to approximately $42 billion in fiscal 1954, and in the fiscal year of 1955 which ended at midnight last night, we have spent around $37 billion on our national defense.

For the foreseeable future—at least until 1960—we will maintain our Armed Forces at a minimum strength of 2,850,000 at an annual expenditure of approximately $35 billion. We are going to avoid the costly and inefficient peaks and valleys, feasts and famines of the past. We cannot forever carry this burden, nor do we forever want to have the draft. We have had it with us for a long time. When it expires or is in danger of expiring, the Congress comes along and extends it. We have already voted an extension of the draft for 4 years, until July 1, 1959.

We are going through a period of transition, trying to get back from a wartime to a peacetime economy. I hope by the passage of this legislation, it will go a long way toward getting our whole defense establishment back on an even keel and for the most part on a voluntary basis. I hope we will be able to do that when the draft act expires in July 1959. Because a volunteer army is the best on earth. Free men always have outworked, outproduced, and outfought slaves.

This measure, if it is enacted and if the program is properly administered, may help to bring about a situation where there will be, perhaps, a sufficient number of young men who, because of certain benefits we have voted in the past two or three Congresses and the present one, interested in a military career so that we will not have to resort to peacetime conscription, which is repugnant to all of us.

There are some things about this bill I do not like. We are still faced with the difficulty of having two different systems running concurrently. That creates difficulty, but you have got to begin this transition at some time, and heaven knows, I think it is long past due. Since it is a voluntary system, there is no compulsion in it, since it rather distributes and equalizes the burdens and does not place all of the responsibility and duty on the backs of men brought into the service through the Selective Service System, I think it is a measure that deserves our support. While I cannot hope that it will accomplish all that some people think it will accomplish, I do think it will go a long way toward building up a strong, virile, active Reserve which we so sadly need at the present time. Of course the bill is not perfect. There never was a bill, I suppose, that we all could agree on in its entirety. All legislation is a result of compromise. One can give and take without surrendering principle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have great respect for the gentleman's experience in this matter. I think the gentleman will agree that he has been somewhat disappointed at the degree of training that in the Reserve program the Pentagon has practiced in the past in regard to Reserves; is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I have been not only disappointed but also disgusted. I was coming to that very point. We already have a Reserve law. We spent $1 billion a year on our Reserves between the close of World War II and the Korean conflict. At the present time we are spending $700 million a year on our Reserves with only about 700,000 out of 1,500,000 participating in the Reserve. One reason that the present Reserve system has not worked is because the penalities for failure to discharge Reserve obligations are too severe; 5 years imprisonment, $10,000 fine or both.

How in the world we ever let that get through this House or why the President would ever sign such a vicious measure I cannot understand, but that is the reason we do not have a strong, virile Reserve today. Perhaps it happened because of the hysteria that war breeds. No attempt has been made over in the Pentagon nor will it be made to enforce such severe penalties. It just cannot be done. Congress, more than the military, are to blame.

This measure lowers the penalty. The only penalty it involves after these boys take their 6 months' training and go into the Reserve for 7½ additional years is this. They will have to remain in the Active or Ready Reserve until they go into the Standby Reserve, and take their 48 weekly drills each year plus 2 weeks of summer training or, if they choose, they can take 30 days' training in the summertime or sometime during the year in lieu of those weekly drills. Should a boy refuse to discharge that Reserve obligation, then he can be drafted for 45 days, not fined $10,000 or thrown in prison for 5 years. He can be forced to serve the 45 days, and in the event he refuses to do that, of course, he is subject to general court-martial. So the plan is watered down, it has been weakened to some extent, but the penalties will be severe enough to get service out of the man, yet not too severe that you cannot enforce them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman also agree that the degree of readiness that can be accomplished under this bill depends on the type of training the individuals will receive during that 2 weeks' training and during their 1 hour a week or the month they must be there?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman be able to tell me whether he has assurance that there will be a different kind of training afforded these Reserves under this program if it is adopted?

Mr. SHORT. I certainly hope and pray it will be. I would like to know a little more about the curriculum, a little more about the type of instruction and the kind of training these boys will get. The gentleman knows, and we all know, that in the past the Army, the Air Force, and at times the Navy, though the Navy has a much better Reserve program than any other branch of our services, have sent into this training their older officers who have approached the time of retirement and who have little chance for further promotion, and probably have not been doing too well, and have kind of lost the sparkplug or the fire to train these new Reserves properly. I think under this program we should restore some prestige and dignity to these Reserve forces and we should send our very best military officers to train these men. The Reserves are not a secondary outfit.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Have we any assurance that such will take place?

Mr. SHORT. We have been promised that, but certainly, judging from past performances, I would not entertain too much hope. I think, however, a more serious and earnest effort will be made, and should be made. Our committee will watch and check this more closely in the future.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think all of the Members of the committee are in agreement with the gentleman from Virginia that we have not been given the overall picture of the training. Therefore, in this bill we have placed a provision that the Defense Department would have to come back to the Congress and make a yearly report as to the progress under the present bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri does not want to leave the Committee under the impression that all of the Reserve units have been carrying on without an adequate training program. He knows that during the Korean war the Department of Defense called up units of the Marine Corps Reserve who within 30 days were on the front line in Korea. Those men were adequately trained. The Navy called up individuals by rating and placed them on board ships alongside the regulars and performed in a complementary manner. Therefore several of the services have provided adequate training for their Reserves.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is a Naval Reserve officer. I said the Navy and the Marine Corps have done much better than the other services. But I have here, and I want to quote without revealing the man's name, this is from a very good friend of mine whom I have known all his life, a letter written to me on May 29. I will skip part of it, but here is the part I want to read, where he agrees with the position I have always taken on UMT and on Reserve legislation:

Among other things he said:

> Just want you to know this small fry is in complete agreement with you. It is probably that the Navy's Reserve program has been somewhat better than the other services because our regulars have had a genuine interest in the Reserves and our Regulars on duty with the Reserve program do not consider it a second-class assignment.

I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will say "amen" to that. But we can pass this bill or any other bill, and we will never have a Reserve worth the paper it is written on until these boys over in the Pentagon make up their minds that they really want one and will put forth earnest and sincere, honest, and determined efforts to build up a Reserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Missouri is exactly right.

Mr. SHORT. And this officer, may I say, is one of the greatest living aces. He goes on to say this. I think this is worthy of your consideration.

> If we are to have combat-capable Reserve units, the individual services must be held accountable for intelligently planned and capably executed programs consisting of up-to-date training syllabi similar to the combat readiness training programs for the Regulars. To do this the services must share their best leadership—

Not the poorest.

> their best leadership with the Reserves.
>
> I have observed that the Army and Air Force and sometimes the Navy assign to work with the Reserve units those Regulars who are not doing well. Too often they are officers who have almost no hope for promotion, and the spark of ambition which motivates a military man has flickered out. Such "floaters" are devoid of leadership, and their Reserve units are without pride.

I think that answers the gentleman from California and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think we will all agree to the truth and accuracy of that statement.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I am very interested in this discussion on what this bill would do with regard to the Army reserve. One point, I think, needs to be made, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, and that is that the Army reserve has been lagging considerably because it has not had sufficient enlisted men in it. This program, we hope, will give it the enlistments which would make it an overall workable reserve. The other branches of the service have not suffered in the same way that the Army has with regard to enlistment. They have had various attractions such as cruises and things of that kind, which have made the other branches of the service attractive to the enlisted man. This bill, we hope, will give us enough enlistments so that we will have a workable reserve and the whole tenor and the whole attitude throughout the Army reserve will be improved. I think the gentleman will agree with me that that is one purpose of this bill.

Mr. SHORT. It is one of the purposes and it is a big improvement. Let me take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and members of the subcommittee who spent at least 6 long weeks in careful, painstaking study of this particular measure. It is an improved bill. It is shorter, simpler, and better. It is a little different, but only in minor respects from the former bill that we brought in. It is more understandable. However, it eliminates the National Guard completely. Nothing is said about it, and it leaves it in status quo. This measure simply gives an equal opportunity to the youth of this Nation to join a Regular Reserve unit as do the members of the National Guard.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that one of the reasons the Reserve program is not working well under the present selective-service setup is because the penalties therein were too severe?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Would it not be a simple process to amend the selective-service law and reduce your penalty than to come to the House today to seek what the gentleman himself called a backdoor approach to UMT?

Mr. SHORT. I cannot for the life of me see any UMT in this bill, as it is. When the original bill was before the House a short time ago, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], stated that I could recognize UMT or any part of it in the dark. That was a great compliment and with all modesty and humility I agree with his statement. I can even smell some people before I see them. But if we load this bill down with a lot of amendments, and if we load it down with a lot of hogwash, I am going to fight it tooth and toenail. Let me talk about the thing that disturbs me the most about the measure. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. What disturbs me in enacting this law is what might happen to it when we start reading the bill and attempt to amend it on the floor, and particularly what might happen in another body or when we go to conference. I know how bloody our heads get in these conference fights. I have been through a few.

I am for this bill. I voted for it as it came out of committee. It takes out the Guard, and it reduces the Reserve service from 8 years to 6 years. A boy does not have to take this thing, but if he voluntarily elects to take it before his 18½ birthday, then after that he is obligated until he is 28 years of age. If he enters a regular Reserve unit and serves 2 active years, then he goes into the Regular Reserve for 3 years and in the Standby Reserve for 1 year, which makes a total service of 6 years. He will then be about 24 years of age. Perhaps he will not be married or rearing a family by that time. I do not think he should be. If he is going into a profession, or whether he seeks employment in some great industrial plant, or goes into a business of his own, I cannot see how this program, if it is honestly and intelligently administered, will seriously interfere with the personal education of the individual or seriously disrupt our industrial economy. So that is a great improvement in the bill.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Would it not have been simpler to reduce the penalties in the Selective Service Act?

Mr. SHORT. No. I do not think so. This is a new, clean bill, and it gives opportunity to every young man, just as it does for those who are entering the National Guard, to enter any Regular Reserve unit, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, or the Coast Guard, and discharge his military obligation before he becomes married and assumes the responsibility of rearing a family or before going into a profession or an established business.

I am for this bill as it is, but what disturbs me is in attending a conference at the White House—I did not attend it—I want to read this press release that was given out about 10 days ago:

> Senate Republican Leader KNOWLAND emerged from the White House and said he is still hopeful a Reserve bill satisfactory to the President can be passed.

Well, so am I. Though even President Eisenhower is not the keeper of my conscience:

> Then, Republican House Leader MARTIN of Massachusetts—

Joe's honest and frank and forthright. He could not lie to you if he wanted to. He is one of God's noblemen and I love him. "Nuff sed."

> Republican House Leader MARTIN, of Massachusetts, also at the weekly meeting with President Eisenhower agreed something adequate might be worked out through floor amendments, Senate action, and Senate and House conferences.

The gentleman from Massachusetts let the cat and all the little kittens out of the bag there.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. At the time that statement was made, the legislation that we had heard was coming out of the committee was a mere skeleton in form and would have done no good. Therefore, I said we would take what we got and try to improve on it.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is pretty well satisfied with this particular measure, is he not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, and I know the administration is satisfied with the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Good enough. Something happened then, too, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] withdrew consideration and moved that the committee rise on the former measure. He was simply going to bring a bill to implement the Draft Act. All of the burden would have been carried only by those boys who were drafted. Large segments of our population would have escaped all military responsibility or duty.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. That was the bill that the distinguished minority leader had reference to. He had no reference to this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I was sure of that. I am very glad it is cleared up. But don't emasculate or stuff this bill if you want me to support it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the gentleman's statement, he tells us that this is not a universal military training bill.

Mr. SHORT. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But if a man should take advantage of this legislation, as I understand, he must join the Reserves before he is 18½ years of age.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. When he does join before he is 18½ years of age his entire military drill would be a period of 8 years, excepting he might cut it back to 6 years under certain conditions. Is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. That is what he has today. These boys who are drafted and serve 2 years in the Army—usually it is 3 or 4—in the Navy it is 3 or 4 and in the Air Force it is 4; they need them that long, but under present existing law a boy who is drafted today and serves 2 years in the military goes into the Reserves for 6 years more, and if he does not perform his reserve duties there are severe penalties, 5 years imprisonment, or a $10,000 fine, or both.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And it simmers down to this: This proposal is one that applies to boys who are 18½ years of age; does it not?

Mr. SHORT. Seventeen and eighteen, absolutely so. He can discharge his obligated duty at an early age.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And if he is 25 years of age it does not do him any good.

Mr. SHORT. No, it does not; and anyone with service prior to July 27, 1953, cannot be called back, no boys who served before the Korean truce. If we pass this legislation we will no longer be grabbing the poor fellow who served both in Europe and in the Pacific in World War II and in Korea. We will take the younger men without prior service first.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you keep the Draft Act going at least until 1959.

Mr. SHORT. Absolutely. We have already passed the draft law. That act is signed, and it does not expire until July 1, 1959. This piece of legislation runs concurrently with it until that time. I hope in 1959 we can end the draft.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I know the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has always opposed compulsory military training.

Mr. SHORT. And I am still opposed to it. I will forever oppose it except in time of war.

Mr. DONDERO. I join him in that. Now, does the gentleman tell the House today and the country that there is no compulsory military training in this bill?

Mr. SHORT. That is what I say.

Mr. DONDERO. And the gentleman is for this bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am for the bill, although it is the most painful, most disturbing decision I ever made. I spent many sleepless nights, may I say to the gentleman, and I have not capitulated or surrendered my principle.

There is no compulsion in this. It is voluntary. It does give the youth of the land a chance to choose the branch of service they serve in under the Reserve unit of the different services, and it shortens the length of obligated service from 8 years to 6 years.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am glad to have the frank opinion of the gentleman from Missouri, because I look to him for guidance and advice in this type of legislation. Now the gentleman is telling the House that he is for the House bill as written.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. HOEVEN. His fear is that it may be loaded down in the other body.

Mr. SHORT. If it is I will fight. I will be one of the conferees. And I will not surrender. We surrendered day before yesterday on the doctors' draft. Yesterday we surrendered on the judges pay bill. I am tired of surrendering and will fight to retain or restore some independence, prestige, and dignity to this House.

Mr. HOEVEN. So the gentleman gives notice to the conferees on the part of the House that they are expected to stand by the House version of the bill?

Mr. SHORT. I gave my position unmistakably when we reported it out of committee and I feel I have an obligation to my friends in this body who have stood with me on this proposition all through the years. I respect and love you. I am only one Member of this body but I will not let you down.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And the gentleman is one of the conferees.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman knows the respect in which I hold him and I desire to go along with him as far as possible. I raise this question merely for information. There is much in this bill I would like to support, but am I correct in understanding that with respect to those who have been drafted since July of 1953 or those who have voluntarily enlisted since then that there is a compulsory provision with respect to their training after they terminate their active-duty service.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes. You have got to have some teeth in it. And they are now obligated under existing law. At the present time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. And to that extent there is compulsion?

Mr. SHORT. To that extent there is in the form of 6 years of Reserve service.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I should like to ask this question of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. I have received a number of letters from educational organizations stating that if this bill is passed there will be a tendency for young men to leave high school and enter the Reserves before graduation. Has the gentleman considered that?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; we considered that very carefully and I entertain no great fears as to that.

Now, something has been said about pressure. If you have any imagination you can realize some of the pressures that have been brought on me from the Pentagon, and I was also called to the White House. But the pressure, I must say, from the military has not been half as insistent or persistent as a lot of other organized groups. My dear church friends have been after me so hard and so long, and I have fought with them and for them and I intend to continue to do it, but they have spent enough money on telegrams that have flooded me the past 2 or 3 days to send a missionary to Africa for the next 100 years. They do not need to send me telegrams. I am definitely on their team. I once preached and still do if anyone will listen. I was a college professor and believe in education, but not too much. I must confess my patience has been worn a bit thin, I have been just slightly irritated and annoyed by this constant prodding by some of these good friends. I want to say, and I say this in all honesty, fairness, and frankness, the military has been just about as considerate of my position as some of the opponents of this legislation.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask two questions, in very great sincerity. I would like to know whether it is true in this bill that that group of young men who do not volunteer for this training before the age of 18½ or are not among those drafted, the group in between—will never be called upon to serve their country either actively or in the Reserve?

Mr. SHORT. That is very true. You take the gamble. Some men may never be called.

Mrs. CHURCH. Is that not a very discriminatory provision?

Mr. SHORT. Let me say to the very beautiful, intelligent, and charming Member from Illinois——

Mrs. CHURCH. I am overcome.

Mr. SHORT. I mean every word of it and she knows it. Mrs. Short knows it, too. So I am safe. I do not know how in the world you could ever pass a law that would do equal and exact justice to every individual. I just do not think it is humanly possible. We talk about universal service and equality of treatment. In time of war, after all, only a very small percentage of our soldiers and sailors ever get up to the front lines where they fight. It takes about 20 people back home to support that 1 man up in the front lines.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. I may say in all seriousness to the gracious lady, I do not know how we could legislate where we would place an equal burden upon every single individual.

Mrs. CHURCH. Now, my second question runs a bit deeper. The gentleman with equal sincerity fought this bill some time back.

Mr. SHORT. Not this bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. The somewhat similar bill then under consideration. The gentleman at that time referred to the provision for the 6-month voluntary training program, as being the opening door to a possible UMT. I believe today that he says there is nothing of that nature in this present bill. Will he outline in the RECORD, so that we might report it, the changes in that respect between the two bills which made him change his mind?

Mr. SHORT. One thing is, we have taken the Guard completely out of the bill and we have shortened the obligated service from 8 to 6 years. I would cut it to 4 years but I was the only member of our committee to vote for the 4-year period.

Mrs. CHURCH. I was asking the gentleman about that group who might volunteer before 18½. That is the only section of the bill which is really in question here.

Mr. SHORT. It would shorten the period of obligated service.

Mrs. CHURCH. I was worried about that first opening wedge and I think that the country would like to know what safeguards against it have now been written in this new bill—safeguards which have led the gentleman to feel that the danger no longer exists.

Mr. SHORT. I think this bill is better than the draft. We are going to have to maintain the draft law for at least 4 more years, as long as this international tension exists. The goal and the ideal is, of course, universal disarmament, and we could get it if the Communists would submit to open and fair inspection, and here we are apostles of peace, and the President has named a member now, giving Cabinet status to Mr. Stassen, to head up this drive for peace, and we are holding conferences. It does seem incongruous, a bit contradictory, when we are talking about world peace and universal disarmament, that we are trying to strengthen our Reserves. We shall remain strong until we are safe. But, I think there is less real militarism in this present bill than there is in the draft law. This is by far the best bill we have had and I do not want to be stupidly obstinate or unreasonably stubborn.

Mrs. CHURCH. Is there less chance of UMT in this bill than in the bill brought in 4 weeks ago?

Mr. SHORT. I think there is. I would say this to the gentlewoman: If after trying this plan and they see it will not work, if the boys from the Pentagon come to us at the next session of Congress or in the next Congress, if I happen to be here, I can promise the gentlewoman from Illinois that I will fight to the last ditch and breath left in me to prevent UMT.

Mrs. CHURCH. I hope that it would not then be too late.

Mr. SHORT. I have always been against UMT; I am today, and I shall continue to be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman told us he opposed the other bill because of the compulsory features or at least some of the compulsory features in the other bill; is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. That first bill could be an opening wedge that would lead to UMT. It is not only where you start; it is where you end that counts. But I am willing, after all these years, to give this thing a whirl and a try. Frankly, there is some risk in this.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know what compulsory features have been eliminated as between the two bills.

Mr. SHORT. The bills are practically the same. There are some minor differences. But this is an improved bill. I have pointed them out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there is eliminated from this bill the compulsory assignment of the National Guard. That is the difference.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is the only one.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In the interest of doing what the gentlewoman from Illinois so well pointed out, could you tell me why the age of 18½ is set as the limit for people to volunteer? Why could not somebody volunteer when he is 21 or 20 or 23?

Mr. SHORT. That is more or less arbitrary, I will say, but it is like fixing a date line. If you were born before a certain date and you received an injury, you would get a pension. You have got to have a date or an age of some kind, and the committee, after going into all aspects of the problem, thought 18½ was the proper age. That is when they come under the National Guard and are drafted. We wanted to keep it uniform.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It has nothing to do, then, with the filling of the draft?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because the goal is set at 250,000?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The draft begins at age 18½. That is the reason for it.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I want to thank Members for their patience and understanding.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time simply to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is any truth to the statement that I have heard that in cases where there are no armories available for the training of these reservists, that they will have to take a correspondence course and thus obtain their training. Does the gentleman care to answer that?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question, in detail, because I do not have the breakdown in front of me, but we appropriated this year $250 million for the construction of armories, and last year it was $250 million, and we hope there will be available all over the country armories where the Reserve units are established.

Mr. KLEIN. It is perfectly obvious, of course, that you could not have them all over the country, and as long as this bill would require these reservists to be trained weekly or more often, obviously they would have to have some other kind of training, and they will probably come up with a correspondence course. I should like to tell a short story I heard some time ago, on the subject of correspondence courses, and their effectiveness. I certainly would hate to depend to be defended by an army that is trained by correspondence courses. They had a dinner in a small town, and a prominent citizen of that town was selected to be the guest of honor at the dinner to give a eulogy on Abraham Lincoln. He had never made a speech in his life. The dinner was about 2 months off, so he decided to take a correspondence course in public speaking. He did his homework religiously, and came the night of the dinner he was letter perfect. He had practiced in his bedroom before the mirror, and really impressed himself as being an excellent public speaker. He knew his subject by heart, and then came the time to speak. He was called on, and he started off by saying, "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Abraham Lincoln is dead." And then, as happens so often, either through stage fright or nervousness, he forgot the speech. He stood there for a minute. The minute seemed like an hour to him. He was panic stricken. Finally he remembered a footnote in one of the lessons of his correspondence course which said that when you get up to make a speech and you forget your speech, start all over again and it will come back to you. So he heaved a mental sigh of relief and started all over again. He said: "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Abraham Lincoln is dead." But nothing happened, he still could not remember the rest of it. He tried it a third time, and when he got to the point where he said, "Abraham Lincoln is dead," he continued, "and I don't feel so good myself."

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that if we have to depend on correspondence courses, I don't feel so good myself, nor will the rest of you, in that event this will be some Army and some Reserve.

I intend to vote against the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, listening to the debate here, it would seem that everybody is trying to find some criticism of this legislation on which so many hours and days and weeks have been spent by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services. I cannot understand why they are not interested in trying to develop the national Reserve program, to contribute to our national defense, or why we should not be interested in trying to educate and instruct mentally and physically the youth of America in the fundamentals of war so in the event that we should suddenly be catapulted into a war and they are called upon to do their part they would have the basic knowledge and training.

Every speaker seemed rather half apologetic about this proposed legislation to strengthen our reserves. I do not think there are any apologies needed for this legislation. I think the youth of America want and are ready to receive this training to be prepared in the event we should again find ourselves in an emergency. I think it is logical for them to be educated to love of our country, and devotion to duty, discipline, mental and physical training and all of those things that this voluntary program will teach them.

It will teach them discipline. They will be instructed in the fundamentals of modern warfare.

Let me take myself as an example. In World War I, I landed down at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. I had been eating T-bone steaks and living on top of the world. At that time, the Ft. Oglethorpe training center left much to be desired. It was a tent outfit in a sea of mud with but few facilities. It was more disorganized. I did not know what it was all about, but there I was.

After I had been there a couple of days, a top sergeant bellows out one morning, "Everybody outside." So I go outside. He barks out, "Line up in a company front." Everybody lines up in a company front. The sergeant commands, "Everybody who is 6 feet or better take two paces to the front." So I take two paces to the front. He says, "Right face." So I right face. He says, "Forward march," and I forward march. And they marched us over to the 6th Division which needed 200 replacements, and the outfit was ready for shipping overseas. So in short time I landed over in France, and I never shot a rifle in my life before. I did not know squads right from squads left. I was rather ill at ease. I did not know what it was all about, but I soon caught on. I often thought to myself, "If I only had some basic training, if I only had 6 weeks I would have been in a much improved position." Six months' training would have helped greatly. I would have known what it was all about.

So giving the youth of America an opportunity for a 6 months' training period would be helpful. This program will give him this voluntary opportunity for this training. During this period, as stated, he will receive mental and physical training, taught many things he ought to know if called on for the defense of our country. This instruction in all of those things will build them into vigorous, fine American citizens. So let us change our attitude and see how we can make this Reserve program work. This program is going to be helpful to the youth of America. They will come out of the service with a great pride. They will be proud to have participated.

What did we do after World War I? I actually thought we meant what we said, "A war to make the world safe for Democracy." "This is a war to end all wars." Rather than a "war to end all wars" we paved the way for the dictators that followed. We then went down the way of pacifistic peace. We sank our battleships, destroyed our fortifications, and put our trust in treaties with people we thought were as right-minded as ourselves.

What happened? We let down our defenses. Then we got the Trotskys, the Lenins, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Himmlers, the Goerings, the Mussolinis, the Cianos, and the dictators that followed. We went down the line of pacifism. We sat on the sidelines and did nothing about it. We wishfully thought, "Well, it will all work out." But it did not work out. Again suddenly we were catapulted into World War II, and at the Battle of the Bulge which you well recall, we were sending these boys in with 14 or 15 weeks of basic training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to recall to the membership that after World War II the clamor was on to demobilize the Army. I went over to hear General Marshall at the Congressional Library—to hear him explain how he was trying to get the boys back. We had 14 or 15 million men going forward. The war was over. The cry was "Bring the boys back home." The Members were on the floor of the House berating the "brass." We had been going forward with 14 or 15 million, so we had to stop and go into reverse. It was a tough assignment for the military. And what did we do? We skeletonized our Army, we skeletonized our Navy, we skeletonized our Air Force. Then suddenly, in 1949, we pulled out of Korea. Then we found ourselves catapulted into the Korean war. And what happened? We were totally unprepared. We had but little manpower, a few obsolete tanks and bazookas in Japan. We were nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan. It was the most humiliating incident in the history of this great Nation of ours because we were not prepared, the youth of America was not prepared. We called up our Reserves, we called up the boys that had been fighting in World War II, and we again asked them to come in and carry on the fight in Korea. They did, and turned in that magnificent performance.

Now we are trying to build up these reserves so the veterans of World War II and the Korean war would not be called again in event of an emergency. We are trying to build up an organization to meet any emergency. What do you want to do—call back again the boys who fought in World War II? Do you want to call back the boys again who took the punishment in Korea? Certainly not. This bill should pass and pass overwhelmingly. It should have the support of every Member of the House. We need a hard-hitting, aggressive Reserve to tie in with our national defense program. This is part of the program. The President said it is necessary and essential to our national defense. The necessity for this program is proven. Let us see how we can build up this reserve program. It is not perfect. It needs some refinements. It will be improved over the years, however let me say it is the basis upon which we can build up a great reserve corps. I trust it will have the overwhelming support of the Members of the House.

I have every confidence in the youth of America. They will handle themselves. Recently I was privileged to observe the training program of the 82d Airborne at Fort Bragg. They train a fine soldier in a 4-month training program. We saw them pass in review. It was a thrilling sight and I certainly was proud of them. They will come through with flying colors. This program I know will build fine Americans and will build up a great national reserve corps for our national defense.

At this time I would like to define the word "reservist" as defined by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States:

> Let's define a reservist. He is one prepared in peacetime to quickly and effectively assume military duties in time of war or national emergency. He follows a dual career. As a citizen he must provide a living for himself and his family; as a reservist he voluntarily imposes upon himself the additional responsibility of military preparedness.
>
> It is an immeasurable compliment, which has often been reiterated, that the caliber of so many Americans has enabled them to perform their active duty responsibilities, throughout all echelons, on a par with career personnel.
>
> Such performance is dependent upon the time devoted by an individual to preparing himself. Our problem today is to encourage a sufficient number to devote that time and to provide the tools necessary to permit the development of the necessary proficiency.
>
> In the past when crises occurred we augmented our Regular forces by employing hurriedly trained citizens who were successful in meeting the problems of wartime conditions. Term our citizens-at-war what you will, every conflict has been won because we employed Reserve forces. In the future such procedure will be axiomatic * * * it is an inescapable requirement to success.
>
> The time element we have enjoyed in the past is no longer with us. If we are to survive an aggressor's attack, we need face the facts of life, today. We must have a better trained, better equipped, and better prepared Reserve than in the past.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that as long as we have a few Sergeant GAVINS we need not entertain fears of dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to add anything to what has already been said with respect to the pending bill. But I feel I would be amiss in my duty not to make a few general observations, if for no other reason than that the people I represent may know why I believe this bill should have our overwhelming support.

I am supporting this bill because it is vital to the defense of our country. The penalties to our people, in lives and in money, for our failure to provide them with a proper national defense are almost beyond imagination. The ever-increasing armed might of Communist Russia and her satellites daily remind us of an ever present threat to our security and our very existence as a free people. We must be prepared to meet it, not just for today, or tomorrow, but for the unforeseeable future as long as this threat is present. This bill, to provide a Ready Reserve, is an essential part of that preparation.

The most difficult, and yet the most important phase of all defense planning is manpower—not just mere masses of men, but highly trained men who can be moved into action on a moment's notice. In this day of speed and power, with a mile having become but an inch and an hour but a minute of time, we cannot expect to have time to raise and train men for military action should an enemy suddenly move against us. It is imperative that we have trained forces ready for every emergency.

If we do not have such trained forces in reserve and in a state of readiness, what is the alternative to insure that we have adequate forces to repel and defeat the enemy? As I see it, the alternative to the Ready Reserve program proposed by this bill is an increase in the size of our standing Armed Forces. This would necessarily mean a stepup in the draft calls under the Selective Service Act, with its disruptive impact on individual lives and our economy. To make certain that we had adequate forces on hand there would be inevitably fewer and fewer deferments as now granted under existing law and regulations.

Bear in mind that our defense planning must necessarily be for the long pull. For many years we shall probably be obliged to burden our taxpayers with large defense expenditures. A larger standing Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps as now contemplated would add to that economic burden.

The Reserve program envisaged by this bill will make possible to have immediately available trained men, with a very minimum cost and a very minimum of impact on individual lives and our civilian economy. This proposed program will give a flexibility to our whole defense planning. And flexibility is an important characteristic in any sound defense planning in a world filled with uncertainties.

As the Members of the House know, I am unalterably opposed to UMT. Three years ago we had such a bill before us. I opposed it in committee, and I opposed it on the floor of the House. I spoke against it. I voted against it. And I take pride in having had some active part in bringing about its defeat.

I was opposed to UMT then. I am opposed to it now. And I will continue to oppose it. This bill has been misrepresented. It has none of the elements of UMT.

The fact of the matter is that the bill before us actually lessens the military obligation imposed on our youth by the Selective Service Act which we have already voted to extend. It even reduces the degree of compulsion imposed by existing law.

Under the so-called Draft Act which most of us voted for, every young man is subject to military service before reaching age 26. He is obliged to serve 2 years on active duty. But that does not complete his military obligation under the law. He still has 6 years of Reserve obligation, and should he refuse to discharge that obligation as may be required he is subject to $10,000 fine or imprisonment for 5 years.

I call your special attention to the fact that under the terms of this bill the Reserve obligation is reduced. Instead of an 8-year military obligation, this bill reduces it to 6 years. The reduction will apply retroactively to June of 1951.

I also stated that this proposed program even reduces the degree of compulsion imposed by existing law. This bill would give a young man a choice in the fulfilling of his military obligation that he does not presently have. A young man may either wait his draft call to which he is subject or, if he wishes, he may enlist directly into the Reserve by undergoing 6 consecutive months of active-duty training. The choice is his. It is a choice he does not presently have.

During the debate on this pending measure, and the one we previously had before us, much was said about such a reserve training program as this seriously interrupting the normal lives of our youth. There is no doubt that for a young man to be required over a period of time to attend drills or go on active training duty will represent an interruption in his normal pursuits. It does constitute a continuing obligation for a few years. There is no question about that, and I wish it could be avoided. But bear in mind that there is the continuing, even longer obligation, in existing law for which I repeat the great majority of us voted.

To be sure, in the course of 6 years a young man's status or situation may change. It may be that his parental or paternal obligations will increase. Any number of things might occur. It may develop that for him to take active-duty training will represent a great hardship.

Those contingencies have not been overlooked. They are provided for in this bill. They are provided for not only in the interests of the individuals affected but also in the best interests of our defense program itself.

We are seeking by this program to have a mobilization base. We are seeking to have a Ready Reserve. It would not be in the best interests of the military service to have in the Ready Reserve men whose family or perhaps his critical job in some essential industry would suffer greatly were he called to duty. If that were not so, the word "ready" will have become meaningless. He must be ready to go into action for his country not simply in terms of training but also in terms of his readiness from the standpoint of his family situation or the job he holds. To have a Ready Reserve in the full sense of the term you must have a readiness in all respects.

Under the terms of the bill, provision is made for the continuing screening of the Ready Reserve by which an individual, by virtue of the change in his circumstances, will be transferred to the Standby Reserve. It will be a continuing process to make certain that our Ready Reserve is really a reserve in readiness in all respects, military and civilian. Under the process the members of the Ready Reserve with critical skills, combat veterans, or those whose call to duty would result in extreme hardship to him, to his family, or to his community, will be screened for possible transfer to the Standby Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like the Draft Act. But we must have it in the interests of having an adequate defense that we may insure peace by being prepared in the event of war. We have no alternative.

We likewise have no realistic alternative except adopt this proposed military-reserve program. Surely we will not allow sectionalism, political considerations, or other extraneous questions, influence how we shall vote on this bill. There is much more at stake. The defense of our country is at stake, and a vote for this bill is a vote for military strength that no one dare try to take away our freedom.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, first, as for a statement that has been made raising the question as to whether we want a strong Reserve force, there is no one in this Chamber who is more desirous of having a strong Reserve than am I. I first took military training 34 years ago this month, and have been active at it every year and still am. So in my objections to this bill I wish to point out that this bill will injure instead of assist in bringing about a strong, healthy, voluntary Reserve.

First, for the sake of the record, I want to ask the chairman of this committee a question. This is only for the sake of the record. Does this bill, in your opinion and the opinion of the committee and the counsel for the Committee on Armed Services, entirely eliminate the National Guard from all provisions of this act?

Mr. VINSON. As far as the bill is concerned, and it is as plain as language could make it, in my judgment it has no relation whatsoever to the National Guard.

Mr. BRAY. Frankly, I think the same, but I did want this a matter of record.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. At no place in the bill is it even mentioned.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is better than the last bill we had a little over a month ago. The reason is that this bill can only damage one section of the Reserve. It cannot damage the National Guard because it is out of the bill. So, at least for that reason, this bill is materially better than the bill we just had.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The President has authority to call the National Guard at any time, has he not?

Mr. BRAY. That is correct. There is no question about that. Everybody in the National Guard wanted to be there when they enlisted, and they realized their obligation when they took it.

Now, I do not have time to analyze this bill in any great degree, but I do want to read from page 2, line 19, of this bill. It reads:

> Until July 1, 1959, whenever the President finds that the authorized strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained at the strengths deemed sufficient by him, he may authorize, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

What that means is that we are telling the Secretaries of Defense that they can write this bill as to training for the Ready Reserves outside of the National Guard. If that is what you want, that is what this bill gives. There are other phases of the bill.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. I would like to ask my distinguished colleague, a member of the committee and a student of military affairs, does that mean that the Secretary of Defense can say how long these young men will serve?

Mr. BRAY. It means he can say how long they shall serve up to 8 years, which is the limit of time if the present act becomes operative.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is this not the greatest delegation of authority on the part of this Congress to the Secretary of Defense in a time when we were not in actual shooting war? That is one major reason for my bitter opposition to this legislation.

Mr. BRAY. I have never seen such a broad delegation of power. This legislation in effect states that this House is not capable of legislating on this important subject.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I propose to offer an amendment on page 2.

Mr. BRAY. Just a moment. I have only 5 minutes. I will yield to the gentleman if he will get me more time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. All I want to tell the gentleman is that I am going to offer an amendment to clear up that point which the gentleman raises.

Mr. BRAY. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Special Committee considering this legislation. The gentleman from Louisiana has not to my knowledge taken this amendment up with any member of the committee. I do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that a certain group of people intend to go to the other body and get a different bill. As has been brought out previously in this debate, it seems as though the Defense Department intends to get their version of the bill written in the other body and then have it accepted in conference.

I do not generally criticize the Defense Department. It has on the whole done a fine job, and I have been a strong supporter of adequate national defense. However, I do want to reiterate that the Pentagon has never shown any real interest in getting a strong Reserve. In our 7 weeks of hearings on the bill, at no time did anyone say anything complimentary about the Pentagon's administration of the Army Reserves. No one on this floor today has been complimentary of the Pentagon's handling of the Reserves. By that I do not mean that all of the officials in the Pentagon are against the Reserves. That is not true. There are some, and I believe increasing numbers, who believe in a strong, capable Reserve. Notable among them is Gen. Hugh Milton, Assistant Secretary of the Army. Apparently though all too many have no interest in a strong voluntary Reserve system.

The proponents of this bill say that they only want a bill to help them to train a strong Reserve. I want to assure them and point out to you that they have all of the legislative authority that they need to carry out what they say they desire to do. Allow me to quote to you from the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended:

Section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, reads in part as follows:

> Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secrettary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the Armed Force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein.

Section 12 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, reads in part as follows:

> Or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this title, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct.

It is a fact that the Pentagon has never attempted to enforce this act at any time, although it was a bill that they wanted when it was passed. I will attempt, later, to give you what I believe is the reason no attempt was ever made to enforce this act. That disposes of the Pentagon's authority to force veterans of 2, 3, or 4 years service to take additional Reserve training. As for the statement made that this bill is needed to train the Reserves, I want to point out to you in detail that no such authority is needed. The National Guard has a plan to train enlistees that gives exactly the results the proponents of this bill say that they favor. All of this is accomplished without additional legislation. On July 23 at Lackland Air Base, 1,400 members of the Air National Guard will graduate from a 11 weeks basic training course, at which time they will return to their National Guard unit in their home towns. They are volunteers and are being trained under existing legislation. Commencing the 1st of July there is a quota of 1,000 each month of Army National Guard recruits to take 8 weeks' basic training. This will be followed later by advanced training in their special fields. All of this is done on a voluntary basis and under existing legislation.

Why is the National Guard program effective while the rest of the Reserve program of the Army is not effective? The officers and men in the Guard are no better or more capable than are the officers and men in the other branches of the Reserves. However, the National Guard has the backing of their respective States. They want to make a creditable unit and they are constantly battling the Pentagon to see that the Guards do get proper training and proper treatment. The Reserve, outside of the Guard, however, does not have that assistance from the States. They must rely on the tender mercies of the Pentagon.

The Pentagon, as I have already pointed out, now has authority to force veterans to perform their Reserve obligation and can try them by court martial or in Federal court. Do they want more authority than that? As I have pointed out, they have the authority to carry out any voluntary training program that they desire. I want to make only one brief remark as to the forcing of the 2-, 3-, or 4-year veterans to participate in weekly drills and go to summer camp.

In my opinion, while you can draft men for service for 2 or more years, and make them into capable soldiers, I doubt the effectiveness of forcing a veteran to take the weekly training program after he returns from service. Since he is a forced Reservist, I think he will be so bitter against the program he will cause authorities more trouble than he will do good. It also seems to me to be unfair that the veteran of 2, 3, or 4 years would have to perform these services. I would rather have a strong, vital voluntary Reserve, and protect the veteran from further service as much as possible, unless the need for his service is great, and this 2-, 3-, or 4-year veteran is the only one forced to train.

This philosophy of forcing prior-service men to drill is not in keeping with that of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. However, I want to point out that while the Pentagon is asking for that authority in this bill, they already have that authority.

It is difficult for me to understand exactly why the Pentagon is asking for authority in this bill, which it already has, unless they plan to get the House to pass this bill and then get the other body to write their version of the bill, and get it through conference. The only other reason I can think of as justification for this bill is that the Pentagon knows that it does not intend to have the bill succeed, and build a strong voluntary Reserve. Then the Pentagon will come back next year, or the year following, and again tell us that we must have a stronger bill. That we must give them the authority to draft the youth into the Reserve. That we must give them more and more authority for the regimentation of American youth.

If this bill becomes law, I will be waiting with interest to see if the Defense Department really attempts to build a strong reserve, or if they will come back next year asking for more and more regimentation.

In closing I want to again state that I am in favor of a strong voluntary reserve, and I am certain it can be achieved, but I am equally positive it cannot be achieved while the Pentagon is more interested in regimenting the youth of America than it is in getting this strong voluntary reserve program.

I again want to state that my voiced opposition to the Pentagon in this debate does not apply to its general actions on other phases of national defense, but only to its failure to bring about a reserve program.

I believe there is one significant point of evidence that shows the Pentagon does not intend to attempt to build a reserve, at least of the magnitude they say they intend to do. Today there are approximately 700,000 more or less active Reservists. Most of those are in the National Guard. It has taken a half century to build sufficient armories and facilities to take care of this 700,000 Reservists. By this bill the Pentagon intends to immediately have an active Reserve of 2,900,000, which is an increase of 400 percent. Yet they have made no plans to increase the training facilities, such as armories, and the like, to any appreciable degree. Neither have they presented to this body any figures as to the amount of money that it will take to place this program in effect, if it becomes law.

In closing, I want to again emphasize the importance of a strong voluntary Reserve, and also point out that this bill takes no steps toward that goal that are not already in effect. This bill, however, may become a move to obtain more and more regimentation of the youth of America. In these troubled times we must have a strong Army, Navy and Air Force. However, if the time ever comes in America when we believe that our principal strength is in our tanks and cannons, our ships and planes, just as that time will America give way to the regimentation of militarism.

The real strength of America is, and always has been, a free people and a free economy. Our youth is our greatest asset in maintaining the freedom and dignity of man to our country for future years. In our desire to remain strong, we must never for one moment forget that our true strength is the spiritual strength of a free people. This bill will not provide a strong free Reserve. It should be recommitted to the committee until a good bill is worked out.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the prime reason for action on this bill at this moment is a request by the President of the United States that this specific legislation—H. R. 7000—be enacted into law. To me the situation confronting us points to a matter of extreme urgency arising out of a recent first-hand experience of the Chief Executive.

The Civil Defense Administration decided to have a simulated atomic attack and designated the roles that various persons and groups would carry out in this exercise. The plans called for the President and his top assistants to go to a hideout that was set aside for them. Their part of the exercise was carried out to the letter.

The astonishing thing about this is that when the President emerged from this experience, the first public comment that he made was that Congress should promptly write and pass a Reserve bill. H. R. 7000 is the answer to that request. The awful contemplation of what an atomic attack could mean emphasized to the President the absolute necessity for strengthening our military position, especially in the matter of Reserves.

He also emphasized that a previous bill which had been considered by the House had failed of passage, not because the bill was unsatisfactory, but because an auxiliary problem had been injected into the discussion through an amendment concerning a race issue.

The proponents of the first bill met every objection and all suggested amendments to its military features. These amendments were rejected by the Committee of the Whole. Then, when a purely collateral matter was raised which forced into the bill a provision attempting to solve a race problem, the opponents of the bill, not having been able to defeat the military features of the bill, seized upon this feature and mustered enough votes to defeat the bill which had the blessing of the President.

We are here today with a good bill. It is again one that meets with the approval of the President, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. It has been made shorter, simpler, and better than the former bill.

It reduces the military obligation from 8 years to 6 years. This reduction applies retroactively to all who have acquired the 8-year obligation since June 19, 1951, the effective date of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

It exempts ordained ministers and divinity students from the obligation to participate in military training.

It permits direct enlistment of individuals into the Reserve of any military service for a normal 6 year obligation, provided they will agree to perform 2 years of active duty.

In the bill we provided that the Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations governing such enlistments. Some of us had doubt about the advisability of granting this power to the Secretary. Those of us who have been active in Reserve legislation for a considerable time had fought for what we called "statutory recognition" for Reserves. We had felt that regulations promulgated by the Defense Department or any of the Military Departments could be changed at will—and sometimes arbitrarily—and many of those subject to these regulations would not know of modification for a long time. Thus we are proposing a change in the bill we have introduced to provide that the Secretary can prescribe regulations, but he cannot extend the period of enlistment beyond the time prescribed in this act, which is 6 months.

The question that may be presented to the Members again is whether they will follow the desires of the President who is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or the leadership of the gentleman from New York, who, I presume, will again introduce his former or a similar amendment.

I want to be definitely on record as supporting the President. He is the one that has the terrifying responsibility of developing and using our Armed Forces as a symbol of strength, while he is giving leadership to the development of world peace that will be lasting. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, undoubtedly our greatest military mind of this age, is on record that we must find a way to permanently outlaw war, otherwise world suicide might follow. As the recognized spokesman and leader of the free world, our President's aim is the accomplishment of this objective. A strong military posture, including a strong Reserve force, will help him accomplish that aim.

If he goes to the summit conference and his request for a strong Reserve bill has been rejected, his situation will be one of embarrassment. His position will be weakened immeasurably.

Fortunately there is in writing over the name of the gentleman from New York, an article in the Reader's Digest that tells in vivid and unmistakable language what our President has unobtrusively done for the gentleman's race. I shall place it in the RECORD and I hope every Member of the House reads it and particularly notes the changes that have occurred in the armed services, due to the influence of the President.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE NEGRO

(By Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.)

I am a Negro by birth and a Democrat by choice; for nearly a quarter of a century I have worked to advance the rights of Negroes. During the 1952 presidential campaign, I tried desperately to get Dwight D. Eisenhower to endorse a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. This he steadfastly refused to do. I did not understand why and, like many Negroes, I feared his election meant a setback in the struggle for fairer treatment and equal opportunities for our people.

I was wrong.

In less than 2 years in the White House President Eisenhower without political trumpeting, has quietly started a revolution which, I firmly believe, means an era of greater promise for Negro citizens. Today I think I understand what the President believes, and why he believes it. I know now that he practices what he preaches.

Our Chief Executive does not believe that civil rights are primarily the responsibility of the politician. He believes this issue is a problem for every citizen and that, through personal leadership, by personal example, Americans can be counted on to follow decent instincts without legislation. In an open letter to me in the early months of his administration, he made this declaration.

"I shall continue to devote my earnest efforts to advance the spirit as well as the fact of equality. We shall not take a single backward step. There must be no second-class citizens in this country. To achieve our purpose we must work together and not be content until we have gained our goal."

Those were fine words. The President has proved he means them.

The example he has set began in the White House. Until he took over, no Negro had ever been employed there except as messenger or janitor. President Eisenhower installed Mrs. Lois Lippman as the first Negro secretary. Politics had nothing to do with her appointment. She was hired not because of her color or in spite of it. She had proved to be an efficient secretary when working in General Eisenhower's campaign headquarters in New York. The White House needed capable secretaries, and so she was brought to Washington. No publicity use was made of it. Nor has political capital been made of the President's appointment of 47 Negroes to important posts, or to the fact that 27 of those positions had never been held by Negroes.

Since the Taft administration, no Negro had been appointed to a post of Little Cabinet status until Eisenhower appointed J. Ernest Wilkins, prominent Chicago attorney, as Assistant Secretary of Labor. Mr. Wilkins was not appointed on account of his color but because Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell believed him to be the best man for the job and so recommended him to the President. In the same way Scovel Richardson, former dean of law at Lincoln University, became the first Negro Federal Parole Commissioner.

The population of Washington, D. C., is more than one-third Negro. Segregation has been the established pattern. As candidate, General Eisenhower said: "I shall never cease to work to get rid of this in the District of Columbia."

This is the Eisenhower record:

Washington's restaurants, following vigorous action by the new Attorney General, have stopped segregation. Officials of the Restaurant Association report not a single case of serious friction.

At the urging of the Eisenhower appointed chairman of the District Board of Commissioners, segregation has been voluntarily eliminated from bars and restaurants in Washington's hotels. As a result of this some hotels are following a more liberal policy with regard to rental of rooms.

With the help of movie magnates, Jim Crowism has been wiped out in Washington's big downtown movie theaters. This was done with such an absence of publicity that last summer a group of Negroes, bent on picketing a theater, were so surprised when tickets were sold them that they turned around and went home.

Segregation has been abolished in the city's recreational areas and facilities—without a reported case of serious trouble. It has been ended in 21 out of 23 departments of the District government.

The District's public-housing agency has ordered that the 4,000 dwellings to be constructed with Federal aid be made available to low-income families without discrimination as to race. "White" and "colored" signs have already come down from all but 4 of the 19 projects already occupied.

Washington at last is becoming the Capital of our democracy in fact as well as in name. Today, when foreigners come to study our democratic institutions, Americans, instead of apologizing, can point with pride to their National Capital.

In 1948, President Truman ordered complete integration of white and colored soldiers in the armed services. Four and a half years later, when President Eisenhower took office, 40 percent of the Army's all-Negro units were still intact; 75 percent of Negroes in the Navy were servants in the segregated messmen's branch.

Today there is not a single all-Negro unit in the Army.

It was reported to the President that at 21 Army, Navy, and Air Force bases segregated schools were operated for the children of servicemen. Investigation disclosed that at other bases, some in the South, integration had been successfully achieved. Whereupon, many months before the recent Supreme Court decision, the President ordered all schools at all military bases put on a nonracial basis.

Soon after his inauguration President Eisenhower ordered an inquiry to find how segregation could be eliminated with a minimum of friction from many Southern naval bases and installations. The action which followed was another example of the President's silent revolution. At night, the "white only" and "colored" signs were removed from drinking fountains at these bases. A few days later, the signs pointing to "white" and "colored" restrooms were painted over. Soon, without announcement, cafeterias were opened to both races. Within a few months segregation was completely eliminated in 21 naval plants employing 70,000 whites and Negroes.

"The walls are really tumbling down," said a grateful southern Negro leader. This approving opinion is shared by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Formerly there was racial segregation in 47 hospitals of the Veterans' Administration, ranging all the way from separate waiting rooms for Negroes to their total exclusion from some institutions. Today, on orders from Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, there are no segregated libraries; partitions separating the races at snack bars have been torn down, recreational facilities have been made open to all. Negroes are treated at previously all-white hospitals, and there are white patients at the former Negroes-only hospital at Tuskegee, Ala.

Since 1942 virtually all Government contracts and subcontracts have contained provisions prohibiting job discrimination for reasons of "race, creed, color, or national origin." For 10 years this clause meant little or nothing. In midsummer 1953, Eisenhower set up the President's Committee on Government Contracts to deal with this problem. The new committee is headed by the Vice President. Its 15 members include the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell; the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers; and distinguished representatives of business and organized labor. It lacks any enforcement authority, but with active Presidential support it accomplishes through quiet persuasion what a decade of legal agreements failed to do.

The committee, for example, appealed to the telephone company serving Washington to drop its color bar in employment. This appeal was supported by one of the President's White House assistants. "The President wants you to know," he said, "that he's not trying to hit anybody over the head. But whatever you do here in Washington to help end segregation will have an influence all over the world on people who are judging democracy by us." Today, without friction, Negro and white clerks are working side by side. In scores of other companies doing business with the Government, friendly appeals from the committee have produced like results.

Recently the Chicago Defender, an influential Negro newspaper which supported Truman and Stevenson, commented with delighted astonishment on President Eisenhower's race record. What he has done, said the Defender, "is not so much from a political motive, but more from deep-seated moral and spiritual convictions. Dwight Eisenhower is determined to be President of all the people."

I am a Democrat. I nonetheless believe that he is proving to be such a President, and all the people, Negroes and whites, will be better and America stronger, because of it.

That article shows the implicit confidence that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] had in the President of the United States. But now he wants to deny the President the right to strengthen the Armed Forces which the President believes is essential if he is to bring about the world peace we are all looking for. When I read that article I said to myself "President Eisenhower has done more for the Negro than any person since Abraham Lincoln or Booker T. Washington."

I want to point out also that more than 60 percent of the Members of the 84th Congress are veterans who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Here is the list of these members:

Members of Congress Who Have Served in the Armed Forces

(There are 63 Senators, including Vice President Nixon; 261 Representatives, or a total of 324.)

Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

SENATORS

Allott, Gordon, Colorado.
Barrett, Frank A., Wyoming.
Beall, J. Glenn, Maryland.
Bennett, Wallace F., Utah.
Bricker, John W., Ohio.
Bush, Prescott S., Connecticut.
Butler, John Marshall, Maryland.
Capehart, Homer E., Indiana.
Carlson, Frank, Kansas.
Case, Francis, South Dakota.
Clements, Earle C., Kentucky.
Daniel, Price, Texas.
Dirksen, Everett M., Illinois.
Douglas, Paul H., Illinois.
Dworshak, Henry C., Idaho.
Ellender, Allen J., Louisiana.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., North Carolina.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., Delaware.
Goldwater, Barry M., Arizona.
Gore, Albert, Tennessee.
Green, Theodore Francis, Rhode Island.
Hayden, Carl, Arizona.
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., Missouri.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., Iowa.
Hill, Lister, Alabama.
Holland, Spessard L., Florida.
Ives, Irving M., New York.
Jackson, Henry M., Washington.
Jenner, William E., Indiana.
Johnson, Lyndon B., Texas.
Johnston, Olin D., South Carolina.
Kennedy, John F., Massachusetts.
Kerr, Robert S., Oklahoma.
Kilgore, Harley M., West Virginia.
Knowland, William F., California.
Kuchel, Thomas H., California.
Lehman, Herbert H., New York.
Long, Russell B., Louisiana.
McCarthy, Joseph R., Wisconsin.
McClellan, John L., Arkansas.
Magnuson, Warren G., Washington.
Malone, George W., Nevada.
Mansfield, Mike, Montana.
Martin, Edward, Pennsylvania.
Martin, Thomas E., Iowa.
Millikin, Eugene D., Colorado.
Neely, Matthew M., West Virginia.
Neuberger, Richard L., Oregon.
Payne, Frederick G., Maine.
Potter, Charles E., Michigan.
Purtell, William A., Connecticut.
Robertson, A. Willis, Virginia.
Russell, Richard B., Georgia.
Saltonstall, Leverett, Massachusetts.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., Kansas.
Scott, W. Kerr, North Carolina.
Smathers, George A., Florida.
Sparkman, John J., Alabama.
Symington, Stuart, Missouri.
Thurmond, J. Strom, South Carolina.
Thye, Edward J., Minnesota.
Welker, Herman, Idaho.

REPRESENTATIVES

Adair, E. Ross, Indiana.
Addonizio, Hugh J., New Jersey.
Albert, Carl, Oklahoma.
Alexander, Hugh Q. North Carolina.
Alger, Bruce, Texas
Allen, John J., Jr., California.
Allen, Leo E., Illinois.
Andersen, H. Carl, Minnesota.
Andrews, George W., Alabama.
Arends, Leslie C., Illinois.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.
Ashmore, Robert T., South Carolina.
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colorado.
Auchincloss, James C., New Jersey.
Ayres, William H., Ohio.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., California.
Barden, Graham A., North Carolina.
Bass, Perkins, New Hampshire.
Bass, Ross, Tennessee.
Bates, William H., Massachusetts.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.
Beamer, John V., Indiana.
Becker, Frank J., New York.
Belcher, Page, Oklahoma.
Bell, John J., Texas.
Bennett, Charles E., Florida.
Blatnik, John A., Minnesota.
Boggs, Hale, Louisiana.
Boland, Edward P., Massachusetts.
Bolling, Richard, Missouri.
Bolton, Oliver P., Ohio
Bonner, Herbert C., North Carolina.
Bray, William G., Indiana.
Brooks, Jack B., Texas.
Brooks, Overton, Louisiana.
Brownson, Charles B., Indiana.
Broyhill, Joel T., Virginia.
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.
Burleson, Omar, Texas.
Bush, Alvin R., Pennsylvania.
Canfield, Gordon, New Jersey.
Carlyle, F. Ertel, North Carolina.
Carnahan, A. S. J., Missouri.
Cederberg, Elford A., Michigan.
Chase, Jackson B., Nebraska.
Chatham, Thurmond, North Carolina.
Chelf, Frank L., Kentucky.
Chiperfield, Robert B., Illinois.
Clark, Frank M., Pennsylvania.
Colmer, William M., Mississippi.
Cooley, Harold D., North Carolina.
Cooper, Jere, Tennessee.
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., New York.
Cramer, William C., Florida.
Cretella, Albert W., Connecticut.
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., Indiana.
Cunningham, Paul, Iowa.
Curtis, Laurence, Massachusetts.
Curtis, Thomas B., Missouri.
Dague, Paul B., Pennsylvania.
Davis, Glenn R., Wisconsin.
Davis, James C., Georgia.
Dawson, William L., Illinois.
Denton, Winfield K., Indiana.
Derounian, Steven B., New York.
Devereux, James P. S., Maryland.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Michigan.
Dolliver, James I., Iowa.
Donohue, Harold D., Massachusetts.
Donovan, James G., New York.
Dorn, Francis E., New York.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, South Carolina.
Durham, Carl T., North Carolina.
Eberharter, Herman P., Pennsylvania.
Edmondson, Ed, Oklahoma.
Elliott, Carl, Alabama.
Ellsworth, Harris, Oregon.
Evins, Joe L., Tennessee.
Fascell, Dante B, Florida.
Fenton, Ivor D., Pennsylvania.
Fjare, Orvin B., Montana.
Flynt, John J., Jr., Georgia.
Fogarty, John E., Rhode Island.
Forand, Aime J., Rhode Island.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Michigan.
Forrester, E. L., Georgia.
Fountain, L. H., North Carolina.
Frazier, James B., Jr., Tennessee.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., New Jersey.
Fulton, James G., Pennsylvania.
Gary, J. Vaughan, Virginia.
Gavin, Leon H., Pennsylvania.
Gentry, Brady, Texas.
George, Myron V., Kansas.
Granahan, William T., Pennsylvania.
Grant, George M., Alabama.
Gray, Kenneth J., Illinois.
Green, William J., Jr., Pennsylvania.
Gross, H. R., Iowa.
Hagen, Harlan, California.
Hale, Robert, Maine.
Haley, James A., Florida.
Halleck, Charles A., Indiana.
Harrison, Robert D., Nebraska.
Hays, Brooks, Arkansas.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.
Hayworth, Don, Michigan.
Henderson, John E., Ohio.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Florida.
Heselton, John W., Massachusetts.
Hess, William E., Ohio.
Hillings, Patrick J., California.
Hinshaw, Carl, California.
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.
Hoffman, Richard W., Illinois.
Holt, Joseph F., California.
Hope, Clifford R., Kansas.
Horan, Walt, Washington.
Hosmer, Craig, California.
Huddleston, George, Jr., Alabama.
Hyde, DeWitt S., Maryland.
Ikard, Frank, Texas.
Jackson, Donald L., California.
James, Benjamin F., Pennsylvania.
Jarman, John, Oklahoma.
Jennings, W. Pat, Virginia.
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa.
Johnson, Leroy, California.
Jonas, Charles Raper, North Carolina.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., Alabama.
Jones, Woodrow W., North Carolina.
Judd, Walter H., Minnesota.
Kean, Robert W., New Jersey.
Kearney, Bernard W., New York.
Keating, Kenneth B., New York.
Kelley, Augustine B., Pennsylvania.
Kilburn, Clarence E., New York.
Kilgore, Joe M., Texas.
King, Cecil R., California.
King, Karl C., Pennsylvania.
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.
Kluczynski, John C., Illinois.
Krueger, Otto, North Dakota.
Laird, Melvin R., Wisconsin.
Landrum, Phil M., Georgia.
Lane, Thomas J., Massachusetts.
Lankford, Richard E., Maryland.
Latham, Henry J., New York.
LeCompte, Karl M., Iowa.
Lesinski, John, Jr., Michigan.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., California.
McCormack, John W., Massachusetts.
McCulloch, William M., Ohio.
McGregor, J. Harry, Ohio.
McMillan, John L., South Carolina.
Macdonald, Torbert H., Massachusetts
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., Michigan.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., Illinois.
Mack, Russell V., Washington.
Madden, Ray J., Indiana.
Mailliard, William S., California.
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), Florida.
Metcalf, Lee, Montana.
Miller, A. L., Nebraska.
Miller, Edward T., Maryland.
Miller, George P., California.
Miller, William E., New York.
Minshall, William E., Jr., Ohio.
Moss, John E., Jr., California.
Murray, James C., Illinois.
Murray, Tom, Tennessee.
Natcher, William H., Kentucky.
Nelson, Charles P., Maine.
Nicholson, Donald W., Massachusetts.
Norblad, Walter, Oregon.
Norrell, W. F., Arkansas.
O'Hara, Barratt, Illinois.
O'Hara, Joseph P., Minnesota.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., New Jersey.

OSTERTAG, HAROLD C., New York.
PASSMAN, OTTO E., Louisiana.
PATMAN, WRIGHT, Texas.
PATTERSON, JAMES T., Connecticut.
PERKINS, CARL D., Kentucky.
PHILBIN, PHILIP P., Massachusetts.
PHILLIPS, JOHN, California.
POAGE, W. R., Texas.
POFF, RICHARD H., Virginia.
PRESTON, PRINCE H., Jr., Georgia.
PRICE, MELVIN, Illinois.
QUIGLEY, JAMES M., Pennsylvania.
RADWAN, EDMUND P., New York.
RAY, JOHN H., New York.
REECE, B. CARROLL, Tennessee.
REED, CHAUNCEY W., Illinois.
REES, EDWARD H., Kansas.
REUSS, HENRY S., Wisconsin.
RHODES, GEORGE M., Pennsylvania.
RHODES, JOHN J., Arizona.
RICHARDS, JAMES P., South Carolina.
RILEY, JOHN J., South Carolina.
ROBERTS, KENNETH A., Alabama.
ROBISON, JOHN M., Jr., Kentucky.
RODINO, PETER W., Jr., New Jersey.
ROGERS, BYRON G., Colorado.
ROGERS, PAUL G., Florida.
ROOSEVELT, JAMES, California.
RUTHERFORD, J. T., Texas.
SADLAK, ANTONI N., Connecticut.
SAYLOR, JOHN P., Pennsylvania.
SCOTT, HUGH D., Jr., Pennsylvania.
SCRIVNER, ERRETT P., Kansas.
SCUDDER, HUBERT B., California.
SEELY-BROWN, HORACE, Jr., Connecticut.
SELDEN, ARMISTEAD I., Jr., Alabama.
SHORT, DEWEY, Missouri.
SHUFORD, GEORGE A., North Carolina.
SIEMINSKI, ALFRED D., New Jersey.
SIKES, ROBERT L. F., Florida.
SILER, EUGENE, Kentucky.
SIMPSON, SID, Illinois.
SMITH, FRANK E., Mississippi.
SMITH, LAWRENCE H., Wisconsin.
SMITH, WINT, Kansas.
SPRINGER, WILLIAM L., Illinois.
STAGGERS, HARLEY O., West Virginia.
STEED, TOM, Oklahoma.
TALLE, HENRY O., Iowa.
TEAGUE, CHARLES M., California.
TEAGUE, OLIN E., Texas.
THOMAS, ALBERT, Texas.
THOMPSON, CLARK W., Texas.
THOMPSON, FRANK S., Jr., New Jersey.
THOMPSON, T. A., Louisiana.
THOMSON, E. KEITH, Wyoming.
THORNBERRY, HOMER, Texas.
TRIMBLE, JAMES W., Arkansas.
TUCK, William M., Virginia.
TUMULTY, T. JAMES, New Jersey.
UDALL, STEWART, Arizona.
VANIK, CHARLES A., Ohio.
VAN ZANDT, JAMES E., Pennsylvania.
VELDE, HAROLD H., Illinois.
VORYS, JOHN M., Ohio.
WAINWRIGHT, STUYVESANT, New York.
WALTER, FRANCIS E., Pennsylvania.
WEAVER, PHIL, Nebraska.
WESTLAND, JACK, Washington.
WHARTON, J. ERNEST, New York.
WIER, ROY W., Minnesota.
WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B., Massachusetts.
WILLIAMS, HARRISON A., Jr., New Jersey.
WILLIAMS, JOHN BELL, Mississippi.
WILSON, ROBERT C. (BOB), California.
WITHROW, GARDNER R., Wisconsin.
WOLCOTT, JESSE P., Michigan.
WRIGHT, JIM, Texas.
YATES, SIDNEY R., Illinois.
YOUNG, CLIFTON (CLIFF), Nevada.
YOUNGER, J. ARTHUR, California.

They have an interest in seeing that the defense structure of our country is not weakened. We are going to look to these veterans for help in this bill which I consider an excellent and very propitious one at this particular time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, upon my return to Congress after duty in World War II, I was appointed as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and later on assigned to several subcommittees, one of which was the subcommittee on personnel. Since then it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services and likewise a member of the subcommittee on personnel.

Year after year this subcommittee on personnel has considered bills and has written and reported bills which are now laws, all designed to build a real reserve for our country. In the 80th Congress we wrote Public Law 810 which provides retirement for the Reserves. In the 81st Congress we wrote Public Law 783, the Joint Facilities Act to provide armories for the Reservists of this country. During the 82d Congress we wrote the Armed Forces Reserve Act, which is the basic law for Reserve activities of our defense forces. And lastly we wrote during the 83d Congress Public Law 773 which is the Reserve Officer Personnel Act.

These four laws have given the type of a Reserve that many of us in this Congress have tried to build over a period of years. Now what do we find today? We find the Navy is about 75 or 80 percent up to strength as far as Reserves are concerned. We find that the Marines are likewise about 75 to 80 percent of strength. The Air Force is coming along rapidly and building up its Reserve units. The Army we find is composed mostly of officers and noncommissioned personnel, lacking woefully in enlisted personnel. Over a period of years many efforts have been made by the Department of Defense to recruit enlisted men for the Army Reserve without too much success.

The men making up the Reserve today are mostly veterans of World War II or Korea. I trust the committee will keep in mind that when the Korean war was thrust upon us 975,000 veterans of World War II were called into action. They were taken from their families, their education and jobs, and, with practically no training whatsoever, were thrown into combat. Many of them lost their lives and many were maimed and are still in veterans' hospitals today.

Mr. Chairman, today 78 percent of the men who make up the reserves of this country are veterans of World War II and the Korean war. What does that mean? It means that if we are thrown into another war, the veterans of World War II and the Korean war will have to fight America's next war.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true that 60 percent of the Naval Reserves are men who have had no previous training, and without additional legislation, the Army cannot build an Enlisted Reserve?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is exactly right.

This bill is needed and needed badly to assist in the establishment of an adequate reserve for our country. All this bill does is to superimpose another program on the program provided for by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. Like my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], I have opposed UMT. My vote 3 years ago will show I voted against it. Therefore, I join him when he says there is not one iota of UMT in this bill. This bill is designed to provide personnel for the Armed Forces Reserve of this country and the committee will approve it overwhelmingly.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, as I rise in opposition to this bill, I do it with a great deal of trepidation, because I feel, as an expression in Maine puts it, that I am spitting into the teeth of a northeaster. I do it with an extreme amount of trepidation, because I find that my great and beloved leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], has given his dubious and reluctant blessing to this bill. I would not say all this if I was not sincerely convinced that this bill is neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring. I would not say it unless I was sincerely convinced that this bill, rather than strengthening the Reserves, would weaken them and also weaken our active forces, and that by the passage of this bill we would be unnecessarily regimenting the youth of this Nation and causing them more and more definite uncertainty in planning their own futures.

Now, what is the purpose of this bill? The gentleman from Louisiana has said that the Volunteer Reserve program has failed and that we need compulsion. That is not the purpose of this bill. I call your attention to a statement in the report of the committee where it says, on page 2: It should be noted that there is ample authority in existing law to require participation in Reserve training. We do not need compulsion. It has been on the books for 3 years and has not been used either because they do not have the facilities or the inclination to use it. It is only a further excuse for the abject failure of the Army to develop an adequate Reserve.

What does this bill do? This bill is primarily designed to build up the Army Reserve. The Navy and the Air Force do not need it or want it. The Army wants young men in the Reserve. What are we doing under this bill? To my mind, we are creating a privileged class of from 100,000 to 250,000 men under 18½ years of age, a privileged class that goes in for 6 months and then serves the remainder of the 8-year obligation in a Reserve unit.

They serve in Reserve units with men who have been drafted, who have served on active duty for 2 years and come back to serve the remainder of their Reserve obligation. Then if we come to any emergency, who do you think is going to be called? Not the man with 6 months' training, but the man who has already been drafted and served 2 years on active duty. He is the man the Army is going to put the tab on for active duty, and this privileged class of from 100,000 to 250,000 is going to continue to serve in the Reserve.

Then when you have the mothers of your district come to you when this law becomes effective and one mother asks you why her son should be drafted for 2 years when the son of the mother down the street goes for 6 months' training, what are you going to tell her?

This will weaken the morale of the Reserves by putting those two classes together. Those who have already served and must serve again and those who will stay in the Reserve. It will weaken the active forces which, to my mind, are the primary requisite for our defense today, an Active force ready to move at any moment's notice, first by siphoning off from its source of 4 years enlistees these 100,000 to 250,000 of privileged persons per year, and secondly by increasing the cost of the Reserve program in 1959 by $1 billion. And if we are going on the theory of a balanced budget, then if we increase the cost of the Reserve program by $1 billion, it has got to come out of our active forces and by that much has got to reduce their effectiveness.

So I say to you in all sincerity that I am convinced that this bill, far from strengthening the Army Reserve, will weaken it and that it will further have the effect of weakening the effectiveness of the primary defense of this country, our active forces. And I know that the gentlemen and gentlewomen of this House would not want to pass any bill—presumably—to strengthen the Reserve when it would at the same time weaken our active establishment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, practically every veterans organization in the Nation, large numbers of patriotic societies, the newspapers of the country, and people in every walk of life, all agree that this Nation must develop and maintain a strong, well-trained, Ready Reserve—a Ready Reserve made up of young men capable of defending the Nation, should that necessity ever again arise.

Now why is it so compelling, why is it so urgent, why is it so necessary, that we pass a law creating a Ready Reserve?

Why do we need this Ready Reserve? Why cannot we just drift along the way we are doing today?

Well, part of the answer to that question goes to the very heart of our national economy. Let me say to you that it is just as essential to be strong economically as it is militarily.

I ask you, how much longer can this Nation afford to continue to be required to spend 65 cents of every appropriated dollar for our armed services?

How long can our economy withstand this constant drain of dollars and manpower?

How long must we be bled before we take action?

There is not a Member in this House who would oppose any intelligent, reasonable economy move.

There is not a Member in this House who would say that he is opposed to balancing the budget at the earliest possible date.

There is not a Member of this House who desires to continue deficit spending.

There is not a Member of this House who does not feel that we should balance our spending with our intake and start to reduce our national debt.

Well, let us be practical about this problem. Two-thirds of our tax money and thus two-thirds of our deficit can be attributed to the fact that we are forced, because of world conditions, to maintain a large standing force.

Therefore, it logically follows that the only place where any sizable savings in expenditures can be made is in reducing the heavy cost of maintaining a large standing force.

It costs us $5,000 a year to maintain a man in the Regular force.

It costs $1,000 a year to maintain a man in the Ready Reserve.

The savings that will result if we adopt a program such as set out in this bill which will permit us to develop and maintain a strong Ready Reserve, a virile Reserve, are bound to be enormous.

If we want economy in government, it naturally follows that we have to start where the largest expenditure is being made. And it is right in our Armed Forces.

So if you want economy in government, this bill is one of the very first steps, an important step, in that direction.

Now let us look at another side of the picture.

There is not a Member of this House that likes compulsion of any kind.

There is not a Member of this House who would vote to draft a man into the armed services, if it were not absolutely necessary to do so.

Every Member of this House would like to see the day come when the Nation could afford to get rid of the draft. However, we know this cannot take place until we provide, by some other method, the national security that the draft gives us.

The security of the Nation, and an adequate defense of the Nation, should ever be our first and most important duty.

However, the world of today that we live in will not let us hide our head, hoping that the specter of communism will go away and never darken our door.

In all our approaches to national security, we must always remain realistic and deal with facts as they actually exist.

Through no fault of ours, by no choice of ours, we are living today in an era of turmoil, we are living in an era of uncertainty—no one knowing what tomorrow will bring—we are living in an era of tension, we are living in an era of fear, we are living in an era of bewilderment, we are living in an era of scientific development in the art of warfare that carries with it the power of world destruction.

As a Nation, we know that our intentions and aspirations are peaceful.

We would live in the world, molesting no one, helping all who seek help to the best of our ability. We are a God-fearing Nation—a Nation that recognizes the human being for what he is—a creature of God. We do not subjugate human dignity to the supreme right of the State; we do not deny God; we do not covet the possessions of other nations; we follow the Golden Rule and the free nations of the world respect us for this position.

We are also an intelligent Nation.

We know that sacrifices are necessary to preserve freedom. We know that freedom and liberty are not inherent birthrights that are merely handed down from one generation to the next. We know that every generation must preserve its freedom and liberty.

We know that we must have an armed force capable of defending our Nation and carrying the fight to the enemy if it ever becomes necessary.

So, therefore, we are willing to pass draft laws and other laws to preserve our Nation, our liberty, our freedom, and the freedom of the free world.

But if we can find some other method of remaining strong and yet at the same time reduce the sacrifice of time and manpower that exists in our present laws, we should do so.

This bill opens the door for that accomplishment. Now, that is the second thing this bill will permit.

It will permit us to give serious consideration to get on the road to the elimination of the draft law in the years ahead so long as we have created by this bill a strong, virile Ready Reserve to take the place of the draft, one of the main props in the defense of the Nation.

I repeat, and desire to emphasize, that when you have a Ready Reserve such as this bill contemplates, we can look forward to the day when our draft law can be revised; the period of required service reduced; and, as I have said, probably even eliminated.

But if we do not provide the alternative to a large standing force in being, composed of well-trained men, as sought by this bill, then we must face the inevitable fact that our draft law will be with us for the indefinite future.

We must face the fact that without this bill, all young men as they turn 18½ will have to face the future, taking their chances on being drafted for 2 years depending on the then current manpower situation.

Now there is a third part of the objective of this bill which must also be considered. And it deals with "equity."

We all love the word "equity." It is inherent in the whole American way of life. We constantly say "Is it equitable?" "Is it fair?" "Does it do justice for all?" Mr. Chairman, as we all know, our present draft laws are not as fair, are not as equitable, and are not as just as they should be.

Why do I say that? Because under the law today only our veterans, for practical purposes, make up our Ready Reserve.

The one exception is the law with regard to the National Guard. But other than the National Guard, the individuals today who have imposed upon them a Ready Reserve obligation, by law, are those individuals who have been drafted and who have served in the armed services.

Now what are we trying to do with this bill?

We are trying to make the law fairer—we are trying to make the law more equitable.

We are doing this by creating a new method by which young men can voluntarily fulfill their obligation to the country by serving on active duty for a lesser period of time than the draft period—but accepting a heavier Ready Reserve obligation.

By enacting this bill into law, we are also eliminating from the statutory imposition of a Ready Reserve obligation those individuals who served on active duty prior to July 27, 1953—the veterans of Korea.

We say to these veterans: "We will not call you again so long as we can bring a new class of young men into the Reserve who have had no prior active duty, who will be in our Ready Reserve and who will be able to come on active duty if their services are needed."

Now, of course, there is no sense in kidding ourselves in this matter. It is obvious that a man who is inducted and serves 2 years is going to be better qualified than a man who is trained for only 6 months.

But we are saying to the man who served during the war in Korea that you will not have a Ready Reserve obligation, and we are able to say that because we will have a million men by 1959 who will be in the Ready Reserve through their own choice—voluntary trainees—no compulsion—taking a 6 months' training program.

Those individuals will have to spend 7½ years in the Ready Reserve.

Now we are saying to the other men who have been drafted for 2 years and who did not serve on active duty prior to July 27, 1953, that you are the backbone of the Ready Reserve, because you have had a longer period of training and active duty, but to make it more equitable and fairer, and to spread the obligation we are reducing your total obligation from 8 to 6 years so that you will be required to serve 3 years in the Ready Reserve and only 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

There will be approximately 1,900,000 men in this category by 1959. And by this approach we are adhering to the well-established policy of seeking to do justice to all, and in as equitable a manner as possible.

We are trying to do three things for the safety and security of the Nation:

First. We are trying to make it possible to reduce our heavy expenditures for our Armed Forces—without jeopardizing the security of the Nation.

Second. We are trying to set the pattern for the eventual elimination of the draft.

Third. We are trying to be more equitable in the military obligation by bringing in by volunteer methods a new group of young men.

That is what we are trying to do.

There is no manpower bill that has ever been enacted into law that satisfied everyone.

It obviously is impossible.

But we have tried to bring to the House a bill that will accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

This is the main objective of this bill—

National security, your security, the security of generations yet to be born; the preservation of this, the greatest nation on earth, under God.

You can find fault with any manpower program that is offered by any President, any committee, any group of citizens.

But when all is said and done, when you can develop a program with three basic objectives in mind such as this bill proposes, then I say it is worthy of your support.

Think, first, of your Nation, your freedom, your liberty, your State, and your home.

Let us face this vital question of a Ready Reserve with one thought uppermost in our minds—what is best for the Nation—what is best for our security—what is best for the preservation of America.

Clarence Mitchell, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, testified before the subcommittee last Monday. He proposed this amendment:

> Section 6 (c) 2 (A) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by substituting a comma for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "provided said unit does not exclude or segregate any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

Let me say to you that such an amendment, if offered, would have no relationship to the problem at hand; it simply would be offered as a device to inject an unrelated issue into a national defense problem. In effect, the amendment would be aimed at bringing about a social change by latching extraneous matter to legislation vital to our national security. It would change the basic law that has been in effect since 1948.

The representative from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in his presentation to the subcommittee, said that President Eisenhower had called this type of amendment "extraneous."

And indeed such an amendment, if offered, would be completely extraneous.

It would not aid the defense of the Nation in any way.

It would be offered purely and simply as a method of attaining a political goal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Now, we all know that the National Guard of any State is completely under the control of the governor until that unit is called into Federal service. Once it has been called into Federal service the problem of segregation becomes a Federal problem, but prior to being called the Guard is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the State.

The bill before the House today does not deal with the National Guard.

There is no involuntary assignment to any National Guard unit, nor any authority in this bill to assign an individual to a National Guard unit. So there is no reason for such an amendment to be offered. Such an amendment would be entirely foreign to the objective of the bill. It would not be germane to the purpose of the bill.

If such an amendment is offered it would not be for the purpose of contributing to the safety of the Nation, but solely to force upon this House a completely unnecessary, a completely unrealistic, a completely extraneous matter in a problem vital to our security.

I repeat, the President has said that such an amendment has no place in this bill.

What does it have to do with the Reserve program before the House today? Nothing! It has absolutely nothing to do with the problem of building and maintaining a Ready Reserve in this Nation. It is a completely extraneous matter—not related to the bill before us.

As we all know, the President of the United States had the courage to say that this problem of segregation is a social problem and should not be considered in connection with this Reserve bill.

Here is a chance to support the position of our President who has had the courage to put the defense of the Nation above all other considerations. I am sure you will show the same courage.

I repeat, the President has said it is extraneous, and we all know it has no place in this legislation.

The suggested amendment has nothing to do with the Reserve plan that is proposed in this bill. The National Guard is not mentioned in the bill. The National Guard will continue under present law as it does today.

If you are opposed to the Reserve program, vote against it—but don't try to justify your conscience by voting for some extraneous amendment.

Here is an amendment aimed at disrupting and destroying overnight the National Guard in 21 States in one fell swoop.

I, for one member, am standing firmly behind the President in his determined effort to keep out this "extraneous" matter that has no relation to the Reserve bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true the bill you are proposing is also an amendment to that same law?

Mr. VINSON. It is an amendment to the Draft Act but it is so drafted that it is purposely designed to designate specifically to whom it is applicable, because we say in very clear language that it applies only to the Army Reserve, the Navy Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve. We specifically limit this bill as to whom it applies. We knew what we were doing, because the gentleman from New York himself, when he presented the amendment before, was forced to do it because the National Guard was in it. Now the National Guard is not in this bill. Of course his amendment was in order before because all through the bill the National Guard was mentioned. Now he is offering to amend this bill, but he is amending a law that was passed in 1948, the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Look at the phraseology of this bill. Look how it is drafted, deliberately. It refers to any person enlisted in the Army Reserve, the Navy Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve. We purposely said what Reserve this bill had application to, and it does not refer to the National Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that when this amendment is offered the amendment will be voted down, because it is not an amendment to this bill; it is an amendment to a specific provision of the act of 1948, which is not before the House for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 4 (d) (3) is amended by striking out the words "8 years" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "6 years."

(2) Section 4 (d) (3) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That any person who, while otherwise subject to the provisions of this act, becomes a regular or duly ordained minister of religion shall, at his request, be entitled to a discharge in accordance with regulations adopted by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further,* That a student preparing for the ministry in a recognized theological or divinity school shall not be required to serve on active duty, active training and service, active duty for training or inactive duty training while in such status: *Provided further,* That any person enlisting in the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve for a period of 6 years, which enlistments are hereby authorized, must agree to accept active duty for a period of 2 years. Following completion of such duty, he shall be a member of the Ready Reserve for a period which, when added to the time spent on active duty, shall total 5 years, provided he participates satisfactorily.".

(3) Subsection 6 (c) is amended by changing the designation of present clause (b) paragraph (2) to clause (c), and inserting new clause (b) as follows:

"Until July 1, 1959, whenever the President finds that the authorized strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained at the strengths deemed sufficient by him, he may authorize, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, that volunteers be accepted, within quotas to be established by him (the quotas not to exceed a total of 250,000 persons annually for such Reserve components) and thereafter any person, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction may volunteer in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, or units thereof, and such persons shall be deferred from training and service under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such Reserve component in accordance with section 2 of this act. Any person deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for induction until attaining the 28th anniversary of his birth if he ceases to satisfactorily participate in such Reserve components."

(4) Subsection 6 (d) (1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon graduation persons who successfully complete the Army or Air Force ROTC course or the Marine Corps platoon leaders' class and are qualified shall be commissioned in the Reserve of the appropriate service. Thereafter, such persons in excess of the active forces requirements existing at that time, shall be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 6 months with the service in which commissioned. Upon the completion of such active duty for training such person shall be returned to inactive duty and assigned to an appropriate Reserve unit for the remainder of the military obligation. The Secretary of Defense shall develop standards and regulations to require satisfactory participation by such a person. Failure to meet these standards may result in hs commission in the Reserve being revoked."

(5) Add new subsection 6 (p) as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no person who is honorably discharged upon the completion of 8 years of satisfactory service pursuant to enlistment or appointment under the authority of subsection (c), paragraph (2), clause (B) of this section, which satisfactory service includes 6 consecutive months of active duty for training performed pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection. For the purposes of this act the words 'active duty for training' mean full-time duty in the active military service of the United States for training purposes. The National Security Training Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Defense and the President, as Commander in Chief, with respect to the welfare of persons while serving on active duty for training for 6 months under this subsection. The National Security Training Commission shall report with respect to the welfare of such persons annually to the Congress. The advice and reports rendered by the National Security Training Commission pursuant to this section shall be with reference to the welfare of the persons involved and not with respect to the military training required. The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the selection of persons with critical skills engaged in critical defense-supporting industries and research who may be allowed, notwithstanding their age at the time they are ordered to report for induction, to fulfill their military obligation by serving on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years under the terms of this subsection. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person while undergoing 6 months' active duty for training provided for in this subsection shall—

"(i) be entitled to pay in the amount of $50 a month, as well as for any period of hospitalization incident thereto;

"(ii) for the purposes of subsistence and travel and transportation allowances and title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, be treated as if he were serving in pay grade E–1 (under 4 months); and

"(iii) be entitled to the benefits authorized for reservists by Public Law 108, 81st Congress, approved June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 201) (for the purposes of which the term 'active duty for training' shall be considered to be 'extended naval or military service'), except that he shall not be entitled to the benefits of section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and the automatic indemnity coverage under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended, shall be limited to 30 days after separation or release from the initial 6 months of active duty training."

(6) Section 9 (g) is amended by adding the following new paragraph, to be known as paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"Any person who performs 6 months of active duty for training pursuant to, and as defined in subsection 6 (p) of this act shall be entitled, upon application for reemployment within 60 days after (a) release following satisfactory completion of required training or (b) from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 6 months, to all reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons enlisted under the provisions of this title, except that any person so restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of this title shall not be discharged from such position without cause, within 6 months after such restoration."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the bill is considered as read, I assume shortly thereafter there may be a motion or unanimous-consent request to circumscribe debate. A few of us would like a little time to speak on this bill other than those who, perhaps, may have amendments to offer. If any move is going to be made here to cut off debate, I cannot go along with the gentleman; but if the gentleman will assure us that he is not going to try to limit debate on the bill, I will go along with him.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot make that kind of statement, Mr. Chairman, but I will do my best to be considerate of all Members.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ARENDS (interrupting the reading of the section). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this section of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the section.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Insert the following language immediately after the word "changing" on page 2, line 16: "the period at the end of present clause (A) paragraph (2) to a comma and adding the following language: 'provided said unit does not exclude or segregate any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin'; said subsection is further amended by changing."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would not have been constrained to ask for extra time except for the fact that the gentleman from Georgia has raised indirectly the question that my amendment is extraneous, erroneous, and not germane. Of course, if he were standing on solid ground he would have raised it as a point of order, and that would rule this amendment out. But he will not raise the point of order and, therefore, he indicates that the ground he stands on is nothing but shifting sands.

My amendment is germane, and the gentleman from Georgia, even though he said it is not, is not quite sure or he would have raised the point of order.

I hold in my hand a copy of H. R. 7000, which is before us. This is not a bill, this is an amendment and so stated:

> That the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended as follows.

That is Mr. VINSON's language, Mr. BROOKS' language, the Armed Services Committee language.

My amendment comes in on page 2, line 16, where the Armed Services Committee states in the Brooks amendment, H. R. 7000:

> Subsection 6 (c) is amended by changing the designation of present clause (b) (2) to clause (c), and inserting new clause (b) as follows.

In other words, that is where the Brooks bill H. R. 7000 does amend the 1948 draft act; and my amendment comes right in at the same place using their language. Mark you, my amendment uses the same language, comes in at the same place, the 1948 Selective Service Act.

The gentleman from Georgia knows that my amendment is germane. If not germane he would now raise the point of order. The parliamentarian is right there to advise the Chairman. The Chairman will rule it out of order if it is not germane. Let us get this clear so that tomorrow morning we will not read in the papers where again there has been an erroneous, extraneous rider attached to the bill. This is germane, and I stand here now and will let anyone raise the point of order that it is not germane.

I see no one raising the point of order.

Now there is no point of my going over this amendment. The membership voted on it twice, on May 18 and on May 19. I just want to point out 1 or 2 things.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman agree with me that there is quite a bit of difference between the technical question of germaneness and the question of whether or not an amendment proposed is really one that should be considered along with the bill that is under consideration?

Mr. POWELL. I do not agree with you at all. If you think that way, go ahead and raise the point of order against my amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not talking about germaneness; the only point I am suggesting is whether or not an amendment that might be technically germane is one that should have any place in particular legislation.

Mr. POWELL. I believe that any language germane has a place in every piece of legislation, in any bill that is before us. That is what I think the legislative process is, unless we are going to rewrite Jefferson's Manual and Cannon's Rules of Procedure.

Did you see the front page of our paper today? The Post and Times Herald? Here in Washington at No. 3519 13th Street NW., Negro families are moving into an apartment house and the whole crowd of Soviet employees from Soviet Russia who have been living in there are running; they do not want to live with Negroes. But the five white American families that lived there are staying. Read that in the paper. It is a fantastic story. This ought to be a great blow to Soviet Russia in its relationships with the people of the East, in Africa, and in Asia: Soviet Communists in the United States cannot live in the same house with Negroes. What a joke.

Now, what are we going to do? Are we going to tell the Soviets this afternoon, You are right, we do not want our white boys to serve in the National Guard with Negroes. That is what you are going to tell them if you follow the pressure which has been put on you. But if you follow your conscience, if you follow the love of our country so dear to us, if you want to take this opportunity to strike a great blow against communism today, what a headline it will make on the same page in tonight's paper: "Soviet Russians run; Americans stay."

This is a government of the people, black and white; of the people, Jew and Gentile; of the people, Protestant and Catholic. So I am not going to talk any more. The story has been told. My amendment is germane. The hour has struck, the moment of truth has arrived. Your conscience tells you what to do. Forget Republicans, Democrats, Pentagon, and White House and let America speak, let our conscience dictate what we do here this afternoon.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement just made by the gentleman from New York that he will press for a teller vote, I ask unanimous consent that we limit debate to 5 minutes on the Powell amendment, that 5 minutes to be given this side to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this brings up an emotional issue and that perhaps it is entirely futile to attempt to discuss it from any other standpoint. However, I should point out the situation which does exist.

The amendment does apply solely and exclusively to the National Guard. I am sure the gentleman from New York and I are in agreement on that. We are not raising any question of germaneness.

But, going back to what the authority of the Congress of the United States is in the premises, first, let us understand that the Congress is not required to raise and support armies. It is given the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy. But when you come to the question of the militia, and the National Guard is, of course, the militia, our powers are tremendously circumscribed by the Constitution.

In the body of the Constitution itself it is provided specifically what we can do in reference to the militia.

It gives the Congress authority for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, to suppress insurrections and to repel invasions. It gives the power for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by the Congress.

Then in the second amendment of the Bill of Rights it is provided:

> A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

It is clear that the militia constitutes the Armed Forces of the respective States and the governors of those States. There is no power in the Congress of the United States to control the training or what not of the militia except to provide for disciplining. The appointment of the officers and the training of the militia passes to the States until such time as the militia may be called into Federal service in accordance with an act of Congress permitting the President to call it into service.

So here we have this admittedly divisive amendment which would restrict the one effective Reserve component which we have. At least, it would cause a great disruption of the effective, ready component that we have.

Now, as to whether or not this applies only in the southern part of the United States, any tampering with the National Guard will have its effect in every part of the United States. Let us go to the National Defense Act which created the National Guard and defines the militia as consisting of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, and the Unorganized Militia. The National Defense Act very particularly and definitely protects the customs of the ancient corps. Under section 63 we find this language:

> Any corps of artillery, cavalry, or infantry existing in any of the States on the passage of the act of May 8, 1792—

This refers to organizations in existence in 1792—

> which by the laws, customs, or usages of said States has been in continuous existence since the passage of said act * * * shall be allowed to retain its ancient privileges.

That means that they shall be permitted to retain their customs and usages and that the ancient corps shall be protected. You gentlemen who come from the New England States, from Connecticut I think particularly, with your ancient corps of militia, your ancient militia companies, wearing the colonial customs, they are part of the National Guard. To you gentlemen from the State of New York, and New York City particularly, you have an organization of the National Guard there which has its customs and its proud traditions. I refer to the Fighting 69th. And, I ask you how this might affect your 69th Regiment, the Fighting

Irish Regiment of New York. Those are some of the old customs and traditions that we are going to change here in 15 minutes of debate on this floor on a subject that has nothing to do with the bill under consideration. The amendment has to do with your National Guard solely and exclusively, while the bill has nothing to do with the National Guard.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Does the gentleman know that the State of Connecticut has an integrated National Guard?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know whether Connecticut has an integrated National Guard or not. I know that the State of Texas has an integrated Reserve system. Four years ago, the Reserve was integrated and integrated completely, but the same does not apply to the National Guard. But, I say that such a vital subject as this relating to another portion of our Reserve components should not be included in this bill in a matter of 15 minutes of debate on the floor of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 156.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, offered by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. On page 2, line 25, following the comma, after the word "Defense", insert the following: "which regulation shall not require more than 6 months active duty for training."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 2, line 7, after "That", insert "subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned lest the committee, in its headlong rush to create an organized Federal Civil Defense Force, inadvertently and unintentionally do serious harm to our first line of defense, namely, the regular Armed Forces. It has seemed to me from a careful reading of the language found on page 2 of the bill, beginning on line 7 with the words "Provided further," and continuing to the end of the paragraph on line 15 of page 2, that a door might thereby be opened for a prospective enlistee to claim that he had a statutory right, as distinct from a privilege subject to the needs and requirements of the services, to enlist in one of the regular services for a minimum active-duty tour of 2 years.

At all other points, both in this bill and also in the basic legislation which this bill seeks to amend, where reference is made to terms or conditions of enlistment language is included clearly indicating that the numbers to be enlisted or inducted shall be limited to definite quotas set either by law or by the Secretary of the Department concerned in line with the needs of the services and possible interferences with recruitments for differing terms of service. It is my fear that the provision in the bill, as now written, might cause many men who might otherwise enlist for 4 or more years in the Air Force or the Navy to decide instead to enlist in the Air Force or Naval Reserve for 6 years with an agreement to accept only 2 years of active duty. If the Navy and Air Force were forced to accept such enlistments beyond the numbers that they might regard as necessary for their requirements, in lieu of regular 4-year enlistments, the effective strength of those services could be seriously reduced.

A very substantial proportion of the young men who now enlist for 4 years in the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard do so because their preference for those services as compared with the Army is sufficiently great that they are willing to serve an extra 2 years in order to be able to pick their own branch of the service. If these young men could pick the branch of service of their preference and still only serve 2 years of active duty, they could be expected to choose this course in preference to enlisting for 4 years. As long as the services concerned can clearly limit such 2-year enlistments to such numbers as they may deem appropriate, there should be no interference with the normal recruitment of 4-year enlistees. But, under the unclear language now in the bill, it might be ruled that the services must accept the 2-year enlistments in lieu of 4-year enlistments.

Because of the complex nature of the equipment used by several of the services a 2-year term of service is regarded as inadequate. The amount of training required in order to adequately perform duties in these services is so extensive that too high a proportion of a 2-year term of service would be occupied with training and too little with actual service to make such a term either practical or economical. They must have 3- or 4-year enlistees to carry out their primary responsibility for the first-line defense of the United States.

I feel that the amendment I have offered would clear up any possible misunderstanding and prevent any unintended result which the language now in the bill might create, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of our very interesting debate yesterday on the Status of Forces Treaty, in relation to the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho, the gentleman from South Carolina has agreed to schedule hearings at an early date on House Joint Resolution 309, providing for the revision of the Status of Forces agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

During previous discussion of this subject many Members have suggested that the proper and orderly way to consider the effect of these agreements was to have hearings in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, until now it has not been possible to look forward with any degree of certainty to the hearings which now are promised.

In fact, the chairman has suggested that it may be possible to announce a schedule early next week.

In view of this development, I will not present the amendment I had prepared for H. R. 7000, the Reserve bill, and I have asked others to refrain from so doing.

I think it is appropriate for a moment to review what has happened since we first came to grips with this problem during the consideration of the previous Reserve bill, H. R. 5297.

At that time, Members will recall, I offered my amendment to prevent the assignment of any person newly inducted to any installation in any nation with which a Status of Forces agreement was in effect.

This amendment was offered without fanfare and it received the spontaneous approval of three-fourths of the Members present. In fact I was pleased to observe that the gentleman from Georgia in offering his own amendment on May 19 included the language of my amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] also indicated that the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services did not object.

I believe the vote on May 18 was a fair representation of the sentiment of Members of the House on the Status of Forces agreement. I believe it reflected also the sentiments of the American people.

In the debate yesterday the gentleman from Idaho offered a slightly different approach to the subject, which did not require revision of treaties or new agreements, but simply encouraged our allies to refrain from exercising their treaty right to try our men. At the present time the Department of Defense is requesting the Government of France to waive its jurisdiction in the case of Airman Jose Montijo, the object of a hate campaign in the French Communist press. The Government of France has refused to waive jurisdiction. Under the Budge amendment assistance to France would be cut off if that nation persisted in its refusal to waive jurisdiction over Montijo. With my knowledge of justice in France and in the light of the French attitude toward our airmen, I believe the Budge amendment might very well have been the only hope Montijo has to escape the guillotine.

However, many expressed the belief that the subject of Status of Forces should not be included in the Mutual Security Act.

Today I had prepared an amendment to H. R. 7000 which would have amended the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide that no American serviceman could be stationed in a foreign nation with which a Status of Forces agreement was in effect after August 23, 1958.

Having carefully studied the precedents, I have no doubt but that my amendment is germane to this bill. The purpose of the bill is to strengthen our military might by improving our Reserve forces. I can tell you from the hundreds of letters and many personal interviews that I have had in the past 45 days, the status of forces agreement is in fact a serious deterrent to willingness to serve either in the Armed Forces or the Reserve Forces.

Many men are reluctant to become a part of a military organization which can offer them no protection against the whims and vagaries of foreign laws. They are reluctant to place themselves in jeopardy of unfair trial and imprisonment in foreign lands.

Aroused parents have stated publicly that they would advise their sons to refuse to serve, exposing them to possible trial and conviction for violation of the selective service law, rather than exposing them to trial and confinement in foreign lands.

Further, my new amendment would overcome the objections of those who felt that the May 18 amendment was too severe a restriction on the Armed Forces. The new amendment would provide an effective date 3 years hence. Thus it takes into account that the treaties themselves provide for a 4-year period before a nation may withdraw, and a 1-year waiting period after notice is given. The earliest date at which the United States could withdraw under the terms of the treaties themselves is August 23, 1958. Thus the new amendment would not have placed any restriction on the mobility of our armed services.

The Constitution gives the Congress the power to regulate and govern the land and naval forces. It is clearly within our power to act in this matter. As I view it, the executive agreements extending criminal jurisdiction to nations not covered by treaty are unconstitutional. I believe there is no question but that we are empowered to overrule and set aside such agreements at any time. Treaties, of course, present a somewhat different problem.

I have decided, however, to refrain from offering the new amendment, as I have said, in view of the agreement that we will have open public hearings on the entire subject at an early date.

At that time I shall be prepared to offer ample precedent for House action on this subject as well as information on the foreign codes of justice to which our men are subjected, the experience we have had in recent months, and other pertinent material.

In passing, let me point out that I have recently learned of the existence of agreements which give criminal jurisdiction over our Armed Forces stationed in Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Iceland, among others. Saudi Arabia, as all of us know, is an Arab nation whose laws are said to include amputation, decapitation, and castration as penalties for various offenses. Libya is a new nation in the throes of organization and I am very apprehensive about what might happen to Americans subjected to its laws.

Let me mention also that the Department of Defense reports four Americans awaiting trial in Turkey for insulting the Turkish flag. I do not know the penalty for that offense nor the circumstances of the cases, but I have asked for reports and hope to have them for the committee hearings. It disturbs me greatly that an American serviceman should be subject to trial and confinement in the medieval prisons of Turkey for an alleged offense of this nature.

I am confident that the overwhelming majority is disturbed by these conditions, and I trust that the hearings we have been promised will result in definite action leading to the withdrawal of our Nation from any agreement that places American men in jeopardy and deprives them of their constitutional rights.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this one further thing: I hold in my hand—and I shall not raise a question of personal privilege about it—a newspaper clipping from the Cleveland Press in which it is stated:

> Congressman FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, will again offer to amend President Eisenhower's military reserve bill to bar sending United States troops to any country.

In this article this statement is made:

> Bow would virtually wreck United States military strength overseas.

Is there a man on this floor—any of my colleagues—who believes for one moment that the gentleman from Ohio who presented that amendment 2 weeks ago would ever do anything to wreck the defense of this country? Is there one among you who agrees with this article in this Cleveland paper which says that I would wreck the defense of our country?

Mr. Chairman, I challenge anyone who wrote that article who is an editor of the paper to test my patriotism against theirs. I say to you the only purpose I had is to try to fulfill my oath of office as a Member of this Congress, and see that the Constitution of the United States is preserved, and I shall fight for that so long as I am a Member of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. On the contrary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is contributing to the defense of our country by offering his amendment.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Whenever any newspaper says that when a Member of this House defends the GI boys and wants to insure their constitutional rights, that that is wrecking the defense of this Nation, why that is an asinine statement.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that neither I nor any other Member of the House believes he is actuated by any impulse other than to do that which he thinks is right. I am sure from my conversations with him that he has been at all times trying to build up the national defense.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for what he has done. I believe that he has moved to strengthen the United States and its defenses. Had he not been as vigorous and as energetic with respect to this matter, I doubt very much that we would now be on the verge of holding hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee on this important question. The gentleman may be interested to know that I, also, was the victim of some critical newspaper comment, but I am convinced that the writer did not understand the problem or our efforts to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the Clerk's desk, and since they all deal with the same subject, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendments offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: On page 4, line 25, after the word "persons", insert: "and with respect to the military training required of such persons."
>
> On page 5, line 3, after the word "welfare", insert: "and military training."
>
> On page 5, line 4, strike out the sentence beginning with the word "The" and ending with the word "required."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the amendments which I have just offered may not have the emotional appeal which the amendment we just voted on certainly had. But, I believe if you will consider it, you will recognize it deals with the lives of the boys and men who may be called upon to fight for our country. What I am suggesting is that in the part of the bill which states that the National Security Training Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Defense and the President, as Commander in Chief, with respect to the welfare of persons, there be added the provision that this Commission also act in relation to the quality of the training which these men and these boys are getting. Our country is being told that if this Reserve bill is enacted into law it will give to our country a Ready Reserve, and if we do anything to give a feeling of false impression to our country, if we lull our citizens into a false feeling of security, we may be doing something toward the doom of our own Nation. It would seem therefore wise, following the words of the distinguished ranking minority member on this committee, when he admitted that the Pentagon had not come up with a qualified training program, and when he stated to this House that he only prayed that in the future the quality of the training would improve, that we not rely just upon that prayer. We have this distinguished body of men, appointed by the President, men qualified to act on the training provisions, and should give them a right to report as to whether or not the quality of this training is really giving us a Ready Reserve.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I understand, this Commission would be an advisory Commission on the value of the training that these men receive?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. On the value and the quality of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would it have dictatorial rights to enforce it, or just to recommend?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They would have no dictatorial rights. They would give no orders whatsoever. They would make a report. They are going to be in those camps, because they are there under this bill to look after the welfare of these boys.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended for 3 minutes; and if that is granted, I would like to question the gentleman from Missouri, the minority member of the committee on this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. At this time I would like to direct a question to my esteemed friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who for some 12 or 13 years I have been following on the subject of compulsory military training, as he knows, and have taken essentially the same stand he has taken up until the last bill that was passed.

I want to ask, Does the gentleman from Missouri feel that this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] would add anything to the value of getting better training for the Reserves?

Mr. SHORT. I may say to both gentlemen from California that our committee considered this matter rather thoroughly when the bill was drawn. I see no harm in the amendment, except that I question whether all the members of that Commission would be qualified to render judgment on purely military training. However, I think 2 members of the Commission, who are military men, together with the 3 civilians—I have always thought it wise to keep civilian control over the military at all times—I have no objection to it. However, I feel constrained to follow the members of the subcommittee who studied the matter more thoroughly than I did and who I think were unanimous in their agreement that this Commission should serve only in an advisory capacity.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is functioning in an advisory capacity, and to pass on matters such as health and other matters.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that the members of this Commission are made up of Admiral Kincaid, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Mr. Julius Ochs Adler, who is a prominent member of the Reserve, also a former commander of the American Legion as another member.

I know of no group you could put together who would be better qualified, more able, competent, or experienced to pass upon the quality of training we are going to have.

Mr. SHORT. I have no particular objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee who will pass on the quality of the training.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We have serious objections to this amendment because this is more or less a Russian type of control of the military where they have a commissar system of civilians to check on the military.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. How do we check on them?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In answer to the last remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, does he think it is following the Russian system for the Members of this Congress and the President to try to have a report on the quality of training our young men are to receive?

Russian system. I think, if I may say so, that that is insulting. I think this House ought to know what happens to these young men. Where is that any more a Russian method than other checks we provide for?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 provides for the Armed Forces Reserve Policy Board composed of Reserve officers who are required to advise the President, the Secretary of Defense as to Reserve activities in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. In addition they are required to report to the Congress of the United States through the Armed Forces committee as to the reserve training program.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is perfectly true. Unfortunately they do not make a direct report on this subject. You have provided a commission here to report on this particular subject in this particular bill. The other relates to all kinds of things affecting the Reserve, including methods of promotion and such matters.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was considered at length by the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. This amendment would change the law relating to the National Security Training Commission as established in the Universal Training Act, Public Law No. 51, passed by the Congress several years ago.

First let me say to my distinguished friend from California that I certainly had no reason to offend him in any way and did not intend to. Perhaps I should not have made a defense at that point, but should have given a more extensive explanation later but if I gave any offense I am very sorry for it.

Here is our objection: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], has already said we have a board to check the progress of the Reserve program. In a military establishment you must have authority in an ascending line, and you cannot have different groups coming in from the side checking them on this and checking them on that, and especially checking as to the military standards and the military requirements.

To give this Commission this authority would simply divide the authority of the military so you might have 1 report from this Commission, 1 report from the Reserve Components Policy Board which is legally set up, and a third report from the Secretary, and you might run on to a bewildering stage.

We did want to go along with the Commission and say it shall have authority to check the condition and the welfare of these young recruits. We think that is as far perhaps as you should go.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Can the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee tell us whether they wanted any more jurisdiction than over the welfare of the group?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They did not wish any additional jurisdiction. This Commission as set up now is a very fine Board. You have three men with a military background—a former commander of the American Legion and two military men. Then you have two civilians on the Board who are not military people. We are fortunate to have a fine Board at this time. The time may come and maybe not too far in the future when you will not have military men of this stature on the Board. We do not want another divided line of authority here so that the Congress will be regaled with reports from civilian groups that do not understand the problem of training men. These men can give us an idea about the welfare of young recruits in the camps throughout the Nation, and this is as far as we should go.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Armed Forces Reserves Policy Board is composed of officers of the military who are current with present-day methods of war; therefore, they know something about the needs of present-day training.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are appointed from the different Reserve services so that each service is represented. That Board knows the current status in reference to training in the military Reserves.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to call the committee's attention to section 5, page 10, wherein we provide for the Secretary of Defense making a report annually to the Congress.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That report, however, comes directly from the Pentagon, who are the people putting the training in effect; is that not true?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They give you a report on whether or not their training is good.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, these are not good amendments. The motive behind them may be fine, but they are not good amendments. It is another check from civilian outside sources on the standard of training of our military personnel. Oftentimes they will not know what the requirements for military training, military standards, and military objectives and goals may be, and what the military has in mind. I think the amendments are bad and I ask the Members to vote them down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Roosevelt) there were—ayes 54, noes 122.

So the amendments were rejected.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to announce it. When we adjourn today we will go over until Tuesday.

On next Tuesday there will be the call of the Consent and Private Calendars. There are four suspensions: H. R. 7066, conservation of coal resources, mine drainage; House Joint Resolution 330, Presidential libraries, as to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. Rees], and I introduced resolutions; S. 928, Air Pollution Control Act of 1955; H. R. 4744, amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; H. R. 5166, Alaska constitutional convention.

It is understood between the leadership that if there is any rollcall on Tuesday, as distinguished from a quorum call, it will go over until Wednesday.

Also on Tuesday there is House resolution 262, authorizing certain surveys in connection with printing.

On Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday we will take up the following bills: H. R. 3210, Lake Michigan diversion of water; H. R. 6059, Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955; H. R. 3822, Mexican labor bill; H. R. 3253, operation of schools, Marine Corps. Then there is a bill relating to survivors' benefits. I will announce that pending the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], having a talk with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], with whom I spoke earlier in the day, that might come up. If there is a rule reported out on the housing bill, the social security bill, and the minimum wage law, they will be in order for consideration.

It is understood that the bills I have listed may not be brought up in the order I have announced them for Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, or Saturday.

On Tuesday there will be 3 resolutions out of the Committee on House Administration as to which there is no opposition. One relates to appropriating money for the Committee on Agriculture, a resolution which the House adopted. Another is a printing resolution in connection with some report of the Atomic Energy Commission, and there is 1 other of that nature. So, those will be in order for Tuesday, but if unable to be brought up on Tuesday, sometime during the week.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and if there is any change in the program, I will give notice as far in advance as possible.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported a bill this week which will be filed tonight to amend section 309 (c) of the Federal Communications Act. That is pretty much of an emergency situation in which something needs to be done. I just wonder if the program next week would permit that to be called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the bill relate to?

Mr. HARRIS. Applications before the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. How urgent is it?

Mr. HARRIS. It is rather urgent.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can take that up with the leadership. I do not want to make any commitment now. We have a pretty stiff program outlined here.

Mr. HARRIS. I realize that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had no knowledge of this bill until the gentleman just made the inquiry.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that, but I think there will be little, if any, opposition to it. I should be glad to talk to the gentleman about it later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be pleased to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Thomson of Wyoming: On page 3, line 3, after "any persons,", strike out the remainder of line 3 and all that follows down through the end of line 12, and insert in lieu thereof: "who has satisfactorily completed high school or has reached the age of 19 years and who is under the age of 20 years may, prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction, volunteer in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, or units thereof, and such persons shall be deferred from training and service under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such Reserve component in accordance with section 2 of this act."

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I think this is important enough to take 3 additional minutes. This amendment pertains to at least 33⅓ percent of the youth of our Nation, stretching all the way from Maine to Texas and from the State of Washington to the tip of Florida.

I am all for this Reserve bill. I have been for it all along. But we want it to be a good bill.

I am for it because of the fact that when I came back, I tried to set up a Reserve program in a brand of the service that we have not heard much about here, the infantry, and I found out that I could not get the job done under what we had. There were two reasons for that. One was that the Pentagon, the Department of Defense, refused to implement any program. I am taking it on faith that they will do a better job. Besides that, we need this legislation. But we do not want it in its present form.

The question that I am submitting by this amendment is purely and simply this. Do you want to encourage boys to leave high school in order to get into this 6-month training program?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let me see if I can understand the gentleman's amendment. It prevents any boy between the ages of 17 and 18½ from volunteering if he has not finished high school.

Mr. THOMSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I think that goes right to the heart of our proposal, of offering an opportunity to the youth of America to join. You are putting an additional condition upon them before they can volunteer.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If it please the gentleman, I should like to proceed a little bit further here. This has been discussed in the committee. I do not want to wreck this program. I discussed it downtown. They could see that we would be requiring people to leave high school to get into this program if we are going to keep the age at 18½. Just stop a moment and figure it out. A child has got to be 6 years of age to get into the first grade. If his birthday falls between September 2 and December 30, he is going to be from 18½ years to 18¾ years before he gets out of high school. This law says you must come in before you are 18½. This involves one-third of your youth. And you are denying them this program unless you adopt this amendment.

The reason I know that it works out that way is that I have three boys. One of them was born at 8 o'clock in the morning on September 2, and the other two were born in the summer months. I am not worrying about them. They will probably get into the ROTC program if I am able to send them to college, but I would hate to think that other boys would be prevented from getting into it unless they quit high school and would have to go for 2 years or over.

After talking about this, downtown, they said that the Pentagon had some technical objections, which I should discuss with their representatives. I have been listening to the Pentagon's technical objections for the last 10 years, ever since I got out of the service after commanding an infantry unit in World War II. That is one principal reason we do not have a Reserve program, because of their technical objections. Did they send somebody down here at a policy-making level to talk to me? No. They sent a colonel down here who was instructed to say "No," and he raised the very same objection raised by the gentleman from Georgia, the very able chairman of the committee. The real basis of it is that they claim it would interfere with the long-term enlistments of these young men who do not finish high school.

It does not touch long-term enlistments. We are saying to a man, "If you want to get into this program where you are supposed to acquire a military education in 6 months of training, you ought to have a high-school education. We want to see you get one. You cannot go into it until you are 19 unless you get one. As far as the long-term enlistments are concerned, if you quit high school at 17 or 18 you can enlist for 2, 3, or 4 years." So we are not stopping that long-term enlistment by this action.

As far as the Pentagon is concerned, and I will repeat that charge, if they do not do a better job of administering this act than they did the present one in Wyoming, Georgia, Tennessee, and other places, and Texas, where my executive officer came from, then we are destined to failure.

Right in this committee report it says the military shall encourage the boys to stay in high school. I was in the infantry. Will that infantry recruiting sergeant go to the high-school boys and say, "Go sign up in the Navy in their recruiting program, and you can finish high school?" He will say, "Boys, I will give you a better deal. Come on with me now, quit high school, and you will have to serve for only 6 months." That is the way it works as a practical matter. There is competition between the services in recruiting.

We want a Reserve program and an adequately strong country, but to do that we must have this amendment because we will have a strong country by having a well-educated country, not by discouraging education. We want them to finish high school. Further, they will be better soldiers by reason of having finished high school.

I know something about that because I was at Camp Wolters, Tex., where they started the first infantry replacement training center. We took the first units through the 13½-week basic course. You cannot teach boys that cannot speak English very well. I know because I had some of them in that first platoon. I know the high-school trained boys can do a better job of assimilating training quickly. So, for a strong country, a well-educated country, we have to have this amendment. In my humble opinion, I would be constrained to vote against the bill if the Pentagon through its brassy attitude insists upon taking kids out of high school to get their fingers on them then. That adds fire to all the arguments I have been hearing from various groups against this bill. If they insist upon getting our youth before they are out of high school, then I cannot go along with them. I think we need this amendment.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any more time than necessary to explain this amendment to you this afternoon. I am then going to sit down. There has been much said already in reference to the bill.

This amendment has been pushed for some time by the gentleman from Wyoming. In fact, he came to my office and I discussed it with him at length. He knew my viewpoint on it. Then, after he left he tried to reframe it a little bit so as to make it a little bit more palatable to the committee.

The gentleman from Wyoming also wrote the chairman of the committee, Mr. VINSON, a long letter which Mr. VINSON had at the time the bill was considered by the committee, and it was read to the committee. After considering the matter, the full Committee on Armed Services voted down the gentleman's amendment. I will tell you why they voted it down.

The suggestion was made that this was largely a matter of regulation. We are interested in seeing young men finish high school. We do not want to see the high schools robbed of young people who are about to finish. The committee felt that it was largely a matter of regulation. Unless it was regulation, the amendment would be a source of hardships unintentionally visited upon young men who wanted to go into the program but who would be delayed in finishing the high-school program. The committee decided to ask counsel for the committee to write in the committee report a recommendation to the military and this recommendation is written in the report on page 6. I quote:

> The committee is anxious that the operation of this program not interfere with persons completing their high-school educations. It is to be hoped that the Department of Defense will cooperate in this regard and will include encouragement in its recruitment campaign to young men to complete their education.

Here is why this amendment would be bad. A young man in high school, perhaps may be sick for 1 or 2 years. In my State, and I think in most of the States of the Union, it takes about 12 years to finish school. A young man may be 18 years of age before he finishes high school. That is the average age, I believe, of young men finishing high school. If a boy has been sick for a year, he then would be 19 before finishing high school. This would take him right into the scope of the amendment. Another boy may be just floundering around in high school. I have seen many older boys in my section of the country who wanted to get out of high school and who were just floundering around. They may want to get out of high school and get into the service. Such a boy could not do that. He would have to stay in school until he graduates regardless, before he could be accepted in this program. So we felt, generally speaking, it would be improper. If you go too far and raise the age too high for the 6 months' enlistments, you may pass the period when a man is subject to the draft. To be very frank with you, we think most of the men who are going to volunteer for this program are going to be men below the draft age. They are going to say, "It is a gamble. I may be called by the draft and rather than be called, I will go in under this 6 months' program." If you wait until the draft decides whether or not they are going to take that young man, he may decide not to enter the service at all. And the entire committee felt that, frankly, to tell a man who did not want high-school education or who has not finished that he must have that high-school degree before he can volunteer under this program was not the right thing to do.

Another thing about it is that it does not accomplish the purpose which it is intended to accomplish in any sense of the word. In the program provided for in another section of the bill, the services can, and they do, go into the high schools and sign up men to go into the Reserves to serve after they finish high school. That is permitted and it is done. The Navy and the Air Force have such programs. It does not rob the high schools of men who are anixous to finish school. It permits them to finish school. After they finish school, they go into active service. That program has worked well. I think it would be a serious mistake to add this to the requirements for enlisting young men who are in that period of life where they want to enter a program which would mean a great deal to them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that when this amendment was discussed by the Committee on Armed Services, it was pointed out that it was discriminatory and espeically against the young men in agricultural areas and industrial areas of the country. I am especially thinking of the coal-mining areas of the country where many young men do not finish high school.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not know what you would do with the men from the coal-mining areas, for instance, from which the gentleman comes. They may not finish high school and they would not be permitted in the program.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming. At this time I would like to ask some questions of the gentleman with reference to some of the statements he made here. Does the gentleman feel in view of the past record of the Pentagon and of these military officers that they are going to pay any attention whatsoever to his suggestion in the report?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would think so. I will say this, and I do not want it to be misunderstood on the floor of the House, when the Pentagon needs chastisement, I am not holding back on the words I use in addressing the Pentagon. When they do wrong, I am against them. So far as legislation is concerned, I am not a particular favorite there. I think they will pay attention because, after all, outside of the act itself, it is the law to them in the way of regulations.

Mr. SISK. Certainly it would seem to me on the basis of past experience with these boys in the Pentagon, the military brass have in mind grabbing these boys just as quick as they can get them. It seems to me every opportunity should be given to our young men to finish high school.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a program now by which they can go to the high schools and enlist these young men in the Reserves, with the understanding that they finish high school. Those men in the Pentagon have done a good job to keep those boys in high school and let them finish before they enter the Reserves.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In view of the fact that it was said the Pentagon is against this amendment, does the gentleman believe there is any remote chance that they will do by administration what they do not want done by law?

Mr. SISK. I do not believe so, because the very actions of the military have been to the contrary.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would like to point out that the gentleman from Louisiana was talking about an amendment that was submitted to the committee, but that is not this amendment. This is not the amendment that was discussed in the committee at all. It is the amendment that was agreed to when this was considered by the House before.

Mr. SISK. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not the intention of his amendment to give these boys an opportunity to finish high school without endangering their opportunity to enlist under the 6 months rule?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. That is exactly correct. This is a volunteer program. We do not want one-third of our youth to quit high school in order to take advantage of it.

Mr. SISK. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Is it not a fact that by reducing the age from 19 to 18½, as this bill does, the committee has discriminated further against this type of boy, and that makes the amendment all the more necessary.

Mr. SISK. That is exactly my understanding and that is the reason I am here defending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. DIXON. Would the gentleman say that to require a boy to go to high school is discriminating in favor of him?

Mr. SISK. Certainly this amendment would permit a boy to complete his high school education and thereafter remain eligible for the 6 months' voluntary program.

There is one thing I would like to say with reference to a conversation I had with an officer just returned from England. He was complaining about the number of these young fellows who were in the guardhouse over in England because they do not know what the situation is all about. Many of these boys have been grabbed up by the brass merely because they wanted to fill up the armed services with a bunch of people in order to have more officers and get more gold braid on their shoulders. While we have many fine officers in the armed services, it appears we also have too many in the Pentagon who seem mostly interested in their own glorification. I think it is important that we protect these young fellows and that we do everything we can to see that they stay in high school until they have attained the age of 19, or completed high school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has expired.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 5297, the first National Reserve Training bill, was presented, and before any amendments were offered to that bill, I called the attention of my colleagues in a speech on the floor of the House to the fact that the bill should be amended in a way that would encourage young men to stay in high school.

The bill as originally drawn nullified the established and accepted policy of the Armed Forces, which policy is to encourage every young man to remain in high school until the time of graduation.

The following day my colleague, KEITH THOMSON, submitted an amendment which was accepted by the honored chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and naturally we all expected that this amendment would be included in the new bill, H. R. 7000. The new bill, however, does greater violence to the position of the Armed Forces and to the philosophy of most Americans than did the original bill.

The original bill provided that "any person who is under the age of 19 may be enlisted to serve on active duty training" while the new bill says, "any person prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months" may volunteer.

If the original bill was bad with regard to interrupting a young man's high-school education, the new bill is still worse.

For these reasons I plead again for the inclusion of the Thomson amendment in H. R. 7000 and hope that it will receive the same unanimous support as it did when it was introduced as an amendment to the old bill.

The Thomson amendment reads "any person who has satisfactorily completed high school or who has reached the age of 19 and who is under the age of 20" may enlist.

The Thomson amendment gives the advantage of opportunity to the boy who completes high school. It supports our public-school system and the American philosophy. H. R. 7000 holds out a great inducement to a boy to terminate his high school, because the problem confronting him will be, "Shall I complete high school and later be drafted for 2 years' active duty?" or "Shall I quit high school in order to serve only 6 months on active duty?"

I leave it to you which choice he would make. You know as well as I that the 6 months' inducement would be the attractive one and that floods of boys would abandon their education in order to enlist.

The National Education Association provided me with the following statistics on the age of students at graduation: 6 percent graduate at 16 years or younger; 30 percent at 17 years or younger; 66 percent at 18 years or younger; 90 percent at 19 years or younger; and 10 percent over 20 years.

H. R. 7000 would subsidize approximately 34 percent of our high-school students either to quit school before graduation in order to enlist for the 6 months' active-duty program.

Again I plead with you to protect every boy's right to a complete high-school education by supporting the Thomson amendment. President Eisenhower says:

> To neglect our school system would be a crime against the future. Such neglect could well be more disastrous to all our freedoms than the most formidable armed assault on our physical defenses. * * * Where our schools are concerned, no external threat can excuse negligence; no menace can justify a halt to progress.

H. R. 7000 is worse than neglect of our school system. It is an out-and-out attack upon it. School people are unanimous in claiming that it is hard enough to keep boys in high school without adding inducements to encourage them to quit early. Such lack of teamwork in our country is disintegrating to our society.

This inducement to high-school boys to drop their education is tantamount to saying that we need numbers rather than qualified, educated, and technically trained individuals. Such a position reminds me of the children in the kindergarten who attempt to spell their words with the wrong blocks. If the forces of freedom can meet poverty's army in terms of numbers only, we might just as well fold up our tents now, because we are far outnumbered. It was not our numbers alone that have won the last two wars. It was our science and our technically trained people.

I repeat again what Herbert Hoover says:

> America has but one-sixth of the world's population. Yet it has 40 percent of the world's college graduates. Therein lies America's might. Let no one shear us Delilah-like of this strength.

I commend the committee for its tireless work on this national Reserve plan, and I wish to state that I am strongly supporting the idea of the economy and the effectiveness of building strong Reserves. I also commend the committee on its policy with regard to the interruption of high-school education by military service, because the committee in its report on H. R. 7000 says:

> The committee is anxious that the operation of this program not interfere with persons completing their eduction. It is to be hoped that the Department of Defense will cooperate in this regard and will lend encouragement in its recruitment campaign to young men to complete their education.

If that is the policy of the committee, why should not that policy be written into the bill. What I am afraid of is that the competition between the divisions of the Armed Forces and the pressure put on recruiting officers to enlist large numbers of boys will cause the committee's policy and hopeful wish to be ignored, if not entirely forgotten.

If the committee accepts this policy as a sound principle, as all of the Members of Congress seemed to do when the Thomson amendment was presented, then why not accept it in fact and include it in the law?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I, a member of the committee, have been on my feet here seeking recognition, yet the Chair has recognized three other people ahead of me; likewise the gentleman from Iowa would like to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized to offer an amendment. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania as soon as the gentleman from Missouri has concluded.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 3, line 19, after the word "Army", add "ROTC, Navy ROTC."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if you will glance at page 3, line 19, you will see it reads:

> Upon graduation persons who successfully complete the Army or Air Force ROTC course, or the Marine Corps platoon leaders' class and are qualified shall be commissioned in the Reserve of the appropriate service.

I have talked to a member of the staff of the Armed Services Committee and was informed that the reason the naval ROTC was not included in this bill was because the Navy requested that they not be.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Briefly.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment simply means that he is inserting the Navy ROTC. The reason we left that out was because the Navy desired to have men serve longer than 6 months.

I have just consulted with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana. We will accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I just want to say to the Members of the House that I heartily concur in the remarks made by our great minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and what he had to say about our very good and able friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. Let me say further that I think FRANK BOW is an outstanding Member of this Congress. By his work he has won the respect and admiration of the membership on both sides of the aisle. The people of the 16th District of Ohio can well be proud to have a man of his character and ability representing them in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some member of the committee a question or two. I should like to have it perfectly clear whether a young man who volunteers for 6 months' service, and does not carry out the Reserve obligations under this bill, can be drafted.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; he can.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman, but before I do, let the answer of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] be clearly understood—there is compulsory service in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If he is within the draft age he would be subject to the draft.

Mr. SHORT. As long as he performs his obligatory Reserve duty he would not be.

Mr. GROSS. Only yesterday this House voted to pour out approximately another $2 billion in military aid of one kind or another to foreign countries.

I should like to know how many countries in the world levy upon their men as is proposed here by this bill and the draft law as we do in the United States? Does any member of the committee care to tell me how many countries levy upon their manpower—upon their youth—for military purposes as will the United States under the draft and this monstrosity?

Mr. Chairman, the answer is a lot of silence and the reason for that silence is that members of the Armed Services Committee well know that few, if any, foreign countries conscript their youth as we do.

Mr. Chairman, it must have been a pulmotor, operating under high pressure, that was used both at the White House and by the House Armed Services Committee, to pump life back into this legislative corpse. Make no mistake, we have here a foot in the door to universal conscription. I am saying to you that the President of the United States is for universal conscription. If any of you doubt that statement, I want to read you his words. In testifying before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on the conscription bill, S. 1, February 2, 1951, General Eisenhower, now President of the United States, stated in answer to a question:

> I firmly believe in the principle of universal military training at this critical stage in our affairs.

And again, in answer to a question propounded by Senator Johnson, chairman of a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee:

> In effect, then, you believe in and endorse the provisions of this bill which provide for the induction of young men at 18 years for 27 months of service, and that out of that group, 75,000 will be selected by civilian boards set up by the President to pursue scientific studies?
>
> General EISENHOWER. It sounds to me like a very wise provision and a very well-thought-out bill.

The President of the United States in lieu of any public statement to the contrary since 1951 is in favor of universal military conscription. I say to you again if you approve this bill today you will be opening the door wide to the next step, which is the universal conscription of manpower and only manpower because I doubt if there will be the courage to vote a bill through this House in the event of war, which would provide for universal conscription of every facility of this Nation.

And President Eisenhower apparently thinks the womanpower of this country has not been fully utilized for military purposes. Let me read to you what he said at that Senate hearing about womanpower:

> There is a great untapped pool of call it manpower or womanpower that has not been exploited in our country at all.

I repeat, "has not been exploited."

I wonder, if in the light of this testimony, the President of the United States is ready to endorse a bill to draft the womanpower of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, this is basically the same bill that was before the House a few weeks ago and on which the chairman of the committee stalled final action because he knew then it would be defeated.

The National Guard is written out of this bill and I predict that if it becomes the law of the land as it now stands it will gut the National Guard for lack of recruits. Aside from deleting the Guard from its provisions, this is the same legislation that was before us. It has simply been rigged out in a new kimona.

It has been repeatedly stated on the floor today and a few weeks ago that through the years a large segment of the Reserve has been maltreated by the administrative brass in the Pentagon. Yet without cleaning up the Reserve system it is proposed to pass this bill and probably compound the sorry situation that already exists.

I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon on the floor that with some 55,000 officers being commissioned each year out of various training programs it appears that this bill is necessary to provide Indians for the chiefs to command.

If this bill is enacted, Mr. Chairman, some Members of the House are going to have to answer a lot of questions. Thousands of boys and their parents will ask why this levy of years upon our lives and the lives of our sons. Draftees now serving will ask, and justifiably so, why their service contracts have been changed. Parents will ask why one boy can be drafted for 24 months and another volunteer for 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, this is discriminatory—this is bad legislation, and I resent the fact that it is being rammed down our throats under pressure this afternoon.

Vote this through if you will. I want no part of it. Let a roll-call vote tell the people of this country where you stand.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Section 208 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.) as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as (h), (i), and (j), and adding a new subsection (g) as follows:

"(g) Unless otherwise provided by law, each person inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the active forces after July 27, 1953, shall upon his release from active service become a member of the Ready Reserve. Thereafter such person may be required to perform active duty for training or inactive duty training in the following manner:

"(1) An annual minimum of 48 assemblies for drill; or

"(2) When authorized by the appropriate Secretary concerned, other equivalent periods of training,

and in addition to either (1) or (2) above an annual period of active duty for training of not to exceed 17 days."

Whenever a member of the Ready Reserve of the reserve components of the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve elects not to participate in any of the foregoing procedures, such member shall be offered the alternative of active duty for training of not to exceed 30 days annually. Any member of the Ready Reserve of the Reserve component of the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve who fails through refusal, when able to perform his obligation pursuant to the above alternatives, may by competent authority be ordered to and required to perform active duty for training, without his consent, for not to exceed 45 days annually. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person who served on active duty in the armed forces prior to July 27, 1953, will not be required, unless he has agreed or may hereafter agree, to participate in active duty for training or in inactive duty training in the Ready Reserve.

(2) Section 208 (f) is amended by striking out the words "upon his request."

(3) Subsection (j) as redesignated is amended by deleting (g) where it appears therein and substituting (h).

(4) Add a new subsection (k) as follows:

"(k) Under regulations prescribed by the President, each armed force of the United States shall provide a system of continuous screening of units and members of the Ready Reserve to insure that—

"(a) no significant attrition will occur to those members or units during a mobilization;

"(b) there will be a proper balance of military skills;

"(c) members of the Reserve forces possessing critical civilian skills will not be retained in numbers beyond the requirements for those skills except for persons who have military skills for which there is an overriding requirement;

"(d) with due respect to national security and military requirements, recognition is given to participation in combat; and

"(e) members of the Reserve forces whose mobilization in an emergency would result in extreme personal or community hardship are not retained in the Ready Reserve."

(5) Add a new subsection (l) as follows:

"(l) Under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, any member of the Ready Reserve may be transferred to the Standby Reserve."

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 233 (a) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 in time of war, or of national emergency declared by Congress, after the enactment of this amendatory act, members of the Standby Reserve may be ordered to active duty only after a determination of availability by the Director of Selective Service.

Sec. 4. Section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 is amended by striking the words "one million five hundred thousand" and inserting the words "two million nine hundred thousand".

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense shall cause records to be maintained in the three military departments, as far as practicable, on the number of persons participating in active duty for training in the reserve components and in a drill status with pay. The Secretary of Defense shall report in January of each year to the President and to the Congress on the progress as to the strengthening of the Reserve Forces.

Sec. 6. Section 233 (b) (1) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "in excess of 1,000,000 members comprised of units and members thereof or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purposes as serving as such".

Mr. VINSON (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the other sections of the bill, that it be printed in the Record and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have such great admiration and affection for the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, one of the great Americans of our time, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carl Vinson, that it is always with a sense of reluctance and regret that I disagree with him. I also entertain the highest regard, respect, and esteem for my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Overton Brooks, who has handled this bill, in such a painstaking, able, and efficient way, and I am sorry to differ with his views. However, I must follow my conscience and my convictions.

In the past, I have been opposed to UMT. I have taken this position, because I do not believe that in peacetime it is necessary to militarize the United States in order to set up an adequate national defense. Of course, I have other strong reasons for this view. Admittedly, this bill is not UMT. It does not directly compel any boy to become a member of any branch of the Armed Forces. In part, it is merely another option which permits an American boy, if he so chooses, to fulfill his military service under the Reserve plan. If a boy does not want to avail himself of the specific program provided in this bill to join the Reserve and fulfill his military obligation, that is his right and privilege and he is entitled, upon his own account and own judgment, to make that decision.

It should be noted, however, that notwithstanding the provisions, under which a boy may voluntarily enlist in the Reserve, this bill, insofar as boys already drafted or enlisted into our armed services are concerned, it requires them under pain of punishment to remain in the Reserves after they have completed their tour of active duty.

If the bill is enacted, Congress would thus be changing the rules of the game while the game is in progress. There are thousands of young men, who entered the various services by draft or voluntary enlistment believing that when they had completed their tour of duty, they would be free to resume their civilian pursuits unhampered and unfettered by further military obligation.

They all know present Reserve laws are not enforced. For them, and for them only, of all other eligible young men in the country presently in the military pool, this bill requires additional Reserve service. I do not believe that this result is either equitable, just, or wise. It is very unfair to change the rules in the middle of the game. It is most unjust to put the brunt of the burdens and sacrifices of military duty in the active service and in the Reserves upon only a relatively small portion of the entire available manpower. That is not the American way.

I am not urging at this time, nor would I suggest that at this time these burdens and sacrifices be saddled upon all boys in this so-called manpower pool, because I believe that definite principles could and should be applied to any Reserve bill, which would result in more equitable treatment of every eligible American boy. It is most unfair and discriminatory to compel boys who have served in Korea, in Japan, in Germany, and in other remote parts of the world to serve further in peacetime.

The basic purpose of this bill is, of course, to build up our Reserve Army forces during this period of turmoil, uncertainty, and danger. The Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps do not need this bill. To provide adequately for the national security is a solemn duty of this Congress and present conditions in the world require careful thought and expeditious action. Of that I am completely convinced. But this must be done under American principles, fairly, impartially, and justly. It must be done with least impact upon our youth and our national life.

I have very serious doubts and misgivings concerning the scope, the form, the pattern, the fairness, and the wisdom of certain of this bill's provisions and I voiced my reservations in the committee.

In the first place, I do not believe that the Army, which is the only service that really needs this bill, has made an earnest, determined effort to build up the Army Reserve under existing laws. I do not feel that the 1952 Reserve bill has been properly implemented and that, if it had been, the Army could have constructed a suitable, reasonably well-organized Army Reserve. I sincerely believe that the 1952 bill, if amended, would serve the purpose of building an adequate Army Reserve.

Moreover, I do not believe that the Reserve force proposed by the bill, if it eventuates, is an adequate answer to our current military manpower problems and needs. Time and time again, I have pointed out the swift developments of science and technology that are so rapidly and radically reshaping our military setup and organization. Under this situation, it is not possible to train boys in 6 months, or in limited weekly drills, to understand, and be able to cope with, the complex mechanisms and intricate technical equipment which are an essential, integral part of modernized Armed Forces.

We are not moving fast enough, I believe, in converting and reorganizing our miltary components in the light of the great changes in strategy and tactics and logistics which necessarily and most realistically derive from the stupendous and amazing scientific progress we are recording almost daily. Industrial techniques and progress must be coordinated with educational and military activities. The high school, the college, the technical school and military training, the factory and the laboratory must be integrated into a cohesive voluntary program coordinated with the active forces. For the most part, this could be done without compulsion if a real, honest determined effort were made by the Army.

New concepts are required. New techniques must be rapidly incorporated. Sweeping changes in organization, in grouping, in emphasis, in training, in format, in missions and objectives are urgently and imperatively needed now in our Armed Forces if we are to be in a position to face up to some of the terrible contingencies that could conceivably arise like a bolt from the blue. Civilian defense should definitely be an important part of such a program. It should not be overlooked in any Reserve plan adopted by this Congress. But it is not in this bill.

I will not here elaborate upon or belabor these most vital considerations, but clearly the present bill falls far short of meeting the requirements of such a modernized military Reserve program based on voluntary, incentive principles. In fact, no one here asserts that it presumes to answer all these questions. It is a mere skeleton and a mere gesture and no one can make anything else out of it.

Let me emphasize that I am opposed to the long Reserve obligations of this bill. As pointed out above, it discriminates violently against those boys already in service, who, under its terms, are compelled to remain in the Reserves for an extended long period. Cutting the obligation from 8 years to 6 years in one category is no answer to this serious problem because every one of these boys regardless of his prior active service would have to serve at least 5 years overall time. This is a palpably unjust provision.

This is a democracy, a free representative government, not yet a militarized dictatorship. We admire and are most grateful to all our military of every service for their great, glorious contributions to the Nation, and I would personally yield to no man in earnestly acknowledging our great debt to them for their sterling, loyal services, past and present. But I do not believe that the military should be allowed to dominate the affairs of this Government. They should not be permitted to reshape the social, educational, and economic life of America. Not only would that be entirely unnecessary, except in total war, but it would be a great travesty upon our Constitution, the democratic spirit of our institutions so essential to national well-being and the freedom of our people. We must never consent to the peacetime militarization of the Nation. The civil authority representing the sovereign will of the American people must always conduct the affairs of this Government. To that authority the military must always be subordinate.

I am also disturbed about the effects this bill will have on the National Guard—that great, historic arm of our national defense with its glorious record in war and peace. In time, this bill provides for a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 at an annual cost of about $2 billion in some circumstances. To serve its purposes, armories will be constructed all over the country. In fact, a measure to start the construction of these armories is already pending before the House. Authorization has already passed our committee. These armories will be built by the United States Government and the full cost thereof will be borne by the American taxpayer. On the other hand, National Guard armories, where authorized, are built on a matching basis of contributions by the States and the Federal Government. Obviously, it is only a question of time, after operation of this bill, when the Army Reserve will dominate the Reserve military picture throughout the country and the National Guard will be pushed unceremoniously into the background, since this bill prevents any boy coming out of the active service from entering the National Guard to fulfill his Reserve obligation but compulsorily channels him into the Reserve. It also denies to American boys, because of race, specific guaranty against segregation, and the opportunity that is given to other boys to join the National Guard and in that way complete their military service.

Let us have no illusions about the bill. It has at present certain features which require unreasonable length of Reserve service, which subordinate the National Guard, entail expensive duplication of armory facilities and the like, which I do not believe are either helpful or salutary. It constitutes an excessive delegation of power to the Department of Defense to require military service in peacetime.

The bill is extremely costly. The huge outlay of over a billion dollars the first year, rising to almost $2 billion ultimately, and perhaps much more, in certain contingencies, is too high a price for the American people to pay for an Army Reserve system of questionable value which does not even begin to solve our military manpower problems. I hope the bill is satisfactorily amended to meet these objections, and I pray that some consideration may be given to the vital question of setting up properly integrated, properly trained, properly implemented professionalized Armed Forces, Active and Reserve, which in the days of rapid scientific advance are so essential to any well-conceived, well-balanced, effective system of national defense.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that there are Members seated here who are crying for a vote. We are establishing a new pattern for the lives of our children and for our America, and I trust that no colleague of mine here will resent any Member coming down to the well and speaking his full 5 minutes. Our time is not so valuable that we cannot consult one another, and listen to every word that anyone in this body wishes to say, before we pass judgment on the pattern for the lives of American youth. I would have preferred not to take the time of this House. I have such respect for the sincerity, the industry, and the intelligence of the members of the Armed Services Committee, that I would not choose to raise on an ordinary occasion my humble voice in question of decisions that were grounded in the experience and the wisdom of that great committee.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not an ordinary occasion. We are voting upon a pattern of life. Today we are deciding the kind of life our children may expect. I do feel a responsibility, shall I say, in these aging years of life, to tell my colleagues the convictions that a span of years not brief have brought to me. In my life there has been one major war after another, and now we are in a race of armaments that, if I read correctly what we are doing and have been doing in this Chamber, can reach only the destination that has been reached by all races of armaments in the history of the world.

I have been voting, as have my colleagues, day after day for measures to keep America strong to meet the perils in a changing and uncertain world. With all my heart I love my country, as does every Member here in this Chamber, and I want it strong to defend itself, to uphold its honor, and to fulfill its mission for all humanity. But as I have voted for the strength we must have, and in this I cannot question the planning of those best qualified to know, I have prayed, silently and very humbly, that never again would our country be called upon to employ in the achievement of our destiny for humanity any strength save the strength of the Prince of Peace. I want my country to be strong in every way. I have not withheld my vote even when I questioned details. When a bill was brought here providing for homes costing $60,000 apiece for 5 Army generals, the Chief of Staff, and the other great generals serving with him, I did not withhold my vote, even though I questioned. Those homes, costing $60,000 apiece, were to be built here in Washington. I questioned it. I questioned whether we were not enlarging the gulf between the officers who command and the enlisted men who serve under those officers. But I resolved the question contrary to how I might have regarded it when the House was informed that the highest authority in the Government, and this I took to mean the President of the United States, recommended it. If important to our national security, in any sense, I could not vote against it.

But I wonder at times if we are building a strong America, an America in the future that will be defended as the America in the past by volunteers, as they responded from the North to the call of Lincoln, and in the Spanish-American War to the call of McKinley, and sometimes I wonder if little by little we are not departing from what we were by broadening too much the gulf between the men who command and the men who obey.

My colleagues, think twice before you vote today. And, however you vote, let your convictions and your identity be known. You have extended the draft 4 years. I do not think you had any moral right to do it for more than 2 years, the life of this Congress, but you did it for 4 years. You have included in the draft the doctors over draft age for others, and I think if you encouraged doctors by a career incentive you would not have to place that discrimination upon them. You and I have voted billions of dollars for military defense. You and I have provided for our defense all over the world by cooperation with our allies. What further contribution to our security can come from the immediate passage of this measure? If war should come between now and the time we reconvene in January no one expects that any strengthening of our defense or of our offense would result from this measure, not to the extent of the weight of a toothpick. Why not submit the proposal to the churches and the schools and the educators and the fathers and the mothers in the homes? Then when we return in January we will have before us, under such world climate as then obtains, a program that has had the study of all the American people, not alone that of the Pentagon, and that has stood the test of public opinion. That, I submit, is the way American democracy functions. And what we are doing is changing a pattern of life.

Now, my friends and colleagues, right now all over America men and women are praying for peace. We know that if we do not have peace all this great civilization we have built will be destroyed. We are praying for peace. We are working for peace. We have the draft continued. We have the money for the full arming of ourselves and our allies. With no risk, we can leave the changing of the pattern of our national life for January.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHANSEN: Page 7, line 12, after the word "after", strike out the date "July 27, 1953," and insert "the date this act becomes effective"; and on page 8, line 13, strike out "July 27, 1953" and insert "the date this act becomes effective."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not need all of 5 minutes. The purpose of this amendment is simple and obvious. The bill as it now reads provides that all men who have enlisted or been inducted through the draft or appointed to the service since July 27, 1953, shall be liable to certain additional, specific, spelled-out obligations for training service as members of the Ready Reserve. Among those obligations that are spelled out in the act is the provision that they shall be required, upon the completion of their active duty for service period, to attend 48 weekly assemblies a year for the remaining period of their Ready Reserve obligation and in addition they shall be required to spend 17 days a year in training; or in lieu of those two items, required to spend 30 days in active training per year. Or in case of the failure to exercise any of these alternatives they shall be liable to a penalty induction of 45 days of active service.

The only intent of the amendment that I have offered is to make these added requirements effective and obligatory upon all persons entering the service either by enlistment or induction on and after the effective date of this act.

As it now stands, my understanding is—and that is one reason I questioned the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] earlier regarding the compulsory features of this bill—my understanding is that there is added a plus of obligation imposed on those now in service which amounts to a change of the ground rules for those now in service either by induction or enlistment. This amendment would eliminate the retroactive or ex post facto feature of the provision and would make the requirement effective with the effective date of the act. I think it goes to the question of changing the ground rules and adding terms to a contract after the date it was entered into.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but rise at this time to say that I believe my colleague from Ohio, Congressman FRANK BOW, to be one of the outstanding Americans of the House of Representatives. He was one of the first I became acquainted with in the House and I have been proud not only to be associated with him but to join him in his many patriotic endeavors on behalf of legislation in the best interest of all Americans and the defense of our country. I have also been very happy to be one of those who have joined with him in support of his amendment or further legislation to remove the provision in the Status of Forces Treaty giving permission to foreign countries where our military forces are serving, to prosecute our soldiers, sailors, and so forth, in their civil courts. I believe that if we send our men to these foreign countries for the protection of these foreign countries, our forces should have the protection of the Constitution of the United States. Immunity is given to civilians serving our embassies and consulates abroad, people who go of their own volition. Their, our fighting forces, who go because they are ordered to, should have the same protection and be subject to prosecution by their military command. It is unthinkable that such a provision was permitted to enter the treaty at all and every step should be taken to eliminate it as soon as possible. I shall be happy to continue working with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] to this end.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment it would, on page 7, line 13, change the date from July 27, 1953, and make it 1956. The committee placed the date July 27, 1953, in the bill because that was the date of the ending of the Korean war. We wanted to relieve the man who had been in combat of the necessity of being called first in another war and having to carry the burden of combat in two successive wars. We think the obligation of military service should be spread a little more than that. We used the date July 27, 1953, which will mean that combat veterans will not be called upon to serve again in anything short of an all-out congressional mobilization.

The gentleman's amendment would bring that date to 1956. Here is what is wrong there. It would mean that you would eliminate your Ready Reserve at the present time. You would have no Ready Reserve at the present time. You would have to begin at scratch. You would weaken the defenses of this country very, very seriously by destroying the Ready Reserve.

The gentleman has stated this is changing the ground rules. The only change in the ground rules has been to soften the impact of the ground rules on those since 1953 and to this hour. We have actually reduced the obligation to some extent of those people but we have in no instance made the obligation heavier on those who were in the service since 1953 to the present hour than it is at the present time. We have made the obligation lighter. They have no complaint about the obligation that they have assumed prior to the time when this bill would go into effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if the Department of Defense wanted to they could apply the provisions of law which states that if a man does not fulfill his Reserve obligation he is subject to a fine of $10,000 or 5 years in jail?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, but I am not in favor of enforcing that drastic provision. It is far too severe. We have reduced the obligation and reduced the penalty. We have reduced the overall ground rules so that they are softer on the man in service under this measure than they were before this bill came to the House.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think the gentleman misunderstands the intent and the effect of the amendment. The effect and the intent is simply that these requirements with regard to men volunteering or drafted for the service of the 48 drills, and so forth, will become effective with all men drafted or enlisting after the effective date of the act. I do not know where the gentleman gets the 1956 date.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman by inference would relieve us of the Ready Reserve we have at the present critical time. Then we would have to start from scratch with no Ready Reserve and build here in the 4 or 5 years allotted under this law a brand new Ready Reserve to defend our country. We need those men at the present time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman's amendment would postpone the implementation of this program until 1956, should the amendment become law within the next several months.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is what I understand. So I think the amendment is a bad one. I ask that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the motion speaks for itself. I have no desire to take any further time and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ENGLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House resolution 291, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NELSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NELSON moves that H. R. 7000 be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services for further study.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NELSON) there were—ayes 52, noes 161.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 5614

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5614.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PREDICTION WITH RESPECT TO APPLE PRICES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 213)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the United States House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5188, to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices. This bill would amend section 15 (d) of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U. S. C. 1141 (j) (d)), as amended, by inserting after the word "cotton" the words "or apples." The effect of this would be to extend to apples the existing prohibitions with respect to the publication of price prospects that now apply only to cotton.

The provision of the act to which apples would be added is very broad. It applies to any officer or employee of the United States, in either the legislative or executive branch of the Government, except to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. It should not be extended to other farm products. In particular, the addition of apples to this provision would further restrict the agricultural outlook service of the Department of Agriculture, since it would prohibit the publication and, on occasion, the formal discussion of future price prospects for apples by any employees of the Department, including cooperative employees of the Federal-State Extension Service.

I believe that it is a vital responsibility of the Federal Government to gather and disseminate accurate, timely, comprehensive, and useful economic information, so that producers and consumers, buyers and sellers may have available to them the maximum amount of economic knowledge. This is especially true of farmers, who generally are not in a position to acquire for themselves all the necessary facts concerning supply and demand conditions affecting their commodities. Because of the great instability of their prices and incomes, they stand in particular need of accurate, timely, and comprehensive economic information to assist them in the development of their plans for production and marketing. Denial to farmers of this type of information in the case of another major commodity would represent a backward step, tending to undermine the foundations of the entire agricultural outlook service.

It is difficult to see how the cutting off of analysis of price trends and dissemination of price prospects by the Department of Agriculture can in any way assist the farmer. Interpretations of the price situation will still be made by others. At times, these may come from sources whose interests run contrary to those of the apple producers. This legislation would reduce or seriously limit the ability of fieldworkers to counteract price rumors detrimental to the farmers' interests.

For these reasons I have felt obliged to withhold my approval from this measure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1955.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the President's action in vetoing a bill to stop apple price forecasting by the Department of Agriculture is as inexplicable as it is petty. It is a cruel and unwarranted blow to the smaller apple farmers. The veto does not square with the professed determination of the administration to get the Federal Government out of activities which are wasteful of the taxpayers' money and serve no essential purpose. Apple farmers will find it difficult to understand why the President heeded the plea of bureaucrats of his Department of Agriculture to let them continue the useless and often damaging guessing game on apple prices without giving the apple farmers' organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, or the authors of the bill any opportunity to explain why price forecasting on apples has been of no value and has done substantial harm.

In congressional hearings on this legislation, representatives of the apple farmers, and of agriculture generally, testified to the damage and confusion caused by these price guesses, when made under auspices of the Federal Government. The only witness in opposition to the bill was a bureaucrat who understandably did not want to be told to stop doing what he had been doing at public expense, even if it were useless. It was agreed that the bill would have no effect on the other valuable statistical services of the Department of Agriculture, to which the President refers in his message, and would prohibit only price forecasting unwanted by all who were supposed to be served by it. For a number of years, cotton farmers have been protected by law against this crystal-balling by Federal bureaucrats on cotton prices. The apple farmers merely thought they were entitled to the same treatment as the cotton farmers. The Congress agreed. The President now has told them they are not.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my shock at the President's action in vetoing H. R. 5188. This measure would prohibit publication by the Department of Agriculture of its predictions as to the future price of apples. This was a bill which passed the House and the Senate with little or no opposition. This happened because it had been clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Members of both Houses that this was legislation that was needed. It was needed because many apple growers, large and small, had suffered substantial losses on their crops because in past years the Department of Agriculture's guess as to the future prices of apples proved to be well below the ultimate market prices. As the result of relying on the bad guessing of Mr. Benson's experts, many a farmer was misled into selling his crop for a price far short of what he could have realized without the misguiding guidance forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture.

When similar speculations in cotton prices worked a hardship on the cotton growers the Congress passed a law prohibiting the Government from expressing any predictions as to cotton futures. What the Congress attempted to do was to give this same protection to the apple growers of this country, but now the President has come along to deny them this protection. Mr. Eisenhower has recently taken up residence in one of the great apple producing counties of this Nation, and it is difficult to estimate the losses which will flow to many of his new neighbors as a result of today's action by the President. This is indeed an unfortunate veto. One that reflects a complete failure to understand the plight of the typical farmer and the problems he faces.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Anfuso
Baker
Barden
Barrett
Belcher
Bell
Bentley
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bowler
Boykin
Buchanan
Burdick
Canfield
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chiperfield
Clark
Cole
Coudert
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Dingell
Dollinger
Doyle
Eberharter
Fine
Fino
Fjare
Frazier
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hess
Hill
Holifield
Jackson
James
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krueger
McDowell
McGregor
Mack, Ill.
Mason
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
Perkins
Polk
Powell
Preston
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Riehlman
Rivers
Robsion, Ky.
St. George
Scherer
Sheehan
Siler
Smith, Wis.
Taylor
Udall
Van Pelt
Watts
Widnall
Wier
Williams, N. Y
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 294 which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 7117, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 294 would waive points of order against the bill and that is all that it would do.

Mr. Speaker, I think a rundown on the figures that are contained in this bill would be helpful and interesting to the membership of the House. In 1955 the total appropriation in this bill was $63,062,003. The budget estimate for this year was for $66,572,138 while the Committee on Appropriations actually recommends in this bill the sum of $66,280,675 for this fiscal year, which is $1,291,463 less than was in the 1956 budget estimate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains the appropriations necessary for the House of Representatives, the joint offices, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Speaker, the waiver of points of order is necessary because of a few limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore included in an appropriation bill. The most important of these is to be found on page 13, line 24, of the bill, which establishes a Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol.

On page 7, line 24, of the bill is found a provision which would authorize the Sergeant of Arms to make arrangements for any committee appointed to attend the funeral of a deceased Member.

On page 8, line 13, of the bill is found a provision regarding payments with respect to House employees from the contingent fund of the House of moneys, for employees insured under the provisions of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

On page 12, line 21, of the bill is a provision which would authorize the Architect of the Capitol to delegate to the Assistant Architect and other assistants such authority of the Architect as he deems proper.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule will be adopted by the House and that consideration of this bill will then proceed expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the chairman would let some other Members other than the members of the committee have a part of that 5 minutes. Could I have a minute of that time?

Mr. NORRELL. I will not need more than 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield 1 minute of our time to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hesitate to speak in this vein, and I, myself, have a reservation on a plane which will leave in a very short time. However, I have sat here this afternoon and seen legislation passed without a record rollcall vote, legislation which I think may change the pattern of life in our country. Whether we were for it or against it, I think it behooved us all to rise and be counted. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, considering that this, too, is an important bill, even though it only—and I speak ironically—appropriates money, I object to the request that only 10 minutes be allowed for consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 197, noes 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] 245 Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is recognized.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. With the situation with which we are confronted, it is necessary that the membership of the House stay here so that we have a quorum right through, and I think we can get through in reasonable time if we do that. I hope so.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it might be well to point out at this point in the proceedings that there is nothing in the bill now pending before the Committee of the Whole with one exception which is not authorized by previous resolution of the House and by existing law. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. This bill is essentially the same bill as we had last year. Every item that is in the bill has been debated. It is identified in the report and there should be no difficulty about it. We are not trying to pull any fast ones on our colleagues.

Mr. ROONEY. When I say there is nothing in this bill which has not been heretofore authorized, I should point out the one exception. There is the amount of $5 million in this bill in connection with the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. NORRELL. That is absolutely correct. We considered the matter thoroughly and decided that nothing in the bill concerning salaries should be allowed except matters that were absolutely authorized by law. There is nothing of this type, as far as I know, that has not been authorized by law.

There is one exception, and that is with respect to the Capitol grounds. We had to ask for a rule on that because we had no other recourse.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say much because it is late and I know the Members are all interested in going home. The bill contains nothing, you might say, that was not allowed for the fiscal year just ended. I see no reason why anybody should object to the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, without trying to burden the House with a lot of talk, I merely want to call attention to one statement. I would call the attention of the gentleman on the left side of the aisle to this: If there is nothing new in this bill why is it necessary at the bottom of page 21 to include this section:

> SEC. 103. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

If I know anything about the English language we are making permanent law. If it is not the intention to make it permanent law why will not the committee agree to amend it to read "shall not be the permanent law and shall apply only to this particular bill"? And give the appropriate committee, the Committee on House Administration, an opportunity to bring the matter in here for debate and get the authority of the House for it.

Mr. NORRELL. Answering the gentleman I may say the reason I cannot agree to that amendment is that for years and years that language has been included in this bill. It is not changed in any way. It was there this year, it was there last year, it has been there for a long, long time; so I see no reason why we should get uneasy about that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If we are not making it permanent law then there should be no objection to saying it is not permanent law. If we are going to make it permanent law, I think the membership should have notice thereof.

Mr. NORRELL. I think it is sufficiently like the language that has been carried so many times that I would not agree to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a minute?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to point out, as has been stated by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] that the section to which the gentleman from Missouri referred has been carried in the legislative appropriations bill year after year. A consequence is to make permanent law the provisions of the resolutions referred to in the latter part of section 103, to wit: House Resolution 714 of the 83d Congress and House Resolutions 73, 74, 75, 81, 82, 140, 163, and 195 of the 84th Congress.

It makes permanent law of these resolutions previously agreed to with regard to the housekeeping and functioning of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. If reference is made to page 12 of our hearings there will be found a list of the resolutions passed by this Congress upon which our action is based. There is nothing misleading about the language here. It has been carried in the bill for years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The reason that these things are referred to here is because those resolutions that are referred to were reported out by the Committee on House Administration and were approved by the House. Everyone of those resolutions came from that source.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If that is true, Mr. Chairman, why do we put it at the beginning of the section here referring to the other acts and then bring down a proviso for these particular resolutions? It would appear if that was the intention the resolutions would be put up there and the statement that it is permanent law and not refer to anything other than the resolution.

Mr. TABER. The resolutions became permanent law as a result of action here. They become basic legislation. That is the reason why that provision has been carried and with the waiver of points of order it permits that section to stay in and makes those resolutions from the Committee on House Administration which relate to different matters all through the bill permanent law.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. This is based upon the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, which is continuously revised. The proviso in making them become permanent law is by action of the Congress. The subsequent resolutions are again referred to in this general proviso.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. On page 3 there are 3 items that I may use here as an example. Two printing clerks, 1 for the majority caucus and 1 for the minority caucus, to be appointed by the majority and minority leaders respectively, $7,485. Was that in the law last year?

Mr. NORRELL. It has been authorized.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. At that salary?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill that you need to be afraid of. It is all recorded in the hearings and in the report, as I have said, with minor adjustments due to the acts of this body. It has been revised, and is practically the same bill we had this year with 1 or 2 exceptions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not know exactly what the gentleman from Missouri is getting at by his questions, but may I ask this question, whether in the section to which he referred, section 103, or anywhere else in this bill, there has been any effort made by the committee—and I am very happy to take the assurance of the gentleman from Washington in answer to this question—to write into law in this bill something contrary to the action taken by the Committee on House Administration recently with reference to clerk hire and other matters?

Mr. HORAN. No, because there has been no authorization bill. We steered clear of that. We felt that the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee and therefore we avoided that.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman's method of approach to the problem. On the other hand, I would also contend that the Committee on Appropriations should not endeavor to circumvent or to defeat in any way any action of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HORAN. We did not do that.

Mr. KEATING. It keeps free and clear that entire question?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think there have been many times when we have passed legislation where Members like myself have not read it. I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] for paying attention to the language and raising points. I think more of us should follow suit. I am glad to have the assurance and I am glad to vote for this legislation, but I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will continue to read the various bills that come up here, and I will try to follow his example.

Mr. HORAN. I commend the gentleman from Missouri, and we are ready and willing to answer all questions directed either to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], or myself or any member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I hate to make myself obnoxious, but here on page 15 we speak of a legislative garage. Now, there may have been a garage in the bill for all of these years, but to my knowledge there is no legislative garage. I think there is a garage over here in the Senate Office Building that is available to Members of the Senate. Is that true, or is that garage available to all Members of the Congress?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is available to many Members of Congress, and personally I happen to know about that. For years and years Congressmen have had space in the Senate garage.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly only a few Members of the House have had an opportunity to use the legislative garage; is that not correct?

Mr. HORAN. I think the last time I looked there were 84 Members of the House who had space over there.

Mr. GROSS. And there are 435 Members of the House; is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. That is true, but we cannot do anything about that.

Mr. GROSS. Another question I would like to ask: How much money is programed in this bill for a new House Office Building? Is there anything programed in this bill for condemnation of land?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the money in connection with the new House Office Building was appropriated in the supplemental bill which has become law. There is no money in this bill in connection with the third House Office Building.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to ask the gentleman who announced that the $2 million was appropriated for the new House Office Building in that other bill whether that was the bill where I was refused recognition on a motion to recommit, or does not the gentleman remember?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am not sure that is the bill. There are so many times that I have seen that happen that I cannot recall one way or the other whether that is the particular bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman, and I was just suggesting, and I will try to take advantage of that hereafter.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the bill before you today, I would like to take a moment to thank my colleagues on the Legislative Subcommittee for their support and assistance in handling the bill. Messrs. KIRWAN and ROONEY on the majority side and Messrs. HORAN and BOW on the minority side have been fully cooperative and helpful at all times. I have enjoyed very much working with these gentlemen.

The legislative appropriation bill for 1956 carries a total of $66,298,175. This is an increase of $3,236,172 over 1955 appropriations and a decrease of $1,273,963 in the budget estimates. The increase includes a little over $2,213,135 for the House of Representatives, $837,673 for the joint offices of Congress, $277,100 for the Architect of the Capitol, $22,900 for the Botanic Garden, $260,364 for the Library of Congress. These are offset by a reduction of $375,000 below 1955 for the Government Printing Office.

With respect to the $31,123,305 recommended for the House of Representatives, an increase of $2,213,305 is provided. This includes an additional $1,862,000 to cover Members' salary increases approved earlier in the session, $270,050 additional for the work of the various offices and committees of the House, and an increase of $81,085 under the heading "Contingent Expenses." The later increase is due to the insertion of $100,000 for preparation of a revised edition of the United States Code, which amount is offset by several minor decreases.

For the various joint offices, an increase of $837,673 is provided for next year. This includes an additional $14,373 to reimburse the District of Columbia for additional police protection assigned to the Capitol, an increase of $15,000 to provide additional help for the Legislative Council, and an increase of $808,300 to cover the penalty-mail costs of Congress for the past year.

Appropriations for the Architect of the Capitol for the coming fiscal year total $11,200,000. This is an increase of $277,100 over the 1955 fiscal year and is a decrease of $380,300 in the budget estimate. The increase provides some additional help for the Architect to enable him to meet the additional responsibilities being imposed upon him as a result of major improvements at the Capitol. In addition, it provides additional funds for maintenance of the various buildings on Capitol Hill, plus an additional amount to speed up conversion of the Capitol powerplant.

For the Library of Congress, the committee is recommending appropriations totaling $9,660,000 for 1956, an increase of $260,364 over the present fiscal year and a decrease of $206,098 in the budget estimate. The increase covers the additional costs resulting from Public Law 763, the so-called fringe-benefits bill, adopted at the last session of Congress. Also it provides a small amount for increased costs for communications, penalty mail, and within-grade salary advancements, and allows a modest increase in the staff of several of the more important functions of the Library.

The amount recommended for the Government Printing Office, $11,650,000, is $375,000 les sthan the funds provided for 1955. The committee is recommending a reduction of $400,000 in funds for congressional printing and binding in view of the fact that the 1955 appropriation was increased to cover the costs of the special session of the Senate last fall. Since no such session is contemplated this year, it was felt that some reduction in this fund could be made. A small increase of $25,000 has been included for the Superintendent of Documents to enable him to meet his mandatory within-grade salary increases during the coming fiscal year.

Before concluding, there are two important matters which I wish to discuss briefly. The first has to do with the proposed extension of the east front of the Capitol. You will note that the bill carries funds for this purpose. The proposal before you contemplates that a commission for the extension of the United States Capitol will be established to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol to supervise the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol in substantial accordance with scheme B of the architectural plans submitted by a joint commission of Congress on March 3, 1905. The committee feels that this much-needed work is long overdue and must be undertaken as soon as possible to meet the expanding needs of the Congress.

The other matter has to do with recent proposals to adjust salary rates and provide certain other personnel increases here at the Capitol. As pointed out in the committee report, proposals were submitted to the Appropriations Committee for the consideration of such changes. However, the committee felt that such action was within the province of the Committee on House Administration, and the Appropriations Committee should not carry any such legislation unless specifically requested by that committee to do so to facilitate consideration by the House. Accordingly, the bill before you carries no provisions for new positions or increased salaries. The committee feels that some adjustment in legislative salaries is justified, and it is anxious to support legislation for this purpose. It believes, however, that the proper legislative committee should handle the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

For clerk hire, necessarily employed by each Member in the discharge of his official and representative duties, which shall be at the basic rate of $15,000 per annum: *Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a basic rate in excess of $6,000 per annum; $11,500,000.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of Indiana: Page 4, line 15, after "of" strike out "$6,000" and insert "$8,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. There is no authorization for this proposal.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. Just read the paragraph pertaining to Members' clerk hire. If that is not legislation I do not know what it is and I do not know how to read the English language. It merely states:

For clerk hire, necessarily employed by each Member in the discharge of his official and representative duties, which shall be at the basic rate of $15,000 per annum: *Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a basic rate in excess of $6,000 per annum.

I merely changed the $6,000 to $8,000. This does not involve an increase in funds in the bill. It does not require an increase in appropriation and, therefore, should not be interpreted as legislation on an appropriations bill. If so, the paragraph to which the gentleman referred a little while ago would take care of it, as it is taking care of many other items in the bill.

The purpose of this amendment is merely to bring the Members of the House more nearly on a level, so far as clerk hire is concerned, with the Members of the other body. They have four positions over there for which they can pay much higher salaries than a Member of the House can pay to any one of his employees. The lowest employee in the office of a Member of the other body is authorized a base pay of $6,420, which is $420 more than we can pay our top assistant. Are we going to serve as a training ground for Members of the other body? Are we going to continue to train people and then lose them to the other side? Every one of us has a responsibility here.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the argument the gentleman is making, but the question before the House is a point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. I not only endorse my chairman's point of order, but I want to point out that the proposal of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] changes existing law. It raises the maximum amount that is fixed by law. Therefore, the point of order of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] should be sustained.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is interested only in the remarks directed to the point of order. The Chair is willing to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am addressing my remarks to the point of order, and I hope the Chair will recognize that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and discuss the point of order.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. At the present time, under the $6,000 limitation, with the 7.5-percent pay raise, we can pay our highest assistant only $10,645.25. If that were increased to $8,000, with the 7.5-percent pay raise, we would be able to pay $13,617.70 which, even then, would not be equal to the salaries paid 3 top positions in the other body.

We are not going to be able to hold our staffs. We are becoming merely a training institution for the other body.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] would change existing law by increasing the amount provided in the paragraph.

The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that the Committee on Appropriations feels that anything dealing with personalities and salaries should be handled in the proper way, by the proper committee of the Congress. I do hope that action will be had before this session ends and a supplemental appropriation can be provided to take care of it. However, we should move in an orderly way in this Chamber. That is the point I would like to make, that we do not feel that the Committee on Appropriations is the proper medium to provide this service for our colleagues.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that as majority leader, with my knowledge of the situation, I should at least advise my colleagues of my own state of mind in relation to the general situation.

I appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Administration and told them frankly that I thought the Members were entitled to an administrative assistant or a research assistant, whatever they wanted to call it. I felt that certain employees of the House were entitled to an increase in their basic pay. The subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration for many weeks diligently looked into the whole matter. It is a hard, painstaking job. I also felt that other considerations should be extended to the membership of the House.

As leader I am not in that position. There are certain prerogatives that go with the office of the leadership on both sides, but I recognize the position that individual Members are in. We thought that the recommendation of the Committee on House Administration to the Committee on Appropriations might be considered by that committee, but I recognize the fact that the Committee on Appropriations in their judgment felt that the House should act first and then the Committee on Appropriations follow. I am not going to argue that. It was an honest difference of opinion and it can be reconciled.

I am very glad to listen to the debate, however, showing that there is an appreciation on the part of the membership on both sides that there is a situation here that ought to be cured. I am glad to hear the minority member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations make the remarks he has.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says it was the feeling of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not a question of the feeling of the Committee on Appropriations, it is a question of the law of the House.

If you discuss the question of the feeling of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, I am certain there is not a member of that committee that does not feel that the pay schedule of the House should be readjusted and that an increase in salaries is long overdue.

We favor increases, I think, without exception, but we had no authority to proceed under the rules of the House. The committee which has legislative authority to handle this matter made a suggestion to the Committee on Appropriations. They sent us a plethora of material, every figure of which would have had to be studied and revised. It was not a proposition which could be incorporated in this bill. For example, there was not an item that would not have had to be readjusted to include or not include the 7.5-percent increase recently granted. The memorandum submitted to us indicated that it should be frozen in some instances and added in others. It suggested that we change the law by including additional money for postage for Members of the House and additional funds for telegrams and for mileage and stationery and additional clerks. They sent us nothing that could have been incorporated in a bill. They merely suggested what might be done.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations was never busier than it has been this week. We have had bills and conference reports coming up every day and we had neither the time nor the staff to go into this exceedingly complicated matter on such short notice.

We notified the legislative committee that if they would offer a complete title, we would be glad to include it in this bill. That offer has been standing for some time. It was made in writing. We have received no word from the legislative committee and we had no alternative but to present the bill as it is before you today.

What we really need in this matter is action and the Committee on Appropriations is anxious to cooperate in any workable plan to get a readjustment of salaries through before the end of the session.

May I suggest that Members consult the report?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say that the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, has been a very clarifying one. I think if we can follow it, the desired results can be obtained very quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, let it not appear that the Committee on House Administration did not know what it was doing. Of course, we sent the schedules of salary adjustments with 8 or 9 pages of justification for our conclusions to the legislative appropriations subcommittee. This procedure was in agreement with the views of the leadership of the House and was done in order to expedite this matter. Certainly, we did not act in ignorance of the procedures and certainly the Committee on Appropriations could work their will on the recommendations made. The committee could have acted on the recommendations in the same manner as it acts on authorizations on any other type of legislation after it has been approved by the House.

Let me repeat, that the Committee on House Administration was not shirking its responsibilities. The action was taken because time was of the essence. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was insisting that the legislative appropriation bill be voted out and that the items of pay adjustments and other features in which the membership is interested be included.

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee on House Administration writes a bill we will bring it here to the floor ourselves for authorization. There certainly would be no point in the Committee on House Administration writing a bill and submitting it directly to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, there is one point which I think ought to be brought out. If the gentleman from Indiana is correct, then the other body has already given themselves or arranged to give themselves not an administrative assistant or a research assistant, but a third member who would be paid a higher salary than could be paid by any Member of the House. Now that means that this bill we are talking about will go over to the other body and will have that put into this bill and then will be brought back to this House. All I am suggesting is that it emphasizes the urgency of the matter and the need for immediate action.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say it is true that the Committee on House Administration has studied, through a subcommittee, for several weeks the schedule of salaries and has had before the committee a big chart showing the present salaries and the proposed increase and has had considerable difficulty coming to an agreement. Finally, the majority, although I was opposed to it, voted to transfer the whole problem to the Committee on Appropriations, which I felt was an abdication of authority. I think that the Committee on House Administration ought to study the problem at length, if it takes the rest of the session, and come up with the proper answer, because I do not think it belongs to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I disagree with the gentleman that there was any attempt to abdicate. We were told that if we made specific recommendations, the quickest way and the easiest way to make these specific appropriations so as to prevent coming in here twice, once with an authorization and then once with an appropriation. On the matter in question I think the vote was 15 to 1.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. And I was the one.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. On this question the vote was overwhelming at least, and we specifically recommended it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I came here in 1940, a new and inexperienced legislator. I brought a young man with me, and we worked hard, days and nights and Saturdays and Sundays. After a couple of years the Navy got him, and I put his wife on the payroll, and she held his job. In the meantime the load got heavier and heavier. As you know, we are legislating for the world today, not just the United States.

Some time ago we passed the Reorganization Act, which provided for an administrative assistant for Members of the other body. Then what happened? The other body says to our top assistants: "We will give you $3,500 a year more than you are making and we offer you a 6-year job." I had worked day and night for years getting my man to the point where I could place responsibility on him and give him authority. I kept his wife on the payroll for 4 years while he was in the Navy. But I lost them.

I picked up another man and I kept him part time for 2 years, and I worked 3 or 4 hours every night with him trying to develop him to the point where I could put responsibility on him and give him authority. I now have that man on full time, and he is doing an outstanding job. But could I blame that man for leaving me if a Member of the other body offers him a 6-year job at much more money? Certainly not. In the recent appropriation bill on the other side they set up increases to the level that they can put on anybody—a plain, inexperienced typist—and pay them more than we can pay our top assistants. This is indeed a sorry state of affairs.

How many of you are going to be able to keep competent assistants in your office when they can go to the other side after you train them and get $3,000 or $4,000 more a year than you can offer them?

I do hope we can get some legislation here which will provide one top man whom we can hold on our side, who can keep his head up and raise his family without having to go to the other side to get a little extra money to properly bring up his wife and kids.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. With the gentleman's indulgence I would like to call the attention of the House to the situation of the Member from Nevada who represents the entire State in this body, whereas it has two Representatives in the other body. Each of them has a number of people on his payroll, yet I think perhaps the mail on our side is the heavier. I know that with the one aide I have in my office I am not able to meet the demands made upon me and at the same time keep up with the manifold bills that are presented for our consideration.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Certainly, and over there they can pay them more. They can offer 6-year jobs, but we can only offer 2-year jobs. That is the predicament we are in. Why should we feel inferior to the other branch? If we feel that we are competent to represent our constituencies, then we should insist on having the help we need and at a salary scale that will hold them. This body of Congress is just as essential, just as responsible as the other branch. This situation has existed for too long. We should be ashamed of it. We should do something to correct it, at long last.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the point we have been discussing should be understood before we leave it. The majority of the members of the Committee on House Administration in their wisdom thought that the quick and expeditious way of handling the matter of adjusting salaries was to prepare some kind of report and send it over to the Appropriations Committee; and I have no criticism of any members of the committee who hold that view. My own idea was that the House Administration Committee is charged with the responsibility of fixing the salaries for the employees of the House and that we should come in with a resolution if necessary, and have the resolution adopted rather than having it put in an appropriation bill, do it in such way that the House of Representatives could work its will, offer amendments, change the resolution in any way the majority pleased and proceed in an orderly regular manner. Then the Appropriations Committee could furnish the money to carry out those provisions.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would just point out that I am sure the gentleman agrees when he uses the word "majority" that it was not a partisan majority; this issue crossed party lines.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I did not mean that and I beg pardon if I gave that impression.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I know the gentleman did not mean that. It was a majority that crossed party lines.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Oh, yes, indeed, there is little or no partisanship in the Committee on House Administration. I feel that the rules of the House give jurisdiction to the several committees rather implicitly and I think this jurisdiction should be observed. When I said a few minutes ago that I felt the Administration Committee, by a rollcall vote, abdicated its jurisdiction, I was speaking only of my own feelings.

I was a very small minority when the vote came, but that did not make any difference. That was my feeling.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There were some who voted for it and some who voted against it.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. On both sides, that is true. It was not along party lines at all. The majority in their wisdom thought the quick way to do the job was to transfer the whole problem to the Appropriations Committee, get it in here under a closed rule that waived points of order and roll it through. That was not my feeling, but that is my explanation of the present situation.

I was opposed some time ago to a bill from the Judiciary Committee adjusting salaries of committee staffs. I did not like the bill that recently raised all salaries on the Hill together with civil-service employees because it was under suspension and did not permit of an amendment. The salaries for employees on the Hill should have been left to the Administration Committee I thought.

The Clerk read as follows:

Extension of the Capitol: The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized, under the direction of a Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, to provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol in substantial accordance with scheme B of the architectural plan submitted by a joint commission of Congress and reported to Congress on March 3, 1905 (H. Doc. No. No. 385, 58th Cong.), but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol Grounds, together with utilities, equipment, approaches, and other appurtenant or necessary items, as may be approved by said Commission, and for such purposes there is hereby appropriated $5 million, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by said Commission to be required for the purposes hereof: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of said Commission and without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 14, lines 12 and 13, strike out the word "restaurant", the comma following the word "facilities" and insert the words "for the feeding of Members of the House, their guests and their employees".

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of $5 million. It provides for an extension of the Capitol. It authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of a commission composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the minority leader of the Senate, and the minority leader of the House, to, among other things, "provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol" * * * "but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol Grounds," and so forth.

The amendment just offered is to strike out the word "restaurant," the comma following the word "facilities," and insert the words, "for the feeding of Members of the House, their guests, and their employees."

Mr. Chairman and my dear colleagues, we all know that for 10 years or more the Members and their guests have been herded down on the first floor of the corridor adjoining the House Restaurant, like sheep waiting to be herded into a new and lush pasture. It is nothing unusual for Members and their guests to wait as long as a half an hour in order to obtain an opportunity to sit down for a few moments, hurriedly snatch something to eat, drink a cup of scalding coffee, and then to again be herded out.

This is not a criticism of those in charge, for all of us are anxious and impatient to be seated, and we know that if we linger over our food or attempt to visit with a constituent, others, usually impatient are waiting to take our places.

Because our constituents judge us not only by what they see from the gallery, but from what they observe around the Capitol, we are subject to an unfair impression when they note the discourtesy which they, as our guests, are subjected to when we ask them to lunch at the House restaurant.

It is all very well for some to talk about maintaining the dignity of the House, but if we cannot provide suitable and adequate facilities where we can get food which is necessary if we are to carry on our duties, where we can entertain, as we are under obligation to do, those who elect us, those who furnish the funds to run this Government, in a dignified, respectable manner, naturally our constituents, as they visit us, wonder if we are competent to transact the Nation's business, whether we are competent to handle our own.

You will note this provision in the bill that a restaurant should be established. Well, we have a restaurant, and from past experience I want no more of a House-type restaurant. I have had more than enough of that. What assurance have we that if this change is to be left to the decision of those named in the bill—and the same officials have been in charge for the last 20 years or more—we will not get a diner, a snack bar, a hole-in-the-wall, a continuance of the present facilities. The expression "facilities for feeding" is not an elegant expression, and if someone in conference wants to make the language more appropriate, such a change, I am sure, will be welcomed by every Member of the House.

On the west side of the Capitol, facing the mall, is an unused space, three floors deep.

There is ample room for a ground floor, well-ventilated, sanitary kitchen. There is ample room for a cafeteria, for a restaurant, and for a dining room, all of which might well reflect credit upon the Congress or which might give our constituents, who are taxed so heavily for the maintenance of their Government, an opportunity to dine, to consult with their Representatives here in Washington, to view the reflecting pool, the Washington and Lincoln Monuments, and to sit back and reflect that here, indeed, is the Capitol of one of the greatest nations in the world, where the Government's business will, they hope, be carried on efficiently.

There are some 42 or more cafeterias in Government buildings. In some of the buildings there are private dining rooms. In none, so far as I know, are the dining facilities of the employees and those whose presence is required by their official duties, as cramped, as unsanitary, as inadequate, as are those in the Capitol.

My great admiration for the ability of those under whose direction this change will be made is unlimited. But, if a suggestion may be made, it would be that the Speaker and the minority leader in the House consult with some southern mammy or Yankee housewife when they give consideration to the ways and means and the manner of providing food for the Members of the House, House employees, and their guests.

The suggested facility is one which, adequately managed, would return at least a nominal profit to the Government. Lest there be misunderstanding, permit me to add, I am not thinking of myself. I can carry a paper sack or I can go to the grocery, as I have done some times in the past, get a package of cheese and crackers, and get along without too much discomfort.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) there were—ayes 82, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Commmittee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COLMER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with a recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to be recognized when the Chair puts the question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I entitled to hear the words, "The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill?"

The SPEAKER. The Chair always puts that question.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION IN RE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF SECTION 22-2501 OF TITLE 22, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUNE 30, 1955.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before the grand jury of said court in reference to an investigation of alleged violation of section 22-2501 of title 22, District of Columbia Code, and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES *v.* INVESTIGATION IN RE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF SECTION 22-2501 OF TITLE 22, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The President of the United States to Ralph Roberts, Clerk of United States House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend before the grand jury of said court on the 6th day of July 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and bring with you all files, records, minutes, and proceedings of the Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, for the 82d Congress and for the 83d Congress, particularly the House resolution of the 82d Congress, 1st session, adopting the rules of said 82d Congress; House

Resolution 38 of the 82d Congress, 1st session; letter dated between September 1 and December 19, 1951, from Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman on Armed Services, to Hon. W. STERLING COLE, designating Congressmen W. STERLING COLE and PAUL J. KILDAY to act as a special subcommittee; House Resolution 5 and 125 of the 83d Congress, 1st session; letter dated March 11, 1953, from Hon. DEWEY SHORT, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, to Hon. W. STERLING COLE and Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY; and records, minutes, transcripts of testimony, and files of said Committee on Armed Services relating to an executive session of the aforesaid special subcommittee of said Committee on Armed Services on March 26, 1953, presided over by the Honorable W. STERLING COLE, chairman of said special subcommittee, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness: The Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 28th day of June 1955.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By MABEL R. HOUSTON,
Deputy Clerk.

RICHARD E. PAINTER,
Attorney for the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 296) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in re investigation of alleged violation of section 22–2501 of title 22, District of Columbia Code, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear before the grand jury of said court on Wednesday, the 6th day of July 1955, at 10 o'clock antemeridian to testify and to bring with him certain files, minutes, and records in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the grand jury of the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers, documents, or records on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers, documents, and records called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any papers, documents, or records and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such papers, documents, or records in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, so as, however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena duces tecum aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6417.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, was bitterly disappointed and somewhat frustrated today in not having an opportunity to go on record and vote my vigorous opposition to H. R. 7000, a piece of legislation which will affect the lives, the education, the leisure time, and the freedom of our young men for years to come.

It was disappointing and somewhat surprising to me that those who carved out this legislation were not more anxious to stand up and be counted when the moment of decision came.

I can only hope that when this legislation comes back to us from the other body it will not be loaded with compulsory UMT provisions and come up to us at such a time that the conference report will have to be voted through hastily while the Members are on the way to the train.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May we hope that when the conference report comes back we can have a vote on this legislation?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is exactly my request and reaction.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days to extend their remarks on the legislative appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON FEDERAL POWER AND WATER RESOURCE POLICIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission has now released its report on Federal power and water resource policies. This has been a matter of deep conflict within the Commission itself and the report comes to us with serious dissents. Those dissents are deserved. If put into effect the policies recommended by the Hoover Commission would be dangerous to the welfare and security of the United States.

The fact is too often overlooked now that great Federal power projects, such as TVA, which were in existence at the time of our entry into World War II, made possible the early development of the atomic bomb and the almost miraculous expansion of the aircraft industry. Without the vast quantities of electric power from such projects as these this Nation would have been delayed in developing the atomic and hydrogen bombs by as much as 2 years or more in each case. If this Nation had been forced into the time lag required to construct adequate power facilities, it is quite possible the Soviet Union would have come near control of the free world. And, I do not believe that this is an exaggeration of the facts.

Our victory, and that of the free world, in World War II was intimately related to the fact that we were able to expand the production of aluminum on a vast scale. Without this increase in the production of aluminum this Nation could never have achieved those marvels in the production of aircraft which were essential to the winning of the war.

I understand the devotion of those men who signed this Hoover Commission report to the profit principle. I am for it myself. Yet, those of us who have experience in Government know that there are other elements, and often greater and more vital elements, in determining the policies of Government. I believe that those who signed this report have either not had the experience in Government which would cause them to take cognizance of these elements, or have not thought deeply enough about the problem on which they are reporting.

It is true that neither TVA nor some of the other great power projects sponsored by the Federal Government were designated for war purposes. But, they were intended to take care of long-term power needs and when the power was demanded by the needs of national defense, it was there and available.

The purpose of TVA was to bring about the economic revival of a great area of the Nation which had been a have-not area since the War Between the States, a condition made much graver by the effects of the great depression. A fine and resilient people lived in this area. They needed but the added power provided by TVA and distributed to them by their own systems at reasonable cost, to turn the corner economically. Today the area served with TVA power has grown mightily and is still growing. To provide this spark, to provide the means by which the people of this area could change their conditions for the better, was a national purpose, a great purpose, a vital purpose.

The Hoover Commission points out that other and more populous areas of the Nation do not have the benefit of Federal public power. This may be. But, the people of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania benefit directly from the important market for manufactured goods which has developed in the Tennessee Valley since the beginning of TVA. The people of the middle Atlantic area have benefited tremendously from sale of clothing, television sets, refrigerators, and a thousand and one types of goods. The people of Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and other States which are centers of automobile production have jobs because of the market for cars and trucks in our area. And so it goes for all the States of the Union.

Let us not forget, either, that better economic conditions have made bigger taxpayers of us in the TVA area. We are carrying more and more of our share of the burden of government.

Better economic conditions in the TVA area have produced healthier and better educated citizens. I submit that making possible better health and a higher standard of education is a national purpose.

I am glad that in making this report, such as it is, and backward as it is in certain respects, that the Hoover Commission overruled its shortsighted task force which had recommended the abandonment and sale of the entire Federal power structure. Yet, if the policies which the report does recommend were put into effect it would cause grave economic dislocations in the TVA area, it would leave the Nation without the means of supplying great amounts of low-cost power if national-defense requirements should suddenly demand them, it would return us to another era of an economy of scarcity as far as power production is concerned and it would remove the famous yardstick on power costs which has benefited consumers in States far removed from the TVA or other Federal power installations. In removing or debilitating the preference clauses in the sale of public power it would hamper the freedom of our cities and rural communities in their growth and independence of monopolies.

There is one aspect of the report of the Commission with which I will wholeheartedly agree. It proposes that the various Federal power authorities issue their own bonds and finance themselves. We have sought the right to do just that. We seek that right now.

The report, at another point, sets up the Port of New York Authority and its method of self-financing as an example. We ask nothing more than that TVA be given like authority instead of the complicated, legalistic, limiting authority which would be granted it under the recent proposal of the Bureau of the Budget.

If there could be any issue, Mr. Speaker, which would arouse the people of the TVA area almost unanimously, it would be this issue. The TVA is the lifeblood of that area. We do not want it hampered, we do not want it limited in its ability to serve and grow with the needs of its area. My people do not want to have to pay higher electric rates in order to make the rates of some utility up in Pennsylvania or New Hampshire look good.

We believe in the profit motive. We want to make profits for our farms, our businesses, and ourselves. We want to make profits for the Federal Government as taxpaying citizens. We want to help the TVA be so successful that it can finance its future progress.

No greater tribute to the belief of the people of the Tennessee Valley in the future of their area and of the TVA can be found than in the determination of the city of Memphis to spend $100 million for the construction of a steam plant for the production of electric power to make unnecessary the construction of the Dixon-Yates plant.

If this House wants an example of enterprise, there it is. If this administration wants to save the taxpayers' money, here is its opportunity to cancel Dixon-Yates as an unnecessary and unneeded expenditure of public funds.

The feeling of the people of Memphis about TVA is echoed all over the Tennessee Valley. It is echoed in my own district. The people will not countenance the destruction of TVA or any perversion of its purposes. Behind it we stand firm and united, knowing that when we do we uphold not only our own best interests, but the best interests of all the people of the United States.

In preparing to abandon Dixon-Yates the administration has at last faced up to the realities of the situation in the Tennessee Valley.

Getting out of this contract is likely to be a costly business. The cost will be worth it if the administration has at last learned the lesson that an essential partner in any partnership arrangement for the development of electric power is the people of the area.

Even though its action is belated, I congratulate the administration on its efforts to get out of an untenable position.

CHARLES N. COLLATUS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article appearing in the Boston Globe which gives a brief résumé of the work of a past commander of the American Legion, Charles N. Collatus, a constituent of mine. It is a description of his work last year.

Mr. Speaker, this man is an unusually fine individual, and the résumé here does not nearly cover his activities. He went all over the State visiting every sort of veteran activity. He worked tirelessly. It seems to me he must have been engaged 24 hours a day.

All honor and respect to Charles Collatus.

The editorial from the Boston Globe follows:

AMERICAN LEGION STATE COMMANDER REPORTS ON A YEAR IN OFFICE

(By Virginia Bright)

Home ties may tug at his heart, but Charles N. Collatus, for the past year State commander of the American Legion, considers it a privilege and a duty to spend his spare time vigilantly working to protect the rights of veterans.

A vigorous program has been waged by the Legion during his tenure in opposing legislation which would restrict veterans' benefits and reduce VA hospital facilities. As State chairman, Collatus has aggressively fought for a national security training program, for the establishment of hospital services to aged veterans at Cushing General Hospital in Framingham, and for a thorough review of the case of the American airmen imprisoned by Red China. He has worked to create better relations between the American Medical Association and the Legion.

Last winter he severely attacked the practice of unloading goods manufactured behind the Iron Curtain here.

In the field of community relations the commander recommended an appropriation of $1 million for the establishment of an emergency Salk vaccine inoculation program free to all in Massachusetts between the ages of 1 and 20.

President Eisenhower later recommended that $28 million be applied toward polio shots on a national scale. Federal funds will, therefore, be available to augment State expenditures when needed.

"We aim to serve in peace as we did in war," Commander Collatus said. "Over three-quarters of the American Legion projects are not alone for veterans but for the betterment of local community life."

A friendly, positive personality, Collatus is a veteran of World War II, having served as gliderman with the 1st Airborne Task Force and with the Allied Airborne Army. While assistant secretary to former Gov. Paul A. Dever, he married the former Florence

Koniares. Now residents of Arlington, they have two small children, Nicholas and Dianne, who strenuously object whenever they see their dad in the Legion's uniform leaving home to attend the innumerable official meetings.

Shortly after talking office of commander, Collatus exposed the proposed veterans' benefit law as a measure which would deprive thousands of civil-service employees of veterans' benefit rights. He recommended a special session of the legislature "to rectify injustices in the law." The resolution was unanimously approved by the Legion's executive board, representing the State's 94,000 Legionnaires, and forwarded to Governor Herter.

The commander specifically objected to two clauses in chapter 627, the so-called veterans' benefit law passed by the 1954 legislature.

Under the first clause, he stated all employees with less than 90 days in the armed services will lose rights to veterans' benefits "unless they were awarded a service-connected disability or a Purple Heart."

The other section he objected to stated that veterans who leave civil-service jobs for more than 2 years and then return to their post may not count prior years of employment toward veterans' retirement rights.

Under such a law, the commander explained, many veterans of World War I, having served less than 90 days, would be denied veterans' pensions even though they had been contributing into the veterans' retirement fund for over 30 years. Special session of the legislature reviewed the inequities of the measure and did revise the bill affecting World War I veterans. The law is undergoing study dealing with veterans of World War II and Korea.

Governor Herter lauded the Legion and Collatos, in particular, for being the first to point out the errors in the first amendments in the veterans' bill.

"I am certain," the Legion commander said, "that the bipartisan Military Affairs Committee which approved the amendments originally did not intend to deprive employees of their rights as veterans. I am confident the difficulties will be resolved."

Speaking on the subject of the Hoover Commission's proposal to close some VA hospitals, Commander Collatos emphasized the need of keeping the Murphy Army Hospital and the Brighton VA Hospital operating.

He explained that 1,800 Air Force personnel at Hanscom Field and the dependents of Army and Air Force personnel now overseas use the Murphy Hospital. He also pointed out that present plans call for increasing the complement at Hanscom Field to 5,000. If Murphy Hospital were closed, its patients would have to go to Fort Devens Hospital.

"Transportation difficulties and security requirements at Devens will prevent the efficient handling of such a patient load," he declared.

Personnel from the merchant marine are treated at the Brighton V. A. Hospital where, according to Mr. Collatos, in the event of atomic attack, casualties could be well cared for.

"I am not opposed to the Hoover Commission's efforts to economize so long as the economies do not impair essential services," he said.

A graduate of Northeastern University in 1941, Collatos is a strong advocate of the National Security Training program. Backed by the American Legion the bill promises to strengthen our military forces by bringing into being a well-trained Reserve force, ready at a moment's notice for immediate mobility and combat deployment. At present, the commander continued, America's Reserve Forces are far less than the 1,900,000 provided for in the NST bill.

"Approximately 800,000 World War II veterans were called back into service even though more than 2 million young men who reached military age between the end of World War II and the start of the Korean war were never called at all. The NST bill should correct this unfair system," Collatas emphasized.

Answering critics who label the American Legion as treasury raiders, Collatos explained the Legion is not fighting to increase benefits to veterans; only to keep those benefits given veterans by a grateful Government and avoid unjust discriminations.

He expressed concern over the studies currently being made at the instigation of President Eisenhower to alter the structure of the Nation's pensions and compensation laws, linking veterans' benefits with social security and survivors' benefits.

"Our foreign aid payments have exceeded $80 billion," he reported, "while the total cost of pensions and compensations to veterans and dependents during the entire history of our country has been less than $35 billion."

An elaborate youth program is also conducted by the Legionnaires. It includes a boys' State camp, held at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, and also a girls' camp, held at Bridgewater Teachers College, for those high school students who show, not just high scholastic standing but leadership potentialities.

EXTENDING THE TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted to extend the present temporary increase in the public debt ceiling which was authorized last year. Since we voted for the appropriations and expenditures which will push the Treasury over its debt ceiling, at least temporarily, I cannot see how we can disapprove an increase in the Treasury's borrowing authority. However, not all of the increase in the public debt is the fault of the Congress.

A $200 MILLION INCREASE IN ANNUAL INTEREST CHARGE SINCE AUGUST 1954

Mr. Speaker, I note that in August 1954, the computed annual interest rate on the direct Federal debt was 2.292 percent. The computed annual interest charge was $6,250,000,000. Since August 1954, there has been a steady tightening up in monetary and credit policy. As a result interest rates have gone up, thereby increasing the annual interest charge on the Federal debt. In May 1955, the computed annual interest rate on the direct Federal debt had risen to 2.348 percent. The computed annual interest charge was $6,452,000,000. It is true that between August 1954 and May 1955, the direct Federal debt increased by $2 billion. However, the rise in interest rates on Federal securities accounted for an increase of about $150 million in the annual interest charge on the Federal debt.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PRACTICE ECONOMY AND PRUDENCE

Mr. Speaker, in authorizing this temporary increase in the debt ceiling we should point out that the tendency of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve to disregard the interest charge on the Federal debt is not consistent with the principles of economy and prudence which the heads of these agencies recommend to others with respect to their credit requirements. I was impressed by a newspaper account of Secretary Humphrey's testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with the hearings on extending the increase in the debt limit. According to this report Secretary Humphrey was quoted as saying: "It is important in a situation like the present that the Federal Government set itself an example of economy and prudence."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Secretary for those sentiments and urge that he bear them in mind when he makes his decision as to the interest rate he will offer on his new issues. I hope that the Secretary's testimony reflects a change in his attitude from that of May 1953. I well recall the Secretary stating after he had put out those costly 3¼ percent 30-year bonds that he believed interest rates were still low. The gigantic windfall gains that were made on those bonds within a very short time after their issuance proved how wrong the Secretary was in his estimate of the level of interest rates.

DECISION AS TO INTEREST RATES ON FEDERAL SECURITIES RESTS WITH OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

As the Members of this House well know there is only one place where the interest charge on the Federal debt is determined and that is in the Federal Open Market Committee. The Federal Open Market Committee through its purchases and sales of Federal securities, along with the Secretary of the Treasury who has the say about the manner and type of their issuance, sets the interest rates on Federal debt issues. This House had an opportunity 2 weeks ago in considering House Resolution 210, to express itself on the matter of economy and prudence insofar as interest charges on the Federal debt were concerned. Unfortunately, those administration leaders in the executive branch, who are loudest in their advocacy of economy in the Federal Government were not interested in finding ways and means of economizing if the profits of the banks were to be affected as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Members of two statements made by Marriner Eccles, former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. They are of particular importance at this time when we are considering this question of increasing the debt ceiling.

Testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Eccles said:

> We can guarantee that the interest rate, so far as the public debt is concerned, is where the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve desires to put it.

I bring that statement to the Members' attention to show the tremendous power that this committee has in determining the cost of servicing the public debt. Now consider that power in the light of this next statement by Mr. Eccles:

> When a reserve bank president sits as a member of the Federal Open Market Committee, he participates in vital policy decisions which affect all banking. So far as

I know, there is no other major governmental power entrusted to a Federal agency composed in part of representatives of the organizations which are the subject of regulations by that agency.

Mr. Speaker, I might add what Mr. Eccles did not mention. The day-to-day transactions of the Open Market Committee are carried out by an employee of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York who is responsible to the president of the bank and not to the Federal Open Market Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in considering this question of authorizing an extension of the temporary increase in the debt ceiling how can we ignore the question of interest rates on the Federal debt issues and the role that bankers play through the Open Market Committee in influencing those interest rates?

Mr. Speaker, the bankers, the Open Market Committee, and the Secretary of the Treasury should be informed by this House that interest rates and the interest charge on the Federal debt are to be kept at that minimum level consistent with the principles of economy and prudence in Government which the Secretary of the Treasury enunciated in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

BANKERS' BENEFITS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker, the banks are deep in the business of servicing the Federal debt. I think they perform a valuable service for which they should be compensated. They are essential to our private enterprise economy. I want to see them profitable so that they can continue to perform their valuable services. I submit, however, that there is a public interest that needs to be considered also in this question of determining the interest charge on the Federal debt.

Securities of the Federal Government constituted over 40 percent of all commercial bank earning assets at the end of 1954. Interest earnings and profits on sale of Government securities of member banks in 1954 amounted to $1,431 million, or nearly 30 percent of their total earnings. They were far more than the $944 million of all taxes on all banking operations of member banks for 1954.

The private assets in commercial bank portfolios are sheltered by Government guaranties, deposits are insured by the Federal Government; excessive competition is restricted by the authority of the Federal Government and expensive services running into the millions are provided free each year by an independent agency of the Federal Government, the Federal Reserve System.

BANKERS SHOULD TAKE THE PUBLIC INTEREST INTO ACCOUNT

Mr. Speaker, according to a report in the New York Journal of Commerce for Monday June 27 preliminary data indicate that earnings of the larger New York banks for the second quarter of 1955 and for the first 6 months will establish an all time record high. In authorizing this extension of a temporary increase in the Federal debt ceiling which will enable the commercial banks to acquire some more risk-free earning assets the Congress might well consider the desirability of calling attention of the Treasury, the Federal Open Market Committee and the commercial bankers that the taxpayers would like a little consideration when it comes to their setting the interest rates on these new public debt issues. The Congress might well reconsider its action on House Resolution 210 and express its concern about the tendency of Federal Open Market Committee policies to introduce excessive fluctuations in the prices of Treasury securities, thereby causing interest on the Federal debt to be higher than it would otherwise be, and coincidentally making it possible for some to realize huge speculative gains on sales of Federal securities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include resolutions.

Mr. UDALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS and to include a statement.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 184. An act to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 315. An act for the relief of Asher Ezrachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 476. An act for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 717. An act for the relief of Hedi Gertrude Spiecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 987. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Luca Saltarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1220. An act for the relief of Josephine Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1577. An act to amend the acts granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate toll bridges across the Connecticut River; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn, nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer;

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 195. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi; and

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court, and the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1955:

H. R. 619. An act to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust";

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.;

H. R. 5560. An act relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6367. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6795. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6871. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1956;

H. R. 6992. An act to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit;

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, providing for increased pay costs for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1955:

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 5, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

954. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Central Intelligence Agency and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $1,480 million for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

955. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $3,266,641,750 to carry out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1955 (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

956. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U. S. C. 1827) (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

957. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available on a voluntary basis group hospital, surgical, medical, and other personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, through the facilities of prepayment group plans, group practice prepayment plans, Federal employee organizations, and insurance companies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

958. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Pacific Area Command, Pacific and Mid-Pacific Operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

959. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. A preliminary report on Small Business Administration and related activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4744. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6641. A bill to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6472. A bill to amend further the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to promote the redevelopment of the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 295. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6417. A bill to revive and reenact the act "Authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5614. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; with amendments (Rept. No. 1051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 7144. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7145. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tin in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (by request):

H. R. 7146. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 7147. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a personal exemption with respect to certain dependents in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 7149. A bill to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7150. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income in certain cases of indebtedness discharged 20 years or more after the date on which it was incurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7151. A bill to amend section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7152. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7153. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7154. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7155. A bill to provide that the outer covering of income-tax returns mailed to taxpayers shall not bear colored stripes or other identification devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 7156. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 7157. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 7158. A bill to provide that a miniature bronze replica of the Marine Corps War Memorial shall be placed at the grave of each of the participants in the flag raising on Iwo Jima; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7159. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department, of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 7160. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in abnormality relief cases arising under the World War II Excess Profits Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7161. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 369. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7163. A bill for the relief of the estates of Gertrude Ornellas and Barbara June Ornellas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Consolacion A. Yacap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7166. A bill for the relief of Teresina N. Feola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Maj. Irving H. Stammreich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Doris Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7169. A bill for the relief of Anna Czekajlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

345. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 143 persons urging Congress to enact legislation to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

346. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., relative to criticizing the use of "riders" to block pending legislation affecting the welfare and security of the country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, Before International Lutheran Laymen's League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] before the International Lutheran Laymen's League at Seattle, Wash., on June 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE INTERNATIONAL LUTHERAN LAYMEN'S LEAGUE, SEATTLE, WASH., JUNE 29, 1955

I come before you this morning as a Lutheran layman—who was born into the Lutheran Church as it were—who has spent his entire life there—and as a United States Senator who has served in that body for 11 years after an 8-year apprenticeship as a Member of the House of Representatives.

As we all know, the Lutheran Church is not a politically minded church. It was the first church to insist upon the complete separation of church and state—a conception that was later to become one of the basic principles incorporated in the Constitution of the United States.

There is, however, a close tie between the two. Being a United States Senator, I find it quite impossible not also to be a Lutheran and to carry over the teachings and concepts I acquired as a boy.

I was raised in a Lutheran church back in North Dakota. Dr. Stub was the pastor. His son is here in Seattle, the pastor of the Emmanuel Lutheran Church, of which I am a member.

As Lutherans, we have always stood for the separation of the church and state. Luther himself fought as persistently against the encroachment of the state upon the church as against oppression of the church by the state. He felt that the ordinary man was endowed with enough integrity and insight to administer civil affairs with justice and equity—but that it was the duty of the church to inculcate the virtues of humility, patience, and charity to temper and give direction to his administration.

In thinking over what I should say to you this morning, I reviewed decisions I have made as a Congressman and fought for and I have been surprised at the number of these that have been influenced by my Lutheran training.

In politics, of all places, a person's fundamental conceptions of human relations, his sense of duty and responsibility—come to the surface every day.

I believe in the separation of the church and state—that every man's religious and political beliefs should be respected. This goes for the individual citizen as well as the state. No man should take up where the state leaves off and promote intolerance, prejudice, and hatred on religious or political grounds.

I also feel that the state or the government has a definite, but sometimes not well defined, responsibility to its citizens. I feel there is enough hardship. Ill fortune, lack of opportunity, enough just plain misery in human life, without the state adding to it with laws that grant small groups special privileges or with laws permitting one group to prey upon another legally. I feel, what is more, that it is the duty of the government to see that hardship is lightened—that ill fortune is minimized—that opportunity is equalized and that just plain misery is abolished.

All this, I think you will agree, is both Lutheran and Christian. What is more, I feel that since I have been given the job of representing a lot of people in the most powerful legislative body in the world, I should do something about it.

This comes down to what you might call applied Christianity. And it is my opinion, that by applied Christianity, and by applied Christianity only, have we created a strong and prosperous Nation and can we meet with any hope of success the terrible challenge that faces us today throughout the world. It is not only what we believe that counts—it is, in larger measure, what we do about it. The golden rule is of no use to anyone if it is not put to work.

One of the outstanding examples of applied Christianity comes from your group. Look at the birth of the organization. The Missouri Synod was having a tough struggle back in the early depression when a group of laymen met, affirmed positively that the work of the church was the work of the laymen. That is why we have the Lutheran Laymen's League. That is why it has grown so much since that early roundtable session. That is why you will continue to grow just as long as the Christianity can be applied in the other important avenues of the church that you are broadening and using in your daily lives.

I am going to take a few examples from my own political experience and hope they will not sound presumptuous.

Back in the very early thirties—1932—I was elected to the State legislature here in Washington. I was pretty young then. Everyone was broke. The fabulous purchasing power of the United States we boast about today was nonexistent. People were hungry, and through no fault of their own. All had been thrifty, useful citizens. The injustice of the whole thing kept me awake nights. I felt that any government worth its salt had a responsibility to see that such a thing could never happen again.

What did we do? A few of us got together and wrote up a State social-security bill. We used to work on it at night and we had a lot of good legal assistance because the best lawyers were as broke as everyone else. The result was that I introduced the first social-security bill that was ever passed in this country. Later I had the honor of having our bill taken as the basis of the social-security bill passed by Congress which is in effect today.

We did two other things at that session, too. I got through the first bill abolishing the poorhouse and started a long fight to stop corporations from making excess profits out of such things as electricity, which everyone has to use.

Along this same line of applied Christianity there is another instance I would like to tell you about. I have been called the father of cancer research, of government research to save human life, and of the National Institute of Health.

This is not entirely true. I was one of many—but I did lead off, and the best scientists of the country did camp in my office for 2 years while we put over the National Science Foundation bill without any fanfare at all.

It happened this way. When I got to Congress back in 1937 I was under the tutelage, more or less, of Homer T. Bone, a Senator from this State. We were struck by an inconsistency which we felt intolerable. Uncle Sam was spending millions to cure disease in cattle, to exterminate beetles in timber, and rust in wheat, but not one cent to control the diseases that were taking human lives and hospitalizing millions. Today you can scarcely believe it. Up to that time, however, the only research for the control of disease had been done by the Army for its own purposes, especially to wipe out yellow fever at the Panama Canal, which the Army controlled.

Cancer, then as now, was the great killer. We introduced a bill putting the Government in the research business. I got the money through the House. Bone handled the Senate. And believe it or not, some of the best medical talent in the Nation came to Washington, called us socialists, insisted this was not the Government's responsibility, that the medical profession could do it better themselves.

Later when I became a Senator, toward the end of the last war, Dr. Vannevar Bush and a group of the best-known scientists in the country came down and asked me to help expand this small cancer program.

As head of the Government's scientific research then, Dr. Bush had set up teams of scientists, provided them with funds, used existing laboratories, and assigned them specific problems. They had developed the atomic bomb, perfected radar, proximity fuses—scores of things. They now wanted to do the same things—not to destroy, but to preserve human life. Dr. Bush's assistant took a desk in my office and we did the job.

Today we have the National Health Institute working on cancer, heart, and mental afflictions. A few months ago they were able to make the most optimistic reports yet on cancer. We have no trouble now in getting appropriations. We are no longer called socialists. Our Government is performing what, in my opinion, is one of its first responsibilities to its citizens.

We should be doing much more to safeguard the national health and to pass those developments along to peoples over the world because we're following the greatest example of all when we do it. It was Christ who not only was the great Teacher, but the great Healer who points the way.

It is a grave injustice to look only at His teaching—and his preaching—without remembering the example in healing. Everything that He did was done for others. Never was the concern for Himself. Out of that example comes one that our Nation can take to heart. We may make the developments in the treatment of disease, whether of the mind or of the body. But the greatest test is what we do after the developments and the improvements are known. If we selfishly keep them for ourselves or our Nation alone, are we following His teaching? If we choose to build a wall around the discoveries, are we living applied Christianity?

The same is true of international relations. As a Senator, I have to face the international situation directly. I have a definite responsibility. I must meet it with what conceptions of justice and equity I have.

When you start to think about our international situation, the growth and aggressiveness of international communism, our inability so far to halt it, we must remember that our ultimate goal is international peace.

We must also start out by realizing what sort of a world we actually live in.

We do not live in a Christian world. Outside of communism, which is definitely anti-Christian—this world of ours has three times as many professing Moslems, Hindus, Confucianists, Buddhists as it has had Christians of all faiths, Protestant, Roman and Greek Catholic. Moslems and Confucianists each outnumber Protestants 3 to 2. Each of these groups are as devoted to their faith as we are to ours. And each because of his faith do not have the same ideas of justice, mercy, and long-suffering as we have.

Then we most definitely do not live in a white man's world. We live in a world overwhelmingly black and yellow.

Furthermore, we live in a world overwhelmingly ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed. A tremendous majority of the human beings in this world go to bed hungry according to our standards. They can give their children nothing in the way of education, and they can promise them nothing in the way of hope.

It is this last; this little matter of hope and the realization of hope where our applied Christianity may go to work.

After all, God sends His rain "upon the just and the unjust." Before Him, we as Lutherans and Americans believe all men stand as equals. The king and the pauper—also the United States Senator and the Hottentot—anyone of you here and, say, the Javanese.

What is more, into each one of these humans God has put a soul and has lit a spiritual and intellectual fire. Be it ever so dim, it will burn so long as a man lives. Because of it, he hopes for the same things we do. He wants freedom from want, disease, and fear. He wants to enjoy better food, better clothing, better opportunity. At bottom he wants to be freed from his economic oppressors, whoever they be, and given the privilege of sitting, as it were, in the same sun we enjoy.

Because of these wants, this hope is alive in the hearts of the people of the world more today than it ever has been. We face the spectacle of the common man being on the march. From the jungles to the Arctic he is demanding his place in the sun and is making ready to fight for it.

Communism has taken advantage of this. Actually it has stirred it up with malicious intent and cunning. It has promised economic freedom to the underprivileged and pictured it as salvation in as glowing terms as Martin Luther used. That the masses don't get it—that they project themselves into chaos and the most bitter form of slavery the world has ever known—is beside the point. Communism uses these natural instincts of man as their chief weapon against us.

Our first and most emphatic answer has been—what? An atomic bomb. We have enunciated a policy of massive retaliation. We have fenced ourselves in with airfields and planes and said whoever raises his hand against us will be showered with atomic death.

This sounds all right as a temporary safety measure. But it is far from applied Christianity. God most certainly does not hate or fear our enemies as we do. Most important our policy does not fulfill our Christian responsibility of helping our fellow man regardless of race or persuasion to a realization of the better things in life. After all, if we are Christians, that is our job.

Aside from that, however fearful it is to say, but the worst part is that the whole conception will not stand up. We have no monopoly on invention and inspiration. Russia has as brilliant mathematicians and scientists as we have. They have atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. They have as many planes as we have. Whatever they lack, they will make up in time. Our military intelligence tells us they will probably surpass us in some fields before the end of the year.

At best, what we have enjoyed and still enjoy is only a temporary technical advantage over the rest of the world—and if ever we drop an atomic bomb and a war of extermination falls upon us—if six of us here today survive we will be unbelievably lucky.

What, then, is the answer? Simply applied Christianity.

Our foreign-aid programs are built on this rock. We have spent billions in rebuilding the world and we must spend more and more. Through the United Nations we are daily promoting world understanding, easing injustice, in a slow and apparently endless effort, working out the problems that plague mankind.

All this is not enough. When we started our foreign-aid program Congress wrote into the act that it was to be aimed principally toward assisting the little man in these other countries. I think we have forgotten that. We have built up cartels. In many cases we have made the exploiters stronger and the poor weaker, and have given the Communists a better argument.

In this we have a very delicate problem. Just how much can we meddle in the business affairs, in the economic setup as it were, of some other country in order to better the living standards, expand opportunity, and social justice as we see it? Our State Department says not at all. Yet I feel we have a duty there, too.

I know a lot about China. In fact, I was decorated by the Chinese Government for repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. I have had Chinese come to my office and with tears in their eyes, saying, "If with all these millions you are pouring into China you could just insist upon some small reforms, could just give the people some hope of better conditions, they will never go Communist." We didn't, or couldn't—they went Communist. It is really a problem we must apply ourselves to.

How, I cannot detail. But having the goal in mind, realizing the road we must take little by little, everything we do must be aimed in that direction.

Of this I am convinced, and I hope you are too, that so long as there is a slave in this world, so long as any human being is denied justice and opportunity, so long as the fruit of one man's work is exploited—taken from him by another—we shall never have peace in this world and shall live in danger. Abraham Lincoln said that "no man had the right to a loaf of bread earned by the sweat of another man's brow." So long as one man is permitted to take that loaf—one other has the right and will fight against it.

Our job is to so conduct ourselves first that we deny none what we would have ourselves. Second, that we help every man achieve what we enjoy; and third, that we declare implacable opposition to all who would do otherwise.

This is the Christian doctrine and responsibility. If we do it, we—with the grace of God—may achieve peace. If we don't, by the grace of God, the rest of the world will take it for itself by whatever means comes to hand.

REA in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a radio broadcast by my colleague the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL who has ably explained rural electrification and how it has developed in the great State of Colorado. The broadcast is as follows:

Greetings to my friends and neighbors of Colorado's fourth district. This is Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL speaking to you by transcription over your own local radio station. I should like today to discuss with you a part of the great story of rural electrification and the benefits that have come to this Nation through the operation of the Rural Electrification Act.

Just last week, approval was given to a $10,155,000 generation and transmission loan to the Colorado Ute organization by the REA. This is a matter of considerable importance to western Colorado for Colorado Ute is made up of four REA co-ops which serve a substantial part of southwestern Colorado. These co-ops joined together in order to obtain this loan to build their own generating plant and certain lines necessary to utilize the power to be produced. When the plant is in operation it will help to provide power to areas now served by the Delta-Montrose Rural Power Lines Association, the San Miguel Power Association, the LaPlata Electric Association and the Empire Electric Association. The need for this generation facility highlighted at the moment by the installation of temporary diesel generating facilities by the San Miguel Association to meet the power needs of this REA co-op serving not only rural areas of the co-op but a good part of the uranium area of western Colorado.

I will return to this loan in a moment but reference should first be made to the 20th anniversary of the REA program. REA began back in 1935 by executive order as the outgrowth of the demand by rural groups that they were entitled to have electric service. At that time private utilities were refusing to serve them. In 1936 the REA Act gave permanent status to this program and in 1940 it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. In 1949 a rural telephone program was passed into law as an outgrowth of the great success in the providing of electric power to rural areas.

On May 11 the Congress of the United States paused in its other duties and paid tribute to the 20th anniversary of the REA program. On that date more favorable comment concerning REA was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than could have been gathered in a year back in the days of its infancy. In 1935 when the program began, it was supported and pushed to passage by men of vision for a better tomorrow, and the greatest of these, of course, was Senator Norris of Nebraska. As usual, it received the standard opposition of those who had little confidence in the past, virtually none in the future, and even less confidence in the ability of rural America to supply itself with central station electric power. As the years rolled by and as there has been living demonstration of the soundness, the doubters and distractors have diminished and the supporters have increased to the extent that on the May anniversary of the program, no voice was raised in opposition. However, just last year it was necessary for the Congress to insist that additional funds be provided for the REA Administration to insure the availability of funds for all who could come forward with a sound program. This indicated clearly that no longer is there overt opposition to this valuable program. * * * but unfortunately, it does not indicate that there is no covert opposition, as that remains and no doubt always will. One of the many recommendations of the present Hoover Commission is that the policy and procedures of the Rural Electrification system be substantially modified and if they are modified as recommended, the REA program as we know it today will be consigned into outer darkness and in its place will come a banker-utility type operation of little value. I am inclined to doubt that any such program could ever be sold to the Congress, but I mention it merely as a reminder that though opposition may be less vocal, it lives on. More open and obvious opposition is easier to meet and overcome but if a relative disinterest replaces emphatic and enthusiastic support in policy and program centers, then we have entered a dangerous situation.

I believe the most explicit testimony of the need for a bold program for rural electrification and the relative disinterest of private utilities to provide such power is the very success of the REA program. Back in 1935 when the necessary sort of support and enthusiasm was available to start the REA venture the cities of America had long had electric power, but only 11 percent of the rural areas had central station power, and it seemed that such situation would long be the case. Ample testimony was given to the effect that it was impossible to provide area coverage for scattered rural customers, and it was just not economic to build lines to serve rural areas. Many rural customers who had obtained power had been able to do so only by insisting that they be served by the private utility and by paying exhorbitant costs for the installation of lines, poles and lead-in lines; and anyhow, in the opinion of some, lamplight somehow improved the character of the farmer and made him more hardy just as the washboard and the wash bucket improved the character of the farm wife, even though it might be a bit hard on her back. In just 15 years the percentage of farms on the line was completely reversed; in 1935 about 10 percent of the farms had service and in 1950, 90 percent had service and only about 10 percent did not have. Surely if so much could be done in so short a time just by having a program of loans to those wishing to establish service, then more should have been done in earlier years. What remains now, and in a way its a bit peculiar, is to make provision for supplying the amount of power desired by the farm users. Just a while back he was not an economic customer—today he is such a good customer that his company is having difficulty in keeping its line heavy enough and in finding reasonably priced sources of power. It is this very factor which stood behind the recently approved Generation and Transmission loan for Colorado UTE. Once you get power down on the farm, its hard to keep up with the new uses and demands of this once shunned customer. It is estimated that there are something like 250 separate uses for electric power on the farm. By reference to actual consumption this is shown in Colorado by the average increase in use from 162 kilowatt hours per month in 1949 to 258 kilowatt hours in 1954. A power source and a mainline adequate in 1949 would not meet the needs of 1954.

For those of you who have received such power, I need not recount the values and blessings of power on the farm; power to make domestic life more comfortable with washers, refrigerators, freezers, mixers, plumbing and light and power for radio, reading and now television. Of equal value, and actually more important to the economy of the Nation, is the wired hand that has come to help the farm producer, power to install milk coolers, stock watering facilities, repair facilities, hay drying equipment, lifting equipment, feed mixing equipment and again even lights for evening and morning chores. Such equipment and such assistance from electric power has not only made farm life more pleasant and less of a back-breaking enterprise, but it has enabled the farmer to produce more food and fiber in a situation where the number of farmers is decreasing and the general population is increasing. (Just as a side note, it is most unfortunate that the farmer has seen his income go steadily down the last few years while general income has gone up, but his increase in efficiency has thus helped the Nation most and perhaps enabled him to survive.) Beyond this, the availability of central power service has had other substantial benefits to the Nation. It is estimated that for each $1 spent in bringing power to the farm, $4 are spent by the farmer for electrical equipment. Thus, as we approach the $3 billion point in total loans from the REA program, we have the record that at least $12 billion has been spent for equipment—pumps, motors, grinders, household equipment—all products of American industry. The benefit then has spread to all parts of the Nation, to manufacturing establishments, to workers in such plants, to service and trade organizations. Put in another way, the old mail order catalog has been brought into the house and now is used to order those modern conveniences and work saving devices which used to be but pretty pictures of what others had. Of the many social programs that we have established over the years, I believe that this program to help electrify rural America has been one of the most successful and worthwhile.

Figures tend to be boring but perhaps these have a special interest to you. As of January 1 of this year, the REA had approved $3 billion in loans to 1,075 borrowers. Of these 90 percent or almost 1,000 were cooperative associations organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service, an outstanding example of local, independent, private enterprise. For Colorado, the figures are almost as substantial. Ninety percent of Colorado farms are now served while but eleven percent were in 1935. Up to June 1, the REA had approved a total of $80,700,000 in electric loans to 25 organizations, 24 of which were co-ops. These groups have built 30,000 miles of line to serve 70,600 rural consumers. Of the funds actually advanced, the borrowing groups in Colorado have paid $3,738,000 in interest and repaid $6,710,000 of principal. This includes, and this is an important figure, $1,690,000 of payments made ahead of schedule.

The national repayment picture is just as remarkable as the total interest payment runs over $192 million and repayment of principal at $376 million of which over $78 million represents payments made ahead of schedule. Only a minute fraction is delinquent over 30 days. Truly this is an achievement of great magnitude.

The recent generation and transmission loan approved for Colorado Ute is the second approved of recent weeks for co-ops in Colorado. At the end of April, a $3½ million G & T loan was approved for the Arkansas Valley organization to serve three REA financed co-ops of southeastern Colorado, part of which comes under the Sangre De Cristo Electric Association of Salida. Like the loan to Colorado Ute, this loan for generation equipment involves an agreement between the member co-ops and a private utility for the construction, operation and use of the plant.

In the case of Colorado Ute, the private utility, Western Colorado Power (owned by Utah Power & Light) will operate and maintain the generating plant on an established fee basis. The co-op groups will retain ownership of the generating plant and own, operate, and maintain the distribution system to its members. It can, under certain situations, take over the plant, but the main advantage is the pooling of generation and reserve facilities of the 2 systems, 1 cooperative, 1 a private utility for a firm supply of energy. The exact site of the plant is not known, but the initial installation will be a 2-unit 25,300-kilowatt steam plant. A third unit of 12,650 kilowatts will be added later but the first service in late 1956 will not be any too soon.

This particular loan has long been pending and I wish it were possible to recount all the effort that has gone into this program on the part of the member co-op organizations and the many pitfalls that have marked the path to success. The agreement between Colorado Ute and Western Colorado Power is not all that was desired by Colorado Ute, but the form involved is necessary if a loan is to be secured. Some of the delay can be laid to the time required for Utah Power & Light to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity and a rapid writeoff certificate, to build a new line down into southern Utah. Left alone, the Colorado Ute organization could have served this territory without the tax writeoff proposition—a form of subsidy—but as usual, it just works out where the co-ops are left with the area the private utilities do not want; or if one would paraphrase it, but to us (the co-ops) they keep the leavings of the lights far from shore.

Additionally, the REA Act has always contained an allocation formula designed to insure a division of the loan funds by States so that each State got an equal chance to obtain loans. This worked out without particular difficulty in the early years, but as the bulk of the job got done, the formula did not leave enough for some States and too much for others. The Congress this year has amended this formula to straighten out this new problem, but in order to make the Colorado Ute loan now, the REA had to do a bit of fancy footwork among its figures and draw down on its reserve funds.

May I sum this up quickly. One of the greatest of our programs of joint government and private initiative has been the rural electrification program. It has proved that electric service is possible to rural areas, and so feasible and worthwhile that with over 90 percent of our farms now electrified, the big job is to increase the load factor of the distribution lines and to find reasonably priced power. If the old determination lives on, and I for one think it will, then we will see this problem fall away and a better day tomorrow for rural America.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative Elizabeth Kee)

This is being written in fear, in dread, before the frightful toll is known, before the final figures are in.

It is being written in fear of friends hurt—of neighbors maimed—of people we know being killed—losing loved ones. We shall know soon enough how many—how badly. But this is being written before we know who, and where, and under what terrible circumstances, injury or death has struck.

Why can we not—why can't we—celebrate a glorious national holiday—a great patriotic anniversary—or any holiday, and particularly a holiday which brings with it an extended weekend—why can't we celebrate such a wonderful occasion without destroying each other like armies in battle, or like hoodlums in a gang vendetta?

Individually we are such pleasant people, we Americans; we are normally fine, decent, genial, courteous.

And the automobile, the great American blessing, is such a fine instrument for transporting people and things quickly, cheaply, efficiently; a finely made, beautifully engineered, attractively designed machine.

When this handsome automobile swallows in its shiny and inviting interior a fine, decent, genial, courteous American, why is it that the driver becomes a different person, mesmerized by the purring, rarin'-to-go horsepower of a powerful motor, and seems often to forget every civilized virtue?

Why is it that the combination of good American and fine motorcar seems to make cannibals out of us? We do not eat each other. But we maim and kill each other.

True, the hurt is always unintentional. But that makes it hurt no less.

Haven't you, too, noticed how the neighbor who may smile at you as you walk past each other on the sidewalk will as often as not snarl and scream at you, roaring past you and snaking in front of you with a squeal of tires on a crowded highway? How, as a fellow pedestrian, he will yield to you, but as a driver he is unable to wait until you cross the street to safety but will honk his horn and scare you half to death, letting his car creep across the intersection and block your path? How he will speed past you on an approach to a curve, putting the occupants of your car as well as his in danger?

We can redesign our highways until they stretch out in the straight true line of perfect horizontals; we can redesign our cars to make them easier to maneuver, stronger, safer. Yet accidents mount, and highway deaths multiply.

Have we built into our cars more speed than the average driver can handle, more zip than his reflexes can control, more getaway than he can tame and manage and direct?

The experts all say that our basic highway trouble is speed—excessive speeds for road conditions, for driver skill. Well, then, we must discipline ourselves, restrain ourselves or suffer a punishment which is instant and meaningful.

I think the best hope on the horizon for restoring sanity—and that would mean safety—to the American highway is that unseen but everseeing miracle of science which is now helping our police in so many places to catch speeders and nail them without argument or alibi to the undisputed evidence of their transgressions.

Reporters have begun to identify this scientific marvel as the "Whammy." It puts an evil eye, indeed, on those whose excessive speeds on the highway jeopardize not only their own lives but the lives of everyone they meet and pass on the road.

That marvel would be, of course, radar—an electronic conscience for the forgetful driver. And I say let's have more radar detection on our highways until we finally come around again to believing in signs—in speed-limit signs. Maybe then we will stop driving ourselves headlong to disaster by being forced to slow down or pay up.

Perhaps then, too, a 3-day Fourth of July weekend would be a happier event for more motorists, with fewer broken speed limits, broken bodies, and broken families.

The Role of the States in Our Federal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, one of the major areas of study by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was, of course, the States, and their historic and contemporary relation to our National Government. The States in our Union are unique in their capacities as units of government. Nowhere else in the world are there governmental entities, below the national level, with so much autonomy, authority, and responsibility. The whole concept of our Government is a strong union of strong States.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made an analysis of State governments, therefore, to determine the effectiveness with which they are meeting their great responsibilities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD excerpts from chapter 2 of the Commission's report, setting forth some of the Commission's observations and findings on this subject:

THE ROLE OF THE STATES—CHAPTER 2

The American Federal system was founded on the general principle that the National Government should act only where the States would be incompetent to act, or where action by the individual States might be injurious to the harmony of the United States. The changes in our society reviewed in the preceding chapter have deeply influenced the application of this principle, but have not affected its validity.

The success of our Federal system thus depends in large measure upon the performance of the States. They have the primary responsibility for all government below the national level. The States and their subdivisions bear directly more than two-thirds of the growing fiscal burdens of domestic government. In recent years their activities have been increasing faster than the nondefense activities of the National Government.

Some activities of government are of such a nature that only the National Government is competent to perform them. By and large, however, the ability of the States to perform governmental activities is flexible, depending in part on the nature of the activity, and in part on the way in which the States and local governments organize and utilize their governmental resources. Even where a vital national interest requires national action, the initiative, energy, and competence of State and local governments may help to determine whether the national role is to be minor or major, cooperative or dominant. There is, therefore, a direct relationship between the ability of the States to perform their functions adequately and the duty of this Commission "to study the proper role of the National Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions."

To be sure, under our constitutional system as currently interpreted, the National Government can, if it wills, undertake to perform certain activities regardless of the competence of the States to perform them. This makes it even more important to develop the capacity of the States to handle a larger share of the total task of government. It means also that the National Government has a responsibility on its part to leave room for and not to frustrate such development.

The strengthening of State and local governments is essentially a task for the States themselves. Thomas Jefferson observed that the only way in which the States can erect a barrier against the extension of national power into areas within their proper sphere is "to strengthen the State governments, and as this cannot be done by any change in the Federal Constitution * * * it must be done by the States themselves * * *." He explained: "The only barrier in their power is a wise government. A weak one will lose ground in every contest." [1]

There is a growing knowledge and understanding of the means available to strengthen State and local governments. For example, the Council of State Governments, an organization founded and supported by the States, has called upon them to revise their constitutions, to modernize their legislative processes and procedures, to reorganize their executive branches, to make more extensive use of interstate compacts and other methods of interstate cooperation, to reorganize their tax systems, to maintain adequate planning and resource agencies, and to extend home rule to their political subdivisions.

State constitutions

Early in its study, the Commission was confronted with the fact that many State constitutions restrict the scope, effectiveness, and adaptability of State and local action. These self-imposed constitutional limitations make it difficult for many States to perform all of the services their citizens require, and consequently have frequently been the underlying cause of State and municipal pleas for Federal assistance.

It is significant that the Constitution prepared by the Founding Fathers, with its broad grants of authority and avoidance of legislative detail, has withstood the test of time far better than the constitutions later adopted by the States. A due regard for the need for stability in government requires adherence to basic constitutional principles until strong and persistent public policy requires a change. A dynamic society requires a constant review of legislative detail to meet changing conditions and circumstances.

The Commission finds a very real and pressing need for the States to improve their constitutions. A number of States recently have taken energetic action to rewrite outmoded charters. In these States this action has been regarded as a first step in the program to achieve the flexibility required to meet the modern needs of their citizens.

THE STATE LEGISLATURE

In the early history of our country, State legislatures were the most powerful and influential instruments of government in the Nation. It was to them that the average citizen looked primarily for initiative and wisdom in the formulation of public policy on domestic issues. They overshadowed the other branches of State government. In power and influence they are no longer as dominant as they were, partly because of the ascendancy of the National Government, partly because of the increased influence of the State executive, but primarily because they have not found effective solutions to problems that become more chronic and more difficult to cope with in a rapidly changing society.

Importance of reapportionment

One of these problems is to maintain an equitable system of representation. In a majority of States, city dwellers outnumber the citizens of rural areas. Yet in most States the rural voters are overwhelmingly in control of one legislative house, and overweighted, if not dominant, in the other.

In a majority of State constitutions, population is the sole or principal basis of representation in both houses. But this basis is in many cases modified, at least for one house, by provision for a certain minimum or maximum number of representatives per county or other district. As cities have grown more rapidly than rural areas, these systems of apportionment have tended to create an increasing imbalance in legislative representation in favor of rural areas.

The constitutions of 43 States call for some reapportionment in at least 1 house as often as every 10 years. In nearly half of these States, reapportionment lags behind schedule. Ten States provide for reapportionment of one or both houses by some agency other than the legislature, either initially or in case the legislature fails to act. In these States, some reapportionment takes place on schedule—a fact worthy of study by States whose legislatures have been reluctant to obey the constitutional mandate to reapportion themselves.

Revising an outmoded pattern of representation is, to be sure, a difficult act for a legislative body, each of whose members has a vested interest in the status quo. Many States would need a constitutional amendment to redistrict, for at least one house, as well as legislation to carry out the constitutional intent of periodic reapportionment. Since both require action by the legislature, except in States where they may be initiated by petition, a heavy premium is placed upon the farsightedness of legislators and upon the willingness of citizens to reconcile their special interests with the general good.

Reapportionment should not be thought of solely in terms of a conflict of interests between urban and rural areas. In the long run, the interests of all in an equitable system of representation that will strengthen State government is far more important than any temporary advantage to an area enjoying overrepresentation.

The problem of reapportionment is important in the area of study of this Commission because legislative neglect of urban communities has led more and more people to look to Washington for more and more of the services and controls they desire. One of the study reports prepared for the Commission makes this very clear:

"If States do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature, the tendency will be toward direct Federal-municipal dealings. These began in earnest in the early days of the depression. There is only one way to avoid this in the future. It is for the States to take an interest in urban problems, in metropolitan government, in city needs. If they do not do this, the cities will find a path to Washington as they did before, and this time it may be permanent, with the ultimate result that there may be a new government arrangement that will break down the constitutional pattern which has worked so well up to now."

One result of State neglect of the reapportionment problem is that urban governments have bypassed the States and made direct cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such fields as housing and urban development, airports, and defense community facilities. Although necessary in some cases, the multiplication of national-local relationships tends to weaken the State's proper control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

Paradoxically enough, the interests of urban areas are often more effectively represented in the National Legislature than in their own State legislatures. Originally there was no substantial difference between the representativeness of Congress and of State legislatures, but history and population shifts have affected these bodies differently. Reapportionment in the House of Representatives has occurred after nearly every census; since 1929 it has been automatic. The same shift of population which has resulted in State legislatures becoming less representative of urban areas has had the effect of making the United States Senate more representative of these areas, because Senators, elected at large, must depend heavily upon urban voters, even in predominantly rural States.

---

[1] Letter to Archibald Stuart, December 23, 1791, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, ed. Paul L. Ford, New York, 1892, vol. V, pp. 409–410.

For these and other reasons, the Commission has come to the conclusion that the more the role of the States in our system is emphasized, the more important it is that the State legislatures be reasonably representative of all the people. This conclusion is in line with the view of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Local Government that the States could help "to minimize the pressure for greater centralization or greater Federal participation in State and local affairs," by making sure that representation in their legislatures is "on a fair and equitable basis."

Soo Locks Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, June 28 marked the opening of the Soo Locks centennial celebration commemorating the locks on their 100 years of operation.

On this momentous occasion Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., the home of the Soo Locks, was highly honored with the presence of the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield.

I deemed it a great honor and privilege to be invited and take part in the opening ceremonies of this occasion.

Tuesday, June 28, was the date set by the Postmaster General to offer to the public the commemorative stamp, which was designed and authorized by the Post Office Department, carrying a complete picture of the Great Lakes, the Soo Locks with a vessel approaching the locks and one steaming westerly toward Duluth. At 9 a. m. the morning of the stamp sale, there were 165,000 requests for cancellation of the stamp. At 2 p. m. the same day, the requests for cancellation of the stamp had reached one-fourth of a million. It was estimated that the Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., post office would possibly cancel up to 1 million stamps on the first day's issue.

The Postmaster General delivered the main address, which I am including with my remarks. Undoubtedly this masterpiece will become a part of the first chapter of the second volume of the history of the Soo Locks.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein the address of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield on the opening day of the centennial celebration of the Soo locks:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., JUNE 28, 1955

We stand at a significant milestone in American and Canadian history—the centennial of the Soo Locks.

Behind us is a century of achievement that began with the pioneers whose foresight and enterprise transformed a wilderness river into a great artery of transportation.

But our past—a magnificent record of accomplishment—only faintly foreshadows the mighty strides in every human good that the people of this continent can make, joined in partnership with like-minded peoples around the globe.

Before us lies a future that is limitless in its promise of an abundant prosperity, for the United States; for Canada; for all free nations.

The Soo—a cardinal agent in the unlocking of continental riches—will be a potent agent in the unlocking of the free world's potential for human betterment.

As a native of Michigan, quite naturally I am proud that the Post Office Department is issuing a commemorative postage stamp in honor of this centennial celebration.

The 110 million 3-cent stamps that we are issuing for this occasion will be a constant reminder through years to come of the wisdom and the courage of those great men who made this achievement possible: Charles T. Harvey, who inspired the entire project; James Joy; the Fairbank brothers, and a host of other dedicated men who triumphed over discouragement and adversity and built here a major channel to economic growth for the continent.

Yet—broad as his vision was—I cannot believe that Charles T. Harvey could possibly have foreseen the tremendous future that lay in store for the Soo.

Today these are the most important set of locks ever built by man. Here is the busiest canal in the world. In 9 months of the year, the Soo Locks handle almost as much cargo as do the Panama and Suez Canals combined in 12.

In the dark days of World War II, the Soo was the chief link in a lifeline that stretched from the Middle West to the battlefronts of the entire world. This was then the most heavily guarded and protected area in America. No other section compared with it in strategic importance. On these locks depended victory and freedom.

More than that: They are, in fact, a showcase of freedom—of free men, citizens of two independent nations, using together their talent, and energy, and initiative, risking their private capital for a public purpose and international benefit.

When the pioneer builders undertook to build these locks they stretched out their hands for tools—not for Government subsidies.

They were subsidized only by their own determination, their own courage, and their own faith in the boundless future of our two countries.

I doubt that they ever thought of failure. But if they had failed, there would have been no soothing application of taxpayer dollars to ease the pain.

The responsibility of such failure would have rested completely on their shoulders—and there was nobody to lighten that burden or to shift it to others.

The Soo Locks are one of the great examples of private enterprise in this hemisphere.

Now, we have reached a milestone in history. It is entirely natural that we should look back and consider the way we have traveled. But it is proper that we consider the way we shall travel.

What does the future hold for us?

It has never looked so bright—so clear—so promising.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, who led a wartime crusade against the Communist, the defeatist, and the neutralist, now leads a third crusade—for a better and stronger and greater America; for a world of peace and justice and freedom among men.

And in this third crusade, he will be once again the triumphant leader.

The American people know that he will not rest until his full share of the job is done.

He now works on a daring, dynamic campaign to harness the atom for the peaceful service of mankind. The Soo, the hemisphere, the entire free world will reap a golden harvest from his proposals.

Before us, we see mighty advances in the standards of living, the increase of leisure, the welfare of humanity.

Under the leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower, we already have moved far.

Here in the United States the economy has never been stronger than it is today, and the economy is based on production for peace—it is not dependent on the spurious hypodermic of wartime expenditures.

Manufacturing productivity increased this year by 6 percent over last year—as contrasted with the average increase of 4 percent in the years immediately following World War II.

This increase reflects industry's huge capital investments in new plants and equipment. These investments, in turn, demonstrate industry's unlimited faith in America and in the ability and integrity of an administration led by a great President.

Labor and management relations are better than ever before. In the automobile industry, for instance, long strides have been taken to insure permanent progress. As a result, we can confidently expect an all-time record of production this year. Almost certainly our production lines will build more than 7 million passenger cars by the year's end—almost half a million more than were produced in 1950.

Seven million passenger cars in 1 year—that is more than the entire industry produced in all the years prior to World War I.

Every index of economic activity shows that we have either regained or exceeded our previous highs.

Every indication we have shows that 1955 will be the greatest year in history for our national economy.

And, I repeat, this will be peacetime prosperity—not wartime inflation.

Here in Michigan—and this applies with equal force to our good neighbors across the border—the future looks brighter than anywhere else in the world.

The St. Lawrence Seaway—when it is completed and the Soo Locks are widened—will enable 3 out of 4 ocean-going ships to make Duluth a port of call.

Our inland cities will become thriving seaports.

Our steel industry—essential to Soo prosperity—faces an unprecedented inflow of orders. Ahead, undoubtedly, is a major expansion of our steel mills.

During the next 25 years more tonnage will pass through these locks than during the entire first century of their existence.

And when the great Mackinac Bridge is finished—thus perfecting the arteries of transportation between the rich and productive central sections of the United States and Canada—the pattern for our future joint economic prosperity and cooperation will be at last complete.

So, for us here in Michigan—and for our good friends and neighbors in Canada—the future today is without precedent in the past. The possibilities are immeasurable in traditional terms.

Here in the United States this happy state of affairs has not come about by accident. It is the result of careful planning. It is the fruit of integrity in administering the Nation's business.

To Washington, Dwight Eisenhower brought men and women—great in mind and heart and vision—to work on the problems of the Nation. Inspired by his genius, his love of America, his tremendous integrity, they dedicated themselves to their task.

His program in domestic and foreign policy is, consequently, a safe, sure chart to prosperity and to a peace that will be just and lasting. Already, a new climate of hope and confidence and optimism is its offspring.

Never in generations have people had so much faith in our economy—our Government—our future.

Never before in history have so many people had so many of the good things in life.

We are fortunate indeed to live in such an age as this.

But Canada and the United States—alone—cannot achieve either the richest prosperity or the stoutest security.

The free world must be a market place for all free nations. Their peoples must be our friends and our partners.

With them we must labor in many fields:

That we may come to know each other better and understand each other with a deeper sympathy.

That we may enrich each other by a more free exchange in thought and trade and travel.

That we may bind ourselves together more tightly in the defense of human freedom against those who by force and fraud would destroy it.

That we come to realize more sharply the common humanity, the common aspirations, the common goals that are rooted in our common brotherhood.

The future is infinite in promise. But, as we stand on the threshold of a bright new age—the age of atoms for peace—let us not be infected with the withering contagion of false pride.

There will be days to test our spirit.

They shall not shake us, if we are men and women of faith—faith in ourselves; in our two countries; in the providence of Almighty God whose guiding hand is seen throughout the history of men and of nations, aiding those who strive for righteousness and justice and mercy.

In that faith, every day, may we humbly thank God, the Author of all our benefits, that He has seen fit to bless us with vast resources of His making.

And may we pray the Almighty that He endow our two countries with an abundance of the greatest of all His natural resources—men of stature, men of courage, of vision, of integrity—men like those who conceived and brought to completion the Soo Locks, transforming a wilderness into an empire of material and cultural and spiritual richness.

It is now my pleasure to present special albums, each containing an autographed sheet of the new commemorative Soo Locks stamps, to—

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

Louis S. St. Laurent, Premier of Canada.

The University of Michigan, Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president.

Victor A. Knox, United States House of Representatives.

Herbert Smale, mayor, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada.

James B. Robertson, mayor, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and president, Soo Locks Centennial Corp.

John A. Curran, Chairman, Soo Ontario Locks Centennial Committee, Ontario, Canada.

Ray D. Hollingsworth, Chairman, United States Soo Locks Centennial Commission.

George A. Osborn, chairman, Michigan Soo Locks Centennial Commission.

Chippewa County Historical Society, Miss Myrtle Elliott, president.

Carnegie Library, Miss Alice Clapp, librarian.

Clifford Aune, superintendent, St. Marys Falls canals.

Verne Biggings, postmaster, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada.

Mrs. Mary Ripley, postmaster, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

Joseph Patton, lockman, Soo Locks, the employee now active with longest service record.

George Tardiff, rural carrier, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Post Office, the employee now active with longest service record.

Robert C. Kline, Jr., chairman, Soo Locks commemorative stamp luncheon.

Stanley R. Pratt, chairman, Soo Locks commemorative stamp day.

High Praise for the Dean of the Congress, Senator Carl Hayden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, within recent days announcement has been made in my State that our senior Senator, Carl Hayden, will stand for reelection again next year. By virtue of hard work and statesmanlike conduct over the years, Senator Hayden has won the esteem and gratitude of nearly everyone in Arizona. Typical of the response to his announcement was an editorial published in the politically independent Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson.

I have asked that this editorial be reprinted so that his colleagues may know that he is honored for his fine qualities "in his own country" as well as among his coworkers here.

The editorial follows:

HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

A few days ago an announcement was made that Carl Hayden, Arizona's Democratic Senator, would seek reelection in 1956.

The announcement pleased practically all Democrats in the State, and many Republicans, as well.

For Carl Hayden, dean of the Congress in point of service, who started his work as a representative of his State in the House, in 1912, goes far beyond party lines in his service to his State. He serves all Arizonians, regardless of party, and very effectively, too.

Politically, Hayden is one of the least heard, but one of the most powerful men in Washington. His long record for fairness has made him innumerable friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate, and his political astuteness has gained him the respect of friend and political foe alike.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he has the power, and uses it, to support legislation he feels is beneficial to his State; but even before he held that post Senator Hayden had placed his indelible stamp on the great distances of the American West. The initials FAP on the national highway markers are there as a memento to Hayden's work for Federal aid to the highways of the Western States where great distances but small populations made it impossible for the States to properly construct sufficient main highways alone.

The Federal matching funds worked out under Hayden's plan, permitted the construction of the great highway network we have today and which is constantly being extended.

But to the people of Arizona Carl Hayden is more than just a powerful Senator. He is a personal friend to whom they turn when they need help. A letter to Senator Hayden, outlining the problem, never goes unanswered and seldom is it futile. His ability to smooth the way for his fellow Arizonians has been tried and tested often, regardless of party affiliations. Senator Hayden, folks will tell, is the man to see if you want to get things done.

Senator Hayden has been in Congress 43 years, 28 of those years in the Senate. Arizonians will be glad to know that he is willing to run again and will undoubtedly send him back to round out his full 50 years in Congress and celebrate his golden anniversary as Mr. Arizona, in Washington.

Perspective and Prospective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today marks the fifth anniversary of the repeal of the discriminatory Federal taxes on margarine.

Many Members of the Senate and the House will recall the bitter resistance to the proposal to remove the margarine taxes which had been in existence since 1886. It is appropriate, therefore, to point out that during the last 5 years, the dairy industry has not been destroyed; rather, milk production has increased 6 percent since 1950.

Dairy leaders are devoting much thought to further means for increasing milk consumption, and I have been pleased to note the increase in consumption of fluid milk and other whole milk products during the past few years. The repeal of the Federal taxes has also brought about a rapid expansion of margarine production and Americans may now enjoy in most States this fine nutritious table spread.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a speech which I delivered at a conference on margarine at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 24.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE

Speech by Hon. J. William Fulbright, chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, before the Conference on Margarine, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., June 24, 1955

We stand now only a few days from the fifth anniversary of the repeal of the old Federal taxes on margarine. I say "old" advisedly. For I believe all of us, those of you in the margarine manufacturing industry, those in the great agricultural industries related to it, and those of us in Congress and in the State legislatures who labored for repeal of unfair restrictive laws against the product, and certainly the great mass of consumers throughout the land whose voice was the deciding vote in our cause—I believe all of us agree that the

Federal taxes are now well buried in the dust heap of historical failures.

In our busy world of the past 5 years, we have left them to the yellowing pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And this is as it should be. None of us is interested in reviving the controversy. All of us are deeply interested in ties of constructive activity between important industries like those of margarine and dairying. It is for that purpose that I hinge my remarks on the fifth anniversary of Federal repeal.

Five years of intense activity are drawing to an end. Briefly recapitulated, it is possible to sum up margarine's history in this country as a series of waves. First, there was the initial introduction and the period from 1886 to 1902 of early restrictive efforts. Those were crucial days for margarine, although the product then bore no resemblance to the one now provided by your industry, and although market and tonnage alike were scarcely enough to keep a single modern plant going. For in a group of early court decisions it was determined that margarine is a nutritious, healthful food; that it has a right to be sold in interstate commerce; that it represents a legitimate interest of American agriculture and American consumers. Thus, despite another wave of restrictionist activity after 1902, the basic right of margarine existed and gradually rallied public opinion to the cause that if a product is made as good or better than another at less cost, the consumer has a right to be offered it without artificial protective legislation; and—to state it another way—American farm products all should have unhampered free access to our markets. During the thirties, another wave brought severe new Federal and State restrictions, but beginning about 1940, the emergence of margarine as an unfettered product began, signalized by the repeal of Federal taxes effective July 1, 1950.

What has happened during these past 5 years? What is the shape, the promise of margarine's new historic period? For one thing, the movement to afford consumers margarine without legislative restriction has not finished. There is this piece of unfinished business. Let me say that those of us who fought the good, if somewhat hectic, fight for free margarine in Congress and many State legislatures—and, despite the passage of time and elections we still remain a numerous battalion—believe this unfinished business should not be permitted to stand by indefinitely. Now let me add to that the fact that we did not act to repeal the restrictions on margarine to please the margarine manufacturing industry alone. I know of no occasion when your industry assumed any such thing.

The repeal came because, preeminently, the housewives and families throughout the country accepted margarine and were opposed to its restriction. It arrived because farmers producing your ingredients had come to realize there was a legitimate market for them that was denied by laws erroneous in principle and wrong in their discriminatory effect. It came because there arose, quite apart from the interests involved, a sense that laws fostering one legitimate product in trade to the injury of another were not in accord with our sense of justice and were inimical to our national well-being. These reasons are just as strong now as before. Today, two States still bar yellow margarine; 15 States still tax the product; 13 States impose various license fees on its makers and distributors; 8 States bar its use in their tax-supported institutions in whole or in part. The record of legislative history so far this year shows that this kind of threat to your industry, however much we may decry it or think "it, too, shall pass away," is with us still. In Congress, a simple bill to permit our Navy to buy margarine if it chooses for serving to its personnel is, for the 4th consecutive year, not getting past the floor of the House. In 19 States, some 30 bills were introduced affecting your product. Three might be construed as neither particularly for nor against; 10 as favorable; and 17 as imposing new restrictions. The restrictive bills were successfully pushed through at a ratio of 5 to 1 of the favorable type.

From one point of view, margarine legislation can be considered as successive changes in national policy toward the product. Thus, in 1886, 1902, and 1931, Congress adopted a policy of restricting margarine. In 1950, Congress reversed this policy in respect to taxes and license fees. But Congress did not pass any resolution or law stating that Government policy must be to safeguard margarine's right of fair competition in every market. Congress did not, for example, enact any rule that any solution to the problem of surplus butter must not be discriminatory in its effect on the vegetable spread. Quite the contrary, last year Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1954, with a provision authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to do as he sees fit to remove the taxpayers' surplus butter burden. The present administration is attempting to dispose of much of the butter overseas, and in all frankness I think they are doing the more difficult and desirable thing. Many leaders of the dairy industry have worked hard to solve this problem in such a manner. But others have worked hard toward some type of program whereby butter will be sold into your market at a low price made possible by tax subsidy. It is estimated that margarine is losing about 150 million pounds a year to subsidized surplus butter being sold or given to the Army, the school lunch, and various other recipients. From the standpoint of simple interest, say, for instance, the cottonseed growers' interest, what is the difference between a tax on margarine and a subsidy for its chief competitor?

Let us look at this question of "free" or "unfree" margarine a little more. Let us go into what may be debatable ground, yet which also deserves to be covered in a thoughtful way in the light of the past 5 years. The repeal act of 1950 created two principal conditions under which margarine might legally be sold. First, it specified that colored margarine in public eating places must be made known to the patrons, as a matter of fair protection to butter, much of which is also colored. You and I and a majority of Congress readily agreed to this principle—proposed it, in fact. As finally passed, if colored, or yellow margarine is served in public eating places, patrons must be notified by a sign on the wall, or notice on the menu; and also by a label on the plate, or by being in triangular shape. The Food and Drug Administration was given the enforcement task. Each year at their budget hearings, the agency's representatives tell Congress that they do not have sufficient funds to enforce these regulations. They have also stated that compliance with the law, which is admittedly a difficult one to follow, is increasing. To my mind, the problem calls not so much for more enforcement as it does for a more efficient law that will protect all interests concerned. It seems to me that a simple requirement that each restaurant serving yellow margarine serve it in triangular patties, only, would suffice. In stating this, I do not at all agree with proposals that retail margarine be forced to package in or with triangular or other shapes or markings. Such proposals are clearly aimed to secure the very kind of unenforceable, discriminatory laws Congress and most States have canceled.

I have so far limited myself to the subject of legislative matters. The margarine industry has followed a wise course in not provoking or responding to senseless controversy about "margarine versus butter," in not reaching for headlines but rather emphasizing the story of your product as a good food product. Where your existence is threatened by discriminatory legislation, however, you should enter the lists and be heard. It is a distinction that, to my mind, presents no very great problems, except that from time to time it may be misunderstood, and therefore needs occasional restatement. But what exactly are the conditions you face now? What is the margarine industry of June 1955? The obvious charactertistics need little comment—margarine consumption has risen to a record high of 8.4 pounds per capita, or 1,365,000,000 pounds a year; margarine utilizing farm products, contributed a considerable sum (estimated at $150 million) to farm cash income yearly; and margarine as a national resource has a capacity probably sufficient to take care of all our national vitamin A—high calorie needs in its field in the event of emergency. The ruin to the dairy industry and to agriculture so freely prophesied when repeal was proposed, has not materialized. The price of margarine has been kept low. The increase in its usage has resulted in a greater merchandising effort for butter which, by last year, resulted in gains for both spreads, showing that both products can compete normally.

The margarine repeal movement is of interest today for the broader results it may be achieving. It was a movement based upon the idea of freedom in the market place. This is an exceedingly old idea. It is deep in the history of western civilization as we know it today. In a sense, the men of the margarine industry are experts on freedom. For two generations they were preoccupied with their special problem of securing freedom of their product. Of course, concepts change with circumstances and doubtless what was freedom to you before July 1, 1950, is not exactly what it is now. Then, freedom meant relief from certain restrictive laws. Now, freedom for you must have a wider significance. It must mean freedom for all products, and for persons also, for what you won was given through the opportunities afforded you by our history and economic and political systems of freedom. We realize that the very word "freedom" is, by the pressure of our times, much abused and disabused. I think it is worthwhile today, as we approach this fifth anniversary of your declaration of independence, to consider some aspects of freedom today—in reference to your product, in reference to our Nation, and to the world.

Today, for one thing, freedom means, for you, living together in the field of business, promoting your brands as skillfully as you can to attract the eye of the purchaser, and promoting the idea of your product among yourselves and to your consumers. Without the existence of the old oppressive laws, you face new problems. Competition in all industries has increased a great deal. That is natural and, so far as it is not destructive, healthy. The very purpose of margarine tax repeal was to create more, not less, competition. The natural result of the violent adjustment the margarine industry has had to make within the past 5 years is an intensified search for markets. An examination of our economic situation leads one to the conclusion that margarine can and will continue to expand its consumption. It can be said that the margarine industry in the United States is, practically, but 5 years old. You have here, I think, the problem of developing leadership for the greater industry you are bound to become.

Your business freedom offers to you today another challenge. Margarine is of course a part of the highly competitive fats and oils industry. I have read with interest the observations made at your last Conference concerning the role margarine can play in the development of a stronger protein pillar for our agriculture. During the repeal effort many of us in Congress learned much about your industry, the diary industry, and the agricultural economics behind each. Currently we in Congress are hearing more and more about the problem of increasing milk consumption. I know that diary leaders are devoting a very considerable amount of thought to this subject, so vital to their industry. One of the good fruits of the margarine movement is that attention is being directed increasingly to ways and means of increasing and improving or utilization of milk. We produced last year 123½ million pounds of milk, of which about 63 percent is estimated to have gone into fluid, cheese, condensed, evaporated, ice cream, and dry whole milk. We are especially proud of our growing cheese industry and fluid consumption. I am informed that our milk production has increased 6 percent since 1950; our fluid milk consumption, 3 percent; and our cheese production 14 percent. I congratulate this conference upon its theme—greater consumption of "milk, bread, and spread." Insofar as the dairy industry can move toward greater whole milk markets, your difficulty is lessened. It is no accident that a great many dairy companies now offer margarine. In different ways your industry can help promote the theme you have stated here. If the past 5 years offer any lesson, it is that this subject deserves continued study by your industry: It is a new opportunity for you to work cooperatively to benefit consumers and farmers alike. You can help your product by providing it with a theme important to your progress and commensurate with your experience and association. We in the legislatures are watching this whole field with interest, as, to some degree, an extension of the margarine freedom concept.

And so in these 5 years your opportunities for freedom have grown. So freedom has grown in our modern world. The margarine industry is well acquainted with what might be called the point of view of history. And sharp though our present changes from the past are, we have only history for a guide. Like your industry, America is essentially young. As your industry contains a diversity of firms, so America contains (and I think probably always will) a great many differences. You are facing the problems of your new freedom; the United States has done so from its inception. As a nation we had to win independence from European domination, principally by the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Monroe Doctrine, and national growth. We had to win unity on our form of democratic government, through constitutional development and the Civil War. Through all this runs a stream of liberalism that is continuous and deep in American development. This liberal trend seems to have been most pronounced in periods of economic expansion such as we have now. The point I wish to make is that while freedom may seem a different thing from one generation to another, it is inherent in our national mind and spirit. Your "Declaration of Independence" in 1950 was merely one more result of the Declaration of 1776.

Is our national policy today, by and large, dominated by this spirit to protect our traditional liberties? We are told that this is a businessman's administration. All administrations have to more or less extent considerably reflected the businessman for he is a central figure in our progress. Certainly the Federal Government is calling upon businessmen to give more than lip service to the fantastically large and complicated work of running the country. A heavy responsibility therefore rests upon the business community. All industry, large and small, shares this responsibility. I think businessmen today are considerably more sophisticated, more "knowable" about Government matters than ever before. Through their personal participation in Government; through the many laws and regulations affecting them; through their trade associations and in other ways, the idea that the average businessman need neither know nor care what Government is doing, is obsolete. But where a President once would say, "The business of America is business," we recognize now that the business of America is to protect its true liberties.

In this connection I should like to comment briefly on the national business outlook. It is a subject of so much comment and discussion and analysis that I doubt there is much I can add to it. A question often asked me is "What is the economic outlook for the next year or so as seen from the standpoint of the Banking and Currency Committee's stock market hearings and research?" I will tell you frankly that I am no more able than the next person to give a concrete prophecy on such a vast subject. The object of the recent hearings, however, was an attempt to bring about greater stability in our economic system. The violent fluctuations of the past should be prevented, or at least minimized.

Japanese Textile Tariff Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, only recently the Congress gave final approval to H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. This was accomplished only after long consideration and extended debate. When H. R. 1 was first considered in the House, I joined many Members in seeking to write into the bill some safeguards for domestic industries against unfair competition from low-paid labor abroad. We did not win that fight in the House, but it was won in the Senate. In approving the conference report a few days ago, the House indicated its general satisfaction with the measure as amended in the Senate.

While the conferees of the House and Senate were seeking to reconcile the differences over H. R. 1, the State Department announced that our Government had just concluded, at Geneva, a new trade agreement with Japan.

An analysis of the terms of the agreement indicates that our country is granting heavy additional tariff reductions on cotton goods imported from Japan, effective September 10, 1955. In addition, the United States granted tariff concessions to third countries in exchange for concessions by those countries to Japan.

These new tariff cuts on textile products imported from Japan concern me very much, because the production of cotton and the manufacture of cotton goods are very important activities in the District I have the honor to represent in Congress. They apply to goods representing a substantial part of our domestic textile production, and I fear the results will be disastrous to millions of our citizens who derive their livelihood directly or indirectly from cotton textiles.

Notwithstanding the fact that our present tariff rates are so moderate that Japanese-made textile goods are being imported into this country now in substantial quantities, our representatives at Geneva granted additional tariff cuts ranging upward to 50 percent. In some cases these tariff cuts, when translated into prices per pound or yard, will exceed the total profit being earned by domestic mills. It is difficult for me to see how our representatives who negotiated this agreement at Geneva expect the United States textile industry to exist, much less prosper, when subjected to such handicaps.

The argument is advanced by those who defend these tariff cuts that the quantity of textiles imported by this country is insignificant in comparison with domestic production. This is an utterly fallacious and unrealistic argument. It ignores the fact that the importation of textile goods, even in small quantities, affects the domestic market price—not only affects it, but in many cases dictates it.

All of us are, of course, interested in the rehabilitation of Japan. But I submit that the domestic textile industry, and the millions of our citizens who depend upon it for a living, should not be expected to absorb the cost.

The truth about the matter is that the textile industry in Japan does not need stimulation. The facts are that imports of textiles by the United States have been rising rapidly. In the first quarter of 1955, for example, imports of textiles were almost double the amount imported in the first quarter of 1954, and approximately two-thirds of the total came from Japan. Moreover, 90 percent of the textile equipment now in use in Japan is new machinery. It is just as modern and efficient as the equipment in our own mills. The textile business in Japan is exceedingly profitable, and Japanese textile firms are paying substantial dividends. All of this indicates that the Japanese textile industry is flourishing, is able to pay our very modest tariff import duties and still undersell domestic producers in our home market.

The fact should not be overlooked that the United States textile manufacturer furnishes the principal market for the cotton produced in this country. Japan imports cotton in large quantities, but more than half of it is obtained from countries other than the United States. If these drastic textile tariff cuts remain in effect, and if imports are not limited, I am afraid that the result will be disastrous not only to the cotton processors and manufacturers, and their employees, but also to the cotton farmers of our country.

In the light of these actions and these facts, the executive committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute met in an emergency session in Charlotte, N. C., on June 30, 1955, and adopted a resolution setting forth a sound and sensible plan to cushion the effect of these new and drastic tariff reductions. This plan recognizes the importance of expanding and stimulating international trade and contemplates a substantial increase in textile imports from Japan. At the same time, it indicates a commendable concern lest we inadvertently and mistakenly subject a great and important domestic industry to destruction by opening our home markets to unlimited, unfair competition from abroad.

In the interest of acquainting the Members of the House with the position taken by that organization, which speaks for 85 percent of the domestic textile industry, I incorporate the statement issued by the executive committee of ACMI as a part of my remarks.

The statement follows:

Statement by Executive Committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Meeting in Charlotte, N. C., on June 30, 1955, the executive committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute herewith recommends the adoption of an equitable quota system on imports of cotton goods as the only practical solution to the problem created by drastic tariff reductions at Geneva.

In reaching this conclusion the committee had in mind the best interests of all segments of the cotton industry, including 3½ million people in cotton farmers' families, 8 million in the families of textile-mill employees and apparel employees, plus hundreds of thousands more engaged in cotton ginning, shipping, and warehousing.

It is the judgment of this committee that American mills will find it impossible to adjust to conditions resulting from the Geneva action; and that heavy inroads of cotton-goods shipments from foreign countries will nullify the present quota protection for American cotton farmers.

This committee's judgment is that the vastly reduced tariff rates, when they go into effect September 10, will force many cotton mills to import foreign gray goods, particularly from Japan, for finishing and distribution as a competitive necessity. Converters likewise will be forced into similar action because of the lower prices of Japanese goods, as some are already doing.

In addition, the situation is certain to create the opportunity for a new type of adventurer-importer who, without a spindle or loom or a vestige of textile experience, will operate largely on a speculative basis to disrupt and demoralize the established system of textile distribution.

Under these circumstances, American cotton is destined to a minor role in cotton-goods consumption in the United States. Today, over 98 percent of the cotton goods manufactured and consumed in this country is American-grown cotton. The prevailing State Department policy points to the loss of the American cotton farmer's chief customer. Just as foreign-made goods are the product of foreign labor, so are foreign fabrics likewise in greater part—upwards of 75 percent—the products of foreign cotton.

Any effort to establish free, unrestrained competition with Japanese goods must inevitably fail, because the only outcome will be Japanese monopoly at the cost not only of American industry but also American agriculture.

It is imperative, therefore, that a system of overall quantitative limitation be placed on imports of foreign cotton goods. In advocating a system of import controls, this committee wishes to emphasize that the cotton textile industry makes its sales, purchases its raw materials, and schedules its manufacturing operations all on a futures basis. For this reason, a condition of reasonable certainty regarding imports is essential.

In the spirit of the Government's foreign economic policy to expand international trade, it is not our wish to restrict unduly such imports. To the contrary, in the interest of industry stability and at the same time in the interest of considerate treatment for Japan, we favor a quota which will permit a substantial increase of Japanese imports. It is our belief that this industry would approve an increase not over 50 percent, based on the average annual volume of 1953–54, which are the two highest import years since World War II.

To assure equity of treatment for importers, foreign exporting countries and the various divisions of the domestic industry, the total quota should be appropriately subdivided by products, or produce categories, in such manner as to avoid injurious or inequitable import concentration. In arriving at such determinations, representatives of the industry and the cotton goods trade should be consulted.

Warning Signals on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955. The measure passed the House, 372 to 31, and now goes to the other body. Because of the widespread public interest in this legislation and its very great importance to millions of Americans, I wish to make very clear the grounds of my opposition. My opposition was twofold:

First. I objected to the legislative procedures followed by the House in its consideration and enactment of this measure.

Second. I was—and am—deeply concerned over the cost and tax implications of these new amendments. I am equally concerned over the warnings of responsible members of both the legislative and executive branches—including many in the House who reluctantly voted for the measure—that it may well jeopardize the long-term financial soundness and stability, and even the very survival, of the entire social-security system.

Despite insistence of Republican members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the urgent appeal of representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, public hearings on the legislation were denied by the majority of the committee. Testimony of HEW representatives on the bill, taken in a few closed sessions of the committee, was not available to Members of Congress prior to yesterday's vote.

The measure was brought onto the floor of the House under a suspension of the rules, with only 40 minutes of debate permitted proponents and opponents combined, and with no opportunity for amendments.

This measure, lowering the retirement age of women to 62, providing for total disability benefits for covered employees starting at age 50, providing benefits for disabled children, and extending coverage to certain self-employed professional people, contains many desirable features and has objectives which are commendable.

The gag-rule procedures under which the legislation was handled do no credit to the faith of its sponsors in either the merits of the bill or its objectives and do no credit to their faith in the proper legislative processes of full disclosure of facts and free debate.

House adoption of the measure under these conditions follows on the heels of last year's action of Congress extending social-security coverage to many additional millions of self-employed persons. The actuarial implications of this added coverage have not yet been fully assessed. Now scores of additional grave, unanswered questions are raised by the new legislation.

The legislation voted by the House yesterday increases the social-security tax next January 1 on both employer and employee from 2 to 2½ percent. By 1975 the combined tax rate projected in this bill will be 9 percent. The tax on gross (not net) income of self-employed individuals, including farmers, will become 6¾ percent by 1975. It is conservatively estimated that by that year the total social-security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually. Clearly, the saturation point on this tax has been, or soon will be reached. Other revisions of the law which may prove even more important than those currently proposed, and involving additional costs, may well be precluded. Yet no serious study of the claims or proper priorities of these other possible revisions has been made.

I concur completely with the supplementary views stated by seven members of the Committee on Ways and Means:

> We are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social-security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax. * * *
>
> Insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide even greater benefits and to provide against an ever-wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the costs by shifting most of the burden to the future.

I do not believe it is true devotion to the solution of human needs, to the maintenance of a sound social-security system, or to the welfare of present or future generations, to disregard these warnings. There is no kind of political pressure which can persuade or compel me to disregard these warnings or to share in legislative procedures which refuse even to give adequate hearing either to the warnings or to the facts.

Resolutions Adopted by Nebraska Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Young Republican Club, at its annual convention, held on May 28, 1955, in Lincoln, Nebr., adopted these resolutions, among others:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas this administration under Dwight D. Eisenhower has made tremendous progress by ending the tragic slaughter of our young men in Korea and by maintaining prosperity at its highest peacetime level and by reducing Government spending, reducing the budget deficit and stabilizing the value of the American dollar; and

Whereas this administration under Dwight D. Eisenhower has been free from scandal and has made significant progress in the field of foreign relations, and has taken steps to return government to the people and to the States, and has made the greatest advancement in the field of civil rights of any administration in our history: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convention of the Nebraska Young Republican Club hereby express its deep gratitude to this administration for its tremendous accomplishments, and that Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his devotion and duty to his country, seek reelection as President of the United States in 1956.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas the Nebraska Young Republican Club has assembled in Lincoln, Nebr., this 28 day of May 1955 in its annual State convention; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that at such time we reexamine and reaffirm the principles and programs of our organization: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we express our profound confidence in the leadership of our congressional delegation, namely, Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA, and Congressmen MILLER, WEAVER, HARRISON, and CHASE, for their intelligent cooperation and leadership demonstrated thus far in the Halls of Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas the present State administration is continuing the policies of efficiency, honesty, and good government: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convention of the Nebraska Young Republican Club go on record as congratulating Gov. Victor E. Anderson and his administration.

I, in turn, am deeply grateful to the Nebraska Young Republican Club for the many significant contributions it has made to the cause of good government in the Nation and the State of Nebraska. A large number of its members are active in the affairs of the State central committee. Many county central committee chairmen are young Republicans. Many young Republicans hold State and county elective offices. One of the Members of Congress from Nebraska is a Young Republican, the Honorable PHIL WEAVER, representing the First District. The United States district attorney for the district of Nebraska was formerly active in Young Republican organizations. Many others are performing outstanding services to their communities, the State, and the Nation by taking roles of leadership in the Republican Party.

Last year the Nebraska Young Republican Club inaugurated a "first voters campaign" in our State, which will help to bring home the responsibilities of voting to thousands of young men and women who reach their majority each year, and which I feel is a very worthwhile program. I am informed that the progress of this campaign has been quite satisfactory. More than 3,000 young people have been contacted by the First Voters Campaign Committee, according to the present State chairman of the Nebraska Young Republican Club, Jack F. Jacobson, of Lexington, Nebr.

The Young Republican movement has received great encouragement from President Eisenhower, who, many times, has publicly recognized the tremendous value of this vital and dynamic organization. I am heartily in accord.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to whom the darkness and the light are both alike, as the Nation turns from celebration of an epic day in the past when a clanging bell was the signal for costly payments of lives and fortunes and sacred honor to be poured out that the declaration might be the firm foundation of this experiment in liberty, give us the grace, as we hallow that deed of the yesterdays, to remember that not annual observances, but eternal vigilance, is the price of liberty, and that each generation must earn the right to keep it.

We ask that those chosen by the people to guard their freedom, in this day of denials of it and threats against it, may trust a strength that is not their own. With pressures upon them which tax to the utmost human resources of endurance, may the masses of citizens for whose welfare public servants labor think of their representatives with prayerful sympathy and understanding, rather than with captious and petty criticism.

We think this day with tender solicitude of the stalwart leader in this body who so recently spoke from his place of high responsibility with passion and deep sincerity regarding pending public questions. Now that suddenly he has been stricken, in this time of anxiety we pray for his family watching by his side. In Thy will we lift our petition that the dedicated skill of physicians and the ministry of nurses may soon restore him to his dear ones and to his place in the councils of the Nation in this crucial day. Guide his colleagues upon whom for the time his mantle rests. May each of us in the place where we stand do our best as each day beckons, knowing that the night cometh when our work will be done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 1, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 195) for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ILLNESS OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, following the beautiful prayer of the Chaplain, I desire to make a statement, but prior to doing so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

She Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I know how anxiously the friends of the Senate majority leader have been awaiting a complete report on his condition. For their benefit, I should like to make a very brief statement.

Last Saturday, after visiting the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his apartment, Senator JOHNSON of

Texas drove down to Middleburg, Va., to spend the weekend with friends. On the way, he began to suffer from attacks which appeared to be indigestion.

When he arrived at Middleburg, his friends called in a local doctor, who diagnosed the condition as a heart attack. He was taken to the Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., in an ambulance, and placed in an oxygen tent while treatment began.

Physicians report that his response to treatment has been satisfactory, but that his condition remains serious.

At the hospital, he is receiving the best of care. In addition to the regular staff—one of the most competent medical staffs in the Nation—Dr. Howard Burchell, Mayo Bros. heart specialist, was called in from Rochester, Minn., over the weekend for consultation.

Dr. James Cain, another Mayo Bros. physician, and a longtime personal friend of the Johnson family, was also flown to Washington. So that I could have an exact report on Senator JOHNSON'S condition for the Senate, I asked Dr. Cain to prepare a statement, which I now read:

> Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON has had a myocardial infarction of a moderately severe character. He was quite critically ill immediately following the attack but his recovery has been satisfactory.
>
> His physicians agree that under no circumstances can he return to his duties during this session. He cannot undertake any business whatsoever for a period of months.
>
> However, if there are no further attacks of a severe character and his recovery continues to be satisfactory, he should be able to return to the Senate in January.

The medical statement speaks for itself. It is not my intention to seek to interpret it in any way or to add additional medical information.

Senator JOHNSON is permitted no visitors, other than his wife, who is constantly at his bedside. He has been resting comfortably, even though he is still in the oxygen tent.

His mother is in Washington, having flown here from Austin.

Under the circumstances, it becomes my duty, as acting majority leader, to assume his responsibilities. I have no hesitancy in confessing that it is difficult and disturbing to step into the shoes of such a man, even if my tenancy is only temporary.

During this session, LYNDON B. JOHNSON has set standards of leadership that have won him the deserved acclaim of all who are devoted to democratic ideals of government. His hard work and his tireless efforts have reflected credit not only upon him, but upon the entire Senate.

As a close, personal friend, I am deeply devoted to LYNDON JOHNSON. As an American citizen, I am proud of the opportunity to be associated with him in any capacity.

I doubt that there is a Member of the Senate—on either side of the aisle—who does not look upon LYNDON JOHNSON as a friend. He has always regarded his position as one that goes beyond narrow partisanship, into the realm of protecting and advancing the interests of the entire Senate and the entire Nation.

It is fortunate that we are "over the hump" of legislative activity for this year. We still face important and difficult issues, but the great volume of work is behind us. This fortunate state of affairs can be attributed largely to the work of the majority leader and to the splendid cooperation he has received from both sides of the aisle. Certainly he has received fine support and fine cooperation from the minority leader.

As acting majority leader, it is my hope that I can carry on in the same spirit. I intend to devote all of any ability that is mine to establishing the same relationship with all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle.

By working together, we can finish the work of this session in a way that will make LYNDON JOHNSON proud of this Senate, which so strongly bears the stamp of his leadership.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say, first of all, to the acting majority leader and to the members of Senator JOHNSON'S family, that Senator JOHNSON has the prayers of all of us on this side of the aisle, as I know he does of every Member of the Senate, that he may recover, and that he may recover even sooner than the doctors have indicated.

I believe I have had as close an association with LYNDON JOHNSON as has any other Senator in this body. While we sit across the aisle from each other, I think both of us understand some of the responsibilities and burdens of both the majority and the minority leaderships in a Senate which is so closely divided as is this one.

In connection with the mechanics of legislation, I hope that in the future all Members on the other side of the aisle and all Members on this side will continue to cooperate with the acting majority leader in the orderly processes of this body, as we have tried to do in the past.

Of course, there are issues which will divide us from time to time; but I think it very important for the Senate, as an institution, that in connection with the mechanics of its functioning and legislative work, including establishing the procedures for the day, for which, under our system, the responsibility primarily rests upon the majority leader, insofar as possible the minority cooperate in facilitating orderly processes.

I wish to assure the acting majority leader that he will have from me the same cooperation I was so glad to give the distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

Again I express, on behalf of all of us, our hope for LYNDON JOHNSON'S speedy recovery.

Mr. CLEMENTS obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before I yield to my friend, the Senator from New York, I wish to place in the body of the RECORD—and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose—an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, one from the Washington Evening Star of July 4, one from the Washington Post and Times Herald of the same date, one from the Washington Daily News of July 5; and two excellent articles—one from the New York Times, written by William S. White, under date of July 4; and one written by Jack Steele, under date of July 5.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 4, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The heart attack suffered by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is bad news for the Senate and for the Nation. As Senate Democratic leader, Mr. JOHNSON has won the respect, if not always the agreement, of legislators in both parties as a capable and devoted officer of Congress.

The heart attack is listed as moderately severe, and Mr. JOHNSON'S condition as serious. While it will prevent him from returning to the present session of Congress, it will not, we hope, terminate his legislative career. Mr. JOHNSON is known as one of the hardest workers in Congress, and if the current session of the legislature is operating according to schedule, it is largely due to his efforts and his example. Perhaps, too, his strenuous activities contributed to the attack he has just suffered.

Certainly the messages of regret and encouragement now reaching him from Congressmen on both sides of the aisle tell of the widespread affection and regard in which he is held. We join his colleagues in bidding him good cheer, and in hoping for his rapid and complete recovery.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 4, 1955]

THE SENATE'S LEADER

The brand of Senate leadership exercised at this session by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was effective, as the records show. But it called for more energy and unceasing effort than any man can expect to exert without injury to himself, and it has been without doubt a contributing cause of the Senator's illness. He put more into his job, from early in the morning until late in the night, than anybody could expect. He was not satisfied with giving direction to the movements of his Senate partisans. He supported every decision in that respect with personal persuasion—one result of which was to produce a rare degree of party unity.

The hope expressed now by so many of his friends, regardless of their party affiliations, is that a man who has such rare gifts of self-dedication to the job at hand will exert them now in one direction, and allow nothing to interfere. The important thing is his recovery. His own solicitous cooperation with his doctors to that end should provide the needed medicine.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 4, 1955]

MR. JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the majority leader of the Senate, was stricken at a moment when he was being widely acclaimed for unusual achievements in a most difficult assignment. Friends and admirers were talking confidently of "JOHNSON for President"—perhaps not in 1956, when Adlai Stevenson seems to have the inside track for the Democratic nomination, but in 1960, or later. Senator JOHNSON'S little spat with the President last week had also given emphasis to the unique quality of his leadership in the Senate. His heart attack is thus a shock to many people. It has brought a profound sense of regret without regard for party lines.

The majority leader has seemed to marshal his forces with ease, to harmonize the different factions within his party by the charm of his personality. But most feats that look easy from a distance are characterized by toil, careful planning, and perhaps endless attention to details that may not at first glance seem important. It is all too obvious that the strain incident to his work has been costly to Senator Johnson in terms of health. His illness is another reminder of the incredible load that congressional leaders carry.

We earnestly hope that Senator Johnson's doctors will not permit him to return to his job during the present session of Congress. But we also earnestly hope that his health will permit a resumption of his leadership next year. The Senator's unity policy has been good tonic for the Democratic Party and for the country. He has operated on the theory that the people would expect responsibility and good judgment of the Democratic leadership in Congress in this period of divided party control. He has sensed that the people easily tire of mere opposition for opposition's sake. By tact, good will, and levelheadedness he has managed to work with the Republican President and to make a creditable record for his party, too. For that he has his country's thanks and its warmest wishes for his speedy recovery.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 5, 1955]

Lyndon Johnson

It is ironic that Lyndon Johnson was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a "natural" as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. Johnson earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small-bore about Lyndon Johnson.

An urbane, wise and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. Johnson has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. Johnson's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the "loyal opposition." To the contrary. There is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. Johnson's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator Johnson will have to remain in the hospital for a long time. But the record of this Congress' session, now speeding toward adjournment, largely will be a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the New York Times of July 4, 1955]

Democrats Fear Johnson Illness Will Hurt 1956 Bid—Afraid Senator May Not Be Able To Act as Leader—President Voices Regrets

(By William S. White)

Washington, July 3.—The serious illness of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, the Senate Democratic leader, is throwing shadows across the whole politico-governmental scene.

Senator Johnson, 46 years old, suffered a heart attack yesterday. He entered the Naval Hospital at nearby Bethesda, Md., last night for what obviously may be a long and dangerous stay.

He suffered the heart attack while visiting near Middleburg, Va. This afternoon the hospital said "his condition is still serious" and had not changed materially although he appeared more comfortable.

President Eisenhower, notified of the Senator's illness at his retreat in Maryland's Catoctin Mountains, said he was very sorry and expressed deep regret.

The loss to Senator Johnson's party is not so much for the present, because the work of this first session of the 84th Congress is finished in principle and requires now only the unfolding of details.

Clements to Carry On

Moreover, his deputy, Senator Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky, the Democratic whip, or assistant leader, without doubt will carry forward for the rest of this session the essential Johnson policies.

What more gravely concerns the Democrats is the possibility that Senator Johnson may not be strong enough to resume his leadership in the second session of Congress opening next January in a presidential year.

All significant wings of the Democratic Party long have acknowledged that the Johnsonian leadership has been almost matchless in terms of tactical skill and in giving the Democrats a new and almost monolithic unity on nearly every high occasion.

This they have acknowledged despite differences as to the validity of Senator Johnson's policy of constructive opposition to the Eisenhower administration.

Too, there is for the Democrats the fact that Senator Johnson now is the most powerful elected politician from the South, and that he is a member, if sometimes seemingly not a very belligerent one, of the southern regular or "loyalist" faction.

His prestige and his admittedly vast operative ability as a political manager have been regarded by the northern and predominately liberal Democrats as of great value to the party in the coming presidential test.

In specific terms, they have assumed—and Senator Johnson had in private told his friends—that granting the probable renomination of Adlai E. Stevenson, or the nomination of another basically liberal Democrat for President, the Senator could be counted on to go all-out for the party in the South.

Now all this prospect is thrown into question by the enigma of Senator Johnson's health. If he is, in fact, unable to resume the burden of the leadership next year—and his inability to return to the leadership during the present session is clear—the Democrats as a party will suffer greatly.

This is true, too, of the Senate as an institution, where Senator Johnson is vastly popular as an instinctive "Senate type" and as an extraordinarily capable manager of Senate functions.

The absence of Senator Johnson cuts the Democratic margin of control in the Senate to 1 vote. The line-up will be 48 Democrats and 47 Republicans. Senator Johnson's illness is not expected to affect plans for adjournment around August 1.

For the Eisenhower administration, too, his illness poses sharp and painful problems. He has served President Eisenhower as few Senate leaders have served a President, even when both were of the same rather than of differing parties.

This is so even though in recent days the two clashed publicly over the record of Congress in the present session. The President told his news conference that Senator Johnson had issued a statement pointing out that Congress had passed much legislation without the cold war between White House and Capitol that the President had predicted during the 1954 campaign.

The President retorted at his news conference that Congress had, indeed, passed a good deal of legislation, but "now I want more," including 16 pieces of must legislation.

No Basic Differences

This in turn prompted the Senator to remark that Congress was not going to act "like a bunch of second lieutenants obeying orders."

The spat, however, did not disclose any really basic bitterness between the two men. Both were good natured, and the Senator was already proceeding to move ahead with more administration measures at the time of his sudden attack.

It was Senator Johnson who more than any other brought the Senate around in due course to voting a condemnation last year of the methods of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, and thus thrust the McCarthy wing from its old position dangerously athwart so many of the President's policies.

It was basically Senator Johnson who more recently so arranged matters as to have Senator McCarthy repudiated by the Senate, 77 to 4, in the most crushing—and the most public—way in his effort to put restrictions on President Eisenhower's participation in the forthcoming Big Four Conference.

Helped Save Trade Plan

It has been Senator Johnson who has, more than any other man in the Senate, helped save such Presidential programs as the reciprocal trade plan.

The view of many detached observers in short is that Mr. Johnson has been since the death of Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, the most indispensable man at the Capitol to the Eisenhower administration.

As to the illness, itself, Senator Johnson may confidently be considered to be almost altogether the victim of his own work. A big, vigorous man, he nevertheless has not for years been in really top health.

He returned here in the spring, from a 6-week stay at the Mayo Clinic for a kidney operation, still in fever, in pain, and wearing a steel brace for his back. Against medical advice, he immediately thrust himself into one of the bitterest fights of this session of Congress, the lost effort of the Democrats to cut the individual income tax by $20 a person.

Since then he has been working always 6 days a week and often 7; always at least 12 hours a day and sometimes 18. It has been almost a commonplace for friends to receive telephone calls from him as late as 10 o'clock at night and to find that he still was at his Capitol office.

He has not only exercised the ordinary and exhausting function of party leadership to full measure; he has done much more.

Of late, anxious to speed the work of the Senate, he even has been observed to make impatient circular motions with his hand from his Senate seat to remind the clerk to hurry his reading of the rollcall.

Seeks to Speed Bills

He has alternately cajoled, pleaded with, and stormed at Democratic committee chairmen to bring forth their bills and clear their dockets. He even has taken the unusual step of keeping in close personal touch with the clerks and technicians of Senate committees to keep them going at full tilt.

Finally, his friends believe beyond question that one of the explanations of his illness is quite apart from the long exhaustion of his official life.

Though he is a hard, tough man in action, he is in thought and spirit both a sensitive and delicate man. He has been deeply hurt, compounded both of exasperation and of sorrow, at the criticisms made so often of him by the advanced liberal Democrats who have accused him of undue cooperation with the President.

He has felt that his policy of responsibility in opposition won the 1954 elections for the Democrats and would do so again in 1956.

It is a fact that, right or wrong, the vast majority of practical politicians in the Democratic Party, including a good majority of the liberals themselves, have agreed most of the time with him.

Nevertheless, Senator Johnson came into political life as a Democratic liberal, a protege of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and he has found it surpassingly hard to bear the sense of alienation from some in the extreme liberal wing.

It has long been clear to those who know him well that, justifiably or not, this situation has borne very heavily, almost crushingly, upon him.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 5, 1955]

On Senator Lyndon Johnson—A Job That Maims Men Physically

(By Jack Steele)

The heart attack which struck down Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democrat, of Texas, over the weekend focused attention on what has become one of the toughest jobs in Government—that of Senate majority leader.

Outside the Presidency itself, the Senate floor leadership is perhaps the most taxing and vexing post in Washington.

It is said around the press galleries that this job either maims men physically or kills them politically. It has done one or the other to many who have held it.

Senator Johnson, in the 6 months he has been majority leader, has demonstrated the rare combination of abilities needed for the job.

ON TRACK—ON TIME

He has made the Senate run on the track—and on time.

And he has done so as leader of a split party which had only a two-vote margin and a role to play as opposition to a popular Republican administration.

Making the Senate operate on schedule is only one of his accomplishments. He also has:

Reunited the members of his own party as they have not been in the Senate for 20 years.

Pushed through most of the Eisenhower legislative program without bringing down on his own head more than a smattering of criticism from Democrats.

The chief ingredient in Lyndon Johnson's success formula has been sheer hard work—12 to 15 hours a day.

A close associate told this reporter less than 24 hours before Senator Johnson's heart attack that the Senator was near the edge of sheer exhaustion.

His hope had been to hold on for a few more weeks, then take a long trip with his wife before going back to his Texas ranch to relax.

Senator Johnson has not been a flashy floor leader. He has made few speeches, indulged in no tirades. He has rarely held the Senate in night sessions.

GETS THINGS DONE

But he gets things done. The bulk of his work is done in the cloakrooms, in conferences in his office, and over the telephone.

He has prodded chairmen constantly to get key bills out of their committees.

He has worked for days with leaders of both parties to compromise most of the fight out of measures before they reached the floor.

His tact, his knack of getting politicians to settle their differences quietly and his consuming interest in politics have helped him and the Senate.

As a result, controversial bills which normally would have tied up the Senate for weeks have slipped through in a few hours or 2 or 3 days at most.

RESULTS IN STATISTICS

The results show in the statistics of this session compared with the 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953.

As of June 30, the Senate Calendar—which lists all bills reported by committees but not yet acted upon—contained only 19 measures. On June 30, 1953, the Senate Calendar listed 135 unpassed bills.

On June 1, committees had reported 445 bills and acted on 408. At the same time in 1953, only 366 bills had been reported and 296 disposed of.

And the majority leader during the 1st session of the 83d Congress was the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, generally acknowledged as one of the great legislators of modern times.

Senator Taft's death of cancer may not be attributable to his work as majority leader, but others have come close to cracking physically under the strain. Former Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, a robust former athlete, nearly sacrificed his health as leader of the recalcitrant 81st Congress.

No Senate floor leader has been elected President since the Civil War. Many have been vice presidential nominees, including Senator Alben W. Barkley, Democrat, of Kentucky, and the late Charles McNary, Republican, of Oregon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I shall yield now to the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman], who will offer a very appropriate resolution.

But before yielding to him, I desire to express my thanks to the minority leader for the statement he has just made, which is in keeping with the man who made it.

Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be reported.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate stand in silent prayer to the Almighty for the early and complete recovery of the majority leader, the beloved senior Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 122) is considered; and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

(Thereupon, pursuant to the foregoing resolution, all Members of the Senate and all other occupants of the Chamber stood in silent prayer.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished acting majority leader to yield in order that I may express my personal regret over the unfortunate attack which has befallen the distinguished majority leader. He and I have been friends for many long years. I have ever held him in the highest esteem and affection.

We all recognize his outstanding accomplishments as majority leader of the Senate. We know, in fact, that he has broken records of the Senate by the very able, devoted, and brilliant manner in which he has expedited and brought about the passage of important legislation.

I join the acting majority leader, the minority leader, and the entire membership of the Senate in the fervent hope and prayer that the distinguished majority leader may have full and speedy recovery.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was my good fortune Friday evening last to have dinner with our beloved friend and leader, Lyndon Johnson, as well as with a friend of us all who might be considered his political godfather, Speaker Sam Rayburn.

At that time, although he seemed in the best of health, the Speaker and I cautioned him about the tremendous effort he was exerting to make this one of the most notable sessions of the Senate.

The distinguished acting majority leader mentioned several doctors in his remarks of a few minutes ago. I know that when Senator Johnson gets well, and I am sure he will, he will also thank one of his close friends, a friend of many of us, Dr. J. Lawn Thompson. Dr. Thompson had a very great deal to do with bringing him through successfully during those first long, critical hours.

In the Dallas Morning News of July 4, 1955, a significant date with respect to the career of our beloved majority leader, there was published an editorial entitled, "Wish You Well, Senator," which I wish to read into the Record at this point:

Wish You Well, Senator

The redoubtable Dr. Robert T. Hill used to say that to live a long life a person should have a heart attack at an early age and learn to take care of himself. He should have known. After his first serious attack, he lived through nearly 50 years of arduous studying, writing, and tramping over hill and dale to become one of America's most famous geologists.

So there is no reason why Senator Lyndon Johnson should not be cheerful, as reported in the dispatch from Washington telling of his heart attack Saturday. Nor his friends. A prodigious worker, the Senator's ailment probably comes not from any physical weakness of the heart, but rather from the burden he has put upon it.

Through hard work, commonsense intelligence of the kind one finds in the Blanco Counties of Texas, tolerance and political know-how of the highest order, Senator Johnson has become one of the most influential men in the political life of the Nation. Like most other men who remain long in public service, he has not muffed many political plays, but he has built his record on consistent and constructive attention to the Nation's business.

Often a critic of the Senator, the News recognizes his splendid service and joins his many friends in wishing him a speedy recovery.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the statements made by the distinguished acting majority leader and the distinguished minority leader with respect to our beloved majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. My wife and I were greatly distressed yesterday to learn of his sudden illness, and we fervently wish him a speedy recovery.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives must have been sorely distressed over the weekend by the report on the sudden and most unfortunate disability visited upon the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON.

Certainly the prayer enunciated by the Chaplain earlier, and joined in by all of us, will be answered, and we devoutly hope his recovery will be rapid and complete.

As a Republican I have the most profound respect for the distinguished majority leader, a Democrat. He brings to the Senate a magnificent combination of qualities which stamp him as a great American. But I am also proud to call LYNDON JOHNSON my personal friend. On a number of occasions I have sought his assistance and his advice, and he always freely and generously has given me both.

The American people are completely unaware of the prodigious tasks which confront Members of Congress in these modern days, and which tax their strength to the utmost. All of us are troubled by the unceasing series of responsibilities, great and small, which come to each of us. That is particularly true of anyone who is clothed with the authority of representing either the majority or the minority of the Senate. Both upon the majority leader and the minority leader fall heavy burdens, which sometimes exact a very heavy tax on their health.

I should like to say through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas: Godspeed; get well fast, Lyndon, and come back here, where 95 other Members of the Senate of the United States call you their good and dear friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say concerning the distinguished majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, a word of appreciation for the magnificent leadership he has given the Senate during this session, and a word, also, of appreciation for his human qualities.

I think one of the criteria of greatness happens to be human understanding; and LYNDON JOHNSON possesses human understanding to a remarkable degree.

On last Friday afternoon the majority leader called me on the telephone when he heard I was planning a trip to Oregon that would keep me in Oregon until the coming Thursday. He advised me that the Public Works Appropriation Committee's report would be the unfinished business on Tuesday, and, under those circumstances, he respectfully suggested that I cancel my trip because of the interest which I have in a series of recommendations in the report affecting Oregon and the rest of the Pacific Northwest. When he advised me that the public works appropriations bill was the pending business, I, of course, agreed immediately to cancel my trip. His concern for my best interests on that occasion was so very typical of his human qualities.

What I wish to say about this great leader is that too frequently we do not appreciate the qualities of some of our closest friends until some misfortune overtakes them. And then we ask the question, Why were we not more cognizant and appreciative of true friendships prior to the misfortune?

When I speak of LYNDON JOHNSON's human qualities, I speak about a quality which all other Senators have observed time and time again—the unselfishness of the man. He has always been more considerate of the personal well-being of the rest of us than of himself. He has paid close attention to the health and personal welfare of his colleagues with no thought of himself. I have seen him time and time again postpone action in the Senate or recess the Senate in order to avoid a late session because some Senator deeply involved in the debate of a pending issue was not feeling well or obviously needed a rest. Yet he could brush aside any suggestion that he slow up for his own personal welfare.

Again referring to the telephone conversation of last Friday, here was a man about to suffer a physical misfortune, urging me to slow up, to take things more easily, without the slightest thought of the great energy he was expending to his own physical detriment.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I deeply appreciate the many, many friendly services LYNDON JOHNSON has rendered to me during the past year. He need not have done it. In fact, considering it outside the realm of friendship, perhaps from a political standpoint, his own political welfare might have dictated that he not do it. But that is not LYNDON JOHNSON. When he is once a friend he is always a friend.

We worked closely together on the Armed Services Committee to which he rendered statesmanlike service. Our friendship became closely knit together as we were associated on the Johnson preparedness subcommittee. During the past year, I have been the beneficiary of one kindness after another from LYNDON JOHNSON. I consider him not only a great statesman, but a good man. A higher compliment I think no human being can pay to another than to refer to him, when the facts warrant it, as they do in this case, as a good man. He is a good man in the true sense of the word "good."

Mrs. Morse joins me in wishing for our great majority leader the most speedy recovery, and we feel confident that will occur.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am grieved at the illness of our distinguished and able majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas. It has been my good fortune to serve with him in both the House and the Senate. We were elected to the Senate in the same year. We served on the Naval Affairs and Armed Services Committees in the House before serving together on the Senate Armed Services Committee. In that service we became very good friends.

I have never known a more effective or more considerate majority leader than LYNDON JOHNSON. We will sorely miss him. Not only for his sake but for the sake of the Senate as well, I wish my very good friend LYNDON JOHNSON a speedy and happy recovery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on Friday afternoon, as is the case now, I was temporarily acting as the minority leader during the necessary absence of the distinguished minority leader, the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I had occasion to visit with LYNDON JOHNSON 3 or 4 times during the afternoon. There was no evidence at that time, to my lay mind, of course, of the strain on his heart, of which, perhaps, he was not aware, but which must have been starting at that time as a preliminary to the attack which occurred on Saturday. I thought he was a little tired. We were conferring about the pace at which the Senate was moving and the prospect of adjournment. But then, as always, he was most considerate of the plans of Senators. He asked me about some bills in which I was interested. I deeply appreciated his solicitude, which was a characteristic of him.

Lyndon and I were Members of the House together in the 75th Congress. That was the first Congress of which I was a Member, as it was the first Congress of which he was a Member. During the years since then he and I, and Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Case, have been the best of friends. He served, of course, on the other side of the aisle, but that has never interfered in the least with our very warm personal friendship.

It was characteristic of Mrs. Johnson, when the attack came to Lyndon, that she should suggest that friends might offer their prayers for him. I am certain that both Lyndon and Mrs. Johnson have a deep faith that more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. Lyndon on occasion told me of the devoted faith which was present in the family in which he grew up. He told me of his father's remarks on various occasions about prayer. Today I earnestly believe that that faith will be rewarded by progress toward steady recovery, which is something all of us devoutly hope and pray for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who are paying tribute to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON by adding my word of hope and prayer that he may have an early and complete recovery.

First of all, it was most fitting and appropriate that the resolution which was offered this morning by Senator LEHMAN should have been agreed to and acted upon readily and without any delay. It was a privilege to join in a moment of silent prayer in behalf of Lyndon and for his early recovery. May God in his infinite wisdom hear our prayer and grant our wish. I am certain this will gratify Lyndon and raise his spirit, and will also be a source of inspiration to his family.

LYNDON JOHNSON has meant so much to all of us in the Senate. I think most of us who have had the privilege of coming in contact with him have sensed a genuine spirit of sociability and friendship which is most gratifying in the competitive nature of our legislative work. He always was and is able to make a distinction between political differences and personal friendships and associations. I know he can hardly wait to get back to his post of duty. I can imagine that even now he is restless. When I heard that the doctors had said his condition had become stabilized and the reports indicated that he was wide awake and alert, to me this meant that his creative, agile mind is thinking about what is going on right here, and that he is planning for the future.

LYNDON JOHNSON is a big man with a big heart who comes from a big State. Only momentarily has that heart been weakened. I cannot help believing that the reservoir of mental and physical strength which he possesses will bring about the healing of the tissues and a strengthening of the heart, which in turn will return him to us in full strength.

I extend to my personal and good friend, LYNDON JOHNSON, the best wishes of the Humphrey family. Our families are close. Mrs. Lyndon Johnson is one of our dear friends. She is at Lyndon's side as his good wife and sweetheart, watching over him, seeing to it that he gets the best of care, and that his physical and spiritual needs are cared for and guarded. How I wish that some of us could be of help—and we do stand ready at all times to do whatever may be asked or needed.

I should think the Members of the Senate would want to send Lyndon a message of good cheer. I only wish we could tell him a good story now, because I know of no one who likes to hear one more, and can tell one better, than does Lyndon.

I wish he could step up here and advise me, as he has done so often, in order to see that things went along right, at least from this desk. Then I wish I could have the chance to go up to the majority leader's office right after our discussion and enjoy that splendid fellowship which has been one of the true blessings of my experience in the Senate.

LYNDON JOHNSON will be back with us shortly. I think we had better get our work done, so that he will not worry. I have only one admonition to our colleagues: The better the record we make here, the easier the work of the doctors will be; the finer our activities and the more cooperative we are, the more cooperative with his physicians Lyndon will be. He seems to react automatically to what we do in the Senate. In that spirit I shall try to dedicate myself to expediting the business of the Senate, so that we can really be of assistance to Lyndon in providing him with the rest he so urgently and desperately needs and deserves.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, LYNDON JOHNSON is a great Texan, a great southerner, a great Democrat, and a great American. I think it was altogether fitting that the Senate should have paused a moment this morning in silent prayer and have asked Him who marks the sparrow's fall and numbers the hairs of our head to restore LYNDON JOHNSON soon to complete health, so that he may continue the great service which he has been rendering to all the people of America.

It happens that on June 30 I made a statement expressing my opinion of LYNDON JOHNSON as majority leader. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

Commentators upon political matters marvel at the efficiency of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, who occupies the post of majority leader of the Senate. Senator JOHNSON assumed this position as the unanimous selection of the Senate Democrats at the time of their reorganization of the Senate in January of this year.

It is the duty of the majority leader to see to it that the Senate functions with efficiency as a legislative body. To this end, he determines the order in which pending measures are to be considered and he does what he can to expedite final action on such measures.

If he is to function efficiently, the majority leader must be able to obtain the cooperation of virtually all Members of the Senate. This being true, he must possess a complete understanding of his fellow Senators and exercise in his dealings with them unfailing diplomacy, fairness, and perseverance. In his performance of the difficult tasks of majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON possesses this knowledge and exercises these virtues to a most remarkable degree. As a consequence, the Senate is performing its legislative duties in a well-nigh unprecedented manner, which is earning for him the praise of all observers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the entire Nation, as well as every Member of Congress, was shocked at the word of the heart attack suffered by our majority leader, Senator JOHNSON of Texas, last Saturday.

In their grave concern and prayers for his recovery, many men and women from every walk of life, and from dozens of States, have communicated their hopes for his safe recovery. Newspapers across the Nation likewise have expressed their hopes for his recovery, together with well-deserved tributes to the great work Senator JOHNSON has done for his Nation during his leadership of the Senate.

It is recognized by all that his serious illness today is due largely to the cruel and grinding pace he set for himself in carrying on the Senate's business. In order to make it easier on the 95 other Senators, Lyndon made it harder on himself by his long hours of personal supervision of every phase of Senate business.

It has been the making of agreements and holding conferences with other Senators, arriving at understandings, and making friendly suggestions, that have expedited progress on the floor of the Senate. But the personal work involved in making the Senate run so smoothly was bound to put a heavy strain on the man who had to accept the responsibility.

All America is hopeful that the danger soon will be past, and that Senator JOHNSON will next year again be able to resume the role of selfless leadership which he has so ably filled.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, our Senate leader, is stricken. We are sorrowful. We are prayerful. Seldom in the history of our country has a Member of this body attained such proportions and such influence as he has reached and maintained. Since I have been privileged to be about the Capitol, which covers a span of several years, seldom has a Member of this body been held in such affection.

His colleagues bow their heads in sorrow and prayer, and so it is, I believe, with uncounted thousands of people across the country, because I am sure, more than Senator JOHNSON ever dreamed, his name has come to be held dear, and his position in public life has become firmly entrenched in the hearts of his countrymen.

Our love and our sympathy go out to his family—his mother, his wife, and his children. May he soon recover.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a new Member of the Senate, I desire to express briefly my deep appreciation to LYNDON B. JOHNSON for the many courtesies and kindnesses he has shown to me. I have always found our majority leader fully aware of the tensions, uncertainties, and lack of experience under which a new Member must work in this illustrious body.

Although Mrs. Neuberger is a member—a new member, too, I might add—of the executive board of Americans for Democratic Action, I did not agree with that group's recent criticism of LYNDON JOHNSON's leadership in the United States Senate. I expressed some of that disagreement in an article which I wrote for the July 4, 1955, issue of the New Republic, under the title "Making a Scapegoat of LYNDON JOHNSON."

I shall always be proud of the fact that LYNDON JOHNSON came to my desk in the Senate on last Friday morning and told me that he and his wife had read my article together the night before, and that both of them were grateful for the sentiments which I voiced.

In conclusion, let me say to LYNDON JOHNSON and his family that Mrs. Neuberger and I hope fervently for his complete and speedy recovery. We want him to forget politics and legislation and affairs of State for the time being, and to take care of his neglected health. We mean every word of the telegram we sent to him Sunday night from Jamestown, R. I., when we telegraphed: "Dear Lyndon: Get well soon. We need you. Lots of love, Dick and Maurine Neuberger." LYNDON JOHNSON is a fine majority leader, a loyal Democrat, and a great American citizen.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD the article which I wrote in tribute to LYNDON B. JOHNSON for the July 4 issue of the New Republic, which was published last Thursday, June 30, before his untimely illness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING A SCAPEGOAT OF LYNDON JOHNSON

(By RICHARD NEUBERGER)

George Norris once said, "Mine has been a lonely pilgrimage." As a new Member of the United States Senate, I believe Norris' experience is a lesson we are going to have to keep in mind. Perhaps it has been forgotten in the decade since Norris died. This in essence, is my personal reaction to the current complaints over the strategy and tactics of the Democratic Party leadership in the Senate.

Of course, Lyndon B. Johnson is not as liberal as George W. Norris. Who in politics is, for that matter? Yet I think Johnson is as liberal as he can be and still continue as the effective leader of the Senators who sit on the Democratic side of the aisle. We hold a 49 to 47 margin over the Republicans, and even this majority of onion-peel proportions depends on conversions rather than on victory won at the polls. It exists because (1) My Oregon colleague, Wayne L. Morse, changed his party affiliation from Republican to Democratic, and (2) because Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, triumphant as a write-in candidate over the regular Democratic nominee, has voted with the party which tried to keep him out of the Senate.

Lyndon Johnson could cease to lead a majority the moment any one Democratic Senator decided Johnson's leadership did not please him. A single defection would throw the Senate into a deadlock of 48 to 48, with Vice President Nixon holding the decisive vote. And even a casual canvass of the Democratic roster would indicate a number of prospects for such a bolt were Johnson to seem to be too liberal. In fact, Johnson can tally among his followers at least 3 or 4 Democratic Senators who actively supported Eisenhower for President in 1952. Minority leader Knowland faces no comparable problem. Republicans are far more orthodox.

There is a nervous tendency to saddle Lyndon Johnson with some of our own shortcomings. I hear Johnson criticized because he favored turning over the tideland oil reserves to the States, because he now wants to take natural gas pipelines out from under Federal regulation. It is claimed that a majority leader, particularly a Democratic majority leader, should rise above such heinous local pressures. I do not agree with Senator Johnson in either of his stands which have lured such criticism, but I wonder how much we liberals of modern vintage have a right to assail Johnson for succumbing to the special interests of his Texas constituents. For example, when it came to removing the oppressive penalty taxes from colored margarine, most contemporary Senate liberals voted with their dairy constituents and against the same consumers whose welfare they champion on the natural-gas bill. I think only Estes Kefauver warned that everyone's civil liberties might be imperiled by the so-called anti-Communist bill which was whooped through the Senate in 1954. To be quite candid about it, I cannot understand why Lyndon Johnson is expected to display Victoria-Cross political qualities when his liberal critics are not themselves bent double with the weight of decorations won for bravery under heavy fire.

Johnson cannot be fairly blamed for some of the lost opportunities which have occurred thus far since Congress convened January 5. These major omissions strike me as four.

1. Echo Park: This is the proposed dam which will breach our national park system with commercial development for the first time in history. In a dubious effort to get some Rocky Mountain Republicans to vote for such bona-fide project as Hells Canyon, many Senate liberals actually gave strong support to Echo Park. Yet determined opposition to Echo Park might have stirred throughout the Nation the kind of thrilling support which Norris rallied in 1913 when he sought to protect the waterfalls and gorges of the Hetch Hetchy. Americans love the scenic outdoors, and they do not want to see it desecrated. In defense of Senate liberals, it must be said that they were under incomprehensible pressure from the CIO to back Echo Park Dam, despite its adverse impact on long-standing national park policy.

2. Salk vaccine: If anything has stirred the conscience of America, it is the harsh stand taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare toward the safety and distribution of the new antipolio vaccine. The contrast with Canada's orderly and humane program is self-evident. Yet efforts in the Senate to emphasize and underscore this situation have been, at best, disorganized and sporadic. And Senate liberals failed to take advantage of the existing circumstances to present a long-range health program promising to prevent any repetition of the Salk "snafu" in the future. Our efforts were hit-or-miss rather than coordinated.

3. Prevailing wages: After the Davis-Bacon amendment providing for payment of standard wage rates was included in the Gore Highway bill in committee, an amendment made its appearance on the floor to eliminate this guaranty of fair play in the spending of approximately $18 billion in public funds. The amendment was sponsored under heavy pressure from Dixiecrats and some New England Republicans, who did not want prevailing wages guaranteed on highway projects.

This presented a traditional opening for Senate liberals, who had fought for a decent wage rate ever since the days of Norris and the elder La Follette. All they had to do was point out that the American people did not desire to drive on superhighways built by men getting coolie paychecks. But the vast majority of Senate liberals were not even on the floor when the perfunctory debate occurred which preceded the elimination of the prevailing-wage provision by an unrecorded vote.

4. The security program: If my office is typical, every Senator is buried beneath a cascade of letters from men and women who have been separated from either Federal military or civilian service as security risks. Many of these separations, clouding careers indefinitely, have occurred after the most casual and cavalier investigations. In several instances, it took my office only a comparatively short time to convince certain departments that the person branded as a security risk was a perfectly loyal citizen. But the fight now being made by ex-Senator Harry P. Cain, for all his faults, should be receiving the active and continuing support of some of the articulate and eloquent liberal voices in the United States Senate.

I realize full well the presumptuousness of a freshman Senator in voicing some of these mild and well-intentioned criticisms. Yet I do so only because of my great admiration and respect for the liberals who now decorate the floor of the United States Senate. The eloquence of Wayne Morse, the vast knowledge of Paul H. Douglas, the shining humanitarianism of Herbert Lehman, the parliamentary skill of Hubert Humphrey—these qualities would not be wasted in even a liberal as illustrious as George Norris. But one hates to see such skilled and adventurous climbers failing to rope up when the most challenging glaciers loom directly ahead. I still remember my scoutmaster of troop 69 in Oregon, who showed us that 5 matchsticks tied together made a stronger and stouter staff than 20 matchsticks kept apart.

Although this may bring some skepticism, I would venture the thought that sheer physical exhaustion figures in some of the lost opportunities of the current session. The Senate liberals are a pestered lot. To them, either personally or through the mail, are brought all the injustices of a broad continent. Can't they do something? Won't they speak up? Every liberal is deluged with mail, visitors, and demands for speaking engagements. Nor are the sources of the speaking invitations always tolerant when a weary man tries to explain why he cannot finish a tense Senate debate at 5:30 p. m., rush to New York by plane for a scintillating speech at an 8 o'clock banquet and then hurry back to Washington by the midnight train to attend a 9:30 committee meeting the next morning. I have seen Senate liberals, their shoes off and ties loosened, lying exhausted on the black leather couches in the Senate Marble Room. Flesh and blood could stand no more. Indeed, I am more drained of strength by the Senate than by climbing mountain peaks with my wife back home.

Still, the coal miner must toil when he is tired, and so must Senators. George Norris had a dogged persistence, and this is one of our needs today. When he was in a desperate struggle, Norris rarely read the newspapers. He told Irving Dilliard, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and me, on the last occasion that I ever saw him, that worry over his press notices merely lessened his capacity for effective service in the cause at hand. Some of this selflessness and determination are required now. Nor can any lack of such qualities be rightfully attributed by us or by our liberal adherents to the Democratic leadership. Lyndon Johnson, for example, wasn't within cablegram distance of the decision by Senate liberals to let the Echo Park issue go by the boards. In fact, Johnson himself might have been on the conservation side if the Democrat liberals hade made a fight of it.

Speaking wholly from a lack of experience, my own practice as a Democratic liberal can be explained quite briefly. On issues where I think Democrats may reasonably be united, I go to the majority leader for advice and assistance. This would include such matters as the high dam at Hells Canyon, the public-power preference clause, and lowering the social-security retirement age for women from 65 to 60. On all such questions I have found Lyndon Johnson helpful, sympathetic, and in nearly complete agreement with my views. He never has turned me down nor been cavalier with my requests. I doubt if a freshman Senator has a right to ask more.

But with respect to the issues which will be fought in the future, once public opinion has been mobilized, I do not pester the majority leader at all. Here a freshman Senator must do his chores first. They won't be accomplished if he is crouching by the fireside, full of self-pity over his alleged abandonment by Lyndon Johnson.

A better example for liberal Senators to follow is that of Norris who was unshackled by the attitudes of party leaders on forward-looking programs as he was indifferent to pressures from his own State of Nebraska when he believed those pressures were misplaced. Loyal to his own convictions, Norris in 1928 blithely stumped Nebraska which was dry and Protestant and Republican, for Alfred E. Smith who was wet and Catholic and Democratic.

Perhaps we need a few more liberal pilgrims who will strap on crampons, shoulder their kitbags, and set out across uncharted snowfields. That's what Norris did. Why gnash our teeth from the overstuffed chairs in the Senate Marble Room? A grinding of molars passes no legislation. Have we gone so soft that we embark only on expeditions which take us no more than a discus throw from the majority leader's chambers? If Norris had waited for an official fiat from either political party before he hit the high trail to reform, the TVA and rural electrication would still be due about the year 2000.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I, along with millions of Americans and my fellow colleagues in the Senate, was both shocked and grieved to learn of the untimely illness of our distinguished majority leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas. I wish him a most speedy recovery to his duties in the Senate, where he has served his State and Nation in a superlative manner.

Until he can return to the Senate, we shall sorely miss his great leadership, his efficiency in conducting Senate business, his kind, and helpful attitude, and his splendid spirit of cooperation with everyone.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know of any greater tribute that we could pay to our friend and colleague, LYNDON JOHNSON, than to proceed with the disposition of the Senate's unfinished business with dispatch. Last Friday, immediately prior to adjournment, as the RECORD will show, Senator JOHNSON moved to make the public works appropriation bill the Senate's unfinished business; at that time he expressed the hope that this bill could be passed without delay.

Senators will recall that last Friday Senator JOHNSON also discussed the probability of final adjournment this month. He had his heart set on adjournment by the end of July. I hope that nothing will interfere with his wish. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated a while ago, it is difficult to think of anything that would do more to assist him in his recovery than for us to carry on the work of the Senate in the manner in which he had been conducting it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I was detained earlier when Senators were expressing their sentiments with respect to the distinguished majority leader.

I wish to extend my sympathy to the family of LYNDON JOHNSON and express the wish that his illness may be brief, that his recovery may be complete, and that his capacity for public service may long continue.

Our chairman is quite correct in saying, with respect to the functions of the Senate, that our majority leader would like nothing better than for us to continue with the program he has laid out, and promptly complete the work presented to the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, all I wish to say about the majority leader is amen to whatever has been said heretofore.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues who have spoken today about the condition of our beloved majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. For the second time this year he finds himself incapacitated. I fervently hope that his recovery will be swift; that he will not leave the hospital too soon, and that he will take care of his health, because we all want him back at as early a date as possible.

I was very much impressed with the demonstration in the Senate today when Senators stood in silent prayer on behalf of our leader, and I am constrained to remark that, to the best of my knowledge—and I have checked into this from a number of sources—the demonstration in honoring the Senator from Texas is something new in this body. The senior Senator from Texas, the majority leader, is down, but he is not out; and I express the hope that this man, who has done so much for his country, will be back shortly, and will be able to resume his duties as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], I ask unanimous consent to have a statement prepared by him printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

As we go into the last stages of this session of Congress, I think each and every Member of the Senate should pause and be thankful for the exceptionally fine leadership of the majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

The most appropriate get-well card the Senate could send him would be to assure Senator JOHNSON that we will carry on our business in the same orderly, effective manner that we would if he were with us.

Although Senator JOHNSON will have to be away from his duties for some time, he has laid the groundwork for us to complete an unusually successful session of Congress. It has been the hard work and devoted service of Senator JOHNSON that has carried us through especially troublesome waters. Without his outstanding leadership, I feel sure that we would not have been able to hurtle many of the barriers that are now behind us.

I would like to join each and every Member of the Senate in wishing Senator JOHNSON a speedy recovery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair) subsequently said: The Presiding Officer asks unanimous consent that he may make a brief statement from the rostrum, because prior to being called to preside, he had intended, in his capacity as a Senator, to make a brief reference to the illness of our distinguished majority leader. With the permission of the Senate, I shall make my statement from the rostrum.

I believe I have known LYNDON JOHNSON for as long as any other Senator has known him. I knew him when he first became a Member of the House of Representatives. I and my family know him and his family and have had rather intimate associations with them.

When I was a schoolboy in the country studying one of the McGuffey Readers, I believe, I ran across and still remember an adage which said that talent will bring a man into the world, but it takes tact to take him through the world.

I believe that description of man's capacity fits LYNDON JOHNSON as well as any man I have ever served with, because certainly he has talent, and certainly he has shown tact in his successful leadership of the Senate. Since he has become the leader of the Senate, and even while he was still serving as minority leader, he exhibited both qualities.

I think I can speak with some knowledge of the burdens of the position which he holds and also with reference to the selflessness with which he performed those duties.

Naturally I was shocked last Saturday to learn of his sudden illness. While no doubt it is serious, I happen to be affiliated, in a sense, with the great organization known as the American Heart Association, and I have learned more about that disease and malady than I ever knew before. I certainly hope, wish, and pray that the majority leader's recovery will be as speedy and as permanent as recovery from any malady or any disease or any affliction can be.

I believe the greatest tribute all of us can pay to him in the Senate is to cooperate with the acting majority leader in carrying forward the necessary business of the Senate for the remainder of this session, and not to allow it to lag in any way. So far as I am concerned—and I am sure I speak for all other Members of the Senate—I am ready to cooperate with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is acting in the place of our majority leader, in furthering not only the program of the Senate but in winding up the business of this session of Congress, so that the majority leader may be relieved of any anxiety he may feel during his illness because of his absence from the Senate.

I am devoted to LYNDON JOHNSON, and I admire greatly his character and qualities and humanity, and I join all other Senators in wishing him a speedy and complete recovery.

I thank the Senate for allowing me to make these few remarks from the rostrum.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there is a morning hour today for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of resolutions, petitions, memorials, and other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that any statement in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is now in order.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FREAR, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, recommending certain amendments of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SOVIET BLOC ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES IN THE FREE WORLD

A letter from the Director, Foreign Operations Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration entitled "Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in the Free World," for the period July to December, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PACIFIC AREA COMMAND, ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Pacific Area Command, Pacific and Mid-Pacific Operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited by the rehabilitation of major facilities of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract on the South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACT 273 OF LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of Act 273, of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to public improvements and the financing thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE IN CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF FALSE ADVERTISING AND MISUSE OF NAMES RELATING TO EXCHANGE SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEALTH SERVICE BENEFITS FOR CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Civil Service Commssion to make available on a voluntary basis, group hospital, surgical, medical, and other personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, through the facilities of prepayment group plans, group practice prepayment plans, Federal employee organizations, and insurance companies, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Republican Central Committee of San Diego County, Calif., favoring the establishment of flexible quotas on the importation of Japanese tuna-fish; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of John F. Engelke, relating to the training of certain persons to hold certain positions under a process of discipline; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A petition signed by Hallie G. Tankersley, and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to proclaim the rose as the national flower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 787. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 701).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1210. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 702).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 5, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 195) for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2404. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 2405. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

S. 2406. A bill relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 2407. A bill relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, for personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees, and for other purposes; and

S. 2408. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 2409. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valentine Averdoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2410. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2411. A bill to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act; and

S. 2412. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 2413. A bill providing for the conveyance by the Administrator of General Services to the Board of Commissioners of Lee County, Fla., of a certain tract of land situated in such county; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2414. A bill for the relief of Lina Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2415. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2416. A bill for the relief of the Henly Construction Co.; and

S. 2417. A bill for the relief of Chester Rak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2418. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2419. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2420. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROPOSED OVERSEAS FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. This bill relates to the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees whose services are performed in a foreign country or on Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island. This proposal is a part of the legislative program of 1955 of the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the President of the Senate transmitting this proposal, together with the text of the bill, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2404) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Overseas Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1955."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) in subsection (a), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following new paragraph:

"(3) if such employee is employed in Guam, American Samoa, or Wake Island, not less than the applicable rate established by the Secretary of Labor as herein provided. The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to any employee specified in this paragraph (3), but when the Secretary of Labor finds that economic conditions in such possession, in a specific area or areas thereof, or in relation to particular work to be performed therein warrant, he shall determine and promulgate, following a public hearing on the matter, the minimum wage rate which he shall find appropriate for such geographical area or particular work in conformity with the policy of this act. In making such a determination, the Secretary shall take into account the level of the economy of the area and its capacity to sustain the rate without causing substantial curtailment of employment, substantial hardship to business enterprise, or other disruptive effects; and he shall also take into account the reasonable relationship of such rate to wage rates paid in neighboring economies on which such area draws substantially for its labor supply. The minimum wage rate thus established by the Secretary shall not exceed the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 13 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections (e) and (f):

"(e) The provisions of sections 6, 7, 11 and 12 shall not apply with respect to any employee whose services during the workweek are performed in a work place within a foreign country or within territory under the jurisdiction of the United States other than the following: A State of the United States; the District of Columbia; Alaska; Hawaii; Puerto Rico; the Virgin Islands; outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (ch. 345, 67 Stat. 462); and the possessions named in section 6 (a) (3).

"(f) The provisions of section 7 and section 12 shall not apply with respect to employees for whom the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish minimum wage rates as provided in section 6 (a) (3), except with respect to employees for whom such rates are in effect; and with respect to such employees the Secretary may make rules and regulations providing reasonable limitations and allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions to and from any or all of the provisions of sections 7 and 12 if he shall find, after a public hearing on the matter, and taking into account the factors set forth in section 6 (a) (3), that economic conditions warrant such action."

SEC. 4. Section 16 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (d):

"(d) In any action or proceeding commenced prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under this act or the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 on account of his failure to comply with any provision or provisions of such acts with respect to work performed in a work place to which the exemption in section 13 (e) is applicable, or with respect to work performed in a possession named in section 6 (a) (3) at any time prior to the establishment by the Secretary, as provided therein, of a minimum wage rate applicable to such work."

SEC. 5. Section 17 of such act is amended by striking the word "and", after the words "Canal Zone," and inserting the words "and the District Court of Guam", after the words "Virgin Islands."

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U. S. C. 201) to provide that its principal provisions shall not apply to employees whose services are performed in a foreign country or within United States territory other than a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, outer Continental Shelf lands, Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island. With respect to Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island, this proposal provides that the Secretary of Labor after a public hearing may determine the minimum wage appropriate for the geographical area or particular work performed, not in excess of the minimum rate applicable within the continental United States.

The proposal also provides that no employer shall be subject to any liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Portal-to-Portal Act for work performed outside the areas named above, or for work performed on Guam, American Samoa, or Wake Island prior to the effective date of a minimum wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act covers employees engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce. The geographic coverage of the act turns upon the definition of "State" as "any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States." As a result of this broad definition, the act may be interpreted as applicable not only to employees in the United States and its Territories but also to employees upon any United States base anywhere in the world.

This broad interpretation of coverage is supported by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Vermilya-Brown Co., Inc.* v. *Connell* (335 U. S. 377 (1948)). This case held that the Fair Labor Standards Act, if otherwise applicable, covered employees of United States contractors engaged in construction of a military base for the United States on land in Bermuda acquired from Great Britain under the destroyer-lease agreement. The Court held that the "facts indicate an intention on the part of Congress in its use of the word 'possession' to have the act apply to employer-employee relationships on foreign territory under lease for bases."

The full effect of the Vermilya-Brown decision was not immediately felt by the Department of Defense because the Department was not then engaged in a mobilization effect which involved extensive overseas construction in areas covered by this decision. However, the expansion of military operations at home and abroad since the Korean incident has precipitated serious problems relating to the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the various overseas possessions.

The Fair Labor Standards Act imposes a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour and requires that overtime compensation at time and one-half for all hours worked beyond 40 in a workweek be paid to all employees covered by the act. On bases or establishments in foreign areas where the act may presently be held applicable and where native workers are utilized, labor standards for areas contiguous to the base or establishment are under the jurisdiction of foreign governments and are established at levels consistent with the prevailing local economy. Applying the conditions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to work performed within the base or establishment would require, in most instances, wage payments on the part of contractors performing work for the Department of Defense to be made at higher wage scales than those generally prevailing in the area. Such wage payments would obviously distort the local economy and, in some instances, objections have been received from foreign governments. In addition, such payments would result in higher costs to the United States.

With respect to areas, other than those designated in section 3 of the proposal, upon which the United States may have defense bases or other establishments, the proposal expressly provides that the minimum wage, overtime, records keeping, and child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not apply. With respect to Guam, American Samoa, and Wake Island, the proposal would authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine minimum wage rates not in excess of the generally applicable minimum, now 75 cents per hour, taking into consideration the fact that the labor standards in these areas are unlike those in the United States. In addition, where such minimum-wage rates are established, the Secretary of Labor may make rules and regulations providing variations and exemptions from any of the provisions of section 7 (overtime payments) and section 12 (child labor) if he shall find that economic conditions warrant such action.

The principal problem now arises upon Guam where Department of Defense contractors have been engaged in a major expansion program for improving defense facilities. There have not been sufficient local resident workers to accomplish this program. The remoteness of the island, its climate, and the more favorable economic conditions in the United States have prevented the attraction of sufficient United States workers, particularly in the laboring and semiskilled classifications. As a consequence, a large number of the required workers were recruited under contract from the Philippines. These workers had to be taught new skills and techniques, and their usefulness and productivity suffered from inability to understand English. They have been paid hourly wages and have been provided with lodging, board, and medical care. The compensation and the conditions of employment had the approval of the Philippine Government. The total of such compensation and benefits has been commensurate with their productive efficiency. Although for the less skilled workers the total compensation and benefits have not amounted to the 75 cents minimum prescribed by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the compensation has been substantial and has been much greater than they would have earned in the Philippines.

The Department of Defense believes that the employment of native workers in foreign areas as well as the employment of Filipinos on Guam has been advantageous to the workers and to their countries. The program has been administered fairly, without exploitation, to produce substantial savings for the United States and to promote good international relations. To remove any technical doubt as to the legality of this employment, the Department of Defense proposes the exemptions from the Fair Labor Standards Act as set forth in the attached draft of legislation.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced in the form of H. R. 10181 and S. 3831. No further action was taken on the bills.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would forestall claims that could amount to several million dollars from foreign workers on defense bases who have been paid less than the 75-cent minimum wage. It will also make unnecessary, increases in the wage scales for foreign workers on such bases to pay all employees who may be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act not less than this minimum and to maintain established wage differentials above this minimum. These claims and these increased wages would be reflected in higher costs to the United States for its contract work. For example, if the Fair Labor Standards Act is enforced on Guam, the Department of Defense is faced with a potential cost of more than $3 million for retroactive wage payments; in addition, annual costs would increase by a minimum of $1,500,000, which figure would be greatly increased if existing wage differentials between occupational categories are maintained.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. Thomas.

BILLS IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills to carry out those recommendations of the Hoover Commission report on Federal Medical Services which require legislative action.

The first of these implements recommendation No. 1 and would create a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President.

The second bill would implement recommendations Nos. 6 (a), 7, 9, and 10 relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration and the hospitalization of veterans.

The third bill implements recommendations Nos. 15, 16, and 17 relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees.

The fourth bill would implement recommendation No. 23 which calls for the establishment of a National Library of Medicine.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these four bills be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, in the near future I plan to address the Senate on the whole subject of the extremely important service rendered the American people by the second Hoover Commission, and especially by its Chairman, our beloved former President, Herbert Hoover.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Smith of New Jersey, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2405. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the Government.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a Federal Advisory Council of Health (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") to be composed of ——— persons who are members of the medical profession and ——— persons with distinguished records in fields other than medicine, to be appointed by the President, and to hold office at his pleasure. Each member of the Council shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

Sec. 2. (a) The Council shall—

First. Make a continuous evaluation of and recommendations as to policies and programs relating to Federal medical care and national health.

Second. Advise on measure to assure adequate health manpower and hospital facilities for the Nation's health.

Third. Review the various proposals and programs relating to hospital construction involving Federal funds, including Federal grants.

Fourth. Advise with respect to the coordination of regional hospital services of all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Fifth. Advise with respect to more systematic cross-servicing between the various Federal medical agencies.

Sixth. Advise upon measures for the adequate training and selection of the medical staffs of all Federal services.

Seventh. Advise the executive departments and agencies on all Federal medical policies and programs.

Eighth. Advise the Selective Service System on the mobilization of medical personnel.

Ninth. Advise concerning systems of project grants for health research programs of the Federal Government.

Tenth. Report periodically to the President and to the executive departments and agencies involved, on the success or failure of Federal health programs and policies.

Eleventh. Report to the President and advise the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress with respect to such matters as they may request.

Twelfth. Assist the Secretary of Defense to develop recommendations for revision of the Selective Service Act, as amended, so as to effect maximum utilization of medical personnel.

Thirteenth. Advise the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to recommendations for closing certain hospitals belonging to such Administration.

Fourteenth. Review the manner in which the hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration are being used and make recommendations for the disposal or more economic utilization of such facilities.

Fifteenth. Advise the President, or any committee established or designated by him, with respect to the policies, programs, and operations of the Food and Drug Administration and the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, with a view to eliminating those which are no longer necessary under present conditions and eliminating conflicts and overlapping of jurisdiction and functions between departments.

Sixteenth. Make recommendations to improve preventive health services, including those rendered in connection with medical care of Federal beneficiaries, in the interests of both health conservation and long-range economy.

Seventeenth. Review and make recommendations to the President with respect to the health research programs of the Federal Government.

Eighteenth. Examine the means of establishing cooperative planning among the Federal agencies which provide psychiatric care.

Nineteenth. Serve as consultant to the President's advisor on personnel with respect to making more uniform the personnel systems of the several Federal agencies using health personnel.

(b) The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this act.

Sec. 3. The head of each executive department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Council to the fullest practicable extent and to furnish the Council with such information and data as it may from time to time request.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

S. 2406. A bill relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That no part of any appropriation heretofore made for the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration shall be used or made available for use for such construction except in the case of a hospital (1) the construction of which has actually been commenced on or before the date of enactment of this act, or (2) with respect to which a contract for such construction has been entered into on or before such date. All authorizations for appropriations for such construction pursuant to which no appropriations have heretofore been made or obligated are hereby rescinded, and all amounts heretofore appropriated for such construction which are unobligated on the date of enactment of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each statement is signed by a veteran on or after the date of enactment of this act pursuant to section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 9), as amended, to the effect that he is unable to defray the necessary expenses for hospitalization or domiciliary care in connection with any disability, disease, or defect not due to service, shall be subject to verification under such rules and regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe. In the event that any such statement is found by the Veterans' Administration not to be substantiated, such Administration is authorized to collect the amount of the medical costs incurred, together with any amount paid in connection therewith for transportation of the veteran to and from the Veterans' Administration facility, in such manner as the Administrator shall prescribe.

(b) Hereafter each veteran who applies for hospitalization or domiciliary care in any Veterans' Administration facility for any disability, disease or defect not due to service shall be required to assume an obligation to pay for the costs of such hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation to and from such facility) at some future time if he is financially able to do so, but no interest shall be charged in connection with any such obligation. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to provide for the payment of such obligations.

(c) Hereafter the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish out-patient treatment and care, prior to or following hospitalization, to any veteran of any war who was not dishonorably discharged, who is suffering from disability, disease or defect (not including neuropsychiatric ailments prior to hospitalization), who is in need of out-patient dispensary care, and who is unable to pay therefor, irrespective of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service. Any veteran who receives such out-patient treatment or care shall be required to assume an obligation for the future payment of the costs thereof similar to that provided for in subsection (b) of this section with respect to hospitalization or domiciliary care.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

S. 2407. A bill relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, for personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after —— days after the date of enactment of this act, seamen employed on vessels of the United States registered, enrolled, and licensed under the maritime laws thereof, shall no longer be entitled, in accordance with regulations, to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 2. (a) On and after —— days after the date of enactment of this act, the medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization to which personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service are entitled under section 326 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 697) shall be provided at the nearest available facilities of the military medical services.

(b) Pending the establishment by the Government of voluntary contributory health insurance plans for dependents, the medical advice and out-patient treatment, and the hospitalization, furnished pursuant to section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 697–698) by the Public Health Service at its hospitals and relief stations to the dependents of the persons referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall, after the effective date of such subsection (a), be furnished at the nearest available facilities of the military medical services. The cost of the treatment and hospitalization furnished pursuant to this subsection and subsection (a) shall be reimbursed by the agency whose personnel or dependents thereof received such treatment or hospitalization to the extent that such cost is not charged to the officer, enlisted person, or member of a crew concerned.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, or an officer or employee of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary for that purpose, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, acting jointly, are authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(d) On and after —— days after the date of enactment of this act, the medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies provided at institutions, hospitals, and stations of the Public Health Service pursuant to section 324 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 697), for persons entitled to treatment under the United States Employees' Compensation Act and extensions thereof, shall be provided in non-Federal hospitals and the costs thereof shall be reimbursed to such persons, or paid directly to such hospitals, by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor, under such regulations as the head of such Bureau shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the first two sections of this act become operative, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall close all the general hospitals of such service, and the other institutions, clinics, stations, and facilities thereof, except (1) those used for the care, detention and treatment of narcotic addicts, and persons afflicted with leprosy, mental illnesses, or tuberculosis, (2) facilities for the care of Indians, (3) Freedmen's Hospital, (4) those used for research activities, including the National Institutes of Health, and (5) the clinics and other facilities necessary for making the medical examinations authorized for Federal employees and others pursuant to section 324 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 697) and for making the physical and mental examinations of aliens provided for pursuant to section 325 of such act (58 Stat. 697). Any hospitals and other institutions, clinics, stations, or facilities which are closed as herein provided may be disposed of to the States or local communities or in such other manner as the Surgeon General may prescribe. All proceeds derived from any such disposition shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

S. 2408. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a division to be known as the National Library of Medicine, which shall be under the direction of a board of trustees of ——— members (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be selected by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The members of the Board first taking office shall have terms expiring one each on July 1 of ———, ———, ———, ———, and ———, as designated by the Board of Regents. A successor to any such member shall be selected in the same manner and shall have a term expiring ——— years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was chosen, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of such term shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term.

SEC. 2. (a) The Board shall fix the time for the regular meetings of the Board, and is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed, and to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this act. The Board may function notwithstanding vacancies, and ——— members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(b) The Board is further authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of a librarian, a secretary, and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary for the efficient administration of its functions.

(c) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Board, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

(d) The Board shall submit to the Smithsonian Institution an annual report of its activities under this act.

SEC. 3. The site for the National Library of Medicine, which shall be in the District of Columbia, shall be selected by the Board, and the Board shall have authority, subject to the approval of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, to provide for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of such building or buildings as may be necessary for such library. The total cost of the library and grounds, including improvements thereto, shall not exceed $———.

SEC. 4. There are hereby transferred to the National Library of Medicine all property, records, personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available, of the Armed Forces Medical Library.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

This bill is part of the long-range effort of the United States Information Agency to improve the administration of our overseas information program. As most Senators will recall, the United States Information Agency was established by a Presidential reorganization plan in 1953 as an independent agency of the Government to conduct the vital information activities abroad provided for in the so-called Smith-Mundt Act. Congressional policy set forth in the Smith-Mundt Act was supplemented at that time by a directive of President Eisenhower setting forth the mission of the new agency.

I ask unanimous consent that the directive be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the directive was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

In carrying out its responsibilities in accordance with pertinent statutes and Presidential directives, the United States Information Agency shall be guided by the following:

The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace.

The purpose in the paragraph above is to be carried out primarily:

1. By explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the United States Government.

2. By depicting imaginatively the correlation between United States policies and the legitimate aspirations of other peoples of the world.

3. By unmasking and countering hostile attempts to distort or to frustrate the objectives and policies of the United States.

4. By delineating those important aspects of the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Congress recently appropriated $85 million to USIA for the coming fiscal year in recognition of the crucial part the information program plays in the cold war.

The bill we have introduced contains a number of amendments designed to improve the administrative tools provided in the Smith-Mundt Act for carrying out the information program overseas. The provisions relating to improvements in the administration of the overseas personnel system of the Agency are needed with particular urgency in order to attract new people of ability to work in the program and in order to retain some of the able and experienced people already in the program.

At the time the President submitted the reorganization plan setting up the United States Information Agency he said:

> The Director of the new United States Information Agency will need personnel authority. I, therefore, plan to authorize an independent personnel system for this Agency's foreign operations under authority of the last subsection of section 2 of plan No. 8. This system will be based on the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. It will give authority to the Director to appoint personnel and take such other personnel actions as are necessary, thereby relieving the Secretary of State of responsibility with respect to personnel actions. Such personnel would receive compensation, allowances, and other benefits applicable to Foreign Service Reserve, Staff, and alien personnel. It is not planned to extend to the new Agency any authority with respect to the appointment of Foreign Service Officers.
>
> While these arrangements will enable the new Agency to function with reasonable effectiveness from the outset, I do not consider them permanently suitable.

The provisions of this bill concerning personnel have been developed to supplant those aspects of the temporary personnel system which the President considered inadequate for the long haul.

This bill has the approval of the Department of State, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. It is also endorsed by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, who is both Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization and Special Assistant to the President for the "cold war."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a brief explanation thereof be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2410) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 402, 80th Cong., as amended) is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 603 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the report of the Commission on Information to the Director of the United States Information Agency shall hereafter be submitted semiannually and its report to the Congress annually."

(2) Subsection (4) of section 801 is amended by adding "of materials for use" before the words "outside the continental limits of the United States. * * *"

(3) Subsection (6) of section 801 is amended by substituting the figure "15" for the figure "10" appearing in the second sentence thereof.

(4) Section 801 is further amended by inserting the following new subsections:

"(7) to engage the services of experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), and individuals so engaged may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per day and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be paid travel expenses, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at the rates provided for in the Standardized Government Travel Regulation."

"(8) to provide hospitalization and medical care for alien employees while assigned temporarily for duty outside the countries in which they reside."

(5) Section 802 is amended by adding after the word "including" in the first line of subsection 2 the following language: "contracts of insurance, guaranty, and indemnity, and * * *"

(6) Section 802 is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(5) to pay the travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, of alien employees and their dependents when such employees are authorized to travel in connection with appointment, change of duty, or separation."

SEC. 2. The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 402, 80th Congress, as amended) is further amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"SEC. 1012. For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations abroad by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in a foreign country, the Secretary of State and the Director of the United States Information Agency, and such other officers as they may designate for such purposes, and under such regulations as they may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimants in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public or private property both real and personal or on account of personal injury or death, including claims respecting personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, whenever caused by any instrumentality, officer, agent, or employee of the Department or Agency, incident to the performance of any official functions for the United States, when the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, payment shall be made only after approval by the Secretary or Director.

"The Secretary or Director may certify to Congress any meritorious claim or portion thereof which is in excess of $5,000 as may be deemed to be just and reasonable for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.

"No claim shall be considered unless presented within 1 year after the claim arose, except for good cause shown that the claim could not have been presented within that period of time.

"Every claim settled under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary."

"SEC. 1013. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by him and after suitable examination, the Director of the United State Information Agency may appoint persons to be known as United States Information Officers. Such Officers shall be appointed, promoted, and retained on the basis of merit and fitness and may be separated only in accordance with law. Except for the limitations of time contained in sections 522 and 527 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, all provisions of law not inconsistent herewith which are applicable to Foreign Service Reserve Officers shall be applicable to United States Information Officers, and the Director shall be guided by the policies and principles prescribed in those sections. The Director shall establish such examining and selection boards or panels as may be necessary for use in the appointment, promotion, and separation of United States Information Officers.

"(b) Any United States Information Officer may be separated by the Director for unsatisfactory performance of duties, but only after review of his case by, and opportunity for a hearing before, an impartial advisory board appointed by the Director. The Director shall also provide for the periodic appraisal of such officers and, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, may separate those who are consistently ranked below a minimum level prescribed for their class.

"(c) The Director may establish an independent retirement and disability system for the benefit of United States Information Officers based on the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as heretofore or hereafter amended. Any Officer separated pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be entitled to the payments or retirement benefits prescribed in sections 634 or 637 of that act, as appropriate."

The explanation presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

EXPLANATION

Section 1: Proposed amendments to the International Information and Educational Exchange Act.

Subsection (1): This change provides that the Commission on Information make its report to the Director, United States Information Agency, semiannually rather than quarterly, and to the Congress annually rather than semiannually. This change will serve the convenience of the Commission better and will result in economies, while retaining the essential value of periodic reports from a public advisory group.

Subsection (2): This change would enable the Agency to contract quickly and directly with commercial printers. Under existing regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing, a pilot model of each pamphlet intended for publication overseas must be presented in its proposed form to the Government Printing Office, with an application for a waiver if the Agency wishes on contract directly with a commercial printer.

In almost all cases time is of the essence in the publication of these pamphlets. Generally they are designed to take advantage of, or to counteract the effect of, events that may occur in any part of the world without advance notice. Since United States Information Agency pamphlets are designed to have a quick and dramatic appeal to foreign readers, most of them require the use of color and illustration. Work of this type must generally be done by commercial printers whose facilities and experience fit them for this kind of work. At present waivers permitting the Agency to contract directly are infrequent and the GPO usually handles the job. Under GPO procedures a minimum of 3 weeks is required before the contract may be awarded and the job actually presented to a commercial printer. If the Agency were authorized to contract directly with private printers, without reference to GPO, much of this time could be saved.

Moreover, the time required to make up the complete pilot version of a particular pamphlet for advance presentation to GPO could be saved. Under this amendment the Agency could go to a qualified commercial printer within hours after a pamphlet has been decided upon and the commercial printer could schedule its production on the basis of simple physical specifications. The details of the pilot model, the exact text, color, and illustrations, could then be concurrently worked up by the Agency's creative staff.

Subsection (3): This change will permit members of advisory committees, and of the advisory commissions, established under Public Law 402, to receive $15 per day, instead of the $10 currently paid them, to defray their expenses when they travel away from home to attend meetings or to consult on activities under the act. It has become clear that $10 does not meet even minimum expenses of the committee members, who are, of course, not compensated for their services. Members of advisory groups of many other Government agencies receive $15 or more. For example, members of the advisory committees of the General Services Administration receive $25, and those advising the Defense Production Administration receive $15 per day.

This change would also affect the State Department's Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. A similar change was proposed last year in S. 1802 and had the Department's support.

Subsection (4): (a) (New sec. 801 (7)). This change will enable the Agency to employ and compensate experts and consultants for temporary periods on a basis similar to that provided for many other Government agencies. The increase in basic compensation amounts to $4.34 per day above the present maximum authorized under the law cited in the text (5 U. S. C. 55a). This permits payment at flat dollar rates rather than the present odd dollar and cents, which makes for easier bookkeeping. It also offers a somewhat more attractive monetary basis for recruiting.

(b) (New sec. 801. (8)). It has been the policy to bring selected local employees (foreign nationals) to the United States for orientation and indoctrination, and on occasion it is necessary to send aliens away from their homes or countries of residence to other countries on temporary duty. In the past there has been no provision for care in case of illness incurred while on assignment away from home. In the interests of good public relations and personnel policy, it is thought desirable that the Agency, in its discretion be authorized to provide such care.

Subsection (5): A number of situations arise in the course of the diversified operations of the Agency which require the Agency to give assurance to private parties that assistance they render to the information program will not result in loss or damage to them. For example, the Agency frequently borrows paintings and other art objects from private parties for distribution in its exhibits program. Naturally, it must give the owner assurance that in case of loss or damage he will be made whole. In its film program the Agency finds from time to time that prospective distributors and exhibitors of its films want the Agency's protection against claims by persons subsequently asserting ownership of rights in the films. This latter is an especially difficult situation because the intangible rights in motion pictures and similar properties are manifold and exceedingly complicated. It is frequently necessary for the Agency to use materials in which full rights cannot be obtained or where the exact rights acquired by the Government cannot be ascertained.

Still other situations arise during the course of the Agency's varied activities where the interests of the information program require agreements of insurance, guaranty, or indemnity, but the Agency's legal authority to assume contingent obligations of this character is not always clear. General authority to make agreements of this sort would ease a number of operating problems.

Subsection (6): At present the Information and Educational Exchange Act authorizes the Agency to transport natives of other countries, who are hired to work for the Agency, to their place of work in the United States, or in countries other than their native ones. However, the act does not permit the Agency to bear transportation expenses for dependents of these new employees. Until last year the Agency has relied upon special authority in the annual appropriation acts. But last year, for unspecified reasons, the authority was left out of the annual appropriation. As a result the Agency is presently in the difficult position of trying to hire persons native to other countries for essential positions in the United States without being able to pay the expenses of transporting their families to the United States.

Section 2: (a) The authority set out in the proposed new section 1012 for the settlement of claims abroad is patterned on the authority presently available to the armed services (31 USC 224 (d)). Heretofore the United States Information Agency has relied upon language in its appropriation acts authorizing settlement of claims arising out of torts occurring in other countries in accordance with the domestic tort claims law. The domestic law (28 USC 2672) authorizes only the settlement of claims for which the United States, if a private party, would have been liable under the law of the place where the tort occurred. This limitation makes the law difficult to apply abroad because of the great variation in notions of legal liability among different countries abroad, whose legal systems differ widely from the common-law system in the United States. As a result the Agency has not been able to settle several claims which technically did not create a legal liability but which did create substantial inequity.

In view of the nature of United States Information Agency operations and its special duty to create the best relations for the United States among foreign peoples, it is important that the Agency be able to settle and pay just claims of foreign nationals arising out of the actions of the Agency's agents and employees. Under the circumstances it is believed that the more flexible authority available to the military service should be incorporated in our basic law. The provision is by its terms applicable to the State Department as well, and has the support of the Department.

(b) The proposed section 1013 will enable the Agency to make needed improvements in the overseas personnel system of the United States Information Service. The Director is authorized to appoint officers, to be known as United States Information Officers, who will have permanent tenure except as separation or retirement is provided for in the proposed section or in other laws. United States Information Officers will be selected, appointed, promoted, and separated in accordance with published regulations prescribed by the Director. All appointees will serve for probationary periods before they acquire permanent tenure. The proposed section explicitly requires that appointment, promotion, and retention shall be on the basis of merit and fitness so that all persons will be assured equal treatment and opportunity. During the first few years after the enactment of the legislation, entry will be permitted above the minimum grade in order to expedite the establishment of the United States Information Service. Thereafter, it is planned generally to recruit new personnel at the bottom grade, on the basis of examinations open to the public, and provide opportunities for them to advance steadily to more responsible positions. Appointments will be made at higher grades only when necessary to secure qualified individuals.

Those provisions of the Foreign Service Act and of other laws and regulations which are applicable to Foreign Service Reserve Officers appointed by the Director under Reorganization Plan No. 8, are made applicable to United States Information Officers, except for the limitations of time contained in sections 522 and 527 of the Foreign Service Act. This Agency will also continue to utilize authority presently available to it to appoint Foreign Service Reserve and Staff Officers as needed.

Subsection (b) authorizes the separation of United States Information Officers for unsatisfactory performance of duty. In order to give assurance that any such separation will be made with a scrupulous regard for their rights and their previous public service, it is provided that separation for unsatisfactory performance will be made only after a review by an advisory board appointed by the Director to consider the case. Prior to final decision an officer charged with unsatisfactory performance may request a hearing before the board. He will have the right at the hearing to present evidence in his own behalf, to examine into the charges against him, to be attended by counsel, and generally to avail himself of the protections of legal procedures customarily attending hearings into serious charges.

The Agency also needs authority to separate those officers who are judged over a period of time to be substantially less useful to the United States Information Service than their colleagues. The proposed legislation therefore requires periodic appraisal of all United States Information officers and permits separation of those who, over a period of years, consistently rank below a minimum rating prescribed for their class by Agency regulation. It is contemplated that such appraisal will be made at least annually on a basis which will rank officers in each class from the highest to the lowest. Appraisal will be made, probably by a panel of high-ranking fellow officers designated by the Director, according to a regular procedure established by Agency regulation. For example, the regulations may provide that those officers who are rated in the lowest 10 percent of their classes for any 3 out of 5 years, may be separated. This selection-out process will permit continuous opportunities for promotion and entry at the bottom, and will provide the necessary environment for the continuous development of able officers. It is believed that this approach will achieve better results than a selection-out procedure which requires separation of officers regardless of their ability or the needs of the United States Information Service after they have passed a fixed number of years in their class without promotion.

The proposed section also provides authority to establish a retirement and disability system for United States Information officers paralleling that established for the Foreign Service Officer Corps by the Foreign Service Act. Conditions of service and employment in the United States Information Service are almost identical to those in the Foreign Service of the Department of State, with whom United States Information officers will be serving, side by side, in diplomatic and consular missions all over the world. United States Information officers, like Foreign Service officers, will be selected, promoted, and retained on the basis of merit. They will be subject to assignment and service anywhere in the world, including posts of extreme hardship, at any time. Generally speaking, they will have to work up from bottom to top. They face the possibility of separation in midcareer for unsatisfactory performance or failure to live up to the standards of a highly competent group of men. Because service and employment requirements will be almost identical, it seems clear that officers should receive the same retirement benefits available to Foreign Service officers. Sections 633 and 634 of the Foreign Service Act provide benefits to Foreign Service officers selected out by the Department of State, and section 637 provides benefits to Foreign Service officers separated for unsatisfactory performance of duty. The section authorizes the same benefits to United States Information officers who are separated for similar reasons.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, RELATING TO THE RETURN OF CERTAIN PROPERTY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIBLE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 854) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND RESEARCH FACILITIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 1323) to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical, educational, and research facilities, which was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on behalf of himself and 12 other Senators, and which I had the honor to cosponsor. These amendments would provide Federal grants for the construction and expansion of dental-school facilities.

I am convinced that it is in the public interest to extend the bill so as to make dental schools eligible for such grants.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter, dated May 23, addressed to me by Dr. Henry E. Colby, president of the Minnesota State Dental Association, supporting the amendment and urging a Federal grant program for dental schools.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA STATE DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 23, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On behalf of the Minnesota State Dental Association I solicit your support of Federal grants for the construction and expansion of dental-school facilities. Senate bill 1323 does not now make dental schools eligible for such grants and we believe it would be in the public interest that they be included in the provisions of this bill. We emphasize the following reasons for asking your support:

1. The funds presently available to maintain and expand dental-school facilities are not nearly adequate to meet even short-term requirements.

2. To encourage increase in dental-school enrollment during the next 5 years so that the number of graduating dentists will keep pace with dental-health needs, requires that at least $100 million be invested in our dental schools for new construction and expansion.

3. A 5-year Federal-grant program involving $50 million as recommended by the American Dental Association will stimulate States and private revenue sources to supply the necessary matching funds to meet financial requirements of the dental schools over the 5-year term.

4. Of the approximately 7,000 qualified persons applying for admittance to dental schools this year, only some 3,300 could be accepted on present capacities.

5. The needed increase of dental services can be met by increasing the number of dental graduates and dental-hygiene graduates. This can only be accomplished by obtaining the financial aid requested for new dental schools and expansion of present facilities.

We will appreciate your consideration and support.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY E. COLBY, D. D. S.,
President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend to the attention of the Senate the arguments used by Dr. Colby. Dental schools are today operating under serious financial shortages. In order for the dental schools to produce for the American society enough graduate dentists to keep pace with dental health needs of this Nation, it is estimated that the dental schools will require $100 million for new construction and expansion. Funds presently available are hardly adequate to meet even short-term requirements.

The American Dental Association has proposed a 5-year Federal program involving $50 million. I agree fully with the premise of that proposal that such a program would stimulate States and private revenue sources so as to supply the necessary matching funds to meet our Nation's dental needs. It is most unfortunate that of the approximately 7,000 applying for admittance to dental schools this year only some 3,300 could be accepted in the light of the present capacities in the schools.

We need more dentists and more dental hygienists graduates. My amendments are designed to accomplish that purpose.

I present the amendments, and ask that they be appropriately referred and printed.

There being no objection, the amendments were received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] be excused as a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be appointed in his stead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by Senator SPARKMAN before the Institute for International Order in celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, on June 24, 1955.

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address which I delivered last night at Huntington, W. Va., at a Fourth of July celebration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, on July 4, 1776, our forebears, with great personal risk, declared the Thirteen Colonies to be free and independent States, and proclaimed:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Just before the signatures were attached, the charter of our liberty states "and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

What a sharp contrast to the doctrine of hate and oppression of Marxian communism, the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

America still represents the authentic revolution where government is and should remain the servant and not the master of the people.

Marxian communism of the far left and fascism of the far right are both totalitarian in character and the negation of everything for which our Declaration of Independence and Constitution stand.

At a later period in our history Abraham Lincoln stated that this Nation could not remain half slave and half free.

In the day and age in which we live there is doubt that the world can continue half slave and half free.

Our objective in foreign policy is peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

We would hope for all mankind that in our lifetime or that of our children the nations of the Western Hemisphere, of Europe, Africa, and Asia might live together as good neighbors as we do with our great neighbor of Canada to the north.

For a long period of our history we have had a common international frontier stretching 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific without a single military post or fortification on either side for the purpose of protecting one of our countries from invasion by the other.

However, in the world in which we now live we must recognize the fact that all nations are not as civilized or as peace loving as are Canada and the United States of America.

Like the early pioneers who first established our country and then moved out to the West we should, of course, continue to work, hope, and pray for peace with honor, but we should also keep our powder dry.

In the last 10 years great advances have been made by the Communist world.

In 1945 there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom. Millions have been liquidated or work in slave-labor camps.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

I do not believe the men in the Kremlin have changed their long-term strategy of ultimately having a Communist world. They continue to follow the doctrine that, in order to achieve their ends, anything is allowable, including deception and assassination.

We must face up to the fact that to date the Communist concept of peaceful coexistence means that the United States or other free nations of the world will be allowed to exist only until communism is able to subvert them from within or destroy them by aggression from without.

It is the type of peaceful coexistence that the turkey has, well fed and housed, until the axe falls before the holiday season.

It remains my belief that the Soviet Union is advancing the Trojan horse of coexistence only for the purpose of gaining sufficient time to accomplish what we may term "atomic stalemate." When would they hope to accomplish this objective? The target date is probably between 1957 and 1960.

In the meantime, they will strive to neutralize potential allies and if possible to divide, destroy, or paralyze the Western alliance.

If we are to survive as part of a free world of free men this they must not be allowed to do.

Some believe that when that point arrives the world will have gained a stalemated peace because neither side will then dare to use or threaten to use its atomic or conventional power against the other. At that point, so the reasoning runs, the two great world powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, will checkmate and immobilize each other and a sort of troubled peace will settle down over the balance of the world.

Let us examine the possibility then of even a troubled peace. It is more likely that at that point, if the free world should allow itself to become paralyzed and immobilized, that the men in the Kremlin will see their best opportunity to start with what for the want of a better term I will call Operation Nibbling, wherein they will seek to take over the peripheral nations bite by bite.

Then, through the capitals of what remain of our anxious allies and with loud voices from the neutralists, as well as from sources in our own country, will rise the anguished cry, "Should we risk all-out atomic war for Iran, Sweden, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, India, Finland, Burma, and so forth?" "For after all," the argument will run, "we have no treaty obligations to them." Then the Soviet Union and Communist China will start down through our smaller allies first to soften us up. These will not all be nibbled at once, but will be spaced out so that as each country passes behind the Iron Curtain, it will increase the despair of the other victims and the paralysis of the nations which might be willing to resist.

Since stalemate would put the Soviet Union itself off limits, the intended victim of the aggression could only look forward to a localized war within their own frontiers with the destruction of life and property that would entail. Since there would be no hope of restraining this new type of Soviet aggression by placing the body of the octopus in danger, these nations individually, one by one, might prefer to accept Communist terms rather than even call on the West for aid.

Before our eyes the people of the United States would see nation after nation nibbled away and when the realization finally dawned that this policy would inevitably result in our country becoming a continental Dien Bien Phu in a Communist totalitarian world, the chances of our winning such a struggle would be so lessened and the Soviet world so extended that they then would be prepared for an all-out challenge to us wherein we would be allowed the choice to surrender or die.

Americans have faced tough decisions in the past and have measured up to every challenge.

Without this quality of courage, commonsense and belief in divine guidance we would not have settled on these shores, achieved our independence, preserved the Union, won the West or grown to be a world power.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) mutual defense pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the Formosa resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific.

The Soviet Union is now engaged in a series of diplomatic moves of far-reaching consequences.

Their apparent objective is to build a neutral block of nations between the Soviet Union and its satellites and the free Western World.

This effort is primarily directed toward the neutralization of nations which have had close ties with the West.

They also seek to outlaw the use of the atomic weapon without providing a satisfactory inspection system, and the proposal for checking upon conventional armaments is based on the model of the Korean Neutral Nations Commission which has been a dismal failure.

For the purpose of exploring the areas of tension in the world, the Government of the United States has agreed to a Big Four meeting "at the summit." This gathering, which will take place 2 weeks from today, is exploratory in character. Its purpose, at least as far as we are concerned, is to find or define areas of tension and leave to later meetings of the foreign ministers, of ambassadors or to the United Nations the recommendation for solutions if such can be found.

Certainly at this first Big Four meeting which President Eisenhower will attend as Chief Executive of our country, he will go with the prayers and hopes of our people that a just and durable peace may eventually be found based on human freedom, justice, and honorable dealings among nations.

The President and the Secretary of State are fully cognizant of the fact that the Soviet Union has violated an overwhelming majority of the treaties and agreements it has entered into during the past quarter of a century.

The once free people of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria can all give conclusive testimony in that regard.

Certainly a practical question must be faced if 50 out of 52 past agreements and treaties have been broken, what good is the signature on another one? Will it also be a "mere scrap of paper?"

An effort will be made by the Soviet Union to bring Communist China into the United Nations. The Chinese Communists were the aggressors in Korea; they inflicted 140,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead; they are now in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice; they admit holding 11 of our airmen, 35 of our civilians and there is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred others.

I am opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

Until the people of Eastern Europe who have lost their freedom through no fault of their own have an opportunity of electing their own governments by free elections under the supervision of the United Nations or of the Big Four powers, there can be no real release of tensions in that area of the world.

How can there be an effective release of tensions, when for over three decades it has been the policy of the men who rule the Kremlin to subvert governments all over the world and to bring the people of other nations under Communist control. A test of Soviet intentions for a just and durable peace would be the renunciation of the worldwide revolutionary aims of Marxian communism. The act would have to be more effective than that which took place when they changed the name of their worldwide revolutionary agency from the Comintern to the Cominform which was merely doing business at the same old stand under a nom de plume.

The question of a free and united Germany in contrast with a divided country on the Korean and Vietnam pattern is also of major importance.

Our representatives will be fully alive to their responsibility, under our Constitution, to the American Congress, to the American people, and to history.

There may be some who will attempt to sell the conference some shoddy merchandise in gilt wrappings. They may suggest that the territory and the people of free nations not represented should be bartered in order to gain a signature to some agreement. I have a deep conviction that our representatives there will not succumb to such blandishments or contribute their moral or legal endorsement to the enslavement of more people behind the Iron Curtain.

We may well be at one of the great crossroads of history.

Prior to the signing of the document the 179th anniversary of which we celebrate today, Patrick Henry, an American from a neighboring State, said:

"Is life so sweet and peace so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I care not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

As an American citizen and a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if this generation of Americans will use the same courage and commonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and, under what I believe was divine inspiration, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States, there are none of our great domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

PAYMENTS MADE AND AMOUNTS DUE TO SUBSIDIZE MARINE OPERATORS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report which I received from the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce showing the payments made and amounts due each subsidized operator for the period January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments made and amounts due each subsidized operator [1] for the period Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1955

	Estimated cumulative subsidy accrual	Estimated cumulative recapture	Estimated cumulative subsidy payable	Paid through June 30, 1954	Paid from July 1, 1954, to May 1, 1955	Vouchers on hand and in process	Total paid from Jan. 1, 1947, through May 11, 1955	Unliquidated obligations as of June 30, 1955
American Export Lines, Inc	$65, 623, 793	------	$65, 623, 793	$26, 880, 270	$10, 154, 442	$6, 961, 301	$43, 996, 013	$21, 627, 780
American Mail Line, Ltd	18, 671, 752	$4, 030, 863	14, 640, 889	7, 289, 309	2, 038, 659	1, 472, 908	10, 800, 876	3, 840, 013
American President Lines, Ltd	63 949, 354	8, 559, 847	55, 389, 507	29, 384, 696	9, 422, 961	4, 176, 103	42, 983, 760	12, 405, 747
Bloomfield Steamship Co	1, 409, 952	------	1, 409, 952	------	311, 622	183, 399	495, 021	914, 931
Farrell Lines, Inc	28, 109, 168	------	28, 109, 168	14, 941, 076	3, 592, 909	1, 981, 413	20, 515, 398	7, 593, 770
Grace Line, Inc	41, 755, 912	9, 969, 204	31, 786, 708	16, 108, 340	4, 019, 857	2, 903, 927	23, 032, 124	8, 754, 584
Gulf and South American Steamship Co	1, 271, 320	------	1, 271, 320	------	36, 625	270, 458	307, 083	964, 237
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	62, 790, 987	27, 611, 160	35, 179, 827	10, 353, 039	9, 001, 951	6, 175, 406	25, 530, 396	9, 649, 431
Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	25, 436, 380	4, 156, 195	21, 280, 185	12, 498, 437	2, 137, 092	1, 757, 352	16, 392, 881	4, 887, 304
Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	74, 844, 852	14, 704, 601	60, 140, 251	32, 299, 137	8, 703, 902	5, 369, 310	46, 372, 349	13, 767, 902
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.[2]	5, 680, 730	------	5, 680, 730	3, 894, 918	739, 047	------	4, 633, 965	1, 046, 765
The Oceanic Steamship Co	6, 176, 329	------	6, 176, 329	3, 242, 404	728, 870	562, 431	4, 533, 705	1, 642, 624
Pacific Argentine Brazil Line, Inc	5, 929, 490	------	5, 929, 490	2, 755, 023	363, 158	987, 713	4, 105, 894	1, 823, 596
Pacific Far East Line, Inc	5, 417, 363	968, 459	4, 448, 904	1, 105, 373	929, 623	953, 163	2, 988, 159	1, 460, 745
Pacific Transport Lines, Inc	3, 307, 470	735, 326	2, 572, 144	518, 895	619, 591	732, 766	1, 871, 252	700, 892
Seas Shipping Co., Inc	18, 003, 554	430, 982	17, 572, 572	8, 591, 993	2, 247, 443	1, 112, 600	11, 952, 036	5, 620, 536
United States Lines Co	101, 711, 919	24, 082, 438	77, 629, 481	39, 254, 753	10, 185, 183	8, 864, 979	58, 304, 915	19, 324, 566
Pending applications	6, 040, 361	267, 142	5, 773, 219	------	------	------	------	5, 773, 219
Total	536, 130, 686	95, 516, 217	440, 614, 469	209, 117, 663	65, 232, 935	44, 465, 229	318, 815, 827	121, 798, 642
Cash on hand as of May 11, 1955	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	[3]—5, 719, 776
Total	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	116, 078, 866

[1] On the basis of subsidy accrued as estimated in fiscal year 1956 budget.

[2] Contract terminated Dec. 31, 1953.

[3] To be expended prior to June 30, 1955, on basis of 20 percent of 1st quarter calendar year 1955 vouchers from each operator.

THE GREAT AMERICAN HERITAGE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, recently there was published a book entitled "The Great American Heritage." Its author, Bela Kornitzer, is a native of Hungary, where he was prominent as a writer and in the affairs of government. In 1946 he was forced to flee the Communist tyranny of Hungary, and, by special act of the Congress, he became a citizen of the United States.

The book is the interesting and inspiring story of the five Eisenhower brothers—Arthur, Edgar, Dwight, Earl, and Milton—and of the late Roy J. Eisenhower. It is especially the story of two wonderful parents, David and Ida Eisenhower. Most of all, it is the story of American family life at its best.

In referring to his book, Mr. Kornitzer has stated:

> The book, although it has the Eisenhower name emblazoned on its cover, is a nonpolitical biography and intends to convey an accurate estimate of the lives of an American family. I have not aimed to center my interests on Dwight D. Eisenhower, as President of the United States; instead, I portrayed the lives of the five Eisenhower brothers of Abilene, Kans., with emphasis on their religious background and on the homely virtues which dominated this Midwestern American family.
>
> Being a political exile from communism, I pray that the spirit of democracy, liberty, and freedom—under which members of this average American family rose to success—will reach the American people and make them conscious of the intangible values of democracy which are not appreciated as fully as they should be.

This book has received much favorable comment by way of book reviews and editorials. Perhaps the most pertinent and effective presentation of this nature appears as an editorial in the June 26, 1955, issue of the New York Sunday News; and I ask that the text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL THE BROTHERS ARE VALIANT

Suppose you were the parents of six boys. How would you go about bringing them up so that one of them would become a President of the United States and the others successful, popular and respected men in their various occupations?

There isn't any surefire formula, of course. But here is the story, in outline, of how 1 pair of parents of 6 boys (5 still living) turned the trick.

They settled in a small Kansas town, on what is known in such places as the wrong side of the railroad tracks.

Both parents were genuinely religious. What church they belonged to is immaterial. The important facts in this part of the story are that they practiced their religion 7 days a week, 12 months a year; were thoroughly familiar with the Bible and saw to it that their sons became so; and were neither bigoted nor holier-than-thou.

Discipline in this home was firm but invariably fair.

The boys were encouraged to make what money they could, from the moment they were old enough to make any. It was okay for them to fight any kid who insulted them—though pappy was visibly unhappy when one of his youngsters lost a fight.

"THE END OF A PERFECT DAY"

There was a lot of fun in this family. The general principle under that head was: Work hard when you work, play hard when you play.

The emphasis throughout the six boys' growing-up years was on courage, industry, initiative, faith, hope, charity.

Among the many grateful memories all the brothers carried into adult life was that the parents never tried to choose their sons' trades or professions for them. Their attitude was: "You do what you want to do to make a living, and we'll back you up if and as we can."

After many years, the father neared his last roundup, so to speak. Between him and one of the sons, there occurred the conversation printed below. Somehow, it reminds us of the old song, The End of a Perfect Day.

"Did your father ever talk to you about the disposition of his estate?" I asked Edgar.

"When I last saw Dad in Abilene, he was not feeling well," Edgar replied. "He was lying in bed. When I saw his condition, I said, 'Why, Dad, what is the matter?' And he said to me, 'Well, Edgar, I got something that has been bothering me for a long time.'

"He said, 'You know, I am not going to leave you boys anything.' He said, 'This sort of breaks my heart.'

"I said to him, 'Dad, you probably don't appreciate what you are leaving us. You are leaving us, in my opinion, a very great heritage. We have all got good, clean, healthy bodies; we have all got good, clean, healthy minds and we have all got a very deep appreciation and affection for the inheritance which we already have enjoyed from you and Mother.'

"And he said, 'Yes, but Edgar, I don't like the fact that there just isn't any money that I can leave to you boys.'

"I said, 'Dad, look. I happen to sit on a number of directors' boards in Tacoma, Wash., and, to me, one of the greatest satisfactions I get as a director is when it comes to issuing dividends to the stockholders because this indicates to them that we have managed their business successfully. Now, did you ever stop to consider that you have made an investment in six boys and that those boys are now paying dividends and each of the boys, whenever he can contribute anything to your comfort and to your welfare, is only showing that he has managed the things that you have given him so that he is in a position now to pay these little things which we call dividends to you?'

"And Dad cried. The first time I ever saw him cry in my life was at that time."

In case you haven't already guessed it, we've been discussing President Dwight David Eisenhower and his brothers—Arthur, Edgar, Roy (died 1942), Earl, Milton—and their magnificent parents, David J. and Ida Stover Eisenhower.

The above editorial is based, with heartfelt thanks, on a new and we think splendid book, The Great American Heritage—The Story of the Five Eisenhower Brothers, by Bela Kornitzer; Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, New York; 331 pages, 6 pen portraits by the author, 60 photographs; $5.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Hells Canyon is a worse blot on the record of the administration than is Dixon-Yates. Dixon-Yates involves financial manipulation. Hells Canyon involves the disposal of a priceless natural resource belonging to the American people.

Inasmuch as the President of the United States has promised he will take a second look at Dixon-Yates, I plead with him to take a second look at Hells Canyon.

Once the Hells Canyon power site is given to the Idaho Power Co., the decision is irreversible. It endures for decades to come. Hells Canyon is the finest natural power site on our continent. It should be the location for a great Federal dam in the pattern of Grand Coulee, Bonneville and Hoover Dam. Such a dam would generate 686,000 kilowatts at the site, and its vast reservoir would add 436,000 kilowatts to the output of plants further downstream.

Yet a Federal Power Commission examiner has recommended that the Idaho Power Co. be allowed to construct, in the Hells Canyon Reservoir area, a project known as Brownlee Dam, producing 221,000 kilowatts of firm power. Thus, we would be swapping a 1,122,000-kilowatt horse for a 221,000-kilowatt rabbit. Is this fair to future generations of Americans?

Half a century ago, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot fought and won a fight to create our national forest reserves; thus they set aside Hells Canyon for the American public. Why surrender this magnificent site to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation with its roots in distant Augusta, Maine?

Even if Dixon-Yates were authorized—which I trust will not occur—it might be undone at some distant time. But the relinquishment of Hells Canyon will be permanent. Once the Idaho Power Co. erects its low dam, the high dam is an impossibility—just as Grand Coulee Dam would have been an impossibility, if the Washington Water Power Co. had secured permission for a low-head dam in that reservoir area during the 1920's.

I plead with our distinguished President not to let his administration go down in history tarnished for countless decades with the deed now contemplated at Hells Canyon. A second look on the part of Dwight D. Eisenhower is called for at Hells Canyon—and quickly.

RUSSIA'S NEED OF A PEACEFUL WORLD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently one of the acknowledged great newspapermen of the United States, Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, completed his fifth visit to the Soviet Union in the past 30 years.

On Sunday Mr. Brandt wrote an article entitled "Russia Needs a Peaceful World—An Opportunity for West at Geneva." The last portion of this article reads in part as follows:

> They (the Soviet Communists) have made some concessions from their previous stands on reduction of conventional arms. The Supreme Soviet has officially proposed exchanges of parliamentary delegations. They welcome the exchange of cultural, educational, editorial, farm, and sports groups.
>
> The United States, principally as spokesman for the Western Powers, can take advantage of the present Russian situation by bringing to Geneva agreed-upon concrete proposals to match the Russian peace program. Long negotiations may be required for permanent results, after some common grounds for discussions have been reached for achieving an eventual peace with freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the body of the Record. I am certain it is an article which will be of real interest to Members of the Congress. I also hope the article will be read carefully by those who plan to represent the United States at Geneva.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Russia Needs a Peaceful World—An Opportunity for West at Geneva—Correspondent Summarizes His Impressions of 30-Day Stay in Soviet Union—Notes Real Changes, Also Some Signs of Economic Strain—Summit Meeting Will Show How Far Reds Will Go Toward Peace

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

Berlin, July 2.—The shift toward peace negotiations by the new collective leadership in the Kremlin opens a challenging opportunity for President Eisenhower at the Big Four summit meeting in Geneva this month. After my 30-day stay in Soviet Russia, preceded by talks with diplomats and correspondents in Stockholm and Helsinki and followed by similar talks in Berlin, the overall impression is that Russia, its satellites—and the relatively inexperienced leaders—need and seek a peaceful world.

The Geneva meetings will show how far Prime Minister Bulganin, as spokesman for the new leaders, is willing to shift Soviet strategy and Communist tactics to attain that end. They will also show how far President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, as principal spokesmen for the West and the free Asian nations, will agree to ways and means for relaxing the hostile and frequently war-endangering relations with Russia which began when the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917.

Prime Ministers Eden, of the United Kingdom, and Faure, of France, have indicated that they and their governments are willing to go further to meet the Russians than are the White House, the Congress, and a great many of the American people. Whatever is agreed to by the United States at Geneva as an approach to settling concrete problems later is likely to be accepted by other independent nations. Russia will have no trouble with its satellites. It may have to consult with the Red Chinese leaders.

Other impressions are of greatly relaxed relations between Russians and foreigners and the obviously directed campaign to try to win friends and influence people, including American visitors; the extensive construction everywhere, especially large apartments, and, to a lesser extent, small suburban homes, which must be easing the terrible housing shortages in the overcrowded cities; better clothing but still extremely shoddy and ersatz by Western standards; the happier attitude of people seen on the streets and at large gatherings; evidences of inflation and an apparent desire to spend money as soon as possible; women, young and old, still doing the dirty pick-and-shovel work in city and country; the low quality and poor workmanship, in Western eyes, of the consumer and semidurable goods; the debasing of Yalta as an overcrowded health resort on the Black Sea; the city planning being followed in Moscow and other cities, particularly Stalingrad and Rostov, and the mediocre appearance of the present government and party leaders.

Every diplomat and permanent correspondent with whom I talked commented on the change to a friendly attitude by governmental officials. Ordinary people still remain aloof from foreigners but I did not encounter the hostility prevalent in 1937, the time of the purge trials. Qualified observers attributed the change to the passing of Stalin and the inexperience and perhaps the lack of self-confidence of the new leaders.

To understand the present situation, it is desirable to summarize Stalin's career and to speculate on what the current Kremlin crowd may do. The death of Stalin in March 1953 and the intervening rule by the current seemingly headless Kremlin team have made a marked change in Russian life, as I have periodically seen it at first hand over the past 33 years, and may give the Western Powers their best chance ever of successful negotiations for something beyond mere coexistence. Completely harmonious international relations must be a distant goal from any realistic appraisal of Communist ideology and practice.

Persons who have not visited Russia will find it difficult to picture how Stalin was and is regarded or revered by the lowest to the highest Russians. His deep and pervading influence from the time of Lenin's death in 1924 has been far greater than that of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the United States or Sir Winston Churchill on the British Commonwealth and Empire.

He was a ruthless dictator, a political killer who permitted no opposition to himself or his plans. He dominated everything in the Communist world—the party, the government, the economy, the secret police and the propaganda. He more than held his own in the negotiations with Roosevelt and Churchill at Teheran and Yalta and with Truman, Churchill, and Attlee at Potsdam. His pictures and statues, together with those of Lenin, are everywhere throughout the Soviet Union. He is the reputed author of many books and of the 1936 constitution.

He was, in fact, the law, and he let nobody forget it. Even today his benign portraits, usually in his marshal's uniform, look down from the walls of hundreds of thousands of offices and homes. He was and to some extent still is Big Brother of George Orwell's novel, 1984. He trained no successor, either as head of the state or as head of the party, and not even the closest foreign observers of Russian affairs predicted that Malenkov would be chosen Prime Minister by the other party leaders. Khrushchev was named First Secretary of the All-Union Communist Party.

Malenkov counted on popular favor by reducing consumer-goods prices, emphasizing light industries production and relaxing payments by the farmers. The tipoff that there was not to be another dictator in the near future came when Beria, head of the secret police under Stalin and later named a Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, or cabinet, was charged with treason, together with 6 aides, in July 1953, and executed 5 months later.

In March this year, Malenkov was deposed as Prime Minister, after Khrushchev had made a bitter attack on him and his consumer-goods-light-industries program. Marshal Bulganin, a political not a military leader, was selected to succeed Malenkov, on nomination by Khrushchev. Marshal Zhukov, a wartime hero, was named to succeed Bulganin as Defense Minister. At the time, it looked as though Khrushchev was the man above the scene manipulating the puppets.

Foreign diplomats, whose business it is to know who are the real powers, frankly admit they don't know who is the strongest man in the present setup. They deduce or guess that the major decisions are group affairs and cautiously predict they will be reached that way in the immediate future. Some think a totalitarian government and economy cannot be ruled by a team and that eventually another dictator, but not another Lenin or Stalin, will come out on top. None will predict who that dictator will be.

I saw Stalin only at a distance at a Moscow Red Square celebration in 1937 and like most other visitors have seen his embalmed body alongside that of Lenin in the red granite tomb outside the Kremlin wall. His face still fits the conception of Big Brother.

On this trip, I saw all the highest leaders at close hand. Only Bulganin had the dignified bearing associated with the premiership. He dresses conservatively and the times I watched him he appeared to be in command, smilingly directing others what to do.

Khrushchev, with his ill-fitting clothes, his shaved head, gaudy necktie, and boisterous manner, looked more like a city alderman of the old days than the efficient director of international communism. Persistent and well-founded reports of his heavy drinking are hurting his international reputation. They are not mentioned, of course, in the Russian press.

In a Kiev motion-picture house when a newsreel of the Belgrade Conference with Tito of Yugoslavia was shown there was a scene of Khrushchev waddling across the street to catch up with the delegation. A titter went through the audience. When I asked my interpreter why the audience had reacted so, was it because they recognized their former Ukrainian leader or because of his walk, he insisted he had heard no titter or subdued laughter. Foreign diplomats in Moscow said they had no report of such a thing happening there. A big-shot politician or a prospective dictator can't afford to have people laughing at him.

Malenkov, with his inscrutable round, pale, pudgy face, with a lock of black hair coming over his right forehead, is still the mystery man. There is something cruel looking and determined in his eyes, offset by a weak mouth. One diplomat found no takers for a small wager that he would again be Prime Minister. He might try to be a dictator and even his face could be idealized if he got control of the propaganda apparatus and he could rebuild the new deemphasized security police.

One Western European diplomat claimed he had predicted Malenkov would not last as Prime Minister because he was not "esthetically" fitted for the role. Well, Hitler was no esthetic bargain.

The two present leaders with the sharpest looking faces and best reputations as administrators are Mikoyan and Kaganovich. Both, however, are in their sixties and the first is an Armenian and the second a Jew. Although Communist propaganda boasts that there is no racial discrimination in Russia, their chances of becoming Prime Minister or party boss are heavily discounted by competent observers. I recall that in 1923, during persistent rumors of Lenin's failing health, there was speculation on his successor. The Russians with whom I could then associate asserted that Trotsky had no chance because he was a Jew, that the time had not yet arrived when the Russians would accept a Jewish ruler. In that year Stalin was virtually unknown to the masses. Later he was built up as Lenin's most valued friend and adviser.

Molotov, who was an intimate of Lenin and Stalin, is in his late sixties and is no Churchill or Baruch for rugged health. He is markedly showing his age and speculation has begun as to his successor as Foreign Minister, with no diplomat courageous or reckless enough to make a firm prediction. Mikoyan, who has had international experience, is frequently mentioned. Younger and ambitious men are in the background who undoubtedly will come to the forefront as the years pass and the domestic and international situation, now in a state of flux, are more defined.

In 1931, after a 6,000-mile tour of the country, I wrote a series called Russia in Transition, a fitting title in the middle of Stalin's 5-year program but even more appropriate today when the Kremlin appears to have modified its aggressively communistic tactics and is conducting propaganda campaigns at home and abroad for peace on Soviet terms. Whether this is a turning point in Soviet history no outsider can say.

From the evidence at hand, it does not look as though the present leadership will go back to Stalin's ruthless domestic dictatorship and double-dealing abroad.

The purposes of the international campaign are apparent. They are to divide and confuse the Western allies, to get the United States Armed Forces out of Europe and Asia, and, above all, to bar the use of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. A special objective is an unarmed, neutral Germany. The Kremlin's determination to pursue these purposes can perhaps be measured at Geneva.

The equally intense domestic campaign is less comprehensible to outsiders. It could have two major purposes: First, to convince the Russian masses that if there is war it will be an aggressive attack by capitalistic America on peace-loving Russia; second, to overcome the belief of the masses there is no use working hard to develop the country when it might be overrun again as it was by the Germans. Whatever the purpose or purposes, the campaign is in full force and if agreements are reached at Geneva and subsequent conferences, the Russian people will welcome them.

Peace posters and slogans are everywhere—along the country roads, in plants, on state and collective farms, in the parks, and in the dirty streets.

On returning from a collective farm to the center of Rostov, the vice chairman of the regional agricultural planning commission remarked that when he returned from the war, this part of the city had been completely leveled. He was proud of the postwar buildings and park and observed, "That is why we want peace. Every family in Russia suffered from the war. We must have peace to continue our work."

I assured him Americans wanted peace as much as the Russians but if there was an atomic or hydrogen war not much would be left of the world. He grimly replied, "We must have peace."

Throughout the trip, from Leningrad to Yalta, new construction was going on everywhere, not as much as in the United States and Western Germany but more than in England, France, Holland, and Belgium.

Eastern Germany was stripped of many of its heavy industries to help Russia and reportedly the same process has been going on to a lesser degree in the other desperate shortages and is not keeping pace in food and consumer goods with its rapidly growing population.

Military expenditures are taking a far greater part of the national revenue than the country's economy can afford and the evidences of growing inflation—a word the Russian censor will not pass—are seen by the most casual visitors to free markets, city shops, and department stores. The government has already tried to drain off consumer purchasing power by increasing the "voluntary" buying of state securities. Workers were said to be "unanimous" in accepting this increase.

A few diplomats hazard the guess that the Russian economy is breaking down under the pressure of armament costs and the outlays for the heavy industry. Others dispute this, pointing out that in a totalitarian state, with a planned economy, there are many ways in which a dictatorship can keep a country running. The citations are Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany.

Although the Kremlin, in its domestic and international peace propaganda, derides or sneers at the Western arguments for negotiations from "positions of strength," the new leadership is doing its utmost to weaken the West and to strengthen Russia's own positions as an individual nation and as the controller of a satellite empire, with allies like Mao Tze-tung's China and friends like Nehru's India. To these ends the new leadership humbled itself at the Belgrade conference and courted Nehru with flattering celebrations unlike anything seen before in Communist Russia. It will be interesting to watch what blandishments and promises it uses on Adenauer when the West German Chancellor goes to Moscow.

By the Warsaw Treaty the Kremlin began formally building a Soviet hegemony which, beyond mutual military assistance, could create a ruble currency bloc comparable to the sterling and dollar blocs. As a self-supporting empire it would need only tropical products, nonferrous metals, rubber, foods, and fibers. That is why India, Indochina, and Indonesia will be so important in the coming years.

The Soviet Union is still a vast, incomprehensible, backward, undeveloped country whose 200 million population need Western know-how and Far Eastern raw materials. Quantitatively, its per capita output is about one-third that of the United States and qualitatively the spread is much wider. There are signs that the present leaders, less communistically doctrinaire than Stalin, are hoping to make deals with the West and the so-called "neutrals" to improve this situation. Within Russia today, I was told by my young interpreter, a Communist if not actually a party member, that the local party meetings are devoted to the necessity for increasing efficiency, reducing the number of bureaucratic conferences and cutting down correspondence rather than to the inculcation of communistic dogmas.

Within a totalitarian planned economy, with the forced help of the satellites and the aid of allies and friends, the Kremlin can channel the efforts and products of 200 million people for the spectacular production in special lines, such as atomic and thermonuclear projects, aircraft, and guided missiles and heavy industries necessary for defense. The country is ending its fifth 5-year program and is drafting the sixth. Even under a communistic system, which Westerners think gives inadequate personal incentives, some—even great—economic progress is inevitable.

Communist Russia had no rich economic heritage from the czaristic past comparable to what Hitler took over under the Nazi regime. East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and to some extent Hungary can supply some of the know-how the country so desperately needs if the Soviet empire is to hold its own with the Western and free Asian nations. But most of the present Russians have known no better life, and from the Communist propaganda they believe they have made sensational progress.

It is highly unlikely that the present leaders, some of whom have seen Western developments over the past 35 years, are kidding themselves by their own propaganda. The recent proposal for a world trade conference indicates they realize they need outside experts and outside products. As with their seven-point peace program they have seized the initiative and put the Western diplomats and businessmen on the defensive.

They have made some concessions from their previous stands on reduction of conventional arms. The Supreme Soviet has officially proposed exchanges of parliamentary delegations. They welcome the exchange of cultural, educational, editorial, farm, and sports groups.

* * * * *

The United States, principally as spokesmen for the Western powers, can take advantage of the present Russian situation by bringing to Geneva agreed-upon concrete proposals to match the Russian peace program. Long negotiations may be required for permanent results, after some common grounds for discussions have been reached for achieving an eventual peace with freedom.

PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN FLAG TO THE SENATE BY THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I am pleased to call the attention of Senators to the new American flag draped behind the Vice President's chair. This flag, the bronze stand, staff, and the golden eagle at its head, have been presented to the United States Senate by the Daughters of the American Revolution. It was received by the Vice President, the majority leader, and the minority leader at a ceremony held under the historic crystal chandelier and the Rembrandt Peale painting of Gen. George Washington in the Vice President's room, off the Senate lobby, on June 7, last. The presentation was made by a delegation of the members of the DAR, headed by Miss Gertrude Carraway, their president-general.

It is fitting that this new flag has been placed permanently in the Senate Chamber on the Fourth Day of July, to lend its constant inspiration to the Members of this body as the world's foremost symbol of freedom, justice, liberty, and peace.

REVERSAL OF DECISION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON IN LADEJINSKY CASE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within the limitations of the morning hours, I should like to say that I think all Members of the Senate are aware of the decision on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture over the weekend relating to the case of Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky. From time to time in the Senate I have spoken out on this particular case, charging that the Department of Agriculture security division had arrived at a conclusion which was unwarranted and unmerited.

I am happy to note today that the Secretary of Agriculture has reversed the earlier decision. In a rather extended statement, the Secretary found that on reappraisal of the case Mr. Ladejinsky was not a security risk, that the decisions which had been made by the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration favorable to Mr. Ladejinsky were sound. The Secretary has acknowledged again, for our understanding and information, that the Department of Agriculture has revised its security program. This is a long overdue reorganization—and one that has been recommended by some of us here in the Senate.

Mr. President, it is because of numerous cases like the Ladejinsky case that Members of the Senate have come to the conclusion that the entire security program needs objective study, review, reevaluation, and constructive recommendations for revision and improvement.

I am very much pleased with the reversal of the earlier decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope that Members of the Senate will feel that Mr. Ladejinsky was done a great wrong in the original decision. He is serving his country well at the present time in free Vietnam, as he served our Nation in Japan.

I should like to have the Record show that at least one Member of the Senate is appreciative of his service, and that Members of this body and of the other House have spoken out vigorously against the unfair decision which was handed down originally, which blackened Mr. Ladejinsky's character, which spread doubt over his record, and which, of course, caused him great heartache. The Government has been guilty of a gross injustice—an apology is in order.

This can be a happy day for Mr. Ladejinsky. At long last, his Government has rectified a great wrong, and the Secretary of Agriculture, in substance, has apologized for this wrong.

As one Member of the Senate, I wish to say to Mr. Ladejinsky that we are indeed sorry that he had to go through this trial, this long suffering, and emotional strain. Let one and all now know that the Government of the United States retracts any doubt or adverse reflection cast upon his character, and may he proceed in his work with the fullest and most complete confidence on the part of the Government of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have certain newspaper articles printed at this point in the body of the Record. These news reports tell the story of the retraction by the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of Mr. Ladejinsky.

There being no objection, the newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 3, 1955]

Benson Reverses Ladejinsky Stand—Clears Agriculture Expert of Security Risk Charge—Cancels Earlier Ruling

Washington, July 2.—Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, took back today his charge that Wolf Ladejinsky was a security risk.

The Secretary said he had ordered the records of the Department expunged of his finding last year that the agricultural expert had failed to meet security requirements.

Mr. Ladejinsky was dismissed last year by Mr. Benson as agricultural attaché in Tokyo, although he previously had been cleared by the State Department.

After his dismissal, Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared again by the Foreign Operations Administration and sent to southern Vietnam as a consultant on land reform problems.

In a letter to Senator Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas, Mr. Benson noted that the case had been considered "by two agencies more experienced in security than this Department," and that in both instances Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared.

EXPLAINS HIS POSITION

"I hope both the public and Mr. Ladejinsky realize that, as far as I am concerned, a security decision at a given time, either adverse or favorable, is not necessarily a decision for all of the future," Mr. Benson wrote.

He said he now felt that the Department's adverse security finding against Mr. Ladejinsky should "not continue to be permanently effective." He reported that "the memorandum record of the decision and the press release of December 22, which announced it, will both be canceled so that our records will not show Mr. Ladejinsky as a security risk."

There had been recent indications that the Secretary felt his decision in the Ladejinsky case needed review. In May he set up a permanent committee to review all security cases. In June he conceded that the press release of December 22, announcing the adverse findings, "was probably written a bit too hard" in imputing to Mr. Ladejinsky membership in "two Communist-front organizations."

CITES BETTER COORDINATION

In his letter to Mr. Carlson, ranking Republican on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. Benson said he had canceled his earlier findings after reviewing the case with his new committee. Moreover, he said, "We now have better coordination all through the Government."

The Secretary said he was convinced that the new committee appreciates the sensitive factors in dealing with security cases from the point of view of the individual as well as the Government.

His mention of better coordination apparently was a reference in part to President Eisenhower's news conference statements last February that hereafter when two department heads differed on security issues the problem would be carried to the White House for decision.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, one of the severest critics of Secretary Benson in the case, said it was very refreshing that departments of government are now seeing eye to eye.

The Minnesota Democrat is a cosponsor of a bill approved by the Senate this week, to set up a bipartisan commission to study the Federal employee security program.

Secretary Benson recalled that he had told a news conference on January 5 that reasonable and conscientious men might reach opposite conclusions in security cases.

FOCAL POINT FOR ATTACKS

The Ladejinsky case has been a focal point for attacks on the administration's employee security program since Mr. Benson's decision was announced last December.

At the time Mr. Benson said, "The fact that Mr. Ladejinsky has sisters living in the U. S. S. R. through whom he may be subject to coercion is in itself sufficient to deny the necessary clearance as an agriculturel attaché."

The Secretary also cited Mr. Ladejinsky's brief employment more than 20 years ago with the Amtorg Trading Corporation, the Russian buying facility in this country.

For these reasons and others, Mr. Benson held, he could not retain Mr. Ladejinsky in a job "which would make available to him the most highly classified documents of the United States Government."

Mr. Ladejinsky fell under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department under a new law that had transferred agricultural attachés to that agency from the State Department.

Mr. Ladejinsky, 55 years old, became a United States citizen in 1928.

He was a far-eastern specialist with the Agriculture Department from 1935 to 1950, when he went to work with the State Department in Japan; he was credited with having played a key role in shaping the postwar land reform program under General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

[From the New York Times of July 3, 1955]

TEXT OF BENSON'S LETTER

WASHINGTON, July 2.—Following is the text of the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, to Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, announcing his decision on Wolf Ladejinsky:

"I am glad for the opportunity to respond to your letter about the Wolf Ladejinsky case.

"As you will appreciate, I have given much consideration to this whole matter since the case arose last December.

"A procedure has been set up under which every adverse recommendation that comes to me is now, and will be, screened by a high-level policy group which includes the Under Secretary, the administrative assistant secretary, the director of personnel and the general counsel. I am sure that this group appreciates the sensitive factors in dealing with security cases and recognizes that the decision is important from the point of view of the individual as well as the Government.

"I have publicly stated many times that employment in the Federal Government is not a right but a privilege. I am determined to live up to three responsibilities which I feel are inherent in my position: (1) To aid in safeguarding the security of the United States; (2) to get the best qualified men in the Federal service to serve agriculture, and (3) to preserve and defend the rights of individuals in the American tradition.

"I hope that both the public and Mr. Ladejinsky realize that as far as I am concerned a security decision at a given time, either adverse or favorable, is not necessarily a decision for all of the future. Every such decision should be made in the light of the information currently available at the time the case is reviewed. When the decision on Mr. Ladejinsky's appointment as agriculture attaché was made last year, the security procedures in this Department were being reorganized and we now have better coordination all through the Government. In going over this matter again with my newly constituted security committee, we recognize that since the case was considered by Agriculture it has been reviewed by two agencies more experienced in security than this Department. We further recognize as expressed in my statement at a press conference on January 5, 1955, that 'It will always be true with respect both to qualifications and to security that reasonable men may not take the same view as to a particular person. It is possible for two equally reasonable and conscientious men to reach different conclusions.'

"In these circumstances and to emphasize our feeling that the previous security decision made by this Department should not continue to be permanently effective, and particularly since Mr. Ladejinsky is an employe of another agency, I have given instructions that the memorandum record of the decision and the press release of December 22 which announced it both be canceled so that our records will not now show Mr. Ladejinsky as a security risk."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 3, 1955]

BENSON IN REVERSAL CLEARS LADEJINSKY

(By Audrey Graves)

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson yesterday removed the security risk label from Wolf Ladejinsky, 7 months after he had pinned it on him.

The 55-year-old Russian-born naturalized American was fired from his post as agricultural attaché at Tokyo last December. Benson claimed in a press release at that time that the veteran land reform expert was unsafe.

This was true, Benson charged, because Ladejinsky had sisters living behind the Iron Curtain, had once worked for a Russian firm, and had belonged to two Communist-front organizations.

Ladejinsky stoutly denied he had ever been affiliated with any subversive group or had ever promoted the cause of communism. High United States and Japanese officials, aware of his anti-Communist land-reform work in Japan, rushed to his defense.

Benson said yesterday: "I have given instructions that the memorandum record of the decision and press release of December 22, which announced it, both be canceled, so that our records will not now show Mr. Ladejinsky as a security risk."

Benson made this statement in a letter to Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, in reply to one from CARLSON asking how the newly organized security committee in the Agriculture Department might affect the Ladejinsky case. CARLSON is a member of a Senate Civil Service Subcommittee investigating Government personnel policies.

This reversal came as a sudden and dramatic victory for both Ladejinsky and those who have doggedly protested what Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, called Benson's cruel and inhuman treatment of a time-tried and highly effective public servant.

Ladejinsky had twice been cleared by the State Department on the basis of the same information on which Benson acted. And after Benson fired him, the Foreign Operations Administration, headed by Harold E. Stassen, cleared him and sent him to a sensitive job in Indochina.

The FBI found no evidence that Ladejinsky was ever a member of any Communist-front group. The most damaging evidence found, Stassen reported, was that Ladejinsky along with several thousand other loyal Americans had been on the mailing list of a book-lending agency which had been listed as subversive.

Ladejinsky has since been supervising a land-reform program for the Free Viet-Nam Government in its fight to stem the onrush of communism.

Benson had stuck to his guns until yesterday. Even then Benson did not admit he had been wrong in removing Ladejinsky. He said his case had come up at a time when the Agriculture Department was reorganizing its security procedures.

He added that since the case had been considered by Agriculture, "it has been reviewed by two agencies more experienced in security than this Department."

That was as close as Benson came to admitting error. He recalled a statement he had made at a press conference last January: "It will always be true with respect both to qualifications and to security that reasonable men may not take the same view as to a particular person."

Benson wrote CARLSON that "a procedure has been set up under which every adverse recommendation that comes to me is now, and will be, screened by a high-level policy group which includes the Under Secretary, the Administrative Assistant Secretary, the Director of Personnel, and the General Counsel."

The Secretary's action in removing Ladejinsky was based on the recommendations of two young aides with whom he had been associated in his Mormon Church work before becoming Secretary, and in whom he expressed great confidence.

One was J. Glen Cassity, the Department's then new security officer, who had been an Army intelligence officer. The other was Milan D. Smith, Benson's administrative assistant, who had been a pea packer in Oregon.

To CARLSON yesterday Benson said he hoped the public and Ladejinsky realize that "a security decision at a given time, either adverse or favorable, is not necessarily a decision for all of the future."

Senator HUMPHREY commented yesterday that Benson's present position on Ladejinsky "could have been stated more clearly." He said, however, he gathered from the Secretary's "verbiage" that he was saying Ladejinsky is not a security risk.

"If that's what he meant," HUMPHREY said, "it is a welcome reversal and an apology. * * * It is very refreshing that departments of Government are now seeing eye to eye."

Said Harry P. Cain, a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board: "Ladejinsky will forgive his accusers, who never faced him, and Secretary Benson is certain not to rely on unsupported allegations in the future. What saves an American tragedy is the happy ending through which justice prevails."

To one man more than any other, Ladejinsky can give thanks for this happy ending, Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register's Washington staff. Convinced that a grievous wrong had been done, Mollenhoff kept hammering at Benson and even tackled President Eisenhower last February 23.

What would he do, Mollenhoff asked the President, if it should come to his attention that a member of the executive department had called a man a member of a subversive organization and had no proof to sustain the charge?

Mr. Eisenhower asked the reporter to submit any facts he had. "I assure you they will get the finest kind of consideration," the President said.

Mollenhoff delivered a letter of specifications to the White House later that day. During the past 4 months Mollenhoff checked periodically to ask whether there was any reply to his letter. There wasn't, at least not until 2 weeks ago.

Meantime, there were reports of strong pressure being put on the President by White House aids and Members of Congress to induce Benson to soften his characterization of Ladejinsky.

HUMPHREY threatened to bring the whole case before the Senate Government Operations Committee.

A forecast of yesterday's culmination came on June 23 when Presidential Press Secretary James C. Hagerty finally answered Mollenhoff's letter.

"I have discussed the matter with the Secretary of Agriculture," Hagerty wrote, "and he has indicated that the release was written a bit too hard. I believe you should get in touch with the Department of Agriculture for any further discussion of the release."

MULTIPLE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

THE CAPITAL TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a brief report—there probably will be a later report this afternoon—from the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia on the Capital Transit strike. We are still searching for Mr. Wolfson—which is a commentary. There is no question about the fact that the chairman of the board of the Capital Transit Co. knows that his Government wants him to appear before a committee hearing on Thursday. He is making his record for the public to judge. Of course, good citizenship and a sense of public responsibility call upon Mr. Wolfson to present himself to the District of Columbia Committee on Thursday for a discussion of the Capital Transit strike. I think it is a very interesting commentary on the chairman of the board of the Capital Transit Co. that he follows fugitive tactics.

However, the committee intends to call upon the Federal law-enforcement agencies to track Mr. Wolfson down, no matter how long it may take. If we cannot get him here on Thursday, we shall have to change our subpena into a subpena calling upon the Federal officials to produce him forthwith. But we are going to produce him, Mr. President, no matter how long it may take to track him down, because he has a responsibility to the people of this District to do what he can to bring to an end the present lack of a public transportation service in the District of Columbia.

I wish to make it clear, speaking for myself—although I know I speak the view of many—that the franchise should be lifted in any event. As one studies the financial manipulations of the Capital Transit Co. and recognizes that their aim obviously is "our profits first, and the public be damned," it becomes very clear that the duty of Congress is to bring to an end the franchise, no matter when the strike is settled. In my judgment, the settling of the strike would not justify a continuation of the franchise to the Capital Transit Co.

I wish to repeat that the members of the subcommittee—and I know it is true of the full committee—are unanimously opposed to a public-ownership program. Some of us are inclined to think that the Wolfson syndicate, now that they have just about milked all the profits out of the Capital Transit reserves, would not now object to the District Government's taking over the line in the name of public ownership. However, we are opposed to public ownership. We are satisfied we can get a private enterprise, which places service to the public first, to operate the lines. We are also satisfied that a private company which places public service first can also make a substantial profit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot yield without the permission of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to express a personal hope which grows out of a little experience with some phases of the operations of the Capital Transit Co. I desire to express the hope that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and his associates will pursue this matter until they get not merely a solution of the immediate strike, but also a solution of the problem which will continue to confront the District of Columbia in connection with transportation matters.

I know that several years ago it came to me as a distinct shock to learn that the reserves of the Capital Transit Co. were to be used for cutting a melon, rather than for meeting an emergency situation. I do not understand the logic of the law which authorizes that a reserve be set up, apart from liability for taxes, and then permits the reserve to be used for declaring a special dividend later on, rather than to be used for whatever emergency may arise, whether it be because of higher operating costs for a period of time, or for replacement of equipment, or for some other emergency problem.

I think the situation calls for an examination of the law and its application, in the light of the facts which were established by the investigation conducted by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. In connection with the audit of the operations of the Transit Co., I believe some difficulty may be found as regards legislation which would be corrective and helpful.

Several years ago, when this matter came to the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia, it was my thought that possibly we should take legislative action on the subject at that time. But it seemed logical to say then that before we passed legislation on the subject, we should have the benefit of the audit which was provided for by the Payne investigation.

With that as a background, and in view of the bitter experience now being had, I trust that the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Congress will take whatever legislative action may be needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I wish to say I am glad the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has made his comments. No Member of the Senate is more familiar with the transportation problems of the District of Columbia than is he. He was chairman of the District of Columbia committee when the Payne investigation of the Capital Transit Co. was conducted. I also happened to be a member of that subcommittee, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]; but all members of the subcommittee were under the able leadership of the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I remember that in the full committee session when we were discussing the various implications of the report, the Senator from South Dakota said many times in effect, as he has just said here on the floor of the Senate, "We are not going to solve this problem until we meet it legislatively, so that we can prevent the kind of depredation the Capital Transit Co. is guilty of, even though technically it is within the law."

After all, Mr. President, the disheartening thing about the company's financial procedure was that it acted technically within the law. The people of the District of Columbia owe a great debt of gratitude to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for taking the position he assumed at the time the investigation was made.

The problem presented by the strike still confronts us, but we are also confronted with the problem of providing the citizens of the District of Columbia with means of proper transportation. I am satisfied that proper transportation will not be available to the District of Columbia under the Wolfson syndicate, because its gory record is one of profits first and public service last.

Therefore, in view of that situation, and in view of our obligation to the people of the District of Columbia, we must face the fact that in this situation there is a transit company which no longer justifies our confidence. Let me say that a year ago we had some hope that perhaps as a result of our hearings, the transit company would turn over a new leaf. But it has not done so.

In view of that fact, we should do now what would be done in the business world. If one had a partnership arrangement with a businessman who was guilty of the kind of pickpocket activities of which the Capital Transit Co. has been guilty, the partnership would be broken up at once. That is what this situation boils down to; it is just that simple. In this case we have had a partner who has demonstrated that he is no longer deserving of our confidence. So I am in favor of ending the partnership, and of giving the franchise to a company which is deserving of it, because we must see to it that the people of the District of Columbia have the transportation service they need.

So, Mr. President, I repeat what I said last year at the hearings: I favor having Congress cooperate with the transit company; and I have favored having the Congress cooperate with this transit company, by way of setting the school-fare issue and by way of granting exemptions from the gross receipts tax. But it makes no difference how much financial benefit is handed to this company, for it has demonstrated that it will continue to "milk" this transportation system solely for the advantage of the transit company itself.

So it is, Mr. President, that the time has come to end the franchise of the existing transportation company; and it is time for us to see to it that the public receives the transportation service it needs and deserves, but which it will not get under the existing franchise with the Capital Transit Co.

I say to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that they had better face also the fact that they cannot do business with the existing company, but must take steps to bring it to an end. They should get behind the movement to bring the franchise to an end. In the meantime they must proceed to provide the people of the District of Columbia with emergency transportation service.

The other day I suggested a jitney service, of the kind which has worked satisfactorily in other jurisdictions; and it could work in the District of Columbia. We can provide that service until a final solution of the transportation problem is had.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before proceeding with discussion of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that on page 20 of the bill, in line 18, the figure "$1,000,000" be stricken out, and the figure "$500,000" be substituted therefor. The bill as it will then read will conform with the committee's actual recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as the original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Independent Offices—Atomic Energy Commission—Operating Expenses", on page 2, line 8, after the word "travel", insert "including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which this appropriation is made"; in line 23, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$618,000,000" and insert "$575,000,000", and in line 24, after the word "with", strike out "$481,400,000" and insert "$582,400,000."

Under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority", on page 5, at the beginning of line 19, strike out "$26,214,000" and insert "$27,053,000", and on page 6, line 18, after the word "amended", strike out "not to exceed $600,000 from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority" and insert "not to exceed $1,000,000, of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $600,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Under the heading "Title II—Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration", on page 7, line 19, strike out "$684,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

Under the subhead "Bonneville Power Administration—Operation and Maintenance", on page 8, line 11, after the word "energy", strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$6,650,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—General Investigations", on page 9, line 13, after the word "States", insert "and the Territory of Hawaii", and on page 10, line 2, after the word "which", strike out "$2,987,254" and insert "$4,421,812."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 12, line 6, after the word "law", strike out "$23,500,000" and insert "$24,750,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", strike out "$19,912,000" and insert "$20,223,638."

Under the subhead "General Administration Expenses," on page 12, line 23, after the word "Reclamation", strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,700,000."

Under the subhead "Emergency Fund," on page 13, at the beginning of line 7, strike out "$600,000" and insert "$500,000."

Under the subhead "General Provisions," on page 18, after line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 206. The Secretary hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Director, Division of Budget and Finance, in grade GS–17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Under the heading "Title III—Civil Functions, Department of the Army—General Investigations," on page 20, line 17, after the word "expended", strike out "$5,190,000" and insert "$5,940,000."

Under the subhead "Construction, General", on page 21, line 9, after the word "expended", strike out "$369,894,800" and insert "$411,273,000"; in line 12, after the numerals "1954", strike out "of which" and insert "and"; in line 14, after the word "Project", insert a comma and "and $100,000 shall be made available for the preparation of detailed plans for the Bruces Eddy project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho, recommended for construction in the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, contained in Senate Document 51, 84th Congress, 1st session, and the preparation of such plans is hereby authorized"; on page 22, line 10, after the word "litigation", insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $210,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for relocation of those permanent resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled within the project area on May 17, 1950, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary therefor on the condition that the Secretary of the Interior transfer to the control of the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Dalles Dam project, Oregon, an irregular shaped parcel of land containing in the aggregate approximately $5\frac{5}{10}$ acres located in lot 1 of section 17 and in lots 1 and 2 of section 20, township 2 north, range 15 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, being a portion of the land previously transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the act approved February 9, 1929 (45 Stat. 1158). Title to the lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior for the above stated purpose shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian for whose benefit it is acquired; any such trust may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior by conveyance of a fee simple title to the Indian or his heirs or devisees, without application therefor, when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the Indian or his heirs or devisees are capable of managing their own affairs. In carrying out such relocations, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into a contract or contracts with any State or political subdivision thereof"; on page 23, at the beginning of line 13, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000"; in line 17, after the word "appropriated", insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein for the replacement of the Soo Line Railroad bridge over the South Canal at Saint Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., shall be available for the replacement of said bridge under the terms of the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended (54 Stat. 499, as amended), in lieu of the replacement of said bridge, as a part of the project for the removal of Bridge Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945: *Provided further*, That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, not to exceed $2,050,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and not to exceed $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein: *Provided, however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the landowners, on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, not to exceed $1,750,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of land and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation project: *Provided however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the landowners on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount of such land acquisition: *Provided further,* That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost to the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District the construction charge obligation as set forth in a proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form, February 23, 1955, assignable to such remaining lands shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district: *Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the port of Tacoma for such work as they may have done within the limits of the Federal portion of the Tacoma Harbor project, over and above the work required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the authorized modification adopted in the 1954 River and Harbor Act: *Provided further,* That such payment shall not exceed the sum of $373,216"; and on page 26, line 7, after the word "Wisconsin", insert a colon and "*Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River, shall be available to cooperate with the State of South Dakota in restoring a reasonable water level to a portion of McCook Lake, Union County, S. Dak., which water level has been impaired and surrounding residential properties damaged by the reduced flow of the Missouri River due to the construction of the Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dam projects: *Provided,* That the cost to the United States shall not exceed $150,000: *Provided further,* That the State or local agencies shall contribute an equal amount to the cost of the restoration works which restoration shall be accomplished by agreement between the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission of the State of South Dakota and the Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance, General," on page 27, line 15, after the word "expended", strike out "$82,500,000" and insert "$83,560,000."

Under the subhead "General Expenses", on page 28, line 2, strike out "$9,200,000" and insert "$9,400,000."

Under the subhead "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries," on page 28, line 8, after the word "expended", strike out "$50,885,000" and insert "$52,960,000."

Under the subhead "Administrative Provisions", on page 29, line 11, after "(68 Stat. 1114)", insert "as amended."

On page 29, after line 19, insert:

"The Chief of Engineers hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Chief of the Programs Branch, Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in the grade GS-17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The inquiry is made merely for the purpose of establishing the record.

My understanding is that the unanimous-consent request submitted by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], which has been agreed to, adopted the amendments printed in the bill in italics, which were also printed separately, containing legislative matter. Also, I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement a point of order may still be raised against any of such amendments containing legislation by any Senator who desires to raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order was waived by the unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, a point of order may be registered against any of the amendments which contain legislative provisions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not my purpose or intent to raise a point of order, as I have gone over those amendments. However, I wish the record to be clear, that the rights of all Senators are preserved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is much more extensive in its provisions than the bill of last year, which provided money for only flood control and for rivers and harbors work.

The new subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, known as the Public Works Subcommittee, in addition to considering appropriations for flood control and for rivers and harbors, also considered appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the past, appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and TVA were included in the independent offices appropriation bill. In addition to the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and TVA, the public works appropriation bill as it appears before the Senate today also contains appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, which were formerly included in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

In order to facilitate its work, the subcommittee was divided into three divisions. One of these considered budget requests for Army civil functions. I conducted the hearings on that subject. The division which studied appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The other division, which considered budget requests for the Bureau of Reclamation, was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

We spent approximately 2 months in holding hearings on the bill. We heard testimony from 820 individual witnesses and organizations. On the desk of every Senator there are four volumes of the hearings. They contain 3,349 pages of testimony. It was an arduous task, but, speaking for myself, I can truly say that I enjoyed the work. It gave me an opportunity to find out more and more about our great country. It gave me an opportunity to learn more and more about our great rivers and about the devastation which is being caused by floods and erosion, including the great and often needless loss of precious soil.

I wish to point out that for the past 15 years at least we have been sadly neglecting our obligation to preserve and conserve our soil, to keep our harbors up to date, to develop our inland waterways, and to protect the lives and property of our citizens from the destruction caused by floods.

As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the bill before the Senate containing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Army civil functions, and the Bureau of Reclamation, and power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, carries an overall total of $1,377,491,000, which is an increase of $5,368,200 over the amount voted by the House, and $423,974,000 under the budget estimate for the 1956 fiscal year.

I should first like to invite attention to title I, which deals with the needs of the Atomic Energy Commission. It will be noted that the budget estimate of new money required in order to operate this facility for the 1956 fiscal year was $1,045,000,000; funds provided by a transfer from "Plant and Equipment," $220,804,000, plus an unobligated balance of $259,447,000, left over from last year would bring the total requested by the Budget Bureau to $1,525,251,000. Instead of appropriating new funds in order to carry on the operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission, it was possible for us to increase the amount of unobligated balance to be transferred from "plant and equipment" to the sum of $582,400,000, as compared to the $220,840,000 in the budget estimate, thereby permitting a decrease in the amount of new money.

It will be noted that the House allowance for the same item, namely, transfer from "Plant and Equipment," was $481,400,000. The most recent figures presented to the committee indicated an additional amount of $101 million would be available for plant and equipment, making up the total of $582,400,000 to which I have just referred.

As I have just stated, the huge sum which we are now providing for the Atomic Energy Commission is to be used merely to defray operating costs. The evidence presented to the committee shows that when the Atomic Energy Commission completes the erection of all facilities it now contemplates, the amount which will be necessary each year in order to operate the facilities will be roughly $2 billion. The amount of $1,481,847,000, total funds available for 1956 bears out that estimate for operating expenses. It is expected that within the next few years all the facilities contemplated by the Atomic Energy Commission will have been erected, and that the costs of operation will, as I have just stated, be stabilized at roughly $2 billion each year.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to page 2 of the report. As there indicated, we learned that within the past 2 years the Atomic Energy Commission has inaugurated a program of technical training for foreign technicians, as well as for Americans. This training has, in the case of foreign trainees, been made available on a more or less free basis. We learned that the Commission intended to spend approximately three-quarters of a million dollars in order to erect a college in which to teach atomic science not only to Americans but technicians from abroad.

The committee felt that the Commission was going beyond the scope of its authority. We suggested that before proceeding with the erection of such an institution, and expanding it, the AEC should submit its plans to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Many of us on the committee felt that while we had no objection to providing schooling for our own people in America, as well as foreigners, those who came from abroad should at least pay all their expenses, including a fair share for tuition.

Mr. President, the next item is the Tennessee Valley Authority. It will be noted that the amount recommended by the committee exceeds the amount appropriated by the House by $839,000. The House had deleted a few items and reduced others with respect particularly to navigation operations in the Tennessee Valley as well as flood control.

It may be remembered that when the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, the Authority was empowered to do flood-control work within the area in which it operated, and also to initiate certain flood-control measures. We raised the amounts for several such items; the increases aggregate $839,000.

As is known by most of the Members of the Senate, the committee voted $6.5 million in order to provide for the construction of a transmission line which would carry power generated under the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. The transmission line item as well as others under TVA authority are explained in the report, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the applicable portion of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tennessee Valley Authority

Appropriation, 1955	$120,000,000
Estimate, 1956	27,550,000
House allowance	26,214,000
Senate recommendation	27,053,000

The committee recommends a total appropriation of $27,053,000 for the programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority, being an increase of $839,000 over the House allowance, for the following specific additions:

Investigations for future multipurpose projects	$104,000
Navigation operations	150,000
Flood-control operations	29,000
Fertilizer and munitions development	81,000
Resource development	400,000
Government relations and economics staff	75,000
Total increases	839,000

The total amount povided is $497,000 below the budget estimate.

The President has released a resolution of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority stating that the city of Memphis has advised TVA that it will not accept power generated at the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. plant and will proceed with its own generating plant to supply power requirements in that area and will not seek a renewal of its present power-supply contract expiring in June 1958. In view of this development, the committee directs that if within a period of 90 days after the approval of this act the city of Memphis has made a definite commitment to supply its power needs and the Tennessee Valley Authority is relieved of this obligation, that the funds provided for the transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. in the amount of $6,500,000 be not obligated. If said definite commitment is not made within 90 days by the city of Memphis, then the committee directs that such funds will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

In recommending an increase of $81,000 for the fertilizer and munitions development program, the committee not only restores the House reduction of $31,000 for agronomic research, but also allows an increase of $50,000 in the farm-test demonstration program. In this connection, the committee is impressed with the value of the educational sales program carried on through the county agents for the benefit of the farmers, and believes it would be unwise to restrict the production of the new fertilizer, diammonium phosphate, to 5,000 tons in 1956. The committee believes that the farmers and the fertilizer companies would greatly benefit through allowing TVA to develop this new product and to create a demand for its use, in similar fashion to the results obtained by them on triple superphosphate.

In connection with the restoration of $400,000 for the resource development program, the committee recommends that the limitation be changed to the following: "not to exceed $1,000,000, of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $600,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. ELLENDER. Briefly stated, Mr. President, the bill provides that should the city of Memphis build a power-generating plant, as is now contemplated, the amount included in the bill will not be spent for the purpose of building a transmission line.

I express the personal hope that the city of Memphis will build the facility. If it does, in my humble judgment it will be unnecessary for the so-called Dixon-Yates project to be constructed, because, as I understand the situation, the Dixon-Yates plant is to be built primarily for the purpose of generating sufficient electricity to make available to the city of Memphis the amount of electricity which that city is now obtaining from TVA. If the debate on the Dixon-Yates contract has done nothing more than to awaken the people of Memphis to the need for building their own facilities, it has done a great deal of good.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. With reference to the words "definite commitment," does that mean a signed contract on the part of the city of Memphis for a construction plant?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe it would go that far. It will be enough if we know definitely that the city of Memphis will build this facility.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I would hope that that is what it means, but I wished to try to establish the legislative intent of the provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language in the report is very plain. It is the committee's intention that if the city of Memphis does proceed to build the facility, the Tennessee Valley Authority will, in turn, cancel the contract it now has with the city of Memphis, which will expire, I think, in 1958. If the city of Memphis shows a definite inclination to act or proceeds to take action which will lead eventually to the erection of this facility, then the $6,500,000 item in the bill will not be obligated for the purpose of building a transmission line. I hope the city of Memphis is acting in good faith; I feel certain the city is. The quicker a decision is made by the city of Memphis to build the facility, the quicker the whole matter will be settled.

I, for one, voted for the Dixon-Yates contract. I did so in good faith; and under similar circumstances I would do so again. I am not here to discuss with Senators the terms of the contract or the conditions under which it was made operative.

My opposition to the building of more steam plants in the Tennessee Valley dates back quite a number of years. The record will show that I took the position before the Committee on Appropriations that no steam plants should be built in the Tennessee Valley except those necessary to firm hydroelectric power which was then being produced or which would thereafter be produced in that area. But the war came, and there was an immediate need for electricity in order to operate the atomic energy plant. During the emergency, Congress voted additional funds to build steam plants, far in excess of what was actually required to firm up the TVA's hydroelectric power.

The record shows that when the steam facilities which are now in contemplation are built, 70 percent of the electricity generated in the Tennessee Valley will be generated from steam, and only 30 percent from falling water.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Louisiana think that the city of Memphis is proceeding in good faith now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do, too. I am trying to establish what might be deemed sufficient to constitute a commitment. The city of Memphis announced long ago, not recently, but on February 17, that it planned to build its own plant. That fact has not been changed by anything which has happened since. The only thing which has changed has been the investigation which has been going on into the activities connected with certain officials of the Government. The position of Memphis is as it was. Memphis has been trying to build a plant, and I am unusually happy to hear the Senator from Louisiana say that he regards Memphis as acting in good faith toward this commitment.

I think the $6,500,000 might have been profitably stricken from the bill. I do not question the Senator's judgment in trying to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem. But I point out to him that if a definite commitment could be translated into an actual contract, then the city of Memphis probably would not be able to make an actual contract for the completion of a plant within the 90-day limitation. I should hate to have Congress provide money for the building of the transmission line, if by that time the Dixon-Yates contract had been canceled, and then merely have built from one side of the Mississippi to the other a transmission line which, perhaps at a later date, the Arkansas Power & Light Co. might use to carry its current into another part of the area.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the language now in the report was originally submitted by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] it contained a 30-day limitation. During the course of the discussion which took place in committee, I suggested that the time limit be increased to 90 days. So far as I am concerned—I speak only for myself—I would not object to making it 120 days, if that should be desired.

So far as I am concerned, I think it ought to be established without question that the Memphis facility will be built, that the city of Memphis will vote bonds or take other concrete action toward building the plant. I suppose they will have to vote bonds. I suppose the city of Memphis will have to borrow money in order to build the facility.

The moment the intent to build is established or work is started, then, of course, under the language which now appears in the report, I am satisfied that the $6,500,000 will not be available for obligation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I commend, and commend strongly, the senior Senator from Louisiana for raising the period from 30 days to 90 days, because if the commitment were to be regarded as definite, in the sense of a binding contract, then the 30 days did not mean a thing. There is no way under the sun by which the city of Memphis could make a definite commitment if the language be regarded to mean the making of a contract within 30 days. Therefore, the change from 30 days to 90 days is very desirable.

There is no way to amend the report so as to provide for 120 days, but if we had a statement from the chairman of the subcommittee to the effect that he felt 120 days was appropriate, I should say that such a statement would remove a great deal of doubt. I think it will take almost 120 days for the city of Memphis to work out its bonding arrangements and advertise for bids on a plant of this size. It will take a good, long time in which to get bids and then to be in a position to carry forward.

We had never seen until very recently the bank credit agreement for the Dixon-Yates project which was entered into in about April. It was not until the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] loaned me his copy that I was able to send it to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and to say that if individual Senators had it in their portfolios, maybe it was proper to file it with the Joint Committee, where the law requires it to be filed.

Therefore, on the 29th of June, copies were finally made available to the Joint Committee. We have found a number of things in it which are very interesting. For instance, the power contract has been put under the mortgage, so that the contractors have obligated themselves to carry out the power contract the day they sign the mortgage. Under those circumstances, I am questioning now whether the power contract is going to be cancelled or whether it is not. If the power contract is not to be canceled, then someone may come along who wants to build a transmission line, because the city of Memphis may not be the party finally building the plant. The city of Memphis may decide it will want to contract for that power with some other group rather than with an independent agency of its own.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my judgment that because of the statement made by the President recently that he wants to take a long look at the contract, and the fact that the city of Memphis is contemplating building its own facility, a little difficulty may result in the financing of the Dixon-Yates project. I do not know; that is my own opinion.

The point is that most of us—I think I speak for most Members who voted for the Dixon-Yates contract—do not have any disposition to force Dixon-Yates to build the plant. Since it is to be built in order to furnish, as we are told, the city of Memphis with power, if Memphis agrees to go on and build its own plant, then the result will have been achieved without the necessity for the contract.

As a matter of fact, I commend the people of Memphis, Tenn., for taking the position which they have taken, in saying to the United States Government, "We will build our own plant. We do not want the Federal Government to build a plant across the river from us in order to furnish us with electricity; we can finance our own plant, and we will build our own plant."

My hope is that if the demand for power in the Tennessee Valley continues to grow, other communities in that valley will take the same position the city of Memphis has taken, and will not let the Federal Government further expand the development of power in the Tennessee Valley by building more steam plants. I can name many other sections of the country which would like to have the Federal Government build facilities like the one proposed at Memphis. The city of New Orleans, and other large metropolitan areas, might like it.

I have no doubt that perhaps cities in Florida—in fact, all over the country—would like to have the Government step in and build facilities for them.

Mr. President, there will be absolutely no need for building the Dixon-Yates plant if the city of Memphis proceeds to erect its own. If it requires 120 or 150 days to determine that, it is, of course, all right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Before the Senator from Louisiana yields to the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to say that I fully agree with the Senator in his assertion that if Memphis builds its plant there will be absolutely no need for the Dixon-Yates plant. That bears out what some of us were saying, that the plant was not for the national defense. Yet those who are to build it get rights under notional-defense provisions. They want help from the Government. Rights under the banking credit law are sought. Under the contract there a mortgage is provided for, and a copy is not made available to us. The contract refers to commitments to a bank. We are not able to get copies of it. It will take weeks to procure all this information. I think it would be too bad if language were left which would permit such things to happen.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator made a statement with reference to there no longer being a need for a Government contract. Actually the Senator should have added if there is no requirement for additional power.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There may be a need for Dixon-Yates on perhaps a modest scale.

Mr. ELLENDER. To supply its own customers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But what we are talking about is a Government contract with Dixon-Yates to furnish power to a Government agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, all the talk has been to the effect that the plant was to be built in order to integrate into the Tennessee Valley Authority transmission lines the electricity which it would manufacture.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We may say that the line as now proposed was in response to a need of the Government for additional power in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are two principles involved. The Government could have built its own plant at Fulton, Tenn., or somewhere else to supply power, or it could have entered into a contract with private enterprise, as it undertook to do, to supply power to supplement its needs there. Some persons may have said, "We do not want private power. We still want public power." That is the thought many have. Rather than to take private power which the Government might purchase and have transmitted into the system, they may have said, "We propose to build our own municipal plant." On that basis, if that were done, then insofar as the Government's making a contract is concerned, there might be no longer any need for it. There is a principle being established here in the final manner in which this commitment is resolved. So far as the Tennessee Valley is concerned, it is not the responsibility of the Government to go into that area, and, with the taxpayers' money, build steam plants, because the same obligation would or should follow as to every other community in the United States where a power shortage existed.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall yield in a moment. In connection with the statement of the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to ask him if he recalls when the question arose several years ago of building extra steam plants in the Tennessee Valley area. Some of us took the position at that time that they should be built by the Atomic Energy Commission itself, and not integrated with the Tennessee Valley Authority. But we were outvoted. I personally thought then, and I think now, that under no condition should the Government have built steam plants in the Tennessee Valley area other than to firm hydroelectric power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was done because of the war emergency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not the firming of power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, not the firming, but beyond what was required to firm it, it was done for that purpose. I have always supported building facilities to firm up the Government's hydroelectric power, and I will do so with respect to every area. That is the proper procedure, unless an advantageous contract can be made with private enterprise to do it. I think it is the responsibility of the Government to see that the full potentialities of its hydroelectric power are utilized. If it is necessary to build steam plants to bring this about, that is the obligation of the Government. Once that is done, it is not the Government's obligation to build steam plants with taxpayers' money simply to supply hydroelectric power in any area or community where there may be a shortage of or a demand for additional power.

Mr. ELLENDER. The matter of building steam plants in the Northwest came up during the course of the hearings. The suggestion I made was that since there was a fine partnership arrangement in that area between the Government and the private utilities, the private utilities should start now to erect necessary steam plants, in the hope any excess power which was developed from steam might be made use of. As the record will show, I was promised by the interested parties that would be done. To the extent necessary I think that ought to be done. As I have said, it is my hope that hereafter no effort will be made to get the Government to use the taxpayers' money, as the Senator just stated, to continue to expand the production of electricity in the Tennessee Valley just because there is a need for it. It strikes me that ought to be done by the people of the area, themselves, and without any help from the Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I should like to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, not only upon his able presentation of the situation with reference to the particular matter he has been discussing, but upon having conducted what I think is the most exhaustive set of hearings in this field, at least during my membership in the Senate. The Senate is highly indebted to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his able handling of a difficult task.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from Florida. He also assisted. Do not give me all the credit. All the members of the committee worked hard. Sometimes we sat late into the night in order to hear witnesses who had come from afar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that was the case, but since I was not a member of the subcommittee, I can say that I sat in only when the matter was before the full committee.

I think the Senator from Louisiana has correctly answered the questions propounded by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico—and I invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to this statement—but I believe I might be able to amplify a little the discussion which took place in the committee.

My recollection is that the committee was trying to reach and state a formula which would make it very clear that the appropriation of $6½ million for the transmission line was not to be available and was not to be obligated in the event the city of Memphis became irrevocably committed to the building of the powerplant to supply its own need. Therefore a question in the committee was as to whether or not such an irrevocable commitment had yet been made. Certainly, as one member of the committee, I do not pretend to have all the details. Nobody in the committee had all the details. We all realized that in some communities a bond election would be required; in other communities, perhaps not. We all realized that a contract for actual construction of the power facility might be a very long way off in the future, even with the best intentions present on the part of the governing board and the city of Memphis, and with a determination made to proceed irrevocably.

We recognized that it might be said that Memphis was irrevocably committed at different stages in the matter—for instance, on the purchase of an expensive site, or when Memphis enters into an arrangement to dispose of a bond issue, or when several other things might happen.

So in the discussion—I shall not call it a debate—it was frequently said that the committee wished to be sure that Memphis should make an irrevocable commitment before the committee directed that the fund was not to be obligated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, if I may obtain unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the purchase of a site by Memphis be regarded by the Senator from Florida as a definite commitment for the establishment of the plant?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might or might not be, depending on the amount spent by the city for the site, and on the powers of the city under its charter, and on the preliminary action taken in connection therewith.

The question was whether we should decide for ourselves, and should so state in the report, the exact formula; or whether we would leave it to the executive agency to determine, under the circumstances which might develop, when Memphis became irrevocably committed.

All of us are trying to reach the same end. Let me say in all good humor that in agreeing on the final draft of the report—and I believe the final draft was agreed to by all the members present—the desire was to incorporate in its wording which would make it clear that when Memphis became irrevocably committed—and that decision would be made, of course, after the funds were appropriated—the money should be regarded as being not available to be obligated. That was the essence of the action taken by the committee.

The report shows that the committee took two actions in that connection. The first sentence relates to the contingency about which we have been talking, namely:

> In view of this development, the committee directs that if within a period of 90 days after the approval of this act the city of Memphis has made a definite commitment to supply its power needs and the Tennessee Valley Authority is relieved of this obligation, that the funds provided for the transmission connections with the Mississippi

Valley Generating Co. in the amount of $6,500,000 be not obligated.

That is the first part, namely, that if the final commitment is made by Memphis within the 90 days, the committee is in effect stating that it understands that the $6,500,000 is not thereafter to be obligated.

But in the report there is an additonal sentence, and in including that sentence the committee makes it clear that even if the $6,500,000 is available for commitment after the 90 days, it is not to be available except in a certain case, which is set forth in the following sentence:

> If said definite commitment is not made within 90 days by the city of Memphis, then the committee directs that such funds will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

So in taking that action—and, as I recall, it was taken by the unanimous vote of the committee—the committee also set forth the condition that even if the $6,500,000 is available after the 90 days, because of the failure or inability of Memphis to take irrevocable action by that time, the $6,500,000 still is not to be expended for this purpose unless and until the steps regarding the financing and the construction of the plant, as set forth in the second sentence I have just read, are taken prior to the time when the $6,500,000 would be obligated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Florida that I am not in the slightest trying to question the judgment of the committee or its good intentions, but I point out to him that the second part of those conditions has already been met, for the Dixon-Yates people have financed their plant, and the Senators from Arkansas attended the ground-breaking ceremonies, when the golden shovel was used to turn a little dirt. So there is no prohibition at all against the use of the $6,500,000 if the definite commitment is not made within 90 days.

Mr. HOLLAND. On that point, the Senator from New Mexico probably has more information than does our committee, but this is the qualification regarding the point on which our committee had information:

> If said definite commitment is not made within 90 days by the city of Memphis, then the committee directs that such funds will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced, according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

The members of the committee, of whom I was one, did not know whether the budget program had been followed out completely and accurately. If any member of the committee had that information, it was not communicated to the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. If any plans were submitted to the Congress by the Budget officials in the budgetary year 1955, for the fiscal year 1956, they never got to anyone. The Bureau of the Budget merely submitted an estimate of what would be spent, and obtained approval of it; but no plans were submitted. There seemed to be no plans. Test holes still were being driven in the river bottom.

So, so far as we know, the condition set forth in the second sentence has been fully met.

Mr. HOLLAND. What the Senator from New Mexico has said makes it clear that there still is not complete information regarding what is contained on this point in the justification submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

The sole point of my statement is that the committee was taking those two steps; and I think the committee would unanimously be delighted if Memphis proceeds to make an irrevocable commitment, if it has not already done so, and proceeds to take over construction of the powerplant and to relieve the Nation of the obligation to supply a large part of the funds or, at least, credit in connection with construction of the plant.

Mr. President, before I take my seat, let me say that I also completely approve the statement of the Senator from Louisiana to the effect that at least some of us, of whom I was one, who had strongly supported the Dixon-Yates contract, felt that great good has come from this entire discussion and arrangement, if Memphis has irrevocably decided or does irrevocably decide to supply power to itself, by means of the construction of a steam plant, which we were unwilling to vote for as an addition to the steam-plant facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senator from Louisiana spoke of cities in Florida. For instance, Jacksonville, our second city, has for many years had a public-utility plant which has been a great asset to it. Orlando, another of our fine cities, has a similar plant; and various other Florida cities have similar plants.

We are very happy if it is now a fact that the people of the fine city of Memphis have decided that it is in their own interest to take care of their problem and take over construction of the needed powerplant.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have faith in the people of Memphis, as I said a while ago; and I am satisfied that if the present leadership of that great city states that the city intends to build the plant, it will be built; and I am sure that the $6,500,000 appropriation in the pending bill will not be spent.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. With reference to the intention of Memphis: Is it not true that Memphis has officially advised the Tennessee Valley Authority that when the present contract with the Tennessee Valley Authority expires in 1958, Memphis will not renew that contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. At least, that is the information I get from the newspapers. It has also been so stated for the Record, I believe.

Mr. HILL. It is to be found in the Record, in the letter of General Vogel. I call the Senator's attention to the letter which appears in Friday's Record. It was placed in the Record by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Johnson]. It is found on page 9701 of the Record.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in the Congressional Record, not in the hearings.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to the statement that the city of Memphis will not renew the contract, which expires in 1958.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the Legislature of the State of Tennessee has authorized the city of Memphis to issue bonds for the construction of Memphis' own plant, and that the city government of the city of Memphis has voted to issue such bonds; also that the city government of the city of Memphis, acting through its governing body, its board of commissioners, has voted to direct the light and power division of the city government of Memphis to proceed with the construction of the plant?

Mr. ELLENDER. If all that takes place, and then the power contract between the city of Memphis and TVA is canceled, a lot of people will be without electricity in Memphis, unless Memphis builds the plant.

Mr. HILL. The information is that the city of Memphis will not renew the contract, which expires in 1958. Memphis will therefore go to work and build its own plant, so its plant will be ready to supply the power when the present contract with TVA expires in 1958.

If the Senator will further yield, with reference to what my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. Holland] has said, in calling attention to the second condition, with reference to the financing of the Dixon-Yates contract, the Senator from Florida was absolutely correct; but I think my friend from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] did not appreciate the fact that that financing has not been completed. The contract is not financed, for the reason that the question is tied up in the Securities and Exchange Commission, and also in the Federal court. Until the matter is cleared by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the contract is not financed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I stated a while ago, that in view of the recent statement by the President, and further, in view of the present intention of the city of Memphis to build its own facility, the Dixon-Yates company may have a great deal of difficulty in financing the building of the plant. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that in the committee, and heretofore, I voted against the Dixon-Yates contract. I voted in the committee to delete this part of the appropriation from the pending appropriation bill. However, I think the language in the committee report is very clear, and I think it is very fair. As one who has opposed the Dixon-Yates contract, I am willing to abide by what the Appropriations Committee has done in connection with this important matter. I base that statement partly also upon the faith I have in the fine people of Memphis. I know a great many of the city officials personally, and I know that they are not merely making a gesture, or trying to mislead anyone.

However, I wish to comment upon the very broad statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and his point that this situation demonstrates that, with respect to all future requirements of any consumers within the TVA area, they will have to build their own plant.

I would not subscribe to that statement, without a particular and express limitation. There are great REA groups within that area, which have no means of financing their own independent sources of power. There are a great many small municipalities in the TVA area which are now served from those sources.

Certainly, in this modern time of high-priced machinery and generators, the interests of a small town of 1,200 or 1,500 people should not be ignored. We should not say to such a community, "Root, hog, or die." We should not say, "Finance yourself, or we will cut you off." I do not think the Senator from Arkansas intended any such meaning. However, I wish particularly to make the point that there is a great deal more involved than a large city like the city of Memphis.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me complete my thought. With all due deference to the Senator from Arkansas, I say that there are other questions involved.

Based upon the committee report, based upon my faith in members of the Appropriations Committee, as well as other Senators who have taken part in the debate, and based upon the good faith of the city of Memphis, I am willing to abide by and rest the case on the language to which reference has been made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to emphasize the point that if the Federal Government is under obligation to build for the REA in the Tennessee Valley area, and for any community in that area which cannot furnish its own power facilities, there are many other communities and many other REA's throughout the United States which should have equal treatment. That is the question for us to determine. This area should not be a favored area. There are many other places in the United States where there is a crying need for additional power. If this is to be a Federal policy, let us equalize it. Let us not discriminate in favor of one area of the country and against other areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language appearing on page 3 of the report, which we are discussing, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the language referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The President has released a resolution of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority stating that the city of Memphis has advised TVA that it will not accept power generated at the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. plant and will proceed with its own generating plant to supply power requirements in that area and will not seek a renewal of its present power supply contract expiring in June 1958. In view of this development, the committee directs that if within a period of 90 days after the approval of this act the city of Memphis has made a definite commitment to supply its power needs and the Tennessee Valley Authority is relieved of this obligation, that the funds provided for the transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. in the amount of $6,500,000 be not obligated. If said definite commitment is not made within 90 days by the city of Memphis, then the committee directs that such funds will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] appeared before our subcommittee and suggested the language which was finally adopted by the full committee. The subcommittee placed in its original report to the full committee this language:

> The committee directs that the funds provided for the transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., in the amount of $6½ million, will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

When that language was submitted, the Senator from Tennessee suggested that we should add to that language a provision that if the city of Memphis did construct this plant, the $6½ million would not be spent. When the question was reconsidered by the full committee, the language which now appears in the report, including the language which was suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, was finally adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Can the Senator from Louisiana relate to me other instances in his long experience in the Senate in which Congress appropriated money for transmission lines to be built by the Federal Government from an alleged source of power which had not even been contracted for or financed, and with respect to which even the plans had not been completely drawn and submitted to the Congress, for supplying power to an area which indicated that it did not want the power? I most respectfully ask, is there a precedent for a transmission line to be built to connect a nonexistent plant with a nonexistent market? Can the Senator relate some precedents to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there were some instances in either South Dakota or Nebraska, of transmission lines having been built far in advance of even the starting of the building of a dam. It was contemplated that in time the transmission line could be used. As I remember, a certain sized line was planned. The Senator has asked me for an example. The suggestion was made that instead of building a line sufficient only to carry the electricity which was then being generated, a line of larger capacity be built, so as to take care of the electricity which would be generated in a few years to come. As I remember that instance, the plant in question had already been started.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that it involved facilities which could use the transmission lines?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Such as REA's?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator have any information which shows that anyone would use the transmission lines if the Dixon-Yates contract were not fulfilled?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the electricity produced by the Dixon-Yates organization would not be sold to the city of Memphis. The intention was to integrate it into the TVA system, and TVA was to dispose of the current generated by Dixon-Yates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But is it not correct to say that the kilowatts so generated were to be disposed of in the Memphis area?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask one further question. However, first of all I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for doing what I consider to be an admirable job in connection with the whole bill. He was faced with a tremendous assignment, I know, and we are deeply grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for all he has accomplished. I wish to commend him for much he has done in certain areas of the country in which I am deeply interested. I do not want to join the issue on the basis of firming up secondary power by building additional steam plants. I wonder, too, how far we should go with steam-plant construction for other than firming up hydroelectric power. However, I believe there is much that we must get clear, as Members of the Senate, about the contract that is involved.

The point has been made that Dixon-Yates could build the plant. That is true. No doubt they could build the plant, and perhaps they want to build it. However, the Dixon-Yates plant is important to the Senate only because it relates to a Federal contract between a private company and a Government instrumentality.

It is important also because the contract was posed to us as a part of a program to implement our system of national security and national defense. I believe that is a specious argument. It is an argument that cannot be sustained. I will not even go into the merits or demerits of the argument.

Let us assume that the report before the Senate, which I identify simply as Report No. 700 on the Public Works appropriation bill of 1956, should be adopted by the Senate. Would that be binding on the House of Representatives?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not binding on the House. But I should like to say to my good friend from Minnesota that the language in a committee report is usually followed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If both Houses agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the House committee issued a similar report?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be necessary to put the language in the bill to have it absolutely binding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Could that not be done in this case? Could not the language of the report be added as a proviso in the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would represent legislation on an appropriation bill and it would require a two-thirds vote. However, I believe that what is stated in the report is conclusive, as a practical matter. It is direct. I am sure the city of Memphis is acting in good faith, and I am sure it will build the plant. The moment that fact is made known, I can assure the Senator—at least, so far as I am concerned—that the $6½ million will not be spent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully agree with the Senator that if the language in the report is made a part of the conference committee report by both Houses, it will exercise some control, because, as I understand, the language would be directed to the TVA Board. The TVA Board is an instrumentality under the direction of Congress. I am willing to trust the TVA Board. If the language were directed to the Atomic Energy Commission or to the Bureau of the Budget, I would feel that the language was worth only about as much as the lines on the paper.

Does a Senate document, then, standing on its own, distinct and separate from a House report on the same bill, also standing on its own and without this language, control in this case?

Mr. ELLENDER. I know of language in a House report, which did not appear in a Senate report, being respected, even though the Senate had not passed on it. That was the situation with reference to some flood-control work, in the making of surveys, and in advance planning. However, I wish to assure the Senator from Minnesota that during all the time I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations—and that has been quite a number of years—whatever has been written in a report formally submitted by the committee usually has been respected by the authority which is called upon to spend the money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask one final question of the Senator from Louisiana. The observation which the Senator makes with respect to Senate committee reports and House committee reports generally portrays the situation as the Senator has stated it. The language they contain is generally followed and acknowledged by the departments of Government. I think, however, that in the present situation we ought to keep in mind the fact that we are dealing with a highly volatile and explosive situation. The administration has falsified records and has deluded Congress and has refused to reveal pertinent documents in connection with this situation. Therefore, I do not believe that the administration can be trusted very much to follow the language in the report. I should like to trust it. However, when the President of the United States says he has revealed all the evidence, and it is shown that he has not revealed all of it—I am sure inadvertently—and when members of the administration have refused to testify and to bring pertinent documents before committees of Congress, it seems to me we would certainly be putting a lot of trust in such an administration if we raised no questions. My heart swells with trust, but I must certainly have much more trust in my heart before I can go along with this kind of proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. No doubt the bill will go to conference, and whatever is written in the Senate committee report, and which is not negated by the conference committee, will stand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is true, provided it is not negated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not anticipate that the House will fail to adopt and concur in the direction which has been adopted by the Senate committee and written into its report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana how much it will cost the Government of the United States to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract, if the city of Memphis goes through with the building of the power project, as I assume it will.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. We did not go into that subject, although we discussed it somewhat in committee. Apparently the longer we wait, the more it will cost. In other words, if the contract is canceled in 120 days, instead of 30 days from now, it may cost a great deal more. As I understand, the Dixon-Yates group are still of the opinion that their contract is good and that they can proceed under it. Of course, the longer we wait and the more they spend, the greater will be the cost to the Government. The problem is really a matter of damages, which must be determined by litigation, in all probability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why would it not be a good idea for Congress to eliminate the $6½ million and cancel the contract immediately?

Mr. ELLENDER. We cannot do that. It would require legislation to do that. I am sure that objection would be made to doing that. I do not know of any better way to remedy the situation than by doing what the committee suggests be done. I believe the matter is in excellent shape, particularly in view of the position taken by the President, that he is taking a new look at the Dixon-Yates contract. I am satisfied that when the further investigation is made, and when the city of Memphis proceeds to build its own facility, there will be time enough to cancel the whole contract. I am sure the President will act accordingly. Of course I am speaking only as an individual.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. In order to set the record straight, I noticed that in response to a question asked by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana said there were some transmission lines built in North Dakota.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may have been Nebraska, or——

Mr. LANGER. It was not in North Dakota.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may have been in South Dakota. I shall strike out "North Dakota." I made an error. I was speaking from my recollection of the situation.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wished to keep the record straight.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Louisiana and of the Senator from Florida, but the word of the city of Memphis has always been good. Although the officials of that city have not always been friendly with me, when they say they are going to do something, they always do it. But the effort to hang a hammer over their heads when they have made an unequivocal statement that they are not going to accept Dixon-Yates power is a gratuitous insult to the people of Memphis. When the word of a great city or political body has been given, or it has made an agreement, I know of no legislative precedent for placing a hammer over its head in the language of an appropriation bill. Of course Memphis is going to build its own steam plant; it said a long time ago that it would build the plant. It seems to me that if the President of the United States wishes to reexamine the matter, looking to the cancellation of the contract, this appropriation should be stricken from the pending bill. That is the easiest way to solve the problem. It requires only 1½ years to build a transmission line; it takes 3 years to build a generating plant such as the one proposed by Dixon-Yates. If anyone has any question as to whether Memphis will keep its word, there will be plenty of time next year to appropriate money for a generating plant.

The Senate is only one body. We do not have any control over what the House will do. We do not know whether the language in the report of the Senate committee will be accepted by conferees and placed in the conference report.

We should also, it seems to me, keep in mind the fact that up to this time nothing has passed through both Houses of Congress that gives any legitimate sanctity to the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. By appropriating $6½ million, even though it may be on a deferred basis, we are putting Congress into the situation of giving Dixon-Yates legislative approval of a contract which is likely to cost the Government a great deal of money. The Dixon-Yates group have been using gold shovels in celebration, and many other things, for which I do not think the Government should have to pay. By appropriating money on a deferred basis we are likely to stick the Government for a lot more than it has already been stuck for. On every basis of the argument, the contract is no good, and the Government is going to cancel it, as should have been done a long time ago. Why appropriate $6½ million 3 years before any transmission line, in any event, could be needed?

I think there is something to the idea that we do not know exactly who is going to make the decisions in connection with it. If the contract is bad, I think we should strike out the $6½ million appropriation and see what happens.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I wish to invite the chairman's attention to the language on page 3 of the report, which I now read:

> If said definite commitment is not made within 90 days by the city of Memphis, then the committee directs that such funds will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

At page 161 of the House hearings, the sum of $6.5 million is shown for the construction of this transmission line. No other plan has ever been submitted and, in my opinion, no other plan ever will be submitted. So I am unable to understand what this language means. It does not say anything about the transmission line. It says:

> And the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress.

The construction of the plant has commenced. Gold shovels have been at work. So I submit that part of the Senate committee's requirement has been met. The able Senator from Alabama said that the financing had not been completed. If we can get the courts to sustain that point of view, then Dixon-Yates cannot get a penny out of the United States Treasury for cancellation costs. But they claim they have a sound agreement. I have a copy of the agreement which they have signed. Therefore, the whole section falls, because the financing is completed according to the legal definition. I simply do not understand why the language which I have read is in the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I promised to yield to the Senator from——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not someone besides the TVA representatives have the right to a word?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who speaks for Memphis, and what have they done to insure performance on the part of Memphis? If they are going to proceed, why is there objection?

There is in the House hearings a letter dated as late as May 16, which the mayor of Memphis wrote to the chairman of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, in which, among other things, he said:

> Memphis, of course, wishes to continue as a part of the TVA system, because the arrangement is sound and has produced great benefits for all concerned.

Of course, they want the situation to continue.

I noticed in a newspaper a few days ago that the mayor of Memphis was asked about what the situation would be if the contract were canceled, and he said, "The TVA will take care of us until our plant is built."

I think the committee was justified in putting into the report this language. Consider the chaos which will result from the point of view of the Government if it is decided that Memphis does not have power to construct an electric plant. They have not had a referendum. In most communities the orderly way is to seek the opinion of the citizens. I certainly think there may be some question about the power of the mayor by his own words to commit the city or the community to build a plant. The purchasing of the site is not a guaranty. They could buy a piece of real estate and resell it the next day. There must be something more than that to set aside all the plans which have gone into effect. Is it not true that Memphis has been taking very substantial amounts of electric energy from the Midsouth organization over the past several years? Last year the TVA purchased more than 400 million kilowatt-hours from the same company which is building the Dixon-Yates plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, there is a large amount of power which was integrated with TVA assistance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the city of Memphis has used power in that way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the same way they would if the proposed plant were constructed. There is a variety of connections from the Arkansas Power & Light Co. across the river into the TVA area, through which power has flowed in past years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe there is a large amount of integration all around the periphery.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true; and all that is proposed is an additional connection. There is nothing unique about it. There are already 2 or 3 connections across the river, a little lower down, carrying power into the TVA system. Is not that true?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All the talk about Memphis not having a kilowatt from across the river is nonsense. Memphis has been taking kilowatts from across the river for many years. Is not that true?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not directly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As directly as would be the case if the proposed connection were installed. A ready kilowatt is not always identifiable. A kilowatt is a kilowatt.

Mr. ELLENDER. The contract between the city of Memphis and the TVA is one thing. As I said a while ago, there is an integrated system among, I believe, 3, 4, or 5 different concerns, including companies in Georgia and, I think, Alabama.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true. The Arkansas Power & Light Co. is a member of the group.

Mr. ELLENDER. They interchange electricity. That is also true in Virginia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I mean when I say that all the talk about the mayor of Memphis stating, "We will never accept a kilowatt of power from across the river," is nonsense. There is nothing wrong with those kilowatts. They are just like any other kilowatts which Memphis has been taking for years. It is purely a question of rates.

Is it not true that as late as 6 or 7 weeks ago Memphis was not offering to build her own plant, and that it was as a method to destroy the Dixon-Yates contract that Memphis made this move? Of course, they may build their plant; I do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not question the good faith of the city of Memphis or of the city fathers of Memphis. Personally, I believe they are going to build the plant. In order to prevent the expenditure of $6,500,000, all they need to do is to proceed with their proposal, and the funds will not be spent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from Louisiana give any assurance to the Government and the Congress that Memphis will build its plant without such a provision as that contained in the report? And what would be the recourse if Memphis did not build it, and this provision were not included?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. They could not be forced to build it; it would have to be a voluntary action on their part.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask one other question, suggested by the remarks of the senior Senator from Arkansas with regard to the situation as to power in that whole area. Is it not true that the TVA had requested some additional steam units in Johnsonville and in Gallatin in this year's budget?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but they had authority to do that under the present law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand, but did they not disapprove of the building of those units?

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee, on motion by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], struck out that provision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My point is that in the opinion of the TVA there is a large demand and will be a large demand and need for power in this area, aside from the Dixon-Yates plant. Is not that so?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. The report which was made by the subcommittee to the full committee contained this provision:

> Although the committee is providing no new funds for such purpose, the committee approves the proposed addition to the power capacity by the use of proceeds from power operations or funds otherwise available to provide additional units 7 to 10 at Johnsonville, unit 4 at John Sevier, and unit 3 at Gallatin, thus adding units at existing steam plants to build up the capacity to more nearly meet the heavy load forecast for 1957 and 1958.

When that report by the subcommittee came before the full committee for adoption, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] moved to strike it from the report, and the committee did so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator familiar with the telegrams which the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] addressed to General Vogel and the answer from General Vogel with regard to this particular point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not seen them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator from Louisiana permit me to read them? They are very short.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After these two items had been discussed, the senior Senator from Arkansas sent a telegram to General Vogel under date of July 2, reading as follows:

> Please advise me promptly by wire total estimated cost of additional power units 7 to 10 at Johnsonville, unit 4 at John Sevier, and unit 3 at Gallatin, which I understand the TVA proposes to construct, or begin construction of, within this fiscal year. In other words, these are the proposed additional power capacity units the Senate Appropriations Committee was asked to approve. I understand the cost of construction is to be paid out of proceeds and earnings of the TVA and not out of appropriated funds. Thanks for your prompt response.
>
> JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
> *United States Senator.*

General Vogel's reply, under date of July 2, was as follows:

> Reurtel Johnsonville units 7 to 10, John Sevier unit 4, and Gallatin unit 3, which would add approximately 1 million kilowatts to TVA's assured load-carrying capacity, are estimated to cost $144,500,000.
>
> HUBERT D. VOGEL,
> *Chairman of the Board, TVA.*

In other words, this is an additional load factor which it is estimated will be needed, which is far greater than the proposed Dixon-Yates plant would furnish, in addition to whatever Memphis might need. Would it not still be possible—I do not know the facts, but it could well be possible, upon a resurvey, that the Government might decide that the TVA could use the power, if Memphis does not build its own plant?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a possibility if the plants to which the Senator has referred are not built.

As I understand, in the overall estimate of the power to be produced by the end of 1958, the plants to which he has referred were included in the estimate, and that is why, when the matter came before the full committee, I voted not to strike that provision from the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee in disapproving of those units—I do not know whether their action will be followed or not—is not appropriating money, as has already been stated. The units referred to would be financed from a revolving fund, which would take them from under the control of the Committee on Appropriations. The TVA is the only organization I know of which has immunity from control by the Committee on Appropriations. This is something which I think ought to be looked into for the future, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said a moment ago, when the Senator brought the matter to the attention of the Senate, the TVA has the power to do so, and I presume they will proceed to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana and the committee for including this language in the bill, because it would be very improvident and foolish to make this appropriation without any real assurance other than the word of the mayor of Memphis that Memphis will build its own plant. The mayor is a new mayor. The mayor whom the Senator from Tennessee was talking about, and on whom he relied in the past, has recently died. The present mayor is so new that he may not be certain that he is speaking for everyone in Memphis. He may be speaking alone for himself. I hope the language will be retained.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to supplement very briefly my statement of a few minutes ago. First, what I said was not intended as a gratuitous insult or an uncomplimentary statement about the city officials of Memphis or the citizens there, or of any group of people in the Tennessee Valley or the State of Tennessee. My respect for Tennesseeans is very great.

It happens that a great Tennesseean, Andrew Jackson, was the first Governor of Florida, and our gateway city, Jacksonville, bears his name, as does one of our important counties.

It happens, also, that Andrew Johnson, the generous and constitutionally minded President who succeeded Abraham Lincoln, is venerated by a great many of our people because of his fairness to a prostrate South.

It happens, further, that I was privileged to be nearby to Sgt. Alvin York, from Tennessee, on the occasion of his rendering gallant military service which will always be remembered among the finest annals of America.

I have nothing but respect and affection for the people of Tennessee, including the people of Memphis, and also for the officials of Memphis, whom I do not know personally.

I realize that this whole fight has been a question of whether or not there were to be new steam powerplants built in the area of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That was the subject of the fight last year. I voted for the Dixon-Yates program because I felt that, by all means, the Nation must stop building additional steam plants in the TVA. We had already built more TVA power there which was developed from steam than was the total amount of power which was generated from hydroelectric facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this point.

I have voted, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and as a Member of the Senate for numerous projects, not only to complete the hydroelectric development of the Tennessee Valley, but also to install steam units to firm up the hydroelectric power, and then, during wartime, to authorize additional steam units, which I knew, and I think every other Senator knew, went beyond the amount which was required to firm up the hydroelectric power.

The Senator from Florida felt last year as he still feels, that it is completely unjust to the rest of the people of the United States to continue to build steam plants in the Tennessee Valley, and that there is no way to justify it unless we are to adopt Federal public power as the established method of supplying the power needs of all our people.

The fact of the matter is that the Senator from Florida was glad when the people of Memphis, through their officials, indicated that they had decided to rise to their own responsibility and furnish their own power. The Senator from Florida was rather proud that the people of Memphis did that. Sometimes even a proud and independent people can get so used to being the beneficiaries of a generous Federal Government that they lose that fine sense of independence which has always characterized Tennesseeans, and I hope always will, to such a degree that they expect the Federal Government to supply their needs. I began to fear that might be the case. These fears have been completely laid at rest since the Senator from Florida has seen the action which the city of Memphis is preparing to take.

The reason for the elimination of the paragraph from the proposed report which was mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana, and read into the RECORD, was exactly the reason for the support of the Dixon-Yates program last year by the Senator from Florida and by many other Senators. The question was whether we were going to approve more steam units for TVA. It was not a question of whether there was a law on the books already to confirm the proposal of the committee. The committee, by mere words in a report, could not change whatever the law has provided, and whatever the law has provided is still the law.

But it was proposed in the committee report that those members who were opposed to new steam plants for the TVA should give their specific approval to the construction of six additional steam units at the named places, at a total cost of $144 million, as now disclosed by the telegram which has been placed in the RECORD, and this amount is based on estimates made a long time ago.

The Senator from Florida felt, and he is happy that a majority of the Committee on Appropriations agreed with him, that this is no time to give blanket approval to such a heavy additional expenditure for the production of steam power in the Tennessee Valley. It was for that reason that the Senator from Florida offered his motion to strike out the paragraph in the proposed report. It was for that reason, as the Senator from Florida believes, that a majority of the committee voted to strike out the paragraph.

In closing, I should like to say—and I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Louisiana—that it seems to me we ought to proceed and dispose of this matter. The action of the committee which I have stated was taken after decision of the question whether the $6,500,000 was to be eliminated from the bill. The sole meaning of the words placed in the report is to make it very sure that before the funds are made available, it will be required that the Dixon-Yates project is to be actually built, and to make sure that the funds will not be made available if the building of the Dixon-Yates plant is made unnecessary by the serious determination by the people of Memphis to go ahead with their program to build their own powerplant and furnish their own power.

As long as that fact is definitely, clearly, and irrevocably established, under the action taken by the committee, there will be no need for the $6,500,000 appropriation. So far as the committee could go without putting further legislation in the bill, which we were banned from doing, it was the intent of the committee to strike the appropriation when it became clear that the people of Memphis were actually to go through with the supplying of their own power needs. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In my own time I shall answer the questions of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], but at this time I should like to ask if the testimony before the Appropriations Committee was not to the effect that a transmission line could be built in a year or a year and a half, whereas it takes 3 years to build a steam-generating plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall the time element. I have no knowledge of it at the moment, but I am sure it takes longer to build a plant than it does to build transmission lines.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has that information from competent engineers, and I also have the information. It takes a relatively short time to build transmission lines in comparison with the time required for building a steam plant. In view of the great doubt that a steam plant will be constructed and that the administration may cancel the contract, in order to prevent giving sanctity to a larger claim against the United States Government, why would it not be better to eliminate the language? If perchance the city of Memphis should not build its own steam plant, which I do not think any of us contemplate will happen, there would still be ample time to appropriate sufficient money to have the transmission lines constructed ahead of the steam plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to say to my good friend from Tennessee that a moment ago I was unable to answer his question, for the simple reason I did not conduct the hearings on the TVA appropriation. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] conducted them. He happened to be present when the question raised by the Senator was discussed, and I should like to yield to him.

Mr. HILL. It would not take over 18 months to build transmission lines. It would take from 32 to 36 months to build the plant.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will answer my question. Certainly the Government would have an opportunity to save a lot of money, in connection with the cancellation of the contract, if the whole matter were deferred until next year. There would still be ample time to build transmission lines.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee thought otherwise. That is all I can say.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield, he may recall that General Vogel, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, testified before the subcommittee, and made it very definite and clear that the additional units to which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has referred, the units at the Johnsonville plant, the Gallatin plant, and the John Sevier plant, are needed, irrespective of the needs of the Memphis area. In other words, irrespective of whether the Dixon-Yates plant should be built, or the contract should go through, and Memphis should get its power from that plant, or whether Memphis should get its power from a plant of its own, these other units are definitely needed for the TVA system.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was my understanding. As the Senator may remember, I questioned the witness at considerable length as to the overall planning of the plant which was to be constructed, say, in 1958, and it was testified that the amount of electricity which would be produced would be all used, and there was a need for it.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The power from these units would be needed, and, in addition thereto, power would be needed for Memphis.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is why, I repeat, when the motion to strike the paragraph from the subcommittee's report was made, I voted in the negative.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator has also said, under the basic TVA Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority has the power to provide additional units to improve the existing facilities at the Johnsonville plant, the Gallatin plant, and the John Sevier plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. And that it has the power from the proceeds it derives to install these units.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. And the power is needed now.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is also my understanding.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question: Is this arrangement satisfactory to the Tennessee Valley Authority? Is that true, according to General Vogel's testimony?

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from North Dakota refer to that particular paragraph?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is satisfactory.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But not according to General Vogel's testimony.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from North Dakota is talking about this paragraph.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and about the need for these additional steam plants.

Mr. LANGER. I am talking about the particular language used.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the Senator from North Dakota had reference to this paragraph which the subcommittee had incorporated in its report but which was deleted by the full committee.

Mr. LANGER. No. I wish to know whether the arrangement is satisfactory to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, the language of the report, as finally approved, was not discussed, so far as I know, with any member of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee ?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank the able Senator from Louisiana for his generous references to me and for his patient consideration and diligent efforts in this field.

He has said that the genesis of the language in the report was the statements I made to the subcommittee. If the Senator from Louisiana will recall, at the time when I was testifying, question was raised as to whether the action of Memphis was a maneuver or whether it was an act of good faith. I stated to the subcommittee that I had been in close communication, contact, and cooperation with the officials of Memphis, and that I had every confidence that the city officials were acting in good faith; and I ventured so far as to suggest to the Senator from Louisiana and to his committee that in the event it should be revealed that Memphis was not acting in good faith, but, on the contrary, was attempting to perpetrate a political maneuver, I would vote to support an appropriation for the building of the transmission line.

Mr. ELLENDER. I well remember the statement to which the Senator from Tennessee refers.

Mr. GORE. Thereafter, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, the committee made the fund available only upon the condition that Memphis fails to act in good faith.

Now the able Senator from Louisiana has made it very clear that in the event Memphis is moving in good faith, the money will not be available for obligation, and therefore will not be available for expenditure.

Mr. President, this has been a long fight. I believe I made the first speech on the subject on April 21 of last year. I realize that an unconditional surrender would be preferable to those of us who have been in the heat of the battle. But I am willing to accept victory under these conditions.

I believe that the city of Memphis is moving in the utmost of good faith and determination. The Legislature of Tennessee has authorized the bond issue. The city council has unanimously voted, in a formal, recorded vote, to proceed, and has directed its light, gas, and water division to proceed with all dispatch. Furthermore, Memphis has officially notified the Tennessee Valley Authority that it does not expect to renew its contract with TVA which expires in 1958.

Mr. President, I do not know how the city could demonstrate its good faith more impressively. I believe that in the ensuing weeks, one move in good faith after another will follow. I think this means the transmission line will not be constructed. On that basis, I accept the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Louisiana in yielding to me, and I also appreciate his statements and his action.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I return to inquire about the plans contained in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, as referred to in the committee report. I have available page 273 of the hearings on the public-works appropriations for the calendar year 1956. That part of the hearings contains nothing in regard to any plans. If that be true, I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana can tell me why page 3 of the committee report includes the following words:

> According to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

Because there is nothing of that sort.

Mr. ELLENDER. We were then of the impression that there was.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where did that language come from?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me? I can inform the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am interested in knowing, because nothing of that nature exists. We are afraid this language will constitute a hook to tie it to again.

Mr. HOLLAND. It comes from the report of the subcommittee headed by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Certainly such a source would not be hostile to the Tennessee Valley Authority or to any of the objectives the Senator holds dear.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but originally the Senator from Alabama tried to strike out the appropriation.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; he did not.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Alabama sought to strike out the $6,500,000 appropriation, but he was defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to state——

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether I have misstated the fact.

Mr. HILL. No. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me, Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. First, Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD the paragraph prepared by the subcommittee headed by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. That paragraph contains the words to which the Senator from New Mexico has referred. It reads as follows:

> The committee directs that the funds provided for the transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., in the amount of $6,500,000, will only be obligated when the construction of the plant with which the lines are to be connected for use in transmitting the power is financed and the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he did or did not make a motion to strike out the $6,500,000.

Mr. HILL. I certainly did make a motion to strike out the $6,500,000. That motion was defeated. Then the subcommittee wrote into the report the language the Senator from Florida has just read.

Mr. ANDERSON. Who suggested the language "according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956," when there is nothing to back up those words? Was it a proposal which had been sent to Congress by the administration?

Mr. HILL. No. As I recall, the language was suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. ANDERSON. What purpose does it serve?

Mr. HILL. What purpose does it serve?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Nothing of that nature exists. Why should the committee state in the report "the construction of said plant commenced according to the plans submitted to the Congress in the budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 for the fiscal year 1956," when no such plan exists?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama is not the author of that language. He did not write it. As the Senator from Alabama said, he moved to strike out the appropriation of $6,500,000. Then the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] offered that language.

The Senator from Alabama takes the position that the financing of the plan has not been completed, because the matter is now in the Securities and Exchange Commission and in the Federal court. Therefore, the position that the money cannot be obligated until the plant is financed is a sound position, as the matter stands today. There is no financing of the plant today, because the matter is before the Securities and Exchange Commission and also in the Federal court.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Attorney General of the United States agree with the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. I have not consulted the Attorney General.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Securities and Exchange Commission agree with him?

Mr. HILL. I have not consulted the Securities and Exchange Commission, but I know that the matter is pending in the Securities and Exchange Commission and also in the Federal court; and until the question is disposed of by the Securities and Exchange Commission and by the Federal court, the financing has not been completed. The plant is not financed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Take the Senator's statement as to the time of construction. If only 18 months are required to complete the transmission line, and from 32 to 36 months to complete the generating station, why is provision for the transmission line necessary at this time? Can some Senator explain that?

Mr. ELLENDER. The money is being provided on a contingent basis. We say that it will not be spent under certain conditions. That is all it means.

I reiterate what I have said many times. This money will not be spent if and when Memphis builds a plant to produce her own electricity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman, and the effort he has made to explain the situation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. On last Thursday, June 30, the chairman of the TVA Board, General Vogel, speaking for the Board, wrote a letter to Hon. Rowland Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C. In this letter General Vogel had the following to say:

> Since the Dixon-Yates plant was proposed as a source of supply for the Memphis load, the city's action eliminates the possibility of using its output in the Memphis area, and the transmission costs involved and other factors would make it impracticable for TVA to utilize MVGC power—

That is, Dixon-Yates power—

> elsewhere on the TVA system. We believe, therefore, that no arrangements between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. should any longer be predicated on the use of the MVGC plant—

That is, the Dixon-Yates plant—

> as a source of supply to TVA. A formal resolution with regard to this matter was adopted by the TVA Board today, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has stated again and again, if Memphis proceeds in good faith to build its plant, it means, in view of the language adopted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the end of the Dixon-Yates contract. That kills the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if there be no further questions with respect to the TVA appropriation, under title I, I shall now proceed with title II.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the Senator's attention to page 29, in connection with the Garrison Dam. The only question I wish to ask is this: Was this provision inserted with the consent of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was.

Mr. LANGER. Did the junior Senator from North Dakota approve it in its entirety?

Mr. ELLENDER. He did.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator. The junior Senator from North Dakota is not present today.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, he proposed the language.

Mr. LANGER. I wished to be certain that the language was exactly the way he proposed it, and that it was not changed in any way. The junior Senator from North Dakota is absent, and I am trying to protect his interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. He proposed the language with respect to that project, and the language he proposed was adopted by the full committee.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now, Mr. President, we move to title II of the bill, providing appropriations for four agencies within the Department of the Interior.

The budget estimate for this purpose was $203,913,000. This appropriation will be used for the programs and activities of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation. For all these purposes the House allowed $201,689,000; the Senate committee has recommended $203,755,000, or an increase of $2,066,000 over the amount allowed by the House. This amount is a reduction of $158,000 below the budget estimates.

The first item is the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, including funds for operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.

The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $1,160,000—the budget estimate—for the expenses of operation and maintenance of the Southeastern Power Administration. Of the total amount recommended, $925,000 is necessary to implement the "wheeling contract" with the Virginia Electric Power Co. under which preference customers in the State of Virginia are served with power and energy from the John H. Kerr project. This contract has proven that power and energy from Federal hydroelectric projects can be made available to preference customers by utilizing the existing transmission facilities of the utilities serving the area. It is my hope that similar arrangements can be worked out with the utilities in the other States of the Southeastern power area, in order that preference customers might take advantage of power and energy available without the Federal Government having to build additional transmission facilities.

For operation and maintenance of the Southwestern Power Administration the budget estimate was $1,134,000. The House allowed only $684,000. The recommendation of the Senate committee is $1,250,000. Although the House allowed only $684,000, it provided for a fund of $6 million to be acquired from the sale of electricity to carry on this work. The Senate committee recommended an addition of $116,000 for administration purposes, above the budget estimate, for the reason that Mr. Aandahl, who appeared for the Interior Department, stated that he would require some funds in order to facilitate the renewal of contracts or the maintenance of contracts for the generating and transmission facilities in that area. Under this action the existing contracts with the generating and transmitting cooperatives can be reactivated immediately, and it is the desire of the committee that these contracts become operative upon the approval of the act.

In taking this action, the committee suggests that the existing contracts be amended to allow the cooperatives to operate and maintain their own transmission facilities as well as the deletion of the provision in the existing contracts that gives the Federal Government an option to purchase the transmission facilities.

I may say that the Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations have the duty of disposing of electricity generated by the Government at the dams in that area.

The next item is the Bonneville Power Administration.

The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $14,600,000 for the construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration. However, the committee recommends that two facilities, that were disallowed by the House, be restored to the approved construction program. These facilities are: First, the Upper Olympic Peninsula service; and second, Olympia-Aberdeen, No. 2.

With respect to operation and maintenance, the House provided $6,500,000, which is $150,000 under the budget estimate. The Senate committee restored the $150,000 which was deleted by the House, for the simple reason that there is a continuous need for expansion of the distribution of electricity which is produced in that area, and the amount of $150,000 is very necessary if the Bonneville Administration is to carry on its work adequately. It is the view of the committee that it is imperative that the extensive transmission system of the Bonneville Power Administration be operated and maintained on a standard that assures the best possible service to the area.

The Bonneville Power Administration is the marketing agency for power and energy from Federal hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest. To accomplish this function it has built and must maintain and operate one of the most extensive electric-transmission systems in the world. I would like to state that the cooperation and the working arrangement between the Bonneville Power Administration and the private utilities serving the area is most encouraging. It proves that there can be full development of the hydroelectric potential of an area through the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government, and the private utilities serving the area.

Next is the Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations. The House allowed $5,104,000, or $71,000 less than the budget estimate. The Senate committee concurred in the recommendation of the House. This amount provides funds for the entire investigations program presented in the budget, with the exception of Blue South Platte project.

In the field of water resource development, nothing is more important than the initial investigations of the potential of our streams and the projects to fully develop them.

The same may be said for Construction and Rehabilitation. The budget estimate was $146,041,000. The House allowed that amount, and the Senate committee concurred in that allowance. The House committee had deducted from the appropriation requested an amount equal to about $8 million of carryover funds, and that amount and other recommended reductions were restored, as I understand, on the House floor when the bill was considered there. With that additional amount of $8 million, the committee provided for 5 new starts, as follows:

The Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California; the Rogue River project, Talent division, Oregon; the Provo River project, in Utah; the Hardin unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Montana, and the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Wyoming.

These new projects are to be undertaken, but the money for them was provided without any necessity of appropriating new funds. Carryover funds, which were left over from projects on which bids had been obtained, are to be used for the purpose of starting the new projects to which I have referred.

For operation and maintenance, the budget estimate was $24 million. The House allowed $23,500,000. The Senate committee recommended $24,750,000.

I may state that to the budget estimate was added $750,000, to carry on a dredging operation of the Colorado River in the vicinity of Needles, Calif., below Davis Dam. I call attention to the fact that of the total amount recommended over $23 million will be returned to the Treasury in the form of power revenues and irrigation water charges.

For general administration expenses, the budget estimate was $3,700,000. The House allowed $3,500,000. The committee restored the budget estimate. The extra $200,000 is necessary to meet the added cost of the increased program provided in the bill.

With reference to the emergency fund, the budget estimate was $700,000. The House allowed $600,000. The committee recommendation is $500,000, a reduction of $100,000 below the House allowance. The $500,000 recommended plus funds available from prior years will provide an adequate amount to meet the emergency.

Hearings on this title of the bill were conducted by a special subcommittee on the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior Power Marketing Agencies. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, presided at these hearings. Any questions on this title of the bill should be directed to him.

We now come to title III, Civil Functions, Department of the Army.

The first appropriation under that title is for cemeterial expenses. The budget estimate was $6,027,000. The House allowed $6 million. The committee recommendation is in accord with the House allowance.

With reference to the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers, I should like to particularly call to the attention of the Senate the committee's action with respect to providing more funds than the budget estimate calls for.

The committee felt that because of the constant state of emergency in which we have been living for the past 7 or 8 years, we have been more or less negligent in not providing sufficient funds to take care of hundreds of projects which have been authorized by the Congress, but on which work has not started.

I desire to call attention to a new procedure for funding small authorized projects. I have served on the Committee on Appropriations for 6 years, and year after year we have heard the same story from people who are interested in these projects. Many of the projects, though small, are important, and they are located all over the country. They are small projects for which people from afar have come to give testimony but for which a budget estimate has been lacking. Great difficulty has been experienced by some people in obtaining sufficient funds to carry out the construction of these small projects. Although none of them cost more than $150,000, the great majority of them cost much less than that. The budget estimate for this work was $2 million. The House doubled the amount, and made it $4 million. We added $500,000 to that fund.

Therefore, $4,500,000 will be available to take care of a large number of small projects, some of which cost $10,000 or $12,000, and on up to as much as $150,000. I may say that this action will clear the record of these little projects that have been pending before the committee for many years.

With respect to the total amount recommended for Army civil functions the committee has increased the funds available by more than $46 million over Budget Bureau recommendations.

I should like to point out to the Senate that even with the small amount we have added over and above the budget estimate, we are not spending as much money in dollar value to perform the work this year as we did in 1938. In 1938 we provided in dollars of the same value as those of 1955, $581 million for Corps of Engineers civil functions. This amount was used principally for construction. In 1948 we appropriated an equivalent of $609 million of these 1955 dollars for similar work. In 1950 we provided $825 million, based on the purchasing power of today's dollar. With the outbreak of the Korean war that amount was gradually decreased until last year, 1954, when we appropriated only $443 million for fiscal year 1955.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table showing the appropriations for Corps of Engineers civil functions, expressed in 1955 dollars, for the fiscal year 1938 to 1955, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Amount made available to Corps of Engineers (principally construction)

Fiscal year	Total appropriations (in millions of dollars)	Index [1]	Appropriation in terms of 1955 dollars
1938	208.7	235.8	581
1939	223.0	235.5	621
1940	270.3	242.0	732
1941	204.3	257.8	520
1942	191.8	276.3	455
1943	238.8	290.0	540
1944	84.0	298.7	184
1945	92.1	307.8	196
1946	268.0	346.0	508
1947	320.8	413.2	510
1948	427.2	460.7	609
1949	622.1	477.0	868
1950	639.7	509.4	825
1951	617.4	542.0	748
1952	616.4	568.8	711
1953	561.9	600.0	615
1954	424.2	628.0	442
1955	443.4	656.0	443

[1] Engineering News Record Index.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition to construction funds, we have increased the planning funds by a little more than a million dollars. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the additional projects for which we have provided planning funds.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Included in the construction appropriation are funds for advance engineering and design totaling $6,304,000, which is an increase of $1,304,000 above the House. The Senate increases are as follows:

Project	Navigation	Flood control	Multiple purpose
Painted Rock Reservoir, Ariz.		[1]—$90,000	
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir, Ariz.		100,000	
Greers Ferry Reservoir, Ark.			[2] $150,000
Ouachita River, Ark.	$100,000		
Terminus Reservoir, Calif.		50,000	
Bruces Eddy Reservoir, Idaho			100,000
Mansfield Reservoir, Ind.		90,000	
Markland lock and dam	[1]—125,000		
Manhattan, Kans.		15,000	
Little Sioux River, Iowa		—150,000	
Lock and dam No. 41, Kentucky	150,000		
Catlettsburg, Ky.		—50,000	
No. 2 Barren Reservoir, Ky.		100,000	
Overton Red River, La.	350,000		
Los Esteros Reservoir, N. Mex.		50,000	
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.		100,000	
Marmarth, N. Dak.		23,000	
Coos Bay, Oreg.	36,000		
Cougar Reservoir, Oreg.			—100,000
Green Peter Reservoir, Oreg.			200,000
John Day Reservoir, Oreg.			[2] 100,000
Deferred for further study		37,000	

[1] Senate committee allowed construction funds, and the balance of planning is to be derived from the funds appropriated for construction.

[2] Shows net Senate increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee feels that the increases recommended are necessary to insure a steady flow of well-planned projects for consideration in future years.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the projects, for which increases in construction funds are recommended by the Senate committee, most of which are unbudgeted. The list includes some projects which were mentioned a moment ago.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate increases for construction

Project	Estimated cost	Appropriations to date	Navigation	Flood control	Multiple purpose
Metlakatla, Alaska	$383,000		$383,000		
Petersburg, Alaska	274,000		274,000		
Wrangle Harbor, Alaska	520,000		220,000		
Painted Rock Reservoir, Ariz	35,000,000	$329,000		$600,000	
Arkansas River bank stabilization			[1]1,000,000		
Red River below Denison Dam				[1] 150,000	
Richmond Harbor, Calif	2,160,000		1,000,000		
Russian River Reservoir, Calif	16,600,000	546,000		1,000,000	
San Joaquin River and tributaries, California	9,700,000	396,000		500,000	
Sherwood Island State Park, Conn	159,000		[2] 159,000		
Inland Waterway, Rehoboth to Delaware Bay	817,000		147,000		
Mispillion River, Del	475,000		275,000		
Apalachicola Channel, Fla			[1] 82,000		
St. George Sound, Fla			[1] 100,000		
St. Augustine Harbor, Fla	2,582,000		326,000		
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	94,300,000	952,000			$3,000,000
Nawilwili Harbor, Hawaii	1,210,000		500,000		
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill	60,000		60,000		
Markland lock and dam, Indiana	69,700,000	420,000	1,250,000		
Little Sioux River, Iowa	16,500,000	152,000		500,000	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Omaha			[1] 700,000		
Catlettsburg, Ky	4,560,000	52,000		300,000	
Rough River Reservoir and channel	9,370,000	134,000		500,000	
Plaquemine-Morgan City, La			[1] 240,000		
Beals Harbor, Maine	200,000		200,000		
Wood Island Harbor and pool at Biddeford, Maine	153,000		153,000		
Town River, Mass	525,000		250,000		
Black River Harbor, Mich	238,000		110,000		
Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich	$241,000		$241,000		
Port Austin Harbor, Mich	1,160,000	$4,000	433,000		
Knife River Harbor, Minn	258,000		258,000		
Pomme de Terre Reservoir, Mo	22,500,000	523,000		$500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton	95,100,000		6,000,000		
Chamita Reservoir, N. Mex	12,600,000	354,000		425,000	
Manteo, N. C	47,000		47,000		
Wilmington Harbor, N. C	2,100,000		557,000		
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak					[1] $100,000
Keystone Reservoir, Okla	137,000,000	651,000			450,000
Markham Ferry Reservoir, Okla	6,500,000	406,000		6,300,000	
Oologah Reservoir, Okla	31,420,000	392,000		1,000,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon	8,640,000		750,000		
Coos Bay, Oreg	696,000		200,000		
Cougar Reservoir, Oreg	37,400,000	266,000			500,000
Hills Creek Reservoir, Oreg	32,300,000	588,000			300,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg	1,611,000		200,000		
Port Royal Sound to Beauford, S. C	735,000		[1] 250,000		
McCook Lake, S. Dak	150,000				150,000
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	3,650,000			400,000	
Canyon Reservoir, Tex	11,900,000	559,000		340,000	
Houston ship channel, Texas			[1] 500,000		
Deep Creek, Va	200,000		150,000		
Winter Harbor, Va	239,000		150,000		
Ice Harbor lock and dam	142,000,000	1,082,000			1,000,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash	646,200		646,200		
Hildebrand lock and dam, West Virginia	14,200,000	157,000	1,000,000		
Cornucopia Harbor, Wis	230,000		230,000		
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis	218,000		218,000		
Small authorized projects			500,000		
Fish and Wildlife Service, lower Columbia River			−500,000		

---

[1] Net Senate increase.

[2] Beach erosion.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my hope that the Senate will stand by the committee, and it is also my hope that we will be able to convince the House conferees that the amount we have added should be retained in the bill.

As a matter of fact, the House saw fit to increase the budget estimate by a little more than $20 million. It is my belief that we will be able to make a good case in conference, and to retain in the bill all the moneys recommended by the committee and approved by the Senate for the various projects.

Mr. President, under the heading of General Investigations, in connection with surveys of the projects, the House allowed $5,190,000. The budget estimate was $3,905,000. In order to take care of many needed surveys the committee recommends increasing the amount which the House approved to $5,940,000. It is hoped that with that amount we shall be able to undertake a number of surveys and studies of projects which have been in the offing for quite some time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Calling the Senator's attention to page 14 of the report, with reference to general investigations, I note that the committee's recommendation is as follows:

> In the allocation of the balance of the increases recommended, it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee.

In that connection, I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that after testimony was presented to the committee, the City of Las Vegas, in my State of Nevada, was hit by a very serious flood, the damage being estimated at $400 million. I presented a statement to the committee pointing out the real need for an investigation and an Army engineers' survey; and at this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks a letter I received this very morning from the Governor of Nevada pointing out the real necessity for a survey to be made by the Army engineers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, June 30, 1955.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATER BIBLE: I have just written the division engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers in San Francisco urging that his organization undertake a comprehensive survey of the Las Vegas area with the objective of ascertaining the type of storm drains and other construction necessary to divert flash flood waters.

The recent cloudburst, followed by a flash flood, which devastated a considerable portion of Las Vegas resulted from waters which come from Red Rock Canyon and the Mount Charleston section, all of which comprises either Government-owned land or national park area.

I believe that in view of conditions in that section around Las Vegas could well be recognized and designated as a flash flood section by the Federal Government and construction of necessary protective drains and dams be undertaken at Federal expense.

Anything you can do to further a survey by the Army engineers and favorable action on a report made by them will be greatly appreciated.

With every best wish,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a letter from the city of Las Vegas, Nev., signed by the city manager, pointing out the need for immediate study by the Army engineers because of the great damage done by the flood to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEV.,
July 1, 1955.

The Honorable ALAN BIBLE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Under separate cover you will receive from the city of Las Vegas immediately, photographs that were taken by the local newspapers and the police department and public works department of the city of Las Vegas at different areas during the height of the flood. I hope these photographs will enable you to give the Appropriations Committee a general idea of just exactly what did occur here and the amount of water that was running through the city of Las Vegas in certain areas.

Our main concern is that a reoccurrence of this, which would not have to be of a major flood nature, but following the same general path, would completely close down our sewer plant. The said sewer plant serves not only the city of Las Vegas, but the city of North Las Vegas, and portions of Clark County, and is the only sanitation system for a population of 75,000.

We hope the committee is favorable toward appropriating money for this study, and want to thank you for your work and cooperation on this matter, on behalf of the people of this area.

Very truly yours,
A. H. KENNEDY,
City Manager.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I realize that the report states that the committee does not make specific allocations for individual investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not the custom of the Committee on Appropriations to earmark funds for specific investigations, but, as a rule, the Army engineers take note of the committee hearings and usually give preference to those projects the discussion of which gave rise to the amounts recommended. Much testimony regarding many worthy projects was presented. If the Corps of Engineers can find a more worthy project than those named, of course, it is within their discretion to take care of such projects. Possibly the project to which the Senator has referred will be included. However, I wish to point out that it has been the policy of the committee not to earmark the general investigation funds, but merely to leave their expenditure to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers. But, I repeat, the Corps of Engineers usually takes note of all the projects discussed before the committee and for which funds were added. I may further assure my good friend that the committee added a few thousand dollars in addition to the amount necessary to cover many of the projects which were brought to our attention.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his explanation. I brought the matter to his attention primarily because testimony was not presented to the committee for the very reason that the calamity had not then occurred. If it was given consideration by the Army engineers, that is satisfactory.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee added $750,000 to the amount provided by the House, and, as has been pointed out, the House bill was over the budget request by more than a million dollars.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the report of the committee, under the heading "General Investigations," I find an item headed "Hurricane Study," for which the House provided a million dollars and for which the Senate committee provided $500,000. In view of the keen interest in that item on the part of many Senators, and the evidence brought before the Senator's subcommittee and the Public Works Committee, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if by the reduction of the House figure of $1 million to $500,000 there was any purpose on the part of the committee to slow down, delay, or postpone the action of the Army Engineers in undertaking a study and making a survey of the hurricane problem for which that amount of money is being provided.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend from Oklahoma that what prompted the committee to cut the amount in half was that the appropriation act for the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies for fiscal year 1956 provided $4,150,000 to carry on work in connection with facilities and research in hurricane, storm and tornado warning services. I wish to give assurance to my good friend that this is an unbudgeted item which the House put in. It is a new matter. The study of hurricanes by the Corps of Engineers is something new, and we felt that since it was new and was not entirely in the field of the Corps of Engineers, the sum of $500,000 was ample to make a good start. I wish to give assurance to my good friend that if perchance an additional $500,000 is needed in the near future to make the studies, I shall assist to the best of my ability in obtaining the necessary funds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the committee, I wish fully to concur in what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said. It in no sense implies, directly or indirectly, any lack of interest in the importance of the problem in the minds of the committee. The action of the committee was based solely on the fact that having just passed an item to provide for a hurricane study by the Weather Bureau, we thought, under the circumstances, the matter had been taken care of and that the amount provided for the Army engineers would be adequate. I am sure that if any facts to the contrary are presented to the subcommittee or to the full Appropriations Committee there will be a most sympathetic understanding, because not only in States directly affected by hurricanes, but in all other States, I believe there is a realization of the importance of gathering data which will enable steps to be taken to avert, insofar as possible, the damage done by hurricanes.

So there is no indication of any lack of interest, but the reduction in the amount was recommended solely for the reasons which the Senator from Louisiana has stated and in which I fully concur.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from California.

On page 2092 of the hearings on this particular item I asked the following question of General Itschner:

> I would like to ask the general, if the Congress saw fit to provide $500,000 in that item for the first year, would not that enable you to get a substantial start on that program?

And General Itschner answered:

> Yes, sir; it certainly would.

In view of that, I should like the distinguished Senator to advise me if I am correct in the belief and in stating that it was the purpose of the committee to have the engineers proceed with the same dispatch, diligence, and effort as though the committee had allowed the same amount as that provided by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. KERR. And that there should be no delay whatsoever by reason of the change.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, of the funds allowed for the Weather Bureau, there was language included which would limit the use of $4,150,000 to operation, improvement, facilities and research in hurricane, storm, and tornado warnings services and that would include the storm area of which we are now speaking. The committee felt that since this item was something new in which the Corps of Engineers was engaging for the first time the sum of $500,000 should be ample.

I repeat that if perchance more money is necessary—and no one in the Senate is more sensitive to storms than I am, because there have been hurricanes in my area ever since I can remember, and I have lived through many of them—I am certain the committee would be agreeable to providing sufficient additional funds if the $500,000 proves to be inadequate.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been interested in the report in regard to the Civil Functions items. It is rather difficult for Senators who are not members of the committee to understand clearly the number of surveys and States the appropriation figure encompasses. I am very much concerned about the upper Mississippi and its tributaries. Does the appropriation of $6 million include all the Army engineer projects for surveys which have been approved thus far?

Mr. ELLENDER. A list was furnished to the committee which was really so long that we did not include it in our report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But are they the projects which the Army engineers felt were in need of surveys or studies? Are they included in the figure?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; it includes all the surveys recommended in the budget, the increases allowed by the House, and an increase of $1,250,000 recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that list available in the committee's records?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is included in the side slips, but it was not incorporated into the hearings. I may say that the list is, however, available to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I was trying to understand. I could not find it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said a while ago in answer to a question asked by the Senator from Nevada, the committee has never earmarked any of those funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I so understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. We depend largely on a list furnished to us by the Corps of Engineers. In addition, there is testimony on quite a number of surveys which are not included in the list.

As a rule, the Corps of Engineers follows the suggestions made by the committee. For instance, if the amount of

X dollars is provided for a number of projects which the Corps of Engineers has recommended, and then someone else comes in and says that certain projects will cost so much, and an amount is added to cover those recommendations, the Corps of Engineers usually follows the suggestions made by the committee and also the evidence developed during the hearings.

Many small surveys, some of them costing from $1,000 to $5,000, are usually taken care of. We have provided in the bill somewhat more than is usually appropriated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is, for the surveys and investigations?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They will include, as the Senator said, the projects which were supplied by the Corps of Engineers, those which were recommended by the Corps of Engineers to be included in the total appropriation figure. As I understand, there may be others which are testified to by Members of Congress or by the lay public.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. As a rule, when the Corps of Engineers presents its budget for, let us say, as in this case, $3,905,000, they usually furnish a list of the projects which they think are the most necessary. Even though that be done, sometimes they may find a project which may be more important, or which it is believed should be attended to earlier than some named project. It is usually left to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers to do the work which is the most necessary.

For example, as I stated to the Senator from Nevada, the flash floods in Las Vegas, Nev., may be a project approved by the corps, and upon which work may be done, although it did not come before our committee. Nevertheless, it has been mentioned on the floor, and it may be necessary that a survey of that work should be done at once. It is up to the Corps of Engineers, as a rule, to make that decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield to me at this point in the discussion, for the purpose of enabling me to place in the Record a statement I have prepared relating to the water-resources program, as the Senator has described it in the report, particularly as it relates to a project which is of great concern to the area of the country which I am privileged, in part, to represent. I refer to the deepening of the channels in the Great Lakes. Would the Senator be willing to yield for that purpose, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection. I may say to my good friend from Minnesota that if he will look at page 15 of the report, subparagraph (d) (3), Special Studies, he will find allowed for a survey of water levels of the Great Lakes $300,000. The Senate committee approved that amount, as did the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for that. We have obtained something we have looked forward to.

In order to have the record complete in terms of an area of interest in which a considerable amount of work has already been done, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the House of Representatives has just completed its hearings on the proposal to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels. The hearings in the Senate have been put off, pending a report from the Bureau of the Budget. That report has not come either to the House or to the Senate.

I respectfully suggest that the Senate follow the lead of the House in going ahead with its hearings regardless of the Bureau of the Budget's difficulty in making up its mind on this necessary project. If hearings can be started without further delay, perhaps the Bureau of the Budget will put a little more push behind getting out its report.

When you consider the interrelationship of the Midwest economy with that of the rest of the country, there is not, in my opinion, any other single public works project that would extend more widespread benefits to the Nation than the improvement of these channels. Authorization of this improvement, for which bills have been introduced by myself and others, would be practical recognition of the country's increasing reliance on its water transportation facilities. It would also show commendable foresight in anticipating the needs of the Nation's major water transportation system—a need that could easily prove vital in the event the present cold war should turn hot, for through these channels is transported 85 percent of the iron ore consumed by the country's steel mills.

Nowhere in the country are water transportation resources so vital to the economy of a region as in our great Middle West, so aptly called the arsenal of democracy.

Divine providence endowed our region with the Great Lakes, the largest fresh water body in the world, with a total water surface area of some 95,000 square miles, 60,950 of which are in the United States. These lakes are connected with one another by the so-called Connecting Channels, which, as I see it, are the key to the entire Great Lakes water system as we know it today. It is by means of these channels that the five Great Lakes have been welded into one tremendous water transportation unit which has become the busiest, and cheapest, transportation system in the world.

This great water transportation system is the hard core of the economies of 17 of the 48 States; 8 of these border on the lakes and 9 are tributary to them in whole or in part. In this area live 35 percent of the country's population; 38 percent of our farms are in this region and 36 percent of the rural farm people live here. In 1949 these farmers produced 49 percent of the total value of farm products sold in the Nation. It is also a hive of industry; 32 percent of the country's manufacturing establishments are in this area, 42 percent of our production workers live here and produced, in 1947, 44 percent of the total value added by manufacture in our Nation. Duluth-Superior, the country's second largest port, is in this region as are Chicago, which is seventh, Toledo, ninth, and Detroit, tenth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an article entitled "Seaway Sparks Billion Dollar Trade Race." This article, written by Mr. Joseph M. Gambatese, describes some of the developments that are taking place throughout the Great Lakes area as a result of the authorization of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and the pending proposal for deepening the connecting channels. It is obvious from reading this article that the investment in the St. Lawrence Seaway—all of which will be repaid—is stimulating literally millions of dollars in supplemental project development by private industry and the municipalities in the Great Lakes area. I commend this article to the Members of the Senate. It underscores the importance of completing the St. Lawrence Seaway project through congressional authorization of the connecting channels.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seaway Sparks Billion Dollar Trade Race

(By Joseph M. Gambatese)

The $1 billion St. Lawrence Seaway development, just begun, has sparked a race for port improvements and expansion among a score of cities ringing the 5 Great Lakes all the way from Oswego, N. Y., the country's first fresh-water port, to Chicago and Duluth, Minn.

Another $1 billion in both private and public funds is likely to be spent in and around the lakes and connecting rivers before a ship from the Atlantic Ocean steams up the new St. Lawrence Seaway and into the lakes with the first 10,000-ton cargo for some lake port. This will happen 4 years from now if present schedules are met.

The prize: more than 40 million tons of increased cargo which will pass through the seaway's canals and 7 locks along the St. Lawrence River after the Midwest's gate to the Atlantic is enlarged.

With shipments over the St. Lawrence Waterway now limited by the 14-foot controlling depth of the present Canadian locks and canals in the 114-mile stretch between Montreal and Ogdensburg, N. Y., only 10 million tons of cargo can get through to the lakes. The vessels must be restricted to loads of less than 2,500 tons, even though they may have larger capacity.

When the seaway development is completed, two things will be achieved:

1. Cargo ships of 20,000 tons will be able to maneuver the St. Lawrence, thereby increasing the potential annual tonnage moving between Montreal and Lake Erie to more than 50 million tons.

2. Northern New York State and part of eastern Ontario will share 1,880,000 kilowatts of electricity from a hydroelectric power project at Massena, N. Y., a potential capacity now exceeded only by the 1,974,000 kilowatts of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

The United States has authorized $105 million and Canada is spending $261 million for the joint navigation project, which will increase the controlling depth to 27 feet from the Atlantic to Toledo on the western end of Lake Erie. The New York Power Authority and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission are building the $600 million power project, consisting mainly of a powerhouse and 145-foot spillway dam at Massena and a control dam at Iroquois, Ontario. They will share both the cost and the electric power which will start flowing in 1958.

Beyond Toledo, however, waterborne commerce to Detroit and into Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior is limited by a controlling depth in the connecting channels of 25 feet downbound and 21 feet upbound.

The plan to deepen these channels to 27 feet was left out of the present authorization which passed Congress last May, although it was included in earlier seaway development bills which failed to pass.

Members from Midwest States are pushing for approval of the connecting channels phase in this Congress. This will cost $110,327,000; or $115,818,000 if a cutoff channel is dug to eliminate a bend in the St. Clair River above Detroit, as recommended by the Army's Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The connecting channels plan involves deepening of three links between Lakes Erie, Huron, Michigan, and Superior at Detroit, the Mackinac Straits and the approaches to the Soo Locks. The Welland Canal joining Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is in Canada and will need slight deepening, which Canada is doing as part of the approved navigation project.

Opponents of the seaway warn, however, that even the 27-foot depth will be inadequate to make real ocean ports out of lake cities, and that Congress will soon have to provide for further deepening to 30 feet or more at a cost of many more millions.

Such skepticism has not deterred the cities from pushing ahead with big plans to get the jump on their rivals and be ready with the best and the most facilities when the larger ships come steaming in.

As one lake city was advised: "Traffic flows where transportation facilities are provided. Waiting until the traffic exists may not be wise."

These cities want to make sure they get their share—or more—of the increase in waterborne tonnage and the anticipated economic benefits from the seaway. These benefits are expected to include attraction of industries which will find the seaway advantageous either for receiving bulk raw materials or for shipping products overseas, and increased business activity related to foreign trade.

Improved harbor and port facilities will benefit some ports even without much seaway traffic, through the handling of more of the present lake shipping and by attracting chemical and other industries which rely heavily on fresh water and shipping within the lake areas. This, of course, has been—and for many years will likely continue to be—the major basis for improvement of Great Lakes harbors, ports, and rivers, which the Federal Government has been doing for more than 125 years.

A Nation's Business survey of port activity stimulated for the most part by the coming of heavier seaway traffic into the largest manufacturing center in the world—now being called a new frontier in the heartland of America—discloses that:

Work in the two major Canadian ports—Toronto and Hamilton, Ontario—has progressed further than in most United States ports.

At least eight United States cities have made, or are making, studies costing more than $300,000 to find out what economic impact the new seaway tonnage will have on their ports and what, if anything, they should be doing about it. From east to west, these cities are: Oswego and Buffalo, N. Y.; Erie, Pa.; Cleveland, Lorain, and Toledo, Ohio; Detroit, and Duluth.

Legislation is being pressed in State capitals to permit port authorities for Toledo, Erie, Buffalo, and Oswego harbors to facilitate their development, growth, and operation.

Some $8 million already has been spent in Green Bay and Milwaukee, Wis.; Muskegon, Mich.; Hamilton, and Toronto, for warehouses, docks, buildings, and other facilities.

Another $9 million worth of similar port improvements has been started in Green Bay, Milwaukee, Hamilton, Ontario, and Ashtabula, Ohio.

More than $200 million in port development, exclusive of harbor dredging by the Federal Government, is being planned in Milwaukee, Chicago, Muskegon, Windsor, Ontario; Toledo, Cleveland, and Oswego.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress for more than $11 million during the next fiscal year for dredging, widening, and otherwise improving harbors and channels at Duluth, Sault Ste. Marie, Chicago, Indiana Harbor, Ind.; Cleveland, and Buffalo.

The Army's Corps of Engineers, which handles river and harbor improvements, is doing preliminary work on plans for a $4,900,000 extension of the Ashtabula harbor area and for shoal removal and construction of a detached breakwater at Oswego costing $2,500,000. Congress has also directed the engineers to determine the economic justification for further improving the harbors of Duluth, Milwaukee, Toledo, Lorain, Cleveland, and Conneaut, Ohio. Studies have been proposed for Buffalo and other ports as well.

Major lake harbors will require dredging to 27 feet and new facilities to accommodate larger vessels. Only at Duluth, Chicago, Ashtabula, and Buffalo has Congress "authorized" depths of more than 25 feet, and only Duluth's harbor actually is more than that depth. Its lake approaches are 32 feet. Depths of 28 feet have been authorized at Chicago and Ashtabula and 27 feet at Buffalo.

Before getting into the details of what each port city is doing, let's look at the total seaway development and its impact as a whole.

Basically, developing the St. Lawrence Seaway consists of enlarging a series of bottlenecks which now limit the size of vessels which can navigate between Lakes Superior and Michigan on the west and the Atlantic Ocean on the east—a total distance of 2,350 miles from Duluth to the ocean. This navigation phase involves the widening and dredging of narrow passages and bypassing dams, unnavigable falls and rapids with locks and canals so that the ships may rise and drop the 600-foot elevation between Lake Superior and the ocean.

At the same time, the descending water level permits the development of hydroelectric power. At Niagara Falls at present the United States power station has a capacity of 445,000 kilowatts and that on the Canadian side has 848,000 kilowatts. With the seaway, it is planned to increase the kilowatt capacities to 1,945,000 and 2,276,000, respectively.

The New York-Ontario power project in the International Rapids section of the seaway at Massena will produce 1,880,000 kilowatts. Water backed up by the 145 foot long Sault Spillway Dam to be built at this point will create a pleasure lake almost 30 miles long and 4 miles wide, inundating considerable land, mostly on the Canadian side, and forcing the relocation of railroads, highways, and even whole towns.

Below Massena, where the St. Lawrence runs completely within Canadian borders, that country has developed 1,408,000 hp. (1,083,000 kw.) at the Beauharnois powerplant in the Soulanges area and hopes to raise it to 2 million hp. It also plans to develop 1,200,000 hp. farther down at the Lachine Locks, near Montreal. (Canadians measure electric-power capacity in terms of horsepower. It takes 1.34 hp. to produce a kilowatt.)

Thus, there are 3 major phases of the seaway development: 1, the St. Lawrence navigation project, with Canada and the United States participating jointly; 2, the power project shared jointly by Ontario and New York, and, 3, the deepening of the connecting channels, which it is expected the United States will do alone.

The United States section of the navigation project is being built by a Government agency created specifically and solely for that purpose: St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. It is headed by Administrator Lewis G. Castle, who, when appointed last summer, was president of the Northern Minnesota National Bank in Duluth and of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, which led the postwar fight for the seaway.

The Seaway Corporation has designated the Corps of Engineers as its agent to supervise construction of the United States section, mainly two locks and a canal to bypass the power project at Massena. Congress fixed a spending limit of $105 million, which the Treasury will advance as needed against 50-year revenue bonds to be issued by the Corporation. Tolls fixed by the International Toll Commission will be charged on the seaway to liquidate the bonds. Congress, in passing its first seaway bill last May, also included construction of a lock at Point Rockway, across from Iroquois, to bypass on the United States side the Iroquois Control Dam being built as part of the power project. But Canada insisted on building its own lock on its side of the dam, and in fact began construction. As a result, it was agreed a month ago that the United States will not build its lock at the control dam upriver and Canada will not build its locks on the Canadian side of the powerhouse and spillway dam, both governments reserving the right to build the locks in the future, but not without consulting the other beforehand.

The net result, then, is that the control dam upriver will be bypassed through a Canadian lock at Iroquois and the power project near Massena will be bypasseed through two United States locks—leaving each country dependent on the other for through passage.

The United States will also dredge to 27 feet the Thousands Islands section of the St. Lawrence—68 miles from Ogdensburg, N. Y., upriver to Lake Ontario, at a cost of $2 million.

Canada, in addition to the Iroquois lock, is building 4 more locks and digging canals along the 68 miles within the Canadian border from the power project to Montreal, and will deepen the Welland Canal to 27 feet, the latter costing only $2 million because the 8 locks within the canal already meet the 27-foot measure.

Lake ports already handle 500,000 tons of overseas shipping a season, much of it United States and Canadian grain, but it is carried in small vessels lightly loaded.

This tonnage, however, is an almost negligible one-fifth of 1 percent of the more than 250 million tons of total shipping on the lakes, about one-third of it iron ore moving down from Lake Superior.

With the new seaway, overseas shipping is expected eventually to exceed 5 million tons.

During the first year, Administrator Castle estimates that the seaway will carry 12,100,000 tons of grain, 10,500,000 tons of iron ore, 6,400,000 tons of general cargo, 3,700,000 tons of coal, 2,300,000 tons of petroleum, 800,000 tons of nonferrous ores, and 700,000 tons of woodpulp. Grain and iron ore shipments are expected to dominate seaway freight.

New and larger ore freighters now on the lakes were built to fit seaway specifications.

The more than 50 million eventual tonnage will exceed by about 25 percent the tonnage through the Panama Canal.

Hardly any luxury ocean liner traffic is expected.

Specific lake harbor improvements planned by the Corps of Engineers during the coming fiscal year and the necessary funds requested of Congress include:

Cleveland: $5,300,000 to widen bends and alter obstructing bridges in 23-foot Cuyahoga River on which most industrial piers are located. This is part of a $20 million river program on which $11 million already has been spent.

Chicago: $4 million—the beginning of an $80 million project—to start widening to 225 feet the Calumet-Sag Channel, important link between the Mississippi River and Lake Michigan on the southern edge of Chicago.

Buffalo: $1,200,000 to complete deepening of the Buffalo River, part of the Buffalo Harbor, to 23 feet. This job was started this fiscal year with $1,100,000.

Soo: $338,000 to begin alterations at the Soo Locks. This includes removal of an island in the St. Mary's River to facilitate approach to the locks and alteration of a railroad bridge. It will take $3 million more to complete.

Duluth: $215,000 to complete a 25-foot channel in a part of the Duluth Harbor. Project was begun this fiscal year with $300,000.

Indiana Harbor: $45,000 to widen a portion of the harbor canal, which leads into the Calumet-Sag Channel.

Here, in addition to the engineers' program, is what United States lake cities are doing to improve their ports:

DULUTH

Gov. O. L. Freeman has asked the Minnesota Legislature to study the seaway's impact on the State's economy and look toward development of the Duluth Harbor. The 3-man port authority has been reactivated and legislation is being considered to create a more effective 7-man authority. The port authority has a $100,000 budget for each of the next 2 years—$53,500 to come from the State legislature, $38,000 from the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission, and $8,500 from a local levy. Some $76,000 is being spent for a survey of the harbor's economic potential, with four studies by the University of Minnesota's business research division already under way.

MILWAUKEE

A $200,000 addition to Municipal Transit Shed No. 1 is opening this spring. A $2 million viaduct is being built to carry harbor truck traffic over two railroad lines. The following $4,700,000 in projects have been projected for completion before the 1959 seaway opening:

New pier and general cargo terminal	$4, 000, 000
Replacing obsolete cranes and equipment	350, 000
Dredging outer harbor slips to 27 feet	200, 000
Highways to serve outer piers	80, 000
Expanding harbor railroad system	70, 000

Harbor deepening is being sought from Congress, with a study being made by the Corps of Engineers.

There were 188 sailings with 43,000 tons of overseas cargo from this port last year, according to Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee Port Director, who is also a director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association.

GREEN BAY

A new city harbor and industrial commission is directing technical development of the port. A nonprofit industrial development corporation, set up within the Green Bay Association of Commerce, is selling 100 shares of $100 to raise money for port promotion. Leicht Transfer & Storage Co. has built two $250,000 warehouses and is planning another. Efforts are being made to get funds for improving the harbor with a turn-around basin in the river mouth, a project approved by the Corps of Engineers some time ago. Sixty foreign ships used the port last year.

CHICAGO

As part of a 10-year $125 million program, the regional port board is issuing $25 million in bonds to start construction of facilities around Lake Calumet. Present plans include four major transit sheds, two 6,500,000-bushel grain elevators, 1,000 feet of universal bulk dock and other docks, heavy lift cranes, and other facilities. A large liquid tank farm, positioned to handle rail, barge, truck, lake, and ocean traffic, will also be built.

Because of vast and modern facilities and its unique link between the lakes and the Mississippi River, Chicago expects to handle 50 percent of the general cargo moving through the seaway and also to become, in the opinion of Maxim M. Cohen, general manager-secretary of the Chicago Regional Port District, "the most strategic grain-shipping port on the American Continent."

Chicago's port handled 178,000 tons of overseas shipping in 1953 and expects this to increase four times, according to A. H. Schwietert, traffic director of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

MUSKEGON

This port is planning two more docks to match the existing $2 million dock and related facilities. With one of the lakes' best natural harbors, it stresses ship repair work but, like many other small lake ports, it is thinking in terms of handling more of the present fleet of 2,000-ton vessels serving Great Lakes and foreign ports.

Larger lake ports will find it uneconomical to handle some of these smaller ships.

John C. Beukema, president of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, says the association has counseled smaller lake ports to be cautious and make detailed studies before making appropriations and letting contracts for improvements which may prove unwise.

DETROIT

A $50,000 economic survey of the port has forecast an increase in overseas trade from 150,000 tons to 300,000 tons within a year of the seaway's opening. If suitable facilities and services are developed, overseas trade will increase to between 750,000 and 1 million tons 5 years later. There were 320 foreign sailings in 1953, many of them carrying automobiles and trucks to foreign ports.

The harbor needs little development except deepening of the Detroit River. Gov. G. Mennen Williams asked the State legislature to approve a $500 million bond issue for highways, to build in 3 to 5 years what would normally take 15 to 20 years. The road program includes a north-south highway from Saginaw Bay, down through Detroit and almost to Toledo, which will aid the port development.

TOLEDO

An $8,000 study recommended construction of a $20 million general cargo terminal on the Maumee River and a $5,900,000 recreational area on the bay.

A hot scrap is raging over whether the port should be run by the city or the Toledo-Lucas County Port Commission with new powers of a port authority. Toledo is sponsoring a port authority bill which the Ohio Legislature is expected to pass. The bill would let a county set up a port authority with power to issue bonds, levy taxes, build navigational facilities, rent the facilities and amortize the bonds from revenues.

Toledo, a leading coal port with annual shipments of 20 million tons, also handles considerable overseas shipping of petroleum and grain. Ships of foreign registry in the Toledo port increased from 1 in 1946 to 80 last year.

CLEVELAND

A $40,000 port development study is being made by New York consultants.

Cleveland is seeking Federal participation in a proposed $15 million breakwall 6½ miles long running west from downtown. Inside of this a $30 million highway would be built facilitating vehicular traffic to and from the harbor.

A $500,000 service road connecting with a freeway on the east side is being started this spring. Director of Port Control William J. Rogers says the city is considering a $5 million bond issue to build a cofferdam from 500 to 700 feet out in the lake to permit filling and extension of the waterfront land.

Cleveland leases its two piers to a stevedoring firm. The waterfront will be zoned and made available for development by private industry, which is expected to spend $20 million for port facilities. Curtis Lee Smith, president of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, feels private industry "is fully capable of taking care of whatever new business develops from the new seaway."

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. has intensified its promotion of northeastern Ohio as the best location in the Nation for new industry.

An international trade exposition in 1959 is being considered by Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze. Mayor Celebrezze and private industry are cold to a port authority, because the harbor is within city limits and was developed by the city.

Cleveland is also the focal point of a fight over the proposed construction of a 103-mile $300 million belt conveyor between Cleveland and East Liverpool on the Ohio River. The enclosed conveyor would carry 20 million tons of iron ore down from Cleveland to East Liverpool, whence barges would take it to Pittsburgh steel mills. In the other direction, the conveyor would move 45 million tons of coal, particularly metallurgical coal from West Virginia needed by steel mills in Youngstown and Cleveland.

LORAIN

A $10 million harbor improvement is sought to meet present needs. The Corps of Engineers is restudying the economic justification for improving the harbor, which handles 8 million tons of iron ore and 2,600,000 tons of coal. Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, has been retained as a harbor and seaway expert for 2 years to help get Federal aid for present harbor improvement needs and to survey the port's expansion possibilities. Dr. Danielian does not visualize Lorain as a major seaport, pointing out that ports need an economic hinterland to feed on. Lorain is between Toledo and Cleveland.

ASHTABULA

Private industry is spending $3,710,000 for construction of slips, docks, and handling facilities, including 2 bulk-cargo docks 2,000 feet long and 500 feet wide.

Ports of Ashtabula and nearby Conneaut will be aided by a Conneaut-Cincinnati 350-mile toll highway, costing $500 million, which the State is planning to build. It will have a spur connecting the State capital, Columbus, with Toledo.

This northeast-southwest diagonal expressway will connect with, and cross, the 241-mile, $325 million east-west toll road extending from the Pennsylvania Turnpike, near Pittsburgh, across Ohio to the Indiana border, near Toledo. This will be completed in October and will be useful to other Ohio ports as well.

ERIE

Additional dock and warehouse facilities will be built after completion of a survey costing $15,000. Members of the Erie Engineering Societies Council donated $30,000 in services in making a preliminary study of the port's potential. The State legislature has been asked to authorize an Erie Port Authority.

BUFFALO

A $50,000 port study is being made. Findings and recommendations will not be completed until next month, but it is reported the port will need:

A 600-foot, $2,950,000 pier; an $800,000 package cargo warehouse; $500,000 for handling facilities; $350,000 for administration and engineering; $500,000 for financing and interest the first 2 years; $400,000 for contingencies; and $35,000 for dike repair.

The port board has approved a $5,535,000 port improvement program as the first phase of a master development plan and is seeking authority from the State legislature to create a Niagara Frontier Port Authority of wider scope.

Improvement of the harbor by the Corps of Engineers is only 36 percent complete, with $11 million more needed to finish the job.

Buffalo's major gain from the seaway is expected to be ore shipments from the rich open-pit deposits of 600 million proven tons—with a potential of 1,500,000,000 tons—whose postwar discovery in the barren Quebec-Labrador region helped get the seaway through Congress. Buffalo will have an advantage because it is nearer the deposits than other lake ore ports.

Six Midwest steel and ore companies under the leadership of Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, then head of M. A. Hanna Co., participated in the discovery and development of the deposits. Almost $300 million is being spent on the Quebec-Labrador project.

A railroad was built to carry the ore 360 miles to freighters at Seven Islands on St. Lawrence Bay.

This Quebec-Labrador ore will supplement the dwindling deposits of the Mesabi Range on Lake Superior which have fed more than 3 billion tons to hungry iron and steel mills since the Soo Locks were opened 100 years ago this spring. The centennial anniversary will be celebrated at the Soo on June 18.

First ore shipment from the new Canadian deposits left Seven Islands July 31, and more than 1,700,000 tons was moved before the shipping season—only 244 days—closed because of freezing. Most of the ore went to east coast and European ports on large ore freighters, but 170,000 tons moved up the St. Lawrence on 2,000-ton "canalers" to mills near the lakes. Almost 70,000 tons went to Buffalo.

ROCHESTER

A survey of more than 700 companies in western New York has been made by the Rochester Chamber of Commerce to determine what use they might make of seaway shipping. The potential tonnage indicated will serve as a guide in planning port development. Preliminary examination of the questionnaires returned indicates "quite a bit of interest," according to Fidelis J. Taylert, chairman of the chamber of commerce subcommittee making the survey.

OSWEGO

Oswego is the lake port closest to the seaway and at the terminus of the northern branch of the New York State Barge Canal, whose 9-foot depth extends from Buffalo to Albany on the Hudson River—the shortest water link between the lakes and the Atlantic.

Here is its program:

1. A $20,000 study indicates it will take $10 million to improve and expand the harbor to attract seaway shipping. This covers only harbor deepening to 28 feet and construction of a $2,500,000 detached breakwall approved by Congress, but funds for this have not been appropriated.
2. A budget of $20,000 for the employment of Arthur W. Mengel of Cleveland as port director and for port promotion activity. Port authority legislation is being sought.
3. Advertising Oswego as the "port of central New York" to attract foreign trade shipments.
4. Stepping up "Operation Oswega," which last year induced three companies to locate in the area.
5. Obtaining the Federal funds necessary to improve the harbor, which handles more than 2 million tons a season. Lionel A. Mohnkern, executive manager of the Oswego Chamber of Commerce, says more than $11 million in improvements has been planned and approved by the Corps of Engineers.

ELSEWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES

There is also considerable activity in many other cities on the lakes and along the seaway route.

In Michigan, the Monroe Port Commission is improving its port, hoping to attract waterfront industries and become a rail-truck-water terminal for lower Michigan and upper Indiana. Grand Haven plans to improve its channel; the city plan commission is working on waterfront industrial subdivision projects. Benton Harbor plans to move a ship canal and build a slip and a 500-foot dock and wharf.

Along the St. Lawrence, Ogdensburg and Massena—46 miles apart at the ends of the International Rapids where the power project and United States navigation construction is taking place—are planning largely for tourist business and new industries which the seaway and the power will attract. Many recreational facilities will also be developed around the huge lake and inlets which will be created between them.

CANADA

Canadian lake port activity is concentrated at Toronto, Hamilton, and Windsor.

TORONTO

Planning and construction for the seaway began 3 years ago. A $1 million freight terminal for handling ocean ships and a $1,250,000 new dock wall have already been built. A new dock within the new dock wall is being studied. Toronto expects soon to have port facilities for 20 larger ships which will come up the St. Lawrence. After the seaway is a fact, it hopes to accommodate twice that many.

HAMILTON

Hamilton has built a $2,750,000 harbor administration building and has started an additional $2 million dock expansion and improvement program. It is extending the Welland Street docks to take care of six more oceangoing vessels and installing modern equipment to handle any kind of cargo.

On the books for later: Construction of more docks toward edge of city nearer to the big industrial area.

WINDSOR

Allocation of $2,800,000 for new dock facilities is the first step in a recommended development which will total $19 million. Construction of dock space and terminal warehouses would follow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want the capable Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to know that the people of Minnesota deeply appreciate the consideration given by his appropriations subcommittee to many of the public works projects vital to our State.

I also want to convey to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] our appreciation to the full Appropriations Committee, which he so effectively directs, for concurring in the subcommittee's recommendations for advancement of necessary flood-control work, navigation improvements, and future power development for Minnesota.

Our rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and private power companies alike will welcome as constructive progress the action of the Appropriations Committee in including in this bill $125,000 for planning toward eventual extension of a 230 kilovolt transmission line from Granite Falls through Benson and Fergus Falls to Fargo. We have worked for years for this high voltage transmission line loop linking western Minnesota into present and future power developments in the Missouri Basin, giving our State the opportunity of sharing in the benefits of Missouri Valley projects.

The bill also includes funds for completion of necessary navigation improvements in the Duluth-Superior Harbor, construction of new harbor facilities at Knife River to alleviate emergency conditions confronting the fishing industry at Two Harbors, permit substantial progress on our flood-control work along the Red River of the North, and provide for substantial further work on the St. Anthony Falls extension on the Mississippi at Minneapolis. We welcome and appreciate the chance to make this progress. We also appreciate the increases in general investigation funds for the Army engineers to permit additional flood-control surveys in Minnesota such as on the Rum River and the Minnesota River.

All of these are projects in which I have taken considerable personal interest, as the chairman of the subcommittee knows. I know the careful scrutiny the Appropriations Committee has given all the projects in this bill to make sure the maximum benefits are obtained for each dollar of public funds expended.

The knowledge of that care and study makes me all the more pleased at the acceptance of the work we feel is so vital to Minnesota.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from Minnesota has said, the committee saw fit to provide funds for the Markland project, on the Ohio River, in Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio, and for several projects which were not budgeted. The plans are to build 1 dam which will take the place of 4 dams, in some cases. Some of those projects have been pending year after year. So the committee thought the time had arrived to provide sufficient funds to take care of these navigation projects which are so essential to commerce. Surely, if we are to continue to progress as we have, it is necessary constantly to improve our transportation facilities. That is exactly what the committee has provided for in many instances. I hope next year we shall be able to add a little more to it. It was felt that many of the projects were worthy ones.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful for the start which has been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the item "Construction, General," the appropriation for 1955 was $306,352,600; the budget estimate for 1956 was $367,675,000; the House allowed $369,894,800, and the Senate recommendation is $411,273,000.

Beginning with page 17 of the report, and on through page 27, will be noted the different projects for which funds have been provided, those which are budgeted, and those which are unbudgeted. Money will be used as indicated, for construction, planning, or both.

The next item is Operation and Maintenance. The House allowed $82,500,000, and the Senate increased that amount by a little over $1 million. In fact, the Senate provided what the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Next is General Expenses. The House approved $9,200,000; the committee has recommended appropriation of the full budget estimate of $9,400,000.

Next is the item for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries. The budget estimate was $50,885,000, which was approved by the House, and the committee has recommended $52,960,000.

Mr. President, that, in a general way, is my statement as to what the bill provides. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief summary of title III of the bill, dealing with Corps of Engineers Civil Functions.

There being no objection the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE III

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

The committee recommends $6 million for the operation and maintenance of the national cemetery system, and for the procurement of headstones, and markers for graves as authoried by law. This is the amount allowed by the House, and is $27,000 below the budget estimate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

General investigations

The committee recommends $5,940,000 for this purpose which is $750,000 above the amount allowed by the House. It has also recommended a reduction in the funds made available for the study of hurricanes from $1 million to $500,000. The authority for this investigation has just recently passed the Congress and there is no budget estimate for this study. In the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies there was included for the Weather Bureau $4,150,000 for operation, improvement, facilities and research in hurricane, storm, and tornado warning services in the United States. The committee in its report pointed out that in recommending a reduction from $1 million to $500,000 for the hurricane studies, it desired to make it clear that it does not in any way minimize the importance of these studies. The report then states that this is a new field for the Corps of Engineers, and that a great deal of advance study should precede the actual investigation to insure the most efficient utilization of the funds provided.

There is a backlog of approximately 800 authorized studies, some of which have been authorized for a great number of years. I believe that all of the members of this body are familiar with the type of replies the Corps of Engineers is forced to furnish in response to inquiries concerning authorized investigations. "It is an authorized study, we recognize the importance of the investigation, and will undertake the study when funds for that purpose are made available by Congress." The action recommended by the committee is intended to permit a start on the reduction of this backlog.

The committee recommendation of $5,940,000 includes $435,000 for the collection and study of basic data, and $1,500,000 for research and development, and in these respects agrees with the bill as passed the House. For examinations and surveys the committee recommends $4,005,000, which is $750,000 above the $3,255,000 approved by the House.

I believe it would be well to consider this recommendation in connection with past appropriations for this purpose.

Appropriations for surveys (exclusive of contingencies and collection and study of basic data)

1948	$5,900,000
1949	4,280,000
1950	4,690,000
1951	5,572,000
1952	950,000
1953	2,825,000
1954	$2,240,000
1955	1,970,000
1956:	
House	[1] 3,255,000
Senate	[2] 4,005,000

[1] $1 million, or 31.8 percent, earmarked for the hurricane study.

[2] $500,000, or 12.5 percent, earmarked for the hurricane study.

Construction general

The committee recommends $411,273,000 for this purpose, which is an increase of $41,378,000 above the House.

The report pointed out that due to the decrease in the amount of funds carried over from previous years the current appropriation will now control the size of the program.

The peak of the appropriations in dollars was in 1949 and 1950, and these have steadily decreased by over one-third, by 1954 and 1955. In terms of work that can be accomplished per dollar, however, the decrease has been much greater as only about half as much work could be accomplished with the 1954 and 1955 appropriation as with that of 1949.

Delay in developing our natural resources—particularly water resources—is costing this Nation millions of dollars every year. Money appropriated and spent for water-resource development is actually an investment in the future of our country. Refusal to appropriate for worthwhile projects may seem like economy by reducing the Federal budget; but it is false economy insofar as the welfare of the Nation is concerned.

Navigation

The results obtained from our investment in navigation improvements are outstanding. Our coastal harbors and Great Lakes navigation system are national facilities essential to maintenance of our position as a leading maritime nation and for national defense.

The remaining element of the navigation program is the inland and intracoastal waterway system. The Federal Government has improved in varying degrees some 22,600 miles of waterway in this country to give us the most extensive inland navigation system in the world.

Traffic on these waterways has grown tremendously during the past 25 years from 8.6 miles in 1953—an increase of 800 percent. The extent to which industrial development billion ton-miles in 1929 to 75.1 billion ton-has followed waterway improvement to reap the benefits of economical water transportation is further evidence as to the value of these improvements to the Nation's economy.

The committee has recommended an increase of $19,259,200 for navigation improvements. This will provide $16,387,200 for 30 projects not provided for in the bill as passed the House, and $2,872,000 for continuing 7 projects at a faster rate.

Flood control

With respect to flood control, the record shows that Congress has appropriated about $4 billion for construction of flood-control works through fiscal year 1955. Almost 400 projects have been completed or placed in operation. These have been in operation only 11 years on the average; but in that time they have prevented flood damages of over $7 billion.

Our investment in flood control has paid big dividends. But our failure to continue this work is proving equally costly. According to the best information available flood damages amounting to over $400 million still occur on the average annually in major river basins where floods are uncontrolled or where protection is incomplete.

Our responsibility for action is plain when we realize that flood-control works under construction, plus projects which Congress has authorized but not started, will prevent about $200 million in average annual flood damage—or half of the residual damage.

I am advised that we can never completely prevent all flood losses; but it is possible to prevent much of the residual damage. How much of this we can prevent, how it can be prevented, and what this will cost can be determined only by the surveys that Congress has authorized and for which we must provide adequate funds.

The committee has recommended an additional $12,515,000 for flood-control projects. This will provide $12,365,000 for 12 projects for which no funds were included in the bill as passed the House. The remaining $150,000 is to accelerate construction on one of the projects.

Hydroelectric power

There is another phase of the Federal civil-works program that should not be overlooked in calculating the costs of delay.

Improvement of our rivers for navigation and flood control has afforded many possibilities for economical development of waterpower. We have made substantial progress. The Chief of Engineers in a recent statement before the Public Works Committee of the Senate showed that we now have almost 3 million kilowatts of electric-generating capacity in service at 21 projects. He also indicated, however, that the presently authorized projects that have not been started would have ultimate power installations of over 7 million kilowatts.

The existence of this large block of economical undeveloped power in the flowing water of our streams is an economical waste. The energy of this flowing water when not developed and used is lost to us forever. If we do not develop this resource it means that our power must come from our fuel resources which can be exhausted; while the energy of our rivers renews itself year after year.

The committee has recommended an increase of $5,500,000 for this phase of the program. This will permit the initiation of 5 new multiple-purpose projects with power features.

Operation and maintenance

The committee has recommended the full budget estimate of $83,560,000 an increase of $1,060,000 over the amount allowed by the House. The lack of proper maintenance, will result in the loss of our national assets in this field of resource development. The maintenance of many of these improvements have been on a substandard basis for many years with the result that there is an accumulation of over $69 million for which no provision is made in the Senate recommendation.

General expenses

The committee has allowed the full budget estimate of $9,400,000 which is $200,000 over the amount allowed by the House. With the expanded program recommended by the committee, the restoration of this cut was considered necessary.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

The committee has recommended $52,960,000 which is an increase of $2,075,000 above the budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House. The amount recommended is considerably less than the average amount provided in the past.

Fiscal year:	*Appropriation*
1948	$50,000,000
1949	61,000,000
1950	67,000,000
1951	61,400,000
1952	60,500,000
1953	60,020,000
1954	51,433,000
1955	46,450,000

Niagara remedial works

The committee recommends the House allowance of $2,400,000 which will permit financing this work during the current year.

United States section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers

The committee recommends $150,000 for this purpose, which is the budget estimate, and the amount allowed by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$411,273,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$411,898,000."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The purpose of the amendment is to increase the appropriation for the Dardanelle Dam by $550,000, and planning for the Beaver Dam by $75,000.

I should like to say the Dardanelle project has a long history. In 1950 $1,100,000 was appropriated to begin construction of the project, but the intervention of the Korean war, along with many other events was the reason for freezing all those funds by President Truman. So, the project was pushed aside, and we have never been able to get it revived. I think the Arkansas River has been neglected more than has any of our major rivers. I hope the committee will agree to raise the sum for the Dardanelle project to $1 million, so that construction may begin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a statement with regard to the Dardanelle project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The Dardanelle Dam and Reservoir is an integral part of the multiple-purpose project for the development of the Arkansas River and its tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma which was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946, as amended by the Flood Control Acts of 1948 and 1950.

The overall project as authorized provides for the improvement of the lower Arkansas River and tributaries (in Arkansas and Oklahoma) by construction of coordinated developments to serve navigation, produce hydroelectric power, afford additional flood control, provide bank stabilization, and related benefits such as recreation and wildlife propagation. The navigation features of the plan provide for a channel 9 feet deep following generally the Verdigris River from Catoosa, Okla., 52 miles downstream to the Arkansas River; thence along the channel of the Arkansas River to mile 42; thence by a land cut designated as the Arkansas Post Route to the White River at mile 18.3; thence along the channel of the White River to mile 7.8; thence by a land cut to the Mississippi River at a point about 590.5 miles above the Head of Passes, La. The waterway would be canalized throughout its length by 3 navigation locks and dams on the Verdigris River, 16 locks and dams on the Arkansas and lower White Rivers, and 4 navigation-hydroelectric power dams on the main stem of the Arkansas River, of which 15 navigation locks and dams and two navigation-power projects, Ozark and Dardanelle, would be in Arkansas. A minimum channel width of 150 feet is proposed for the Verdigris River section and 250 feet for the Arkansas and White Rivers section.

The estimated annual benefits which are expected to result from construction and operation of the project as a whole are as follows:

Savings in transportation charges	$40,470,000
Power value	11,416,000
Flood control benefit	4,566,000
Channel stabilization	4,327,000
Other	217,000
Total	60,996,000

The benefits for that portion of the project in Arkansas have not been determined. The estimated cost of the Arkansas portion of the entire project is $588,160,000.

The Dardanelle dam site is on the Arkansas River in Pope and Yell Counties, about 2 miles upstream from the town of Dardanelle, 93 miles above Little Rock, and 257.8 miles upstream from the mouth. The project provides for navigation of the Arkansas River and generation of hydroelectric power by construction of a gravity concrete dam and controlled spillway with a reservoir extending 40 miles upstream providing for the storage of 495,000 acre-feet and a surface area of 36,700 acres for navigation and power. Power-generating equipment will include four units with a capacity of 30,000 kilowatts each. The navigation lock will be 110 by 600 feet in size with a lift of 52 feet.

The crest length of the dam will be 2,306 feet. It will have a top elevation of 373 feet, and a maximum height above stream bed of 88 feet. The net length of the spillway, which will have 25 movable gates, will be 1,000 feet.

Construction on this vital Dardanelle Dam project has long been delayed. In 1949, Lt. Col. R. L. Jewett, then deupty chief of civil works for rivers and harbors, testified for the Chief of Engineers before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations that if money was made available, construction could be started on the Dardanelle dam, and that for the first year $1,100,000 could be utilized. The portion of this testimony pointing to the need for an appropriation that year is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF LT. COL. R. L. JEWETT, DEPUTY CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

"DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM

"Amount needed to start construction in 1950

"Colonel JEWETT. Our planning has progressed to such a state on the Dardanelle lock and dam, sir; that if we were given, say $1,100,000 for the fiscal year 1950, we could initiate construction work on the Dardanelle lock and dam.

"Senator MCCLELLAN. It is in the same state then as the one dam on the Eufaula project?

"Colonel JEWETT. Yes, sir.

"Senator MCCLELLAN. That is, 1 of the 2 dams that you said you are ready on?

"Colonel JEWETT. Yes, sir.

"Senator MCCLELLAN. Then you woud be ready to start on the Dardanelle Dam if the money was made available; that is, the amount of $1,100,000?

"Colonel JEWETT. Yes, sir; we would be.

"Senator MCCLELLAN. I understand that there is no opposition in connection with that project and that everybody is satisfied, and further, that that is one of the major projects in the overall comprehensive plan. Is that correct?

"Colonel JEWETT. It is, sir; it is one of the major projects.

"Senator MCCLELLAN. And you could judiciously spend the sum of $1,100,000 in preparing the foundation, and so forth, and providing the preparations for the project?

"Colonel JEWETT. Yes, sir; providing the access roads, the camp, and actually initiating work on the navigation locks."

Congress that year made an appropriation of $1,100,000 so that construction on the Dardanelle project could begin, but President Truman under the special emergency powers, suspended the appropriation because of the Korean situation. Since that time, work has been suspended on the comprehensive plan except for bank stabilization and setback levees.

A 2-year restudy has recently been made by the Corps of Engineers of the entire Arkansas River program, and it has been announced that the program has been restored to the active list. Now is the time to begin the construction on this Dardanelle project which is a major link in the overall development plan for the Arkansas River. The Corps of Engineers in their latest approved estimate, placed the cost of the Dardanelle project at $94,600,000. One million dollars appropriated now will allow work to begin on the project which was delayed primarily because of the Korean conflict.

Year after year, interested citizens from Arkansas have come to the Congress to request the money to start the Dardanelle project. The appropriation which was finally made was suspended in 1950, and since that time nothing has been done to restore it. An appropriation of $1 million at this time for the project would merely be restoring an appropriation which has once been approved. It would restore us to the position we were in almost 5 years ago.

Only last month, a delegation from my State again came to Washington to testify before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on the urgent need for moneys to carry out these projects authorized nearly 10 years ago. The testimony given by them is available to the Senate. Many of those who came have been here before to plead for this program, and many of them have worked for years in the hope that the program for the Arkansas River as originally envisioned would soon become a reality. Their testimony on the need and the value of this program speaks for itself. They have demonstrated adequately that moneys for the program are now desperately needed.

An appropriation for this project now would mean much to the people in an area which for the past 3 years has suffered disastrous droughts. It would mean economic encouragement to an area with the lowest per capita income of any in the whole United States. It would give aid to a part of the country which because of its economic conditions has been losing population at a time when all other areas have recorded population gains.

Those of us in the Congress from Arkansas have for many years voted to appropriate moneys to develop the Tennessee, Missouri, Columbia, and many other of our major rivers, some of which have not been as economically feasible as the project for the Arkansas River. We generally have not opposed these developments, and have not objected, for we have felt that eventually all our great national rivers must someday be controlled and developed, but we feel that the Arkansas River has not had its fair share of the funds that have been appropriated for river development. The Arkansas River Basin has been too long neglected, and now is the time for some long-sought action on this the only major river in the Nation which still remains largely undeveloped.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will look with favor upon the amendment, because, as he well knows, the Arkansas and White Rivers have long been under consideration, but very little has been done to improve them. In fact, except for bank stabilization, nothing on the Arkansas River itself has been done. The Beaver Dam, for which we are asking funds, is the next dam from Table Rock which is under construction. It will be the last dam on the river. I think to raise the amount from $25,000 to $100,000 is a very modest request. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will agree to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not insist on his amendment. We have gone into the matter very thoroughly. The cost of the Dardanelle Lock and Dam is estimated to be $94,600,000. As the Senator stated, the House allowed $450,000. It is an unbudgeted item. In addition to providing funds for the Dardanelle Dam, the House also provided for Eufaula Dam. In order to help, and because they are considered necessary to prevent siltation, if the Dardanelle Dam is built, the building of other dams at Oologah and Keystone was provided for. The Dardanelle Dam, particularly if built independently of the Eufaula, Oologah and Keystone, will silt up. So we recommended not only the funds that the House approved, but also funds for Oologah and Keystone. If those amounts are added together, the area affected should receive a large sum.

The committee tried to spread the projects throughout the country, so that many of the older projects might receive early attention.

I can say to the Senator that once construction on the Dardanelle Dam is started with the $450,000 we have approved, there will be a demand by the Army engineers to increase the funds next year. If I happened to be chairman of the committee next year, as I hope to be, we would grant such a request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator feel that, in view of the long period in which an appropriation has been frustrated because of the Korean war, construction of the Dardanelle deserves prior consideration?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about the merit of the project. However, I can point out many other dams in addition to the Dardanelle where that statement would also apply. In this case we are making a modest start. We have made many modest starts, and if all the modest starts are added together, it will be seen we have added about $46 million to the budget requests. If we keep adding such amounts, we might lose some of the good projects that are included in the bill. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on page 21, line 10.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas is going to insist on his amendment, since it involves more than a half million dollars, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. I should like to inquire whether the Senator is going to insist on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as one representative of the Tennessee Valley area, I am glad that the administration has retreated so completely from the Dixon-Yates proposal. In my opinion, the language contained and money provided for in the bill, with strings attached, on the theory that the city of Memphis must prove its intention, is of no more importance than that of simply another gratuitous insult to the local people of Memphis and west Tennessee. The word of the citizens of the city of Memphis should not be doubted. I want my position to be clearly understood: I do not believe the appropriation bill ought to carry $6½ million, or any other amount of money, which could in any degree be used to build a transmission line from a nonexisting plant to a nonexisting market.

I know of no legislative precedent for holding a hammer over the heads of the people of a great city and questioning their word as to what they will do.

I wish to state my personal view, although I know that many of my colleagues may have other ideas about the language embodied in the report. I wish the RECORD to show that I am unequivocally opposed to the appropriation of $6,500,000, and I am opposed to relying upon the language of the report. I do not think the people of Memphis or the Memphis city government deserve that kind of treatment, and I do not believe the appropriation can be justified either now or 90 days from now, regardless of what may happen in that time.

There is no doubt about the intention of the people of Memphis or of their city government. To keep the record straight, I wish to say that their flat refusal to accept Dixon-Yates power, accompanied by their plan to build their own steam plant, cannot come as a surprise to the administration. They have made that flat statement and proposal, and they acted in good faith upon it many, many months ago—as long ago as November of last year. In 1938, in a public referendum, the people of Memphis voted out the Old Electric Bond & Share crowd by a margin of 17 to 1; and at this late date they do not intend to start purchasing their power from the same crowd through a Government-manipulated backdoor contract with the Atomic Energy Commission.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a point to the effect that there was interchange of power between the TVA system and the private utilities in the power perimeter of the TVA. It is true that in this case, as in the case of other power-generating facilities, there has been exchange of power between the TVA and Memphis; but that is entirely different from putting the people of Memphis at the mercy of the same group they voted out in 1938. The people of Memphis do not wish to have their future supply of electric power tied up with the same group.

Representatives of Memphis have testified before both the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees that this is their plan. The Shelby County—Memphis—delegation to the last session of the Tennessee Legislature successfully sponsored the bonding authorizations which will make financially possible construction of the plant by the city of Memphis.

I may say that the bond rating of the Memphis city government is as good as that of any other city government in the country; again, that is a matter of public record.

The Senator from Arkansas said the mayor I was talking about was the mayor a long time ago, and that he spoke with authority. But the Senator from Arkansas knows quite well that the aldermen or commission of Memphis reached a unanimous decision. The Senator from Arkansas also knows that since the beginning of the TVA system, in the case of the furnishing of electricity to Memphis, Major Allen has largely spoken for the city. He is a director of its public utility board, or whatever the exact name may be. His testimony is on record; and the government of Memphis has, I believe, always followed his recommendations in regard to these matters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, let me ask why the city waited so long to make this firm offer. Why did not it come forward sooner with the proposal? It would have saved many persons a great deal of trouble if, a year ago, Memphis had taken such action. Why did Memphis wait so long?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The delay occurred because the contract was negotiated behind the back of the Tennessee Valley Authority and behind the backs of the people of Memphis. No one ever asked the people of Memphis whether they would accept Dixon-Yates power; they were never consulted about it. Their representatives had to come to Washington, and appear before the Senate Appropriations Committee in November 1954, to find out what kind of contract was being forced upon them. When they found out what kind of a contract it was, then and there they said they would not accept Dixon-Yates power.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the contract between Memphis and Dixon-Yates?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is no contract at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the contract is not between Memphis and Dixon-Yates; it is with the Atomic Energy Commission, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but the people of Memphis, who will be served, are, it seems to me, entitled to be consulted to some extent on the question of who will supply electric power to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What significance does the source of the power have? Really, what is the difference? Are not kilowatts the same, regardless of their origin?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course a kilowatt is a kilowatt, but there are many differences between obtaining TVA power for the city of Memphis and obtaining Dixon-Yates power for the city of Memphis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, one difference—the price—is about all that is involved; is not that true?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, with the guaranteed profit Dixon-Yates would make—from $3,500,000 to $5 million a year—there probably would be an increase in the rates. But there are many other differences.

One difference is that if Dixon-Yates fails to supply the power—for instance, if Dixon-Yates has a breakdown—there is no guaranty to Memphis as to how it will obtain power.

Furthermore, even though they might have to pay for a part of the contract, the people of Memphis know that by chopping off that section now and putting it under the contract with Dixon-Yates and the private utilities—and that contract will expire in 1958—they would be right back where they are beginning, and the people of Memphis do not want to take a chance on that sort of situation. They look to the distant future, as well as to the immediate future.

Another difference—and one which seems to have been overlooked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]—is that for all practical purposes Congress approved the TVA sales-distribution area by the passage of the 1939 act, at which time Congress gave the TVA the responsibility of furnishing power to this particular area. So the people of Memphis naturally have had a right to look to the carrying out of that commitment by Congress. However, it has been increasingly evident that Congress has been forgetting the responsibility it assumed in 1939.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Last year this very question about the contract came before the Congress, did it not? An attempt was made to destroy the contract; but that attempt failed, did it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; the contract never was passed upon by the Congress. Last year, Congress approved the action in removing the 30-day notification or waiting period. That is all that has been done by Congress.

Let me say here that although I believe the Dixon-Yates group will, if the contract is canceled now, be entitled to very little, if anything, by way of compensation—and probably it is true that a lawsuit will ensue—yet I desire to point out that until the financing plan is approved by the Securities and Exchange Commission, there is no valid contract. Although, Mr. President, upon the urging of the President and the Atomic Energy Commission, some money has been spent, and no doubt the Dixon-Yates group will be entitled to get some money back, yet the moment we include in this bill an appropriation of $6,500,000 for something which might be used by the Dixon-Yates group to transmit their power across the river, we are giving some legislative approval to the Dixon-Yates contract; and then the Dixon-Yates group will be in a position to "stick" the Government by means of a claim for damages, in the event of eventual cancellation of the contract.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Is not a contractual relationship between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission also a prerequisite to a valid contract? Is not this question still involved, as well as others?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think the Dixon-Yates contract has any provision that it does not become effective before the TVA and the Dixon-Yates and the Atomic Energy Commission sign up, although I am not intimately informed about it. I do know that the fact is that the TVA has refused to sign a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, and rightfully so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Ferguson amendment, adopted by the Congress last year, which authorized this type of contract, predicated such authorization upon replacement power to the TVA. Unless there is a contractual relationship between the Atomic Energy Commission and the TVA, by which TVA agrees to accept the power upon whatever conditions may be agreed upon, then the condition prerequisite to making the authorization of the Ferguson amendment effective has not been met.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that is a strong point. It will undoubtedly be a strong point in favor of the Government when the lawsuit to which reference has been made comes to trial. There will be the biggest lawsuit we ever saw, over golden shovels, breaking ground, and other claims. So I think my colleague from Tennessee has a strong point, namely, that the contract question has not been met, and that Congress has never actually gone on record approving it. No congressional action approved the contract. The Ferguson amendment was adopted. As the Senator says—and I think properly—it has no applicability to what took place. The Congress and the joint committee also waived the 30-day provision, but that does not change the terms of the contract.

What I am saying to my colleagues today is that if we appropriate $6,500,000, which may at some subsequent time be used for the purpose of building a transmission line to link up with Dixon-Yates, we are giving tacit approval to the contract. We shall be met with that contention by the Dixon-Yates lawyers when they make their claim against the Government. It is a gross waste of money, particularly when this whole question could be deferred until next year, because even if construction of the plant were begun, it would require from 32 to 36 months, whereas, according to the information I have from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and from the engineers, a transmission line could be built in 18 months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If that be so, and if the Senator is so certain that Memphis is going to proceed with the plan to build a plant, why is the Senator so disturbed about this provision? It raises the suspicion that he has no faith in the purposes of the city of Memphis.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is dead wrong. I have absolute faith in the city of Memphis. The Senator asks what has been done. Everything has been done that could be done up to this point. The city has obtained legislative authority from the General Assembly of Tennessee. The project has been approved by the government of the city of Memphis. The civic leaders, including the mayor and head of the power division, have testified before committees of Congress. I have absolutely no question about the good faith of the city of Memphis. I wish to say again that I think it is an unnecessary reflection upon their good faith to write into this appropriation bill, or into the committee's report, language questioning the good faith of the city of Memphis.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have been trying to tell the Senator from Arkansas why I think the language is insufficient, and why I think the appropriation should be stricken out of the bill.

I yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the hearings which were held on the waiver, as shown on page 486, there is a repetition of the language which Mr. Allen had used in concluding his remarks the previous day. He said:

> If the United States Government through any of its agencies would be willing to contract with the city of Memphis for a 650,000-kilowatt steam-generating plant located on the east side of the river in the vicinity of Memphis, which contains all of the provisions and terms and conditions as set out in the proposal made by Dixon-Yates to the Atomic Energy Commission, I would enthusiastically recommend to the city government and to the people of Memphis that the city of Memphis consider the inviting profits inherent in such a contract, and am sure that any number of plants could be built under similar conditions.

The mayor was present at that hearing. When he was asked to comment on what Mr. Allen had said, he said:

> I have known and worked with Major Allen for a number of years. We, the people of the city of Memphis have the greatest confidence and respect in his ability and intelligence and integrity. I can assure you while I am only one member of the city commission, I can assure you that I believe that whatever recommendation that Major Allen might make in that connection, I think I can safely say that it would be followed by the city commission.

I ask the Senator if that recommendation was not followed by the city commission when it voted to construct a plant?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it was. The testimony the Senator is reading was given in November. At the session of the legislature beginning in January action was taken upon the project, and every action necessary up to this date has been taken.

Of course, the city of Memphis naturally hoped that the United States Senate and the House would live up to their contractual obligation in the act of 1939 giving TVA the responsibility for furnishing power to this section. It was not until it was evidenced by the House that the contract was not to be lived up to that the city of Memphis gave the TVA final notice.

Mr. ANDERSON. I invite the Senator's attention to a letter written by J. W. McAfee, who was one of the negotiators of one of the original contracts—I think the OVEC contract, or perhaps the EEI contract. It was written on the letterhead of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri, and is dated St. Louis, Mo., January 4, 1954. It is reprinted at page 929 of our hearings. The letter was addressed to Mr. Walter Williams, Assistant to the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington, D. C. The letter reads:

> I have been thinking about our conversation the last time I saw you in Washington. The more I consider the possibility you are investigating—

That is, the Dixon-Yates proposal—

> the more impressed I am with the necessity of considering other alternatives before a final decision is made. I am sure I suggested some of the things that would accomplish the desired result but I think now that I could put them in order of priority. If I had the responsibility of relieving the national budget of avoidable capital expenditures in the TVA area, I would consider:
>
> First. That TVA no longer assume full responsibility for supplying all the needs of municipalities. Thus, as present contracts expire, those municipalities which need a greater supply than is available from the Authority would be obliged to arrange for purchase from others or for the construction of a plant with municipal funds.

Did the Senator from Tennessee ever hear of anyone in the administration taking up this suggestion by one of the power officials of this country, to the effect that the best way to relieve the TVA supply situation was to allow Memphis to build its own plant?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. Although the administration sent forth engineers to see where the power was to come from, and although the engineers made quite a survey, they never got in touch with Major Allen, with the engineering division of the city, or with any other official of the city of Memphis.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has invited attention to this letter, which was dated January 4, 1954, more than a year ago.

I believe I should also call the Senate's attention to the fact that in testifying before the Securities and Exchange Commission, either in February or March of this year, Mayor Tobey stated unequivocally again that the city of Memphis would build its own steam plant before it would ever accept Dixon-Yates power.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no doubt that Memphis will build its own plant. There never has been any doubt that Memphis would refuse Dixon-Yates power, and would build its own plant as an alternative, if necessary.

What is it that makes the administration so likely to drop the Dixon-Yates hot potato, after clinging so stubbornly to it for so long? I believe it is because the President has finally discovered that he had on his hands an incipient Teapot Dome. He should have known that before he personally ordered the Dixon-Yates contract.

This is the first instance in the history of our Nation, so far as I have known, of a President of the United States ordering an independent agency, against the will of the majority members of the agency, to negotiate a contract with a particular corporation or group, and naming the group—Dixon-Yates.

He should have been advised when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] made his now famous speech on the floor of the Senate last February that a consultant of the Bureau of the Budget was also representing the company which became the financial agent for Dixon-Yates. Evidently he was not fully informed, because only last week Budget Director Rowand Hughes, the man who should have checked up on the matter, told a committee of the Senate that he still does not believe that the First Boston Corp., of which Mr. Adolphe Wenzell was a vice president and director at the same time he was a consultant for the Bureau of the Budget, is the financial agent for Dixon-Yates. That testimony was given by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, despite sworn testimony to the contrary before the Securities and Exchange Commission by Mr. Wenzell himself.

I have before me the transcript of the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, from which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] has been reading. These hearings were held last November. At the urgent request of the President himself, the committee waived the 30-day waiting period for the contract. Both the mayor of Memphis and the president of the Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Division testified at these hearings to the effect that no member of the Bureau of the Budget, no representative of the President, and no representative of the AEC ever had conferred with them about the Dixon-Yates plan.

I wish to read one quotation from what Mayor Tobey said in testifying in November. This came as a great surprise to all of them. They were told nothing about it. The TVA officials testified that the contract was made behind their backs. Certainly the people of Tennessee, who had been told by the President, when he was a candidate for public office, that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be maintained at maximum efficiency and would continue to serve this great region as it had served it in the past, were surprised by this contract being made behind their backs and behind the backs of TVA and the government of the city of Memphis. I read from page 479 of the hearings. Mayor Tobey testified as follows:

> We are here to protest the wisdom of this contract and the manner in which this contract has been handled. Despite the tremendous interest of the city government and the people of Memphis and Shelby County in this contract, they have never been invited to have a look at it. Engineers have prowled around the city to find ways and means of bringing the power into Memphis without so much as consulting our engineering department as to the feasibility of rights-of-way. If this contract is good for the AEC and a good contract for the people of Memphis and of the United States, should it not have been discussed openly with the officials of the city of Memphis and the division?

Mr. President, on page 478 the mayor of the city of Memphis is quoted as testifying as follows:

> We learned from the newspapers on the morning of November 5 that copies of the Dixon-Yates contract in final form had been distributed, but we had not received a copy in Memphis at the time this statement was prepared.

He testified further they had to come to Washington to find out what was being cooked up for them.

When Mr. Hughes sent a copy of the speech of the Senator from Alabama to the President, the President told him he did not believe it, according to Mr. Hughes' statement.

At his press conference last Wednesday, the President showed quite clearly by his answers that he still had not been told the truth about the part played by Wenzell and the First Boston Corp. I wrote a letter to the President on Wednesday afternoon, telling him the facts in the matter. If he saw my letter—and I hope he did—then apparently it was the first time he got all the facts.

None of this, of course, can excuse the President. He took it upon himself to overrule the opinion of the majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, and a majority of the Board of the TVA, when he personally awarded this iniquitous contract, with the specified firm.

Therefore he should have known what he was doing. Having taken such an unprecedented step, he should be willing now to take the consequences of his incredibly bad judgment.

I believe the record should be set straight on one other matter. I notice that in trying to explain the administration's about-face, the distinguished minority leader stated that it represents no change in policy, and that the President has always wanted the local people to accept the responsibility for their own power needs.

Of course, it is a change in policy from that publicly espoused by the President when he was a candidate for election, in speeches in Knoxville and in Memphis and in telegrams he sent to two of the great daily newspapers of Tennessee.

However, more important, it is eyewash and nothing more to say that the administration was ever interested in what the local people thought about the contract.

While we are considering this subject, I believe it is well to point out some further facts related to it. I heard the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] move to strike out the item for six other steam plants which are proposed to be added to existing steam plants. He stated he did not think the Government ought to be financing any steam plants in that area, although these new steam plants were additions to existing ones.

The Senator from Florida did not point out that the Government has a responsibility, under the act of 1939, when it gave the TVA its service area. He did not point out that the Government is interested in TVA repaying the investment. He did not point out the fact that as of the present time and for years to come approximately one-half of all the power generated at the steam plants and at the hydroelectric facilities will go for defense facility operations, such as the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah.

The Senator from Florida also failed to point out that this defense power supply will continue to come from existing facilities.

If he wishes to penalize the people of the Tennessee Valley region by having Congress refuse to carry out its obligation to the people of that section in not letting them have sufficient electricity—of course, the full amount will continue to go to the defense facilities—that may be his privilege. However, I do not call it justice to the people of that great section of the country.

The mayor and the head of the publicly owned utilities of Memphis were put in the position at this meeting—and the meeting was held in November of 1954—of pleading with the Government to tell them something about the power supply the Government was going to force upon them.

If that indicates any cooperation between the Federal Government and "local initiative"—I put that phrase in quotation marks purposely, because that is what we have been hearing a great deal about from the administration and from the President—then I am afraid I do not know the definition of the term.

We had in the Tennessee Valley the world's outstanding example of the Federal Government, the States, the municipalities, and the rural cooperatives—the people, in other words—working together for a common objective, to reclaim once wasted natural resources, to build up the region socially and economically.

We may never again achieve that old working arrangement in the way we once knew it. For that, and that alone, the Eisenhower administration can take credit, if it wants such credit.

However, Mr. President, we will also not have the iniquitous Dixon-Yates contract. We will not have the evils of absentee-controlled, Wall Street-dominated and holding-company-operated power again in the valley.

For that, the people of the valley, fighting for months against an administration determined to jam it down their throats, can take credit.

Mr. President, it is rather a shame, that this fine effort of democracy, which has demonstrated what people working for the development of the resources of a great region can do and which is a showplace where foreign ministers and foreign representatives coming here to see what has been done in this great country inevitably go, should be subjected to such a thing as the Dixon-Yates contract. It is unfortunate, I think, that the city of Memphis is subjected to the necessity of having to build its own steam plant. It is unfortunate because it breaks up the system and the area defined by the Congress in the act of 1939 when it authorized the purchase by TVA of certain transmission facilities. It may result in other unfortunate things. I can only hope that the day may come when the campaign pledge of the President of the United States will be fulfilled. I hope the day will come when the Congress of the United States will realize that this is a great, worthwhile investment and that it should enable the TVA to continue to furnish power in connection with the development of the resources of the great valley of the Tennessee River.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask about an item of $750,000 on page 24 of the report. Is that amount allotted for actual dredging in connection with deepening the channel over the bar at the mouth of the Columbia River to the project depth of 48 feet?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to take this opportunity, if I may, to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and his fellow members for including this item in the appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. We considered it a very worthy project.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am particularly grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee, because I realize that his own experience as the senior Senator from Louisiana has acquainted him with the importance of navigation, since in his State is the mouth of the greatest river system in the United States. The Columbia River system is second only to the Mississippi-Missouri River system. For many years the people of my State and of the adjacent State of Washington have dreamed of a channel over the bar which would be deepened to 48 feet.

I think I speak for many persons in my State and in the Pacific Northwest as a whole when I express my gratitude and appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the patience which he showed in listening to the information which my senior colleague and I presented in behalf of the full project depth of 48 feet. For many years navigation on our second greatest river system has been retarded by the extremely perilous conditions at the bar. Ships which otherwise could go up to Portland, and even beyond, have not dared to risk the bar which has ripped the bottom out of many ships. At that point a sudden high wave or a sudden gust of wind could result in great damage to ships and in death to their entire crews.

I think I can truthfully say that if this item is held in the conference report it will result in more progress for navigation in the Pacific Northwest than will any other item which has ever been provided for.

I also wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the very generous allotments made for such projects in my State as the Cougar Dam and Hills Creek Dam projects in Lane County, and the Talent project in Jackson County. The wisdom of the chairman of the subcommittee, I think, will be shown in future years as these projects are developed.

The administration's budget provided no construction funds at all for the Talent project, although that project had previously been authorized. But the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, has seen fit, and very wisely so, to get that very important irrigation project under way in the southern part of our State.

As a new Member of this body, I am particularly grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee for the many courtesies which were shown me in presenting the information.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to return to that one project on the Columbia River to which I previously referred. I know of the great interest of the Senator from Louisiana in navigation, because the Mississippi is the greatest inland waterway that exists in our country, and perhaps in the entire world. He has done a great deal, I think, for his own State in improving our inland waterway, the Columbia River, because it will result in a vastly increased amount of heavy tonnage between the mouth of the Mississippi and through the Panama Canal, up the Pacific coast, and to the interior of Washington and Oregon.

I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for the courtesy and for the wisdom he has shown in providing for this project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 28, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$52,960,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$53,040,000."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my amendment pertains solely to an item of $80,000 of planning money for a small harbor project. The record sustains its need. I had the matter in mind, and it was presented to the subcommittee, but in some way it was overlooked. I had to be on the floor of the Senate in connection with the military construction bill, and was detained here after the full committee was in session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say it was more or less an oversight. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi had spoken to me about it, and while the Appropriations Committee of which he is a member was in session passing upon this matter, the Senator was on the floor in charge of an important bill reported from the Armed Services Committee. I gladly accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the question of whether the city of Memphis had ever planned to build a plant; who knew it; and when it was known.

The New York Times of February 18, 1955, published a dispatch from Memphis, Tenn., dated February 17, 1955, which reads, in part, as follows:

> The city of Memphis threatened today to short circuit the Dixon-Yates power proposal by building its own power plant. The city buys its electric power from the Tennessee Valley Authority, to which the Dixon-Yates plant would supply power.
>
> Without the need to supply additional power to the rapidly burgeoning Memphis area, the need of the Dixon-Yates plant might be seriously questioned.

That was on February 17. I might add that I see nothing unusual in the city of Memphis making this announcement. As a matter of fact, the New York Times on the same day, February 18, in an adjoining column, carried another statement as follows:

> Edgar H. Dixon said tonight that Dixon-Yates "never had offered to sell power" to the city of Memphis.
>
> "If they wish to build their own plant, that's their privilege," he said in answer to questions on Mayor Tobey's assertion that the city would refuse to buy Dixon-Yates power.
>
> Mr. Dixon, president of the Middle South Utilities Inc., asserted: "We never had any intention of raiding TVA territory. We never had any notion of selling to the city."

It simply seems to me that they never had any notion of selling to the city.

The sudden announcement by the city that it was going to build its own plant certainly should not have caused the withdrawal from the Dixon-Yates contract.

There may be other factors involved, which we will attempt to bring out as we go along. I commend the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] for the investigation he has been making. We who have been concerned with the Dixon-Yates contract for a long time know how very difficult it is to obtain factual information.

I noticed that one of the benefits of the Dixon-Yates contract was that the plant would be integrated with the TVA system, thus allowing steam power to compete with hydropower.

If the President has authorized this arrangement for Dixon-Yates, I hope Memphis and 148 other distributors will have an opportunity also to integrate their power with TVA, if it goes along.

I hope this power line will not be constructed. I hope the language in the report is strong enough to prevent it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate, but I would not want the opportunity to pass without paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender].

Having served as chairman of the subcommittee in the prior Congress, when this side of the aisle was in the majority, I know the burdensome details which are involved in a bill of this magnitude and importance. I know of no Member of the Senate or of no chairman of a subcommittee who has given closer attention to the details of the bill or who has worked longer and harder over a long period of time, in guiding a bill through his subcommittee, then through the full committee, and then on the floor of the Senate, than has the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to pay my tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana and to commend him for the excellent job he has done. I am prepared to support the bill as it was reported by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the senior Senator from California in his comments about the senior Senator from Louisiana. I could give a bill of particulars, if I were to take the time of the Senate to do so, to show the breadth and scope of the understanding by the Senator from Louisiana of all the details of the bill. I have talked to him not only about projects in the Northwest; but in my discussions he has shown a knowledge of the details of projects all over the country. It gives us, his colleagues who are not on the Committee on Appropriations, great assurance, let me tell him, to know that we have as chairman of the subcommittee one who insists upon a belief in uniformity of fair dealing with all his colleagues, no matter from what part of the country they may come, or to what party they may belong.

I extend to the senior Senator from Louisiana my very sincere commendation for the grand job he and his colleagues have done on the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations ex officio from the Committee on Public Works, the committee which authorizes the various projects, I extend my sincere appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, and thank him for the thorough manner in which he has considered all the important projects covered by the bill.

I think the bill as it is now submitted to the Senate probably is one of the most diversified in the history of our appropriations. I offer to the Senator from Louisiana my sincerest commendation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I commend the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana. He has performed a herculean task in a magnificent way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had prepared and had intended to offer an amendment which would have accomplished the results sought to be obtained by the provision in the report with reference to the transmission line. I still feel it would be preferable to do it by amendment to the bill, to make it strong.

On the other hand, I have observed the able senior Senator from Louisiana in his steady opposition to many items in appropriation bills calling for additional money for investigations. I have watched him, in round after round, in the position he has taken and from which he has not wavered.

I have talked to him about this item, and on the basis of those conversations I am persuaded that an amendment will not be necessary. In view of this statement, I do not intend to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6766) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer [Mr. Barkley in the chair] appointed Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hill, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Knowland, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Young, Mr. Thye, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Mr. Dworshak, Mr. Kerr on River and Harbor and Flood Control, and Mr. Anderson on Atomic Energy, conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONOPOLY AND ANTITRUST DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice of a meeting of the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust of the Committee on the Judiciary tomorrow afternoon in the Judiciary Committee room at 2 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may meet, notwithstanding the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to make a brief announcement of plans for this week. Beginning tomorrow, and continuing for the remainder of the week, it is planned to have the Senate consider the following bills:

Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 1835, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Calendar No. 703, H. R. 245, to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905, as amended.

Calendar No. 704, H. R. 3636, to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands in the city and county of Honolulu, Island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

Calendar No. 705, H. R. 3990, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

It is expected, also, that conference reports will come before the Senate whenever they are ready for action. A number of bills are in conference at present, and there should be Senate action on some conference reports during this week.

In addition, there are on the Executive Calendar four conventions relating to prisoners of war. These are Executive D, E, F, and G of the 82d Congress. It is planned to take action on the conventions by a yea-and-nay vote. I serve notice now that they will be taken up at the earliest time tomorrow, if that is possible.

ROADBUILDING ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 703, H. R. 245.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 245) to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 5, 1955:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island for a term of 4 years, vice Jacob S. Temkin, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be major

Buscemi, Michael D., MC, O382088.

To be captain

Thomas, Charles A., Jr., MSC, O996986.

To be first lieutenants

Baker, Roger W., VC, O1941750.
Camp, Melvin J., MSC, O1893779.
Dohnal, June P., WAC, L1010084.
Fountain, Edmund L., VC, O2041165.
Funk, John C., MSC, O1917698.
Kawas, Elias E., MC, O4021973.
Kepp, James C., VC, O1878029.
King, Zane K., MSC, O961354.
Lyday, James M., VC, O1934051.
McCandless, Earl R., MSC, O2050887.
Rosa-Perez, Cesar E., MC, O1893306.

To be second lieutenants

Bullock, Howard R., MSC, O1928022.
Estrada, Betty A., WMSC, R2665.
Fowler, Harland W., Jr., MSC, O1887446.
Heath, Jack F., MSC, O1937254.
Hoggan, Malcolm D., MSC, O1928155.
Johnson, Wirt V., MSC, O2102734.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Bennett, Delmer R., O1853003.
Cox, William A., O2273233.
Klemme, William M.
Story, Stratton R., O2273732.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Burckert, James F., O1876377.
Jacobs, Kenneth R., O2265452.
Richards, Abraham L., O1924883.
Svoboda, Charles J., O1876597.

To be second lieutenant

Warner, Paul B., O4000076.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Bass, Bobbie R.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abraham, Albert III
Ashley, Clarence D., Jr.
Bentley, Thomas N.
Boyer, Henry, Jr.
Dahl, Hans E.
Dutton, Howard M., O4025292
Glasson, Robert P.
Hamilton, Milton H., Jr., O4034391
Harris, James W.
Jeffries, Charles O.
Melville, Royall T.
Murphy, John J., Jr.
Nugent, Frank J., Jr.
Lueptow, Lowell E.
Lundin, Keith E.
Sentell, Joseph W.
Torno, Harry C.
Underwood, Elvin H.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast guided our beloved country safely through many dangers and difficulties, may our hearts be filled with a greater faith in Thy divine providence.

Grant that the manifestation of Thy grace and goodness in the past may inspire us to dedicate ourselves anew to our Republic in the spirit of patriotism and fidelity.

Forgive us for ofttimes being indifferent and unresponsive to the needs and longings of others who are finding their struggles for health and happiness, and for a freer and fuller life, so burdensome and difficult.

Give us more of sympathy and understanding, of generosity and charity, and help us to close the chasms between the members of the human family, casting into those chasms our selfishness, our pride and prejudices, and changing them into beautiful highways where all shall walk together in brotherhood and good will.

Hear us as we daily remember in our prayers Thy servant, beseeching Thee to share Thy eternal wisdom with the doctors and nurses, enabling them to know just what to do for his recovery.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 1, 1955, was read and approved.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN FORT WAYNE, IND.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 279, Rept. No. 1052) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities 3,500 additional copies of the hearing of the 84th Congress held by the said committee on Communist activities in the Fort Wayne, Ind., area.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY ON RADIATION STERILIZATION OF FOOD

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 148, Rept. No. 1053) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 25,000 additional copies of the hearing held by the said joint committee on May 9, 1955, on "Radiation Sterilization of Foods."

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS BY PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 147) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 144, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, not to exceed $50,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 156) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 139, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.
>
> SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 1, line 2, strike out "139" and insert "266."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I ask the gentleman from Texas what these two resolutions are? I understand one provides funds for investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and I believe the other by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct; the one for Public Works is for $50,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Both were authorized.

Mr. BURLESON. Both were authorized, and budgets have been presented to the committee supporting the request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide funds for the expense of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 266."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTUARIAL CONDITION OF OLD AGE AND SURVIVORSHIP INSURANCE FUND

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it will be my purpose to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a statement setting forth some very alarming testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means by the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

If the Secretary of the Treasury's testimony is true, then I know of no man who has ever served in high public office who is more guilty of "fiscal irresponsibility."

As a result of some observations that the Secretary of the Treasury had made before our committee in regard to the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, I asked the Secretary if it was his opinion that the old-age and survivors insurance system is actuarially unsound. To this question the Secretary replied:

> Yes, under the present provisions of collection and disbursement.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by the Secretary of the Treasury is totally inconsistent with a statement contained in the annual report of the board of trustees of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund which was signed by the Honorable George M. Humphrey, as managing trustee. In that report, it is stated:

> Accordingly, it might be said that in the 1954 amendments, the increase in the ultimate contribution rate meets all of the additional costs of the benefits proposed and a substantial part of the deficiency which the latest estimates indicated in the financing of the 1952 act.

Mr. Speaker, because of the vital stake that every American citizen has in the soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance system, I think it essential that the Honorable George M. Humphrey clarify the record as to the actuarial soundness of the social security system.

MIGRANT MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled for action by the House of Representatives this week H. R. 3822, to extend the Agricultural Act of 1949, commonly referred to as the Mexican labor bill.

Many practices have developed since this legislation was enacted. The transportation of these people under this act has created a problem. Some people using these laborers have transported them in trucks from the Mexican border for many miles. Recently, one of these trucks overturned and there were 52 people in the truck. One was killed and several injured.

We should have some regulation on this transportation, and when this legislation is considered I propose to offer an amendment, which is as follows:

> Page 2, after line 18, insert the following: "SEC. 4. Title V of such act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> " 'SEC. 510. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to require employers to provide adequately for the safety, health, and welfare of workers while they are being transported from reception centers to the places of their employment and returned from such places to reception centers after termination of employment. Any person who violates any such regulation shall, for each violation, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both'."

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will appreciate my interest in the welfare of the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows. On Saturday last in the delightful column written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt sympathetic mention was made of legislative proposals before us in the interest of the Spanish War veterans and their widows. In her concern for the rapidly diminishing remnants of the Armed Force that started our Nation on its road of destiny, and for the aged widows of those passed on, Mrs. Roosevelt, as always, truly interprets the heart of America. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the present commander in chief of the United Spanish War veterans is the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, who came to the Congress with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our beloved former Speaker. He served on the Rules Committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Appropriations Committee in the House, later was narrowly defeated for a seat in the other body.

It is my hope and prayer that during the administration as commander in chief of our former colleague, and while some of the veterans and the widows remain in the flesh, the too-long-delayed enactment of these meritorious measures will be adopted, I trust, on the Consent Calendar with hearty and unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, as the last Spanish War veteran in this body and speaking as well for our former colleague, Commander in Chief Thurston, I am asking the thoughtful and sympathetic attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as I read the words of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as given in her column printed on Saturday last in newspapers from coast to coast. Mrs. Roosevelt said:

> A very appealing letter came to me yesterday about a bill introduced in Congress by Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois. It deals with questions affecting the Spanish-American War veterans. The bill asks for an increase in pensions for the widows of these veterans, provides that Navy personnel in the Spanish-American War be treated on the same basis as Army personnel, and finally it asks that the Moro bill be passed to grant the veterans of Moro Province of the Philippine Islands the same pensions and benefits as are received by the Spanish-American War veterans.
>
> This particular bill covers the longest undeclared war in our history. It started July 5, 1902, and did not end until December 31, 1913. There were 130 engagements and 5,000 casualties—15 participants received the Congressional Medal of Honor and to those who lost an arm or leg $12 a month was granted.
>
> Bills for these veterans have been before the Congress many times over the years and since all-Spanish-American War veterans are now getting old—68 years is the average age—this probably will be the last time that any effort will be made to have something done to improve their conditions.
>
> There are not many of them left so they cannot bring much pressure to bear on Congress. What they ask seems fair and right and I wonder if this last effort should not be given real consideration in the Congress at a time when, on the whole, our country is well able to support the small additional tax that these requests would entail.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on July 20, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on July 20, immediately following Mr. PATMAN, and following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

UNDERGROUND PARKING FOR EMPLOYEES IN FRONT OF THE CAPITOL AND UNDER THE PROPOSED NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to relieve parking congestion for Government employees and to make more surface space available for constituent and visitor parking on the Hill, today, letters in the mail will be addressed to the Speaker of the House, and to the floor leaders on both sides of the aisle, as well as to the Architect of the Capitol, scouting the possibilities of putting 2 floors of underground parking facilities in front of the Capitol when its center is alined with the Senate and House wings, and under the proposed new House Office Building. In neither case will eye appeal in present blueprints be disturbed. The observation carries forward parking plans in operation in the new General Accounting Office Building, which has two floors of underground parking available for its employees, who park their cars and take an elevator to their office. It would be regrettable if the two new projects proposed for Capitol Hill did not keep pace with the up-to-date planning evident in the facilities of the General Accounting Office.

I trust that the Speaker and the floor leaders of the House and the Architect of the Capitol see sufficient merit in the suggestion to lend the project their influence and support.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 108]

Abbitt
Adair
Alexander
Ashley
Ashmore
Baker
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Bentley
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bowler
Buchanan
Burdick
Bush
Byrne, Penn.
Canfield
Carnahan
Chase
Chatham
Chelf
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Cooley
Corbett
Coudert
Cretella
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dies
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger, N. Y.
Dolliver, Iowa
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Fallon
Fascell
Fine
Fino
Fjare
Fogarty
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Granahan
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gwinn
Hand
Hardy
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Herlong
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Huddleston
Jackson
James
Jennings
Jensen
Kean
Kearney
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Landrum
Lanham
Latham
Lesinski
McConnell
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mason
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Norblad
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Powell
Prouty
Radwan
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Scherer
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Shuford
Smith, Wis.
Staggers
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Tuck
Udall
Van Pelt
Velde
Vorys
Walter
Watts
Westland
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Wolverton
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 245 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

INCREASING FEE FOR EXECUTING APPLICATION FOR PASSPORT FROM $1 TO $3

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to call attention at this time to a matter of deepest concern to the country in general.

The farmers of America are in desperate straits. Their income is steadily decreasing, and their costs of operation are rising.

The distressing feature of the continued decline in farm income, at a time when everyone else in the Nation is receiving the highest income in history, is that there is no indication of recovery, and the Doan Co., of which Under Secretary True D. Morse was president, predicts in its latest issue that farm prices will continue to decline in 1956.

Notwithstanding the discrimination under which the farmer labors, he is now faced with lack of railroad transportation and a famine of freight cars just at the time his wheat harvest is moving into peak production. With wheat now ripening, harvest cannot be delayed if the crop is to be saved, and it is useless to combine his wheat if freight cars cannot be obtained to get it to the center markets.

In Missouri this week requisition has been made by the Missouri Farmers Association for 200 cars for immediate requirements in 1 section of the State alone. At Bethany, Mo., yesterday, July 4, 250 trucks were lined up at the elevators waiting to unload—and no freight cars in sight.

At Pattonsburg they are calling for 40 cars, at Salisbury 25, at Columbia 25, at Grant City 20, at Wright City 10, at Gallatin 15, at Paris 15, just to name a few of the many. At Albany they can load 24 cars a day, and wheat is being dumped on the ground in the absence of storage accommodations. At Wentzville this morning the Missouri Farmers Association manager notified 25 farmers that he could not handle their wheat.

To add to the confusion and loss, the new wheat is beginning to heat where stored without opportunity to transfer to cars and unless it can be moved in time, it must take a dock in price of a dollar a bushel. The Missouri Farmers Association has 100,000 bushels in storage at Brunswick, for example, which is heating and on which they stand to lose $100,000 in dockage due to heating. They have 50,000 bushels at Albany and 40,000 bushels at Bethany in the same condition. And these are only three of many. As low as the price of wheat is dropping and as restricted as their quota is for the coming crop, they must take this additional loss due to lack of transportation.

President Heinkel telephones me that he has never had this trouble before. When there has been a shortage of cars in past years it was only necessary to get in touch with Washington to get action and cars would be in on the siding the following day.

On Mr. Heinkel's complaint, I have taken up the matter with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the American Association of Railroads, as well as individual railroads serving this territory.

Some 10 days ago I had the matter up with the Interstate Commerce Commission and was advised that the Commission was doing everything that needed to be done. Last Friday my office was again advised that the Commission was giving the situation every attention. Assistant Secretary Roberts of the Department of Agriculture assured us he was working on the matter. But Missouri is still telegraphing and telephoning for cars.

This morning the Interstate Commerce Commission tells me that an unfavorable factor in the car famine is the movement by the Department of Agriculture of old wheat which has long been in storage. Mr. W. V. Simmons, General Superintendent of Transportation of the Burlington Railway, telephones Fred V. Heinkel, of the Missouri Farmer Association at Columbia, Mo., that the Department of Agriculture is moving old wheat and is using cars to ship out corn in Illinois, in this section, which he says explains to that extent the shortage of cars for the new crop which must now be combined, before it is shattered and lost.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand why the shipment of any grain, either wheat or corn, under seal was not made before this critical time. Or why it cannot be deferred until the harvest has been completed. It is to be hoped that the Department can adjust its policy in this respect to permit the current crop to be harvested without further loss. Surely the farmer has already suffered sufficient loss without this further handicap.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that this bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3758) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:
>
> (a) By adding a new subsection (g) to section 507 to read as follows:
>
> "(g) The Administrator is hereby authorized to receive duplicate originals or duly authenticated copies of agreements or compacts entered into, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, between States now or hereafter admitted to the Union, and to take all necessary actions for their preservation and servicing."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is on the Speaker's desk an identical bill (S. 1007), and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill S. 1007, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:
>
> (a) By adding a new subsection (g) to section 507 to read as follows:
>
> "(g) The Administrator is hereby authorized to receive duplicate originals or duly authenticated copies of agreements or compacts entered into, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, between States now or hereafter admitted to the Union, and to take all necessary actions for their preservation and servicing."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 3758, was laid on the table.

CLAIMS FOR RETAINER PAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 800) to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINAL PHYSICAL EXAMINATION WAIVED FOR CERTAIN INDUCTEES INTO ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 802) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the second sentence of subsection 9 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 614), as amended, is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding at the end thereof the following proviso: "*Provided further,* That, if upon completion of training and service under this title, such person continues on active duty without an interruption of more than 72 hours as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, a physical examination upon completion of such training and service shall not be required unless it is requested by such person, or the medical authorities of the Armed Force concerned determine that the physical examination is warranted."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 804) to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of subsection 210 (e) the following provision: "Any pay and allowances authorized by this act which will lawfully accrue to members for their return home incident to release from active duty or training duty may be paid to such members prior to their departure from their last duty station incident to such release, without regard to the actual performance of such travel.".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 933) to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of this act the term "Department" shall mean the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, and the terms "uniformed services," "member," and "Secretary" shall have the respective meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 804), as amended, on the date of enactment of this act, except that "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" shall be substituted for "the Federal Security Administrator" in the definition of the term "Secretary."
>
> SEC. 2. In the settlement of the account of any deceased member of the uniformed services or of the National Guard or the Air National Guard, the amount found due therein from the uniformed service of which

the decedent was a member shall be paid to the person or persons surviving at the date of death in the following order of precedence:

First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries named to receive any such amount in a written designation executed by the member and received, prior to his death, in the place designated for such purpose in the regulations of the Department concerned;

Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such member;

Third, if there be no beneficiary or surviving spouse, to the child or children of such member, and descendants of deceased children, by representation;

Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of the member, or the survivor of them; and

Fifth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of the estate of the deceased member, or if there be none, to the person or persons determined to be entitled thereto under the laws of the domicile of the deceased member.

SEC. 3. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, amounts payable to beneficiaries designated by the member under section 2 of this act shall be paid by the Department or uniformed service concerned. All other payments under this act shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any payment made under this act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of any amount so paid.

SEC. 4. Designations of beneficiary under this act, and changes therein, shall be made under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries concerned, and such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable: *Provided*, That any designation of beneficiary made for the purposes of any 6 months' death gratuity (including any designation of a person whose right to the gratuity would not depend upon such designation) and heretofore or hereafter received in the Department concerned before the effective date of the payment provisions of this act shall be considered as a designation of beneficiary for the purposes of this act, in the absence of a designation of beneficiary under this act, unless the member making the designation shall have been missing, missing in action, in the hands of a hostile force, or interned in a foreign country during any part of the period between the date of enactment of this act and the effective date thereof as prescribed in section 5 of this act.

SEC. 5. The payment provisions of this act shall be effective only in cases wherein the member's death occurs on or after the first day of the sixth month following the month in which this act is enacted. The following statutory provisions are repealed as of the effective date of the payment provisions of this act, except with respect to the deaths of members occurring prior to such effective date:

(1) The paragraph of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 750), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, as amended by the act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 795), and section 4 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 10 U. S. C. 868).

(2) Section 1 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30), as amended by section 18 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 560, 34 U. S. C. 941a).

(3) The paragraph in section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 531), which relates to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted persons of the Coast Guard (14 U. S. C. 466).

(4) Section 507 of the Public Health Service Act, approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 711), as amended by section 2 of the act of February 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 30, 42 U. S. C. 225).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN REGULAR ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1137) to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask some member of the Armed Services Committee a question or two in connection with this bill.

Can men be enlisted overseas under this program?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that that is where the enlistment takes place; it takes place overseas; it does not take place in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore, aliens can enlist in the United States Army overseas in countries whose emigration quotas are oversubscribed; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Under the conditions set out in the law. This law originated with the former distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge. It has been the law for some time and there are a certain number of these individuals in the service now.

Mr. GROSS. Why is it the Navy and the Air Force do not enlist men under it, but only the Army enlists aliens?

Mr. VINSON. They have never requested authority to do so.

Mr. GROSS. That is hardly answering my question.

Mr. VINSON. That is the only reason I can give.

Mr. GROSS. Why should not this opportunity be made applicable to the Navy and the Air Force? If it is good to enlist aliens in the Regular Army, why is it not good to enlist them in the Navy and the Air Force?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Because the problem is entirely different in the Army. These men are enlisted on account of their language attainments, also on account of their military attainments. They work with the international army over there of which the general is an American.

Mr. GROSS. Do we not have units of the United States Navy and other Armed Forces in international military setups?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; we do.

Mr. GROSS. Why are aliens not serving in the Navy?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As the gentleman from Georgia said, the Navy did not ask for them. They do not have the need for them at sea as they would on the continent of Europe.

Mr. GROSS. If it is good for the Army, why not spread the good things of life to all the services?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We consider this a very meritorious bill and a very important one.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there is provision for the enlistment of 12,500 in this category, but up to date only 866 aliens have seen fit to enlist.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thought the number was greater than that.

Mr. GROSS. The report shows 866.

I am intrigued by the Secretary's letter in the report. I should like to read this paragraph from the letter from former Secretary of the Army Stevens:

> Although information relating to the number of aliens now serving in the Regular Army under the authority of this legislation and other aspects of the program is classified, the Department of Defense will, upon request, furnish additional information during closed congressional hearings on the proposed legislation.

If it is classified why did you state in the report that you have enlisted 866? How can you state the number in the report and still call it classified?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that they released the classification. The number appears in the report, it has been declassified.

Mr. GROSS. But in the letter they say it is classified information.

Mr. VINSON. We did not write the letter. It is no longer classified.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first section of the act of June 30, 1950 (ch. 443, 64 Stat. 316), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "June 30, 1955", and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "June 30, 1957."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUNTARY EXTENSIONS OF ENLISTMENTS FOR LESS THAN 1 YEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5000) to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill, the bill S. 1571, which is identical with the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two concerning this bill. It is stated in the report:

> Under existing law, enlisted personnel of the Navy may be retained beyond the normal expiration of their enlistment when the ship to which they are attached is outside the continental limits of the United States. They may be retained until the vessel returns to the United States.

It already applies, as I understand it, to the Navy; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that it only applies to the Navy when they are serving outside the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Now, you want to be able to extend the enlistments in the Air Force and the Army for an additional 1 year if it is convenient to do so?

Mr. VINSON. It must be done upon the request of the individual. It is done upon his request. It is all done for the individual's convenience.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but let us go to the language of the report that states "which will restrict extensions of enlistments for less than 1 year to those situations where acceptance of such extensions would be to the best interests of the Government."

Under that language, are you actually taking the enlisted man into consideration? Is the extension completely elective with the enlisted man?

Mr. VINSON. Why, it is to the best interests of the individual. It is necessarily to the best interests of the Government also.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Sometimes they have a man doing a job on a certain mission which he has not completed. They would like to have him stay longer in order to complete the particular job he is doing.

Mr. GROSS. The point I am making is that in the report you say "at the convenience of or in the best interests of the Government."

You do not say "in the best interests of the enlisted man." Yet you say it is voluntary?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is voluntary.

Mr. VINSON. Let us take the man who is on a cruise. He wants to finish that cruise. It is to his best interest to do so. That is all the purpose of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. All I want to know is this: The enlisted man cannot be continued in service for 1 year except upon his own election?

Mr. VINSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth paragraph under the heading "Pay, Miscellaneous" of the act of August 22, 1912 (ch. 335, 37 Stat. 331), as amended, is amended by deleting the word "either" and substituting therefor the words "less than 1 year or for a period of."

Sec. 2. The term of enlistment of any enlisted man in the Army and the Air Force, may, by his voluntary written agreement, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, be extended for a period of less than 1 year from the date of expiration of the then existing term of enlistment, and subsequent to said date such enlisted men as extend the term of enlistment as authorized in this section shall be entitled to and shall receive the same pay and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of their term of enlistment, and such extension shall not operate to deprive them upon discharge at the termination thereof of any right, privilege, or benefit to which they would be entitled at the expiration of the former term of enlistment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5000) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING TWO PROVISIONS OF LAW REQUIRING THAT CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL SHALL BE PAID MONTHLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5270) to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the report states that this bill will not cause any additional cost to the Government, this two-pay period monthly for certain categories of the service; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. How can you pay twice a month without additional cost to the Government if you are paying once a month now?

Mr. VINSON. You will not have to employ any additional personnel. It will probably keep them on the job a little more efficiently than they are now. It would certainly accrue to the benefit of the personnel to be paid twice a month instead of once a month. It is not going to cost $1 more to do it. You will not have to bring in any civil-service employees to do the additional work.

Mr. GROSS. Is this extended to all enlisted personnel?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Throughout the whole service?

Mr. VINSON. Throughout the whole service, yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is telling me that 2 pay periods a month will not cost the Government any more than 1 pay period?

Mr. VINSON. That is what the Department advises us, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the provisions of the bill, S. 1725, for the House bill, the provisions being identical.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1268 of the Revised Statutes is repealed.

Sec. 2. The last proviso in subtitle "Pay" of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 400), is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5270) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4118) to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That subdivision (5) of section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1176), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) That when at the end of any 10-year period during which an operating-differential subsidy has been paid under a contract or consecutive contracts (such period to be computed from the end of the operator's last completed recapture period regardless of its duration, or from the beginning of subsidized operations if the operator has not previously completed a recapture period), or when prior to the end of such 10-year period subsidized operations shall be finally terminated, if the net profit of the contractor on his subsidized vessels and services incident thereto during such period or time (without regard to capital gains and capital losses), after deduction of depreciation charges based upon a life expectancy of the subsidized vessels determined as provided in section 607 (b), has averaged more than 10 percent per annum upon the contractor's capital investment necessarily employed in the operation of the subsidized vessels, services, routes, and lines, the contractor shall pay to the United States an amount equal to one-half of such profits in excess of 10 per cent per annum as partial or complete reimbursement for operating-differential subsidy payments received by the contractor for such recapture period, but the amount of excessive profit so recaptured shall not in any case exceed the amount of the operating-differential subsidy payments theretofore made to the contractor for such period under such contract or consecutive contracts and the repayment of such reimbursement to the Commission shall be subject to the provisions of section 607;"

Sec. 2. Each operating-differential subsidy contract in force on the date of enactment of this act shall, if the subsidized contractor consents, be amended to conform to the provisions of section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR LOAN OF A SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO FRANCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, could tell me where this aircraft carrier is going to be used by the French Government.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, I regret very much that I cannot furnish that information. I imagine it would be used wherever the French Navy found it necessary to use it; probably with its fleet.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will remember that the House, by unanimous vote, a short time ago passed a resolution stating that it was opposed in principle to colonialism. The gentleman recalls that.

Mr. VINSON. I do not think that is involved in this legislation. It is merely to be part of the French Navy connected with NATO training operations. I would imagine that it would be used around the coast of France, in the Mediterranean area or someplace else. I do not think it would be used in Indochina, because there is no French Navy over there so far as I know.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman now saying to me that this United States carrier will not be used in support of French forces in north Africa?

Mr. VINSON. I would say it is not going to be used in north Africa. It is going to be used, as the report indicates, for training purposes. That is what it is going to be used for.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, this carrier could be used down in the Mediterranean; it could be used in the French north African operation, the colonial exploitation of the natives of north Africa. The gentleman, I think, will agree to that, even in so-called training, the French may use this United States warship to perpetuate her colonial empire.

Mr. VINSON. It never was loaned for that purpose. It was loaned for training purposes only and not for any other military use. And, wherever they deem it would be necessary to train, why, there is no limitation in the bill. They may train in the Atlantic or in the Mediterranean or off the coast of Africa or wherever they want to train.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think there ought to be something in this legislation, in this extension, to provide that they cannot use it to further their colonial policy?

Mr. VINSON. I have no objection if the gentleman wants to draft an amendment of that nature. But I think that is far beyond the scope of this bill, because it is not involved in this legislation. You cannot loan anything for one purpose and then write some language in that is entirely extraneous.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that that language would not be extraneous. Who supplies the ammunition for this carrier?

Mr. VINSON. The French Government supplies it.

Mr. GROSS. How can they supply ammunition that will fit American guns aboard an aircraft carrier?

Mr. VINSON. They buy their own ammunition supplies. We do not pay the personnel; we do not supply the oil and fuel. It is all borne by the French. All we do is loan them a ship for training purposes.

Mr. GROSS. You say in your report that to continue to turn this carrier over to the French until 1958 would accomplish a savings of funds which would be expended in deactivating and preserving the ship. Suppose you get the ship back in 1958. You would still have to spend the money to put it in mothballs; would you not?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; we will have to spend money to put it in mothballs if we have no need for it. But, it serves a friendly nation, an ally of ours, by making it available to them to train their midshipmen for their navy.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman has confidence that the French will join us in all-out fighting when the chips are down, he has more confidence in them than I have.

Mr. VINSON. Again let me say to the gentleman that this is purely for training purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 107) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land comprising 66 acres, more or less, together with buildings and improvements thereon, being a portion of Fort Devens Military Reservation and being the same property now utilized by the Massachusetts National Guard under a license granted by the Secretary of the Army, subject, however, to reservation in the United States of all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land authorized to be conveyed by this act.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the property identified in section 1 of this act to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall be made without consideration therefor and upon condition that it shall be used for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and in the event it shall not be used for such purposes title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and, in addition, title to all improvements made by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor. The deed of conveyance shall also provide for such reservations and joint use of facilities as the Secretary of the Army determines as necessary for the use and maintenance of Fort Devens and contain the further provisions that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right without charge to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for a period not to exceed the duration of such state of war or national emergency plus 6 months and upon cessation of such use, such property shall revert to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, together with any or all improvements thereon and appurtenances appertaining thereto.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the grantee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE TO ANNISTON, ALA., OF REAL PROPERTY WITHIN FORT McCLELLAN, ALA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 46) to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized, after he determines that such real property is excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense, to convey to the city of Anniston, Ala., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this act, subject to (1) the condition that the real property conveyed under authority of this act shall be used only for a cemetery, and, if such real property shall ever cease to be used for such purpose, all the right, title, and interest, in and to such real property, shall revert to, and become the property of, the United States which shall have the immediate right of entry thereon, and (2) subject to such other terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section is a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 32, township 15 south, range 8 east, and a parcel of land in the southwest quarter of section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, and lying west of the Anniston-Fort McClellan Highway, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the Anniston city limits line and the west right-of-way line of Anniston-Fort McClellan Highway, said point being 740 feet east of and 253 feet south of the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, thence northerly along said west right-of-way line of said Anniston-Fort McClellan Highway, 2,715 feet, more or less, to a point on the south boundary line of the Old Anniston-Jacksonville Road, thence southwesterly along the meanderings of the south boundary of the Old Anniston-Jacksonville Road to the point of intersection with the south boundary line of the northwest quarter of southwest quarter section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, thence east along aforesaid south boundary line of said northwest quarter of southwest quarter section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, 455 feet more or less, to the southeast corner of said northwest quarter of southwest quarter of said section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, thence south along the west boundary line of the southeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 29, township 15 south, range 8 east, and the northeast quarter of northwest quarter section 32, township 15 south, range 8 east, 1,428 feet more or less to the intersection of the Anniston city limits line, thence easterly along the Anniston city limits line 765 feet more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 38.2 acres, more or less, in Calhoun County, Ala.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized, after he determines that the real property described in section 2 of this act is excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense, to convey to the city of Anniston, Ala., at the then fair market value thereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such real property subject to (1) the condition that if the real property conveyed under authority of this act shall not be utilized for cemetery purposes prior to the expiration of a period of 2 years from the date of the conveyance made pursuant to this act, all the right, title, and interest, in and to such property, shall revert to and become the property of the United States who shall have the immediate right of entry thereon, and (2) subject to such other terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

On page 3, line 12, strike "38.2" and insert in lieu thereof "38.5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN ORANGE COUNTY, N. Y., TO THE VILLAGE OF HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1459) to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] whether it is correct to say that the reason for this bill is to expedite this transfer which could be accomplished under another law, but would consume more time?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, that is the exact reason for bringing this bill in. I wrote to the Bureau of the Budget and received a letter from them. Originally they had objected to this bill on the ground that the land could be conveyed through other means, that a special bill was not required. In their answer to me of June 22, they say:

> The Bureau of the Budget does not object to the transfer of the land in question. The purpose of our comments in connection with the Army report on the bill was to point out that the transfer could, in all probability, be made under general provisions of law, and that the enactment of special legislation was not actually necessary.

Of course, it would take a great deal longer; and if it could pass now it would be a help. This is a very small matter, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know how it could be transferred except in this manner unless it were declared surplus and then disposed of. But as the gentlewoman from New York has said, this is a small matter. It would be a great convenience to this community. We had a full hearing on this. According to the amendment, if it ceases to be used for municipal purposes, it comes back to the Government. In view of the amendment which will be reported, I certainly hope that the gentleman will not interpose any objection to this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. At this point I am seeking information. It is my understanding that it will be, in the deed of conveyance, subject to reservations as the Secretary of the Army deems necessary, to protect the United States.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So that the use of the property will not interfere with any Federal activities located in that area?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to donate and convey to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land in the town of Highlands, Orange County, N. Y., containing approximately 6.4 acres and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the westerly side of the right-of-way line of United States Route 9W running between Fort Montgomery and West Point in the town of Highlands, Orange County, N. Y., where the projection of a line almost due west from the northerly end of an abutment for a culvert leading under the said highway would strike said right-of-way line running in a westerly direction and which said point of beginning is approximately 30.0 feet southerly from a southerly side of a roadway leading into the within-described site, and running from said point of beginning in a westerly direction 309.0 feet more or less to a knob of rock on a high ledge; running thence north 425.0 feet to a point near the top of a ledge of rock; running thence in a northeasterly direction 650.0 feet to a point on the easterly side of a high ledge of rocks; running thence east 185.0 feet to a point which point is northeast of a shallow pond on the within-described premises; thence in a southwesterly direction 820.0 feet along the westerly slope of a high ledge to a point which is almost 25.0 feet from the easterly edge of the road leading into the said site; running thence in a southerly direction and approximately 25.0 feet from said road for a distance of 100.0 feet to a point; running thence in an easterly direction approximately 60.0 feet to the right-of-way line aforementioned; and running thence in a southerly direction, crossing the said roadway leading into the said site 75.0 feet to the point or place of beginning.

SEC. 2. (a) The conveyance to the village of Highland Falls of the tract of land described in the first section of this act shall be made upon condition that such land be used by the village only as a trash dump or incinerator (and for purposes appurtenant thereto), and that such land be used by the village in such manner as will insure that its use does not interfere with the use of property of the Federal Government located in the vicinity.

(b) In the event that the village of Highland Falls shall at any time cease to use the tract of land conveyed to it under the first section of this act as a trash dump or incinerator (and for purposes appurtenant thereto), all right, title, and interest in and to such tract of land shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The conveyance authorized in the first section of this act shall be made upon condition that in the event that the land shall be used by the village of Highland Falls at any time for any purpose other than as a trash dump or incinerator (or for purposes relating thereto), all right, title and interest in and to said land shall revert to the United States.

"(b) The deed of conveyance shall contain such other terms, conditions and reservations as the Secretary of the Army determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO LEND CERTAIN EQUIPMENT TO GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4218) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout senior roundup encampment, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a corporation created under the act of March 16, 1950, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 5,000 Girl Scouts and officials who are to attend the Girl Scout senior roundup encampment to be held during the period beginning in June 1956 and ending in July 1956, at the Highland State recreation area in the State of Michigan, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, following the word "That", insert "(a)."

On page 2, add new subsections (b) and (c) as follows:

"(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such encampment and to be returned at such time after the close of such encampment as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Girl Scouts of the United States of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUDING ACTIVE SERVICE IN ARMY AND AIR FORCE IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4886) to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved February 21, 1946 (34 U. S. C., sec. 410b), is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "Navy, Marine Corps," the following: "Army, Air Force."

SEC. 2. Section 232 of title 14 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "Navy," the following: "Army, Air Force."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING NUMBER OF CADETS THE PRESIDENT MAY SELECT FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5269) to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Members of the House ought to have an explanation of this bill. Will some member of the committee explain it?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, the reason we have increased the number of appointments we allow the President is because of the increased number of service personnel we have throughout all of the services; also to take care of the Air Force Academy. Traditionally, the President has been allowed to appoint on a competitive basis sons of service personnel to the academies. This simply brings it in line with the expansion we have had of career personnel and to take care of the Air Force Academy.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state how many additional appointments this will give the President of the United States to the Air Force Academy?

Mr. VINSON. It is 40.

Mr. GROSS. According to the report, this bill would provide for an increase of 211. The report says that the bill would provide an increase of 211 in the present authorization of 89 cadetships appointed at the personal selection of the President.

I point out to the Members of the House that Iowa next year will have 6 appointees for all Members of the House of Representatives and the 2 members of the other body. We will have a total of 6, there being an increase of 1 over last year. Yet you propose here to give the President 211 additional appointments.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to it, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will withhold it.

Mr. VINSON. The President will not have this authority under the language of the bill until the Air Academy gets its full strength. He has 89 under the law now, and when the Air Academy gets its full strength this law would be applicable to this increased number.

Mr. GROSS. That lends itself to another question. What is the number of appointments Members of Congress are going to have to the Air Force Academy when it reaches full strength? You are setting up here what the President will have.

Mr. VINSON. You will have the same as you will have at West Point. This does not interfere with it at all.

Mr. GROSS. The Presidential appointments are to be made from the families of career officers in the Army; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Not necessarily, but probably some of them will be from the families of Air Force officers.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is now saying to me and to the Members of the House that this increase in the Presidential appointments will not take place until and unless Members of Congress also get their increases; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is the way I would interpret it.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any doubt about it?

Mr. VINSON. Not in my mind; not at all. I am absolutely correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Under the present system for the Air Force Academy, if the gentleman would like an explanation, we all appoint them and then they go before a board. That is the same situation that holds so far as any Presidential appointments are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WIER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I take the same position as the gentleman from Iowa does with regard to the Air Force. The number permitted entry in the Air Force next year will be the same as this year, which is a very, very limited number.

Mr. VINSON. The academy has not been built. It would not be sound to authorize them until you have facilities for them. We are building up as fast as possible. This does not go into effect until the Air Academy has been developed and fully manned by students.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say just a word about the Military Academy, where you are increasing his quota. Where does that increase come from? Are they increasing the enrollment there, or where are they going to be taken from for the present?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I think it is far too important a bill to be passed here under unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5623) to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 1 (b) of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 303), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1092a (b)), 40 cadets may be nominated for the United States Air Force Academy from among members of the Civil Air Patrol, in lieu of the 40 who may be nominated from among honor graduates of honor military schools.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTIVE DUTY FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6601) to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of what is proposed to be done here?

Mr. VINSON. The main purpose is to permit a man with a disability of 10 percent to go on active duty.

Mr. GROSS. That is to permit a man with a disability of 10 percent or more to go on active duty?

Mr. VINSON. That is a minor disability. Thus, many a reservist could be called back to active duty and be entitled to compensation therefor.

Mr. GROSS. This would in no way affect their disability compensation?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all, but, of course, the man cannot draw both.

Mr. GROSS. He cannot draw both?

Mr. VINSON. He cannot draw both.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2135) to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854), as amended, is further amended by deleting the final period, inserting a colon in lieu therof, and adding the following new proviso: "*Provided further,* That in the case of any member of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve receiving a pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States by virtue of prior military service who is ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and is found physically qualified to perform active duty, entitlement to the pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended for the period of the extended active duty unless that compensation is greater than the compensation specified in clause (1) of this section. During the period of such suspension the member shall receive compensation for such extended active duty as specified in clause (1) of this section. Upon termination of the period of extended active duty the pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay of the member shall be resumed and paid as provided by law. The suspension herein provided shall not operate to affect any other rights or benefits to which the member or his dependents may be entitled under this or any other provision of law."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067), is amended by inserting before the final period a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That in the case of any such member receiving a pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States by virtue of prior military service who is ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and is found physically qualified to perform active duty, entitlement to the pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended for the period of the extended active duty unless that compensation is greater than the compensation specified in clause (1) of this section. During the period of extended active duty the member shall receive the compensation for that duty specified in clause (1) of this section. Upon termination of the period of extended active duty the pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay of the member shall be resumed and paid as provided by law. The suspension herein provided shall not operate to affect any other rights or benefits to which the member or his dependents may be entitled under this or any other provision of law."

Sec. 3. Section 3 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067), is hereby amended by changing the comma after "1947" to a period and striking out the words "and shall terminate 5 years after the date of approval of this act."

Sec. 4. The term "disability allowance" is deleted from section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854), as amended, and from section 2 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6601) was laid on the table.

CLEMSON COLLEGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4280) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget on this bill, and there are other reasons as well why this bill should not be considered on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SAG HARBOR, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4717) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain lands, to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2109) to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Navy and Marine Corps Officer Augmentation Act of 1955."

Sec. 2. (a) The President may appoint to permanent commissioned grades in the Regular Navy and in the Regular Marine Corps, respectively, officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve, and officers of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps who do not hold permanent commissioned appointments therein, subject to the conditions and limitations in the following subsections of this section.

(b) Appointments made under this section shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President for the administration of this section, which regulations shall include, among other provisions, the following:

(1) Provisions establishing standards and qualifications for appointments to the grades specified herein;

(2) Provisions for the determination of the lineal position and precedence of appointees; and

(3) Provisions for the assignment of running mates to officers appointed to the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy notwithstanding the provisions of other laws.

(c) Persons appointed under this section shall be citizens of the United States, and have such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) No person may be permanently appointed in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps under the authority of this act to a grade higher than that in which he is serving at the time of such permanent appointment.

(e) A person permanently appointed in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps, under the authority of this act, may also be temporarily appointed to a higher grade appropriate to the lineal position assigned, and such temporary appointment shall be regarded as having been effected pursuant to the law under which officers of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps having comparable lineal position were temporarily appointed to such higher grade.

(f) Persons permanently appointed to the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps pursuant to this act who at the time of such appointment had to their credit leave accrued but not taken, shall not, by reason of such appointment, lose such accrued leave.

Sec. 3. (a) The commission of any person appointed under the provisions of section 2 may be revoked by the Secretary of the Navy until the third anniversary of such appointment in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps.

(b) Each officer whose commission is so revoked shall thereupon be discharged from the Navy or Marine Corps without advanced pay or allowances.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Navy may provide by regulations for appropriate readjustment of lineal position and precedence of former commissioned officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve who were appointed to the permanent commissioned grades of ensign and second lieutenant in the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps, respectively, subsequent to December 7, 1941, and prior to the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "in the Regular Navy and in the Regular Marine Corps, respectively," and substitute in lieu thereof the words "not above lieutenant in the Regular Navy and captain in the Regular Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1614) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WAIVER OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1617) to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1008), as added by section 10 of the Insurance Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 36), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That no premium shall be waived under this section for any period before the date of application therefor, except that if the insured is determined, as provided in the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to have been in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged, at any time after April 25, 1951, and before April 26, 1952, (A) all premiums due or paid after June 1, 1951, on 5-year level premium term insurance shall, during the period of such status and during the remainder of his continuous active service and 120 days thereafter, be waived unless the insured requests in writing that this waiver be terminated; and (B) that portion of any permanent insurance premiums due or paid after June 1, 1951, which represents the cost of the pure insurance risk shall, during the period of such status and during the remainder of his continuous active service and 120 days thereafter, be waived if the insured applies therefor within 120 days after the date of enactment of this clause or the date of his return to military jurisdiction, whichever is later, or if the insured dies or is declared dead while in such missing status or if the insured dies on or prior to the last day upon which he may apply for such waiver under this clause."

SEC. 2. The third proviso of section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1008), as added by section 10 of the Insurance Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 36) is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further,* That premium waiver benefits under this section render the contract of insurance nonparticipating during the period a premium waiver is in effect."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1619) to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (38 U. S. C. 854), is amended to read as follows: "Any person having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after April 25, 1951, or within 120 days after separation from such active service, shall, upon application made within 120 days after separation from service or the enactment of this amendment, whichever be the later, payment of premiums and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (p. I, Public Law 23, 82d Cong.), is amended, effective April 25, 1951, by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "The United States shall bear the excess losses resulting from the regranting or reinstating of insurance under this section without medical examination, as such losses may be determined by the Administrator."

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 2, line 6, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (pt. I, Public Law 23, 82d Cong.), is amended, effective April 25, 1951, to read as follows: 'Waiver of premiums and local disability income benefits otherwise authorized under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, shall not be denied in any case of issue or reinstatement of insurance on a permanent plan under this section in which it is shown to the satisfaction of the administrator that total disability of the applicant commenced prior to the date of his application. The cost of premiums waived and total disability income benefits paid by virtue of the preceding sentence and the excess mortality cost in any case where the insurance matures by death from such total disability shall be borne by the United States and the administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from time to time from the National Service Life Insurance appropriation to the National Service Life Insurance fund and from the Military and Naval Insurance appropriation to the United States Government Life Insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the funds for such costs'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFIT CHECKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1821) to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to take this time to point out to the House that under existing law the Post Office Department is required to return to the Veterans' Administration checks for certain items in such cases where the payee has moved or the payee is a widow and believed by the person delivering the mail to have remarried, unless the mail is addressed in the name under which the widow remarries. The practical problem is that the veterans are treated differently from those who receive social security checks. They are forwarded, if the beneficiary leaves a forwarding address, but the veteran is not treated that way. I understand the gentleman's objection. I know that the Veterans' Administration did not approve of this legislation. There is a great deal of value in this legislation. What I am pleading for in this bill is to treat our veterans the same way we treat those who receive social security benefits. Let us give this idea a chance. The Veterans' Administration feel if this bill becomes law they cannot keep in touch with the beneficiaries as well, but the favorable aspects of the bill are such that it should be passed by the House. We might save some money if this legislation were passed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Of course, we have to realize that at this time what we are questioning is whether the bill is to be passed by unanimous consent. The fact that the Veteran's Administration, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget have expressed disapproval of the legislation would seem ample evidence that if it is considered it should be considered in some other fashion than by unanimous consent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. The Treasury Department made a report on this legislation. They were not opposed to it. They did not seem to think it would be bad legislation. They were not particularly for it, but they are not opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin that this bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

LAND TRANSFER TO NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4225) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to section 2 of this act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to quitclaim to the city of North Little Rock, Ark., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing four hundred and thirty-four acres, more or less, situated in the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation in that city, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act (1) shall provide that the tract of land so conveyed shall be used for park purposes, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such park purposes the title to such property shall revert to the United States, which shall have the immediate right of reentry thereon, and (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land so conveyed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "four hundred" and insert "six hundred."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "thirty-four" and insert "fifty-six."

On page 2, line 8, strike out "and."

On page 2, line 10, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last Friday many Members were irritated and resentful because, late in the afternoon, and after the Reserve bill, H. R. 7000, was jammed through without a record vote, a point of quorum was made by me.

That resentment was no greater than that of many of us who were deprived of an opportunity to go on record on proposed legislation which would, in the opinion of many of us, affect to as great a degree as would a declaration of war the future of every young American who is mentally and physically qualified to be conscripted into the armed services for a period of at least 6 years.

Some of us are exceedingly weary, and we are growing wearier as the days go by, because of our inability to get a record vote on questions in which our people are not only presently vitally interested, but which affect the future welfare and the security of our Nation.

Of course we know—as I was advised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] when I made the quorum call—that a record vote can be obtained on any measure at any time if a sufficient number of the Members will rise and demand the yeas and nays. Sure, I am familiar with that procedure, as is every other Member of the House.

But I also know that Friday last, July 1, and on other occasions, the leadership on both sides, as is its right, circulates around on the floor of the House among the Members and, as is its prerogative, suggests and advises that perhaps it would be helpful if Members would either be absent, remain in the lobby, or sit quietly on the floor when the yeas and nays are demanded on a pending issue.

Let us face the facts as they are. We hear not a little about lobbying—I have not the slightest objection to lobbyists giving me the benefit of their advice—but no lobbyist on the Hill, no matter what group is back of him, can exert the pressure, make his wishes as effective, as can the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Not a Member of this House but who knows that his future advancement in the party organization is to a large measure in the control of the party leaders. No one would charge that the average Member is either cowardly or susceptible to undue influence.

Nor would anyone be so dumb as to minimize the fact that, when those in authority in the party crack the whip, the ears of the average Member, like those of the rabbit, stand at attention.

Last Friday, as on previous occasions, when an issue was before the House on which the leadership wanted quick action, when it wished to smother opposition, the heat was on. Added to the effective whipcracking of the leadership was the fact that many Members, as on previous occasions, wanted to adjourn over from Friday to Monday or Tuesday.

The burden that falls upon the leadership of the House, especially upon the majority leadership, to program legislation is fully understood and realized, I think, by most of us. That is a very, very difficult task, but some of us are growing just a little weary of the procedure—and this is not said in criticism, because the task is difficult. But we are getting a little weary of the procedure which, at least on 3 occasions—I recall the $31 billion bill which went through not so long ago on a Thursday evening; it was rushed through at a time when 42 Members each were given 2½ minutes to speak—denies the Members a record vote—of equal importance is the opportunity to our constituents to gain a knowledge of how we vote.

Just a few days ago, on a Thursday, we had before us the $31 billion appropriation bill for the armed services. On that occasion, the leadership, and I am referring to the leadership on both sides—it is a powerful, irresistible combination—exerting its power, denied the yeas and nays.

Is there any valid, sound reason why our constituents should not know how each of us votes on a bill so important?

I recall another occasion when the Members of the House, 30 or 40, I think, were given 30 seconds each to debate a very important bill. After all, when this kind of legislation comes up there should be some way to program it along the first of the week.

What happened last week? Pressure from both sides, the leadership on both sides—and I am not critical, that is their prerogative, that is their right if they want to use it—pressure from both sides drove some Members, better than a hundred, drove them out into the lobby or kept them down in their seats when we wanted a rollcall.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I want the gentleman from Michigan to know and to appreciate that I associate myself with everything he has said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So far. I thank the gentleman, but I do not want him to commit himself to the unknown, unpredictable—I think the right word is "unpredictable."

Mr. WIER. I am sure I can take the rest of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When the time comes that the gentleman from Minnesota wants to disagree, just indicate it so we can put it on the record. I do not want to get the gentleman into something he does not want.

And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] came over and said, "You can get the yeas and nays anytime if a hundred of the Members stand up." Well, we all know that; that was not anything new. I said: "Yes, but Charlie, when you and Joe and Les here"—as we all on this side stand in fear of all of them—as well as in admiration—when they come around and say "Boys, boys, boys, thus and so," I am telling you there is an exodus. We are all aware we must be realistic about this; we all understand that our advancement in the party organization depends upon the good will of those at the top. Even I will admit it does not help to disagree with their views; on occasion it makes it more difficult for them to see you. The pressure exerted is greater than that exerted by any lobbyist, by any labor organization, by the school groups, or the farmers.

It was only a few weeks ago when a bill for the creation of a Reserve and other similar purposes was before this House, the Powell and Bow amendments were adopted and the bill withdrawn.

Thereafter, apparently it was agreed by those in control of the party organizations and the Pentagon that both amendments should be scrapped.

More than one hundred Members were, for some reason, not put upon the record, induced to change their views. The Powell amendment was defeated, the Bow amendment was withdrawn. And, without a record vote, the bill, which will take into the service every young man as he reaches the age of 18½, who will either directly or indirectly have his future patterned by the military, was passed.

The establishment of freedom from universal military conscription, so early and so courageously won by our forefathers, was thrown out of the window without a record vote.

Over Sunday, I could not help but think. I had plenty of time over Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, the glorious Fourth. The anniversary of the day we declared our independence.

What would the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence say if they knew of our cautious, concealed—cowardly is not the word, is it?—vote on this issue?

When those patriots signed the Declaration of Independence, they knew they were taking a stand which, if they were unable to maintain it, would end by their dangling at the end of the hangman's noose. They not only stood up, they not only pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," but they wrote their names where all might read. Each, as he took the quill in hand, knew that if their efforts failed he was signing his own physical as well as political death warrant.

Not only did many of them lose all their worldly goods, but home and family. They realized the gravity of the action they were taking. When Charles Carroll, Maryland delegate, stepped up to sign, he was reminded that there were two Charles Carrolls in Maryland. A colleague, somewhat facetiously, asked "How will King George know which one to hang?" Carroll had the answer—if you will take a look at the Declaration of Independence, you will find it written there—after his name you will find he added "of Carrollton"—the name of his family estate, his post office address, as it were, was there for the King and his minions to read. And Carroll said, "Now he [the King] can make no mistake."

That man had courage. And yet when we vote to go back, as it well may be, to what may amount to universal military conscription, because we want to go home over Saturday and Sunday and the Fourth, because we have some little dinner or some social engagement or because the leadership on both sides—and again I say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, I know you have a tremendous task—does not want it, we cannot have the yeas and nays.

Oh, yes, when the Reserve bill was before us, we were told that the future of our country, its safety, depended upon the passage of that bill. But Friday afternoon, when some of us wanted a rollcall, unlike the signers of the Declaration of Independence, we not only had no opportunity to sign our names, with the address of each, we had no opportunity to answer either yea or nay.

We hid—no, I withdraw that—that might be a violation of the rules—we did not hide, we just took advantage of the rule and with statesmanlike courage, passed the bill by a voice vote. And permit me to add, because I do not desire to offend anyone or to hurt anyone's feelings, our actions in denying the yeas and nays were not because, let us say, of any pressure put on by the leadership; it was not because we wanted to catch a train or a plane or leave in an auto for a reunion with our folks. Our action was motivated, let us say, by a desire, a wholehearted desire—a consuming anxiety—to serve our people—but anonymously.

If some say they had previous engagements, well, so did I. In my home there was to be a family reunion—the good wife, the sons, the grandchildren, and, believe it or not, two great-granddaughters. One grandson will follow the Navy's commands—he has been in 6 years; another goes to the West. I have not the slightest hope that ever again they will all be together, and great was my desire to be with them.

But that desire to satisfy a personal longing was no reason why I should not go on record on a bill which will vitally affect the lives of everv one of those young people who would have been present, as well as the lives of millions of other young Americans.

Why is this situation called to your mind? Full realization is had of the difficult task of our leaders, who must program our legislation. However, no reason has occurred to me, no reason has been given, as to why, on an important bill which affects either the appropriation of billions of dollars, imposes new and additional burdens on our taxpayers, or which affects the lives of our citizens, a record should not be made.

Is there reason why, even though it be the end of the week, when presumably many are tired, others desire to leave Washington for the weekend, we should not feel obligated to give adequate consideration to a bill or to spend an hour taking the yeas and the nays?

What has been here said is not vindictive, but has been said in a desire desire to secure full, fair, adequate consideration, and a record vote on legislation which is vital. Why not program the important bills for action early in the week?

Hereafter, on some of these bills that are vitally important, I hope we may have them programed for earlier in the week, and then the membership, the rank and file of privates in the rear ranks, will have an opportunity to tell their constituents who sent them here whether we are for it or whether we are against it. That is all I am asking. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman has yielded back his time, then I find myself in complete agreement with everything he said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So it is; sometimes we do not see eye to eye, and I hope the gentleman will take the floor to make his protest. He has a tremendous influence on that side. I hope he will take the floor and then privately as well try to prevail on the leadership which has so many difficult problems to program these important bills earlier in the week if that can be done. I do not want to be mean, although I sometimes seem to be that way. I want to be a Christian, I want to be kindly and considerate, but, really my duties to my constituents require that I go on record when before us is a bill which may affect not only the welfare of our people individually but, and I am not saying too much when I add, the future well-being and security of our Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is performing a genuine service in continuing to make known his indignation that the leadership of the House did not insist upon a rollcall vote on final passage last Friday of the foot-in-the-door universal military conscription bill.

I join him in that indignation and in his assurance that the House will continue to be reminded of the failure to take the time necessary to meet that issue squarely and on the record.

That legislation dealt with the lives and fortunes of thousands, perhaps millions of young Americans and, indirectly, their families. Important as are huge appropriations—the dealing in huge sums of money—these pale into insignificance compared with the conscription of the youth of America.

Yes, there is talk of a record vote when this legislation may come back to the House in the form of a conference report, but there is no way now by which a vote on the terms and conditions of the House bill can be had.

Again I commend the gentleman from Michigan for continuing to call this situation to the attention of the citizens of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELIVERY OF BURIAL FLAG TO FRIEND IN ABSENCE OF NEXT OF KIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4727) to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LIMITATION ON APPLICATION FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4946) to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 409 of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 409. (a) No compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than 3 years after the effective date of this amendment to this section or the effective date of the discharge or release prescribed in section 407 (a), whichever is the later date.

"(b) In the case of any veteran who has pursued a program of education or training under title II, a program of vocational rehabilitation under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), or a program of education or training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) for a period or periods in excess of 2 years after the 90th day after the date of enactment of this act, or after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the later, no compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than 1 year after the termination of his program of education or training or vocational rehabilitation or 5 years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the earlier.

"(c) In no event shall compensation be paid under this title for any period after January 31, 1960."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 10 and 11, and on page 2, lines 1 to 11, inclusive.

Page 2, line 12, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR APPLYING FOR MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5792) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 503 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended by striking out "within 2 years after the date of enactment of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before July 16, 1956."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL IN FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5893) to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the gentlemen in charge of the bill as to some of the language appearing in the report. I notice that there are only two exceptions made in this particular case.

Mr. ASPINALL. There are two exceptions to the general statement, as the gentleman suggested. The prohibition does not apply to any regular or emergency commissioned officer retired for disability on a basis (1) of an injury incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States, or (2) caused by an instrumentality of war. The amendments to this act will not have any effect on the right of Reserve or National Guard officers to draw civilian compensation without regard to section 212 of Public Law 212, 72d Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting a semicolon after the words "in the World War or in World War II during the dates specified" and adding immediately after said semicolon the words "or where such disability was incurred in or aggravated in active service in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955".

"SEC. 2. Section 212 of Public Law No. 212, 72d Congress, approved June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), is hereby amended by striking out '$3,000' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000'."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDEFINING "STEPCHILD" AND "STEPPARENT" UNDER SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6419) to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 3 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (38 U. S. C. 852) is hereby amended (1) by deleting therefrom the words "including a stepchild, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including a stepchild if designated as beneficiary by the insured or if a member of the insured's household, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured", and (2) by deleting therefrom the words "including a stepparent, parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured at any time prior to entry into the active service for a period of not less than 1 year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including a parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured prior to attainment of 21 years of age and for a period of not less than 1 year prior to entry into the active service, or a stepparent who does not meet the loco parentis requirement if designated as beneficiary."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall be effective April 25, 1951, but shall not be construed (1) to require the discontinuance, for any period prior to the first day of the third calendar month following approval of this enactment, of any servicemen's indemnity award made prior to the date of this act, or (2) to require duplicate payments of benefits in any case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6727) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO CITY OF CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6796) to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey, without monetary consideration and subject to the conditions in section 2 of this act, to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land currently leased to the city of Clarksburg, situated on the western end of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, near the city of Clarksburg, in Clark District, Harrison County, W. Va., the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized by this act shall provide that—

(1) such tract shall be used only for park and recreational purposes; and

(2) if such tract is used in any manner that, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate, interferes with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital located on land contiguous to such tract, such interference shall cease immediately upon notice thereof to the city of Clarksburg by the Administrator or his designate; and

(3) if either of the conditions prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) is violated, title to such tract shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. Clause (2) of the act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 677), is hereby repealed, and clauses (3) and (4) of that act are renumbered (2) and (3), respectively.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEES FOR ATTORNEYS IN SUITS INVOLVING WAIVERS OF PREMIUMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6832) to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 500 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, is hereby amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and adding the following: "except that in a suit brought by or on behalf of an insured during his lifetime, for waiver of premiums on account of total disability, the court, as part of its judgment or decree, shall determine and allow a reasonable fee to be paid by the insured to his attorney."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARE PORTION OF WATERWAY AT GREENWICH NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1300) to declare a portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn., in which is located the Greenwich Harbor, a nonnavigable stream.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in which is located the Greenwich Harbor in the town of Greenwich, Conn., lying north of a line extending south 84 degrees 00 minutes and 36 seconds east from a point (365 feet from the northwest corner of the existing Greenwich Harbor bulkhead and pier line) whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line System are north 6,244.55 and west 377.41 is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The line hereinbefore described shall be established as a combined pierhead and bulkhead line of the Greenwich Harbor.

SEC. 3. Any project heretofore authorized by any act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above-described portion of the Greenwich Harbor, is hereby abandoned.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. This act shall become effective when the State Highway Department of Connecticut has completed the dredging to a depth of 6 feet of a compensating anchorage area of nine-tenths of an acre, to the satisfaction of the Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers in charge of the locality.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6991) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill was enacted by the 83d Congress and was vetoed by the President. There are no departmental reports with this bill. It is a very large one, consisting of upwards of 100 pages. It has to do with amending the United States Code insofar as drugs and cosmetics are concerned. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DECLARE PORTION OF WATERWAY AT BRIDGEPORT NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1469) to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in which is located the west branch of Cedar Creek in the town of Bridgeport, Conn., lying north of a line extending north 78 degrees 56 minutes 01 second east from a point (773 feet from the northwest corner of the existing bulkhead and pier line) whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line System are south 937.23 and west 1,108.40, is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The line hereinbefore described shall be established as a combined pierhead and bulkhead line of the west branch of Cedar Creek.

SEC. 3. Any project heretofore authorized by an act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above-described portion of the west branch of Cedar Creek, is hereby abandoned.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIKE CREEK ABOVE HIGHWAY BRIDGE AT KENOSHA NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1250) to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Pike Creek, in the State of Wisconsin, above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable stream within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha, Wis., a nonnavigable stream."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARE A SECTION OF THE ACUSHNET RIVER NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2866) to declare the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) north of the Coggeshall Street Bridge in Massachusetts a nonnavigable stream.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet lying north of the Coggeshall Street Bridge (north 41 degrees 39 minutes 23 seconds), is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States. Any project heretofore authorized by any act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above-described portions of the Acushnet River section of New Bedford Harbor, is hereby abandoned. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLSON:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "39 minutes 23 seconds" and insert "31 minutes 00 seconds."

Page 2, line 1, after "Bedford", insert "Fairhaven."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet, Mass., a nonnavigable stream."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT TO INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 38) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HESELTON Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, inasmuch as this bill is on the Consent Calendar, I would like to get more clarification of the House committee amendment. It will be noted in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 38 that the other body inserted an amendment which spells out in rather complete detail the things that shall be reported upon to the Congress by the Attorney General. But, when that is analyzed, I think it will be made clear that it is simply spelling out the prohibitions of article 5 of the Interstate Oil Compact which has been in effect in substantially the same form for some 20 years.

The House committee has recommended a much more concise amendment making it necessary for the Attorney General to make annual reports for the duration of this compact as to whether or not the activities of the State under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact.

The Attorney General, in filing his report, raised the question as to the advisability of requiring the Department of Justice to make this sort of report, pointing out that it involved a certain amount of economic study and indicating that the Department would not be in a position to make an adequate study. However, I would like the RECORD to show that section 11 of the Natural Gas Act specifically requires the Federal Power Commission to assemble and keep current pertinent information relative to the effect and operation of any compact between two or more States heretofore or hereafter approved by the

Congress and make such information public, and report to the Congress from time to time the information so obtained, together with such recommendations as may appear to be appropriate or necessary to promote the purposes of such compact.

In all frankness I should say that I do not consider the report of the Federal Power Commission signed by its chairman as at all satisfactory to those who for many years, at least since the 80th Congress, have made an effort to have some responsible agency in this Government attempt to look into the question as to whether the provisions of article V, which were specifically and definitely written into this compact, are being carried out in good faith. I think the Congress is entitled to that information. I think the Congress is entitled to the recommendation of the Federal Power Commission on the economic side.

The Chairman of the Commission reports, apparently with satisfaction, that information was given to the Congress in 1948 and a brief summary was given to the Congress in the 1954 annual report. I submit that that is no kind of a way to discharge a serious obligation imposed upon an agency of this Government. If the Federal Power Commission is not interested, and at times I think they are not, in the question of a proper development of a power policy, particularly as it relates to oil and natural gas, then I think the Commission should be changed or else Congress should write some more definite rules for its conduct.

In any event, unless the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] or the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], sees fit to dispute my basic contention, I would like to have that left in the RECORD as of this moment for the attention, not only of the Attorney General and any subdivision which is charged with the responsibility under this law and the antitrust laws, but also the Federal Power Commission. I believe those two agencies could and should work together in the interest of the public.

Unfortunately, I must add, as a member of the current minority, that I do not think they have been working in the interests of the public. I think there has been a great deal of dilatory action. I think much could be accomplished if they were to look at the law and read its plain import and carry out their sworn obligation. I do not say that that applies to the Attorney General at this stage, but I do want to say that I am not satisfied, that 2 reports in over 20 years do not constitute anything like a jealous guarding of the rights of the public, nor do they, in my opinion, constitute a carrying into effect of the solemn words of the compact in article V, where the other body, as a matter of fact, in its version, simply spelled out article V.

What I want to come back to is this: Is not the amendment that the committee has recommended essentially a concise form of stating that we want the Attorney General to look into this situation, to report to us annually as to whether or not the interstate compact is working as it should work under the provisions of article V?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In the first place, this bill which approaches or tends to approach a compact among States involves questions which verge on monopoly, which involve restriction of markets and setting up of quotas, and fixing of prices, all of which are parts of the fabric of our antitrust laws. Under the Reorganization Act, all State compacts are to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. You will note that in the report there is an opinion of the Attorney General on this matter all indicating indicia that the Committee on the Judiciary is the proper tribunal to pass upon this interstate compact rather than the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I would like to know why this bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HESELTON. I would rather have the chairman make reply to that, but I should like to make this comment, that I think we ought to give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce specific jurisdiction over matters involving petroleum and I believe natural gas. For over 20 years without any contest or suggestion of impropriety so far as asserting jurisdiction is concerned the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has exercised that jurisdiction.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts has given the very answer I intended to give to the gentleman from New York. Since 1935 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has handled jurisdiction over this question of interstate oil compacts. I agree fully with the gentleman from Massachusetts that under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is given jurisdiction over petroleum, petroleum products, natural gas, and other matters of that sort affecting interstate commerce. I cannot see any question of any jurisdictional violation in the fact that this Senate resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the Reorganization Act of 1946 to which the gentleman from New York referred a moment ago, jurisdiction was given to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as follows, and it appears in the Rules of the House of Representatives under rule 11, paragraph 11, subparagraph (e):

> Interstate oil compacts and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

That is the reason it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HESELTON. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I share his concern as to the question of whether or not any compact, not necessarily this particular one but any compact, runs counter to the established policy of Congress in the field of monopoly and antitrust laws and the like. I want to show at this point in the RECORD what I believe is the best kind of language that could have been devised, and I think this was devised over 20 years ago:

> It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

If that is carried out, I do not believe the gentleman from New York and other gentlemen or I would have anything to worry about; but I am not satisfied it has been carried out yet.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman points out many dangers with reference to the practice that may be involved in all these transactions. Those dangers are primarily within the purview of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has primary and exclusive jurisdiction over all antitrust matters. The Reorganization Act provides that all interstate compacts are to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. That is not correct.

Mr. CELLER. I will accept the Chair's word. Upon recheck of the Reorganization Act I find I am in error. Interstate compacts in oil go to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. HESELTON. I thought it was the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. It is both. This is specifically referred to among the matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as set forth in the Reorganization Act. That is why it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce just as these matters have always been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Referring to the language which the gentleman read a moment ago, which he said was adopted by the Congress in the first interstate oil compact among the States in 1935, the identical language which the gentleman read is incorporated in article V of the present resolution on page 8.

Mr. HESELTON. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Tex., the 16th day of February 1935 by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and prior to August 27, 1935, said compact was presented to and approved by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, which said compact so approved by the six States last above named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress, and the Congress gave consent to such compact by House Joint Resolution 407, approved August 27, 1935 (Public Resolution No. 64, 74th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1937, by an agreement executed as of the 10th day of May 1937 by the representatives of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, Illinois, and Colorado, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 183, approved August 10, 1937 (Public Resolution No. 57, 75th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1939, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Michigan, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 329, approved July 20, 1939 (Public Resolution No. 31, 76th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1941, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, Michigan, Arkansas, Louisiana, New York, and Pennsylvania, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 228, approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 246, 77th Cong.), and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, by an agreement executed and ratified by representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 139, approved July 7, 1943 (Public Law 117, 78th Cong.), and thereafter the representatives of the States of Montana, West Virginia, Alabama, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, Tennessee, and Indiana executed counterparts of said agreement, and said counterparts so executed were deposited in the Department of State of the United States; and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of September 1947 by an agreement executed and ratified by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Indiana, which was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress, and Congress gave its consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 122 (Public Law 184, 80th Cong.); and thereafter the representatives of the States of Kentucky, Illinois, Mississippi, and Michigan executed counterparts of said agreement, which executed counterparts were deposited in the Department of State of the United States; and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of September 1951, by an agreement executed and ratified by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia, which was deposited in the Department of State of the United States and such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress and Congress gave its consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 42 (82d Cong., 1st sess.); and thereafter the representatives of the States of Illinois, Kansas, North Dakota, and Nebraska executed counterparts of said agreement which executed counterparts were deposited in the Department of State of the United States.

The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, to September 1, 1959, duly executed by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Whereas, on the 16th day of February 1935, in the city of Dallas, Tex., there was executed "An interstate compact to conserve oil and gas" which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"An interstate compact to conserve oil and gas

"Article I

"This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"Article II

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"Article III

"Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

"(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

"Article IV

"Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"Article V

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"Article VI

"Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the duty of which said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"Article VII

"No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"Article VIII

"This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon 60 days notice, withdraw herefrom.

"The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the

United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified."

Whereas the said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1955; and,

Whereas it is desired to renew and extend the said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, to September 1, 1959;

Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

It is hereby agreed that the compact entitled "An interstate compact to conserve oil and gas" executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, its present date of expiration. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in article I of the original compact.

The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which is deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

Executed by the several undersigned States, at their several State capitals, through their proper officials on the dates as shown, as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State legislatures.

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,
By GORDON PERSONS, *Governor.*
Dated: 6-29-54.
Attest:
[SEAL]. MRS. AGNES BAGGETT,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF ARKANSAS,
By FRANCIS CHERRY, *Governor.*
Dated: 6-14-54.
Attest:
[SEAL]. C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
By DAN THORNTON, *Governor.*
Dated: 5-3-54.
Attest:
[SEAL]. HOMER M. BRUCE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,
By CHARLEY E. JOHNS, *Governor.*
Dated: 9-13-54.
Attest:
[SEAL]. R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
By ————————, *Governor.*
Dated: ————.
Attest:
[SEAL]. ———— ————,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF INDIANA,
By GEORGE N. CRAIG, *Governor.*
Dated: 5-21-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
By EDWARD F. ARN, *Governor.*
Dated: 11-18-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF KENTUCKY,
By LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY, *Governor.*
Dated: 10-19-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA,
By ROBERT F. KENNON, *Governor.*
Dated: 7-5-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] J. R. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,
By G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, *Governor.*
Dated: 12-14-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] OWEN J. CLEARY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
By HUGH L. WHITE, *Governor.*
Dated: 8-19-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
By J. HUGO ARONSON, *Governor.*
Dated: 5-26-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

THE STATE OF NEBRASKA,
By ROBERT B. CROSBY, *Governor.*
Dated: 6-22-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
By EDWIN L. MECHEM, *Governor.*
Dated: 5-12-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] BEATRICE B. ROACH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
By THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor.*
Dated: 10-7-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] RUTH M. MINER,
Executive Deputy
(For Secretary of State).

THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
By C. NORMAN BRUNSDALE, *Governor.*
Dated: 8-16-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.
By FRANK DIETTMAN,
Deputy.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
By FRANK J. LAUSCHE, *Governor.*
Dated 7-26-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] TED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
By JOHNSTON MURRAY, *Governor.*
Dated: 4-1-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] JOHN D. CONNER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
By JOHN S. FINE, *Governor.*
Dated: 8-27-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE,
By FRANK G. CLEMENT, *Governor.*
Dated: 8-10-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] G. EDWARD FRIAR,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
By ALLAN SHIVERS, *Governor.*
Dated: 4-27-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] HOWARD CARNEY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
By WILLIAM C. MARLAND, *Governor.*
Dated: 11-1-54.
Attest:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall, within 1 year from September 1, 1955, and annually thereafter for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, make a report to the Congress as to whether or not in his opinion the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact (1) have remained within the purpose of such compact as set out in article V thereof, and (2) have resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation or perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production or sale of oil or gas, with the understanding that conservation and the protection of the small producer are the paramount purposes of any rules and regulations issued under the compact.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 17, line 7, strike out all of section 2, and insert in lieu the following:

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make an annual report to the Congress for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas as to whether or not the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 273) to establish a commisson for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 15 Commissioners as follows: The President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio, and 8 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 2 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission, after announcement to the American people of its creation and purpose, to prepare plans and a program for signalizing the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt in the year 1958, including plans for the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital," approved May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163), as amended by the act approved February 11, 1933 (47 Stat. 799). In preparing such plans and program, the Commission shall give due consideration to any plan which may be submitted to it, and shall take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by State or civic bodies. If the participation of other nations in the commemoration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the State Department.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, and may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 216, 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) or section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (22 U. S. C. 1584); nor shall any member of the Commission by reason of his status as such be deemed to be an "officer of the Government" within the meaning of the act of April 27, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 101).

SEC. 4. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 5. When the Commission has approved a plan of celebration, it shall submit it, insofar as it relates to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts for its approval.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, on or before March 1, 1956, make a report to the Congress in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $10,000.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than October 27, 1959.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KRUEGER: Page 2, line 18, strike out the period and insert a comma in lieu thereof and "and including the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park in North Dakota, created by the act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52), as amended."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUEGER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will that all come within the $10,000 that is appropriated?

Mr. KRUEGER. That is the preparations for the celebration.

Mr. CELLER. I do not see how the $10,000 can be made to stretch that far. I wonder whether the gentleman is by his amendment destroying the very purport of the resolution to have an appropriate celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. Ten thousand dollars is not going very far and if you add that provision embodied in the gentleman's amendment, I fear me that you may have to have more money.

Mr. KRUEGER. I do not believe that, since the resolution only asks for $10,000. I am not asking for any additional funds. It is merely the inclusion of Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota in preparation of the celebration.

Mr. CELLER. I fear me you are going to destroy the very purport of the resolution if you add that amendment, because you are endeavoring to stretch the $10,000 too far and you will prevent the appropriate celebration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUEGER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the author of the bill, to state that this amendment is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3702) to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313, of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers, and truck semitrailers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2311 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting in the definition of "Motor vehicle," after "automobile wagon," the following: "tractor, commercial truck trailer, or truck semitrailer having a chassis weight of over 750 pounds."

SEC. 2. Section 2312 of such title is amended by inserting after "stolen," the following: "embezzled, feloniously converted, or taken feloniously by fraud."

SEC. 3. Section 2313 of such title is amended by inserting after "stolen," the following: "embezzled, feloniously converted, or taken feloniously by fraud."

With the following committee amendments:

Amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 5, strike out "tractor," and insert in lieu thereof "farm tractor, truck tractor."

Amendment No. 2: "Page 1, line 7, strike out "750 pounds," and insert in lieu thereof "2,000 pounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 256) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 64 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 104 (a)) is amended to read as follows: "(2) wages, salaries, and commissions, not to exceed $1,500 to each claimant, which have been earned within 6 months before the date of the commencement of the proceeding, due to workmen, servants, clerks, or traveling or city salesmen on salary or commission basis, whole or part time, whether or not selling exclusively for the bankrupt; and for the purposes of this clause, the term 'traveling or city salesman' shall include all such salesmen, whether or not they are independent contractors selling the products or services of the bankrupt on a commission basis, with or without a drawing account or formal contract."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to proceedings commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the word ", salaries,".

On page 1, line 6, the figure "$1,500" is changed to read "$600."

On page 1, line 7, the word "six" is changed to read "three."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2384 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "6 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 years."

SEC. 2. Section 2385 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "10 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 years" and by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"If two or more persons conspire to commit any offense named in this section, each shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction."

SEC. 3. The foregoing amendments shall apply only with respect to offenses committed on and after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORIDA STATE HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of the Florida State Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Florida State Hospital, Chattahoochee, Fla., is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,626.27, representing the penalty which was assessed against the hospital by the Department of Agriculture (under section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938) for cotton planted by the hospital in excess of its 1954 acreage allotment. Such excess cotton was intended solely for use by the hospital and not for sale on the market; and the officials of the hospital, in planting such cotton, were acting in good faith on their understanding (based upon conversations with personnel of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Office in Marianna, Fla.) that cotton so used would not be subject to marketing penalties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 278) for the relief of the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5421) entitled "A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal and equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBSECTION 303 (c) OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949 CONCERNING TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6277) to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the distinguished gentleman to the report. The report estimates that the savings to the Armed Forces would have amounted to approximately $10 million, had it been in effect during fiscal year 1955. In other words, if this bill had been on the statute books last year, we would have saved $10 million.

The bill has reference to permitting personnel to use commercial warehouses as well as Government warehouses in storing their household effects. For example, on a transfer from Washington, D. C., to an overseas station, the nearest available Government storage depot is normally Richmond, Va. However, when space in that depot is not available for household goods, Memphis, Tenn., may be the nearest point. Upon return to the United States, the owner might be assigned to New York, Boston, Massachusetts, or some other northeastern point. Consequently, the household goods would be backhauled toward or past the station from which originally forwarded. If in such a case commercial nontemporary storage is authorized, transportation costs other than from the old duty station to the assigned station upon return to the United States would be avoided.

It is estimated the savings would have been $10 million last year, if that had been the law.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman whether the next bill on the calendar relates to this bill?

Mr. VINSON. They are on entirely different subjects and I will be glad to explain that when we reach it.

Mr. GROSS. We have had some legislation covering the transportation and storage of goods. I do not know whether it applied to the military or not.

Mr. VINSON. This is the only one on the calendar from the Committee on Armed Services applying to the shipment of household goods. I do not know what these other bills were.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) is amended by inserting the following at the end of the first sentence thereof: "Nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects may be authorized in Government facilities, or in commercial facilities whenever such storage is considered to be more economical to the Government: *Provided, however,* That in no instance shall the weight stored plus the weight transported in connection with a change of station exceed the maximum weight limitation fixed by regulations promulgated by the respective Secretaries where not otherwise fixed by law: *And provided further,* That nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects shall not be authorized for a period longer than 1 year from the date members are separated from the service, except that a longer period may be authorized by regulations promulgated by the respective Secretaries where a member is confined in a hospital or in its vicinity undergoing medical treatment on date of separation."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 303 OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6600) to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman make an explanation of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. The purpose of this bill is to permit a reservist who has been in the service at least 8 consecutive years, when he retires after 20 years or more of active duty, to designate his domicile; that is to say, that this or that is his home, and therefore his household effects can be shipped to that designated point.

Mr. GROSS. How much are we spending each year on this business of transportation and storage of household goods?

Mr. VINSON. I am very sorry, but I do not have that information available today.

Mr. GROSS. But this is extending——

Mr. VINSON. No; no. This is merely permitting a man to designate his domicile; where he wants his household effects to be shipped.

Mr. GROSS. This is not extending to a new category the privilege of moving household goods or storing household goods at Government expense. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It does not bring in any new category to be benefited. It simply clarifies a ruling of the Comptroller General.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 303 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 813) is amended by inserting the following sentence immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of the uniformed services who—

"(1) is retired for physical disability or placed upon the temporary disability retired list; or

"(2) is retired for any other reason, or is discharged with severance pay, immediately following at least 8 years of continuous active duty (no single break therein of more than 90 days);

may select his home for the purposes of the travel and transportation allowances payable under this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 814) is amended by inserting the following sentences at the end thereof: "Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of the uniformed services who—

"(1) is retired for physical disability or placed on the temporary disability retired list; or

"(2) is retired for any other reason, or is discharged with severance pay, immediately following at least 8 years of continuous active duty (no single break therein of more than 90 days);

is entitled to transportation for his dependents and for his baggage and household effects to the home selected for allowance purposes under subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from April 1, 1951. No additional amount may be paid to members of Reserve components as a result of enactment of this amendatory act unless travel to such selected home be performed on or prior to April 28, 1953, or within 1 year after such retirement or discharge, whichever is later.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "retired", add the words "with pay."

On page 2, line 14, after the word "retired", add the words "with pay."

On page 2, beginning on line 21, strike out all of section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from April 1, 1951. No additional amount may be paid to members of the uniformed services as a result of enactment of this amendatory act unless travel to such selected home be performed on or prior to April 28, 1953, or within 1 year after such retirement, placement upon the temporary disability retired list, or discharge, whichever is later."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS RELATING TO ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code entitled "National Guard."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very large bill. The report and the bill have been available only since last Friday. While I know of no objection to it, I think the matter should go over to the next call of the calendar so that Members may have an opportunity to look at it if they so desire.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ROSTER OF SENIOR JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6248) to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 294 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by renumbering subsection (d) thereof as subsection (e) and by inserting in such section immediately following subsection (c) thereof a new subsection (d) reading as follows:

"(d) The Chief Justice of the United States shall maintain a roster of judges who have retired from regular active service but who are willing and able to undertake special judicial duties from time to time, which roster shall be known as the roster of senior judges. Any judge of the United States who has retired from regular active service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title but is willing and able to undertake special judicial duties from time to time either in a particular court or courts specified by him or generally in any court may so indicate by requesting the Chief Justice of the United States to place his name upon the roster of senior judges as available for such duty. The Chief Justice shall remove from the roster of senior judges the name of any such judge who is no longer willing or able to perform any judicial duties. Any retired judge whose name appears upon the roster of senior judges shall be known as a senior judge, and may be designated and assigned by the Chief Justice of the United States to perform such judicial duties as he is willing to undertake in any court of the United States other than the Supreme Court, upon presentation of a certificate of necessity by the chief judge of such court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISION OF BOUNDARY BETWEEN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DIVISIONS OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 65) to amend the act of August 23, 1954 (Public Law 632, 83d Cong.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 23, 1954 (Public Law 632, 83d Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"Division No. 2 shall consist of all territory and islands lying north and west of a line beginning at a point in the Beaufort Sea latitude 70 degrees 30 minutes north, longitude 147 degrees 30 minutes west, thence in a southwesterly direction to triangulation station 'Delta' latitude 70 degrees 12 minutes 50 seconds north, longitude 147 degrees 43 minutes 18 seconds west on the north shore of the mainland about 5½ miles south southeast of the north tip of Foggy Island; thence due west about 5 miles to the east edge of the delta of the Sagavanirktok River, at approximate latitude 70 degrees 12 minutes 50 seconds north, longitude 147 degrees 56 minutes west; thence southwesterly along the southern and southeastern edge of the delta of the Sagavanirktok River to a point on the east bank of the river at approximately latitude 69 degrees 57 minutes north, longitude 148 degrees 39 minutes west; thence in a meandering line in a generally southerly direction along the eastern main bank of the flood plain of the Sagavanirktok River to the junction with the Ivishak River, approximate latitude 69 degrees 32 minutes north, longitude 148 degrees 29 minutes west; thence due west approximately 2 miles to the divide between the waters of the Sagavanirktok and the Tooliok Rivers, approximate latitude 69 degrees 32 minutes north, longitude 148 degrees 35 minutes west; thence in a generally southwesterly direction following the height of land dividing the waters of the Tooliok, Kuparuk, and Itkillik Rivers from those of the Sagavanirktok River to a point on the Brooks Range Divide between the headwaters of the Colville River on the north and west and the waters of the Yukon River on the south at approximate latitude 68 degrees 9 minutes north, longitude 149 degrees 51 minutes west; thence southwesterly along the divide between the waters of the Colville River, Kotzebue Sound, and the east end of Norton Sound on the north and west and the waters of the Yukon on the south to the one hundred and sixty-first meridian of west longitude, thence along said meridian to latitude 61 degrees 30 minutes; thence southwesterly to latitude 61 degrees, longitude 165 degrees 30 minutes; thence south along the meridian of 165 degrees 30 minutes to latitude 58 degrees; thence west to the international boundary."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "That", strike the remainder of line 3 and the language on line 4 through the word "is", inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the third paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled 'An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes,' approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 101), as amended by section 1 of the act of August 23, 1954 (68 Stat. 772), is further."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4792) to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 372 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof an additional subsection reading as follows:

"(b) Whenever any judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who is eligible to retire under this section does not do so and a certificate of his disability signed by a majority of the members of the Judicial Council of his circuit in the case of a circuit or district judge, or by the Chief Justice of the United States in the case of the chief judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court, or by the chief judge of his court in the case of a judge of the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or Customs Court, is presented to the President and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Whenever any such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled. Any judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge shall, for purpose of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit, district, or court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNETTE ISLAND AIRPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6573) to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States hereby approves the extension, from year to year, until June 30, 1999, of a lease of certain land comprising part of Annette Island, Alaska, for use by the Civil Aeronautics Administration as an airport, entered into by the United States of America and the Council of the Annette Island Reserve on December 13, 1948, section 5 of which lease provides that no renewal thereof shall extend beyond June 30, 1959, unless approved by Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISH RESERVED SPACES BETWEEN CLAIMS ON SHORE WATERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 605) to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898, as amended (48 U. S. C. 461, 462), for the reservation from sale and entry of spaces at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold under the provisions thereof on shore waters in Alaska are hereby abolished.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 1 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409), as amended by the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1028; 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 371), is amended by striking out the following language: '*And provided further,* That no location of scrip, selection, or right along any navigable or other waters shall be made within the distance of 80 rods of any lands, along such waters, theretofore located by means of any such scrip or otherwise;', and 'and along such shore a space of at least 80 rods shall be reserved from entry between all such claims;'.

"SEC. 2. Section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413; 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 462), is amended by striking out the following language: '*Provided further,* That there shall be reserved by the United States a space of 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions of this act on lands abutting on any navigable stream, inlet, gulf, bay, or seashore, and that the Secretary of the Interior may grant the use of such reserved lands abutting on the waterfront to any citizen or association of citizens, or to any corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State or Territory, for landings, and wharves, with the provision that the public shall have access to and proper use of such wharves, and landings, at reasonable rates of toll to be prescribed by said Secretary, and a roadway 60 feet in width, parallel to the shoreline as near as may be practicable, shall be reserved for the use of the public as a highway:'.

"SEC. 3. The act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1059, 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 372), is amended by striking out the following language: 'reserve from sale and entry a space of at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions thereof along the shore of any navigable water, and', and by also striking out the following language: 'restore to entry and disposition such reserved spaces and may'.

"SEC. 4. All lands restored from reservation by this act shall be restored to all forms of appropriation under the public land laws applicable to the Territory of Alaska, but a restoration from reservation by this act shall not be construed as a revocation of an order of withdrawal within the meaning of section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748), as amended (43 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 282).

"SEC. 5. All conveyances of lands opened for sale, entry, or settlement under this act shall be subject to (a) grants heretofore made by the Secretary of the Interior for the use of reserved lands abutting on the waterfront to any citizen or association of citizens, or to any corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State or Territory, for landings and wharves as provided by section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409, 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 462), with an easement for not more than a 100 foot right-of-way for an access road to such wharves and landings, and (b) reservations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the natives of Alaska of tracts of land along the waterfront of any stream, inlet, bay, or seashore for landing places for canoes and other craft used by the natives, as provided by said section 10 (30 Stat. 409; 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 464), together with necessary right-of-way for access to such natives to such landing places: *Provided,* That any such reserve or grant for use for landings, wharves, or landing places which are no longer being used may upon proper evidence of nonuser be revoked and abrogated and conveyances under this act made free and clear thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING HAWAII TO SETTLE CERTAIN DAMAGE CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6331) authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the concurrence of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands and of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, is hereby authorized and empowered, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to enter into a compromise agreement with the owners of certain shorelands in the Territory of Hawaii covered by land court applications numbered 314, 1549, 1653, and 852 and 1092 (land court consolidation 32), and with any other owner or owners of lands abutting any part of the tidelands described in section 2 hereof, involving the conveyance by the Territory to said owners, or some of them, of all or any part of the tidelands described in section 2 of this act, or to make a sale of all or any part of said lands described in section 2, to said owners, or some of them, or to exchange all or a part of said lands described in section 2, with said owners, or some of them, provided that said owners, who may have littoral rights appurtenant to said shorelands, affecting the tidelands described in section 2, convey to the Territory such littoral rights, agree to the construction of a public beach and groin along the seaward side of the lands described in section 2 of this act, and release all claims for compensation, damages or otherwise which they have or might have against the Territory of Hawaii by reason of acts or omissions of the Territory, or for which the Territory is claimed to be responsible, done or omitted in connection with the development of the shoreline, yacht harbor and beaches in and adjoining said area. The Commissioner of Public Lands, with the concurrence of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, is hereby authorized and empowered, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to lease for a period of 55 years all or any part of said lands described in section 2, to said owners, or some of them.

SEC. 2. The tidelands authorized to be conveyed or leased by the Commissioner of Public Lands by this act are described as follows: Land at Waikiki, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Being a portion of area transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 1856, dated October 27, 1928. Situated off Kalia, Waikiki, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Beginning at an ↗ cut in face of seawall on the easterly boundary of this parcel of land, being also the west corner of land court application 1653, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Punchbowl" being 10,981.46 feet south and 3,555.61 feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

Along face of seawall, along highwater mark of land court application 1653 for the next 3 courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points along said face of seawall being:

1. 310 degrees, 12 minutes, 46.20 feet to an ↗ cut in face of seawall;

2. 297 degrees, 18 minutes, 23.90 feet to a † cut in face of seawall;

3. 296 degrees, 10 minutes, 24.62 feet to a ♀ cut in face of seawall;

Thence along face of seawall along highwater mark of land court applications 624 and 264 for the next 11 courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points along said face of seawall being—

4. 296 degrees, 06 minutes, 27.85 feet to an ↗ cut in face of seawall;

5. 293 degrees, 08 minutes, 22.85 feet to a + cut in face of seawall;

6. 298 degrees, 14 minutes, 44.75 feet to a spike in face of seawall;

7. 248 degrees, 12 minutes, 0.97 foot to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

8. 269 degrees, 48 minutes, 55.85 feet to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

9. 270 degrees, 42 minutes, 37.45 feet to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

10. 274 degrees, 46 minutes, 16.35 feet to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

11. 277 degrees, 33 minutes, 16.65 feet to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

12. 281 degrees, 22 minutes, 32.66 feet to an ↗ cut in top edge of seawall;

13. 282 degrees, 58 minutes, 32 feet to a pipe;

14. 234 degrees, 59 minutes, 0.27 foot; thence

15. 319 degrees, 19 minutes, 154.69 feet to a † cut in concrete tile walk;

16. 239 degrees, 30 minutes, 36.95 feet;

17. 329 degrees, 30 minutes, 34.37 feet along end of Dewey Way, the true azimuth and distance from U. S. M. R. Monument 32 being: 58 degrees, 03 minutes, 82.92 feet;

18. 58 degrees, 03 minutes, 90.96 feet along United States Military Reservation (Fort DeRussy) and passing over U. S. M. R. Monument 31 at 30.93 feet;

19. 139 degrees, 19 minutes, 157.27 feet;

20. 96 degrees, 18 minutes, 45 seconds, 190.64 feet;

21. 120 degrees, 05 minutes, 25 seconds, 208.60 feet;

22. 149 degrees, 25 minutes, 115 feet;

23. 157 degrees, 41 minutes, 29 seconds, 427.19 feet;

24. 239 degrees, 58 minutes, 406 feet to the west corner of land court application 1549;

Thence along highwater mark of land court application 1549 for the next five courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points along said highwater mark being—

25. 320 degrees, 22 minutes, 18.48 feet;

26. 291 degrees, 45 minutes, 15.75 feet;

27. 297 degrees, 01 minute, 22.75 feet;

28. 318 degrees, 42 minutes, 32.70 feet;

29. 326 degrees, 46 minutes, 15.03 feet;

Thence along highwater mark of land court application 314 for the next four courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points along said highwater mark being:

30. 325 degrees, 00 minutes, 35 feet;

31. 334 degrees, 10 minutes, 125 feet;

32. 336 degrees, 15 minutes, 189 feet;

33. 334 degrees, 00 minutes, 93.42 feet to a † cut in top of stonewall;

34. 61 degrees, 39 minutes, 60 feet along land court application 1653 to a 2½-inch pipe in concrete;

35. 61 degrees, 46 minutes, 67.74 feet along land court application 1653 to a spike in face of seawall;

36. 61 degrees, 56 minutes, 273.88 feet along face of seawall along highwater mark of land court application 1653 to the point of beginning and containing an area of 6.39 acres.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Public Lands, with the concurrence of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands and of the Governor is also authorized and empowered in the making of any such compromise agreement, exchange, sale, or lease to covenant with such owners to create and maintain a public beach and groin on the seaward side of the lands described in section 2 of this act, so long as and to the extent that appropriations are and may from time to time be available therefor, and to permit access to and from said beach across courses 19 to 23, inclusive, of the land described in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC WEAPONS REWARD ACT OF 1955

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6901) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Any person who furnishes original information to the United States—

(a) leading to the finding or other acquisition by the United States of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon which has been introduced into the United States, or which has been manufactured or acquired therein contrary to the laws of the United States; or

(b) with respect to an attempted introduction into the United States or an attempted manufacture or acquisition therein of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon, contrary to the laws of the United States, shall be rewarded by the payment of an amount not to exceed $500,000.

SEC. 3. An Awards Board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury (who shall be the chairman), the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of Central Intelligence, and of one member of the Atomic Energy Commission designated by that Commission, shall determine whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to any award and the amount thereof to be paid pursuant to section 2. In determining whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to an award and the amount of such award, the Board shall take into consideration—

(a) whether or not the information is of the type specified in section 2; and

(b) whether the person furnishing the information was an officer or employee of the United States and, if so, whether the furnishing of such information was in line of duty of that person. Any reward of $50,000 or more shall be approved by the President.

SEC. 4. If the information leading to an award under section 3 is furnished by an alien, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of Central Intelligence, acting jointly, may determine that the entry of such alien into the United States is in the public interest and, in that event, such alien and the members of his immediate family may receive immigrant visas and may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. The Board established under section 3 is authorized to hold such hearings and make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. Any awards granted under section 3 of this act shall be certified by the Awards Board and, together with the approval of the President in those cases where such approval is required, transmitted to the Director of Central Intelligence for payment out of funds appropriated or available for the administration of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

SEC. 7. As used in this act—

(a) The term "atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

(b) The term "atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

(c) The term "special nuclear material" means plutonium, or uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, or any other material which is found to be special nuclear material pursuant to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(d) The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all Territories and possessions of the United States, and the Canal Zone; except that in section 4, the term "United States" when so used shall have the meaning given to it in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "State;" and insert "States."

Page 3, line 22, strike out "2;" and insert "2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Insert the words "The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico" after the word "includes" and before the word "all" in section 7 (d).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE to the committee amendment: Strike out the words "the Commonwealth of."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

RETIREMENT OF TEMPORARY OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2112) to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am delighted the gentleman has asked for an explanation of the bill. This corrects a ruling of the Comptroller General which affects largely men in the Navy and in the Marine Corps. Under the law as originally contemplated, a man in the service as an enlisted man may work his way up in the service; finally he gets a temporary commission as an officer. It was intended that those men who served many years as an officer would be retireable as an officer rather than as an enlisted man. The Comptroller General, however, recently ruled that they were retireable as enlisted men rather than as officers. As a result a man who has been in the Navy for over 20 years for instance, is retireable as an enlisted man under those circumstances; he is retired to the Fleet Reserve or to the Fleet Marine Reserve if he is a marine as an enlisted man although he served for many years as an officer in the service. The idea is to correct the situation so that he will be retirable as an officer when he served for a long period of time, for more than 10 years and less than 30 years, as an officer.

Mr. GROSS. Does he have an election whether he retires as an officer or as an enlisted man?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He has the election, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), as amended, is further amended by—

(a) inserting in section 6 after the word "thereof" where it first occurs a comma and the phrase "including any member of the naval service temporarily appointed to commissioned grade whose permanent status is enlisted,";

(b) adding at the end of section 6 the following new sentence: "As used in this section 'active commissioned service' includes all active service performed under a temporary appointment to a commissioned grade, including a commissioned warrant grade, by an officer whose permanent status is enlisted."; and

(c) deleting section 7 (c).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any person who, on the date of enactment of this act, is a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and who prior to his transfer thereto—

"(1) was serving under a temporary appointment in a commissioned grade, and

"(2) had completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, Army, Air Force, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which was active commissioned service,

may, in the discretion of the President, be placed on the retired list with the highest rank in which he served satisfactorily before his transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, if application therefor is made within 90 days after the enactment of this act.

"(b) Any person transferred to the retired list under subsection (a) is entitled to retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active duty pay, with longevity credit, or the grade in which he is placed on the retired list, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of his active duty pay at the time of transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of the active duty pay of that rank. A fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2746) for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of $12,042.30. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such bank against the United States for repayment of sums which it loaned in 1950 to the Alabama Aero-Mechanic Institute, Division of Airplane Engineers, taking as security for the loans an assignment of certain contract claims of such institute against the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration, discovering in 1951 that such institute (without the knowledge of the bank) had been guilty of fraud under the contract, refused to pay such claims to the bank and instead offset the amount of such claims against the penalties which were imposed upon such institute by reason of such fraud: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$12,042.30" and insert "$6,021.15."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE E. McCONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of Florence E. McConnell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Florence E. McConnell, widow of P. H. McConnell, Box 1336, Fort Peck, Mont., the sum of $4,370.76, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for work performed by P. H. McConnell under contract No. W–631–eng–2373, dated May 14, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD GORDON ET AL.

The Clerk called House Resolution 273.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2458) entitled "A bill for the relief of Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriquez, and 62 Lenox Avenue, Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The House resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES J. ANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1940) for the relief of James J. Andrews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James J. Andrews, New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,711.51. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James J. Andrews against the United States for payment for annual leave due as of April 16, 1953, the date of his resignation from the Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. DELIZIA CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2898) for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the F. Delizia Co., Inc., Springfield, Mass., the sum of $100. Such sum, together with the indemnity of $100 already received by such company, shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for damages resulting from the loss in the United States mails of a package belonging to such company which the schedule of insurance fees incorrectly showed to have been insured for $200 but which, because of a recent change in rates not reflected in such schedule, was actually insured for only $100: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELZIE C. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of Elzie C. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to consider any claim filed under such act within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Elzie C. Brown, of Mountainair, N. Mex., for compensation for disability resulting from injuries received while performing services as an employee of the War Relocation Authority in Amache, Colo., and (2) to award to the said Elzie C. Brown any compensation to which he would have been entitled under such act had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such sections. No benefits shall accrue under this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "injuries", insert "alleged to have been."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "benefits", insert "except hospital and medical expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. H. PRATHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5535) for the relief of S. H. Prather.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. H. Prather, Americus, Ga., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in settlement of all the claims of said S. H. Prather against the United States for property damage and personal injury damages sustained by S. H. Prather, together with all hospital and medical bills incurred by said S. H. Prather, arising out of a collision which occurred on August 6, 1935, when an automobile in which the said S. H. Prather, his wife, his minor daughter, Florence Prather, and his minor son, S. H. Prather, Jr., were lawfully traveling in a lawful manner upon and over a certain public street and highway in the city of Quitman, Ga., was struck by an automobile driven upon, and into said public street and highway, by one Howard Hart at the rate of at least 60 miles per hour, the said Howard Hart being at the time pursued by an officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of overtaking Howard Hart and making a search of the automobile driven by Howard Hart for illegal liquors, and thereby demolishing the automobile of S. H. Prather and inflicting personal injuries to S. H. Prather consisting of a fractured collar bone, body contusions, and a brain concussion; severe shock and body contusions upon the wife of S. H. Prather; body contusions, a sprained back and broken rib being thereby sustained by S. H. Prather, Jr., and the said daughter, Florence Prather, thereby sustaining a broken shoulder and a fractured skull: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of service rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. H. Prather, Americus, Ga., the sum of $5,000; to pay Mrs. Florence Prather Penman the sum of $2,000, and to pay S. H. Prather, Jr., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sums shall be in settlement of all of the claims against the United States for property damage and personal injury damages sustained by them, together with all hospital and medical bills incurred by them, arising out of a collision which occurred on August 6, 1935, when an automobile in which the said S. H. Prather, his wife, daughter, Florence Prather (now Mrs. Arthur Penman), and his son, S. H. Prather, Jr., were traveling in a lawful manner upon and over a certain public street and highway in the city of Quitman, Ga., was struck by an automobile driven upon, and into said public street and highway, by one Howard Hart at the rate of at least 60 miles per hour, the said Howard Hart being at the time pursued by an officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of overtaking Howard Hart and making a search of the automobile driven by Howard Hart for illegal liquors, and thereby demolishing the automobile of S. H. Prather and inflicting personal injuries to S. H. Prather consisting of a fractured collarbone, body contusions, and a brain concussion; severe shock and body contusions upon the wife of S. H. Prather; body contusions, a sprained back and broken rib being thereby sustained by S. H. Prather, Jr., and the said daughter, Florence Prather (now Mrs. Arthur Penman), thereby sustaining a broken shoulder and a fractured skull."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF CARLO DE LUCA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6158) for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

STEPHEN SWAN OGLETREE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6232) to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, it shall be considered that Stephen Swan Ogletree, who was a member of Company G, Second Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, had at least 90 days' active military service during the Spanish-American War.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "Administration", insert "from the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY M. CAUDILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6709) for the relief of Harry M. Caudill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry M. Caudill, Whitesburg, Ky., the sum of $335. Such sum represents reimbursement for expenses incurred by the said Harry M. Caudill in August 1946 in connection with an operation performed at the Norton Infirmary, Louisville, Ky. The said Harry M. Caudill was wounded in the left leg on May 16, 1944, while serving in the United States Army in Italy, and such operation, which surgeons of the Veterans' Administration refused to perform, was successful in bettering appreciably the condition of such leg: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLISON B. CLEMENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1172) for the relief of Allison B. Clemens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Allison B. Clemens, of Stoneham, Mass., the sum of $. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Allison B. Clemens against the United States arising out of national service life insurance issued to her husband, the late William J. Clemens, who designated the said Allison B. Clemens as the beneficiary of such insurance: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "the sum of $", insert "5,000."

Page 1, line 8, after "out of", insert "any and all."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HANNAH MAE POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3728) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell, of 1950 East Lehigh Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $24,932.39, in full settlement of all claims of said Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell for refund of income taxes and other expenses sustained as a result of the actions of the Collector of Internal Revenue of Philadelphia, Pa., in the years 1937, 1941, and 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASQUALE GENTILE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3979) for the relief of Pasquale Gentile.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Pasquale Gentile, of 62 Summit Street, Brooklyn 31, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund for the amount which he posted as cash bond in the case of Teresa Acquafreddo, now Manzella, an alien (file No. 0300–273425): *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. RYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4410) for the relief of William E. Ryan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of William E. Ryan, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as an employee of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., in September 1935, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided,* That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO BOTOSHANSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5282) for the relief of Mario Botoshansky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Mario Botoshansky, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted on his sister, Miss Esther Botoshansky or Botosanchi or Botosanchi on October 11, 1950: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GAY STREET CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6706) for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $3,145.94, representing the amount reported by the Court of Claims to the Congress in response to House Resolution 566, 82d Congress (Congressional No. 3–52, order entered January 11, 1955), to be the amount agreed to by the United States and the said Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md., as constituting a full settlement of all past and future claims of the said Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md., against the United States with respect to a lease entered into on October 1, 1946, between the said Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md., and the War Assets Administration, an agency of the United States, and all other claims within the scope of H. R. 2779, 82d Congress: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELMA RIVLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 42) for the relief of Selma Rivlin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Selma Rivlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAXIMILIAN KARL MANJURA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 88) for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilian Karl Manjura may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEJIBE EL-SOUSSE SLYMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 90) for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTHER CORNELIUS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 94) for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER CHARLES BETHEL (PETER CHARLES PETERS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 95) for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

XANTHI GEORGES KOMPOROZOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 99) for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Xanthi Georges Komporozou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEON J. DE SZETHOFER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the grantng of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIGI ORLANDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 323) for the relief of Luigi Orlando.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Luigi Orlando, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Ricci, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSEPPINA LATINA MOZZICATO ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 378) for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCISZEK JANICKI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 429) for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of the first paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERARD LUCIEN DANDURAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 481) for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Gerard Lucien Dandurand. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Gerard Lucien Dandurand shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELSA LEDERER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 502) for the relief of Elsa Lederer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elsa Lederer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELENA APOSTOLESCU BUSTIUC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 938) for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SAFIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 939) for the relief of Laura Safir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Laura Safir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASIMIR KRZYZANOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1019) for the relief of Casimir Krzyzanowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Casimir Krzyzanowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", insert the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE DOMINGO QUINTANAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1185) for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Domingo Quintanar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Domingo Quaintanar may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARCEL DUVIVIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1191) for the relief of Marcel Duvivier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marcel Duvivier shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMONDE ROUXEL WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

JOHANNA JURESIC GRGURICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1752) for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johanna Juresic Grgurich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee." strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUD MARIA SCHURHOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1878) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

May I say that there is no objection to this bill or the one which just a moment ago I asked be passed over without prejudice, except that the committee reports have been confused and are not in order. Though there is no objection to the bills, in my opinion the reports should be in order before we pass the bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

INGEBORG LUISE FISCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1958) for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ingeborg Luise Fischer, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Henry Joseph Walling, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA DEL PILAR VALCARCEL CALDERON ARMISTEAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2494) for the relief of Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the period and add the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERESA JURJEVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2738) for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Teresa Jurjevic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Jurjevic, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORIS KOWERDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6617) for the relief of Boris Kowerda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Boris Kowerda may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ROBERT C. JALBUENA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIESELOTTE BOEHME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Boehme shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALVATORE CANNIZZO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2078) for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvatore Cannizzo may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMONE GILLILAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2296) for the relief of Simone Gilliland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Simone Gilliland shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. GINO EVANGELISTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. Gino Evangelista may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELO DEVITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4147) for the relief of Angelo DeVito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelo

DeVito may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions or that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARETHE BOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4468) for the relief of Margarethe Bock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margarethe Bock, the fiancee of Harry J. Trahan, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Robert Harald Bock, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Margarethe Bock is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Harry J. Trahan and that she is found admissible under all the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Margarethe Bock and Robert Harald Bock, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Margarethe Bock and Robert Harald Bock, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Margarethe Bock and Robert Harald Bock as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERT ARTHUR PARADAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 904) to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the northwest quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter of section 36, township 4 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian, shall be open to homestead entry under the appropriate public land laws: *Provided*, That Bert Arthur Paraday of Anchor Point, Alaska, shall be given preference right of entry on the land released to be considered as part of his homestead application, Anchorage serial 02560: *Provided further*, That the Territory of Alaska shall be allowed to make in lieu selection for the land released.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike the following: "northwest quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter" and insert in lieu thereof "north half southwest quarter."

Page 1, line 6; after the word "laws" insert the following: "but all entries and patents hereunder shall be subject to a reservation to the Territory of Alaska of all minerals in the lands so entered and patented, and all minerals so reserved shall be subject to disposition under the same laws as other minerals reserved to the Territory."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO ROBERT HENRY SOYK, OF KENAI, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 897) to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the east half southeast quarter of section 36, township 3 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian, shall be open to homestead entry under the appropriate public land laws: *Provided*, That Robert Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, shall be given preference right of entry on the land released to be considered as part of his homestead application, Anchorage serial 022329: *Provided further*, That the Territory of Alaska shall be allowed to make in lieu selection for the land released.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, insert "but all entries and patents hereunder shall be subject to the reservation to the Territory of Alaska of all minerals in the lands so entered and patented, and all minerals so reserved shall be subject to disposition under the same laws as other minerals reserved to the Territory."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO JOSEPH BOOTH, OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 896) to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth, of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the south half northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter of section 36, township 3 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian, shall be open to homestead entry under the appropriate public land laws: *Provided*, That Joseph Booth, of Anchorage, Alaska, shall be given preference right of entry on the land released to be considered as part of his homestead application, Anchorage serial 023958: *Provided further*, That the Territory of Alaska shall be allowed to make in lieu selection for the land released.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "laws", insert "but all entries and patents hereunder shall be subject to a reservation to the Territory of Alaska of all minerals in the lands so entered and patented, and all minerals so reserved shall be subject to disposition under the same laws as other minerals reserved to the Territory."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO PATRICK HAROLD JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 902) to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the west half northwest quarter of section 36, township 4 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian shall be open to homestead entry under the appropriate public land laws: *Provided*, That Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, shall be given preference right of entry on the land released to be considered as part of his homestead application, Anchorage serial 021580: *Provided further*, That the Territory of Alaska shall be allowed to make in lieu selection for the land released.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "laws", insert "but all entries and patents hereunder shall be subject to a reservation to the Territory of Alaska of all minerals in the lands so entered and patented, and all minerals so reserved shall be subject to disposition under the same laws as other minerals reserved to the Territory."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO LAND IN ALASKA TO CARL E. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 905) to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the north half northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter of section 36, township 3 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian shall be open to homestead entry under the appropriate public land laws: *Provided*, That Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, shall be given preference right of entry on the land released to be considered as part of his homestead application, Anchorage serial 023957: *Provided further*, That the Territory of Alaska shall be allowed to make in lieu selection for the land released.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "north half northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter" and insert "north half north half."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "laws", insert "but all entries and patents hereunder shall be subject to a reservation to the Territory of Alaska of all minerals in the lands so entered and patented, and all minerals so reserved shall be subject to disposition under the same laws as other minerals reserved to the Territory."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 167) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7858789, Afonsky, Dimitri Alexandrovich.

0300-301341, Bart, Fannie, or Fejga Slonimtzik also known as Fejga Slonimtzik Bart.

A-7228067, Bart, Mordecai, or Mordchay Bart.

E-084291, Berkovits, Elias.

E-082603, Blady, Ryfka, also known as Ryfka Larish, also known as Rywka Larisz.

E-082606, Blady, Szmerla, also known as Schmerla Blady.

A-6668006, Brown, James Crawford Su, also known as James Su Brown, James Watkins Brown, Su Gin Ling.

E-094405, Bugaj, Leckadja.

A-9645740, Chai, Woo Suit.

E-079967, Chan, Get Wing.

A-6847712, Chang, Charles Chi.

0300-448176, Chang, Sophia Ho-Ying.

0200-86319, Chang, Rev. James Aloysius.

V-606664, Chang, Kuei Lien alias Patricia Chang.

A-6851618, Chang, Kuei-Sheng.

0300-449543, Chang, Lee Yen Yuen.

0300-460323, Chang, Jimmy Zung-Tsu.

0300-460324, Chang, Betty Zung-Wei.

A-6986482, Chang, Shu Hsi (Sister Mary Assunta).

A-7135671, Chang, Szu Shiang.

A-6848690, Chang, Lucy Ding.

A-7368961, Chang, Yun.

A-7197724, Chao, Bei Tse.

A-7197725, Chao, May.

A-7395205, Chao, Hsiang Lin Lee.

A-6948661, Chao, Huang.

A-7286960, Chao, Paul Kwang-Yi.

A-6589877, Chao, Tai Siang.

A-6958993, Chen, Chi Kwan.

A-7828485, Chen, Chin-Ping, also known as Nellie Chin Ping Chen.

A-7915742, Chen, Chuang.

T-1502014, Chen, Chung Wei.

A-6967329, Chen, Kuan-I.

A-6851578, Chen, Kuan-Ning, or Kenneth. K. Chen or Kenneth Kuan-Ning Chen.

A-7280718, Chen, Pao-Chong.

A-6967328, Chen, Paula Keojui.

A-6967673, Chen, Rosemary Yu-Shia.

A-6704081, Chen, Shih-Dzung.

A-6849406, Chen, Tsi Yang.

A-7802169, Chen, Yee Chwang.

A-6985479, Cheng, Chi-Hao.

A-7296197, Cheng, Gilda Kit, or Gilda Cheng or Cheng Chieh-Hwa or Cheng Kit Wah.

A-7285817, Cheng, Jesse Tsai-Shih.

A-7118665, Cheng, Kuo Shiuan, also known as Louis Cheng or Louis Chend.

A-7118666, Cheng, Kuo Yin, also known as Donaldson Cheng or Donaldson Chend.

A-7368970, Cheng, Shirley.

A-6704649, Cheng, Sze-Chuh.

A-6555841, Cheng, Teresa Loh.

A-7269658, Cheng, Tsung-Hsien.

A-6953289, Chien, Pu-lun.

A-7185290, Chien, Sieh Wal Lieu (Helen).

A. 4918489, Chin, Peter, also known as Jung Dot Chin.

A-7457589, Chiu, Chi-Chao.

A-6461103, Chou, Adam Keh-chia.

A-6967737, Chou, Catherine Ai-Sine.

A-6847979, Chou, Mildred.

A-7248476, Chou, Tu Fu (Sister Mary Adolph).

A-6142710, Chou, Yen-Ping.

A-7988230, Chou, Yuan Pin.

A-6847977, Chow, Tsai Hwa J.

A-6847886, Chow, Ven Te.

A-6848371, Chu, An Shek.

A-6026528, Chu, Bei Sun.

V-739114, Chu, Chee Kong.

A-6148175, Chu, Chiao-Min (Cho-Min).

A-6848693, Chu, Irene Erh Ying Chen.

A-7046629, Chu, Samuel Chong-Ling, or Samuel C. Chu.

A-7367958, Chu, Seu Heung.

A-6620863, Chu, Yuin Hsin, or Clayton Hsin Chu.

A-6794602, Chuang, Sheng-Lun.

V-886673, Dao, Thomas Ling-Yuan.

A-3186666, Dekhour, Jamil Sion.

A-6986532, Dung, Won Tsui (Sister Mary Theresa).

A-6699868, Fang, Frances Foon-Chiu (nee Mok).

A-6851609, Fang, Ken Shou.

E-086460, Farkas, Alexander.

E-086459, Farkas, Vilmos.

A-7444695, Feldstein, Leizor.

0300-388792, Feng, Chun Po.

A-6973667, Feng, Meng Hsiang Tsai.

A-6457478, Feng, Tai Nien.

A-7201203, Fischman, Abraham.

A-7399967, Fong, Jeanne Kwan.

A-7287975, Fong, Kong-Sen, also known as Fred Kong-Sen Fong.

A-7197273, Fong, Freda Wei-Teh Yong (nee Wei Teh Yong).

A-7285979, Friedman, Charles G.

0300-458485, Fu, Yuan Sheng, also known as Fu Yuan Sheng or Yuan Shen Fu.

A-7362422, Gabor, Laszlo.

A-7362419, Gabor, Margit.

A-7362420, Gabor, Zsuzanna.

E-085882, Gutt, Kalman.

A-7913546, Gutwein, Osias.

A-6851475, Han, Tsu-Ming.

0612/33289, Hi, Won.

A-7768052, Ho, Carol Tsu.

A-6822856, Ho, Monto.

V-189655, Ho, Helen Wen Lou.

V-189654, Ho, Siu Ing or Caroline Mo I Ho.

V-2147451, Hoecker, Julianna (nee Kovats).

A-7367941, Hon, Ching-Ya, also known as Sammy Ching-Ya Hon.

A-7197632, Honigstock, Efroim Isai.

A-7197631, Honigstock, Maria W.

A-7193954, Honigstock, Taube E.

A-6958623, Hsia, Hsiang-Ming (nee Hsiang-Ming Wang) or Wang Hsiang-Ming or Chiang-Ming Wang.

A-6848395, Hsiao, Betty Ye-May Chang.

A-6704072, Hsiao, Sun-Chien.

0300-243307, Hsieh, Fan Jui Kwan.

0300-459418, Hsieh, Hsien Yuen.

A-8063679, Hsieh, George Jay.

A-6967255, Hsieh, George Shan-Chang.

A-7196410, Hsieh, Rose Shiuan-Ching Wang.

A-6851687, Hsu, Fred.

0800-110931, Hsu, Lan-An.

A-6606736, Hu, Chai Cheun.

A-7135309, Hu, Chang Tu.

1200-34721, Hu, Christopher.

A-7135309, Hu, Dorothy Geraldine.

A-7200846, Huang, Yu-Ching (Eugene).

E-082296, Hwang, Michael Ling-Kuei.

A-6694143, Hwang, Minnie Young.

0800-84199, Hwang, Rensen Lu.

A-7286741, Jen, Isaac I-Chun.

A-7135174, Jen, Lancy Chien (nee Chien Lung-Chu), or Lung Chu Chien or Lancy C. Jen or Lucy Chien Jen.

A-6967547, Jen, Yun, or Jen Yun also known as James Yun Jen.

0300-456145, Jing, Bao-Shan.

A-6975455, Kahan, Eugene.

A-6976871, Kahan, Gizella.

A-8031446, Kahan, Kathleen Judith.

A-7462128, Kassay, Attila.

A-8198572, Kaufman, Abraham.

E-085893, Kaufman, Regina.

A-6008445, King, Chung-Chang.

0300-337782, King, Fung Tseng.

A-7863591, King, Grace, or Cher Min Chang King.

A-7863590, King, Joseph, or Yung Tsu King.

A-6623727, King, Te Piao.

0700-27056, Koo, David Yee Shih, also known as Yee Shih Koo.

A-6967278, Koo, Dominic (Sze Yi).

A-6849861, Koo, Margaret Wei-Shan Chung.

A-3377964, Koo, Robert Chung-Jen.

A-7243147, Kovesi, Eugenia.

A-7243146, Kovesi, Ignatz.

A-7274518, Kuang, Chen Wei or Wei Kuang Chen or Janet Wei-Kuang Chen or Janet Chen.

A-6986561, Kung, Hans Kuo-Hsiung.

0300-368834, Kuo, Chang Iu.

0300-433542, Kuo, Chang-Yun (nee Huang).

0300-441985, Kuo, Fa Jean.

A-6958524, Kwo, Tsuo-Tsing.

0300-456155, Kwok, Julie Tsung-Kwung.

0300-455908, Landkas, Carolus, or Charles Landkas.

0300-455907, Landkas, Hedvica or Hedy Landkas.

0300-455906, Landkas, Matthaeus Aloysius, or Mathias Aloysius Landkas.

0300-455909, Landkas, Ruzena or Rosena Landkas.

V-890377, Lee, Chan Hoo.

A-6967499, Lee, Cheng-Chun or Li.

A-7290200, Lee, Chi Hao.

0300-365060, Lee, Fung Lai.

A-6381300, Lee, Hsin Te.

A-6861454, Lee, Hun.

A-7389483, Lee, Ling Hong.

A-6545347, Lee, Luke Tsung-Chou.

V-885330, Lee, Sau Lan, or Mable Lee.

A-6967338, Lee, Sheng Ting.

0300-345151, Leifer, Bertha.

A-7819567, Leifer, Joseph.

A-7354776, Leung, Anna, formerly known as Anna Theresa Pai-Kwan Leung.

A-9831240, Leung, Harry.

A-7296195, Leung, Yuen Chu.

A-7913448, Levertov, Moise.

A-7961356, Lewintow, Chaskiel.

0300-442126, Lewintow, Frejda, also known as Fredja Kurman.

A-6848444, Li, Kwang Chiu.

0300-455550, Li, Sue Yung.

A-6983825, Li, Wen Hsiung.

A-7209054, Liang, Daniel Shao-Fu.

A-7209053, Liang, Mary Hsiu-Chen (nee Hsu).

A-6483737, Lieu, Hou-Shun.

A-6916531, Ling, Ting Hung.

A-8001558, Lisbona, Leon Albert.

A-8001557, Lisbona, Yvette Romano.

A-6887720, Liu, Joanna Kung Ying.

V-285171, Liu, Kai-Hsien.

A-7118723, Liu, Ke-Chia, also known as Jack Ke-Chia Liu.

A-6940549, Liu, Paul Yu-Ling.

A-6847865, Liu, Su-Ying (Lucille).

A-6972941, Liu, Wei-Jui.

A-7444634, Loh, Daniel You-Chi.

A-5928220, Lom, Hin.

0301-16903, Long, Jane Chen.

A-7456052, Long, Keh-Hsuin.

A-7125135, Lowinger, Joseph (Jozsef).

1600-77319, Lu, Su-Tsing (nee Chiu).

A-6959896, Lu, Te-Chuan or Abraham Te-Chuan Lu.

A-6877788, Ma, Si Hon.

T-120820, Mar, Bing Noon, also known as Gilbert Bing Noon Mar.

A-7913533, Meyersdorf, Szlama.

A-9744399, Moa, Chen Ah.

A-6988410, Mooaliem, Aziza.

A-6988411, Mooaliem, Salim Jacob.

V-1360391, Nagy, Gizella Dalnoki.

V-1360390, Nagy, Irme Dalnoki.

A-7138008, Nasch, Elvira.

A-6985447, Nasch, Gyula.

V-1360424, Nemeth, Joseph.

0900-73171, Ng, Yung.

A-9769824, Nung, May.

0205/26290, Ong, Linda Tsien (nee Chien Chia Chun) or Tsien Chia Chun or Chia Chun Tsien, also known as Mrs. Kuo Chun Ong.

A-7350673, Ong, Hsiao-Pao.

A-6387408, Ong, Tzo-Hsung.

A-6043196, Ong, Shao-chiu.

A-7483840, Kuo, Sue-Chuang.

A-8031488, Pai, Chi Shih.

A-8031489, Pai, Ming Hsing.

A-7436640, Perl, Leb Chaim.

A-6868241, Rapp, Arnold.

0300-299431, Reisman, Eva (nee Hollander).

A-7228283, Reisman, Imre (Emeric).

A-7809774, Runko, Antonio.

E-082310, Saad, Esther M.

E-082113, Saad, Jacques S.

A-6905017, Schachter, Gizella.

A-7808050, Schwartz, Frigyes.

A-7289305, Sheng, Yao Nan, or Sheng Yao Nan.

0300-457353, Shiah, Betty.

0300-457352, Shiah, Eugenia.

0300-457354, Shiah, James.

A-6848130, Shih, Chung-Wen.

A-6967702, Shih, Yang-Ch'eng.

A-6986546, Shou, Chuan-Ling (nee Chuan-Ling Chu), also known as Mabel Chuan-Ling Shou.

A-6851334, Shou, Te-Fen, also known as Stephens Te-Fen Shou.

A-6565148, So, Kwan-Wai.

A-6567547, So, Yi Wu.

0300-462334, Soffer, Jack Khedouri.

T-979133, Soong, Chia Lin (nee Chen).

T-142269, Soong, Yuan Chio.

A-7096171, Stamberger, Katalin.

A-7096170, Stamberger, Sandor.

A-7081511, Stegman, Emanuel.

A-7177408, Stegman, Fania.

A-6988127, Su, Kendall Ling-Chiao

A-6958619, Su, Mary Chik-Kie.

0300-457100, Sun, Cedric.

A-8091151, Sun, Lilla Shu-Yung, formerly Wu (nee Kuo).

A-7913550, Sun, Theresa I-Feng.

A-8154174, Sun, Yee-Chung.

A-7283609, Sung, Harriet Emily (Shen Sing-Vong).

A-7365717, Szameth, Szlama.

0300-328447, Sze, Elsie Sun or Too Chen Sun.

A-6300097, Sze, Shou Chiang, or Thomas Sze.

A-7052474, Szpiro, Genia.

0300-462184, Tan, Charlotte.

V-753629, Tan, Peter Nei-Wan.

A-7457341, Tang, Nancy Tse-Yuin.

0300-462015, Tannenbaum, Eva.

0300-462016, Tannenbaun, Paula.

A-8071100, Tannenbaum, Samuel.

A-7292420, Tao, Ching Hwa.

A-6851494, Tao, Yung.

A-7274851, Tchen, Lily Li-ing Yang.

A-7200859, Teng, Ching Tseng.

A-7290253, Chao, Hsi Chih (Dora Chao Teng).

T-1503525, Ting, Donald Ta-Yu.

A-6986552, Tong, Bik Yuan.

0200/86111, Tong, Rev. Paul Ki-King.

E-082718, Towfik, Nissim Moshi.

V-754351, Tsai, Albert Yungshu.

A-7290335, Tsai, Shih Yuan.

A-6881740, Tsao, Chia-Kuei.

A-7436712, Tsao, Ying-Lan Wang.

A-8198382, Tsao, Joseph Chao.

A-6827808, Tsao, Peh-Nien, also known as Daniel Peh-Nien Tsao.

A-6704225, Tsao, Peter Yao-Shang.

A-7135173, Tsao, Stella Chen-Yuen.

A-6848477, Tseng, Ching-Hsuan (nee Fong).

A-8015091, Tseng, Hsiang Len.

A-801-13839, Tseng, Robert.

A-7795780, Tsi-Kong, Chia.

A-6843407, Tsiang, Shou-Jen.

A-6381299, Tsou, Leslie Kuo-Kuei.

1200-23447, Tsou, Rose Chiayin.

A-7247147, Tsu, Aimee Marie.

A-6916558, Tu, Ju Ching.

A-6923178, Tuan, Ren-Deh Dah San.

A-7865348, Tuan, Tai Fu.

A-7277347, Tung, Nathan, also known as Chao-Yuan Tung.

0300-320503, Turek, Ludmila (nee Vrtala).

A-7248808, Turek, Miroslav.

E-078100, Vunk, Rustan.

A-6967759, Wan, Grace Jung-Fang, or Jung-Fang Wan, or Wan Jung-Fang or Grace Wan.

A-6973691, Wang, Cary Ching-Tao.

A-7133277, Wang, Chen-Dju Chen, also known as Pearl Wang.

V-908974, Wang, Chiu-Chen.

A-6973692, Wang, Irene Li-Chen.

A-7292415, Wang, Mae Hoang-Mei.

A-7197271, Wang, Yung-Fa.

A-8000614, Wee, Hedy Deh-Yuin.

A-1397738, Wei, Joseph Chu-Feng.

A-7879635, Wen, Hsiu Jui.

A-7879636, Wen, Sun Hsing-Fan.

A-7274557, Wen, Shirley Hsiang-Ju.

A-7389487, Weng, Cheng Kuang.

A-8031672, Wiesenfeld, Bronislava, also known as Brena Garson.

A-7387975, Wiesinger, Frederick Paul.

V-1184125, Wong, Gee Cheng.

A-6953089, Wong, Yau Chun.

0300-268257, Woo, Siu Mui Lee.

0300-268256, Woo, Soe Vei.

A-7274361, Wood, Fu Liang, also known as George Fu Liang Wood.

A-6848025, Wu, Ching Ying.

A-6851447, Wu, Jane Sun, also known as Hsia-Chen Sun (Shen).

A-7450708, Wu, Lawrence Liang-Shuen.

A-7395271, Wu, Stanley, Liang-Chun.

A-6754387, Wu, Szu Siao.

A-1365247, Wu, Tong Yong, or Wu Tong Yong.

A-7247103, Wu, Wan Lien Dorothea.

A-6851549, Wu, Yao-Hua.

A-7247102, Wu, Ying Victor.

A-6567549, Yang, Arthur.

E-89279, Yang, Chin Tse.

A-7860211, Yang, Kwai-Hsi.

A-6702393, Yang, Luciana Theresa Fang.

A-7118758, Yang, Maurice Min-Sun.

V-778302, Yein, Chung Sang.

A-6026505, Yen, Chia Shiang, also known as Charles Yen.

A-7366212, Yen, Kuo Tai.

A-6966530, Yen, Kwang Tsung (nee Chow), also known as Florence Yen.

A-7285975, Yin, Louis Lo I.

A-6958665, Ying, Sai Hou.

A-7897615, Ying, Thomas Orrin.

V-884814, Young, Koon Chock.

V-383286, Young, Siu Fun Hui.

A-6967653, Young, I Teh (nee Yang).

A-6847807, Young, Sing Sze.

A-7860214, Yu, Chuan-Tao.

A-6694192, Yu, Tsi Shan.

0300-346716, Yu, Wei-Liang.

A-6703491, Yuan, Lun Lee or Yuan Lun Lee.

V-658602, Yuan, Rosaline Sung (nee Sung Lu Sing) or Lu Sing Sung.

0300-354976, Yung, Hong San.

0300-371624, Yung, Ung Siue Chang.

0300-348266, Yung, Vong Wei.

A-7210499-T, Lutyk, Jan Bugien.

A-7890110, Lutyk, Sophia Sabina.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 17, lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, insert:

"A-7244861, Chrosciechowski, Julian Thaddeus.

"0501-238, Constandaky, Serban George.

"A-6975638, Ma, Chan Chow.

"A-7850962, Mar, Margaret Wan-Yuin Yang nee Wan Yuin Yang.

"A-7480726, Tang, Hsin Ming."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 168) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7962136, Chin, Por alias Yat Song.

A-9657768, Chum, Tham Lie.

A-6983648, Goldstein, Baruch Gershon.

A-9825250, Picinich, Martin or Martino Antonio.

1300-127438, Chan, Rose Edith.

A-6033462, Chang, Yuan Hsiao also known as Jason Chang.

T-278633, Choy, Sing Lum.

A-1073526, Chu, Thomas Wencao.

A-6967626, Fine, Chang also known as S. Dick Chang.

A-7096034, Gawronski, Michal.

A-6933885, Ho, Eugene Ngok.

A-6858260, Klimas, George (Jerzy).

A-8065424, Kwong, Chan Pan.

A-9561134, Ngee, Foo Tick.

A-6848418, Pih, Peter Dueh Chang.

A-6142704, Su, Er-Ching.

E-119236, Sum, Yuen.

A-7095905, Szonyi, Francois.

A-9632713, Tang, Tan Ju or Tong Tan Ju.

A-9672198, Viporn, Uno.

A-7874957, Wagner, Christine Maria Theresia.

A-7176012, Wagner, Ferenc Stephen.

A-7176013, Wagner, Irene nee Trefny.

A-9635248, Wong, Hoe Kwan or Hoe Kwan Hong or Wong Lie Puo or Cheong Puo.

A-9733998, Yong, Tan Boon.

1300-129063, Yu, Pio Chung.

A-6762014, Yui, Wei-Tsen also known as Paul Yui.

A-6877740, Chu, Johnson Cheng.

A-7064137, Chu, Siu-Fan Cheng.

A-7415019, Fore, Mark.

A-8091059, Hong, Chon also known as Young Fatt also known as Tong Fatt.

A-6671045, Hulicka, Karel.

A-7243491, Langbergs, Alberts.

A-7243590, Langbergs, Emma Pauline.

A-9561078, Long, Foo Chin also known as Chin Long Fong.

A-7879327, Wah, Ho Gate (Lana Wong) or Lana Meyers.

A-9782981, Wan, Chan or Yin Chan.

A-6922678, Weiser, Leopold alias Artur Fried.

A-7120673, Chang, Kuo-Sui.

A-7262024, Goldman, Andre.

A-9526887, Grubelich, Danijel Nanad.

A-7395210, Pavlousek, Maria Anna.

A-6407327, Pavlousek, Oldrich Adolf.

A-6480058, Sarapa, Djordje Vukicevich or George Sarapa.

A-6764709, Sarapa, Wladimih Vukicevich or Walter Sarapa.

A-7073962, Sipajlo, Ema.

A-9825133, Sztam, Henryk Maksymilian.

A-6704089, Wang, Ambrose Joseph Ching-fu.

A-6982870, Wen (Wu), Lai Kwan.

E-070837, Abolins, Aleksander.

A-7538137, Chang, Ping Chung also known as David Ping Chung Chang.

A-6847766, Chang, Pien-Tseng.

A-7941171, Chang, Florence Shih.

A-7941172, Chang, Ta-Chun.

A-7941173, Chang, Kuo-Chun.

A-7941174, Chang, Pu-Chun Chang.

A-8082017, Choi, Ho.

1300-127921, Chow, Ma.

A-7125062, Fu, Ching Mark.

A-7381295, Humaciu, Aurel.

A-7863016, Kiedyk, Kazimierz.

A-8258542, Liu, Shao-Wen.

A-6043197, Lu, Yung Tai.

A-7176709, Warga, Gerzson.

A-9682999, Yue, Hau Chung.

A-7125362, Dreszer, Anna (nee Anna Kamila Monseu).

A-6472694, Simmons, Miriam or Maria (nee Horowitz).

A-7868116. Berkowitz, Abraham or Abraham Grossman.

A-6438289, Briks, Vladimirs.

A-7093100, Furth, Julius also known as Julius Firt.

A-7280236, Holczler, Imre.

A-7280337, Holczler, Sara.

A-8082095, Holczler, Gabriel.

A-8082096, Holczler, Dezso.

A-8082097, Holczler, Zoltan.

A-8082098, Holczler, Esther.

0300-411863, Hoo, Soo or Hoo Soo or Soo Ho or Soo Bah Ho.

V 606154, Lee, Ling Yun.

0300-390016, Lee, Wah or Lee Wah or Yoke Wa Li.

A-6848478, Wang, Ke Liang.

A-7383455, Rudzinski, Aleksander Witold.

0300-346584, Rudzinski, Maria Anna (nee Tenenbaum).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, strike out all of line 25.

On page 5, strike out all of line 13.

On page 5, at the end of the concurrent resolution add the following name:

"A-6694114, Zazoulinsky, Moisel or Michael Isiah Zazoulinsky."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA ANITA HILDEGARD SPARWASSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser, the fiance of Thomas Roy Tallant, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Thomas Roy Tallant and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the said act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK BUDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1668) for the relief of Frank Budman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frank Budman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "act", insert "*Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPIROS TZAFERIS AND ERINI AVERINO TZAFERIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1673) for the relief of Spiros Tzaferis and Erini Averino Tzaferis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Spiros Tzaferis and Erini Averino Tzaferis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert ", the allocation of visas authorized to be issued pursuant to section 4 (a) (8) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "fee" and insert "fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLANKA GOLDSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of Blanka Goldstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Blanka Goldstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHIU-AN WANG (NEE ALICE CHIACHENG SZE)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Chiu An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze), who was born in the United States in Washington, District of Columbia, in 1924, shall be held and considered to have acquired United States citizenship at birth.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SADA ZARIKIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2065) for the relief of Sada Zarikian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 352 (a) (2) shall not apply to Sada Zarikian, born in Turkey on May 31, 1922, brought to the United States on September 1, 1922, and naturalized on January 19, 1928.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. KLAUS SCHWARZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2480) for the relief of Dr. Klaus Schwarz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Klaus Schwarz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 8, 1949.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INAKO YOKOO AND HER MINOR CHILD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2735) for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Inako Yokoo, the fiance of Roland K. Johnson, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Emiko Yokoo, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Inako Yokoo is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Roland K. Johnson and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Inako Yokoo and Emiko Yokoo, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Inako Yokoo and Emiko Yokoo, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Inako Yokoo and Emiko Yokoo as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE ARMANDO QUARESMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2949) for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Armando Quaresma shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", strike out the period and insert the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM LAWLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3188) for the relief of William Lawler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William Lawler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD RAFFO HANSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Richard Raffo Hanson, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Richard Raffo Hanson shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JAMES C. S. LEE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3375) for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent resident as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA H. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Freda H. Sullivan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", strike out the colon and insert the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VLADISLAV BEVC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4289) for the relief of Vladislav Bevc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vladislav Bevc shall be held and considered to be the minor child of his parents, Ladislav Bevc and Ivanka Sket Bevc, lawful permanent residents of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIKA MARIE DIETL, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erika Marie Dietl, the fiance of Joseph A. Dombroski, a citizen of the United States, and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Erika Marie Dietl is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Joseph A. Dombroski and that Erika Marie Dietl is found otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of that act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond of undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Erika Marie Dietl, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "act", insert: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "fee" and insert "fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY ANTONIA LEONG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1084) for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", insert "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HENRY MAHONEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of George Henry Mahoney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Henry Mahoney may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 7 inclusive and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Henry Mahoney shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA EDITH MANNS MONROE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1458) for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Edith Manns Monroe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and substitute "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after "212 (a)", insert "(9) and."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINO SANTI AND HIS WIFE DINORA SANTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of Lino Santi and his wife, Dinora Santi, nee Balestri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lino Santi and his wife, Dinora Santi, nee Balestri, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the name "Balestri", insert "and Aldo Martini and his wife, Maria Martini, nee Balestri."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "two" and insert "four."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lino Santi, Dinora Santi, Aldo Martini and Maria Martini."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFA MARTINEZ INFANTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2782) for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josefa Martinez Infante shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAKOB HASS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3037) for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Naturality Act, Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELHEID GLESSNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4146) for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZABEL VARTANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of Zabel Vartanian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zabel Vartanian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for lawful residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien, as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTUR SWISLOCKI OR ARTHUR SVISLOTZKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5283) for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for lawful residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien, as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANASTASIOS SELELMETZIDIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2049) for the relief of Anastasios Selelmetzidis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anastasios Selelmetzidis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALERIE ANNE PETERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6396) for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Valerie Anne Peterson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Dr. Freddie N. Peterson, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUJI DOI AND MRS. MATSUYO YAMAOKA DOI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6613) for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Doi, may be classified as nonquota aliens under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGFRIED OLSEN SHIPPING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5891) entitled "An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO PROVIDE FOR CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7066) to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby recognized that the presence of large volumes of water in anthracite coal formations involves serious wastage of the fuel resources of the Nation, and constitutes a menace to health and safety and national security. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations and thereby conserve natural resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in order to carry out the abovementioned purposes, to make financial contributions on the basis of programs or projects approved by the Secretary, to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (hereinafter designated as the "Commonwealth") for control and drainage of water which, if not so controlled or drained, will cause the flooding of anthracite coal formations, said contributions to be applied to the cost of drainage works, pumping plants, and related facilities but subject, however, to the following conditions and limitations:

(a) The amounts authorized to be contributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Commonwealth shall be equally matched by the Commonwealth;

(b) The total amount of contributions by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of this act shall not exceed $8,500,000;

(c) The amounts contributed by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of this act and the equally matched amounts contributed by the Commonwealth shall not be used for operating and maintaining projects constructed pursuant to this act;

(d) The Commonwealth shall have full responsibility for installing, operating, and maintaining projects constructed pursuant to this act, and shall give evidence, satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, that it will enforce effective installation, operation, and maintenance safeguards; and

(e) Projects constructed pursuant to this act shall be so located, operated, and maintained as to provide the maximum conservation of anthracite coal resources and, where possible, to avoid creating inequities among those mines which may be affected by the waters to be controlled thereby.

Sec. 3. The Commonwealth shall furnish to the Secretary of the Interior a statement with respect to the project showing work done, the status of the project, expenditures and amounts obligated, at such times and in such detail as the Secretary of the Interior shall require for the purposes of this act.

Sec. 4. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that there is a failure to expend funds in accordance with the terms and conditions governing the Federal contribution for such approved projects, he shall notify the Commonwealth that further payments will not be made to the Commonwealth from appropriations under this act until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold the payment of any financial contributions to the Commonwealth.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the first day of February of each year for 4 consecutive years, commencing on or before February 1, 1957, a report of the progress and accomplishments of the program provided for by this act.

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

If not the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who desires to do so may extend his remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is a great moment for me and a great moment for the anthracite coal industry of this country, for my State of Pennsylvania, and especially for the northeastern part of that State, and even more particularly for the people of my Congressional District, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of H. R. 7066, the bill introduced by me and reported out last Friday by the great Committee on the Interior of this House. I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of that committee, Mr. Engle, of California, and the distinguished chairman of the mine subcommittee of this Interior Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers]. I am grateful as well to all the members on both sides of the aisle of the subcommittee and the full committee for the full and complete attention and understanding given to this vital legislation. They have performed a service not only to my people, but to the Nation.

The title of this bill is "to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes." This law recognizes that the presence of large volumes of water in anthracite coal formations involves serious wastage of the fuel resources of the Nation and constitutes a menace to health and safety and national security. This bill then provides for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations, to conserve the natural resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and to preserve public and private property.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the provisions of this bill will do much to aid surface support in the anthracite areas. By maintaining present water levels in the mines, by controlling surface drainage and preventing water from entering the mines, by pumping the water from abandoned operations, the hydrostatic pressure against existing barrier pillars will not be increased. The increase in the hydrostatic pressure resulting from increased water in the mines and rising of the water levels would produce unbearable pressures against the barrier pillars, breach and destroy them and, hence, endanger surface support to which the barrier pillars give aid. It is because of the conditions in our mines that I ask today that this bill be considered under suspension of the rules of the House rather than in due course; and I feel certain the House, as it always does, will recognize the great merit in this legislation.

This bill is most important as a means of conserving a valuable, basic natural resource. I would like to emphasize that. The adoption would aid materially in reviving a depressed industry and permit the mining of anthracite reserves vital to the economic future of the Nation; it would also help to minimize danger to the lives of persons employed in the anthracite mines. It is designed to authorize measures for preventing water—and this is the crux of the whole business—from entering and flooding these mines, a project that has been approved by the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce. Unless this legislation is enacted into law, large reserves of anthracite will be inundated and lost to the Nation, and additional fuel oil—and I would like to emphasize this for the benefit of my friends—and additional fuel oil, natural gas, and bituminous coal will be necessary to replace it.

The largest known deposit—and I would like to emphasize this—the largest deposit of anthracite in the world is in 10 counties of northeastern Pennsylvania and is divided into 4 geographical fields, the northern, eastern middle, western middle, and southern.

The anthracite region itself covers approximately 8 percent of the area of the State, and the six major coal-producing counties have a population of approximately 1.1 million people, most of whom depend either directly or indirectly upon the anthracite industry for their livelihood. As very little anthracite is produced elsewhere in the United States, the distress of this one-powerful industry has been heretofore presumed generally to be a State problem rather than a matter of national importance. Nevertheless, the preservation and judicious utilization of all fuel reserves and the welfare of the people are and always will be the Nation's concern.

Anthracite was mined first in 1755, just 200 years ago. By 1880, production was 28 million tons, and 73,000 persons were employed within the industry; and output increased gradually until 1917, when 100 million tons of anthracite was produced, and 180,000 persons were employed. Since then, production has declined so sharply that the annual average for the 10-year period 1921–30 was 77 million tons and for the 10-year period 1941–50, 55 million tons. In 1954, it dropped to an estimated 27.1 million tons and employment to 34,000 persons, decreases of about one-third in production and one-half in personnel since 1952. The payroll for mine employees in 1952 was $228 million; the value of the product, $379.7 million. The loss in wages, continuing over the past 25 years, has severely depressed all business and financial activities of the region and has doubtless lowered the local standard of living.

Five billion tons of anthracite has been mined and marketed frim a relatively small area of northeastern Pennsylvania during the past 150 years, yet the most reliable estimates indicate enough remains to support current production for about 200 years. This vast reserve of fuel is extremely valuable and in any recent year ranged from $270 to over $400 million. As mining is the basic industry in the anthracite region, the abandonment of properties, because of water infiltration, will have a marked deleterious effect upon the people, industries, and local communities depending upon the anthracite industry for a livelihood.

The threat to the economy of the anthracite region posed by the water problem is complicated by another—competition from other fuels. Since the close of World War II, the anthracite industry has lost heavily to oil and natural gas in the residential heating market. Anthracite is primarily a high-grade domestic fuel. The susceptibility of anthracite to competition may be attributed to several factors, but large increases in the cost of removing water from the mines and of producing and transporting anthracite have been responsible for some of the loss. The fundamental factors underlying the industry—the character of anthracite and its geographical location near thickly populated industrial centers requiring heat and power—remain favorable only if the industry can be helped to meet ever-growing competition.

Experience gained in World War II indicates that, should the country become involved in a worldwide conflict, Pennsylvania anthracite would again have to assume a larger part of the fuel load, and I would like to emphasize that. A rapid increase in the output of coal can be accomplished only by a healthy coal industry; therefore, assurance that anthracite reserves will be available and not lost beneath a veritable underground sea is imperative. Further increases in the cost of mining anthracite, additional losses to competitive fuels, and the possibility of losing billions of tons of an extremely valuable natural resource are conditions that darken the future of the anthracite industry.

The drastic decline in anthracite production has been paced by a comparable decrease in railroad revenue from anthracite traffic. Freight-rate increases in the past few years have not offset the effects of reduced traffic. About 67 percent of the anthracite mined in 1952 was shipped to market by rail, and the freight revenue accruing to class I railroads therefrom was $110,239,000. The latest information available from the Interstate Commerce Commission shows that, on the average, about 48.5 percent of railroad gross income is used to pay wages, from which it is calculated that rail transportation of anthracite involved payment of $53.4 million in wages to railroad workers. As anthracite production in 1954 was one-third less than that in 1952 and as anthracite has ranked high as a revenue producer for the railroads, the decline clearly indicates just how severe the impact has been upon the earnings of those railroad employees who live in the anthracite region.

The water problem has long vexed the anthracite industry. Rainfall in the region has altered relatively little over the years, but the quantity of water that enters the mines through natural and manmade breaks in the strata between the surface and the mine workings has increased materially, as indicated by the ratio of tons of water pumped to tons of coal produced underground. The ratio has increased from 8 to 1 in 1920 to 14 to 1 in 1944 and 27 to 1 in 1951. The coal production used in calculating the above ratios included that from water level and other mines from which no water was pumped; thus inclusion of such production shows a lower water load than that actually handled. In 1953 it was estimated that 48 tons of water was pumped to the surface for each ton of anthracite won from deep mines. In solving the water problem the industry does not seek assistance in handling conditions resulting from present operations, but rather in coping with the flooding of properties close to abandoned operations. That is the crux of this whole problem. As I have already said, this encroachment of water, resulting in progressive flooding of mines, is threatening to submerge our irreplaceable anthracite reserves and is depressing the entire economy of the anthracite region.

Past mining practices have allowed surface water to enter present and abandoned mine workings and to accumulate in mines now in operation; it has to be pumped from these workings to the surface or drained through lower-level tunnels. Active mines are thus burdened with infiltration of water from abandoned mines in addition to the water normally found in those active mines. As more mines are abandoned, for whatever cause, the situation becomes cumulatively more serious with regard to both economics and safety.

The structure of the coal measures in the anthracite region facilitates this accumulation of water in the strata, in abandoned mines, and in active workings. The mountains surrounding the anthracite fields are steep, and the coal beds dip from the sides of the hills to the valleys below. All the water that reaches the valleys must—and I would like to emphasize this—flow over the coal measures, and the anthracite fields are traversed by 750 miles of streams and rivers, including the Lackawanna, Susquehanna, Lehigh, and Schuylkill. Rock fissures, cave-ins, cracks in outcrops, and strippings, either on the flood plains of streams or on drainage areas, provide easy ingress for much of the surface water entering the mines.

Heavy rainfall swells the quantity of water that accumulates in abandoned mines, and unless drainage facilities are adequate to handle this excess water, the hydrostatic pressure against the barrier pillars increases. To obtain a clear picture of the mine-water problem and the relation of underground and surface-water pools to that problem, it is necessary to understand the part played by the barrier pillars that separate active, abandoned, or flooded mine workings from each other. A barrier pillar, for our purpose, may be described as a large block of solid coal left unworked, between two mines, for security against an inrush of water. Exclusive of a few barriers pillars in the Eastern Middle field, the system comprises 433 barrier pillars affecting 218 mines. These barrier pillars have a total length of 344 miles and confine 150 underground pools, which in 1952 contained over 106 billion gallons of water.

A survey made to determine the size, position, and physical condition of the barrier pillars established the fact that the stability of many barriers was uncertain. Where a barrier pillar must act as a dam, its failure may result in loss of life—and I cannot emphasize that too strongly—the mine, or both; it would be far better had the barrier pillar never existed to give a false sense of security. Present day problems would not be so involved if the need and value of barrier pillars had been realized 75 years ago, when mining at considerable depth below water level was getting underway. Before 1891, when establishment of natural barriers was made compulsory by Pennsylvania State law, openings were driven into adjacent mines and properties, and excavations had been made too close to property lines before any attempt was made to establish barrier pillars. Obviously, then, all that could be done was to make the best of what existed, and these conditions have come to plague the industry. Reinforcement of existing natural barrier pillars and/or construction of artificial barriers are both physically and financially impracticable. Investigation has revealed that damage to many barriers pillars may be anticipated. Few can be depended upon to act as dams, because they are too small, are partly removed, may be damaged by subsidence, or are punctured; encroachments also render their stability uncertain. Many barriers between underground pools and active workings are not strong enough to withstand additional hydrostatic pressure beyond a definite limit; consequently, either costly standby pumping facilities must be maintained to handle the excess inflow induced by heavy rainfall or the active mines will be forced to close when workmen's lives are jeopardized. Because of the intimate interrelationship of adjoining mines, abandonment of a mine and suspension of pumping in that mine do not reduce pumping in a particular basin, but usually mean that adjoining mines must prepare to handle—and this is very important—more water seeping through or over barrier pillars or to maintain the water in the abandoned mine at such an altitude that seepage does not occur. For example, in order to safely conduct operations in three large mines in the northern anthracite field a number of years ago, it was necessary for three operating companies to install pumping equipment to relieve the hydrostatic pressure against the barrier pillars separating an abandoned mine from the three active mines. The cost of pumping and the related facilitics was borne by the three operating companies. This example shows how operating mines gradually assume the pumping loads of all abandoned mines in their basin. With ordinary mine facilities, this situation is rapidly approaching, and in some districts has approached, a physical and financial impossibility on the active mines. Unfortunately, such methods can only result in higher pumping costs for the remaining mines, with little hope of relief, and inundation of deeper reserves in each field must be the ultimate effect. Once mines are flooded, the hope of reopening them becomes remote if the enormous volumes of water in them must be pumped to the surface. It is going to be a very, very costly operation.

Anthracite companies have done much to prevent the infiltration of water into underground workings, but because of the magnitude of the mine-water problem and the vast expense of its solution, handling by the industry, unaided, is beyond its financial ability. The most modern pumping equipment has been employed, and in 1 year over 200 billion gallons of water—this is from many operating companies at the present time—has been removed from the mines. In view of the increasing costs of pumping water from the mines—sometimes against heads of 1,200 feet—considerable effort has been devoted to preventing the inflow of surface water. Large sums have been spent in constructing flumes and ditches to conduct water to watercourses, thereby circumventing to some extent flow into outcrops, rock fissures, cave-ins, and other mine openings. Some of these flumes and ditches are paved where they cross broken ground, some are made of wood, some of steel, and some of woodstave pipe. In spite of the many protective flumes and ditches used to prevent inundation of mine workings, large volumes of water still flow into active workings by way of abandoned mines, simply because many such properties do not maintain protective flumes and ditches, and this maintenance is too costly for the contiguous mine owners.

The importance of diverting surface water to eliminate pumping is clearly shown in the following example of the efficient use of a flume in the Western Middle Field. During the first 6 months of a year before this flume was built, 3,624 million gallons of water was pumped at the shafts involved; the rainfall during this period was 15.71 inches. During the first 6 months of the next year, after the flume was erected, 3,202 million gallons was pumped, and the rainfall was 19.91 inches. This shows a pumping decrease of 11.6 percent, while the rainfall during the comparable period increased 26.7 percent.

The answer to the question "How can the problem be solved?" is of paramount interest to the industry and to the Nation, especially in an emergency; it is intended to arrest the progressive destruction of mine operations, thereby saving and extending the anthracite resources, on which the community life of the anthracite region depends. Bureau of Mines studies of the situation and the conditions involved extend over the past 15 years; recommendations have been made for alleviating them, and a few isolated projects have proved them practicable.

In recognition of the magnitude of the problem, the 1953 session of the general assembly of Pennsylvania appropriated $1.5 million—I think that figure may be just a little low—for the biennium ending May 31, 1955, to be used by the State Department of Mines "for the sealing and dewatering of, and extinguishment of fires in, abandoned coal mines." Seven deep-well pumps purchased by the State have been installed at abandoned mines and are being maintained by the coal companies; and some of the money has been spent to fill and grade stripping excavations, preventing the flow of surface water into underground operations. These funds have now been spent.

The Anthracite Mine Drainage Study Commission appointed by former Governor Fine, of Pennsylvania, has recommended to the Governor a mine rehabilitation program involving a total expenditure of $17 million by the State, and employment of 2,634 men. This commission, planned to be continued indefinitely, is composed of the secretary of the State Department of Mines, three prominent representatives of the anthracite-producing companies, and the presidents of the three anthracite districts of the United Mine Workers of America. Relevant data accumulated by the Bureau of Mines were used in determining the nature of the work to be accomplished through this program, including the construction of flumes and earthen ditches, the backfilling of stripping pits, improvement of stream beds, and installation of strategically located pumping facilities. Estimated expenditures for surface construction are $7,320,525, for underground work $3,522,915, and for pumping equipment and installation $6,074,375. It is estimated that the completed project will reduce the present pumping load 20 to 25 percent, thus ameliorating, to a considerable degree, the anthracite industry's problem of survival. The reduction in pumping costs would help to provide new life for the industry, so that it could again compete vigorously for its share of the peacetime fuel market and also be in a position to produce to the utmost in time of national emergency.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 7066, known as the mine drainage bill.

Early in the session I introduced H. R. 77, together with three other of my colleagues from the anthracite area. These bills are almost identical with H. R. 7066 and had the same purpose.

A reading of these various bills might lead one to believe that they were concerned only with a condition that existed in one locality and that the overall good of the country was not involved. One of the very first questions that was raised by the subcommittee of the Interior was whether or not this measure was of national scope. The answer of the proponents of the measures was that the question of mine drainage affected the public security and therefore was national in character.

We know from experience that once a mine is closed down because of flooded conditions it takes approximately 5 years of constant labor to restore that mine to production. Taking this period of time into consideration think what might happen to our national security in time of emergency, when perhaps our supply of fuel might be endangered by enemy action.

We realize how much our Navy depends on oil for its supply of fuel and how much of this supply is imported into this country especially in time of war. We are also well aware of the fact that Russia has built up a great fleet of submarines which could cut our supply lines almost at will, against these possibilities we must build up our coal supplies.

In addition to being a security measure this legislation will assist in the conservation of a great natural resourse.

Those of us who have lived all our lives in the anthracite sections of Pennsylvania have been viewing with great alarm the economic crisis that has struck that area and we know that the passage of this measure would provide a "shot in the arm" for this industry. This is made more pronounced by the fact that the Legislature of Pennsylvania has just passed similar legislation to match the funds that the Federal Government is being asked to provide in H. R. 7066.

I sincerely urge the passage of this measure.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress I have been endeavoring to secure some assistance for one of the Nation's greatest industries and natural resources—the anthracite industry. In 1942 I introduced legislation with regard to a mine drainage survey being conducted, but this was not found necessary and plans proceeded to do this work through the Bureau of Mines.

Accordingly, in September 1944, the Bureau of Mines started an engineering survey of mine drainage in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania and this survey was just completed on June 30 past. The Federal Government expended $1,024,565 for the survey, and some of its recommendations are among those included before the House today, and embodied in a bill which I introduced at the end of the last session, and which I reintroduced on the opening day of the current session.

My bill is H. R. 38 and with amendments I had already discussed with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is essentially the same as the bill H. R. 7066 now before the House. Similar bipartisan bills have been introduced by Congressmen CARRIGG, FLOOD, and WALTER, and Senators MARTIN and DUFF; also one by Congressman SAYLOR.

This legislation has been recommended by President Eisenhower, the Budget Bureau, the Department of the Interior, and our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This is not only a local economic problem, but one in which the entire health, safety and security of the Nation is involved, and I sincerely ask that the House accept the bill now before us.

This bill is important as a vital conservation measure; its enactment into law would contribute greatly to the preservation of an industry and a natural resource essential to the economy of the Nation. It is designed to prevent surface water from entering and flooding anthracite mines, and embodies a Federal-aid program which has the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce. The expenditure of the money authorized, trivial when compared with the vast natural resources it will save, is contingent upon the State of Pennsylvania contributing an equal sum thereto.

The Pennsylvania anthracite-mining region is the only one in the world of major magnitude. As the deposits of anthracite in the United States are limited virtually to Pennsylvania, the difficulties of this industry have been commonly considered a State rather than a national problem. However, there is also national interest in the conservation and wise utilization of all fuel resources, in the control of interstate waterways, and in the welfare of the people. The population of the anthracite region, about 1.25 million people, most of whom are dependent directly or indirectly upon the anthracite industry for their livelihood, exceeds the population of each of 14 States and the District of Columbia.

The first anthracite was mined in the year 1755, and in 1768–69 anthracite mined from a quarry or stripping in the Wilkes-Barre region was transported down the Susquehanna River for delivery to Carlisle, where it was used in the forges at the arsenal to make weapons for the Revolutionary War. An increase in production ensued until the peak was reached in 1917; however, demand has been decreasing gradually and the industry and the region have been in a depressed condition for 25 years. Although anthracite mining is still a major producer of mineral wealth in the United States, it has shrunk greatly in stature from a colossus of industry that during World War I employed 180,000 men and produced 100 million tons of anthracite a year to one that during 1952 employed but 65,923 men and produced 40,582,558 tons. The payroll for these employees in 1952 was approximately $228 million—more than the payroll for the entire metal-mining industry throughout the United States for that year—and the anthracite had a value of $379,714,071. Last year, production dropped to an estimated 27.1 million tons and employment to about 34,000 men, the lowest in both categories since 1879. As anthracite is sold and used for heating homes and generating industrial power throughout the northeastern part of the United States and Canada, the anthracite industry thus provides additional substantial revenue to railroads, truckers, and retailers in a great number of localities. The freight revenue from transporting anthracite from mines, except by truck, to market in 1952 is estimated to be $110,239,000.

The anthracite region covers about 3,508 square miles in northeastern Pennsylvania, 8 percent of the area of the State. It is in the heart of the richest and most densely populated area in the United States. Every important industry on the north Atlantic coast is within 48-hour freight service of the area. Seventy million people reside within a radius of 500 miles from the region, and 130,000 manufacturing plants employ 8 million factory workers who receive more than 60 percent of the industrial payroll of America.

Early mining took only the best, thickest, and most accessible anthracite beds, and little thought was given to conserving reserves for the future. The cause or blame for the presence of enormous volumes of water entering the mines is attributable to both nature and man. The geologic structure of the anthracite measures is typically basin and range; the beds dip from the mountainsides to the valleys below, thus facilitating the accumulation of water. All drainage in the valleys must flow over the coal measures, and the anthracite fields are traversed by 750 miles of rivers and streams in two drainage basins—the Susquehanna River and the Delaware River—straddled by the anthracite measures. These rivers and streams normally lose water through their beds, and mining operations near or under the stream beds disturb natural conditions, adversely affecting original drainage facilities, and increasing seepage into the mines.

Mine water originates as rainfall. The volume of water entering mine workings during and after any period of rainfall varies greatly in adjoining basins, and even in adjoining mines, because of the differences in condition of the strata as affected by the progress of extraction of the anthracite, particularly that from the uppermost beds. The ratio between runoff and infiltration also varies for each period of rainfall because of variables in the rate of rainfall, duration of storms, nature of the terrain, and other factors. Pumping records maintained in each of the 4 anthracite fields show that 30 to 65 percent of a volume equal to total annual rainfall during the 8-year period 1944–51 entered the mines either through surface seepage or barrier-pillar seepage. In 1 year, more than 200 billion gallons of water was removed from the mines, a volume of water the size of Lake Tahoe in California and Nevada, or 3 times the size of Lake Wallenpaupack near Scranton, Pa. United States Bureau of Mines records reveal that during the year 1944 there was 14.1 tons of water pumped for each ton of coal mined and the comparable figure for the year 1951 was 27.1 tons. The coal production used in arriving at the above quantities of water pumped included production from both water-level and other mines from which no water was pumped, and the inclusion of such production reflects a lower water load than was actually handled. In the year 1953, it was estimated that 48 tons of water was pumped to the surface for each ton of anthracite gained from the deep mines. Mining men have long realized that the chief product of anthracite mines is not anthracite, but water—excess and unwanted water that must be removed from the mines at ever-increasing cost.

One hundred six billion gallons of water was impounded at the end of 1952 in 150 pools in underground mine workings that are not tributary to present drainage systems. Often, pools of water are in abandoned mines because no one is financially interested in removing them. The water has accumulated because pumping was stopped. The operator of the adjoining active property takes just enough action to protect his own property and the lives of his workmen. If this active mine, in turn, ceases operation for any reason whatsoever, the same procedure is followed, resulting in enlargement of the pool and possibly a rise in the altitude of the surface of the water. In some mines, pools of water have been formed purposely to create a stabilizing effect and reduce the hydrostatic pressure exerted on the barrier pillars by the water in the abandoned mines.

Factual data procured in 1948 show 141 water pools in abandoned stripping excavations, new pools being formed, and old pools being filled or drained by active stripping operations. These pools contained 2.3 billion gallons of water and affected the safe operation of some underground mines, in addition to making future underground operations hazardous.

The principal function of a barrier pillar in anthracite mining operations is to act as a dam to prevent water that accumulates in a mine from suddenly breaking into an adjacent mine or into adjacent mine workings and causing loss of life, property, or both. The barrier-pillar system in the anthracite region, except for a few pillars in one district, consists of 433 barrier pillars, affecting 218 mines, totaling 344 miles in length, and confining the 150 underground pools mentioned previously. Prior to 1891, when establishment of natural barriers was made compulsory, openings were driven into adjoining properties and mines, thus making connections which have come to plague the industry in that they permit the diversion of water from one mine to another. It is impossible, from economic and practical standpoints, to construct artificial barriers to prevent the free flow of water from abandoned mines into active mines, where it must be handled by the operator in order to continue mining. This increasing burden has greatly affected the economics of the industry since 1930, when large-scale abandonment of mines and properties began.

The acidity of anthracite mine water is such that it is destructive eventually to any base metal or alloy that has been used to date. So long as the mines continue to operate, the industry and the State will be confronted with the matter of mine drainage, whether it will continue to enter and pollute the streams as acid mine water as it does at present, or whether a substantial part of the rainfall will be diverted from the mines and directly into the streams.

The position of the United States in world affairs depends, to a large degree, on her success in maintaining supplies of minerals that are essential to her industrial well-being. The industrial significance of coal is that it is the primary requisite for making steel, and the distribution of coal reserves will continue to be the principal factor determining the industrial pattern of the world of tomorrow. The significance of conserving the anthracite reserves of Pennsylvania for the Nation is of paramount importance, and their judicious conservation is a responsibility of government. As of January 1952, recoverable reserves of anthracite were 15.2 billion tons. A prime objective of this legislation is to conserve this valuable natural resource so that the reserves menaced by accumulation of water will not be lost to present and future generations.

While the anthracite industry is beset with many other problems, arising chiefly out of the competition from fuel oil and natural gas, the most threatening single difficulty that might bring the mining of anthracite to an end is the mine-water problem. The industry, collectively or by individual companies, is neither physically nor financially able to execute a plan for its own salvation. Therefore, it is the responsibility first of the Federal Government to make the necessary funds available and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to provide funds and the initiative for further prevention of water from entering the active mines, either through surface construction and/or the installation of adequate pumping facilities at strategic locations. It is essential to protect the public interest and permit the investment in the anthracite industry to have a chance in peacetime to remain long enough to exist in wartime.

Recognizing this situation and the economic condition of the industry, the 1953 session of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania appropriated $1½ million, for the biennium ending May 31, 1955, to be used by the State Department of Mines "for the sealing and dewatering of, and extinguishment of fires, in abandoned coal mines." Pumps that have been installed at abandoned mines are being maintained by the coal companies. Some of these funds, together with other moneys paid by the companies in accordance with the State "strip pit" law, have been used to fill stripping excavations, thereby preventing the flow of surface water into underground operations. These funds have been exhausted. An Anthracite Mine Drainage Study Commission appointed by ex-Governor Fine, of Pennsylvania, has recommended to the Governor a mine rehabilitation program involving a total expenditure of $17 million by the State and employment of 2,634 men.

The steady abandonment of mines over the past 25 years has aggravated the water-flooding problem for mines remaining in operation to the critical point where anthracite in a usable state for future generations is now seriously threatened. In light of this critical condition, constituting a state of emergency, the proposed Federal aid would help provide a continuing source of supply for anthracite users, fuel insurance during national emergencies, availability to national economic expansion as technology develops new uses, insurance against ultimate depletion of domestic oil and gas resources, and continued employment of miners.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RELATING TO AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 928) to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control, as amended.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation, from air pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States and local governments in controlling air pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and develop methods of abating such pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and local governments air pollution control agencies and other public or private agencies and institutions in the formulation and execution of their air pollution abatement research programs. To this end, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) shall have the authority relating to air pollution control vested in them respectively by this act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized, after careful investigation and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State and local government air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies and institutions, and with the industries involved, to prepare or recommend research programs for devising and developing methods for eliminating or reducing air pollution. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies or institutions.

(b) The Surgeon General may (1) encourage cooperative activities by State and local governments for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; (2) collect and disseminate information relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; (3) conduct in the Public Health Service, and support and aid the conduct by State and local government air pollution control agencies, and other public and private agencies and institutions of, technical research to devise and develop methods of preventing and abating air pollution; and (4) make available to State and local government air pollution control agencies, other public and private agencies and institutions, and industries, the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof.

SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State or local government air pollution control agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting such State or local government air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish from time to time reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this act as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of air pollution.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health Education, and Welfare for each of the 5 fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed $5 million to enable it to carry out its functions under this act and, in furtherance of the policy declared in the first section of this act, to (1) make grants-in-aid to State and local government air pollution control agencies, and other public and private agencies and institutions, and to individuals, for research, training, and demonstration projects, and (2) enter into contracts with public and private agencies and institutions and individuals for research, training, and demonstration projects. Such grants-in-aid and contracts may be made without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Sums appropriated for such grants-in-aid and contracts shall remain available until expended, and shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 6. When used in this act—

(a) The term "State air pollution control agency" means the State health authority, except that in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency other than the State health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other State agency;

(b) The term "local government air pollution control agency" means a city, county, or other local government health authority, except that in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is a single agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other other agency; and

(c) The term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. Nothing contained in this act shall limit the authority of any department or agency of the United States to conduct or make grants-in-aid or contracts for research and experiments relating to air pollution under the authority of any other law.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for quite some time the Congress has been aware of the dangers to the public health, to agriculture, and livestock, to property values, and air and ground navigation of what we know broadly as air pollution.

A great deal of technical research is necessary in order to be able to cope with a problem that is as complex as this one is. The bill that is reported today for consideration is a bill passed by the other body with an amendment adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without any opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the bill first of all recognizes that the control of air pollution primarily is a State responsibility, is a function of State and local governments. The committee, however, having studied this matter, not only during the current session of Congress but in previous sessions of Congress, feels also that the Federal Government has a stake in this question, that it may well conduct research, provide technical services and some financial aid to agencies and individuals concerned with the problem of air pollution.

The pending bill as amended, would do simply this, Mr. Speaker. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting through the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local governmental agencies and with other public and private agencies or institutions, to prepare, recommend, and carry out a program in the study of air pollution. It authorizes an appropriation of $5 million for each of 5 consecutive years.

It was felt by the committee, on the basis of studies our committee has made in the past, that this is a program that cannot be completed quickly. It is one that will require a rather considerable period of time. This $5 million appropriation may be allotted by the Surgeon General to public or private institutions or foundations or agencies of Government for the purpose of doing research in this field of air pollution under regulations that shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other Government agencies, of course, are interested in this problem. The Weather Bureau in recent months has shown a great deal of interest in the question of air pollution. The Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Mines and Mining, the Atomic Energy Commission, all of these agencies have devoted some study to this complex subject within recent months.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill authorizes private industry to participate in this problem, and of course it is true that private industry has spent a great deal of time and money in the investigation in this field. They are one of the elements that are to be considered in this study.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is quite correct. I was coming to that just a little later in explaining the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill, because the Senate bill did not provide for industrial organizations that are interested in the problem and many of them are greatly interested in doing something about the growing problem. The House bill does provide that they may be included. However, it was felt, Mr. Speaker, that in order to have a coordinated program there should be one directing agency of the Government, and it was felt by the committee that the Public Health Service should be that directing agency.

It may take all of the 5-year period before any recommendations are made generally to the public and to industry and to other governmental agencies. The problem is a very complex and vast one. It should not be attempted without a coordinated effort by many different agencies of both the Federal and the State Governments and private agencies and institutions who may have an interest in the subject.

I should explain briefly the changes from the Senate bill. The Senate bill limited the Public Health Service to dealing with educational institutions. The House bill lifted that limitation and provided in addition that grants may be made and technical help given to private institutions and agencies or to industrial groups, and many of them face a real problem in this respect.

The bill was amended by the House committee to change the appropriation from $3 million a year over a 5-year period to $5 million a year over a 5-year period, believing that the problem was of sufficient importance to justify this additional amount.

The amendment, added by the House, which struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, also eliminated a special advisory commission that had been set up in the other bill. The reason for that, as the House committee saw it, was that we believe that an overall coordination of Federal effort in the question of control of air pollution can best be achieved by an interdepartmental committee of the agencies that are dealing with this problem, that already have given it some study, and that, therefore, it is better to eliminate the advisory board as it was contained in the bill passed by the other body and simply rely upon an interdepartmental committee or board in making these plans.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I commend my distinguished colleague from Tennessee and my friend on the fine statement he has made on this bill, and for bringing this important bill before the House. It certainly is a very vital subject, one in which we are vitally interested in some areas of Tennessee, particularly in the chemical industry area of our State. I join in the gentleman's remarks, and certainly hope this bill will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my colleague. I am aware of some difficulties in connection with at least two chemical plants which are located in the gentleman's district. One of these companies operates a plant in my own district. That is true throughout the United States. It is not a local problem, it is a national problem. We feel this modest appropriation of $5 million over a period of 5 years will help to coordinate this study and to make it really effective in meeting the problem of air pollution.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Five million dollars is certainly a nominal sum when we think of the benefits that may come in increased production in agriculture and livestock, which is now being contaminated in certain areas.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have a chance to support this bill to provide for research on the causes, hazards, and control of air pollution and to bring to Members of this body some information about the experience of one congressional district with the growing problem of air pollution.

One-half of the district which I represent is Staten Island, the most southerly county in the State of New York and also 1 of the 5 counties which constitute the city of New York. Although the whole island is in the city of New York, we do have nurseries, vegetable farms, and quite a few other uses of land for agriculture by people who depend on that for their living.

To the west, across a narrow strip of water is the State of New Jersey. On both sides of that strip of water are industrial plants. When the wind is from the northwest, the smoke and all that is in that smoke, comes over Staten Island. When the wind blows from the east the effects are felt in the opposite direction. The stock of nurserymen has been damaged and in many cases the entire crop of the people who grow flowers for the market has been destroyed. Vegetable growers have often lost much of their crops overnight.

It is very difficult to find out what chemicals cause this damage. Moisture affects it. The wind direction and velocity affect it. Some of the pollutants come from industrial plants and some from the exhausts of automobiles, busses, trailer trucks—and some from home oil burners and incinerators, and so on. We have been working on this problem for more than 20 years without finding the answer.

Three years ago the House passed a bill for research of this kind. It failed to get unanimous consent in the other body and did not pass there. I introduced a similar bill in 1953 and a revised bill drawn with the help of the Public Health Service in the last session of Congress. In this session of the Congress I have introduced a bill very much like the one that has now come out of the committee. Companion bills were introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAY. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am a resident of Jersey City, and our studies show that air pollution generally comes from the State of New York.

Mr. RAY. All I am trying to show is that it is an interstate problem.

Mr. TUMULTY. That is quite agreeable, but suppose you concede its origin.

Mr. RAY. I can make that concession with respect to the north, but further south the situation is different.

Mr. TUMULTY. Any way you want, but the origin still remains the same.

Mr. RAY. The States of New York and New Jersey have just organized an interstate commission and authorized it to make a preliminary study in the field. There are local air-pollution boards in New York and in cities on the Jersey shore. But they cannot deal with the whole problem, because interstate features are involved. The States cannot cross State lines, and the cities cannot go outside their own jurisdiction.

Beyond that it is important to have coordination of the work that is being done all over the country. There are many places where research on air pollution is underway. Industry has spent several hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to find the causes and the possible controls of air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass by a large majority.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I commend the gentleman on his interest in this subject. I recall when the distinguished gentleman first came to Congress he spoke to me because of the fact I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he told me of his great interest in the problem as it affects his district, the State of New York, and the State of New Jersey, which is adjacent to his district. I do know the gentleman has spent a great deal of his personal time in investigating the problem in his district, as it affects his district. I do know that the gentleman has spent a great deal of time in research and in efforts to get legislative action on this bill. I want to compliment the gentleman upon his real and sincere interest in this problem.

Mr. RAY. I thank you, sir.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill, S. 928.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues in support of this important legislation.

The 21st District of Ohio, which I represent, is situated principally on the east side of Cleveland, and my entire district is subject to the tremendous pollution of air which emanates from the industrial Cuyahoga River Valley in the heart of Cleveland. This contamination of air is general throughout the entire eastern portion of the city and the downtown area. The damage to public health and property is beyond estimation.

Several years ago, in 1950, the Southeast Cleveland Citizens Committee on Air Pollution brought Dr. Clarence A. Mills to the city to make a study as to the deterrent effects of industrial contamination of the air on the east side of Cleveland. Dr. Mills was then on the staff of the School of Experimental Medicine of the University of Cincinnati. Dr. Mills spent many weeks in Cleveland and from a comprehensive study he made on the vital statistics of cancer deaths resulting from lung cancer, he concluded that in the residential areas close to the center of the city there were 240 more deaths per year resulting from lung cancer than there were in the cleaner sections of the city. His information was authoritative and was derived from a careful study of the death records.

At that time, as at present, the city of Cleveland was endeavoring to enforce an air pollution code which was directed toward the reduction of fly ash and soot fall in the Cleveland area. The code, however, was ineffective as against the industrial purveyors of fumes, and steps are now being taken in Cleveland to control the pollution of air by noxious and harmful fumes which emanate from the industries of the Cleveland area.

The problem of air pollution control is beyond the customary power of city governments. The pollution is difficult to isolate as to source where there are many industries contributing to the pollution. In addition, there are vast conflicts of judgment concerning the cause, abatement, and control of smoke and fumes. The several cities are generally operating independent of each other and the programs of the cities must be coordinated and accelerated. The technical assistance and counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would go a long way toward facing this real problem in the heavy industrialized cities of our country.

It is my hope that the laboratories of the Federal Government, the testing techniques, and the weather experiences will be effectively consolidated to bring about a successful attack against the hazards of air pollution. It is my sincere hope that my city of Cleveland may be one of the first project areas for study.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a measure of very vital importance not only to every large city but to the people living within a radius of 10 or 20 miles of those cities.

Smoke abatement has generally been well brought under control, but in recent years industrial growth has loaded the air in or near cities with fumes of not only annoying but actually injurious intensity.

All urban communities are affected. Because Chicago, the windy city, has lots of wind, air pollution is less serious there.

Los Angeles, with less wind has had a disproportionate notoriety in this regard.

Most of us agree that air pollution enforcement is a matter for local authorities. But this is a nationwide problem. This bill as the committee presents it, provides for national coordination and cooperation under the direction of the Surgeon General and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this way all of the scientific studies and research of all the cities, especially Los Angeles, can be pooled and built upon for the good of all.

The money authorization, $5 million, is nominal and I urge the immediate passage of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937, AND THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4744) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective with respect to annuities accruing in months following the month of enactment hereof, section 2 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "than $40" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", with respect to any month, than an amount equal to the maximum amount which could be paid to anyone, with respect to such month, as a wife's insurance benefit under section 202 (b) of the Social Security Act as amended from time to time."

Sec. 2. Effective with respect to annuities accruing in months following the month of enactment hereof, section 5 (g) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

Sec. 3. Effective as of January 1, 1955, section 5 (l) (9) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the language between "(ii)" and "(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "if such compensation for any calendar year before 1955 is less than $3,600 or for any calendar year after 1954 is less than $4,200 and the average monthly remuneration computed on compensation alone is less than $350 and the employee has earned in such calendar year 'wages' as defined in paragraph (6) hereof, such wages, in an amount not to exceed the difference between the compensation for such year and $3,600 before years 1955 and $4,200 for years after 1954, by."

Sec. 4. Effective as of the dates of their original enactment, section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and section 2 (e) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, are each amended by striking out "No" and inserting in lieu thereof "Nothwithstanding any other law of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, no."

Sec. 5. Section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following sentence: "All positions to which such individuals are appointed shall be in and under the competitive civil service and shall not be removed or excepted therefrom."

Sec. 6. The second paragraph of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by inserting immediately before the first colon therein the following: ": *Provided,* That all positions to which such persons are appointed shall be in and under the competitive civil service and shall not be removed or excepted therefrom."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill H. R. 4744 would amend the Railroad Retirement Act in 3 major respects, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act in 1 major respect. Everyone who is familiar with the problem is in thorough accord with these amendments.

There have been some 50 bills introduced in this Congress proposing to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. Many Members of Congress have expressed their interest in the various proposals which they have brought to the attention of our committee and the Congress. It was the thought of the committee that each of these bills introduced by Members of Congress were meritorius, particularly from the viewpoint as expressed by the sponsor of the bill; but since they interposed so many problems and since they would have far-reaching effect on the Railroad Retirement Act, it was considered best to consider these amendments separately at the earliest possible opportunity.

This bill now under consideration is sponsored by all the standard railroad brotherhoods, representing approximately 1,250,000 active railroad employees, which are virtually all railroad employees in the United States.

On page 4 of the report you will find the organizations affiliated with the Railway Labor Executives' Association and also other organizations of the railroad brotherhoods joining together in sponsoring this legislation.

The railroad industry itself did not oppose this bill. So long as no amendments of substance were made to the provisions of this bill, there was no opposition from the industry itself.

I might say, in fairness to some, particularly Mr. Thomas Stack and his pension forum, that he was not altogether satisfied. In fact, he was not at all happy with this bill because it did not go further and include certain provisions to amend the Railroad Retirement Act which his forum desired. There are sponsors of certain other bills who are for this bill, but they too felt that the amendments should go further and include other matters which are not included in this bill. However, in view of the unanimity of agreement of everyone concerned with these particular provisions, the committee limited its consideration to H. R. 4744 with the assurance that as soon as the committee could get to it—and it probably will be after the next session starts, when the sixth actuarial valuation report of the Railroad Retirement Board will be available—the other proposals to amend the Railroad Retirement Act will be given a hearing and, therefore, they will be considered at that time.

This bill is a very simple one. It contains three major provisions. In the first place, it increases the maximum amount of benefits which a spouse may receive.

You will recall that the Retirement Act amendments of 1951 contained a provision limiting the spouse's annuity to not more than one-half of the amount received by the retired railroad employee, not to exceed $40. You remember at that time there was a provision for reinsurance of the railroad retirement system with the social security system. At that time, the Social Security Act contained a provision for a spouse's benefit, equal to half of the primary insurance amount, but not exceeding $40 a month. Since then the Social Security Act has increased the spouse's benefit twice. Consequently, under the integration feature, Social Security is crediting to the Railroad Retirement account for spouses' benefits an amount which exceeds by an average of $10.50 a month, the $40 maximum which is payable to the spouse under the present Railroad Retirement Act.

At the present time 106,000 spouses are receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. Some 82,000 of those are receiving the maximum benefit of $40 a month. Under the provisions of the bill, these spouses will be eligible for an immediate increase, averaging $10.50 a month. In 1956, there will be another increase of between $1.50 to $2 a month, making the maximum spouse's annuity of $54.30. In other words, at the present time, on the average, $10.50 per month per spouse is being credited to the railroad retirement account from the social security account for the purpose of paying a spouse's benefit, but because of the $40 limitation in the Railroad Retirement Act, the spouse cannot receive more than this amount.

We believe that if the railroad retirement account is going to be credited with this money from the social security fund, then the spouse is entitled to receive it. So that is what section 1 of this bill will do. It will raise the maximum spouse's benefit to the maximum level that is payable under the Social Security Act.

Section 2 repeals the dual benefit restriction on a widow's annuity. You will recall in the last Congress, the bill proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], repealed the dual benefit provision insofar as the retired railroad employee was concerned. H. R. 4744 extends the same consideration to the widows.

The third main feature of this bill involves the Railroad Retirement Board personnel. Many of you received last fall communications with respect to the proposed action of the Railroad Retirement Board and the Civil Service Commission of placing certain employees under so-called schedule C under the Civil Service rules. Strong objections were made to the proposal and finally the request was withdrawn. The bill provides language which would give assurances that such action could not be taken in the future.

Then there are some technical provisions. One technical provision of the bill changes the method of calculating the "average monthly remuneration" in certain cases. Another provision restores and clarifies the exemptions from taxation, attachment, and so forth, of railroad retirement and unemployment insurance benefits.

That is just about what this bill before us would do. I believe, Mr. Speaker, you will find almost anyone who is familiar with the problem, will be in thorough accord with this bill which does equity and justice and should be adopted and passed by this Congress.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I notice on page 13 of the report the statement that the enactment of this legislation will increase the deficit in the account to approximately 1.4 percent of payroll; and dollarwise it would be increased from $51 million a year to approximately $76 million a year on a level-cost basis.

Does the gentleman have an opinion and will he assure the House that the integrity of the fund will not be jeopardized by the legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will turn to page 4 of the report, paragraph 5, he will see a statement with reference to the cost of benefits provided in the reported bill. It is thought by those who know something about actuarial problems that the fund is now actuarially unsound; that is, on a level-cost basis. Many of us who are not actuaries, but who are familiar with the practical and realistic facts of life do not believe that the fund is in jeopardy. We think it is sound. The benefits provided for in the bill would cost about $26 million a year. It would increase the present indicated deficit of $51 million a year to about $76 million, in the long run. That is the estimate of actuaries.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply want to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina what the gentleman from Arkansas has been saying. On page 13 of the report the last paragraph reads as follows:

> Your committee believes that the cost of H. R. 4744 as reported will not jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account.

That is included in the report.

Mr. HARRIS. We do not believe it will be jeopardized at all. Neither did any of those who came in during the course of the hearings and testified on this bill believe it will be in jeopardy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the present law I understand that $40 a month is the maximum amount a spouse can receive under the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. SHORT. Under the proposed legislation it will be increased for the remainder of the year at the rate of $51.80 a month?

Mr. HARRIS. It will be increased by $11.80.

Mr. SHORT. Making a total of $51.80.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. SHORT. In 1956, next year, it will be further increased to $54.38 and if the social security law and the benefits under it are increased that might be further increased following 1956?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true, and the bill so provides.

Mr. SHORT. Let me congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas and all members of his committee who have gone into this matter so thoroughly and diligently. I am glad to read such an intelligent, comprehensive, and clear report as the committee has submitted to us and I want to compliment the committee particularly on sections 1 and 2 of the bill providing for an increase in the maximum spouse's annuity, and the repeal of the dual benefit restrictions. I think this will correct a great inequity. There are many railroad people in my district who need and deserve the benefits of this legislation. I am strongly in favor of it for after all it is their own money.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman and I commend to the membership of the House this report. If they will get a copy of it it will help to answer many communications the Members will receive.

Mr. SHORT. It is one of the finest and clearest reports I have read in a long time.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not so much in any dispute with the great majority of the committee as to the wisdom of most provisions of this bill, because I share their convictions. My concern is confined almost exclusively to sections 5 and 6. The gentleman from Arkansas the chairman of the subcommittee, has referred to that briefly.

You will find in the report from the Bureau of the Budget, the United States Civil Service, and the majority of the Railroad Retirement Board have definite and flatfooted objections to these two sections. In my judgment they have no place in this bill. This bill primarily deals with benefits to the employees or their spouses or people they left behind, and very probably seeks to cure some inequities that have crept into the law as the result of amendments in recent years. However, these two sections deal entirely with another matter. It seems to me it is wholly illogical and irrelevant to place them within the scope of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, also, that it is quite unwise to present it under this procedure where there is but 20 minutes on a side and where particularly no amendment whatsoever, of one word, can be submitted by any Member to the House for its consideration. In other words, it is a question of take it or leave it, and in this event, perhaps the reasons for taking it outweigh the reasons for not taking it.

However, I want to make one point particularly clear.

The impression seems to be prevalent that the so-called civil-service protection amendment in H. R. 4744 and similar bills would restore to the civil service substantial numbers of jobs which have been removed by action of the present administration.

This impression is not correct.

One schedule C position has been approved—that of confidential administrative assistant to the Chairman of the Board. In addition, for many years there have been on schedule A—which covers positions not filled by competitive examination—the two members of the Actuarial Advisory Committee selected by the Board. Competition on these jobs is not practicable, since one is chosen from recommendations made by representatives of labor and the other is chosen from recommendations by the carriers. The third member is appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Finally, according to the Civil Service Commission, there is also on schedule A a small but not numerically limited number of special claims agents who must have such special combinations of training, experience, and geographical location—for example on Indian reservations—that competition for appointment would be impracticable.

It should be added that because of the prohibition against the Civil Service Commission conducting examinations for attorneys, which has been on the statute books for many years, attorney positions also are perforce carried in schedule A. It is understood, however, that the Board has established standards for its attorney positions and they are recruited in accordance with those standards.

The Civil Service Commission believes that the merit system in the Railroad Retirement Board has been and will continue to be satisfactorily protected under existing legislation and that only special needs have been met by the use of schedules A, B, and C. Certainly, it is proper for railroad employees and railroad management to have a voice in selecting the members of the Actuarial Advisory Board. There has never been any controversy about the persons appointed as special claims examiners, at least so far as the Civil Service Commission knows. Until the Congress changes its present policy with respect to placing attorney positions in the competitive service, the Civil Service Commission assumes that the prohibition against expending funds for examining attorneys will be continued.

I have no right to speak for the executive department, but I can say this, that if the executive department feels as keenly as they showed they did feel in these three reports, then by passing this legislation in this form this afternoon, what all of us have agreed is a praiseworthy effort to cure inequities may go by the board completely due to the fact that the executive department will not be induced to approve what it does not believe to be wise legislation.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is addressing his remarks particularly to sections 5 and 6 of the bill. Would the gentleman agree with me that the position of the committee was unanimous as to all of the other portions of the bill except sections 5 and 6, upon which there was some difference of opinion?

Mr. HESELTON. That is my recollection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The general features of the bill for the spouses' benefit and others were unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. HESELTON. I believe that is so. However, I do not want to ask for a rollcall. I simply want to call attention of the Members to the situation

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks, the following:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRIEST: This is a report on H. R. 4744 which you introduced in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1955, and on which you requested this Board to report in your letter of March 15, 1955.

SECTION 1. INCREASED MAXIMUM FOR SPOUSE'S ANNUITY

Section 1 of the bill would increase the maximum spouse's[1] annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act from the present $40 a month to the highest amount which could be paid to anyone as a wife's insurance benefit under the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended from time to time. In effect, this amendment would establish in lieu of the present $40 a new maximum of $51.80 a month for the remainder of 1955, and $54.30 beginning with January 1956. Further increases in the maximum would automatically take place if and when the Social Security Act is amended in the future to provide for higher benefits.

Section 1 would immediately affect the following:

1. An estimated 82,000 wives on the rolls now receiving the maximum of $40 would become eligible for immediate increases. The Board estimates that the average increase for them would be about $10.50 a month during the remainder of 1955 and that a further increase averaging between $1.50 and $2 a month would be given to them in January 1956.

2. About 2,500 wives are now receiving less than $40 a month (or no annuity at all) solely because their old-age social security benefit reduces their wife's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act. However, when the maximum wife's annuity is raised, these wives will become eligible for increases in their benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act.

3. A number of aged widow's annuities awarded in the future will also be affected because of the guaranty in the Railroad Retirement Act that the widow's annuity shall be no less than the wife's annuity the same individual was receiving. With a higher maximum for the wife's annuity, this guaranty would operate in a larger number of cases. The Board estimates that about 1,500 new awards of widow's annuities a year may be so affected.

4. Currently, some 15,000 newly awarded wives' annuities a year would be increased by the amendment. The average increase for them would be about the same as for wives' annuities now on the rolls, that is, $10.50 a month during the remainder of 1955 with the further increase which would become effective in January 1956.

5. In a relatively small number of cases the increases in wives' annuities will result in decreasing by the same amounts employee annuities which are computed under the social security minimum guaranty provisions. However, the combined total of the two annuities to the employee and his wife would in no case be decreased as a result of this amendment.

---

[1] The term "spouse," as defined in the Railroad Retirement Act, includes dependent husbands. Among the more than 100,000 spouse annuitants on the Board's rolls, only about 25 are husbands. For this reason, the word "wife" or "wives" is used in this report instead of "spouse" or "spouses."

Contrary to what has been alleged it is not inequitable for the benefit of a wife under the railroad retirement system to be less than under the social security system.

The railroad retirement system had no provision at all for wives' benefits from the time when the system was first established (in 1937) until November 1951, and during most of that period there was no great demand for such benefits. Now the objection is that many wives get less than they would under social security. It should be noted, however, that late figures show the average wife's benefit under the Railroad Retirement Act is $37.20, and under the Social Security Act only $31.70. These benefits were added, presumably, to fill the gap resulting from the general exclusion of railroad employment from social-security coverage. This purpose is fulfilled so long as no less favorable treatment than under social security is guaranteed on a family basis, and such a guaranty has already been provided. How the benefits are distributed in the family is a matter of the internal workings of the railroad retirement system; that is, the question of equity is not measured by the benefits to any particular individual but by the total to the individual's family. Moreover, wives' benefits are not provided at all by the civil service retirement system or the great proportion of pension plans.

It should be considered, also, that when the wives' benefits were added to the railroad retirement system by the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, the Congress limited the maximum wife's benefit to $40 in order to effect savings to the railroad retireent fund so as to permit higher benefits to other groups. At the time these other benefits were provided, such savings, which the present amendments would discard, were counted on and are still required in order to keep the railroad retirement system anywhere near sound. Their elimination would merely mean further liberality to a special group at added expense to younger employees who will not retire for many years. The latter will not only fully pay their own way but along with employers will be required to contribute enough in taxes to make up this deficit during all of their years of railroad employment.

SECTION 2. ELIMINATION OF THE PRESENT RESTRICTION ON SURVIVOR BENEFITS BECAUSE OF SIMULTANEOUS ENTITLEMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Section 2 of the bill, by proposing to strike out the second sentence of section 5 (g) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act, would eliminate the present restriction on the amount of a survivor annuity payable under the act to a widow, widower, child, or parent of a railroad employee. At present, such annuity is reduced by the amount of any social security benefit to which the annuitant is (or on application would be) entitled, but the bill would eliminate this reduction so that the annuitant would receive both the full survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act and social security benefit under the Social Security Act. This amendment would affect, in the main, widows who are age 65 and over who are (or on application would be) entitled to a primary old-age benefit under the Social Security Act.

At present, there are some 5,500 widows and about 300 children and parents whose railroad retirement benefits are reduced because of the second sentence of section 5 (g) (2). For these individuals, the average increase in the survivor annuity would be about $20 a month. In the future, the effect of the elimination of the restriction on dual benefits will be very much greater, because relatively more women are expected to have a social security benefit in their own right. For this reason, the long-range cost of this amendment will be much greater than the immediate effect.

It is not inequitable for the benefit of a widow under the railroad retirement system to be reduced by the amount of her social-security benefit.

As in the case of the wives' benefits, the purpose of providing such other auxiliary benefits as the widow's benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act was, presumably, to fill the gap resulting from the general exclusion of railroad employment from social-security coverage; and as explained above this purpose is already fulfilled by the guarantee in the present Railroad Retirement Act against any loss in benefits from such exclusion.

In this connection it may be noted that a year ago this Board was unanimously opposed to H. R. 356, when that bill, which became Public Law 398, was before the Senate committee to repeal the restriction on dual benefits to retired employees. The present restriction on dual benefits to widows, which section 2 of this bill would repeal, is more justifiable than was that on retired employees.

Further, this restriction against dual benefits, which section 2 would eliminate, was enacted, among other reasons, as in the case of the maximum for wives' benefits, for the purpose of effecting savings to the retirement fund to permit higher benefits to other groups, so that section 2, like section 1, would operate to eliminate savings needed to keep the railroad retirement system on as sound a basis as possible, and would merely result in further liberality to widows at the expense of the younger workers.

It may be noted also that the great proportion of pension plans do not provide for survivor benefits and, when they do, such benefits are limited and require in some cases a reduction in the employee's pension.

Some of the complaints as to its being inequitable not to pay dual benefits to widows are based on the feeling that ordinarily commercial insurance companies pay whatever benefits are specified in their policies regardless of how many other companies may have issued policies to the insured. Social insurance is an entirely different matter. Under commercial insurance, each age group or class has to pay in premiums enough to meet the cost of benefits that are eventually paid by the insurance company. Under railroad retirement and social security an average tax rate is applied to all age groups and classes, with the result that, even considering both employer and employee taxes, nearly all beneficiaries so far awarded benefits, and that will be true for a number of years to come, have by no means paid their way.

Estimated cost

The Board's estimate on the basis of the fifth actuarial valuation assumptions is that the additional cost resulting from the amendments specified in sections 1 and 2 of the bill would come to about 0.47 percent of payroll, or $26 million a year on a level basis.

SECTION 3

Section 3 of the bill is merely a technical and clarifying amendment which would involve no additional costs and would not affect any benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act. Without it, the Board would interpret the present section 5 (1) (9) exactly in the same manner as is specified in the bill.

SECTION 4

Section 4 raises a question of Federal policy. Benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts are not subject to attachment except by the Internal Revenue Service under a provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This is true also of benefits payable under the Social Security Act, and of other payments due from the Federal Government such as paychecks to Government employees.

Benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts were not at any time subject to attachment until the above-mentioned provision was included in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The bill under this section would abolish this new right of attachment by the Internal Revenue Service as to benefits payable under the two railroad systems. Obviously, this is a question of Federal policy broader than the administration of the two acts under the jurisdiction of the Railroad Retirement Board.

Incidentally, this section would also clarify in favor of beneficiaries under the railroad systems the question occasionally raised by some States that benefits payable under the two railroad systems are subject to State taxes.

SECTIONS 5 AND 6

Sections 5 and 6 are presumably intended to make inapplicable to this agency the President's Executive Order No. 10440 dated March 31, 1953, that provided for schedule C positions and under which practically all Government agencies have acted. But sections 5 and 6 would apparently also preclude the continued use of schedule A excepted positions and would require that such positions be filled competitively in the future. In schedule A are included all attorney positions, national reporting officers, special claims agents, and members of the actuarial advisory committee.

There is one schedule C position in the Board organization, namely, the position of administrative (confidential) assistant to the chairman. In order to permit the chairman to obtain an assistant of his own choice, this position was placed in schedule C by the unanimous action of the Board on October 27, 1953, under the authority of Presidential Executive Order No. 10440, and this classification of this position in accordance with requirements was submitted to and received the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

The effect of sections 5 and 6 on present incumbents in excepted positions now in schedules A and C who happen not to possess competitive status is not clear, but the bill certainly would prevent any future chairman or other member of the Board from free selection of an assistant, if his choice happened to be someone not possessing competitive status.

It is understood that the Civil Service Commission is precluded by law from holding any examinations for attorney positions and, therefore, the Board would apparently not be able to fill any future attorney vacancy within the competitive service. Neither would the Board be able to fill the position outside of the competitive service by reason of sections 5 and 6 of this bill.

National reporting officers are officials of national railway labor organizations who are nominally employees of the Board for the purpose of collecting and reporting information on wages and services of labor organization employees. They receive no Government salary but are paid for their expenses when attending training meetings, and also have the privilege of using the Government frank for Board business. Their positions are obviously not suitable to opening for competition under the competitive civil service.

Special claims agents are appointed in isolated areas (particularly, Indian reservations) to take unemployment claims where railroad claims-taking facilities are unavailable. The appointments are of men engaged locally in other business and are made on the basis of literacy, reliability, and good repute. Compensation is on a piece-rate basis. It would be entirely impracticable to conduct examinations for these positions for inclusion in the competitive civil service.

The three members of the actuarial advisory committee established by a specific provision of the Railroad Retirement Act examine and pass upon actuarial estimates and reports made by the Board's actuary every 3 years. Compensation of two of the members is paid on a per diem basis. Under the law 2 members are appointed by the Board, 1 upon recommendation by the railroads, 1 upon recommendation by the labor organizations, and a third member is named by the Secretary of the Treasury from his Department. It would be impracticable to have the two Board appointments under competitive civil service.

The Board is, of course, only one of many agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government operating under existing rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission and the President's Executive order, and having some schedule A and schedule C positions. Under such rules and regulations, all agencies have the right to employ persons in excepted positions regardless of whether they have competitive status. It should be noted that the Board does not now possess and has never possessed the power to classify any position as "Excepted" without approval by the Civil Service Commission. Involving, as sections 5 and 6 do, civil service matters and even a general Presidential Executive order common to all agencies, it seems there are presented questions of Federal policy much broader in application than merely to the Railroad Retirement Board.

CONCLUSION

The changes in the benefit provisions would become effective the first of the month following the month of enactment of the bill, and the Board would be required to recertify without application all annuities which would be affected by any of the changes proposed in the bill.

The combined employer-employee taxes for the support of the railroad retirement system amount to 12.5 percent of taxable payroll with a limit of $350 a month in earnings per employee. The latest actuarial estimates made in connection with the 1954 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act show that the level cost of benefits under the act is 13.43 percent of taxable payroll, indicating a present deficiency of 0.93 percent of payroll, or approximately $51 million a year.

The Board's estimates of the additional cost of the amendments proposed in H. R. 4744 would come to about 0.47 percent of payroll, or $26 million a year on a level basis. This amount, when considered in addition to the present deficiency of 0.93 percent, or $51 million a year, would result in a total deficiency in the neighborhood of 1.4 percent of payroll, or $77 million a year. All of these estimates are based on the assumptions of the fifth actuarial valuation.

The Board recommends that no favorable consideration be given to the bill. One member of the Board dissents from this report and his dissenting views are set forth below.

This report has been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, which informs us that there is no objection to its submission.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND J. KELLY,
Chairman.
F. C. SQUIRE, *Member.*

MINORITY REPORT ON H. R. 4744 OF HORACE W. HARPER, MEMBER

I am in favor of the bill H. R. 4744 for the following reasons:

1. The maximum benefit payable to the wife of a railroad man should not be less than that payable to any other man's wife.

2. An employee's annuity is not reduced by any social-security benefit. His widow should be accorded the same treatment.

3. The removal of inequities from the railroad retirement system is a policy which the Congress adopted last year in the belief that the elimination of inequities justified the additional cost.

4. Unlike other Government agencies, the Railroad Retirement Board administers a retirement and unemployment insurance system for a single industry. Board employees should not be required to identify themselves with a partisan political point of view and thus to stake the future of their careers on the future of any political party. No good substitute for the merit system has yet been devised.

1. THE MAXIMUM BENEFIT PAYABLE TO THE WIFE OF A RAILROAD MAN SHOULD NOT BE LESS THAN THAT PAYABLE TO ANY OTHER MAN'S WIFE

Section 1 of the bill H. R. 4744 merely carries out the congressional policy established in 1951 by enactment of Public Law 234, 82d Congress. The Railroad Retirement Act was then amended to provide an annuity for the wife or husband of a railroad employee, patterned after a similar provision in the Social Security Act. In order to make certain that the spouse's annuity would be no less than a spouse's benefit under the Social Security Act, the amendment provided that the spouse's annuity be composed in exactly the same way as a spouse's benefit is computed under the Social Security Act; that is, in each case the spouse's monthly benefit would be one-half of the retired employee's monthly benefit, subject to a maximum of $40 a month, the same as that which the social-security formula then produced.

The maximum for the spouse's benefit under the Social Security Act, however, has been raised by the 1952 and 1954 amendments to that act. In order to carry out the original congressional intent and, at the same time, avoid similar problems in the future, section 1 of the bill is so worded as to make certain that at no time in the future will a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act be reduced by the maximum provision below the maximum spouse's benefit that could be paid to anyone at the same time under the Social Security Act. For example, assume a case in which the employee's annuity is $150. The spouse's annuity would be one-half of that, or $75, but for the maximum provision limiting the annuity, under the present law, to $40, which was the maximum under the Social Security Act in 1951. Under the bill, however, the spouse's annuity would not be limited to $40, but to $51.80, which is now the maximum spouse's benefit under the Social Security Act; and whenever such maximum could be higher than $51.80, the same spouse's annuity would then be increased to the higher amount (up to one-half her husband's annuity), but not retroactively.

2. AN EMPLOYEE'S ANNUITY IS NOT REDUCED BY ANY SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFIT. HIS WIDOW SHOULD BE ACCORDED THE SAME TREATMENT

As in the case of section 1, section 2 of the bill would also be in full accord with established congressional policy. Prior to the enactment in 1954 of Public Law 398, 83d Congress, an annuity of a railroad employee was reduced if he was also entitled to an old-age benefit under the Social Security Act. This provision was vigorously protested so that no less than 18 bills to repeal it were introduced in the 83d Congress. The result was that the provision was repealed on June 16, 1954, with the consequence that railroad employees now receive both their retirement annuities and their old-age social-security benefits without reduction. The same principle was incorporated to a limited extent by Congress in another amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, Public Law 746, 83d Congress, which provided that a widow of a railroad employee may receive both her widow's annuity and her railroad retirement annuity in her own right. Section 2 of the bill would lift the restriction completely, as in the case of the railroad employees themselves, for widows, widowers, parents, and children of employees. I can see no justification for distinguishing between a widow of a railroad employee on the one hand and the railroad employee himself on the other. Section 2 of the bill would therefore treat widows, widowers, parents, and children of railroad employees in respect of this kind of eligibility the same as the railroad employees themselves; that is, these widows and other dependent survivors would be allowed to receive these benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act without reduction by reason of eligibility for benefits under the Social Security Act.

3. THE REMOVAL OF INEQUITIES FROM THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM IS A POLICY WHICH THE CONGRESS ADOPTED LAST YEAR IN THE BELIEF THAT THE ELIMINATION OF INEQUITIES JUSTIFIED THE ADDITIONAL COST

It is estimated that the enactment of the provisions in section 1 would cost 0.22 percent of payroll, and those of section 2 would cost 0.25 percent, or a total of 0.47 percent, thus increasing the cost of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act from the present 13.43 to 13.90 percent of payroll. Since the total tax for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system is only 12½ percent (6¼ on railroad employers and 6¼ percent on railroad employees) up to $350 a month, the result of the enactment would be a deficit, in the long run, of 1.40 percent of the payroll. In this connection I call attention to the fact that the Congress enacted the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act in spite of the fact that the total cost of benefits, as the result of such enactment, was increased to 14.43 percent of payroll, showing a deficit of 1.93 percent, which is in excess of the 1.40 percent deficit estimated to be the result of the enactment of this bill. The fifth actuarial valuation, published by the Board early in 1953, showed that the 1.93 estimated deficit resulting from the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was for various reasons reduced to 0.91 percent of payroll. In the light of similar experiences in the past, it is quite possible that the sixth actuarial valuation, to be published late this year or early next year, will likewise show a reduction in the estimated cost. In any event, it is certain, even on the present estimate, that the enactment of this bill would leave the financial status of the railroad retirement fund sounder by 0.53 percent of payroll than did the enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

The congressional policy of avoiding inequities with regard to eligibility under the railroad retirement system was established in 1954 when the dual benefit restriction against employee annuities was repealed in spite of the added cost (Public Law 398, 83d Cong., 2d sess.). At that time the cost of benefits was 13.41 percent of payroll, showing a deficit of 0.91 percent of payroll. Nevertheless, in order to remove what was believed to be an inequity, the Congress repealed the dual benefit restriction, which repeal added to the cost 0.15 percent of payroll, bringing the deficit to 1.06 percent. The same policy was reaffirmed by Congress in 1954 when it enacted Public Law 746, 83d Congress, 2d session, providing that a widow of a railroad employee may receive her widow's annuity without reduction therefrom of her railroad annuity in her own right. The position of Congress in both instances was that the railroad retirement system should not permit inequities and that the elimination of inequities justified the additional cost. The principle involved here is exactly the same.

Sections 3 and 4 of the bill are of a technical and clarifying nature.[2]

4. UNLIKE OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ADMINISTERS A RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM FOR A SINGLE INDUSTRY. BOARD EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES WITH A PARTISAN POLITICAL POINT OF VIEW AND THUS TO STAKE THE FUTURE OF THEIR CAREERS ON THE FUTURE OF ANY POLITICAL PARTY. NO GOOD SUBSTITUTE FOR THE MERIT SYSTEM HAS YET BEEN DEVISED

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill would amend the respective sections of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which give the Railroad Retirement Board the authority to hire and employ such persons as it finds necessary for the proper discharge of the Board's functions. All persons in the employ of the Board on the date of the enactment of these amendments, regardless of position or manner of appointment, will have the protection of the competitive civil service. These amendments would not permit the appointment, or transfer, of anyone in the Board to any excepted position, and would thus assure that the employment, or transfer, of persons to positions such as schedule C, and the placing of positions in such schedule, have no place in the Railroad Retirement Board which, in accordance with legislative history of the Railroad Retirement Act, has been established to administer the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance programs on a completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis. The amendments would only make more explicit what is now implicit in the present legislation, providing as it does for employment of Board personnel under the civil service laws and rules, and setting forth clearly a policy requiring administration without regard to political considerations. Thus, of the 3 Board members, 2, a majority of the Board, must come from railroad labor and management, respectively, on the basis of selection by those interests, and the terms of all 3 members are for 5 years each with not more than 1 term beginning in any particular year. The method of selection, length of tenure, and the staggering of appointments so as to overlap the 4-year presidential term, together with, and even apart from, the special and limited nature of the 2 programs, demonstrate a clear legislative intent not to permit anything other than the strictest nonpolitical and nonpartisan administration of these 2 special programs.

HORACE W. HARPER, *Member.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
1334 House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge and reply to your requests for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on various bills which would amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Act, specifically H. R. 4744 and 11 other identical bills (H. R. 4828, 4879, 4906, 4950, 5039, 5104, 5148, 5149, 5173, 5182, and 5305).

These bills would raise the maximum wife's annuity to the present maximum under the old-age and survivors insurance system; permit widows and other dependents of railroad workers to obtain dual benefits in certain cases; make certain necessary technical amendments and authorize or direct certain administrative and procedural changes which do not affect benefits or eligibility for benefits.

With respect to the first change, the present maximum annuity for a wife under the railroad retirement system is $40, as compared with a present maximum under OASI of $54.30. The effect of the bill would be to equate the maximum annuity under the railroad retirement program with the maximum, now or hereafter, available under the OASI program. The OASI maximum benefit has been increased substantially since 1951 when the present railroad retirement maximum was established. It is our understanding that the amendment would affect some 82,000 railroad wives now on the rolls. In the future an additional 15,000 wives coming on the rolls each year will benefit similarly. Because of special circumstances, some 4,000 other wives and widows would also receive small increases.

The Bureau of the Budget favors the correction of any inequities that may exist in wives' benefits as between the two programs. However, the amount of a wife's annuity under railroad retirement cannot be divorced from certain other considerations which are of basic importance in the railroad retirement system. Most important is the fact that the railroad retirement system stresses family benefits as opposed merely to the benefit for a wife or widow. Under the circumstances which now prevail, the annuities of employees under railroad retirement are considerably higher than the average of primary benefits available under OASI. It follows that railroad family benefits are higher than the family benefits under OASI. Furthermore, by reason of credit of prior service to older workers, the burden of cost of the proposed measure would fall on the younger workers. These factors, when considered in the light of the additional fact that the bill makes no provision for increasing the revenues of the system, leads us to recommend that the committee consider most carefully whether the proposed increase in the wife's annuity is justifiable.

Section 2 of the bill would permit widows of railroad workers and other dependents to obtain dual benefits in certain cases. While probably less than 6,000 individuals would be affected by this provision, we are concerned that it would authorize the third in a series of departures from the 1951 action toward coordination of the railroad retirement system and the old-age and survivors insurance system. It was one of the purposes of the 1951 statute to recognize and compensate for the fact that both the OASI and railroad retirement programs provide benefits which are weighted to favor workers with limited wage credits. As a result, if persons were permitted to qualify under both programs, they would receive excessively high aggregate benefits. Accordingly, the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act provided a series of offsets. However, in 1952 railroad retirement annuitants were permitted to obtain benefits from both systems without any offset. In 1954 the act was again revised, and a railroad widow who herself had worked as a railroad employee and earned a right to an annuity was authorized to receive both her annuity and her widow's benefit without any reduction in either.

If the 1951 principle of coordination, which the Bureau of the Budget supports, is to be abandoned, then it would seem to the Bureau that the entire question of weighting of benefits where dual benefits are involved needs to be reconsidered. It is our belief that more rather than less coordination should be the ultimate goal. Such further coordination should accept and maintain as the central consideration the principle that the railroad retirement system is primarily a staff pension plan for long-time railroad workers who qualify for its benefits over and above basic benefits which should directly parallel or be equivalent to the basic benefits under the OASI system for persons with 10 years in covered employment. Thus, it seems to us that the amendment which would be made by section 2 moves in the wrong direction. We would recommend against its favorable consideration.

The technical amendments contained in section 3 of the bill are without objection.

With respect to section 4, which would place railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance payments beyond attachment by the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau wishes to point out that this would effect a partial repeal of recent amendments to the Internal Revenue Code which brought railroad retirement and other like benefits within the purview of attachment for income-tax purposes. If this provision of law is to be changed, we believe it should be changed across the board on a generalized basis and not on a piecemeal basis. In view of the fact that the authority to levy upon such benefits, among others, has only recently been granted by the Congress, and since repeal of this authority with respect to railroad retirement benefits may have serious implications with respect to other forms of income, the Treasury believes that any change in the present rules should be made only after the most careful and deliberate consideration. We, accordingly, recommend against favorable consideration of this section.

The Bureau also opposes and recommends against favorable consideration of the amendments proposed by section 5 and section 6. The Railroad Retirement Board, in our judgment, should be subject to and bound by the same rules respecting appointment, employment tenure, and pay and privileges as apply to other Federal agencies within the civil service system. Mandatory exclusion by statute seems to us to be unsound.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PRIEST: This letter is in reply to your request for the Commission's views on H. R. 4828 and H. R. 4744, bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

---

[2] Sec. 3 would effect a needed technical correction in the method provided in section 5 (1) (9) of the Railroad Retirement Act for figuring the average monthly remuneration which determines the amount of survivor benefits. It would provide in all survivor benefit cases for the computation of this average on the basis of as much as $4,200 a year when both railroad and social security credits are involved, just as in the case when the computation is made solely on credits from one system alone. Section 4 would clarify for the tax collecting authorities of certain States who have attempted to tax the receipt of annuities and pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act and of unemployment and sickness benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act despite the prohibition in sections 12 and 2 (e) of the respective laws. Further, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 placed a restriction on the effect of such sections, without direct amendment, by making benefits payable under these acts subject to attachment. Section 4 would restore or make fully effective the long-established congressional policy of exempting benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act from all taxation and attachments, State or Federal, leaving no room for doubt.

The Commission does not believe that it is necessary to enact this bill in order to protect the merit system within the Railroad Retirement Board.

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit the Civil Service Commission from removing or excepting positions in the Railroad Retirement Board from the requirements of the competitive civil service. The bill prohibits removing or excepting any positions except member of the Board positions from the competitive civil service. It would also require the Commission to restore to the competitive civil service all positions which are now excepted. At present the Railroad Retirement Board is authorized to fill (1) 1 position in schedule C—the administrative (confidential) assistant to the Chairman of the Board; (2) 2 positions in schedule A—members of the actuary advisory committee selected by the Board, 1 from recommendations made by the representative of the employees and 1 from recommendations made by the carriers; (3) an unlimited number of special claim agents in schedule A under certain specified conditions; and (4) attorney positions in schedule A. The Commission believes that these positions have been properly placed in the excepted schedules.

The Commission believes that the merit system in the Railroad Retirement Board can be satisfactorily protected under existing legislation. The existing legislation provides that employment shall be under the civil service rules and regulations. The civil service rules provide flexible methods of appointment to meet special needs. These needs are recognized in schedules A, B, and C. The Commission believes that this flexibility is essential to the effective administration of the civil service system. For example, the Commission believes that it is quite proper that the railroad employees and railroad management should have a voice in selecting the members of the actuary advisory board. It would obviously be inconsistent to require that these persons qualify through regular competitive civil service procedures. The changing nature of Government organization, assignments, duties, and responsibilities together with changes affecting the conditions of appointment often require movement of positions from the competitive to the excepted service or from the excepted to the competitive service. Both types of movements have taken place in the Railroad Retirement Board on several occasions in the past.

The placement of attorney positions in the competitive civil service is contrary to present congressional policy. The Commission is specifically prohibited in its appropriations act from expending funds for the examining of attorneys.

The Commission believes that the use of schedules A, B, and C is an essential part of the operation of the merit system. The Commission carefully examines each request that positions be placed in these schedules, in order to assure itself that the positions meet the criteria prescribed by Executive order. The Commission does not believe that competitive civil service procedures can satisfactorily be applied to every single position in an organization. The Commission cannot, therefore, recommend enactment of this legislation.

We are advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, my particular interest in this legislation stems from a number of years on this particular committee. I think that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and I presume others who will follow, will explain this legislation to a great degree from the point of view which most particularly affects them. I am going to say this much. I think we should always bear in mind that this agency is somewhat different from any other or at least from most of the other governmental agencies in this respect.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to say to the gentleman that the explanation that I attempted to give a moment ago was not particularly from a point of view as it might affect me or anyone in my district, but how it would affect all people who come under the Railroad Retirement Act. I hoped that would be the way it would be received.

Mr. BEAMER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I probably should revise my remarks by saying as these gentlemen view it, not as it affects them. After all, what I was going to say is that so far as this particular agency is concerned, the money involved is raised by the employees and the employers. There is no tax money contributed by other people, by you and by me or our constituents—only by the railroad people. In that respect this agency is considerably different as far as policymaking is concerned. There are two groups particularly interested, shall we say; first, railroad employees, who contribute money out of their salaries or wages each month, and the employers, the railroads, who contribute an equal amount. For that reason it seems to me that this agency is somewhat different from other Government agencies in which there might be necessary certain policymaking procedures.

The point to which I want to address myself is what I consider the most important portion of this legislation, the fact that it does repeal the dual benefit provision as it pertains to spouses. In the 83d Congress we passed what is now known as Public Law 398, that repealed the restrictions on the dual-benefit provisions, but it neglected to include the widows, the spouses, and other dependents and children. I introduced last year a bill, H. R. 9999, which would have taken care of the spouses; and I reintroduced the bill this year, as H. R. 3743, to accomplish the same purpose. I know there are many other Members who were very conscious of this deficiency in the legislation that was passed by the 83d Congress. I feel the important portion of this bill is that which increases payments to widows, or dependent spouses, or children as the case may be, up to $54.30 a month for next year as maximum payment and this year $51.80 per month. Those extra dollars will mean a lot to those individual people.

I feel with others that this is a very important measure and that the portion of it that takes care of the additional payments to these deserving spouses is the important provision.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of H. R. 4744, a bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

With a large active and retired railroad population in my congressional district I can assure you there will be a lot of disappointment over the failure to amend the Railroad Retirement Act by increasing benefits and liberalizing other provisions of the existing law.

It is my understanding that H. R. 4744 is being rushed through this session of Congress now nearing adjournment with the expectation that next year when the second session of this Congress convenes consideration will be given by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to some 50 amendments now pending before it.

I hope that the hearings will be scheduled early next January so that thousands of active and retired railroaders in whose behalf these amendments have been introduced will have their day in court.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 4744 on the theory that "a half of a loaf is better than none," especially since the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act are being liberalized for the benefit of widows and spouses.

As many of you know, over a period of years I have been directing my efforts toward repeal of the provision in the 1951 amendments prohibiting the payment of dual benefits to persons entitled to social-security and railroad-retirement benefits. When the 1951 amendments were approved I warned the membership of the House that the dual benefits provision was discriminatory and that sooner or later Congress would have to repeal it.

During the 83d Congress my bill H. R. 356 was enacted and is now known as Public Law 398. Under its provisions some 30,000 retired railroaders had their rights to social-security benefits restored.

As stated previously, one of the provisions of H. R. 4744 now under consideration restores the rights of widows to receive social-security benefits to which they are entitled in their own right.

At present there are some 5,500 widows and should this provision of H. R. 4744 become a law it is estimated that these widows will receive an average increase in their survivor annuity of about $20 monthly.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to state that while the elimination of the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows is meritorious legislation, if H. R. 4744 becomes a law the job of eliminating the prohibition against dual benefits is not complete. As you know there are still hundreds of spouses under the Railroad Retirement Act who are being denied social-security benefits which they earned in their own right and thus they are being penalized under the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

You will recall that last year we repealed the prohibition against dual benefits as far as the retired railroader is concerned. H. R. 4744, now under consideration, will remove the prohibition against dual benefits to widows. It is my earnest hope that during the next session of Congress we can complete the job by eliminating the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to spouses who have earned social-security benefits in their own right.

Another provision specifies that the spouse of a retired railroader would in no instance receive less than the benefits he or she would be entitled to if covered by social security.

In effect this amendment would establish a new maximum of $51.80 a month for the remainder of 1955 and $54.30 beginning January 1956 in lieu of the present $40 a month maximum spouse benefit. Further increases in the maximum would automatically take place if and when the Social Security Act is amended in the future to provide for higher benefits.

It is estimated that 82,000 wives now receiving maximum spouse benefits of $40 monthly under the Railroad Retirement Act would become eligible for an average increase of about $10.50 a month during the remainder of 1955 and that a further increase averaging between $1.50 and $2 a month would be given them starting January 1956.

The third provision of H. R. 4744 will make certain that railroad retirement unemployment insurance benefits are exempt from Federal taxation, attachment, and so forth.

The fourth provision of the bill concerns personnel of the Railroad Retirement Board and places them under classified civil service. Naturally, I am in support of this provision.

Mr. Speaker, should the provisions of H. R. 4744 become law the additional cost to the railroad retirement fund will approximate $26 million annually. From the benefits received the expenditure is fully justified and will not jeopardize the solvency of the retirement fund, now approximately $3½ billion.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening statement I am supporting H. R. 4744 because it is a step in the right direction. I want to serve notice, however, that an across-the-board increase in benefits is badly needed in view of present-day living costs. Therefore, I hope that retired railroaders can look forward with confidence that consideration will be given to their plight during the next session of this Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the committee on reporting this bill to the House. This measure will have my full and enthusiastic support.

Is it obvious that certain amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act are necessary in order to correct certain injustices that now exist, particularly with reference to the payments to widows of retired railroad employees. Congress last year removed the dual benefit restriction for the men who are now receiving benefits, but in some manner overlooked the women. For this reason, this legislation is of great importance to the many women who are now receiving railroad retirement benefits.

Several women have written and spoken to me concerning the inequity that now exists. These women receive small annuities from the Railroad Retirement Board. Some have been able to obtain employment and have established a social-security record so that they are now entitled to benefits under that act. However, they find that their railroad retirement benefits are reduced by the amount of their social-security payments, so they are prevented from receiving the benefits to which they are entitled. This bill will now make it possible for these women to receive the full benefits to which they are entitled, both from the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Board.

I am also happy to see the maximum spouse's annuity increased from $40 to $51.80 a month during 1955, and to $54.30 beginning January 1956. This increase will bring much happiness to the thousands of spouses who are now receiving payments from the Railroad Retirement Board.

I have always been interested in increasing the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. I was a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the 1951 amendments were adopted. Prior to that time the spouse received no benefit under this law. The need for taking care of the spouse was recognized by the committee and the Congress, and as a result spouses are now receiving benefits. I am now happy to support this bill which will increase these benefits.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing to the floor of the House H. R. 4744, which will increase the benefits for widows of the railroad workers and also make it possible for a railroad worker's widow to be eligible for social-security benefits in addition to her railroad pension. I regret, however, that the committee has not included in this bill the provisions of my bill, H. R. 5426, which would correct hardships placed on those railroad workers with service prior to January 1, 1937.

These railroad workers are unjustly discriminated against by the original act's base period for computing annuities. My bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act would correct the inequities by changing the base period for computing annuity from the 7 years between 1924–31 to the 7 years between 1940–47, whichever is the greater. This means that employees whose service dates back before 1937 would receive a retirement income more nearly in line with the original intent of Congress in passing the act.

I also recommend very strongly to the committee another provision in my bill which permits railroad employees to retire after 40 years of service regardless of age. I hope the committee will act favorably on my bill within the very near future.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of sympathy with the views expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] as far as the personnel of the Railroad Retirement Board is concerned. I think it has been an excellent agency, fair-minded, considerate, and cooperative always ever since the Board was established. I do not particularly relish the thought of restoring a lot of civil-service jobs, but the biggest thing that gives us concern about this legislation is the integrity of the railroad retirement fund itself that has been built up over a period of years.

It just happens that three of my sisters married railroad men, two conductors and a brakeman, my brother fired a locomotive for a while, and I am more or less acquainted with railroad people and their interests. I am interested not only in a brother-in-law of mine who has been retired for some time and who justly has been drawing railroad retirement but I am also interested in another brother-in-law and many friends who are actively working and will not be retired until future years. I want to make sure that when the railroad workers active today are retired in a few years or several years from now this fund will not be impaired to jeopardize their interests.

The statement made by the chairman of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. PRIEST] is very reassuring to me. I want to take a minute or two of the time that has been so generously granted to me by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] to point out to the committee the second paragraph on page 13 of this excellent report.

> In consideration of all bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, your committee has placed great emphasis on the effect of the proposed amendments on the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account. The committee is unanimously—

I want you to get that—

> The committee is unanimously of the opinion that, regardless of the desirability of certain proposals for the liberalization of benefits under the act, no amendments to the law should be made which would jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement system. This principle is accepted by all the standard railway labor organizations as well as railroad management.

They could not be on sounder ground than that. I quote from the last paragraph on page 13:

> Your committee believes that the cost of H. R. 4744 as reported will not jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I agree fully with the comments made by the gentleman from Missouri. I also have read this report. I was pleased to see the comment made by the committee in the last paragraph on page 13 to which the chairman of the committee referred and which has since been quoted by the gentleman from Missouri. But there has not yet been explained how the committee reconciles that statement with the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 13, in reference to the deficit that will occur in this railroad retirement account, which I quote:

> Dollarwise, the deficit would be increased from the present estimate of $51 million to approximately $76 million a year, on a level-cost basis.

Do I correctly understand the committee to say that notwithstanding the fact there will be a deficit in the fund of $76 million a year, the integrity of the fund is not jeopardized thereby? If so, how can that be possible?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will read the third paragraph from the bottom on page 13 he will find the answer to his question. Time does not permit me to read it to him.

Mr. JONAS. The committee does not think that there will be an annual deficit of $76 million although the report so states in the first paragraph on page 13?

Mr. HARRIS. No, we do not at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, there are three principal features to the bill under consideration, which proposes to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

First, the bill provides for an increase in the maximum annuity payable to a spouse from the $40 now payable, to the highest amount which could be paid to anyone as a wife's insurance benefit under the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended from time to time. In effect, this amendment would establish in lieu of the present $40 monthly maximum, a new maximum of $51.80 during 1955, and $54.30 beginning with January 1956. Approximating 82,000 wives, or 80 percent of the total spouses now on the rolls, will receive an increase averaging approximately $10.50 a month during the remainder of 1955, and an additional increase averaging from $1.50 to $2 a month beginning with January 1956.

Second, the bill provides for the repeal of the dual benefit restriction in the Railroad Retirement Act on the amount of a survivor annuity that is payable to a widow, dependent widower, child, or parent of a deceased railroad worker. At present, such annuity is reduced by the amount of any social security benefit to which the annuitant is, or on application would be, entitled to receive under the Social Security Act. This bill would eliminate this reduction so that the annuitant would receive both the full survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act and the social security benefit payable under the provisions of the Social Security Act. Approximately 5,500 widows and about 300 children and parents would benefit from enactment of this legislation. Their annuities would be increased, on the average, by $20 a month.

Third, the bill provides that practically all positions in the Railroad Retirement Board shall be in and under the classified—competitive—civil service, and shall not be removed or excepted therefrom.

This bill has the unanimous backing of all the standard railway labor organizations, representing virtually all the railroad employees of this country. It is not opposed by the railroads. This fact weighs very heavily in favor of the legislation, since the entire cost of administering the railroad retirement system is paid for by the railway employees and the railroads.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce believes that the cost of the additional benefits provided by this bill will not jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account.

This legislation is highly meritorious, and I urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support H. R. 4744. I am also glad to have been one of the coauthors of this bill, and did introduce such a bill, H. R. 5104, on March 21, 1955.

There are some amendments that should be made to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 in order to extend some benefits and to remove certain inequities existing at the present time.

I am sure most of the House has heard the explanations of this bill during the past hour. However, I believe that the language has not been simplified sufficiently and there are two or three points I would like to bring out.

Section 1 of this bill increases the wife's maximum annuity payable under the act from the present $40 a month to the highest amount which could be paid as a wife's insurance benefit under the Social Security Act. In effect, this amendment establishes, in lieu of the present $40 monthly maximum, a new maximum of $51.80 a month during 1955, and $54.30 beginning in January 1956. If in the future the Social Security Act is amended to provide for higher benefits, further increases in the maximum under railroad retirement would automatically take place. This amendment does assist in evening out the benefits payable under this act and under social security and keeps the two well in balance.

This will affect about 82,000 wives who will become eligible for an immediate increase in benefits of approximately $10.50 per month during the remainder of 1955.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce felt there was a real need for this legislation. Last year, the Congress passed H. R. 7840 which repealed a social-security restriction on railroad survivor annuities when the survivor was entitled to railroad retirement benefits in the wife's own right. Retention of such a restriction in cases where the eligible survivor is entitled to social-security benefits can no longer be justified. These inequities will be corrected by the enactment of the committee bill.

Section 2 of this bill will eliminate any reduction in the widow's survivor benefit paid under the Railroad Retirement Act by reason of the fact that such survivor is receiving an insurance benefit payable under the Social Security Act. I think it is plain to see that where the person has paid for social security and has also paid for the full benefits of the Railroad Retirement Act, such a survivor should not be penalized by having her railroad retirement benefits reduced by benefits received under social security. Previously such a person had been in the position of having paid for both benefits, but able to receive only one.

Sections 5 and 6 of this bill provide that all positions to which individuals are appointed by the Railroad Retirement Board shall be under civil service and may not be removed except under rules of civil service.

When the act was first founded, it was intended that the personnel of Railroad Retirement should be under civil service, but there were some positions which could be transferred to other schedules. This legislation will make that impossible in the future and for all practical purposes will remove these employees from the spoils system. This is a progressive step in railroad retirement legislation.

I can tell by some of the questions which have been asked this afternoon that there are some doubts as to the effect of these amendments on the financial soundness of the railroad retirement fund. I do want to point out to my colleagues that this committee in all of its deliberations has placed great emphasis on the effect of these amendments on the financing soundness of the Railroad Retirement Act. The committee was unanimously of the opinion that no amendments to the law should be made which would jeopardize the railroad retirement system in any way. We are mindful of our grave responsibility not only toward the currently active railroad workers, but future railroad workers, who will retire many years hence. We have received the testimony in writing of all of the actuaries who have had anything to do with the railroad retirement account. The committee again was unanimously of the opinion that the financial status of the railroad retirement system will be adequate to pay the benefits which we have set out in this bill.

Historically, it can be shown that the actuarial costs in the past have been on the conservative side. For example, the cost estimates of the benefits provided by the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended in 1951, have been less than were actually estimated at the time.

I know that this subject when brought before the House always proves to be rather technical. For that reason many of the Members do accept the word of the committee as to the necessity of these amendments. The fact that all of the committee on both sides of the aisle have recommended this legislation seems to be proof that all believe it would be sound legislation.

For all of these reasons, I believe this legislation should pass today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

MANAGERS OF TELEPHONES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 297.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective July 1, 1955, the positions of floor manager of telephones (one minority) and the assistant floor manager of telephones (one minority) shall be at the basic salary rate per annum of $5,000 and $3,800, respectively. The additional sums necessary shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is the objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

PROVIDING ACCEPTANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U. S. C., sec. 397), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) The Administrator is authorized, whenever he deems it to be in the public interest, to accept for deposit—

"(1) the papers and other historical materials of any President or former President of the United States, or of any other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with any President or former President of the United States, subject to restrictions agreeable to the Administrator as to their use; and

"(2) documents, including motion-picture films, still pictures, and sound recordings, from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions."

(2) By redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

"(f) The Administrator is authorized, whenever he deems it to be in the public interest—

"(1) to accept, for and in the name of the United States, any land, buildings, and equipment offered as a gift to the United States for the purposes of creating a Presidential archival depository, and to take title to such land, buildings, and equipment on behalf of the United States, and to maintain, operate, and protect them as a Presidential archival depository, and as part of the national archives system; and to enter into agreements, upon such terms and conditions as he deems proper, with any State, political subdivision, university, institution of higher learning, institute, or foundation to utilize as a Presidential archival depository land, buildings, and equipment of such State, subdivision, university, or other organization, to be made available by it without transfer of title to the United States, and to maintain, operate, and protect such depository as a part of the national archives system: *Provided,* That the Administrator shall submit a report in writing on any such proposed Presidential archival depository to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which report shall include a description of the land, buildings, and equipment offered as a gift or to be made available without transfer of title as aforesaid, a statement of the terms of the proposed agreement, if any, a general description of the types of papers, documents, or other historical materials which it is proposed to deposit in the Presidential archival depository so to be created, and of the terms of such proposed deposit, a statement of the additional improvements and equipment, if any, necessary to the satisfactory operation of such depository, together with an estimate of the cost thereof, and an estimate of the annual cost to the United States of maintaining, operating, and protecting such depository: *Provided further,* That the Administrator shall not take title to any such land, buildings, and equipment or enter into any such agreement, until the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such report is transmitted, which 60-day period shall be computed as follows: Continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment sine die, but the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain shall be excluded from the computation;

"(2) to deposit in any such Presidential archival depository any papers, documents, or other historical materials accepted under subsection (e), or any Federal records appropriate for preservation therein;

"(3) to exercise, with respect to any papers, documents, or other historical materials deposited under this subsection or otherwise in any Presidential archival depository, all the functions and responsibilities otherwise vested in him pertaining to Federal records or other documentary materials in his custody or under his control: *Provided,* That the Administrator, in negotiating for the deposit of Presidential historical materials, shall take steps to secure to the Government, so far as possible, the right to have continuous and permanent possession of such materials: *Provided further,* That papers, documents, or other historical materials accepted and deposited under subsection (e) and this subsection shall be held subject to such restrictions respecting their availability and use as may be specified in writing by the donors or depositors, including the restriction that they shall be kept in a Presidential archival depository, and such restrictions shall be respected for so long a period as shall have been specified, or until they are revoked or terminated by the donors or depositors or by persons legally qualified to act on their behalf with respect thereto: *Provided further,* That subject to such restrictions, the Administrator may dispose by sale, exchange, or otherwise, of any papers, documents, or other materials which the Archivist may determine to have no permanent value or historical interest or to be surplus to the needs of any Presidential archival depository;

"(4) to cooperate with and to assist any university, institution of higher learning, institute, foundation, or other organization or qualified individual to further or to conduct study or research in any historical materials deposited in any Presidential archival depository;

"(5) to charge and collect reasonable fees for the privilege of visiting and viewing any exhibit rooms or museum space in any such Presidential archival depository;

"(6) to provide reasonable office space in any Presidential archival depository for the personal use of any former President of the United States; and

"(7) to accept gifts or bequests of money or other property for the purpose of maintaining, operating, protecting, or improving any Presidential archival depository: *Provided,* That the proceeds of any such gifts or bequests, together with the proceeds from any fees or from any sales of historical materials, copies or reproductions thereof, catalogs, or other items, having to do with any Presidential archival depository, shall be paid into the National Archives Trust Fund provided for in section 5 of the act of July 9, 1941, to be held, administered, and expended under the provisions of such section for the benefit and in the interest of the Presidential archival depository in connection with which they were received, including such administrative and custodial expenses thereof as the Administrator may determine."

(3) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'Presidential archival depository' means an institution operated by the United States to house and preserve the papers and books of a President or former President of the United States, together with other historical materials belonging to a President or former President of the United States, or related to his papers or to the events of his official or personal life.

"(2) The term 'historical materials' includes books, correspondence, documents, papers, pamphlets, works of art, models, pictures, photographs, plats, maps, films, motion pictures, sound recordings, and other objects or materials having historical or commemorative value."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes to the House with no evidence before the subcommittee of any opposition. It enjoys wide support on both sides of the aisle inasmuch as it was offered originally to companion resolutions by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And also the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Rees].

Mr. MOSS. Yes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Rees]. The only question of which I am aware relative to this resolution is one of policy as to the desirability of maintaining all Presidential papers made available to the Government of the United States in a centralized location here in Washington rather than permitting the geographic dispersal which naturally follows when we accept in toto libraries which have been established by past Presidents of the United States. It has been suggested that such a system of centralized maintenance would be more economical. As to the cost for operating libraries, the testimony before the subcommittee indicates a small economy might be effected through centralization. On the basis of operation of the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, the cost is estimated at approximately $150,000 a year for each library with offsetting revenues of approximately $50,000 leaving a net prospective operating cost of around $100,000. If, during the next century, we acquire another 12 or 15 of these libraries, the total cost might be around $1½ million a year. I would like to point out, however, that these libraries are built through private contributions. They house extensive collections reflecting upon the activities of the administrations of the presidents. It is highly possible that if they are not centralized in areas chosen by the President, and the friends of past presidents, some of the important material might not be made available to the United States.

In addition, we here today, realize that centralization of important records in Washington is not desirable in this time of atomic weapons. As a matter of fact, it was attested by the General Services Administration that sometimes, as we expand centralized functions in Washington, we actually increase rather than diminish the total cost. I think the policy of decentralization, of making available to scholars throughout the Nation, and of having national collections available on a geographical basis is an excellent one, because these libraries would afford a place for deposit of related Government information, related documents of interest to students of history and of current events.

From the standpoint of making available as much information as possible on a widespread basis, there seems to be no feeling that the decentralization policy is undesirable.

It is well to bear in mind that in our own Government, our own departments—as witnessed by the Post Office Department's recent policy of decentralization—there is an attempt to take out of Washington vast accumulations of information and material which may be important in the future course of this Government in the event of war.

As I say, the question of decentralized versus centralized keeping of these records is the only point which has been met by any opposition.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman would not use the Post Office Department's new decentralization program as any criterion for this sort of legislation. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if an atomic bomb fell on Washington the mail would be carried just the same, if it was able to get to St. Louis or to Iowa.

Mr. MOSS. I simply pointed that out as an illustration of current trends.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 330 does in fact, as the committee report points out, provide that the presidential archival depositories will be maintained, operated, and protected as a part of the National Archives system.

The intent of the legislation is to make possible the integration of valuable historical collections of our Presidents in the system of maintaining the archives of the Nation.

The cost of administration of centralized presidential papers, while somewhat less than a decentralized system, would not be enough to outweigh the disadvantages of centralization. The estimated cost of a presidential library will be about $150,000 a year . A library will produce about $50,000 in income from fees, leaving a net cost of about $100,000. If, during a century, 12 or 15 libraries were established the total cost of administration would be around $1,500,000. This is not excessive considering the advantages of such decentralized institutions.

The centralization of presidential papers and other research materials in one spot—Washington, D. C., or one of the other metropolitan centers in the East—is shortsighed and unwise, and, in this day of the microfilm camera, unnecessary from the point of view of the student and scholar.

First. There is a grave danger in concentrating our cultural possessions in one spot. The destructive power of modern warfare argues in favor of decentralization. For reasons of physical security if for no other decentralized presidential libraries would be justified.

Second. During the past 50 years there has been a great expansion of our educational system and in the number of students and scholars wishing to use research materials. All parts of the Nation are affected. There are great universities in every State of the Union. Regional libraries will do much to stimulate interest in the study of American history. They will serve as centers of research and will educate communities in the value of preserving historical sources.

Third. Decentralized presidential libraries will make available regional points of deposit for permanently valuable records of the Government. The physical facilities of the National Archives are not unlimited, and ultimately some means of providing for the proper care of the archives created by the field agencies of the Government must be found. These records of local and regional interest should be kept in the areas where they will be used. Presidential libraries are a good solution to this problem.

Four. Finally, it should be remembered that presidential papers belong to the President, and that they have increased tremendously in volume in the past 25 or 30 years. It is no longer possible for a President to take his papers home with him and care for them properly. It is no accident that the last three Presidents—Hoover, F. D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman—have had to make special provisions through the means of the presidential library to take care of their papers.

The presidential library, operated by GSA and in immediate charge of the Archivist of the United States, is in accord with our constitutional principles. It offers the best means of bringing the great collections of presidential papers into the national record keeping system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have what some people term a monumental debt, when the burden upon our taxpayers is increasing, if not every day every year, even though the objective, the preservation of historical papers is certain a fine objective—even though the objective is good, it would seem as though, until the members of the majority party and until the members of the minority party have made some effort to comply with the campaign promises to economize, to lessen the tax burden, to reduce the debt and to balance the budget—until we have made some move in that direction, we should refrain from going further even on desirable projects.

This bill proposes that the Administrator of General Services shall accept the papers of any President or former President—and get this one—papers and other historical materials of any other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with any President or former President of the United States.

Then it further provides that the Administrator shall accept the lands and buildings where these papers in any State may be stored.

What is the net result?

We have a library in New York of a former President. I understand there is one or will be one down at Independence, Mo., of another former President. Certainly when the present occupant of the White House moves out we will have a library with papers somewhere, and so on; and then not only those who may come after, but we go back perhaps and we find some President with some papers or some other official of the Government, no matter who he is, and the Government accepts those papers, and from that day on—now, think of it—from that day on the Government maintains that library, pays the cost of maintenance, when here in Washington we have the Library of Congress; we have down below the Archives Building, both of them places where these papers could be put, kept, and made available to everyone.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Maine.

Mr. HALE. As I read line 11, page 6 of the bill, the papers and other historical materials do not necessarily bear on the Presidency; and we may look forward legitimately to the day possibly when every Member of Congress can have a library in his own right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It looks a little that way. We have a distinguished former member of the House from Michigan, our friend, Mr. Blackney. He has a very very large library, a private collection of books and papers over on one of the beautiful lakes of Michigan, where I hope you can all sometime go and enjoy his hospitality while he is alive. We have that library established over there. A friendly administrator might want to continue or maintain it.

Then the great Supreme Court here. It is fine and all that, but go over and look at it. Was it necessary to spend $12 million to erect that building? Perhaps it was. Perhaps the Court needs it. I do not mean the present Court, I am not criticizing individuals, but perhaps the Court needs a building of that kind to recognize its dignity, its impartiality. But it is also well to bear in mind that throughout the years when that Court met here in the Capitol Building they set forth principles which are still good doctrine.

Figure out the number of charwomen needed to take care of that building. They have a magnificent cafeteria over there while we eat down below here in this little pen. Over there they have a dining room for each of the Justices.

I do not begrudge the Speaker or the minority leader their dining room because they share it and do very nicely with others of us; but why all that continuing, never-ending cost, the effort and money it takes to keep it clean and keep it polished?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman that the State of Maine has an admirable location for a library.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, well, I have in my own home county, in my own home town. Oh, yes, my district in my own home county borders on Lake Michigan. There is a wonderful library site there. All we need are papers and materials.

Julius Caesar Burroughs was a Senator from Michigan, from Kalamazoo. I remember when he used to come to the House as a Republican. Well, they redistricted the State, gerrymandered him out of his district, you would call it, so we sent him to the Senate. I wish they would do that to me.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. This bill does not contemplate the construction of these libraries by the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no; you just take over the land and the buildings and maintain them. That is what the bill provides. That is what the bill says.

Mr. MOSS. Yes. For presidential libraries. The gentleman is referring to collections of others. It authorizes the acquisition of the collection but not of the buildings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At the top of the page, as pointed out by the gentleman from Maine, you accept these historical materials, and so forth, of the President or former President of the United States, or of any other official or former official of the Government.

Then it goes on over here and another section authorizes acceptance of the buildings and title to the land. Then another one provides for maintaining, operating and protecting them as a presidential, and so forth. It makes no distinction. It is wide open.

But if the Members want it, that is all right. This Congress is on a spending spree. There is no indication that we intend to comply with any of our campaign promises. I am not going to object.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does the gentleman remember when we had this bill before the committee I asked specifically whether the Government would be obligated to maintain any library other than that of a President or a former President, and we were assured by the author of the bill that there was nothing in the bill which obligated the Government to maintain a library of anyone other than a President or former President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am not prepared to say what happened in executive session.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is that not true?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not prepared to say that. All I say is that the bill speaks for itself. It is to be a continuing obligation upon the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let us not have injected into this discussion extraneous matters. This bill does not permit the taking over or the maintenance of any library other than the library of a former President. The gentleman from Maine, if he will read the language, and he is a very able gentleman whom I profoundly respect, will find "any papers and other historical materials of any President or former President of the United States, or of any other official or former official of Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with any President or former President of the United States."

So it has got to be related and identified with a President or former President of the United States, then it says "subject to restrictions agreeable to the Administrator."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. With the highest respect to the gentleman, I do not construe the language as he construes it. It says, "other papers of any President or former President of the United States, or of any other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with any President or former President of the United States."

It seems to me you are going pretty far afield. In my opinion that language is very loosely drawn. I am willing to agree that the intention of the bill is probably exactly as the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated, but I think it should be amended; however, under this procedure we cannot amend it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am constrained to differ with the gentleman from Maine. If I had some papers in my possession which were of import in connection with construing or evaluating the history of a former President, certainly authority should exist in law for those papers to be accepted as a part of a presidential library. This does not mean any of my papers or the papers of any other official. It means the papers of an official or former official which relate to and are contemporary with. Certainly that language is plain and is not possible of any misconstruction through thinking that the entire libraries of some officials might be taken over.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Can the gentleman possibly imagine any paper that is not contemporary with some President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, certainly I can. As a matter of fact, those from an historical angle and contemporary would be very limited so far as you or I having them in our possession is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 2, section 2, I find the following: "documents, including motion picture films, still pictures, and sound recordings, from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions." That goes beyond Presidential limitations or former Presidential limitations.

Mr. McCORMACK. But it is subject to restrictions and regulations.

Mr. GROSS. Agreeable to the Administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. As provided for by the bill itself, if it becomes law.

Mr. GROSS. No; subject to the Administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I want to assure my friend that he is giving a much broader construction than the bill justifies.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the language to which reference has just now been made applies only to the acceptance of documents and has no relationship to the acceptance of a library?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. JONAS. I think the comments made with respect to papers of other officials perhaps are correct, because I think the act does authorize the Administrator to accept such papers, documents and films and what not. But that does not authorize him to accept a library and maintain it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It does not compel him to accept all papers and all documents, only those that he considers to be pertinent.

Mr. JONAS. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot agree with the gentleman on the construction, but if we can get unanimous consent, even though it is a suspension, to add after line 10, you can cure the whole thing by saying "or any papers or historic materials of any other." That would clear it up beyond any controversy. Also strike out the "or" in line 10. As I understand, even the way the rule is now, if there is unanimous consent, the gentleman who moved the suspension can amend it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say to the gentleman from Michigan that this bill was very carefully gone into by the subcommittee. It was very carefully gone into by the full committee, and several amendments were adopted. The subcommittee recommended several clarifying amendments.

Now, this is a very simple bill. It is designed to immediately take care of the Eisenhower library and the Truman library. The library of former President Hoover is under such circumstances in its relation to Stanford University, as I remember it, that the probabilities of that library being taken over would be very, very remote.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman think that unless this legislation is passed many valuable papers that should be preserved for historical reference will be lost?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. It would be unwise on our part if we did not pass legislation of this kind. We know from past history what has happened in the case of former Presidents, Presidents who have died, where their papers have been widely distributed and many of them completely destroyed, absolutely essential in evaluating history not only while they were President but in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. MARTIN. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope the legislation will be passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] introduced House Resolution 331. I introduced House Resolution 330, which is now being considered, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] introduced House Resolution 322. I want the RECORD to show, so far as this bill is concerned, that this is the bill of all three of us, not only myself but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

With reference to the argument that all of these libraries and all these historical papers should be concentrated in Washington, I do not think that is a very sound one. This is a great country, with a population of 165 millions of Americans, and the population will sharply increase in the years that lie ahead. The center of population is gradually going farther and farther west. So it seems to me it would be a serious mistake for Congress to say that the city of Washington, simply because it is the Capital, shall have a monopoly on all the historical papers of all the Presidents now living or those to be in the future.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As a member of the committee that supplies the money for the Archivist and the Archives, I have a very personal interest in this bill, and am very anxious to see it pass.

The point I should like to make is that modern methods of reproduction and the speed with which that reproduction can be secured are such that there is no point in having all of these documents in one library. We have already accumulated here in Washington a great collection of documents. It is better to have these where they are for other reasons and then have them made available to students, to colleges, and individuals by methods of reproduction. That is a very simple matter.

I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that the subcommittee was of that opinion, as well as a great majority of the full committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Did not the subcommittee take into consideration also, on the question of dispersal, the fact that with respect to the Truman library, for instance, in Missouri, and the proposed Eisenhower library in Kansas, the people of those sections of the country would have a special interest in seeing the documents and historical papers preserved in the locality that gave the particular President to the Nation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. JONAS. Instead of bringing them all here to Washington?

Mr. McCORMACK. That question was gone into thoroughly by the subcommittee. We unanimously agreed and reported to the full committee, giving our views in detail, and the great majority of the full committee concurred that there should be a distribution rather than a concentration.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to intrude on this colloquy, but some things have been mentioned in which I have a personal interest.

My Uncle Joe was Secretary to Woodrow Wilson in World War I, and after the President's death many of the papers relating both to President Wilson and my Uncle Joe were in possession of my uncle. If there had been such legislation in existence, such as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is urging today, it would have been an aid to historians writing of both President Wilson and my Uncle Joseph P. Tumulty in those days. At that time the Government did not take such good care of documents and papers of the Presidents, and those affiliated with them. It seems to me in this type of affair it is in the interest of the Government that the papers of Presidents be preserved and that the Government see to their preservation. Naturally, men such as secretaries, aides, congressional leaders, come into contact with writings both of themselves and the various Presidents which are of historical interest. Such papers can only be covered by broad language and the present bill seems to me to be drawn to fit just such eventualities.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] a question concerning the probable cost of this legislation. I am still not clear as to how many millions this is going to cost over the years. If there is any way by which that can be determined, I would like to know what the figure is for this has all the appearance of a blank check.

Mr. MOSS. Of course, the gentleman asks a question which cannot be answered specifically, as to how much it is going to cost over the years. But on the basis of the present operation of the Hyde Park Library, the cost is about $100,000 a year. As this contemplates the creation or taking over of the Truman and ultimately the Eisenhower libraries, that would add an additional $200,000 for those two on the basis of the information presently available.

Mr. GROSS. Then there would be the Hoover Library, and perhaps many others in the years to come?

Mr. MOSS. The Hoover Library is on the campus of Stanford University and is already being maintained.

Mr. GROSS. If we endowed these libraries, would we not be expected to contribute to the support of the Hoover Library at Stanford?

Mr. MOSS. That is an assumption that I should not care to comment upon at the moment.

Mr. GROSS. But in perpetuity we would be supporting these libraries, maintaining, and taking care of them when there are already facilities available in Washington, and when the Nation is already heavily in debt?

Mr. MOSS. If we gain the very rich historical material available through the libraries established by past Presidents of the United States, I think the cost would be very small and I think most assuredly the American people would want to pay it in order to have those records maintained.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN ALASKA

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 292 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5166) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5166, which briefly has for its purpose the authorization of the selection of members of the Territorial House of Alaska to serve as delegates to the constitutional convention. Under the present law the members of the Territorial legislature are not eligible to serve in the constitutional convention.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think if the gentleman will recall the testimony before the Rules Committee there was a question as to the eligibility. There has been no actual claim that they are ineligible, but there was a question of their eligibility. Therefore, this is curative legislation.

Mr. COLMER. I will accept the gentleman's statement about it. The point is, this would remove any question of their eligibility.

I do not think it is of too great importance one way or the other except that certainly if there is going to be a constitutional convention they ought to have an opportunity to choose those who are best qualified, and certainly the members of the legislature would be among those best qualified.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first public office I held was as a member of the Massachusetts constitutional convention in 1917. Members of the legislature were permitted to run. Dave Walsh was then in the Senate, and he was a candidate, and was a member. I think when we view constitutional conventions they are looked at differently, because they involve the fundamental law of a State, or in this case, the Territory of Alaska. There is so much precedent which justifies this bill. I wanted to call attention to my own experiences as a member of the Massachusetts constitutional convention in 1917 and 1918.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I merely wanted to emphasize that if they are going to have such a convention, and, of course, I do not know that they are going to have it at any time right away, but that is another question, they should have an opportunity to select the delegates that are best qualified.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think they plan a constitutional convention in November 1955. At the present time the Organic Act of Alaska makes it impossible for a member of the legislature to serve as a delegate even if he should be elected. I think this would make it possible for him to be elected and to serve as a delegate to the constitutional convention.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say it is my understanding that this bill was unanimously reported by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that a hearing was held before the Committee on Rules, and it was unanimously reported there.

It seems to me that while there has been some question as to whether members of the legislature should serve in a constitutional convention, and some States by their organic law prohibit such service while others permit it, certainly in the case of a Territory such as Alaska that Territory should be permitted to have serving in any constitutional convention which it may hold men who have had broad experience in the legislative and government field, such as those that serve in the legislature.

It is not a partisan bill in any way. But I believe this simply makes for good government. Therefore, I support it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5166) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1633) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska, an identical bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (48 U. S. C., sec. 82), any member of the legislature may be a candidate for election as a delegate in the formation of a constitutional convention and if elected may serve at such convention.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5166) was laid on the table.

STUDY OF UNNECESSARY GOVERNMENT PRINTING AND PAPERWORK

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 262) to authorize the Subcommittee on Printing to make studies and inquiries relative to unnecessary Government printing and paperwork, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> Whereas Federal printing facilities are presently operating at near excess of their manpower, machinery, and storage capacities; and
>
> Whereas there are increasing evidences of costly and unnecessary duplication of printed matter which has little or no demand, thus creating vast stores of unused and outmoded publications; and
>
> Whereas greater economies can be effected with a view to securing increased services for all branches of Government by elimination of said needless duplication and extraneous publications; and by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the House Subcommittee on Printing is authorized and directed to con-

duct a full investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services with particular reference to the administration, by rule, regulation, or otherwise of the provisions of law to Government printing, binding, reproduction, and distribution services, the sale and distribution of Government publications, and Government paperwork in general. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee or any member of the subcommittee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the Committee on House Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct a full investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services with particular reference to the administration, by rule, regulation, or otherwise of the provisions of law to Government printing, binding, reproduction, and distribution services, the sale and distribution of Government publications, and Government paperwork in general. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Strike out the preamble:

"Whereas Federal printing facilities are presently operating at near excess of their manpower, machinery, and storage capacities; and

"Whereas there are increasing evidences of costly and unnecessary duplication of printed matter which has little or no demand, thus creating vast stores of unused and outmoded publications; and

"Whereas greater economies can be effected with a view to securing increased services for all branches of Government by elimination of said needless duplication and extraneous publications; and by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork: Therefore be it"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to make studies and inquiries relative to unnecessary Government printing and paperwork."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4362) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203, title II, of Public Law 780, 83d Congress, be amended by adding thereto the subtitle "Red River Basin" and the following wording under that subtitle:

"That the existing flood-control project for Red River below Denison Dam be modified to provide for improvements substantially in accordance with the construction plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 488, 83d Congress: *Provided,* That local interests shall contribute toward the costs of construction, maintenance, and operation of Cooper Reservoir the amounts allocated to water supply; and shall, with respect to other features of the modified project, give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will—

"(a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and make alterations and relocations of highways and related facilities, and utilities except railroads, necessary for the construction;

"(b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction; and

"(c) maintain and operate all works after completion, and preserve channel capacities by preventing encroachment, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FERRELLS BRIDGE RESERVOIR

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water-supply feature of that reservoir.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House concurring therein), That the general plan for flood control on Red River below Denison Dam, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.) is hereby modified to include in Ferrells Bridge Reservoir approximately 250,000 acre-feet of increased storage for water supply: *Provided,* That local interests shall contribute the increased cost, including appropriate interest charges, of planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining such added storage as determined by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further,* That this contribution may be made on a percentage basis as construction of the project progresses or in a lump sum as soon as a reasonably certain date of completion can be given: *And provided further,* That payment of such contribution, irrespective of the method selected, shall be made no later than at such time as may be determined by the Chief of Engineers that will assure orderly construction to proceed to completion without interruption or delay.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENISON RESERVOIR, RED RIVER TEXAS-OKLAHOMA PROJECT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6641) to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized in the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma, at or near the Willis Site, to replace the crossing of Texas State Highway Numbered 91 and Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 99. Such bridge shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The construction of such bridge shall be subject to the condition that the States of Texas and Oklahoma shall each contribute the sum of $606,000 toward the cost of such bridge.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1318) as a substitute for H. R. 6641.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized in the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma, at or near the Willis site, to replace the crossing of Texas State Highway No. 91 and Oklahoma State Highway No. 99. Such bridge shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The construction of such bridge shall be subject to the condition that the States of Texas and Oklahoma shall each contribute the sum of $606,000 toward the cost of such bridge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6641) was laid on the table.

PUBLIC INTEREST NOT PROTECTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3½ minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Big Steel and big union leaders after bargaining for a short time last week agreed to a wage raise of 15 cents an hour, which will affect about 1,500,000 steel employees. This will increase the average wage from $2.33 to $2.50 an hour, to $20 a day—this increase notwithstanding living costs which are now the lowest in the past 3 years. This action again raises the question of its effect on the public, which will have to pay the bill, which will compel the steel companies to raise the price of steel about $6.50 a ton, or more.

We now produce 100,000,000 tons of steel a year. An increase of $6.50 a ton will cost the public an additional $650 million. It will mean higher prices for all farm machinery—now already too high; for all automobiles and trucks—affecting every farmer; higher costs for veterans' homes and all houses; for machine tools and steel used in industrial buildings; for pipe for oil wells and pipelines; for the housewives' stoves and ranges; and for everyone using a pound of steel.

It will cost the Government many millions of dollars in higher prices for the millions of tons of steel it must purchase to build our military strength. No one can escape—not even the millions of other laboring men. All will pay more for what they buy.

Union leaders contended that they were entitled to the recent raise, because the companies were making greater profits. If it is agreed that labor should have a partial share of the increased profits, should they have all?

The agreed-upon settlement raises the question: Should the increased profits of steel—the biggest and the most basic industry in the Nation—be divided only between management and the employees, or should the price of steel be reduced benefiting all other citizens including the rank and file of labor, further reducing the cost of living? Such action would seem consistent due to the fact that the cost of living is declining, and is now at its lowest point in 3 years.

This raise of $650 million annually and for the future, plus the recently granted guaranteed wage raise for automobile workers, amounts to over $1 billion a year, the public will have to pay in higher prices, which had no voice at the bargaining table. It is a billion dollar pressure being built up for inflation and higher prices.

Can it even be in the longtime interest of big business and big labor to monopolize the prosperity of this great basic industry and divide it among themselves, excluding the public which has to pay the costs?

Unless big business, big labor, the public and the Congress recognize the danger and can find the answer, and the solution to this problem, another round of inflation may well follow—the public may be priced out of the market, resulting in an inflationary depression that could wreck our economy and penalize the workers, farmers, business, and everyone.

It is time these groups take a serious look at this entire problem and try to find its solution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KARSTEN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include related matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include other material.

Mr. RAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter, the remarks to be inserted in the RECORD on 2 successive days.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babaothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Morika Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney; and

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

960. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relative to recommending certain amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, relating to the wheat program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

961. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited by the rehabilitation of major facilities of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts, Oreg., was completed as part of the investigations required in the formulation of plans and estimates and in the determination of the feasibility of rehabilitation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

962. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Mr. Mack Lazarus which, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, will authorize Mr. Lazarus to provide facilities and services for the public within Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, during a 10-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

963. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the fourth annual report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, together with pertinent recommendations for civil defense in our future national security structure, pursuant to Public Law 920, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

964. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names

indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 279. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on Communist activities in the Fort Wayne, Ind., area for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1052). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 148. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 9, 1955, on "Radiation Sterilization of Foods," without amendment (Rept. No. 1053). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 147. Resotion to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 144; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 156. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 139; with amendment (Rept. No. 1055). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4362. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7066. A bill to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 94. Concurrent resolution favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in certain elections; with amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7170. A bill to amend section 491 of title 18 of the United States Code, prohibiting the use of tokens as money, to extend the operation of such section to 10-cent, 25-cent, and 50-cent pieces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income in certain cases of indebtedness discharged 20 years or more after the date on which it was incurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair (including painting and papering) of his home to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7173. A bill to amend section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 so as to make such act inapplicable to stockyards which engage exclusively in the sale of livestock on commission at public auction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 375. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Congress shall have power to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 376. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the people of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 377. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of an enrolled Senate concurrent resolution by the State senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature, the House concurring therein, memorializing the United States Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to permit the people of the Five Civilized Tribes to have a voice in the selection of their tribal governor or chief; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of a House concurrent resolution by the house of representatives of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature, the senate concurring therein, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to issue special commemorative postage stamps in honor of the golden anniversary of the State of Oklahoma's admission into the Union; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of a joint resolution by the State senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature, the house of representatives concurring therein, directing attention to sound public policy with respect to division of taxing powers as between the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions; and calling upon the Congress of the United States to institute appropriate action to reduce excessive Federal tax rates and limit the unrestricted taxing power of Congress in favor of the States and their subdivisions to the end that our form of government shall survive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7174. A bill for the relief of Lucy Rolandone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7175. A bill for the relief of Yu Heng Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7176. A bill for the relief of the Maco Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7177. A bill for the relief of Kau Sei Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Future of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], at a luncheon sponsored by the Institute for International Order to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 24, 1955.

The address, entitled "Disarmament and the Future of the United Nations," is timely and challenging, and I hope that every Member of the Senate will read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISARMAMENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Speech by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN at a luncheon sponsored by the Institute for International Order in Washington to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, June 24, 1955)

This is a great week in the world's history—this week in which men of many nations are celebrating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. I am glad to take part in this celebration today with Americans who are dedicated to the preservation and strengthening of the world organization which holds our best hope for peace.

In San Francisco, statesmen from all parts of the earth have gathered to reaffirm their faith in the United Nations and to try to recapture the spirit of conciliation which prevailed in the summer of 1945. President Eisenhower and former President Truman, two American leaders with very different views on many things, have shown the essential unity of America's support for the United Nations by their participating in the San Francisco celebration.

I believe everyone here shares my belief that American membership in the world organization is extremely valuable.

I do not think I need to list all the benefits the United States has received from its membership—the opportunity for world leadership, the friendships we have made, the achievements we have helped the United Nations attain in its crusade against poverty, misery, and despair.

Today I want to discuss with you two topics which affect the lives of every human being—disarmament and the future of the United Nations.

I approach these topics with the full consciousness of how many complexities are involved in each of them, and a realization that my own knowledge of many aspects of these complexities certainly is limited. I have studied them and thought about them for a long time, and I offer my views and my suggestions today because I think we all have a responsibility and an obligation to talk about these questions, however lacking in wisdom we may be. I think so because these matters are issues of life and death for ourselves and our children.

Let us look first at the future of the United Nations.

When 40 nations send their foreign ministers to a celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, that is evidence of their conviction that the U. N. is tremendously important.

When 21 nations are trying to get into the United Nations and no nation is trying to get out, that is evidence of the prestige and moral power of the organization.

When the President and two former Presidents of the United States tell the American people of their belief in the United Nations, that is evidence of the impression made by the United Nations during its first 10 years.

As a member of the United States Senate, I know that the majority of Senators—in addition to knowing of its positive achievements—are well aware of the value of the United Nations as a forum for mankind, as an escape valve for the tensions existing between nations, as a great debating society.

Senators are not among those who regard debates and discussions as a waste of time. Senators realize that they learn from one another, correct their misconceptions, broaden their viewpoints, increase their tolerance and understanding, through the process of full and free debates. Sometimes the debates go on a little too long, but it is better to have them run too long than to cut them off short, to prevent men from having their say.

I think the United Nations will endure because it has the qualities of adaptation which have enabled parliamentary systems of government to function successfully.

It has proved flexible enough to meet the needs of the last 10 years.

When the Security Council, after an initial success in the Iranian case, seemed to be virtually paralyzed by the exercise of vetoes by the great powers, principally Soviet Russia, the General Assembly was given greater power.

Without any formal amendment of the charter, the Assembly adopted the uniting for peace resolution. Under that resolution, it made recommendations for keeping the peace in cases where the Security Council seemed unable to throw off the shackles of the Russian vetoes.

Of course, the charter did not authorize the Assembly to require action from member nations. The Assembly simply had the power to adopt resolutions and make recommendations.

But that power proved strong enough. Its strength astonished some of the experts who overlooked the fact that a recommendation resulting from a vote taken by representatives of 60 nations had immediate effects upon public opinion around the world.

The leaders of nations could not afford to ignore the impact of votes in the General Assembly. In fact it has been said that the Assembly carried greater weight with the people of the earth than the Security Council with its 11 members.

So the United Nations moved around the roadblocks cast in its path by Soviet vetoes.

It was able to move because mankind was determined that the United Nations should not fail.

Sick of war, impatient with the arguments of demagogic leaders, the people of the world brushed aside technical obstacles and infused the Assembly with the strength it needed.

Of course, the United Nations did not develop the power to solve all the difficult issues existing between nations. It has not proved itself able to settle the cold war between the Communist and non-Communist countries.

These two facts have led some diplomats and some newspaper correspondents to conclude that the failures of the U. N. outweigh its successes.

In an article which appeared recently in many newspapers, one of these correspondents—R. H. Shackford, a Scripps-Howard staff writer—declared: "Any balance sheet of the first 10 years of the United Nations is bound to show a deficit—fewer major successes than failures."

He went on to give a balance sheet which contained, it seems to me, quite a number of major achievements for the U. N. Here are his headings and his summaries:

"Iran: The most outstanding peaceful settlement was the U. N.'s very first problem in 1946. Russia refused to remove its troops from northern Iran as provided for by treaty. Iran appealed to the Security Council. Soviet Delegate Andrei Gromyko walked out and refused to participate in the deliberations. But in the end Russia, confronted with overwhelming world and U. N. opinion, withdrew her troops and returned to the Council.

"Korea: Here the U. N.'s only collective action goes into the credit column. To be sure, the United States took the initiative and carried the ball, both militarily and financially—and was extremely unhappy at times about U. N. interference. But the fact is it was the first time in history that the principle of collective security was invoked to stop an aggressor. However small or grudging the token contributions of others were, the United States did not have only moral support of many big and little U. N. members individually, but also the U. N.'s legal support.

"Greece: This is similar to the Korean war case where the decisive factors were the initiative and action of the United States. The U. N. did focus attention on the Balkan Communist attempts to subvert Greece and established and publicized the facts.

"Italian colonies: After failure of the Big Four, the U. N. Assembly did work out a formula for a settlement—an independent Libya and ultimately independent Somaliland—which was put into effect.

"Indonesia: The United Nations played a major role in bringing about independence of Indonesia from the Netherlands. In that sense U. N. action was successful.

"Syria-Lebanon: Britain and France withdrew troops after complaints were aired in the U. N.

"Trieste: Total failure after exhaustive efforts. Subsequently settled by a direct Italian-Yugoslav deal.

"Berlin blockade: Possible minor contribution to its lifting; but direct U. N. efforts failed.

"Palestine: Success in obtaining an uneasy truce, but total failure since to obtain an Israeli-Arab settlement.

"Kashmir: U. N. arranged a cease-fire but there is still no political agreement between India and Pakistan.

"North Africa: A lot of smoke in the Assembly, but no signs of any effect on French colonial policy.

"Apartheid: No change in racial policies in South Africa, but much increase in tensions between South Africa and India each time it is debated.

"Germany and Austria: Total failure each time it has adopted resolutions urging settlements. Russia refused the U. N. Commission entry to East Germany.

"Korea, again: On the political side, total failure before and after the war to make any progress toward unification and freedom for all of Korea.

"Formosa: Efforts to seek a cease-fire rudely rejected by Red China."

Before presenting this balance sheet, Mr. Shackford wrote: "It would be unreasonable to write the U. N. off as a total and hopeless loss today, just as it was fatuous and naive 10 years ago in San Francisco to believe that the U. N. would solve all the world's problems and let us live happily ever after."

In a later article, he indicated that he thought the United Nations would survive in some form, although he foresaw many dangers ahead for it. He said: "The future of the U. N. points to an existence that will fluctuate, in unison with the ebb and flow of relations between East and West."

I have not quoted Mr. Shackford's opinions out of any desire to engage in any quarrel with him or to pick his statements apart, although I do not agree completely with his review of the United Nations first 10 years or his doubts about its future. But he is an excellent newspaperman, and he has given in his articles his honest views of how the United Nations looks through his eyes.

His very excellence as a newspaperman led me to quote some of his statements—because I believe he has expressed, in his own vivid manner, ideas about the United Nations held by a great many Americans who know that organization only as it appears in the newspapers.

Mr. Shackford, like many Americans, seems to feel some impatience with the United Nations. It does not get results fast enough. With a few exceptions, it has not provided scenes of dramatic excitement. It has not produced electrifying answers for the world's troubles—so its failures, to many people, outweigh its successes.

In our country, drama is the stuff from which news is made. Drama implies conflict. To be satisfying, the conflict must move to some definite outcome. If this does not happen, it is considered vague, unfinished, not professionally successful—and not thrilling enough for many in the audience.

When I look at Mr. Shackford's balance sheet for the United Nations I think it reflects the feeling of many Americans that the drama in the United Nations has not reached a smashing third-act curtain. While he disavows any hope for a completely happy ending, it seems to me that he has been disappointed—as many Americans have been disappointed.

It is true that the world has not been straightened out.

It is true that guns are still being fired from time to time—in Argentina, in Palestine, in Indochina, in other areas of trouble.

It is true that the Red Chinese still threaten Formosa.

It is true that Korea is still a divided and tragic land of suffering.

It is true that the Communist villains still walk the stage—and they are deadly, they are dangerous, even though they have begun to make sounds like cooing doves.

Yet I believe the greatest achievement of the United Nations in its first 10 years is a thing that has not happened.

There has been no third world war.

That does not appear in big black headlines in our newspapers—and yet it is the most tremendous fact of our time.

There has been no third world war.

When we pause and think, we realize that millions of us are alive today because of this fact—and there is much evidence to prove that this is largely due to the existence of the United Nations.

This point was made clear recently in testimony given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by former President Truman, a moving force in the establishment of the United Nations. In speaking of the contributions that the organization has made to the maintenance of peace during the past 10 years, Mr. Truman said:

"I believe that had we not had the United Nations, the events of the past 10 years would again have plunged the world into unlimited international warfare. The fact that we have not had such a war is attributable in considerable measure to the existence of the United Nations."

There has been no third world war.

That is a mighty achievement, which cannot be mentioned too often, which cannot be praised too much.

There has been no third world war.

If we had a peace day every year—a day when bells would ring and proclamations would call for public rejoicing at the passage of another year without the devastation of a global struggle—perhaps we would realize how much we have gained by preventing this catastrophe.

I would like to see the establishment of such a day, to be observed under the auspices of the United Nations in every country belonging to the United Nations. Perhaps October 24, now observed as U. N. Day, might be renamed world peace day. The United Nations anniversaries could be celebrated in June, perhaps on June 26, the date of the charter's actual signing in 1945.

I would like to see the countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain accept this idea—and join wholeheartedly in its observance.

Perhaps the Communists would try to steal this peace day celebration, or claim that they thought of it first, as they have tried to claim many things developed in the free countries.

Let them try, I say. Let them try to outdo us in proclaiming their devotion to peace.

Such a competition could not bring harm to the world.

Such a contest could not be lost by any nation, or won by any nation.

Such a day would be dedicated to the veterans and the casualties of past world wars—the millions of men, women, and children who were sacrificed in the furnaces of past destruction.

On this day of rejoicing, each nation could recite what it had done in a year to spread the benefits of life and to get along in harmony with its neighbors.

That would be news worth sending around the world.

That would be news of achievement, news of construction, news of man's upward climb toward the stars.

Think of how often the world has seemed close to the burning pit of disaster in the last 10 years.

There was the tension over Iran in 1946, when U. N. had scarcely begun to function.

There was the tension over the Berlin blockade in 1948, when the East and the West seemed poised for battle.

There was the fierce outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950, when the world wondered whether the flames would spread from one nation to another.

There was the tension over Indochina last fall, when we seemed on the verge of committing American troops to the front once again.

There was the tension over Formosa this spring, when the vision of a holocaust rose before us.

And yet we came through.

And yet the world was spared the ultimate horror of universal slaughter.

Whether the United Nations was involved in the foreground of all these events or not, it was always involved in the background.

No matter how loud the voices of anger grew, the voices calling for peace were always speaking at the U. N., day and night, tirelessly, endlessly—and those voices prevailed in the end.

That is why I am sure the United Nations has a magnificent future and humanity is determined to use the U. N. as a key to open the doors of peace.

The future of the U. N. is dependent to a large degree upon the maintenance of a stable international order—and the maintenance of such a stable order depends to some degree upon the progress we make in creating an unarmed peace.

Let us look now at the difficulties involved in disarmament, the second topic I want to discuss with you today.

On this, the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, one of the world's great unattained goals is disarmament.

While I think that the preservation of an armed peace, such as we now have, is worth celebrating in the light of the tensions existing in the world, I believe we must recognize that an armed peace is an uneasy peace.

An armed peace has an unsteady equilibrium—and has a constant tendency to break down.

An armed peace contains the elements for war—because the growth of enormous military power causes the growth of fear, although the expansion of military forces is also due to fear. These two things are linked together and feed upon one another

When nations agree to disarm, fear begins to go down.

The more fear declines, the more possible it becomes to disarm.

In the last few years we have lived in such an atmosphere of fear that those who advocated any form of disarmament were likely to be branded by some as appeasers.

Appeasers were subject to suspicion, and regarded as the possible friends of the Communists.

Now the idea of disarmament is in the air again.

Now the nations are putting forth plans and proposals, amendments, and counterproposals.

Now the President has appointed a Special Assistant in Charge of Disarmament and has called upon all citizens to aid him by providing ideas and suggestions.

Now a leading American newspaper publisher, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., has asked consideration for a resolution calling upon members of the U. N. "to reduce by 1 percent their respective military expenditures for the year 1955–56 and further agree to contribute at least 50 percent of this saving to a United Nations pool for research in the cure and prevention of children's diseases, including possible new applications of atomic energy for that purpose."

You may recall that on June 3, 1953, along with several other Senators, I joined Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

Briefly, this resolution declared it to be the purpose of the United States to obtain, within the United Nations, agreements by all nations for enforceable universal disarmament, down to those arms and forces needed for the maintenance of domestic order, under a continuing system of United Nations inspection, control, and international police protection.

I have already discussed the reintroduction of this resolution with Senator FLANDERS, and it is my hope and belief that we will reintroduce it in the future.

This spring the United Nations Disarmament Commission subcommittee resumed its long-adjourned sessions in London.

Many proposals were offered at these sessions, which continued from February 25 to May 9. The major proposals were made public a month ago. Some experts found in the Soviet program some signs that Russia was moving toward acceptance of the Western demand for international inspection of atomic facilities as an essential condition for effective disarmament.

Some of the ideas now being discussed were foreshadowed 5 years ago by the late Senator Brien McMahon in a brilliant speech on the floor of the United States Senate. He introduced a resolution, of which I was a cosponsor, embodying these ideas.

Later in 1950, when I represented the United States at the United Nations General Assembly, I presented these proposals before the Economic Committee.

President Truman expressed similar hopes and promises in his address on United Nations Day on October 24, 1950. And in January 1953, President Eisenhower repeated the promise.

The disarmament resolution which I joined Senator FLANDERS in introducing in 1953 gives furtherance to this great possibility by calling on the President to develop a plan for the transfer of resources and manpower now being used for arms to constructive ends at home and abroad. Moreover, the resolution recommends similar action to the United Nations and member states.

I believe the world is now ready for more serious consideration of these ideas, which rose in the mind and heart of Brien McMahon when he saw the people of the earth walking into the dark shadow of the hydrogen bomb. As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he knew the power that would come from that bomb and the other awesome weapons springing from the laboratories of the scientists.

Last week our country went through an Operation Alert. It was assumed that hydrogen bombs had wrecked 58 cities, killed about 8,200,000 people, injured 6,550,000, and contaminated vast areas with radioactive fallout. Reporting these facts, the New York Times declared: "Operation Alert had underlined a fact that was well known before it was staged: The country is far short of being ready to deal with the problems a hydrogen bomb attack would create. The effort to drive home that point—to the people and to Congress—is believed to have been one of the principal reasons why the Government staged the test."

After the test, one Cabinet member was quoted by a newspaper as saying that the results indicated the Nation would survive even such a disaster as a real hydrogen bomb raid and would make surprisingly quick recovery.

Would the millions killed in such a raid ever make a recovery? Would the millions of maimed people make a quick recovery? Would the millions who lost their homes and their jobs find it possible to make a surprisingly quick recovery?

I do not believe we should talk in such terms or think in such terms. I believe we should acknowledge that our Nation would not surrender, no matter how hard it might be hit, but we should use the results of such tests to show the world that we are aware of what another global war would cost—and we do not want to pay such a fearful price unless we are compelled to.

We must take the leadership in proposals for disarmament, as we have taken the leadership in combating communism, launching the Marshall plan, meeting aggression wherever it has occurred.

We must take the leadership because the world looks to the United States for constant and positive efforts to reduce the possibility of war and increase the likelihood of peace.

At the same time we will insist upon guaranties to make any disarmament program effective, with safeguards to make certain that the Communist nations carry out each step in the program. We can be sure that the free nations, eager to be rid of the crushing weight of gigantic armaments, will do their share.

In an address honoring the memory of Woodrow Wilson just a month ago, Bernard Baruch reached the heart of the matter.

Baruch said: "It is the hope of the world, of course, that the threat of war will be lifted, that the fear of atomic devastation will be dispelled, that the burden of armament will be lightened. But we must not be beguiled by wishful thinking. Every plan for disarmament deserves careful consideration, but none can be adopted which fails to provide direct, effective, and certain guaranties for enforcement of its terms.

"International disarmament of both conventional and atomic weapons requires an international authority with power to inspect, control, and impose punishment, swift, sure, and condign, against any transgressor. Any agreement which does not establish the authority to enforce it would be incalculably dangerous. To permit any nation the right to veto the decisions of the control agency, or actions taken against violators, would be to make the plan meaningless."

Much as we want disarmament, much as we want peace, we can never abandon these conditions.

It takes courage to advocate a plan which places so much power in the hands of an international authority, as Mr. Baruch does.

Yet, there seems to be no alternative which offers any real possibility of a disarmed peace that will endure.

Mr. Baruch feels, as many other American leaders feel, that we must rely upon the development of the United Nations in the future to make any disarmament plan workable.

Today, knowing that the power of modern weapons gives mankind the terrible strength to wipe out civilization itself, we must summon all the courage and all the faith and all the hope we have within us to support the United Nations.

For the sake of our children and the generations to come, we must help the U. N. to grow stronger in the years ahead.

We must help to make it a true parliament of man and a firm shield against the scourge of war.

Costly Snag Revealed in River Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Calif., of Wednesday, June 22, 1955:

COSTLY SNAG REVEALED IN RIVER PLAN—GIFT OF IRRIGATION PROJECTS HELD CHEAPER TO TAXPAYER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of a series on the dispute over a proposed development of the upper Colorado River. It is written by a Long Beach Congressman who is leading his southern California associates in a fight against the development.)

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

According to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period as required by reclamation law and precedent.

ENTITLED TO WATER

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

Thus, proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent.

IN NATIONAL MONUMENT

They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true "cash-register" nature.

As a starter two power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon and one at Echo Park, within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Other power projects would follow later.

The Glen Canyon and Echo Park power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The 11 projects could function to supply water entirely without Glen Canyon and Echo Park. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $600 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the upper basin States and forgets the power features completely.

CALIFORNIANS CONCERNED

It is with these power features that Californians also have a special concern. The power projects would hold back, for power use, most of the 48 million acre-feet of water to be stored by the development. In the storage process, another 10 million acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation.

Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water a year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million persons.

The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects.

Public Law 51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a detailed analysis of Public Law 51, the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act of 1955, prepared on my request by Elizabeth Elward, American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, and which I wish to share with my colleagues for study and ready reference:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC LAW 51, 84TH CONGRESS

(Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1956)

Title I—Treasury Department

Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$2, 680, 000
Bureau of Accounts:	
Salaries and expenses	2, 600, 000
Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses	15, 475, 000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	18, 075, 000
Bureau of the Public Debt	44, 500, 000
Office of Treasurer, United States: Salaries and expenses	15, 000, 000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	41, 200, 000
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	282, 250, 000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	2, 990, 000
U. S. Secret Service:	
Salaries and expenses	2, 960, 000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	800, 000
Salaries and expenses, Guard Force	268, 000
Total, U. S. Secret Service	4, 028, 000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	3, 650, 000
U. S. Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	153, 750, 000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	7, 000, 000
Retired pay	21, 300, 000
Reserve training	3, 175, 000
Total, Coast Guard	185, 225, 000
Total, title I—Treasury Department	599, 598, 000
Federal Facilities Corporation	[1] (800, 000)
Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation	[1] (1, 400, 000)
Total	[1] (2, 200, 000)

Title II—Post Office Department

Administration	$15, 500, 000
Operations	1, 870, 000, 000
Transportation	661, 620, 500
Finance	17, 200, 000
Facilities	157, 400, 000
Total, title II, Post Office Department	2, 721, 720, 500

Title III—The Tax Court of the United States

Salaries and expenses	$1, 170, 000
Total, title III, The Tax Court of the United States	1, 170, 000
Grand total appropriations, titles I, II, and III	3, 322, 488, 500

[1] Authorized expenditures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Treasury Department

(a) Makes available from travel expenses the expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the applicable appropriation is made.

(b) Authorizes appropriations necessary for the care and treatment of Halsford V. Sharpe as authorized by Private Law 419, 83d Congress.

Post Office Department

(a) Makes expenses of attendance at certain meetings available from any funds at the disposal of the Post Office Department.

(b) Authorizes the use of up to $100,000 during the current fiscal year for training programs from available funds.

(c) Authorizes the use of up to $12 million from available funds for property improvement.

Contains antistrike provisions.

Elizabeth Elward,
American Law Division.

June 16, 1955.

S. 2407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, S. 2407, introduced by Senator Smith of New Jersey, would cut off merchant seamen from medical, surgical, and dental care they now receive at the Public Health Service hospitals and permit them only to get such help as might be available at the nearest military facility.

At a time when the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, is hard put to find ways and means of preventing a further decline of our merchant marine strength, it is shocking to find a bill offered in the Senate that would eliminate the privileges which for many years have been accorded to those engaged in the hazardous maritime profession. We should remember that even with the few privileges they now have, comparatively few young men are turning to the sea as a profession—this in a country that once boasted the finest sailors afloat and showed its flag around the world.

The idea that the service is not needed or may be provided by makeshifts at some military facility is not supported by the facts. There is a Public Health Service hospital in my district. As of a few days ago it had 645 patients, 404 of them American merchant seamen. For more than a year it has averaged a daily load of more than 400 merchant seamen bed patients. Between July 1954 and May 1955—a period of 11 months—American merchant seamen made 42,339 outpatient visits to the Public Health Service hospital on Staten Island, in my district. Figuring this on the average of about 3 visits per patient, we have more than 14,000 American merchant seamen using the Public Health Service hospital outpatient service in 11 months. That is more than 1,200 a month—I would like to know what military facility can handle that hospital care and outpatient load.

I consider S. 2407 for a bad and dangerous bill. I shall oppose it in every possible way and I hope my colleagues who have the welfare of our merchant marine at heart—to say nothing of the Coast Guard and other Government services dependent upon the Public Health Service hospitals for medical, surgical, and dental care—will join in that opposition.

Republican Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago when the Democratic Party was endeavoring to give a $20 tax credit to the American people we listened to some unwarranted and unfounded charges about fiscal irresponsibility directed toward Democratic Members of Congress. This allegation of fiscal irresponsibility was made by the Eisenhower administration because the Democratic Party was endeavoring to give approximately $2 billion in individual income tax relief which would principally have gone to low income families.

This tax reduction was necessary to balance the distribution of the tax burden equitably among all taxpayers. The so-called tax relief of the 83d Congress had cast our tax structure into imbalance by giving over 75 percent of the tax reduction to individuals with incomes over $25,000 and to corporations. It was against that background that the Secretary of the Treasury termed as fiscal irresponsibility the recent attempt by Democratic Members of the Congress to give needed tax relief to our low income families.

Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight I would like to point out an instance of true fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the same Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to certain responses made by that Secretary of the Treasury to questions which I addressed to him during the recent public hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means on legislation providing for a temporary increase in the statutory debt limit.

In these hearings a distinguished Republican member of our committee raised the question of the proposed liberalization of our social-security laws on which the Committee on Ways and Means is presently working. These Democratic-sponsored amendments are designed to correct certain inadequacies in the present law and to make benefits available to certain classes of people that, in general, are now enduring real hardship. In response to an observation by this Republican member of our committee to the effect that it would be irresponsible on the part of Congress to enact these long overdue changes in the social-security law, the Secretary of the Treasury said as follows:

> It would be an extremely serious thing, with the amount of debt we owe, to not pay our bills. It is unthinkable.

At that point I undertook to set the record straight and to determine what the Secretary's position was with respect to these amendments. The Secretary informed me that the proposed social-security changes would very definitely change the national debt if the funds provided for social security were not sufficient to cover the obligations incurred by social security. I then asked the Secretary if it was not true that he was the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. He stated that he was. He agreed with me that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and costs of the social-security program are financed by the contributions made to the fund rather than out of the general funds of the Treasury but he volunteered the information that if the contributions fall below the obligations of the fund it will be necessary to meet the deficit out of the general funds of the Treasury. I then asked the Secretary this question:

> Is it—

Referring to the trust fund—

> able to meet its current obligations, Mr. Secretary?

To which the Secretary of the Treasury, who had charged the Democratic Party with fiscal irresponsibility, replied:

> It can meet current obligations. I think it is very questionable that the fund is sufficient to meet its full obligations if they are incurred.

I then asked the Secretary of the Treasury, who I will remind you is the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, if it was his opinion that the old-age and survivors insurance system is actuarially unsound. In response to this question the Secretary of the Treasury replied:

> Yes, under the present provisions of collection and disbursement.

Mr. Speaker, the law requires that the trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund report annually to the Congress on the status of the trust fund. The trustees are also required by law to report immediately to the Congress whenever the trustees are of the opinion that the amount of the trust fund is unduly small. To date the Congress has received no notification from the managing trustee of the trust fund—the Secretary of the Treasury, or any of the other trustees of the trust fund, either individually or collectively, that the old-age and survivors insurance system was not actuarially sound. In fact, in the report of the trustees on March 1, 1955, which is printed as Senate Document No. 39, of the 84th Congress, it is stated on page 30 thereof, as follows:

> Accordingly, it might be said that in the 1954 amendments, the increase in the ultimate contribution rate meets all of the additional costs of the benefits proposed and a substantial part of the deficiency which the latest estimates indicated in the financing of the 1952 act.

Hon. George M. Humphrey, when wearing the hat of the Secretary of the Treasury, is totally inconsistent in maintaining that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is actuarially unsound with his utterances when he is wearing the hat of the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in assuring the Congress that the system is actuarially sound.

Mr. Speaker, the fraud is even more serious than that. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the tax recommendations of the President of the United States contained in his message to the Congress of May 20, 1953. In those recommendations he stated:

> The increase in the old-age insurance tax from 1½ to 2 percent on both employees and employers, now scheduled to go into effect next January 1, should be postponed until January 1, 1955.
>
> The old-age and survivors trust fund has now reached almost $18 billion. Receipts at present tax rates are currently well in excess of expenditures. The further addition to the fund which would flow from the projected tax increase is not required.
>
> From now on, the old-age tax and trust accounts, while maintaining the contributary principle, should be handled more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is in the position of having Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey disagreeing with Managing Trustee Humphrey and with the President. We are compelled to wonder who is right and who is wrong.

In view of the fact that the Republican Members of the 84th Congress are desperately resorting to their traditional obstructionism in opposing any liberalization of the social-security program, I am inclined to believe that the Honorable George M. Humphrey is talking through his Secretary of the Treasury's hat when he condemns the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

It is inconceivable to me that any President who even feigns any semblance of fiscal responsibility would advocate a delay in the scheduled increase in social-security taxes without the most thorough and thoughtful consideration of the matter.

It would seem that the Secretary of the Treasury is basing his charge of fiscal irresponsibility in regard to the proposed liberalization of the social-security program on the same political expediency and opportunism that motivated his charge of fiscal irresponsibility when he opposed the $20 tax cut that would have meant so much to the average American family. The administration's shotgun opposition is in keeping with what I have always regarded as the unstated underlying philosophy of the Republican Party to the effect that "what is good for the common man is not good for him unless the Republican Party condescends to give it to him."

The truth with respect to the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is that it is sound. Furthermore, I am sure that I am correct in stating that it is the intention and conviction of every Member of Congress that the fund always be maintained in an actuarially sound condition. I think it is important to set the record straight on this matter because otherwise there can be no confidence in the social-security system on the part of the American public.

The actuarial experts at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are extremely able and competent in their field. The Committee on Ways and Means has always given careful consideration to their recommendations and counsel in enacting any amendments to our social-security law. In reporting social-security legislation to the House, the Committee on Ways and Means has always acted prudently and provided a tax contribution schedule that was consistent and in keeping with the actuarial aspects of the program.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these conflicting and inconsistent statements by representatives of the Republican administration, I would like to recommend that those representatives of the Eisenhower administration abandon their allegations of fiscal irresponsibility whenever they are opposed to something that the Democratic Party is trying to do for the welfare of our American citizens.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the bill includes projects which have been disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Budget Bureau has specifically recommended that the Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho units not be authorized at this time. The Bureau has pointed out that there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of these projects due to the lack of data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the works.

With respect to participating projects outrightly authorized for construction in section 1 of the bill, the Bureau of the Budget has submitted that their authorization should be conditioned upon a new finding of favorable economic justification by the Secretary of Interior which must include (a) a joint study with the Department of Agriculture of the direct agricultural benefits of each project and (b) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of each project, based upon a reexamination of the methods presently used to compute the indirect and public benefits of reclamation projects. Based on the insufficiency of the available information regarding these participating projects, which this bill would authorize, the Budget Bureau has stated that a reexamination is necessary "so that there could be no doubt about the economic justification of the projects finally undertaken."

Congress should not undertake to authorize questionable or unjustified projects. Until the information requested by the Bureau of the Budget is made available, Congress should not act on these projects.

Full Freedom of Captive Nations an Essential Prerequisite to Any Big Four Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1955, the President of the United States will meet at Geneva with the heads of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. This will be the first Four Powers Conference on the summit to be held with the Russians since 1945. The purpose of this meeting will be to explore the possibilities of relieving world tensions.

According to a statement made recently by Mr. Herbert Hoover before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee "it has been agreed in the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the Conference, that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which is believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions."

In this connection I would like to make the following remarks for the RECORD.

As far as Europe is concerned the tension started, when—after Hitler's defeat—the Red army occupied Eastern and Central Europe to the Elbe River, and communist expansion became a menacing threat to the continent.

Since that time we have witnessed the subjugation, one after another, of the Central Eastern European countries by brutal force or fraudulent methods exercised by the Kremlin powers.

Before World War II those countries were sovereign states, forming an integral part of Europe and of its cultural heritage, contributing to Europe's political stability and peaceful development.

Speaking in this connection of Poland, this country fought on our side during World War II, it had an alliance with France and Great Britain and became a signatory on January 1, 1942, of the Washington Declaration of the United Nations. The Polish Government in

Exile, residing in London, cooperated closely with the nations at war with Hitlerites Germany, and was generally recognized by all governments with the exception of the axis partners. Polish forces fought under the Supreme Allied Command in France, Italy, Germany, Africa and took an active part in allied air and sea operations.

It seems appropriate to remember these facts at the present juncture.

Poland is today an enslaved country.

The grim Soviet technique in depriving individuals and nations of personal freedom and political independence was revealed in all details during the hearings of the Select Committee on the House of Representatives to investigate Communist aggression—and I therefore will not dwell on this subject.

From a moral point of view, the American people strongly resent this brutal Communist assault against the free nations of Europe.

It is our national tradition inherited from those who inspired the Declaration of American Independence, to defend and promote freedom. We therefore abhor every form of moral and physical tyranny.

Apart from ethical considerations we have a direct interest in the fate of the Central Eastern European countries and in the restoration of their national independence. We have assumed a large part of responsibility in maintaining peace and security in Europe. We should not forget that the Soviet-occupied countries are an essential component of the European Continent, and that the artificial line separating today the free from the enslaved is a most disturbing factor and a serious menace to peace.

We cannot envisage a return to normalcy in Europe or believe in the validity of security pacts as long as an iron curtain is drawn over nearly 100 million Europeans, submitted to totalitarian Communist rule and denied political and personal rights.

This in practice means severance of all cultural and social links between the two parts of Europe, disruption of economic ties, compulsory political and military realinement of the subdued states against the West.

The closing up by Soviet Russia of its zone of influence from the Free World and the imposition of puppet governments was followed by the integration of the subjugated countries into Moscow's military organization. The national resources of these countries, their industrial output, labor and skill have been added to the Soviet war potential. Our friends, the Poles, and the other nations linked with us by common traditions are forced against their will to deliver the goods to the oppressors hostile to the West. It is generally estimated that the U. S. S. R. has gained a biological and economic surplus of about 40 percent as a result of the occupation of the nine captive countries.

In spite of 10 years of Soviet oppressive rule there is abundant evidence that the spirit of resistance still remains strong behind the Iron Curtain. The people of Poland as well as of other captive nations in Europe do not morally surrender to their forcefully imposed Communist regimes. The resistance is silent without spectacular moves, it is rather of a psychological nature, very subtle, taking various forms according to circumstances. Despite Communist propaganda directed specially against the United States of America the people behind the Iron Curtain maintain a very friendly interest toward America. They consider this country as the bastion of freedom and center their hopes on it.

On the threshold of our talks with Soviet Russia on the highest level we should remember that behind the Iron Curtain millions of our natural allies are watching us with hope and extreme anxiety.

Let us not deceive them, or lure them by vain illusions.

Since Stalin's death Soviet diplomacy has gradually abandoned its rigid form, becoming more subtle and flexible. Quite recently it has shown unprecedented initiative. Soviet moves with regard to Austria, Yugoslavia and Western Germany, constituting a complete aboutface in the position Moscow had taken so far, came as a surprise to the free world.

When analyzing Soviet policy we should make a distinction between essentials and mere tactics. After all this apparent change of Soviet attitude has paid them a good dividend from the propaganda point of view although behind the smokescreen their objectives remain unchanged.

Moscow's initiative in the last months centered on problems connected with the Western security system. In other words it was an effort to weaken our position of strength.

Moscow did not hesitate to make direct approaches to Vienna, Belgrade and even to Bonn, and we can still expect further surprise moves. This should encourage us even more to take the initiative in our hands.

The Four Power Conference offers an opportunity to raise an essential problem on which peace depends—namely the restoration of freedom to the captive countries of Europe.

On that score, we stand on firm ground from a moral, legal, and political point of view.

I have already dealt with the moral and political aspects.

Legally, the Soviets are well aware of the weakness of their position in view of flagrant violations on their behalf of practically all bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties to which the U. S. S. R. was a partner. On the other hand the United States of America has in these agreements and common declarations of policy solid ground for claims to restore peaceful conditions in Soviet occupied part of Europe. In the face of broken pledges by the U. S. S. R., to insist on respect of human rights and national independence is a moral obligation and sound policy for the United States and its Western Allies.

It, therefore, is essential to the future of the world and to the maintenance of the high position of leadership of the United States that at the coming meeting of the four powers, the representatives of our Government insist, as a prerequisite to any agreements, that certain conditions be met with reference to the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The restoration of independence and the creation of peaceful conditions of life to the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe should be carried out under international protection and control. Such control must be insisted upon to give the agreements any meaning whatsoever.

It should comprise the withdrawal of Soviet forces to the prewar frontiers as well as of Russian military and police personnel, the end of every form of Soviet occupation, the release of political prisoners and return of deportees from Russia, freedom of activities for political parties and self-determination expressed through free elections.

Unless such demands are made by our Government and agreed to by the Soviet powers, there can be little, if any, hope for beneficial results from the summit meetings.

Basin Project Peril Outlined by Hosmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of Friday, June 24, 1955:

BASIN PROJECT PERIL OUTLINED BY HOSMER

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

That the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project would euchre California out of vast quantities of Colorado River water to which she is legally entitled is well known and understood.

Two additional specific objections to the project must not be ignored by Californians:

It threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction; and

POWER CURTAILED

Power generating capacity at Hoover Dam would be curtailed and the lost power would have to be replaced at a cost of millions to southland California consumers.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalis and salts before use in homes and factories.

Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject.

Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

FIGURE WOULD JUMP

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

The reasons why southern California's water quality would suffer are simple: First, water returning to the river after new upstream irrigation uses would contain added impurities dissolved from the soil.

Second, pure upstream water diverted in large amounts through mountains and out of the river system forever would not be available to dilute concentrated impurities farther downstream.

Third, water withheld in upstream storage reservoirs would likewise be lost for dilution purposes.

ENGINEERS ESTIMATE

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre.

Adding further insult to these injuries, the project would cost home and industrial customers of the Southern California Edison Co., the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and other Hoover Dam power contractors an extra $2 million a year in higher electric rates.

Gilmore Tillman, assistant Los Angles city attorney, places the exact figure at $2,152,000 a year. This would be the cost of fuel oil burned in steam generating plants for replacement power, less what would have been paid for the same amount of Hoover power.

At the same time, and for the remaining life of the power contracts at Hoover Dam (until 1987) the Federal Government, and thus the United States taxpayers, would lose a total of $187 million in revenue from power not sold because there was no water to generate it.

This $187 million loss to taxpayers illustrates that there are substantial reasons not to build the upper Colorado River storage project in addition to those local to California. These reasons, shared by the citizens of all 48 States, are varied and compelling.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Illinois?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Illinois has more than 69,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

We Cannot Afford To Treat the Russian Bear as a Playful Kitten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert an address I delivered July 2, before the 62d annual convention of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, held at the Sheraton Park Hotel, in Washington, titled "We Cannot Afford To Treat the Russian Bear as a Playful Kitten":

It is a pleasure for me to join with the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in this, its 62d annual convention. The cause of Armenia is well known to the American people, and the never-ending struggle of the Armenian people for their national independence is a matter of inspiration to all those of us who have come to know about it.

The cause of Armenian independence is of unusual importance today because its success or failure, will echo the success or failure of the cause of peace and human freedom.

During the past several months there have been a number of developments which bear an important relationship to the fight for Armenian national independence, and the struggle of all the captive non-Russian nations within the Russian Communist empire. Those developments are a natural outgrowth of the work done by the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, whose chairman was our friend, Charles Kersten of Wisconsin.

The first of those developments came when 6 former members of the select committee in Congress introduced simultaneously on March 22, 1955, a resolution calling for the Secretary of State—

1. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to transmit to each member nation of the United Nations copies of the summary report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, as well as copies of all other reports submitted to the House by such Select Committee;
2. To formulate a resolution, based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in such House report, naming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism; and
3. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

This resolution was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and after a careful study of the matter, including a full opportunity for the career officers of the Department of State and others, to present their opinions on the resolution, the committee then approved it by a vote of 17 to 5. Our good friend, the very able Congressman from Connecticut, the Honorable Thomas Dodd, played a major role in the preparation of the majority report accompanying his resolution on this matter which was numbered House Resolution 183. Many long time observers of the international scene have commended this resolution and the report which accompanied it, as the most significant political action taken against the international Communist conspiracy during the 38 years of its despotic reign.

House Resolution 183 was then referred to the Rules Committee, and a hearing was held. Mr. Richards, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, together with Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Walter Judd, and I, appeared in support of that resolution.

The spokesman for the well organized minority of four was Congressman Vorys, of Ohio. By an unfortunate turn of events, the spokesman for the minority presented a last minute letter signed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles requesting the rejection of this resolution on the basis that it would likely provoke the Russians, and therefore disturb the tranquility of the waters upon which the leaders of the Big Four expect to bask during their conference at the Summit. Equally unfortunate, but understandably, the House Rules Committee, upon receipt of the letter from Secretary of State Dulles, determined that further hearings would be held on the resolution.

Since these further hearings would involve the testimony of Secretary Dulles himself, it is very unlikely that any action will be taken on House Resolution 183 before the conference at the Summit because Secretary Dulles will not be available for such hearings.

Several weeks ago, on the occasion of my appearance at the Baltic States freedom rally in New York City, I expressed my concern that Secretary of State Dulles may have fallen under the influence of the tip-toe artists in the Department of State who have long advocated a policy of delicate diplomacy in dealing with the Russian autocrats. I made it clear that the same group who sabotaged the dynamic policies of President Truman were still in the career service of the Department of State, and that it appeared they would never learn that anyone who regards the Russian Bear as a playful kitten would soon fall under the gentle strangling embrace of the red-nosed Bear. I hope we will soon be able to rid our ship of state of these parasitic barnacles and that we will be able to launch an all-out political offensive against the international Communist conspiracy.

The Russian conspirators in the Kremlin consider House Resolution 183 to be a matter of major crisis for them. One development in recent days which demonstrates the importance they attach to that resolution is the following monitored broadcast of Radio Prague on June 21, this year:

"UNITED STATES SENATE RESOLUTION PROVOCATIVE

"Czechoslovakia, June 21, 1955.—Certain United States politicians are doing everything possible to provoke a war as they are obsessed with the idea of war. Recently, these people succeeded in piloting through the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee a new, nonsensical, and provocative resolution. They want the United States Government to propose to the United Nations that the Soviet Union and her relations with the people's democracies be condemned.

"The purpose of this provocation is quite clear: Its authors want to poison and trouble the international atmosphere just before the beginning of the forthcoming four-power conference. They do not like the lessening of international tension achieved by the great and tireless efforts of the Soviet Government, and, for that reason, they would also like to drag the United Nation into their dark plans. However, there is an immense abyss between the plans of the United States aggressive circles and the possibility of realizing these plans. Despite all the pressure in the Senate, four of its Members refused to support this provocative resolution.

"Assistant Secretary of State Morton also declared, by way of a warning addressed to

United States Senators, that the United States might be isolated if it submitted the above-mentioned resolution to the United Nations. Morton also mentioned the nonexistent problem of the east European countries, which is so ardently propagated by some United States circles, and he made an interesting admission. He said that United States interventions about the people's democracies were worthless, because the nations of those countries were proud of the fact that their countries were independent, that their governments were freely elected, and that their relationship with the Soviet Union constituted a bond of friendship characterized by mutual respect for independence.

"These words uttered by Morton, therefore, confirm the fact that certain United States officials, for example, Mr. Dulles, although they submit for discussion to the forthcoming four-power conference the so-called problem of the east European countries, know full well that such a problem does not exist."

The compliments paid by the international Communist conspiracy to Assistant Secretary of State Morton, Congressman VORYS, and his three associates, to put it mildly and as gently as circumstances permit, is indeed dubious. To put it another way, the Kremlin, in its overanxiety over the telling effects of that resolution, has let the cat out of the bag.

I regret to say that there is a striking similarity between the monitored broadcast and some of President Eisenhower's answers during his most recent press conference, Wednesday. According to the New York Times, June 30, the White House authorized release of a transcript, and I quote therefrom:

Mrs. May Craig, of Maine papers: "Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Theis' question, the House passed last week, 367 to 0, a resolution of Democratic Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, expressing sympathy with the satellites, condemning colonialism of all kinds, and asking that the United Nations and any organization in which we participated do what they could to release them.

"Did you favor that resolution? Did you know about that?

"Answer. As a matter of fact, I did not know about that. Maybe I was fishing that day. I don't know.

"Question. Three hundred and sixty-seven to nothing.

"Answer. Well, I still say that there are all kinds of nuances in any such statement, possible complications, that make you very careful in uttering an official statement.

"For example, if you believe that, how far are you going? You are certainly not going to declare a war, are you? So there instantly you fix for yourself limitations on how far we, as a people, will go in accomplishing this thing.

"That means, therefore, that we use peaceful means and means that are not provocative. But we use moral suasion. We use refusal to be drawn into any seeming approval of such a situation. But we do place limits on ourselves instantly when we think about the thing. And so that means that there is a problem. It is not just as simple as just saying something and forgetting it."

I am sure, this must be for President Eisenhower a coincidence, but in any case, it is a very unhappy coincidence.

On May 31, the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives introduced House Concurrent Resolution 149 which condemns all forms of colonialism and imperialism and restates the support of the American people to the right of all people to national independence and national sovereignty. That resolution passed the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote of 367. This action on the part of the House of Representatives, speaking as it does for the American people, should give renewed hope to the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people enslaved within the Russian Communist empire as well as a new confidence that as sure as day follows night, the despotism of the Russians will be destroyed.

During the past week the House of Representatives had before it the 1955 Mutual Security Act. During the course of debate on this legislation, I offered two amendments, the object of which was to support the principles embodied in the McCormack resolution. I offered an amendment which required Tito and his henchmen to permit United States Representatives to make complete and continuous inspection of the manner in which all assistance received from the United States was used, including the utilization and possession of all military equipment we give to Tito.

I am happy to report that this amendment was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives and I trust will very soon bring us the final answer as to what Dictator Tito is really up to. By making complete and continuous inspection of all the assistance we give to the Communist leader, Tito, including the location and utilization of all the military equipment we have given and will continue to give to him, I am sure we will soon have the answer to that important question. It may shock you to know that the executive branch of this Government has not, up to now, carried on any thoroughgoing complete, or continuous inspection of what Tito has been doing with our assistance, including military end items.

I should also like to remind you that in the hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee having to do with economic and military assistance to Tito, the Republican administration put themselves clearly on record stating that it was essential that this assistance be given to the Communist dictator, Tito. I should also like to commend four members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who dissented, on the question of giving aid to the Communist dictator, Tito, and who submitted a minority report strongly recommending to all the Members of Congress that we stand firmly by our adherence to anticolonialism and antiimperialism, and that we reject all forms of communism, even the so-called national style of which Tito is the leader.

We, as a nation, are still suffering from a tremendous amount of ignorance concerning the international Communist conspiracy and the part the Russian imperialists play in that design for world conquest. While some improvement in our understanding of the crises of our time has taken place in recent years, I feel we have a very long way to go before we have established in the public mind the real force behind the scourge of international communism. When we have gotten across to the people of the United States, and to all the other people of the still free world, that the Russian despots who, under the czars, had a well developed plan of world conquest and who now, under the commissars, utilize the Pied Piper promises of Marx and Engels to further their diabolical scheme of world domain, we will have taken our most important step on the path to peace and freedom.

The effort which is made today to disguise the historical Russian involvement in the international Communist conspiracy must be exposed and ridiculed. We must return to the reality of the moral and political principles upon which the American way of life is based.

We must support without hesitation, and with fervor and determination, all those nations and people who adhere to and strive for those same moral and political principles. We must regard as an enemy of the cause of peace and freedom, anyone who rejects those moral and political principles and who considers them inapplicable in the world in which we live today.

I know that you, as delegates of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, will continue the patriotic work which you have engaged in throughout the years and that you will increase your work of educating all the still free people on the facts concerning Russian imperial communism. In the performance of this urgently needed public service, you will have made a great contribution to the preservation of the American way of life.

May God give you strength and wisdom to succeed in that mission.

American-Israel Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Attorney General of the United States, at the 58th Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, held recently in Washington. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, DELIVERED BEFORE THE 58TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, HOTEL WILLARD, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 18, 1955

It gives me great pleasure to participate in this evening's session of the 58th national convention of the Zionist Organization of America and to convey the warmest greetings of the Government of the United States on this important occasion.

The theme of your convention—American-Israel friendship—is one with which I believe an overwhelmingly majority of our fellow-Americans would wish to be identified; for the task of creating understanding and promoting friendship between our country and other free nations throughout the world is one of the supreme challenges to Americans at this moment in our country's history. If we are to discharge successfully the tremendous responsibility which America has been called upon to assume in our generation—the obligation to lead the free world toward security, progress and peace—it is imperative that our life should be correctly interpreted to our friends of other lands and that their hopes and aspirations should be fully explained to us.

The young State of Israel stands high on the list of nations whose friendship is of great importance to the American Government and people. The significance of that friendship is not to be measured by Israel's size and numbers, although that country's strategic location and the high caliber of its population are no doubt weighty factors which must be recognized. It is the spirit that animates Israel that is of primary importance to us. We see in Israel a pilot-plant of American ideas in an area of the world that sorely needs these concepts, a striving after goals that are similar to our own.

I recently found striking evidence of this in a field in which I find myself continually occupied, the area of constitutional law. I have had occasion to read a fascinating account of four cases, involving important constitutional questions of law, which recently came before the Supreme Court of Israel. The central fact that emerged from this paper by Judge Cheshin, Deputy President of Israel's Supreme Court, is that Israel's still-evolving system of justice not only shows a close affinity for our American system, but often utilizes opinions delivered throughout the years by the Supreme Court of the United States. No one who is close to the legal procedures of our Nation can fail to be both proud and inspired by what I have just described. This trend augurs well for the citizens of Israel and the protection of their rights. It also reflects the continued vigor and health of our American legal system.

As the chief legal officer of this country, I am naturally interested in comparative law. I am mindful that the Talmudic law has contributed to our own. During all the time that the Jews formed communities in one country after another, often only to be expelled, the elaboration of the Talmud continued. This was, and is, a manifestation of the creative spirit of Israel.

I am also aware, sympathetically aware, of the complex structure of the law in Israel, consisting, as it does, of the law of the old Ottoman Empire, the British Mandatory law, and the laws enacted by the new state. In addition, each religious community applies its own laws to all matters affecting personal status, such as marriage and divorce, guardianship and alimony.

This complicated structure of laws is undoubtedly cumbersome. The Government of Israel long has recognized the necessity of developing a new legal system for Israel. It is approaching this momentous task in a manner which has impressed me from the beginning and which I have spoken of before. It manifests not only a creative spirit, but also a flexibility which is characteristic of youth, strength, and growth.

About 3 years ago the Ministry of Justice of Israel joined with Harvard Law School in the establishment of the Harvard Law School-Israel Cooperative Research project, supported by voluntary funds. Harvard University, on its part, has made available the resources of its outstanding Library of Comparative Law and the scholarly advice of its staff. But it has done more. It has enlisted the active participation of scholars from many other leading American law schools and is expanding their participation. On its part, Israel has provided representatives of the Ministry of Justice and experts in Hebrew and in jurisprudence. In no sense, of course, are laws for Israel being drafted at the Harvard Law School-Israel Cooperative Research project center. What is being done is the collection and organization of the infinite variety of information necessary to enable the Knesseth, Israel's legislative body, to draft the new code in the light of complete knowledge.

This approach to this problem, which has such huge importance, is of particular significance in this day and age. How good it is to see scholarly cooperation across continents in creating means to enable men and women to live in peace and confidence.

I have no doubt that from this present effort new concepts may arise. They will take their place along with the many gifts which the legal minds of Israel have bestowed upon the philosophy of the law. I believe that when the work of Harvard is utilized by the Knesseth, it will carry with it the conviction that ultimate good and justice can be achieved through peaceful cooperation with neighboring nations.

I am interested not only in the development of the law of Israel, but as a member of the Cabinet I have watched with admiration Israel's growth among the community of nations in almost every area of human endeavor—in science, industry, literature, and other areas of mankind's never-ending struggle for progress. There is already a great deal of traffic over the American-Israel "Friendship Bridge." As time goes on, I am convinced, this will increasingly become a two-way movement, for we will surely have much to learn from a people that has produced the ethical values that are held in common by all Americans, particularly after this people has resumed its normal existence in its ancestral homeland. This close collaboration extends to the most important areas of scientific research. All of us were gratified to hear of the atomic energy agreement recently concluded between the United States and Israel. The promise of nuclear energy means much to Israel where natural resources are sparse. The prospect of Israel's scientific genius being brought to bear on the peaceful use of atomic energy means much to the United States and to free people everywhere. In dealing with the question of this two-way bridge between the United States and Israel, I wish to express my hearty congratulations to the Zionist Organization of America, whose current work in this field is no less important than the historic role it played in the creation of the State of Israel.

Now, I am persuaded that in our relations with Israel, any differences which may arise from time to time will undoubtedly be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both countries. Occasional differences are bound to arise between the friendliest of nations, and the Government of the United States has encountered this even in its dealings with its closest allies. But where there are strong ties of mutual interest, identity of outlook, and common aspirations, the disagreements are bound to be temporary. The geographic distance between the Potomac and Jordan Rivers may be great, but there is certainly little difference in spirit between the two countries. I, therefore, firmly believe that our initial premise is that Israel's destiny will remain linked with that of the United States of America.

I know that the continuing tension between Israel and her neighbors figures prominently in your deliberations at this convention. The absence of peace between Israel and the Arab States certainly provides ample reason for concern. The Government of the United States is not only mindful of the urgency of the problem, but is actively seeking to bring about a solution. This was recently clearly expressed by President Eisenhower. In his message requesting congressional approval for the new mutual security program, the President stated:

"The continuing tension between the Arab States and Israel handicaps the people of all Near East nations. We should continue to work with the governments and peoples of both sides to improve their economic status and accelerate their progress toward lasting peace between them. Our cooperation is beginning to bring results, particularly in the development of water resources. Such developments in the Palestine area can go far to remove present causes of tension."

This Government is determined to move forward in the spirit reflected in the President's message and we shall persist in our efforts until we have achieved the peace which is required in the region by all those who seek to achieve a free world, and without which neither Israel nor the Arab States will be able to prosper. The issues of the Arab-Israel conflict can be resolved through patience and understanding. It is the task of everyone to recognize this and to work toward it.

By continuing our economic and technical assistance to both Israel and the Arab States and by raising living standards throughout the region, we shall be doing much to bring peace to the area. With respect to our planning for regional defense, I should like to say this:

The United States Government, I assure you, is not unmindful of Israel's security and the protection and welfare of its people. It is our hope and our desire that area defense arrangements will develop through which all countries in the area can contribute toward their mutual protection against aggression from the Communist menace. This is definitely in our own interest and represents a major element in our policy for the Middle East and for strengthening the defense of the free world.

Bananas on Pike's Peak or Good Land in Georgia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Georgia has more than 1,721,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Bluestone irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Bluestone project is a part of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1955

Rev. Ethan W. Dodgen, minister, First Methodist Church, Jonesboro, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee for the rich heritage of this Nation. For as we have trusted in Thee and followed Thy laws, great good has come to us, and Thou hast used us to bless mankind. May Thy grace sustain us, Thy strength undergird us, and Thy wisdom guide us as we face the issues of this day. In the spirit and name of Thy Son, Jesus, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 5, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 1, 1955, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 243. An act for the relief of Szjena Peison and David Peison;

S. 375. An act for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ioanna Katyll;

S. 735. An act for the relief of Sarah Kabacznik; and

S. 1747. An act to increase the public benefits from the national-park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 107. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife, Stefania Janicki;

S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand;

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 802. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 804. An act to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1127. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1318. An act to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1571. An act to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year;

S. 1633. An act relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska;

S. 1725. An act to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly;

S. 2135. An act to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water supply feature of that reservoir.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura;

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control;

S. 1250. An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream; and

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, MILLERTON LAKE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in the Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the 56th annual convention of the American Federation of Musicians, at Montreal, Canada, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2421. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2422. A bill for the relief of Manuel Vilar Soler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2423. A bill for the relief of Lin Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2424. A bill to provide that Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead Lock and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. Carlson) (by request):

S. 2425. A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available on a voluntary basis, group hospital, surgical, medical, and other personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, through the facilities of prepayment group plans, group practice prepayment plans, Federal employee organizations, and insurance companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2426. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aberasturi (Cigorraga); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. Morse, and Mr. McNamara):

S. 2427. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. Morse, and Mr. McNamara) (by request):

S. 2428. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2429. A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

OVERTIME PAY FOR POLICE WORK IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it for 1 minute in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency.

We in the Nation's Capital are in the midst of a transit strike. The suspension of bus and streetcar service has affected almost every segment of life in the city, the commuters, business houses, private car owners, and others. This strike is most unfortunate, but one of the hardest hit is Washington's Metropolitan Police Department.

Since the beginning of the strike on Friday, July 1, the whole force has been on duty 12 hours a day and every day. All regular days off were canceled. Men were called in who were on vacation. Until the transit strike is over, these policemen will be working overtime and extra shifts without extra pay. The police have met the traffic emergency with astonishing efficiency and resourcefulness and will continue to do so and are to be commended for their fine efforts.

This is not the first time they have been called upon to put in such overtime. Recently leaves have been canceled to take care of crime waves, celebrations, and school integration. For example, in January 1953, men had to work extra time due to the crime situation. During that month 24,000 man-hours were put in without pay.

What is the financial status of our police force today? The starting salary is $3,900. Many have to find part time jobs to meet family expenses. Many wives work to supplement their husband's salary. At present 350 policemen are working on part-time jobs. I sincerely hope that some additional compensation will materialize under a bill now before Congress providing for a 7.5 increase. Adequate pay is necessary to maintain our force at full strength.

We, in Washington, D. C., have a police force of which we can be justly proud. In 1954 when the crime rate was increasing nationally in our large cities by 5 percent, the crime rate decreased 8 percent in the same year in the District. The approximate figures for fiscal year 1955 indicate another 8-percent drop in the crime rate in the District.

It is unfortunate indeed that these men should be required to put in this extra time serving the public without proper compensation. The bill which I am introducing today will provide for such compensation on this and future occasions. This bill is retroactive to July 1 to provide overtime pay to meet the present emergency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2421) to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency, introduced by Mr. Mansfield, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] be named conferees on the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, in lieu of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Green] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Statement by Senator Anderson with reference to the Dixon-Yates contract.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Weekly newsletter entitled "The Search for Peace," written by him under date of June 20, 1955.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Smathers):

Sermon on the subject Religious Liberty, delivered by Rev. John H. Haldeman together with remarks by Senator Smathers.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nominations of Caleb M. Wright, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware, to fill a new position, and Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island for a term of 4 years, vice Jacob S. Temkin, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Wednesday, July 13, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning these nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by me, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations, together with a table summarizing the information compiled in a report on the same subject by the committee, as of March 31, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement By Senator Byrd

Agencies of the Federal Government in the first 3 quarters of fiscal year 1955 spent $47.2 billion, and entered the last quarter of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $101.1 billion.

As of March 31, 1955, military services, exclusive of civil functions, in the first three quarters of the year had spent $26.3 billion, and entered the last quarter of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $57.3 billion.

During the first 9 months of fiscal year 1955, the Foreign Operations Administration had spent $2.8 billion and entered the last quarter of the year with unexpended balances in its appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $10.1 billion.

Other agencies of the Government in the first three quarters of fiscal year 1955 spent

$18.1 billion and entered the last quarter of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $33.7 billion.

Of the $47.2 billion spent in the first three quarters of fiscal year 1955, $20.4 billion was spent from appropriations and other authorizations enacted for fiscal year 1955 and $26.7 billion was spent out of balances carried over from appropriations and other authorizations enacted in prior years.

These figures were revealed today in the 18th report in a series of compilations of "Federal Appropriations and Authorizations, Expenditures and Unexpended Balances," by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The term "unexpended balances" in appropriations and authorizations does not mean that the cash is in the Treasury. It means the agencies, on March 31, 1955, were still authorized to call upon the Treasury to meet their obligations to the amount of the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As the bills come due, the Treasury must provide the funds from tax collections, other cash on hand, or from borrowed funds which increase the Federal debt.

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORITY TO EXPEND FROM PUBLIC DEBT RECEIPTS

The $101.1 billion in unexpended balances included $79.7 billion of balances in appropriations, etc., and $21.4 billion in unused authority to expend from public debt receipts. Expenditures from appropriations, etc., and use of the authority to expend out of the debt, along with the balances in each of these categories as of March 31, 1955, are summarized as follows:

Appropriations and authorizations

[In billions]

	Fiscal year 1955 [1]	Prior year balance	Transfers	Total after transfers	Expenditures	Unexpended balances
Appropriations	$48.2	$77.6	+$1.1	$126.9	$47.2	$79.7
Authority to expend from public debt receipts	2.9	20.8	−2.3	21.4		21.4
Total	51.1	98.4	−1.2	148.3	47.2	101.1

[1] Including supplementals for fiscal year 1955 enacted to Mar. 31, 1955, but excluding all appropriations for fiscal year 1956.

TABLE I.—*Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,*[1] *showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1955 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of Mar. 31, 1955*

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations					Expenditures (through Mar. 31, 1955)			Unexpended balances as of Mar. 31, 1955
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations [2]	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1955 [3]	Total funds	Transfers [4]	Total after transfers	Out of prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total [5]	
Executive Office of the President	2,730	8,755	11,485		11,485	761	5,709	6,470	5,015
Funds appropriated to the President [6]	11,463,675	2,823,502	14,287,177	−16,771	14,270,406	1,934,854	1,072,372	3,007,223	11,263,182
Independent offices	12,584,508	3,304,640	15,889,148	−101,806	15,787,342	4,329,228	653,113	4,982,347	10,804,995
General Services Administration	1,258,709	535,594	1,794,303	+6,732	1,801,035	617,763	104,626	722,386	1,078,649
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,923,563	507,605	6,431,168	+418,276	6,849,444	250,958	−150,670	100,286	6,749,159
Department of Agriculture	5,567,860	2,837,715	8,405,575	−3,090	8,402,485	2,870,429	354,799	3,225,224	5,177,261
Department of Commerce	303,792	971,798	1,275,590	+1,041	1,276,631	90,761	746,106	836,868	439,763
Department of Defense	55,470,753	30,131,374	85,602,127	−1,062,047	84,540,080	15,769,666	11,151,177	26,920,843	57,619,237
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	588,778	1,354,316	1,943,094		1,943,094	441,658	1,057,780	1,499,438	443,656
Department of the Interior	289,197	501,216	790,413	+2,455	792,868	176,680	226,400	403,077	389,791
Department of Justice	23,810	182,075	205,885	−1,268	204,617	16,690	119,086	135,777	68,840
Department of Labor	56,020	340,805	396,825		396,825	32,928	245,693	278,619	118,206
Department of the Post Office	365,576	175,900	541,476		541,476		260,513	260,513	280,963
Department of State	59,662	130,582	190,244	−6,341	183,903	16,444	95,891	112,336	71,567
Department of the Treasury [7]	4,480,112	7,252,913	11,733,025	−424,540	11,308,485	174,248	4,501,918	4,676,164	6,632,321
Undistributed [8]							−709	−709	709
Total	*98,438,745	51,058,791	149,497,536	**−1,187,361	148,310,175	26,723,068	20,443,804	47,166,863	101,143,311

*Includes relatively small amounts for which time for obligation has expired and time for transfer to surplus has not arrived.

**Represents largely transfers to the surplus fund and capital transfers representing payment to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury for the retirement of capital stock and for disposition of earnings of business-type activities (principally wholly owned Government corporations).

[1] Excluding trust and deposit fund accounts.

[2] Includes balances in 1953 and 1954 appropriation and other authorization accounts and balances in no-year and multiyear appropriation and other authorization accounts.

[3] Includes all regular appropriations and all supplemental appropriations to date.

[4] Represents transfer of funds from one account to another within the same agency or among agencies; funds so transferred from parent accounts are merged with balances in recipient accounts, and all expenditures are charged against the recipient accounts and not against the parent accounts.

[5] Negative expenditures in these columns represent an excess of collections over disbursements, for example: Credits in the expenditures of working funds represent advances to the funds from other accounts. Expenditures will be charged against these funds as work is performed or completed.

[6] Includes figures for foreign aid.

[7] Includes interest on the public debt. Excludes principal of refunds of receipts representing overpayment of taxes.

[8] Represents net differences resulting from variations in methods of reporting and classifying expenditure data. For this reason expenditures stated in this report may differ slightly from those reported in the Monthly Treasury Statement in certain line items.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Fiscal Service, Bureau of Accounts, Department of the Treasury. (Expenditures are stated on the basis of checks issued and cash payments made as reported by Government disbursing officers.)

CONGRESSIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned over the question of congressional interpretation of the general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States.

This concern led me to prepare a discussion of the subject which I felt would be appropriate to present in the course of Senate debate on the Public Works appropriation bill. Since the bill involved a total of $1,377,571,000, and included funds for some highly controversial projects, I assumed there would be extended debate, followed by a recorded vote. On yesterday, however, the bill was passed after a minimum of discussion and by a voice vote.

The fact that the Senate acted so quickly on this bill convinces me all the more of the importance of our soberly reviewing the constitutional sources of our spending authority. Therefore, although I do not wish to consume the time of the Senate by reading all of my prepared speech, which would require about an hour, I ask unanimous consent that the full text may appear in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. ROBERTSON's prepared speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

For the first time in my recollection the Senate is considering an appropriation bill for the civil functions of the Army to which has been added reclamation and other types of public works including the Tennessee Valley Authority. In considering the TVA item the Senate is faced with a question of fundamental principle as well as policy.

Some want the Government to build a steam plant for the TVA at Fulton, Tenn., or, in any event, to strike out the item for a transmission line without which a steam plant proposed to be built by the Dixon-Yates private utility group in Arkansas could not furnish power to TVA.

Others want to retain the item for the transmission line across the Mississippi River because they prefer the authorized proposal of the Dixon-Yates group to build the plant with private funds.

Each of these plants would be for the avowed purpose of furnishing power needed for operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. Justification for financial backing of the Federal Government, directly for construction costs in one case and indirectly through annual payments for power which would amortize the cost in the other case, is claimed, therefore, because the power would be used by an authorized agency of the Government. Actually no plant on either side of the Mississippi River near Memphis would furnish power for atomic energy operations in Kentucky except theoretically through a bookkeeping transaction.

The city of Memphis now gets its power from the TVA system. The ability of that system to supply power from its present sources is limited. If future needs of the AEC are to be met, more power will be required and if it is supplied by TVA that agency will have to have new power sources or take some power away from present users. If either the proposed Fulton TVA plant or the Dixon-Yates plant provided power for use by Memphis, that would release an equivalent amount for use elsewhere on the TVA system, including the atomic energy plants. On the other hand, the needs of the AEC could be met, as they have already been met in some instances, by building new powerplants at or near the point of demand; and if this were done the need which is claimed for the plants in the Memphis area would not exist.

Obviously, therefore, the real purpose of either the Fulton TVA or the Dixon-Yates plant would be to furnish power for Memphis, Tenn., and the Congress now finds itself engaged in a controversy over which source of power it shall choose to serve an independent city in a sovereign State.

I shall not discuss today the pros and cons of the policy involved because I am more concerned about the constitutional principle.

What is happening to a central government of limited powers, such as was intended by the Founding Fathers of this Nation when the Congress of the United States undertakes to solve the electric power supply problem of a single city by use, either directly or indirectly, of tax revenues collected from citizens of the whole United States? And where will such actions lead us?

To answer that question it is necessary, I believe, to review the history of the general-welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States, the only source from which the authority we are proposing to exercise could possibly come. I believe that such a review will indicate how far we already have moved away from the concept of a Federal Government of limited powers such as was envisioned by James Madison and Andrew Jackson and how grave is the responsibility now resting on Members of the Congress to check our course before we confirm the prediction of Lord Macaulay that our Constitution would prove to be all sail and no anchor.

At the outset of this discussion, Mr. President, I wish to gratefully acknowledge the assistance given me by Loyd Wright, president of the American Bar Association, who is justly recognized as possessing one of the great legal brains of the American bar, and by F. D. G. Ribble, dean of the University of Virginia Law School, a brilliant teacher of constitutional law whose views on the Constitution have been frequently quoted by the Supreme Court.

I must frankly admit that I called on these authorities in the hope that they could furnish me proof that the Congress cannot go beyond a certain point in operating or even financing commercial activities but the gist of their response was that the Senate cannot make the Supreme Court the keeper of its conscience.

As Dean Ribble put it: "The spending power, as the Supreme Court held in *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447 (1923)), cannot be tested directly by citizens in the courts. Here the Constitution in practical fact is to be applied by the Congress or not at all. Members must recognize this obligation to the Constitution and to the oath they have taken. Unless they follow their duty as interpreters of the Constitution, it will surely lose meaning and its power. They may surrender, by careless acts day by day, the basic and fundamental instrument of this Government."

The oath to which Dean Ribble referred is the one taken by every Member of the Senate when he assumes office. In taking that oath each of us said: "I solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same" and "that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion."

I am sure every Member of the Senate wants to live up to that obligation but, in order that we may remain true to the spirit as well as the letter of our oath, I believe we should periodically review the principles of the Constitution and their particular application to current problems. So, today I am proposing that we see whence we derive the powers which would be exercised in handling this public works bill and what moral, if not legal, limitations are imposed by a clear understanding of constitutional limitations.

The Constitution of the United States of America provides in article 1, section 8, clause 1, that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." The phrase "general welfare" also appears in the preamble to the Constitution. The problem under consideration is to determine what power has been conferred upon Congress under this clause. Has Congress the unlimited power to provide for the general welfare, that is to say, to enact any laws it might conceive were for the general welfare, of the United States?

Apparently no one ever has seriously contended that the framers of the Constitution intended to grant to Congress a blanket separate power to provide unrestrictedly for the general welfare. Those who oppose the adoption of the Constitution pending its ratification suggested that this provision empowered the Congress to enact any laws it might conceive were for the general welfare of the United States, but the two main contemporary authorities, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, in the Federalist papers and in their other writings have given us the two interpretations which subsequently have been followed. Hamilton gave the clause a rather broad construction and Madison a more narrow one, but even under Hamilton's view the spending power of Congress is quite restricted, namely, a limited power to appropriate money for the general welfare. The classic statement of Hamilton relative to the general-welfare clause is found in his report on manufactures rendered in 1791:

"The phrase is as comprehensive as any that could have been used, because it was not fit that the constitutional authority of the Union to appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within narrower limits than the general welfare, and because this necessarily embraces a vast variety of particulars which are susceptible neither of specification nor of definition. It is, therefore, of necessity left to the discretion of the National Legislature to pronounce upon the objects which concern the general welfare, and for which, under that description, an appropriation of money is requisite and proper. And there seems to be no room for a doubt that whatever concerns the general interest of learning, of agriculture, of manufactures, and of commerce are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money.

"The only qualification of the generality of the phrase in question which seems to be admissible is this: That the object to which an appropriation of money is to be made must be general, and not local; its operation extending in fact or by possibility, throughout the Union, and not being confined to a particular spot.

"No objection ought to arise to this construction, from supposition that it would imply a power to do whatever else should appear to Congress conducive to the general welfare. A power to appropriate money with this latitude, which is granted, too, in express terms, would not carry a power to do any other thing not authorized in the Constitution, either expressly or by fair implication."

Under Hamilton's interpretation, while Congress may not legislate generally with respect to any matter which concerns the general welfare, it may appropriate money for any purpose concerning the general welfare. Under the narrower view of Madison, the first clause of article 1, section 8, is coextensive with and limited by the powers expressly conferred on Congress in the remaining clauses of section 8. Under Madison's interpretation Congress can appropriate money for the general welfare only insofar as the appropriation may be incidental to its other expressly delegated powers, such as the power to regulate commerce and the power to establish post offices and post roads. Madison's argument was that where general words or phrases are followed by special words or phrases, the general words are limited by the special words. This argument is analogous to the legal principle of ejusdem generis under which in the construction of laws, wills, and other legal instruments it commonly is held that where general words follow words of a particular and specific meaning, such general words are not to be construed in their widest extent but are held to be limited to persons or things of the same general kind or class as those specifically mentioned. In No. 41 of the Federalist papers, Madison set forth his argument relative to the general welfare phrase as limited by the succeeding clauses of section 8 as follows:

"Had no other enumeration or definition of the powers of Congress been found in the Constitution than the general expressions just cited, the authors of the objection might have had some color for it. * * *

"But what color can the objection have, when a specification of the objects alluded to by these general terms, immediately follows; and is not even separated by a longer pause than a semicolon? If the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded as to give meaning to every part which will bear it; shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any significance whatsoever? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power."

Another contemporary of Madison and Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, likewise construed clause 1 of section 8 relative to the general welfare as a qualification of the power to lay taxes. In his Opinion on the Bank, dated February 15, 1791, is found the following:

"To lay taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States is," said Jefferson, "to lay taxes for the purpose of providing for the general welfare. For the laying of taxes is the power, and the general welfare the purpose, for which the power is to be exercised. Congress is not to lay taxes ad libitum, for any purpose they please; but only to pay the debts, or provide for the welfare of the Union. In like manner, they are not to do anything they please to provide for the general welfare, but only to lay taxes for that purpose. To consider the latter phrase not as describing the purpose of the first, but as giving a distinct and independent power to do any act they please which might be for the good of the Union, would render all the preceding and subsequent enumerations of power completely useless. It would reduce the whole instrument to a single phrase, that of instituting a congress with power to do whatever would be for the good of the United States; and, as they would be the sole judges of the good or evil, it would also be a power to do whatever evil they pleased. It is an established rule of construction, where a phrase will bear either of two meanings, to give that which will allow some meaning to the other parts of the instrument, and not that which will render all the others useless. Certainly no such universal power was meant to be given them. It was intended to lace them up strictly within the enumerated powers, and those without which, as means, those powers could not be carried into effect."

The last-cited sentence would seem to indicate that Jefferson followed Madison's view that the general-welfare clause was limited by the succeeding enumerated powers listed in section 8.

The great Chief Justice John Marshall shared the views of Hamilton, Madison, and Jefferson that clause 1 of section 8 simply granted to Congress the power to tax in order to provide for the general welfare and did not grant a broader power to legislate substantively for the general welfare, for in Marshall's opinion in the Landmark case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 199, 6 L. ed., 23, 71 (1824)), in discussing the grant of the power to lay and collect taxes, he remarked in passing, as if there was no question about it:

"Congress is authorized to lay and collect taxes, etc., to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Madison's argument that there would have been no purpose in inserting the subsequent enumerated powers in section 8, if a general power to legislate for the general welfare was intended, is of great force, because it is obvious that the Constitution was not framed to contain useless surplusage. Thus, it is accepted today that clause 1 gives to Congress only a limited power to appropriate money for the general welfare, and that, so limited, delegation of other powers in section 8 was both necessary and purposeful.

The main controversy that remains, therefore, concerns the permissible purposes for which the money may be appropriated. Madison's contention was that such purposes were only those listed in the succeeding clauses of section 8, whereas Hamilton contended that Congress had the power to appropriate money for the promotion of the general welfare without restriction to the other delegated powers. It is Hamilton's opinion which now is generally accepted.

James Monroe, who followed Madison as President, seems to have taken a middle ground. On May 4, 1822, he vetoed a bill for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road. He argued:

1. Congress has an independent power to appropriate money for the general welfare, but the purpose indeed must be general, i. e., national in character.

2. The power to so appropriate money does not carry with it any rights of Federal jurisdiction within the States, nor may the individual States consent to such Federal jurisdiction.

3. While Congress may contribute money toward the construction and maintenance within the States of internal improvements planned on a nationwide basis, the States would retain all jurisdictional rights over such works.

4. None of the remaining enumerated powers in section 8 grant to the Congress jurisdiction to construct internal improvements within the States.

Accompanying the veto was a document entitled "Views of the President of the United States on the Subject of Internal Improvements," in which Monroe said, inter alia, "My idea is that Congress has an unlimited power to raise money, restricted only by the duty to appropriate it to purposes of common defense and of general, not local; national, not State benefit."

Here Monroe sounds like Hamilton, but he goes on to point out: "The right of appropriation is nothing more than a right to apply the public money to this or that purpose. It has no incidental power, nor does it draw after it any consequence of that kind. All the Congress could do under it in the case of internal improvements would be to appropriate the money necessary to make them. For every act requiring legislative sanction or support the State authority must be relied on. The condemnation of the land, if the proprietors should refuse to sell it, the establishment of turnpikes and tolls, and the protection of the work when finished must be done by the State. To these purposes the powers of the general government are believed to be utterly incompetent."

President Jackson followed Monroe's reasoning but in addition to insisting that no rights of jurisdiction accompany congressional appropriations for the general welfare, he emphasized that such appropriations must be for general, not local, national, not State purposes.

Under Jackson, congressional spending for roads and canals came to an abrupt close.

Between 1845 and the Civil War, a period when the doctrine of States' rights was at its peak in acceptance, the Presidents generally leaned toward the view of Madison that the general welfare clause was limited by and coextensive with the specific powers subsequently enumerated in section 8. Prominent among these were Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan. (See, 5 Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 20, 90, 218, 259, 457.) It was Pierce who began the practice of grounding measures upon the war power as a means of justifying an appropriation. The last President to follow Madison was Buchanan, who in February 1859, in vetoing a bill to establish land-grant colleges in each State, declared that Federal moneys were for the purpose of raising and supporting armies, maintaining a navy, and the other great objects enumerated in the Constitution, and were not to be "diverted from them to pay the debts of the States, to educate their people, and to carry into effect any other measure of their domestic policy. This would be to confer upon Congress a vast and irresponsible authority, utterly at war with the well-known jealousy of Federal power which prevailed at the formation of the Constitution. The natural intendment would be that as the Constitution confined Congress to well-defined specific powers, the funds placed at their command, whether in land or money, should be appropriated to the performance of the duties corresponding with these powers." (5 Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 547.)

With the advent of the Civil War and the building of the cross-continental railways there was a return to the broad construction of Hamilton. The practical reasons for this move are well stated in *California* v. *Central Pacific Railroad Co. et al.* (127 U. S. 1, 39; 32 L. Ed. 150, 157 (1887)), as follows:

"It cannot at the present day be doubted that Congress, under the power to regulate commerce among the several States, as well as to provide for postal accommodations and military exigencies, had authority to pass these laws. The power to construct, or to authorize individuals or corporations to construct, national highways and bridges from State to State is essential to the complete control and regulation of interstate commerce. Without authority in Congress to establish and maintain such highways and bridges, it would be without authority to regulate one of the most important adjuncts of commerce."

Whether Madison or Hamilton was right, probably always will be subject to debate. Justice Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, which he dedicated to Chief Justice John Marshall, stated it thus: "It has been in the past time, it is in the present time, and it will probably in all future time continue to be the debatable ground of the Constitution, signalized at once by the victories and the defeats of the same parties." (5th Ed., vol. 1, p. 661.)

Insofar as the Supreme Court of the United States is concerned, the contest now is settled by decision in favor of Hamilton, although the decision was delayed until 1935. In that year, in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1; 80 L. Ed. 477), speaking through Mr. Justice Roberts, the Court adopted the Hamiltonian construction. The decision held the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933, unconstitutional. It was sought to sustain the act under the general welfare clause. Justice Roberts said:

"The question is not what power the Federal Government ought to have but what powers in fact have been given by the people. It hardly seems necessary to reiterate that ours is a dual form of government; that in every State there are two governments—the State and the United States. Each State has all governmental powers save such as the people, by their Constitution, have conferred upon the United States, denied to the States, or reserved to themselves. The Federal Union is a Government of delegated powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it and such as are reasonably to be implied from those granted. In this respect we differ radically from nations where all legislative power, without restriction of limitation, is vested in a parliament or other legislative body subject to no restrictions except the discretion of its members. * * *

"The clause thought to authorize the legislation—the first—confers upon the Congress power 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. * * *' It is not contended that this provision grants power to regulate agricultural production upon the theory that such legislation would promote the general welfare. The Government concedes that the phrase 'to provide for the general welfare' qualifies the power 'to lay and collect taxes.' The view that the clause grants power to provide for the general welfare, independently of the taxing power, has never been authoritatively accepted. Mr. Justice Story points out that if it were adopted 'it is obvious that under color of the generality of the words, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare," the Government of the United States is, in reality, a Government of general and unlimited powers, notwithstanding the subsequent enumeration of specific powers.' The true construction undoubtedly is that the only thing granted is the power to tax for the purpose of providing funds for payment of the Nation's debts and making provision for the general welfare. * * *

"The Congress is expressly empowered to lay taxes to provide for the general welfare. Funds in the Treasury as a result of taxation may be expended only through appropriation (art. I, sec. 9, cl. 7). They can never accomplish the objects for which they were collected unless the power to appropriate is as broad as the power to tax. The necessary implication from the terms of the grant is that the public funds may be appropriated 'to provide for the general welfare of the United States.' These words cannot be meaningless, else they would not have been used. The conclusion must be that they were intended to limit and define the granted power to raise and to expend money. How shall they be construed to effectuate the intent of the instrument?

"Since the foundation of the Nation sharp differences of opinion have persisted as to the true interpretation of the phrase. Madison asserted it amounted to no more than a reference to the other powers enumerated in the subsequent clauses of the same section; that, as the United States is a Government of limited and enumerated powers, the grant of power to tax and spend for the general national welfare must be confined to the enumerated legislative fields committed to the Congress. In this view the phrase is mere tautology, for taxation and appropriation are or may be necessary incidents of the exercise of any of the enumerated legislative powers. Hamilton, on the other hand, maintained the clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, is not restricted in meaning by the grant of them, and Congress consequently has a substantive power to tax and to appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Each contention has had the support of those whose views are entitled to weight. This Court has noticed the question, but has never found it necessary to decide which is the true construction. Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries, espouses the Hamiltonian position. We shall not review the writings of public men and commentators or discuss the legislative practice. Study of all these leads us to conclude that the reading advocated by Mr. Justice Story is the correct one. While, therefore, the power to tax is not unlimited, its confines are set in the clause which confers it, and not in those of section 8 which bestow and define the legislative powers of the Congress. It results that the power of Congress to authorize expenditure of public moneys for public purposes is not limited by the direct grants of legislative power found in the Constitution.

"But the adoption of the broader construction leaves the power to spend subject to limitations.

"As Story says: 'The Constitution was, from its very origin, contemplated to be the frame of a National Government, of special and enumerated powers, and not of general and unlimited powers.'

"Again he says: 'A power to lay taxes for the common defense and general welfare of the United States is not in commonsense a general power. It is limited to those objects. It cannot constitutionally transcend them.'

"That the qualifying phrase must be given effect all advocates of broad construction admit. Hamilton, in his well-known Report on Manufactures, states that the purpose must be general, and not local. Monroe, an advocate of Hamilton's doctrine, wrote: 'Have Congress a right to raise and appropriate the money to any and to every purpose according to their will and pleasure They certainly have not.' Story says that if the tax be not proposed for the common defense or general welfare, but for other objects wholly extraneous, it would be wholly indefensible upon constitutional principles. And he makes it clear that the powers of taxation and appropriation extend only to matters of national, as distinguished from local, welfare."

Justice Roberts then went on to hold that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was an unconstitutional attempt to invade the reserved rights of the States in contravention of the 10th amendment. Congress, in effect, under the pretext of exercising the taxing power, in reality was attempting to accomplish prohibited ends in a field of activity which lay within the province of the States.

Justice Cardozo, in *Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 619, 640, 81 L. Ed. 1307, 1304–1315 (1936)), admirably summed up the situation with this succinct statement:

"Congress may spend money in aid of the 'general welfare.' (Const. art. 1, sec. 8; *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1, 65, 80 L. ed. 477, 488, 56 S. Ct. 312, 102 A. L. R. 914); *Chas. C. Steward Mach. Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 548, ante, 1279, 57 S. Ct. 883, 109 A. L. R. 1293, supra).) There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision. *United States* v. *Butler,* supra. The conception of the spending power advocated by Hamilton and strongly reinforced by Story has prevailed over that of Madison, which has not been lacking in adherents. Yet difficulties are left when the power is conceded. The line must still be drawn between one welfare and another, between particular and general. Where this shall be placed cannot be known through a formula in advance of the event. There is a middle ground or certainly a penumbra in which discretion is at large. The discretion, however, is not confided to the courts. The discretion belongs to Congress, unless the choice is clearly wrong, a display of arbitrary power, not an exercise of judgment. This is now familiar law."

The case in which Justice Cardozo used that language involved validity of titles of the Social Security Act imposing an excise tax upon employers and a special income tax on employees and providing for the payment of old-age benefits. The law was sustained. Thereafter Federal courts approved expenditure of Federal funds for maintenance of the Civilian Conservation Corps and sustained the power of Congress to make appropriations under the National Industrial Recovery Act for public works including public schools, to refinance mortgages and to improve housing conditions.

These decisions were quite generally related, however, to nationwide conditions, such as a depression or to matters like unemployment relief and old-age pensions which no single State could handle individually.

Acceptance of congressional power was based not alone on the general welfare clause, which I have been discussing, but also on the last clause of article I, section 8, which says the Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The classic interpretation of this clause was given by John Marshall in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 316 (1819)) in which he said:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

The history of TVA illustrates the modern application of the "necessary and proper" clause. In *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288 (1936)) constitutional authority to construct the Wilson Dam was found in the powers of Congress to provide for the national defense, the dam being useful to provide electric power for the production of nitrates needed for the manufacture of explosives. Once a hydroelectric plant had been built and was not currently needed to produce materials of war, it might, of course, be retained as a reserve.

The Constitution, article IV, section 3, also provides: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations with respect to the territory or other property belonging to the United States." Congress could, of course, simply maintain a large powerplant in a standby position as a facility useful in the event of a later war. But it could also, provide for the use of this powerplant in the production of electricity and the sale of that electricity, and that is what it did.

It would be hard to find any limitation in the Constitution or in commonsense under which a properly built powerplant must remain idle, a drain on the taxpayers. Congress might have handled this situation by leasing the plant to a privately owned company or by selling power at the plant to such a company. However, the choice of means of disposal under article 4, section 3 was left to the Congress, within a wide range of discretion and it elected to use a governmental agency for distribution.

The original dam was supplemented by other dams and powerplants. Then, since hydroelectric power may be affected by drought and since to maintain customers there must be a steady supply of power, the next step was to build supplemental steam plants. This in turn led to the building of more steam plants, not to balance the supply of hydropower but to create a better balanced distribution system and to meet the increasing needs of more power customers.

Each step in this process has been justified by reference to the "general welfare" and "necessary and proper" clauses and the section covering disposal of Government property. Sooner or later, however, we must face the question of where the ultimate line of congressional discretion shall be drawn.

Once a national agency is authorized to maintain a power system and sell electric power, can Congress authorize all the things which are customary or suitable to develop that system to its fullest capacity? For example, can Congress provide cooking schools to teach a community how to use electric power for their cooking. Can Congress provide stores to sell electric equipment and household appliances? Then, can Congress provide for the manufacture of such equipment as a means of having it readily available at reasonable prices?

Evidently many Members of Congress think so because Congress has allowed the TVA to conduct studies in the utilization of the natural resources of the South, to study the best types of fertilizer for southern soil and plant utilization of that fertilizer, to manufacture fertilizer and to conduct farm demonstrations in the use of fertilizer. The TVA is now selling to farmers thousands of tons of fertilizer at 45 percent of what it costs private manufacturers to produce it and next to furnishing domestic power for municipalities and individual homes at the cheapest rate east of the Mississippi River, the TVA distribution of fertilizer is one of its most popular activities which many farmers would like to see expanded on a grand scale.

And even the Atomic Energy Commission, which is headed by an able advocate of private enterprise, has concluded that its power to produce atomic energy and disseminate information concerning it included the right to set up a school to teach the principles of nuclear power to which it would invite students not only from our country but from all foreign lands and pay all of their expenses. In the committee report filed with the pending bill you will see a reference to that activity and a warning to the Atomic Energy Commission that it shall not turn that school into a full-fledged college with dormitories, classrooms, etc., without the subsequent approval of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

If all these things are approved one might argue that Congress should go still further and provide for the mining of coal, limestone, and iron ore to produce steel for the manufacture of electrical equipment and for the mining of copper and the manufacture of wires and cables.

In other words, is there not available under the broadest interpretation of these clauses a means by which Congress could take over any industry in the United States and all collateral industries which supply it with necessary raw materials or fabricated products?

The seriousness of these questions, from our standpoint, is emphasized by the difficulties which face citizens or corporations inclined to challenge our actions and by the reluctance of the courts to define the limits of congressional power.

Much has been written and said about the so-called American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy. We are inclined to think of it particularly in times like these when areas of the Nation are struggling with a problem created by a court decision which will change the whole structure of social life. This does not mean, however, that Congress can leave all constitutional questions to the Supreme Court.

John Marshall held in *Marbury* v. *Madison* that the Court could exercise its independent judgment in matters coming before it involving the meaning of the Constitution, but in our tripartite system the President and the Congress have a similar right and duty to exercise their judgment on the meaning of the Constitution.

The President exercises his judgment in use of the veto power and it is interesting to recall that George Washington's first veto message was on constitutional grounds. He took the advice of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Edmund Randolph and these three drafted the message.

Congress exercises its judgment in considering pending bill and some of the best debates on constitutional law have been in the Halls of Congress. It is notable that from the beginning of the Government until the end of the War Between the States, there were only two cases wherein an act of Congress was held invalid by the Court. One was *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cr. 137 (1803)), and the other was the *Dred Scott* case (19 How. 393 (1857)).

Following that war there was a period in which the Court was more active in exercising its independent judgment and upsettings acts of Congress. From 1865 until 1937 such cases averaged about one a year. Since 1937, however, there has been so sharp a change that that year has been referred to as marking a constitutional revolution involving a renunciation of judicial power. The authorities I consulted could find only 3 cases holding acts of Congress invalid since 1936. Two of those related to improper punishment of individuals and one outlawed segregation in the schools of the District of Columbia.

It is apparent, therefore, that the Court has not relieved Congress of its constitutional obligation. In a vast and wide range of situations a constitutional question can never come before the Supreme Court. Where the question may reach the Court, the Court will avoid it if possible and deal with it, if at all, only as a last resort. This attitude was indicated by Justice Frankfurther when he said: "The jurisdiction of a Federal Court can be invoked only under circumstances which to the expert feel of lawyers constitute a 'case or controversy'." *Joint Antifacist Refugee Committee* v. *McGrath* (341 U. S. 123, 150 (1951)).

Another illustration of the Court's attitude may be found as far back as 1923 in the cases of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* and *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447). In these cases the State of Massachusetts, appearing as a champion of States' Rights, challenged constitutionality of the Federal Maternity Act under which the United States Treasury would provide appropriations for States which accepted its provisions. The court found the State had no standing to sue in its own behalf because acceptance of the act was voluntary and that it had no basis for suit on behalf of its citizens because the relationship of citizens to the United States is direct and not through their respective States. Frothingham claimed standing to sue as a taxpayer on the ground that unconstitutional expenditures would increase the burden of future taxation, but the court ruled that his interest in revenues obtained from taxation was shared with millions of others and was so minute and indeterminable that he had no basis for appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity.

The court concluded its opinion in this case with a declaration that to accept jurisdiction would be not to decide a judicial controversy, but to assume a position of authority over the governmental acts of another and co-equal department.

Similar failures of complainants to gain an opportunity in court to test constitutionality of acts of Congress were recorded in *Tennessee Electric Power Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (306 U. S. 118 (1939)) and *Alabama Power Company* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464 (1938)). The court found the complainants had no standing to sue and therefore refused to pass on constitutionality of the act.

The individual citizen plainly can find only limited protection through court decisions and presidential vetoes from unconstitutional actions of the Congress, particularly as applied to the spending power and he must look to the consciences of the Members of Congress, whom he elects, as his chief bulwark.

The dangers of unrestrained use of the spending power have been recognized from the earliest days of our Government. For example Hugh Williamson of North Carolina, who had been a member of the 1787 Constitutional Convention wrote: "If Congress can apply money indefinitely to the general welfare and are the sole and supreme judges of general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their hands; they may establish teachers in every State, county and parish, and pay them out of the Public Treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post roads. In short, everything from the highest object of State legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress; for every object I have mentioned would admit the application of money and might be called, if Congress pleased, provisions for the general welfare."

I would commend to your attention, in connection with this subject a book by the noted legal historian, Charles Warren, based on a series of lectures he delivered at the University of Virginia, and published in 1932 under the title: "Congress as Santa Claus."

In this book the author cites instances of expenditures which obviously were for local rather than general benefit and the comment which some of these actions evoked in and out of Congress. Warren found that the "desire of the States to participate in the political pap from the Treasury spreads from State to State with every new measure" and he concluded: "If the people are to be taught to look to the Government for their support, if the Government is to assume to defray the needs of its individual citizens, then one result will inevitably follow: Elections will become a mere barter of promises of Government appropriation; competitive promises of public property will take the place of competing political principles; and those candidates for office who promise to vote us the most Government support will receive the most support from the voters. Certainly, only a return to strict constitutional principles can prevent such an evil in the future, if politicians continue to inculcate in the people the belief that the Government must supply the people with their livelihood."

That possible condition of our Government, which was suggested nearly a quarter of a century ago, has not come to pass because there have been enough Members of Congress who have placed loyalty to constitutional principles above expediency. Pressures to use Federal spending power for the benefit of special interest groups, localities and regions continue, however, and over the years there have been, in my judgment, too many instances in which the Congress has responded too liberally.

The struggle to preserve the essential principles of a limited constitutional government is not over. Whether the Constitution is to be a living instrument or a dead letter is, in the vast majority of situations, a problem for the Congress. Our action on the pending public works bill may determine whether ground is won or lost.

I, for one, shall approach our decisions on that bill believing that there is nothing we can do to promote the general welfare of our Nation so surely as limiting Federal spending to those functions which are essential and which cannot be handled by private enterprise or by localities or States.

So, if Memphis wants to build a steam plant to furnish its own power, that will have my full approval. And if the Atomic Energy Commission needs more power at Paducah or anywhere else, let the Government build the plant where the power is needed for Government use. But, for the production of power solely for commercial purposes, let us recognize our oath to support and defend a Constitution that is dedicated to the principle of individual enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is there further morning business?

DISARMAMENT POSSIBILITIES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for not to exceed 10 minutes, on a subject relating to disarmament.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in the July 5 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald there was published one of Walter Lippmann's columns, under the title "Disarmament Revisited." This respected dean of columnists is so convinced of the impossibility of general disarmament, that he has devoted the article to demolishing that hopeful project. Referring to the proposals in a memorandum from the Western Powers to control all types of weapons, all types of armed forces, and military facilities of all kinds he says:

> To supervise and control these infinitely complicated agreements we have been proposing that all the powers agree to construct

> a little tin god, to be known as the Authority with a capital A: "The Authority would be empowered to supervise and control progressive and continuous disclosure and verification of all Armed Forces, including paramilitary, security, and police forces, and—all armaments including atomic armaments." And what is the little tin god to do if it finds a violation of the agreement? The little tin god is to report to the Security Council, to the General Assembly, and to all states—all of them "inherently" incapable of waging war—"to permit appropriate action to be taken."

So much for Mr. Lippmann's conviction of the impossibility of general disarmament. What is his alternative? He writes:

> The fallacy of the conception we have been working with is, I believe, to suppose that there is such a thing as absolute disarmament—such a thing as making war inherently impossible. The alternative conception is to recognize that each nation's armaments are relative to the armaments of his rival and adversary—no matter whether the military forces are at a high level or at a low level.
>
> The true goal is not to deprive nations of the capacity to wage war. Men can fight with clubs. The true goal is to make victory in war, to make profitable war, improbable, and so to inhibit the will to start the war. Wars can always be waged. There will long be men who are willing to wage wars. What will inhibit them is not that everyone is less well armed but that they have no plausible hope of winning a war.
>
> This is a feasible goal, which is attained now and then—whenever military rivals, find they are in a balance of power which makes it most unlikely that they could win a war. As a matter of fact, the East and West are now in such a balance of power. The existence of this balance of power is the reason why they are beginning to negotiate, and the preservation of this balance of power can be—and ought to be—the guiding principle of these negotiations.

Mr. President, the revival in this atomic age of the old-fashioned balance-of-power, doctrine, I find to be most astonishing. Mr. Lippmann says we are in one of those periods of the balance of power. He is probably right in this statement, but has he reckoned what the balance of power is costing us? For the Defense Department, we appropriated nearly $31,900,000,000. For the military part of the foreign-aid program, we appropriated $1,125,000,000; and for the Atomic Energy Commission, whose fringes only are devoted to peacetime uses, we are proposing to appropriate more than $1,480,000,000. This amounts to more than $34,500,000,000. That is the cost for the coming fiscal year of maintaining this highly prized balance of power.

The cost to the Soviet Union cannot be given in corresponding dollars. The cost is best realized when we consider the drain on the natural resources of the Soviet area and the diversion of the labor of its inhabitants away from their own well-being to the heavy task of maintaining this balance.

Not only is this balance maintained at an enormous cost in natural resources and physical toil, but the most that ourselves or the Soviet can do with this tremendous effort is to maintain a precarious balance. There is no security in this balance. Like a lightening flash from the sky, it can be demolished by a single atomic raid. Never have balances of power existed under such burdens of expense or under such shattering dangers as those which exist today. We must be thinking new thoughts for this new age. The old thoughts will not do.

Mr. Lippmann's article would seem to focus on a balanced reduction in armaments and armies. But, again, this is impossible in this modern age without the inspection, inventory, and control of the means of warfare which he conceives to be impossible. The Soviet government has to know that we are obeying our agreements in reduction. We have to know that the Soviet Government is doing the same. There is no safety in anything except complete inspection and control.

However, Mr. Lippmann writes:

> What the modern world needs is not so much inspection to see that armaments stay reduced but a very early warning system—much earlier than the one which we are building in Canada—against the mobilization for surprise.

I cannot help wondering whether he has heard anything about the immense cost of complete warning against mobilization for surprise, remembering again that in this age we are concerned not with the mobilizing of armies, but with sending a fleet of planes with atomic warheads on a mission of aggression.

Mr. President, we have to think new thoughts. We do have to think of the control the world over of the means of delivering atomic missiles more easily observed than would be stores of the fissionable material itself. We do have to recognize that there is a satanic logic which drives us and the Soviet power to ever more furious activity and burdensome expenditure for the maintenance of our precarious balance.

We do have to note that this burden is becoming increasingly difficult, and will shortly become politically impossible for the Soviet power to maintain.

It is this fact which will in the not-too-distant future make the rulers of the Soviet, whoever they may be, more amenable to considering inspection, inventory, and control than is our respected dean of columnists.

To ease up the pressure in any way which does not preserve the requirements of control is to lose our chance for the making of aggressive war impossible. If we continue in firmness, there will surely arise within the Soviet Government a ruler or a committee who will firmly establish themselves in power by redirecting the resources of their country and the labor of its citizens to the promotion of the citizens' own well-being.

If we keep these facts and possibilities in mind, the summit meeting at Geneva may well be the beginning of the end of the armament and balance of power burden.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

GENEVA CONVENTIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF WAR VICTIMS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four conventions on the Executive Calendar be considered en bloc; that the reservations to Executive D and Executive G, with the accompanying statements, be also considered and voted upon en bloc; that a yea-and-nay vote be taken upon the question of advising and consenting to Executive D, and that the resolutions, with the accompanying reservation and statements, advising and consenting to the ratification of the other three conventions be deemed to have been agreed to by the same vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider, en bloc, the following conventions, which were severally read the second time.

> Executive D, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field.
>
> Executive E, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of the armed forces at sea.
>
> Executive F, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.
>
> Executive G, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations on June 9 unanimously voted to report favorably to the Senate the four conventions for the protection of war victims which were opened for signature at Geneva on August 12, 1949. Seldom does the Senate have an opportunity to act upon instruments of such lofty and humanitarian character as are represented by these four conventions. They are documents struck off with no thought of material gain or aggrandizement to any nation, but to meet a universal need. They have but one purpose, to relieve mankind from the suffering and the physical and moral degradation which in the past have so often been experienced by the victims of war.

The four Geneva Conventions grew out of a recognized need for revising the existing conventions dealing with sick and wounded of the armed forces, prisoners of war, and the treatment of the civilians. The United States is now a party to the Geneva Convention of 1929 to ameliorate the condition of wounded and sick of armies in the field; the Geneva Convention of 1929 on prisoners of war, and the Hague Convention (No. X) of 1907 for adapting maritime warfare to the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1906.

It had become apparent, during the Italo-Ethiopian campaign and the Spanish Civil War, that the conventions needed revision. Experience in the Second World War confirmed the necessity of bringing them up to date, making them susceptible of more uniform application and less divergent interpretations, and improving them so as to provide a more effective protection for the persons covered. Moreover, since there was no separate treaty which established humane standards of treatment for civilians in time of war, the 1949 Conference also reached agreement on a convention which would secure for civilians in belligerent and occupied territories, international legal protection by treaty.

Basically, therefore, all of the conventions which the Senate is now asked to approve, with the exception of the convention relative to civilian persons in time of war, embody principles which the United States had accepted in previous treaties. The 1949 texts are an effort to provide greater protection and to fit the conventions to modern conditions. While the convention on civilians is itself a brandnew document, the principles which it contains generally reflect a combination of concepts contained in the fourth Hague Convention of 1907 on the treatment of inhabitants of occupied territory, and, with respect to civilians found inside belligerent territory, the practices we ourselves have regularly followed.

A considerable portion of the United States position on all of the conventions was accepted by the Conference as presented. We supported, for example, a rewording of the 1929 article on food, so as to require that food of prisoners of war must be sufficient in quantity, quality, and variety to keep prisoners in good health and prevent nutritional deficiencies. We also obtained a new and simplified formula regarding employment of prisoners of war which, among other things, prohibits their use for clearing and disposing of mines; acceptance of the principle of prompt repatriation of prisoners of war after cessation of hostilities; a provision which would permit transfers of prisoners of war among cobelligerents, upon condition that the receiving government is also a party to the convention and that the transferring government retains a contingent responsibility for insuring that treatment of the prisoners after capture conforms to the convention; application of all four conventions to conflicts which are not international in character by providing certain minimum humane safeguards for persons not active in the hostilities; definition of the conditions under which partisan forces would be entitled to the benefits of the prisoner-of-war convention; making illegal the taking of hostages; prohibiting deportation from occupied territory; and, finally, improved identification markings for hospital ships.

Apart from these changes for which the United States won approval at the Conference, several other innovations merit attention. A number of these are provisions which are common to all four conventions. Thus, it is stipulated that they apply not only in the case of formally declared international war, but also on the outbreak of de facto hostilities, without a declaration. Moreover, to prevent a practice followed by some belligerents in the Second World War of depriving prisoners of protection on the ground that the conventions did not apply after occupation or capitulation, or by concluding special agreements with the prisoners or their own governments, the conventions are made applicable to all prisoners without discrimination until they are finally released or repatriated.

Mr. President, many war victims were unrepresented during the great war by any power who would defend their interests. The revised conventions provide that in such cases, belligerents must invite a neutral state or welfare agency to assume the duties of protecting power on behalf of the person in enemy control.

Another group of articles which are virtually identical in all of the conventions relates to the execution of their provisions and the prevention of abuses and violations. Among other things, the parties agree to enact legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing those violations of the conventions which are designated as grave breaches. Each contracting party, moreover, is under an obligation to search for persons alleged to be guilty of such breaches and to try them before its own courts. Or, in accordance with its own legislation, it may hand such persons over for trial to another contracting party concerned, if the latter has made out a prima facie case against the suspects.

While it is obviously impossible to discuss here in any detail all of the 429 articles of the conventions, I should like to refer to certain aspects of these instruments which merit particular notice.

The Geneva Convention of 1929 with respect to the treatment of sick and wounded of the armed forces permitted the military authorities to call upon the charitable zeal of the civilian population to collect and nurse, under appropriate direction, all wounded and sick combatants. The new convention stipulates that the military commanders must allow the population and relief associations to volunteer in such humane tasks, irrespective of the nationality of the sick or wounded victims.

Another modification which was introduced relates to the controversial status of medical personnel. Traditionally, hospital personnel have enjoyed immunity from capture and the right of repatriation. But the last war showed that there was a need for providing retention of a part of the medical personnel which fell into enemy hands, in order to nurse sick prisoners of war for whom adequate care would otherwise be lacking. The compromise adopted at the conference provided that while doctors, chaplains, and medical orderlies shall not be considered as prisoners of war, they shall enjoy the advantageous provisions of the 1949 Prisoner of War Convention, and shall be held in captivity only to the extent that the health, moral needs, and numbers of the prisoners may demand.

The 1949 Convention on Prisoners of War added partisans to the categories of persons whose protection is guaranteed by the convention; but such organized resistance movements are placed on the same footing as militia and volunteer corps not forming a part of the regular armed forces. These forces as well as partisans must conform to the requirements of the Hague Regulations—Convention IV of 1907. The regulations require such persons to act under orders of a responsible commander, to wear a fixed emblem recognizable at a distance, to carry arms openly, to obey the laws and customs of war, and to treat captured enemies conformably with the convention.

The 1929 convention contained a rather vague stipulation that labor extracted from prisoners of war should have no direct connection with the operations of war. No clause proved more troublesome during World War II. The 1949 document contains a limitative enumeration of the kinds of work upon which prisoners may legitimately be employed.

In contrast with the general statement in the 1929 convention on disciplinary punishment, the new convention enumerates the types of disciplinary punishments which are authorized and the circumstances under which they may be imposed. Specific safeguards and guaranties of a fair judicial proceeding are provided, and punishments and procedures contrary to those set out in the convention are prohibited. Women prisoners may not be more harshly treated or severely punished than women members of the detaining power's own forces. On the other hand, a prisoner may not be tried for an act which is not forbidden by the law of the detaining power or by international law in force at the time the act was committed. He is given the right to choose his own counsel, to call witnesses, and to have a competent interpreter. Opportunity for an adequate defense must be given him.

The 1929 convention on prisoners of war was silent with respect to acts committed by prisoners prior to capture. Article 85 of the new convention formally recognizes that guilty prisoners continue to benefit by its provisions despite the seriousness of their offense.

The 1949 Convention on the Protection of Civilians is a detailed attempt to avoid the bitter experiences and horrors of the concentration camps of the last war. Among other things, it institutes substantially the same protection for wounded and sick civilians as provided for members of the armed forces. Parties are required to authorize the free passage of medical supplies intended for another signatory, even if he is an enemy belligerent.

General rules are laid down for the protection of individuals in both belligerent and occupied countries. Torture and the taking of hostages are prohibited. A reprehensible practice of the past war is prohibited by the provision that no person may be punished for an offense he has not himself committed, nor the death sentence executed except after regular trial and judgment by a duly constituted tribunal. Deportations in occupied territories are strictly prohibited. The rights and duties of the belligerent occupant with respect to such matters as food, public health, and punishment for criminal acts, are defined. All interned civilians are now brought under the aegis of a set of regulations similar to those protecting prisoners of war.

When the United States signed the convention on civilians, it made a declaration with respect to article 68, paragraph 2, under which it reserved the right to apply the death penalty, irrespective of the limitations in that article. The provision in question permits the imposition of the death penalty by an occupying power only in cases involving espionage, serious acts of sabotage, or intentional offenses causing the death of one or more persons. But the application of the death penalty even in those three cases is dependent upon whether such offenses were punishable by death under the local law in force before the occupation began. Our Government was perfectly willing to limit the death penalty to the three categories mentioned, but was unable to accept the proviso which makes its use dependent upon preoccupation legislation. If that were approved, the way would be open to repeal of capital measures by a sovereign on the verge of dispossession by the enemy. The belligerent occupant, in such case, would be barred from recourse to extreme measures in dealing with acts of sabotage, espionage, and rebellion, which would seriously impair his authority and control.

For this reason, the committee concluded that the reservation was essential to the interest of the Nation and recommended that it be included in the resolution of the Senate giving advice and consent to ratification.

There was, Mr. President, only one other reservation recommended by the committee, in addition to the one I have just mentioned. I refer to the prohibition on the use of the Red Cross emblem in the Convention for the Amelioration of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field. Article 53 of that convention prohibits at all times the use by any individuals, societies, firms, or companies, whether public or private, "of the emblem or the designation 'Red Cross' or 'Geneva Cross,' or any sign or designation constituting an imitation thereof, whatever the object of such use and irrespective of the date of its adoption."

Article 54 further provides that the parties, if their legislation is not already adequate for that purpose, shall take measures necessary to prevent and repress the abuses in the use of the emblem mentioned in article 53.

Several American companies had long enjoyed the use of the Red Cross emblem or designation in the sale of their products, in accordance with Federal legislation permitting such continued use if begun prior to the act of June 5, 1905. In many cases their product had been associated with the emblem for 75 years, and considerable sums of money had been expended in advertising it under that trademark. It was felt that these valuable interests would be seriously prejudiced unless a reservation excepting them from the prohibition was adopted. For that reason, the committee recommended that a reservation be included in the resolution giving advice and consent to ratification, in the following form:

> The United States, in ratifying the Geneva Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in Armed Forces in the field, does so with the reservation that irrespective of any provision or provisions in said convention to the contrary, nothing contained therein shall make unlawful, or obligate the United States of America to make unlawful, any use or right of use within the United States of America and its Territories and possessions of the Red Cross emblem, sign, insignia, or words as was lawful by reason of domestic law and a use begun prior to January 5, 1905, provided such use by pre-1905 users does not extend to the placing of the Red Cross emblem, sign, or insignia upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings, or other structures, or upon the ground.

The reservation, it will be observed, has been drawn in such a manner as to avoid the possibility that the outdoor use of the emblem might diminish the protection furnished to members of our Armed Forces and the civilian population.

All the members of the Soviet bloc filed a reservation at the time of signature to article 85 of the prisoners of war convention which accords the benefit of the convention to prisoners prosecuted by the detaining power for offenses committed prior to capture. The Soviet reservation would deny such protection to prisoners convicted under the laws of the detaining power of war crimes in accordance with the principles of the Nuremburg trial. This and certain additional reservations made by members of the Soviet bloc to the other conventions were deemed unacceptable by the committee, which shared the views of the executive branch in this matter. If ratification were to be approved by the Senate without an express rejection of those reservations by our Government, the act of ratification might possibly be construed as acquiescence under the opinion the International Court of Justice in the Genocide case.

These circumstances impelled the administration to suggest that we indicate in the resolution of ratification our unwillingness to accept the objectionable reservations, while making it perfectly clear that we intended to enter treaty relations with the other governments on all matters not expressly excluded by their reservations.

The committee on Foreign Relations considered this to be the most satisfactory way of dealing with the problem, and has therefore recommended in its report that an appropriate statement to that effect be included in the Senate's resolution giving advice and consent to ratification. Such a statement, adapted to each of the conventions, is contained in the four resolutions, and is in the following form:

> The United States, rejecting the reservations—other than to article 68, paragraph 2, of the Civilians Persons Convention—which states have made with respect to the Geneva Convenions, accepts treaty relations with all parties to those conventions, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations.

Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, the undertakings incorporated in these four conventions parallel to a very great degree the actual policies followed by the United States in World War II. There is no burden here which we would not voluntarily assume ourselves in the event of a future conflict, whether contained in a formal treaty obligation or not. Three of the conventions are but improvements and clarifications of basic concepts already binding upon the United States in previous treaties; whereas the fourth, that on civilians, constitutes essentially an adaptation to civilian war victims of the principles applicable to prisoners of war.

We have been assured by spokesmen for the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice that there is nothing in these conventions which would prejudice the success of our arms in battle. On the contrary, it is to the interest of the United States that the principles of these conventions be accepted universally by all nations. This Government and its people have everything to gain, and nothing to lose, by obtaining world recognition of them. Our own standards are already high. The conventions point the way to other governments. Without any real cost to us, acceptance of the standards provided for prisoners of war, civilians, and wounded and sick will insure improvement of the condition of our own people as compared with what had been their previous treatment.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate to give their approval to the ratification of these four conventions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Montana for his comprehensive presentation of the conventions to the Senate. I anticipate no opposition to the ratification of the conventions, and I shall not undertake to do more than merely express my approval of them, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to urge the ratification of all four of them promptly.

The question has been asked why the conventions were negotiated and signed in 1949, but not taken up by the Senate until 1955. The answer to that question is obvious. It was explained by the Secretary of State in his testimony before the committee.

I might say that the principles set forth in the conventions are fundamental principles which the United States has for many years observed in the treatment of war prisoners, civilians, and other victims of war. For a long time we have adhered to them, not only under the treaty of 1929, but also under the treaty of 1907 and other treaties. In addition, we have adopted these principles even in fields where there was no treaty obligation, as representing the most humane manner in which prisoners of war and other war victims should be treated. So these conventions incorporate very largely the humane principles which the United States has practiced over a long period of years.

We have been able to obtain in these conventions, which have been ratified by a large number of nations, some additions, some amendments, and some advancement in the international agreements dealing with the subject.

But after the conventions were signed in 1949, and before they had been ratified by a sufficient number of nations, the Korean situation arose, creating international tension, and it was not thought advisable during those tense days to submit the conventions to the Senate for action. That was a worldwide situation, involving the United Nations, the United States, and some 15 or 20 other nations. Action upon the conventions was therefore delayed, because it was not thought desirable to proceed with ratification.

I think this is an appropriate time for the Senate to consider their ratification, because the world today is looking hopefully to the inauguration of conferences which may result in a mitigation of the suffering caused by war, so far as that can be done, and paradoxical as the idea may seem.

The conventions represent the work of two administrations or more. They represent the work of nonpartisan groups. They represent the response of mankind to the universal demand that harsh as war is, its harshness, its asperities, its cruelties, its animosities may be, so far as possible, either eliminated or assuaged in the treatment of victims of war. Not only prisoners of war, but also civilians who are the victims of war, those who are captured at sea, and others, are contemplated in the four conventions. They include the helpless and frequently unprotected victims of the cruelties of war.

Without any further comment upon the conventions and the reservations in regard to the imposition of the death penalty for certain offenses and the use of the Red Cross emblem, which have been already explained and which the committee unanimously agreed were appropriate reservations, I hope that, without opposition of any sort, the Senate may now proceed to the consideration of the resolutions of ratification, and agree to them, so that the United States may take her place among the other nations in an effort to advance the cause of the humane treatment of mankind even in time of war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long, but I wish to make a few remarks relative to the conventions which were unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I hope that it will never be necessary to invoke the provisions of the pending four conventions which relate to the protection of war victims. But in the event there should ever be another war, it is only commonsense to take action which will make available to us some devices to protect those of our Armed Forces and those American civilians who may fall into the hands of the enemy. That is the purpose of these conventions—to give nations at war some basis for the treatment and protection of the sick and wounded, for the protection of prisoners of war, and for the protection of civilians in the hands of the enemy.

During the last war the United States was a party to a series of Red Cross conventions which prescribed standards of treatment for prisoners. Those conventions served as the basis for the return to this country of many sick and wounded Americans who had been captured by the Axis Powers in Europe. They served as a basis for representatives of the International Red Cross and of the neutral powers of Switzerland and Spain to visit American prisoners of war and civilians held in Germany, Italy, and Japan. Reports to this Government were regularly submitted through these neutral representatives. Thus we were able to determine to some extent the condition of these unfortunate prisoners, and on numerous occasions, through the intervention of these neutral representatives, we were able to improve the treatment of our men who were held prisoners.

I am under no illusion, Mr. President, that the Red Cross Conventions of 1929 were perfect. But I can say with authority that they were better than nothing. I believe the interests of this Nation will be promoted by our becoming a party to the conventions now before the Senate.

The experiences obtained during World War II in the operation of the earlier Red Cross conventions indicated a number of respects in which they might be improved. For example, the earlier conventions provided that prisoners of war were to be given rations equivalent to those given to the armed forces of the capturing power. Thus in the case of Americans captured by the Japanese, the treaty merely required that those men receive rations equivalent to those received by members of the Japanese armed forces. This meant slow starvation for many Americans. The conventions now before the Senate, however, provide that rations are to be determined largely on the basis of the calory content of the food captured men had been receiving as members of their own armed forces.

I cite this as one example of the type of change brought about by the conventions now before the Senate. There are many others which have been set forth by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The principal concern over the ratification of the pending conventions was voiced by representatives of groups who feared that they would not be able to continue the use of the Red Cross emblem on their products. The committee heard those representatives, and a reservation has been proposed by the committee which is supported by those groups.

No witnesses were heard in objection to the ratification of the conventions.

The conventions do not impose onerous conditions on the United States. This Nation, as we all know, is incapable of inhuman treatment of any prisoners. During the last war our treatment of prisoners was so good that there were many cases of enemy soldiers deserting so that they might become American prisoners. Every man captured by that device meant one less enemy for our troops to fight. No standards of treatment are required of this Nation that we would not voluntarily assume ourselves.

I wish to point out what I believe is an important improvement. The 1929 convention provided, in effect, that prisoners of war were to be repatriated after the conclusion of the peace treaty. In the new convention, article 118 states:

> Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities.

I think that is very important, because, as we all know from reports, which I believe to be well substantiated, actually many thousands of German and Japanese prisoners are still held by the Soviet Union, and are, in fact, performing what may quite frankly be termed slave labor for the Soviet Union. We do not know whether or not the Soviet Union would comply with the provisions of the convention in the event of hostilities, but I certainly believe that they are provisions with which any nation that calls itself a civilized nation will comply. I think the conventions are an improvement over the 1929 conventions. For that reason I hope the conventions will have the unanimous affirmative vote of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it had been my intention to make a few remarks on the pending conventions, but I have been detained because of consideration by the conferees of the mutual-security bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of the debate on the pending conventions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY ON THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949

I wish to speak briefly concerning two aspects of the conventions now before us to which the Committee on Foreign Relations gave particular attention. The first is the factual background which led the committee to recommend that a reservation should be adopted which would protect the rights of pre-1905 users of the Red Cross emblem against the prohibition contained in articles 53 and 54 of the Convention on Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field. The decision of the committee on this matter was not taken lightly. It was only after long and careful investigation of this problem in concert with the Departments of Defense, State, and Justice, that a formula was conceived which has the merit of protecting the property rights of individuals and companies which have used the emblem, while at the same time ensuring that the protection to persons and property afforded by legitimate use of the emblem will be retained. The reservation avoids the possibility that protected areas and establishments will lose immunity by virtue of an unwarranted or confusing commercial use.

The reason for limiting the exemption to pre-1905 users of the emblem, as the committee report shows, is that until 1905 there was no Federal legislation dealing with the use of that trademark by other than the Red Cross Societies. In that year, the act of January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 600), made it unlawful for any person or group other than the Red Cross of America, "not now lawfully entitled to use" the symbol, to make use of it thereafter. Again, the act of June 23, 1910, limited the use of the emblem to those who had enjoyed the right before 1905, and for only the same purpose and class of goods.

It seems to me that these Federal statutes have recognized that the use of the trademark by the pre-1905 companies constitutes a valuable property right; and there are Federal court decisions which support this view.

Witnesses before our committee stated that millions of dollars have been spent on the symbol in advertising and marketing. If, therefore, no reservation protecting the interests of these pre-1905 users accompanies our ratification, it may open the way for the companies to contend that they have been deprived of a valuable property right in violation of the due process clause of the fifth amendment. I confess I do not see how it is possible to ignore such a contention, and the other members of the committee were of the same opinion.

There is another point to be noted. Article 53 of the convention provides that the use of the emblem "shall be prohibited." Although there is a degree of ambiguity in the article, use of the future tense would seem to indicate that the prohibition was not intended to be self-executing. Such is the position of the executive branch of our Government. But, whether regarded as self-executing or not, once the treaty is ratified, the United States will be under an international obligation to prohibit all private use of the emblem. Adequate protection of the rights of private users, therefore, seemed to justify approval of the reservation we have recommended.

The other problem I wish to refer to concerns those common provisions of the conventions known as the "grave breaches" provision. Thus, article 49 of the convention on wounded and sick in armed forces in the field stipulates:

"The high contracting parties undertake to enact any legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing, or ordering to be committed, any of the grave breaches of the present convention defined in the following article."

Article 50 then defines the grave breaches as—

"Any of the following acts, if committed against persons or property protected by the convention: wilful killing, torture or inhuman treatment, including biological experiments, wilfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health, and extensive destruction and appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly."

Members of our committee were concerned lest these provisions might possibly be construed as having the effect of enlarging the power of the Federal Government to enact penal legislation beyond that now vested in it under the Constitution. It is clear, however, that the undertaking in article 49 was not intended to enact an international penal code; nor was it intended that there be any enlargement of existing Federal power. Such power is already adequate to accomplish the purposes embraced within the "grave breaches" provisions. All of the acts enumerated in article 50 are acts already condemned and punishable under Federal and State criminal law.

On the other hand, there is no question but that the sources of constitutional power are sufficiently definite and broad to authorize legislative action for the suppression of acts listed in article 50. For example, article I, section 8, clause 10 of the Constitution empowers Congress to "define and punish * * * offenses against the law of nations." It is well settled that this power embraces the power to provide for the punishment of offenses against the laws of war. Not only the general war powers of the Constitution, but also the right given Congress under article I, section 8, clause 14 "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" provides a basis for enacting penal sanctions for mistreatment of "protected persons" under the Wounded and Sick and the Civilians Conventions.

Finally, a review of existing Federal legislation by the Department of Justice has established that no further measures are needed to provide appropriate punishment for those violations of the conventions which I have been discussing. I am satisfied that the provisions are necessary to put additional teeth in the conventions, and that it would be a mistake to have left them out.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the one nation which stands to benefit the most from these four conventions is our own United States. The standards which they set create no problem for this Government. We have never wavered in our conviction that a decent regard for civilized usages requires that victims of war be treated with humanity and a concern for their welfare. Our practices in the last war evidence the depth of that concern. But we have been even more concerned and more resentful at the brutal, yes, barbaric treatment which has too frequently been experienced by American servicemen and private individuals who have fallen into the power of the enemy. To the extent that we can obtain a worldwide acceptance of the high standards in the conventions, to that extent will we have assured our own people of greater protection and more civilized treatment.

For these reasons, I join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in wholeheartedly urging the Members of the Senate to give their approval to the four conventions.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, preceding the vote on the ratification of the conventions, a statement prepared by him.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

I particularly regret the fact that an unfortunate delay en route to the Senate floor will prevent my casting an affirmative vote for the Geneva Conventions.

I have a real interest in these treaties, and followed their progress closely in committee. Thus, it is a matter of personal regret to find myself in a position whereby I must miss adding my voice to a vote which will surely prove overwhelming in support of these important conventions.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on Executives D, E, F, and G be printed in the RECORD at the point just prior to the taking of the vote.

There being no objection, the report (Ex. Rept. No. 9) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the 4 Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims (Ex. D, E, F, and G, 82d Cong., 1st sess.) opened for signature on August 12, 1949, reports the conventions to the Senate with 2 reservations and a statement rejecting certain reservations by other parties to the conventions, and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

1. MAIN PURPOSE OF THE CONVENTIONS

The purpose of these conventions is to improve the treatment to be given persons who become the victims of armed conflict and to relieve and reduce the suffering caused thereby. To that end the four conventions are designed to modify, clarify, and develop existing international rules and practices dealing with the condition of wounded and sick in the armed forces in land and martime warfare, prisoners of war, alien enemies within the territory of a belligerent and the inhabitants of areas subjected to military occupation.

At the present time the United States is a party to four basic conventions covering all these subjects except that relating to alien enemies in the national territory; but as early as the Italo-Ethiopian conflict and the Spanish Civil War it had become apparent that their provisions were in need of reexamination. The conventions referred to are: The Geneva Convention of 1929 for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armies in the field; the Geneva Convention of 1929 relative to the treatment of prisoners of war; Hague Convention No. IV, respecting the laws and customs of war on land; and Hague Convention No. X, for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1906.

Experience acquired during 1939–45 amply demonstrated the necessity of bringing these instruments up to date, making them susceptible of more uniform application and more definite in interpretation, and further improving them so as to provide greater and more effective protection for the persons whom they were intended to benefit.

Until the present time there has not been in existence a separate, comprehensive treaty establishing standards of humane treatment for civilians in time of war, although the matter is partially dealt with, so far as concerns territory under belligerent occupation, in the regulations annexed to Hague Convention No. IV of 1907. For this reason, a new convention was drawn up at the Geneva Conference in 1949, which spells out to a degree never before attempted the obligations of the parties to furnish humanitarian treatment to two broad categories of civilians: enemy aliens present within the home territory of a belligerent, and civilian persons found in territory which it occupies in the course of military operations.

The essential point is that all of the conventions now before the Senate, with the exception of the convention on civilians, are based, fundamentally, on treaty obligations which the United States had previously accepted. The function of the new texts is to provide better protection and to adapt the earlier treaties to modern conditions. So far as the policies of the United States are concerned, the convention on civilians, while new in form, reflects generally the practices which we ourselves have followed. It combines both the precepts of the Hague regulations on inhabitants in occupied territory and the concepts we apply in our domestic law relative to civilian internees in the United States. There is, therefore, nothing in that convention in the nature of a departure from those basic principles which the Senate—or the Congress—had previously sanctioned. Certain specific points in the conventions which are unacceptable to the United States, are taken care of by appropriate reservations. (See below, secs. 9, 11, and 13.)

2. BACKGROUND OF THE CONVENTIONS

The conventions now before the Senate are the product of years of study and preparation commencing even before the Second World War had terminated. Probably no treaty or group of treaties previously submitted to the Senate have been subjected to such thorough-going and painstaking development and analysis, not only among the several interested branches of our Government, but as between the United States and other nations. Two major preparatory conferences were held in contemplation of the definitive Diplomatic Conference of Geneva in 1949. Not long after the close of hostilities in World War II, an interdepartmental committee was established on the initiative of the Secretary of State to work out improvements in existing treaties dealing with the protection of war victims. All agencies of our Government which had been involved in problems arising from applying provisions of these treaties contributed their experience in reaching decisions as to what changes or additions were in the best interests of the American people. Representatives of the Departments of State, Army, Navy, Air Force, Justice, Treasury, Post Office, and Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and the American Red Cross met at regular intervals to formulate a national position for this country. In 1947, a meeting of Government experts was held in Geneva, which prepared basic drafts of the four conventions. As reviewed and revised at the 17th International Red Cross Conference at Stockholm in 1948, these draft texts became the working papers of the 1949 Conference. The United States was represented at all 3 conferences, the American delegation in 1949 being composed of officials of the Department of State, the 3 military services, the Department of Justice, and the American Red Cross. Fifty-nine governments participated in the work of the Diplomatic Conference, which devoted over 3 months (April 21–August 12, 1949) to the preparation of the final instruments.

The conventions were open for signature on August 12, 1949, and were transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent on April 25, 1951. At the present time they have been ratified or acceded to by 48 governments, including all of the Iron Curtain countries.

3. COMMITTEE ACTION

Not long after the treaties were received by the Senate, the Department of State indicated its desire that further action be postponed in view of developments in the Korean conflict. This suggestion seemed a wise course to pursue, since all parties to the Korean conflict had signified in one way or another an acceptance of the principles of the conventions, and there was every reason to believe that more careful and mature consideration could be given to their detailed provisions after, rather than in the midst of, armed conflict. In consequence, no steps were taken in the Senate to consummate ratification of the conventions. With the Korean conflict abated, it became possible to reconsider the matter of ratification.

Accordingly, on March 29 of this year, the Secretary of State transmitted a second statement to the Committee on Foreign Relations, supplementing the report and commentaries which had accompanied the original message from the President requesting Senate approval. In this statement, Secretary Dulles summarized the present status of the conventions, and recommended that, in the national interest, action on ratification should no longer be delayed.

One June 3, 1955, a public hearing was held, beginning with testimony in support of the conventions by administration witnesses. Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy dealt with the background and general policy aspects of the conventions. Mr. Murphy was followed by the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Wilber M. Brucker, who addressed himself to the principal features of the conventions on prisoners of war and wounded and sick and the occupied territory portions of the civilians convention. The views of the Department of Justice, which emphasized the position of alien enemies under the civilians convention, were presented by J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General of the United States. Ellsworth Bunker, president of the American National Red Cross, gave testimony on behalf of that organization in support of ratification.

Spokesmen for a number of private companies appeared to urge adoption of a reservation which would except pre-1905 users of the Red Cross emblem from the effects of the obligation contained in articles 53 and 54 of the convention on wounded and sick to prohibit all uses of the convention not authorized therein. The legal and historical setting upon which they based this request was developed before the committee by Senator Everett Dirksen, former Senator Millard Tydings, Mr. Clark Clifford, Mr. Kenneth Perry, Mr. John Cassidy, and Mr. Robert P. Smith.

The committee considered the 4 conventions in executive session on June 9, 1955, and voted unanimously to report them to the Senate with 2 reservations—1 to the convention on sick and wounded in armed forces in the field, another to the civilians convention—and a statement to accompany the resolution of ratification regarding the United States position on reservations made to various provisions of the conventions by other parties.

4. CHANGES SUPPORTED BY UNITED STATES AT THE CONFERENCE

The United States can well be proud of its efforts at the Diplomatic Conference to elevate the standards of treatment applicable to war victims. It found support for a substantial portion of the position it took to Geneva. One significant example is furnished by the revision of the 1929 article in the Prisoners of War Convention on food furnished to prisoners of war. The United States successfully supported a proposal to require that food of prisoners of war must be sufficient in quantity, quality, and variety to keep prisoners in good health, and to prevent loss of weight or the development of nutritional deficiencies (art. 26). This was a considerable improvement over article 11 of the 1929 convention, which specified that food rations of prisoners should be equivalent to those of troops at base camps—an inadequate standard recalling the familiar "fishhead and rice" diet of American prisoners of war in the Pacific. We likewise obtained a new and simplified formula regarding employment of prisoners of war. In contrast with article 31 of the 1929 convention, which provided somewhat obscurely that prisoners' labor shall have no "direct relation" to war operations, and prohibited "unhealthful or dangerous work," articles 50 and 52 of the new convention limit compulsory work of prisoners of war to specific categories and prohibit compelling prisoners to clear and dispose of mines. Other revisions for which we contended were acceptance of the obligation to carry out release and repatriation of prisoners of war immediately following the cessation of active hostilities, rather than awaiting the conclusion of peace (art. 118, prisoners of war); a provision which would permit transfer of prisoners of war among cobelligerents upon condition (a) that the receiving government is also a party to the convention and (b) that the transferring government retains a contingent responsibility either to take effective measures to correct the situation or request the return of the prisoners where the transferee fails to treat them in accordance with the convention (art. 12, prisoners of war); application of all four conventions to conflicts which are not international in character by providing certain minimum humane safeguards for persons taking no active part in the hostilities (art. 3, prisoners of war); making illegal the taking of hostages (art. 34, civilians); prohibition of deportations from occupied territory (art. 49, civilians); and improved identification markings for hospital ships (art. 43, wounded and sick at sea).

5. PROVISIONS COMMON TO THE FOUR CONVENTIONS

Each of the four conventions contains certain general provisions which deal with its application and the mechanics of its enforcement. Thus, for example, articles 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the first 3 conventions (Wounded and Sick, Wounded and Sick at Sea—or "Maritime"—and Prisoners of War Conventions) are identical with the corresponding provisions of the Civilian Convention (arts. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12), except for adapting differences in phraseology.

Article 1 establishes as the basic theme of all the conventions the undertaking of the parties to respect and insure respect for the conventions in all circumstances. Article 2 incorporates the principle found in article 82 of the 1929 Prisoners of War Convention to the effect that although one of the parties to the conflict may not be a party to the convention, those powers which are parties shall nevertheless remain bound by it as between themselves. This avoids the unfortunate concept of the Hague Conventions which renders them inapplicable if they have not been accepted by all the belligerents (the si omnes provision). Article 2 further provides that the conventions shall apply to all cases of declared war or "of any other armed conflict which may arise" between two or more contracting parties even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them. Partial or total occupation of the territory of one of the parties brings the conventions into operation even if there is no armed resistance to the occupation.

Article 3 deals with a feature already referred to, namely, application of the conventions to armed conflicts not of an international character. In such circumstances, the parties are bound to apply humane treatment to noncombatants and those hors de combat because of sickness, wounds, or any other cause, without regard for race, color, religion, sex, birth, or wealth. As to these persons, physical violence, cruel treatment, torture, the taking of hostages, outrages upon personal dignity, and executions without the judgment of a duly constituted court rendered under recognized guaranties of a fair trial, are prohibited.

Three of the conventions (all except the one on civilians) contain a provision defining the conditions under which resistance fighters or "partisans" are entitled to protection. In the 1929 convention on prisoners of war (art. 1, par. 1), eligibility to protection was determined by compliance with the first three articles of the regulations annexed to Hague Convention No. IV of 1907. Inclusion of organized resistance movements (in art. 13 of the 1949 Wounded and Sick and Maritime Conventions and in art. 4 of the Prisoners of War Convention) does not change the basic principle. Such movements are placed on the same footing as militia and volunteer corps not forming part of the regular Armed Forces. Both these groups and partisans must conform to article I of the Hague regulations, which requires such persons to act under orders of a responsible commander, to wear a fixed emblem recognizable at a distance, to carry arms openly, and to obey the laws and customs of war. In sum, extension of protection to "partisans" does not embrace that type of partisan who performs the role of farmer by day, guerilla by night. Such individuals remain subject to trial and punishment as unlawful belligerents.

To tighten up the obligations of the parties in still another respect, three of the conventions (all but the Maritime Convention) are expressly made applicable to all protected persons without discrimination until they are finally released, repatriated, or reestablished (art. 5, wounded and sick, and prisoners of war; art. 6, civilians). These provisions, among other things, should serve to prevent a practice followed by some belligerents in World War II of arbitarily depriving prisoners of protection on the ground that the convention did not apply after occupation or capitulation.

Article 6 contemplates that the parties may enter into special agreements in addition to those provided for in the conventions with respect to protective functions of a neutral power or a humanitarian organization (as, for example, arts. 10, 15, 23, 28, 31, 36, 37, and 52 of the Wounded and Sick in the Field Convention); but no such agreements can diminish or prejudice the rights established in the conventions. This restriction is complemented by the provision in article 7 that persons protected by the conventions "may in no circumstance renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them" thereby. Comparable provisions were not contained in the 1929 conventions (e. g., art. 83 of the Prisoners of War Convention of 1929).

Under article 8, the conventions are to be applied with the cooperation and under the scrutiny of the protecting powers whose duty it is to safeguard the interests of the parties to the conflict. To that end, the protecting powers (neutral nations which endeavor to insure that the conventions are being properly applied) may appoint delegates from their diplomatic or consular staffs, or otherwise, subject to the approval of the detaining power. These representatives or delegates are enjoined to take account of the imperative necessities of the security of the state in which they are acting. The limitation was accepted in preference to a proposal advanced by the Soviet delegation that the protecting power or its delegates "may not infringe the Sovereignty of the State," which was roundly rejected by the Conference.

Article 9 supplements the protecting features of these instruments by expressly providing that the conventions constitute no obstacle to the humanitarian activities which the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other impartial humanitarian organization may undertake, subject to the consent of the parties, on behalf of persons protected by the conventions. The possibility of a substitute for the protecting power—should activties fail to benefit the war victims—is envisaged by article 10. In such case, the detaining (usually the capturing) power is required to request a neutral state or an impartial humanitarian organization to assume the functions performed under the conventions by a protecting power agreed upon by the parties to the conflict.

In the event of disagreement between the parties to the conflict concerning the application or interpretation of the conventions, the protecting powers, under article 11 are authorized to lend their good offices with a view to settling the disagreement, a concept which was embodied in article 87 of the 1929 Convention on Prisoners of War.

6. PROVISIONS RELATING TO EXECUTION OF THE CONVENTIONS

In addition to the articles set forth above, all of the conventions contain general, virtually identical, provisions concerning their execution and the prevention of abuses and violations. These provisions (arts. 47–52, wounded and sick; arts. 48–53, maritime; arts. 127–132, prisoners of war; and arts. 143–149, civilians) obligate the parties both in peace and in war to disseminate the texts of the conventions as widely as possible within their respective countries and to include the study thereof in programs of military and, if possible, civil instruction so that the entire population will become familiar with their principles. The parties agree, moreover, to enact legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing violations of the conventions enumerated as grave breaches (art. 130, prisoners of war; art. 50, wounded and sick; art. 51, maritime; art. 147, civilians). Each contracting party, moreover, is under an obligation to search for persons alleged to be responsible for the commission of such breaches of the convention, and to try them before its own courts regardless of their nationality. It may, on the other hand, in accordance with its own legislation, hand such persons over for trial to another contracting party concerned, provided the latter has made out a prima facie case against the suspects. These sanctions for compelling observance of the conventions are an advance over the 1929 instruments which contained no corresponding provisions. In view of a number of special problems which it raises, the matter of grave breaches is discussed in more detail later in this report. (See sec. 12 below.)

A final group of articles (arts. 55–64, wounded and sick; arts. 54–63, maritime; arts. 133–143, prisoners of war; arts. 150–159, civilians) regulates routine items pertaining to the official text of the conventions, the status of the conventions in relation to prior conventions dealing with the same subjects, ratification and accession, registration with the United Nations, and denunciation. As was true of the 1929 conventions, denunciation takes effect 1 year after being notified to the Swiss Federal Council; but no denunciation made during the course of a conflict in which the denouncing party is involved can take effect until peace has been concluded and the obligation of release and repatriation of persons protected by the conventions has been met. Such denunciation is effective only for the denouncing party, and does not release it from other obligations incumbent upon all nations under international law and civilized usages.

7. SUMMARIES OF THE CONVENTIONS

(*a*) *Wounded and sick in Armed Forces in the field* (*Convention No. I*)

This convention has a distinguished history, with antecedents going back to the Geneva Convention of 1864, a monument attributable to the inspiration of a Swiss, Henri Dunant, after witnessing the suffering of wounded soldiers at Solferino. That convention instituted the principle that wounded and sick combatants should be protected and taken care of irrespective of their nationality, and that special protection should be enjoyed by ambulances, military hospitals, medical personnel and equipment. In 1906 and 1929 the convention was revised. The 1949 document retains its basic features, but introduces a number of important modifications consonant with present-day requirements. It consists of 10 separate headings, of which the most important is the chapter on wounded and sick. Other divisions deal with medical units, personnel, buildings and material, medical transports, the distinctive Red Cross emblem, execution of the convention, and repression of abuses and infractions.

(1) Wounded and Sick

Article 12 (art. 1 of the 1929 convention) attempts to define with greater accuracy and detail the manner in which wounded and sick are to be treated by the parties to a conflict, in the light of some of the experiences of World War II. Although the 1929 convention prohibited differential treatment of victims on the basis of nationality, it is now prohibited also on the basis of sex, race, religion, political opinions, or similar criteria. Priority in order of treatment is justified only by urgent medical reasons. The article strictly prohibits such acts as murder, extermination, or violence to the person. It provides that sick and wounded members of the opposing forces shall not be subjected to torture or to biological experiments, or left without medical care and assistance. In a wholly new provision reflecting changes in the composition of modern armies, women are required to be treated with all consideration due their sex.

Article 13 substantially changes the various categories of persons entitled to the benefit of the convention. The 1929 document was applicable only to members of the armed forces and other persons officially attached thereto. The present convention amplifies the scope of its beneficiaries to include members of militias and corps of volunteers, together with resistance-movement groups which meet the conditions already described in this report. Other new categories comprise members of regular forces claiming allegiance to a government not recognized by the detaining power (such as a government in exile), and members of crews of merchant marine vessels and civil aircraft.

Article 15 authorizes the conclusion of local arrangements between the parties for removal or exchange of wounded and sick from a besieged or encircled area, and for the passage of medical and religious personnel and equipment on their way thereto. It consequently extends article 3 of the 1929 instrument, which merely made possible the conclusion of arrangements for temporary suspension of hostilities to collect and remove the wounded.

Article 16 clarifies the provisions of old article 4 relative to the identification of wounded, sick, and dead, and new provisions have been adopted in article 17 with respect to handling of the dead. Burial or cremation is to be carried out individually as far as circumstances permit, but cremation is permitted only for imperative reasons of hygiene or for motives based on the deceased's religion.

Article 5 of the 1929 convention permitted the military authorities to call upon the charitable zeal of the civilian population to collect and nurse, under appropriate direction, all wounded and sick combatants. During the Second World War the provision was found inadequate with respect to wounded parachutists or members of a resistance movement, assistance to whom was frequently prohibited upon severe penalties. For this reason, article 18 of the new convention stipulates that the military authorities shall permit the inhabitants and relief societies spontaneously to collect and care for wounded and sick of whatever nationality, and that no person may be molested or convicted solely for having nursed such individuals.

(2) Medical Units and Personnel

Articles 21–22 set forth the circumstances under which misuse of fixed medical establishments and medical units forfeits their protection, and lists specific acts (such as possession of small arms, treatment of civilian wounded and sick) which do not have this effect. Article 23 introduces an entirely new concept, that of "hospital zones and localities." Under this provision the parties may establish, during time of peace or after war has begun, hospital zones or localities organized to protect the wounded and sick from the effects of war and staff them with personnel required for their administration. A model agreement is annexed to the convention to facilitate mutual respect for the zones created.

One of the most fundamental changes wrought in 1949 relates to the status of regular medical personnel and chaplains attached to the Armed Forces. Traditionally, such personnel have enjoyed immunity from capture as prisoners of war, and the right of early repatriation. Their detention was expressly prohibited in article 12 of the 1929 convention except for agreements between the belligerents authorizing their temporary retention. Experience in the last war showed, however, that there was a need to permit retention of at least a part of the medical or religious personnel who fell into enemy hands to nurse and minister to wounded and sick prisoners who might otherwise fail to receive adequate care. Article 28 adopts a compromise formula under which medical personnel and chaplains, while not to be deemed prisoners of war, may be retained as far as the medical and spiritual needs of the prisoners may require. While in detention, they are to enjoy the advantageous provisions of the 1949 convention on prisoners of war. Personnel attached only temporarily to the medical service are, on the other hand, treated as prisoners of war, but must be employed on their medical duties if needed (art. 29). This modifies the 1929 principle under which they were treated on the same basis as permanent medical personnel.

Another drastic departure from past practice has been introduced with respect to the material of mobile medical units. Article 14 of the 1929 convention provided that such material, if it fell into the power of the adversary was subject to restitution as far as possible when sanitary personnel were returned. Article 33 of the 1949 convention stipulates that this medical material may be retained, but shall be reserved for the care of the wounded and sick. Materials, buildings and stores of fixed medical establishments of the Armed Forces remain subject to the laws of war, but the materials of mobile and fixed installations may not be intentionally destroyed. Similar treatment is accorded to transports of wounded and sick or of medical equipment (art. 35) in contrast with article 17 of the 1929 instrument which required them to be returned. The new convention makes these transports and vehicles subject to the law of war on condition that the capturing party will in all cases insure care of the wounded and sick they are carrying.

(3) Medical Aircraft

Medical aircraft are dealt with in article 36. The inadequate identification markings specified in article 18 of the 1929 convention ("painted in white and * * * the distinctive sign * * * alongside the national colors on their upper and lower surfaces") are improved, lateral surfaces now being included. Likewise intended to reduce the margin of confusion is the provision prohibiting any attack on such aircraft when flying at heights, times, and on routes agreed upon between the beligerents. Medical aircraft are prohibited from flying over enemy territory. They must obey a summons to land, but are permitted to continue in flight after an examination. In the event of an involuntary landing in enemy territory, both the crew of the aircraft and its wounded and sick become prisoners of war. By contrast, the 1929 rule extended the benefits of the prisoners of war convention to the wounded and sick, the sanitary personnel and material, and the aircraft; but pilots, mechanics, and radio operators were to be returned on condition that they would only be utilized in the medical services. Flight over neutral territory, which the 1929 convention failed to consider, is permitted after appropriate notification (art. 37). The neutral nation may, however, attach restrictions or conditions upon the use of its airspace. Wounded and sick who are landed in neutral territory with the latter's consent must be interned if required by international law, to prevent further participation in the conflict.

(4) The Distinctive Emblem

Articles 38–43, relating to the military use of the distinctive emblem of the Red Cross, make very few changes in the corresponding text of 1929 (arts. 19–23). Article 40 clarifies provisions for identifying medical and religious personnel. A new, pocket-size identification card supplements the red-cross armlet. Temporary personnel are identified by the wearing of a white armlet with a red cross smaller than those borne by permanent personnel (art. 41).

As in article 24 of the 1929 convention, article 44 prohibits the use of the distinctive emblem in peace or in war except to protect the medical units and establishments, the personnel and material protected by the convention. Article 53 supplements this general proscription by specifically prohibiting at all times the use by individuals, societies, firms or companies, whether public or private, unless entitled thereto under the convention, of the emblem or any imitation thereof, regardless of purpose and irrespective of the date of its adoption. The article encountered considerable opposition from companies who considered it a threat to their long-recognized property interests. The circumstances which gave rise to approval of a reservation by the committee, and the reservation itself, are discussed in a separate section of this report. (See sec. 11 below.)

National Red Cross societies are permitted in time of peace to make use of the name and emblem as prescribed by the International Red Cross conferences; but this use confers no protection in wartime, when the emblem must be small and not placed on armlets or on the roofs of buildings.

For the first time International Red Cross organizations are authorized to make use of the emblem which they themselves had introduced.

(b) *Wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of Armed Forces at sea* (*Convention No. II*)

This convention is essentially a revision and a refinement of Hague Convention X of October 18, 1907, for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva convention of 1906—itself a predecessor of the 1929 Convention on Wounded and Sick. The United States, as a maritime nation and a party of the 1907 document, welcomed the opportunity to rephrase its articles in the interest of clarity, amplification, and enlarged protection. The result is a much more detailed and comprehensive instrument than the earlier convention, and one which ensures better protection to wounded, sick, and shipwrecked at sea. Henceforth, these war victims enjoy the same conditions of treatment as those provided for forces in the field under the Wounded and Sick Convention (No. I).

Insofar as it deals with the treatment of wounded and sick, persons entitled to the benefits of the convention, identification and handling of wounded and dead, the status of medical and religious personnel, medical transports, and the use of the distinctive emblem, its provisions are largely identical to corresponding provisions of the Wounded and Sick Convention. Details concerning such matters will not be repeated in this portion of the report, which is devoted to provisions characteristically maritime in nature. The common articles have also been previously discussed.

(1) Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked

Article 12, which is new, defines "shipwreck" as a shipwreck from any cause, including forced landings at sea by or from aircraft. Article 16 of The Hague convention obligated the parties to search for shipwrecked, wounded, and sick. Article 18 of the 1949 convention adds to this the duty of taking them aboard and providing necessary care for them as well as protection against pillage and ill-treatment. Moreover, whenever permitted by circumstances, the parties are to conclude local arrangements for the removal of the wounded and sick by sea from a besieged or encircled area, and for the passage of medical and religious personnel and equipment on their way thereto—phrasing which recalls article 15 of the Wounded and Sick Convention. Article 14 reproduces the principle of article 12 of The Hague convention giving belligerent warships the right to demand the surrender of wounded, sick, and shipwrecked from hospital ships and other craft, but upon the new condition that the wounded and sick "are in a fit state to be moved and that the warship can provide adequate facilities for necessary medical treatment."

The conditions under which hospital ships are entitled to immunity from attack or capture are now conditioned upon a notification of their names and descriptions to the parties in conflict 10 days before employment of vessels as hospital ships (art. 22). Article 23 incorporates the provisions of the Wounded and Sick Convention by reference, in providing that shore establishments entitled to its protection shall also be protected from bombardment or attack from the sea. No comparable provision was in effect previously.

Hospital ships of any tonnage and their lifeboats, wherever operating, are protected by the convention and are exempt from capture (art. 25). But to insure the maximum of comfort to wounded and sick, the parties to the conflict "shall endeavor to utilize, for the transport of wounded, sick, and shipwrecked over long distances and on the high seas, only hospital ships of over 2,000 tons gross" (art. 26).

Hospital ships which happen to be in a port falling into the hands of the enemy must be allowed to depart (art. 29), a new provision applying the principle of exemption from capture.

Article 31 continues the rights which parties were granted under article 4 of The Hague convention to control and search hospital ships, adding a provision that belligerents may control the use of their wireless and other means of communication, and detain them for not more than 7 days if circumstances so require. Another new clause permits the parties to place neutral observers on board to verify strict observance of the provisions of the convention.

To prevent abuses from occurring, article 33 prevents merchant vessels, which have been converted into hospital ships, from being put to any other use for the duration of the hostilities. No corresponding provision was contained in The Hague Convention. Without it, it might be open to a government to transform merchant vessels into protected vessels as the dangers of particular areas required, then reconvert them to merchantmen.

(2) Medical Personnel and Transports

Articles 36 and 37 deal with the protection of medical and religious personnel, and contain many new features. The immunity from capture of religious, medical, and hospital personnel of hospital ships is extended to the crews of such ships, without whom the ships would be rendered useless. No such reason exists in the case of crews of vessels other than hospital ships who are therefore denied immunity (art. 37). A new provision permits retention of their medical and religious personnel when required to care for the medical and spiritual needs of prisoners. Upon being put ashore, this personnel becomes subject to the corresponding provision of the Wounded and Sick Convention. Whereas the 1907 convention, in protecting medical and religious personnel, did not distinguish between warships, merchant ships, and other vessels, article 37 restricts that protection exclusively to personnel engaged in the medical or spiritual care of persons described in articles 12 and 13 as protected by the convention. In short, religious, medical, and hospital personnel of vessels other than hospital ships enjoy the same protection as the personnel of the latter, except for the provision permitting their retention in the manner already noted.

The chapter on medical transports (arts. 38–40) is entirely new. Under article 38, ships may be chartered to transport medical equipment for the exclusive use of the wounded and sick if duly notified to the adverse party and approved by it. The latter has the right to board the vessels, but may not capture them or seize their equipment. Articles 39–40 reproduced the principles concerning medical aircraft (arts. 36–37) of the Wounded and Sick Convention, adapted to maritime warfare.

Articles 41–43 pertain to the distinctive emblem of the Red Cross. Articles 41–42, while new so far as the Maritime Convention is concerned, are basically the same as the corresponding provisions of the Wounded and Sick Convention.

One of the principal inadequacies of the 1907 convention was that of article 5 concerning the markings of hospital ships. Most of the attacks on such ships in World War II could be attributed to the fact that they were not recognizable as hospital ships. It is therefore provided under article 43 that all exterior surfaces must be painted white with red crosses as large as possible placed so as to afford maximum visibility from the sea and from the air. The national flag must be flown along with a Red Cross flag at the mainmast as high as possible. Smaller craft (such as lifeboats) must be similarly identified.

(c) *Prisoners of war* (*Convention No. III*)

Some of the more significant features of this convention have already been discussed in the sections summarizing American contributions to the conference and the common provisions. The convention contains 143 articles, divided into 6 major parts accompanied by 4 annexes, including a model agreement for repatriation of wounded and sick prisoners, and regulations for the work of the mixed medical commissions contemplated under article 12. It is an enlightened code which, if applied with a reasonable degree of good faith, should give assurance that captured members of a nation's military forces will be treated with the decency to which all self-respecting, civilized governments should aspire.

(1) Captivity and Internment

Articles 17–24 deal with the beginning of captivity and the internment of prisoners of war. Several other new classes are brought within the scope of the convention in addition to those categories of persons who qualify for protection under the Wounded and Sick Convention. Thus, persons arrested by an occupying power because of membership in the armed forces of the occupied country, military personnel interned in neutral countries, as well as the regular armed forces of governments or authorities not recognized by the detaining power (exiled or ousted governments) enjoy protection. Whenever the status of a person as one protected is in doubt, he enjoys protection pending a determination of that status by a competent tribunal (art. 5). Each party to the conflict must issue an identity card to every person under its jurisdiction who is liable to become a prisoner of war, showing his name, rank, serial number, and date of birth. As in article 5 of the 1929 convention, article 17 forbids physical or mental torture or any form of coercion to secure information of any kind whatsoever.

Article 21 contains provisions authorizing the release of prisoners on parole or promise if allowed by the laws of their own nations, but parole release may not be imposed involuntarily. Article 22 directs the detaining power to assemble prisoners of war in camps or compounds according to their nationality, language, and customs, provided that such persons are not separated without their consent from prisoners appertaining to the armed forces with which they served. Article 23 strengthens the safety provisions of article 9 of the 1929 convention by requiring that prisoners of war shall have shelters against air bombardment and other hazards to the same extent as the local civilian population. Another innovation requires prisoner compounds to be indicated by the letters PW or PG so as to be clearly visible from the air, whenever military considerations permit. Prisoners in permanent transit camps must be given the same treatment as other prisoners (art. 24).

Articles 25–28 completely restate the obligation of the detaining power under articles 11–12 of the 1929 convention with respect to the quarters, food, and clothing furnished to prisoners. As already noted in this report, the 1929 food standard is abandoned in favor of a ration which maintains the prisoners in good health and takes account of their habitual diet.

Articles 29–31 amplify and clarify the provisions of articles 13–15 of the 1929 convention relating to medical care and sanitation. Under a new article (33) medical personnel and chaplains who fall into the hands of the enemy are not considered to be prisoners of war. They may, however, be retained to minister to prisoners of war "preferably those belonging to the armed forces upon which they depend." Articles 34–38 guarantee to prisoners the enjoyment of religious, intellectual, and physical activities, and require facilities to be furnished for out-of-doors exercise. The provisions are a marked improvement over article 17 of the 1929 convention, which contained a weak exhortation that "so far as possible, belligerents shall encourage intellectual diversions and sports organized by prisoners of war."

Recognition of promotions in rank received by prisoners is required by the detaining power, in a new provision (art. 43). The impracticable rule of article 22 in the 1929 document under which officer prisoners were to provide their own food and clothing has been abandoned in article 44 which treats officers and other prisoners alike in this regard.

Articles 47–48 are improvements on the conditions accorded prisoners in transfer, who are permitted to take with them their personal effects not in excess of 25 kilograms (55 pounds) per person.

(2) Labor of Prisoners of War

The conditions under which the detaining power may utilize the labor of prisoners of war are set forth in articles 49–57. The 1929 convention contained a rather vague stipulation that labor exacted from prisoners should have no direct relation with war operations. No clause proved more troublesome to apply in World War II. Article 50 now lists the specific classes of work which may be exacted, and article 52 retains the prohibition of former article 32 against involuntary use of prisoners on unhealthful or dangerous labor, included in which is the removal of mines or similar devices. The 1929 principles on working conditions, duration of the hours of labor, accidents, pay, and rest periods (arts. 27–30) are spelled out in greater detail in articles 53–57. However, in place of the detaining power's former obligation to pay compensation equivalent to that of comparable laborers in cases of accident, it is provided only that injured prisoners shall be given all the care their condition requires, it being left to their own country to meet claims for compensation.

(3) Financial Resources of Prisoners of War

A completely new section (arts. 58–68) introduces a number of far-reaching changes in the 1929 rules dealing with financial resources of prisoners of war. The detaining power may fix the maximum amount of money which a prisoner may have in his possession, and any excess is credited to his account (art. 58). Whereas under the former convention, pay was only given to officers, under article 60 of the 1949 convention, pay is given to all prisoners, fixed on the basis of five categories for the separate ranks. This is called "advance of pay," indicating it is only a part of the amount paid them in their own army, and is fixed by the detaining power in amounts which may not go below a specified number of Swiss francs, as converted into the national currency. The detaining power is responsible for paying prisoners for work they perform, whether for private or public employers (art. 62). It must also pay them for work performed when they are permanently detailed to duties connected with the administration or management of camps.

Article 24 of the 1929 convention required each prisoner to be given pay to the credit of his account at the end of captivity. The 1949 convention (art. 66) instead requires that he be furnished a statement signed by an authorized officer of the detaining power and showing the credit balance due him, and a copy thereof certified to the prisoner's own government. It is further provided that "the power on which the prisoner depends shall be responsible for settling with him any credit balance due to him from the detaining power on the termination of his captivity."

Inasmuch as the United States paid out millions of dollars in the settlement of accounts of prisoners of war which it held during World War II without corresponding benefits to American prisoners held by the enemy, the new provision would seem to be to our distinct advantage.

(4) Relations of Prisoners of War With the Outside World

Articles 69–77 deal with the relations of prisoners with the outside world. Among other matters, it is provided in article 69 that the prisoner shall be permitted to send out a "capture card" addressed to the "Central Prisoners of War Agency" for its card index system. Prisoners' correspondence is treated in article 71, which entitles them to mail a minimum of 2 letters and 4 cards each month; but this minimum may be reduced if the protecting power finds that to be required by necessary censorship. A new provision likewise allows prisoners to send telegrams under certain circumstances.

The right of prisoners' representatives to take possession of collective relief shipments and to distribute them as desired by donors is recognized in a new article (73) which is accompanied by another new provision to the effect that such relief shipments shall be exempt from import, customs, and other dues (art. 74). Where military operations prevent the powers from complying with the convention's requirements on transport of these shipments, such transport may be undertaken by the International Red Cross (art. 75).

Articles 78–81 concern the important matter of requests and complaints as to the conditions of detention, in the relations between prisoners and the authorities, and the appointment of prisoners' representatives who must be allowed ready access to the representatives of the protecting power.

(5) Penal and Disciplinary Sanctions

One of the most important chapters in the convention is that relating to penal and disciplinary sanctions (arts. 82–108). This chapter sets forth the circumstances under which prisoners may be tried for various infractions of the laws and regulations of the detaining power; establishes maximum punishments for disciplinary offenses including attempted escapes; provides specific safeguards and guaranties of a fair judicial proceeding; and prohibits procedures and punishments contrary to those set out in the convention.

Article 82 provides that acts punishable by the laws of the detaining power, but which are not punishable if committed by a member of that power's forces, shall entail only disciplinary punishment. This provision should be read together with article 87, which excludes the application to prisoners of any penalties other than those provided for such acts in respect of members of the armed force of the detaining power. Women prisoners may not be more severely treated or punished than women members of the detaining power's own forces for like offenses (art. 88). No prisoner may be tried or sentenced for an act which is not forbidden by the law of the detaining power or by international law in force at the time the said act was committed (art. 99)—a provision of particular significance in view of criticism voiced against the alleged ex post facto nature of certain aspects of the Nuremberg war crimes proceeding. Under article 84, the prisoner has the right to be tried by a military court unless the existing laws of the detaining power expressly permit the civil courts to try members of that power's own forces in respect of the offense alleged. In no event may he be tried by any court not offering the essential guaranties of independence and impartiality generally recognized, nor under procedure which fails to accord the rights of defense set forth in article 105. The latter article gives him the right to freely chosen counsel, to call witnesses, and to the services of a competent interpreter. Should he or the protecting power fail to select counsel, the detaining power must find one for him. Other provisions ensure that his counsel will have opportunity to prepare an adequate defense along with the right of appeal (arts. 106–107).

One of the most extensively debated subjects at the conference was whether a prisoner who is prosecuted for a precapture crime, in particular, offenses against the laws of war, should enjoy the benefits of the convention. On this, article 85 provides:

"Prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the detaining power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present convention."

The article was adopted over the opposition of the Soviet bloc, which attached a reservation thereto at the time of signature. That reservation, and the committee's recommendations with respect to it, are discussed in a separate section. (See sec. 13 below.)

Article 88 repeats the injunction of article 52 in the 1929 convention against punishing prisoners more than once for the same offense (non bis in idem). Article 102 requires that trials be by the same court as in the case of members of the armed forces of the detaining power. Collective punishment for individual acts, corporal punishment, imprisonment in premises without daylight, and any form of torture or cruelty are prohibited.

In contrast with the rather general language of the 1929 convention on disciplinary punishment, the 1949 convention contains a limitative enumeration of those types of disciplinary penalties which may be applied to prisoners. In no case may such punishments be inhuman, brutal, or dangerous to the prisoners' health. Whereas article 55 of the former document permitted food restrictions as an increase in punishment, the present instrument omits any authorization of this kind.

(6) Escape, Release, and Repatriation

Articles 91–95 detail with greater thoroughness than heretofore the consequences of attempted escapes and define the conditions which must be met before an escape can be regarded as successful (art. 91), an important addition because of the effects produced by a successful escape. Another new provision prohibits camp commanders from delegating their disciplinary powers to prisoners of war, and requires a record to be kept of disciplinary punishments open to inspection by representatives of the protecting power (art. 96).

Articles 109–116 deal with direct repatriation and accommodation of prisoners in neutral countries. Articles 109–110 set forth principles under which parties to the conflict are obligated to repatriate seriously wounded and sick prisoners of war. Specified categories may also be accommodated in neutral countries after agreement with the latter. No wounded and sick prisoner eligible for repatriation may be repatriated against his will during hostilities.

Articles 118–121 contain provisions on the release and repatriation of prisoners of war at the close of hostilities, deceased prisoners, death certificates, burial and cremation, and the transmittal of wills to the protecting power. Article 118 requires that prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities, a principle which occasioned the dispute during the Korean armistice negotiations as to whether a belligerent was obligated to repatriate prisoners against their will (see sec. 10 below). Finally, under article 121, whenever death or serious injury of a prisoner of war is caused by a sentry or any other person or is due to unknown causes, an official inquiry must be held by the detaining power, and measures taken to prosecute the guilty.

(*d*) *Civilian persons* (*Convention No. IV*)

The Convention on Civilians, as already noted in this report, adheres closely to principles to which the United States has subscribed previously, either in earlier international undertakings (the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention No. IV of 1907), or in its own treatment of internees within its territory during the last great war. Because, however, the convention is completely new in form and creates a number of new international obligations for the parties, particularly with respect to alien enemies within the home territory of a belligerent, its provisions merit examination in somewhat greater detail than those of the three conventions thus far discussed.

(1) Scope and Coverage of the Convention

Article 4 identifies as a person protected by the convention anyone who, during a conflict or military occupation, falls into the hands of a power of which he is not a national. The convention does not, however, protect nationals of a state not bound by it, nor nationals of a neutral state found within belligerent territory as long as that state maintains diplomatic representation with the latter. Nor does it cover individuals who are protected by the other three conventions under consideration.

Protected persons suspected of hostile activities within the metropolitan territory lose only such rights and privileges under the convention as would prejudice the state's security. Similarly, protected persons in occupied territory who are detained for spying or sabotage, or as persons under definite suspicion of activity hostile to the security of the occupying power, may be deprived of all rights of communication under the convention (permitting contacts with relatives and the protecting power) where absolute military security so requires. However, such persons must be humanely treated and shall also be granted the full rights and privileges of a protected person at the earliest date consistent with the security of the state or occupying power (art. 5).

Articles 1–3 and 8–12 are those common articles already discussed above which concern the applicability of the convention to undeclared and civil war, to protecting powers and related matters.

Part II of the convention (arts. 13–26) deals with the general protection of populations against certain consequences of war.

(2) Hospitals and Safety Zones

Article 14 encourages the parties to establish within their territories hospitals and safety zones organized to protect and shelter young children, the aged, wounded, and sick and expectant mothers from the effects of war. Neutralized zones may be established, upon agreement between the parties, in regions where fighting is going on, for wounded and sick combatants and noncombatants, or civilian persons not participating in the hostilities (art. 15). The parties agree to facilitate measures taken to search for killed and wounded, to protect them against pillage and ill-treatment (art. 16) and to try to arrange for the removal from besieged or encircled areas of the wounded, sick, infirm and aged persons, children, and maternity cases (art. 17).

Articles 18–23 provide for the immunity of civilian hospitals from attack, the manner of their identification by the Red Cross emblem, the circumstances under which such protection is lost by acts harmful to the enemy, and the protection to be accorded personnel engaged in the operation of civilian hospitals. Similar provision is made for the protection of hospital convoys on land and sea, and of aircraft used for removing wounded and sick when properly marked with the emblem and flying on courses agreed between the parties. Under specified conditions protecting a party from improper use, the free passage of medical supplies, food, and clothing for children and maternity cases is stipulated.

Articles 24–26 relate to the welfare of children under the age of 15 and measures for facilitating the establishment of contact between members of a family who have been separated because of the war.

Part III is the largest and most important portion of the convention (arts. 27–141). It sets forth the principal obligations of the parties with respect to the two broad categories of persons which it protects: (a) alien enemies and other protected persons within the territory of a party to the conflict (sec. II) and (b) persons residing in territory which is occupied by the enemy (sec. III).

(3) Provisions Applicable to Both National and Occupied Territory

Certain common provisions applicable to both categories are set forth in articles 27–34 (sec. I). These common articles provided for humane treatment of the individuals protected, and bind the parties to respect their person, honor, family rights, and religious customs. Women are to be especially protected against any attacks on their honor and against enforced prostitution. Any distinction in treatment based upon race, religion, or political opinion is specifically forbidden. It is, however, recognized that a party may be justified in taking such measures of control and security in regard to protected persons as may be necessary because of the war.

Article 30 seeks to put teeth into the protection given, by requiring the parties to give protected persons "every facility for making application to the protecting powers, the international committee of the Red Cross, the National Red Cross (Red Crescent, Red Lion and Sun) Society of the country where they may be, as well as to any organization that might assist them."

Detaining powers must facilitate visits by other humanitarian or relief organizations to persons in their custody.

Coercion of any kind to elicit information from protected persons is prohibited (art. 31), as are any measures causing the physical suffering or extermination of such persons, including mutilation or so-called scientific experiments not necessitated by medical treatment (art. 32). A familiar precept of The Hague Regulations of 1907 (art. 50) is found in the prohibition of collective penalties, and of the punishment of a protected person for offenses which he has not committed (art. 33). Pillage (also prohibited in art. 47 of The Hague rules), reprisals against a person or his property and the taking of hostages are prohibited (arts. 33-34).

(4) Aliens in Territory of a Party to the Conflict

The convention grants to any protected person during a conflict the right of voluntary departure unless contrary to the national interests of the state. In the event that permission to leave is denied, the convention provides that the applicant's request shall be reconsidered by an appropriate court or administrative board designated by the detaining power (art. 35). This is analogous to the United States practice during World War II in giving interned enemy aliens hearings before advisory boards which recommended release, parole, or continued internment to the Attorney General. Persons permitted to leave are entitled to take with them necessary funds for expenses and reasonable amounts of personal effects.

Articles 27 and 38 require protected persons in the territory of a belligerent to be treated humanely, even while confined pursuant to a sentence involving loss of liberty (art. 37). Apart from the special measures of security and control contemplated by articles 27 and 41, their situation continues to be regulated in principle by the provisions concerning aliens in time of peace; but in any case they are entitled to receive individual or collective relief sent to them, medical attention if needed, and to practice their religion. Children under 15 and pregnant women and mothers of children under 7 years of age enjoy any preferential treatment provided for the nationals of the state concerned (art. 38).

Protected persons who have lost their employment as a result of the war must be permitted to find paid work on the same basis as nationals, except for security requirements. If they cannot support themselves as a result of security measures the detaining power must insure their support and that of their dependents (art. 39). On the other hand, they may be compelled to work only to the same extent and under the same conditions as nationals of the territory. Alien enemies, however, may only be compelled to do work normally necessary to insure the feeding, sheltering, clothing, transport and health of human beings, and not related directly to the conduct of military operations (art. 40). This, too, is a general reflection of past American practice.

Under article 42, the internment or placing in assigned residence of protected persons may be ordered only if the security of the detaining power makes it absolutely necessary; and, if such internment is maintained, the internee is entitled to periodic review of his case by an appropriate court or administrative board at least twice yearly.

Article 43 introduces, with respect to internees, the concept of the protecting power borrowed from the 1929 Prisoner of War Convention. Unless the individual himself objects, the detaining power must give to the protecting power the names of any protected persons who have been interned or thereafter released. Similar opportunities to communicate with the protecting power are provided for internees as are enjoyed by prisoners of war. Protected persons may not be transferred to a power not party to the convention (art. 45) nor may the detaining power automatically treat as enemy aliens exclusively by virtue of their nationality of an enemy state refugees who in fact enjoy the protection of no government (art. 44).

(5) Occupied Territories

Articles 47-78 of the convention deal with the highly important subject of the treatment of inhabitants of occupied territory by the occupying power. In that connection, it should be noted that articles 27-34, which have already been discussed, are common both to this portion of the convention and that dealing with enemy aliens in belligerent territory.

This portion of the convention constitutes the first successful attempt in almost 50 years to revise treaty law dealing with belligerent occupation. It presents primarily a refinement, expansion, and clarification of the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention IV of 1907 respecting the laws and customs of war on land, by which the United States is presently bound. The provisions do not replace The Hague rules but are supplementary to them as between powers which are bound by the 1899 or 1907 conventions, and are also parties to the 1949 document (art. 154).

Article 47 prohibits the occupying power from depriving protected persons who are in occupied territory of the benefits of the convention by any change it may attempt to make in the government of that territory or its institutions, or by agreements between the occupying power and the authorities of the occupied territory, or by annexation thereof in whole or in part. Protected persons found therein who are not nationals of the dispossessed power must be given an opportunity to depart in accordance with procedure established pursuant to article 35 (art. 48). Article 49 prohibits individual or mass forcible transfers and deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to another country; but evacuation of specific areas is permissible for imperative military reasons or the security of the population (art. 49). Specific measures to insure the care, health, and education of children and prohibiting changes in their personal status are set forth in article 50. Compulsory military service by protected persons in the armed forces of the occupant is prohibited, along with pressure or propaganda aimed at inducing voluntary enlistment. Forced labor of protected persons is forbidden unless they are over 18 years of age, and then must be limited to work necessary either for the needs of the army of occupation, public-utility services, or for the feeding, sheltering, clothing, transportation, and health of the inhabitants. Compulsory work in connection with military operations is excluded (art. 51).

(6) Welfare of the Inhabitants

Article 55 considerably enlarges the responsibility of an occupying power with respect to the welfare of the occupied territory. Under article 43 of The Hague regulations, that obligation was stated merely as one to "ensure, as far as possible, public order and safety." Moreover, the occupant, under article 52, could only requisition goods and services "for the needs of the army of occupation." Article 55 of the Civilian Convention goes beyond this by imposing upon the occupying power the duty of ensuring the food and medical supplies of the population to the best of its capabilities, even if it has to bring these in from outside the territory. Services may be requisitioned, as previously noted, for the benefit of the population. Foodstuffs, articles, or medical supplies may still be requisitioned for the use of occupation forces and administrative personnel, but only if the requirements of the civilian population have been taken into account.

Articles 56-63 set forth the obligations of the occupant relative to the maintenance of hospital and medical establishments, the prevention of disease, relief consignments and their distribution, and the activities of Red Cross societies.

(7) Punishment of Criminal Offenses

Article 64 substantially rephrases article 43 of The Hague rules which required the occupant to respect "unless absolutely prevented," the laws in force in the country. Instead it is now provided that the penal laws of the occupied territory shall remain in force, with the exception that they may be repealed or suspended by the occupying power when they constitute a threat to its security or an obstacle to applying the convention. Local tribunals will continue their functions with respect to offenses covered by such laws. Penal laws enacted by the occupant may not be retroactive (art. 65). The occupying power is authorized to try offenses against such laws by its properly constituted, nonpolitical military courts, provided they sit within the territory (art. 66). Only provisions of law applicable prior to the offense and in accordance with general principles of law may be applied by the courts (art. 67). Internment or simple imprisonment is the maximum penalty which may be applied to offenses intended solely to harm the occupying power but which do not constitute an attempt on the lives or persons of members of the occupying forces or administration, nor a grave collective danger nor damage property of the occupying forces or installations used by them (art. 68).

It is further provided in article 68 that the penal provisions promulgated by the occupying power may impose the death penalty upon protected persons only for cases of espionage, sabotage, or intentional offenses which have caused the death of one or more persons—"provided that such offenses were punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory in force before the occupation began."

The United States attached a reservation to this provision at the time of signature, which is discussed in a later section of this report. (See sec. 9 below.)

Articles 70-76 contain enlightened provisions safeguarding the rights of protected persons arrested for criminal offenses. Among other things accused persons are assured the right to be informed promptly of the charges against them, to call witnesses and present evidence, to defense counsel and an interpreter, the right of appeal and to have the protecting power notified of particulars of the proceedings. No person condemned to death may be deprived of the right of petition for pardon or reprieve and, except in grave emergencies, execution of the death sentence may not be carried out before the expiration of 6 months from the date of receipt by the protecting power of notification of final judgment confirming such sentence (art. 75). Article 76 provides that protected persons who are accused of offenses shall be detained in the occupied country and serve their sentences there if convicted. Under article 77, protected persons, who have been accused of offenses or convicted by the courts in occupied territory, shall be handed over at the close of occupation to the authorities of the liberated country, with all relevant records.

(8) Treatment of Internees

Regulations for the treatment of internees are contained in articles 79-135, which are similar in a great many respects to the provisions governing the treatment of prisoners of war and need not, therefore, be recataloged here. They embrace such matters as places of internment, food and clothing, hygiene and medical attention, religious, intellectual, and physical activities, personal property and financial resources, administration and discipline, relations with the exterior penal and disciplinary sanctions, transfers of internees, deaths and release and repatriation. A final section (arts. 136-141) concerning information bureaus and a Central Information Agency also follows closely provisions on the same subject in the Prisoners of War Convention.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF DETENTION AND INTERNMENT DECISIONS

The committee's attention was particularly drawn to articles 35, 43, and 78 of the Convention on Civilians. Under article 35, a protected person who has been denied permission to leave the home territory of a belligerent in time of war is entitled to have such denial reconsidered by an appropriate court or administrative board designated for that purpose by the detaining power. A similar right is provided by article 43 for persons who have been interned or placed in assigned residence in a belligerent's home territory. In article 78 it is likewise provided that persons who have been placed in internment or assigned residence in occupied territory shall be entitled to review or reconsideration by a competent body. From information furnished to the committee by the executive branch is appears that the administrative boards and the competent bodies contemplated by the three articles to reconsider decisions in these cases may be created with advisory functions only, leaving the final decision to a high official or officer of the government. This understanding of the provisions appears to be a reasonable one to the committee.

A spokesman for the Department of Justice emphasized that the internment provisions of the Civilian Convention do not require a belligerent government to hold a hearing before it interns an alien enemy in time of crisis, and that policies which the United States have heretofore followed would not be handicapped thereby. However "they do require that the internment weapon be used with discrimination and commonsense, and that opportunities for reconsideration be provided as a safeguard against mistakes. The internment policies and procedures followed by the United States in World War II would comply with articles 42 and 43."

9. APPLICATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY IN OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Of the four conventions, the only instrument to which the United States made a reservation at Geneva was the one on civilians. Article 68, paragraph 2, of that convention in its present form permits the imposition of the death penalty by an occupying power only in cases involving espionage, serious acts of sabotage, or intentional offenses causing the death of one or more persons; provided, however, that such offenses were punishable by death under local law in force before the occupation began. Adoption of this limitation upon the death penalty was due to the efforts of a number of countries, some of which had experienced wholesale imposition of this extreme measure under military occupation, and others of which have abolished the death penalty in their legal systems. Our own Government, while willing to agree not to impose it except in the three categories of cases listed in article 68, was unable to accept the proviso further limiting its use. Along with the United Kingdom, we took the position that an occupying power would be unable to protect its own forces adequately against the activities of illegal combatants unless it retained the power to take drastic legal action to meet the situation. From a practical standpoint, moreover, the limitation in article 68 would permit an enemy on the point of being dislodged from the national territory to repeal a death penalty law previously applicable, thus opening the way to all kinds of subversive activities against the occupant which would not be punishable by death. Reasons of this kind impelled the United States to sign the convention with a reservation in the following form:

"The United States reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offenses referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

Similar reservations to article 68 were made by the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, and the Netherlands.

The committee considers that this reservation is essential to the protection of the national interest and, accordingly, in reporting the convention to the Senate, recommends that it be included in the resolution giving its advice and consent to ratification.

10. RELEASE AND REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

During the Korean armistice negotiations the most contested legal issue was whether the parties were obligated to compel prisoners to be repatriated against their will, or whether the detaining power could in its discretion grant asylum to any prisoner who desired it. The United Nations Command maintained the position that all prisoners who wished to be repatriated were entitled to repatriation, but that international law did not require force to be used if they were unwilling to return. The Communists asserted that forced repatriation was prescribed under the principle of article 118 of the 1949 convention on prisoners of war. That article provides in part:

"Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities."

In the United Nations General Assembly in the fall of 1952, during debates on the Korean armistice negotiations, the Soviet bloc sought to maintain the thesis that the principles of articles 118 and 7 (which prohibits renunciation of rights by a prisoner) did not encompass a grant of asylum to prisoners of war. The exchanges, in which our own Government took a leading part, developed that the practice of many nations, including the practice of the Soviet Government, was authority for granting asylum to prisoners of war; that at Geneva, in 1949, the negotiators proceeded upon the premise that the doctrine of asylum was applicable; and that they did not intend to overturn customary law in this respect. Both General Assembly Resolution 610 (VII) and the eventual armistice agreement in Korea permitted the individual prisoner of war a free choice between return and asylum under safeguards of impartial supervision. The fact that it is an unrestricted opportunity of repatriation, and not an absolute obligation or predetermined fate of repatriation which the prisoner is given under article 118, was similarly recognized by the General Assembly in Resolution 427 (V) of December 14, 1950, and reaffirmed in Resolution 741 (VIII) of December 7, 1953.

Members of the committee, exploring the problem of involuntary repatriation with the executive branch, were informed at the hearing that the United States official position continues to be that maintained in Korea and overwhelmingly supported in the resolution of the General Assembly, and that article 118 does nothing to change accepted principles of international law under which asylum is applicable to prisoners of war.

The committee unqualifiedly concurs. It finds nothing in the Geneva conventions of 1949 which will compel the United States forcibly to repatriate prisoners of war who fear political persecution, personal injury, or death should they return to their homeland. That article, being intended for the benefit and the well-being of prisoners, will permit the United States to continue the policy of nonforceable repatriation, while at the same time leaving it free, where necessary, to refuse requests for asylum. The interpretation which has thus prevailed gives due weight to the word "release" in article 118, is faithful to precedent and legislative history, and is fully consistent with the great humanitarian purposes which underlie all four of the conventions.

11. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF THE RED CROSS EMBLEM

Article 53 of the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (Convention I) prohibits at all times the use by any individuals, societies, firms, or companies, whether public or private, unless entitled thereto under the convention "of the emblem or the designation 'Red Cross' or 'Geneva Cross,' or any sign or designation constituting an imitation thereof, whatever the object of such use, and irrespective of the date of its adoption."

Article 54 further provides that the parties to the convention "shall, if their legislation is not already adequate, take measures necessary for the prevention and repression, at all times, of the abuses referred to under article 53."

Testimony was presented to the committee on behalf of several well-known private business organizations (including Johnson & Johnson, the A. P. W. Paper Co., and others) that the prohibitions in these articles would impair their enjoyment of a long-standing right to the use of the Red Cross emblem in the advertisement and sale of their products. It was therefore urged that a reservation be adopted which would protect the property rights here alleged to be affected.

The committee has weighed carefully the evidence submitted to it on the use of emblems by these companies and, after examining pertinent Federal legislation, has concluded that justice and equity as well as the provisions of our own law require that the interests here involved should receive appropriate safeguards in the ratification of the convention. This conclusion is based upon the following considerations.

There was no Federal statute dealing with the use of the Red Cross trade-mark until the act of June 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 600; 36 U. S. C., sec. 4), made it unlawful for any person or group other than the Red Cross of America "not now lawfully entitled to use" the symbol to make use of it thereafter. The act of June 23, 1910 (36 Stat. 604; cf. 18 U. S. C. 706), limits the use of the emblem to those who had enjoyed the right before 1905, and for only the same purpose and class of goods. This legislation, as well as the decisions of high Federal courts (e. g., the opinion of Judge Learned Hand in *Loonen* v. *Deitsch* (189 F. 487); and of Mr. Justice Douglas in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. P. W. Paper Co.* (328 U. S. 193)), appear to give support to the proposition that the trade-mark and its use by private companies constitute a valuable property right.

All of the companies represented before the committee enjoyed the right to use the symbol before the 1905 statute was passed, and several have used it regularly for 75 years. According to testimony presented by these witnesses, this long continued use has created valuable interests in associating certain products with the emblem, the loss of which would have an appreciable effect upon sales. That testimony further indicated that millions of dollars had been spent on the symbol in advertising and marketing.

The problem is not a new one. After ratification of the 1929 Convention on Wounded and Sick, which contained a similar prohibition, an unsuccessful attempt was made to enact implementing legislation (cf. H. R. 6911, 77th Cong., 1st sess.). Hearings on the bill then introduced likewise appear to sustain the thesis that to the extent that pre-1905 users established a property right they would be entitled to just compensation.

The committee cannot ignore the contention that if no protective reservation is attached to the treaty, the foundation will have been laid for a claim of deprivation of private property rights in violation of the just compensation clause of the fifth amendment. It is the position of the executive branch that the prohibition of articles 53 and 54 is not intended to be self-executing. Nevertheless, once the treaty is ratified, the United States will have assumed an international obligation under article 54 to give effect to its injunctions.

In testimony submitted at the hearing, the Department of Defense expressed opposition to any reservation to this convention which would have the effect of diminishing the protection it guarantees to members of our Armed Forces and the civilian population. As stated by Mr. Brucker:

"We are not opposed to the observance of proper equities as far as the business, industrial firms of this country are concerned, but * * * balanced against that, we have a very serious international problem which, if we unilaterally make reservations that dilute the Red Cross emblem, are going to bring perhaps not only repercussions but failure to recognize even our own marked spots for the Red Cross emblem, both abroad and here, whenever it may occur."

Subsequently, the Department of Defense advised the committee in a letter to the chairman dated June 6, 1955, that its principal concern over any proposed reservation related to the possible use of the Red Cross emblem on buildings and other outdoor structures; and suggested appropriate phrasing to that effect for inclusion both in a reservation and in such legislation as might hereafter be enacted for the protection of the emblem.

Because of the facts which have been set forth above, the committee, after extended consultation with the executive departments concerned, the American National Red Cross and representatives of the pre-1905 users, considers that a reservation should be adopted which would relieve the United States of any obligation to disturb continued enjoyment of any use of the emblem which was lawful under domestic law in the United States at the time of ratifying the convention. Such a use would be one lawfully begun prior to January 5, 1905, and permitted to continue under the act of January 5, 1905, the act of June 23, 1910, and subsequent Federal legislation, subject, of course, to extinction by abandonment at any time.

Moreover, the protection of the national interest—and especially the interest of wounded and sick—requires that such a reservation be qualified so as to express the acceptance by the United States of an obligation to enact legislation prohibiting any use of the emblem on aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings, or other structures, or upon the ground, except as authorized under the terms of the conventions.

Accordingly, the committee, in reporting the convention to the Senate, recommends that the resolution giving its advice and consent to ratification, include the following reservation:

"The United States, in ratifying the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, does so with the reservation that irrespective of any provision or provisions in said convention to the contrary, nothing contained therein shall make unlawful, or obligate the United States of America to make unlawful, any use or right of use within the United States of America and its Territories and possessions of the Red Cross emblem, sign, insignia, or words as was lawful by reason of domestic law and a use begun prior to January 5, 1905, provided such use by pre-1905 users does not extend to the placing of the Red Cross emblem, sign, or insignia upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings or other structures, or upon the ground."

12. THE "GRAVE BREACHES" PROVISIONS

In an earlier section of this report, reference was made to a number of common articles of the conventions relating to sanctions for what is described as "grave breaches." (See sec. 6 above.) Thus, for example the first paragraph of article 49 of the convention on wounded and sick in armed forces in the field provides—

"The high contracting parties undertake to enact any legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing, or ordering to be committed, any of the grave breaches of the present convention defined in the following article."

Article 50 defines such "grave breaches" as "any of the following acts, if committed against persons or property protected by the convention: willful killing, torture or inhuman treatment, including biological experiments, willfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health, and extensive destruction and appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly."

These provisions gave rise to a searching discussion in the committee concerning the possible extent to which they might be construed as enlarging the power of the Federal Government of the United States to enact penal legislation, beyond that now vested in it under the Constitution.

Administration witnesses stated that the undertaking in article 49 was not designed to enact an international penal code, and that it was not intended that there be any enlargement of existing Federal power, which it was felt was already adequate for that purpose. On the other hand, they pointed out that the acts enumerated in article 50 were all acts already condemned by Federal and State criminal law.

At the request of the committee, which felt that no doubt should be allowed to subsist on a question of such importance, this testimony was later supplemented by an authoritative communication from the Department of Justice to the chairman, under date of June 7, 1955, discussing the matter in some detail. The letter pointed out that broad authority exists under those clauses of the Constitution which empower Congress to "define and punish * * * offenses against the law of nations (art. I, sec. 8, clause 10)" which, it is well established, includes the power to provide for the trial and punishment of offenses against the laws of war; and under the war powers as set forth in the Constitution which provide a basis for Congress to regulate the treatment accorded by the United States to enemy wounded and sick, inhabitants of territory under our military occupation, and civilian internees. Moreover, article I, section 8, clause 14, which gives the Congress the right "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces" would warrant enactment of penal sanctions for mistreatment of such "protected persons" by members of our Armed Forces.

The committee is satisfied that the obligations imposed upon the United States by the "grave breaches" provisions are such as can be met by existing legislation enacted by the Federal Government within its constitutional powers. A review of that legislation reveals that no further measures are needed to provide effective penal sanctions or procedures for those violations of the conventions which have been considered in this portion of the report. It should be emphasized, in any event, that the grave breaches provisions cannot be regarded as self-executing, and do not create international criminal law.

The committee was also concerned as to whether these provisions as to "grave breaches" would impose criminal liability upon persons without official status. However, it is clear that these provisions of the conventions do not convert into a "grave breach" every corresponding crime in which a protected person is the victim, but are concerned primarily with the action of civilian or military agents of a government. It should further be noted that as a practical matter only individuals exercising governmental power would normally be in a position to maltreat such protected groups as prisoners of war, civilian internees or the inhabitants of occupied territory.

13. RESERVATIONS TO THE CONVENTION BY THE SOVIET BLOC

Members of the Soviet bloc (Albania, Byelorussia, Soviet Socialist Republic, the Bulgarian People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, Poland, the Rumanian People's Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Soviet Union) entered a group of reservations which are of such potential significance that the committee considered at some length the desirability of specifically stating in the resolution of ratification that the reservations are unacceptable to the United States and that we could not agree to them as proposed changes in the convention.

These reservations pertain to common article 10 (art. 11, Civilians Convention), article 12 (art. 45, Civilians Convention), and article 85 of the Prisoners of War Convention, the reservation respecting the latter article being the most important. The possibility that the reservations might be used by the Soviet bloc to evade normal international obligations under the conventions in a broad sphere has been the subject of most extensive examination by the executive branch and the committee.

Article 85 deals with the treatment of prisoners of war who are prosecuted and sentenced for precapture offenses. It provides:

"Prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the detaining power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present Convention."

A typical reservation of the Soviet bloc (that of the Soviet Union) to this article is worded as follows:

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the obligation, which follows from article 85, to extend the application of the Convention to prisoners of war who have been convicted under the law of the detaining power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, for war crimes and crimes against humanity, it being understood that persons convicted of such crimes must be subject to the conditions obtaining in the country in question for those who undergo their punishment."

A reservation of this kind raises the question as to whether the Soviet-bloc countries will consider themselves bound by the convention to accord to prisoners of war accused of war crimes, as described in the reservation, the benefits of fair trial which the convention insures. By reasonable construction and its literal wording, the reservation quoted above declares that it is only when a prisoner of war has been convicted of a war crime that he ceases to benefit from the provisions of the convention. Accordingly, it would appear that the protection of the convention would continue through trial and, indeed, until exhaustion of the appellate proceedings provided by the convention.

There is, however, no definite assurance, beyond the reasonable construction of the language used in the reservation, that the Soviet bloc intends thereby to recognize the applicability to prisoners of war of the provisions of the convention respecting trial and appeal. On the other hand, in the light of the practice adopted by Communist forces in Korea of calling prisoners of war "war criminals," there is the possibility that the Soviet bloc might adopt the general attitude of regarding a significant number of the forces opposing them as ipso facto war criminals, not entitled to the usual guaranties provided for prisoners of war. As indicated above, however, the Soviet reservation expressly deprives prisoners of war of the protection of the convention only after conviction in accordance with the convention.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concurs with the conclusion of the executive branch that the most satisfactory means of dealing with these reservations is to make it clear that the United States does not accept them, but proposes to enter into treaty relations with the Soviet-bloc countries with respect to the remaining, unreserved parts of the conventions. If in the event of armed conflict any of those countries were to exploit reservations in an unwarranted manner so as to nullify the broad purposes of the conventions, such action would, of course, alter the legal situation for the United States; and this Government would be free to reconsider its position. It is hoped that the members of the Soviet bloc may one day find it possible to withdraw their reservations, or will at least construe and apply them in a manner compatible with their legal and humanitarian obligations. In the meantime, by having treaty relations the United States has obtained agreement to the best standards of treatment and is in the soundest position to protect our nationals.

To avoid any possibility of misunderstanding on this aspect of the conventions, the committee, in reporting the conventions to the Senate, recommends that there be included in the resolutions giving its advice and consent to ratification a statement adapted to each convention in the following form:

"The United States, rejecting the reservations—other than to article 68, paragraph 2, of the Civilian Persons Convention—which states have made with respect to the Geneva conventions, accepts treaty relations with all parties to those conventions, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations.".

It is the committee's view that this statement adequately expresses the intention of our Government to enter into treaty relations with the reserving states so that they will be bound toward the United States to carry out reciprocally all the provisions of the conventions on which no reservations were specifically made.

14. EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONVENTIONS IN KOREA

Although the provisions of the Prisoners of War Convention were not recognized as being legally in force with respect to the Korean conflict, the United States, the Republic of Korea, and the North Korean regime had early stated that they would apply its principles. Moreover, while the Chinese Communist regime never explicitly undertook to apply the convention, its Foreign Minister did inform the Swiss Government on July 16, 1952, that his Government had decided to "recognize" the 1949 conventions, subject to certain reservations.

The lamentable contrast in the treatment which was accorded to prisoners by the two sides impelled members of the committee to inquire whether the 1949 instrument afforded adequate protection against the kind of cruelties which our men had undergone at the hands of the Communists, such as "brainwashing" and other types of torture. On this point administration spokesmen emphasized at the hearing that the draftsmen had anticipated thoroughly the principal problems which might arise. In the words of Mr. Brucker:

"The conventions give us the means of dealing with the problems we encountered in Korea and forbid those very acts which so outraged our conscience. The conventions, for example, impose no impediment to restoring and keeping order in prisoner of war camps; indeed, they require it * * *. They do not authorize "brainwashing." They forbid those very killings, acts of torture, and forms of harsh treatment for which our enemies were justly condemned."

The entire problem of brainwashing has received intense study by the intelligence services of the three military departments, for the purpose of detecting the techniques by which it has been accomplished, and the most appropriate method of combating this new kind of warfare. The 1949 convention, in the views of those appearing before the committee, contains more definite and positive language against such abuses than the 1929 document.

With respect to the organized uprisings and attendant violence in the Korean camps, which produced such adverse propaganda effects for the United States, questioning by the committee elicited testimony from the executive branch that the problem was not one of lack of authority under the convention, but rather the means of exercising that authority. Attention was directed to article 83 which provides:

"A prisoner of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders in force in the armed forces of the detaining power; the detaining power shall be justified in taking judicial or disciplinary measures in respect of any offense committed by a prisoner of war against such laws, regulations or orders."

The committee was assured that measures had been introduced to give complete effect in the future to the authority contained in article 83:

"There has been considerable indoctrination in the armed forces by way of prevention, to see that that doesn't get underway again, and * * * the matter has been the subject of numerous conferences by the Secretary and others since that time."

It was emphasized that should any future occasion arise prompt and vigorous steps would be taken to meet the situation.

15. EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION REQUIRED

From information furnished to the committee it appears that very little in the way of new legislative enactments will be required to give effect to the provisions contained in the four conventions. The problem of continued use of the Red Cross emblem by commercial organizations has already been discussed. However, under article 38 of the convention on wounded and sick in armed forces in the field, certain countries are permitted to use, in place of the red cross, the red crescent or the red lion and sun on a white ground. While article 53 also forbids commercial use of these distinctive signs, without effect on rights acquired through prior use, no legislation restricts the use of such emblems in the United States. For this reason it will be necessary to make appropriate changes in title 18, section 706, of the United States Code.

Similarly, as already noted, the 1949 conventions for the first time authorize the use of the Red Cross emblem by the International Red Cross and its personnel (art. 44, Wounded and Sick Convention), civilian hospitals and personnel engaged in their administration, and convoys of vehicles hospital trains and aircraft carrying wounded and sick civilians (arts. 18–22, civilian convention). Further amendment of title 18, section 706, of the United States Code would seem necessary to anticipate these uses. Legislation providing workmen's compensation for civilian internees, where not otherwise provided under Federal or State law, may be needed to give effect to article 95 of the civilians convention. The necessity of such legislation is dependent upon whether civilian internees in a future conflict work for public or private employers and upon the type of work which they perform. In any event, the matter is not one requiring immediate statutory action.

In World War II, specific legislation was enacted (act of June 27, 1942, 56 Stat. 461, 462) to implement the provisions of the 1929 convention (art. 38) which provided that "relief in kind for prisoners shall be * * * exempt from all import and other duties, as well as of payments for carriage by the state railways."

It may be necessary to consider reviving this statute to effectuate the intention of article 74 of the Prisoners of War Convention and article 110 of the Civilians Convention which provide that "all relief shipments * * * shall be exempt from all import, customs and other dues."

In that connection, attention is directed to section 1318 of title 19 of the United States Code, granting the President power to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the free importation of emergency relief food, clothing, and other supplies. Despite this general power, specific legislation was enacted for the purposes we have been considering.

Finally, enforcement of the provisions of article 23 of the Prisoners of War Convention, and article 83 of the Civilians Convention may require adoption of appropriate penal measures. These articles provide that the location of prisoners of war and internment camps shall be identified by the letters PW, PG (prisonniers de guerre), or IC, so placed as to be clearly visible from the air. It is only such camps which may be so marked.

16. IMPORTANCE OF THE CONVENTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

The history of war years since the 1929 conventions were formulated is a tragic testimonial to their value and to the importance of improving their provisions in ways dictated by the cold and cruel logic of belligerent experience. In the same way, the mistreatment of American civilians abroad in World War II has demonstrated that such civilians, particularly if they are interned, need the general benefits of the protection secured to prisoners of war. During that terrible conflict the United States, without the compulsion of an international agreement, applied the principles of the 1929 convention to civilians interned in this country; and in occupied territories our relief and reconstruction activities not only went far beyond the requirements of the Hague regulations, but stand as a model for all enlightened nations to emulate, should civilization unhappily be visited, once again, by the scourge of war.

If it be objected that the treatment of our soldiers captured in Korea by the Communists was in many respects ruthless and below civilized norms, it is also true that without the convention, that treatment could have been still worse.

Our Nation has everything to gain and nothing to lose by being a party to the conventions now before the Senate, and by encouraging their most widespread adoption. As emphasized in this report, the requirements of the four conventions to a very great degree reflect the actual policies of the United States in World War II. The practices which they bind nations to follow impose no burden upon us that we would not voluntarily assume in a future conflict without the injunctions of formal treaty obligations.

We should not be dissuaded by the possibility that at some later date a contracting party may invoke specious reasons to evade compliance with the obligations of decent treatment which it has freely assumed in these instruments. Its conduct can now be measured against their approved standards, and the weight of world opinion cannot but exercise a salutary restraint on otherwise unbridled actions. If the end result is only to obtain for Americans caught in the maelstrom of war a treatment which is 10 percent less vicious than what they would receive without these conventions, if only a few score of lives are preserved because of the efforts at Geneva, then the patience and laborious work of all who contributed to that goal will not have been in vain.

17. CONCLUSIONS

The committee is of the opinion that these four conventions may rightly be regarded as a landmark in the struggle to obtain for military and civilian victims of war, a humane treatment in accordance with the most approved international usage. The United States has a proud tradition of support for individual rights, human freedom, and the welfare and dignity of man. Approval of these conventions by the Senate would be fully in conformity with this great tradition.

Through its own conduct in previous wars the United States has been instrumental in encouraging the acceptance of standards of treatment which would preserve the peoples of all races and all nations from the savageries and barbarisms of the past. By adding our name to the long list of nations which have already ratified, we shall contribute still further to the worldwide endorsement of those high standards which the draftsmen at Geneva sought to achieve.

For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the four conventions, subject to the reservations and the statement which have been noted above.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the conventions will be considered as having passed through their various parlamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the respective resolutions of ratification.

The resolutions of ratification of Executive D and Executive G with the reservations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with the accompanying statements, will now be read.

The resolutions of ratification to Executive D and Executive G, with the reservations and accompanying statements, were read, as follows:

EXECUTIVE D

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field, subject to the following reservation:

"The United States in ratifying the Geneva Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field does so with the reservation that irrespective of any provision or provisions in said convention to the contrary, nothing contained therein shall make unlawful, or obligate the United States of America to make unlawful, any use or right of use within the United States of America and its Territories and possessions of the Red Cross emblem, sign, insignia, or words as was lawful by reason of domestic law and a use begun prior to January 5, 1905, provided such use by pre-1905 users does not extend to the placing of the Red Cross emblem, sign, or insignia upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings or other structures, or upon the ground."

In giving its advice and consent to the ratification of this convention, the Senate makes the following statement:

"Rejecting the reservations which States have made with respect to the Geneva Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field, the United States accepts treaty relations with all parties to that convention, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations."

EXECUTIVE G

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive G, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva convention of August 12, 1949, relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, subject to the following reservation:

"The United States reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offenses referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

In giving its advice and consent to the ratification to this convention, the Senate makes the following statement:

"Rejecting the reservations—other than to article 68, paragraph 2—which States have made with respect to the Geneva convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, the United States accepts treaty relations with all parties to that convention, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the reservations and accompanying statements.

The reservations and the accompanying statements were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Douglas
Duff
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Ives
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Neely
Neuberger
Pastore
Payne
Potter
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Watkins
Williams
Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committe on Appropriations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The resolutions of ratification of Executive E and Executive F, with the accompanying statements, will now be read.

The resolutions of ratification, with the accompanying statements, were read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of Armed Forces at sea.

In giving its advice and consent to the ratification to this convention, the Senate makes the following statement:

"Rejecting the reservations which states have made with respect to the Geneva convention for the amelioration of the condition of wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of Armed Forces at sea, the United States accepts treaty relations with all parties to that convention, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations."

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

In giving its advice and consent to the ratification to this convention, the Senate makes the following statement:

"Rejecting the reservations which states have made with respect to the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, the United States accepts treaty relations with all parties to that convention, except as to the changes proposed by such reservations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the question will now be taken on advising and consenting to the resolution of ratification of Executive D. The resolutions of ratification of Executive E and Executive F, with the accompanying statements, and of Executive G, as amended by reservation, and with the accompanying statement, will be deemed to have been respectively agreed to by the same vote.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator fom Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Douglas
Duff
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Ives
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Neely
Neuberger
Pastore
Payne
Potter
Robertson
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Watkins
Williams
Young

NOT VOTING—19

Beall
Case, N. J.
Curtis
Daniel
Dirksen
George
Green
Humphrey
Jenner
Johnson, Tex.
Kennedy
Malone
Murray
O'Mahoney
Purtell
Russell
Thye
Welker
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolutions of ratification of Executive D and Executive G, as amended by reservation, and with accompanying statements, and the resolutions of ratification of Executives E and F, with accompanying statements, are agreed to.

Without objection, the President of the United States will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ROADBUILDING ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 245.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 245) to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322).

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] to take charge of the pending bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, H. R. 245 is a measure designed to assist materially in the development of an adequate road system in the Territory of Alaska. As all the Members of the Senate are aware, lack of transportation is a great obstacle to the economic development of Alaska.

The measure would accomplish its objective by amending a 1905 statute—found in title 48, United States Code, section 332—which provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall "locate, lay out, construct, and maintain wagon roads and pack trails from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to any town, mining or other industrial camp or settlement, or between any such town, camps, or settlements therein," and so forth. It is obvious that the language of the statute with its restrictions to "wagon roads" and "pack trails" is not realistic in the light of 1955 conditions, and those restrictive words would be stricken out by H. R. 245.

However, the major change that would be effected by the proposed legislation would be to authorize the building and maintenance of roads through towns in Alaska as well as to and between them.

This is necessary because many towns have been unable, for financial reasons, to improve and pave portions of highways through their town limits. The Secretary's authority under the present statute does not include building and maintaining roads within those limits. Consequently, the Territory's highway system is spotted with unimproved roads in some urban areas, while the highway on either side of a town will be in good and usable condition.

At the hearing held by the Senate committee, care was taken that the Alaska Road Commission, which is an agency of the Department of the Interior, would not become a street building agency for the Territory's cities and towns. Therefore, the committee was careful to maintain the House language which specifically provides that the Secretary of the Interior can build and maintain only those roads which, first, are part of the through highway system in Alaska; and second, pass through unincorporated towns or villages.

Action by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in urging enactment of H. R. 245 was unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 245) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, around the time of July 4, our thoughts turn to the Declaration of Independence, that immortal document which expressed the hopes of our country's founders for freedom, liberty, and equality in the New World.

Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, publisher of the New York Post, has written an eloquent and moving tribute to the Declaration of Independence which was published in that paper on July 3, 1955.

Sometimes we speak of the Declaration and overlook its inspiring and exalting passages. Mrs. Schiff has reminded us of those ringing phrases, phrases which we must not forget now in the struggle between those who value human dignity and those who would subject us to Soviet tyranny.

I particularly commend Mrs. Schiff's tribute to that illustrious statesman, Thomas Jefferson, in whose creative mind were born many of the ideas which have given vitality to American democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR READER

(By Dorothy Schiff)

One hundred and seventy-nine years ago the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress and signed by John Hancock, President, and Charles Thompson, Secretary. Two days later it was published by the Pennsylvania—not the New York—Evening Post.

A few weeks later a copy of the famous document, engrossed on parchment, was signed by Members of Congress.

I have been reading their 56 names in the World Almanac. Many were lawyers. Quite a few were merchants or farmers. Several were soldiers. There was a college president, a physician, a brewer. And one is listed as a printer-publisher, Benjamin Franklin was his name.

(You will be hearing a good deal about this exciting man next year because plans are afoot to celebrate his 250th anniversary.)

Most of the Congressmen were born in the States, but 2 came from England, 1 from Wales, 3 from Ireland, and 2 from Scotland. The birthplace of one farmer, Lewis Morris, is listed as "The Bronx, N. Y. C."

The Declaration was written by the greatest American of them all—Thomas Jefferson.

I think it is especially interesting to reread the Declaration this year. The beautiful and familiar words of the revolutionary document take on new meaning in the light of what is happening on other continents today.

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station—note that word 'equal'—to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them * * *."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal"—that controversial word again. Then follow the inalienable rights—rights which cannot be surrendered. "Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To secure these rights, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Then comes the revolutionary statement embodying another inalienable right: "That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

A word of caution follows. Prudence will dictate that long-established governments should not be changed for frivolous reasons. Indeed, experience has shown that "mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations * * * evidence a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government * * *."

The King of Great Britain was accused of dictatorship. "To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world."

The facts were many and were listed in detail. The King's methods of exercising his tyranny were the same as those employed by all tyrants, ancient and modern, local and international.

The last paragraph is our declaration of Independence to which the signers mutually pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

As we learned in school, the despotic British Government was overthrown with the consent of a majority of the governed. Unfortunately, it was necessary to use force and violence to do so.

WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the agriculture policies of Eisenhower and Benson, farm income has dropped, while the cost of living for our farmers has remained high. In the recent wheat referendum farmers showed their concern over their loss of income by voting in larger percentages for a national support price.

The vote was a slap in the face to those who claim our farmers want no price-support program.

I was pleased to join with my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] in sponsoring proposed legislation for the two-price, domestic-parity wheat program, covered in Senate bill 1770.

Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg., and Jack Smith of Condon, officials of the Oregon Wheat League, have enthusiastically endorsed the two-price wheat plan, and I have had the pleasure of conferring frequently with them and with other Wheat League officials over the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Oregonian of June 27, 1955, entitled "The Wheatgrowers' Vote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHEATGROWERS' VOTE

Wheat farmers of America surprised some observers by voting for rigid marketing quotas on the 1956 crop. With the support level set at 76 percent of parity for next year, as against 82½ percent for 1955, it was thought by some that more than a third of the farmers voting would reject controls. This would have thrown wheat growing wide open and dropped the support level to 50 percent of parity.

Surprisingly a larger percentage voted for controls this year than last year, though the average national support price in 1956 will be only $1.81 a bushel, compared with this year's $2.06. A lot of farmers, this year as last, didn't bother to vote at all, the total being only a little more than half of the approximately 600,000 eligible farms. Evidently a large number of growers who have allotments of 15 acres or more didn't much care whether controls remained or not.

In areas where wheat is the major crop, however, farmers are greatly concerned over the Government support program. Their acreages have been cut severely and their income consequently reduced. The lower support price in 1956 will reduce their income still more.

Perhaps a considerable number of growers voted for quotas in the belief that a negative vote would have indicated they want no relatively high support program. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, advised a strong "yes" vote for this reason. He reportedly feels that an "improved" support program can be enacted by Congress next winter, before the 1956 election, and that it may be made retroactive. The National Farmers Union also campaigned for a heavy "yes" vote.

Undoubtedly there will be great activity to bring about enactment of new wheat support legislation in the next few months. The favorable quota vote can be reasonably classed as a holding operation. The two-price program advocated by many Oregon wheat growers probably will be one of the alternatives considered.

New legislation may be pushed through before Agriculture Secretary Benson's theory of flexible supports gets a thorough test as it applies to wheat. If left alone, it might bring production closer to demand by diverting more wheatland to hay and pasture and encourage growing of higher quality wheats which bring better prices.

ISSUANCE OF LAND PATENT IN THE ISLAND OF OAHU

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 704, House bill 3636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3636) to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands in the city and county of Honolulu, Island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, H. R. 3636 is a measure to remove a restriction in the title of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands to a city lot in Honolulu. The size of the lot is 14,351 square feet.

The lot in question was at one time part of a Federal Government subdivision. Some years ago it was conveyed to third parties, but because of the restriction in section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act—found in title 48, United States Code, beginning with section 663—the deed contained a restriction that the land may be used for residence purposes only. About 2 years ago the church purchased the lot from the third party, but because of the residence restrictions is unable to build a mission church on it.

H. R. 3636 would remove this restriction, and permit the church to build a mission on the land it has purchased. No expenditure of Federal funds or transfer of Federal property is involved. The action of the Senate Interior Committee in recommending enactment of H. R. 3636 was unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3636) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H. R. 3990.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That any amount of any annual appropriation left unexpended at the end of any fiscal year shall be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, H. R. 3990 is a measure which was transmitted to Congress by the Department of the Interior to enable the Department to make long-range investigations of projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. The Subcommittee on Territories of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the bill, and received testimony from the Delegate from Alaska and the Department of the Interior in support of its purposes.

H. R. 3990 would authorize no new activity for the Federal Government in Alaska. For some years the Bureau of

Reclamation has been conducting water resources study programs in the Territory on the basis of authorizations in appropriations bills. The pending measure would merely give legislative authority for such study programs on a permanent basis.

The legislation will encourage the industrial development of Alaska through wider use of hydroelectric power, and through irrigation and drainage activities.

Annual appropriations of not more than $250,000 are authorized. The committee was informed that this amount is in line with sums which have been allowed for the past several years by the Appropriations Committees for the purposes of the bill.

In its consideration of the bill, the House of Representatives inserted language which would have required that all unexpended balances of any annual appropriation be returned to the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year. Such a proviso would not be in accord with the customary practice in appropriating investigation funds to the Bureau of Reclamation, which funds are available until expended. Furthermore, work of this sort in Alaska must necessarily be done during a short season, with the end of the fiscal year falling in the middle of that season. The proviso creates a grave danger of unnecessary interruptions each year in the middle of that work. For these reasons the committee recommends deletion of the proviso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, the acting majority leader has moved the consideration of the bill merely to make it the unfinished business; he does not expect to have the defense production bill considered today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader, is absolutely correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to announce the program for tomorrow, and I do so after having consulted with the minority leader.

Following the completion of action by the Senate on Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391, it will be the intention of the acting majority leader to move the consideration of Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 1835, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

That bill will be followed by Calendar No. 707, Senate bill 787, granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes, and Calendar No. 708, Senate bill 1210, to amend the Public Building Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia.

Unless there should be some change in the program, it will be the intention of the leadership to move that the Senate adjourn from tomorrow until Monday noon.

It is the plan of the leadership to have a call of the calendar on Monday, if the Committee on the Judiciary, between now and Friday, will do what we are very hopeful it will do, namely, report to the Senate some of the bills pending before it so that they may be considered on the call of the calendar.

Certainly nothing will be considered on the calendar on Monday except measures to which there is no objection.

For the information of the chairmen of committees, the presently announced schedule for tomorrow and Monday leads me to say that the intervening time will afford the committees an excellent opportunity to take action on measures which are pending before them. If the adjournment target date which we individually and collectively have set in the Senate is to be met, it is necessary that measures of real importance which are pending before the committees be acted upon at a very early date.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the event the conference report on the mutual security authorization bill should be ready, will the Senator from Kentucky be prepared to have it considered tomorrow?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Not only will I desire that the Senate do that, but yesterday I made the statement that any conference report which came before the Senate would be considered immediately.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Kentucky and I understand each other perfectly, working together as we do. However, I assume, as to conference reports, that there will be advance consultation, because sometimes interested Senators wish to be on the floor at the time the reports are being considered. I merely wished to modify the Senator's use of the word "immediately."

Mr. CLEMENTS. The suggestion by the able minority leader is well taken. When I use the word "immediately," I mean as soon as possible after all the customary negotiations have taken place.

THE PRESERVATION OF OUR BASIC LIBERTIES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, we are living through the most critical period of Western civilization. President Eisenhower carries the most momentous responsibilities of any man alive today. When he meets at Geneva with the leaders of the countries behind the Iron Curtain for negotiations which may have consequences which may last a generation, he should carry with him the assurance that this country is united behind him in defending our basic liberties, our belief in God, and the free-enterprise system, which has been endorsed repeated by both major political parties. None of us were elected to this body as Socialists, so let us speak and act like Republicans and Democrats who, regardless of our political differences, are all dedicated to the preservation of a free-enterprise competitive economy.

Mr. President, we are approaching an election in the United States. Some partisans on both sides of the aisle may make extreme statements which cannot be supported and which can seriously damage our position internationally. Recently I have been reading the official records of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. I have been dismayed to see how often the burden was placed upon our representatives to correct loose statements, often originally made by our own citizens and Government officials, which were thrown back at us in the course of debate by representatives of the Iron Curtain countries.

The 17th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council took place in New York in April 1954. One item on the agenda was a report on freedom of information. It had been prepared by a Mr. Lopez, a rapporteur, who had been instructed by the Council at its 14th session to prepare a report on national contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information. The report was supported by the United States representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the official debates printed at this point in the RECORD, so that my colleagues can have some concept of the tenor of the debate when Mr. Tsarapkin, the delegate from Soviet Russia, took the floor. In making his statement Mr. Tsarapkin, the official delegate of the U. S. S. R., spoke for 2 days in reference to the report on freedom of information which had been prepared by Mr. Lopez pursuant to the direction of the Economic and Social Council. Because of language problems the United Nations does not publish a verbatim transcript of debates.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Tsarapkin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that Mr. Lopez' report had been criticized from all sides and that its only defender had been the United States of America. That was understandable, for the rapporteur, instead of dealing with the problem in an objective way and with all the conscientiousness that the terms of reference given him by the United Nations demanded, had produced a work which was a mediocre repetition of the opinions of information monopolies, mostly American, such as the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Agency. He had not even taken the trouble to collate the information supplied by those agencies with that obtained from the countries he had criticized.

It might be thought at first sight that the Rapporteur had endeavored to examine all the problems arising in the field of information, but it quickly became clear that his chief aim had been to comply with the wishes of the monopolists concerned and that he had merely reproduced their point of view in order to lead the United Nations to adopt it.

The rapporteur had deliberately avoided the real problem. When he had tried to define freedom of information, he had not realized that such liberty existed only where it furthered the cause of peace, and that there could be no question of freedom when that information was used to disseminate warmongering propaganda. Neither had he thought of finding out who were the owners of information media in countries which were supposed to have freedom of information.

On the contrary, it was clear that he had wanted to present a favorable picture of the situation existing in certain countries, especially the United States of America, and through the use of lies and slander to paint a dark picture of the situation in the U. S. S. R. and the peoples' democracies.

He asserted that the Soviet press was a state monopoly, but that very choice of words revealed the source to which he owed his statement. It had been quite ridiculous for him to allege that freedom of criticism was limited, since one had only to open a Soviet newspaper to see numerous criticisms with respect to shortcomings in production or the incompetence of this or that person, as well as concerning economic, scientific, and other developments. Naturally they did not contain sensational items because Soviet newspapers did not sell their articles as did the capitalist press. Neither were they the echo of their masters' voice. While in the U. S. S. R. the press belonged to millions of workers, laborers, and peasants, in the United States of America it was millionaires who selected news. The rapporteur had not questioned the right of the Hearst group or the Associated Press to process news and to publish only what they wanted. Every day there could be found in the Hearst press, lies, slander, and war slogans which only misled and poisoned public opinion. In that connection he read out several significant titles of articles which had appeared in American newspapers, and stated that it was impossible to find articles of that type in the Soviet press.

The rapporteur had incorrectly described the condition of foreign correspondents in the U. S. S. R. when he had alleged that it was increasingly difficult for them to enter the U. S. S. R. and to do their own work properly after their admission. No obstacles were placed in the way of the movements of foreign correspondents in the Soviet Union. He recalled that at the end of 1953 and the beginning of 1954 two groups of American journalists had paid a long visit to the Soviet Union. During the period from January 1953 to February 1954 there had been 50 foreign correspondents in the U. S. S. R., not to mention business representatives and representatives of sports organizations, who had received all necessary travel authorizations. The real difficulty faced by American correspondents was not in obtaining a U. S. S. R. visa but rather in obtaining a United States passport; it was well known that passports issued by the United States were valid for all countries with the exception of the U. S. S. R. and the peoples' democracies, in the case of which special permission was necessary.

The rapporteur's report even contained obvious untruths, such as his allegation that Soviet citizens could not speak to foreigners. That statement was so ridiculous and so unfounded that it would have been unworthy of mention if it had not appeared in a United Nations document.

In short, he had tried to fill his report with as many slanderous statements as possible in order to please American monopolies. He had tried to escape his responsibility by publishing the memorandum of the International Press Institute in the annex of his report, but that had only served to bring out his unfairness.

When he had examined the question of freedom of information in the United States of America, the United Kingdom or France, he had not mentioned the fact that information media were controlled by plutocratic circles which utilized them for warmongering. Under the United States Constitution, every citizen had the right to publish a newspaper, but since that required a capital of several million dollars, the press was, as a result, concentrated in the hands of a few millionaires who enforced their desires and imposed their points of view. The Hutchins report drew attention to the reduction in the number of newspapers in the United States, where independent publishers were absorbed by the large monopolies. That report also pointed out that 40 percent of the newspapers had no competition to cope with, and that the circulation of newspapers owned by 14 persons, represented 25 percent of the total circulation, which meant that those persons were able to mold the opinion of a quarter of the population of the United States. Similarly, sources of information were in the hands of three press agencies, which belonged to the owners of newspaper enterprises. Under those conditions, it could well be asked where freedom of information came in.

Mr. Tsarapkin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), continuing his statement begun at the previous meeting, said that the rapporteur's lack of objectivity was illustrated by the fact that he had annexed to his report (E/2426) a memorandum by the secretariat of the International Press Institute. The memorandum contained a number of slanderous and inaccurate statements about the U. S. S. R. and the peoples' democracies; moreover it said that in the United States of America the freedom of the press was greater than anywhere else in the world. The rapporteur had appended the memorandum to his report because he wished to slander the U. S. S. R. and to repeat the legend that the press was entirely free in the United States.

The rapporteur had referred to the Freedom of the Press Committee of the Inter-American Press Association, but had overlooked a number of its conclusions. The committee had reported that ownership of the press was concentrated more and more in the hands of a few large combines, that it was not fulfilling its democratic functions, that it did not give the full news, and that it did not offer a free forum for discussion. It had also said that the United States press should promote thought and discussion rather than stifle it and that newspapers should not cheapen and vulgarize humanity, exaggerate or minimize the importance of events, foment excitement or spread false news, all of which it was doing. Nothing of that appeared in the rapporteur's report. He preferred to ignore the activities of the McCormick, Scripps-Howard, Hearst, and other newspapers which regarded the publication of news only as a source of profit and a means of promoting narrow reactionary policies. The press magnates were veritable dictators in their relations with their editors and other employees. In addition, the shadow of the McCarran Act hung over any journalist who attempted to depict the truth in an objective manner.

* * * * * *

The rapporteur had stated in his report that correspondents are excluded from more than one-third of Moscow and from many parts of Moscow province, may not travel more than 40 kilometers from the center of the city and may use only four highways for such travel. In that respect he was guilty of a number of errors. With the exception of a few cities, foreign correspondents could move freely all over the U. S. S. R. He had, however, said nothing about the situation of foreign correspondents, and especially Soviet correspondents, in the United States of America; he had made no reference to the McCarran Act, the restrictions placed upon the movements of TASS correspondents or the fact that all incoming and outgoing dispatches of TASS were read by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He wondered whether the rapporteur was aware that Soviet publications such as Around the World, a geographical magazine, and The Young Pioneer were officially banned in the United States, or whether he knew of the burning of Russian books, including such a work as Maxim Gorky's The Lower Depths, written and published long before the Revolution. Apparently, too, he had not heard that people were imprisoned or deported from the United States for venturing to write the truth about the Soviet Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, now let me read from the official record of the United Nations the report of the statement by the United States Representative, Mr. Hotchkiss, in reply to Mr. Tsarapkin's charges:

The U. S. S. R. representative had alleged that in the United States a man had to be a millionaire at least to own a newspaper. That was not true; small-business men owned independent local newspapers in many American towns. They were not the subsidiaries of any large organization; they printed the best facts they could obtain. Such small concerns were typical of businesses in the United States of America, where 95 percent of the business was transacted by small private enterprises.

The Soviet Union representative had contended that the United States press was a monopoly operated by dollar-grabbing capitalists. With the exception of some public utilities, which were strictly regulated by the States or the Federal Government, there were no monopolies in the United States.

They were prohibited by antitrust laws. In the U. S. S. R., on the other hand, there were only monopolies. The state owned everything, and all information came from Government dictates.

The contention that the United States public could read only such news as a small group of Wall Street bankers wished it to receive was absurd. The U. S. S. R. representative could obtain for a few cents at the United Nations newsstand a wider selection of newspapers expressing more varied opinion than throughout the whole of the Soviet Union.

The U. S. S. R. representative had claimed that all news in the United States was dominated by three international agencies—the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service. That fact scarcely seemed open to objection, since the agencies in question printed the facts, not propaganda dictated by a totalitarian regime. In the U. S. S. R. there was only one agency, Tass. Its representatives were Government employees and its correspondents were in the

> United States as representatives of the Soviet Government. The dispatches transmitted by Tass merely followed the official Soviet line.

Mr. Tsarapkin replied to Mr. Hotchkis, according to the official record, as follows:

> Mr. Tsarapkin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the only proof invoked by the United States representative in support of his repeated contention that there were no monopolies in the United States was the antitrust law. The people of the United States, however, were fully aware of the existence of monopolies in their country. If such huge industrial enterprises as the Standard Oil Co., General Motors, General Electric and the United States Steel Corp. were not monopolies, the word was devoid of meaning.
>
> The United States representative seemed to attach great importance to the absence of censorship as one element in freedom of information. It seemed unreasonable, however, to condemn the U. S. S. R. for preventing its newspapers from publishing war propaganda, sensational items and dispatches intended to kindle national hatred. The U. S. S. R. had no intention of permitting the publication of such information. Under Soviet Union legislation, warmongering was a punishable offense. The United States representative had spoken eloquently of the protection of human rights, freedom of information and freedom of the press, but all he really wanted to do was to protect a group of large capitalist organizations such as the Associated Press.

Mr. President, these statements sound only too familiar. During the last Presidential campaign, President Truman and the Democratic national chairman, Mr. Mitchell, were constantly berating the press for not giving Democrat candidates what they called a "fair" press. President Truman and Mr. Mitchell knew that every important statement made by Democrat candidates was accurately reported by the press services, but that did not prevent them from impugning the integrity of the American press. The necessities of Democrat political propaganda were the first consideration. Unfortunately, Mr. Tsarapkin was actually able to cite statements by President Truman to support his fantastic charges.

Mr. President, let me continue with Mr. Tsarapkin's statement to the council:

> Mr. Truman had spoken of the return to political bogymen who, while ostensibly the custodians of freedom, were in fact making a mockery of the very institutions they claimed to preserve.

Mr. Hotchkis did not make any reference to Mr. Truman in his reply. The official record reports Mr. Hotchkis' reply as follows:

> Mr. Hotchkis (United States of America) pointed out, by way of example, that anyone who drove a car or used an electric iron knew that General Motors and General Electric had no monopoly of the automobile or electrical-appliance industries; there were a good many companies in both industries.
>
> It was significant that the list of sales agents for United Nations publications on the back of the Rapporteur's report contained no mention of a sales agent in the Soviet Union. Apparently the distribution of United Nations publications was not permitted in the U. S. S. R.

Mr. President, I have been reading from the official record of the 17th session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, covering its 773d and 774th meeting, on Tuesday, April 13, 1954.

It is quite apparent that the Communists read the American newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are aware of what President Truman said in the 1952 campaign.

Mr. President, too many of our own Members have used the term "monopoly" indiscriminately. They have applied it loosely to any big business. Hence, it is not surprising that the Russians feel justified in quoting them and in taking the same course of action. Committees of the Congress are presently holding hearings to determine whether our antitrust laws should be revised. This is an important subject, which merits careful and deliberative study. My concern is to be sure that in making these studies we refrain from any actions which can damage our own internal unity and which will provide additional ammunition for those who wish to discredit the American free enterprise system which I am proud to call capitalism. I have no hesitancy in taking a forthright position in support of capitalism.

Mr. President, we have been elected to the Senate as Republicans or Democrats, not as Socialists. Let us be certain that we always speak as Americans who believe in the preservation of a free enterprise economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RILEY, Mr. EVINS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HAND, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 46. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 65. An act to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska;

H. R. 256. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 896. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth, of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 897. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 902. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 904. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 905. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc;

H. R. 939. An act for the relief of Laura Safir;

H. R. 1019. An act for the relief of Casimir Krzyzanowski;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena;

H. R. 1084. An act for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of George Henry Mahoney;

H. R. 1172. An act for the relief of Allison B. Clemens;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1191. An act for the relief of Marcel Duvivier;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1459. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

H. R. 1617. An act to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940;

H. R. 1619. An act to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1673. An act for the relief of Spiros Tzaferis and Erini Averino Tzaferis;

H. R. 1752. An act for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Blanka Goldstein;

H. R. 1940. An act for the relief of James J. Andrews;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Anastasios Selelmetzidis;

H. R. 2065. An act for the relief of Sada Zarikian;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2109. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Simone Gilliland;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of Lino Santi, Dinora Santi, Aldo Martini, and Maria Martini;

H. R. 2480. An act for the relief of Dr. Klaus Schwarz;

H. R. 2494. An act for the relief of Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante;

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government;

H. R. 2866. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet, Mass., a nonnavigable stream;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3188. An act for the relief of William Lawler;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3702. An act to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers, and truck semitrailers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda J. Sullivan;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell;

H. R. 3979. An act for the relief of Pasquale Gentile;

H. R. 4118. An act to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega);

H. R. 4147. An act for the relief of Angelo DeVito;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4225. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark.;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4362. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954;

H. R. 4410. An act for the relief of William E. Ryan;

H. R. 4468. An act for the relief of Margarethe Bock;

H. R. 4744. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of Elzie C. Brown;

H. R. 4792. An act to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 4946. An act to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act;

H. R. 5080. An act for the relief of Florence E. McConnell;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of Mario Botoshansky;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5522. An act for the relief of the Florida State Hospital;

H. R. 5535. An act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr.;

H. R. 5623. An act to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy;

H. R. 5792. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6232. An act to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War;

H. R. 6248. An act to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States;

H. R. 6277. An act to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station;

H. R. 6331. An act authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell, or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6419. An act to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended;

H. R. 6573. An act to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States;

H. R. 6600. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 6796. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used;

H. R. 6832. An act to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability;

H. R. 6901. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons;

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 9, 1955, on radiation sterilization of foods;

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 46. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 1459. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 2109. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout senior roundup encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5623. An act to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy;

H. R. 6277. An act to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station; and

H. R. 6600. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 65. An act to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 896. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth, of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 897. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert

Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 902. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 904. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 905. An act to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6331. An act authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights;

H. R. 6573. An act to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States; and

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite-coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite-mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 256. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc;

H. R. 939. An act for the relief of Laura Safir;

H. R. 1019. An act for the relief of Casimir Krzyzanowski;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena;

H. R. 1084. An act for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of George Henry Mahoney;

H. R. 1172. An act for the relief of Allison B. Clemens;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1191. An act for the relief of Marcel Duvivier;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1673. An act for the relief of Spiros Tzaferis and Erini Averino Tzaferis;

H. R. 1752. An act for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Blanka Goldstein;

H. R. 1940. An act for the relief of James J. Andrews;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Anastasios Selelmetzidis;

H. R. 2065. An act for the relief of Sada Zarikian;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Simone Gilliland;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of Lino Santi, Dinora Santi, Aldo Martini, and Maria Martini;

H. R. 2480. An act for the relief of Dr. Klaus Schwarz;

H. R. 2494. An act for the relief of Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante;

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties, applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3188. An act for the relief of William Lawler;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3702. An act to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers, and truck semitrailers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda J. Sullivan;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell;

H. R. 3979. An act for the relief of Pasquale Gentile;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega);

H. R. 4147. An act for the relief of Angelo DeVito;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4468. An act for the relief of Margarethe Bock;

H. R. 4792. An act to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code;

H. R. 5080. An act for the relief of Florence E. McConnell;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of Mario Botoshansky;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5522. An act for the relief of the Florida State Hospital;

H. R. 5535. An act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr.;

H. R. 6248. An act to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill; and

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1617. An act to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940;

H. R. 1619. An act to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6232. An act to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War;

H. R. 6419. An act to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended; and

H. R. 6832. An act to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2866. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet, Mass., a nonnavigable stream; and

H. R. 4362. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4118. An act to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4225. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark.;

H. R. 4410. An act for the relief of William E. Ryan;

H. R. 4744. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of Elzie C. Brown;

H. R. 4946. An act to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act;

H. R. 5792. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments; and

H. R. 6796. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 148) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 9, 1955, on Radiation Sterilization of Foods, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 25,000 additional copies of the hearing held by the said joint committee on May 9, 1955, on Radiation Sterilization of Foods.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 167) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7858789, Afonsky, Dimitri Alexandrovich.

0300-301341, Bart, Fannie, or Fejga Slonimtzik, also known as Fejga Slonimtzik Bart.

A-7228067, Bart, Mordecai, or Mordchay Bart.

E-084291, Berkovits, Elias.

E-082603, Blady, Ryfka, also known as Ryfka Larish, also known as Rywka Larisz.

E-082606, Blady, Szmerla, also known as Schmerla Blady.

A-6668006, Brown, James Crawford Su, also known as James Su Brown, James Watkins Brown, Su Gin Ling.

E-094405, Bugaj, Leckadja.

A-9645740, Chai, Woo Suit.

E-079967, Chan, Get Wing.

A-6847712, Chang, Charles Chi.

0300-448176, Chang, Sophia Ho-Ying.

0200-86319, Chang, Rev. James Aloysius.

V-606646, Chang, Kuei Lien alias Patricia Chang.

A-6851618, Chang, Kuei-Cheng.

0300-449543, Chang, Lee Yen Yuen.

0300-460323, Chang, Jimmy Zung-Tsu.

0300-460324, Chang, Betty Zung-Wei.

A-6986482, Chang, Shu Hsi (Sister Mary Assunta).

A-7135671, Chang, Szu Shiang.

A-6848690, Chang, Lucy Ding.

A-7368961, Chang, Yun.

A-7197724, Chao, Bei Tse.

A-7197725, Chao, May.

A-7395205, Chao, Hsiang Lin Lee.

A-6948661, Chao, Huang.

A-7286960, Chao, Paul Kwang-Yi.

A-6589877, Chao, Tai Siang.

A-6958993, Chen, Chi Kwan.

A-7828485, Chen, Chin-Ping, also known as Nellie Chin Ping Chen.

A-7915742, Chen, Chuang.

T-1502014, Chen, Chung Wei.

A-6967329, Chen, Kuan-I.

A-6851578, Chen, Kuan-Ning, or Kenneth K. Chen or Kenneth Kuan-Ning Chen.

A-7280718, Chen, Pao-Chong.

A-6967328, Chen, Paula Keojui.

A-6967673, Chen, Rosemary Yu-Shia.

A-6704081, Chen, Shih-Dzung.

A-6849406, Chen, Tsi Yang.

A-7802169, Chen. Yee Chwang.

A-6985479, Cheng, Chi-Hao.

A-7296197, Cheng, Gilda Kit, or Gilda Cheng or Cheng Chieh Hwa or Cheng Kit Wah.

A-7285817, Cheng, Jesse Tsai-Shih.

A-7118665, Cheng, Kuo Shiuan, also known as Louis Cheng or Louis Chend.

A-7118666, Cheng, Kuo Yin, also known as Donaldson Cheng or Donaldson Chend.

A-7368970, Cheng, Shirley.

A-6704649, Cheng, Sze-Chuh.

A-6555841, Cheng, Teresa Loh.

A-7269658, Cheng, Tsung-Hsien.

A-6953289, Chien, Pu-lun.

A-7185290, Chien, Sieh Wal Lieu (Helen).

A-4918489, Chin, Peter, also known as Jung Dot Chin.

A-7457589, Chiu, Chi-Chao.

A-6461103, Chou, Adam Keh-chia.

A-6967737, Chou, Catherine Ai-Sine.

A-6847979, Chou, Mildred.

A-7248476, Chou, Tu Fu (Sister Mary Adolph).

A-6142710, Chou, Yen-Ping.

A-7988230, Chou, Yuan Pin.

A-6847977, Chow, Tsai Hwa J.

A-6847886, Chow, Ven Te.

A-6848371, Chu, An Shek.

A-6026528, Chu, Bei Sun.

V-739114, Chu, Chee Kong.

A-6148175, Chu, Chiao-Min (Cho-Min).

A-6848693, Chu, Irene Erh Ying Chen.

A-7046629, Chu, Samuel Chong-Ling, or Samuel C. Chu.

A-7367958, Chu, Seu Heung.

A-6620863, Chu, Yuin Hsin, or Clayton Hsin Chu.

A-6794602, Chuang, Sheng-Lun.

V-886673, Dao, Thomas Ling-Yuan.

A-3186666, Dekhour, Jamil Sion.

A-6986532, Dung, Won Tsui (Sister Mary Theresa).

A-6699868, Fang, Frances Foon-Chiu (nee Mok).

A-6851609, Fang, Ken Shou.

E-086460, Farkas, Alexander.

E-086459, Farkas, Vilmos.

A-7444695, Feldstein, Leizor.

0300-388792, Feng Chun Po.

A-6973667, Feng, Meng Hsiang Tsai.

A-6457478, Feng, Tai Nien.

A-7201203, Fischman, Abraham.

A-7399967, Fong, Jeanne Kwan.

A-7297975, Fong, Kong-Sen, also known as Fred Kong-Sen Fong.

A-7197273, Fong, Freda Wei-Teh Yong (nee Wei Teh Yong).

A-7285979, Friedman, Charles G.

0300-458485, Fu, Yuan Sheng, also known as Fu Yuan Sheng or Yuan Shen Fu.

A-7362422, Fabor, Laszlo.

A-7362419, Gabor, Margit.

A-7362420, Gabor, Zsuzanna.

E-085882, Gutt, Kalman.

A-7913546, Gutwein, Osias.

A-6851475, Han, Tsu-Ming.

0612-33289, Hi, Won.

A-7768052, Ho, Carol Tsu.

A-6822856, Ho, Monto.

V-189655, Ho, Helen Wen Lou.

V-189654, Ho, Siu Ing or Caroline Mo I Ho.

V-2147451, Hoecker, Julianna (nee Kovats).

A-7367941, Hon, Ching-Ya, also known as Sammy Ching-Ya Hon.

A-7197632, Honigstock, Efroim Isai.

A-7197631, Honigstock, Maria W.

A-7193954, Honigstock, Taube E.

A-6958623, Hsia, Hsiang-Ming (nee Hsiang-Ming Wang) or Wang Hsiang-Ming or Chiang-Ming Wang.

A-6848395, Hsiao, Betty Ye-May Chang.

A-6704072, Hsiao, Sun-Chien.

0300-243307, Hsieh, Fan Jui Kwan.

0300-459418, Hsieh, Hsien Yuen.

A-8063679, Hsieh, George Jay.

A-6967255, Hsieh, George Shan-Chang.

A-7196410, Hsieh, Rose Shiuan-Ching Wang.

A-6851687, Hsu, Fred.

0800-110931, Hsu, Lan-An.

A-6606736, Hu, Chai Cheun.

A-7135309, Hu, Chang Tu.

1200-34721, Hu, Christopher.

A-7135309, Hu, Dorothy Geraldine.

A-7200846, Huang, Yu-Ching (Eugene).

E-082296, Hwang, Michael Ling-Kuei.

A-6694143, Hwang, Minnie Young.

0800-84199, Hwang, Rensen Lu.

A-7286741, Jen, Isaac I-Chun.

A-7135174, Jen, Lancy Chien (nee Chien Lung-Chu), or Lung Chu Chien or Lancy C. Jen or Lucy Chien Jen.

A-6967547, Jen, Yun, or Jen Yun also known as James Yun Jen.

0300-456145, Jing, Bao-Shan.

A-6975455, Kahan, Eugene.

A-6976871, Kahan, Gizella.

A-8031446, Kahan, Kathleen Judith.

A-7462128, Kassay, Attila.

A-8198572, Kaufman, Abraham.

E-085893, Kaufman, Regina.

A-6008445, King, Chung-Chang.

0300-337782, King, Fung Tseng.

A-7863591, King, Grace, or Cheh Min Chang King.

A-7863590, King, Joseph, or Yung Tsu King.

A-6623727, King, Te Piao.

0700-27056, Koo, David Yee Shih, also known as Yee Shih Koo.

A-6967278, Koo, Dominic (Sze Yi).

A-6849861, Koo, Margaret Wei-Shan Chung.

A-3377964, Koo, Robert Chung-Jen.

A-7243147, Kovesi, Eugenia.

A-7243146, Kovesi, Ignatz.

A-7274518, Kuang, Chen Wei or Wei Kuang Chen or Janet Wei-Kuang Chen or Janet Chen.

A-6986561, Kung, Hans Kuo-Hsiung.

0300-368834, Kuo, Chang Iu.

0300-433542, Kuo, Chang-Yun (nee Huang).

0300-441985, Kuo, Fa Jean.

A-6958524, Kwo, Tsuo-Tsing.

0300-456155, Kwok, Julie Tsung-Kwung.

0300-455908, Landkas, Carolus, or Charles Landkas.

0300-455907, Landkas, Hedvica or Hedy Landkas.

0300-455906, Landkas, Matthaeus Aloysius, or Mathias Aloysius Landkas.

0300-455909, Landkas, Ruzena or Rosena Landkas.

V-890377, Lee, Chan Hoo.

A-6967499, Lee, Cheng-Chun or Li.

A-7290200, Lee, Chi Hao.

0300-365060, Lee, Fung Lai.

A-6381300, Lee, Hsin Te.

A-6861454, Lee, Hun.

A-7389483, Lee, Ling Hong.

A-6545347, Lee, Luke Tsung-Chou.

V-885330, Lee, Sau Lan, or Mabel Lee.

A-6967338, Lee, Sheng Ting.

0300-345151, Leifer, Bertha.

A-7819567, Leifer, Joseph.

A-7354776, Leung, Anna, formerly known as Anna Theresa Pai-Kwan Leung.

A-9831240, Leung, Harry.

A-7296195, Leung, Yuen Chu.

A-7913448, Lovertov, Moise.

A-7961356, Lewintow, Chaskiel.

0300-442126, Lewintow, Frejda, also known as Fredja Kurman.

A-6848444, Li, Kwang Chiu.

0300-455550, Li, Sue Yung.

A-6983825, Li, Wen Hsiung.

A-7209054, Liang, Daniel Shao-Fu.

A-7209053, Liang, Mary Hsiu-Chen (nee Hsu).

A-6483737, Lieu, Hou-Shun.

A-6916531, Ling, Ting Hung.

A-8001558, Lisbona, Leon Albert.

A-8001557, Lisbona, Yvette Romano.

A-6887720, Liu, Joanna Kung Ying.

V-285171, Liu, Kai-Hsien.

A-7118723, Liu, Ke-Chia, also known as Jack Ke-Chia Liu.

A-6940549, Liu, Paul Yu-Ling.

A-6847865, Liu, Su-Ying (Lucille).

A-6972941, Liu, Wei-Jui.

A-7444634, Loh, Daniel You-Chi.

A-5928220, Lom, Hin.

0301-16903, Long, Jane Chen.

A-7456052, Long, Keh-Hsuin.

A-7125135, Lowinger, Joseph (Jozsef).

1600-77319, Lu, Su-Tsing (nee Chiu).

A-6959896, Lu, Te-Chuan or Abraham Te-Chuan Lu.

A-6877788, Ma, Si Hon.

T-120820, Mar, Bing Noon, also known as Gilbert Bing Noon Mar.

A-7913533, Meyersdorf, Szlama.

A-9744399, Moa, Chen Ah.

A-6988410, Mooaliem, Aziza.

A-6988411, Mooaliem, Salim Jacob.

V-1360391, Nagy, Gizella Dalnoki.

V-1360390, Nagy, Irme Dalnoki.

A-7138008, Nasch, Elvira.

A-6985447, Nasch, Gyula.

V-1360424, Nemeth, Joseph.

0900-73171, Ng, Yung.

A-9769824, Nung, May.

0205-26290, Ong, Linda Tsien (nee Chien Chia Chun) or Tsien Chia Chun or Chia Chun Tsien, also known as Mrs. Kuo Chun Ong.

A-7350673, Ong, Hsiao-Pao.

A-6387408, Ong, Tzo-Hsung.

A-6043196, Ong, Shao-chiu.

A-7483840, Kuo, Sue-Chuang.

A-8031488, Pai, Chi Shih.

A-8031489, Pai, Ming Hsing.

A-7436640, Perl, Leb Chaim.

A-6868241, Rapp, Arnold.

0300-299431, Reisman, Eva (nee Hollander).

A-7228283, Reisman, Imre (Emeric).

A-7809774, Runko, Antonio.

E-082310, Saad, Esther M.

E-082113, Saad, Jacques S.

A-6905017, Schachter, Gizella.

A-7808050, Schwartz, Frigyes.

A7289305, Sheng, Yao Nan, or Sheng Yao Nan.

0300-457353, Shiah, Betty.

0300-457352, Shiah, Eugenia.

0300-457354, Shiah, James.

A-6848130, Shih, Chung-Wen.

A-6967702, Shih, Yang-Ch'eng.

A-6986546, Shou, Chuan-Ling (nee Chuan-Ling Chu), also known as Mabel Chuan-Ling Shou.

A-6851334, Shou, Te-Fen, also known as Stephens Te-Fen Shou.

A-6564148, So, Kwan-Wai.

A-6567547, So, Yi Wu.

0300-462334, Soffer, Jack Khedouri.

T-979133, Soong, Chia Lin (nee Chen).

T-142269, Soong, Yuan Chio.

A-7096171, Stamberger, Katalin.

A-7096170, Stamberger, Sandor.

A-7081511, Stegman, Emanuel.

A-7177408, Stegman, Fania.

A-6988127, Su, Kendall Ling-Chiao.

A-6958619, Su, Mary Chik-Kie.

0300-457100, Sun, Cedric.

A-8091151, Sun, Lilla Shu-Yung, formerly Wu (nee Kuo).

A-7913550, Sun, Theresa I-Feng.

A-8154174, Sun, Yee-Chung.

A-7283609, Sung, Harriet Emily (Shen Sing-Vong).

A-7365717, Szameth, Szlama.

0300-328447, Sze, Elsie Sun or Too Chen Sun.

A-6300097, Sze, Shou Chiang, or Thomas Sze.

A-7052474, Szpiro, Genia.

0300-462184, Tan, Charlotte.

V-753629, Tan, Peter Nei-Wan.

A-7457341, Tang, Nancy Tse-Yuin.

0300-462015, Tannenbaum, Eva.

0300-462016, Tannenbaum, Paula.

A-8071100, Tannenbaum, Samuel.

A-7292420, Tao, Ching Hwa.

A-6851494, Tao, Yung.

A-7274851, Tchen, Lily Li-ing Yang.

A-7200859, Teng, Ching Tseng.

A-7290253, Chao, Hsi Chih (Dora Chao Teng).

T-1503525, Ting, Donald Ta-Yu.

A-6986552, Tong, Bik Yuan.

0200/86111, Tong, Rev. Paul Ki-King.

E-082718, Towfik, Nissim Moshi.

V-754351, Tsai, Albert Yungshu.

A-7290335, Tsai, Shih Yuan.

A-6881740, Tsao, Chia-Kuei.

A-7436712, Tsao, Ying-Lan Wang.

A-8198382, Tsao, Joseph Chao.

A-6827808, Tsao, Peh-Nien, also known as Daniel Peh-Nien Tsao.

A-6704225, Tsao, Peter Yao-Shang.

A-7135173, Tsao, Stella Chen-Yuen.

A-6848477, Tseng, Ching-Hsuan (nee Fong).

A-8015091, Tseng, Hsiang Len.

0801-13839, Tseng, Robert.

A-7795780, Tsi-Kong, Chia.

A-6843407, Tsiang, Shou-Jen.

A-6381299, Tsou, Leslie Kuo-Kuei.

1200-23447, Tsou, Rose Chiayin.

A-7247147, Tsu, Aimee Marie.

A-6916558, Tu, Ju Ching.

A-6923178, Tuan, Ren-Deh Dah San.

A-7865348, Tuan, Tai Fu.

A-7277347, Tung, Nathan, also known as Chao-Yuan Tung.

0300-320503, Turek, Ludmila (nee Vrtala).

A-7248808, Turek, Miroslav.

E-078100, Vunk, Rustan.

A-6967759, Wan, Grace Jung-Fang, or Jung-Fang Wan, or Wan Jung-Fang or Grace Wan.

A-6973691, Wang, Cary Ching-Tao.

A-7133277, Wang, Chen-Dju Chen, also known as Pearl Wang.

V-908974, Wang, Chiu-Chen.

A-6973692, Wang, Irene Li-Chen.

A-7292415, Wang, Mae Hoang-Mei.

A-7197271, Wang, Yung-Fa.

A-8000614, Wee, Hedy Deh-Yuin.

A-1397738, Wei, Joseph Chu-Feng.

A-7879635, Wen, Hsiu Jui.

A-7879636, Wen, Sun Hsing-Fan.

A-7274557, Wen, Shirley Hsiang-Ju.

A-7389487, Weng, Cheng Kuang.

A-8031672, Wiesenfeld, Bronislava, also known as Brena Garson.

A-7387975, Wiesinger, Frederick Paul.

V-1184125, Wong, Gee Cheng.

A-6953089, Wong, Yau Chun.

0300-268257, Woo, Siu Mui Lee.

0300-268256, Woo, Soe Vei.

A-7274361, Wood, Fu Liang, also known as George Fu Liang Wood.

A-6848025, Wu, Ching Ying.

A-6851447, Wu, Jane Sun, also known as Hsia-Chen Sun (Shen).

A-7450708, Wu, Lawrence Liang-Shuen.

A-7395271, Wu, Stanley Liang-Chun.

A-6754387, Wu, Szu Hsiao.

A-1365247, Wu, Tong Yong, or Wu Tong Yong.

A-7247103, Wu, Wan Lien Dorothea.

A-6851549, Wu, Yao-Hua.

A-7247102, Wu, Ying Victor.

A-6567549, Yang, Arthur.

E-89279, Yang, Chin Tse.

A-7860211, Yang, Kwai-Hsi.

A-6703293, Yang, Luciana Theresa Fang.

A-7118758, Yang, Maurice Min-Sun.

V-778302, Yein, Chung Sang.

A-6026505, Yen, Chia Shiang, also known as Charles Yen.

A-7366212, Yen, Kuo Tai.

A-6966530, Yen, Kwang Tsung (nee Chow), also known as Florence Yen.

A-7285975, Yin, Louis Lo I.

A-6958665, Ying, Sai Hou.

A-7897615, Ying, Thomas Orrin.

V-884814, Young, Koon Chock.

V-383286, Young, Siu Fun Hui.

A-6967653, Young, I Teh (nee Yang).

A-6847807, Young, Sing Sze.

A-7860214, Yu, Chuan-Tao.

A-6694192, Yu, Tsi Shan.

0300-346716, Yu, Wei-Liang.

A-6703491, Yuan, Lun Lee or Yuan Lun Lee.

V-658602, Yuan, Rosaline Sung (nee Sung Lu Sing) or Lu Sing Sung.

0300-354976, Yung, Hong San.

0300-371624, Yung, Ung Siue Chang.

0300-348266, Yung, Vong Wei.

A-7210499-T, Lutyk, Jan Bugien.

A-7890110, Lutyk, Sophia Sabina.

A-7244861, Chrosciechowski, Julian Thaddeus.

0501-238, Constandaky, Serban George.

A-6975638, Ma, Chan Chow.

A-7850962, Mar. Margaret Wan-Yuin Yang nee Wan Yuin Yang.

A-7480726, Tang, Hsin Ming.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 168) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7962136, Chin, Por alias Yat Song.

A-9657768, Chum, Tham Lie.

A-6983648, Goldstein, Baruch Gershon.

A-9825250, Picinich, Martin or Martino Antonio.

1300-127438, Chan, Rose Edith.

A-6033462, Chang, Yuan Hsiao also known as Jason Chang.

T-278633, Choy, Sing Lum.

A-1073526, Chu, Thomas Wencao.

A-6967626, Fine, Chang also known as S. Dick Chang.

A-7096034, Gawronski, Michal.

A-6933885, Ho, Eugene Ngok.

A-6858260, Klimas, George (Jerzy).

A-8065424, Kwong, Chan Pan.

A-9561134, Ngee, Foo Tick.

A-6848418, Pih, Peter Dueh Chang.

A-6142704, Su, Er-Ching.

E-119236, Sum, Yuen.

A-7095905, Szonyi, Francois.

A-9632713, Tang, Tan Ju or Tong Tan Ju.

A-9672198, Viporn, Uno.

A-7874957, Wagner, Christine Maria Theresia.

A-7176012, Wagner, Ferenc Stephen.

A-7176013, Wagner, Irene nee Trefny.

A-9635248, Wong, Hoe Kwan or Hoe Kwan Hong or Wong Lie Puo or Cheong Puo.

A-9733998, Yong, Tan Boon.

1300-129063, Yu, Pio Chung.

A-6762014, Yui, Wei-Tsen also known as Paul Yui.

A-6877740, Chu, Johnson Cheng.

A-7064137, Chu, Siu-Fan Cheng.

A-7415019, Fore, Mark.

A-8091059, Hong, Chou, also known as Young Fatt, also known as Tong Fatt.

A-6671045, Hulicka, Karel.

A-7243491, Langbergs, Alberts.

A-7243590, Langbergs, Emma Pauline.

A-9561078, Long, Foo Chin, also known as Chin Long Fong.

A-7879327, Wah, Ho Gate (Lana Wong) or Lana Meyers.

A-9782981, Wan, Chan or Yin Chan.

A-6922678, Weiser, Leopold alias Artur Fried.

A-7120673, Chang, Kuo-Sui.

A-7262024, Goldman, Andre.

A-9526887, Grubelich, Danijel Nanad.

A-7395210, Pavlousek, Maria Anna.

A-6407327, Pavlousek, Oldrich Adolf.

A-6480058, Sarapa, Djordje Vukicevich or George Sarapa.

A-6764709, Sarapa, Wladimih Vukicevich or Walter Sarapa.

A-9825133, Sztam, Henryk Maksymilian.

A-6704089, Wang, Ambrose Joseph Ching-fu.

A-6982870, Wen (Wu), Lai Kwan.

E-070837, Abolins, Aleksander.

A-7538137, Chang, Ping Chung, also known as David Ping Chung Chang.

A-6847766, Chang, Pien-Tseng.

A-7941171, Chang, Florence Shih.

A-7941172, Chang, Ta-Chun.

A-7941173, Chang, Kuo-Chun.

A-7941174, Chang, Pu-Chun Chang.

A-8082017, Choi, Ho.

1300-127921, Chow, Ma.

A-7125062, Fu, Ching Mark.

A-7381295, Humaciu, Aurel.

A-7863016, Kiedyk, Kazimierz.

A-8258542, Liu, Shao-Wen.

A-6043197, Lu, Yung Tai.

A-7176709, Warga, Gerzson.

A-9682999, Yue, Hau Chung.

A-7125362, Dreszer, Anna (nee Anna Kamila Monseu).

A-6472694, Simmons, Miriam or Marie (nee Horowitz).

A-7868116, Berkowitz, Abraham or Abraham Grossman.

A-6438289, Briks, Vladimirs.

A-7093100, Furth, Julius, also known as Julius Firt.

A-7280236, Holczler, Imre.

A-7280337, Holczler, Sara.

A-8082095, Holczler, Gabriel.

A-8082096, Holczler, Dezso.

A-8082097, Holczler, Zoltan.

A-8082098, Holczler, Esther.

0300-411863, Hoo, Soo or Hoo Soo or Soo Ho or Soo Bah Ho.

0300-390016, Lee, Wah or Lee Wah or Yoke Wa Li.

A-6848478, Wang, Ke Liang.

A-7383455, Rudzinski, Aleksander Witold.

0300-346584, Rudzinski, Maria Anna (nee Tenenbaum).

A-6694114, Zazoulinsky, Moisel or Michael Isiah Zazoulinsky.

MODERNIZATION OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to give the Department of Commerce greater authority to conduct research in the design of ships and port facilities to modernize the Nation's merchant marine.

The research would be conducted in behalf of public and private interests. The proposal, which would amend section 212 of the existing law, would give the Commerce Department, and the Maritime Administration within the Department, authority to study the possibilities of the use of nuclear power for propulsion of merchant vessels, and would furnish an opportunity for carrying out a proposal submitted by myself that the Government construct ships to be propelled in this manner.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has made a similar proposal. We are very much in agreement on this matter. I do not know what conflict there is between my proposal and the President's proposal for a so-called "show" ship. However, whether we are for or against that proposal, our interest is much deeper, in that if we are to have nuclear propulsion for our merchant marine, we had better be thinking about it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the Senator from Washington is correct, although my bill was primarily designed to have a ship constructed which could go around the world and show the world the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I might say apparently that there has been some misconception about the President's proposal. I never understood his proposal as being that we merely build a show ship, or a museum ship, or one which would demonstrate the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I think what he stated and what he had in mind was that a merchant vessel should be built which would, in the course of events, carry normal merchant cargoes, but that on its initial trip it would do something similar to what was done by a certain British Empire ship, which, on its first trip, carried exhibits of British Empire products. I think the President had in mind that there would be carried on the ship, which would be a merchant ship in every sense of the word, various exhibits, such as might be established at the Library of Congress, showing the ways in which atomic energy can be utilized in medicine——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Such exhibits as we will have at Geneva.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; such as we will have at Geneva. There would be shown the uses of atomic energy in medicine, agriculture, and other fields. Also, it might be feasible to have a powerplant aboard so that when the ship arrived at a port city, the atomic powerplant could be connected up with the power system of that city for a certain period of time and could be used to light the city, so that the people might be shown that, instead of atomic energy being used merely for wartime purposes, the American Government and the American people have conceived of peaceful uses for atomic energy.

In my opinion the purposes of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], will serve a useful purpose. Apparently a misunderstanding as to the President's proposal has existed, and the proposal of the Senator from Washington would be in general compliance with what the President had in mind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to the Senator from California that my proposal is not intended to be incompatible with the suggestion made by the President. The two are different matters. I personally voted against the President's proposal, but my bill is not incompatible with it. I think the Senator from Maryland and I are thinking of something that goes deeper. Knowing the severe competition which even now exists between our merchant marine and foreign shipping, if there is going to be a new era in the means of propelling maritime transportation, we had better get going so that we may keep up with foreign countries. I would not like to get up some morning and read in the New York Times that a foreign merchant ship without smokestacks came into New York Harbor. I do not think the Senator from Maryland would like to see that happen. I do not think it is too early for us to give to the Commerce Department the authority proposed. By the way, the bill is being introduced at the request of that Department. I do not think the provisions of the bill would be incompatible with the proposal made by the President.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield in a moment.

The proposal is merely to give the Commerce Department authority to go ahead with the planning of a prototype ship, and consider the question in a coldhearted, commercial way. There could be propaganda value in such a ship, and I do not think that would be particularly bad. But if we are entering a new era of merchant marine ship propulsion, we should keep abreast of such developments, because we are even now having a difficult time with foreign competition.

The bill would permit the Commerce Department to make the necessary studies and investigations which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and our committee have always suggested should be done. However, the Department thought it would need authority which could be obtained by amendment of section 212 of the Maritime Act.

I wanted to make it clear that my bill would not be incompatible with the President's proposal. The two are not necessarily different, but they have different purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill which the Senator from Washington has just introduced, but on May 17 of this year I introduced a bill, S. 2005, for the purpose of developing, as speedily as possible, the use of nuclear transportation power in peaceful pursuits of domestic and foreign commerce. The bill introduced by me is really an authorization bill for the construction of an atomic-powered ship.

I ask unanimous consent to have S. 2005 printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2005), was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of developing as speedily as possible the use of nuclear transportation power in peaceful pursuits of domestic and foreign commerce, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sum as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered merchant vessel of such type, size, and speed as the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, may determine to be most appropriate. Such construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, shall be subject to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. The Maritime Administration in carrying on activities and functions under this act may employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by the Administration in carrying on such activities and functions, and may with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof, in carrying on such activities and functions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Maryland may recall that in 1950, when I headed a committee which was created to make a study of the whole maritime problem, we made a similar proposal. I also had proposed a bill to authorize the construction of a merchant ship for similar purposes. I think we are setting all the ducks in a row, as it were, by giving the Maritime Administration and the Commerce Department—and the bill has been approved by the Budget Bureau and others who have responsibility in the matter—authority now to go ahead and see what can be done about planning a prototype ship or making a study of the future use of propulsion by atomic energy.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that I shall be very happy to aid him in any way in getting the bill, which he has just introduced, passed. I think it is very essential that such a ship be constructed at once.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From what information I get, I may say very informally that the use of atomic energy for merchant ships is a little nearer than many persons think. Such construction would be costly at first, but, as is true in any new achievements of science, costs of construction are high at first, until production is increased. I think such a ship will be economically feasible in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Washington made a statement of considerable significance when he said it is important that we do not wake up some morning to find that an atomic-powered Soviet merchant vessel has entered one of our ports, or has undertaken a voyage around the world. Such a thing would indicate that Russia had obtained quite an advantage, not only in world opinion, but also a substantial advantage in the construction of merchant marine ships of the future. That statement would be applicable whether it was a vessel of the Soviet Union or of some other country.

The United States has been a pioneer in the field of atomic energy, and should continue to be in a position of leadership in the peaceful aspects of atomic power. I hope, and I believe, that in due time, after we iron out difficulties and gain further experience, power produced by atomic energy may be competitive with steam power or even hydroelectric power, except perhaps under certain very unusual circumstances. But I would not want to see our development of plants held back until such a day as I have mentioned should come. Such a day will never come if we gain some experience. I would not want to see the development of an atomic-powered merchant vessel held back until it could be certified that such a vessel could cross the ocean as cheaply as an oil-driven ship, a diesel-powered ship, or some other kind of ship.

So I think it is important that we proceed, keeping in mind, however, as the Senator from Washington has ably pointed out, that we should be looking to the time when atomic energy may be used for the propulsion of our merchant marine as well as for the propulsion of our Navy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we realize that we must think of the commercial and economic aspects of atomic energy. In that connection it should be pointed out that we already have in existence a great number of ships, and we hope to build more. So there is the marine-engineering question of what hull design is to be used in the future. We hope that if it is possible to use nuclear power to propel our ships, such power may be used with ships of the same hull design that our ships now have, inasmuch as we have in "mothballs" many ships which could be used, and which thus could become economically useful for the hauling of either tanker cargoes or dry cargoes.

By permitting the Department of Commerce to proceed with this research and experimental work, regardless of the other bill, I think we shall be doing what should be done at this time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this morning I read in the press a statement by Admiral Strauss that the conference in Geneva would not be approached on behalf of the American delegation as a race for supremacy in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Nevertheless, Mr. President, we must be realistic. Some of these days someone will produce an atomic-powered ship; the sooner we produce one the better off we shall be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate very much the contributions of both the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from the Department of Commerce, addressed to the President of the United States Senate; a statement of the purpose and provisions of the bill, and the text of the bill itself, which I ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let me say that I am sure we can help work out this matter, once it gets before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2429) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs to read as follows:

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy, to conduct research and experiments, developmental, trial, and demonstration work with vessels, propelling machinery, cargo handling and other vessel equipment, improvements and facilities, and to prepare plans and designs for new and improved vessels, machinery, equipment, and facilities;

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports, to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation."

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 28, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith draft and statement of purpose and provisions of a bill "to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports."

The Department of Commerce considers research and design and developmental work in these fields to be a means of obtaining more efficient and economical operation of ships and port facilities. Current problems, such as rapid obsolescence of our World War II fleet, both active and reserve, the need for studying possibilities of using existing vessels through improvements and conversions, and the need for improvement of cargo handling practices and facilities in our ports and on our ships, emphasize the importance of devoting time and personnel and funds to design, research, experiments, and testing activities in these fields. The need for investigation and study of the possibilities for use of nuclear energy in the propulsion of merchant vessels is, of course, an outstanding example of the critical necessity for these activities.

The purpose and provisions of the proposed legislation are set forth in detail in the accompanying statement.

The Department urges early consideration and enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL WORK WITH VESSEL PROPULSION AND EQUIPMENT, PORT FACILITIES, PLANNING AND OPERATION, AND CARGO HANDLING ON SHIPS AND AT PORTS

Increasingly important and necessitating increased expenditures for the purpose, in the program for the promotion of the American merchant marine in this critical period, is the development of means to improve the efficiency of existing vessels and port facilities.

The Department of Commerce considers research and design and developmental work in these fields to be the key to solution of many difficulties facing the American merchant marine. The high cost of new construction and the rapid obsolescence of the existing fleet and existing shipping facilities make it imperative that our dollars and our present investments be more effectively used in improved ships and improved use of ships. In view of the rapid obsolescence of our World War II fleet, both active and reserve, and in view of the necessity for the Government to take the lead in development of the possibilities for using existing vessels through improvements and reconversions and to take the lead in the development of cargo-handling practices and facilities, both on ships and in the ports, the Department considers that the program for the reconversion of hulls and propulsion machinery of Liberty vessels is a sound program with great possibilities for pointing the way in meeting the problems of competition facing our merchant marine. The results of such experimental and developmental work should be consolidated and further developed as the most economical means of improving the capabilities and defense potentialities of our merchant fleet, both privately owned and Government owned, and of our port facilities for water transportation. Plans must be developed for improved ship designs to obtain cheaper and more efficient operation, and plans must be developed for cutting down the high percentage of a vessel's lifetime spent in port compared with its operating time at sea.

The Government must take the lead in the development of both facilities and cargo-handling equipment and practices at shoreside water terminals, including research and development to attain the best facility designs, procedures, operating systems, and mechanical equipment, working toward the progressive improvement of the process of transferring cargo between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports. Current problems of national defense port planning, the early opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway with attendant port-development problems, the critical necessities for improvement in cargo handling, and vessel turnaround combine to emphasize the importance of devoting time and personnel and funds to this design, research, experiment and operational activity.

While the Government generally will initiate studies, investigations, and experimental work, the activities under the proposed bill are to be carried on in collaboration with public and private interests concerned. Thus, the activities may be conducted with such cooperative financing and cooperative use of facilities, personnel, and data by the Government and public and private interests concerned, as may be found practical and appropriate from time to time.

The general authority of the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, to carry on these activities should be made the subject of specific attention in the Merchant Marine Act 1936. The authority contained in section 212 and other provisions of the 1936 act and the authority in section 8 of the Merchant Marine Act 1920, should be strengthened by emphasis on the research, design, experimental, and development activities in respect of ships and port facilities. The accompanying draft bill would amend section 212 of the 1936 act to provide authority in the research and design fields relating to ships and to port facilities as important avenues of attack on pressing problems of the merchant marine in maintaining its national defense and competitive commercial strength.

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RELATING TO AIR-POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives regarding Senate bill 928. I wish to say that I have discussed this matter with the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the subcommittee, and with the distinguished acting majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, all of whom are in agreement with my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 928) to provide research and technical assistance relating to air-pollution control, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That in recognition of the dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation, from air pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States and local governments in controlling air pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and develop methods of abating such pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and local government air pollution control agencies and other public or private agencies and institutions in the formulation and execution of their air-pollution-abatement research programs. To this end, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) shall have the authority relating to air-pollution control vested in them respectively by this act.
>
> SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized, after careful investigation and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State and local government air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies and institutions, and with the industries involved, to prepare or recommend research programs for devising and developing methods for eliminating or reducing air pollution. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies or institutions.
>
> (b) The Surgeon General may (1) encourage cooperative activities by State and local governments for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; (2) collect and disseminate information relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; (3) conduct in the Public Health Service, and support and aid the conduct by State and local government air pollution control agencies, and other public and private agencies and institutions of, technical research to devise and develop methods of preventing and abating air pollution; and (4) make available to State and local government air pollution control agencies, other public and private agencies and institutions, and industries, the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof.
>
> SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State or local government air pollution control agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting such State or local government air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem.
>
> SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish from time to time reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this act as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of air pollution.
>
> SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for each of the 5 fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed $5 million to enable it to carry out its functions under this act and, in furtherance of the policy declared in the first section of this act, to (1) make grants-in-aid to State and local government air pollution control agencies, and other public and private agencies and institutions, and to individuals, for research, training, and demonstration projects, and (2) enter into contracts with public and private agencies and institutions and individuals for research, training, and demonstration projects. Such grants-in-aid and contracts may be made without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Sums appropriated for such grants-in-aid and contracts shall remain available until expended, and shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
>
> SEC. 6. When used in this act—
>
> (a) The term "State air pollution control agency" means the State health authority, except that in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency other than the State health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other State agency;
>
> (b) The term "local government air pollution control agency" means a city, county, or other local government health authority, except that in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is a single agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other agency; and
>
> (c) The term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia.
>
> SEC. 7. Nothing contained in this act shall limit the authority of any department or agency of the United States to conduct or make grants-in-aid or contracts for research and experiments relating to air pollution under the authority of any other law.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is my understanding from the junior Senator from California that he has discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and that the Senator from Oklahoma is in complete accord with the procedure proposed to be followed in this instance.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct, I will say to the distinguished acting majority leader. I have discussed this measure with the senior Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings originally on Senate bill 928; and he is in complete accord with the action which I propose, namely, that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I wish to say, by way of introduction, that I am perfectly delighted with the legislative action which is about to transpire today in the Senate. Ever since I first came to the United States Senate, from the State of California, 2½ years ago, I have endeavored to acquaint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives with the growing problem of air pollution. From time to time I have stood on this floor and have spoken with respect to findings made by various public officials, and agencies, and professional groups regarding the increasing hazards involved in air contamination both in the United States and throughout the world, not alone to human beings and their very lives, but also to agriculture and industry and to various kinds of property.

During the 83d Congress, the Senate accepted the recommendations which had been made jointly by my colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the two distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and other Senators, including myself, and adopted a proposal to enlist the might of the Federal Government against the growing problem of air pollution in our land. I regret that the House of Representatives did not see fit at that time to concur in the judgment of the Senate, and during the 83d Congress no constructive action was taken on this problem.

After the adjournment of the 83d Congress, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I wrote a letter to the President of the United States in which we urged that the President consider the appointment of an interagency committee to study the problem of air pollution, with a view to the taking of some constructive action in the 84th Congress.

I was most happy to find that the President of the United States thereafter appointed an ad hoc committee, consisting of representatives from appropriate agencies of the Federal Government—namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and others; and a study was made of the posibility of Federal assistance in combating, controlling, and ultimately eliminating air pollution in the United States.

In the state of the Union message which President Eisenhower delivered to the Congress last January, I was delighted to note that he indicated that prevention, control, and elimination of air pollution constitute, in his judgment, a matter of Federal interest; and it was his recommendation that this Congress take an interest in the subject and that it consider the enactment of legislation in this field.

Shortly thereafter, when a message from the President on the question of public health came to the Congress, once again the administration indicated that air pollution is a subject upon which Congress might legislate to the benefit of the 166 million American citizens.

I introduce Senate bill 928, along with my able colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the two distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], and the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Public Works, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was chairman. Thereafter Senate bill 928 was favorably reported from the subcommittee and the full committee, came to the floor of the Senate, and was passed by the Senate.

The House has considered Senate bill 928, and has adopted an amendment to it. Let me outline the most important features of the amendment.

First, the authorization in the bill, as it was passed by the Senate, was for a 5-year study by the appropriate Federal agencies, under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Surgeon General; and at that time the bill provided that during that period, $3 million a year would be authorized for expenditure, making a total authorization, over a 5-year period, of $15 million.

The House of Representatives has seen fit to increase the authorization to one of $5 million a year, thus providing a maximum authorization for expenditure, during the 5-year period, of $25 million. Certainly that amendment will be entirely acceptable to the Senate, and, I am sure, to the administration.

Second, the bill, as passed by the Senate, provided for the appointment by the President of an advisory committee on air pollution, to be composed of various governmental officials and private individuals, as well.

The House saw fit to delete that provision. In his comments yesterday in the House the distinguished Member of the House who was handling this measure indicated it was the judgment of the House committee which had jurisdiction of the bill that an interagency committee, perhaps similar to that which the President himself appointed on an ad hoc basis last year, was an appropriate instrumentality for advice to the various agencies of the Federal Government.

I do not quarrel with the decision of the House in that regard. Neither does my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. Thus we are united in not objecting to the action of the House in this respect.

The remaining changes are relatively minor in character. I think they improve the proposed legislation in a number of respects. So I am most happy that the Senate, which I trust will approve the House action in amending Senate bill 928, is now taking constructive action, in conjunction with the House, toward having the Congress of the United States accept jurisdiction and responsibility for technical assistance and advice to State and local governments in a field which has been of growing concern to our people, namely, that of air contamination and air pollution, which we in California call smog.

Control of the problem will remain in the State and local governments, where it should be, but I think it is a grand thing that, under the leadership of the President of the United States, the Congress now sees fit to accept responsibility for research and technical assistance in what we hope will be an effective effort leading to the early elimination of air contamination in this country.

On that basis, I respectfully ask my brethren to approve the action of the House. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 7, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Maurice E. Curts, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation by the President in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Irving A. DeBlanc, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Behold us, O God, gathered together to do Your will. All things are Thine and the world bows before Thee.

We know that You are specially present when legislators meet because You, too, are a legislator. Your laws are present in the throbbing heart of the atom, in the galaxy of stars that swing through the most distant regions, in the laws of family life, of business, of recreation. Is there any greater impact on society than law?

But just being legal is not sufficient. Christ was arrested legally. He was tortured legally, jailed legally, nailed to a cross legally, killed legally.

Inspire good men to be able, and able men to be good. Teach men that more harm is done by the inactivity of the good than by the activity of evil men in the world.

The greatest principle You introduced into the world was the dignity of man. It revolutionized churches, governments, schools, hospitals, laws. But a principle is next to nothing unless applied. Our Constitution had to be applied in the Bill of Rights. Sacred Scripture had to be applied by churches. Change is our greatest challenge, greatest problem.

So religion is not a walking stick that we lean on, a pegleg that is not a part of us; it is not a compartment, not an aspirin, it is not something I apply as wallpaper and can skin off, not a luxury as going to an opera, not a decoration like a flower, not a private affair like a diary; rather it is something I cannot live without, like my blood, my breath, a complete surrender of all I am to Your will.

It makes a difference what I believe as it makes a difference what I do, where I go, what I eat. And business is not business, fun is not fun, law is not law, politics is not politics, and religion, religion. That is the cult of insincerity. Religion is a way of life for all. People cannot explain my actions, I am a mystery, unless You, O God, exist.

Every piece of money in our United States of America has "In God We Trust." Never once has this Nation persecuted You. Legislators here want to apply Your principles to economics, family life, rural-urban problems, but especially to the two greatest problems—of race and the inarticulate masses. If Your principles fail, then we fail and ours becomes one of 23 other cultures—16 dead, 5 struggling, only 1 really alive.

In Thee we place our hope. From Thee we ask help and guidance. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6766. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and asks a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. KERR, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, KIRWAN, FOGARTY, MARSHALL, RILEY, EVINS, BOLAND, MURRAY of Illinois, MAGNUSON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, JENSEN, PHILLIPS, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HAND, and TABER.

THE SALE OF UNITED STATES FARM COMMODITIES ABROAD

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I received consent earlier to address the House this afternon for 30 minutes. It is my purpose to present to the House the report of an investigation we have made of the expansion of agricultural production in foreign countries, with particular reference to the basic commodities, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and wheat.

As many of you know, for many years I have tried to get the Department to use its authority to offer United States commodities in world trade on a truly competitive basis. This investigator's report will show that many, many American financial interests are getting tax concessions and Federal loans while they expand production of the same commodities in foreign fields, which compete with American production. At the same time, in many instances representatives of those large companies are in excellent position to advise the present shortsighted agricultural policies of holding United States production off the world markets and letting such markets go to American financed foreign production.

I hope the membership will read this report. It is highly interesting, and I think it offers an explanation of why the Department of Agriculture has said it will not sell United States farm commodities because of the recommendations of the trade. This report in a number of instances clearly shows just who constitutes the trade. This report also shows we are lending money and granting financial aid to develop foreign lands; we then grant special concessions to United States business interests to move in; then we give technical assistance so the local people can produce such agricultural commodities so they can put us out of business; then the United States Department of Agriculture holds our own farmer-produced commodities off world trade so they can sell; then the United States Department of Agriculture counts such unsold and unoffered commodities to cut United States acreage. Our farmers are cut out or down in income. And our President asks the Congress to help the low-income farmer. If it were not so serious it would be ludicrous.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald appeared an unusual editorial entitled "A Policeman's Lot." It is unusual that the Washington Post and Times Herald should pay these respects to the Washington Metropolitan Police Department, but on this morning they paid an unusually fine and well-timed tribute to this outstanding organization. I rise this morning to add my humble voice to the fine work this great department is doing in this strike and the fine morale it has under the leadership of its new chief, Chief Murray. This editorial called to the attention of the Congress and the Nation how these boys gave up their leaves for the whole Fourth of July weekend, with no time off, no extra pay, no nothing but serving the country and the Nation in this paralyzing strike. We say too little about this police department. I want to say something good. Now, we have given all other Federal employees raises, but we have not given these boys anything. Let us get busy and reward them in deeds and not only in words.

The editorial is as follows:

A POLICEMAN'S LOT

It was a busy weekend for Washington's Metropolitan Police Department. The whole force was on duty—Saturday, Sunday and the Fourth of July. Those who had made plans to get away from Washington with their families over Independence Day had to cancel them; men who were out of town on vacation were called back to duty. Ever since the Capital Transit strike started on Friday morning, every member of the police department, from Chief Murray himself down, has been at work on a 7-day-a-week basis putting in 3 hours of overtime each day. Chief Murray has some hope of being able to give his men compensatory time off in some slacker season, although the law does not now make provision for anything of the sort; overtime payment is definitely out, there being no funds with which to pay it. The police have met the traffic emergency—and are continuing to meet it—with a resourcefulness, good humor, and devotion to duty that deserve the heartiest thanks of the whole community.

The flow of traffic to and from the downtown areas at the rush hours on Friday and Tuesday was handled with astonishing efficiency and dispatch. But no one ought to be lulled into thinking that this remarkable achievement of the police force can be continued indefinitely. This is pretty torrid weather for a 7-day, overtime workweek out of doors on asphalt pavement. Even the best of cops is bound to wilt in the sun after a while. It behooves the city, therefore, to do everything it can to reduce traffic congestion and develop orderly patterns for travel in and out of town. This means maximum cooperation among office associates in forming car pools and maximum utilization of such jitney service as can be developed among taxi drivers; the Public Utilities Commission ought to act as speedily as possible to push the latter idea along. And beyond these makeshifts, of course, it remains incumbent upon the transit company, the transit workers' union and District of Columbia officials to make every effort to achieve a settlement of the strike.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM TODAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that H. R. 3210, the diversion of Lake Michigan water, will be the first order of business today, and thereafter H. R. 3822, the Mexican labor bill.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the sweetness and light, the wining and dining, and the boon companionship at the recent United Nations in San Francisco, the Russians shot down another United States military plane.

Why is it that it is usually our military planes that are shot down? Is it possible that none of our so-called free-world friends are flying military patrols? If not, why not?

In shooting down our plane did the Russians commit an act of aggression or did they simply engage in target practice? Must the answer come from the badly burned members of the bomber crew?

Would it be too much to expect the hitherto spineless United Nations, soundly slapped in the face by this latest act, to tell the Russians to pack their baggage and get out of that organization immediately?

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may meet tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 293 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 293, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into purposes.

House Resolution 293 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. H. R. 3210 would authorize the withdrawal from Lake Michigan a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years from the enactment of the bill. The bill also would provide that the Secretary of the Army would study the effects of the increased diversion and report on it, with recommendations, to the Congress before January 31, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, the estimated cost to the United States in order to carry out the provisions of H. R. 3120 would be approximately $280,000, of which $190,000 would be incurred by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The report on this bill states that there is no objection on the part of the Army to the enactment of the legislation, although an official report on this bill has not been received by the Department of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, this diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway has been going on for a number of years, and it is the considered opinion of the people who live in this great and important region that the diversion has been highly beneficial. The sewage-treating program has been very successful, and according to the report it is estimated that an increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second above the present 1,500 cubic feet per second would completely take care of the situation in the Illinois Waterway from Chicago to the Mississippi River. The buildings and construction located on the southern shores of Lake Michigan in the Indiana area extending as far east as Michigan City, Ind., have on several occasions recently been greatly damaged by the lashing of water during high winds and storm periods. Reasonable diversion will greatly decrease the damage caused by these high-water floods during Lake Michigan storms.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 3210 will be adopted. Members on both sides of the aisle from Illinois and Indiana, the region affected, favor the bill, and it merits the serious consideration of the Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, this test was contemplated by the Supreme Court decision of 1930 when it stated that after the Sanitary District of Chicago completed necessary sewage facilities a further test should be undertaken to determine again the possibility of additional water diversion. This bill contemplates that test; is that not correct?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is correct. I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his comment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the bill states that this diversion will take place under the direction of the Army. May I remind the gentleman that the President appointed a Water Resources Board about 2 years ago to study all water conditions, with the Secretary of the Interior being chairman of that Board and the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare being represented on the Board. I wonder why they did not follow the pattern of the Water Resources Board, which will make a report in the next 30 days or sooner? That study was made under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MADDEN. This legislation will have a great deal to do with interstate transportation down the Illinois River. Back through the years the Army engineers have made preliminary investigations of the diversion of water as it pertains to navigation in the Great Lakes area. There is no doubt in my mind but that with the work the Army engineers have already done on the project this legislation would provide the most practical way of handling the test.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one on this side who objects to this rule or the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend a cordial welcome back to one of our beloved friends who has been necessarily absent for several months. He is a great, patriotic, conscientious legislator; a fine grand fellow. We all welcome GORDON CANFIELD to his duties here in the House. His great legislative knowledge, his fine discriminating mind have made his service here a distinct success. We need men here like GORDON CANFIELD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are all glad to see our dear friend GORDON CANFIELD back with us again. We were all concerned when we heard of his illness and followed him through the weeks and months of his illness, keeping in touch with his office to find out how he was progressing. One of the most pleasant pictures to me was when I saw him at the Speaker's table a few minutes ago talking with the Speaker.

GORDON CANFIELD is one of the finest gentleman I have ever met, a great legislator, one whose nobility of character is an inspiration to all of us. I join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in welcoming him back. I might offer a little word of caution, that he follow his doctor's orders and not overwork himself.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be very closely associated with GORDON CANFIELD for a number of years. He is the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Department Appropriations. I have the privilege of being the chairman of that subcommittee. We have, however, during the past few years alternated the chairmanship. When the Republicans were in power Mr. CANFIELD was the chairman, and when the Democrats are in power I have that honor.

I have never worked with anybody who has been more cooperative. Largely through the influence of Mr. CANFIELD our committee has been remarkably free from partisan politics, and its recommendations have been generally accepted on the floor of the House.

Mr. CANFIELD is an able legislator and an outstanding public servant. I am delighted that he has returned to the floor of the House, and extend to him my very best wishes for many more years of faithful service to his district, State, and Nation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer man in the Congress of the United States, or ever has been, than GORDON CANFIELD. I am overjoyed to see him back again.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, it warms my heart to see GORDON CANFIELD back on the job again. He was missed by all of us. He is a splendid Congressman, I know. I especially observe his fine work because he represents the district which includes the city of Paterson, where I was born. The district is fortunate to have his services. No better man has ever represented it. I wish him good health and many more years of continued services.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the New Jersey delegation, I join most heartily in the felicitations extended to our beloved and esteemed colleague, GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, upon his return after his illness. We are all extremely glad to see him again in our midst looking again in his usual good health. He has been greatly missed, and we know that he has regretted that illness has kept him from being among us.

It has been noticeable during his absence he has kept in touch with the work of the Congress. His views have been recorded on all important matters of legislation by extension of remarks and by recorded pairs with other absent Members. In this way he has been able to keep his constituents well informed as to his attitude on matters of legislation. His sincerity and conscientious consideration of legislative matters have been apparent as well as his interest in all that pertained to the welfare of the people of his district that he has long and faithfully represented. Gordon, your host of friends are glad to see you back with us.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with the Members of this honorable body in welcoming back to the Congress our genial and lovable colleague, the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD.

Some months ago it came to us as a severe shock that Gordon was seriously ill and that he would be unable to attend to his official duties. Suffice to say, all of us hoped for a speedy recovery and the restoration of his good health.

Personally, I know of no Member of the Congress for whom I have higher regard and admiration than the active, sincere, honest, and conscientious Member from New Jersey. From the time I became a Member of this legislative group to the present time, I have always considered him one of the outstanding Members of our body and one who at all times was kind, helpful, and cooperative in his advice on matters of legislation.

Possessed of a pleasing disposition, jovial at all times, and with a winning way, but serious enough on matters dealing with the Congress, GORDON CANFIELD stands out as the ideal Representative.

To know him is to like him, and I am more than happy to endorse those complimentary remarks of my colleagues and to say that I, too, am more than pleased that his good health has been restored, that he starts life anew with renewed vigor and strength to cope with all of the controversial problems facing this House. It is our fervent hope and sincere wish and desire that he will continue to enjoy the best of health now and for unlimited years in the future. Best of luck, Gordon.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in concluding I also wish to extend a hearty welcome back to our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES]. He has recovered from a difficult operation and we are happy to see him resume his work. Mr. JAMES is an invaluable Member of Congress, a man of integrity and good commonsense.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FIRST LADY OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has established many precedents during her 30 years of outstanding service in this House.

The rollcall of her achievements is long and distinguished.

We who represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are particularly proud of her because she is a pioneer in every sense of the word, with the conscience, the integrity, the independent judgment, and the brave vision of the first settlers who stepped ashore at Plymouth Rock; the patriots of Concord and Lexington; the Yankee merchants and sea captains; and the immigrants from every country in the world who have brought variety and vitality to the great State of Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS is the undisputed champion of every man and woman who ever served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

She is not only my colleague, but my neighbor.

Our districts adjoin, and the problems of our constituents are similar.

With unfailing courtesy and consideration, Mrs. ROGERS assumes responsibility beyond the official scope of duty.

To all of the 365,000 members of her "family" she is accessible, understanding, and beloved.

On the national scene she has exerted an influence for good that merits an accolade from every living American. Generations to come will have occasion to remember her, and be grateful to her.

When the day comes that a woman is elected as President of these United States, she will owe much to the example of Mrs. ROGERS, who has proved that a woman is every bit as able to bear the burdens of public office as any man.

And I hope that this future President will acknowledge her indebtedness to Mrs. ROGERS in her inaugural address.

We pause, at this 30th milestone, to compliment Mrs. ROGERS for the distinguished service she has given to the people of her district, and to the Nation; paying tribute to the first lady of the United States House of Representatives, and to pray that we may have the benefit of her experience, her advice, and her helpfulness for many, many years to come.

AMENDING TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 255) providing for the consideration of H. R. 3822, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 255 will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date.

House Resolution 255 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill as reported from the Committee on Agriculture are simple. H. R. 3822 would simply extend the Mexican Labor Act for 3½ years, that is, until June 30, 1959. The bill would also amend section 502 of the present law and would relieve employers of double liability for the cost of returning a worker to Mexico if after the employer has paid once for the transportation of the worker back to Mexico, the Mexican employee fails to actually return to Mexico. The bill would also amend the present law to make it mandatory for the Secretary to obtain information on the availability of domestic workers and the wage rates paid to them by agricultural employers and farmworkers employed in the area where a shortage of domestic workers is reported to exist. The Secretary would then see to it that notices are displayed in public places giving the number of workers to be imported and other information on this subject.

Extension of the Mexican Labor Act has been recommended by the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Immigration and Naturalization Services of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule will be adopted, for in the agricultural areas of certain sections of our country the importation of these temporary farm laborers is necessary if crops are to be harvested and gathered. The rule is an open one and therefore the bill would be open to amendment from the floor. In view of this, I can see no reason why there should be any objection to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone understands the merits of this bill. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOLS ON MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for the consideration of H. R. 3253, a bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3253) to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of House Resolution 281, will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 3253, to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations.

House Resolution 281 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill. For purposes of amendment it would be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. One motion to recommit with or without instructions will be in order.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3253 proposes to amend the present law regarding the operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations to provide that before the Commissioner of Education of the United States can decide that local facilities are suitable for the free public education of children who reside on a military installation, he must have the concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned. As the report on this bill indicates, this bill would not convey any new authority to anyone in connection with the establishment of schools on military installations. It is hoped that this bill would simply put in the statute the idea of the Congress regarding the care which should be exercised in closing existing school facilities on these bases. The bill is particularly aimed at the situation which exists at Quantico Marine Corps Base where an attempt has been made to close the existing post high school at Quantico Base.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that the Committee on Rules reported out is an open one and therefore amendments will be in order from the floor. I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 281 and that consideration will be given to H. R. 3253.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3210, with Mr. Preston in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski] is recognized for 30 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien], the sponsor of H. R. 3210.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of my bill, H. R. 3210. This is one of several similar bills for the purpose of enabling the State of Illinois and the sanitary district of Chicago, under the direction of the Corps of Engineers, to conduct a 3-year test on the effect of water diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway.

This bill provides for diversion during this period at a total annual average rate of not more than 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, which is a 1,000 cubic feet per second increase over the presently authorized average annual rate. The study by the Army engineers will provide sufficient information upon which to ascertain whether or not such increase should be made permanent or whether the amount of diversion should be decreased, or what the exact amount should be.

When the Chicago Drainage Canal was first opened in 1900, the process of treatment of sewage was by dilution—by taking something like 10,000 cubic feet per second out of Lake Michigan and by dilution washing it downstate. This situation gave offence to downstate people as the city grew by leaps and bounds and the industrial wastes became larger than contemplated by the engineers when the dilution process was first considered.

The situation today is entirely different—treatment plants have been substantially completed so that raw sewage is no longer being put in the canal. But the present effluent, although usually clear, lacks oxygen and has too much nitrogen, making a need for more fresh water from the lake.

The present diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, as set by the Supreme Court in 1930, was established until such time as the treatment works of the sanitary district had been completed; with a view that at that time a reassessment of the situation should be made. I maintain that this proposed study by the Army engineers is an essential part of this reassessment process.

This bill is similar to H. R. 3300 of the 83d Congress, which was passed by both Houses of Congress but vetoed by the President.

The President in vetoing the bill did so on four counts. They were: First, existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois waterway and the Mississippi River. That is probably true. Commerce has increased from 200,000 tons to 16 million tons within some 20 years. However, while it may be true that there is a sufficient quantity of water to maintain commerce, there is one aspect of the current situation which is bad.

Present sanitary drainage through the river has so changed the quality of the water that the corrosive effect on the ships hulls and shipping facilities is a costly one.

Items 2, 3, and 4 of the President's veto message were that, second, all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion; third, the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada; and, fourth, the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

The items mentioned above are, in my opinion, important in the final consideration. However, the provisions of this bill must first be carried out in order to throw light on the effects on interests of Canada and other States bordering the Great Lakes.

According to the estimates of the Corps of Engineers, the increased diversion will effect the lake levels less than 1 inch in the 3-year-test period; a negligible amount when one considers the fluctuation of several feet occurring periodically in the Great Lakes. Furthermore, there have been incorporated in this bill what I regard as sufficient safeguards to meet any reasonable criticism.

It would limit maximum diversion at any one time to 5,000 cubic feet per second; the Secretary of the Army is directed not to allow any diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers; and the Secretary is given at all times direct control and supervision of the amounts of water to be diverted directly from Lake Michigan. The limitation on maximum diversion should alleviate the fear of down-stream interests. The two items relating to the Secretary of the Army are merely what could be expected under good practice and as is customary—and is to be expected from the Corps of Engineers anyway. This assures complete and undivided authority and responsibility, and places the engineers in the position of treating the problem of diversion in the public interest.

Section 2 of the act directs that the Secretary institute immediately a study of the effects on the lake and the waterway of the increased diversion. These provisions would make is possible for the Corps of Engineers to immediately stop any diversion which might be causing damage to the interests of anyone at all. It insures continuous study by the Army and calls for a final report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1959, of the results of the study together with such recommendations as are called for.

In summary, by this proposed legislation, there is provided a definite period for conducting a test for curative action, together with sufficient safeguards as to prevent damage to anyone's interests, and a final evaluation of the effects of the action. This, I maintain is a most reasonable proposal to obtain the facts and evaluations sorely needed in the public interest.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this subject has been before the House on a previous occasion. The purpose of the bill has been well explained. There is very little I can add to what has been said. I am in favor of the legislation.

The bill provides for a test to be made under the direction of the Army engineers to see whether or not there would be any damaging result from the taking of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water additional to the amount now diverted through the Chicago Drainage Canal. This is a very busy waterway. Some 20 or 25 years ago the total amount of tonnage on the waterway was about 200,000 tons. Five years ago that reached the great amount of 16 million tons annually, a considerable amount.

This is temporary legislation. It asks that the tests be made under the Army engineers, in whom we all have faith and confidence. Not over 2 years ago the Great Lakes area suffered high water resulting in a considerable amount of damage. I think many of you will remember that the engineers were asked to make an investigation to determine the amount of damage caused by high water of the Great Lakes and they reported a figure of $61 million, a tremendous loss. The water has been reasonably high ever since that time and it is reasonably high now. I do not think this will do any damage whatever to the levels of the Great Lakes. If I thought it did, I would not favor the legislation because involved in this is more than the domestic question as to how it affects us within the United States. Canada may have something to say about it.

In addition to what we are attempting to do by this legislation, I might say that there is also the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that is investigating this matter from the standpoint of pollution and sanitary problems. That agency of the Government is bearing one-half of the expense, the total amount being $280,000. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the Government is to assume one-half of the cost, or $140,000.

That is about all there is to this question. In my opinion, the bill should pass, the test should be made and we should determine once and for all whether this additional diversion of water of 1,000 cubic feet per second will have any effect on the level of the Great Lakes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. This bill is considerably modified from the one last year and merely provides that we are to make a test to determine whether or not there will be any damage such as apparently the President stated last year when he vetoed that bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is substantially correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no harm could come to anybody in the Great Lakes region as a result of this kind of a test?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think so. If it can be shown that the diversion of the additional 1,000 cubic feet would lower the Great Lakes and adversely affect commerce that would be reported. Certainly I would not be in favor of the legislation under those conditions.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. A study made by the Army engineers in 1952 showed that Canada was diverting from the Hudson Bay watershed sufficient water to raise the Great Lakes level by 4 or 5 inches. The amount of water that might be taken as a result of this investigation will certainly not compensate for the amount that Canada itself is taking.

Mr. DONDERO. Canada, as is known, has diverted the course of a river that used to flow into Hudson Bay. It now flows into Lake Superior. But Canada reserved the right to take out exactly the same amount of water she was pouring into the Great Lakes down in the Ontario region for power purposes.

Mr. YATES. The amount of water that has come into Superior would more than offset the amount that would be taken out as a result of this investigation?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is substantially true.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman state whether or not this study will include the cause of erosion of the lakes, in Lake Erie, particularly, and as to how that situation may be corrected in order to save millions of dollars of damage that we have in Ohio on the lakes?

Mr. DONDERO. It might. If this test will reveal the fact they can take water out of the Great Lakes when that water is abnormally high and prevent damage, I think the legislation is worth while and should be adopted.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman feel the Army engineers should include that in the study under this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is wide enough so that it would include that particular matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. My understanding is that the Supreme Court has fixed the amount of water that can be diverted by Chicago. Does this have anything to do with that decision?

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentlewoman refers to the Supreme Court decision of 1930. This water would be in addition to what that decree permitted.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. How can the Congress then do it if it interferes with the judgment of the Supreme Court in 1930?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know that they had as high water at that time as they have now. We are suffering damages now; at least on the shore of the Great Lakes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The high peak of water came in 1952, and it is steadily going down and it is going to continue to go down in a regular cycle. We in Ohio are extremely troubled at the thought of losing more water, because if we lower the level of Lake Michigan, inevitably it will lower the level of all the Great Lakes. It would not only reduce the shipping on the lakes but this reduction would affect basic industry.

Mr DONDERO. The gentlewoman understands that this is not permanent legislation. It is only a 3-year test.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I ask the gentleman how this study ties in with the study of the Great Lakes water levels that was authorized in 1952. At that time the Congress made available, I believe, $300,000 as the first increment on a $1 million survey of this whole problem of Great Lakes water levels. In the following year I believe another $300,000 increment to that study was made available. It is my belief that in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1956 there is an additional amount of approximately $300,000 made available for this survey. It was the recommendation of the Army engineers that if that $1 million was made available, within a period of 3 or 4 years a comprehensive report with recommendations could be made to the Congress indicating what should be done with reference to the lake level problem. Can the gentleman tell me how that survey, which is a comprehensive one, ties in with what you have in mind in this legislation?

Mr. DONDERO. I think this is in addition to the question of lake levels. The tests to be made under this bill would become a part of that particular survey to which you have referred. I do not think it is antagonistic to it whatever.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, the problem of lake diversion in Chicago has been a bone of contention for more than 25 years.

Much controversy has developed; charges and countercharges have been made by the State of Illinois and neighboring States. H. R. 3210, that is before us, will authorize experiments and studies and bring to light the need of increasing an extra thousand cubic feet of water a second into the Chicago River. Further, it will allow a 3-year study by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, to determine the effects of diversion on navigation, commerce, and the lake levels. This bill would permit a thorough study of the problems and facts, and allow a sensible approach to a reasonable solution.

I urge the House to pass this most needed legislation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. According to the title of the bill, it says that this is to be a joint study of the State of Illinois and the Federal Government. As I read the report, it says that this study will cost the United States $280,000. Can the gentleman tell me how much the State of Illinois is contributing to this survey?

Mr. BOYLE. I do not know offhand how much the State of Illinois contemplates spending on this legislation, but I know that the sanitary district, in connection with this whole waterway problem, has spent in excess of $85 million, and on its previous record it would seem to me it would be very happy to share its proportionate expense.

Mr. FORD. I think it might be helpful for the record if there was someplace a statement as to the amount that the State of Illinois contemplates spending in this joint effort.

Mr. BOYLE. I really do not know, and I do not know, as a matter of fact, if the Army engineers' exhaustive studies are going to cost $280,000. But I think $280,000 is an inconsequential amount when you consider that this project has to do with the welfare of some 9 or 11 million people. So that if you view it from that overall basis, this is an economical thing.

I want to say, preliminary to my formal statement, that this specific piece of proposed legislation comes before the House today as a bipartisan measure. Our leader of the Illinois delegation was prevailed upon to accept the burden of going forward with this proposed legislation, and his name appears on the bill. That probably was brought about in no small measure by the adroitness of that fine Congresswoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. She felt that since a number of people had gone ahead and introduced similar bills touching on this much-needed legislation, we would all be proud if the dean of the Illinois delegation would sponsor this bill. I am very happy that he did and the Illinois delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, are likewise pleased. I know the 11 million people who will be helped by this measure join me today on the floor of the House in tendering our gratitude for his doing one of the unusual things so far as he is concerned. Usually he stands in the background and lets other people take the limelight and get the attention and the accolades. Now to have him do as he did makes for a very happy situation as well as an expedient one.

With seven-tenths of the world's surface covered by water, it is strange that there should be so much controversy over this matter. This looks to me like merely taking the cup of water out of the ocean, because I am of the opinion that this study is going to demonstrate the fact that the proposed diversion will diminish the lake level—and incidentally as of last month it was 581.4 feet—by very little. The way to attack this problem is to get an authoritative study made so that we do not have to rely on speculation, or guess, or surmise, or so many trite arguments as to what diversion will or will not do. The Corps of Engineers of the Army will be able to demonstrate with certainty just what effect this added 1,000 feet per second will have on the lake level. There have been many changes of conditions since 1933, when the Secretary of the Army made a report to Congress. Testimony of representatives of the Corps of Engineers of the Army indicate a study such as this over a 3-year period should be made.

Experts have further testified that such diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet per second would not lower the lake even 1 inch. Again let me say, in view of the fact that for May 1955 the average depth for Lake Michigan was 581.40 feet, it is very difficult to understand how a possible lowering of the lake of less than 1 inch could in any way be deemed detrimental to navigation on the lake. If any city on the lake would be concerned with hurting navigation on the lake it would be Chicago, and all of the Representatives from Chicago are so strongly convinced that this experiment would in no way hinder navigation that they are all strongly for this bill.

The depth of Lake Michigan varies from time to time. The highest 1-month average for Lake Michigan occurred in June 1886 when it was 583.68 feet. The lowest 1-month average was in February 1926 when the depth was 577.35 feet. In August 1952 the depth was 582.69 feet. In July 1953 the average for the month was 581.58 feet. And as has been mentioned before, the average in May 1955 was 581.40 feet in depth for the lake.

In 1952 and 1953, when the lake was at an uncomfortable high, there was much damage to properties around the lake and possibly this study by the Secretary of the Army would aid in determining how such damage could be avoided in the future.

There have been various precautionary measures instituted into this bill which answer the objections which have previously been raised by Canada to similar projects. This bill imposes certain limitations with respect to the maximum amount of diversion that could be effected at any one time. The bill expressly specifies that the maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second, and provides that the Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision over the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan. Further, it provides that the Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

One of the main problems to be studied by the Secretary of the Army in this experiment is the disposition of pollution in the upper reaches of the waterway. Since 1930, $300 million has been expended toward sewage treatment and substantially all—99 percent by volume—of the sewage has been receiving complete treatment since April 1950. However, even with complete treatment there still appears to be serious pollution in the upper reaches of the waterway. It has been indicated by competent sanitary engineers that an increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second above the present 1,500 cubic feet per second would remedy the conditions complained of in the Illinois Waterway from Chicago to the Mississippi River.

In *Wisconsin et al.* v. *Illinois* (281 U. S. 179), Justice Holmes held that, with respect to the withdrawal of 10,000 cubic feet per second, there was in effect a lowering of international waters, that it was a matter of interstate and international concern. Justice Holmes held that diversion from Lake Michigan was in effect a diversion from international waters. But under the maximum of de minimis non curat lex he held a 1,500-foot diversion was not sufficiently material to justify an injunction, but that they could not take 10,000 feet without making it a matter for action by the Court. Mr. A. O. Stanley, Chairman of the International Joint Commission, has stated that in view of Justice Holmes' decision he did not feel that the withdrawal of an additional 1,000 feet would be material. In fact Mr. Stanley went on to say that he personally felt that under present conditions, when they were troubled by the unusually high waters in Lake Ontario—this was in testimony on July 15, 1953—the diversion of a larger amount of water at Chicago would be beneficial to the lake conditions. Antidiversionists maintain that Congress is without authority to grant increased diversion since the Supreme Court has spoken and limited the diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second. This is far from the fact since Mr. Justice Hughes, acting as a special master in chancer in the diversion case, stated:

> Provision should be made for further study when the sewage treatment (at Chicago) is completed.

And Mr. Justice Holmes, who, as indicated previously, wrote the opinion in *Wisconsin et al.* v. *Illinois* ((1930), 281 U. S. 179, 197–199), declared:

> These requirements as between the parties are the constitutional right of those States, subject to whatever modification they hereafter may be subjected to by the Congress acting within its authority. It will be time enough to consider the scope of that authority when it is exercised.
>
> All action of the parties and the Court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers, and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court.

Clearly, the Supreme Court was rendering its decision in a specific case and not precluding the Congress from further action based upon subsequent developments.

I join with the Congressman of Cook County in urging passage of the O'Brien bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending piece of legislation which would permit the diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. I feel that this is entirely a local problem and I sincerely believe that if this bill is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, it will mean extensive and expensive litigation. Many eminent lawyers are of the opinion that Congress has not the authority or the jurisdiction to regulate the diversion of water from any of the Great Lakes. The attorney general of the State of Wisconsin particularly is very firm in his belief that the Supreme Court is the forum in which it should be decided. To me that seems very reasonable indeed, because when you divert water from Lake Michigan at Chicago, no matter how much that diversion may be, you lower the lake level on every one of the Great Lakes with the exception of Lake Superior. Certainly the people who live in the cities on the lakes will be affected adversely by a lowering of the lake level in their respective lakes. So to me it seems reasonable that this is a question for the Supreme Court to decide.

The Supreme Court as of April 21, 1930 did reduce the number of cubic feet that could be diverted at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second.

In regard to the veto of the President on legislation similar to this, as stated by our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], President Eisenhower as of September 3, 1954, vetoed the bill H. R. 3300, a similar bill, which provided for 1,000 cubic feet per second additional water to be diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago. His reasons were as follows, and I quote from a copy of the veto message of September 3, 1954:

> I am unable to approve the bill because, first, existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River; second, the methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion; third, the diversions are authorized without reference to the negotiations with Canada; and fourth, the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

Further in that message he goes on in detail to enlarge upon his objections to H. R. 3300, which is a measure similar to this one. In the bill before us today, not one single objection of the President has been met. I cannot for the life of me see how the President in good conscience can possibly sign this piece of legislation even though it were approved by both Houses of the Congress.

I am including herewith President Eisenhower's veto message of September 3, 1954.

LOWRY AIR FORCE BASE, DENVER—MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3300, "To authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway."

The bill would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. This diversion would be 1,000 cubic feet per second more than is presently permitted under a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States dated April 21, 1930. The bill also would direct the Secretary of the Army to study the effect in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion, and to report to the Congress as to the results of the study on or before January 31, 1957, with his recommendations as to continuance of the increased diversion authorized.

The bill specifies that the diversion would be authorized in order to regulate and promote commerce, to protect, improve, and promote navigation in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, to help control the lake level, to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway. No mention is made of possible improvement of sanitary conditions or increase in hydroelectric power generation on the waterway.

I am unable to approve the bill because (1) existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River, (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected. I wish to comment briefly on each of these points.

I understand that waterborne traffic on the Illinois Waterway has grown in the last

20 years from 200,000 tons to 16 million tons annually. The Corps of Engineers advises, however, that the existing diversions of water are adequate for navigation purposes in the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River. Surveys are now underway by the International Joint Commission and the Corps of Engineers to determine the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing the recurrence of damage along their shores. Reasonable opportunity to complete these surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.

The diversion of waters into and out of the Great Lakes has historically been the subject of negotiations with Canada. To proceed unilaterally in the manner proposed in H. R. 3300 is not wise policy. It would be the kind of action to which we would object if taken by one of our neighbors. The Canadian Government protested the proposed authorization when it was under consideration by the Congress, and has continued its objection to this bill in a note to the Department of State dated August 24, 1954. It seems to me that the additional diversion is not of such national importance as to justify action without regard to the views of Canada.

Finally, as is clear from the report of the Senate committee, a major purpose of the proposal to divert additional water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway is to determine whether the increased flow will improve existing adverse sanitation conditions. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character. It would seem to me that a diversion for the purposes of one State alone should be authorized only after general agreement has been reached among all the affected States. Officials of several States adjoining the Great Lakes, other than Illinois, have protested approval of the bill as being contrary to their interests and not in accord with the diversion authorized under the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Under all of these circumstances, I have felt that the bill should not be approved.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954*.

You may speak about an inch not meaning much in the lowering of the lake level. It may not mean much when the lake level is up, but there is a cycle involved; there are times when the water is up and likewise there are certain times when the water is down. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that there would be a lowering of 1 inch in the lake level if 1,000 cubic feet per second were diverted at Chicago. What does that mean? Responsible people testified that a lowering of 1 inch in the lake level at a low-level time would adversely affect lake shipping to the extent of 1,800,000 tons annually. Now that means an awful lot. Do you know that during World War I and World War II and during the Korean conflict, fortunately, we had high levels on the lakes.

Certainly we were very fortunate that the levels were high during these critical times.

This question of lowering lake levels by permitting diversion is fundamental. It not only can have an adverse effect upon our economy but it can also greatly impair our national-defense effort. Even during the comparatively high lake level period we are now in, there are numerous ships plying the Great Lakes that are restricted in the amount of tonnage they can carry. When the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, more vessels will have access to the Great Lakes and to Great Lakes ports, which will increase the tonnage adversely affected at the present time. I hope that H. R. 3210 is defeated.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, old bogies never die—old fears keep cropping up to haunt the scene even though facts may change and conditions no longer warrant the continued existence of the fears. This is so evident in this debate in the manner in which the gentlemen from Wisconsin and Michigan view this bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] who just preceded me has talked in terms of diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second. That is no longer the fact. That died almost 25 years ago. He was thinking of the condition which existed prior to the Supreme Court decision in 1930. Up to that time the Sanitary District of Chicago did divert 10,000 cubic feet of water per minute and turned the raw sewage back into the Illinois Waterway for eventual elimination through the Illinois River. But that is no longer the case. Pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court, the Sanitary District of Chicago reduced the amount of water that it diverted from Lake Michigan all the way down to 1,500 cubic feet per second. But in the decision of the Supreme Court which was rendered in 1930, and Chief Justice Hughes was the master in that case, the Supreme Court stated in the absence of action by the Congress, it would have to act. It looked to further action by the Congress in such a situation. It told the Sanitary District of Chicago to complete its sewage disposal facilities and that at that time it would be proper for the Sanitary District of Chicago to ask the Army engineers to inaugurate and to undertake a test such as is proposed in the present bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Does the gentleman say that this test will be for a period of 3 years?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The cycle of high water and low water is from 7 to 14 years; is it not?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. How in the world are you going to get any accurate information through this test? It does not seem to make sense to have a 3-year test when the cycle is from 7 to 14 years.

Mr. YATES. I do not see that that follows at all. It seems to me that the testimony that has been taken shows conclusively that over a 3-year period the level of the lake will not be reduced more than 1 inch. I should like to point out further that according to the survey taken by the Army engineers in 1952, Canada, through the diversion of the river to which my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, alluded, is diverting sufficient water into Lake Superior to more than raise the level of the lake by 3 or 4 inches. So when the gentlewoman from Ohio worries about the level of the lake falling to an unreasonable degree, that cannot occur as a result of the action of the sanitary district.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I question the accuracy of such a test when it is on the downswing and the cycle of high water and low water is from 7 to 14 years.

Mr. YATES. The amount of water that will be diverted will not be influenced by that cycle.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. YATES. All that will be diverted will be 2,500 cubic feet per second, that is the maximum.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. That is an enormous increase, if I may say so.

Mr. YATES. What is?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The increase that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. YATES. An increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman said 25,000 cubic feet?

Mr. YATES. I said 2,500. It is now 1,500. An increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second will raise it to 2,500.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. It is a very heavy percentage of increase.

Mr. YATES. I doubt it. At any rate, it has no significance in view of the testimony of the Army engineers to the effect that the level of the lake will not be lowered by more than 1 inch. It may or may not happen—we do not know. But it certainly is desirable for the residents of our State as well as for the residents of the gentlewoman's State to know what will happen as a result of the diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second more. It is certainly vital to the health of the people of my community that this test be undertaken. I certainly think the gentlewoman should have no fears.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Has that testimony been printed?

Mr. YATES. I do not know whether it has or not—I am not a member of the committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Has the testimony been printed and made available to the Members of the House?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. One point bothers me. Suppose this bill is approved, the President signs it, and the sanitary district gets additional diversion of a thousand cubic feet per second. The sanitary district then builds certain sewerage and pollution works——

Mr. YATES. It has already done that. That is completed.

Mr. FORD. In other words, they use these additional cubic feet per second, and then at the end of the study the Army engineers, through the Secretary of the Army, say that they did not think it was wise, considering all aspects of the problem. Would the sanitary district then be willing to relinquish what they have had for the last 3-year period?

Mr. YATES. I cannot speak for the district, but answering for myself, my own opinion would be that I would not be willing to accept as final the decision of the engineers, because I think it is the function of the Congress to determine whether there should or should not be any increased diversion. The study of the Army engineers should be placed before the Congress for its consideration, and give to those of us who favor additional water an opportunity to urge our viewpoint before the Congress, and give those who may oppose it the right to oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3210, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

As has been stated, as far as Cook County goes, this is truly a nonpartisan bill. We are all for this because we think it is in the best interests of the general welfare of the country.

One of the questions raised before us was why the Congress is concerning itself with this problem. The Supreme Court decision, in 1930, specifically stated that the city of Chicago or the sanitary district should return to Congress after they have completed the construction of sewerage facilities, and they have done that. Under the Supreme Court decision, it is the opinion of the legal authorities in Illinois that the Congress must pass on this matter at the present time.

I am also concerned with the argument made in many instances that this will hurt the shipping interests. All I would say about that is that we, as Representatives, have to make up our own minds whether we want to protect certain shipping interests or whether we want to protect the interests of all of the taxpayers of all Great Lakes areas whose property is being washed away, and who in one year suffered a loss of $61 million, according to estimates of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I am happy to say that at this time I can support the bill which has been voted out of the Committee on Public Works, since it has a limitation of 5,000 cubic feet of flowage at any one time. This would prevent any dry spots in my district. However, I am still worried in behalf of my constituents about the sewage that is dumped into the canal and thence into the Illinois River from Chicago. What assurance does the gentleman have that no additional sewage from Chicago will be diverted into the Illinois River?

Mr. SHEEHAN. There will be no raw or untreated sewage whatsoever under this plan. Chicago has the most complete sewerage treatment facilities of any municipality in the world. All this will do is to put in additional water going down the river, which will help purify the Illinois River and will give the people downstate a much better and healthier stream.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman tell the House the effect this proposal would have on our agreements with our neighboring country, Canada. We have a treaty with that country as to the amount of water that may be diverted from the Great Lakes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. When the original treaty with Canada was signed, the gentleman will find from reading the reports that it was agreed that Chicago was to divert 10,000 cubic feet per second. The Supreme Court of the United States cut that down to 1,000. So under the original treaty provisions we feel, and the attorneys feel, that we could divert up to 10,000 cubic feet per second without any conflict with the present treaty with Canada.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that one reason why President Eisenhower vetoed the legislation last year was because it violated the agreement our country has with Canada. Can the gentleman tell the House whether the executive department has receded from the decision of last year?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I cannot say, but it is my understanding that the situation has now been clarified with the executive departments.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself not to the need for the additional flow of water, which I think is amply demonstrated by the other proponents of this bill, and is amply demonstrated by the fact that the committee recommended the enactment of the bill; but, I would like to address myself to the right of the people served by the sanitary district to this increased flow of water. A right, I might say, that is presently being denied them through the failure of this body to act.

The United States Supreme Court decision expressly limits or enjoins the Sanitary District of Chicago to a diversion of 1,500 cubic feet, pending a different determination by this body.

In other words, the decree of the United States Supreme Court conditions the right of those people served by the sanitary district to divert water from Lake Michigan for sewage purposes to action by this body.

In 1930, the population served by the sanitary district was 3,900,000. At the present time, there are 5,600,000 people served by the sanitary district, an increase in human population served by the sanitary district of some 1,700,000 people.

The effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, reduced to its simplest terms, discloses that it held that each individual, not including factories, and so forth, served by the sanitary district, was entitled to 33.2 cubic feet of water per day for sewage purposes. I have obtained this figure by the simple process of determining the cubic footage allowed per day and dividing it by the total population of the city of Chicago in 1930.

The pending bill, introduced by the beloved dean of the Illinois Democratic Congressmen, THOMAS O'BRIEN, if enacted into law, reduced to its simplest terms, would authorize each individual citizen in the city of Chicago 38.5 cubic feet of water per day. In other words, the O'Brien bill permits the individual citizen of the city of Chicago an additional 5.3 cubic feet of water per day for sewerage purposes. This represents about 37 gallons of water per day. In other words, by this bill, this Congress is being asked to give each citizen, not counting factories, an additional 37 gallons of water a day. And this 37 gallons per day is going to be taken under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and is for the purpose of a study rather than the recognition of a right.

When the various corporations and legal entities served by the sanitary district are taken into consideration, the request of this bill is disclosed to be even more modest.

In 1930, the industrial waste of factories and corporations, who are legal bodies and who under appropriate laws of this country have water rights, amounted to 2,500,000 reflected in terms of population. In 1955, reflected in terms of population, this figure is 3 million, an increase of 500,000.

Using the total of human population and industrial population, stated in terms of human population in 1930, the decision of the United States Supreme Court permitted 20.1 cubic feet of water per day for each person, considering both factory and individual. Considering the increase in human and factory population and the additional amount of water authorized by the O'Brien bill, there will be permitted approximately 25.1 cubic feet of water per person.

Gentlemen, all we are asking you to do by this legislation is to increase the water rights of the people served by the Sanitary District of Chicago about one barrel of water a day.

If the some 5,600,000 people served by the sanitary district were to walk or drive to the shores of Lake Michigan and take a barrel of water each day for their sewerage purposes, in addition to the water from Lake Michigan that they receive from the sanitary district, I doubt if either the Supreme Court of the United States or this body could prevent such action. I think this body and the Supreme Court of the United States would recognize such action to be the exercise of a fundamental and basic water right of these 5,600,000 people protected by appropriate guaranties contained in our basic laws. No treaty with another nation could prevent such action. I think this body ought to permit those people to do it via the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers in the form of a study, which is all this bill authorizes.

I have sat in our Appropriations Committee and voted in favor of legislation and appropriations which would authorize people from one area to obtain water for reclamation purposes in a distant area. Not only have I voted for legislation that would authorize and respect such water rights, but I have voted for appropriations to assist in the distribution of such water.

All we are asking for in this case is that the people living along the shores of Lake Michigan in the Chicago area be permitted to effectuate their right to an additional barrel of water per day for their sewerage purposes at no cost to the Federal Government.

I might add that in recent years the level of Lake Michigan has risen; yet we are in the anomalous situation in the city of Chicago, because of the decision of the Supreme Court, that with a rising population and with rising levels of water the individual water rights of citizens are being decreased.

Gentlemen, I urge the enactment of this legislation which would request from the Federal Government no funds, merely an additional barrel of water for each citizen each day, under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of a study of its effect upon the lake.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

PROTECTION FOR THE LAKESHORE LINE OF WESTERN MICHIGAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3210 is neither wholly good nor wholly bad.

Because Canada has dumped water which should go north into Hudson Bay down into the Lake Superior area and because we have had more than normal rainfalls in the Great Lakes area, the waters of Lake Michigan have been high, washed away much of the shoreline, especially on the southwestern side of Michigan.

Undoubtedly, there will come a time when the lake level will again recede. We have those cycles of high and low water.

This bill will permit the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw a certain amount of water from Lake Michigan during a 3-year period.

During that period a study is to be made of the effect of such diversion on the lake and on the Illinois Waterway. Then a report is to be filed not later than January 31, 1959, giving the Congress the results of such study.

Because of the beneficial results which a lowering of the lake, if that be the result of the permission so granted, will give—and may save the homes of many of our people, protect both State and Federal highways, my inclination is to support the bill.

The fact as indicated by the report that the diversion and the study will cost the United States something like $280,000 is disturbing. One hundred and ninety thousand dollars of that expenditure is to be incurred under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I cannot see the necessity for an expenditure in that amount, one reason being that the Corps of Engineers has a great deal of information now available.

There is another thought that comes and that is that the diversion of this water may cause unjustifiable harm and damage to the people whose lands border the drainage canal. That should be taken care of by the third subsection of section 1.

Another danger which some would call a calculated risk is that if the water is lowered to any great extent, harbors on the lakes will need improvement.

The conclusion as to whether the bill should be supported or opposed in its present form is not one easy of solution. My inclination is to vote for the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with those who favor the passage of H. R. 3210, a bill to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan to the channels of the Chicago Sanitary District. The amount of opposition to this measure is somewhat surprising to me in view of the fact that H. R. 3210, if passed, provides for a 3-year trial period during which a study shall be made by the Army Engineers to determine what effect, if any, additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second might have upon the lake level.

Those Members who argue that a decrease in lake level will follow this additional diversion certainly have no evidence to support this fact. It seems to me that if we should approach this question in an open-minded spirit, we should be willing to have a trial period of 3 years during which the Army Engineers may study the problems involved.

This legislation has been sanctioned by all of the Congressmen who represent Chicago, and there are 13 of us. This is a little more than half of the Congressmen from the entire State of Illinois. All of us, both Democrats and Republicans, have given study to this situation, and are of the belief that additional diversion of water will be helpful to the Chicago Sanitary District, and, at the same time there is no evidence that harm will follow to shipping in the ports on Lake Michigan.

Now, this is an old subject—the same old objections were trotted out years ago. Then too an investigation was called for. We have been patient with these investigations—and this bill does not in any way stop them. My friends in Wisconsin think that an increased flow will jeopardize their shipping from Wisconsin ports. There appears to be more supposition than fact in this statement. With all respect to my friends who made them, I am in doubt as to their authenticity. It has been estimated that this extra flow of water will have little effect on the lake level, and I think it is well to remember that this is a trial period for 3 years only. If, at the end of that time, damage is indicated a change can be easily made by the Congress.

The high-water mark in Lake Michigan comes at the end of a cycle of about 23 years. In August 1952 the lake hit a level of 582.7 feet above the mean tide in New York. The high point in August 1929 was 582.69 feet. In spite of the present flow of 1,500 cubic feet per second, at the end of the last 23-year cycle, the level was slightly higher than 23 years before. There does not seem to be dependable proof that the increase of flow to 2,500 cubic feet per second will have any material effect upon shipping or the lake level.

Objection is made by some Members to the effect that the increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the benefit of the Chicago Sanitary District would trespass upon our treaty obligation with our neighbor to the north. A review of the treaty provisions and the conference reports of the International Joint Council appear to indicate that these objections are in error. The diversion allowed to the Chicago Sanitary District of Chicago was originally 10,000 cubic feet. This was prior to the completion of its sewage-disposal facilities.

A report of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission dated April 25, 1906, and leading up to the treaty of 1909, contained the following recommendations with regard to diversions of water on both American and Canadian sides:

> American side diversion: Niagara Falls, 18,500 cubic feet per second.
>
> Chicago Drainage Canal, 10,000 cubic feet per second.
>
> Total, 28,500 cubic feet per second.
>
> Canadian side diversions: Niagara Falls and on Niagara Peninsula, 36,000 cubic feet per second.

From these reports it is evident that Chicago was given permission to draw up to 10,000 cubic feet of water per second without reference to treaty negotiations. Other reports indicate that both the American members of the Commission and the Canadian members recognize that diversions of lake water at Chicago could take place up to 10,000 cubic feet per second.

It is evident, therefore, that an increase in the diversion from 1,500 cubic feet per second at present to 2,500 cubic feet per second could hardly trespass on any agreements we have made with the Canadian Government. It is problematical as to what effect this increased diversion might have upon the level of the water in Lake Michigan. It is entirely possible the decrease in the peak levels or low levels of the lake would be very slight indeed. However, the increased diversion would have an important effect in the way of introducing more oxygen into the Illinois watershed, thus increasing the growth of fishlife and plantlife.

It should solve also to purify the river beds and be of much benefit to the lands bordering the Illinois Waterway. In times of excessive rainfall and danger of floods, it is understood that the locks at Chicago will be closed and every protection afforded to those who fear that this increased diversion in water from Lake Michigan will add to the flood hazards of those in downstream territory. Because of the safeguards surrounding the enactment of H. R. 3210 and the expected good which its passage will entail, it is believed that support of this measure is fully justified.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, from the discussion thus far I imagine that most Members of the House have the feeling that this bill does not concern their constituency one way or the other, that this is apparently a battle between the people living in the Chicago Sanitary District and the people around the Great Lakes.

I call your attention to the fact that what this bill now does is to add some expensive window dressing to this matter of water diversion. Prior to this time we always have had the straight issue of whether Chicago was to have more water, and let us be frank and understand what they want the water for. It is not for navigation, it is for sewage flushing purposes. They always try to cover up this fact. Now they decide maybe it will look better and would have more appeal if they said, "No, we are only going to ask for this additional water for the purpose of studying something." That, Mr. Chairman, is the aspect that I think should concern every Member of the House, because this is an authorization bill. This involves an expenditure of $280,000. So let us not get the idea this is just a matter of diverting some water down the Chicago River and that somebody living in Florida or Texas or California or wherever it might be has no interest in it, because now they dress up the question of diversion with a study that will cost everybody some money.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The gentleman knows that the $280,000 is only to pay the salary of the Corps of Engineers, that nothing goes into construction?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not questioning where the money goes, but it is an expenditures of $280,000 that we would not have to spend if we did not pass the bill.

So this bill does affect everybody and it affects everybody vitally. There may be some who say that $280,000 does not amount to anything, but in my book that still is a sizable amount.

The peculiar part of this matter is found in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] when he said:

> We want this study, we want to find out what is going to happen because we want to do what is right.

Then again he said:

> We do not want to be bound by any such study. We still are going to be in here asking for increased diversion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Certainly it is the right of the Illinois delegation to ask the Congress to take action on the basis of what the Army engineers' study reveals?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The point is you are not so interested in the study as you are interested in diversion, and I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. YATES. We are interested in the diversion, but we also think in order to make our case and in order for the people of the surrounding area to find out whether it should be made, the Corps of Engineers is the logical agency to do it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, let us take that point. Now, is this diversion actually necessary to make the study?

Mr. YATES. Of course it is.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is willing to contend here that we should rely on the expert advice of the Corps of Engineers without any study, that it would only lower the lake level 1 inch. All the other testimony of the Corps of Engineers as to what happens or would happen under diversion they are willing to stand by. So, if that is the case, why do they need the diversion in order to make a study.

No, Mr. Chairman, the matter of the study is simply some expensive window dressing put in this bill to aid in their fight to get more water out of Lake Michigan.

Frankly, this bill really should not be before us at this time. There are no committee hearings here available for any Member of this House to read. They held hearings, but there are no copies of hearings available for the Members of this House. There are no departmental reports. Look at the committee report filed in connection with this bill. Is there a report from the Corps of Engineers? No. Is there a report from the State Department, which has a concern in this matter because of our treaties and relationship with Canada? No report from that or any other department.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was especially happy to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], who had opposed legislation in this field in the past, state that he was voting for the bill now before us. The reason that the gentleman from Illinois has changed his position is because the present bill is different from the bill that passed in the 83d Congress. It has provisions that take care of the fears that some of the people in down-State Illinois had in the past. Later in my remarks I shall point out in some detail the differences between the O'Brien bill and the measure that was passed by the 83d Congress.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said that the President had mentioned in his veto message that the 1954 bill constituted a violation of the treaty with Canada. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that there is no mention in the President's veto message of the treaty with Canada. As a matter of fact, when that treaty was entered into, Chicago was drawing 10,000 cubic feet of water, and it was only because of the decision of the Supreme Court that the diversion was lessened.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the President in vetoing H. R. 3300 said his third reason was the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It was another distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. ZABLOCKI], who made the statement to which I referred. The President did mention the matter of proceeding without consulting Canada. I can assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that since that time Canada has been consulted and that it is my definite understanding that no objection of any sort will come from Canada to this legislation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Is the gentleman implying that Canada agreed to the diversion?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am saying definitely that there have been conversations, something in the nature of informal negotiations, although not on an official level, and the impression has been given—and it is a strong impression—that Canada has no objection to the proposed diversion. It certainly must appeal convincing to the distinguished and able gentleman from Wisconsin that although the O'Brien bill has been pending for months our State Department up to the present hour, has presented no complaint or objection of any sort from the Government of Canada. If the O'Brien bill, which as I have pointed out is different from the bill that was vetoed, was objectionable either to Canada or our own State Department, I am sure the State Department would have made the fact known to the committee.

PROVISIONS OF O'BRIEN BILL

H. R. 3210 first authorizes the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years from enactment of this legislation. Second, provides that the Secretary of the Army shall study the effects of the increased diversion so authorized, and shall report, with recommendations, to the Congress the results of such study on or before July 31, 1959.

DIFFERENCES FROM 1954 BILL

This bill differs from those introduced in the 82d and passed by the 83d Congress in several respects:

First. It imposes certain limitations with respect to the maximum amount of diversion that could be effected at any one time. It expressly specifies that the maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any one time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second.

Second. It provides that the Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan.

Third. It provides that the Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers. These latter provisions are designed to meet the objections of residents and property owners of the downriver area.

The 3-year study period would constitute a test period during which the Corps of Engineers and the Public Health Service shall observe and evaluate the effects of increased diversion. The results of this period of study with recommendations of the Corps of Engineers as to the effects of this experimental diversion as well as the desirability of an increase or decrease shall be reported to Congress on or before January 31, 1959.

DECISIONS OF THE COURTS

The diversion of water at Chicago from Lake Michigan has been the subject of considerable controversy. In the judgment of antidiversionists the question was settled so far as the States of the United States were concerned by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367 and 281 U. S. 179). Based upon the decision, antidiversionists maintain that Congress is without authority to grant increased diversion because the Supreme Court limited diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second. However, Mr. Justice Hughes, acting as a special master in chancery in the diversion case, stated:

> Provision should be made for further study when the sewage treatment plant (at Chicago) is completed.

Moreover, in Wisconsin against Illinois Mr. Justice Holmes said:

> All action of the parties and the court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers, and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court.

Chicago, in accordance with this recommendation of Mr. Justice Hughes, has built the sewage disposal plant, the largest and most efficient in the world, servicing Chicago and 74 suburbs. It remains for Congress "in pursuance of its constitutional powers" recognized in the decision of the Supreme Court to order that "further study" recommended by Mr. Justice Hughes and following that further study to make any modification which necessity may dictate.

In other words, the Supreme Court decision, far from limiting Chicago for all time to a diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second and circumscribing the power of Congress in this case, recognized the right of Congress to modify and the necessity for modification of this order subject to the further study which this bill provides.

H. R. 3210, therefore, if enacted, will be strictly within the constitutional powers of Congress as recognized in Wisconsin against Illinois, the authority cited by antidiversionists.

The estimated cost to the United States is $280,000 to cover the costs of study and review. Of this amount $190,000 would be incurred by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NO VIOLATION OF TREATY

Into the controversy between diversionists and antidiversionists has been injected the question: "If Chicago increases diversion of water from Lake Michigan will it violate our treaty with Canada?" The treaty pertinent to diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago was signed January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain. The Supreme Court in its decision *Sanitary District* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 405, 426 (1925)) stated:

> The treaty of January 11, 1909, with Great Britain expressly provides against uses "effecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters" without the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein.

It is doubtful that Lake Michigan is a boundary water between the United States and Canada within the terms of the preliminary article of this treaty, which reads:

> For the purpose of this treaty boundary waters are defined as the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes and rivers and connecting waterways, or the portions thereof, along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways or waters of rivers flowing across the boundary.

LAKE MICHIGAN NOT BOUNDARY

(a) No part of the international boundary passes through Lake Michigan.

(b) Paragraph 2, article I of this treaty at least implies that the high contracting parties considered Lake Michigan not to be within the purview of the treaty.

> It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line.

On the basis of this statement it must be concluded that diversion of water from Lake Michigan is not within the ambit of the control provided by the treaty of 1909.

It is agreed in this treaty that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the vessels of both countries equally subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country "not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation"—article I. In view of the fact that testimony of representatives of the Corps of Engineers presented during hearings on similar legislation during the 83d Congress indicates that the lowering effect on the lakes of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second would be less than 1 inch on Lakes Michigan and Huron and about one-half inch on Lakes Erie and Ontario, such diversion could scarcely constitute a regulation "inconsistent with free navigation on these lakes."

NO INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

When the Boundary Waters Treaty was signed on January 11, 1909, a much larger quantity of water was being diverted out of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin through the Chicago drainage canal. It was 10,000 cubic feet per second. The treaty provided—article V—for aggregate daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second in the United States and diversion in Canada of 36,000 cubic feet per second.

Restriction of diversion at Chicago has not been the result of an international agreement but by order of the United States Supreme Court issued April 1930. This amount still controls and without further enactment from Congress no greater amount of water can be taken from Lake Michigan. Such congressional action is contemplated in H. R. 3210.

TERMS OF TREATY OF 1950

In 1950 a treaty between the United States and Canada took cognizance of the inequality of division of water provided in the treaty of 1909—20,000 cubic feet per second for the United States; 36,000 cubic feet per second for Canada. Article III permitted the Hydroelectric Power Co. of Canada to divert 5,000 cubic feet per second from the waters of the Great Lakes Basin. Article IV provided for the scenic beauty of Niagara to limit diversion for power purposes, while all water specified in Article III and not reserved for scenic purposes was to be divided equally between the United States and Canada.

When the treaty of 1909 was signed, Chicago was withdrawing 10,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan. The treaty of 1909 made no change or modification of this withdrawal. Later this was cut to 1,500 cubic feet per second, not by treaty but by Supreme Court order, an order which the Court recognized was subject to further Congressional action and modification.

The 1950 treaty was negotiated between the United States and Canada in an effort to equalize the inequality of water diversion established by the treaty of 1909. At that time Chicago had been reduced to a diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second. That diversion was not established by international agreement. However the difference between 10,000 cubic feet per second recognized by the treaty of 1909 and the 1,500 cubic feet per second in force in 1950 has been awarded by treaty as part of the Great Lakes Basin waters to Niagara for power purposes.

It obviously becomes the duty of Congress in its exercise of its constitutional power to enact legislation which shall take cognizance of the health and commercial needs, not only of the people of Chicago but of the Mississippi Valley. H. R. 3210 takes a step in the right direction by awarding a mere 1,000 additional cubic feet per second to be withdrawn for this purpose.

Summarizing: First. The treaty of 1909 recognized a diversion by Chicago of 10,000 cubic feet per second. Second. That was cut in 1930 to an ultimate 1,500 cubic feet per second by Supreme Court order. Third. Chicago's share of the waters of the Great Lakes Basin was awarded in 1950 to the Canadian Hydroelectric Power Co. and the Niagara Power Co.

AID TO HEALTH AND COMMERCE

The enactment of H. R. 3210 into law is a necessary step in recognizing the health as well as the commercial needs of Chicago and the Illinois Waterway.

That the need for a minimum of 1,000 cubic feet per second exists at Chicago has been brought out by testimony before the Committee on Public Works, and by the growth of commerce on the Illinois Waterway.

This testimony points out that $191 million has been expended by the city of Chicago toward sewage treatment since 1930 and practically all of the sewage has been receiving complete treatment since 1950. Despite modern sewage treatment plants there is still serious pollution in the upper reaches of the waterway.

The area has experienced difficulty in operating a common sanitary and storm sewer system which imposes a heavy volume load on the plants during storms, causing bypassing of the plants at such times. Studies have indicated that an increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second above the present 1,500 cubic feet per second would improve conditions complained of in the Illinois River from Chicago to the Mississippi River.

GROWTH OF RIVER TRAFFIC

House Document No. 184, 73d Congress, contains the report:

> Aside from sanitary requirements, the minimum average flow from Lake Michigan required to meet the needs of a commercially useful waterway in the Illinois River is a direct diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage by the city of Chicago. It does not appear possible to arrive at a conclusive determination whether this flow will afford suitable sanitary conditions on the waterway after the sewage purification plants at Chicago have been completed and placed in operation.

This report was submitted to Congress on December 7, 1933. Commerce on the Illinois Waterway amounted to 200,000 tons then. Since that time that commerce has grown to 4 million tons in 1954. Army engineers estimate conservatively an immediate increase to a yearly volume of 18 million tons.

If the people of Chicago and the area served by the Illinois Waterway are to participate in and profit from the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway, there must be a free flow of commerce from the Gulf of Mexico to Chicago. Without adequate water transportation through the Illinois River cheap freight rates which only barge transportation can provide are denied. Without necessary water, sanitary conditions for river boats and a waterway free from impeding growths and stagnation is impossible.

H. R. 3210 is merely an effort to correct at long last, the disregard of the health and navigation needs of the people of Chicago and Illinois.

CONCLUSION

First. Enactment of this legislation is necessary to the health and navigation needs of the people of Chicago and the Illinois Waterway.

Second. In the enactment of H. R. 3210 Congress is acting within its constitutional powers within the limits defined by the Supreme Court in Wisconsin against Illinois.

Third. By court order November 25, 1940 additional water to be drawn from Lake Michigan up to 10,000 cubic feet per second was authorized from December 2, to December 12, 1940, to remove sludge deposits in the Beardon Road pool.

Fourth. In 1950 when waters from the Great Lakes Basin were reallocated by treaty, all waters over and above the 5,000 reserved to the Hydroelectric Power Co., of Canada, and not reserved to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls, were divided equally between the United States and Canada, thus taking the question of diversion of residual water out of the hands of international agreement and placing it squarely in the hands of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes, but I would like to say that I made a rather thorough study of this bill in the 83d Congress, and I supported it on the floor of the House. I did so because I thought it was beneficial to the entire State of Illinois, with 8 million people, and particularly was it needed by the great metropolitan area of Chicago. It would give relief particularly to the sanitary district that had spent, I think, $85 million in developing the finest possible purification sewage system yet found, and they needed some more flush water for their purposes.

The bill has been changed a little, I understand, and some safeguards are written in so that it can be watched and so that the actual diversion can be cut back if, perchance, there might come a time when they felt the water level in the Great Lakes was sinking to a point lower than it should be. There are several safeguards in this bill, and I think it is perhaps a better bill than the one I supported in the 83d Congress. That is the reason I am imposing myself on the House for a minute or two, to add my endorsement to this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that this bill is of equal importance to those of us who live at the lower end of the Mississippi River. Last year this body passed similar legislation, and I trust will pass this bill today.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for their courtesy. Particularly I appreciate the gift of extra time in order that I may take an additional minute to give due praise to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], who has led this fight and shepherded this bill along its successful way. We are grateful to him.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared a rather thoughtful analysis of this bill and planned to take 5 minutes to explain the bill; to refer to the President's veto and the reasons given for it; and to show how this bill in its new form meets those objections. But so much has been said on the floor of this House today that, if I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include therein the original analysis in order that I may have the opportunity within my allotted time to make a direct answer to some of the points of attack offered against this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, once more—as in the 82d and the 83d Congresses—I join with my colleagues from the Chicago area of the State of Illinois in seeking congressional and Presidential approval of legislation providing for an increase in water diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, which, as you know, connects the two most important waterway systems in the United States, namely, the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River.

In the 82d Congress we were successful in having such a bill reported favorably by the Committee on Public Works but further action was not possible due to the adjournment of Congress.

A new bill for substantially the same purpose was introduced and passed in the 83d Congress after detailed committee hearings and deliberation by the House and the Senate. That bill was later vetoed by the President, the veto being based on the following four points:

First, existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River;

Second, all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion;

Third, the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada; and

Fourth, the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

Mr. O'BRIEN's bill, H. R. 3210—which we are considering today—is identical to bills introduced by myself and all other Members of this body from the Chicago area of the State of Illinois. It is drawn up so as to satisfy the objections referred to in the President's veto message of September 3, 1954.

You will note that this new bill of Mr. O'BRIEN's, H. R. 3210, not only authorizes the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, but it imposes certain limitations which, as stated previously, should remove the main objections to this legislation. This new bill expressly specifies the following limitations.

First. The maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second;

Second. The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and

Third. The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers. These safeguards should meet any objections to this increased diversion of water that residents and property owners of the downriver area might have had to previous legislation of this nature.

Testimony presented by the Department of the Army indicates that the increased diversion and consequent lowering of lake levels would have little if any adverse effect on lake or river interests; and would actually afford an opportunity in the 3-year test period to study the effects on navigation and on flood control. Thus it does not appear that Canada would object to the small increase in water diversion which we seek from Lake Michigan to safeguard the health of our citizens—especially since Lake Michigan is not a boundary water and since the 1950 Treaty with Canada specifically exempts the use of this water for "domestic and sanitary purposes and the service of canals for the purpose of navigation," as provided in H. R. 3210.

The need for passage of this legislation cannot be emphasized too strongly. Because of the radically changed conditions since the 1500 cubic feet limitation was set in 1933, engineering authorities—both of the Department of the Army and the Sanitary District of Chicago—feel that it is imperative that a new study should be made and that the effects of increased diversion, of not to exceed 1,000 cubic feet per second, on sanitation, commerce, and lake levels be studied over a 3-year period.

The major consideration which this bill seeks to meet is in reference to the needs for more water for sanitation purposes. At the time that the 1,500 cubic feet limitation was set in 1933, it was stated in the report as follows: "It does not appear possible to arrive at a conclusive determination whether this flow will afford suitable sanitary conditions on the waterway after the sewage purification plants at Chicago have been completed and placed in operation."

Since that report was made, the Sanitary District of Chicago is now—and has been since 1950—providing complete treatment for substantially all of its sewage; but still the Sanitary District testifies that there is serious pollution in the upper 50 to 60 miles of the Illinois Waterway and that there can be no marked improvement until more fresh water is available.

When the existing water diversion limitation of 1,500 cubic feet per second was established, commerce on the Illinois Waterway was only about 200,000 tons per year. In 1953, this commerce had increased to considerably over 20 million tons per year. Industry has expanded; and the population in the city of Chicago and the area along the Illinois Waterway has increased approximately 1 million in the past 20 years. Certainly such figures attest the fact that the present 1,500 cubic feet of water per second diversion is no longer adequate—neither for a commercially useful waterway nor for satisfactory sanitary conditions for those aboard the ships and the millions of citizens working and residing in the area.

It seems to me that every year, when this matter is brought to the floor, I hear the same fears expounded, the same arguments raised; and nothing indicates to me this year, Mr. Chairman, that those who are objecting really have taken time either to analyze the changes in the bill, which asks only for a study, or on the other hand really to assess for themselves what the failure of this bill might mean to their own districts.

First of all, I am going to meet the question of why we should have a test. For three Congresses I have sat here while we have been told that permanent legislation of this nature should not be passed until a test had been made. I would agree. It is plain commonsense to make a 3-year test before you take a step which we think necessary and which the opponents of the bill consider hazardous. Anyone with good, ordinary commonsense would approve the principle of a test.

Now I address myself to my neighbors in Wisconsin and Michigan, because we are neighbors, we are close neighbors. We have this year done away with the fears of those neighbors down on the Illinois River, because new restrictions written into the bill, and because they themselves realize with us that an impure stream flowing down from Chicago does no good to anybody who uses that river or who lives along it. We have definite testimony that there is, in the upper 50 to 60 miles of the Illinois Waterway, indisputable evidence now of actual pollution. It is on that point that I rise to speak to you good neighbors in Wisconsin, as well as my friends from Michigan.

For some years we argued additionally here on the House floor concerning the dangers of rising lake levels. We came to you with evidence of millions of dollars lost in homes, farms, and particularly fruit farms, in Michigan and in Illinois. It has never been possible for me to see how Wisconsin could have withstood similar damage, because my district goes up to the Wisconsin line, and comparable shorelands at Zion and Winthrop Harbor have been practically swept away by recent high lake levels. These places are not one-tenth of a mile away from Wisconsin with a similar shoreline. I am constrained to say that I think that the opposition from our two neighboring States is historical. I would not say it was hysterical, but certainly it is historical. I conclude that representatives of those States simply have not been able to break away from the precedent that they established of opposition to the former bills.

As to the question of harbors, I have entered almost every harbor along both sides of Lake Michigan during the last 6 years, and more often than not there has hardly been a pier or railroad tie or other post to which you could tie up a rowboat, because all such were under the high lake level. We have a long way to go before we need fear recession of the waters in our harbors. The good harbor in the northern end of my own district is not afraid of the results of this bill.

And now to the last point I would make. I said that we in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan are neighbors, close neighbors. Do you think it would be to the good health of Wisconsin or Michigan, in the future if failure to supply sufficient water for adequate disposal of our increasing sewage load in the Chicago area should cause an epidemic to break out in the city of Chicago? Do you think, if we had a large outbreak of typhoid or something even worse in Chicago, that Milwaukee would not be rising to its feet to ask why Chicago was not allowed to have water to dilute its sewage down the Illinois River? I think that it is time that we see this thing as neighbors, with realistic appreciation of what it would mean to any community around the entire lake if a city of millions of people like Chicago lost its health through pollution of its sewerage system, and thereby endangered the health of the surrounding area, which constitutes our vacation land in addition to being contiguous.

Representatives from Wisconsin and Michigan who have districts along the lakeside of Lake Michigan are supporting this bill. They supported the even stronger bill last year.

In closing, I would again point out that we are not seeking enactment of this bill as a permanent measure. Rather, this legislation is intended to provide temporary relief for the immediate need; and to allow the Corps of Engineers adequate opportunity to study the effects of such increased diversion on navigation and on flood control—besides, of course, the sanitary conditions—over a 3-year period. It would be impossible, without such a trial period, for any sound findings and recommendations to be conclusively drawn. If such a study actually brings forth evidence that the requested increase in diversion does not produce the desired results and/or on the other hand is accompanied by harmful effects, the responsible leaders and authorities from the Chicago area who have sought this action, together with the Members of Congress who have today once more urged favorable consideration of this legislation, would be the first to withdraw further requests for increased diversion.

I join with my colleagues from the Chicago area in urging prompt and favorable action on H. R. 3210 which will provide the temporary relief and the opportunity for evaluation which the situation so signally merits.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] such time as he may require.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, we in Wisconsin are concerned about the health and well-being of our neighbors to the south, in the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago. We certainly would not want to witness any typhoid epidemics raging there.

There appears to be, however, some inconsistency on the part of my distinguished colleagues from Illinois. On the one hand, I have heard claims made by them to the effect that the matter flowing through the Chicago Sanitary Canal is so well treated, and so well cleansed, that it is akin to clean water, almost fit for human consumption. On the other hand, we are told that unless the rate of diversion through the canal is increased, the matter moving through that channel will stagnate and breed epidemics.

Now the two claims are inconsistent and contradictory. It seems that in their eagerness to secure congressional approval for the legislation before us, some people have given vent to their imagination instead of sticking close to the facts.

The question of increasing the rate of water diversion through the Chicago Sanitary Canal has been considered by congressional committees, and by this body, on previous occasions. Each time, I opposed this proposal. I shall continue to abide by this position for reasons which are well known to most of us. These are valid, compelling reasons, which speak eloquently for the rejection of this legislation.

It has been pointed out, and I want to stress it again, that the well-being of 7 States, and of 2 nations, is involved in the issue of Great Lakes water levels. For this reason, all of the parties concerned should be given an opportunity to be heard. Further, no decision should be reached without the agreement of the parties concerned.

Now we have a treaty with Canada, which deals with the water levels of the Great Lakes. The legislation before us would violate this treaty. If we are going to consider any action which may affect the level of the Great Lakes—as the proposal before us certainly will—we should first come to some sensible agreement with our neighbor to the north.

Then, too, the interests of the other Great Lakes States must be considered. The State of Illinois, as far as I know, has no exclusive claim to the water of Lake Michigan. There are many communities in Wisconsin, and in other States, which have equal right to benefit from this great lake. Why should our people be penalized just because Chicago wants to speed up the flow of its sanitary canal? Why should our people have to pay for harbor dredgings, and suffer shipping losses, just so that the wishes of our neighbors to the south may be accommodated?

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is not a sound, or fair piece of legislation. It has been rushed without due notice through the committee stage, and it is being rushed through this House. Our distinguished colleagues from the State of Illinois who are behind this bill, have waited until these closing weeks of the session in the hope that this measure may receive favorable consideration in the final legislative rush which precedes the end of every session. These tactics were used before, but they ran into a great obstacle when a similar bill was vetoed during the last Congress.

I hope that we will not see a repetition of that maneuver. This legislation should be defeated in this House. I shall vote against this measure, and I hope that the majority of the Members will do likewise.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, following is the veto message of the President last year on a similar bill:

> I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3300, "To authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway."
>
> The bill would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second into the Illinois waterway for a period of 3 years. This diversion would be 1,000 cubic feet per second more than is presently permitted under a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States dated April 21, 1930. The bill also would direct the Secretary of the Army to study the effect in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois waterway by reason of the increased diversion, and to report to the Congress as to the results of the study on or before January 31, 1957, with his recommendations as to continuance of the increased diversion authorized.
>
> The bill specifies that the diversion would be authorized in order to regulate and promote commerce, to protect, improve, and promote navigation in the Illinois waterway and Mississippi Valley, to help control the lake level, to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois waterway. No mention is made of possible improvement of sanitary conditions or increase in hydroelectric power generation on the waterway.
>
> I am unable to approve the bill because (1) existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois waterway and Mississippi River, (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.
>
> I understand that waterborne traffic on the Illinois waterway has grown in the last 20 years from 200,000 tons to 16 million tons annually. The Corps of Engineers advises, however, that the existing diversions of water are adequate for navigation purposes in the Illinois waterway and the Mississippi River. Surveys are now under way by the International Joint Commission and the Corps of Engineers to determine the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing recurrence of damage along their shores. Reasonable opportunity to complete these surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.
>
> The diversion of waters into and out of the Great Lakes has historically been the subject of negotiations with Canada. To proceed unilaterally in the manner proposed in H. R. 3300 is not wise policy. It would be the kind of action to which we would object if taken by one of our neighbors. The Canadian Government protested the proposed authorization when it was under consideration by the Congress, and has continued its objection to this bill in a note to the Department of State dated August 24, 1954. It seems to me that the additional diversion is not of such national importance as to justify action without regard to the views of Canada.
>
> Finally, as is clear from the report of the Senate committee, a major purpose of the proposal to divert additional water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway is to determine whether the increased flow will improve existing adverse sanitation conditions. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character. It would seem to me that a diversion for the purposes of one State alone should be authorized only after general agreement has been reached among all the affected States. Officials of several States adjoining the Great Lakes, other than Illinois, have protested approval of the bill as being contrary to their interests and not in accord with the diversion authorized under the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Under all of these circumstances, I have felt that the bill should not be approved.
>
> DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
>
> THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954.*

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the veto message of the President last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in spite of some minor variations that have been introduced into this measure this year, the issue before us is substantially the same as it was last year. The measure upon which we are being requested to take action here today presents the same issue as was presented to the President last year when he vetoed this measure. The matter of the Joint Waterways Commission with Canada whereby we are to consult with them before we make any important decisions involving the level of the water of the Great Lakes is in exactly the same state as it was a year ago. We also mentioned last year the fact that there is now pending, and we have been appropriating for it for the last 5 years, a survey of the water levels of the Great Lakes. This is a cyclical thing over a long period of years, and we are trying to find out the facts with respect to the cyclical level of the Great Lakes, and that is the answer to the question which is raised here by the gentlewoman from Illinois. Sure, people along the lake shore complain this year and complained last year because of the high levels of the Great Lakes. But give us the other end of the cycle, and you will find people complaining about the low water levels and the shipping interests will be complaining because there is not sufficient water level to keep up normal navigation in the Great Lakes and the Great Lakes channels for which we are being asked to appropriate millions of dollars this year and for next year in order to provide a more adequate level for navigation on the Great Lakes. So, I say the issue is substantially the same. It is a little sugar coated, but the issue is only very thinly veiled, as my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, pointed out when he referred to the inconsistency of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois who said, "Give us this money so we can make this study so that we will have a leg to stand on; and when the study is completed, for Heaven's sake, if the result is wrong, do not rely on that but come back to the Congress and let Congress authorize this diversion anyway."

Mr. Chairman, this is not a sincere attempt to handle this problem, but rather this is an attempt aimed at getting at it through the back door the same as was attempted last year. The issue is the same as it was when the President vetoed this measure last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] such time as he may require.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the people of Milwaukee and the people of many other communities bordering Lake Michigan are opposed to the further diversion of water.

This issue has been dangling for many years and has become laden with the emotions of city officials earnestly seeking to protect the safety of their inhabitants.

It is argued that the bill will result in lowering the levels of all the Great Lakes by only 1 inch. Such a lowering of lake levels would prove extremely costly to Milwaukee and other cities along Lake Michigan.

During the past 2 years the city of Milwaukee has been compelled to spend $50,000 to dredge the channels in order to permit the ships entering Milwaukee Harbor to unload their cargo at the docks with the same ease they unloaded during the higher waters of 1952.

To some it may seem that the lowering of Lake Michigan by 1 inch is a small matter. However, a 1-inch loss of draft for shipping means a loss of 2 million tons in carrying capacity on the Great Lakes in 1 year. Thus other cities besides Milwaukee suffer.

A Norwegian freighter which gets stuck in Milwaukee Harbor because the harbor is 1 inch shallower than the draft of the freighter will find that 1 inch is a big inch.

Another objection to these water-diversion bills involves the friendship of our neighbor, Canada. Our Canadian neighbors are adamantly opposed to any increase in diversion of Great Lakes water over and above the amount fixed by the Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930. We should certainly examine the facts carefully before we alienate our good friends to the north in Canada. We cannot afford in these troublesome times to disregard the wishes of so stanch a friend and ally as Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the strong feelings which my colleagues from Chicago have in this matter. But I submit that the long-term solution to Chicago's drainage and sanitation problem does not lie in diverting water from Lake Michigan and flushing it into the Illinois River.

Chicago's sanitation problem, like that of any large city, can better be handled by building additional sewage-disposal plants. I say this because those of us who oppose the diversion of Lake Michigan water are mindful of the enormous problem facing Chicago.

Finally, if Chicago feels there is merit in this bill for water diversion, it could better plead its case in the forum of the United States Supreme Court, which has adjudicated this question in the past. The Court, in its decree of April 12, 1930, expressly retained jurisdiction over this controversy. On three different occasions since 1930, the Court has been called upon to intervene in this question. There is no good reason why the Chicago Sanitary District cannot obtain any relief to which it is properly entitled by application to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I see there is no time for me to make this speech. I had intended to take the floor for 15 minutes. I have studied this speech for about 2 months. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3210. This bill authorizes an increase in diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, in the amount of 1,000 cubic feet per second, in addition to the present amount of 1,500 cubic feet per second annual average now authorized by permit of the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Army to make a study of the effect in the improvement in the conditions of the Illinois Waterway by reason of this increase in the diversion and to report the study results to Congress before January 31, 1959, with the Army's recommendation as to the continuation, increase or decrease as to the proper diversion amount. The Army made a report to Congress in 1933, when a diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, was authorized, and stated that while in their judgment, aside from sanitary requirements, a minimum average diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage as ultimately authorized by the Supreme Court decree would meet the needs of a commercially useful Illinois Waterway, a further study should be made when the sewage purification plants had been completed and placed in operation by the Sanitary District of Chicago.

That time has now arrived and no studies as to the Illinois Waterway on this phase have been made since 1933.

At the hearings before the House Public Works Committee of the 82d Congress in June 1952, the Army engineers recommended an increase in diversion and authorization for the further study, recommended in 1933. They stated 3 years would be required for such study. The Committee on Public Works in the 82d Congress favorably recommended similar bills following the Army engineers' recommendations.

In the 83d Congress, H. R. 3300 was introduced by Representative Jonas, of Illinois. This measure was passed by both the House and Senate. However, it was pocket vetoed by the President after the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

H. R. 3210 was introduced to meet the objections of the President and contain the following sections which were not in the bill which was vetoed.

First. The maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second;

Second. The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and

Third. The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

The Committee on Public Works was requested to consider the following in their hearings on water diversion:

(a) The serious damage along all the shores caused by the present unprecedented high levels of the Great Lakes.

(b) The interest of navigation and interstate commerce both on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway.

(c) Conditions in the port of Chicago and the Illinois Waterway existing since the completion of the sewage-treatment program by the Sanitary District of Chicago.

I firmly believe that this legislation is in the best interests, not only of the Cook County area, but of the entire Midwest.

The Illinois Waterway is steadily increasing in importance. It connects the two most important waterway systems in the Nation, namely the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River. An additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the presently authorized 1,500 cubic feet per second, would provide a clean stream and improve navigation. It would result in a marked improvement in the Chicago sewage system, and would lead to a drop in the level of Lake Michigan.

I know that some of my colleagues are concerned with the effect that this legislation may have on the Great Lakes water levels. I want to reassure them that we are also concerned with those water levels, but this legislation will have no material lowering effect on these lakes, a mere three-quarter inch on Lakes Michigan and Huron and only about one-half inch on Lakes Erie and Ontario and, as the report shows, these effects would not be realized until several years after the increased diversion commenced. The bill provides for the increased diversion only for a period of 3 years, after which the Corps of Engineers will file its complete study report, on which the right to further diversion will depend.

The Great Lakes today are in the period of high levels, causing much damage to adjacent property owners. This condition will continue for several years, so this legislation can have only a salutary effect on the property owners.

As for the shipping interests, I doubt whether anyone can seriously contend that three-fourths inch, lowering can materially affect the shipping to the extent as to outweigh the needs, necessities, and benefits to the residents of Cook County.

There has been some talk of opposition from downstate Illinois, because of the fears of pollution from the filth and slime of the cities downstream. This objection has been adequately met by the assurances that in times of high water in the rivers, the increased diversion would not be used.

Instead of polluting downstream waters, the heavier flow will provide the means to freshen the waterway. The improved sewage-treatment methods used by the sanitary district will help the purification of the water.

Frankly, I see no basic reason why anyone should oppose the adoption of this bill. I sincerely hope and trust it will be enacted by the House by a substantial majority.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BOYLE), all Members were granted permission to extend their remarks at this point.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide a basis for a study of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway, and the extent to which such increased diversion may affect the level of Lake Michigan, authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway during the 3-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this act, subject to the following limitations:

(1) The maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second;

(2) The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and

(3) The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

SEC. 2. As soon after the date of enactment of this act as is possible, the Secretary of the Army shall cause a study to be made of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased diversion authorized by the first section of this act, and the improvement in conditions along the Illinois Waterway which may result from such increased diversion. The Secretary of the Army shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1959, the results of such study. Such report shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amounts authorized by this act, or increasing or decreasing such amounts.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation brings up the same problem that we had during the last session of Congress. It is the same problem in my congressional district and I am sure in all districts that border on any one of the Great Lakes.

One thing that bothers me particularly is the fact that if this survey for a 3-year period results in the Sanitary District of Chicago becoming accustomed to the diversion of this additional cubic feet per second of water, and then the survey determines that it is not desirable for the overall good, I doubt very much if the Sanitary District of Chicago would be willing to relinquish this added diversion. The city of Chicago and the sanitary district are making every effort they can to get this experimental additional diversion. They, in good faith, will utilize this additional diversion, perhaps construct additional facilities for sewage treatment; and subsequently, if the survey determines that for the overall good of the entire Great Lakes district this diversion should not be continued, the city of Chicago, through its officials, will be down here contending that they have a continuing right, regardless of the results of the survey. If the city of Chicago and its responsible people are willing to go on record 100 percent that they will abide by the survey, regardless, then this might be more acceptable legislation. But I have seen no one supporting this legislation, particularly those from Chicago, admit that at the end of the 3-year period, if the survey is adverse, they will be willing to give up the two-thirds increase in diversion.

I point out this specific problem to some of my friends who have districts bordering on Lake Michigan. Many of us remember very vividly when the level of Lake Michigan was down to a disastrously low point. That was early in the 1930's, following the high water of the late 1920's. If 3 years from now, after Chicago has had this additional diversion, and it happens that the lake level is very low, those who voted to help lower it will have some reaction from their constituents.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am greatly impressed with what the gentleman says. I know he has given this matter great study. I happen to represent a district bordering on Lake Ontario, which has been greatly injured by high water.

I also know of the great fairness of the gentleman now addressing the House. What is his advice to me?

Mr. FORD. The distinguished, able, and conscientious gentleman from New York probably has the same problem I have. We have some constituents who are property owners, and they, of course, want a low lake level, but I assume they do not want it down to where it was in the 1930's. Then we have others who represent harbor interests and commercial shippers; and they, of course, are benefiting now from the high water level.

My position is precisely this: I, along with a few others, helped sponsor the comprehensive lake level survey which the Army engineers now are in the process of concluding at a total cost of about a million dollars. That survey when completed will give us all the answers that competent engineers can give us.

This legislation which authorizes the additional survey, in my opinion, duplicates that work and is unnecessary, because the Army engineers today are conducting a most comprehensive lake level survey.

We as Members of this body can get a better answer if we let the engineers conclude what they are now doing. I am dubious of the attitude I suspect exists in the minds of those who represent the sanitary district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FORD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD. If I am right I greatly fear the attitude of the people representing the Chicago area 3 years from now, because if they have acquired what they feel to be a right and the lake level is down 3 years from now they will not then want to give up the additional diversion. Low water in the past in the 1930's did severely damage property rights on the Great Lakes. If the lake levels are down in 1958 or 1959, some people favoring additional diversion today may vigorously oppose it then.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. I was impressed by what the gentleman said in connection with the possible outcome of the study, which I believe he had a major part in starting, now being carried on by the Army engineers.

I cannot see how the results of that study would be conclusive, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, if it did not include some conclusion based on what would happen to the lake level from a projected diversion of water such as we proponents of this present bill are suggesting. How could we or the Army engineers be satisfied with the results of the present study unless they had included such test as this?

Mr. FORD. I will say this to the gentlewoman from Illinois: At the time some of us were helpful in initiating this comprehensive survey we were assured by competent engineers, both military and civilian, in the Corps of Army Engineers that from their technical experience in handling diversions from the Ogokee area in Canada down to Lake Superior, from their experience in the handling of the present diversion through the Chicago drainage canal, from their experience in the diversions which now take place at the eastern end of the Great Lakes Basin, and from their overall knowledge of inflow and outflow from other areas, smaller in amount I admit, they believe they can arrive at a proper solution.

They did not tell us at the time they agreed to this comprehensive survey that it was necessary to increase the diversion through the drainage canal in order to prove or disprove what was the proper way to handle the Great Lakes water level.

Mrs. CHURCH. I appreciate as always the sincerity of the gentleman. I wonder if he would not agree with me, however, that any future epidemic that might arise because of possible future pollution of the waterway would have an effect on the entire area.

Mr. FORD. The pollution problem is a very serious one, and I pass no judgment on the problem or its solution, because I am not qualified to determine whether it is necessary or unnecessary for this additional diversion in arriving at the answer; that is a problem I am not competent to decide. But as to the other matters I have gone into them seriously and have serious reservations about the desirability or necessity of this legislation at this time. My position today is the same as it was last year. We should let the Army engineers finish their comprehensive survey and with this technical information we can act intelligently.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, last year when similar legislation was before the House I supported it. The bill last year called for an actual diversion of the water from Lake Michigan into the sanitary system. Based on all of the evidence that I had before me at that time, I believed the diversion was justified, that it was good legislation and not only in the best interest of Chicago, but was fair to all the other States who bordered the Great Lakes region.

The legislation this year is merely a test which will take place over a period of 3 years to determine whether or not the diversion of this water will do any substantial harm to other communities bordering the Great Lakes. I can see no possible harm that could come to any community as a result of this test being made. It would be of substantial assistance to the city of Chicago and it would once and for all settle one way or another the claims which have been made here on the floor when this bill has been up.

I do not see how we here in the Congress are going to really know what the situation really will be until this kind of a test is made.

My good friends in the House from Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio have repeatedly asked where the proponents of this bill would stand if the result of the Army engineers' test is adverse to the interests of Chicago. I want to be intellectually honest about this matter. If, at the end of 3 years, the test shows that this legislation is not in the best interests of the entire country, then I can assure the Members that I will not support this legislation in the future. On the other hand, I believe those who are now opposing this bill should be willing to rest their doubts with the same test. By that I mean that the opponents should be as willing to abide by the findings of the Army Engineer Corps on this matter as the proponents of the bill. The Members from the Chicago area have asked for this test. It would seem to me that they would have a difficult situation in advocating this diversion if the results of their own test should go against them.

I am a down-State Member. I am not affected by this legislation. However, I have lived in Illinois and I know the sanitary condition which they have been faced with in Chicago over a long period of years. Additional water is certainly needed in the area in order to keep pollution at its lowest. I am sure the Members realize that Chicago would not have been in here during all of these years advocating this legislation so strenuously unless the welfare of the community was vitally affected. I do believe that the trial provided in this bill should be made, as it is the only one I know of which will provide a test of the conditions which would prevail if the water were actually diverted over a long period of time.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman who is speaking and to serve notice that if the Government of the United States should take an adverse position after the study is made and it finally develops it would be unwise to continue such a diversion, I shall vote against it. However, at the present time I am supporting the bill because I think it is fair and good legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that if the comprehensive survey of the Army engineers now in progress recommends this diversion, I will be glad to support it; but I reserve the right to find out what the comprehensive survey now being made recommends.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman be willing to rely at least partially on the report made by the Army engineers if this survey goes through?

Mr. FORD. I will be in favor of the comprehensive survey of the Army engineers.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Why does the gentleman from Michigan expect more from the city of Chicago? We from the city of Chicago and the surrounding region should not be criticized for not coming out with a definite commitment. The gentleman refuses to do so himself.

Mr. FORD. This survey proposed in H. R. 3210 is not necessary because the comprehensive Great Lakes Basin survey will take care of this and everything else without the additional diversion. You do not need the additional diversion for the comprehensive survey.

Mr. YATES. What harm is being done by it? It just adds additional knowledge to the entire survey, and certainly at the end of a 3-year period we will know where we stand. I think the gentleman has been eminently fair in stating he will not be bound, and I am sure the attitude he expressed will be shared by many other Members.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman from Illinois share the same attitude?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman will share the same attitude as the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. And you will vote for whatever the comprehensive Army Corps of Engineers' survey recommends?

Mr. YATES. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that whatever the survey shows I will certainly be bound by, except for this, that if it is a conditional survey, if it is the view or the recommendation that came out of the Supreme Court in 1930 which stated that the Sanitary District of Chicago should undertake certain construction of sewage disposal facilities before it comes back to the Congress, if there are conditions that are attached to it, I would certainly not want to be bound by an overall report which adds certain conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman has stated his position, which I think on the surface looks to be so eminently fair that no one ought to disagree with him.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. However, there are three things beneath the surface that make it less than being completely fair. First of all, we do have the overall survey that the gentleman from Michigan mentioned, which will take a long period of time, and this one, by interfering with the levels of the Great Lakes in an artificial manner, will materially affect the results and detract from the knowledge that this Congress ought to have as the result of that survey. Second, we will have poured $200,000 down the drain for a survey that is inconsistent with the previous survey, and, in the third place, after you take out 3 years of this 67 percent increased diversion down that canal and if damage is done to Wisconsin and Michigan and the rest of the Great Lakes States, as we all are convinced it will, there will be no way of undoing that damage. The gentleman is a lawyer, and he knows that under those circumstances he probably could go into court and get an injunction against the kind of thing he now proposes, saying, "Let us do it, and if it does some harm, we will know about it and we will not do it any more."

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say in answer to that I do not believe there is any chance of this legislation doing any real harm, certainly not nearly the harm which the damage of the lake waters have done in recent years by virtue of those high water levels.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Michigan has more than 1,500 miles of shoreline, and over the past 2 years it has caused millions and millions of dollars worth of damage because of the high water level. I think this bill should be passed, because we can amply afford to give to the State of Illinois such relief as it needs at this time, because of the abnormally high water that we have had over the years.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes. I just want to say that I support this legislation. It does not affect me at all. I come from the 25th District, down in southern Illinois, but I do think this is worthwhile legislation. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this comprehensive survey he has talked about will not determine the extent of the damage that will come from the diversion of water from Lake Michigan. The Corps of Engineers have testified that at the present time 1,500 cubic feet per second of water are being diverted. They propose to divert 2,500 cubic feet per second. Unless the actual diversion takes place, they will not be in a position to tell what damage, if any, will be incurred. So, I cannot see why we should wait for this comprehensive report that the gentleman talks about. I think the bill should be passed and let the folks see whether over a period of 3 years any damage will be done. I am sure no Member of Congress would stand up and vote for a bill that would be detrimental to any section of this country, however, you must first determine whether damage will occur. This is just a study. The Corps of Army Engineers says that it cannot tell whether any damage will be done unless they make this test. Let us give them that opportunity.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for the past 13 years that I know of increased diversion has been the subject of controversy in the Congress. I became acquainted with it as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee at that time. The Honorable Adolph Sabath from Chicago, who served so long, always introduced an increased diversion bill every session. None of Mr. Sabath's bills were accepted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee. No doubt he would be proud today to know that such a bill was before the Congress.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] introduced this year's bill, H. R. 3210, and is to be congratulated upon the leadership on both sides supporting it. There is no question in my mind but that under these conditions the bill will pass. It will pass this year the same as it did last.

With all modesty, probably I will be the only Representative in Congress from Illinois opposing increased diversion. I am rather of the opinion that those living downstream on the Illinois River, in cities and on farms, have reached the same conclusion that increased diversion legislation will pass. Our office has heard very little this year from the area I represent relative to increased diversion. The main opposition to increased diversion in the 20th Illinois District was from those living in the city of Beardstown. Possibly the fact that further protection in strengthening the Beardstown seawall has caused some of the increased diversion opposition to die down. This is now under construction. Possibly because the present bill before the House, H. R. 3210, provides a basis for a study of effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan upon the Illinois Waterway and the effect of improvement in such waterway caused by increased diversion is another reason these people are not so apprehensive.

Last year President Eisenhower vetoed this legislation for reasons that Canada was involved and it being an international question. What action the President will take this year remains to be seen. I assume it will pass the other Body of the Congress this year as it did last. If this legislation does become public law it will be very interesting to watch the test on a 3-year basis and the effect of increased diversion. This is supposed to be the purpose of this year's bill, namely, a test only. It will be interesting to note, as far as we along the Illinois River are concerned, not the effect of the maximum direct diversion of Lake Michigan, which should not exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second, but the effect on the Illinois River and those living along it. All this, Mr. Chairman, remembering the Supreme Court decision, calls for 1,500 cubic feet per second.

I have stated on the floor of the House, and before the committee to which increased diversion legislation was assigned, that the flow of the Great Lakes was northeasterly and into the Atlantic Ocean. Last year the House passed the St. Lawrence Seaway bill which is now public law. It was equally controversial as is increased diversion. The St. Lawrence Seaway bill called for the deepening of the channel. Millions will be spent on the St. Lawrence Seaway project to deepen the river for seagoing vessels. In spending millions to increase the depth of the St. Lawrence River the House today will pass legislation to divert some of the water in Lake Michigan, sending it down by the Illinois to the Mississippi River.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the vote was to deepen the St. Lawrence River and this year it is to send the water southwest into the Mississippi River—rather inconsistent.

This diversion legislation is to bypass the Supreme Court decision which only the Congress can do. I have opposed it for 13 years and said I would oppose it this year. Consequently, I will do just that when my name is called. I expect to do it fully realizing that I am the only Representative from Illinois to so vote. I expect to do so even knowing and fully realizing that H. R. 3210 will pass the same as the kindred legislation did last year.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] I am affected by this proposed legislation. I represent the Second District of Michigan which borders on Lake Erie between Toledo and Detroit. Shore properties on that low-lying section of Lake Erie have been severely affected by high lake levels.

A year ago when this legislation was before us, I voted in support of an amendment offered by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and voted against the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]. I did so because of the immediate crisis to the riparian owners in my district in the county of Monroe, Michigan.

Last year, you may recall, when the Omnibus Public Works bill was before us, I sought to have included in that omnibus bill two flood-control structures, recommended by the Corps of Engineers, pursuant to a study ordered by the House Committee on Public Works. The Corps of Engineers recommended the protection of these low-lying areas along the Lake Erie shore in Monroe County. Because of a legal technicality raised by the Bureau of the Budget, the Committee on Public Works of the House refused to incorporate those two projects, which they agreed were meritorious, in the Omnibus Public Works bill. This year another severe flood has caused extensive damage and loss of property in that area.

Now I am in this predicament. Temporarily, for the purpose of reducing the threat from high water levels I favor this proposed legislation. At the same time, from the interests of the entire area and the port of Monroe, which may be developed as a major port when the St. Lawrence Seaway comes into being, I do not like to see this foot-in-the-door proposition lead to a permanent diversion of water which will affect the entire Great Lakes area.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I should like to correct the statement the gentleman made about the projects in which he was interested. He referred to projects in which he was interested in the omnibus bill of 1954 which he said the Bureau of the Budget refused to approve. They were not put in the bill because of a vote in the committee. They were voted down.

Mr. MEADER. I might say to the gentleman that the record on the floor of the House when I offered an amendment to incorporate those projects in the omnibus bill, contains ample evidence that those in charge of the bill recognized that they were meritorious projects. I may say also that I have introduced a bill which will remove the legal technicality raised by the Bureau of the Budget and I sincerely hope that the Committee on Public Works will grant me a hearing upon that measure in the very near future.

I might say that every congressional district in the Great Lakes area should be interested in this legislation because it would authorize flood-protection structures in the Great Lakes area and would do away with the erroneous interpretation, erroneous in my opinion, of the Bureau of the Budget that the Flood Control Act applies only to floods from rivers and not from lakes.

The Great Lakes system, the entire system, is a river-lake combination system and the Bureau of the Budget never should have raised that legal technicality. This problem must be dealt with expeditiously for the relief of the people in my district who have been affected by these disastrous floods.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of addressing a question to members of the committee on either side in order to obtain some factual information. There are times in the affairs of Members of Congress when it becomes necessary for them to look primarily to the interests of their own constituents and this happens to be, in my case, one of those times. In my area we have suffered greatly from highwater levels. My question is this, and I would hope I could get a nonpartisan, unified answer. If this piece of legislation is enacted, will it raise or lower either temporarily or permanently the lake level of Lake Ontario? Can anybody answer that question for me?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN], who is affected by this bill, to answer the question.

Mr. KEATING. Is he a member of this committee?

Mr. SHEEHAN. No; but I can read the bill. In the bill it states that at the end of 3 years you come back to the Congress and the additional water is through. That is right in the bill. I refer to page 3:

> The Secretary of the Army shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1959, the results of such study. Such report shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water—

In other words, at the end of 3 years it is up to the Congress to act again.

Mr. KEATING. But within the 3-year period I am interested to know what effect the diversion of this water will have on the lake levels other than that of Lake Michigan.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It will not have any effect at all.

Mr. DONDERO. It would have the effect of lowering Lake Ontario, in which the gentleman is interested, because this water will go down the Mississippi River and not down past the gentleman's congressional district.

Mr. KEATING. It impressed me that that was natural physics, and that was my impression, but I am very glad to have it backed up by the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee, in whose judgment I have so much confidence.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I might say as a member of the committee, after extended hearings with the Corps of Engineers, that that is exactly the purpose of this bill. Some of the engineers feel that this diversion will not lower the level too much. Others feel there will be a greater lowering of the level. There is a controversy within the engineers themselves. The purpose of this bill is to try to determine just exactly what this additional diversion will do in the way of lowering levels. That is why everyone should support this measure, to determine exactly what effect it will have. Only through a comprehensive study of the diversion itself can that answer be determined, as to how much the level will be lowered.

Mr. KEATING. At this moment, at least, in my area I would say that the people generally feel that you just could not lower these levels too much. If the effect of the enactment of this legislation would be to lower those levels at this time, I feel it is my duty under these circumstances to support the legislation.

Mr. GRAY. Some of the engineers felt that an additional 1,000 feet per second of diversion would lower it about five-eighths of an inch and others felt it would lower it 2 inches. They are sure it will lower it some, but they do not know how much. That is the idea of having the survey.

Mr. KEATING. I realize it is a matter of inches and not too significant, but in our area with the high water levels every inch counts.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not going to speak on this measure but I would like to ask a question of some informed member of the committee because it might later concern the committee of which I am a member.

I notice in the committee report on this bill the next to the last paragraph on page 3 states:

> The estimated cost to the United States is $280,000 to cover the costs of the study and review, of which $190,000 would be incurred by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

From an examination of the bill itself I find no reference to any authority given to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to do anything. What is the purpose of the bill in that respect? If this bill passes, are we to consider this an authorization for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to do something, although the bill is silent on it? This question is addressed to the chairman, the ranking minority member, or some member of the committee, so that we may have that situation clarified.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand it, one-half of the amount will be borne by the Army engineers and the other half by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HAND. Where does the bill make any reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. DONDERO. The President's Commission is studying water resources, and I understand is to go into this matter as well and study the question from the standpoint of public health.

Mr. HAND. Should not this bill authorize them to do so if they are to have money later, if this bill is passed?

Mr. DONDERO. It does not authorize $190,000 to be paid by them, but I understand that is the arrangement made, to divide the expenses between the two, because both are involved.

Mr. HAND. Where, if the gentleman can inform me, where can I find out how that arrangement was made and what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is supposed to do under this legislation?

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot answer that question. I think the gentleman could find out by inquiry to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HAND. Normally, I should find it in the bill; should I not?

Mr. DONDERO. Not in this bill, not as to the $190,000.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has authority now, and it does not need to be in the bill. It has the authority to investigate anything having to do with Health, Education, and Welfare and, of course, this matter comes under the question of health.

Mr. HAND. Does the gentleman believe that they are authorized to study this particular situation in Chicago at Federal expense?

Mr. GRAY. They are authorized; that is right. It does not need to be in the bill.

Mr. HAND. From the standpoint of the Appropriations Committee, this is a rather vague state of affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 293, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3210, to the Committee on Public Works.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken on a voice vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 74, nays 316, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—74

Allen, Calif.
Bass, N. H.
Baumhart
Becker
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Corbett
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Derounian
Dorn, N. Y.
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Hand
Harvey
Henderson
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hillings
Holt
Hosmer
Jenkins
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McCulloch
McGregor
Mailliard
Miller, Md.
Minshall
Nelson
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Phillips
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Scribner
Seely-Brown
Simpson, Ill.
Taber
Van Pelt
Vorys
Wainwright
Wharton
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—316

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Devereux
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Hagen
Haley
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Hébert
Herlong
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holmes
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jennings
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Scherer
Schwengel
Scudder
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Sieminski
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vursell
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—44

Betts
Buchanan
Carnahan
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Dingell
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Evins
Fogarty
Frazier
Gamble
Green, Pa.
Hays, Ohio
Jackson
Jensen
Kearney
Kilburn
Lesinski
McConnell
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mason
Miller, N. Y.
Mumma
Pilcher
Polk
Prouty
Radwan
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Smith, Wis.
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tumulty
Walter
Watts

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. Betts for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Polk against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Celler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Durham with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Shufford with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Chase.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Tumulty with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. DOLLIVER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FULTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MEXICAN LABOR ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3822, with Mr. Whitten in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings], the author of the bill and chairman of the subcommittee that handled the bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is for the purpose of reducing to a minimum the number of agricultural workers from Mexico who would swim the Rio Grande River to work in agriculture in the United States.

Under the law on the statute books these workers will be brought into this country under a contract. Able-bodied workmen from our sister republic of Mexico would enter this country in an orderly and systematic manner for the purpose of working on the farms in this country. Only males would be admitted. They would come in for a specified length of time, ordinarily, to do a particular job lasting some 60 or 90 days. After completing their assignment here they would be returned to Mexico by the employer, the farmer.

For a number of years these bills have been on this floor. I call your attention to the fact that in 1943, during wartime, Public Law 45 was enacted, which terminated in December 1947. It permitted the entrance of both agricultural and nonagricultural labor into this country.

Then the Department of Labor construed that they had the authority to negotiate with the Government of Mexico as the result of this authority, and in 1948 they had an informal agreement whereby they recruited Mexicans at the border. These agreements were continued until 1949.

Then in the 82d Congress Public Law 78 was enacted; that is the law we are operating under at the present time.

In the 83d Congress Public Law 309 was passed. That was a unilateral action.

Now we are engaged in an attempt to extend Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress, which was enacted in 1951. The Committee on Agriculture held hearings at great length on this legislation. For 4 straight days all witnesses who were interested in the subject were given the privilege of testifying before the committee. We heard from all farm organizations who are interested. They all approved the extension of Public Law 78. We heard from the Department of Labor who favored, with certain amendments, the extension of Public Law 78. We also heard from the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Agriculture. All favor the extension of this act. Then we heard from labor groups who gave us their views. From the consensus of opinion, of all those who testified, they all felt there was a need at certain seasons of the year for the importation of Mexican nationals into this country for the purpose of doing stoop labor. It is very difficult to get domestics to do this particular type of work. The committee passed this extension legislation out by a vote of 17 yeas to 4 noes, and 6 answered "present." I wanted to give you that information because I think the committee is entitled to know how the bill was reported out to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield gladly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's thinking on this problem. It is a serious thing for our State of California, where we need thousands and thousands of outside laborers to harvest the stoop, and tree, and vine crops, which we have. I want to say for the record that we treat these Mexican people very well. We give them the right kind of food, shelter, and transportation. The program has been very successful in our State. I hope the bill which the gentleman is sponsoring here today, and telling us about, will pass. We simply cannot get enough American labor to harvest these important crops.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the farmers have to pay the transportation charges from the reception center to the farm. He has to give the worker an insurance policy and suitable housing and kitchen utensils of all kinds. For the cotton pickers, the farmer furnishes the cotton sack to pick the cotton with. The farmer also gives them subsistence and, in some cases of inclement weather, when they are unable to work, he has to pay them a guaranteed amount for so much work during the existence of the entire contract. It is absolutely necessary to have some workers in the various States of the Union. Twenty-two States in the United States now use this Mexican labor; some, of course, not to as great a degree as others. Most of them will be used along the border, but 22 States do use this agricultural labor. I call attention to the fact that Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress is a most reasonable approach. Yes, this Public Law 78 is far reaching in its provisions. It protects domestic labor. I want to read just a little sentence from Public Law 78, section 503:

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing and qualified are not available at the time or place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

Yes, it has many safeguards written into the act.

> (2) The employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The Secretary must determine that and I am quoting the law:

> (3) Reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours for work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Every safeguard is written into this act. It has worked properly. During the last year the Immigration and Naturalization Service has apprehended so many of these wetbacks and turned them back that it has caused a great increase in the number of legal contracts along the border. So it is working and working properly.

Your Committee on Agriculture had before it the bill, H. R. 3822. H. R. 3822 knocked out the termination date. That was the bill I originally introduced.

Your Committee on Agriculture passed three amendments to that bill. One was that the act should be extended for 3½ years so that it would terminate in the middle of the year, and it would not be necessary for the Department of Labor to come in and obtain a supplemental appropriation to carry the program on until the first of the year. They wanted it to expire on June 30.

Another amendment was this: It did away with double liability on the part of the employer, when he had paid the transportation of the worker back to the border. In many instances they put them on a bus, paid the fare, but they never made it to the border. They skipped out to go to Detroit or somewhere else, and then under the terms of the law the farmer would have to pay his transportation back to the border. So after he has shown that he paid the transportation once, that would be sufficient under this amendment.

The third amendment which the committee wrote into the proposed legislation provided that when a canvass was made by the Department of Labor in any particular community, they would first go out and talk to the employer, and then they would talk to the workers and make determination as to the need for labor in that particular area, and also the amount of wages that had been paid in that vicinity.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bill will be approved without amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I shall use my time to explain the changes that are offered in this bill, and then to answer questions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not true that unless we pass this bill we will return to a situation where there will be no law covering Mexican nationals coming into the United States.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The law that we did pass and under which we have been operating sought to stop the wetbacks from coming into the United States?

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me state again that if we do not have any law there is every possibility that a large number of wetbacks will be coming in here, and there will be no protection either to them or to American labor.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

As far as control and direction of the illegal entrance of Mexican labor into this country is concerned, conditions between this country and Mexico have greatly improved since the passage of this act. The only reason we are asking that it be extended is that the act itself expires and we are asking, under the terms of this legislation, to extend it for 3½ years. I believe the Department of Labor recommended 4½ years, but they accepted our suggestion that we extend it for only 3½ years.

I hope you will all look at the hearings on this bill. Never since I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, something over 12 years, have we given more discussion to a piece of legislation that would bring labor into this country.

I cannot help but bring to your mind the situation that existed when we tried to pass this bill last year. As you will remember, a year ago the 1st of March we had the first display of firearms by a group in this Chamber. I think there have been firearms on the floor of the House before in the pockets of some of the gentlemen who used to serve on the floor, but I am sure a year ago last March the 1st was the first time any gangsters ever appeared in a body to attack this Congress; and I am sure they thought the time to attack the Congress was when feeling was running high about bringing cheap labor into the United States, the farthest-fetched idea that any Congressman on the Committee on Agriculture ever had in his mind. At no time has the Committee on Agriculture ever felt that we should bring cheap labor into these United States. The only reason the Committee on Agriculture is concerned with bringing labor into this country in any sense whatsoever is to save crops or harvest crops.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. Is it not true that in many sections of the United States the crops could not be placed in the ground and cultivated and harvested without the assistance furnished by this labor?

Mr. HILL. Exactly. The gentleman goes a step further than I did; I said to harvest the crops. At the same time, they are necessary to plant the crops; so we might say that this legislation has had quite a history. It is usual to extend the bill for only 2 or 3 years. This particular time we were asked to extend it for 4½ years. We decided to compromise and make it 3½ years. The half year is brought about through no reason whatever connected with labor but only that it may correspond with the legislative fiscal year which ends June 30.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], who had more difficulty with the gangsters than any of the rest of us.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado if he can explain to me why the committee put in the provision in section 503 regarding the availability of domestic labor in the area to be certified and also the prevailing wage in the area.

Mr. HILL. We made very little change in that particular section. At no time has the Secretary of Labor had any right to bring labor into any community unless he was convinced that that particular section was short of assistance, that the farmers were in need of farm labor.

The same regulations have always been carried out concerning wages; they must pay the going wage in the area. The Secretary of Labor is given a system of deciding whether the labor is necessary and at the same time plan the program in regard to deciding the wage. As far as I know he has had little difficulty or little trouble. The law has worked I would say to the satisfaction of both those who needed labor and also the laboring people themselves.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. If provisos were in the present law and working, can the gentleman tell us why it was felt necessary to write a new amendment in section 503?

Mr. HILL. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to supply me with the information on section 503 and the change which we made in that section?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The purpose of the committee amendment was simply to clarify a practice that had been in operation by the Government over a period of years. We simply wrote into the law that they should look over the situation to find why it is necessary for outside labor to come in, and to see what the supply of domestic labor was. It simply carries out a practice that the Department under both administrations has had in effect for many years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say that section 3 in the bill now under consideration just adds another section to section 503. It is an addition. Other than that there is no change in the original section 503.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their explanation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. In reading the committee report there is one question that presents itself to me. On page 2 it is stated:

> The purpose of this act is to permit the Government of the United States to assume more responsibility for Mexicans who come in under the work program and for the performance of individual contracts under that program than would be possible in the absence of such legislation.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. PATTERSON. What are the liabilities and responsibilities of the United States Government when these people come across the border as wetbacks?

Mr. HILL. Let me go back for a moment. That is the only border in the world that is handled in this way. Unless you do as is provided in this bill there would be no way in the world to protect that border for miles and miles, and the folks could come into this area and start to work any place they pleased as long as the farmers would hire them. There would be no protection for the worker because he is not a United States citizen, and there would be no order under such system.

Mr. PATTERSON. What responsibility do we assume as American citizens?

Mr. HILL. Now you are getting down to our job. The farmers hire these men under a definitely planned out and organized contract. He must do certain things under that contract. I have not a copy of it with me but I can supply the gentleman with a copy of that contract. The farmer agrees to do certain things and these certain things are necessary. He protects them. For instance, he has to provide a proper type of living quarters for them, he has to pay a certain wage, he has to pay the expense of bringing them in and taking them back. His job is to see that they get back to Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Colorado 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Under this contractual agreement I cannot see why the United States Government should assume that responsibility.

Mr. HILL. That is a fine question and I will ask the gentleman a question which will answer his question. The gentleman will have a chance to see what we think about it one of these days. Why should we guarantee anybody a dollar an hour in wages? That answers your question fully.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is irrelevant to this issue.

Mr. HILL. It is not irrelevant.

Mr. PATTERSON. That pertains to laws involving citizens of the United States.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is living in a different world. I say to him, we do have some responsibility in letting labor in that would come for little of nothing. The gentleman says that is not our responsibility. I say it is our responsibility because you will soon find your labor folks coming in and down would go the wages of labor for miles and miles around.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. I want to compliment the gentleman and the committee for bringing out such a good bill. It is about harvest time in my part of the country. If it was not for the Mexican laborers coming into that area and harvesting those crops there would be a loss to the farmers of that part of the country. I think it has resulted in better relations also between the two nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I still am not clear about the purpose of the act. The report states that the United States Government is assuming greater responsibility. What greater responsibilities are being assumed under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will be seated, I will soon tell him, if they give me more time, because our responsibility is twofold. We have a responsibility to the Government of Mexico and we have a responsibility to the people of these United States. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has an idea along that line, and I will let him answer that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The reason the United States Government necessarily comes into it is because it is international. If this were a matter between two States, there would be no need for it, but we cannot deal individually with the other country. We have a choice of having legal or illegal passage across the border, or we have a program that is supervised and controlled in which there is certification that that labor is needed and that no other labor is available, in which the farmer is to give the Mexican workers various benefits that he would not be responsible for if it were just ordinary labor. It is not cheap labor. It is necessary because American labor is not available.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman from Iowa has not received sufficient answer, I will yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not understand what greater responsibility we are assuming under the language of your report. You say that the Government is assuming greater responsibility for this labor. The question I want answered is what responsibilities over and above those that have been assumed in the past do you propose to assume under this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. None whatever.

Mr. HILL. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that we expect this bill will operate more easily and that we will be able to keep the wetbacks out, the ones who come in illegally. I do not like the word "wetbacks" because you could not get enough water in that river for a chicken to get a drink out of, let alone a man to get his back wet. Labor organizations that appeared before our committee testified that with a few very simple changes made in this bill it will make the act much more equitable both to the laborers in Mexico and the United States Government.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of H. R. 3822, a bill to provide for continued importation of Mexican agricultural labor to the United States.

My own congressional district normally requires approximately 4,000 of these migrant workers annually and for many of my farmer constituents, especially those producing sugar beets and pickles, the presence of these Mexican workers is essential. Domestic labor is not present in sufficient quantities to fill this need.

I believe the committee amendment which would terminate the act on June 30, 1959, as well as the amendment to section 502 are fair to all concerned.

The committee amendment to section 503 is frankly more controversial, not so much in the new language that would be written into the bill but rather the way that it would permit maladministration of the certification for Mexican nationals. I frankly do not like section 503 as it has been amended by the committee but I intend to support H. R. 3822 nevertheless since I feel that my objections to this particular language are not sufficient to warrant my opposition to the entire bill which is so necessary to my farm constituents.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the text of a letter dated June 6, 1955, which I received from Mr. Max Henderson, Michigan Field Crops, Inc., Saginaw, Mich. This letter should be of particular interest due to the large number of Mexican nationals employed by this organization:

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Your letter of June 1, together with enclosures, was much appreciated. Since receiving it, I have carefully read the committee report.

Certainly the people in this organization cannot quarrel with the amendment which terminates the act on June 30, 1959. Also, the amendment to section 2, subsection 3, of section 502 is certainly a fair and equitable one.

The amendment to section 503 is somewhat difficult to analyze. The original wording of this amendment and the thinking behind it almost spelled out the necessity of organized labor's stamp of approval on every certification for Mexican nationals. It was viewed by all in the employer groups as a method of handling the unions a very useful tool in their so far unsuccessful efforts to organize farm labor. As the language and the committee report now stand, the amendment seems innocent enough. It does not seem to do anything that the original language of the act did not do except to urge the Secretary to do it better. If this is actually the case, then I suppose that the amendment could be considered a sop to labor generally.

The possibility that is disturbing is that insofar as I can tell the Secretary of Labor in some future year may feel that the language authorizes him to require the approval of labor unions and certainly nothing in the language prevents him from so doing if he should so elect.

It is my understanding that Representative GATHINGS has written Mr. Siciliano asking him to state in writing for the record what the Department of Labor feels this amendment requires them to do. It is also my understanding that this letter has not yet been written but that Mr. Siciliano has said that it does not mean, in their present opinion, that hearings will be held throughout the countryside but that within the appropriation granted to the Department by the Congress additional care will be exercised in the matter of certification of need and the determination of prevailing wages.

I guess what I am trying to say is that we do not like this amendment to section 503 but as the language presently stands can find no real issue to stand upon and condemn it. It may also be true that this relatively innocent language may be the means of preventing the introduction of really damaging amendments on the floor. I believe that there is some thought among certain of the employer groups of attempting to remove this amendment when the bill reaches the Senate.

All in all, I feel that we have come through with a better bill than we might have. I guess the best thing is to support it in its present form hoping at the same time that in some way the Department of Labor, which is always sensitive to union pressure, can be restrained from interpreting the language of this amendment to section 503 as giving them cause to do something silly in the future.

I appreciate very much your writing me about this and sincerely hope that my answer has been no more confusing to you than the matter is in my own mind.

Sincerely,

M. C. HENDERSON.

I also wish to read at this point the text of a letter dated June 7, 1955, from the assistant legislative counsel of the Michigan Farm Bureau. The reaction of the farm bureau should likewise be of particular interest since it is the largest farm organization in the State of Michigan:

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Michigan Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND AL: Mr. C. L. Brody, executive vice president of Michigan Farm Bureau, has asked me to write you in reply to your kind letter of June 1, asking farm bureau's standpoint on the extension of the Mexican Labor Act under the bill in its amended form.

As you know, we have favored the extension of this law, and feel that it is of vital importance to many of the specialty crop areas in Michigan. The first amendment, relieving the employer of the possibility of double payment of transportation charges, seems fair to all concerned.

The amendment to section 503 seems to spell out in the act, details of administration; by and large probably they have been followed by the Department of Labor in the past. It would seem that there must be some reason for placing such language in the law and we are somewhat concerned that it may be a foot in the door approach to encourage labor organizations to speak for farm workers. It is difficult to see how this amendment improves the present act.

The third amendment, found in section 509, is simply a change of date in the period of effectiveness of the act. We would have preferred a continuing approach to this problem, and would have favored no expiration. However, a 3½-year extension is generally agreeable.

In summary, we believe the bill, as amended, could perhaps be improved by dropping the new wording in section 503. However, we would not oppose the bill as it is presently amended, and hope that an extension of the Mexican labor program will be passed.

Thanks for this opportunity to express our opinion on this legislation.

Sincerely,

DAN E. REED,
Assistant Legislative Counsel.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that on the whole H. R. 3822 is a good bill and, for many parts of the United States, a very necessary one. I, therefore, urge its adoption in its present form and without change.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I merely take these 2 minutes to clarify my position on this piece of legislation. I listened to the open hearings in committee and all of the discussions in executive committee, and I am going to reluctantly support this bill at this particular time. But certainly I cannot see the necessity for continuing a program of bringing in labor from other countries, working and raising basic commodities that we support under our rigid or the flexible price-support program. We have our own farmers in America who are wanting quotas of price-support crops or other crops that are not able to obtain them under the crop quota program. Now, I see here in the committee hearings, that last year under this program we brought in more than 309,000 farm workers to America to help the farm labor situation. I know that we have in my own State many well, able-bodied farmers who are interested in securing additional crop quotas who certainly would like to replace this labor that is being brought into the country. My hope for the people who are in this big crop enterprise to get to the point where they can take care of their own crops or else reduce the amount of quota for themselves so that the farmers of America, the real Americans, who are interested in making a living on their own farms on basic commodities can secure adequate quotas to take care of their family needs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman can estimate how many of those 309,000 that came in remained in this country?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not think anybody on the committee could answer that question. We do not know how many more came in illegally, but if 309,000 came in under the quota, my own opinion is that we have several more otherwise, because more than 600,000 were apprehended attempting to enter illegally last year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, since coming to the Congress, I have consistently opposed this type of legislation. I think I have voted against it on three separate occasions. My primary objection is predicated on the fact that somebody was sufficiently interested to see to it that these Mexican farm laborers are excused from the payment of income taxes; they are excused from the payment of social-security taxes. They come in here, get a job with a farmer, run away from the farmer, and if they become ill or are hungry, they become a burden on the department of public assistance of that particular State. I could name a half dozen other reasons why I would be opposed to it, but that is all I need to know, that somebody went out of their way to write provisions into this legislation to exempt these people from the payment of income and social-security taxes; and, if for no other reason, for that reason I am opposed to the proposed legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time so that I may explain an amendment that I propose to offer to this bill. I direct your attention to the amendment as it appears in yesterday's RECORD, at page 9884.

The effect of this amendment is to require the Secretary of Agriculture, after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, to establish rules and regulations for the health, safety, and welfare of these workers while they are being transported to and from this work.

This was directed to my attention by the Governor of the State of Colorado, the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, former chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate. The reason it was directed to his attention is that in the early part of May of this year, a truck traveling from the Mexican border headed into Wyoming, turned over east of Denver. They had 54 people in that truck. When that occurred, 1 child was killed, 20 were injured, and the Governor of the State of Colorado took it up with the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain why they did not regulate it. On the 17th day of May of this year, they told him that under the present law it was the opinion of the Commission that it has no jurisdiction over such transportation even as to matters affecting safety.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that when this amendment is presented, you will recognize that there is some duty and responsibility on those who have charge of the transportation of these workers so that they shall at least receive the same treatment that cattle or hogs receive when they are transported in public conveyances.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, if I read the press reports of that accident correctly—and it happened in my district—there were no internationals on that truck at all; in other words, the men, women, and children—no children come in under this act—the question is, Is the gentleman sure that there were internationals on that truck? I am sure there were not.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman, whether they be internationals or nationals, or what not, the gentleman would not advocate that people who contract for these services and transport these workers in a truck should be allowed to do so without regard to any rules of safety or without regard to the welfare of the workers.

Mr. HILL. The question I want to ask is this: Any amendment you put on this legislation should not just affect the Mexicans coming in to work temporarily. Let us get back to our senses now. I am not talking any demagoguery. If you are going to protect temporary workers, let us protect all the workers who ride to work in trucks.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will read my amendment he will find it states that the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules and regulations for the welfare and safety of the workers in this program. If in the gentleman's opinion that does not go far enough to protect all workers that may be transported and used in this program in our State and all other States where these Mexicans are transported, then let the gentleman offer an amendment that will include them.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman answer my question? I thought he thought I favored hauling them around like hogs. I do not agree to any such idea.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we are all very pleased today that our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON], has returned to us to renew his active service as a Member of Congress. He has been ill for several months and has made a very difficult and gallant fight for recovery. We all rejoice that he has won that battle and is now in perfect health and has resumed the excellent service he was performing when stricken. He is a young man of great promise, one that has made a great impression upon all of us and we are happy over his recovery and the resumption of his able service. We are delighted to learn he is fully recovered and predict he will achieve greater accomplishments in the years ahead.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I should like to to express my appreciation not only to the gentleman from Massachusetts for those sentiments but to all of my colleagues in the House who have been so generous with their thoughts and their prayers in the weeks past. I just wish to say how good it is to be back on the job. Thank you very much.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make a speech on this bill and will not at this time, but I should like to answer a few questions that have been raised particularly by the gentleman from Connecticut when he asked how this bill would help the American workers.

In my opinion, this bill will help exclude and will reduce the number of illegal workers who enter the United States. Since the legal workers are coming here under a contract to work at a fair wage, that will reduce the possibility of the wage rates in communities being reduced because of illegal labor.

Answering the question of the gentleman from Iowa about the further obligation under this bill, we have strengthened the bill in this respect. Before, some segments of labor contended that there was not a sufficient investigation made of the need for this labor, because inquiries were usually made only to the employers to determine the need in the community. However, by reading the bill you will see that we also provide for consultation with the workers of the community to determine if there really is a need, and also consultation with them about the prevailing wage in the community to see that we are not bringing in labor to be employed at substandard wages.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to one other point before I conclude. If you will take the time to read the report of the committee, or just read the bill itself, you will see that the Government does assume some additional responsibilities which will react, in my opinion, not only to the benefit of the employers who need this temporary labor during the emergency period, but will also help the labor force in that particular community by keeping wages up.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I believe most Members of the House are fairly familiar with the subject matter of this legislation. It is an extension of the act of 1951. Legislation similar to this goes back to the war period and has been in existence since that time. It has been found necessary, and it is still quite necessary, to import agricultural labor into this country. I think all of us wish that that were not the case. But the fact is that if the farmers of this country are going to be able to meet the demands upon them to supply the food and fiber needed by the people of this country, particularly in the case of certain commodities, this type of labor is required.

I believe all of us can remember when it was possible to have this labor performed by American citizens. But there are very few Americans today who are willing to engage in stoop labor, and that is what most of this labor is. It is hard, tough, stoop labor.

The operation of the act which is being extended at this time has been very successful. I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to Secretary of Labor Mitchell and the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Siciliano, who has been in direct charge of this program, for the very fine and effective way in which it has been carried out. At the hearings which were held by the committee, and rather extensive hearings at that, there was nothing but praise for the manner in which this act had been administered. So, the Committee on Agriculture is coming before the House today with this legislation slightly amending the act and extending it for 3½ years. I am sure there will be some pertinent discussion of its provisions, but I do not believe it is necessary to take much of the House's time in considering it. I can assure you it was considered carefully and reported by the committee only after the most thorough study and discussion.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Tennessee made a statement which surprised and alarmed me both. I believe the gentleman said that part of this labor was being used to harvest crops which were being supported under the agricultural program. I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from Kansas could tell us how many of these laborers are used—or what proportion of them are being used to harvest these supported crops and what those crops are?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The statement I made was particularly with reference to cotton.

Mr. AVERY. That is what I wanted to know. Is that the only one? Is cotton the only crop?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. No, I think that some of them are used in the wheat belt. Is that incorrect?

Mr. HOPE. That is not correct.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I am not sure, but the main crop that I was referring to was cotton. That is in my State. In Arkansas, Texas, and other States, cotton is the primary commodity or the basic commodity I referred to.

Mr. AVERY. Does the gentleman have any figures as to what proportion of these workers might be employed in harvesting cotton?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The chairman has a chart here which shows the various States.

Mr. COOLEY. Last year there were 757 workers in the State of Tennessee. It does not show the crops.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. There were 757 in my State. In the State of Texas there were several thousand. I think most of them employed in Texas are employed in the cotton fields.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute to say that, while some of this labor is used for cotton, in the main it is used for fruit and vegetable crops.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I think the only other basic commodity is rice. Is that not true? Do they not use this on rice?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I do not think so.

Mr. HOPE. If so I do not know of it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Cotton is the one particular commodity to which I was referring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, we may talk about this act as much as we want to, but most of this labor goes into five States. If you eliminate those five States, there would be no need for this program. One happens to be the State of Texas. One hundred and fifty-eight thousand seven hundred and four were brought into Texas. California is next with 77,423, then Arkansas and Arizona. If you eliminate those States the program could not possibly be justified. I made that statement about a year ago. The cost of the program 2 years ago was about $2,750,000. Some savings have been made and it is now down to $1,750,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to make such observations about my remarks as he may wish to make.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am at a disadvantage in making observations about my chairman's remarks, because I find the Committee on Agriculture is somewhat in the position of my old football coach. Some years ago the coach scheduled two major games for the same date. Naturally, he had trouble in both places. The Agriculture Committee has a bill on the floor and we had a bill before the Committee on Rules at the same time. I have been before the Committee on Rules, and I have not heard the remarks of my distinguished chairman, but I am sure they were enlightening and informative.

I do call attention to the fact that when the gentleman refers to the number of Mexican nationals who work in certain Southwestern States, two facts must be kept in mind. In the first place, many of those States who use very few Mexican nationals use a very large number of American citizens of Latin extraction who were born in and who live in the United States. A great many people do not recognize the fact that in my own home State there are probably a million people of Latin extraction. They are American citizens just as you and I. Many of them go into the fields and indeed the factories of the North. Many of them are found working in other parts of the United States. So the fact that some of the States do not seem to use a large number of these Mexican nationals does not indicate at all that they should not be vitally concerned with the program. The success of this program involves the normal flow of American labor throughout this country. As these Latin Americans flow north, as those people want to move—and it is a legitimate practice—as that happens, there must be replacements in southern and western fields. Those replacements normally come from south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Is the gentleman saying that numbers of workers of Latin extraction from Texas move up to Kansas for more desirable working conditions and therefore you have to have the Mexican laborers?

Mr. POAGE. I do not say it half so eloquently as the gentleman from Kansas would say it. I felt it would come with much better grace from the gentleman from Kansas. I do not know why these people go to Kansas, but I suppose they must spend some time there in order to keep employed while they are away from Texas. But the fact remains that a large number of American citizens do move north every year, and someone must work the crops of the Southwest. The crops are primarily fruits and vegetables on which these people work. They do help in the cotton fields, it is true, but fruits and vegetables account for the great bulk of the work.

There is no place in the agricultural field where the costs can be more quickly reflected in the market basket than in the case of fruits and vegetables. So if we do not want to deny to the American consumer the opportunity to get fruits and vegetables at a reasonable price we must not deny the opportunity to the farmer to have an adequate supply of labor at the time he needs it. The important thing is the time, because these people who move from Texas north will go and spend 6 months, they will spend the whole season before they come back, whereas there will be a period of a few weeks or a month at most when there is desperate need for lots of workers in the very area from which they move. They feel that they cannot afford to spend 5 months with very little work simply to be on hand to work for the 1 month of intensive work at home. They go away to work for long periods of employment. Mexican nationals come in and do the more temporary work.

Primarily this is a question involving the welfare of every State in this Union as to whether we are going to carry on a controlled, a regulated, and a decent movement of labor across the Rio Grande, or across the barbed-wire fence in Arizona and California, or whether we are going to encourage the movement of the so-called wetbacks.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to ask my friend if it is not a fact developed in the hearings that there has been a great improvement in the situation all along this 1,600-mile border.

Mr. POAGE. I think there is no question about it, and the hearings reflect that fact.

Mr. COOLEY. And this bill now is regarded somewhat as a protection for our own domestic workers.

Mr. POAGE. It is very definitely a protection for our domestic workers because it requires in the first place that before any Mexican national is employed—and, incidentally, he must be a single man or come without his family, not with a bunch of women and children as some of the pictures out here in the lobby have indicated. A single man comes into the United States working by himself under this agreement and he is guaranteed: First, the prevailing wage; second, transportation; third, housing; fourth, a whole bunch of so-called fringe benefits—which makes it utterly impossible for any Mexican national to ever hope to receive employment if there are American citizens ready, willing, and able to do the work at the prevailing wage, because it simply costs the American employer more to employ the Mexican national than it would cost him to employ an American national on the ground. I know of no firmer way of guaranteeing the rights of the worker than to make it to the self-interest of the employer to employ American citizens. You cannot by legislation give to the worker the same degree of protection that the economic laws give to him.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a very good point in regard to protection of labor and standards provided for by this law. As pointed out a little while ago, the testimony before the committee showed beyond any question that as a result of establishing a workable plan as provided in the international agreement, the wetback menace has been reduced to a minimum simply because they can be brought in legally and they have a workable, feasible system now.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. So the passage of this bill without any crippling amendment would actually help control the wetback movement. Is that not right?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It is the only plan yet suggested which has ever been able to even slow down the flow of wetbacks. If I wanted wetbacks, I would know of no more effective way of getting thousands of them than to vote down this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation. I am fortunate enough to represent one of the great agricultural districts in the country stretching some 400 miles along the California coast. Most of our agricultural products consist of fruits and vegetables, all highly perishable. I know positively of my own knowledge that the labor supply there is just not available to harvest these crops without the addition of this supplemental Mexican contract labor.

I heartily endorse the program and hope it will be extended as proposed by the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], made mention of the fact that if it were not for the necessity of this program in 4 or 5 mentioned States the program could not be justified.

In considering this legislation I offered a motion in committee to extend the act for only 2½ years instead of the 4½ years recommended by the Department of Labor, feeling that the Congress should have the opportunity to review the program as often as possible. However, the committee adopted the 3½-year proviso now contained in the bill.

It is interesting to note that in the testimony given by the Assistant Secretary of Labor before our committee he expressed the fond hope that eventually this foreign labor program could be eliminated; but it seems to me that we are going to have this program with us for a long time to come. Evidence before our committee conclusively showed that American labor will not do the stoop labor work that is required in the fruit and vegetable areas of the country. In the seasonal period for fruits and vegetables it is absolutely essential to garner these crops when they are ripe and the required labor must be available at the time. I hope the program will work out as effectively in the future as it has in the past. But I do think that as often as possible the Congress should review the program to see to it that it is working effectively for the benefit of both labor and the employers.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> That title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out all of section 509.

With the following committee amendment:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'December 31, 1955' and inserting 'June 30, 1959'.
>
> "SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of section 502 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided, however,* That if the employer can establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that the employer has provided or paid to the worker the cost of return transportation and subsistence from the place of employment to the appropriate reception center, the Secretary under such regulations as he may prescribe may relieve the employer of his obligation to the United States under this subsection.'
>
> "SEC. 3. Section 503 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> " 'In carrying out the provisions of (1) and (2) of this section, provision shall be made for consultation with agricultural employers and workers for the purpose of obtaining facts relevant to the supply of domestic farm workers and the wages paid such workers engaged in similar employment. Information with respect to certifications under (1) and (2) shall be posted in the appropriate local public employment offices and such other public places as the Secretary may require.' "

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ANFUSO: On page 2, line 8, strike out all of section 3 and insert:
>
> "SEC. 3. Section 503 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:
>
> " 'No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work and terms and conditions of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers'."

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to accept this change in the law in the interests of simple justice for our own United States agricultural workers, as well as for the long-range protection of our domestic agricultural economy.

Let me say at the beginning that my amendment is one which was proposed to the House Agriculture Committee by the Eisenhower administration, and I hope and trust therefore that it will have the overwhelming support of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle as well as the Members of my own party. Its purpose is simple and clear. As Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco Siciliano, speaking for Secretary of Labor Mitchell, explained to the House Agriculture Committee, its sole objective is to end the present discrimination which exists under the program against our own United States farmworkers. The basic question, therefore, which each Member of the House is called upon to decide when he votes on this amendment is simply this: Are you prepared to allow our own United States farmworkers to be treated any less fairly than the standard for treatment of Mexican farmworkers which you will be establishing by voting for the passage of this law. My whole case, the whole argument for this amendment, comes down to merely that. I ask once more: Are the Members of the House ready to vote for a law which will provide better conditions of work for foreign workers brought into this country than they are ready to provide for our own domestic workers? That is what the law will provide unless this amendment is adopted.

Let me make clear, however, that this amendment would not affect any jobs except those for which it is proposed under this law to use Mexican workers. The amendment, further, would not add to the costs of the growers now using Mexican labor 1 penny, because under the law, and the International Agreement which supplements it, they are now required to offer these terms and conditions of work to the Mexican workers they import. All that my amendment would do is to require them to offer first to our own domestic workers identical terms and conditions of work, which they already must agree to offer to Mexicans under the law before the Secretary of Labor certifies them as being eligible for Mexican labor under this program. Are you ready to say—as you would be saying if you reject this amendment—that you think this law should continue to guarantee higher standards for Mexican workers brought into this country at a time when there is considerable unemployment than it guarantees to our own American workers who must compete with these foreign workers for these jobs?

Now, my interest in international affairs and world cooperation is well known to this body. I believe wholeheartedly in international assistance programs for less fortunate peoples of the world. I believe that we should be doing considerably more for Mexico and other Latin American nations under the point 4 and economic and technical assistance programs than we are presently doing. Nevertheless, I say to this body, without qualification, that while I will constantly work to promote the good neighbor approach in international affairs, I will never vote to sell the people of my own country short. That is why I am asking you to adopt this amendment. It does not provide more or additional benefits for agricultural workers in the United States. All that my amendment does is say that before we allow growers to bring foreign farmworkers in, they must be required first to offer—not one bit more—but only the same terms and conditions of work to our own farmworkers as they are ready to offer to Mexicans. What American can challenge that?

Such a requirement seems to me to be merely commonsense and simple justice. This is the view of all the great labor organizations in this country, and they are supported in this by the overwhelming majority of the Mexican trade unions. I am authorized to say by the Secretary of the United States section, Joint United States-Mexican Trade Union Committee, which speaks for the AFL, the CIO, the United Mine Workers of America, and most of the railway brotherhoods, that this amendment has their wholehearted support. I am further authorized to say that, with the amendments recommended by the House Agriculture Committee, the absence of this one provision requiring equal treatment for our own workers is the sole remaining major objection which prevents the organized labor movement of this country from supporting this law.

We have moved forward considerably this year toward reaching a greater understanding of the purposes of this program. The organized labor movement, which in the past had opposed the program, now has come to realize that, in emergency labor shortages, this law can be made an effective instrument for meeting the growers' needs. Labor spokesmen have stated categorically that they do not want one thing done to this law which will prevent growers from getting the help they need when they want it, provided such help is obtained under proper conditions. All that labor asks is that they obtain such help legally through the procedures set up by this law, that the use of illegal wetback labor be stopped, and that the terms of the law actually be enforced. Labor's chief objection to the Mexican labor program, provided the present loophole under which United States workers are discriminated against is removed, comes down largely to the fact that this law, and the related immigration laws, have not been properly enforced. I am sure every Member of the House agrees with me that the laws passed by this Congress are intended to be respected, and that such respect implies compliance with the terms of the law and proper enforcement. I do not see how any loyal American can quarrel with the demands which labor, many social-welfare agencies, church organizations, and other groups have made for adequate enforcement of this law.

Likewise, I do not see how any patriotic American can argue that a law should be passed under which people of his own country will be discriminated against because that law will guarantee to foreign workers under the international agreement that they will get terms and conditions of work higher than those offered to our own workers.

This situation comes about now, because under the International Agreement with Mexico, employers must guarantee to Mexican workers before they are certified to hire them that they will provide such benefits as housing, a minimum wage, hours-of-work guarantees, insurance for occupational injury and disease, transportation, and others, which now are not offered to domestic workers.

My amendment does not say to growers in general that they must give these guarantees. It merely says to those growers who are already giving such guarantees to Mexicans that they also must offer such guarantees to the workers of our own country before they can become eligible under the program. It does not require any farmer who is not already giving such guarantees to Mexicans to alter his labor practices with respect to United States workers one bit. And it does not require any grower, even those giving such guarantees to Mexicans now, to continue giving such guarantees if he decides that he can meet his labor requirements outside of this Mexican labor program. What my amendment provides is only that those growers who are already giving, or who in the future may be prepared to give, such guarantees to Mexicans must, in order to be eligible for Mexican labor, also offer such terms and conditions to United States workers.

Finally let me say that the only change in the present language of the law which my amendment proposes is the insertion of six words in the present text of section 3, section 503 of the existing act. The present law already provides that no Mexican workers shall be recruited unless the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies, among other things, that "reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers." That is the exact language of the law at the present time. My amendment would merely insert the words "and terms and conditions of work" in this section, so that in addition to requiring growers to offer comparable wages and hours, they also would be required to offer comparable "terms and conditions." I sincerely urge that my amendment which has been recommended by the Eisenhower administration have the complete support of both Republicans and my Democratic colleagues alike.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Everything in the gentleman's amendment is already in the law except the words "and terms and conditions of work." Will the gentleman explain to the House what he means by terms and conditions of work?

Mr. ANFUSO. Mexican workers at the present time are given housing facilities, hospitalization, minimum wage, transportation, insurance for occupational injury and disease, and other benefits which domestic workers do not have.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is under the contract entered into with the Mexican worker.

Mr. ANFUSO. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would not the gentleman say that they also had an unfair advantage in that the legislation itself provides that they shall not pay income taxes or pay social-security taxes?

Mr. ANFUSO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that not also unfair treatment of American labor?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for his amendment, and associate myself with him. It certainly seems to me that the American domestic worker should have all of the privileges accorded the foreign worker, including the same terms and conditions. I think this has been thought out carefully by the Department of Labor and the present administration. It seems to me to be a good amendment.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning transportation. Transportation of Mexican workers is paid from the reception center to the place of work. Would it be the thought of the gentleman, if his amendment is adopted, that transportation of domestic workers would be paid from their homes, say, in the Midwest to the West or wherever they might be employed?

Mr. ANFUSO. I think not. I think there is enough American labor in that vicinity that transportation would not be necessary for American workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, would it not be entirely possible that under this program agricultural workers on the east coast or in the far South might be recruited and have their expenses paid clear across the country to work in the fields of California or even in the Northwest? You could not apply this law, it seems to me, to one group of workers in America and deny the benefits of it to the industrial groups, those unemployed in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and other places. It seems to me we are bringing this to an almost impossible situation. This one other thought; that is that a lot of this labor moves intrastate and never goes into interstate commerce. We have no way of dealing with that which is wholly within the State.

Mr. ANFUSO. I am given to understand that there is enough labor in those particular localities which will not make it necessary to transport workers from the north to the south.

Mr. COOLEY. Suppose the State of California has enough workers at one end of the State who are available. The gentleman's amendment would provide that under this program the Secretary would have to offer those northern California workers the same opportunities he offers workers from south of the border. How can he regulate that if it is wholly intrastate?

Mr. ANFUSO. That would be entirely up to the Department. And I might say that the Department of Labor is willing to undertake that regulation.

Mr. COOLEY. But they have no authority in the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It seems to me the gentleman's plan is absolutely unworkable and his assumption is wrong. The reason we need these workers from Mexico is that there are not enough American workers who will take those jobs to harvest these crops which have to be harvested in a very short space of time.

Mr. ANFUSO. I am afraid that a great many people disagree with that statement. I understand that there are too many American workers out of jobs now who are looking to come in under this program.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Would not this have a tendency to set a standard, including transportation, for all similar domestic workers all over the country? Once it is offered to one set of workers in my State, for example, it would have a tendency to set the same requirements all over the country. And if that is so, should not the Committee on Labor look after this legislation rather than the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is another question. I think the Committee on Labor could consider it. But for the moment we should be concerned with this problem as it is. We are faced with this problem.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the gentleman on offering his amendment because, in my opinion, all his amendment does is to make American labor equal to Mexican labor under this bill. Am I correct in the analysis that if there is no American labor available then any Mexican labor can be hired?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is correct.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a farm employer of foreign labor, I think I should say that this amendment should not be harmful, particularly, neither will it do any good. I know a great many of the employers who use this Mexican labor in Texas and California, and know the system under which they must operate their farms. I happen to be located in the East, as you know, and therefore do not use Mexicans but do import labor from Puerto Rico, some Jamaicans, and incidentally some West Virginians. As a practical matter on this transportation and the special benefits, I do not know any employer in the business who is not willing to give the work to domestic labor, in fact, would perhaps prefer to give it to domestic labor. I certainly do not know of any employer who denies to native labor any of the benefits paid to foreign labor. It is true that the employer actually executes a contract where he must give it to the Mexican labor, but just as a practical proposition in the handling of his farm operations he would be glad to give it to any individual or group of domestic laborers who would come in and do that type of work.

With respect to transportation, sure, he would be willing to pay the equivalent in transportation. In my operation, if I may be personal, we pay transportation for native workers from Florida, Georgia and West Virginia as well as for imported labor and they all have the same side benefits in the form of protective insurance hospitalization, etc.

We in our operations, and I am sure all these fruit and vegetable operators, are perfectly willing to give the same sort of terms to any domestic labor that is willing to come in and do the work.

Therefore, I say that this amendment is more or less useless in behalf of native labor and it does impose added difficulties and expense to administration. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is a very fine man. He is a good member of our committee. He is an earnest and hardworking man. He works tirelessly and looks after the interests of his constituents.

We adopted the amendment of the gentleman. It has been explained here that his amendment provides that before certification can be had in a particular community the Secretary of Labor will go out and confer with the actual workers themselves as well as the employers and make a determination as to the need, as well as the amount of wages to be paid.

Now the gentleman comes in with this amendment which adds the words "under the terms and conditions offered the foreign worker." In other words, domestic workers must come in under the identical terms and conditions. They have to have the same so-called fringe benefits the foreign workers have. They have to be transported from the place of their abode on across to where the workers are needed. Yes, they are going to be taken down to Florida on a nice little trip under the same terms and conditions. They will go to Florida—and listen, he is an American citizen; he does not have to work one single day. He can run off and leave his contract after being employed only 1 day. He can go down there and be ready to come back home the very next day. And who pays the bill? The poor, distressed farmer has to pay the bill under the gentleman's amendment. The farmer will have to bear the burden of that and he will have to pay.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman referred to insurance as one of the terms and conditions. Of course, insurance and transportation and housing as well as, perhaps, the minimum wage that is provided on contract labor is involved in this issue. Under the international agreement, every employer of Mexican nationals under this program is required to carry a life insurance policy on the worker while he is working for him; is that not correct?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. Here the gentleman provides in one fell swoop by this amendment to require every farmer in America and every employer of farm labor in America, before he is allowed to hire a man to work on his farm, to have to take out a life insurance policy on the worker's life. I just cannot believe that he has thought out the implications of his proposal or he would never have offered it here.

Mr. GATHINGS. They would have to offer them housing facilities and they would have to give them kitchen utensils and so on.

Mr. FISHER. Not only that, but under the special contract and the restrictive arrangement which we have with Mexico with regard to this labor, we are allowed to transport only one individual; is that not correct?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. We are not allowed to bring in the whole family and here under this arrangement he could probably bring his whole family along with him.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, his wife and children would have to be carried all across this great land of ours. Under the contract we have with Mexico, just one able-bodied man is under contract.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The terms and conditions of the agreement we have with Mexico prohibit the bringing in of the man's family. The man cannot bring his family with him.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is true.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, this Mexican program is regimented and it is regimented for a very good reason. It is affected with a public interest, and that is the effort to keep down the evergrowing wetback problem that had plagued us before this law was passed. That is the reason we are justified in expending public funds in this program, otherwise we would not be justified in doing that.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct. One of the main faults with this amendment in addition to what has been mentioned here is that the Government of Mexico would be the bargaining agent for the domestic American workers of this country. That is what it amounts to. It would, in effect, place working conditions and the rates of pay of American farmworkers under the will and the arbitration of the officials of whatever government may be in power in Mexico.

I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture which considered this legislation. I sat in on most of the hearings and supported an extension of this program with proper safeguards. I do not want to talk specifically on this amendment, but I do wish to speak generally on the bill. This is a piece of legislation which you can consider in all its aspects with a real rule of reason, unclouded by any emotion or prejudice. It is true there are radicals and conservatives on both sides of this question. There are some employers of this labor, and of migratory, domestic labor who are completely callous to the welfare of their workers, and if they could use the device of foreign labor to beat down the wages of domestic workers, and if they could secure the Mexican workers cheaper, at say 5 cents an hour, they would do so. On the other hand, there are some persons in opposition who are opposed to the program regardless of whether there is a need for it or not. But most of us are, or should be, in the middle, in a conservative position, applying a rule of reason to this problem. We recognize, and responsible labor spokesmen recognize, that there is a need for this program in some areas at certain peak seasons of the year. At the same time we recognize that domestic labor is entitled to assurances that the program will not be used to supplant their work or lower their wage scales and working conditions. Concurrently the whole community has an interest in a fair program because a program subject to abuse swells local relief rolls, deprives merchants of customers, incites crime, and in the case of the Mexicans has brought a problem of narcotic addiction.

The reasonable advocates of the program recognize that this necessity of importing foreign nationals to work in our fields should be a temporary aspect of American life, and that the program should have a reasonable termination date.

Also, I am sure the reasonable employers are in agreement that there should be standards in the bill which would guarantee that the program is not used to beat down the wages of the domestic workers, and that there be a reasonable determination of the need for this labor in a given area at a given time, and that there be a reasonable determination that safeguards of the wages to be paid these Mexicans should be placed in the legislation, to the end that they are protected and that the wages were not so low as to depress American labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentleman is making a sensible and a real argument for this program the way it is written. Is it not true that the California Farm Placement Service combs the areas of the town and they find that American workers are not available; and based on that, then they figure out how many Mexican nationals they have to bring in?

Mr. HAGEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. This is administered by the State, in effect with varying standards of performance. The Department of Labor relies upon the determination of State employment officers to determine the necessity for this labor and the prevailing wages to be paid. I am certain the program has been abused in some areas. It is more fairly administered in some States than in others. I think probably the administration in California has been better than in almost any other State with some differences even among areas intrastate. For that reason, if for no other, I want to see that there are sufficient safeguards in this legislation to protect our farm employers who pay a fair prevailing wage, and who use this labor only when it is absolutely necessary, with some minor exceptions. The theory in law back of this is that there be a determination of need on the basis of an unbiased community survey and that there be administrative determination of prevailing wages on the same basis.

Finally, I would like to reiterate this is not a problem just of labor and management. It is a community problem. Whether these immigrants are legal or illegal, they bring a whole host of social problems with them. We have had a tremendous upsurge of narcotics use in certain territories, attributable in part to the presence of this foreign labor. One of my county supervisors told me that one-third of the burden of aid to needy children in his county was attributable to the Mexican nationals. There was no way of enforcing responsibility, because he was here today and gone tomorrow and this expense is shared by the county, State, and Federal Governments. The increase in petty thefts has grown in latter years. We have had a tremendous unemployment problem in central California with thousands of domestic workers going on relief. I am hopeful that the Labor Department will carry out the intent of this statute, exercise a closer supervision over State determinations, and prevent admitted abuses which will wreck the program for both deserving and undeserving employers, if long tolerated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, very properly, the workers of this country are reluctant to see any foreign workers brought in here who may be competing with them. That is understandable. I think very properly we have written into the law certain safeguards for persons who are brought in. First, it must be determined that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are available for the employment.

Second, that the employment of these foreign workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions in the area.

Third, that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers to such employment.

This amendment seeks to do one thing and one thing only, and that is to put the American worker on exactly the same basis as the Mexican worker. If the American worker is already getting the same consideration, or if he will receive the same consideration from the employer, then this is not going to do any harm. The Department of Labor considered this necessary, and I am willing to accept their word and their experience that it is necessary.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ANFUSO. Is it not a fact that all my amendment seeks to do is to apply comparable terms? In other words, if we are going to pay a Mexican worker $50 for transportation why should we not pay $50 to an American worker?

All my amendment seeks to do is to add six little words that give comparable conditions to our American workers. Is that not a fact?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is true. It perhaps would raise some difficulties of administration.

The statement that it would apply to every farmer in the country, of course, is not true. It means that before you can employ Mexicans you have got to set up the same standards for Americans; that is exactly what it means, no more and no less. If it is true that you could get enough Americans under these conditions then you would not have to employ Mexicans, and if you do not need Mexicans, then you do not have to pay the Americans the same wages or give them the same terms and conditions.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. I am pleased to have the clarification of the amendment because it was misunderstood. I was under the impression that if this amendment were adopted and a farmer out in Arkansas or Texas hired a domestic worker he would have to carry the same insurance on him that he does under the terms of our international agreement with Mexico if he employed a Mexican national; but I understand the gentleman to say that does not apply.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He would have to pay him or give him the same.

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking of insurance. He is required to carry insurance on the life of the Mexican national, but under the amendment he would not be required to take out a similar insurance policy on any domestic worker he might employ.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My time is limited. I will say this. Before he would employ a Mexican he would have to take out some insurance. If he does not want to take out that insurance on an American then he does not have to employ a Mexican. This is only for this one type of employee, the Mexican.

It seems to me that the burden of this amendment is not on the proponents; I think you gentlemen who are opposing it are going to have to do some pretty strong explaining as to why an American is not entitled to the same consideration as a Mexican; at least it is that simple as far as I am concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How is it possible for Congress to legislate with reference to labor that is entirely intrastate? The gentleman is proposing something in those little words, those six little words, that is a nullity. How can we impose any restriction on any landlord or any worker in the State of Texas that does not even go out of his neighborhood or his township? That is what is proposed by this amendment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is my understanding the Department of Labor has recommended this.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care what the Department of Labor has recommended. If they did, they did not understand it either. The gentleman is a lawyer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am willing to take the Department of Labor's words that it is needed and that it can be made effective.

Mr. COOLEY. But as an attorney and as a lawyer the gentleman knows we cannot legislate with regard to wholly intrastate matters.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman must be in error about the Secretary of Labor or the Department of Labor recommending this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to relate to the Committee an experience I had in my district last year. I have no farms in my district, but we do have some Mexican labor that comes up for the sugar-beet crop in Michigan.

It seems that they transport these employees a great distance in trucks, both to work in the morning and from work at night. Sometimes the workers stand around for quite a long while in the morning before their transportation picks them up, and then they are packed like sardines standing in trucks, the trucks being driven quite a number of miles.

One of these men was selected by the group to go back to the head office of the labor organization in Detroit and make a complaint because many of them caught colds, having been sweated up and then driven through the wind standing up in a truck.

The Labor Department turned him over to the Immigration authorities and the Immigration authorities without any further investigation stuck him in jail. Somebody brought the matter to my attention and I went down there. They were surprised that a man that was legitimately sent by a group of his fellow citizens to make a complaint had been put in jail. They left him there. I think he was in jail for 4 or 6 weeks. I thought it was terrible. He was let out the next day after I got down there.

Mr. Chairman, here is some information I happen to have, talking about American labor being discriminated against. Here is the Arkansas Gazette: 109,700 get surplus food during May—American citizens—and they estimate that the surplus food of the Federal Government will reach the proportion of $10 million for the year. That is dated June 3, 1955.

Here is May 20, 1955. Arkansans to employ more Mexican labor. Last year they had 7,400, this year 10,300, but with 109,000 getting surplus food and out of work.

So the Mexican nationals arrive. This is on May 26. I only mention this as an example.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has picked out my State, will he yield?

Mr. RABAUT. This is the only information I have. I do not take this particular State to offer as a citation, but it is the only one I have. The same thing is going on everyplace else.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say to the gentleman, he is aware of the fact that before any Mexicans can be certified into this country, they must go first and make a determination that there is a need for bringing them in.

Mr. RABAUT. I agree, but there must be somebody overlooking this 109,700 on relief.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say to the gentleman that we have had a serious drought in Arkansas. We have prayed for rain and we got some good rain during the spring. But we do need the labor to harvest our crops.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say to the gentleman I know that everyone who is getting surplus food cannot do farm work.

Mr. GATHINGS. That was back in the winter time. The gentleman did not give the date.

Mr. RABAUT. I gave the date. It was June 3.

Mr. GATHINGS. June 3. Read the whole article.

Mr. RABAUT. 109,700 get surplus food during May. That is this year, 1955.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How many people are getting surplus food in the gentleman's State of Michigan?

Mr. RABAUT. I presume there are some in our State getting it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman presumes?

Mr. RABAUT. The same situation exists in the gentleman's State, too.

Mr. COOLEY. But you are getting 5,000 of these workers in Michigan. You came before our committee and told us there were thousands or tens of thousands of people in your district in need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) Mr. RABAUT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is you have an enormous number of people receiving food up there.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the point I am making. I am not against the program to bring them in, but I am in favor of an American getting the first choice. If we can spend money on a national from Mexico, why can we not spend some money on an American citizen?

Mr. COOLEY. It is already in the law that the Department must certify that there is no American available for the work before they can employ the Mexicans.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman think it is being properly checked? Does he not think there is a loophole some place, when you see this in print in the paper?

Mr. COOLEY. It is in print there, but those may be incapacitated, they may not be qualified.

Mr. RABAUT. A hundred thousand? That is a lot of people to be disqualified.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the same terms and conditions which are offered to the Mexicans under their contracts are offered to the American workers—and that is to be the criterion—my opinion is that we will have no Mexicans here, because the Americans could not afford to take the kind of contract we give to the Mexicans.

Mr. RABAUT. That is right, but at least it should be offered to them.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. But if you make that the criterion, then it would be easier to get Mexicans here.

Mr. RABAUT. We in this House should not legislate against American citizens. I am for this Mexican labor that comes in here, and I think they have done a great service, but I do not think we have always treated them right. We treated them better in the beginning than we are lately.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I disagree with the gentleman. I think we are treating them very well.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to come back to this question of that part of the gentleman's amendment which has to do with the payment of equal wages to the nationals coming in from Mexico and to the American workingman. At first glance, this seems like a very innocent provision, but, as I said to the gentleman from Kentucky at the moment his time ran out, it is a self-defeating amendment. I feel positive that this was not recommended by the Department of Labor. At least, I should be extremely surprised if I learned that, because a national coming in from Mexico under contract is paid not only the prevailing wage in the area under the terms of the contract, it having been certified that there was no American labor available, but the national then is given some dozen or more fringe benefits, such as transportation, hospitalization, insurance, and other things.

Let me recite specifically what would happen if this amendment were to prevail. These fringe benefits or an equivalent would presumably have to be paid to the American worker, and, therefore, under the existing law, and again that would become the wage paid in the area, and so a ladder of increases would commence and the provision would be impossible to enforce. I hope the membership will keep that in mind before there is a vote. It is a laudable academic idea. Nobody wants a Mexican national if American labor is available. It is not cheap labor. Not as a moral issue nor as an academic issue, but strictly as a legal issue it would be impossible to enforce it, and the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleague, a member of our committee, from New York introduced this amendment in the best of faith with the hope that he would be able to render some service to the laboring men of this country. I would like to see us be able to improve the standard of living of American farm workers, but merely doing something that may look on its face as if it were going to be helpful can oftentimes be the most dangerous thing you can do.

The people who would be hurt most by this amendment would be the American farm workers. They are the people who have the most to lose, because they now have some real effective protection which neither this Congress nor any other legislative body can ever give to labor, because no legislation that you can pass can ever be as effective as the self-interest of the employer. Today it is to the self-interest of the employer to use American labor if it is available. He saves money by doing it. He saves trouble by doing it. He gets better work, more work, for less money when he can get American workers. And I do not know any American employer who does not use American labor if he can get it. Now, then, if you make this American labor cost him more than it costs him to use Mexican labor or even exactly the same amount, you have taken away that one great bulwark of protection that American labor has today. Pass this amendment and we have made that American laboring man rely upon an edict of a Congress rather than upon the firmness of the economic law to be sure that he gets employment. You have made him rely upon the efficient and intelligent enforcement of the law. Members have just stood here on the floor and told us how this law was not properly enforced. You have just told us that it was utterly impossible to get all of the enforcement that we ought to have. And yet you try to substitute reliance upon some governmental bureaucrats for the firm assurance which economic self-interest today gives to the American worker. I do not know how in the world anyone can say that is a sounder or a better protection. After all, our American workers have been getting pretty sound protection. You do not point to any place where American employers have failed to use American labor if they could get it. On the contrary, they try each time to get it and when they cannot get it they use Mexican labor, and only when they cannot get American workers, because they know today that it would cost them more to use Mexican nationals.

I think it would be a tragedy if this Congress, in a wild desire to try to do something that would look good in the newspapers, look good to American labor, were to destroy the firm protection that American labor has today, destroy the economic protection.

Then, of course, you do another thing to which everyone on both sides of the aisle has given much lip service. You destroy every vestige of the rights of the States, in regard to local contracts. Under our form of government, the States have the right to determine all of these matters that you want to determine, for local American labor. The Federal Government does not have the right to do it. The Federal Government has the right to legislate here only because these Mexicans are engaged in international commerce, international business, only because they are not citizens of the United States. That is the only reason the Federal Government has the right to prescribe the terms of these contracts.

If you want to go ahead and in plain violation of the Constitution proceed to pass legislation proclaiming the right of the Federal Government to control the relations between citizens of the same State, the employer, and the employee, then of course you are flying right squarely in the face of every doctrine that we have preached about States rights. You know we do not have any such constitutional right as that.

One more thing, and that is the practical application of this amendment. I know that the gentleman intended to write a practical amendment. But I wish the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] would tell me in what area these offers have got to be made. Is it true that if a man in Arkansas needs some people to pick cotton, or a man in California needs some people to pick grapes, and there are unemployed people in Minnesota, that they have but to write a letter to somebody and say, "We want a job and we want you to send a bus and get us and transport us to California"? Is that what the amendment does?

Mr. ANFUSO. I do not think so.

Mr. POAGE. What is there in the gentleman's amendment that would limit it?

Mr. ANFUSO. I think this. If in a particular locality, under my amendment, 1,000 workers are needed, and if we can get those 1,000 workers from Mexico under certain conditions, all my amendment seeks to do is to provide the same conditions to 1,000 American workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to this request, but it seems to me this bill has been rather thoroughly discussed and I shall object to any further requests for extensions of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] again to point out the language in his amendment that defines these localities.

Mr. ANFUSO. I believe the Department of Labor has made a complete investigation of that and can give the gentleman the localities.

Mr. POAGE. I am not asking about what the Department of Labor has done. We are not passing upon that. We are passing upon the gentleman's amendment. I am asking the gentleman to read us the words in his amendment—there must be some—that confine these localities. What are the limiting words?

Mr. ANFUSO. I do not think the legislation has to provide every regulation.

Regulations can come after the bill is passed.

Mr. POAGE. Regulations can come and regulations can open the doors wide. I am asking the gentleman what there is in his amendment that limits its application to any locality. The gentleman has suggested that it applied only to those localities where there were American workers available. What if such localities are a thousand miles from the localities where the Mexican nationals are to be employed?

Mr. ANFUSO. I believe under the present law they have to have regulations. They have to have regulations under any law.

Mr. POAGE. They have to have regulations, but I am asking the gentleman the question, and he has not answered. I ask the question again in the presence of this House.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. POAGE. No. I want to know the words the author has suggested confine this to workers in the locality where the work needs to be done. Does the gentleman care to name the words? Does he care to point them out? Or does he simply want this House to accept on faith some proposition because, perchance, he hopes that it applies only to a locality or that somebody in some regulatory agency of this Government will be fair, honest, and intelligent all the way down through time. Does the gentleman from New York propose to limit this thing to what he says he limits it to? I ask him as a lawyer, what is there in this amendment that would keep a worker in Minnesota from demanding that he be transferred to California, if somebody in California wants to employ somebody to pick grapes. Will the gentleman point it out?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with my friend from Texas that certainly the amendment if adopted would be applicable to every nook and cranny of this country.

Mr. POAGE. Of course.

Mr. COOLEY. If a man wanted a Mexican laborer in the southern part of California and I applied for the job, he would have to pay my way out to take the position.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman lived in Nashville, N. C., as he does, and wanted a ride across the country, and a man in southern California wanted a man to pick grapes out there, all the gentleman would have to do would be to write a letter and that man would have to provide the gentleman transportation out there. Then the day the gentleman got there he could quit.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We would be glad to have the chairman come out there.

Mr. POAGE. May I call my chairman's attention to the fact that the day he got there he could quit. There is not one thing in the world in this amendment that binds or that could bind an American worker. Of course, the Mexican worker is bound by his contract and is subject to deportation of he fails to carry out his contract. No such penalty could or should be imposed on an American citizen.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I suggest to the gentleman from Texas——

Mr. POAGE. I am yielding to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. BAILEY. We have 100,000 unemployed over in the State of West Virginia. Maybe we had better send some of those out their in preference to the Mexicans.

Mr. POAGE. I think if this amendment is adopted you would have the most traveling outfit in West Virginia you have seen in a long time. They would travel all over the United States.

In all seriousness, if you do not think that is true, remember what happened back in the days when we were transporting American workers. We did transport them from Arkansas, and from my own State of Texas. I do not mean to confine it to Arkansas, but from Texas, Oklahoma, and all the Southwest. They moved out to the coast country and they moved right back, and many of them did not do a lick of work.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Does the gentleman make the point that this bill would be difficult to administer with the amendment?

Mr. POAGE. It would be impossible.

Mr. BROWNSON. In that case, it is best to vote the bill down, since it is impossible to administer in order to give justice to the American workers.

Mr. POAGE. That might be true were we going to adopt this amendment. If it were going to be adopted I would join the gentlemen, but fortunately we do not have any idea of adopting this amendment. We are going to pass a good bill here, one that we can all vote for.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Anfuso amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to be recorded in opposition to the amendment and I am glad to yield my time to some member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I take a back seat to no one with respect to the fair treatment of American labor. I have on many occasions defended fair treatment for American labor and I will continue to do so. I think we all want our citizens to have jobs and to work under fair and proper conditions for a fair wage. But, certainly, I do not feel this is a matter with which we should be concerned in the discussion on this bill today. This amendment, it would seem to me, would propose to legislate at the Federal level with reference to the management problems that farmers and domestic labor are concerned about. I feel it presents a picture which it would be impossible to live with and to administer. In our area our farmers are not interested in employing foreign labor. They do it only at great expense to themselves, and they do it only when it becomes impossible to secure domestic labor. Certainly, I do not feel we should do anything in this bill which would lead to a bad situation between the employer and the employee in the domestic field. I believe the provisions of the bill as recommended by the committee represent a fair compromise for both the employer and domestic labor, and represent something they both can live with, though neither group may be completely satisfied. I would be most reluctant to see the legislation made unworkable by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, although I am from an area that is not particularly affected by the importation of Mexican farm labor, I am convinced that there is an issue here that cannot be compromised, a principle of importance whether the legislation affects our individual areas or not. As a matter of fact, there is some confusion in many minds between the importation of Mexican labor under the legislation we are discussing today, and the use of American citizens of Mexican origin as migratory workers. I am informed that in Indiana there is, at present, virtually no importation of Mexican workers. However, the issue of far greater magnitude is whether domestic farm labor should receive the same benefits as imported Mexican labor.

Under the present law the imported Mexican agricultural laborers are receiving more benefits, in some cases, than our own migrant farm workers. Some of our colleagues admit that. Mr. Siciliano, Assistant Secretary of Labor testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, that the Mexican Government so ably represents the Mexican workers in negotiating their terms of employment that they now receive housing, minimum wage, and hours-of-work guarantees, insurance for occupational injury and disease as well as transportation. While the Mexican workers are receiving these benefits, our own farm workers, due to the fact that they are largely unorganized, are receiving only what the individual employer chooses to give to them. This situation of preferred treatment for Mexican labor should be, and I am sure is, intolerable to this Congress. It is the underlying reason why this amendment should be passed to perfect this legislation.

It has been argued that such an amendment as that of the gentleman from New York would be difficult to administer, but I would like to remind the Members of the House that the Secretary of Labor has suggested this change in the legislation as being in the best interests of labor. This same Secretary will have to administer the proposal. Surely he can work out a technique for administering it fairly. Difficulty of administration of this amendment should not be used as an overwhelming objection as long as its passage would fill a real need.

I have supported this legislation in the past: I serve notice that, without this amendment granting equality of opportunity to American farm labor, I shall have to vote to recommit this bill. It is not fair that Indiana farmers be forced to compete against farmers from other States who are permitted to exploit either imported or domestic agricultural labor.

A principle is at stake today and not a question of detailed techniques. Ours need not be the problem of dealing with the fine points in the administrative orders to implement this one amendment. A principle to which I think the Congress should be dedicated, the principle of equality for the American working man, be he industrial or agricultural, is involved in the vote on this amendment. I will support it, and I will vote for the bill if this amendment passes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to try to get this whole subject back into some reasonable focus. The original bill, known as the Mexican migrant labor bill was passed in order to stop what we called wetback traffic. This has worked better than it has ever worked before, and we come closer now to stopping that wetback traffic than ever before.

I want to ask my colleague, who lives on the border, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], if the adoption of this amendment will seriously impair the work of the present law.

Mr. FISHER. I certainly think so. For years we were plagued with the wetback menace all along the border, mainly because we had an unworkable international agreement. The average Mexican workers would certainly rather come in under a contract arrangement than swim the river or come in as a wetback where he has no protection whatever. But in the last 2 years we have had a workable agreement. The wetback menace is reduced to the very minimum. There is very little of a wetback problem any more, simply because we have a working agreement whereby they can come in. If we could continue this without these crippling amendments, of which this is one that is proposed now, we could get along very well.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. So if the law is seriously impaired, it will not only shut off the American worker from getting a job that he can get now, but not a single Mexican can come in and we will again make it necessary for the farmers along the Rio Grande and other border communities to get wetbacks as they did before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt; on a division there were—ayes 50, noes 89.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado to the committee amendment: Page 2, after line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Title V of such act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 510. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to require employers to provide adequately for the safety, health, and welfare of workers while they are being transported from reception centers to the places of their employment and returned from such places to reception centers after termination of employment. Any person who violates any such regulation shall, for each violation, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both'."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out wherein it is not germane to the bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. The amendment is not germane inasmuch as it calls for consultation by the Secretary of Agriculture with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is not in anywise affected by this legislation. Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture does not administer this program; the program is administered by the Secretary of Labor. I think therefore the amendment clearly is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very evident that the amendment itself only directs that the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary. The fact is that this legislation is given to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration, and we leave it with him for that purpose with consultation merely a factor so that he may be assisted in proper regulations as far as they may be enforced by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTEN). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

From a reading of the amendment it is apparent that all the actions are required of the Secretary of Agriculture; no specific action is required of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The amendment attempts to change the provisions of the bill having to do with employee safety, health, and welfare; and it is quite clearly, in the opinion of the Chair, germane to the bill.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the full text of the amendment, as I indicated a moment ago, is to be found on page 9884 of yesterday's RECORD, and if you want to consult it to get the exact words of it, there is where you will find it.

First I want to say that this amendment is a just amendment; second, it is a humane amendment; and, third, it is legislation that is needed if this legislation is to be adequately carried out. I want to direct your attention to the situation that now exists. In the first instance, under this legislation it has been represented that those who are made available under this program are guaranteed certain things and one of the things they are guaranteed is transportation. Let us see how that is working.

Heretofore throughout the West where most of this program is in operation the men who take the workers from the border usually load them in a truck and they keep them in that truck until they have reached their destination, be it 500 miles, a thousand miles, or 1,500 miles. Recently in the State of Colorado east of the city and county of Denver one of these trucks overturned and in it there happened to be 54 people. One was killed, a child, and 20 were injured. We need some regulation to prohibit the loading of 50 or 54 people in trucks and driving them a thousand or 1,500 miles across this Nation. We should at least give them the humane treatment the Interstate Commerce Commission requires in the transportation of hogs and cattle. That is all we are asking for here.

When this accident happened, the Governor of the State of Colorado, recognizing the injustice that arose as a result of the accident and believing that such accidents may happen again, contacted the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington and asked them to take some action.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to ask the gentleman if he understands that this amendment would not reach the example that he cites? It is a very bad situation, but his amendment would not reach it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may say to the gentleman that at least it would reach the situation as it deals with the Mexican nationals. If we can take one step forward in the protection of human beings, as my amendment proposes to do, then it is a step in the right direction. The people who are interested in the protection of the people then will see that adequate legislation in the future, in addition to these nationals, will be enacted, they will see that others may be brought in under the program that cannot be brought in under this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentlemen from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It occurs to me that the gentleman's amendment would subject one of his constituents or citizens to a fine and imprisonment for violation of a regulation issued in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture. Is that true?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that if I had a constituent who would not live up to adequate rules and regulations for the protection of human beings being transported for 1,000 or 1,500 miles that may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, then that constituent should be punished.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's amendment is not limited to that area of operation, a thousand or 1,500 miles. It would even apply to reemployment within a township, say 10, 15, or 50 miles, or any other distance within a State. It would apply to transactions which are entirely intrastate.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. COOLEY. Violation would subject your employers to a high penalty and a jail sentence.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. I am afraid that the gentleman has misconstrued the intent and the effect of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. Chairman, no one felt worse than I did when I read the report of the accident referred to, but I am telling you frankly that has nothing to do with this bill in any way, shape or form and should not be a part of this legislation.

We should not permit such large numbers of people to be piled into a truck. But I say again it has nothing to do with the legislation here pending.

On page 39 of the hearings which I hold in my hand appear details of the regulations concerning the transportation of Mexican workers. They are far better than we provide for ourselves. I want to run through those regulations that are now enforced by the Department of Labor handling this program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman tell us whether those involved in that accident were really Mexican nationals or American nationals?

Mr. HILL. They were American citizens.

Mr. POAGE. And, as a matter of fact, the gentleman's amendment would have absolutely nothing in the world to do with this situation?

Mr. HILL. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I read the following concerning the regulations enforced by the Department of Labor:

REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MEXICAN WORKERS BY TRUCK

All transportation of Mexican workers from reception centers to area of employment, from area of employment to reception center or on transfers to other employers, shall be by common carrier or by other adequate means. Where trucks are used, the following requirements shall be complied with:

1. The driver shall be licensed to drive the truck transporting the Mexican workers.

2. A. Transportation from reception centers: Under no circumstances shall Mexican workers be transported for more than 14 hours (including time spent at rest stops or regular food stops) in any one day. There shall be no driving before 6 a. m. or after 8 p. m., except where on the same day as the departure, trucks transporting workers, traveling at reasonable speeds, can arrive at the place of employment before 11 p. m. (and not be on the road for more than 14 hours).

On the first day of travel, trucks may use the following schedule:

If departure is at—	*May drive until—*
6 a. m.	8 p. m.
7 a. m.	9 p. m.
8 a. m.	10 p. m.
9 a. m.	11 p. m.[1]
10 a. m. or later	11 p. m.[1]

[1] Provided they can reach their destination by this time. If they cannot reach their destination by 11 p. m., they must stop driving at 8 p. m.

B. Transportation from place of employment: Workers may not be transported for more than 14 hours (including time spent at rest stops or regular food stops) in any one day. There shall be no driving before 6 a. m. or after 8 p. m. Under no circumstances are trucks to arrive at reception center after 8 p. m.

3. Provision shall be made for 15 minute rest stops every 2 hours.

4. Overnight rest stops must be adequate for the climatic conditions.

5. Each vehicle must have adequate fixed seats not less than 13 inches deep by 18 inches wide. The seats shall be not less than 17 inches from truck floor. Seats must be of solid boards and may not be slatted type. Seats or benches must be firmly anchored to truck bed. A minimum of 18 inches shall be allowed for rows between any two rows of seats. Seats shall be constructed of smooth, planed lumber, free of splinters or protruding nails. All seats must have a backrest extending at least 46 inches from truck bed. Several boards with a minimum width of 4 inches may be used for the backrest.

6. There must be protection against the weather. Tarpaulins must be not less than 6 feet above the floor and along the sides of each vehicle, where necessary.

7. All vehicles must be equipped with—

(*a*) Fire extinguisher.

(*b*) Drinking water in containers equipped with spigots.

(*c*) Signaling device between passengers and driver.

8. All vehicles shall be clean and reasonably comfortable.

9. All workers shall be given 50 cents per meal en route or its equivalent in food.

Before the start of each trip the representative of the Department of Labor shall be shown:

1. Proof of ownership of vehicle.

2. Proof of adequate insurance coverage.

3. Itinerary of route, showing rest stops, food stops, and overnight stops.

4. Drivers' license.

5. State inspection certificate, where applicable (or Department of Labor inspection report will be executed).

After arrival at destination, driver and workers will be questioned as to adherence to these requirements.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that if all these regulations are already a part of the operation of this program, why do you want to bring in a piece of legislation that will tangle this whole business? It will affect the lumber trucks in Maine; it will affect them in the Northwest; it will affect anyone that wants to take a group of men to work who stand up in a truck. Now, I ask if you are not better off to leave it as it is and defeat this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add to what my friend from Colorado has said about the protections that are provided in the contract for the safety and well-being of Mexican nationals that the contract provides the same safety provisions that are required of common carriers. The contract now in force is almost identical with the language contained in the pending amendment. The gentleman's amendment speaks of adequate transportation facilities. The contract now requires adequate transportation facilities.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is reading from a contract that has been entered into for the transportation and welfare of these workers brought from the border as nationals; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. All transportation between the reception center and the place of employment and between places of employment shall be by common carrier or other adequate transportation facilities, provided such other transportation facilities when used to transport the worker shall have sufficient adequate fixed seats for the transportation of passengers, adequate protection against inclement weather, and shall meet the same safety requirements applicable to common carriers. How can you provide any more or better protection?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the event one of the contractors violated that agreement, what could you do about it?

Mr. COOLEY. No more labor would be certified for that employer. They have plenty of ways to control that. But certainly you would not want to lock him up and put him in jail because his truck was overcrowded or because of some other violation of a regulation written by the Department of Agriculture. It seems to me it is a drastic amendment, and I would like to conclude by saying that it would be applicable to interstate movements, because the amendment says from the recruitment center to the place of employment. Recruiting stations are in California; they are in Texas, so that the transportation is wholly within the State of California or Texas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, this amendment was never presented to our committee at all. We had no opportunity to study it or pass judgment on it.

Mr. COOLEY. Unfortunately, it was not presented. I think it is too far-reaching in its effect.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if his attention was ever called to a specific instance where a Mexican national was injured during transportation?

Mr. COOLEY. No. I understood my colleague from Colorado to say that these were not Mexican nationals; they were American citizens.

Mr. FISHER. No instance of that kind has ever been called to my attention.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if you will listen, I will read the figures from the State of California for 1953. There were 23 migrant worker fatalities in 1953 in the State of California alone, and 341 accidents during that year.

Mr. COOLEY. Did they occur on the highway or on a bus, were they due to inadequate facilities?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This was truck transportation last year. These were credited with reducing accidents involving migrants. This has reference to transportation. It is a report from a lady who is now employed by the Department of Labor, who gave the report to the Governor of the State of Colorado.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean by migrant labor? Is he talking about Mexican nationals? If the gentleman is talking about migrant labor, you have "Okies," and so forth, running all over the country. Maybe they were migrant laborers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Maybe we are getting home, at that. I came from Oklahoma, too.

Mr. COOLEY. We have thousands and tens of thousands of migrant laborers. The gentleman talks of migrant labor, but he has not said whether they were Mexican nationals.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will let me read from the migratory labor notice issued by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor——

Mr. COOLEY. We are interested here in Mexican labor. We do not have time to talk about migratory labor.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This mentions Mexican labor, Mexican nationals.

Mr. COOLEY. What does it say?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It says the President's Committee expects to have developed very shortly a set of proposed standards for safety——

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I cannot yield further. We do not have time to talk about proposals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to know who had the floor. That was all.

Mr. COOLEY. I have given it up. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado) there were—ayes 45, noes 76.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: On page 2, line 8, strike out all of section 3 and insert:
>
> "SEC. 3. Section 503 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "'No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment on terms and conditions of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers'."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is exactly the same amendment that was offered a moment ago, "the terms and conditions of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers." That is the same as the Anfuso amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McCARTHY. This is not the same amendment that was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]. If the chairman of the committee will listen to it carefully, I think he will note that it meets the objections which were raised by his own committee to the Anfuso amendment. Therefore, it must be different.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Anfuso amendment contains the words in the latter part thereof "at wages and standard hours of work." Certainly, in the opinion of the Chair, that is a substantial part of the provision. In the amendment now pending such words have been stricken out and that much of the substance of the amendment has been changed. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to establish this standard, that the American workers must be offered, in a package, terms and conditions which include, of course, wages and hours and anything else that might be offered, which are comparable to the offer which is made to the Mexican nationals who are brought in. The offer does not have to be identical but it should be comparable. This seems to me a simple question of justice, that the proposal made to the American worker, whatever it may be, higher wages than are offered to the Mexican, better hours, or insurance, if we want to add that, or other additional benefits, should be at least as good a package as the offer which is made to the Mexican nationals who are brought in under contract. It is difficult for me to understand how anyone who opposed the Anfuso amendment, arguing that he was concerned about justice for the American worker can oppose this simple and clear proposition.

I would like to make one further point before the gentleman from Texas is recognized, if he is to be recognized, and raise the question of areas. The language with regard to areas in my amendment is the same language as is included in the bill, so if there is to be confusion with regard to grape producers in California, or potato growers in Maine, there will be no more confusion arising from my amendment than there will be from the bill which is being considered by the House today, as an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the bill is applicable only to Mexican nationals.

Mr. McCARTHY. The bill is not only applicable to Mexican nationals, the bill provides that American workers shall have been offered terms which are comparable before importation of nationals shall be approved.

Mr. COOLEY. No, the bill does not provide that at all. The Secretary must make certain findings, 1, 2, and 3. The gentleman attempts to amend the third finding with reference to reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. But it does not apply to transportation.

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendment says nothing about the transportation.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman mentions "terms and conditions."

Mr. McCARTHY. Terms and conditions. I did not specify. The legislative intent of the amendment is that the package offered to the Americans taken altogether, shall be just as good as the package offered to the Mexican nationals, taken altogether. I do not say we have to provide an insurance policy for the American worker or transportation.

Mr. COOLEY. No; but the gentleman leaves it to the Secretary to prescribe the terms and conditions.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I do not leave it to the Secretary; I just say that the overall offer made to the Americans must be just as good as the overall offer made to the Mexican nationals. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is admitting that his amendment is in fact the Anfuso amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I am not. The Anfuso amendment as the gentleman interprets it and as the gentleman from New York seems to accept, required that insurance policies be offered to the American workers. I am going to stand by the ruling of the Chair with regard to my amendment.

Does the gentleman have another question?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. "Terms and conditions" as used in the gentleman's amendment certainly includes wages and hours, does it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That would be only a part of the consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. It would include wages and hours?

Mr. McCARTHY. Wages and hours would be included and additional things. Transportation, might be included. Better wages might be included.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is willing, therefore, that this shall apply equally both ways?

Mr. McCARTHY. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That this shall be an equal deal, either way. The gentleman agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That the terms offered to the Americans shall be comparable to those offered to the Mexican nationals?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Either way.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Therefore, the American shall contract with the farmer to leave his wife and family behind, to come in and work under contract, and work for a specific length of time.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the American wishes to enter into that kind of contract we cannot stop him from doing so.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That was under terms of contract with the Mexicans.

Mr. McCARTHY. But he does not have to agree to the specific terms, I have been saying to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is it not true that much has been made of this transportation problem, yet the average cost of transportation for the Mexicans has been between $7 and $15 apiece, which is the total amount that would be required to be met if the gentleman's amendment were adopted for the American migratory worker.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not a significant factor in the debate. But I would like to make this point to the Members. Actually, what we have been doing here through the years with regard to farm labor and migrant labor is to establish standards for Mexican nationals who are brought into this country. On the basis of those standards we now argue that American migrants ought to be treated just as well—not in the same way but just as well. That does not, to me, seem to be an unreasonable request, to ask that American migrant workers be treated just as well—not identically—but just as well as the Mexican national.

That is all I am asking for in my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana apparently is very vitally interested in this legislation now pending. He will notice in the report that only six of these Mexican nationals were transported to the State of Indiana last year. I cannot believe that the agricultural economy of the State of Indiana is so vitally dependent on six Mexican nationals to save it from a depression.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not at the moment.

Mr. BROWNSON. That is why I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not know the gentleman was against the bill—I thought he was for the amendment. There you have it—a man is against the bill, but apparently wants to put in these amendments. I think if you were to adopt this amendment, you might as well vote against the bill. I realize the fact that it is applicable to and is of value to people in about five States. Let us be fair about it. My colleague, a former member of the committee, now has presented to us an amendment which is identical in intent and purpose with the Anfuso amendment which was voted down by a vote of 2 to 1 a moment or two ago. He practically admitted it when he said it serves exactly the same purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Chair has already ruled on that point.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not asking the Chair to rule on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am making a point of order against the gentleman's statement. The Chair has already ruled on the amendment, and I trust that the gentleman will abide by the ruling.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, I am willing to accept the Chair's ruling.

Mr. Chairman, I say the gentleman was very ingenious in drafting his amendment, but his purpose is obvious. He admits that the words, "terms and conditions of work" are comprehensive enough to embrace wages and hours. Now, in ingenious fashion, he presents an amendment which is in order but which he says has exactly the same purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. What?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say identical—I have been protesting that.

Mr. COOLEY. No, I said the intent and purpose is the same. It is far enough reaching to subject all agricultural labor in this country to regulation by Congress. If that is what you want to do, you can adopt this amendment and put agricultural labor under the wage and hour law and subject it to all the other terms and conditions applicable to Mexican labor.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course, the amendment is not the same. Heretofore, American wages and hours have been the criteria. This amendment turns it around and makes the Mexican wage and hours and conditions the criteria.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman knows the gentleman is not exactly right. The standards of employment as regards migrants is not the wage and hour act. There is no standard. The only standard is the Mexican standard.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right and you want to put the American workers under the Mexican standard.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would rather have the Mexican standard than no standard at all.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote and the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCarthy) there were—ayes 52, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hyde to the committee amendment: Add section 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. In the performance of his duties under title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and in the administration and enforcement of that act, the Attorney General is authorized to deport from the United States, as a violator of the terms of the conditions of his admission, any agricultural worker recruited under that act who, subsequent to his admission to the United States performs agricultural work for a wage lower than that specified in his individual work contract. If, in the opinion of the Attorney General, the national interest so requires, he may, in lieu of deportation, return the worker to the reception center for reassignment to another employer under a new work contract."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, under present law—title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended—the Secretary of Labor has the authority to guarantee performance of contract provisions relating to wages. The agreement with Mexico on migrant workers in article 30 includes procedures to enforce compliance with the wage provisions of work contracts. These wage guaranties were intended to protect the migrant Mexican worker from exploitation, and at the same time to protect the interests of

American workers in that a lower wage scale paid the migrant worker would depress prevailing wage scale.

However, the fact is that some employers of Mexican migrant workers have been evading the law. They contracted for a Mexican laborer at a reception center and agreed to pay him the prevailing wage, but subsequently by threatening to send the laborer back, they force him to agree to accept wages at less than the prevailing level. Such foul play by a few unscrupulous employers work to the detriment of the Mexican laborer, the American worker, and is damaging to law-abiding employers who comply with their contractual commitments, and have to compete with the wage-cutting competitor.

These reprehensible practices and their forcible acceptance by the Mexican worker amounts to a violation of the condition of admission of that worker under the immigration laws and regulations, while the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, now expressly provides that these workers are subject to our immigration laws, my amendment would implement these provisions so as to enable the Immigration and Naturalization Service to take prompt and effective action.

I particularly want to point out that under my amendment the Attorney General has the alternative of returning the worker to a reception center for reassignment to another employer under a new contract, instead of deporting him for violation of conditions of entry. This determination is to be made in the light of the national interest of the United States. Thus my amendment would make possible a flexible application of the law, along with providing means for dealing with a situation which must not be permitted to last.

Mr. Chairman, I understand some objection will be made to this amendment, raised by the Department of Labor, that this amendment in some way would interfere with our agreement with Mexico under the migrant workers law. How could that possibly be in the light of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as it is now worded which implements this migrant workers law?

Section 508 of that law provides:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General pursuant to the general immigration laws to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507 or to permit such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he the Attorney General shall specify.

So the Attorney General is given authority under the present law to deal with this problem of these migrant workers under the immigration and naturalization laws. Under this amendment there is spelled out, the particular action the Attorney General may take in the event of violation.

It seems to me this works to the benefit of the migrant worker. All it does is simply this: if they find a violation, under present law they have to deport him, under my amendment they may reassign the worker to another farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel certain that my able, distinguished and usually well informed friend from Maryland who offered this amendment, is not entirely familiar with the provisions under which the present program is being carried out. The agreement which we have with the Government of Mexico which forms the basis of this program covers the rate of wages, working condition and every other situation which might arise between the employer and the migrant worker.

So my first point, Mr. Chairman, is that this matter is already taken care of. There is no need for any provision of this kind.

In the second place, if we adopt this amendments we would have two departments of the Government carrying out this legislation—the Immigration Service—and the Department of Labor, with all of the confusion and duplication which that would imply. But there is a third and still more important reason I think, and that is that this amendment would be an utter violation of the agreement which we have with the Mexican Government.

To substantiate these points I would like to read a portion of a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Siciliano, under date of May 24, 1955 to General Swing, Commissioner of Immigration as follows:

> The migrant labor agreement with Mexico under article 30 provides a procedure for the determination of whether a worker or employer has breached the work contract or the international agreement. This procedure affords the employer or the worker a right to have his alleged violation investigated jointly by representatives of the Mexican Foreign Ministry and the United States Department of Labor. Any party adversely affected by a finding under this procedure has a right of appeal to the Secretary of Labor and the representative of the Mexican Government in Washington (Senor Jose Delgado).
>
> The failure to afford the employer or the worker the rights accorded him under the international agreement is in violation of that agreement and has the effect of relieving him of any financial responsibility arising out of his violation.
>
> If the United States undertakes to make unilateral decisions under the international agreement, in violation thereof, we will find ourselves in a position where we cannot object to similar action on the part of the Mexican Government.
>
> Another important point which I wish to reiterate is the fact that the United States guarantees the wages and transportation of these workers. The failure of the United States to follow the procedure referred to above would make it impossible for us to effect restitution from the employers. At the same time, however, the United States would be required, under article 32 of the Migrant Labor Agreement, to pay the three-quarter guaranty due the worker because of the premature termination of his contract.

Mr. Chairman, what I have just read clearly shows that the adoption of this amendment would not only violate our agreement with Mexico, but would seriously interfere with a program which is at present operating most effectively and successfully.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to add my support to the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman HYDE.

This amendment has been unanimously recommended by the Immigration Subcommittee. The practices brought to our attention are very disturbing. They not only tend to depress wages, but they are in violation of the immigration laws.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina want to press his point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to call attention to the fact that the Department of Justice was invited by the committee to appear and did appear in hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and at that time made no suggestion that it wanted any legislation of the kind proposed in this amendment, but, on the contrary, made the positive recommendation for continuation of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If we adopt this amendment, would we not in effect be turning over enforcement of this law to the Attorney General?

Mr. POAGE. Not to the Attorney General. We would be turning it over to his agents. They drive up and down the Rio Grande with a six-shooter on their hip. We would be making judicial officers out of these enforcement officials. We would tell them that they could pass on the fact and assess the punishment. In short we would be setting up a bunch of six-shooter courts to punish these Mexican citizens for acts beyond their control.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date, pursuant to House Resolution 255, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Saylor moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture for further study.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Saylor) there were—ayes 48, noes 123.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-two Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 298, Rept. No. 1069), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC WEAPONS REWARDS ACT OF 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, or special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, if I may make a short explanation of this bill, a bill similar to the Senate bill now before the House was adopted by the House on yesterday with a minor amendment. In order to expedite the passage of the bill, I am seeking to call up the Senate bill and, if consideration is given to this request, will then offer a minor amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955."

Sec. 2. Any person who furnishes original information to the United States—

(a) leading to the finding or other acquisition by the United States of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon which has been introduced into the United States, or which has been manufactured or acquired therein contrary to the laws of the United States, or

(b) with respect to an attempted introduction into the United States or an attempted manufacture or acquisition therein of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon, contrary to the laws of the United States,

shall be rewarded by the payment of an amount not to exceed $500,000.

Sec. 3. An Awards Board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury (who shall be the Chairman), the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of Central Intelligence, and of one member of the Atomic Energy Commission designated by that Commission, shall determine whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to any award and the amount thereof to be paid pursuant to section 2. In determining whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to an award and the amount of such award, the Board shall take into consideration—

(a) whether or not the information is of the type specified in section 2, and

(b) whether the person furnishing the information was an officer or employee of the United States and, if so, whether the furnishing of such information was in the line of duty of that person.

Any award of $50,000 or more shall be approved by the President.

Sec. 4. If the information leading to an award under section 3 is furnished by an alien, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of Central Intelligence, acting jointly, may determine that the entry of such alien into the United States is in the public interest and, in that event, such alien and the members of his immediate family may receive immigrant visas and may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Sec. 5. The Board established under section 3 is authorized to hold such hearings and make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 6. Any awards granted under section 3 of this act shall be certified by the Awards Board and, together with the approval of the President in those cases where such approval is required, transmitted to the Director of Central Intelligence for payment out of funds appropriated or available for the administration of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

Sec. 7. As used in this act—

(a) The term "atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

(b) The term "atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

(c) The term "special nuclear material" means plutonium, or uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, or any other material which is found to be special nuclear material pursuant to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(d) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all Territories and possessions of the United States and the Canal Zone; except that in section 4, the term "United States" when so used shall have the meaning given to it in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cole: On page 4, line 20, strike out "the Commonwealth of."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is simply to eliminate the characterization of Puerto Rico as having a commonwealth status. The bill retains Puerto Rico, but does not give it the designation of a commonwealth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on S. 2090, to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACT ACT OF 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1290) to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared this with the minority membership of the committee?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is my understanding that the bill has been cleared.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by redesignating section 412 as section 413 and by inserting a new section 412 reading as follows:

"SEC. 412. (a) In exercising the authority contained in section 411 within the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia, the Administrator of General Services shall conform to the plan for redevelopment of that area pursuant to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. Purchase contract agreements for this area shall be for terms of not less than 10 years nor more than 30 years.

"(b) The Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer lands of the United States under his control needed by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to said Agency within the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia, and in consideration therefor, to accept from said Agency other lands and interests of equivalent value within the same area.

"(c) Whenever the Administrator of General Services initially occupies a building in the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia pursuant to a purchase contract agreement, he shall thereupon cause to be demolished temporary Government building space in the District of Columbia of equivalent occupancy.

"(d) In exercising the authority contained in section 411 within the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized, pursuant to section 302 (c) (14) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to negotiate purchase contracts, in accordance with title III of such act. In negotiating such contracts, the Administrator shall take all practicable steps to insure competition among prospective contractors.

"(e) The limitation of 3 years set forth in the second sentence of section 411 (e) shall be read as 5 years with respect to purchase contracts for projects within the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia.

"(f) In transmitting the prospectus required by section 411 with respect to any proposed purchase contract for a project within the southewestern portion of the District of Columbia, which shall be published in the Federal Register for a period of 10 consecutive days from date of submission to the respective committees, the Administrator shall not be required to include the certificate referred to in subdivision (3) of section 411 (e)."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6472) was laid on the table.

INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL ELEVATORS IN THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1993) authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to prepare and submit to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate plans and specifications for the installation of two additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol, to be located adjacent to and east of the existing elevators at the main east front entrance to the Senate wing. Upon approval of such plans and specifications by such committee, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to proceed with the procurement and installation of such elevators, including the making of such structural changes in the Capitol Building as may be necessary to provide for such installation.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $285,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PROSPERITY AND MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article which I prepared for the Worcester Telegram in the guest editorial column entitled "National Prosperity and Massachusetts":

NATIONAL PROSPERITY AND MASSACHUSETTS

Three most desirable economic aims for the national leadership, if general prosperity is to be achieved and maintained are—

1. Eliminating current unemployment.
2. Maintaining present prosperous conditions throughout the Nation as a whole.
3. Aiding in every way we can, consistent with our own capacity, to strengthen the free world against communism so that a just peace can be secured.

Several proposals directed to these ends were articulated by the President in his various messages to the Congress and others are expected to follow suggesting specific blueprints for legislative and administrative action to implement the overall program.

Hardly ever before have stock and market prices reached such high levels. We are assured by financial experts, as well as by the indexes which forecast economic conditions, that there is currently no danger of inflation or of deflation. The problem becomes one of promoting and encouraging those forces in Government and in our economy which will best insure the orderly expansion of our great productive system to serve increased national needs and to blot out the unemployment of many people who, paradoxically enough, in an era of pronounced general prosperity find themselves without jobs.

History abundantly demonstrates that meddling with basic economic laws by Government bureaucrats frequently proves disastrous. Yet it is equally true that in a great economy like ours there are times when a measure of control, regulation, and restriction must be exercised to avoid abuses and excesses of some individuals and groups and to keep unfavorable trends from getting out of hand and producing the extremes of inflation and deflation.

It is, therefore, not so much a matter of whether controls are exercised at all as how, when, and by whom they are exercised. Our past experiences in this field have not been especially fruitful or beneficial because in the past, save for wartime uses, efforts to apply these controls—to put on or release the economic brakes so to speak, have brought unexpectedly damaging results. That we are now in a period when greatest care must be employed by trained, competent economic advisers and farsighted Government leaders in selecting financial and economic policies for the Nation if we are to avoid the evils of depression or overexpansion, is undeniable.

It is my judgment that, if these natural economic forces are properly channeled and prudently and scientifically directed by those charged with responsibility of business and governmental leadership, that this Nation may very well be on the threshold of its greatest prosperity—truly an age of blessed abundance and matchless opportunity for all our citizens. In one sense, assuming the cultivation of the right climate and the pursuit of sound policies by the leadership at Washington, only one factor would stand in the way of the realization of unprecedented prosperity and happiness for the American people and that is something not within our control since it lies exclusively in the province of the leaders of Soviet Russia, namely, whether or not the country and the world will be able to avoid another great catastrophe of war and enjoy a just peace.

We in New England, perhaps to a greater extent than any other section of the country, are not fully sharing the current wave of prosperity which spreads across the Nation. We can be thankful, to be sure, that on the whole, we are doing well, even though it is not so well in the economic sense as most other sections of America. But we must also be concerned about the trouble spots, so-called, scattered throughout our area, even dotting our own immediate vicinity in Worcester County and central Massachusetts, where there is very distressing unemployment sizable enough to warrant Government classification.

From the coldly scientific standpoint of the statistician, it is easy to state that only 3 million or less people in the country are unemployed. It is not easy, however, to give that answer to one of your neighbors who is out of work or to his family actually living with the harsh realities of a meager subsistence and denial of ordinary comforts and conveniences of life and loss of opportunity to pursue their legitimate and rightful aspirations. Yet we know it to be a fact within our area today, the national prosperity notwithstanding, that many of our friends and neighbors are not working. And that must give us not only anxiety but firm resolve to try to do something about it.

Those of us in public life, not only interested, but gravely concerned about this rather extensive unemployment in our midst, feel obligated to search most zealously for causes and for remedies. The causes are readily found, but because of certain economic differentials and political obstacles, the remedies are somewhat elusive and most difficult of accomplishment.

During more than two decades now some industries which, for many years, provided very substantial employment here have closed their doors or migrated to other States. Virtually the entire cotton textile industry once so vigorous has disappeared. The woolen branch of that great industry which once employed literally hundreds of thousands of people has been visited with critical problems of survival in this area. Much of this industry is hanging on by its teeth. The boot and shoe industry almost indigenous to Massachusetts has undergone somewhat similar experiences. There are signs that other industries are following a similar tack, and that conditions in our State repel rather than attract new industries although the electronics, plastic, and related industries would seem to be exceptions to the rule.

Various factors are blamed for these conditions—high taxes, State and local, power and fuel costs, lack of far-sighted cooperation by the State and localities, differentials in wages, labor standards and conditions, remoteness from sources of raw materials and markets, freight and transportation differentials and the baneful effects of the operation of the reciprocal trade treaties. Undoubtedly these and other factors have, in one way or another, contributed to the loss of competitive advantage and consequent shift in status and location of many industries.

How can we find the remedies for this situation? How can we apply a formula that will make it possible for these industries and others desiring to come to our State to operate here on a profitable basis without being priced out of the national and Government procurement markets as has been the experience of so many of our industries in recent years?

These questions are too sizable to be considered here in their entirety. Clearly there would be the greatest resistance, and rightly so, to any proposed relaxation of the high standards of wages, working conditions, safety and health protections and other social advantages which we have established, and a solution can be found least of all in this direction, although I do not mean to infer for one moment that enlightened representatives of labor and management could not make mighty contributions in the direction of retaining, insuring, and in some instances reestablishing the relative competitiveness of Massachusetts industry.

But when all these things are said and done it must be recognized that the trade treaties have dealt a damaging blow to many New England industries and, as to some, they may well have delivered the knockout punch. No great argumentation is necessary to demonstrate this proposition. For example, national wages in the textile industry average $1.41 per hour across the board throughout the Nation. In our own area this average is somewhat higher. At the same time the hourly rate for similar workers in Japan which is now sending goods into the American market in competition with our own, is slightly more than 11 cents per hour. Comparable situations obtain in many other industries. The query: How can any industry, however efficiently conducted, however high its productivity, however skillful its workers and resourceful its management, possibly exist against the onslaughts of such cutthroat competition?

The President says he wants to reduce the existing tariff rates by at least 15 percent below those now obtaining. So far as our industries are concerned, they are gradually being undermined now. If the tariff rates are thus further reduced it is certain that many of them will disappear as has been testified to by eminent economists before recent hearings in Washington on this vital subject.

We folks of Worcester County are not provincial or narrow. We do not seek to live within an ivory tower. Our horizons are as broad as humanity. We ardently desire friendship, cordial relations, and trade and commerce with other free nations. We desire freedom and peace. We have demonstrated this fact to other nations not only with untold billions of our wealth but with the precious blood of our sons. And we are anxious and eager to help other nations get on their feet and to enjoy with them the pleasant mutually profitable relationships in economic as well as in cultural matters.

We have already given them billions of dollars to build up and rehabilitate their war-torn industries. Actually we have gone far beyond that. With huge sums of money and technical aid we have largely enabled them to build up all their industries, new ones included, in terms of physical plant and equipment as well as in terms of productivity and profits well above the levels of prewar years.

In most of the European countries these industries which we have helped so greatly to build up are now competing with us in the world markets and shipping their goods produced under conditions, which we would consider here to be sweatshop conditions and substandard conditions, at only a fraction of the cost of American production into this country to undermine the wage standards, the living standards and to dissipate the livelihood of American workers.

Such a situation is not only unfair to our workers, businessmen, and people, but it is an economic mockery. The trade treaties may benefit the Southern cotton producers, the Detroit automobile manufacturers, the electric appliance industry and the like, but these benefits will only be temporary. Moreover, they will be conferred at the expense of a very large number of long-established, solid, prosperous American industries employing millions of people.

There are important political factors in this situation which I think I should mention. The New England area has but a limited number of Representatives in the House and Senate. Other sections of the country, by joining together to perpetuate low standards, by unalterably opposing national laws to enforce fair, decent labor and social standards, and joining together also in national action to create conditions favorable to the export of their own products at the expense of millions of American workmen and to the detriment of the soundness, stability, prosperity, and preparedness of American industry as a whole, must be aggressively fought.

Anything we do as a Nation to lower the standards of our people, to promote unemployment, to impair or destroy certain American industries while encouraging and building up foreign industry is playing into the hands of the Communists who well realize that, next to our fighting men and the ingenuity of our inventors and the skill of our business leaders and the devotion of our working classes, is the productivity of American industry. Once destroy that and our Nation will no longer be feared and respected by those who are so cleverly plotting its destruction and steadily progressing in their diabolical designs. Happily, the international situation is less tense. Peace proposals are shortly to be considered by the Big Four. We hope and pray they will be successful. But we cannot afford to let down our guard. We must make sure that militarily, economically, and spiritually the Nation is strong and powerful. And we must do our part here in Massachusetts, the cradle of liberty, to keep our own institutions healthy and vigorous.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN THE NEW PHASE OF THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as the time for the much-discussed meeting of the heads of state approaches, I am sure that we all recognize that what is said in the Congress could very well directly affect the chances of success for the free world at this meeting.

If the President and his advisors go to this conference constrained by fears of political repercussions at home of an unreasonable nature, their degree of flexibility will be seriously reduced, and the possibility for negotiation which would hold the chance for establishing peace with honor for the free world greatly lessened. I am sure we all have confidence that the President of the United States is aware of the complex nature of the Communist threat. He has clearly indicated that this shift in tactics by the Soviet Union does not represent a shift in policy goals.

Of course, no one is going to say that carte blanche freedom from criticism should be given the President, no matter what happens at Geneva. But certainly we should say that we are Americans first and we have confidence that the President will act in the best interests of America and of freedom, and that we are not going to engage in any form of unfair recrimination or reprisals for the sake of partisan or intraparty advantage. I do not wish to open the subject of Yalta and Potsdam, since it would merely detract from my main purpose in speaking today. But when we talk about the lessons of Yalta, we should not only recall the lesson that the words and written agreements of the Soviet Union are worthless without tangible evidence to support them, but we should also recall that if the President enters this conference with fear that no matter what he does in negotiation his actions will be criticized, then we restrict his flexibility to the great disadvantage of freedom's opportunity and challenge.

THE NEW CHALLENGE

While it is too early to predict the outcome of this conference, I believe there are certain things that are clear to all of us. First, I think we all realize that we have entered an era of human history in which large-scale war is suicidal. A big war today would mean the death and crippling of millions and the destruction of all those values for which we have traditionally fought. While we have reason to feel that we would win the ultimate victory, a victory of this kind would be small comfort. For this reason we all know that we must do everything possible to protect our national interest and to preserve our freedom without resort to warfare.

On the other hand, there is a second point that is equally clear. I am sure no one believes that the fundamental objectives of the Soviet leaders have changed. Regardless of their peaceful-sounding words, their policy remains the same—their ultimate goal is the domination of the entire world. There is not one shred of evidence that they are yet ready to abandon these ambitions. They will still attempt by every means available to them to spread their influence over other parts of the world until they eventually have obtained sufficient power and resources to overwhelm what is left of the free world.

When you recognize the nature of modern warfare and recognize at the same time that the Soviet Union is not likely to relent in its campaign for world domination, we can see one logical and inevitable conclusion that stands out above all others. We are beginning a new period of the cold war—a period in which it is probable that the struggle for freedom, for survival and peace, will be fought primarily on political, economic, and psychological grounds. This struggle will be no less bitter, no less critical—and it will be no less decisive for the destiny of the United States. To wage this struggle successfully will require a significant expenditure of American resources, the use of all the energy and patience we possess. Most of all, it will require us to make full utilization of our Nation's brain power. We must be constantly alert to Soviet traps and Communist trickery, and at the same time we must be equally alert to every reasonable opportunity for using peaceful means to resolve difficulties and lessen the possibility of military conflict.

We Americans have no reason to fear a prolonged cold war fought on political, economic, and psychological grounds. Our system of democratic Government offers far more hope to the oppressed peoples of the world than any dictatorial system. Our economic system, likewise, has proved that it has the ability to provide greater abundance for human beings than any economic structure based on compulsion and slavery. Our moral values are more attractive to the suffering masses of mankind than the pseudoreligion offered by materialistic communism.

It seems to me that we have the potential to fight the cold war and to win it without involving mankind in a devastating hot war. But we can do this only if we assure that our potential is fully realized. We must maintain a strong military force in America and in allied lands, and also we must capture a real initiative in the political and economic field of conflict. We must fight the cold war with the same fervor and determination that have characterized our people in past military conflicts.

I suggest to you that we must recognize the new phase of the cold war will be a war of brains rather than brawn, and we must make sure that the best, most experienced, and most intelligent and skillful men in both major political parties are fully employed in this great enterprise.

We must have a form of bipartisanship that goes beyond merely refraining from undue criticism. We must have a bipartisanship in which the leading statesmen in both major parties work together positively and constructively in the formulation and execution of policies and programs. We must have bipartisanship at the time that the house is being built and not after the roof begins to leak.

I believe the course of action already adopted by the Democratic Party under the present administration has pointed the way we should go in the future. We have proved that we have the will to be bipartisan. What we need now is a systematic method by which this bipartisanship can be made truly effective and can afford maximum benefits to the Nation.

IMPROVING BIPARTISANSHIP

We will all agree that the very distinguished senior Senator from Georgia played a large role in providing the flexibility which made the forthcoming conference a possibility. I am sure we all join in expressing our deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the magnificent leadership he has shown not only in this grand gesture of bipartisanship but in the many other courageous stands he has taken which have provided maneuverability for the administration. He has done this frequently in the face of rigid political prejudices which might have deterred lesser men.

His leadership in this regard is matched in equal fashion by the cooperative approach which has been exhibited by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Formosa resolution was deemed essential to our policy by the President. Our distinguished chairman immediately called an emergency session of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and held hearings which lasted far into the night in order to expedite action on this measure. While some disagreed with the exact language of that resolution, none will disagree that the actions of our chairman reflected the highest tradition in the handling of the bipartisan American cooperation in foreign policy matters. Of course, I could cite other instances where our chairman has exhibited great leadership in assuring the bipartisan nature of our foreign policy—but it would be totally unnecessary for a junior member such as myself to point this out to this body.

I believe that the cooperative leadership provided by the Democratic chairmen of committees here in the Congress has been absolutely correct. But I believe a great deal more can and should be done in preparing for the meeting at the summit—and, in a broader sense, preparing for the new cold war. In this preparation, I think we would all agree that the best minds in America should be brought into consultation. Any man of experience in the field of foreign policy should be consulted in exploring all of the alternatives that might occur and in determining the best course of action in the face of these alternatives.

As this new phase of the cold war emerges, the temptation to take partisan advantage of the necessity to continue expenditures for technical, economic, and information programs will increase. Without the Czechoslovakias, the Berlin blockades, and the Koreas, we may slip into the pattern of a return to semi-isolation. This could well prove fatal. We must avoid such a potentiality at all costs.

I have asked myself if there is any institutional method we can devise to mitigate against the type of partisan demagogy which could very well occur in the face of the new, more subtle, cold-war challenge we now face?

I think there is. I respectfully suggest that the President could create a foreign policy strategy advisory council to think through with him ways and means of meeting the new type challenge we face. This council could consist of the men with the best minds and the most experience in foreign policy in America. It should be constituted on a completely bipartisan basis.

Of course, such a council would not remove ultimate responsibility, for actions taken, from the President—but it would assure America that the total experience, intelligence and ability available in the United States would be brought to bear on the crucial questions of peace and freedom.

My thought about such a council is that it would be a very high level group of distinguished Americans experienced in matters of foreign affairs, who would directly advise the President. In order to indicate the stature of the council, I might suggest a few people who might compose it.

Certainly, heading the list would be the chairman and ranking minority members of the Foregn Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. In addition, a man who could make an absolutely invaluable contribution would of course be our former President, Harry Truman, who for almost 8 years helped mold free world organization against the Communists.

The first head of the Marshall plan, Paul Hoffman, is respected by Republicans and Democrats alike; is a vigorous statesman and a man with a broad grasp of the intricacies of the Communist threat. His successor, William Foster, also a Republican, has also had vast experience.

The two Secretaries of State under the previous administration could appropriately be on such a council—Gen. George Marshall, who shaped the Marshall plan; the other, Dean Acheson, who built the NATO alliance. Both of these are men whose talents, skills, and experience should not go unused in the new phase of the cold war.

Another man who has given great thought to this problem is the former Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey.

Recently the Foreign Affairs Committee had the honor of hearing the former Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles.

Republican and Democrat on the committee alike would agree that his vast finger-tip knowledge of Asia is as great, if not greater, than that of any man in this country today. We were unanimously impressed by the breadth of Mr. Bowles' knowledge, not only of India but of the entire Asian area.

Certainly, George Kennan's firsthand knowledge of Russia would make a valuable contribution.

Adlai Stevenson is a man whose knowledge of foreign affairs come from his years of experience in the executive branch. His speeches and statements clearly indicate the firm grasp he has of the essentials of this problem. Why should he not be consulted?

I could go on to suggest many other distinguished Americans who would, I am sure, make outstanding contributions.

All I intend to suggest here is that the thinking and experience of these men could play a vital role in our preparations, if we are to approach seriously this new phase of the cold war, beginning with the meeting at the summit. This is a time to have the sure knowledge that all of the thoughtful and experienced people of high stature in the Nation have participated in exploring all avenues and alternatives which might arise and in determining the best course of recommended action for the United States, given the alternatives.

As I have tried to indicate, I believe we face a great opportunity, not only for peace, but for expanding the areas of freedom in the world—if the tactical shift in the Soviet foreign policy proves to be a real change.

But this opportunity presents a tremendous challenge. After so many years of cold war, with repeated military overtones, we face the danger of relaxing as a new kind of task is presented to us.

This we must not do, if we are to remain true inheritors of the great traditions of Paine, Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

One of the greatest dangers confronting us is the trap of partisan squabbles.

I have suggested one small method of partially overcoming such a danger, which would at the same time assure that the best minds and the most extensive experience would be brought to bear on our foreign policy problems.

I do not propose this idea of a foreign policy advisory council lightly. Certainly, should the Democrats win the Presidency in 1956—as I hope they will—I believe the experience and advice of such people as John Foster Dulles and Harold Stassen should remain available for the continuance of our foreign policy.

CONCLUSIONS

There is really no alternative to peace, and it seems to me that the glimmer of hope for peace is growing brighter. As a free Nation interested in maintaining peace with honor, our contribution to keeping this glimmer alive appears to be:

First. We must remain militarily strong. We need not talk so much and so loudly about our military strength as some have been prone to do, but our strength, to be effective, must be real. If it is real, our enemies will know that fact, and so will our friends. We need not continue to brag about it.

Second. We must recognize that the cold war is not fought on the military level alone and that today, possibly the levels of the economic and the political and diplomatic are more important than the military—certainly they are at least equally important. Here we must have firm programs, designed to provide United States assistance to the free world in developing economic strength, political stability, personal hope and moral courage.

Third. In the shifting scene which we presently face, we must have patience, firmness of purpose and, above all, tactical flexibility. The steps which restrict flexibility on the part of the United States are detrimental to the interests of peace and freedom. I hope that during the coming conferences no one will scream "sellout" before we know what the bargain is; or that no one will demand daily publication of the transcripts of meetings. Under our system of Government and our Constitution, the President is the leader of foreign policy, and he must be given the opportunity to lead. This does not mean that whatever he does cannot be criticized, but it does mean that he should not be so hamstrung and shackled in advance that he is prevented from taking the steps necessary and advantageous to our goal of peace and freedom.

Fourth. And finally, a bipartisan foreign policy in formulation and execution becomes even more important in the future than it has been in the past. I believe the creation of a bipartisan foreign policy advisory council, consisting of the most experienced and highly regarded men in the field, would help assure bipartisanship and at the same time would constitute an invaluable contribution to our foreign policy development and execution.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for about 10 years to work with the agricultural program of the United States. For 5 years of that time I have had the privilege and honor of serving as the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations. Before our committee the activities of the Department of Agriculture pass in review each and every year. In that capacity I have had occasion to know something about the Commodity Credit Corporation's operations, about the price-support program, and various other factors that come into agriculture, and, in my opinion, into the life of the Nation.

It has been hard for me to understand, particularly in the last several years, why so much commotion and complaint has been made to the American people about the huge supplies of farm commodities that are in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including the huge storage charges, which have now piled up to about $700,000 per day. I have had difficulty in understanding this, because all the time the Commodity Credit Corporation has had authority to sell such commodities in world trade at a truly competitive price. Those few commodities that we have persuaded the Secretary of Agriculture to offer for trade on the world markets have sold for American dollars.

We have seen many difficulties foisted on the farmers, with these commodities used as the chief argument for it by the Department; and yet the Department never did tell the American people that all the time they had authority to sell but would not because of recommendation of the "Trade."

We have seen the price support program, price support levels, reduced by law under the recomemndation and order of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture. In those recommendations the huge stockpiles were pointed out, but nowhere did they point out that they had the authority but had not offered such commodities for sale on a truly competitive basis.

The Secretary and other witnesses when before our committee had their attention called to the section of the Commodity Credit Corporation charter under which these commodities could be sold in world trade on a competitive basis for dollars, I got at that time an admission from the Secretary and from the Solicitor of the Department that such authority existed. The reason given for their refusal to offer these huge supplies of commodities, some $4 billion worth of them, was that the "trade" recommended against it.

Mr. Speaker, when they pointed out that the "trade" recommended against it, then it was that I asked for an investigation of the expansion of agricultural production in the same commodities in foreign countries, with particular reference to the basic commodities which our Department of Agriculture holds off world markets. I asked for an investigation of the financial interests behind those expansions and I asked for information as to the help that we had given in loans, in foreign aid and in other ways to promote production in the foreign fields. Then it was that we had the committee investigators of the Committee on Appropriations placed on this job. For the last three months they have been checking the files in Washington and elsewhere. The story they have been able to bring is enlightening to say the least, and, in my judgment, presents a story which is almost tragic.

Would you believe me, those findings which I am presenting here to the House of Representatives this afternoon, which will be in the RECORD as a part of my speech, clearly show that for a number of years now this Government has been making loans to build dams and to bring into production land in many, many foreign countries. While we have been doing that we have, as a Government, also been giving tax concessions to American financial interests to get them to go in and put those lands in production. Not only that, but we have made other concessions so that they have put up cotton gins, oil mills and all those things to make it possible for other sections of the world to go into the production of cotton. The same has applied to corn, wheat and other commodities.

While we have put up the money through loans and through grants to bring this land into production and have invited American financial interests to go into those areas to put them in production and in competition with the commodities that are in huge supply in the Department of Agriculture, we find that the Department of Agriculture and the Government, in addition to what I have described, have been holding American farm commodities off world markets, and letting the cotton markets, and other commodity markets go to these American financial interests that we have invited to go into Mexico and other places.

Let me carry that one step further. Under the law which fixes acreage controls and marketing quotas, the commodities on hand have to be counted to reduce acreage. Exports help acreage, but you must count the commodities that are on hand. The major cause of the farm problem and the drop in farm income is the reduction in volume that has been brought about because these commodities were not sold in world trade, not being sold, exports were down, and acreage was cut. Not being sold, they were on hand and counted, and acreage was cut again.

Why was it held? The Secretary's own statement was that these commodities have not been offered in a truly competitive way because the "trade" recommended against sales on a competitive bid basis.

In our investigation we went one step further. We checked to see how many representatives of these financial interests—Anderson Clayton and others, getting tax concessions and benefits through huge loans made by the Export-Import Bank and foreign aid—were listed as members of the advisory committee of the United States Department of Agriculture. One bank in the United States is reported to have made a $10 million loan in Mexico to enable various interests to increase the production of cotton. We find a top official of that bank on the advisory committee of the Department of Agriculture. We find on the advisory committee on the export of cotton, American cotton that is, the chairman of the board of directors of Anderson Clayton Co., which has 122 gins in foreign countries, 22 oil mills, soap factories and everything else. Then it becomes crystal clear why this same segment of the "trade" has recommended that the Department of Agriculture not sell American commodities, but has recommended that we hold such commodities off the world market, reduce more Americans to annual income of less than $1,000 per year—even to the point that our President has had to take note of the situation. He asks that the Congress take action. I say he and the Government should take action.

Now, in a nutshell, repeating once again, we have provided the money to expand the use of lands in foreign countries; our Government has invited American financiers to go in there and has given them tax concessions; the Department of Agriculture and the Government has held our farm commodities so that they could have markets; we have cut American farmers back as the result; the Department has then put their representatives on the advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture; and now our distinguished President, under those conditions, has asked that the Congress do something for the small farmer which present policies help make small. I can show you by their own report that more than 55,000 small cotton farmers were put out of business this year by an order of the Department of Agriculture, which counted cotton that could have been sold had it been offered. This year alone, by the report of the Department of Agriculture, 130,000 of these small farmers that our President would now help have been brought below $1,000 a year in annual income as the direct result of this policy that I tell you about.

I am reading into the Record here this afternoon, in detail, the word-by-word report of the committee investigators which has substantiated the statements that I make here; and if this Government and this Department of Agriculture want to help the poor farmers of the United States—and they need it under present conditions—this report will show them where to start. The first place to start is selling United States commodities in world trade as American farmers are entitled to have it sold, and we must stop inviting American capital to put us out of business, giving them tax concessions in the meantime, and we must stop developing land in foreign countries for use in competing with our own exportable crops.

May I say again in that connection, it is one thing to provide assistance to help the standard of living in a given area for things that they use; it is an entirely different proposition when you put them into the export business, exporting the very things that we have in surplus and for which we normally had an export market. It is the last thing we have been doing, and it is getting ruinous. This report of our committee investigators will clearly demonstrate where the problem lies and where the correction can be made, and the correction is possible if the Government will change its policy and put a stop to many of these things.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is to be highly commended for the statement he is making. He, more than any other Member of the House, has done more to call attention to the failure of this administration and past administrations to dispose of surplus agricultural products in the world market. I shall read with interest his statement in the Record.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate that very much.

Price has been reduced to some extent, and costs have gone up to some extent, but the major fault lies with the Department in its refusal to sell, which cuts volume by reducing exports, it cuts acreage, and by having these supplies on hand, they must be counted and acreage is cut again. If they want to help the small farmer, there are ways to do it but a small loan and further research will not reach the basic problem.

Mr. Speaker, in a few days this investigation will be made part of the hearings, and I trust and hope that not only the Congress but those interested in this subject will read the verbatim statement of this committee's investigators. It leads you to wonder if big American financial interests are not spreading all over the world, and it raises the thought in your mind, that we, by Government aid, may be creating an old-time German cartel system which plaged the world in pre-World War II days.

As you know I come from a cotton section of the country. This is an area where the situation has become acute largely because of departmental policy of holding United States supplies off world markets at truly competitive prices.

Now as we hold our cotton off of the world market Anderson-Clayton and Hohenberg and others are developing acreages in Peru, Mexico, and Brazil. With the know-how folks like Anderson, Clayton, and Mr. Fleming, who is at least close to the present administration, and Mr. Hohenberg, if we stand here until they complete this job and move our cotton acreage to Mexico, Brazil, Peru, and Guatemala, which has increased its acreage sixfold in the last 5 years, we are in trouble. With the know-how of these big American financial interests, and the cheap labor that they find there, when that source of cheap cotton becomes available to foreign mills, the American textile mills will be in the same fix as the American farmers are in now.

I have asked that the Record show the expansion overseas in the very commodities that we have been cutting down on here in the United States. We cannot control the world supply by cutting down on our farmers here. But the Department of Agriculture is promoting world production in other sections by holding our commodities off the market.

Recognizing these facts this committee at my urging asked for an investigation of, first, increased foreign agricultural production in the past 5 years; second, United States interests furnishing financial support to foreign agricultural production; third, special tax concessions on income from production in other countries; fourth, financial interests of members of advisory groups; fifth, foreign-aid funds used to encourage production and to encourage exports.

We have just received a special interim report on this study, which I wish to present to you:

POINT I

The increase in agricultural production in foreign countries during the past 5 years, with particular reference to the basic commodities receiving United States price support.

Twenty-eight countries which showed substantial increases in production of one or more of the price-supported basic commodities (cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco) were selected for special study. An analysis sheet for each country (as well as for the United States and the world) was prepared showing production, acreage, yield per acre, and exports for each commodity for the following periods:

Five-year averages 1935-36 to 1939-40 and 1945-46 to 1949-50.

Annual data for the years 1950-51 to 1954-55, inclusive.

The percentage change between 1950-51 and 1954-55.

Estimates for 1955-56, where available.

Data were assembled by the appropriate divisions of the Foreign Agriculture Service. Some test checks of the accuracy of the figures have been made. A number of meetings have been held with officials of various divisions of the Department of Agriculture and with trade associations to discuss increased production and trends in foreign countries.

For this report, analysis sheets for five of the countries, Mexico, Iran, Turkey, India, and Pakistan, were selected for inclusion. They appear as exhibits 1 through 5 at the end of the report. (Analysis sheets on the other 23 countries are available at the office of the director of the staff.)

Mexico was included because of the substantial increases in cotton and other agricultural products in that country in recent years, much of which may be attributed to private interests in the United States. Iran, Turkey, India, and Pakistan were included because they also have sharply increased production of cotton and other crops in recent years while receiving large foreign-aid grants from the United States.

A detailed analysis of the foreign-aid program in Iran appears in this report and similar data for Turkey, India, and Pakistan will be included in the final report.

A few examples of preliminary findings to date are given below:

"Cotton

"The greatest increases in production and the greatest potentials for future competition with the United States are Mexico and the Middle East countries of Turkey, Syria, Iran, Iraq.

"In Mexico cotton production has increased from a prewar 5-year average of 334,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 577,000 bales and to 1,780,000 bales in the crop year 1954-55. Cotton exports have increased for the same periods from 105,000 to 343,000 to 1,150,000.

"It is reported that Mexico started its program for expansion in irrigation facilities in 1947, and is proceeding approximately on schedule. It is anticipated that the program will be completed in 2 or 3 years, at which time the limit of appreciable expansion will be reached. The Yaqui River project is expected to increase irrigation substantially in the northwestern section."

In the Middle Eastern countries of Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Iraq cotton production decreased from a prewar 5-year average of 459,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 390,000 bales and then increased to 1,260,000 bales in the crop year 1954-55. Cotton exports for the same periods decreased from 157,000 to 85,000 and then increased to 684,000 bales.

"It is believed that there will be continued increases in cotton production in the Middle East.

"Cotton production in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala has increased steadily from approximately 50,000 bales 4 years ago to an estimated 300,000 bales in 1954-55. A further increase of about 100,000 bales is expected in 1955-56, and potential annual production estimates after several more years of development range from 700,000 to 900,000 bales.

"In Peru cotton production has increased 25 percent during the past 5 years to 505,000 bales in 1954-55. During the same period exports, which are a large proportion of production, increased 25 percent. However, it is reported the Peruvian Government holds cotton and sugar production (the most profitable crops) under strict control in order to insure the production of adequate food crops.

"In Argentina cotton production has been fairly stable over the past 10 years, the 1954-55 crop being 500,000 bales. Exports normally amount to about 40 percent of production. It is anticipated there will be no expansion during the next 5 or 10 years, although there is a potential for large increases.

"In Brazil cotton production has been stable for the last 5 years. The 1954-55 crop was 1,600,000 bales, some 350,000 bales less than the 5-year prewar average. Exports have borne little relation to production. It has been reported that Brazil has a policy of encouragement of industry which acts as a deterrent to expansion of agriculture and therefore no significant change is anticipated in cotton production.

"In Egypt cotton production has been fairly stable for the past 10 years, the highest yield being 2,047,000 bales in 1952-53. The 1954-55 crop was 1,598,000 bales. A large proportion of the production is exported. The staff has been informed that the Sudan has a potentiality for expansion if wells and irrigation are increased. However, the necessary machinery and equipment are expensive and no substantial increase in production is anticipated in the near future. It has been reported that German interests are considering the investment of capital in this project.

"In other African countries cotton production has been small and fairly stable. The staff has been informed that there is little chance for substantial expansion.

"In India during the past 10 years there has been a gradual increase in the production of cotton, the 1954-55 crop being 3,900,000 bales. Exports are negligible. It has been reported that some 600,000 bales of American-type cotton are imported, principally from East Africa as the price has been lower than the United States price, the result being that the United States is a residual supplier.

"In Pakistan cotton production has been stable for the past 5 years, the 1954-55 crop being 1,245,000 bales. During the last 4 years, a large proportion of the production was exported but exports for the current year were only 630,000 bales. The staff has been informed that although increased acreages are needed for production of food products for home consumption it is planned to maintain or expand exports of cotton through increased irrigation and improved cultural practices.

"The production of cotton is of minor importance in friendly countries other than those discussed above.

"The following information on the world situation with respect to synthetic fibers was received. World production last year was the equivalent of approximately 11 million bales of cotton and this year is expected to be the equivalent of about 14 million bales; United States production of synthetics has not changed substantially during the last 4 years. Cotton has held its own on a per capita basis; the price of cotton has a definite effect on rayon production and consumption, but the recent expansion of the other higher priced synthetic fibers such as nylon, orlon and dacron has been largely independent of the price of cotton.

"Wheat

"World wheat production increased from an annual average of 6.0 billion bushels in prewar years to 6.6 billion bushels in 1950-51. It continued to rise to 7.4 billion bushels in 1952-53 and 7.3 billion bushels in 1953-54. Lower yields and a slightly lower acreage resulted in somewhat less wheat production or 6.8 billion bushels in 1954-55.

"As compared with the 5-year prewar average world wheat acreage was 9 percent higher and production was 14 percent higher in 1954-55.

"In the United States with acreage allotments and marketing quotas in effect farmers harvested 3 million or around 6 percent fewer acres of wheat in 1954 than in 1935 to 1939. With higher acre yields they produced around 211 million bushels or 28 percent more wheat, however, in 1954 than in 1935-39.

"In the 3 other major wheat exporting countries—Canada, Argentina and Australia—around 6 million fewer acres of wheat were harvested in 1954-55 than in the 5 prewar years 1935-36 to 1939-40. Higher acre yields resulted in the production of about 37 million bushels or 5 percent more wheat in these countries in 1954-55, however, than was produced in 1935-36 to 1939-40.

"These acreage and production data indicate that the relatively high level of world wheat production in 1954-55 was not the result of expansion in the major wheat exporting countries."

Sharp increases in wheat acreage and production have been recorded in a number of the European and Middle Eastern countries which have received substantial foreign aid grants in recent years.

France, although reducing slightly the acreage devoted to wheat in 1954 as compared with the 1935-39 average, produced over a third or 100 million bushels more wheat in 1954 than in the prewar years.

Turkey has almost doubled her wheat acreage since the 1935-36 to 1939-40 average and more than doubled her total production in 1953-54. Unfavorable yields in 1954-55 resulted in a sharp drop in wheat production as compared with a year earlier yet it remained a third higher than in the prewar years.

Greece although on a net import basis has increased her wheat acreage 20 percent and production by 50 percent as compared with prewar years.

Most Latin American countries, as a part of their programs to increase home food production, have expanded their wheat acreage and production. The acreage in wheat in Mexico has increased 50 percent while production has more than doubled since the period 1935-36 to 1939-40. Although wheat is a minor crop in Peru the acreage has increased 50 percent and production has almost doubled as compared with prewar years.

In the interests of maintaining self-sufficiency wheat production is expected to continue at recent high levels in most countries which are now on a net import basis. No definite trends are in evidence in the more important foreign wheat exporting countries.

World tobacco production increased from an annual average 6.5 billion pounds in the 1935-39 period to 7.8 billion pounds in 1954 or an increase of 20 percent. During this same period the world acreage devoted to tobacco production increased from 7.5 million acres to 8.6 million acres or an increase of 15 percent.

United States production of tobacco increased from 1.5 billion pounds in the period 1935-39 to 2.2 billion pounds in 1954, an increase of 47 percent, in spite of the fact that the acreage devoted to tobacco in 1954 was slightly smaller than the 1935 to 1939 acreage.

Canada and Southern Rhodesia are among the more important countries from the standpoint of tobacco production increases. In both of these countries the expansion has been encouraged by longterm contracts offered by British tobacco companies.

Increases in acreage and production from 1935–39 to 1954 are as follows:

	Percent increase in acreage	Percent increase in production
Canada	91	135
Southern Rhodesia	250	360

Japan has increased her tobacco acreage from 92,000 acres in 1935–39 to 172,000 acres in 1954 and from a production of 149 million pounds in the prewar years to 256 million pounds in 1954.

Turkey has increased her production of tobacco sharply from 128 million pounds in the prewar years to 206 million pounds in 1954 and acreage from 194,000 acres to 323,000 acres during the same period.

Italy also has increased both acreage and production of tobacco over 50 percent during the same period.

Brazil, by far the largest tobacco producer in Latin America, has increased her tobacco acreage from 250,000 acres in 1935–39 to 433,000 acres in 1954. Tobacco production in Brazil increased from 203 million pounds a year in the 1935–39 period to 296 million pounds in 1954, an increase of 46 percent.

Colombia almost doubled both tobacco acreage and production in the same period, and Mexico more than doubled her production with about 50-percent increase in acreage.

Tobacco production has declined in India, Pakistan, and Iran.

Flue-cured tobacco usually accounts for about 80 percent of all United States exports. World production of this type of leaf has shown striking increases. The acreage of flue-cured tobacco in the major present and potential competing countries increased from 384,000 acres to 1,045 million acres, 172 percent, between 1935–39 and 1954 and production increased from 370.6 million pounds to 986.1 million pounds, 166 percent, during the same period.

Tobacco production is expected to increase further in the sterling area countries where British interests are stimulating increased production. Further increases in acre yields also are expected in most countries, especially in Latin America.

Peanuts

The principal peanut growing countries of the world are India, China, French West Africa, Nigeria, and the United States. The major portion of world exports is made by the African countries and goes principally to Europe, France, and the United Kingdom.

A significant distinction between peanuts and other United States price-supported crops is that peanuts produced in foreign countries compete with fats and oils such as cottonseed and soybean oil rather than peanuts as such. Exports of foreign countries are predominantly in the form of peanut oil or peanuts, shelled or unshelled, to be crushed into oil by the importing country. One exception to foreign exporting countries is Mexico, which has been exporting peanuts for edible use in small but steadily increasing quantities. The United States raises peanuts for domestic edible purposes, not for export. If the production exceeds local edible requirements such excess is either crushed for domestic consumption or exported for crushing.

At present (May 1955) there is apparently no problem in connection with overproduction of peanuts in the United States. Not only have all peanut stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation been disposed of but Presidential Proclamation No. 3084, dated March 9, 1955, liberalized restrictions on imports. Further, recommendations have since been made to the President by the Tariff Commission that quota limitations on imports be removed through July 1955. Information has been received that difficulty is being encountered in locating peanuts of satisfactory quality for import.

"The United States does not generally import peanut oil but due to the 1954 drought some is being imported this year under an annual quota of 80 million pounds. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that perhaps 40 million pounds will be imported by June 30, 1955.

"Corn and rice

"World production of both corn and rice have increased substantially since the prewar years and since 1950–51. From 1950–51 to 1954–55 the world increase in corn production was 6 percent and the world increase in rice production was 13.5 percent. An analysis of the country by country trends in the production of these crops as well as a more comprehensive analysis of the increases in production of the other price-supported crops will be included in the final report."

POINT 2

The United States interests which have brought about such increased foreign production through furnishing of financial support and technical direction and assistance.

The survey made to date on this phase of the directive indicates that the major portion of private United States capital investments, financing and management, has been concentrated to a large extent on one of the basic commodities, cotton, and that this activity has ben substantially limited to Mexico, Central and South America, generally referred to as Latin America.

Here the increased agricultural production, extensive in cotton but also to a lesser degree in other basic commodities, has been generated to an important extent by United States private interests. Although it is not now indicated that much actual farming or production has been undertaken by Americans, in many instances the establishment of markets, cotton gins, elevators, processing plants and the financing of production has provided the incentive and impetus for an important part of the increased output.

In those countries outside of the Western Hemisphere which show important increases in agricultural production, the main contribution made by United States private capital appears, at this time, to be the introduction, sales and financing of modern agricultural and processing machinery, by a group of the larger manufacturers. There is also evidence of increasing activity by seed companies in the promotion and sale around the world of United States improved varieties. While flue-cured tobacco production has shown a considerable increase, information received to date indicates that this increase has been mostly the results of financing and promotion by the British-American Tobacco Co., and local capital or local governments.

Anderson, Clayton & Co.

In Mexico, Anderson, Clayton & Co. has increased its net capital investment account in plants and equipment by $8,911,709 to a total of $12,653,316 during the period July 31, 1947, to July 31, 1954; and in Brazil by $7,140,303 to a total of $15,354,158 for the same period. This company has increased total net capital investment in plants and equipment in all Latin American operations, by approximately $18,791,214 to a total of $33,073,037 for the same period. As of March 1955 Anderson, Clayton's foreign plants consisted of 15 compress and warehouse units, 22 oil mills, 112 cotton gins, 10 oil refineries, 5 finished product plants, and 5 soap plants. The company operates through a number of subsidiaries in Mexico, Argentina, Brazill, Peru, and Paraguay, all of which are mostly wholly owned. Operations were started in Mexico about 1924 and in Peru, Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay during 1933–35. Crop loans in all foreign operations as of July 31, 1954 were $14,955,477. (Source: SEC records and company reports.)

Anderson, Clayton & Co. is reported to be the largest buyer, processor, and exporter of cotton and peanuts in Brazil, and largely responsible for the growth of the cotton-growing industry in that country. Recent expansion in its Latin American activities appears to be in the field of processing and refining of vegetable oils.

The Nile Ginning Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of Anderson, Clayton & Co., operates in Egypt and the Sudan. The net plant and equipment account of this company increased from $434,094.31 in 1947 to $965,094 in 1954.

The staff has received reports, which it has not yet confirmed, that Anderson, Clayton & Co. is building 20 new gins in Baja California to handle Mexican cotton production. Also, that the company financed new wells and promoted cotton production on a large tract of land in southern Peru. Reports are that the wells are not fully satisfactory, so plans are supposed to be underway for surface irrigation from lakes some distance away.

The Corn Products Co.

This company has plants and grain operations at Guadalajara, Mexico, in Argentina, and in Brazil. It manufactures and distributes products using corn or milo maize as the raw materials. As of December 31, 1954, investment of this company in foreign subsidiaries built up over some period of time is listed at $14,749,000.

During 1954 foreign sales of corn products by the company's domestic plants totaled $11,888,041 or approximately 5 percent of total sales. Latest figures for sales of its foreign subsidiaries show that in 1953 these amounted to $95,313,550. (Source: SEC records and company reports.)

W. R. Grace & Co.

The W. R. Grace Co. has one of its principal foreign operations in Peru. Peruvian subsidiaries of the Grace Co., jointly owned with leading local industrialists, operate 4 integrated cotton mills, the largest in Peru, 2 sugar estates of approximately 10,000 acres each, and numerous other merchandising, exporting, and importing activities. These subsidiaries buy large quantities of cotton, mostly for their own mills, although some is exported. The Grace Co. has other cotton mills in Colombia and Chile. In the latter country it produces 20 percent of Chile's cotton and rayon blend cloth and, in addition, some woolen goods. Overall, Grace's Latin American affiliates produced in 1954, 97,600,000 yards of cotton, rayon, and woolen fabrics.

W. R. Grace & Co. owns a large percentage of the stock in the Grace National Bank of New York City. The foreign branch of this bank is closely connected with banking institutions in Latin America.

United States capital in Mexico

Mexican cotton production is now being more aggressively encouraged by United States capital as the irrigation projects, which were started some few years ago, near completion. New deep-water port facilities being developed in Baja California will further expedite cotton and grain growing and marketing in western Mexico. Major banks in the United States consider cotton production (harvesting) loans in Mexico and some other Latin American countries a sound investment. Crop-production loans made by the banks of Mexico can readily be discounted at a number of American banks.

Unconfirmed reports of individual companies' activities in Latin America

Bank of America, California: In April 1955, the press reported a $10 million credit granted to finance cotton growers in Mexico.

Press comment included the statement that this is an indication of "confidence of American banks in Mexico's economic future and easy sale of a bumper cotton crop."

J. G. Boswell Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.: It is reported that this company recently formed a new wholly owned subsidiary under the laws of Mexico, called Boswell de Mexico S. A., to own and operate a cotton gin in the State of Sonora. The plant is currently under construction and is expected to be operating during the summer of 1955.

Cargill Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.: This company is engaged in diversified activities and is one of the largest grain merchandising companies of international scope. It operates a grain elevator in Argentina.

The Continental Grain Co., Chicago, Ill.: This company is also one of the largest international grain merchants and operates in Argentina.

Cook and Cia. de Mexico S. A., Torreon, Mexico: This company, a subsidiary of Cook & Co., Memphis, Tenn., is reported to have received a loan of $300,000 from a Phoenix, Ariz., bank in 1955 and another loan of $400,000 secured by 4,843 bales of cotton at Sao Paulo, Brazil.

R. L. Dixon & Bros., Dallas, Tex.: This company has a wholly owned subsidiary at Harmosillo, Mexico, operating storage facilities and an 8,500-acre ranch raising cotton and wheat. R. L. Dixon also is a partner in the Brazilian firm of Cia. Algodoeria Wooley Dixon.

Esteve Bros. & Co., Dallas, Tex.: This company sells cotton all over the world. Its Brazilian, Spanish, and Mexican equity is reported to be in excess of $1 million.

Hohenberg Bros., Inc., Memphis, Tenn.: This company is one of the largest companies in the cotton business. It finances and gins cotton in Mexico with its subsidiaries Algodonera Hohenberg S. A. de C. V. in Mexico City, and Empresas Hohenberg of Torreon. It also owns Hohenberg S. A. in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and has a substantial amount of business in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

George McFadden & Bros. Co., Memphis, Tenn.: This company is also one of the largest cotton merchants in the world, with a net worth of over $10 million. The company sells over 1 million bales of cotton annually and is a leader in the world cotton market. It has affiliates in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and Torreon, Mexico.

Sternberg-Martin & Co., Dallas, Tex.: This company advertises Mexican growths and has a subsidiary—Sternberg-Martin de Mexico, at Matamoros, Mexico.

Eugene B. Smith & Co., Dallas, Tex.: Eugene B. Smith de Mexico S. A. has branches at Matamoros, Mexico City, Torreon, Mexicali, and Hermosillo, Mexico, which merchandise, finance, and gin cotton in Mexico.

Starke Taylor & Son, Dallas, Tex.: This company handles Mexican cotton through Starke Taylor de Mexico, Matamoros.

Weil Bros, Montgomery, Ala.: This company operates in Mexico and Central America under the names of Weil Bros. de Mexico S. A. and Algodonera Weil S. A.

Information received from agricultural attachés

The agricultural attaché in Turkey has advised the committee that—

(a) The Minneapolis Moline Co. has recently associated with Turkish interests for the assembly and eventual manufacture of tractors and farm machinery in Ankara.

(b) The Fertilizer Corporation of America has, with Turkish interests, constructed and is now operating a superphosphate factory at Iskenderun.

(c) Anderson, Clayton & Co. recently assigned a man from its European office to be located in Turkey for a year or so to study cotton production and marketing in Turkey, Syria and other neighboring countries. In this regard it is of interest to note that on January 25, 1954, the Turkish Parliament enacted a law which guarantees foreigners the right to withdraw, without limit, all profits earned subsequent to December 31, 1953, in investor's currency of origin. In addition, investors may also withdraw capital and loans at maturity.

The agricultural attaché's office in Italy advised the staff that several American hybrid seed corn companies are producing and distributing hybrid seed corn in the mechanized part of the Italian corn belt.

Foreign activities of farm machinery and food processing companies

The International Harvester Co. manufactures, assembles, or sells in most major producing countries in the world. The same is generally true for Deere & Co. The following United States' companies—Swift, Armour, Kraft, Borden, and National Dairy Products—have gone into many countries in Europe and Asia to process, manufacture and distribute their traditional products.

An American-Australian syndicate called Mainguard—Australia Ltd., headed by Allen Chase of Los Angeles, has been actively interested in promoting rice production in the northern territory of Australia.

American cotton gins are used in practically all cotton-producing countries. The Continental Gin Co., of Birmingham, Ala. is reported to be the largest manufacturer of cotton-gin machinery in the world. It sells to all cotton-growing sections of the world. This company along with the John E. Mitchell Co., Murray Gin Co., Lummus Cotton Gin Co., and several others, manufactures and sells 99 percent of the saw-type gin machinery used in the world. Most countries raising American upland-type cotton use saw gins.

Activities of foundations

The Rockefeller Foundation has supported crop breeding and extension work which has resulted in substantial increases in corn, wheat, and bean yields in Mexico and improved seed stocks of these three crops in Colombia. Corn improvement work has also been started in Central America.

The Ford Foundation overseas development program has concentrated its efforts in Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Turkey. Its rural and agricultural development program includes the financing of a technical consulting group based at Beirut, Lebanon; surveys of the opportunities for development and expansion of small-scale village industries; assistance in organizing agricultural credit systems; and general agricultural education projects.

Agricultural Loans Made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington—July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1954

From July 1, 1947, through December 31, 1954, a total of $3,105.9 million new credits were authorized by the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Of this total approximately $165 million was used by the borrowers in foreign countries for land development, purchases of farm machinery, grain storage equipment, fertilizer plants, and sugar mills. In addition, about $83 million was loaned for highway and hydroelectric construction which opened up important new agricultural producing areas or provided additional water for irrigation purposes.

As a general policy the Export-Import Bank finances only the materials and services purchased in the United States and most industrial, hydroelectric, transportation, and other projects financed by Export-Import Bank loans have a total cost considerably in excess of the bank loan.

The More Important Agricultural Credits

Israel: By far the largest agricultural credits were extended to Israel. In January 1949 a loan of $70 million was made for agricultural production purposes. These funds were used to provide buildings, farm machinery, and equipment for enlarging existing farms, creating new farms, expanding existing irrigation facilities, and related purposes. Important improvements in the central irrigation works were financed out of the proceeds of this loan. Eight and one-half million dollars were used to finance plantings, production, and marketing facilities in the citrus industry.

In addition to this $70 million loan for agricultural production purposes, $6 million out of loan funds for industrial purposes were used to finance a new fertilizer plant which started manufacturing superphosphates and nitrogen fertilizers in 1950–51. Also perhaps as much as two-thirds of a $25 million loan for housing materials made in 1949 was used for housing farm families.

Mexico: The Export-Import Bank extended credits of $5 million to a Government-owned corporation in Mexico in November 1947 for the purchase of agricultural equipment and a month later approved a $5 million loan for the purchase of equipment for two sugar mills.

In December 1950 it approved a loan of $2.5 million for the construction of the Falcon Dam, a joint United States-Mexico project, with part of the water allocated to Mexico and part to the United States. The loan funds financed Mexico's portion of this dam and it stores 2 million acre-feet of water a year. Most of this water is used to increase cotton production in both countries.

At the same time, December 1950, a credit of $17.5 million was approved for the construction of the Yaqui Alto Dam. This dam will store 2,430,000 acre-feet of water. A part of this water will be used on 117,000 hectares of land adjacent to the dam and a part will be used (via a canal) to irrigate 103,000 hectares some distance below the dam.

In addition to cotton, wheat, barley, carbanyas, and alfalfa are grown on these irrigated lands.

Afghanistan: The Export-Import Bank approved a loan of $21 million to the Government of Afghanistan in November 1949 for the construction of a dam and irrigation canal which has a potential capacity of irrigating 500,000 acres. In 1954 after the dam was completed the bank made the Afghanistan Government another loan of $18.5 million for land-development purposes. They are expected to develop around 170,000 acres over a 3-year period with these loan funds.

These lands are now being used primarily for wheat production, and some rice. FOA technical assistants are working with the Afghanistan Government trying to interest the settlers in diversified farming operations and attempting to get present nomad families to settle on these new irrigated lands.

The initiative for this project came originally from a United States contracting firm which interested the Afghanistan Government in the irrigation project prior to the arrival of an FOA mission.

Haiti: In December 1948 the Export-Import Bank approved a loan of $14 million to the Government of Haiti for irrigation and agricultural development purposes. The project is scheduled for completion in 1956. About 60,000 acres will be irrigated and used largely for rice production. Most of the rice produced will be used domestically and the power potentials associated with the dam will be developed later.

Iran: A line of credit of $53 million was approved for Iran in November 1954. The bank sent a mission to Iran in May 1955 to review the several loan proposals which have been sent forward to utilize this line of credit. Among the proposals are included proposals for financing a dam which would provide additional irrigation facilities and for purchasing agricultural equipment.

Turkey: A credit of $4,235,000 was granted to Turkey in November 1954 for the construction of internal wheat-storage facilities. It is estimated that the total cost of these facilities will approximate $6 million and that they will provide storage for 230,000 tons of wheat.

Liberia: In 1951 a loan of $5 million was made to Liberia to finance repairs on the 200-mile main road in that country, making it an all-weather road. Another loan of $15 million has just been approved in 1955 to add 300 miles of new roads opening up new agricultural areas, especially in the western Province. Lack of internal distribution has been the main obstacle preventing self-sufficiency in rice and other foods. The new road constructed with these funds will be the first highway linking the three Provinces of Liberia together. FOA is promoting agricultural development programs in these areas opened by the new highway.

Major agricultural products will be rice, cacao, bananas, palm kernels, coffee, and rubber. The new highways also will open extensive forest areas.

Ecuador: In 1950 the Export-Import Bank made a loan of $250,000 to the Basic Economy Corps (owned by Nelson Rockefeller) in Ecuador to finance purchases of machinery for rice production and harvesting on a demonstration or pilot-plant basis. The project was not successful in getting the natives to adopt mechanization.

In 1953 a loan of $2,280,000 was made to the Government of Ecuador for highway construction. This new highway will open up the richest agricultural lands in the country, 50,000 to 75,000 acres, which will be used to grow bananas, palm nuts, cacao, and coffee.

Bolivia: The Export-Import Bank loaned the Republic of Bolivia $10.3 million in 1942 for highway construction and an additional $18.4 million in 1949 for the same purpose. This highway development program links the tin-producing areas with the lowlands where agricultural production is possible. The lowlands are adapted to the production of a wide variety of crops and livestock products.

A rice mill and cotton gins have been built with private capital in Bolivia. An application for a loan to finance the construction of a sugar mill is now under investigation and study by the bank.

Colombia: In June 1950 a loan of $2.2 million was authorized to the Republic of Colombia for the construction of internal small grain storage facilities at points of collection from farmers.

Exporter Credit Lines

On November 12, 1954, the bank announced a new policy of extending lines of credit to assist United States exporters to finance the sale in foreign markets of capital equipment of a productive nature manufactured in the United States. The bank will finance up to $10 million to an exporter on the basis of a showing of need in maintaining his normal volume of exports. Already all of the major farm manufacturing companies have applied for lines of credit, usually in amounts of several million dollars, to finance their exports of farm machinery and replacement parts.

Credits Extended Directly or Indirectly for Agricultural Purposes by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Up to April 30, 1955, total credits extended by the international bank were $2,168,900,000; $444,400,000 of this total, or somewhat over 20 percent, were used either directly or indirectly to expand agricultural production. (See table 3 for breakdown by country and purpose.)

The bank's members now number 56 and its subscribed capital totals $9,148,500,000. The United States subscription was 34.71 percent of the total on June 30, 1954, and the United States had 30.34 percent of the total votes at that time.

Australia: Almost one-third of all agricultural loans and over half of all loans to finance farm machinery purchases were made to Australia. The first loan to this country was $100 million, made in August 1950. The press release issued at the time this loan was made stated that the major part of the loan funds would be utilized by farmers and business concerns. "They include the purchase of specialized agricultural machinery and equipment, such as crawler and special wheel tractors * * * heavy crawler tractors and earth-moving equipment will be purchased to assist in opening up new areas, clearing land for cultivation, providing irrigation, conserving water resources, and constructing hydroelectric works."

Another loan of $50 million was made in July 1952. The press release stated, "About one-third of the bank's loan will aid agricultural production on existing farms through increased mechanization, the use of fertilizers and * * * the creation of new farms through land reclamation and irrigation. By 1958 farm production is expected to increase by 10 percent."

Additional loans of $54 million were made in March 1954 and $54.5 million in March 1955. Approximately one-fourth of the 1954 loan and one-half of the 1955 loan was used for agriculture. The 1954 press release states "* * * the Commonwealth and State governments have been pushing ahead with projects to increase land use and productivity through reclamation, irrigation, and water conservation * * * today's loan will make possible continuing imports for the improvement of existing farms and for opening up new areas to cultivation. Tractors, earth-moving equipment, farm implements, harvesting equipment, and components for their manufacture in Australia will be bought under the loan."

The 1955 press release states, "Individual farmers are increasing their agricultural output through more extensive mechanization, and imported machinery and equipment has enabled the Commonwealth and State governments to carry forward programs to intensify land use and increase productivity through reclamation, pasture development, irrigation, water, and fodder conservation. Today's loan will finance further imports of equipment and machinery for these purposes, largely tractors, combine harvesters, hay balers, and other equipment for fodder conservation."

Colombia: Colombia ranks second to Australia in terms of total loans for the direct or indirect benefit of agriculture. The first loan of $5 million was made to Colombia in August 1949. The entire proceeds of this loan were used for the purchase of farm machinery and equipment.

Another loan of $16.5 million made to Colombia in April 1951 for highway construction and rehabilitation was of substantial indirect benefit to agriculture. Somewhat more than a year later, in August 1952, the bank made another loan of $25 million to Colombia to help to build a railroad in the Magdalena River Valley, an important agricultural area, and to equip railroad repair shops in Bogotá.

Another loan of $14,350,000 for further highway improvements was made by the bank in September 1953; and in December 1954 the bank made another loan of $5 million to Colombia, the proceeds to be used to finance imports of tractors and other farm equipment.

India: India stands third in terms of total bank loans directly or indirectly benefiting agriculture. In September 1949 the bank loaned India $10 million to be used primarily for financing purchases of agricultural machinery needed for reclamation of lands infested with a weed known as Kans grass, and for clearing of jungle lands.

In January 1953 the bank loaned India $19.5 million for the further development of the Damodar River Valley. The press release issued at that time stated, "The loan will help finance the construction of projects designed to protect this area against floods, to expand electric power capacity, and to build canals for irrigation and transportation * * *.

"Work has already started on the irrigation system; it will include 1,550 miles of irrigation and drainage canals serving an area of 1 million acres in West Bengal. When fully developed the system should make possible the production of an additional 400,000 tons of food grains, mostly rice. An increase in food production is of particular importance in this densely populated area as it is chronically deficient in food."

The Netherlands: The Netherlands stands fourth in volume of loans obtained from the International Bank directly or indirectly for agricultural purposes.

In 1947 the bank made the Netherlands a loan of $195 million for the reconstruction of productive facilities. Of this total $30 million was used to finance feed imports for their livestock and $5 million was used to finance reconstruction of their fertilizer and food processing industries.

Turkey: Turkey ranks fifth in volume of loans used either directly or indirectly for agriculture.

In July 1950 the International Bank made a loan of $3.9 million to Turkey for the construction of grain-storage facilities. The press release issued at that time included the following statement: "Grain is Turkey's largest crop, and present storage facilities are poorly equipped and insufficient to handle the annual movement of grain. Modern storage facilities will reduce losses from exposure, infestation and spoilage and effect considerable savings in handling costs. New agricultural equipment being supplied by ECA and the availability of more storage space will stimulate increased production and, ultimately, greater exports of grain, which should result in greater foreign exchange earnings."

In June 1952 the bank loaned Turkey $25.2 million to be used in the development of the Adana Plain. A multipurpose dam constructed with the assistance of these funds will be used for flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power. The economic development of the Adana Plain has thus far been limited by ruinous seasonal floods, by lack of water for irrigation in other seasons, and by a serious shortage of electric power.

Peru: Peru is sixth in terms of loans made by the International Bank which were used either directly or indirectly for agricultural purposes. Five different loans were made to Peru between January 1952 and April 1955, the proceeds of which were used either directly or indirectly for agriculture.

The first of these loans in the amount of $2.5 million was used to improve the facilities for handling general cargo and for the unloading and storage of bulk grain at the port of Callas, 5 miles west of Lima. The press release issued at that time stated, "The amount of bulk grains handled by the port of Callas has been increasing and will continue to increase * * *. In Peru wheat can be raised only in the high sierra, where the amount of cultivatable land is strictly limited. While improved methods can bring about increased yields, local production is not expected to increase as rapidly as consumption. Wheat brought to the Lima area (the principal area of consumption) from the northern and southern departments of Peru would be transported by coastal vessel to Callas."

In July 1952 a loan of $1.3 million was made to Peru to finance imports of agricultural equipment such as tractors, plows, threshers, and dirt-moving machinery to reclaim old and open new land for cultivation.

In April 1954 the International Bank made another loan of $91.7 million to Peru for the purchase of agricultural equipment. A press release issued at that time contains the following: "There is a rapidly increasing demand for land clearing and land preparation in Peru. On the coastal plain about 370,000 acres of land formerly in production has been abandoned because of deterioration of irrigation ditches, poor drainage, and failure to level for satisfactory water usage. Other lands still under cultivation need to be leveled to permit more effective use of water and the use of mechanized methods of cultivation. On the eastern slopes of the Andes large areas of land can be cleared at relatively low cost.

"It is estimated that during the life of the machinery financed by today's loan (Peru) will be able to rehabilitate about 37,000 acres of land and clear about another 12,500 acres each year. The cumulative effect of 5 years of full operation of the machinery should result in an increase of annual production valued at $36 million, of which about $17 million would be exported, making a substantial improvement in Peru's balance of payments."

In November 1954 the bank made another loan of $5 million to Peru to finance further imports of machinery, livestock, and materials needed to stimulate agricultural production in Peru. The press release issued at the time of the signing of the loan agreement indicated that the machinery obtained as a result of this loan would be used to help expand the production of cotton, sugar, rice, wheat, barley, and potatoes. About a quarter of the loan was to be used for the purchase of irrigation equipment.

In April of this year the World Bank made another loan of $18 million to Peru, the funds to be used to help finance the irrigation of 125,000 acres of new land in the coastal region of northern Peru, to be used for the production of food and long staple cotton. The long staple cotton will be grown for export to improve Peru's trade position.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Statement of loans for the direct or indirect benefit of agricultural and forestry development up to Apr. 30, 1955

[Million dollars]

	Farm machinery requisites	Land improvement	River basin development irrigation	Other	Forestry	Feed	Transport	Power development	Total
Australia	48.8	34.0		3.0	4.0		34.0	3.0	126.8
Chile	2.5		1.3		20.0				23.8
Colombia	10.0						55.85		65.85
Denmark	5.74						4.62		10.36
Ecuador							8.5		8.5
El Salvador							11.1		11.1
Ethiopia		.1		.5			5.0		5.6
Finland		1.0			2.1				3.1
France	1.5								1.5
Iceland	.2	2.15		.85					3.2
India		7.5	10.5					18.5	36.5
Iraq			6.3						6.3
Netherlands				5.0		30.0			35.0
Nicaragua	1.2			.55			7.0		8.75
Pakistan		3.25							3.25
Panama	.5	.7		.29					1.49
Paraguay	3.2	.3					1.5		5.0
Peru	2.0	5.5	18.0	1.5			1.5		28.5
Thailand			18.0						18.0
Turkey			13.4	3.9			16.3		33.6
Yugoslavia		1.2			4.0				5.2
Total	75.64	55.70	67.5	15.59	30.1	30.0	145.37	21.5	441.4

POINT 3

The extent to which such United States financial interests receive special tax concessions from the United States Government on income from production in other countries.

Federal income tax treatment of United States interests on income from without the United States corporations

1. Introduction: The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides certain credits or tax advantages for United States corporations doing business in United States possessions or in foreign countries. In some instances the credits are allowed to avert double taxation; in others special treatment is permitted to encourage United States trade and investment abroad, particularly in this hemisphere.

The following is an outline of Federal income-tax treatment accorded income of domestic corporations from without the United States. The section references are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Public Law 591, 83d Congress, approved August 16, 1954.

2. Foreign Tax Credit (secs. 901–905): A domestic corporation may elect to take credit against its total income tax for any income, war profits, or excess-profits taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States. The term "income, war profits, and excess-profits taxes" includes taxes paid in lieu thereof, such as taxes based upon gross sales or unit of production. The credit is not allowed against the following United States taxes: the tax on accumulated earnings, the additional tax on war-loss recoveries or the personal-holding-company tax. The amount of credit for foreign taxes is limited to the proportion of United States tax applicable to that particular foreign income.

A credit is also permitted a domestic corporation for the proportionate part of foreign taxes paid on income by a foreign corporation which results in dividends to the domestic corporation. At least 10 percent of the voting stock of the foreign corporation must be held. A further proportionate credit is allowed if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of another foreign corporation and receives dividends therefrom, and such dividend becomes part of the dividend paid to the domestic corporation.

An example of the latter situation would be: The A corporation, a domestic corporation, receives $100,000 in dividends from B corporation, a foreign corporation in which A corporation holds more than the requisite 10 percent of the voting stock. B corporation in turn holds all of the stock of C corporation, another foreign corporation. The accumulated profits of B corporation amount to $400,000 (including a $50,000 dividend from C corporation). The foreign income taxes paid by B corporation with respect to such accumulated profits amounts to $120,000. C corporation has accumulated profits of $300,000 with respect to which foreign taxes of $90,000 have been paid.

Under these circumstances there would be added to the $120,000 tax with respect to the accumulated profits of B corporation:

$$\frac{\$50,000}{300,000}\times\$90,000,\text{ or }\$15,000\text{ representing the}$$

foreign income tax paid upon that portion of the accumulated profits of C corporation used in the payment of $50,000 dividend to B corporation. The total tax paid or deemed to have been paid by B corporation with respect to its $400,000 accumulated profits is $120,000 plus $15,000, or $135,000.

The amount of tax deemed to have been paid by the domestic corporation with respect to the $100,000 dividend received from B corporation would then be:

$$\frac{\$100,000}{400,000}\times\$135,000,\text{ or }\$33,750,\text{ which may be}$$

claimed as a foreign tax credit.

3. Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. (secs. 921–922): A Western Hemisphere trade corporation is a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, and which satisfies the following conditions:

(1) if 95 percent or more of the gross income for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for the part of such period the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources without the United States; and

(2) if 90 percent or more of its gross income for such period was derived from active conduct of a trade or business.

A deduction in computing taxable income is allowed Western Hemisphere trade corporations as follows:

(A) First determine the taxable income of the corporation.

(B) Multiply the amount determined in (A) by the fraction—

(a) the numerator of which is 14 percent; and

(b) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate for the taxable year.

The effect of this computation is to allow a deduction which results in a 14-percent reduction in tax rate. It is understood that Western Hemisphere trade corporations are being rather widely used for United States trade and investment in Canada, Central, and South America.

4. Income From Sources Within Possessions of the United States (sec. 931): Domestic corporations engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States are exempt from tax on income from sources outside the United States, if for the 3-year period ending with the close of the taxable year (or the applicable part of that period)—

(a) at least 50 percent of gross income is from that trade or business; and

(b) at least 80 percent of gross income is from any source within the possession.

The Virgin Islands of the United States are expressly excluded by statute from "possessions of the United States."

The credit for taxes paid to foreign countries and possessions, discussed in section

2 above, is not allowed to corporations receiving the benefit of this section of the Code.

5. China Trade Act Corporations (secs. 941–943): Corporations organized under the China Trade Act, 1922 (15 U. S. C., ch. 4, sec. 141 et seq.) are allowed a special deduction derived from a proration of taxable income from sources within Formosa and Hong Kong, such deduction being limited to the amount of the special dividend which must be certified by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of the Treasury.

China Trade Act Corporation benefits are believed to have an inconsequential effect on the agricultural situation under study.

6. Dividends received from certain foreign corporations (sec. 245): Foreign corporation dividends (other than from a foreign personal holding company) received by a domestic corporation are subject to a deduction if—

(a) the foreign corporation is subject to United States income tax; and

(b) if it has derived 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources within the United States for an uninterrupted period of not less than 36 months, ending with the close of such foreign corporations' taxable year in which such dividends are paid (or, if the corporation has not been in existence for 36 months at the close of such taxable year), for the periods the foreign corporations have been in existence as of the close of such taxable year.

The dividends received credit is 85 percent but is limited to the percentage which the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources.

7. Tax treaties (sec. 894): The code in section 894 provides: "Income of any kind, to the extent required by any treaty obligation of the United States, shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt under this subtitle."

The development of United States business abroad and the increasing business done in the United States by aliens throughout the years have created complex tax problems. To solve these problems equitably for taxpayers and to protect United States revenues a number of tax treaties have been concluded, or are in negotiation.

Basically, these treaties are designed to eliminate international double taxation and to assist in mutual tax enforcement. An essential of such treaties is, therefore, the establishment of bases for determining sources of income.

Tax treaties have been concluded with the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom.

Negotiations are underway with: Austria, Colombia, Cuba, Honduras, Israel, Italy (awaiting exchange of ratifications), Mexico, Philippines.

An idea is being explored to consider in future treaty discussions an item of taxes spared. The principle involved is that when a foreign country offers the inducement of waiving taxes for an initial limited period of years to encourage new industry to enter the country, the treaty could provide that the taxpayer be allowed a credit for the taxes which would have been paid but for the tax sparing. The purpose would be to encourage the investment of United States capital in enterprises in friendly nations.

8. Foreign corporations not subject to United States taxes: Foreign corporations owned by United States interests and not subject to United States taxes are naturally not covered by the Internal Revenue Code, but may be an important vehicle for employment of United States capital abroad. Such corporations can be utilized to accumulate earnings, with such earnings being ultimately liquidated and brought under United States taxation only as gains subject to the limitation on taxation of capital gains.

Such corporations would fall essentially into two categories:

(1) Those incorporated in the country in which operations are conducted.

(2) Those incorporated in countries in which operations are not conducted but which have laws favorable to corporations. Panama, for instance, imposes no income tax except on business conducted in Panama. Panama, Bermuda, Bahama, and Liberia corporations have been frequently used.

Such foreign corporations are not under United States authority and information as to the extent of their utilization is not now available. Even though such foreign corporations are subsidiaries of domestic corporations, United States taxation is avoided unless dividends are paid to the parent companies.

Individuals

9. Introduction: The tax benefits to individuals from residence abroad, or from income from United States possessions or foreign countries, are important in encouraging United States citizens to accept employment or to invest abroad. The following sections outline these benefits.

10. Foreign tax credit (secs. 901, 903–5): The foreign tax credit described under section 2 above on corporations is also applicable to individuals. All features enumerated therein apply except for the credit allowed a domestic corporation for a proportionate part of taxes paid by a foreign corporation.

11. Earned income from sources without the United States (sec. 911): An individual citizen of the United States, who has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries for an uninterrupted period which includes an entire taxable year, is exempt from tax on amounts received from sources without the United States (except amounts paid by the United States or any agency thereof) if such amounts constitute earned income attributable to such period. The individual is not entitled to any deductions related to such exempt income, but is allowed personal exemptions.

Exactly the same treatment is accorded individual citizens who are present in a foreign country or countries at least 510 full days during any period of 18 consecutive months. Under this provision, if the 18-month period includes the entire taxable year the amount excluded shall not exceed $20,000. If the 18-month period does not include the entire taxable year the amount excluded from tax is the ratable portion.

"Earned income," under these provisions, means amounts received as compensation for personal services actually rendered, but does not include any payment which represents a distribution of earnings or profits. If the taxpayer is engaged in a trade or business in which both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 30 percent of his share of the net profits, is considered to be earned income.

12. Income from sources within possessions of the United States (secs. 931 and 933):

The provisions relating to income from within United States possessions described under section 4 on corporations are also applicable to individual taxpayers.

In addition, section 933 of the code contains a special provision for individuals on "Income from sources within Puerto Rico." This section provides that in the case of an individual who is a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the entire taxable year income derived from sources within Puerto Rico (except amounts received for services performed as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof) shall not be included in gross income. No deductions assignable to such excluded income (other than personal exemptions) are allowed. Also, if an individual citizen of the United States has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico for at least 2 years before the date on which he changes his residence therefrom, income derived from sources therein (except amounts received for services performed as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof) which is attributable to the Puerto Rican residence is excluded. Deductions relating thereto (except personal exemptions) are not allowable.

13. Tax treaties (sec. 894): The tax treaties mentioned in section 7 under "Corporations" also cover individual taxpayers.

14. Partnerships (secs. 701–771 and sec. 1361): Since partnership returns are informational only and the distribution to partners is taxable on individual returns, the preceding sections dealing with individuals cover the tax benefits arising from partnership operations in possessions and foreign countries.

Section 1361 of the code, added in 1954, provides that partnerships in certain circumstances may elect to be taxed as domestic corporations. This provision is not considered significant to the present study.

POINT 4

The extent to which such financial interests are tied into the Department of Agriculture and national farm organizations, through representation on advisory committees and similar groups.

The Department of Agriculture has furnished the committee staff a listing which purports to include every advisory committee of the Department as well as all its consultants. These advisory committee lists have been reviewed to segregate those which are germane to the survey and those which are not, such as Farmer Cooperative Service, Rural Electrification Administration, etc.

The staff is presently engaged in studying the composition of relevant committees to determine the extent of representation of private United States interests which are engaged in agricultural activities in foreign countries. To date it has been found that the following officials of companies either believed or known to be engaged in such activities are currently serving on the indicated committees:

Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade and Technical Assistance: W. C. Schilthuis, Continental Grain Co., alternate; Lamar Fleming, Jr., Anderson, Clayton & Co., alternate.

Cotton Export Advisory Committee: Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman, board of directors, Anderson, Clayton & Co.

Cotton Price Support Advisory Committee: A. M. Crawford, Weil Bros.

Grain Export Advisory Committee: André Hinschler, Bunge Corp.; Harold E. Sanford, Continental Grain Co.; W. C. Schilthuis, Continental Grain Co.

Wheat Advisory Committee: H. E. Sanford, vice president, Continental Grain Co.

Corn Advisory Committee: William F. Brady, Corn Products Refining Co.; Robert C. Woodworth, vice president, Cargill, Inc.

Dairy Export Advisory Committee: George M. McCoy, Borden Food Products Co.; A. W. Sigmund, Kraft Foods, Inc.; Leslie J. Lindell, General Milk Co.

Dairy Industry Task Committee: Arthur W. Sigmund, Kraft Foods, Inc.; D. M. Dent, Borden Food Products Co.

CCC Storage Committee: Loren Johnson, Continental Grain Co.

National Agriculture Advisory Commission: Jesse W. Tapp, Bank of America.[1]

In connection with the Cotton Export Advisory Committee listed above it should be noted that a temporary committee of the same name was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 13, 1953, and was comprised of the following individuals:

D. W. Brooks, general manager, Georgia Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

C. R. Sayre, president, Delta Pine & Land Co., Scott, Miss.

Everett R. Cook, Cook & Co., Memphis, Tenn.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., president, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

William A. McGregor, vice president, Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N. Y.

Charles H. Cannon, president, Cannon Mills, Kannapolis, N. C.

Walter L. Randolph, president, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, Montgomery, Ala.

This is the committee referred to on February 28, 1955, by Senator EASTLAND, page 49, part I, of hearings before the Subcommittee on Disposal of Agriculture Surpluses of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The committee staff has been informed that it held several meetings during the calendar year 1953, submitted a report to the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the Secretary considered it dissolved.

The present Cotton Export Advisory Committee was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 24, 1955, to serve for the coming year, and is comprised of the following individuals:

Walter L. Randolph, vice president, American Farm Bureau, Montgomery, Ala.

Alan G. Patteson, producer, Jonesboro, Ark.

J. B. Hubbard, president, J. B. Hubbard & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, Dallas, Tex.

Allison Pell, president, Pell Cotton Co., Charlotte, N. C.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman, board of directors, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

E. F. Creekmore, president, Creekmore & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, New Orleans, La.

S. Y. West, president, S. Y. West & Co., Memphis, Tenn.

D. W. Brooks, general manager, the Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

The committee staff is continuing its study to determine the extent of representation of private United States interests, engaged in agricultural activities in foreign countries, on advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture and national farm organizations.

POINT 5

The amount of foreign-aid funds which have been used to encourage increased agricultural production in foreign countries:

As of March 31, 1955, cumulative obligations of the Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor agencies aggregated approximately $19.1 billion. Around 63 percent of $12.1 billion represented obligations for assistance activities in 20 selected countries where agriculture relatively is most important. (See table 1.) In these 20 countries slightly less than $1 billion has been obligated for agricultural assistance including health and industrial assistance activities having a direct bearing on agricultural production and processing. In addition, approximately $710.8 million in local counterpart funds created by assistance activities in these 20 countries have been programed for the furtherance of agricultural production and processing.

Because of the outstanding importance of agriculture and substantial increases in agricultural production, particularly cotton in recent years in Iran, India, Pakistan, and Turkey as compared with the other countries receiving assistance the activities in these countries are being analyzed in detail.

Thus far detailed data are available only for Iran. (See table 2.) As of March 31, 1955, approximately $201.2 million United States foreign assistance funds have been obligated for the Iranian program, of which amount $47.3 million has been incurred for agricultural assistance, including those health and industrial activities bearing directly on agricultural production. The breakdown on these funds by field of activity and between projects and technical assistance is as follows:

"[Amount in millions]

Activity field	Projects	Technicians and trainees	Total
Agriculture	$17.7	$5.6	$23.3
Health	9.9	2.5	12.4
Industry, transportation, and community development	11.6	-------	11.6
Total	39.2	8.1	47.3

TABLE 1.—*Promotion of agriculture abroad—Funds obligated by Foreign Operations Administration and predecessor agencies, Apr. 3, 1948, through Mar. 31, 1955—20 selected countries*

Country	Projects[1]	Technicians and trainees[2]	Commodities[3]	Total for promotion for agriculture[4]	Total aid by FOA and predecessor agencies[4]	Approved withdrawals from counterpart funds for promotion of agriculture[5]
Latin America:						
Brazil	$2,058,489	$3,233,006	----------	$5,291,495	$10,643,471	----------
Colombia	930,588	1,877,536	----------	2,808,124	3,509,826	----------
Mexico	764,500	1,010,064	----------	1,774,564	3,774,289	----------
Nicaragua	480,550	1,047,994	----------	1,528,544	2,413,211	----------
Peru	2,615,341	2,951,383	----------	5,566,724	7,696,890	----------
Total	6,849,468	10,119,983	----------	16,969,451	28,037,687	----------
Europe:						
France	----------	458,000	$179,910,434	180,368,434	3,204,153,586	$253,000,000
Italy	----------	286,000	30,140,821	30,426,821	1,613,736,268	259,000,000
Western Germany	----------	351,000	180,648,397	180,999,397	1,494,547,839	106,400,000
United Kingdom	----------	242,000	103,266,620	103,508,620	3,812,513,529	700,000
Total	----------	1,337,000	493,966,272	495,303,272	10,124,951,222	619,100,000
Near and Middle East:						
Turkey	----------	3,030,637	63,845,967	66,876,604	369,018,922	18,600,000
Greece	424,964	1,766,000	43,177,927	45,368,888	835,508,760	64,800,000
Syria	----------	----------	----------	----------	88,140	----------
Iran	39,246,650	8,087,472	----------	47,334,122	201,229,759	----------
India	167,830,500	6,638,367	----------	174,468,867	261,562,195	----------
Pakistan	42,621,235	1,554,772	5,576,495	49,752,502	118,531,295	2,100,000
Iraq	612,207	2,250,259	----------	2,862,466	6,557,732	----------
Total	250,735,556	23,327,507	112,600,386	386,663,449	1,792,496,803	85,500,000
Africa: Egypt	32,022,964	1,478,261	----------	33,501,225	39,244,551	----------
Far East:						
Burma	6,079,003	450	1,492,906	7,572,359	21,181,588	800,000
Japan	----------	----------	7,000,000	7,000,000	10,140,145	----------
Thailand	34,271,100	377,654	2,500,926	37,149,680	51,329,453	5,400,000
Total	40,350,103	378,104	10,993,832	51,722,039	82,651,186	6,200,000
Grand total	329,958,091	36,640,855	617,560,490	984,159,436	12,067,381,449	710,800,000

[1] Project obligations primarily represent total equipment and supply costs which will be borne by the United States in conducting specific activities, e. g. locust control, dam construction, etc., under signed project (activity) agreements with the respective countries.

[2] Technician and trainee obligations represent salary, per diem, transportation, and other costs incidental to furnishing United States technicians to the respective countries and the training of local nationals in the United States.

[3] Commodity obligations primarily represent the cost of agricultural products, machinery and supplies, textile-mill machinery, and food-processing equipment furnished. Local currency counterpart funds are created by the local sales of these and other commodities in the recipient countries.

[4] Includes the dependent overseas territories of the European countries, nonregional, and other program obligations of FOA and its predecessor agencies.

[5] Counterpart fund withdrawals for the promotion of agriculture are primarily directed toward land reclamation and irrigation, research and extension, and farm credit.

General technical assistance is being provided to Iran in the field of agriculture, health, and industry. Inasmuch as cotton and wheat are grown throughout the country, all technical assistance rendered to Iran is indirectly beneficial to the production of these two commodities.

As of March 31, 1955, approximately $3.4 million in obligations have been recorded for projects related specifically to cotton, wheat, and general agricultural production and the introduction of new seed strains. The amount devoted specifically to cotton and wheat is not available.

Most of the health and many of the industry projects in Iran are also directly related to the agricultural program. Malaria control and sanitation projects in the rural areas primarily account for the $12.4 million in obligations for health activities. Approximately $6.2 million of the $11.6 million in obligations for industry, transportation, and community development programs have been scheduled for expansion of the Tchitsazi cotton mill, cotton classing, introduction of improved hand looms, and rural community development. This latter project includes group demonstrations of better farming procedures, introduction of new plant strains, and rural health and education programs.

An analysis of the field of specialty of the United States agricultural technicians sent to Iran has not yet been completed by FOA. An analysis of the 91 Iranian nationals trained in the United States in the field of agriculture since inception of the program in 1951, discloses that 2 received training in cotton production and culture and 1 received training in cotton classing. The training of these three participants occurred in fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

---

[1] This name is included as the Mexican press has reported that the Bank of America has issued credit of $10 million for financing cottongrowers in Mexico. Several other banks have representatives on committees but it has not yet been determined whether they finance foreign production.

Detailed data on assistance activities relating to the promotion of agriculture in India, Pakistan, Turkey are now being prepared.

TABLE 2.—*Iran: Major projects bearing on agricultural production summary of project obligations incurred from the beginning of the program in June 1950 to Mar. 31, 1955*

	Amount
Agricultural projects:	
Locust control	$272,316
Karaj College (agricultural research)	689,000
Rural improvement (improved production of cotton, cereals, and other crops)	2,037,839
Golpayegan Dam (irrigation)	136,800
Kuhrang tunnel (irrigation)	66,000
Land-use survey (land classification and soil analysis)	535,000
Karkbeh Dam construction (irrigation)	157,816
Ghanat reconstruction (irrigation)	230,000
Livestock improvement (breeding stock, veterinary training)	1,043,992
Cotton improvement (research and improved seed)	33,500
River basin survey (water runoff and erosion)	434,667
Agricultural extension (improve extension service)	592,200
Plant science (plant strain improvement, including cotton and cereals)	1,359,348
Forestry (rural woodlots for fuel)	146,600
Farm-machinery pool (demonstration and repair centers)	613,263
Irrigation (shallow-furrow method demonstration)	176,865
Razi Veterinary Institute (laboratory techniques and diagnosis)	226,465
Cooperative specialist training (training cooperative service workers)	40,032
Deep wells, Yezd area (irrigation)	150,000
Purchase of CCC surplus commodities (to generate local currency for agricultural projects)	6,618,430
All other	2,190,011
Total	17,750,154
Health projects:	
Malaria control (rural areas)	2,937,455
Health cooperative (public health)	1,175,063
Public health (rural-health improvement)	4,096,893
Razi Veterinary Institute (laboratory equipment)	15,000
All other	1,655,767
Total	9,880,138
Industry, transportation, and community development projects:	
Tchitsazi mills (cotton mills expansion)	2,295,999
Sugar plants (construction and expansion)	1,566,336
Teheran slaughterhouse (meat processing)	635,000
Dried-fruit plants (processing)	556,818
Wool-scouring plant (processing)	242,500
Karaj Dam (irrigation)	$1,575,000
Cotton classing	45,000
Railroads	250,000
Highways	544,830
Rural development (demonstration farming, credit, rural community development)	3,756,375
Hand looms (introduction of improved looms)	148,500
Total	11,616,358
Total projects	39,246,650

POINT 6

What special concessions other countries throughout the world make to move their exports, both agricultural and nonagricultural, into world markets.

Export incentives utilized by other countries for nonagricultural products

The most general export incentive employed by other countries is the provision of favorable credits for foreign buyers and credit insurance for the exporters of capital goods. Most countries including the United States have government loan and insurance programs which supplement their private commercial activities in this field.

The enabling statute in Canada typifies the purpose of credit insurance in these words: "To facilitate and develop trade between Canada and other countries by insuring against loss caused by insolvency, delays in collection, and transfer difficulties."

Remission of taxes: Most industrialized countries have substantial manufacturers' excise taxes, sales, or turnover taxes which increase the cost of the manufactured product to the domestic purchaser. Usually these taxes are not applied to exports.

In the United Kingdom, for example, the domestic purchase tax is 50 percent of the sale price of autos. On a Jaguar, MK VII the tax is $570; on an MG, Midget, $275; on a Ford Zephyr, $266; and on an Austin-Healy the tax is $375. Automobile purchase taxes at this level were established in part as an anti-inflationary measure to discourage domestic purchase. These taxes are not applied on export sales, hence a purchaser of a British Jaguar or Austin-Healy car in a nearby country, such as Sweden, where the additional transportation charges are less than the domestic purchase taxes, may be able to buy British cars at a lower price than the residents of the United Kingdom.

Rebate of import duties paid on raw materials: In addition to a remission of excise, sales, and turnover taxes on manufactured products exported, most countries, including the United States, rebate all or a large part of the import duties paid on imported raw materials used in the manufacture of products to be exported.

Retention of foreign exchange: A substantial number of countries which have foreign-exchange controls stimulate the export of selected products by allowing the exporters of these products to retain a percentage of their foreign-exchange earnings which may be utilized for profitable imports from hard currency areas. In Denmark, e. g., exporters of most categories of Danish goods to the dollar area receive import rights or assurances to face value of 10 percent of the dollar exchange earned by them. These rights to import goods from countries in the European Payments Union are transferrable and are customarily sold by the exporter to prospective importers for a "premium," currently equal to 80 percent of their face value.

Japan permits an exporter to retain a percentage (currently 5 percent) of the foreign exchange he earns. Such funds retained by the exporter may be used for imports of specified raw materials, travel, expenses of overseas branches, and other specified purposes. About 400 export items are subject to the system. Pakistan has an export-incentive plan whereby exporters of specified products are permitted to use a percentage of their foreign exchange proceeds for the importation of certain commodities.

Multiple-exchange rates: None of the important exporting countries of industrial goods utilizes multiple-exchange rates to encourage exports. A number of the less important countries such as Spain, Yugoslavia, Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela, however, utilize multiple-exchange rates to encourage the exports of certain products. Where multiple-exchange rates are employed the exchange rate allowed for a particular product usually may be changed at any time by administrative action to maintain the competitive position desired in world trade.

Other export incentives: Examples of other export incentives for manufactured products in specific countries are as follows:

In Mexico where a substantial part of the tax revenue is raised by duties on exports the ad valorem rates on processed goods such as cotton textiles and manufactured wood products are much lower than on raw materials such as cotton and logs.

New industries in Mexico which qualify under the statute for the development of new and necessary industries are entitled to exemption from, or a reduction in export duties for a period of from 5 to 10 years.

Chile has authorized the new investors in a new spinning mill to be transferred from United States to Chile, to keep the exchange returns from their exports for a period of 3 years.

Japan has an Import-Export Link System to encourage exports of manufactured products. Manufacturers of cotton, rayon, and woolen goods are granted allocations for extra imports of raw materials on the basis of their exports of finished products. Exporters of industrial plants, vessels, and rolling stock which may be unprofitable are allowed to use foreign exchange for such profitable imports as sugar, bananas, and pineapples.

Germany, in addition to the usual tax remissions on exports, grants special income-tax deductions based on exports made between January 1 and December 31, 1955.

Canada provides an export subsidy of up to $1 per ton on Alberta and British Columbia coal exported from Canadian seaports and 75 cents per net ton when sold for fuel as ship's stores on oceangoing vessels.

In both India and Pakistan export taxes at a very low rate are levied on certain products, the proceeds from which are earmarked for sales promotion and publicity of the product on which the tax is collected.

Export incentives utilized by other countries for agricultural products

All agricultural attachés have been requested to report on the export incentives, if any, for agricultural products employed by the countries in which they are stationed. Less than half of these reports have been received to date. For this reason the information in this section is incomplete at this time.

Mexico: The agricultural attaché in Mexico reports that an ad valorem export tax of around 25 percent is levied on the principal export products, cotton, coffee, peanuts, fresh fruit, and vegetables, cattle, cacao, etc. This export tax is reduced or eliminated from time to time when export markets of particular products are in distress.

At the present time the export tax on cotton is 22.44 percent on a value set officially at 6.80 pesos per kilo. This is equivalent to 5.54 cents a pound.

The Government has price-support programs on corn, wheat, and beans and provides a subsidy to reduce prices of these products to domestic consumers. They are not important export crops, however.

The producers of henequen and ixtle (two local fibers) have semi-Government monopolies which sell the fibers at fixed prices in the domestic market and at the world market price for export.

Most of the exports of bananas from Mexico come from the State of Tobasco and are made through the Confederation of Banana Growers of Tobasco as a pooled operation.

Brazil: The agricultural attaché in Brazil reports that a system of multiple-exchange rates is maintained in that country. At present this system provides 4 categories of export bonuses above the official exchange rate of 18.36 cruzeiros per dollar.

The effective exchange rates for United States dollars at the present time are for—

	Cruzeiros per dollar
Exports in category 1	31.50
Exports in category 2	37.06
Exports in category 3	43.06
Exports in category 4	50.06

Since the cruzeiro in the free market is selling for approximately 80 to the dollar the Bank of Brazil must control the foreign exchange very tightly to enforce these rates.

Early in May cotton was shifted from category 2 to category 3, increasing the exchange rate from 37.06 to 43.06 cruzeiros per dollar. This made possible a 16-percent drop in the export price of cotton as compared with the earlier classification.

There are no exports in category 1 at present. In February 1955 coffee was moved from category 1 to category 2, increasing the exchange rate from Cr$31.50 to Cr$37.06 to the dollar.

Imports into Brazil are limited by the fact that importers must pay around Cr$85 per dollar for essential goods (official exchange plus auction premium) to Cr$300 per dollar and above for luxury goods.

When exports of a particular product lag, Brazil usually endeavors to stimulate them by adjusting upward the effective exchange rate.

India: The agricultural attaché in India reports India is not using any subsidies to exporters of agricultural products of multiple exchange rates.

India does, however, actively encourage the formation of export promotion councils. A sum equivalent to $475,000 was allocated by India to the Tea Export Promotion Council in 1954–55 for tea promotion in the United States.

Export promotion councils are planned for tobacco, pepper, and cashew nuts. Steps already have been taken to promote tobacco exports.

West Germany: The agricultural attaché in West Germany reports a small soft-commodity arrangement whereby fresh meat and milk sales to the United States Army are made at somewhat below domestic prices, with the exporters' losses paid by the German importers of honey, citrus fruit, juices, fatback, dried fruit, etc. This arrangement is licensed and will be discontinued in 1955.

Exports of canned pork specialities to the dollar area are promoted by subsidy payments out of funds earned by the Government agency which imports feed grains.

Tax exemptions, deductions, and refunds which apply to nonagricultural exports also apply to agricultural exports.

Exports of mineral water are entitled to a reduction of 5.4 percent in freight rates within Western Germany. Exports of beer are entitled to freight-rate reductions of from 5 to 11 percent depending on distance hauled. No other exports are granted freight-rate reductions.

Dominican Republic: The agricultural officer in the Dominican Republic reports that exports of corn from that country are exempted from wharfage and handling charges.

Sugar and sugar products destined for use as livestock feed are exempt from payment of certain duties, taxes, and surcharges.

Cuba: The economic attaché in Cuba reports that Cuba is actively interested in promoting its agricultural commodities, which are deemed to be in surplus. Sugar and tobacco are the major products in this category although corn and coffee have merited some Government attention.

Cuba has set up a sugar-stabilization institute and resorted to Government sales of sugar extending long-term credits (mostly 3 years) to be liquidated by exports from the purchasing country to Cuba. Similar deals have been made for tobacco.

An export bank has been created recently to grant long-term credits in conection with export sales of agricultural commodities.

Loan to Brazil to finance cotton withholdings

Brazil supported cotton prices to her producers for the 1951 and 1952 crops at somewhat higher than world prices. The support level on the more typical cotton, types 4 and 5, was apparently around 38 to 42 cents a pound. When world prices failed to increase to the domestic support level, cotton was withheld from the export market for a considerable period.

On August 1, 1952, cotton stocks in Brazil were 1.4 million bales. A year later they had reached 2.5 million bales. This is in contrast to normal August 1 stocks in 1951 of 600,000 bales, and 500,000 bales in 1950.

Largely because of withholding her normal cotton exports Brazil's dollar accounts became overdue in late 1952 and the Export-Import Bank on February 2, 1953, authorized an 81-month loan of $300 million at 3½ percent interest. The loan was made to the Bank of Brazil for the announced purpose of liquidating past-due dollar accounts.

As of December 31, 1954, $13,348,836 had been repaid. The loan is being paid in installments beginning September 30, 1954, and ending May 31, 1961.

(Details on the method used to dispose of the accumulated cotton stocks will be included in the final report. It appears that late in 1953 Brazilian exporters began quoting prices at a slight discount under New York quotations and continued this price plan until the accumulated stocks were liquidated.)

Mexico

Commodity	Unit	5-year averages		1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55	Change, 1950–51 to 1954–55	Estimated, 1955–56	Notes on factors influencing trend since 1950
		1935–36 to 1939–40	1945–46 to 1949–50								
PRODUCTION									Percent		
Cotton	1,000 bales	334	577	1,151	1,273	1,250	1,210	1,780	+54.6		
Corn	1,000 bushels	67,523	95,389	98,420	135,000	126,060	125,980	141,700	+44.0	135,000	See notes on acreage and yields.
Wheat	do	14,284	15,522	20,210	15,800	17,450	24,650	30,300	+49.9	27,000	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	12	37	71	75	77	55	88	+23.9		Favorable prices; increased demand.
Rice, rough	Million pounds	182	329	315	328	333	330	365	+15.8	365	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	38,200	79,471	78,219	79,452	88,438	77,602	80,468	+2.9		No pronounced trend.
Acreage (1,000 acres):											
Cotton		725	1,034	1,880	2,183	1,937	1,860	1,820	−3.2		
Corn		7,501	8,894	9,880	10,940	10,470	10,725	10,870	+10.0	10,900	Increase under Government support-price program.
Wheat		1,244	1,244	1,591	1,663	1,466	1,623	1,804	+13.4	1,800	
Peanuts		33	79	133	134	136	148	148	+11.3		Favorable prices; increased demand.
Rice, rough		96	190	262	257	204	193	205	−21.8	210	
Tobacco		51	89	87	88	79	88	89	+2.3		Do.
Yield produced per acre:											
Cotton	Bales	0.461	0.558	0.612	0.583	0.645	0.651	0.978	+59.8		
Corn	Bushels	9.0	10.7	10.0	12.3	12.0	11.7	13.0	+30.0	12.4	Improved cultural practices and favorable weather conditions.
Wheat	do	11.5	12.5	12.7	9.5	11.9	15.2	16.8	+32.3	15.0	
Peanuts [1]	Pounds	727	937	1,068	1,119	1,132	743	1,189	+11.3		No pronounced trend.
Rice, rough	do	1,904	1,731	1,203	1,278	1,632	1,710	1,780	+48.0	1,738	
Tobacco	do	749	893	899	903	1,120	882	904	+.5		
		1934–38	1945–49	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1950–54	1955	
EXPORTS											
Cotton [2]	1,000 bales	[3] 105	343	742	972	992	911	1,150	+55.0		
Corn	1,000 bushels	1,232	128					50		50	
Wheat	do	4	64								
Peanuts [4]	1,000 tons	(1935–39) [5]	[6]	17	26	29	32	29	+70.6		Favorable demand.
Rice, milled [7]	Million pounds	(1936–40) 19	(1946–50) 47	(1951) 2	(1952) 4	(1953) 0.4	(1954) 0	(1955) 0			
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	215	497	608	656	362	547	600	−1.3		

---

[1] Calculated from rounded figures. Not published by FAS.
[2] Crop years beginning Aug. 1.
[3] Calendar years.
[4] Shelled and unshelled converted to an unshelled basis.
[5] Less than 500 tons.
[6] Not readily available.
[7] Calendar year trade.

Iran

Commodity	Unit	5-year averages		1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	Change, 1950-51 to 1954-55	Estimated, 1955-56	Notes on factors influencing trend since 1950
		1935-36 to 1939-40	1945-46 to 1949-50								
PRODUCTION									*Percent*		
Cotton	1,000 bales	171	85	129	124	165	240	275	+113.2	-----	
Corn	1,000 bushels	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Wheat	do	72,128	70,791	74,000	66,000	75,000	82,500	77,000	+4.1	80,000	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Rice, rough	Million pounds	836	869	897	787	929	1,100	1,160	+29.2	900	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	34,542	30,820	26,764	29,652	40,829	27,998	32,000	+19.6	-----	Production figures unreliable.
Acreage (1,000 acres):											
Cotton	-----	453	239	321	371	450	555	620	+93.1	-----	
Corn	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Wheat	-----	4,191	[1] 3,860	[1] 4,000	[1] 4,000	[1] 4,000	[1] 4,300	[1] 4,250	+6.2	4,300	
Peanuts	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Rice, rough	-----	534	544	530	476	544	618	620	+17.0	530	
Tobacco	-----	35	38	39	40	66	46	50	+28.2	-----	Do.
Yield, produced per acre:											
Cotton	Bales	.377	.356	.402	.334	.367	.432	.444	+10.4	-----	
Corn	Bushels	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Wheat	do	17.2	[1] 18.3	[1] 18.5	[1] 16.5	[1] 18.8	[1] 19.2	[1] 18.1	-2.2	18.6	
Peanuts	Pounds	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Rice, rough	do	1,566	1,598	1,693	1,653	1,708	1,780	1,871	+10.5	1,698	
Tobacco	do	987	811	606	741	619	609	640	-6.7	-----	No trend.
		1934-38	1945-49	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1950-54	1955	
EXPORTS											
Cotton [2]	1,000 bales	[3] 80	12	105	40	115	160	120	+14.3	-----	
Corn	1,000 bushels	-----	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Wheat	do	709	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Rice, milled [4]	Million pounds	(1936-40) 59	(1946-50) 46	(1951) 56	(1953) 137	(1953) 108	(1954) 85	(1955) 150	(1951-55) +167.9	(1956) 100	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	[1] 477	[1] 1,298	-----	-----	7,126	-----	-----	-----	-----	Exports mostly insignificant.

[1] Unofficial estimates.
[2] Crop years beginning Aug. 1.
[3] Calendar years.
[4] Mar. 21-20.

Turkey

Commodity	Unit	5-year averages		1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	Change, 1950-51 to 1954-55	Estimated, 1955-56	Notes on factors influencing trend since 1950
		1935-36 to 1939-40	1945-46 to 1949-50								
PRODUCTION									*Percent*		
Cotton	1,000 bales	249	268	542	600	690	638	600	+10.7	-----	
Corn	1,000 bushels	22,971	22,406	24,720	33,460	32,950	29,900	35,980	+45.6	35,000	See 71 elc.
Wheat	do	135,690	125,089	150,000	205,000	239,000	293,950	180,040	+20.0	275,000	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	2	3	5	10	13	14	16	+220.0	-----	
Rice, rough	Million pounds	206	162	170	215	314	360	364	+114.1	295	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	128,505	191,488	195,447	202,732	249,119	206,350	214,500	+9.7	-----	Larger export demand.
Acreage (1,000 acres):											
Cotton	-----	667	645	1,100	1,586	1,669	1,495	1,440	+30.9	-----	Sharply increased acreage encouraged by Government measures such as high fixed prices.
Corn	-----	1,098	1,394	1,466	1,540	1,586	1,534	1,779	+21.4	1,800	
Wheat	-----	8,973	9,436	10,500	12,000	13,400	15,840	15,860	+51.0	15,900	
Peanuts	-----	3	7	7	10	12	14	14	+100.0	-----	
Rice, rough	-----	78	56	60	75	121	124	115	+91.7	100	
Tobacco	-----	194	290	300	320	340	323	330	+10.0	-----	Do.
Yield produced per acre:											
Cotton	Bales	.373	.416	.493	.378	.413	.427	.417	-15.4	-----	
Corn	Bushels	20.9	16.1	16.9	21.7	20.8	19.5	20.2	+19.5	19.4	Improved cultural practices and favorable growing—bad in 1954.
Wheat	do	15.1	13.3	14.3	17.1	17.8	18.6	11.4	-20.3	17.3	
Peanuts [1]	Pounds	1,333	857	1,429	2,000	2,167	2,000	2,228	+55.9	-----	
Rice, rough	do	2,642	2,905	2,835	2,869	2,598	2,902	3,166	+11.7	2,950	
Tobacco	do	662	660	651	634	733	639	650	-.1	-----	No pronounced trend.
		1934-38	1945-49	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1950-54	1955	
EXPORTS											
Cotton [2]	1,000 bales	[3] 69	69	349	261	433	374	325	-6.9	-----	
Corn	1,000 bushels	173	113	-----	213	866	76	150	[6]	100	
Wheat	do	2,973	1,559	107	8,102	22,277	32,070	12,000	-----	20,000	Larger crop except 1954.
Peanuts	1,000 tons	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Rice, milled [4]	Million pounds	[5] (1936-40)	(1946-50) 4	[5] (1951)	(1952) 0	(1953) 27	(1954) 2	(1955) 20	[6] (1951-55)	5	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	78,054	105,371	111,702	127,673	125,392	158,088	139,101	+24.5	-----	Recovery in principal European markets—especially Germany; larger export demand.

[1] Calculated from rounded figures. Not published by FAS.
[2] Crop years beginning Aug. 1.
[3] 1933-37 average.
[4] Calendar year.
[5] Less than 500,000 pounds.
[6] All increase.

India

Commodity	Unit	5-year averages		1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55	Change, 1950–51 to 1954–55	Estimated, 1955–56	Notes on factors influencing trend since 1950
		1935–36 to 1939–40	1945–46 to 1949–50								
PRODUCTION											
Cotton	1,000 bales	[1] 5,348	2,304	2,720	3,110	3,005	3,730	3,900	*Percent* +43.4	----------	
Corn	1,000 bushels	67,240	79,836	68,000	79,500	105,000	116,000	[2] 115,000	+69.1	120,000	See notes on acreage and yields.
Wheat	do	262,100	212,336	235,000	237,440	215,340	275,630	290,900	+23.8	310,000	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	3,296	3,751	3,849	3,410	3,230	4,002	4,282	+11.2	----------	Expansion in acreage.
Rice, rough	Million pounds	74,750	76,000	70,000	75,000	84,000	91,500	85,000	+21.4	85,000	1950–51 extremely poor year.
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	761,000	633,405	547,150	589,120	539,840	573,440	561,500	+2.6	----------	No pronounced trend, see below.
Acreage (1,000 acres):											
Cotton	----------	[1] 24,204	11,306	14,556	16,198	15,693	17,027	18,000	+23.7	----------	
Corn	----------	5,526	7,761	7,560	7,960	8,800	9,000	9,000	+19.0	9,200	Government encouragement to increase acreage of food groups to meet needs of rapidly increasing population.
Wheat	----------	25,460	23,312	24,114	24,082	23,235	24,285	25,100	+8.2	27,505	
Peanuts	----------	7,535	9,923	11,130	11,798	11,850	10,869	12,647	+13.6	----------	Government encouragement.
Rice-rough	----------	62,600	71,500	75,990	73,665	74,674	77,000	74,500	−2.0	75,500	Trend of increased acreage but drought restricted plant.
Tobacco	----------	917	864	902	712	895	890	886	−1.8	----------	No trend.
Yield produced per acre:											
Cotton	Bales	[1] 0.221	0.204	0.187	0.192	0.191	0.219	0.217	+16.0	----------	Improved cultural practices. Weather more favorable than in the very bad 1950 season.
Corn	Bushels	12.2	10.3	9.0	10.0	11.9	12.9	12.8	+42.2	13.0	
Wheat	do	10.3	9.1	9.7	9.9	9.3	11.3	11.1	+14.4	11.3	
Peanuts [3]	Pounds	875	756	692	578	545	736	677	−.2	----------	No pronounced trend. 1950–51 lowest yield on record.
Rice, rough	do	1,194	1,063	921	1,018	1,125	1,188	1,141	+23.9	1,126	
Tobacco	do	830	733	607	827	603	644	634	+4.4	----------	
EXPORTS		1934–38	1945–49	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1950–54	1955	
Cotton [4]	1,000 bales	[5] 2,659	568	146	123	292	92	150	+2.7	----------	
Corn	1,000 bushels	43	5	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Wheat	do	10,130	38	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Peanuts [6]	1,000 tons	(1935–39) 1,074	(7)	292	337	257	76	(8)	----------	----------	Government restrictions because of increased domestic demand.
Rice, milled	Million pounds	(1936–40) 622	(1946–50) 1	(1951)	(1952)	(1953)	(1954)	(1955)	----------	----------	
Tobacco [9]	1,000 pounds	43,500	55,445	88,533	109,441	82,881	69,520	70,133	−21.8	----------	Large stocks in British market. Better quality leaf now available in large quantities elsewhere.

---

[1] Pakistan and India.
[2] Calculated from rounded figures. Not published by FAS.
[3] Unofficial.
[4] Crop years beginning Aug. 1
[5] 1935–39 average.
[6] Unshelled peanuts, shelled peanuts, and peanut oil converted to an unshelled peanut equivalent basis.
[7] Not readily available.
[8] Incomplete.
[9] Calendar year.

Pakistan

Commodity	Unit	5-year averages		1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55	Change, 1950–51 to 1954–55	Estimated, 1955–56	Notes on factors influencing trend since 1950
		1935–36 to 1939–40	1945–46 to 1949–50								
PRODUCTION											
Cotton	1,000 bales	(1)	1,024	1,225	1,340	1,525	1,215	1,245	*Percent* +1.6	----------	
Corn	1,000 bushels	14,360	16,688	14,000	16,000	15,000	17,480	[2] 17,500	+25.0	16,500	
Wheat	do	117,000	130,018	147,800	147,600	114,240	105,000	137,500	−7.0	135,000	Bad weather, 1952–53.
Peanuts	1,000 tons	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Rice, rough	Million pounds	24,339	26,891	27,559	26,046	27,398	30,774	29,500	+7.0	28,200	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	324,053	177,435	161,346	167,172	164,771	200,627	204,000	+26.4	----------	Increased domestic demand.
Acreage (1,000 acres):											
Cotton	----------	(1)	2,965	3,011	3,244	3,467	3,100	3,400	+12.9	----------	
Corn	----------	811	986	1,000	960	970	1,070	[2] 1,000	0	1,000	
Wheat	----------	9,305	10,370	10,715	10,832	10,220	9,510	10,650	−0.6	10,600	
Peanuts	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Rice, rough	----------	18,706	21,601	22,401	22,481	23,016	24,535	23,800	+6.2	23,500	High export prices.
Tobacco	----------	355	184	179	179	174	192	200	+11.7	----------	
Yield produced per acre:											
Cotton	Bales	(1)	.345	.407	.413	.440	.392	.366	−10.7	----------	
Corn	Bushels	17.7	16.9	14.0	16.7	15.5	16.3	[2] 17.5	+25.0	16.0	
Wheat	do	12.6	12.5	13.8	13.6	11.2	11.0	12.9	−6.5	12.7	Bad weather 1952–53.
Peanuts	Pounds	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Rice, rough	do	1,301	1,245	1,230	1,159	1,190	1,254	1,239	+0.07	1,200	
Tobacco	do	913	964	901	934	947	1,045	1,020	+13.2	----------	
EXPORTS		1934–38	1945–49	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1950–54	1955	
Cotton [3]	1,000 bales	(1)	(1)	1,039	919	1,273	893	630	−39.4	----------	
Corn	1,000 bushels	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Wheat	do	(4)	[5] 175	6,617	2	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	
Peanuts	1,000 tons	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Rice, milled [6]	Million pounds	----------	(1948–50) 47	(1951) 339	(1952) 182	(1953) 133	(1954) 340	(1955) 190	(1951–55) 44.0	(1956) 150	
Tobacco	1,000 pounds	(4)	[5] 213	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	

---

[1] Included in India until 1947.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Crop year beginning Aug. 1.
[4] Included with India.
[5] 2-year average.
[6] May–April year, except for 1948–50 average, which is for calendar year.

EXHIBIT 6

THE COTTON PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga., May 4, 1953.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: I wanted to give you a report on the last meeting of the Cotton Export Committee in order to bring you up to date on the recommendations of this committee.

First, it is the feeling of this committee that the Secretary of Agriculture should be a member of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The composition of this committee was established in the Export-Import Bank Act and includes the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve bank, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the Administrator of the Mutual Security Agency. In view of the fact that this group deals with agricultural problems, and the Export-Import Bank is used largely for that purpose, we feel definitely that the Secretary of Agriculture should be a member of this group. It is our understanding that additional legislation will be required to accomplish this recommendation.

Second, we feel that at least one member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington should be experienced in the field of agriculture and considered a representative of agriculture.

The committee discussed at length the question of export subsidy. The group felt that export subsidy at this time would not accomplish any beneficial results.

However, export subsidy is still being discussed extensively both in this country and abroad. For this reason, we feel that the Secretary of Agriculture at some point should work out a program or make a firm commitment to make any export subsidy retroactive in the event that an export subsidy is authorized.

We discussed ways as to how this might be done, and there were several suggestions, one being that any United States firm that had cotton on consignment in foreign countries would be protected on those foreign consignments. Another was that both American shippers and foreign mills be protected on any American cotton that was on hand if and when an export-subsidy program should be instituted. Another was that the subsidy apply to all exports during the marketing year in which export subsidies were used, regardless of whether the cotton had been previously shipped or not.

In any event, it seems very desirable to work out a program whereby people who export American cotton to foreign countries in an effort to sell the cotton be properly protected in the event an export subsidy is announced by this country. Otherwise, no cotton firm would be willing to carry stocks of cotton in foreign countries, and neither would foreign mills be willing to stock any appreciable amount of American cotton when they felt there was at least a possibility that an export subsidy would be declared which would not be available to them because the cotton would have already reached foreign shores.

The committee discussed many of the broader problems involved in stimulating cotton exports. It agreed that the fundamental issue involved in exports of cotton and other agricultural commodities was the expansion of foreign trade generally.

It was felt that a stimulus in foreign trade would be a convertibility of currencies.

The committee discussed the Mundt bill, S. 1369. It was the general opinion of the group that it would be very bad to adopt barter as a means of stimulating trade. They felt there were many other better methods of stimulating trade than through barter.

The question of an international cotton agreement was discussed. The majority of the committee were of the opinion that an international cotton agreement at this time was not desirable.

The possibilities for stimulating exports by increasing offshore procurement, particularly for defense purposes, were discussed at length. It was the opinion of the group that this method of increasing exports had great possibilities.

The mechanics of assuring that a substantial part of the dollars were used to purchase agricultural commodities were discussed at length. The committee finally concluded that the best method would probably be to encourage Export-Import Bank loans specifically for agricultural commodities, or for one agricultural commodity, and that repayment of such loans would be made with the dollar earnings from offshore procurement.

It was felt such an arrangement would increase employment and purchasing power in foreign countries, it would stimulate trade, and it would not involve barter or other undesirable practices, but would encourage the normal flow of goods through private trade channels.

We know that this matter would have to be handled at very high levels in Government. We feel it is a matter which the Secretary of Agriculture should immediately explore with both the Defense Department and at the Cabinet level.

We discussed also the question of liberalizing credit for foreign importers and mills, with the belief that if some method could be worked out whereby credit could be liberalized, it should increase cotton consumption substantially. One of the reasons for this is the fact that interest rates are very high in most of the foreign countries, generally running from 8 percent to as high as 12 percent. If cheap credit available in this country could be properly used, it is our opinion that exports could be stimulated.

Since extension of credit is a very highly technical problem, involving not only international financial arrangements, but the credit practices in individual countries as well, the committee felt that the Department of Agriculture should create a task force to intensively study the question of credit. It is our opinion that such a group should be composed of representatives of Government as well as people from outside of Government.

While in Washington at the last meeting, some of our group also testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee with reference to bill S. 1413, making it possible to insure cotton stored in foreign countries.

Also, some of the individual members of the group contacted the Export-Import Bank with reference to not only the loans to Spain and Japan, but also discussed with them the possibility of some additional loans.

To date we have been unable to show any substantial progress in stimulating cotton exports. In order to do so, we believe that some greater effort will have to be made, such as the use of offshore procurement, and also the increased use of credit, if we are going to increase exports to the extent that now seems very necessary.

The only other possibility of increasing exports substantially is through active competition in the form of price and world markets. Since most countries at present are in the position that they have to market their cotton regardless of price, we did not feel that an export subsidy program at this time would be very effective in increasing exports substantially. We felt that the other methods suggested above, namely, the use of offshore procurement and the use of credit as a basis of increasing exports, would be more desirable and probably much less expensive to the Government than the use of a direct export subsidy program.

This for your information.

Yours very truly,

D. W. BROOKS,
Chairman, Cotton Export Advisory Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. YOUNG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW and to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today the veto message of President Eisenhower on H. R. 3300.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. WILSON of California.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TUMULTY (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for Wednesday and Thursday, July 6 and 7, 1955, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 7, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

965. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (21 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

966. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67);

to the Committee on Government Operations.

967. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Verkamp's, a partnership, which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, on behalf of the Government, authorize it to provide and operate concession facilities for the public on the South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

968. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

969. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 727. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school; with amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4047. A bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 303. Joint resolution to establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Commission to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4096. A bill to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2097. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4729. A bill to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3235. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 298. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5168, a bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1069). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6373. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; with amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. S. 2090. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1071). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 898. A bill to provide for the issuance of an unrestricted deed to Mrs. Edith Hollywood, of Sitka, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 910. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks precinct, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 280. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 5385, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7178. A bill to amend section 226 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to remove certain restrictions relating to the percentage of nonveterans required to be enrolled in courses below college level; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7179. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7180. A bill to provide for the granting of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to certain qualified employees of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7181. A bill to provide that Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., shall be a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate for future construction the deductions for amortization of emergency facilities and grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7183. A bill to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7184. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 7185. A bill to allow a waiver of 6 months in the age limitations prescribed for persons entering the service academies prior to July 1, 1956, in the case of veterans of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7186. A bill to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 7187. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 7188. A bill to amend section 4216 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a constructive sale price upon which to compute excise tax in certain cases where an article is sold other than at the first general level of distribution of an industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7189. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of lands in certain reservoir projects in Texas, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7190. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7191. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 7192. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of lands in certain reservoir projects in Texas, to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of restricted stock options which the employee has not exercised at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7194. A bill to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 7195. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of lands in certain reservoir projects in Texas to former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution stating it as the sense of Congress that Italy be admitted as a member of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 299. Resolution providing further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 7196. A bill for the relief of Emily Elkas Batrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 7197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Christine Dowdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 7198. A bill for the relief of Dykeman Hank Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 7200. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Ryzev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his remarks concerning a sermon delivered by Rev. John H. Haldeman, entitled "Religious Liberty," together with the sermon referred to.

There being no objection, the remarks and sermon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

It was my very great privilege to attend on July 3, the Sunday services at the Allapattah Baptist Church, the largest Baptist church in the South.

At those services my very dear and able friend, Rev. John H. Haldeman, delivered a most enlightening and inspiring sermon entitled "Religious Liberty." Dr. Haldeman, who is vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention, pointed out the relationship and dependence which exist between political freedom and religious freedom.

Because this sermon was delivered the day prior to the 179th birthday of our Republic, it was indeed most timely. I was gratified that I was able to hear this marvelous talk and regretted that there were not more who could enjoy and be moved by it. I am confident that Members of the Senate will read this important speech with great profit and enjoyment and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

(Sermon delivered by Dr. John H. Haldeman, pastor of the Allapattah Baptist Church and vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Sunday, July 3, 1955)

Liberty—soul liberty, political liberty—has challenged the deepest devotion of its devotees through the ages. One of the most militant battle signals in all history is the signal for liberty. This battle played a major part in colonizing America and building here a great Nation. It was the cause of religious liberty that ignited that magic movement—and swayed, solidified, and molded it into a mighty empire. This cause was written in blood on the banners of revolutions, on the altars of martyrdom, in constitutions of government, and in struggle of churches so deeply that it awakened a new consciousness in mankind.

The cause of religious liberty has called forth orations of surpassing eloquence; its bewitching cause has led statesmen to enact laws which have blessed humanity; it has inspired the sweetest symphonies of music; it has caused a new sunrise for humanity; it has borne burdens too heavy for finite man, and breathed prayers burning with compassion out of hearts throbbing for humanity's highest good. Its followers are too numerous to be recorded and too heroic to be forgotten. They have tasted the bitter dregs of damp dungeons, the hate and cruelty of the scaffold. They have also sipped the sweetest amenities of life.

America is a demonstration that a free nation cannot be stricken down as long as she is guarded by free churches.

May we notice first, the principles; second, the protagonists; third, the propagation of religious liberty.

I. THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

1. One bedrock principle of religious liberty is freedom of conscience.

Dr. Philip Schaff said, "Religious liberty is the natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded on the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God in man, and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is not written on parchment, and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God—'We must obey God rather than man.'"

God alone is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to impose itself between man and God. Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation.

Religious liberty goes much further than mere toleration. It rests upon the inalienable right of every man. With us this is conviction, not a contrivance. To this end our forefathers have fought, suffered, bled and died that all persons, of all faiths, in all the world might be free to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. We would say with one in another day—"I may not believe a word you utter, but I would go to the death for your right to say it." Religious liberty is more than a license. It is a God-given right.

Dr. Philip Schaff said in 1889, "There is a wide difference in toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other is a right. The one is a matter of expediency, the other is a principle. The one is a gift of man, the other is the gift of God."

Dr. George W. Truett, whose clarion voice held thousands spellbound from the steps of the Capitol in Washington, and sounded a bugle call not only to Baptists but to all Christians everywhere, said: "It is the consistent and insistent contention of our Baptist people, always and everywhere, that religion must be forever voluntary and uncoerced, and that it is not the prerogative of any power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, to compel men to conform to any religious creed or form of worship or to pay taxes for the support of a religious organization to which they do not belong and in whose creed they do not believe. God wants free worshipers and no other kind."

Toleration is better than religious persecution, which results from the union of church and state, but it is a thousand times less desirable than religious liberty, which stems from fundamental principles.

2. Religious liberty rests also on the freedom of choice.

Freedom of choice would liberate all men everywhere from the thralldom and bondage of intolerance. Coercion will bind the minds of men with the shackles of slavery and subservience. Freedom of choice frees men from the corruptions of state churches. Where religious liberty is not found, spiritual thralldom is the rule. Here in America has been established the greatest haven of religious liberty known to the world.

3. Freedom of worship is another principle of religious liberty.

Roger Williams established in Rhode Island the first government in the world where there was complete separation of church and state. Here for the first time in all time men had the opportunity to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. Here soul liberty was guaranteed. Now multiplied millions of many faiths enjoy this priceless privilege. This principle fundamental and indispensable to man's highest welfare, has spread, radiating its blessings in the earth.

4. Religious liberty stems from the principle of freedom of the individual to read and interpret the Bible for himself.

We believe the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the rule of faith. Our one creed is the Bible; not customs, not councils, not confessions, not ecclesiastical formulas, not traditions, but the Bible.

Not only is the Bible to us an unerring guide, an inviolable trust, but to us all men are to be absolutely free to read and interpret its message for themselves. We hold that for any man or group of men to arrogate to themselves the sole right to interpret God's Word is an arrogance, the stench of which reaches to high heaven. This is dictatorship in religion. This is the foulest form of dictatorship. This is coercion set over against freedom. This is absolutism set over against individualism. Under such system religion becomes a slavery to forms, traditions, and overlordship. Freedom to interpret the Bible for oneself breaks the paralyzing spell of tradition and glorifies the individual.

II. THE PROTAGONISTS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Through the centuries, our forefathers have been the chief protagonists of religious liberty. Their belief that the Bible is the unerring, infallible guide for men, their belief in the absolute right of the individual, in the Lordship of Christ, and in the church as a complete democracy, had led them to pioneer in, be the chief promoters of, and the true protagonists of, religious liberty.

For the cause of religious liberty, our early fathers lived, suffered, bled, and died. Roger Williams was banished. Henry Dunster was removed from the presidency of Harvard; John Clark was put in prison; Obadiah Holmes was whipped on Boston Common, for his adherence to and propagation of religious liberty.

No pen can describe, no artist can paint, no speaker can tell the humiliation, the hardships, and the struggles of our early fathers in seeking to gain religious freedom for the world.

Removed far from the scenes of conflict, and never having experienced intolerance in religion—it is not easy for us to appreciate the terrific struggle for and the high privilege of religious liberty. Many of us have become so soft and have so far forgotten what this priceless heritage cost those who purchased it for us, that we have come to acquiesce in anything that masquerades under the name of religion. We have, too many of us, become static on this vitally live issue, tepid and apathetic in our attitude.

The rehearsal of a scene in a courtroom in Virginia should awaken us. Three ministers were arraigned before the bar of justice, indicted as disturbers of the peace. People thronged the courtroom. Patrick Henry was the defending lawyer. He took the indictment from the officers of the law and made a plea which, for effective oratory, as well as for effect in getting the right decision, perhaps, has never been surpassed. When he reached his climax, he thrice reiterated the terrible offense of the three preachers. "These men, your honor, and gentlemen of the jury, are guilty of no less a crime than preaching the glorious gospel of the Son of God." Then waving the indictment over his head, he shouted, "Great God! Great God! Great God! Indicted for preaching the gospel of the Son of God."

James Madison became the political apostle, backing and defending those of his day in their struggles for legislation granting the right of religious liberty. The British statesman, John Bright, asked Dr. Curry what distinct contribution America had made to the science of government. Dr. Curry replied, "The doctrine of religious liberty." Bright replied, "And that is a tremendous contribution."

III. THE PROPAGATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

1. The need: Liberty is never safe.

Liberty, both civil and religious, must be propagated in order that it may be safeguarded. Another has said, "Liberty cannot pause." The principle of religious liberty must be held so dear, guarded so securely, and propagated so compassionately that its beauty may shine upon all the world. Our duty to propagate this blessing is obligatory. We must hold it as a trust inviolate.

2. The means: All the forces of our churches, schools, organizations, papers, legislators—forces small and great should be harnessed to propagate this basic principle. Just as we cannot, must not, dare not, isolate ourselves from the responsibility of this battered, bruised, bleeding, needy world—we must not shirk our task of propagating this fundamental principle. We cannot escape the needs of this bludgeoned world, nor can we evade its cry. We should make religious liberty the boon of all nations.

The pace of progress is the fastest where people are the freest. Our task is not only to free the world from the shackles of political tyranny, but also to free the world from the heathenish shambles of religious intolerance.

3. The end: We should say today about religious liberty what George H. Lorimer said years ago about liberty, generally: "From her hands you must unfasten every shackle, from her wings you must unloose every band, from her feet you must remove every dragging chain. If she is faint, you must revive her; if she is weak, you must strengthen her; if she is maligned, you must vindicate her. To this you must enrich her with knowledge, invigorate her with justice, and adorn her with beauty. Then from your side she will speed her way into ages you shall not see, and into lands you shall never tread, to bless them with her sublime philanthropy forever."

With Jesus we must declare: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and issued on November 11, 1954, concerning the Dixon-Yates contract.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

I have just learned that the AEC and Dixon-Yates have signed a contract, the terms of which I do not know.

But I do know this: The fat is now in the fire. I appeal to my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the AEC, and to the President to let reason prevail and save AEC's house before it is burned down.

During the days of debate, headlines, and editorials about the Dixon-Yates contract, the real issues have become confused. What started out as problem of supplying power for the future needs of the Greater Memphis area has been turned into a public versus private power battle. Now fresh clarity is needed.

On Wednesday, a Washington newspaper which is a member of a great chain of newspapers, published an editorial urging the President to reject the Dixon-Yates contract and call for competitive bids on a contract to furnish the power needed by the AEC. Here is a great newspaper, which has made a commendable fight for a better approach to this problem, trying to clarify the situation. Yet even this editorial indicates a misunderstanding of the problem with which we are confronted.

The evidence which has been presented to the Joint Committee clearly establishes the fact that the AEC does not need the power to be generated in the Dixon-Yates plant. It has firm commitments from TVA, EEI, and OVEC for all its power needs at Paducah and Portsmouth. The TVA provides all its present needs at Oak Ridge and the only additional power the AEC now has a need for is about 175,000 kilowatts for new facilities at Oak Ridge. The TVA can supply this. But if TVA cannot supply the added power, the way to get it is already clearly pointed to in the private power contracts with EEI and OVEC. These plants were built near the AEC plants which needed the power; they were built with private funds under private enterprise on contracts involving only the private companies and the AEC. No one else is involved in those contracts—neither TVA nor any municipality in the TVA area.

Who is it then who needs Dixon-Yates power now? Clearly, it is the city of Memphis and its environs. We are dealing here with the problem of that area and of no other. The question, therefore, is what is the best way to prepare to meet the future power needs of the Memphis area. Now, every municipality in the United States has faced this problem from time to time. Each city has worked it out for itself. What is there about the city of Memphis and its power requirements which results in this being a national problem occupying the time of the TVA, the AEC, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the President himself?

The Memphis area today obtains its power from the TVA. Some of it comes from TVA generating plants. Some of it is purchased by TVA from private electric generating companies outside the TVA area and is fed into the distribution system for the Memphis area. The decision of where to get its electric power is a local decision for the Memphis area. In the past 20 years, TVA has been able to supply that area. The ability of TVA to continue to meet the growing electric power needs of that area have been limited by the refusal of the Congress during the past 3 years to appropriate funds for the construction of additional steam generating facilities at Fulton, but that is a wholly separate fight.

We need not confuse this issue. As members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we are not concerned whether the Fulton steam plant should or should not be built. We are not concerned here with whether TVA should be expanded, contracted, or held at present levels. What we are concerned with is a problem involving a local area—Memphis—of getting power for that area. And I say most intently that this has nothing, I repeat, nothing to do with the Atomic Energy Commission or its power needs or with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Solving the Memphis problem won't build a single bomb; it won't bring a single peacetime atom to the service of mankind. But it will—it has to some extent—contaminate the AEC—an agency that should be, indeed must be, kept out of political fights.

The Dixon-Yates contract must be rejected because it is the wrong way to handle a local area problem. The supply of power to the Memphis area is a problem of that area. We have had no evidence that that area has made any serious efforts to obtain commitments to cover its power needs from other sources. This is not a problem of the Federal Government or of the Congress. It is a problem before the people of the Memphis area.

The Memphis area is a great and growing industrial center. It is entirely able to deal with its own problems. Let the people of Memphis seek competitive bids for the supplying of their future power needs. If TVA can compete successfully, then TVA can be the supplier of this power. But if the TVA cannot compete successfully because the Congress has refused to allow it to expand by building the Fulton plant, then there are other means of getting electric power besides drawing on the public resources made available through the TVA. There are municipal bond issues, contracts with private power groups, and other mechanisms which I am sure are more familiar to the competent Government officials of the Memphis area than they are to me.

Under no circumstances should we get confused. This is a local problem which has no business being before us at all. President Eisenhower has stated that if anyone can offer a better solution to the supplying of the power needs of the Memphis area, he is ready to consider it.

I therefore urge the President, the AEC, and the Joint Committee to have nothing more to do with this matter and to withdraw the Government signatures from the present contract. Let us then turn the problem back to those to whom it really belongs. Let Memphis and TVA work out between themselves that local power supply problem.

More importantly, let the Atomic Energy Commission put its time and talents into bombs and not bonanzas.

The Search for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am certain that all Members of the Senate have endeavored to view the approaching four-power conference in Geneva with calm, yet cautious, contemplations. In the light of the history of the U. S. S. R., and with a full realization of the cunning of the international Communist conspiracy, one could not do otherwise.

In response to a number of inquiries from my constituents, I have attempted to summarize my own opinions in a newsletter entitled "The Search for Peace," which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

(A Weekly Newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1955.—To suggest that our country should not participate in the forthcoming meeting at the summit—if it can be called that—is hardly a popular view. Public opinion has crystallized a pervading attitude, rightfully so, that every conceivable avenue of consideration in the search for lasting peace should be fully exhausted before any overt action is even contemplated.

With many of the unfortunate experiences of the Yalta and other conferences still fresh in memory, more especially as a consequence of the recent release of the Yalta papers, it can be reasonably assumed that our negotiations will reflect an enlightened understanding of rapport with the Communists. Moreover, we must never close our eyes to the real motivations, objectives and treacheries of the international Communist conspiracy. The mistakes of the past most certainly must set the stage for any conference involving the extremely tenuous and complex problem of global peace.

At this point, it would seem timely and pertinent to observe that, in the past 25 years, the Soviet Union has been a party to 52 international agreements, 50 of which they have blithely violated. These have been the end result of some 3,400 meetings between representatives of the United States and Russia since 1933. But, in seven or more years of discussions of more recent vintage, no semblance of accord has been reached on such major issues as the control of atomic weapons, the reunification of Germany, settlement of lease-lend, disarmament, and world peace. Unproductive though this record might be, it nonetheless must be the setting for the coming four-power meeting, and we would be more than naive—if not indeed asinine—to expect that another series of discussions will cause an immediate or early abridgement of deep-seated differences between antagonistic philosophies of life and government.

Senator KNOWLAND last week, properly summarized the sentiments of many when he said, "I do not believe we are bankrupt in our negotiating power. On the contrary, I believe we have an opportunity to cause some grave concern to the Soviet world." At Geneva, next month, the free world will be at another cross-road in history. Rather than peace at any price, the path to peace must be charted by a solid demonstration of honor and good will on the part of the Russians in conjunction with an unflinching willingness to remove from bondage the many enslaved people now trapped in the shadow of the Iron Curtain.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Speech of Senator Barry Goldwater Before the Sigma Chi Fraternity Centennial Commission, June 28, 1955, at Cincinnati, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE THE SIGMA CHI FRATERNITY CENTENNIAL COMMISSION, JUNE 28, 1955, CINCINNATI, OHIO

To have been asked by our fraternity to talk with you this evening is an honor of such magnitude as to defy accurate and adequate description. I am humbly grateful to all of you, and to those who guide the destinies of this observance of the 100th anniversary of our fraternity's founding, for this honor.

Humble, yes, for as I stand here tonight, I do so with full memory of the importance of this day to all of us and I pray that my words will not dull the brilliance that has been given this occasion by those who have preceded me.

As you might well imagine, the selection of the theme for our meeting has not been an easy task. Realizing full well the importance of this anniversary, I was at first tempted to confine my remarks to Sigma Chi. However, inasmuch as we meet as fraternity men, it can be assumed that we meet in full recognition of our obligations to our fraternity, and, inasmuch as we meet as Americans, it is hoped that we gather with the same full understanding of our obligations to our country. I chose, therefore, to deviate from the specific theme of Sigma Chi to attempt to offer an interpretation of our duties and our challenges based on reverence for the American ideal, its defense and its survival.

This approach came to me in the vast and stimulating vault of heaven as I flew several weeks ago with a crew of the Strategic Air Command in a B-47. In fact, it came to me as New Orleans, whose lights made the city appear as a diamond and emerald broach pinned across the dark bosom of the delta, passed 35,000 feet below us. These were the lights of American homes and of American business—lights that this crew and thousands like them are devoted to protecting. The people living with those lights were free people.

As I flew that night in a material expression of that freedom, the thought came to me that, in some other part of this world, there must have been at that same time, a Russian crew in a Russian plane, looking down on Russian lights. I imagined myself calling the captain of this crew on the radio and asking, "Why do you fly this night? What is your purpose?" He would have answered, I am sure, that freedom was his purpose.

Now there would have been the two of us, both flying in machines which were tangible evidence of material strength, achieved through two entirely different concepts of freedom, both flying to protect and to further the interests of those concepts.

Freedom that night—and, I suggest, on too many other nights and days—rested literally on material power. Our B-47 flew as a symbol of power, but I wondered if it had to be the sole and all-important symbol. Surely, there must be some stronger symbol of our freedom; some symbol that could some day preclude the need for material force.

The detection of that symbol, then, becomes our target for tonight. It will require some delving into philosophy and history, but both ventures should provide stimulating and refreshing journeys. Indeed, we will find in the fabric of our fraternity the same threads from which the cloth of our freedom is woven. We will find that our obligations to that freedom are closely akin to the meaning of Sigma Chi and of all fraternities.

The thought that the Russian airman would probably answer "freedom" to my query as to why he flew that night was and is a disturbing one. On thinking about it, one must conclude tht wrapped up in its ramifications, is the situation in which the free world finds itself today.

Freedom has inwardly and outwardly been man's goal since the beginning of time. He has fought many battles with his own conscience and with actual physical enemies in searching for a basis for freedom. For brief periods throughout history, man has enjoyed freedoms of a sort, but always he has gone back into the locked grip of oppression and tyranny through control of the state. This has been true mainly because man has never exactly understood from whence freedom comes. It is evident that civilizations preceding ours sought the free life through strength of arms, through material strength expressed either by armed might or by economic might. It is also evident that these peoples never found true freedom under these concepts of their source.

It wasn't until our Republic was born that man finally recognized that he cannot be free as a materialistic being, but can only enjoy those blessings when he has expressed acceptance of the idea that man's freedom comes from God.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that acceptance for us when he placed these words in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When he noted in that way for all of us that our freedom stems from God, he set us aside in man's search for freedom, and the truth and wisdom of that recognition has been attested to by our nearly 200 years of the world's greatest progress as freemen.

So much have we served as the leaders of freedom, that until the last 20 or 30 years, we were looked on as the citadel of freedom, and our way of life was the goal of all people who sought those blessings. Yet, here is a Russian pilot who would tell me that he flew for and would fight for freedom. Could it be true that after so clear a demonstration of the power of our concept of freedom, a man pledged to the opposite of every facet of freedom we hold true could say those words?

Our understanding is based on the recognition of God as the source of freedom. We uphold the dignity of man. We believe in the freedom of worship, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of assembly; and we hold that the majority rules in free elections.

Now examine the tenets of communism, which would be the ideological manifestation of the philosophy of that Russian pilot who also flies for freedom. God is not recognized. Man has no dignity, for he is a servant of the state. Freedom of worship, speech, and assembly are denied, and a free election in a Communist state is an impossibility. Yet, he speaks of freedom and two-thirds of the earth's population go with this pilot in their search for freedom. Freedom has become, as Tom Payne once predicted it would, "The cause of all mankind."

The struggle in Indochina is one in which freedom is the objective. The issue in Africa is freedom. All over the globe men are engaged in a frenzied search for freedom. Yet, with our example to serve them, compared to that which communism offers them, two-thirds of the world's people have shunned our concept for that offered by this godless philosophy.

This, despite the fact that, as these people have succumbed to or have been driven to this philosophy, they have been denied the very foundations of true freedom as we understand them. They have been imprisoned, tortured, and killed. Yet, in this race for the minds of men, we find ourselves, as of this moment, the losers. Why is not our theory of freedom accepted by all? Where have we fallen down in our responsibilities to freedom?

To find the answer, we must renew our search for truth. We must search ourselves for evidence of weakness. I suggest, too, that these cracks in our armor are quite evident if we are honest in our appraisals.

It is difficult to put one's finger on the date or even the exact period of our history that this weakness first evidenced itself, but I believe that it occurred during the 1920's. Then, after years of fantastic economic growth, under the strength of our basic ideals, we began to feel another surge of power, a lust for materialism.

We gained material strength through our God-given freedoms, through our ideals; but then the idea began to develop that our freedoms came from our economic strength, from physical strength evidenced by arms, or from government itself. As more and more Americans began to retreat into this concept, more and more Americans began to forget the true source of our strength and, slowly, America's light as the beacon of freedom throughout the world began to dim.

As it became clear to the rest of the world that material goals meant more to us than spiritual or idealistic ones, the idea opposite from ours, which is based entirely on man as a materialistic creature, gained strength. As our light dimmed from within, people all over the earth saw this material light as a beacon leading them to an easier attainment of freedom. This is easily understood, of course; but, when the people who epitomized freedom to all the world showed more concern for the material result than for the spiritual cause, and when they began to fear the vehicle of this new idea, communism, the rest of the world began to visualize in this new philosophy a shortcut to freedom.

We had lost so much of our old inward strength that when communism broke on us, after the Second Word War, we became a frightened people—frightened to the extent that we could not recognize that communism, in itself, was but a force to gain control of man's mind. It is, in fact, a tool, and a powerful one, to use to supplant our idea of freedom with the idea of materialistic freedom.

We did not see that we had become engrossed in a struggle between two ideas. Failing to recognize this, we retreated into the shell of materialism where we sought and still seek escape in military, economic, and political actions.

As a result of this, we have failed to see the true nature of the conflict going on in the world today. It is a pitted battle for the mastery of man's mind, a war between two diametrically opposed philosophies of freedom. Now we have reached a position of world leadership, but we have it because of material strength, which we achieved by our God-given freedoms. Yet, there is no great clarity in this doctrine of freedom. We believe that we can preserve it with our might of arms and with our dollars; but we will find, if we pursue that idea, that we will become just another page in the history of man, for we have not made clear our doctrines of freedom. In short, we are not giving real leadership to the world.

Mind you, this clarity cannot come from a political party or parties. It can only come from the whole people. Either we believe our doctrines or we don't; and, if we do, then the world must be told and shown that we do.

The hope that this Republic once stirred in the breasts of freedom-loving people everywhere was a hope based on ideals and not on the hardness of material things. Yet, of late, there has been a curious lack of explanation of these ideals to even our own people, to say nothing of the others who live in this world with us.

Having reviewed what I feel to be the weakness of our position in this freedom-seeking world, I suggest that there are immediate remedies which, if followed, will achieve in a few years that which might and dollars have, in the long run, failed to accomplish.

It should be evident that we can arm ourselves and our allies to the hilt, and we can fight the biggest and most costly war of history, and still lose our freedom. This should be most obvious because the war we are wrapped up in is a war of ideas. As such, our task becomes clear and challenging: To win peace and to lead all people to real freedom, we must win this struggle for man's ideas of himself.

We must show to all men that we were right in recognizing our source of freedom as being from God. We must show that, from this concept, man obtains dignity. We must know anew that our freedoms cannot be taken lightly and that, by constantly and honestly searching for the truth, we can rekindle that light which for so long was the sole beacon of freedom in the world.

We must, as Americans, live that American concept, so that our actions in our homes, our offices, over the backyard fence, and over the fences of the world, will demonstrate to all people that there is only one concept of freedom that produces real freedom, and that is ours.

Yours and my challenge tonight, first as Americans, and then as American fraternity men, is to carry into effect the doctrine of God, but to carry it, we must first rediscover it.

Italian Historical Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the instigation of the Italian Historical Society of America, New York City has been celebrating these past few years Verrazzano Day in honor of the great Italian navigator, Giovanni de Verrazzano, who discovered the harbor of New York in April 1524. This year's celebration, which was proclaimed by Mayor Robert F. Wagner for April 30, was dedicated to the 431st anniversary of this historic event.

Verrazzano was a native of Florence, Italy, where he was born in 1485. In 1508 he embarked as a seaman on a French ship and participated in the discovery of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In 1523 he was commissioned to pilot a 100-ton, 3-masted vessel *La Dauphine* in search for "the blessed land of Cathay." Verrazzano first landed in South Carolina, then followed the coast northward until by mid-April 1524 he had come to the area now known as the Bay of New York. In his report to King Francis I, who sponsored that voyage, Verrazzano gave the first description of the eastern coast of present-day United States.

The Italian Historical Society of America has made a formal request that the proposed bridge connecting Brooklyn and Staten Island be named in honor of this great explorer Verrazzano.

The Italian Historical Society is a comparatively young organization, having been founded on Columbus Day, October 12, 1948, and chartered by the State of New York in 1949. Its purposes are as follows:

A. To gather and preserve historical, biographical, and other material relating to Italians or persons of Italian lineage who have rendered outstanding service to the advancement of mankind.

B. To establish and maintain Italian cultural centers in New York State and elsewhere which will foster knowledge and information on the contributions made by Italians and Italo-Americans in the discovery and development of the new world.

C. To establish scholarships and fellowships for the encouragement of cultural progress.

D. To publish and distribute documents, reports, and periodicals which will serve to make Italian culture more widely known and more fully appreciated in America.

Among its more immediate objectives, the Italian Historical Society is planning the publication of an Italian American almanac for use as a reference work. It is also hoping to obtain wider recognition in school textbooks of the role of Italians and Americans of Italian descent who have enriched American history. Finally, it is taking steps to encourage the study of the Italian language in American schools.

The society is planning eventually to obtain its own building which would serve as a center of the Italian cultural heritage and research in the field of Italian American history.

The honorary president of the Italian Historical Society of America was the late Prof. Enrico Fermi, the noted physicist. Among the members of its board of trustees are: the Honorable John C. Pastore, Senator of Rhode Island; the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, and the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Members of Congress from New Jersey; the Honorable Laurence E. Gerosa, comptroller of the city of New York; the Honorable Michael A. Musmanno, justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; Dr. Edward D. Re, professor of law at St. John's University in New York; and others. Mr. John N. LaCorte is the director of the society.

Investigate the Skeletons in the Textile Closet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I addressed to the members of the House Rules Committee this morning in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 107, which I filed providing that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the economic problems connected with the loss of employment in the textile industry, together with a summary of current economic data on the textile industry which points emphatically to the urgent need for a comprehensive and far-reaching investigation into conditions in the textile industry with a view to developing suitable remedies to check the widespread deterioration.

My statement and the summary follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is no need to prove that clothing is second only to food and shelter, in maintaining the life of our people.

While the textile industry serves other economic purposes, its chief responsibility is to make and sell the cotton, woolen, worsted, and synthetic goods from which clothing is made to give us elemental protection.

This basic industry is not only sick; it is suffering from many mysterious complications.

In some cases, the patient has failed to look after his own health.

In others, there are signs that he has been poisoned.

Since 1948, during a period of great expansion in the American economy, 300,000 jobs have disappeared from the textile industry.

While the population has been increasing by 20 million, the production of broad-woven fabrics, cotton goods, silk, and synthetic yarn fabrics, has remained at the same level. But woolen and worsted output has shrunk from 516 million linear in 1947, to a depression-low of 281 million yards in 1954.

Five hundred and forty-one mills, providing employment for 147,000 people, have been liquidated in the postwar years.

Very few new and modern mills have been constructed during 1951–52–53. Of the $1,008,000,000 spent for new plant and equipment in this same time, only little more than 1 percent was for completely new establishments.

These are cold figures.

The human loss and suffering can never be charted.

In many instances, the closed mills were the economic heart of the communities. Local governments, jobs, stores, professions, services, and churches, depended upon them for income.

Closed mills, runaway mills, merged mills * * * failing or evading their trusteeship in the public interest * * * abandoned the people who had worked for them so long and faithfully.

For thousands of displaced workers there are no jobs of any kind.

One of the most recent casualties was the one-industry city of Sanford, Maine (population 15,000) that lost 3,000 jobs when the textile firm of Goodall-Sanford folded.

"We refuse to die" became the battle-cry of the people.

They knew that they had become the victims of an ultraconservative industry that had failed to keep up with the times, but they refused to quit. The people of Sanford set out with fortitude and initiative to attract new industries, in a determined campaign that has won admiration, and will produce results.

But in the meantime, who was responsible for their serious loss? Any reason?

Must the people of textile communities go on suffering because of poor mill management, or because financial manipulators buy and dispose of mills, and the people in them, as if human beings were as expendable as old plants and outmoded machinery?

A searching investigation of the whole textile industry is imperative.

It must, in the words of House Concurrent Resolution 107, look into the widespread and prolonged loss of employment, the reasons for the outright liquidation of long-established textile factories. the migration of textile factories, agricultural areas, the loss of foreign markets, the decline in domestic consumption of textile production while the demand for other products has been increasing, and the economic effect of synthetic fibers and processes upon the textile industry as a whole.

This is the conventional approach.

Behind the scenes there are other forces at work, that must not escape investigation.

The consolidation of textile power and domination through mergers, is one.

Loopholes in the laws, is another. The incentives given to manipulation by the capital gains tax. Carryover provisions, pensions trusts, and charitable trusts, must be explored.

Price policies, production policies, the impact of mergers upon small and independent concerns, the reasons why textiles have been so deficient in research and innovation, the ill-conceived and antiunion policies prevailing in some areas, are worthy of close attention.

Take the case of the A company. In 1948 it employed 25,000 workers. The problems of this corporation could have been solved by bringing in new and modern management. Instead, a financial manipulator moved in to get at the cash in the till and avail himself of the carryover losses. Then he closed many mills, and expanded elsewhere.

Or the case of W company. It earned more than $20 million before taxes, in the 6-year period ending November 30, 1952. Financial manipulators bought up stock to gain control. They fattened themselves on dividends, then sold the machinery, and finally the plants. A huge profit was made via capital gains, which are taxed at drastically lower rates than ordinary income.

They came, and looted, and went, throwing over 8,000 out of work. Many of the longtime workers, in their fifties, will perhaps never get another job for a long time, if ever.

Maybe Federal incorporation of king-sized enterprises that are developing through mergers is one way to halt such piracy.

Tightening of our income-tax laws would do much to curb this inhuman exploitation.

A case could be made for the imposition of a special tax on the financial gains of large corporations that abandon plants, communities, and workers with the provision that such revenues should be used for the reconstruction of affected communities.

Slick operators have no sense of economic responsibility.

They have no thought of meeting the problems of modernization, of making the enterprise an economic success, of maintaining employment for workers, and the communities.

Vultures, in the likeness of men, are raising havoc with the American textile industry.

Is an investigation of their operations justified?

It is mandatory.

SUMMARY

Second quarter of 1955 statistics on employment and production in the textile industry in the United States shows a continuance of the alarming economic deterioration in practically all sections of this industry.

Although there was a sharp pickup in output and sales in the first quarter of 1955, the second quarter shows a rapid and serious decline. Figures for employment in May 1955 show that a total of a little over 9,500,000 persons were listed as holding jobs. The tragic and startling fact is that employment in the textile industry is lower today than in 1932.

Over 200,000 or more than 25 percent of the textile workers of the United States, are now out of work or have permanently lost their jobs through mill closing, or because of technological changes or for other reasons.

Of those who remain nominally on the payroll, hundreds of thousands are working drastically curtailed hours.

Widespread distress exists in textile communities where many thousands have exhausted unemployment-insurance benefits and have no prospect of being absorbed in other types of employment.

Here are the overall figures in textile employment.

In 1948, there were 1,280,000 production workers. This number dropped to 1,200,000 in 1950. In both 1952 and 1953 the total was about 1,100,000. The low point in 1954 was in July with 953,000 workers. Recovery since July has been minor; in December the total was 998,000 compared to 980,000 in June and August 1954. The latest 1955 figures, as we pointed out earlier, show a still further loss of employment.

The decline in textile employment is not confined to one section of the country, although it is a fact that certain branches of the industry (wool and worsted, for example) have been most severely affected.

Between February 1951 and October 1954, 117,000 textile jobs were lost in New England.

In the same period 85,000 textile jobs were lost in the mid-Atlantic States.

In the South, in this same period, 52,000 textile jobs were lost.

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION DROPS

Per capital consumption of all textile fabrics in the period 1951–54 was 34 pounds as compared with 35.8 pounds for the years 1947–1950. This drop in consumption occurred despite a per capita increase of real disposable income in the United States of 11 percent from 1947 to 1954. Consumer expenditures per capita on apparel have not increased in proportion to over-all consumer expenditures. The share of the consumer dollar formerly spent on textiles is decreasing.

Except for the year 1959, total broad-woven fabric production has varied between 12 and 13 billion yards a year since 1947, with cotton goods production being maintained at the most stable level, varying between 9.5 billion in 1952 and 10.1 billion in 1951, except for 1949. Silk and synthetic yarn fabric production ranged from 2 billion to a maximum of 2.6 billion in 1950. But the woolen and worsted output has continued to shrink from 516 million linear yards in 1947 to a low of 281 million in 1954.

This drop in the volume of production is being experienced in face of a rising population which increased from 144 million in 1947 to 165 million at the present time. Part of the production amounting to 925 million square yards, the difference between the volume exported in 1947 and 1954 (1,730 million and 805 million, respectively) was diverted from export to domestic markets. But fundamentally, domestic textile consumption has diminished.

PRODUCTIVITY PER WORKER UP

While total volume of textile output has been lagging, the productivity per worker has continued to mount even more decisively than has average productivity in all manufacturing industries.

Evidence points to the conclusion that average manhour productivity in textiles has risen by about 5 percent per year since 1947. Yardage output per hour has gone up from 7.8 in 1947 to 8.8 in 1950 to 10.8 in 1954 and in the first quarter of 1955 to 11.2.

The shrinkage in total output and the more devastating drop in employment has been marked by widespread closing down and liquidation of mills.

MILL LIQUIDATIONS

There are no official figures on mill closings. The textile Workers Union of America has made the following startling computations which have not been challenged as far as we know by any responsible person in or out of the industry.

Mr. Solomon Barkin, research director of the Textile Workers Union of America, calls a liquidated bill one in which the equipment has been entirely removed.

A total of at least 541 mills, providing normal employment for 147,000 persons have been liquidated in the postwar years, distributed as follows among the various divisions: 248 mills employing 65,800 persons in the cotton-rayon division; 218 mills employing 70,000 in the woolen and worsted industry; and 75 mills employing 11,350 in the dyeing and finishing industry.

Equally indicative of the importance of the concentration has been the degree to which operating equipment has been reduced in the industry. Active cotton spinning spindles dropped by half a million between 1947 and 1950 and an additional 600,000 by April 1955. Over the 8-year period, some 16,000 looms were scrapped in the basic cotton and synthetic division and 13,000 in the woolen and worsted industry. The latter represents a reduction of one-third of the 1947 capacity in the industry.

MACHINERY HAS BEEN MODERNIZED

It should be noted that while mills have been liquidated the industry has spent between three and four billions of dollars in the postwar period to install up-to-date automatic equipment until today over 70 percent of the total productive machine plant in the industry is completely modern and highly productive. Practically all of this new machinery has been installed in old structures.

TEXTILE SLUMP HAS HIT MANY COMMUNITIES SEVERELY

As textile mills are generally located in nonmetropolitan areas, frequently comprising 1-industry or 1-mill communities, alternative employments in the locality are lacking. The slump in textile employment therefore depresses entire communities and leaves workers and their families stranded. The significance of this concentration is borne out by the fact that 5 of the 8 major areas in the continental United States which are designated "areas of very substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security, are textile areas. In addition, four smaller textile areas are classified in this category (having 12 percent or more of the labor force unemployed). There are also 20 textile areas (including 7 major communities) in the "substantial labor surplus" classification, i. e., with more than 6 percent but less than 12 percent of the labor force unemployed. These communities have not prepared for this situation with new industrial developments. The people have a lifetime investment of skills in the textile industry.

The concentration of textile manufacturing in the States along the Atlantic seaboard makes these areas peculiarly dependent upon the industry. The proportion of total manufacturing employment accounted for by the textile industry is in excess of 50 percent in North and South Carolina and more than 25 percent in Rhode Island and Georgia. In addition, substantial proportions of the factory employment in New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, Alabama, and Tennessee are provided by the textile industry.

REASONS FOR PRESENT CONDITIONS

We cite herewith a few of the many reasons for the deplorable conditions in the industry.

1. Loss of domestic outlets

The industry has lost many major outlets for textiles. These are reflected by the loss of textiles for wrapping, packing, and bagging to paper and plastics. Window shades have been replaced by blinds. Table cloths, aprons, and curtains have lost out to plastics. The losses have been particularly large in industrial and household uses.

2. Loss of export markets

The industry has lost major export markets. From a level in excess of 1.5 billion yards in 1947, the volume of cotton fabric exports has dropped below 600 million yards, with every likelihood that even this level will not be maintained.

3. Changes in types of garments

There has been a drop in the per capita consumption of textiles due to the diminished use of such garments as overcoats. Casual attitudes and habits have reduced consumption and turnover, particularly as clothing lasts longer. Many significant changes in clothing patterns such as the substitution of blouses and skirts for suits and dresses for women and the acceptance of slacks and sport shirts instead of suits among men have sharply affected total output.

4. Changing pattern of consumer expenditures

The inadequacy of income, the appeal of other expenditures, particularly consumer goods, the heavy burden of mortgage debt, have all contributed to a reduced expenditure on apparel. The ratio of apparel expenditures to total consumer expenditures amounted to 6.9 percent in 1954 as compared with 7.7 percent in 1951, 8.5 percent in 1949, 9.5 percent in 1945, and 8.7 percent in 1939.

5. Tardiness in meeting new consumer trends

Apparel has been designed for urban living despite the larger number of people now living in suburban areas. People want washable items. Rayon and woolen fabrics which have been tardy in meeting this demand lost markets which were not entirely filled by other fibers.

6. Interfiber competition has discouraged buying

The excessive claims of the fibre manufacturers have done much to repel the American consumer. Many apparel manufacturers and fabric producers put fabrics on the markets without proper testing for specific end uses. Their shortcomings finally led to their withdrawal and the bad experience brought a revulsion among many consumers who have been wary about buying unproven items.

The substitutions have provided bonanzas for the innovators but later failures followed as the items did not stand up under actual wear. In the meantime demoralization has ensued and the older industries such as woolens and rayons have suffered. New substitutions are rendering obsolete even new innovations. In tire cord, rayon displaced cotton. Now nylon is battling it out with rayon. Already we hear of nonfabric tire.

7. Many textile owners have abandoned their mills

The textile industry has suffered from unprogressive managements.

In the first place many mills have been owned by the same interests for several generations. They had survived the depression and were capitalized at very low values.

(a) Some of these older interests sold out to other textile interests, textile users or financial speculators, during or immediately after the war, who were primarily interested in avoiding the excess profits tax. They paid high prices, which gave the original owners large capital gains. The purchasers financed the transaction with the cash accumulated in the old business and then could continue business with a high capitalization and therefore pay little or no excess profit taxes.

(b) Others sold out to established textile interests, particularly since the carryover provisions of the corporate income tax law have become more attractive. They hereby profited through a merger and acquired the stock of the successor corporation which was generally a nontaxable transaction. The successor corporation has been able to use the carryover provision as a means of escaping future taxes. In some instances these tax savings have amounted to 20 and 30 millions of dollars. These mergers, based on the capitalization of the loss position of the merged companies, have been widespread within the textile industry and are matters for real public investigation.

In the second place, a number of interests have been unwilling to invest to modernize their operations. No mill can survive unless it has the latest type of equipment and those owners who have been unwilling to keep abreast of the times have often abandoned their mills in preference to modernizing them. This procedure was attractive particularly at times and places where the real estate was of substantial value and when a market existed for the used equipment.

In the third place, the decline in the market for certain products has limited the capacity required in them. Older managements have in those cases been unwilling to move into new product areas and start afresh in the competitive struggle.

We urge a thorough investigation into the effect of our tax structure upon the process of plant abandonment and mergers and purchases. Our tax system has inordinately encouraged these movements. And the textile industry has been one of the most important areas for the utilization of the tax laws for personal aggrandizement accompanied by widespread plant abandonment.

8. Imports have seriously affected some division of the industry

While the textile industry as a whole has not been particularly affected by imports, the woolen and worsted divisions has been seriously injured from time to time as the volume of imports has risen in the face of a shrinking market. These imports have then tended to aggravate and demoralize an already difficult situation. The industry must look with alarm at any increase of imports of serious proportions since they would aggravate what is now a seriously disturbed condition. It is an industry which must be maintained.

The hard and soft fiber cordage and twin division has also felt the impact of rising imports and is in need of protection as an essential industry. The threat of a major increase in cotton textile imports from Japan as a result of impending tariff negotiations is a real one. Any action which would compound the difficulties of this depressed industry must be avoided.

9. Prices have been set by the highly efficient mills

In this highly competitive market, prices have been driven to very low levels. Mill margins have also been very low. With the industry now highly concentrated in a relatively few hands, the major mill and selling organizations have set their prices at levels which reflect the southern wage scales and their high efficiencies. As a consequence the less efficient mills and those paying more than the southern wage scales on products predominantly produced in the South have had severe pressure on their income levels.

10. The high rate of mergers and mill purchases has concentrated the industry

The mill mergers and purchases have continued in large numbers since they began during the last war. The movement from 1944 through 1948 has been revived during the last few years so that we are now in a new period of consolidation. This has been stimulated by the tax laws; the decline of the woolen and worsted industry; the drive for diversification; and the practice of integration which has brought production, selling and factoring within the same interest grouping.

11. Local tax and finance subsidies create unfair advantages leading to unnecessary migration

Another stimulant to disorganization and unfair competition has been the local inducements offered by communities in the form of tax exemptions, profitable lease arrangements and local financing of plants and equipment. These have encouraged companies to abandon existing locations and move to new properties with little cost and investment. The result has been an unhealthy competitive situation which has called forth protests both from labor and management in the North and in the South.

GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ASSISTANCE BADLY NEEDED

Government research has aided certain sections of the textile industry; other branches such as the woolen and worsted section desperately need research assistance to retrieve drastically curtailed market.

Impartial, competent research is needed to aid the consumer beset by the insistent claims of the producers of certain synthetic fibers.

Research assistance is urgently needed on the potentialities of textiles for new industrial uses. New designs in textiles must be stimulated to meet the needs of present-day living habits.

Santa Fe Pact Divides Basin of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of June 23, 1955:

SANTA FE PACT DIVIDES BASIN OF COLORADO—LAW OF RIVER ALLOCATES NO WATER TO STATES AS SUCH

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The Colorado River Compact was completed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1929 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First, the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Second, the lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Third, that part of the river which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

DIVIDING LINE FIXED

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon, the negotiators proceeded to apportion "beneficial consumptive use" of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial or domestic purposes.

That kind of use of water in the amount of 7,500,000 acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin. This totals 15 million acre-feet, and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of "surplus" water.

MEXICO TREATY MADE

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they agreed Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This, again, was to come out of "surplus," but if need be, equally out of each basin's apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1,500,000 acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17,500,000 acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river so they set up machinery for a "further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river in fact averages a critical deficiency of almost 2,500,000 acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one party "suicide pact" California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

INTERPRETATIONS TOLD

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water.

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower basin negotiators insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. Thus the upper basin was prohibited from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

HOOVER QUOTED

They persist in this contention even in the face of an intepretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

"* * * The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes * * *"

In the past California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

H. R. 7072, Excise Tax on Truck Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the proposal in H. R. 7072 to increase the excise tax on truck tires to 900 percent.

Both the truck-tire industry and the trucking industry are big and important industries in my district. Both have voiced strong support of the President's highway program. The tire-manufacturing industry in particular has been one of the sparkplugs in the good-roads movement since it was started in 1910.

But both of these industries take vigorous exception to the tax which would be levied against them by this highway-construction bill. They regard it as unfair and grossly discriminatory.

They contend, moreover, with compelling logic, that it would actually constitute a national sales tax—since the tax would be passed on—on every commodity moved by truck and a special transportation tax on the millions of Americans who travel by bus.

This Congress has promised to cut back the present high excise tax on tires and tubes to prewar levels as soon as it can do so. A 900-percent increase in the levy at this time is unthinkable.

A particularly odious feature of the money provisions of H. R. 7072 is that it would saddle upon one industry almost the entire cost of financing a national highway program that would be constructed for the benefit of every segment of the American economy.

Over and above the highly selective character of the levy and the burden that it would add to the users of all goods moved by truck, the tire people in my district object that the tax proposed would encourage tire use practices that would greatly increase highway safety hazards. In this connection, they believe operators would be forced in competition with other carriers to recap tires beyond their safe life. They believe that truck and bus tires would be operated beyond their true safe life. They feel quite sure that operators, either to minimize or avoid the tax, would resort to use of tires in smaller sizes and thus introduce a dangerous element of overloading.

A special hardship would be worked upon the small-business element of the tire industry. The investment of small dealers in new tire inventory would be tremendously increased at the expense of meager working capital. The proposed floor stock on existing inventories would involve a large and immediate capital outlay, sterilized until such time as that stock would move into retail sale.

It is difficult to believe, but the truck tire tax proposed in H. R. 7072 would in the case of large truck-bus tires supplied as original equipment nearly equal the excise tax levied on the truck itself. The current excise tax amounts to 6.3 percent of the tire price. This bill would increase it to an average of 63 percent of the tire price, and would impose a tax on recaps and retreads averaging 84 percent of the price of the recap or retread itself.

May I say, in conclusion, that highway truck and bus transportation would be forced to bear an enormous and disproportionate share of the cost of new highways under this proposal. These highways are for the use of the whole economy, and revenues for them should be raised in a fair and equitable manner, not harmful to the public safety and without special injury to the small-business men in the trade or to the low income consumer who uses both the buses and goods moved by truck.

The breakdown listed below will show the amount of tax now paid by various vehicles and also the amount of the proposed increase:

Increase in gasoline tax from 2 cents per gallon to 3 cents per gallon.

Increase in diesel fuel tax (for highway use) from 2 cents to 6 cents per gallon.

Increase in truck and bus tire tax (size 8.50 and above) from 5 cents per pound to 50 cents per pound; and imposing a tax of 20 cents per pound (total weight) on recapped and retreaded truck and bus tires. No increase in tax on smaller tires.

Increase in tax on tubes for truck and bus tires from 9 cents per pound to 50 cents per pound.

No increase in tax on smaller tubes.

	Present tax	Present tax plus proposed increase	Amount of increase
LIGHTWEIGHT PASSENGER CAR			
Tax on—			
New car	$157.50	$157.50	None
Set of new tires	4.40	4.40	None
Set of new tubes	1.62	1.62	None
Fuel [1]	11.52	17.28	$5.76
Total	175.04	180.80	5.76
4-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	1,056.96	1,056.96	None
Set of new tires	77.00	770.00	693.00
Set of new tubes	15.37	85.40	70.03
Fuel [1]	325.00	487.50	162.50
Total	1,474.33	2,399.86	925.53
5-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	1,918.96	1,918.96	None
Set of new tires	99.00	990.00	891.00
Set of new tubes	19.76	109.80	90.04
Fuel [1]	340.42	1,021.26	680.84
Total	2,378.14	4,040.02	1,661.88
6-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	2,071.92	2,071.92	None
Set of new tires	121.00	1,210.00	1,089.00
Set of new tubes	24.16	134.20	110.04
Fuel [1]	418.60	1,255.80	837.20
Total	2,635.68	4,671.92	2,036.24

[1] Based on 1 year's operation.

Admit Italy to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have recently been celebrating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. Statesmen from all over the world assembled at San Francisco, the site of the United Nations' birth, to pledge again their loyalty, and the devotion of the countries they represent, to the ideals embodied in the United Nations Charter. From far-off Moscow came the new Mr. Molotov, to promote the new look in Russian foreign policy. When he had finished his speech to the assembled delegates, however, they might have been pardoned for failing to discern anything new in what he said. The true prescription for easing tensions in the world was given by Mr. Dulles, when he told the delegates that the key to peace lay in observing the United Nations Charter. This is an injunction which the Soviet Union, if it is really interested in world peace, might well take to heart, for the Soviet Union, as we all know, has been the principal obstruction to the effective functioning of the United Nations Charter.

Take, if you will, the simple matter of the admission of new members to the United Nations. The charter provides only that membership is open to all "peace loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." A two-thirds vote in the General Assembly is necessary for admission, along with the affirmative vote of 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council. While there is room for a difference of interpretation of the latter provision, in practice the Security Council has held that the votes of its permanent members must be included in the affirmative vote required for admission.

This interpretation has worked to the disadvantage of a state which richly deserves membership in the United Nations. I refer to the Republic of Italy. Certainly Italy meets the criteria for admission to the U. N. Having experienced the horrors of war at first hand, having been laid waste by fire and sword, Italy does not rattle the saber. Indeed, there is nothing Italy so ardently desires today as continued peace. Her restraint in the matter of Trieste, despite strong claims to the area, is further testimony of her character as a peace loving state.

Nor can there be any legitimate ground for doubt as to Italy's ability to live up to her international obligations. She is a valued ally in NATO, enthusiastic in the observance of its obligations. Her contribution to the security of free Europe's southern flank is vital. Although she is faced with a strong domestic Communist Party, no one can seriously allege that the Italian Government is not in full control of the internal situation. There is no question about it, her Government has the power and the desire to live up to its international obligations, in the spirit of the charter.

If this is true, why is it that Italy, which has consistently sought admission to the United Nations, has not yet been able to attain that goal? The answer is simple. It is that the Soviet Union, with petty spite for failure to get its own way, has five times seen fit to veto proposals for the admission of Italy to the United Nations. An Australian proposal which would have recommended Italy's admission "at such time and under such conditions as the General Assembly may deem appropriate," was vetoed in August of 1947. After the Italian peace treaty went into effect, the application of Italy was again examined by the Security Council, in the light of a provision in the preamble of that treaty, which stated that the conclusion of the treaty would enable Italy's ex-enemies to support her application for membership in the United Nations. A similar provision was included in the peace treaties with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Finland, and the Soviet Union thus upheld the view that all five applications be acted upon together. The United States stood for separate action on the merits of each application, which was the method adopted. On that basis Italy and Finland received enough votes in the Security Council to be admitted, but they did not receive the approval of the Soviet Union. This was in October 1947.

The next month the General Assembly found that Italy was a peace-loving state within the meaning of the charter, and therefore merited admission. The International Court of Justice, in an advisory opinion, held by a vote of 9 to 6 that no member of the United Nations was entitled to make its consent to the admission of a new member subject to conditions not found in the charter. Particularly, it was not to make its consent conditional upon simultaneous admission of other members. Despite these decisions, the Soviet Union vetoed moves for Italy's admission to the United Nations in 1948, 1949, and 1952. It has persisted in regarding admission to the United Nations as a matter of horse-trading, and therefore, has insisted on the admission of states such as Albania and Mongolia in return for an affirmative vote on the admission of a nation such as Italy. The American view has been that admission to the United Nations should be based on the criteria set forth in the charter, and should not be the subject of political deals. The result has been frustration for Italy, whose admission to the United Nations would serve to strengthen that organization, and futility in the United Nations, which has consistently seen the favorable recommendations of the General Assembly on Italian membership flouted by the will of one power. The United States, which has consistently supported Italian aspirations to membership in the United Nations, has seen that policy thwarted time and again.

Yet in spite of previous disappointments, I believe that the time is ripe for a new attempt to bring Italy into the United Nations. That is why I believe that this Congress should go on record with a demonstration of America's continuing support for Italy's entrance into the world organization. To that end I introduce herewith a resolution "that it is the sense of Congress that Italy should be admitted to full membership in the United Nations at the earliest possible time, and that all of the influence of the Government of the United States should be exerted to accomplish that end."

This resolution can serve several useful purposes. In the first place, it will test the good faith of the Russians. They say they want peace, they say they want good will. Let them prove it. Let them, as Mr. Dulles has said, observe the charter by omitting extraneous considerations, and voting on the question of Italy's admission to the U. N. on the merits of Italy's application. Any such vote, if truly objective, can only lead to Italy's admission. If, however, the Soviet continues to insist on a "package deal" before she will consider Italy favorably, that will be at least one piece of evidence that the Russians have not really changed their ways.

Furthermore, a congressional declaration of support for Italian admission to the United Nations will certainly strengthen the hand of our representatives there in pressing for a resolution to that effect. If Soviet policy has truly changed, such a congressional declaration will be taken as a demonstration of America's unity, and should give impetus to favorable Russian action. Finally, the United States should benefit in its relations with Italy if Congress passes this resolution, for in so doing we will make it clear to the Italian people that we are concerned for the status and prestige of Italy in the world, and that we appreciate her cooperation as a loyal ally.

Let us then strike while the iron is hot. Let us put the Soviet Union in a position where she must show her change of heart by deeds, and not by words. Let us show the world that the United States will continue to support and strengthen the United Nations, in the true spirit of the charter.

H. R. 3253

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks as to my convictions in signing the minority report on H. R. 3253, signed also by Mrs. EDITH GREEN, RALPH W. GWINN, and ALBERT H. BOSCH, I include a statement provided by Dr. Samuel Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, reviewing the situation as of March 24, 1955:

The bill we are considering, H. R. 3253, has the intent of continuing a high school on the Marine Corps base at Quantico, Va., even though adequate high school facilities are available in nearby public schools. Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, which H. R. 3253 would amend, clearly provides that the Commissioner of Education cannot use Federal funds for the operation of schools on military bases if suitable school facilities are available in local public schools. This is a sound provision, Mr. Speaker, because it keeps the responsibility for the control and operation of our public schools where it rightfully belongs—in our States and local communities.

Prince William County, where the Marine Corps base is located, built a new high school more than a year ago and has signified its willingness to accept the approximately 80 children enrolled in grades 8–12 who live on the Quantico base. The Commissioner has therefore no alternative but to follow the requirements of the law. The respective schools were so advised a year ago, in order that there would be ample time to work out any necessary arrangements.

But the consequences of H. R. 3253, if it were to be enacted, reach far beyond the confines of the Quantico base. In effect, the bill would give to the military agencies a veto power over whether or not any local public schools are suitable for providing free education to children who reside on military bases. Under existing law this judgment is exercised by the Commissioner of Education, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency. H. R. 3253 would require this determination to be made jointly, by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of the military department concerned.

Such a requirement would have serious and important implications for the relationship, nationwide, between the military authorities, on the one hand, and the State and local school authorities on the other, implications which go to the very heart of the American system of State and local control of education.

The history of Public Law 874 indicates that the Congress clearly intended that wherever possible education for children residing on Federal property should be provided by local educational agencies under State law. At the same time it was recognized that there might be some exceptional situations in which the local educational agency might be overwhelmed because of the Federal impact and thus find it impossible to provide suitable free public education for children living on Federal property. To meet these situations Congress included section 6 of Public Law 874 which authorized the Commissioner of Education to make arrangements to provide free public education for those children living on Federal property wherever, after consultation with State departments of education, he determined that suitable free public education for children living on Federal property could not be provided in the regular manner. Thus section 6 of Public Law 874 authorizes the Commissioner to make arrangements for the education of children living on Federal property in cases where "it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

This provision of the law, together with Report No. 2287 of the House Committee on Education and Labor (81st Cong.) dated June 30, 1950, indicates that the Congress intended that wherever possible education for children living on Federal property should be provided by local educational agencies in accordance with State law, and only in exceptional cases where no local educational agency was able in the judgment of the Commissioner to provide suitable free public education should the Federal Government undertake directly to operate schools. This position is entirely consistent with the fundamental educational policies of this country. It was wholeheartedly accepted by practically all State and local school administrators as being consistent with our basic education philosophy and in the best interest of the educational programs for the children concerned.

Under the law the responsibility of the Commissioner of Education is to make a finding, after he has consulted the appropriate State educational agency, as to whether a local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for the children in question.

I would furthermore call attention to one other section of Public Law 874. It is section 7 which reads:

"(a) In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system of any local or State educational agency."

Surely this shows the clear intent of Congress that the Commissioner shall accept the curriculum, instruction program and personnel approved by the State in making his determination of what is a suitable school and not attempt to have the program of the local schools modified to suit his ideas which might differ from those established by the State and the local community.

Here we have a situation where in carrying out the law it means that an operating school on a military base would be discontinued and the children would attend a local public school. The parents do not want to make the change.

Thus the issue is clear. Does this Congress wish to take the position, by passing the proposed amendment, that children who live on the Quantico or any other military base, shall have provided by the Federal Government separate schools from children in the local community when the local community is able and willing to provide such schools?

The problem is not a question of a narrow or a liberal interpretation of what is a "suitable" school, for the history of the law is clear that Congress did not intend that the Commissioner of Education should use that term to open or to continue in operation schools on military bases when local public schools were available to pupils living on such bases.

Let us be frank in recognizing that if we adopt the amendment we are in effect saying to the Commissioner of Education not only that we want to continue the school on base at Quantico but that we do not want to close existing schools on any military bases even though the quality of educational program and facilities may be better in the local schools than on the base.

Nevadans Oppose H. R. 7072

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Nevadans are particularly attentive to what transpires here in Congress, but I believe a new degree of interest has been reached since the introduction of H. R. 7072.

Seldom in my congressional experience have I received such a great number of telegrams and letters on a single measure. And never have I received an expression from my constituents that is 100 percent in agreement—in his case deeply, strongly, thoroughly, and irrevocably opposed to H. R. 7072 in its present form.

Nevada needs highways. But we do not want them at the expense of Nevada industry.

The ill-considered tax provisions of H. R. 7072—developed apparently without benefit of public hearing, without consultation of this body's officially designated taxation committee—would ruin businesses and destroy jobs that are an integral part of our western economy.

This applies not just to our trucking and heavy duty equipment operators, although increases on typical line-haul operations in my State should H. R. 7072 become law would amount to approximately $200 per truck yearly.

Our local bus lines, upon which we depend for much of our internal transportation in Nevada, are already in financial difficulties, and I am advised H. R. 7072 would mean ruination.

Our small mining firms, operating already under great obstacles, would be greatly burdened as the added taxes in H. R. 7072 would probably absorb present profits.

Small contractors in Nevada fear these proposed tax increases because it may eliminate them, as only large concerns can stand the capital outlays which would be required for tires on dirt-moving and similar construction equipment.

For the Record I want to bring to your attention some of the typical messages I have received in the past few days from the extremely concerned people of Nevada—typical messages which plainly show the anger and the fear with which H. R. 7072 is justifiably regarded in my State. They follow:

Reno, Nev., *July 5, 1955.*

Representative Clifton Young,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tax increase in proposed H. R. 7072 will be reflected heavily on cost of transporting cattle. In operation such as ours no justification for saddling trucking industry such heavy share of cost of highway program.

Garibaldi Livestock
Transportation,
Al Repetti.

Reno, Nev., *July 5, 1955.*

Congressman Cliff Young,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely request that you vigorously oppose passage of H. R. 7072 as this increase tax structure is prohibitive. On behalf of the trucking industry throughout the United States. Thank you for your attention.

A. O. May,
Secretary, Teamsters Union No. 533.

Las Vegas, Nev., *July 5, 1955.*

Representative Clifton Young,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Where will prices of hamburgers, milk, and other commodities go if motor transports have to double freight rates to realize fair profit. Conferences various groups consider H. R. 7072 immature thinking. Citizens' pocketbooks unreasonably affected.

Desert Development, Inc.,
C. Van Patten.

Las Vegas, Nev., *July 2, 1955.*

Representative Clifton Young,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Financing proposals contained in H. R. 7072 are fantastic. Urge you to do all in your power to prevent this sort of legislation.

Wells & Stewart.

Las Vegas, Nev., *July 5, 1955.*

Representative Clifton Young,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fantastic tax program H. R. 7072 will be most damaging to trucking concerns, automotive and allied industries, even to ultimate consumer of products. Primary interstate roads now, others later. Next 12 years use automotive, gasoline, diesel, and rubber tax now being collected.

Lembke, Clough & King, Inc.

Reno, Nev., *July 1, 1955.*

Hon. Clifton Young,
Congressman for Nevada,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in favor of the administration or Clay bill for a public highway system and feel that the Gore bill S. 1048, has many objectionable features as far as Nevada is concerned. Latest bill, H. R. 7072, has tax provisions which would be ruinous to mining industry, especially tax on diesel fuel and rubber. As bill is drawn, these taxes would apply whether or not vehicles are used on public roads. Rubber tax increases are as much as 1,000 percent on large size truck tires and 500 percent on tubes. Diesel fuel tax is increased 300 percent. Please do everything possible to defeat or greatly modify tax provisions of bill or mines in our State will suffer irreparable damage.

Getchell Mine, Inc.

The Ames Aeronautical Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 27, I attended a most interesting and well-organized presentation. The national advisory committee for aeronautics opened their Ames aeronautical laboratory to a gathering of representatives of Government, industry, and transportation. The occasion was the laboratory's triennial inspection. This installation, located at Moffett Field, Calif., some 40 miles south of the Oakland-San Francisco area, was the scene of a very impressive picture of the committee's valuable contributions to the aircraft industry and to our national defense.

About 400 visitors were shown through the Ames Laboratory on the above date, and another 400 on the following day; the rigorous time schedule, adhered to closely, set the pattern for the extremely well-run manner in which the full day's inspection was handled. The 9 demonstrations illustrating some of the activities of the laboratory necessitated splitting the visiting group into smaller contingents of about 40 each, which proceeded on a staggered-shift basis. The presentation was excellent, and the planning and organization of the inspection program enabled the tour to proceed smoothly and quickly.

At each of the 9 stops the subject-matter was discussed by 3 able speakers in concise, explicit, and relatively non-technical terms. The 27 speakers who presented the problems faced and their eventual solutions worked out in the committee's laboratories gave ample testimony of the quality of the young engineers with which the laboratory is staffed. Averaging approximately 33 years of age these men are among the top researchers in the aeronautical field, and exemplify the forward looking scope of the committee's work.

In a maze of windtunnels, oscillographs and gages of all types, this corps of civilian engineers probes the complex questions which constitute known obstacles to aircraft design progress. The valuable work now being done by this group deserves high commendation, and an enumeration of the benefits of the Committee's past research accomplishments offers us every indication that the research now being conducted will yield a constant flow of knowledge which will serve to continually advance the military and commercial aeronautical superiority of our Nation.

The saving of time, money, and materials which result from the laboratory's predictions with regard to the behavior of prospective airplane designs seems to justify the expenditures for this extremely practicable service.

Crisis in Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 Senator FRANK CARLSON introduced in the Senate the companion measures to my bills to strengthen and improve the civil service. In a recent book, Crisis in Civil Service, Herbert Hollander writes as follows:

> The present attack upon the merit system is less spectacular, less obvious, less clearly defined. * * * Now each move designed to take positions out of the classified service is accompanied by expressions of official devotion to the merit system and fervent assurances that the announced actions will result in a stronger civil service.

Mr. Hollander sees special danger to the civil service in the one-package deal which combines the administration's political appointments with civil service. This is personified by Chairman Phillip Young of the Civil Service Commission who is also on the White House staff as adviser on personnel, for it places an almost irresistable squeeze on Mr. Young who has often expressed his determination to fight for merit and fitness as the sole prerequisites for Federal employment.

These current attacks on the civil service are most generally associated with Charles Willis, Jr., who until recently was on the White House staff. In a recent letter to me, Jerome Keating, vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, pointed out that "the Willis proposition, however, places the power in the administrative branch of the Government and to that we are very much opposed. As a matter of fact, there has been a growing tendency for administrators in the Government to attempt to exercise unwarranted authority over the Members of Congress." Because of its interest, I would like to include the text of Mr. Keating's letter as a part of my remarks.

Various moves on the part of the Administration have created a great and grave problem for those of us who feel a deep interest in maintaining the effectiveness of the civil service. One of the best ways of combating any campaign of this type is to develop an informed public opinion. I was therefore greatly pleased to note the great interest shown in the press in Mr. Hollander's book, from which I have already quoted. I would also like to include as a part of my remarks some of the newspaper comment on this book, namely, an article by John Herlong appearing in the Washington Daily News and one by Joseph Young from the Washington Sunday Star. For the information of my colleagues, I would also like to include press summaries of the bills that have been introduced by Senator CARLSON and myself. These appeared in the Government Standard and the Washington Star.

It is my belief that the bills we have introduced would do much to meet criticisms leveled at the civil service administration today by such critics as Mr. Hollander and Mr. Keating. If we are to maintain the efficiency, moral and effectiveness of the Government in these times of crisis these problems must be met and solved. In closing, I should like to quote once more from Mr. Hollander's able book:

> The United States can no longer entrust the thousand and one functions of government to persons whose selection has been decisively influenced by political considerations * * * until the American people make it abundantly plain that they will accept no compromises which tend to weaken rather than strengthen the career service, the Federal Government will not be the fully effective instrumentality which these times so urgently demand.

Mr. Hollander has been for more than 25 years the public relations director of the great National Federation of Federal Employees. His book should be read by everyone concerned with strengthening and improving the civil service.

The matter referred to follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I read very carefully your insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under dates of May 26 and June 16. We feel that you are absolutely right in your belief that the career employee has been hurt by the policies of Mr. Willis, and also by the policies of the Commission.

Frankly, we are a little dubious of many of the proposals made by the Hoover Commission. Some of the proposals that they have offered in the past would not have helped civil service, but would have placed an excessive amount of authority in the hands of the administrative officers of Government. The grant of excessive authority to administrative officers of Government generally reacts to the disadvantage of the individual employees.

We believe that a balance must be maintained and control must be retained by the legislative branch of the Government over the actions of the administrators. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission, if they were all adopted, would take an immeasurable amount of control over administrative officers out of the hands of Congress and place it in the hands of the Cabinet officers and other administrative men appointed by the President. This type of procedure builds up a tyranny that is probably even worse than the spoils system, and certainly far less desirable than a balanced program.

The Willis proposition, however, places the power in the administrative branch of the Government, and to that we are very much opposed. As a matter of fact, there has been a growing tendency for administrators in the Government to attempt to exercise unwarranted authority over the Members of Congress.

We believe that you are performing a splendid service by analyzing the patronage program and asserting the need for defense of the civil-service system. It was very well brought out recently that the Civil Service Commission must be independent to maintain a proper civil-service program.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 30, 1955]

SPOILS SYSTEM VS. LIFETIME CAREER IN GOVERNMENT

(By John Herling)

About 2,300,000 citizens—or targets—are on the Federal payroll. The average Government worker receives less than $4,000 a year. Fewer than 4 percent receive more than $7,000.

If you have worked yourself up to the level of $7,000 and beyond, you're apt to be in trouble. You may be working yourself out of a job. Your civil-service status—established presumably to make merit and fitness the sole qualifications for a Federal job—suddenly starts to change shape, like looking into a Coney Island-type distortion mirror.

IT'S NOT FUNNY

Except this distortion is not funny. Just how unfunny the situation is appears in Herbert Hollander's swiftly moving new book, Crisis in Civil Service. Mr. Hollander is a veteran Washington newspaperman who is an expert in this field.

In developing his charges that the essential nature of civil service is being corrupted, Mr. Hollander names the Eisenhower administration as the current sinner, but he says the sin is by no means original with this administration.

In the early thirties, Mr. Hollander recalls, the first years of the Roosevelt administration saw a dangerous, open attack against civil service. At that time, however, he finds that public opinion was so effectively marshaled that the merit system was finally rescued from the clutches of the spoilsmen.

Today, Mr. Hollander says another crusade to save the civil service is unmistakably indicated.

As contrasted with 1933–36, Mr. Hollander says, "The present attack upon the merit system is less spectacular, less obvious, less clearly defined. * * * Now each move designed to take positions out of the classified service is accompanied by expressions of official devotion to the merit system and fervent assurances that the announced actions will result in a stronger civil service."

SPECIAL DANGER

Mr. Hollander sees special danger to the civil service in the one-package deal which combines the administration's political appointments with civil service. This is personified by Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission who is also on the White House staff as adviser on personnel. This places an almost irresistible political squeeze on the man whose avowed intention is to fight for merit and fitness as the sole prerequisites for a Federal job.

Mr. Hollander acknowledges that genuinely confidential and policymaking jobs—perhaps about 1,000 in all—should fall outside civil service. But, aside from these obvious exceptions, he says the merit system should be extended in the interest of more efficient Government.

He calls for:

A new, realistic approach to compensation, with salary rates which attract and then hold the most competent employees.

A health insurance program for Federal personnel, to keep pace with progressive practice in business and industry.

A central personnel agency in the Civil Service Commission with overall responsibility for formulating and supervising Federal personnel policies.

Laws and regulations against use of military personnel in civilian positions.

Finally, a far-reaching revision of Federal promotion policies with greater advancement and incentives as well as the reduction of dead-end jobs in all categories of employment.

[From the Washington Star]

The Federal Spotlight

(By Joseph Young)

Hoover proposals: Legislation to carry out the main recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Personnel and Civil Service is sponsored by Representative Thompson, Democract, of New Jersey, and Senator Carlson, Republican, of Kansas.

The bills would abolish the present performance rating system and set up a once-a-year report only on those employees whose work entitles them to promotion or commendation, or whose unsatisfactory work merits a warning or dismissal; establish a senior civil-service system to fill top career jobs in Government; revise the Classification Act to reduce the number of grades, and authorize the transfer of employees from the civil service to other Government merit systems without loss of status.

Veterans' preference: In addition, Senator Carlson, who is the top ranking minority member of the Senate Civil Service Committee, has sponsored two more Hoover group proposals to limit veterans' preference.

One bill would require veterans to compete on equal terms with nonveteran career employees who have 15 years or more of service in reduction-in-force programs. The other would limit veterans' rights of appeal to the Civil Service Commission on agency actions to the first 5 years that a veteran is in Government.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 3, 1955]

The Federal Spotlight

(By Joseph Young)

AUTHOR SEES POLITICS HURTING MERIT SYSTEM

The Government's merit system is gradually being undermined, a veteran observer of the Federal scene declares.

Herbert Hollander, public relations director of the National Federation of Federal Employees for more than 25 years, has written a new book Crisis in the Civil Service (Current Issues Publishers, Inc., $2.75), in which he calls for concerted action to stop "the rising tide of spoilsmanship."

The book is certain to stir lively discussion and will be read avidly by those interested in civil service.

Here are some excerpts from Mr. Hollander's book:

"The merit system in the Federal service is facing a crisis. Through the years, by dint of prodigious effort, the percentage of Federal positions subject to patronage appointment—to the spoils system—was steadily reduced. Today that trend is being reversed and the undermining of the merit principle goes forward on a much larger scale than is generally recognized and by various means. The need for a new effort to combat the rising tide of spoilsmanship cannot be doubted.

"The pressure for Federal jobs to be dispensed as political spoils remains a constant threat to the integrity of the career civil service.

"The Civil Service Commission, traditionally in the forefront of efforts to extend the merit system, has lent itself to stratagems designed to give an aura of respectability and plausibility to the removal of positions from the competitive service."

Morale: "Much more is involved than the substantial numbers of positions which already have been removed from the merit system directly and the scores of thousands of others now subject to an elaborate political clearance procedure.

"The effect upon the efficiency and the morale of the service is all-pervasive.

"In department after department, in agency after agency, positions which for many years have been considered beyond spoils reach either have been removed from the career service or are receiving the eager attention of seekers after additional patronage.

"Inevitably this has adversely affected morale; but it has had even more tangible effects on recruitment and retention of highly competent, experienced, long-time career employees. Moreover, the whole situation is influencing the decisions of many qualified younger men and women with special training and abilities not to enter public service.

"The serious national implications of this as well as other aspects of the whole problem cannot be overestimated, particularly in view of the immense responsibilities of the Federal service at this time."

Change urged: "The whole situation has been further clouded by the fact that for the first time the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission also is serving at the White House as the President's staff adviser on personnel matters. Heretofore these two positions have been, as they should be, separate and distinct. Their functions are only apparently identical; actually, it is anomalous for the head of the Civil Service Commission to function within the White House staff.

"The change has not worked out well. The President has suffered from the lack of a full-time staff member able to function as did Mr. (William H.) McReynolds, for example, during the Roosevelt administrations. Moreover, the pressures which inevitably are found at the White House should not properly be placed upon the officer charged with administering the Federal Government's civil service system through the chairmanship of the Commission. It may well be that the arrangement at first appeared to some to be a sound and logical one. Experience has conclusively proved otherwise.

"The persistent removal of higher level positions will have the effect—already is having the effect—of placing a damper upon initiative, enterprise, and ambition. One of the greatest virtues of a genuine career service is that it affords employees far larger opportunities for advancement and thus stimulates them to higher efficiency and productivity.

"The growing system of personal patronage, even when it is pursued by the most patriotic administrators with the best of motives, is contrary to sound public policy. In addition to its many other faults, it creates a class of employees who have come into the service through the influence of certain individuals to whom they owe their appointments and their tenure and to whom they are, in an important sense, primarily indebted. They have come into the service without regard to civil service; frequently they have little respect for civil-service requirements as a whole. The situation is essentially unhealthy, and it leads inevitably to the conclusion that notwithstanding strenuous attempts to rationalization, there is no such thing as a good spoils system. * * *"

Public service impaired: "In contrast to other times all citizens now are directly and intimately concerned with the functioning of the Federal Government every day and in many ways. The problems of administration have an immediacy and an urgency for each individual in the Nation which would not have seemed possible even in the relatively recent past. Today there is nothing academic about these problems, for upon their sound solution depends, quite directly, the well-being of all.

"Actions inimical to the merit system in the Federal service thus affect the whole people. Whether in Federal laboratory or office, in forest or on conservation project, in any one of the literally thousands of administrative, technical, scientific, professional, and crafts categories, the way Federal employees are recruited and trained, and the climate of public opinion in which they carry out their assignments, all are matters of vital and continuing concern to every American. No one now is remote from the practical, day-by-day working problems of Government.

"The United States can no longer entrust the thousand and one functions of Government to persons whose selection has been decisively influenced by political considerations. Beyond the limits of strictly policy-making and confidential posts, all Federal positions, without exception, should be included within the competitive service.

"Until that has been accomplished, until the American people make it abundantly plain that they will accept no compromises which tend to weaken rather than strengthen the career service, the Federal Government will not be the fully effective instrumentality which these times so urgently demand.

"Both political parties for more than 80 years have pledged complete belief in and unswerving support for the merit system in Federal employment.

"The time is long overdue for redemption of those pledges in full."

[From the Government Standard of July 1, 1955]

Based on Hoover Report—New Bills Introduced

Legislation to carry out the principal recommendations of the Hoover Commission task force on Federal personnel and civil service has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas, and in the House of Representatives by Congressman Frank Thompson, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Both legislators introduced identical bills calling for a revision of the Classification Act to reduce the number of grades, a simplified performance rating system, establishment of a senior civil service to fill the top career jobs in Government, and authorizing the transfer of employees from the civil service to other Government merit systems without loss of status.

In addition, Senator Carlson introduced two bills relating to veterans preference appeals and reduction in force priorities.

NO HEARING SET

With Congress moving toward adjournment, there is little likelihood that hearings will be held during this session. However, several of the bills may become live issues during the 2d session of the 84th Congress next year.

S. 2332 and H. R. 6546 would direct the Civil Service Commission to consolidate grades GS–1 through GS–6 into three new grades, to be designated GS–1, GS–2, and GS–3. Grades GS–7 through GS–11 would be combined into GS–4, 5, and 6. New pay rates would be set within the range of pay now covered by the first 11 grades. Employees would be protected against a loss in pay.

PERFORMANCE RATINGS

The performance rating proposals (S. 2334 and H. R. 6547) carry out the Hoover Commission proposal that written performance rating be abolished except for employees who, in the judgment of the supervisor, should be considered for advancement, deserve special awards, should be assigned to other work, should be denied a within-grade raise or should be dismissed. A single appeal against unfavorable action is provided before a board of review established by the Civil Service Commission for each department.

Most controversial of all are two bills introduced by Senator Carlson. One (S. 2335) would limit the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission under the Veterans' Preference Act to the first 5 years that a veteran is in the Federal civil service.

The other bill (S. 2336) would greatly reduce the advantage held by veterans in reduction-in-force priority. It would also eliminate the bumping system.

Similar proposals have been made from time to time in recent years, but Congress has consistently rejected moves to weaken veterans' preference.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Springfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the week-long observance of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Springfield, N. J., which drew to a close Sunday, June 26, dramatized the 1780 battle which marked the last penetration of the British into New Jersey and served to place due emphasis on the importance of this battle in the War for Independence.

Col. Henry B. Carrington wrote in his Battles of the American Revolution:

> There were few movements during the war which bore so directly upon the safety of the American Army and the general cause, as the operations of the British Army before Springfield during June of 1780; and the conduct of both sides indicated some appreciation of its importance.

A cheering audience of more than 3,000 witnessed last week the reenactment of the Battle of Springfield in a pageant presented as part of the 175th anniversary of the conflict. The gathering saw a graphic portrayal of the engagement between a small band of New Jersey Militia and Continental troops and a force of 5,000 British and Hessian soldiers. It included a reenactment of Rev. James Caldwell bringing Watt's hymnals to the troops to use for musket wadding and closed with the portrayal of the burning of the town as church bells chimed throughout the township.

I was privileged to be on the reviewing stand on Saturday afternoon, June 25, for a six-division parade, including numerous military service units, bands, floats, antique autos, and horse-driven surreys. Officials of the township's historical society noted at the close of the commemoration that it hopes to continue its work of reviving interest in the history of this area and bringing the importance of the battle into its true light, and I would like to commend the society for their outstanding commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Springfield. The committees that arranged all of the aspects of this important historical anniversary are to be commended for making this significant moment of American history come alive for the people of the Springfield area.

The Reserve Forces Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join those Members of the House in deploring the voice vote on H. R. 7000, the Reserve forces bill, on Friday, July 1.

If finally enacted into law, the lives of all young men will be changed, the way of American life will be vastly different and universal military training will become a reality.

The public certainly is entitled to have access to a recorded vote on a measure of such far-reaching importance.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1955

(Legislative day of Wednesday July 6, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom no secrets are hid and from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, we pray that there may be forever cherished in this Chamber, this shrine of freedom, those spiritual values which alone can bring order out of chaos and peace out of strife.

Fit us to be the agents of Thy purpose in fostering in the hearts of all men the true love of peace—always peace with justice, which is a peace which takes into consideration the inherent dignity of every child of Thine. Guide with Thy pure wisdom those who here take counsel for the Nation and for the nations of the earth, that in the irresistible might of human brotherhood Thy kingdom may go forward until all the earth is filled with the transforming power of Thy love. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 6, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1290. An act to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954; and

S. 1993. An act authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3822. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 107. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki;

S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand;

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 802. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1318. An act to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1571. An act to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year;

S. 1633. An act relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska;

S. 1725. An act to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly;

S. 2135. An act to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 3636. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water-supply feature of that reservoir.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3822. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, because of illness, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] be given leave of the Senate to be absent for the remainder of the session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KEFAUVER, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet at 2 p. m. today, during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report (pts. 1 and 2) on the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952, and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions extending to Patrick B. McGinnis and the officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., commendation for and encouragement in their efforts to develop the services of the railroad for the betterment of this area

"Whereas the present management of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. has been in office for just more than 1 year; and

"Whereas its president, Patrick B. McGinnis, has spent considerable time in our State propounding his plans for the improvement of service and equipment on this most important lifeline of transportation; and

"Whereas the said Patrick B. McGinnis has tangibly demonstrated his real interest in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the development of railroad terminal facilities on route 128 in the town of Canton: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the members of the house of representatives, heartily in accord with the efforts displayed by the officials of this railroad and particularly by its president, Patrick B. McGinnis, now commend that spirit of endeavor and development, wishing to said Patrick B. McGinnis every encouragement and success in his continued efforts for the betterment of the economic, social, industrial, and other phases of our life here in Massachusetts and throughout this entire area; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to said Patrick B. McGinnis, to the several Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States and to the Interstate Commerce Commission."

A resolution adopted by the city council, city of Cambridge, Mass., relating to the regulation of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRICKER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to submit to the States for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the treatymaking power, known as the Bricker amendment

"Whereas on April 19, 1920, the United States Supreme Court, in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), held that notwithstanding the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a treaty with a foreign power, implemented by an act of Congress subsequently passed for that purpose, authorized the Government of the United States to control and regulate matters which otherwise would be subject to regulation by the States alone; and

"Whereas in its opinion in that case (two distinguished Justices dissenting) it was said:

" 'Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention * * * there may be matters of the sharpest exigency for the national well-being that an act of Congress could not deal with, but that a treaty followed by such an act could * * * The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution. The only question is whether it is forbidden by some invisible radiation from the general terms of the 10th amendment. * * *

" 'We cannot put the case of the State upon higher ground than * * * that, but for the treaty, the State would be free to regulate this subject itself. * * *

" 'No doubt the great body of private relations usually falls within the control of the State, but a treaty may override its power. On these grounds, it was decided "that the treaty and statute must be upheld" '; and

"Whereas the same court, on February 2, 1942, in the case of United States v. Pink (315 U. S. 203), with 2 Justices dissenting and 2 others not participating, held that an executive agreement, made by the President with a foreign power, but not ratified or concurred in by the Senate (as required in case of a treaty by art. II of the Constitution), has the same dignity as a treaty made by the President and ratified by the Senate. In consequence, the court decided that the insurance laws of the State of New York, made for the protection of policyholders and other creditors, were invalidated by the act of the President alone; and

"Whereas in addition to the treaty and executive agreement referred to in the decisions above mentioned, many others have been made, and still more are proposed, or are in preparation, the effects of which, if made, upon the rights and powers of the States, and the rights of the people, would be disastrous. For examples, reference is made to the Atlantic Charter agreement of

1941; those made at the Cairo and Teheran Conferences in 1943, and at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, all of which were made by the President alone without submission to or ratification by the Senate; also the Potato executive agreement of November 23, 1948, likewise unsubmitted and unratified, but which the United States is now attempting to enforce through the Supreme Court notwithstanding it was held invalid by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (United States v. Capps, Inc., 204 Fed. 2d 655) and by the trial court (100 Fed. Supp. 30), partly because it constituted a clear violation of a valid act of Congress. Reference is also made to the efforts of our State Department (partly successful) to bypass or nullify, by executive agreements, the will of Congress expressed in the stockpiling acts, relating to strategic materials. To the extent of their success, such agreements might make it necessary for this country, in the event of war, to depend upon supplies wholly inaccessible except by the use of long sealanes. Reference is made, further, to the Warsaw Convention, ratified by the Senate in 1928, whereby the right of recovery of an airline passenger holding an international ticket is limited, even where a crash occurs in this country, to about $8,500; and to the Pandora's box of proposed treaties and covenants (including the human rights and genocide covenants) prepared or preparing in the mills of the United Nations, under some of which a citizen of this country might be haled before and tried and convicted by a foreign court, without a jury, for expressing his opinion or practicing his religion in this country. Finally, reference is made to the fact that at least one of our congressional committees has been refused full information as to all of this Nation's unfulfilled commitments under executive agreements on the ground of national security; and

"Whereas to rescue the rights and powers of the States from such Federal encroachments, and to protect the people in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and liberties, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953 reported out favorably Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, introduced by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, and many other Senators, including the Honorable PRICE DANIEL, but no favorable or satisfactory action has so far been taken thereon; and

"Whereas it is evident that under the decisions, treaties, and agreements mentioned above, the rights and powers of the sovereign States and the constitutional rights and liberties of the people of the United States have already been violated and are in great danger of further encroachment and possible destruction by unwarranted and injudicious exercise of the so-called treatymaking power; and that this danger is enhanced by the multitude of treaties, conventions, and international compacts and agreements which have been and probably will be proposed by the United Nations and other international associations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the 101st General Assembly of the State of Ohio*, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States that during its present session it submit to the States for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of limiting the treatymaking power so that, if ratified by the States, (1) no provision of a treaty or other international compact or agreement which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States shall have any force or effect; (2) no international compact or agreement which has not been concurred in by the Senate, as provided in art. II of the Constitution, shall be, or have the dignity or legal effect of, a treaty under art. VI of the Constitution; (3) no treaty or other international compact or agreement shall be effective as internal law within the United States except to the extent it may be made so by an act of Congress enacted to enforce or implement the same; (4) no treaty shall be concurred in by the Senate except by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays shall be entered on the journal; and (5) the Constitution shall not be in any way or to any extent altered or amended except by one of the methods provided in art. V thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the two United States Senators, and to each Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Ohio."

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American-Lithuanian Political Club of Gary, Indiana, Inc., on July 1, 1955, relating to freedom for Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN POLITICAL
CLUB OF GARY, INDIANA, INC.,
Gary, Ind., July 1, 1955.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senator, Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Resolution voted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Gary, Ind., gathered, on June 29, 1955, to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union:

"Whereas the Lithuanian people, like all other nations of the world, expected at the end of mankind's most terrible war the establishment of a peaceful world order of truly united nations based upon respect of freedom, human dignity, and national independence; and

"Whereas instead they were thrown into a slavery never before experienced in their long and often tragic history; and

"Whereas silenced but not conquered, the enslaved Lithuanian people have placed, and still place, their hopes in the free world and especially in the United States, the strongest champion of the ideals of freedom and humanity; and

"Whereas the present administration of the United States has committed itself to make no deal or arrangement with the Soviet Union that would tend to confirm or acknowledge the present unhappy status of the captive nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, American citizens of Lithuanian descent, gathered here today, raise our voice in behalf of our brethren in protest against their subjugation and the intolerable slavery into which they have been plunged by the Communist imperialists; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our gratitude and appreciation to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles for their recent statements in which they stressed the necessity of discussing during the forthcoming big power meeting the issue of captive nations; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the Government of the United States to vigorously demand that Soviet Russia abide by her treaties and pledges by withdrawing her troops, police, political agents and colonists from the Baltic States and other countries and restoring sovereign rights and self-government to their native peoples; be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we shall continue to support wholeheartedly the Government of the United States in its efforts to effect a just and durable peace in the world."

ALEX NAVARDAUSKAS,
President.
JUNE EVANSECK,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
ANTIONETTE NENIOS,
Delegated to American Lithuanian Council, Lake and LaPorte Counties (Vice-president).
JOSEPH J. JANUSAITIS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans (Rept. No. 703); and

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture proposing an expansion of the tobacco production, utilization, and marketing research program, with primary emphasis on basic research (Rept. No. 704).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 82. Resolution requesting a report be made to the Senate Agriculture Committee by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture as to steps taken to improve and expand horticultural and agricultural weather forecasting services; with amendments (Rept. No. 765).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 122. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 766).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2253. A bill to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; with an amendment (Rept. No. 767).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Shima Shinohara (Rept. No. 712);

S. 619. A bill for the relief of Kerson Huang (Rept. No. 713);

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura (Rept. No. 714);

S. 649. A bill for the relief of Zelda Baumzveiger (Rept. No. 715);

S. 663. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis) (Rept. No. 716);

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan (Rept. No. 717);

S. 1238. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz (Rept. No. 718);

S. 1249. A bill for the relief of Nouritza Terzian (Rept. No. 719);

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Joseph G. Ferrara (Rept. No. 720);

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru (Rept. No. 722);

H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas (Rept. No. 723);

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich (Rept. No. 724);

H. R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein (Rept. No. 726);

H. R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou (Rept. No. 727);

H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali (Rept. No. 728);

H. R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Henry Kraemer (Rept. No. 729);

H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Caterina Ruello (Rept. No. 730);

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Helga Kutschka (Rept. No. 731);

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis (Rept. No. 732);

H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams (Rept. No. 733);

H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of the Wojcik family (Rept. No. 734);

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowki (Rept. No. 735);

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Luis Deriberprey (Rept. No. 736);

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Martherita Bruni (Rept. No. 737);

H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello (Rept. No. 738);

H. R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati (Rept. No. 739);

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou (Rept. No. 740);

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa (Rept. No. 741);

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia (Rept. No. 742);

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Gloria Fan (Rept. No. 743);

H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh (Rept. No. 744);

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas (Rept. No. 745);

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk (Rept. No. 746);

H. R. 5456. A bill for the relief of Emil Arens (Rept. No. 747); and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 721).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill (Rept. No. 748);

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Edward and Lily Elsie White (Rept. No. 749);

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad (Rept. No. 750);

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp (Rept. No. 751);

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis (Rept. No. 753);

H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Ebolya Wolf (Rept. No. 725);

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich (Rept. No. 754);

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Ramos (Rept. No. 755); and

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Paul Ichikawa (Rept. No. 756);

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski (Rept. No. 757);

S. 1056. A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their children, Mario Mazartzian and Aram Mazartzian (Rept. No. 758);

S. 1242. A bill for the relief of Purita Rodriquez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte (Rept. No. 759); and

H. R. 6086. A bill for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens (Rept. No. 760).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 689. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 709).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3813. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein (Rept. No. 762); and

H. R. 4754. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) (Rept. No. 763).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt (Rept. No. 761).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 899. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska (Rept. No. 705);

H. R. 3338. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914 (Rept. No. 706);

H. R. 4046. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 707); and

H. R. 5300. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 708).

WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF BENITO QUINTANA SEARA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara, and I submit a report (No. 711) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Benito Quintana Seara (A–4363045) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report an original resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I submit a report (No. 764) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, $20,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

OPPOSITION TO SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 710) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)).

T–2680311, Shuy, Low.
A–9526311, Wong, Sau.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INCREASED EXPENDITURES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution providing for an extension of time to January 31, 1956, for the work of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and for an increase of the appropriations therefor in the amount of $29,000. In this connection I may state that this resolution was approved by a unanimous vote of the Judiciary Committee at a meeting this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the first section of Senate Resolution 62, 84th Congress, 1st session, agreed to on March 18, 1955 (authorizing a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States), is amended by striking out "July 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1956."

(b) Section 2 of such resolution is further amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$154,000."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan; and

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2430. A bill to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof requiring 90 days' suspension as a minimum penalty for violations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Green, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Flanders, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Bush, Mr. Purtell, and Mr. Cotton):

S. 2431. A bill to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum wage determinations and other determinations and interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Smith of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. Neuberger):

S. 2432. A bill to permit the use in the coastwise trade of the barge *Irrigon;* to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. Langer):

S. 2433. A bill to provide for the establishment, within the national parks of the United States, of a series of Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security, and correction of male juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT, RELATING TO MINIMUM PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof requiring 90 days' suspension as the minimum penalty for violations.

The Civil Service Commission in commenting on this proposal stated that time and again the present statutory minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension is excessive when only minor violations of the act occur.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2430) to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof requiring 90 days' suspension as a minimum penalty for violations, introduced by Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPEAL OF SECTION 10 OF WALSH-HEALEY ACT, RELATING TO MINIMUM WAGE DETERMINATIONS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Green], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. Bush and Mr. Purtell], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Duff], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum wage determinations and other determinations and interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Because there may be other Senators who wish to see that the working people of their States and areas obtain more equitable treatment as would be provided by the bill and therefore would like to join in cosponsorship of this bill, I ask that the bill be held open for any possible additional cosponsors until the end of the Senate business on Tuesday, July 12, 1955.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held open for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 2431) to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum wage determinations and other determinations and interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act, introduced by Mrs. Smith of Maine (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL FORESTRY CAMPS FOR MALE JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Langer], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the establishment, within the national parks of the United States of a series of Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security, and correction of male juvenile delinquents. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, a brief statement on the bill, and a brief analysis of it prepared by me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2433) to provide for the establishment, within the national parks of the United States, a series of Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security, and correction of male juvenile delinquents, introduced by Mr. Kefauver (for himself and Mr. Langer), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. Kefauver are as follows:

Statement by Senator Kefauver

I have said before the floor of this Chamber, and I should like to reiterate again, my firm conviction that it is the duty and responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the States in dealing effectively with juvenile delinquency, a problem which threatens to reach into even the smallest American community.

Today, I take considerable personal satisfaction in introducing a measure aimed at rehabilitating the juvenile delinquent and training him to assume the duties and responsibilities of a useful, law-abiding citizen, which will also serve the purpose of conserving our national forestry resources.

In brief, the bill provides for the establishment, within the national parks of our country, of a series of not less than 30 Federal forestry camps where, under the control of the Attorney General, youthful delinquents would be trained and educated to take their proper place in the community by taking part in a coordinated program for the restoration, improvement, development, maintenance, and utilization of the national parks of the United States.

Each camp would accommodate approximately 200 boys between 16 and 18 although, in certain circumstances, youths between 14 and 16, or over 18, would also be admitted. One-half of the working hours of each juvenile delinquent would be dedicated to the conservation of our national parks, and the remainder to learning forestry or other trades which will be useful in later life.

Forward-looking experiments with this form of rehabilitation have already been conducted by two States, California and Minnesota.

These projects have met with decided success in rehabilitating large numbers of youthful offenders. The rugged out-of-door life and useful work in which the boys are engaged have a definite appeal for youth. The physical setting of the camps, the close personal relationships which exist between the boys and the staffs, all contribute to effective rehabilitation.

On a national scale, such a project would have a far-reaching effect in solving the problem of delinquency. Since few States are equipped to establish such a program with their own resources, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to provide leadership and financial assistance.

This bill calls for the Attorney General to enter into agreements with the States prior to the admission to the camps of any juvenile who has been paroled or placed on probation by a court or other State authority. The Attorney General would provide inmates of the camps with proper quarters, subsistence, uniforms and equipment, medical services and hospital facilities, and the States would pay to the Federal Government an amount equal to one-half the cost of the subsistence and training provided for each juvenile delinquent. The boys would be paid at the rate of $60 per month.

I should like to remind you that more than 100,000 children are confined in common jails each year. They are thrown in with hardened criminals and come under their influence for varying lengths of time. Other youngsters are confined for varying lengths of time in institutions wholly inadequate for rehabilitation. This measure will open up a new area of hope for the juvenile delinquent by providing proper facilities in a climate of mental and physical health where he will experience the immense personal satisfaction of working with his hands as a member of a team accomplishing a task which has a direct bearing upon the conservation of our national resources.

This proposed legislation provides an opportunity for Federal and State authorities to launch a cooperative effort to combat the growing menace of juvenile delinquency in a unique program which has already shown excellent results through the "pilot projects" conducted by two of our far-seeing State governments. I respectfully urge the support of the Senate on this measure.

Senator Watkins has heretofore introduced a bill (S. 1281), which provide for camps in the Federal forests. These would be entirely federally built, operated and maintained.

The bill S. 1281 has many commendable features. The approach of the subcommittee bill is different as I have stated. We hope both bills may have early consideration.

ANALYSIS

To provide for the establishment, within the national parks of the United States of a series of Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security, and correction of male juvenile delinquents.

This bill would provide for the establishment within the national parks of the United States of a minimum of 30 Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security and correction of male juvenile delinquents between the ages of 16 and 18 years under the direction of the Attorney General.

Admission to the camps would be on approval of the Attorney General of juveniles who have been sentenced by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction to an indefinite term during minority; have been committed to a State or Federal correctional institution upon conviction of a crime or misdemeanor by a court of competent jurisdiction and have been placed on parole on the conditions that they enter such camps; or have been convicted of a crime or misdemeanor by a State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction and have been given suspended sentences and placed on probation on the condition that they enter such camp.

The program of these camps would provide that one-half of the working hours of the inmates would be dedicated to the execution of projects for restoration, improvement, development, maintenance, and utilization of the national parks and the other half of the working hours would be set aside for the learning of forestry and other trades.

The term of service would end on the inmate reaching his majority or when the Attorney General determines that he has made a satisfactory adjustment.

The States would share the cost of subsistence and training provided for delinquents from State courts or institutions.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FISHERY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on June 30 I introduced the bill (S. 2379) to provide for a fishery education and training program in the United States. Twenty-six Senators joined as cosponsors of the bill when it was introduced. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has since requested that he be included as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that the next time Senate bill 2379 is reprinted the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota be included on the list of cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949—REENROLLMENT OF S. 804

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution providing for the enrollment, with changes, of Senate bill 804, a bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was read, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 804) to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, to make the following changes, viz: On page 1, line 5, and in the first line of the title, respectively, of the engrossed bill, strike out "(e)" and in lieu thereof insert "(d)."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Challenge to American Learning in the Atomic Age," delivered by him before the State Teachers College at Eau Claire, Wis., on June 23, 1955; and an editorial entitled "Overseas Students," published in the New York Times of July 4, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement regarding juvenile delinquency made by him before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with its consideration of Senate bill 728.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "LYNDON JOHNSON's Illness," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 5, 1955.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Article entitled "Mr. 'Social Security'," written by Michael Strauss, and published in a recent issue of the Eagle Magazine, describing the activities of Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, of New Jersey, relative to the social security system.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO REPORT BILLS AND FILE REPORTS DURING PERIOD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT TODAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to report bills and resolutions and file reports with the Senate during the period following its adjournment today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is my information that the Committee on the Judiciary will report today a number of private immigration and claims bills. Accordingly, as announced yesterday, it is planned to have a call of the calendar on Monday at the conclusion of morning business for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. The call will begin where the last call of the calendar ended.

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 11, following the conclusion of morning business, there may be a call of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection; starting at the calendar number immediately following order No. 677.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOOVER COMMISSION BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING REPORT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Senate the report of the Hoover Commission, entitled "Budget and Accounting," submitted to the Congress early last month. I should like to recommend this report to every Member of this body, as well as to every Government official who has anything to do with the fiscal aspects of governmental operations, for very careful study.

As an experienced accountant who has served as finance commissioner and budget officer of the State of Maine, I was deeply impressed by this Hoover Commission report. With only slight reservations, I can heartily endorse almost every one of the 25 recommendations contained in the report.

It is my hope that every Member of Congress will devote a considerable amount of study to the report between now and the next session of Congress, so that at that time it will be possible to enact legislation to implement the recommendations of the report. If for no other reason than the fact that the possible savings which will accrue are in the vicinity of $4 billion, according to the Hoover Commission task force, the recommendations are worthy of the most serious consideration.

Although some legislation is necessary to carry out these recommendations, their full value cannot be realized unless the program has the wholehearted support and cooperation of every official who has any connection with the budgeting, accounting, or fiscal aspects of the operation of our Government. As indicated in the report, while all of the principles of business budgeting and accounting are not applicable to governmental use, the Federal Government in the past has failed to take advantage of developments in business budgeting and accounting which would be beneficial in governmental use.

If implemented, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission would serve to restore to the Congress more control than now exists over the Nation's finances; would put the Federal Government on a sounder accounting basis, so that it would be possible to determine exactly where each agency stands in regard to what it owns and what it owes; would remove the present tendency of various agencies to expend all of an allotment in order to justify the request for funds for the coming year; would serve to make the annual preparation of the budget a more meaningful work; and make the budget itself simpler and more easily understood. In this connection, I should like to refer to my remarks on the floor during the debate on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Joseph Campbell as Comptroller General on March 18, 1955. At that time I stated:

> We are not getting the type of fiscal reporting and accounting the country needs in order properly to evaluate and carry out a performance program in keeping with the budget that is sent to Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent portions of the brief remarks I made on March 18, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my statement.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON SENATE FLOOR, MARCH 18, 1955

I may say that if, during many years of the past, the Members of this body and the Members of the House of Representatives had paid a little more heed to the urgings of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] with respect to financial accounting and other monetary problems which have confronted the Nation, we would be in far better shape, from a fiscal standpoint, than we are today.

I may say that if Mr. Campbell could make no other contribution than to go into the Office of Comptroller General, admirably qualified as he is, and make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the accounting systems which are presently in use at the Federal level, and submit to Congress specific recommendations which would pinpoint the loopholes that currently exist—and we are not getting factual reporting and accounting of value to the Congress in determining the needs of the administration in carrying out its program—then he would be making in that field alone a very great contribution toward putting the fiscal house of the Federal Government in order. When fiscal reports are made we should be able to have confidence that they are actual, factual, and sound.

I am referring especially to the manner in which unobligated balances are reported. There is no uniform or systematic way of making such reports. One department reports such balances on one basis. Another department—say the Defense Department—reports them on another basis. We can go down the line and find that the departments give figures today which in 2 weeks will be out of balance by millions of dollars.

No, Mr. President, we are not getting the type of fiscal reporting and accounting the country needs in order properly to evaluate and carry out a performance program in keeping with the budget which is sent to the Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in this day of Government operations in the multibillion-dollar category, it is vital that the Government itself, as well as the people, have adequate and exact information on how their money is being spent. It is essential that the Government have a sound and efficient accounting system in order to ensure that expenditures are for necessary and justifiable purposes only. When it is reliably estimated that the benefits which would result from improved financial management would be in the vicinity of $4 billion, it is a strong indication of the need for overhauling the present system.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the 25 specific budget and accounting recommendations of the Hoover Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING BY THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

(a) That the Bureau of the Budget expand and make more effective the discharge of its managerial and budgeting functions;

(b) That in order to do this, among other things, it should place in important agencies one or more well-qualified employees whose duties should include continuous year-round review, at the site of the agency, of agency budget preparation and administration and other facets of the Bureau's managerial responsibilities; and

(c) If necessary, the Congress should increase the resources of the Bureau of the Budget for that purpose.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

That the executive agencies report annually to the Bureau of the Budget on the conduct of their operations. On the basis of the agencies' reports and other available information, the Bureau should prepare for the President an annual report on performance for the executive branch as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

That for management purposes, cost based operating budgets be used to determine fund allocations within the agencies, such budgets to be supplemented by periodic reports on performance.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

That the executive budget continue to be based upon functions, activities, and projects adequately supported by information on program costs and accomplishment, and by a review of performance by organizational units where these do not coincide with performance budget classifications.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

That the agencies take further steps to synchronize their organization structures, budget classifications, and accounting systems.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

That executive agency budgets be formulated and administered on a cost basis.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

That the executive budget and congressional appropriations be in terms of estimated annual accrued expenditures, namely, charges for the cost of goods and services estimated to be received.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

That legislation committing the Government to continuing expenditures for special programs which are not susceptible to the usual budgetary control ordinarily be enacted for a limited term in order to require periodic congressional review of their usefulness.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

That the Bureau of the Budget keep such programs under continuing review, and the President's budget contemplate amendments to them when their operation conflicts with current budgetary policy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

That there be established under the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a new Staff Office of Accounting headed by an Assistant Director for Accounting, with powers and duties as follows:

(a) To develop and promulgate an overall plan for accounting and reporting, consistent with broad policies and standards prescribed by the Comptroller General. These broad policies and standards should continue to be developed in cooperation with the executive branch.

(b) To expedite, guide, and assist in the introduction of modern accounting methods in the executive agencies consistent with the overall plan.

(c) To set reasonable but definite time schedules for performance and to watch progress.

(d) To stimulate the building of competent accounting and auditing organizations in the executive agencies and to assist actively in the selection, training, and retention of capable personnel.

(e) To report at least annually to the Budget Director with respect to the status of accounting in each of the executive agencies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

That as an aid to financial management the position of comptroller be established in the principal agencies and major subdivisions thereof embracing the following duties and functions:

(a) To direct the setting up and maintenance throughout his agency of adequate accounting and auditing systems and procedures in conformity with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

(b) To direct the recruitment, training, and development of qualified accounting personnel.

(c) To develop and be responsible for reliable and informative financial reports for (1) internal management purposes, and (2) for issue to the Congress and other executive departments or agencies.

(d) To interpret and advise upon significant aspects of the financial reports.

(e) To direct the preparation, and review execution of budgets prepared at operating levels for the information of top management which is responsible for budget policies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

That the selection of agency comptrollers and the building of competent accounting organizations in the executive agencies through the selection, training, and retention of capable personnel be an important phase of the guidance and help to be given by the Assistant Director for Accounting in the Bureau of the Budget.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

That the allotment system be greatly simplified. As an objective each operating unit should be financed from a single allotment for each appropriation involved in its operations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

That Government accounts be kept on the accrual basis to show currently, completely, and clearly all resources and liabilities, and the costs of operations. Furthermore, agency budgeting and financial reporting should be developed from such accrual accounting.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 15

That after appropriate accrual and cost accounting techniques have been established by the Government agencies, the creation or continuation of revolving funds should be reviewed to determine whether they will add to efficient management.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 16

That the executive agencies accelerate the installation of adequate monetary property accounting records as an integral part of their accounting systems.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 17

That each department and agency be authorized to maintain a single account under each appropriation title or fund for controling the amount available for the liquidation of valid obligations.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 18

That vouchers which are otherwise valid but as to which appropriations have lapsed should not be referred as "claims" to the General Accounting Office, but should be settled within the agencies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 19

That the Comptroller General be given the authority to relieve accountable officers of financial liability except where losses result from their gross negligence or fraud.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 20

That the Bureau of the Budget and General Accounting Office make a study to determine what can be done to eliminate (a) duplicate accounts within the Treasury Department, and (b) duplicate accounting as between the Treasury Department and the various departments and agencies.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 21

That increased and continuing emphasis be placed upon the review and modernization of central fiscal reports by the Treasury Department to the end that they may meet the changing requirements of the executive branch, the Congress, and the public. These fiscal reports should show the Government's cash position and related cash transactions.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 22

That Congress consider amending the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 to make the Bureau of the Budget responsible for developing comprehensive reports (other than purely fiscal reports) showing the financial results of the activities of the Government as a whole and of its major component activities.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 23

That in selecting individuals for comptrollership, civilians with broad management and accounting experience and competence be appointed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 24

That the comptrollers in the military departments be responsible only to the Secretary of their respective services, and that concurrent responsibility to a Chief of Staff or equivalent be discontinued.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 25

That the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office be requested to make an intensive study to determine the adequacy of internal auditing in Government agencies and what steps should be taken to improve it.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 5 minutes on the subject of the summit conference to be held at Geneva.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is my present intention to speak briefly on the subject of disarmament on 2 or 3 more occasions, until I have covered a number of points which I believe need to be considered by the American people.

As a people we need to discipline ourselves. One memorable instance of the lack of self-discipline occurred immediately after V-E Day, when, with one voice, we demanded that the boys be brought home; and brought home they were, except for an occupational force which was little more than a token of the armed might which had played its part in winning the war. Painful though it would have been, a little patience, a longer display of our strength, might well have persuaded Stalin to fulfill the promises made at Potsdam.

The danger facing us now is that we may accept some "proportional" cut in armament which trades away our nuclear strength while leaving intact the vast ground strength of the Soviet. Progressive proportional disarmament, carefully calculated, is a necessary approach to complete disarmament. It is not a safe goal in itself, and our acceptance of it as such would be fatal.

The means of inspecting disarmament are many and various, depending on the nature of the arms to be controlled. As suggested yesterday, the locating of supplies of fissionable material is probably beyond our power. Controlling the means of delivery is not. Bombers and airfields for long-range bombers are not easily concealed. If these are controlled, the bombs are controlled.

Launching platforms for guided missiles present a more difficult, but not an insuperable, problem. Aerial reconnaissance, with the incredibly accurate photographic methods now available, will reveal the installations. To this reconnaissance, we must likewise be willing to submit.

There is another source of information which must not be neglected. This was the plan urged by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] some weeks ago. Let the powers announce the percentage of total steel and aluminum production, for instance, they are devoting to peacetime uses. Steel and aluminum plants are not easily concealed. The destination of their products can be checked, whether here or abroad. There is great psychological value in this proposal for the announced percentages may be taken as a measure of peaceful intentions.

All of these proposals and many more are hopeful for a fundamental reason. The rulers of Soviet Russia are going to find their selfish interests best served by raising the living standards of their own people. If they can do that, they can strengthen their own political position. Long range, enlightened self-interest is one route to virtuous action. If we are patient, if we are persistent, we shall make this road to virtue easy for the rulers of Russia.

GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am looking forward to early action by the distinguished subcommittee of the House of Representatives' Public Works Committee, headed by our good friend from Minnesota, Representative JOHN BLATNIK, on the subject of deepening and improving the Great Lakes connecting channels.

No opposition witness appeared against this indispensable effort to complete the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I send to the desk the text of a statement which I filed with the subcommittee on behalf of the speediest possible action in this session of Congress on the connecting channels.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, House Public Works Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of my absence from Washington on a long-scheduled series of speaking commitments, it is unfortunately not possible for me personally to be on hand to present testimony on the subject of connecting channels legislation, which is now receiving the earnest review of your colleagues and yourself.

I would be most appreciative, therefore, if there could be incorporated in your printed transcript this message conveying my personal position in heartfelt and enthusiastic endorsement of the effort to deepen and improve the Great Lakes connecting channels.

To my way of thinking, there is so strong a need for this legislation (which I have been pleased to offer in companion version on the Senate side) that the action of the Congress should be relatively unanimous on this subject.

It may not prove to be such, because of unwillingness of some groups to realize that the future of our entire country rather than simply of the Great Lakes area, is constructively involved.

Nevertheless, thinking legislators, viewing this subject with an objective approach can, I feel, come to a quick recognition of the clear fact that here is national legislation of the highest priority and of the deepest significance to the expanding population of this great country.

Suffice it to say that, as you personally are well aware, unless and until there is action to deepen and improve the channels for 27-foot deep-draft shipping, upbound and downbound, we will have only a partial Great Lakes waterway. Thus, the noble plan wisely enacted by the 83d Congress, after a 30-year fight, will have sadly suffered from incompletion.

Yet the very same 83d Congress, by its authorization of $116,000 for a survey of the channel problem, indicated the indispensable relationship between the channels and the rest of the seaway.

Briefly, the case for the channels can be summed up in the fact that it is essential for national defense, essential for industrial technology, essential for agricultural prosperity, essential for Canadian-United States good neighborly relations, essential to meet the ever-widening needs of this Nation.

I will not attempt to spell out all the details of this legislation, because I know that your committee has received competent oral and written testimony, amply substantiating the numerous principal points. Let me, however, spell out just a few sidelights and highlights, particularly as regards the current and future status of the Lake fleet.

House Document 335 (filed in 1947) was the last previous Corps of Engineers report concerned with the channels before the current report of October 1954. It did not recommend any comprehensive deepening program for the connecting channels because the composition of the Great Lakes fleet then in existence did not demand it.

But today that situation has changed considerably. New vessels of 700 feet or more in length, with a capacity of over 20,000 tons have been introduced to the Great Lakes waterway. It will not be possible for these new vessels to utilize their larger capacities for iron ore in navigating the connecting channels at their present controlling depths when the water levels of the lakes are at ordinary low stages.

The proposal to improve the controlling depth of the channels to 27 feet from its present depths of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound thus merits quick approval. It will enable the new carriers to operate efficiently during even the period of the low-water cycle of the Great Lakes waterway. And that waterway—may I respectfully remind the subcommittee—is the greatest low-cost transportation artery of the Nation. The projects outlined in the several bills you are now considering will cause to be lowered even the exceedingly low ton-mile costs which now exist. Since 1.7 times more traffic travels the Great Lakes than travels all the other inland waterways of the country combined, any new savings realized will be a most important contribution to the economy of the Midwest and the Nation.

But the advantages of additional savings through deepening the connecting channels must not be allowed to overshadow an ominous truth. This is that if the channels are not improved soon, those fine figures for low-cost ton-miles may well start climbing again. Continuation of the present ton-mile rates depends upon the most efficient usage of carriers, and because of some of the facts of life concerning the composition of the present fleet, the continued use of present vessels is becoming more and more uneconomical.

Let me refer now to certain statistics on Great Lakes vessels, and their importance to the iron-ore trade. The best figures developed show that currently, there are 286 cargo vessels flying the American flag in the iron-ore trade. Of these, 160 are more than 45 years old, and these ancient vessels account for more than one-half of the entire yearly movement of iron ore on the lakes. This fleet is obviously drawing near the end of its useful life. The replacement of these carriers will lag until the most efficient designs can be utilized by the shipowners, and that will only be after passage of legislation enabling the improvement of the connecting channels. Since vessels must soon be built to replace the rapidly aging fleet now in operation, and since they should be able to utilize the most modern and efficient design, their future rests with the fate of these bills for improvement of the connecting channels. It is not sensible to replace the outdated vessels with more of the same type, but even that will soon have to be done if the chanenls are not deepened enough to permit the larger carriers to navigate them. I have dwelt on the iron-ore carriers in particular, but the problem of an aging fleet is just as critical to those engaged in the movement of other cargoes. Even at the present time, many vessels now in use cannot navigate the entire length of the lakes. There are 247 cargo vessels with maximum drafts of more than 21 feet now, sailing under American registry, and 44 now operating which require a draft of 24 feet or more, although 21 feet is the controlling depth upbound for the connecting channels.

As you know, it has long been the policy of the Federal Government to keep abreast of technological changes and improvements for channels, harbors, and rivers. In several bills now before this committee, routine improvements for several of these are recommended. The deepening and improving of the connecting channels can also be considered in this light, over and above the pressing need which I have mentioned earlier. The routine need for improvement of the connecting channels has been met before by the Congress, and modern change now requires that the channels be considered favorably again.

And so, I urge the approval of this legislation to insure that there will be no slackening of the passage of iron ore down the Great Lakes in these times of national uncertainty; to insure the best utilization of new construction of lake vessels; to insure the continuation of low-cost tonnage; and to preserve and strengthen the economy of the great Midwest, in its role of heartland for the Nation.

I have confidence in the judgment of your subcommittee and in your full committee.

So far as I am concerned, the key issue before us is really not, "will we approve the channels," but "when" will Congress approve the deepened channels? Will we, as we should, approve them this year, prior to recess of the first session of the 84th Congress, or will we tarry unnecessarily until next year?

I can appreciate the pressure of other legislation before the Senate and House Public Works Committees, as well as the problem of scheduling this particular bill on the Senate and House floors. But I am firmly convinced that ample time remains for action this year, and I do indeed hope that you and your able associates will be of like opinion.

I am grateful for the opportunity of presenting these views in this form, and I leave the case with you for your fine judgment.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2391.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a privileged matter to present.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 10085, 10086, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there were relatively few differences between the Senate and House versions of this bill, and those differences were compromised without great difficulty.

The total appropriations authorized by the bill as agreed to in conference amount to $3,285,800,000. This is the same as passed by the House and $139,200,000 less than passed by the Senate. As compared to the bill which passed the Senate, the conference report authorizes $145 million less for military assistance, $22 million more for European defense support, $12.5 million less for the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and $3.7 million less for NATO civilian expenses. These last two items were eliminated because there is a continuing authorization for them in existing law and not because the conferees in any way disapproved of the proposed expenditures.

For European defense support, the Senate had authorized $70 million, of which $28 million was proposed for Spain. The House increased the total to $92 million and wrote in a requirement that not less than $50 million should be used for Spain. The conference report retains the House figure but strikes out the House language. Although the conferees intend that the additional money shall be used for Spain, the Senate conferees successfully insisted that individual countries should not be singled out in legislation of this type.

For the same reason, the conferees struck out the House proviso requiring that Greece receive at least as much in fiscal 1956 as in 1955. Again, however, the conferees intend that assistance to Greece shall not be reduced, and that the President shall use his special fund to maintain the Greek program at the same level.

There are only a few other differences which should be mentioned:

First. The House at three points in the bill wrote in a statement that assistance should "emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible." To this the Senate conferees agreed. Personally, I strongly endorse this principle, and I hope the administration will do everything possible to follow that suggestion. I recommend loans or acceptance of local currencies, as under Public Law 480.

Second. The House agreed to the Senate provision earmarking $300 million to be used during fiscal 1956 to finance the export of surplus agricultural commodities. This is approximately $80 million to $100 million more than would have been required under the House bill.

Third. The Senate agreed to a House amendment changing the ceiling on United States contributions to the World Health Organization from $3 million to 33⅓ percent of the total assessments of the active members of the Organization, effective in 1958.

Fourth. The House receded from its amendment providing for a Joint Commission on Rural Development in the Philippines.

Fifth. The Senate agreed to House amendments expressing the sense of Congress in favor of self-government or independence and against the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Mr. President, I think this conference was very successful from the point of view of the Senate, and I strongly recommend approval of the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My attention was distracted as the Senator was concluding his statement. Do I correctly understand that the conferees agreed to the House language, to the effect that it was the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be admitted into the United Nations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator understands correctly. The Senate conferees accepted that language without any change.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the Senate conferees accepted that language, which confirms not only the House action but the unanimous Senate action of last year in this regard. I think it is particularly important, because of the rather unfortunate press conference which the Premier of Burma held in New York yesterday, wherein he indicated that, in discussions in Washington or elsewhere, he gained the impression that there was no opposition to the seating of Red China in the United Nations. He indicated that he had received that impression from Government officials in Washington. I have made some rather extensive inquiries, and I can find no one who has any idea as to where or from whom he received that impression. I can find no one who has any idea as to how he received such an impression from anyone officially connected with the Government of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to get clearly in my mind exactly what was done by the conferees with reference to Spain and Greece.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The conferees on the part of the Senate, including myself, felt very strongly that it would be bad legislative practice to single out individual items and say, "This appropriation must be for this purpose, and that appropriation for that purpose." We had that trouble in the past, and we have gotten away from it. We specifically and unanimously agreed that the report should indicate, in strong language, that we were in favor of the use of the same amount—that is $50 million—for Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Without designating individual countries?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Without the designation being in the bill itself.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is sound policy. As I understand, the general purposes of the program will still be carried on.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. On this subject let me read from the statement of the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

> The conferees accepted the House figure of $92 million, an increase of $22 million over the Senate figure of $70 million, and deleted the language earmarking $50 million for Spain. The committee of conference, however, expresses its unanimous view that at least $50 million of the total amount should, after satisfactory negotiation and agreement, be used for assistance to Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I correctly understand that the conference reached an agreement on a reduced amount of money for the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The Senator misunderstands. At the urging of the Senate conferees, that amount was increased to a minimum of $300 million.

Mr. CARLSON. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I have previously stated, this is approximately from $80 million to $100 million more than would have been provided by the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the conferees. I think it is very important that surplus agricultural commodities which we have available be disposed of to other countries which need them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. The Senator from Arkansas was very much interested in that particular item, and did what he could to persuade the House conferees to accept that figure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly a most disturbing situation which has come to light during congressional consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1955. The Department of Defense supplied estimates to the Congress which were at one point more than $800 million in error. Whether that error resulted from gross negligence or from a calculated attempt to mislead the committee, I am not prepared to state. The discrepancies in estimates were so great, however, that they should serve as a warning to every Member of this body that henceforth figures and estimates supplied by the executive branch must be reviewed with the utmost care.

I should like to give a chronological account of the facts and let them speak for themselves.

First. April 20, 1955: On that date the President asked the Congress to authorize a mutual-security program of $3.4 billion. At that time the Committee on Foreign Relations was informed that the Department of Defense estimated that military assistance funds which the Executive would not be able to obligate or reserve—and the terms are interchangeable—in accordance with provisions of law would total $100 million on June 30, 1955.

Second. May 1955: During consideration of the mutual-security legislation, the Committee on Foreign Relations noted that the Executive did not ask for simple authority to carryover this $100 million amount, but asked instead for broad language which would have permitted the carryover of any amounts not obligated or reserved by the end of the fiscal year.

Third. May 26, 1955: During consideration of the bill in the committee, I offered an amendment which instead of leaving the Executive with blank-check, carryover authority, provided that unobligated and unreserved funds in excess of $150 million should lapse into the Treasury. During discussion of that amendment, the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], asked representatives of the Department of Defense whether the limitation of carryover funds to $150 million would be adequate. They indicated that they had no objections to my amendment provided the carryover amount could be fixed at $200 million. I accepted that amount as an amendment, and it was written into the bill.

Fourth. June 2, 1955: During Senate floor debate the usual criticism was leveled at the Mutual Security Act to the effect that vast unexpended, unobligated, or unreserved funds would be carried over into the new fiscal year. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was asked why the $200 million limitation was placed in the bill. The Senator from Georgia replied:

> It was placed in the bill because the testimony was undisputed and it was unquestioned that every dollar of this money had been allocated under the statutory definition made by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, which was binding upon that committee. It was stated there was remaining only $100 million. It was first proposed that only $100 million of the unexpended balances should be carried over. It is true we did reappropriate the unexpended balances, but in accordance with the testimony, and we limited the carryover to $200 million.
>
> So do not worry about the unexpended balances or the unallocated balances. That is all there is to the question. More than $200 million cannot be carried over. There is no way for more than that amount to be carried over. (RECORD, June 2, 1955, p. 7505.)

This statement emphasizes the good faith with which the chairman and the other members of the committee accepted the estimates of the executive branch.

The Senate passed the bill.

Fifth. June 13, 1955: According to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, information was received on June 13 that the estimated unobligated balances would exceed the $200 million limit fixed by the Senate amendment. I understand that a plea was then made to the House committee to restore the original language—the language permitting a blank-check carryover. That change was successfully resisted by the House committee.

Sixth. June 21, 1955: On that date, according to the House committee report, it received a memorandum from the executive branch stating that the unobligated carryover of military funds would be "some $600 million."

Seventh. June 28, 1955: On this date, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives stated, in presenting the Mutual Security Act to the House, that "on June 21, we received word that the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 would be $670 million"—RECORD, June 28, page 9389.

Eighth. June 30, 1955, the last day of the fiscal year. This was a memorable day with respect to the unobligated balances of the Department of Defense.

Mr. PASSMAN of the House Appropriations Committee announced on the floor of the House that "they—the Department of Defense—called yesterday and said it—the unobligated balance estimate—had gone up to $932 million"—RECORD, June 30, page 9635.

The same day, Mr. VORYS announced on the floor that he had "been informed that the amount of unobligated funds is not $600-some-odd millions, but has been reduced to about $200 million."

At this point I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense asking him for a report on this situation. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of June 30 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1955 by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it received information from the Department of Defense that the "estimated unobligated and unreserved balance" of mutual-security funds as of June 30, 1955, would be $100 million. The Department asked, however, for a blanket authorization to carry over any funds that might have been unobligated or unreserved on that date.

On the basis of the $100 million estimate, I offered an amendment to the bill which provided that unexpended balances in excess of $200 million, not reserved or obligated by June 30, should not be continued available after that date. The figure was raised to $200 million on the chance that Defense Department estimates might have been optimistic.

I now understand on the basis of information obtained from House debate on the bill that about the middle of June the Department of Defense stated that the unobligated and unreserved balance would not be $100 million, as estimated to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but would exceed $200 million. I understand further that on June 21, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was informed that the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 would be $670 million.

Could you tell me if this is an accurate picture of the situation and, if so, why the estimates received by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April were in error by $570 million?

I have noted, in the statement of Congressman RICHARDS on page 9389 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1955, that he said the "rules governing the process of obligation of funds were changed this year by the appropriations legislation" and this change has "interfered with operations in the Pentagon." According to my recollection, however, the obligating procedures were changed during the last Congress and those changed procedures should have been known to the Department of Defense when it submitted its original $100 million estimate.

I should like to have a reply to this letter by July 6 at the latest since the Mutual Security Act will be in conference between the two Houses at that time.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had hoped that the reply of the Department of Defense would have been received by this time so that it could also appear in the RECORD at this point, but, unfortunately, up to 11:30 this morning I had received no answer. My letter was delivered by hand on last Friday.

Ninth. July 1, 1955: On this date, at my request, a member of the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations spoke with Mr. Markley Shaw, Office of International Security Affairs Comptroller, Department of Defense. Information was received that during the last 24 hours of the month of June, $575 million had been reserved or obligated and that during the total month of June, $983 million—nearly $1 billion—had been obligated or reserved.

Mr. President, that is the record. Between April 20 and June 30, the Department of Defense gave various committees and Members of Congress estimates of the unobligated carryover of military assistance funds running from $100 million to $932 million. Then, during the last 24 hours of the fiscal year, the executive branch managed to go through the motions of reserving more than half a billion dollars.

I suppose it will be argued that my amendment limiting the unobligated carryover to $200 million had the effect of forcing the Department of Defense to commit its funds recklessly. If the amendment had that effect, it was because the Department of Defense either did not give the Congress reliable figures in the first place, or because the Department sought to mislead the Congress. Certainly no objections were heard from the Department's representatives when my amendment was offered in the committee. They were there.

My amendment was not designed as an invitation to reckless last-minute obligation of funds. It was not an invitation to financial gyrations which, as I think the record will show, thoroughly confused congressional consideration of a most important matter. The amendment was designed to keep mutual defense funds within reasonable limits so far as planning is concerned. It was designed to keep the authorization funds to those amounts which the Department of Defense can reasonably expect to obligate within 1 year. It was designed to permit excess funds to revert to the Treasury so that the budget might be balanced, rather than to keep it unbalanced by giving the Defense Department a billion dollar "kitty" as a backlog in the event Congress should not appropriate the funds requested.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. President, I want to make three points as forcefully as I can.

First. In a government of separate powers it is essential that the Congress and the Executive deal with each other with a mutuality of confidence. That means Congress must be able to accept proposals of the Executive with assurance that they are backed up by reliable figures and estimates. This Government cannot operate efficiently if Congress must view every Executive estimate with suspicion.

This Congress has been criticized in recent weeks for not acting with sufficient alacrity on the President's program. I do not accept that criticism as valid. I do say that if Congress is confronted by financial manipulations of the kind which have gone on in connection with the unobligated mutual security funds, the interests of the American people require far more careful scrutiny of executive-branch proposals than is possible if we rubberstamp them as is so often suggested.

The second point I want to emphasize, Mr. President, is that despite 24-hour reservations of more than one-half a billion dollars, there is still opportunity for Congress to control these irresponsible actions of the Department of Defense. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will examine these June operations with the utmost care and submit its recommendations accordingly. While I would not intentionally cast any vote which would cripple our mutual-security program, I cannot become a party to loose financial operations in the Department of Defense or anywhere else.

Finally, Mr. President, during the fiscal year just completed, the Department of Defense had available for obligation for military assistance purposes some $3.3 billion. As I indicated earlier, $983 million was reserved or obligated during the 1 month of June. In other words, more than one-fourth of the funds available for obligation during 12 months was obligated in 1 month.

I think the operations of the Department of Defense during the month of June in dealing with these unobligated and unreserved mutual-security funds deserve the most careful investigation and scrutiny by the General Accounting Office and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

STUDY OF ACTIVITIES OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, last July, at the request of Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there was appropriated a fund for the appointment of a representative committee of outstanding citizens to study the activities of the Food and Drug Administration and objectively assess its enforcement and certification policies as to their effectiveness in protecting the consumer. The committee was to make recommendations as to the amount and kind of enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and related statutes which would best serve the interests of this country and its citizens.

The Secretary appointed a committee composed of outstanding and distinguished citizens representing the legal, judicial, pharmaceutical, medical, and scientific fields, as well as consumers and consumer groups and of industries subject to regulation by the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the list of distinguished citizens placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration—Appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mr. G. Cullen Thomas, Chairman; vice president, General Mills, Inc.

Mr. Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Miss Catherine Dennis, president, American Home Economics Association.

Dr. Harry Dowling, professor of medicine, University of Illinois.

Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn, president, the Food Law Institute, Inc.

Mr. Robert A. Hardt, vice president, Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc.

Dr. Leonard A. Maynard, director, school of nutrition, Cornell University.

Mr. Lee W. Minton, president, Glass Bottle Blowers Union, American Federation of Labor.

Mrs. Grace D. Nicholas, executive director, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Dr. Charles Franklin Poe, dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Colorado.

Mr. Herbert N. Riley, vice president, H. J. Heinz Co.

Mr. Walter F. Silbersack, president, American Home Products Co.

Judge Patrick T. Stone, United States district judge, United States District Court (Wisconsin).

Mr. H. Gregory Thomas, president, Chanel, Inc.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I have been furnished a copy of the report and recommendations submitted to Mrs. Hobby by the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration. It reveals that the Committee, while not completely satisfied with all the policies and activities of the Food and Drug Administration, recognizes that the personnel responsible for the administration of the Food and Drug Administration and its various divisions are able and experienced officials with high devotion to the public service. The report says that the returns on the money appropriated to the Food and Drug Administration are high in terms of the protection of public health and other consumer interests, with due regard to the legitimate interests of the industries concerned. It also recognizes that the Food and Drug Administration has efficiently fulfilled its obligations to the fullest extent possible, although seriously handicapped by budgetary deficiencies. The Committee has made concrete recommendattions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which are highlighted by:

First. Increased appropriations to support an expansion in personnel and facilities between three- and four-fold within 5 to 10 years.

In the first year the Committee recommends a budget increase of from 10 to 20 percent over that for 1956 which will be needed for the Food and Drug Administration to initiate the 5 to 10 year expanded program on a constructive basis.

Second. The Food and Drug Administration can do an effective job only if it enlarges and improves its educational and informational programs.

Third. The Committee believes that the Food and Drug Administration should not resort to legal actions unnecessarily, but once legal action has been instituted, it should be prosecuted vigorously.

Fourth. The report recommends that the Food and Drug Administration headquarters staff be strengthened as well as its field and scientific personnel and there should be better programs and planning and better internal management.

Fifth. Through a separate appropriation, the Food and Drug Administration should be provided with a modern building to permit consolidation of its headquarters operations.

The report reveals that the Food and Drug Administration does carry on a considerably greater amount of educational and industry cooperative work than has heretofore been fully appreciated or recognized. The committee commends this and makes rather specific recommendations for its organization and expansion. It says that the purpose of the Food and Drug Administration's educational and informational programs should be to develop a better understanding of the objectives and requirements of the food and drug laws through a dissemination of better and more positive information to industry, certain professions, and the public. The report states that an informed industry or trade association will encourage self-compliance on the part of its members and an informed public will be a better protected one and will make food and drug dollars go farther.

I wish to commend the committee members for a thoroughly objective and statesman-like job, and especially do I commend the Secretary for her great vision in instigating this investigation.

THE ILLNESS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial published in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., on Tuesday, July 5. The editorial bespeaks the interest of my State in the welfare of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson].

Like countless other expressions of good will which have come from all parts of the Nation, the editorial from the Journal-Every Evening not only recognizes the distinguished qualities of leadership evinced by Senator Johnson, but also expresses the hope that his recovery will be a speedy one, and that we can look forward to the pleasure of welcoming his return to the Senate in January.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May His Recovery Be Speedy

The heart attack which felled Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, over the Fourth of July weekend and threatens to keep him out of action for an indefinite period is a heavy blow not only to the Democratic Party but to the Nation as a whole. As majority floor leader, Senator Johnson has displayed not only remarkable qualities of leadership but a high sense of responsibility for the welfare of the country. Against the advice of the more violently partisan members of his own party, he has hewed consistently to the line that sound statesmanship is the best kind of politics and that the Democrats stand to gain more by cooperating with President Eisenhower, where his policies are acceptable to them, than by opposing and frustrating him at every turn.

As a result of this leadership Mr. Eisenhower has had remarkable success in getting his legislation through a Congress, particularly in the field of foreign affairs, even though the Democrats have a majority in both houses. Despite the differences between the two and their fairly frequent clashes, Senator Johnson, in his role as leader of a constructive opposition, has been one of the President's most effective aids. If one of the Texan's major motives has been political—to strengthen the Democratic position for the presidential campaign ahead—there is no doubt that the country has benefited from his type of leadership.

His political opponents as well as his friends join today in hoping that Senator Johnson recovers speedily. Fortunately, his work for the current session is largely done. But it will be a serious loss to his party and his country if he is not able to resume his active leadership again when Congress reconvenes next year.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DELAWARE CHAPTER, AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, recently the Delaware chapter, American Red Cross, observed its 50th anniversary with appropriate ceremonies. On the occasion of this milestone, the executive director of the Delaware chapter, Mrs. Ethel Jean Myers, prepared a brief background statement of Red Cross policies both national and within the State of Delaware. I am happy to commend this brief article to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the Executive Director

The names of Florence Nightingale, Henri Dunant, and Clara Barton would seem to have little connection with our report this year, and yet, what they thought, and did have a very real meaning for those of us who work under the symbol of the Red Cross here in Delaware. Florence Nightingale—who fought for decent nursing care for those brought down in battle; Clara Barton—who fought to bring aid to soldiers and their families; Henri Dunant—who visualized a society that would fight for the relief of battle-wounded fighting men—a society of volunteers. All of these had their part in the birth of the Red Cross in Delaware—they set the sights, we sail the course.

On January 5, 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the bill creating a new organization for the American Red Cross, and on May 15, 1905, he signed the charter that would bring into being the Delaware State Branch of the American Red Cross.

The first meeting of that new Red Cross society was held in Wilmington, Del., on June 20, 1905. A hero of the Civil War, Gen. Charles Bird, was elected president, Dr. James A. Draper, its vice president, its treasurer, Henry M. Canby, and its secretary that never-to-be forgotten great lady, Miss Emily P. Bissell. In this first meeting, General Bird told of the circumstances surrounding the organization of a Red Cross society in Delaware, with a minimum of 100 members, with an executive committee which included such great names, along with its officers, as Judge George Gray, Samuel Bancroft, Jr., Gen. James H. Wilson, Dr. John J. Black, Ex-Governor Ebe W. Tunnell, for Sussex County, Henry Ridgely, Jr., for Kent County, and Governor Preston Lea as an ex-officio member.

Of all the State branches of the national organization that were formed in 1905, and the years immediately following, only Delaware retained its original charter, only Delaware has continued to be the only State Chapter in the American Red Cross.

The tone of that first meeting, held in the rooms of the Historical Society of Delaware, was loud and clear; we hear it today; God willing, we and our children shall hear it for many years to come.

For 50 years, workers of the Red Cross have been sensitive to the needs of their fellowman. Through two world wars, and one cold war, through the depression that was the aftermath of a war, members of the Delaware Chapter have kept fresh in their minds the reasons for their existence—"To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in the time of war in accordance with the Convention of Geneva; To act in matter of voluntary relief and in accord with military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States and their Army and Navy; To continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same."

How well we of this generation are living up to those obligations, you may judge for yourselves in the pages that we bring to you. How well we shall be able to carry on the work outlined for us in 1905 is dependent on the support that the people of Delaware give to their own, unique Red Cross society. We pray that it will be always forthcoming in order that our answer may always be "We serve."

Ethel J. Myers.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a letter from the Comptroller General regarding the bill which is the unfinished business has come to my attention, and I think it warrants consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEASING OF SPACE FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 708, Senate bill 1210.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1210) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1210) which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment.

AMERICA MUST DEVELOP POWER SITES TO THE FULL TO MAINTAIN INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while the national administration proceeds with plans to scuttle the finest hydroelectric power site in North America, the Soviet Union is launching the greatest program in its history to tap the kilowatts which lurk in the swift reaches of Russia's vast rivers.

Fortunately, the United States still leads Russia by a wide margin in power production. Yet, Mr. President, the Russian waterpower potential is larger than the American potential. Are we going to settle for less than full development of our best sites for water power, while the Soviet Union is engaged in an all-out effort to add to its energy supplies?

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report recently announced that the hydroelectric-power potential of all of North America—and this includes the marvelous Canadian sites on the Lawrence, Fraser, and Athabaska Rivers—totals 363,920,000,000 kilowatt-hours. But that of the Soviet Union totals 469 billion kilowatt-hours.

This is a fact of life, Mr. President. It is not something which will be dispelled by political speeches or by Hoover Commission reports bewailing the existence of TVA and the Bonneville Power Administration. The Soviet Union may not catch up with us in power production during the lifetime of any person now sitting in Congress, but no one can know how long the so-called cold war will last; nor can we abandon or neglect the interests of Americans of the future.

The magnitude of the power developments now being undertaken by Russia are sufficiently impressive to give any patriotic American pause; and during this pause, that American might well want to review the attitude of the present Republican administration toward such power sites as Hells Canyon.

HELLS CANYON VITAL TO AMERICAN SUPREMACY

Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, is the strategic powersite remaining in the Columbia River Basin, where lurks 42 percent of all the potential hydroelectric energy of the United States. A high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, as recommended by the famous 308 report of the Corps of United States Army Engineers, could generate 686,000 kilowatts at the location of the dam. Furthermore, the extra flow from its reservoir, released at timely moments during the dry season, could add 436,000 kilowatts to the annual power production of such dams further downstream as McNary, The Dalles, John Day, and Bonneville. Thus the total output due to Hells Canyon would amount to 1,122,000 kilowatts.

Yet because of the policy of the present national administration concerning public power, it is highly possible that the splendid Hells Canyon site will go to the Idaho Power Co. for piecemeal development. A Federal Power Commission examiner already has recommended that the Hells Canyon site be given over for erection of the proposed Brownlee Dam, an Idaho Power Co. structure which will generate 221,000 kilowatts of firm power. Thus, the United States would be swapping a horse for a rabbit, and this fact is recognized by the Federal Power Commission examiner himself. Indeed, he wrote in his opinion:

> The facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake.

But, concluded the examiner, it still is necessary to license the Idaho Power Co. to go ahead with construction of Brownlee Dam because Congress, in its present political mood, is unlikely to authorize high Hells Canyon Dam. In other words, inasmuch as Congress will not recognize national needs and engineering facts, a Federal agency is advised by one of its staff of examiners to follow the least desirable of two alternatives, so far as the full generation of electric power is concerned.

SOVIET UNION TAPPING ENERGY OF VOLGA RIVER

In the struggle between the free world and the Soviet world, energy reserves will play a decisive role in the ultimate production of nuclear weapons, as well as of more conventional armaments. Energy also is decisive in the manufacture of the articles of peace, those manufactured goods which contribute to a nation's living standards.

Raymond P. Brandt, famous Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has just reported from Russia that "one objective of the fifth 5-year program is to increase electric-power production in the Soviet Union so that by the end of this year, it will be 80 percent above the 1950 output. This is possible."

Huge waterpower projects are under construction, according to the Christian Science Monitor, at Kuibyshev, Gorky, and Stalingrad. The Kuibyshev Dam will eventually generate 2 million kilowatts of power, and that at Stalingrad 1,700,000 kilowatts. The Kuibyshev project is claimed by Soviet sources, with their accustomed boastfulness and exaggeration, to be the largest hydroelectric powerplant ever built. Actually, the capacity of 2 million kilowatts will be just about equal to that at Grand Coulee, on the Columbia River. Another reported Soviet project is the Kakhovka unit with a capacity of 250,000 kilowatts. Gorky is scheduled for full production in 1955.

There is an ironic significance to this situation, because a private power company in the Pacific Northwest once almost succeeded, under circumstances similar to those now existing at Hells Canyon, in preventing Grand Coulee Dam from being constructed.

In the 1920's the Washington Water Power Co. applied for a license to build a small powerplant at Kettle Falls, in the reservoir area of the proposed Grand Coulee project. Grand Coulee, even then, was being advocated by public-power leaders like Clarence C. Dill, the late Rufus Woods, Homer T. Bone, and the late Jim O'Sullivan. Had Washington Water Power been granted a license to build at Kettle Falls, there could have been no Grand Coulee high dam. In other words, Kettle Falls in the 1920's was exactly what Brownlee Dam is in the 1950's to Hells Canyon.

GRAND COULEE ESSENTIAL TO AMERICAN DEFENSE PRODUCTION

But the dog-in-the-manger structure at Kettle Falls never was built. Farsightedness prevailed over backward-sightedness.

As a result, Grand Coulee today is the greatest powerplant in the world. During World War II, its electricity made possible the aluminum production to support an output of 50,000 combat planes a year. Still more important, its energy stoked the Hanford atomic works, where plutonium for the atomic bomb underwent its final processing. On top of all this, Grand Coulee has made possible immense increases in peacetime manufacturing and employment in the Pacific Northwest, to say nothing of thousands of irrigated homesteads where valiant ex-GI's are getting a new start in life.

If Hells Canyon is given away to the Idaho Power Co., Mr. President, what will the people of the future say of this generation of Americans in public affairs? Will we have failed our trust where it really counted—in the wise and fruitful use of a basic natural resource?

I think the Senate should know all the facts which are currently available on hydroelectric power production in the Soviet Union. Waterpower is a renewable resource. Energy can be generated from thermal fuels such as oil, coal, natural gas, and even atomic products. But this type of generation depletes fuels which are not necessarily renewable. Every kilowatt of electricity means a certain quantity of fuel which is gone forever. The water of the Columbia, Volga, Snake, Yenesei, and Don Rivers, by contrast, flows on and on as long as "the sun shall set in the sky and grass shall grow on the hills," to quote an ancient American Indian phrase.

Thus, the race between the two most powerful nations of the world in the generation of hydroelectric power, may ultimately prove to be the decisive contest of our times. In the race to maintain leadership in the cold war, our Nation should not be led down a course which will reduce the number of kilowatts needed for the future.

Mr. President, agencies of our Federal Government report that available information on Soviet hydroelectric projects is admittedly sketchy. Perhaps the developments undertaken are greater or less than is indicated by the few facts which have seeped through the Iron Curtain. However, even this information indicates that Russia has launched a river-development program of considerable magnitude. This is revealed in a summary of the main features of Soviet hydroelectric projects which was prepared by the Department of State. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included with my remarks the State Department material on this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN FEATURES OF THE MAJOR CURRENT HYDROELECTRICAL PROJECT IN THE U. S. S. R.

THE KUIBYSHEV PROJECT

The Kuibyshev center will consist of a hydroelectric power station, an earth and ferroconcrete dam, and several locks. Construction begun in 1950. Construction to be completed in 1955.

Electric power station: Location (river), Volga, above Kuibyshev. Installed capacity (thousand kilowatts), 2,000. Output (average year, billion kilowatts), about 10. Number of generators, 20. Capacity of each generator, 100,000 kilowatts.

Dam: Location, just below the town of Stravropol. Length, 5 kilometers. Width, 30 meters. Height in channel part, 42.5 meters.. Length of the water reservoir, 500 kilometers. Width of the water reservoir, 40 kilometers. Overflow of water over the dam in good years up to 70,000 cubic meters per second from a heighth of 26 meters. The dam will be crossed by two railroad lines and an automobile road.

Electric power:

Distribution of electric power:	Billion kilowatt-hours
Moscow	6.1
Cities of surrounding area	2.4
Central chernozem area	0
Irrigation	1.5

Transmission lines: Length, 800 to 1,000 kilometers. Voltage, 400 kilovolts (alternating current).

Estimated cost of current, 3 kopecks per 1 kilowatt-hour.

Irrigation: Agricultural regions to be irrigated, the trans-Volga region. Area to be irrigated, 1 million hectares.

Construction: Volume of basic construction work at Kuibyshev: Earth, about 140 million cubic meters. Concrete, about 6 million cubic meters.

Volume of work in 1 year at the height of construction:	Million cubic meters
Earth work, total	47.0
Excavation	25.0
Filling	22.0
Concrete	2.5

Labor: Size of the labor force expected to work on the Kuibyshev project, 35,000 (maximum).

Main objective of the project: To provide electric power to the central and Volga regions of the U. S. S. R.

THE STALINGRAD PROJECT

Construction begun 1951. Construction to be completed 1956.

Electric power station: Location (river) Volga, north of Stalingrad. Installed capacity (thousand kilowatts), 1,700. Output (average year, billion kilowatt-hours), about 10.0. Capacity of each generator, 100,000 kilowatts.

Dam: Length, over 5 kilometers. Height (in the earth filled part), 45 meters. Length of the water reservoir, 600 kilometers. Width of the water reservoir, 30 kilometers.

Distribution of electric power:	Billion kilowatt-hours
Moscow	4.0
Cities of surrounding area	2.8
Central chernozem area	1.2
Irrigation	2.0

Transmission lines: Length, 800–1,000 kilometers. Voltage, 400 kilovolts (A. C.).

Irrigation (original plan; current objective substantially smaller): Agricultural regions to be irrigated and/or supplied with water; the Trans-Volga region; the northern part of the Caspian lowlands, Sarpinskaya lowlands; Black-soil lands; Nogaiskaya steppes. Length of irrigation canals (main), 600 kilometers. Area to be irrigated, 1.5 million hectares. Area to which water will be supplied (including some irrigation), about 11.5 million hectares.

Construction: Volume of basic construction work at Stalingrad and the main irrigation canal: Earth, about 430 million cubic meters. Concrete, about 5.4 million cubic meters.

Volume of work in 1 year at the Stalingrad center at the height of construction:	Million cubic meters
Earth work, total	27.0
Excavation	16.0
Filling	11.0
Concrete	2.1

Main objective of the project to provide electric power to the Central and Volga regions. In addition this station is to play an important role in the irrigation of the Trans-Volga region.

With the construction of the Kuibyshev and Stalingrad stations, 80 percent of hydroelectric resources of the Volga between Kalinin and Stalingrad will be utilized.

THE KAKHOVKA PROJECT

Preliminary work begun in 1951. Construction of the Kakhovka Power Station and of a small hydroelectric power station (capacity 10,000 kw.) at the dam of the Molochnaya River reservoir (north of Melitopol) was planned to be completed in 1956. Work on this project was expedited so that 2 generators are now scheduled to go into operation at the end of 1955.

Electric power station (Kakhovka): Location (river), Dnieper, South of Kakhovka. Installed capacity (thousand kilowatt), 250. Capacity of each generator not announced; probably 50,000 kilowatts. Output (average year, billion kilowatt-hours), 1.2.

Distribution of electric power:	Billion kilowatt-hours
Cities of surrounding area	0.6
Irrigation	0.6

Irrigation (original goal; now substantially scaled down): Agricultural regions to benefit from the Kakhovka Power Station project and the South Ukrainian and North Crimean canals: Kherson, Zaporozh'e, Nikolaev, Dnepropetrovks oblasts of the Ukraine, northern Crimea. Length of the irrigation canals, total, 910 km. Main, 550 km. Secondary canals, 360 km. Area to be irrigated, 1.5 million hectares. Area to which water will be supplied, 1.7 million hectares.

Construction:

Volume of basic construction work at Kakhovak:	Million cubic meters
Earth	18
Concrete	1.2

Main objective of the project: To provide irrigation and water supply to the surrounding agricultural area.

STATUS OF CAREER ATTORNEYS IN THE COMPETITIVE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I would be derelict in my duty as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee if I failed to acquaint the Senate with an utterly ridiculous and indefensible situation which has been created by the Civil

Service Commission. The situation to which I refer is as follows:

On January 24, 1955, the Civil Service Commission issued Departmental Circular No. 789. This circular has a devastating effect on career attorneys in the competitive civil service with permanent status whose positions are changed in any way. These career employees—veterans and nonveterans alike—are affected if their positions are placed in a lower grade; they are affected if their positions are placed in a higher grade; they are affected if the technical title of their position is changed. How are they affected? In street language they "lose their shirt." In Government lingo they "lose their status." That is how Civil Service Commission Circular 789, dated January 24, 1955, affects attorneys.

This is how this infamous circular works: When the position of an attorney who has a permanent career status is moved upward to a higher grade or downward to a lower grade or is described under a different official title, the departments and agencies are required by circular 789 to—

First. Notify the employee that acceptance of the change will require that he be taken out of the career service; and

Second. Obtain a signed statement from the employee certifying that he is voluntarily giving up his position in the career service.

Under these requirements of the Civil Service Commission, either the agency or the employee, or both, suffer. If the employee has the will to resist, and does not sign the prescribed certificate agreeing to relinquish his status, the agency has an employee on its rolls in an improperly established position. This places the agency in violation of pertinent law and rulings of the Comptroller General. If the employee gives in to the pressure, and signs the prescribed certificate, he loses his career status.

Mr. President, this unjust and utterly ridiculous situation was first called to the attention of Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, by letter, on March 31, 1955.

I asked that the matter be given immediate attention. On April 11, I received a brief reply to my letter of March 31, in which Chairman Young stated, in part:

> Your comments are particularly helpful at this time since we have had under study for several weeks this and similar situations to determine the extent to which the basic policies in the circular need be applied. * * * As quickly as the staff study can be completed and the Commission can take action, I will write you further.

That is the end of the quotation, and also the end of any further attention to the matter by Mr. Young.

Mr. President, as pointed out in my letter of March 11 to Chairman Young, the career status possessed and prized by long-time civil-service employees is not to be regarded lightly, and most certainly should not be subject to forfeiture at the whim of a regulation draftsman. In light of the fact that no action has been taken to correct the situation since it was called to his attention over 3 months ago, I now wonder if this action was not deliberately designed to remove the positions from the career service and make them available for political purposes.

Mr. President, there is no possibility that the matter has been neglected because of an oversight. I have had Mr. Young's office contacted almost weekly since his letter of April 11, in an effort to get circular 789 corrected. On each occasion the word was always the same: "The matter is on Young's desk for decision."

On Tuesday, June 21, I had a final call made. That call was for the purpose of making one last effort to get some action, and to let the Chairman know that unless action was taken, the situation would be exposed to public attention.

During the months that have passed, employees have continued to be harassed, their morale has been destroyed, and one by one their status has been taken from them.

Mr. President, I do not propose to stand idly by and see the career service undermined in this manner. Therefore, I propose to call Mr. Young before the committee at an early date for a full accounting of his actions in many directions, and his lack of action in other directions, which have wrought havoc on our civil-service program.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—REPLY OF RAYMOND MOLEY TO SENATOR WATKINS' CRITICISMS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion, both in this body and in the House of Representatives, about the upper Colorado River project. On the 17th of June, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins] placed in the Record a long statement attacking the arguments of Mr. Raymond Moley on the reclamation question generally, and the upper Colorado River project in particular. I have received from Mr. Moley a reply to the statement by the Senator from Utah. In the interest of fair play, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Newsweek,
New York, N. Y., June 28, 1955.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Douglas: On Friday, June 17, there was presented to the Senate a statement approximately 12,000 words long by Senator Arthur V. Watkins of Utah. This discourse was almost wholly devoted to an attack upon an article which I published under my name in Newsweek under date of May 9, 1955. Since you were "writ with me" in this "sour misfortune's book," I am writing to you to offer a partial comment upon the Senator's criticisms. It is difficult to make a straight rebuttal to the Senator's statement, for apparently the bill in question, S. 500, means not only many things to many men but many things to Senator Watkins himself. He has, in fact, in his zest to prove a case of inaccuracy against me, disarranged the entire factual basis of the Colorado River Storage project.

In this rejoinder, however, I shall show the senior Senator from Utah that it is possible to conduct a discussion with the dignity and propriety appropriate to the magnitude of the subject. I shall avoid those attributions of personal infamy with which the Senator unfortunately defaces his statement. In fact, I feel so secure in my position that I should scorn the adventitious aid of ad hominum references.

The very keystone of my argument in behalf of the taxpayers of the 44 States who will pay without return for this project is that we should have some independent means of determining the facts about it and not lean so heavily upon a party of interest, the Reclamation Bureau.

The Senator makes 18 points against me. Some of these involve tedious repetition; some are not denials of the accuracy of my quotations from your speech on the floor but really denials of your statements. Those I leave to you. Eight have to do with the statistics involved in S. 500 itself; 2 with the general question whether the food from these irrigation projects will actually be needed in the foreseeable future; 1 with the Hoover Commission.

It is difficult to find any ground of agreement on the eight which have to do with S. 500, for, as I have said, the bill, according to the Senator, can mean all things to all men.

I realized that the bill as passed is so nebulous that to use the word "authorization" would be inaccurate. Hence I said that it bore a tag of $1,658,000,000. The Senator quibbles over this. He says that the authorized project will cost only $1,092,999,800.

Such a disparity about what the taxpayer is to be charged is to be explained only by an examination of the strange character of the bill itself.

It is a strange, misshapen legislative oddity, an abortive "what-is-it" born of fragmentary knowledge and unseemly basis.

The Senator proves this in his own efforts to explain what is contained in the bill.

Time was when orderly legislative procedure required first an authorization based upon careful consideration by a committee familiar with the subject. This authorization meant that so far as the merits of the project were concerned, the case was made. What remained was the appropriation of money which of necessity took into consideration the relative claims of other proposals and the resources of the Treasury.

But this bill is and is not an authorization. It contains several kinds of qualified authorizations. Some of these the Senator chooses to call authorized, and some, he says, are not authorized.

Four storage units seem to be unconditionally authorized. Two others, the Curecanti Dam and Juniper, must have further study of various sorts and certifications. These qualifications are not minor. They go to the very heart of the justification of the projects. The Senate in passing the bill, in effect, said that it knew little about these projects and that its action would be a valid authorization only when the responsible administrative officers had made a real study of them.

Since the Senator went to great pains in his attack upon me to say that "the Colorado River storage project, as concretely proposed in S. 500, was born in 1902," that studies have been underway since 1928, and that three Congresses have been asked to authorize it, I believe I have a right to ask when the basic facts will be known concerning Curecanti and Juniper and other units which I shall mention. What kind of expert service are we getting when after 27 years there are no reliable data on this project?

The 12 "participating" projects which were presented to the Congress last year, 11 of which were approved by the President, surely should be ready for action. But apparently they are not. The committee report on S. 500 says that they are to be authorized "subject to report to Congress."

Then there is in this bill a big brood of 21 other participating projects which were not included in the proposals of the Secretary and the President in 1954. These are San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesom, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette.

These are qualified in a wholly different way. They must, according to the Senator's interpretation of the bill, "be studied and resubmitted to Congress." They are not now authorized at all. The common sense in me rises at this point to ask why these unstudied and unready projects should be in the bill at all. Surely it could not be that there was any intent to convey to the States and communities benefited that they were in line for Federal aid and at the same time to be able to say to critics of Federal expenditures that they are not authorized at all.

But the Senator assures us in his statement that these unprepared and unstudied and unauthorized projects are in the bill because the bill makes it "abundantly clear" that the Colorado River storage project is "a comprehensive project, having as its ultimate objective the construction of all feasible water development projects necessary to bring about the use of as much of the water as is possible which is allocated to the upper Basin States by the 1922 Colorado River compact." This is indeed an omnibus bill, carrying in its capacious hold not only the 33 named participating projects and the 6 storage dams, but many more to be conjured up later.

But the Senator assures us that the cost of the project as authorized is $1,092,999,800. However, on a careful examination of the bill I cannot find that even that amount is correct, for the bill specifies no amount at all. It is a wide open affair. A pig in as ample a poke as legislative and bureaucratic fancy ever fabricated. Perhaps this is why so many taxpaying citizens sometime doubt whether their chosen representatives actually study the measures for which they vote.

The estimated cost of all the projects named is what I said it was—$1,658,460,100. But with the vague and unspecified projects which, according to the Senator, are to be included later, the cost may run to a vast and unknown figure very much larger than my own. In view of what the Senator says the bill implies, I am amazed at my own moderation.

Clearly this bill was designed by its architects to mean whatever the interested sponsor happened to want it to mean at a given moment. Specifically, it was intended to tell the people in the beneficiary States that they were to have practically every "participating project" their hearts desired, while it was to tell anxious taxpayers in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, or Michigan that it was to cost only a billion dollars.

To attempt a serious discussion of such a bill would be like trying to anticipate the humors of a coquette. You only know that she will be expensive and that she will never be satisfied.

There are, however, 2 or 3 more points on which the Senator disagrees which deserve comment.

The Senator denies that there are hidden interest charges in such an enterprise amounting to 2½ times the cost. My estimate is based upon a simple exercise in arithmetic. Under the formula for repayment provided in the bill, something like 50 years will elapse before the power revenues will be available for repaying the costs of the irrigation projects. These are, as the Senator says, indeterminate in number. The interest on a dollar borrowed at 2½ percent would, over the planned repayment period of something like 50 years, be nearly $3.50. But under the estimates of these participating projects, something is to be repaid by the water users. But their repayment will not be terminated until many years after the 50. At a modest estimate, it will run on to something between 70 and 100 years. On some part of the Federal investment there will be interest to pay during that entire period. Hence, the ultimate interest cost will be much more than 2½ times the principal.

The discussion concerning the need for the food to be produced on these participating projects occupies several of the Senator's charges against me. I can care for this by citing my own booklet, What Price Federal Reclamation? published this year by the American Enterprise Association. In a chapter therein entitled "Is This Food Necessary?" I state that I asked Secretary Benson by letter, at the time in 1954 when the Colorado storage project was introduced, the following questions:

"1. What are the prospects for the increase in productivity so far as food is concerned from acreage already under cultivation, or in marginal areas which do not need irrigation or on lands which can be reclaimed at reasonable cost by drainage, etc.?"

"2. In the light of the answer to question 1, is it likely that there will be any shortage of food in this country in the next 25 years?"

The Secretary's reply did not meet my questions squarely, but he enclosed two studies made by experts in his Department. One of these was a technical bulletin of the Department entitled "Major Uses of Land in the United States," by H. H. Wooten, and an address delivered by Sherman E. Johnson of the United States Department of Agriculture at the Mid-Century Conference on Resources of the Future, December 2, 1953. Both of these studies show the utterly insubstantial character of the argument for the further irrigation of arid land, at the prices envisaged in the Colorado River storage project, because of a future national need for food and fiber.

The Senator cites approvingly the President's Materials Policy Commission Report of 1952. If he will take the trouble to examine that report, he will find ample proof that there is no need for the irrigation of more arid land in order to meet food needs by 1975. I could cite also a paper presented by John A. Short of the United States Department of Agriculture at an interagency committee meeting in 1952, and an article in the Journal of Farm Economics in February 1953 by Rudolph Ulrich of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Thus we have the Senator and the Reclamation Bureau saying that the food from this proposed additional irrigation is necessary, and many experts from the Department of Agriculture saying in substance that it is not. The taxpayers of the United States are paying these agricultural experts well to inform them on this subject. Are we to believe that the Senator claims priority in foresight and agricultural expertness over them?

Finally, the Senator attacks my statement that the Hoover Commission should have been considered before the Department of the Interior and the President recommended this project in 1954. He mentions the presence on the Hoover task force of J. Bracken Lee, the Governor of his State of Utah. Governor Lee has in many speeches and articles advocated the abolition of the Federal income tax. Perhaps either the Senator or the Governor will explain the financial legerdemain by which they expect to pay for the Colorado River storage project if there is no income tax. Perhaps, moreover, some member of that task force could be induced to relate what Governor Lee himself said at a meeting of that group in San Francisco in 1954 when this project came up for discussion. I would also suggest that before brushing off my plea for some consideration of expert opinion the Senator address a specific question to the chairman of the commission, Herbert Hoover himself.

With reference to this whole subject, I suggest that the Senator also address a question to the agency set up by Congress for expert opinion, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I happen to know that a Member of Congress has already submitted my book, What Price Federal Reclamation? to that agency, and that it has, after a searching examination, replied that my data are substantially correct.

Finally, I shall have the temerity to suggest that the entire project, about which the Bureau of Reclamation itself confesses such sketchy and shaky knowledge, be submitted to a wholly independent committee of engineers and accountants selected by the major professional associations in those fields. It would seem that this is the only fair way to treat the taxpayers of the many States who must shoulder this enormous burden for the benefit of the 4 or 5 States concerned. Certainly, by the admissions of the Senator himself, this bill, S. 500, raises more questions than it answers.

Very sincerely,

RAYMOND MOLEY,
Contributing Editor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—STATEMENT BY JERSEY JOE WALCOTT BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday Jersey Joe Walcott, former heavyweight champion of the world, appeared before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and made a remarkably fine statement on the sources of juvenile delinquency and his recommendations for curing this social sore.

Jersey Joe, as he is called, is a distinguished citizen of New Jersey, whose reputation has continued to grow since relinquishing the world heavyweight title. This title he first won at the age of 37, after years of perseverance and discouragement. After his retirement from the ring the former champion determined to devote himself to the youth of America, and, more particularly, to the youth of Camden, N. J., where he lives. He is now a special investigator, Bureau of Juvenile Delinquency, Department of Police, of the city of Camden. As such he has inspired the youth of all races to such an extent that Camden has made great strides in controlling the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Jersey Joe obviously spoke from deep conviction and spiritual strength before the subcommittee. His eloquence visibly moved not only members of the subcommittee, but spectators as well.

The man who will always be the "champ" to thousands of youngsters all over the country opened his statement by remarking that the words "juvenile delinquency" do not fit the situation.

> What we have to deal with—

He said—

> is parent delinquency. * * * We need more old-fashioned fathers and mothers. * * * To be sure, there are churches and schools and organizations; all good and all trying, but all together they cannot replace a knowing, helpful father and mother.

The champion boxer and devoted public servant outlined a five-point program that merits the serious attention not only of the committees of Congress considering legislation on the subject, but also of all officials and thinking citizens throughout America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Jersey Joe Walcott's moving statement before the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JERSEY JOE WALCOTT, SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR, BUREAU OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, CITY OF CAMDEN, N. J., AT MEETING OF UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, CAPITOL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 6, 1955

The more often I hear the words "juvenile delinquency," the less I think they fit the situation. Actually, and to a larger extent, what we have to deal with is parent delinquency.

In the city of Camden we have our share of trouble with unruly, headstrong and irresponsible youngsters. Fortunately, they are but a small percentage of all the children in the community. In my opinion, most of them would not get into trouble if they had the right sort of home life. Let me explain by personal reference.

I was born and raised in an area often described as "the wrong side of the tracks." It was a tough neighborhood with plenty of tough kids in it. There were times when my brothers and I thought we could ape the bad boys and get away with it. Fortunately we had parents blessed with understanding. They were severe but fair. When we threatened to get out of hand, Pa and Ma stepped in and stopped the smart aleck conduct before it had fairly started.

Each had a different method. Pa's actions were direct. They called for a trip out back to the woodshed and a dose of what, in those days, was called "strap oil." It was painful but effective. It taught us the result of wrongdoing. Ma never interfered but when it was all over used to gather us by her side and explain why what we had done was wrong and why boys who pushed aside the rights and properties of others, broke windows or beat up smaller boys could expect to be punished. Sometimes she used to say a little prayer that we would break off bad habits and become better boys. Pa and Ma were a perfect team. Whatever they did was for our good. We need more old-fashioned fathers and mothers.

I know that there are many good parents who have to work hard to make ends meet, just as there are careless parents who neglect their children no matter what. I hold that all of them, anywhere and, under whatever conditions can find time enough out of the day to make their youngsters face up to a knowledge of right and wrong; to make sure that evil will be punished; that no particular reward ought to be expected from just behaving yourself; that each of us makes his own future and that the beginning of it starts with the things we learn at home. And, in my opinion, while I believe that bad children ought to be punished and not coddled, it is the parents who fail in their duty to their children who rate severe punishment.

Neglect children, let them get into bad company and they follow a pattern. Without home training what has a youngster to go by but the example of others. To be sure there are churches and schools and organizations; all good and all trying but all together they cannot replace a knowing, helpful father and mother.

In Camden, as in many other places, most of our trouble stems from teen-age gang wars, a tendency to vandalism, and a strong flavor of alcohol on the side. We have no difficulty with narcotics. That evil is well under control. Runaways are few and far between. What with one thing and another our boys and girls can find enough mischief at home without hunting for it in far-off places.

As may be expected when youngsters are taken into custody, the first to complain at the arrest are the same parents who failed to keep their children straight. They accuse police of persecution, insist in spite of evidence that their boys and girls are good children and make dire threats against the arresting officer. As for the teen-agers themselves, they laugh at us and ask what we intend to do about it.

Our laws provide that children under 18 must have special treatment. They may not be hauled off in a patrol wagon; no publication may be made of their names; no matter what their known record, officially they have no criminal record and may not be treated as criminals; they must be kept in a special place of detention and have special hearings with no publicity. The juveniles know all this as well as we do. They have no fear of laws which cannot touch them. It is about time we stopped coddling habitual offenders.

Since I have been engaged in juvenile work following my retirement from the ring, my observations suggest several recommendations:

1. Hold parents personally responsible for payment of damage done by their children to property or individuals. Make it impossible for such payments to be evaded. A few digs into the family pocketbooks will affect all concerned.
2. More severity in dealing with the actual wrongdoer. A crime is a crime no matter who commits it. The shock to society remains the same.
3. Stricter enforcement of legislation against the sale or gift of alcoholic beverages to minors with harsh punishment meted out to procurers.
4. Immediate adoption by constituted authority of whatever additional laws are needed to put teeth into acts for the suppression of crime by juveniles.
5. Provision by communities to drain off the pent-up energy of youth by substitution of wholesome activities to replace the excitement of wrongdoing.

Regarding the last-named recommendation, we have recently set up, in Camden, a youth council. It is operated entirely by the teen-agers—14 to 18—themselves. They elect their own leaders and make their own rules of conduct based mainly upon respect for property and the rights of others. It has divided the city into six units each with a potential of several thousand teen-agers. In its 3 months of existence it has developed basketball and softball interdivisional competition. Classes in handicraft are in operation. Meetings with growing attendance are held weekly in housing projects about town. Dances are held in schools. Each member receives 10 tickets and is held personally responsible for the conduct of guests. The council has stimulated an interest in leadership and responsibility. It has developed sportsmanlike competition. There is a growing pride in contributing to the welfare of the city. These teen-agers have their own committees on behavior and if a boy or girl gets out of hand they are dealt with accordingly. There are no arguments. Either a regulation has been broken or it has not.

In summing up for the so-called delinquency problem I, for one, would say that its correction is not an impossible task. I'll admit it may be a long pull. It has been a long time growing. You do not correct that situation overnight. It takes time and patience and understanding, a willingness to see good in youngsters given the right start and to do your part in guiding them toward a happy and useful destiny.

INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY TRADE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18 carried my address before the Executive Club of Chicago. To this group I commended the State Department for its decision to refrain from participating in the United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade. This Commission was authorized by a resolution adopted during the 17th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which was held in New York in April 1954. The United States voted against this resolution, and has continued its opposition to the concepts which underlie the terms of reference of this new Commission.

Mr. President, I regard our action as one of the most significant steps we have taken. We are placing our reliance on free markets, and we are rejecting all measures for a planned economy. As Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, and the first President elected by the Republican Party, once said:

> I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free.

It is equally true in the field of economics that we shall either adopt world planning on a gigantic scale or we shall champion a world economic system predicated on free enterprise principles. Such a system will effect the adjustment of supply and demand by market forces rather than through elaborate and unworkable stabilization devices.

The United States in 1945 advocated the adoption of such devices, and our Government, under a former administration, played the leading role in sponsoring the concept of intergovernmental commodity agreements which were embraced in chapter VI of the Habana Charter.

Mr. President, in my estimation, one of the greatest accomplishments of President Eisenhower's administration is the forthright rejection of such devices.

I have reviewed the extensive literature on this subject, and it is quite apparent that in recent years the Latin American countries have been the principal supporters within the United Nations of numerous proposals advanced from time to time to adopt artificial stabilization devices.

It will be recalled that in April of 1953 President Eisenhower appointed his distinguished and able brother, Milton S. Eisenhower, as Special Ambassador to study the economic problems of our neighbors below the Rio Grande.

Ambassador Eisenhower made his report to the President on United States-Latin American relations on November 18, 1953. The report is a historic document.

Mr. President, the American people are not only fortunate in having Dwight D. Eisenhower as their President, but they are doubly fortunate because he is able to secure such capable and sound advice from a trusted member of his own family.

I shall now read from Ambassador Eisenhower's report to the President:

> There is also considerable misunderstanding of the operation of wartime price controls and of postwar terms of trade. We heard many times the claim that a large part of the purchasing power of Latin American exchange reserves accumulated during the war, when availability of imports from the United States was restricted by shortages of goods and shipping, was lost when goods again came into free supply, but at higher prices. There is also the belief that raw materials prices are low in relation to the prices of manufactured goods. However, an examination of the unit value indexes of United States exports to and imports from the other American Republics shows that the terms of trade shifted in favor of Latin America from a base of 100 for the 1936–38 average to 120 for 1947, and to 171 for the first quarter of 1953.
>
> Preliminary data for the second quarter of 1953 indicate that there was further improvement to an index of 177. In practically every product of trade importance, the Latin American seller stands today in a better position than before World War II.
>
> These complaints likewise do not take into account similar shortages and decline in the purchasing power of savings suffered by United States consumers during and after the war and the serious, and, on the whole, successful effort made by the United States Government, both during the war and during the Korean emergency, to assure continuing supplies of essential goods to the other republics on a basis of equality with our domestic consumers. Nevertheless, the feeling persists in Latin America that the United States should assume some responsibility for maintaining favorable prices of basic commodities which form the bulk of Latin American exports, or, as an alternative, that the United States should refrain from imposing price controls on raw commodities at times when demand for such commodities is abnormally high (p. 9).

Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues that the International Materials Conference, which was operated by the State Department under former Secretary Acheson, attempted to impose worldwide price controls on tungsten. The price controls authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950 were used to implement the allocations of the International Materials Conference. These allocations prevented Chilean copper and South American lead and zinc from entering our markets during the latter part of 1951 and the first 6 months of 1952, when they were badly needed to maintain our own economy. Our action in implementing international materials controls produced great resentment in Latin America, and, as Ambassador Eisenhower indicated, is in part responsible for the present interest of the Latin American countries in stabilization devices, as they do not trust us to rely on free market mechanisms.

Mr. President, I cannot blame them, in view of their experience under a former administration, but I have no doubt that this administration will do everything within its power to preserve free-market concepts.

Now, let me continue reading from Ambassador Eisenhower's report:

> The export economies of most of the other American Republics have been built around their ability to provide certain primary materials for consumption in the United States and Europe. Their supply of imported consumer goods and other materials depends upon their ability to sell these products to the rest of the world. This has been a major reason for the intense desire of the leaders to industrialize and diversify the economies of their countries. We encountered everywhere a widespread desire for steel mills, metal-fabricating plants, food-processing plants, textile industries, and a wide variety of consumer-goods-fabricating facilities.
>
> Industrialization has gone so apace in some countries, notably in Brazil and Chile, that it has outstripped the production of food and fiber, as well as the fundamental services of transportation, communication, and power. This imbalance has been recognized, but it is difficult and will take time to correct. It is a serious roadblock in the way of balanced economic development.
>
> On the basis of our observations we believe that the much-needed balance in economic development will be more rapidly and soundly achieved if the relatively free play of market forces and competitive-price mechanisms are allowed to operate in all countries, as they are now operating in several countries of the continent. The allocation of resources, labor, and capital will then be permitted to occur in the interest of efficient production, distribution, and consumption, and at lower prices (p. 13).

Mr. President, Ambassador Milton Eisenhower thoroughly understands the role of the free market mechanism in allocating resources in any economy so that they will be used most effectively.

Controls always lead to difficulties. Let me continue reading from the report to the President by Ambassador Eisenhower:

> Fortunately, several of the countries recognize that to stimulate domestic food output they must restore the incentive that can flow from the price mechanism. Through inflation, price controls, and subsidy exchange rates, some governments have greatly discouraged domestic agricultural production and encouraged the use of scarce foreign exchange for food imports. So serious has this been that some countries which formerly produced enough of such products as wheat and sugar to meet most of their domestic requirements have recently been importing more and more of these very commodities.
>
> Ceilings placed on domestic prices of foodstuffs as an emergency attempt to control inflation have exerted a regressive influence on domestic producers. Especially favorable exchange rates for food imports have sometimes made it impossible for the local farmer to compete. This has led in some instances to situations of sheer folly, to scarce foreign exchange being used to import food which in turn, has been illegally reexported in large volume at good profit by contraband traders.
>
> Such policies have cause a shift in land resources in the affected areas from much-needed production to less economic and less basic production. As a result, the real standard of living of the people has suffered. Such policies also tend to vitiate, temporarily at least, the positive benefits of United States technical cooperation in agricultural experimentation and demonstration, and work against the usefulness of loans which have been extended for agricultural machinery, irrigation, and related purposes.
>
> In view of the foregoing, we were indeed encouraged to learn from a number of governmental and financial leaders that they have become aware of the self-defeating nature of the policies which have been followed in some countries in that they are taking steps to make possible more realistic domestic prices and exchange rates for agricultural products (pp. 13–14).

The recommendations of Ambassador Eisenhower that the free-price system be utilized fully to allocate resources were accepted by his brother, our President.

The turning point came in the spring of 1954. The United States refused to assent to the Tin Agreement, and we voted against the establishment of the Commission on International Commodity trade at the United Nations Economic and Social Council Session. Last November our delegation to the Rio Conference once again reaffirmed our opposition to artificial stabilization devices. In December, as I have already indicated, we declined to participate in the activities of the U. N. Commission.

Schemes to stabilize commodities have been proposed time and time again. Many have been tried. They have all ended in disaster. No one is more concerned with maintaining a stable and sound agricultural economy than the junior Senator from Iowa, but I am convinced that trick schemes poorly conceived and impossible to administer will not accomplish this result. The free working of a competitive price system and the maintenance of an expanding dynamic economy, both here and abroad, with constantly rising standards of living and higher consumption levels, is the path we must take.

Several resolutions have been introduced and are presently before the Committee on Foreign Relations proposing United States participation in an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. The proponents of these resolutions cite the instability of commodity markets in their support.

Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, during the 83d Congress conducted extensive hearings on the United Nations proposals in this area. I commend to my colleagues part 5 of the hearings conducted pursuant to Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress.

Appendix 1 of part 5 of these hearings contains the United Nations report entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development," submitted by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The present United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade was created to implement the recommendations of these experts. One of them was a distinguished American economist, Professor Knorr. He appeared before the subcommittee and praised the action of the United States representative who voted against the establishment of this Commission.

It must be obvious to all of us that there is no way that the price of any commodity can be stabilized without first controlling its consumption, as well as the price and consumption of all available substitutes. This can only be done through complete planning with a regimented economy. This concept I thoroughly reject.

In view of the statements which have been made in support of the World Food

Reserve, I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the subject of the World Food Reserve by Hon. James Philip Nash, Alternate United States Representative, in Committee II, the committee dealing with economic and financial matters of the United Nations General Assembly in December of 1954, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JAMES PHILIP NASH, ALTERNATE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, IN COMMITTEE II ON A WORLD FOOD RESERVE

Mr. Chairman, the problem of assuring the peoples of the world an adequate food supply has commanded the almost constant attention of the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization since World War II, for, as pointed out by the delegation of Costa Rica, without freedom from hunger, there can be no real economic development or social progress.

In 1952-53, world food and agricultural production, for the first time since 1939, caught up with the growth of the world's population. The FAO reported that, even in the Far East, where the lag in agricultural production was most serious, there were signs of a revival in food production. It also noted that in other less developed regions, production was beginning to move ahead of population. At the same time, it pointed out that there are still wide disparities in consumption levels in different parts of the world. The other day we heard the representative of the FAO in this committee emphasize the need for continued improvement in the efficiency of production and distribution of foodstuffs, in the face of expected increases in the world population. The Costa Rican Government is, therefore, to be commended for once more focusing our attention on the importance of this whole problem.

A World Food Reserve, as suggested by the Government of Costa Rica, would be designed to operate in three fields: (1) to help meet emergency famines; (2) to establish buffer stocks designed to stabilize the prices of agricultural commodities; and (3) to encourage production, consumption, and trade in agricultural commodities. As the memorandum submitted by Costa Rica in document A 2710 itself points out, all these aspects of the "food problem" have been closely examined in one forum or another during the past few years.

The question of international action to assist countries faced with emergency famine, has been considered on various occasions both in the United Nations and the FAO. As a result of action taken by the Sixth Conference of FAO in 1951, the director-general of that organization is now charged with responsibility for investigating the nature of any serious food shortage or famine which may threaten any member nation; to report on the question of any international assistance needed; and when there is an emergency requiring international relief measures, to convene a meeting of the council of the FAO or of interested governments to consider what action may be required.

In 1952, the Economic and Social Council conferred various powers on the Secretary General to coordinate the famine relief activities of inter-governmental organizations, governments, and voluntary agencies, and to secure their cooperation to this end. A series of recommendations designed to assist member governments to attack the problem of hunger and famine has also been adopted by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

We feel that this authority and responsibility, which have been conferred upon the United Nations and the FAO, provides a sufficient basis for vigorous action by these organizations in cases where emergency international action appears necessary.

As has already been mentioned by previous speakers, the Food and Agriculture Organization in November 1951 decided to study the question of establishing an international food reserve to make available supplies in cases of serious shortage or famine. For 2 years, this question was exhaustively analyzed in all its technical and financial aspects. It was considered by two groups of experts, by two meetings of the FAO Council and by the 7th conference of the FAO just 1 year ago. The FAO decided that it was impracticable to create such an international reserve. It recommended instead preparations by member countries for rapid ad hoc action to relieve famine conditions.

In our view, basic conditions have not changed sufficiently to warrant the belief that a new examination of this proposal, either alone or as part of a larger scheme, would lead to any substantially different conclusions. The fact that we do not believe that special international stocks of food are required to meet disaster situations in member countries does not mean that the American people are insensitive to the needs of less fortunate neighbors. The readiness of the American people to help when they are able to do so has a history dating back to the great Russian famine of 1921. The American people contributed from all sources, including congressional appropriations, about $63 million of foodstuffs and supplies to help alleviate the suffering caused by that great famine of over 30 years ago.

In more recent years, the great productivity of our farms has enabled the United States on various occasions to come to the assistance of people faced with famine. In 1953, a serious drought occurred in Pakistan. Famine threatened the country, which had already been forced to devote a large part of its foreign exchange reserves to meet a poor harvest a year before. Pakistan, therefore, requested 1 million tons of wheat as emergency aid from the United States in April 1953.

Following a study of the situation, President Eisenhower recommended to the Congress a grant of wheat to Pakistan on June 10. The necessary legislation was enacted into law on June 25. Within 24 hours after the President had signed this emergency legislation, the first shipload of wheat sailed from the port of Baltimore. By the end of 1953, 62 ships had delivered over 400,000 tons of wheat at Karachi. The last delivery, which was made in May of this year, brought the total of emergency assistance to over 610,000 tons of wheat, valued at about $68 million.

The continued readiness of the United States to share its agricultural commodities with other nations, which are faced with disaster situations, is clearly demonstrated in the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, passed by our Congress a few months ago. This legislation authorizes the President to use, over a 3-year period, surplus agricultural commodities up to $300 million in value to provide relief to peoples in other lands. As the Director of our Foreign Operations Administration remarked recently, "Through this law * * * we will be able to meet any famine or emergency food needs anywhere in the world that we are permitted to."

Under this law, large quantities of food have been and are being made available to the victims of disasters all over the world. This past summer, the world suffered flood disasters in two widely separated areas—in Central Europe and East Pakistan. Just as these floods knew no political boundaries, so the subsequent offers of relief were not confined to any given political area. Thus, after the recent floods in Europe, the United States offered food to stricken people in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the Soviet Zone of Germany, as well as in Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Yugoslavia. These offers were accepted by the Governments concerned and food is now being made available to the disaster areas.

The second general objective of a World Food Reserve, as stated in the Costa Rican memorandum, would be the stabilization of world agricultural prices through the establishment of buffer stocks. The importance of achieving greater stability in the prices of basic commodities is widely recognized. The problem of how this objective might best be achieved has been the subject of extensive consideration in almost all the economic bodies of the United Nations. I shall not attempt to discuss the many complex aspects of this matter; they have been adequately emphasized during debates in the United Nations and the FAO, and more recently in this committee.

The position of the United States on proposals to stabilize prices through direct governmental intervention was made clear at the 17th Session of the Economic and Social Council, when this matter was last discussed in the United Nations. In brief, the United States has been prepared to consult with other interested governments on an ad hoc basis regarding the problems of individual primary commodities. However, any international agreement which attempted to cover several commodities simultaneously would mean, in our view, widespread interference with the workings of the world economy. It would involve serious risk of distorting production, consumption and trade patterns. The net results of such arrangements, even if it were practicable to conclude them, might well be detrimental and not beneficial to economic development.

Finally, it is suggested that a World Food Reserve might encourage production, consumption and trade in agricultural commodities. I believe some delegates have already pointed out that these are among the fundamental responsibilities of the Food and Agriculture Organization itself, and are clearly specified in the Charter of that organization. It seems to me that it would involve unnecessary duplication to establish a new international organization charged with responsibility for these same matters.

Mr. Chairman, the United States completely agrees with the ultimate purposes which are sought by Costa Rica in submitting this agenda item. In our view, however, the United Nations and its specialized agencies have already established such arrangements for international action on these matters as appear practicable at this time. As the representative of the FAO emphasized to this committee, the "experience and attitude of governments have shown that little purpose can be served at this stage by merely submitting another proposal, in general terms, for international action" in this field. Accordingly, it would seem to us that our efforts could be more appropriately directed to making more effective use of existing machinery in the pursuit of our common objectives.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Ambassador Eisenhower recognized the necessity of encouraging food production to meet the needs of those who were undernourished and ill-fed. His remarks, while directed at Latin American problems, have equal validity in connection with the problems of other so-called underdeveloped countries. Ambassador Eisenhower reported:

Larger, more efficient production is absolutely basic to the continent, but agricultural improvement is usually a relatively slow process. In Latin America improvement in farm production calls not only for

> price incentives—to which we shall refer again—but also for the establishment of agricultural research stations and extension systems, for far-reaching programs in fundamental education to decrease illiteracy in the rural areas, and for capital to finance the purchase or importation of machinery.
>
> We were encouraged by what we saw on our visit to the modern effective agricultural experiment station and agricultural college at Palmira, Colombia—projects aided by the United States in the technical cooperation program. We were similarly stimulated by what we saw of the work of SCIPA (Servicio Cooperativo Interamericano de Produccion de Alimentos) in Peru and STICA (Servicio Tecnico Interamericano de Cooperacion Agricola) in Paraguay—outstandingly successful examples of our technical cooperation. Indeed, in every country we visited where our technical program is operating, we saw evidence which convinced us that the funds the United States is putting into servicio-managed agricultural projects is one of the best expenditures made by our Government. At long last science is being introduced to the agriculture of the entire continent. One new variety of corn will produce four times as much as the native variety. Research in genetics, entomology, livestock selection and breeding, fertilization, crop rotations, conservation, and so on, is showing spectacular results; and the discoveries in the stations are already being applied on many farms, though general adoption may have to await progress in fundamental education to decrease illiteracy, the building of practical extension services, and the widening of rural vocational training.
>
> Agriculturally, Latin America is today reminiscent of the United States in the late 19th century. Primitive and inefficient practices are just beginning to be replaced by modern scientific farming.
>
> Major credit for the accomplishments to date belongs to the local peoples and their governments, and, of course, theirs is the major task in the future. The technical assistance we have provided has been of enormous help. United States specialists in all branches of agricultural science have been skillful in training local leaders in research and extension work. Now many American republics have agricultural colleges for the training of expert personnel (p. 13).

Mr. President, no one ever can call either the President of the United States or his family callous to suffering and real human needs. The statement to the General Assembly of the United Nations last December by the United States representative again reflects a recommendation by Ambassador Eisenhower to his brother, the President. Ambassador Eisenhower recommended, as I quote from page 22 of his report:

> That, in very unusual circumstances, the President of the United States be in a position to make grants of food from our surplus stocks to Latin American countries.
>
> Everyone recognizes the validity of food grants to meet problems caused by famine. But a no less serious human emergency exists when a nation which normally imports a substantial percentage of its food is unable to buy and its people are on the verge of starvation.
>
> If food grants should be made, it would be appropriate to require the government receiving the grants to set aside counterpart funds, equal to the value of the grant, to be used in expanding its domestic agricultural production (p. 22).

Mr. President, there is no need for a world food reserve which would really not concern itself primarily with relieving suffering but would devote its principal efforts to interfering with market forces.

I have been amazed, in reading the report of Ambassador Eisenhower, to note his foresight in recommending policies which have been subsequently adopted by this Government to strengthen our defense and to eliminate the need for the artificial commodity stabilization schemes so frequently advanced by those who distrust the price system. Ambassador Eisenhower specifically recommended:

> That the United States adopt a long-range basic-material policy which will permit it to purchase for an enlarged national stockpile certain imperishable materials when prices of such materials are declining.
>
> We import from Latin America many minerals and other primary products whose prices on the world market are subject to wide fluctuation. To a country which sells the products of its mines and then purchases processed goods and food from abroad, a sharp decline in the price of its minerals can be calamitous, leading not only to lower standards of living, but also to political instability.
>
> The United States could not, even if it wished, control world prices of such commodities, and it is clear that private enterprises will buy wherever they can get materials of the needed quality at the least cost.
>
> However, in the light of the findings of the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, which predicted increasing United States deficiencies in important materials, serious consideration should be given to a new policy looking toward building more massive stockpiles when world prices of the storable commodities are declining. Such a policy would, in my opinion, be of immense benefit in protecting the long-term economic future of the United States, and would provide at least some degree of stability in world market prices of raw materials.
>
> I recognize that the implementation of such a policy would presumably have to await the time when United States fiscal resources are not severely strained by defense expenditures; further, this policy is now partly in effect in the defense stockpiling program (pp. 21–22).

Mr. President, the independent study prepared by the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy confirmed Ambassador Eisenhower's recommendations and an enlarged stockpile goal for a long range program has been established and is now in effect. Without interfering with market forces, we are contributing to market stability. Let me reaffirm Ambassador Eisenhower's observation that—

> The United States could not, even if it wished, control world prices of such commodities, and it is clear that private enterprises will buy wherever they can get materials of the needed quality at the least cost (p. 22).

In conclusion, we do not need the world food reserve to prevent starvation. Mr. Nash's statement before the United Nations shows that this country is always ready and eager to relieve suffering and hunger anywhere it may exist. No, Mr. President, the demand for a world food reserve emanates solely from those who are ready to sell out their birthright of freedom for an unworkable stabilization scheme such as buffer stocks which will ultimately collapse to the detriment of all the world's producers.

Mr. President, the difficulties we are experiencing in operating price supports for our basic commodities should make us doubly wary of attempts to stabilize by trick economics all of the world's foods, fibers, fuels, and minerals, which is the real purport of these proposals.

Ambassador Eisenhower's understanding of free enterprise ecnomic principles impresses me greatly. His report included the following significant statement, with which I heartly concur. He said:

> I feel impelled to express the view that the greatest contribution which the United States can make to the well-being of the world as a whole is the maintenance of a high level of economic activity in this country at relatively stable prices (p. 21).

Mr. President, I should like to remind our friends on the other side of the aisle who predicted hardship and chaos when the President removed price controls, shortly after his inauguration, that we have been witnessing an almost stable level in both the wholesale and consumers' price indexes of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. When the general price levels remain stable, variations in the prices of individual commodities should not be prevented by artificial means. These variations signify fundamental changes in the demand and supply relationships and, if not interfered with, will produce new adjustments in altered economic conditions. That is the function of a free price system.

Price controls have never been effective in preventing inflation. The increases in the wholesale and retail price indexes after World War II proves my point. Inflation can only be prevented by sound fiscal and monetary policies. When I read Ambassador Eisenhower's report, made in November of 1953, and examined the behavior of the price indexes and the general level of economic activity since its preparation, the achievements of President Eisenhower's administration in meeting the real problems—not only of this country, but of the world—come into very sharp focus.

LEASING OF SPACE FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1210) to amend the Public Building Act of 1949, so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Works was in line 4, after the word "year", to insert "and by inserting in lieu thereof 'not in excess of 5 years,' ", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 407 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 is amended by striking out ", not in excess of 1 year," and by inserting in lieu thereof "not in excess of 5 years."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to make it possible to lease space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia for periods not in excess of 5 years.

The testimony indicated the belief that enactment of this legislation would be beneficial to the United States, the District of Columbia, and the property owners. It was stated that with a 1-year limitation on lease periods, the Government was an unattractive tenant, caused higher rental rates, did not permit flexibility, and at times was deterrent to obtaining high-class office space or prevented joint occupancy of a building by a governmental agency and a private organization. With longer term leases possible it was thought that many new buildings would be constructed, thereby increasing tax revenues to the District of Columbia government.

The General Services Administration now has authority to make leases outside the District for periods up to 5 years' duration. Experience has proven the wisdom of this 5-year authority. Frequently it is possible to make a longer term lease at a lower rental and on better terms than on a year-to-year basis, as in the District of Columbia. All these considerations, Mr. President, in my judgment, justify the passage of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1210) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia."

REWARDS FOR INFORMATION ON ILLEGAL INTRODUCTION AND MANUFACTURE OF CERTAIN SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons, which was, on page 4, line 20, strike out "the Commonwealth of."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the companion House bill, H. R. 6901, be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPACT FOR CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN THE MISSOURI BASIN

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 707, Senate bill 787.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 787) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "projects", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for a basinwide, comprehensive program of unified planning for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for the coordination of the water-resources development of the agencies of the States in cooperation with the agencies of the United States: *Provided,* That existing compacts between the States and decrees of the United States Supreme Court relating to any of the waters of the Missouri River or its tributaries shall be fully recognized: *Provided further,* That any compact negotiated pursuant to this act shall recognize the provisions of existing law, and that the use for navigation of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial use of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes: *And provided further,* That nothing in this act shall apply to any area of the national park system established as of the date of this act or any future areas added by acts of Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner to represent the United States to participate in such negotiations, and who shall make report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and any compact entered into.

SEC. 3. Any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the committee amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the bill grants the consent of Congress for the 10 States of the Missouri River Basin to negotiate and enter into a compact for a basinwide comprehensive program of unified planning looking to the conservation and development of the water resources of the basin. The proposed compact would also provide for coordination of the planning of the water-resources development of State and Federal agencies. Existing compacts between the States and decrees of the United States Supreme Court relating to any of the waters of the Missouri River or its tributaries would be fully recognized.

Mr. President, the measure has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and in my judgment is worthy of passage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 787) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 1835.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1835) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULATION OF ELECTION OF DELEGATES REPRESENTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 702, House bill 191.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS ON NOMINATIONS AND BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the various committees be authorized to file with the Secretary reports on nominations and on legislative measures during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, ETC.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House, and that the Vice President or the Acting President pro tempore, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to state for the information of Senators that the action of the Senate in making Calendar No. 702, House bill 191, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, the unfinished business does not necessarily mean that it will be taken up for consideration on Monday.

It is the intention of the leadership that there shall be a call of the calendar on Monday, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. No controversial legislation will be considered on Monday.

It is the intention of the leadership on Tuesday to ask the Senate to consider Calendar No. 700, S. 2391, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, provided the committee has reported the bill, after holding further hearings on it between now and Tuesday.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 7, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 107. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife, Stefania Janicki;

S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand;

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 802. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn., (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1318. An act to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1571. An act to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year;

S. 1633. An act relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska;

S. 1725. An act to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly;

S. 2135. An act to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water supply feature of that reservoir.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of mercy and goodness, who art always so bountiful in Thy dealings with man, we rejoice that daily Thou dost bestow upon us and entrust us with innumerable blessings.

Help us to be worthy and appreciative, and may the abundance of Thy gracious and generous spirit make us more sensitive in our sympathies and more sincere in our good will toward all mankind.

We penitently confess that we are frequently very selfish and do so little to discharge the responsibility, which Thou dost enjoin upon us, of sharing our blessings with others.

Grant that we may seek to build a finer social order and do all within our power to minister to the needs of struggling humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who gave Himself for the life of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322); and

H. R. 3636. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3990. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the mutual security appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES reserved all points of order on the bill.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the public works appropriation bill have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF MATUS CERNAK

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the outrageous and dastardly assassination 2 days ago of Dr. Matus Cernak in Munich, Germany. According to the press reports, Dr. Cernak was killed by the explosion of a package which he was opening in a suburban post office. The package, which had been mailed to him from Frankfort, evidently contained a powerful time bomb. The explosion also killed a bystander and injured 13 other persons, two of them seriously.

Dr. Cernak, as regional chairman for Germany of the Slovak National Council, naturally was well known as a leader among the anti-Communist refugees from his homeland. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that this act of terrorism was the work of Communist agents operating on instructions from behind the Iron Curtain. The press indicates the police are searching for a man of Slavic origin who is believed to have mailed the package, and I personally feel sure that an investigation will substantiate the fact that this is merely another of a series of Communist terrorist activities.

In this connection, it should be stated that the Communist government at Prague has recently been making strenuous efforts to lure many of the refugees back to their homeland. It is even possible that Dr. Cernak was urged to return and, when such efforts failed, that other means were found to eliminate him.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to meet Dr. Cernak when I was in Germany in 1953. I found him to be a stanch and uncompromising anti-Communist and a man who was passionately devoted to the cause of freedom for his native country. I am certain that his tragic death will only serve to inspire his Slovak colleagues to continue the work which he is no longer able to carry on.

At this time when the Big Four meeting with the Soviet Union is drawing near, such instances as the assassination of Dr. Cernak should serve as a warning to all of us that whatever mask the Communists may assume for purposes of expediency cannot conceal their true nature. The ruthless elimination of all those who stand in their way is a Communist tactic which has been characteristic of them from the beginning and this barbaric deed is typical of what conceals itself behind a facade of "peaceful coexistence."

In paying tribute to Dr. Cernak's noble and heroic fight for the freedom of his homeland, I should like to compare his untimely death with that of another great Slovak patriot, Gen. Milan Stefanik, who also was struck down in the midst of his efforts. I know that all friends of freedom will join me in expressing horror over this dastardly deed and in extending condolences to those on whose behalf Dr. Cernak fought so well.

A biographical sketch of Dr. Cernak follows:

Matus Cernak was born in 1903 in Slovakia. He studied linguistics in the Universities of Prague and Leipzig and became a professor in Bratislava in the early thirties.

In 1932, he was one of the organizers of the Congress of the Slovak Young Generation in Trencianske Teplice, which claimed a federative reform of the Czecho-Slovak centralistic republic. At that time, he was also a contributor to Politika, a Slovak political review in Bratislava.

During the 1938 political crisis, created by the Sudeto-German problem in Czechoslovakia which was going to reach its climax in Munich, Cernak was appointed a states-minister in the government of General Sirovy, who succeeded Prime Minister Milan Hodza, September 21, 1938. After Munich, October 3, 1938, he presented his resignation to President Benes, because of his refusing to consider Slovakia's claims for self-government.

After October 6, 1938, when, under the pressure of Slovakia's most important political parties, Prague agreed with a tripartite federation—Czechia, Slovakia, Carpathian-Ukraine—Matus Cernak became Minister of Education in Slovakia's autonomous government of Monsignor Tiso.

During the night of March 9, 1939, President Hacha dismissed the government of Monsignor Tiso and transferred all authority in Slovakia to a Czech General Homola. At that time, Cernak was imprisoned with other members of the Slovak Government, in Blansko, Moravia.

After the proclamation of the Slovak state, March 13, 1939, Cernak was sent to Berlin, as a Minister Plenipotentiary to Berlin, where he remained until the end of 1943. Before the occupation of Slovakia by the Red Army in 1945, Cernak left for Austria. In 1946, a measure of extradition turned him to the Benes-Gottwald national front government. Put to jail in Bratislava he was judged by the so-called national court and sentenced to 3 years. Finally released after serving 2 years in jail, he immediately escaped to Germany in 1948.

In Munich, he created a center for the Slovak political refugees and published a strongly anti-Communist newspaper, Free Slovakia.

In the spring of 1953, Cernak took a 2-month lecturing trip through the United States and Canada, where he had a warm welcome. He was enthusiastic about the United States in which he was setting all his hopes for the liberation of the enslaved nations of central Europe and elsewhere in the world.

PASSPORT OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, everybody is going all over the world, everybody wants passports, and everybody wants prompt attention from the Passport Division. I thought it would be interesting to all of the Members if they knew something of the load that is being carried by the Passport Office, so I quote the following statement from Miss Knight, Director of the Passport Office:

> You will be interested to know that a spot check on a few selected telephone lines to the Passport Office totaled over 13,000 calls within a period of 5 days. We averaged 250 calls per day per girl assigned to handle inquiries. According to the chief telephone operator of the Department of State, during the same 5-day period, there were a minimum of 22 calls awaiting service on each line into the Passport Office from 9 a. m. through 5 p. m. I tried to alleviate this heavy telephone traffic by adding four lines into my own office, but the volume has been so great that the addition did not result in a noticeable improvement.
>
> The Passport Office staff has been working long hours, 6 days a week. We issued or renewed 434,644 passports in 1954. We estimate that we will issue or renew a minimum of 480,000 in fiscal 1955. In May 1954 we processed 56,776 passports as compared to 71,055 in May 1955. This increased workload has been carried on with inadequate personnel, equipment, and space.

THE AMERICAN TOURIST TRADE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the figures the gentlewoman from Ohio has just given us with respect to the tourist trade to Europe show that we could and should shelve the foreign giveaway bill. The foreigners are doing well with the American tourist trade, and they will do even better when Congress is over and the junkets can start.

PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the bill providing for public works construction for the Department of Defense agreed unanimously at a meeting yesterday, and I will be in a position to file the conference report sometime this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider that conference report at any time today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE TRADE AGREEMENT REVISION BILL OF 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 289 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6059) to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments hereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 289 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6059) to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.

House Resolution 289 provides for a closed rule on this bill with 1 hour of general debate. All points of order against the bill are waived and only amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be in order. One motion to recommit would be in order under the provisions of this rule.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6059 would provide that the Philippine tariff preferences on United States articles would disappear more rapidly, and the United States preferences on Philippine articles would disappear less rapidly than under the 1946 agreement.

The bill would also provide for the elimination of the present 17-percent tax on all sales of foreign exchange and the substitution instead of a special temporary import tax which would not exceed 17 percent and which would be gradually eliminated by January 1, 1966.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill would revise the quota provisions of the agreement to eliminate quotas that have proved unnecessary; to provide for the slower disappearance of duty-free tariff quotas on scrap and filler tobacco, cigars, coconut oil, and buttons of pearl or shell; and the deletion of provisions specifying how United States quotas on Philippine products are to be allocated among producers in the Philippines.

If this bill is enacted into law, Mr. Speaker, the Philippines would be obliged to take the necessary legislative and executive actions to enter into an agreement with the United States for the reciprocal entry of traders and investors as authorized by Public Law 419 of the 83d Congress and finally the bill would amend the 1946 agreement to provide a clear statement of rights of citizens of the United States to engage in business activities in the Philippines on the same basis as Philippine nationals, and would guarantee the same treatment to Philippine citizens to engage in business activities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6059 is a bill that should be of interest to every Member of this House. We have no better friends in the Pacific than the people of the Philippines, and certainly their strong stand at the Bandung Conference has made them assume the role of a leading bulwark against the further encroachments of communism in Asia. I hope that the rule will be adopted so that we may consider this bill, and I hope that the House membership will give H. R. 6059 the serious consideration that a bill of this importance deserves.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the rule on this side. We believe this bill will cement good feelings and relationships between the United States and the Philippines. I understand the bill was unanimously reported out of the committee and that it is noncontroversial.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is mainly because of the far-reaching implications of the bill we have before us that I am taking the floor. We are ratifying a pact negotiated by the United States and the Philippine Governments in exhaustive discussions that took place here in Washington this year. It will be the instrument governing our trade relations with the Republic of the Philippines.

It is not a perfect bill. Anyone critically minded can pick flaws in it. But our relationship with the Philippines is a unique one. In the eyes of history our responsibility did not end when their independence was proclaimed on July 4, 1946. Whenever the biased and the prejudiced always ready to misrepresent us deliberately distort American policies and present us as imperialistic, we always pridefully point to the Philippines as our most effective refutation. That refutation can only have meaning if the Philippines continues to be a going concern and a true bulwark of democracy.

This trade agreement is vital to Philippine economy. In fact, it is vital to the success of the administration of President Ramon Magsaysay. My interest in this bill—and I know it is that of all of us—is to see to it that we do here on our part anything within reason to assist this stalwart leader of democracy, who is the first man in Asia to defeat communism, to continue serving the Filipino people in a manner that will revitalize democracy in that part of the world and infuse new faith in democratic government among the millions of Asia.

And we have every reason to be proud of our association with the Filipino people. During the Second World War, they stood loyally by us and they gave the world an example of loyalty to democratic ideals that is a lesson for all. When we decided to fight in Korea, the first troops to arrive there to fight side by side with ours were the Filipino troops. At the Bandung Conference, it was the representatives of the Philippines that led the forces of democracy against communism and neutralism and turned the tide for the free world. Only a few days ago, in San Francisco, again it was the Philippines that took the initiative away from Soviet Russia and scored a victory for the democratic side with its proposal of the San Francisco declaration. Wherever democracy is threatened or imperiled, there we have our Filipino allies ready and determined.

We can do no less for them. That is why I support this bill and ask for its passage.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], about people traveling abroad. I could not help being reminded of a story, and it is a true one, that happened in my hometown.

Two members of the Quaker faith met in the town square. One of them was quite a traveler. The other one was not. The one who was not a traveler said to the one who traveled: "Friend, dost thee not know that a rolling stone gathers no moss?" The traveling friend replied: "Yes, but it gets a lot of polish."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6059) to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6059, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 6059, the legislation before this distinguished committee, is the Philippine Trade Revision Act of 1955. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the President of the United States, at any time before January 1, 1956, to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines with a view to amending the United States-Philippines agreement of July 4, 1946, as amended, on trade and related matters.

This legislation was carefully considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in public hearings and in executive session prior to its being favorably reported to the House. As chairman of the committee, I introduced the legislation on the same day that the President of the United States wrote to our beloved Speaker requesting that Congress favorably act, during this session, on legislation that would permit revision of the 1946 United States-Philippines agreement in accordance with the President's message to the Congress of May 5, 1955.

The Members of the House will recall that our present trade relations with the Republic of the Philippines are governed by an agreement that was signed at Manila on July 4, 1946, in accordance with the Philippines Trade Agreement Act of 1946—Public Law 371, 79th Congress. That agreement was entered into at the time the Philippines was granted its independence by the United States. Since that time, the people of the Philippines have worked patriotically and diligently in seeking their rightful place among the nations of the free world. In the intervening years the Republic of the Philippines has progressed from a nation that had sustained the full impact of the economic and physical ravages of World War II to a nation that has become a citadel of democratic strength in the Far East.

On March 7, 1953, the President of the Philippines requested revision of the 1946 agreement as being vital to the economic stability of his country and to the permanent trade relations between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines. In his reply, dated March 16, 1953, the President of the United States expressed the willingness of our Government to give prompt and sympathetic consideration to any specific proposal for revision of the agreement that the Philippines might advance.

To permit the conduct of such negotiations while the reciprocal free-trade arrangement provided in the 1946 agreement was still in effect, Public Law 474, of the 83d Congress, was passed. It will be recalled that that legislation delayed for 18 months the scheduled gradual elimination of reciprocal preferential tariff rates on the exchange of goods by the two countries.

In his message to the Congress of May 5, 1955, recommending the adoption of the proposed amendments to the 1946 agreement as embodied in H. R. 6059, the President of the United States stated:

> I believe that the revision, as proposed in the final act of negotiations, would be beneficial to both the United States and the Philippines and would contribute materially to the improvement of the already friendly political and economic relations between them. I earnestly urge, therefore, that appropriate legislation be enacted at this session of the Congress to permit revision of the 1946 agreement in accordance with the recommendations contained in the final act.

The Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior informed the committee of their support of the enactment of this legislation.

Briefly stated, H. R. 6059 would authorize the following principal changes in the existing United States-Philippine trade agreement:

First. The preferential tariff schedules would be adjusted so that the tariff preferences on United States articles would disappear more rapidly, and the United States preferences on Philippine articles would disappear less rapidly, than under the 1946 agreement. Under the present agreement, as modified, the exports of either the United States or the Philippines are admitted into the other country on a duty-free basis through December 31, 1955. Commencing on January 1, 1956, the imports into the respective countries from the other country will be dutiable at 15 percent of the rate applicable to like articles if imported from the foreign country which is entitled to the lowest rate. On each January 1 thereafter, under present law, an additional 5 percent of the rate in question would be added until January 1, 1973, on which date the duty would become 100 percent of the applicable rate. Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a table which shows the schedule for the disappearance of preferential tariffs as provided under present law and as would be authorized under H. R. 6059:

TABLE I

Period	Percentages of tariff rates that would apply—		
	Under existing legislation to United States imports of Philippine articles [1] and to Philippine imports of United States articles	Under H. R. 6059—	
		To United States imports of Philippine articles [1]	To Philippine imports of United States articles
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1956	15	5	25
1957	20	5	25
1958	25	5	25
1959	30	10	50
1960	35	10	50
1961	40	10	50
1962	45	20	75
1963	50	20	75
1964	55	20	75
1965	60	40	90
1966	65	40	90
1967	70	40	90
1968	75	60	90
1969	80	60	90
1970	85	60	90
1971	90	80	90
1972	95	80	90
1973	100	80	90
1974 (Jan. 1–July 3)	100	100	100

[1] The United States rates here referred to are the rates applicable to imports of like articles from the foreign country that is entitled to the lowest rates. On many articles Cuba is entitled to preferential tariff treatment by the United States, and on some articles imported from the Philippines and preferential rates applicable to like articles from Cuba are the rates to which the percentages shown above relate.

Second. The second point in the enumeration of the principal changes that would be authorized by H. R. 6059 is the fact that the 17 percent tax on all sales of foreign exchange imposed by the Philippines would be eliminated and there would be substituted therefor a special temporary import tax which would not exceed 17 percent and which would be gradually eliminated by January 1, 1966. This change would have the advantage over the present arrangement of not being applicable to transfers of earnings and capital—the so-called invisibles—as is the case under the present agreement. The removal of the exchange tax on "invisibles" is expected to provide a beneficial stimulant to the investment of American capital in the Philippines. In addition, the modification proposed in H. R. 6059 would provide for the elimination of the temporary import tax by 1966. The present foreign exchange tax has no date scheduled for its termination.

Third. The present quota provisions of the agreement would be revised: to eliminate quotas that have proved unnecessary; to provide for the slower disappearance of duty-free tariff quotas on scrap and filler tobacco, cigars, coconut oil, and buttons of pearl or shell; and, to provide for the deletion of provisions specifying how United States quotas on Philippine products are to be allocated among the producers in the Philippines.

Under H. R. 6059, the schedule of declining duty-free quotas applicable to United States imports of Philippine cigars, filler and scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons of pearl or shell follows the same pattern as the schedule of increases in United States duties applicable to other United States imports from the Philippines. As a result, the quantity of each of the aforementioned four categories of Philippine articles that are entitled to duty-free entry is reduced by the same progression as is set forth in the third column of the preceding table I. The base quantities of these articles on which the annual duty-free quotas are calculated are the same under H. R. 6059 as in the 1946 agreement. Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a schedule of these base quantities.

TABLE II.—*Schedule of tariff quotas*

Item	Classes of articles	Amounts
A	Cigars (exclusive of cigarettes, cheroots of all kinds, and paper cigars and cigarettes, including wrappers).	200,000,000 cigars.
B	Scrap tobacco, and stemmed and unstemmed filler tobacco described in par. 602, of the Tariff Act of 1930 of the United States, as amended, which is set forth as annex III to this agreement.	6,500,000 pounds.
C	Coconut oil	200,000 long tons.
D	Buttons of pearl or shell	850,000 gross.

The requirement in the 1946 agreement, that any Philippine article entered or withdrawn from warehouse in excess of the duty-free quota mentioned above shall be subject to 100 percent of the applicable United States duty, would be continued under H. R. 6059.

The more liberal duty-free quotas under H. R. 6059 would be of no immediate significance except for buttons of pearl or shell. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that in recent years imports of none of the other three categories of articles subject to declining duty-free quotas have amounted to more than a small part of the respective amounts entitled to duty-free entry.

H. R. 6059 would retain the present absolute quotas on sugar and cordage. The quota on rice would be eliminated. All other articles which are subject to absolute quotas under the 1946 agreement would become subject to tariff quotas as described above. We were advised that a quota on rice is no longer necessary in view of the fact that the Philippines has become a rice importer.

Fourth. The revised agreement as contemplated in H. R. 6059 would require the Philippines to enact legislation designed to facilitate the entry and residence of United States traders and investors. The present agreement has no provision currently effective with respect to treaty merchant status. Under the revised agreement, as contemplated in H. R. 6059, the Philippines would be obliged to take the necessary legislative and executive actions to enter into an agreement with the United States for the reciprocal entry of traders and investors as authorized by Public Law 419 of the 83d Congress.

Fifth. Under H. R. 6059 the 1946 agreement would be amended to provide a clear statement of rights of citizens of the United States to engage in business activities in the Philippines on the same basis as Philippine nationalists. This revision would also provide for the extension of like treatment to Philippine citizens to engage in business activities in the United States.

In addition to the changes to the 1946 agreement which I have just discussed, H. R. 6059 would also provide for: Mutual national security exceptions to the trade agreement such as the United States has customarily included in international agreements to which it is a party; the elimination of the prohibition against imposition of export taxes; provision for consultation at least 3 years before expiration of the agreement to consider problems anticipated in connection with its termination; and clarification of the definition of United States and Philippine articles for preferential tariff purposes to include articles of each country imported via third countries.

The Committee on Ways and Means approved amendments to H. R. 6059 which were intended to make it clear that the effect of this legislation is merely to authorize amending the 1946 agreement. This clarification eliminates any doubt that the Philippine constitutional amendment required by the parity provision of the 1946 agreement relating to certain rights of American interests will continue in force.

Another amendment approved by the committee would modify the present prohibition against entering into a trade agreement with the Philippines under section 350 of the Tariff Act so that the prohibition would be applicable only to a trade agreement which is inconsistent with the revised agreement.

The amendments contemplated by H. R. 6059 to the 1946 United States-Philippine agreement would enter into force on January 1, 1956, and would remain in effect through July 3, 1974, unless terminated earlier. The agreement could be terminated by either the United States or the Philippines at any time, upon not less than 5 years' written notice. If the President of either country should determine and proclaim that the other country had nullified or impaired any right or obligation provided for in the agreement, then the agreement could be terminated upon not less than 6 months' written notice.

In urging the enactment of H. R. 6059, the Committee on Ways and Means is well aware that favorable consideration of this legislation cannot be justified on purely economic grounds. However, it is the opinion of the Committee that the enactment of this legislation is desirable and is in the best interest of the United States. There are considerations of political and strategic factors transcending any economic factors which justify the adoption of these important amendments to the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

We are all well aware that the Philippine Republic has assumed a position of leadership in the Far East as a spokesman for the nations of the free world. The Committee on Ways and Means was informed during our public hearings and in our executive session that, even though the proposed revision of the 1946 agreement has not yet been approved, the negotiation of the proposed modification has already strengthened the friendly and cooperative ties between the United States and the Philippines. It may be frankly stated that the proposed changes to the United States-Philippine agreement that would be effected under H. R. 6059 would aid the Philippines in creating a more balanced economy. It is for these reasons that the Committee on Ways and Means took favorable action on this legislation and now recommends its enactment to the House of Representatives.

It is my earnest opinion that the historic friendship of the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of the Philippines will be strengthened and made more enduring by the demonstration of understanding and cooperation that will result from the enactment of this important legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, in outlining the changes proposed, mentioned one of the existing tariff schedules. The question I would like to pose is this: Will the State Department negotiate those changes, or are we attempting to write those changes in this bill?

Mr. COOPER. A Commission was appointed by this country and also by the Republic of the Philippines, a negotiating team for each country, and they have worked out the terms of the new agreement, and the new agreement is incorporated in the pending bill.

Mr. BAILEY. That would amend the agreement of 1946?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, would the gentleman tell us this? Speaking in a way of comparison, are the schedules agreed to here by this Commission as liberal as the ones in the Japanese trade agreement?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know of any comparison between this and the Japanese agreement. There is no comparison at all in that respect.

Mr. BAILEY. Since there is no serious question of imports of products that affect the industry of West Virginia, I have no particular inclination to oppose this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman undoubtedly knows, we have a serious situation in this country with respect to fats and oils which have an important effect on livestock prices in this country. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether that situation has been changed by virtue of this legislation; that is, whether more fats and oils, particularly vegetable oils, will be brought into this country under the terms of this bill.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think so.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. As the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means knows, the Philippines recently adopted a policy which was practically a virtual boycott of American tobacco going into the Philippines. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether or not there has been any disposition on the part of the Philippine Government to revise this attitude on buying American tobacco.

Mr. COOPER. It is our understanding that the situation has been satisfactorily taken care of.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. And it is now the gentleman's opinion that the Philippines will buy more of our American tobacco?

Mr. COOPER. We have had assurance from the Philippine Government and from the head of our negotiating team that that situation is taken care of, and the spokesmen of the tobacco interests are in agreement.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the proposed revision of the existing United States-Philippine trade agreement as authorized in the legislation before the House today, H. R. 6059.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which first gave consideration to the subject of Philippine trade at the time the Philippines was granted its independence. I have always viewed the problems confronting the people of the Philippine Republic with a very real interest, and I have constantly worked to perpetuate the close bonds of friendship that exist between our two great countries.

While it is true, as the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has stated, that the proposed amendments to the 1946 trade agreement cannot be justified on the basis of any economic advantage that the United States may hope to gain from this revision, it behooves us to remember the valiancy of our Philippine ally during World War II and to realize the courageous stand that nation has taken since in behalf of all democratic movements and nations.

As an American, I am proud of the altruism and the enlightened self-interest that prompted our great Nation to grant independence to the Philippine peoples. Also, as an American, I am equally proud of the tremendous progress that the Philippine Republic has made toward becoming one of the foremost nations of the free world. It is my view that H. R. 6059 will substantially contribute to the progress of achieving a more enduring friendship and a closer cooperation between the United States and the Philippines.

The enactment of H. R. 6059 can be expected to insure that a continued high level of goods will be exchanged between our two great Nations. We in the United States can be assured that our business interests in the Philippines will be protected and accorded the same privileges as is given to Philippine nationalists. Similarly, the people of the Philippines can look forward to the same consideration with respect to their status in the United States.

I do regret, Mr. Chairman, that I was unsuccessful in having my bill, H. R. 2579, which has as its purpose the repeal of the 3-cent per pound processing tax on coconut oil, reported as legislation to accompany H. R. 6059. It is my view that favorable consideration of this legislation would do much to benefit American labor, industry, and consumers as well as lend assistance to our Philippine ally. It will be my purpose to endeavor to obtain favorable consideration by the Congress of H. R. 2579 at the earliest possible moment.

I have recently received a communication from my esteemed friend and distinguished soldier and statesman, the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, Special Envoy of the President of the Republic of the Philippines. I will include as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD a letter from the general and my reply to him:

EMBASSY OF THE PHILIPPINES,
Washington, May 12, 1955.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Pursuant to the request of President Magsaysay to the United States Government soon after he assumed office in 1954, the free-trade period provided for in the 1946 Philippine trade agreement was extended 18 months and the United States assented to negotiations for revisions in the agreement. These negotiations have been completed and the delegations of the two countries have recommended to their Governments extensive alterations in the trade agreement. To become effective, the revisions must first be ratified by the Congresses of both Governments. The Philippine Congress has already ratified them. Such revisions are now in your committee, embodied in H. R. 6059, and hearings will start on Monday, May 16.

The new agreement eliminates residual controls over the Philippine economy retained in the 1946 agreement. It preserves and increases United States trade concessions designed to aid the Philippine economy during an 18½-year period of transition from mutual free trade to normal international trade relationships between the 2 countries, and it leaves the Philippines fully responsible, as we were not under the 1946 agreement, for the management of our own political, social, and economic affairs.

I am writing this letter to you because the revisions, if ratified by you, will assist the Philippines in accelerating efforts to create a better balanced economy, both as to increase in domestic production, with greater national self-sufficiency, and as to international trade and relationships. I am appealing to you, in behalf of President Magsaysay, to give us your support because this new measure carries out in a forceful way the new United States policy of assisting in the development of free nations through more trade than aid.

With the assurance of my high regard and esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,
CARLOS P. ROMULO.

MAY 25, 1955.

Hon. CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Special Envoy of the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Philippines Embassy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL ROMULO: You may rest assured of my attitude and actions when it comes to extending a helpful hand in the promotion of friendship and trade between the Philippine people and those of my own beloved country.

You are aware, I am certain, that mine was the first move to promote Filipino-American trade and relations when, in 1946, I introduced the first bill of its kind to extend beneficial tariff status to the Philippines. You know, too, I am positive, that the Philippine Congress unanimously approved my bill but that the Congress of the United States decided to act upon the so-called Bell bill, which under my chairmanship of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means I was privileged to completely rewrite and liberalize as much as possible in the face of powerful and concerted opposition.

You know, too, that the tie-in of the Philippine peso to the American dollar in the money market on the ratio basis of 2 pesos to the American dollar was my own brainchild and was intended to strengthen, stabilize, and secure the currency system of the new Republic of the Philippines during a most difficult and treacherous period of history. How well it has served the purpose of stability, and now inflation, you would know even better than I.

Now that it has seemingly served its purpose and run its course to the point where your Government desires to and has initiated the elimination of the arrangement, I shall bow to the will of your Government and the people.

The House report in connection with the original Philippine trade bill might properly and customarily have borne my name, but out of deference to the late and beloved chairman, Robert L. Doughton, it bore his name instead.

With best wishes, I subscribe myself,

Cordially and sincerely yours,
JOHN D. DINGELL.

It is for the reasons that I have briefly set forth that I urge my colleagues in the House to support the enactment of H. R. 6059.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the pending bill following general debate on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very singular and unusual piece of legislation. There will be nothing like it come up in this session of the Congress. There is nothing like it that has been up since we passed the original agreement in 1946. Here are two great countries dealing with each other. We have the right and the power to give to our President the right to make agreements in this case. So, I say it is a very important matter that has come up between one great nation another nation that is striving to be great.

I wish to assure you that the committee took great pains to do a good job in this case. They called in before it those whose business it has been for several years to study and to know about what would be best for both countries. They got the best experts that were available. Both sides were represented and, being friendly, the cordiality on both sides contributed to an equitable adjustment agreeable to both parties. I am sure that you would be interested to know that the

Philippine Congress has already adopted the terms of this agreement.

I was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when we gave formal freedom to the Philippines; in other words, when we assisted in preparing their constitution, as it were. Of course they were not compelled to adopt it, but we worked together and we have been working with them in a very admirable way ever since that time.

This country we call the Philippines has come to be quite a nation. They have quite a large population. They do big business. When you go into the city of Manila you see a thriving city. I was fortunate enough to have been there a few months ago. It looks very much like an American city. They do business the way we do. They want to get along the way we get along and they want to get along with us.

That is what this bill does. It provides what the President may do to encourage friendly relationships. This bill was prepared with the full knowledge of representatives of the Philippine Government; and while, of course, it was not necessary for them to sanction this agreement, but they have done so. We started out by renewing the agreement that we made in 1946. This situation became more complicated, because the Philippines have expanded their economy greatly. But as far as the matter of cordiality and friendliness between the two nations is concerned, it is just as warm as it has ever been.

It is not my purpose to go extensively into a discussion of this whole matter as set out in the committee report, because that would take hours. These paragraphs in the printed report all deal with business, exchange of commodities, and with the exchange of currencies and other constitutional problems. This report is a very comprehensive document. The report made by the committee covers almost every situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this bill directs the President to make a bilateral agreement with the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What is the language of the agreement that is authorized by the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know that I can tell the gentleman without going into much detail. The first paragraph of the report summarizes what they are supposed to do. A great many commodities are referred to and discussed, and it sets out what the President is authorized to do and what he may not do, and so forth.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The dates covered in the pending bill are exactly the same as in the 1946 agreement, which terminates in 1974.

Mr. JENKINS. They are practically the same. Any changes are minor which come about through developments.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman yields further, I recognize the need for this in view of our former relationship with the Republic and the people of the Philippines. I hope that this is not to be something of a permanent nature to extend over an indefinite period of time.

Mr. JENKINS. No, it is not for an indefinite period of time. It is not like a constitution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman consider this to be a broad grant of power to the President, to any President?

Mr. JENKINS. No. I think this is the only way we can deal with the Philippines, keep them with us and have us with them. There is cordiality; there is no rancor. It is not a case of somebody trying to beat somebody else. When I helped prepare this legislation I thought that I was doing something for two great countries honestly and sincerely. We did the best we could, and for the best interests of the people of two great countries.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reed], the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and now ranking minority member, sponsored legislation to extend for 18 months the Philippine Trade Agreement Act of 1946. That extension was intended to provide an opportunity for negotiation between the United States and the Philippines of a revised agreement. The bill before us today, H. R. 6059, contains the terms of the agreement reached as a result of those further negotiations.

There is no question but that from a purely economic standpoint the Philippine Republic receives relatively more advantageous concessions in this agreement than does the United States. To that extent, this agreement departs from the ordinary reciprocal trade agreement based upon arm's-length negotiation. It certainly would not meet a true test of reciprocity such as we would likely expect in the ordinary trade agreement. However, be that as it may, the terms of this agreement are fully justified.

As I have already stated, a special relationship exists between the United States and the Philippines. This relationship fully justifies a departure from the ordinary rules of trade negotiations. The Philippine Government has become a mainstay of the free world in the Far East. Its democratic leaders, especially President Magsaysay, a great friend of the United States, are playing a leading role in halting and turning back the tide of communism in the Far East. For these reasons, the economic strength and political stability of the Philippine Republic are of paramount importance not only to the United States but to all of the free world. Therefore, these trade concessions, relatively more advantageous to the Philippines as they may be, are, in the final analysis, in our own national interest.

As I have already stated, the Philippine Congress has already adopted the terms of this agreement. We should not delay any further our own approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jenkins] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us H. R. 6059 which is not a controversial bill. Two panels composed of duly appointed representatives of our Government and of the Government of the Philippines worked on an agreement that will be the basis of the economic relations between the two countries. Both panels agreed on what is before us and the Philippine Congress has ratified it. It now awaits our ratification.

The Committee on Ways and Means recommends its passage after having studied it carefully. I support the recommendation of the committee not only for the reasons so ably presented by the report, but because I firmly believe it is a measure that in the long-range view of history will serve to strengthen democracy in a region of the world where it can be strengthened only by positive acts such as the approval of this bill.

In Asia today communism is trying to win adherents with the glitter of its shibboleths. All it offers are promises and generalities. It dazzles benighted peoples with the glamor of independence and exploits the words "liberation" and "freedom" to achieve its selfish ends. But it has not given freedom nor has it liberated one single country that has fallen under its domination. We have kept faith with the Filipino people. We promised them independence and we lived up to our promise.

The passage of this bill will be another positive act of good faith. We are helping strengthen Philippine economy. President Magsaysay of the Philippines, who has successfully fought communism, needs a trade agreement such as is provided in this bill to help him continue his work of ameliorating the lot of the Philippine masses and improve their economic welfare. I know none of us here will begrudge him our cooperation in that great task. America has no better friend in Asia and President Magsaysay needs this new trade agreement to carry out the plans of his administration and win his continuing battle against subversion and infiltration.

The Filipino people have earned our gratitude. Their loyalty to our causes was demonstrated in the war against Japan when of all the peoples of Asia, the Filipinos alone remained steadfast to the democratic ideal. When the Asians and Africans met recently in Bandung, it was the Philippines that was recognized as the spokesman of the free world. General Romulo acting for his government was the most powerful voice for freedom. In San Francisco in 1945 when the United Nations was organized, and in the same city 10 years later, again it was the Philippines that fought Soviet Russia on the floor of the conference and succeeded in asserting the principles of democracy against communism.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is not a controversial bill; I will vote for it, and I hope it will merit the support of all of us. By doing so we bind closer together the rising Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. I have no further requests for time on this side, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the gentleman from Ohio yield further if he has any requests for time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking a few questions, which I should like to direct first to the chairman of the committee. Is there anything in this proposed legislation which in any way conflicts with the philosophy of our Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act?

Mr. COOPER. None whatever. This amended agreement is limited to the two countries only.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is there anything in this bill which grants a most-favored-nation position to either the United States or the Philippines as far as trade with each other is concerned?

Mr. COOPER. None whatever. This agreement stands on its own basis.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I make just this statement to the distinguished chairman of the committee: As the gentleman knows, in the Pacific we have the responsibility we have taken on in connection with the trade of Japan and tried to keep its economy going. Is there anything in this agreement which would conflict with trade originating between the Philippines and Japan?

Mr. COOPER. None whatever. This has no relation to the trade agreement which has recently been negotiated with Japan under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This is separate and apart and, as I indicated a few moments ago, stands on its own basis between us and the Philippines only.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman this, as a matter of information: At the present time is there restrictive legislation in the Philippine Islands against the importation of Japanese products?

Mr. COOPER. I am really not prepared to answer that question, as to what detailed relations may exist between the Philippines and Japan.

Mr. SPRINGER. This legislation is consistent with all of our trading relations with the Southeastern Asia countries?

Mr. COOPER. This is a special trade agreement between the United States and the Philippines.

Mr. SPRINGER. What I am trying to get at is this: Is there anything in this which grants a most-favored-nation position, so to speak, to any country over other nations of southeast Asia?

Mr. COOPER. No, it does not deal with that. Just the United States and the Philippines are involved.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Then we can understand that there is nothing in this agreement that will extend the most-favored-nation clause to any other nation in the world? Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any similar agreement such as this with any other country in the world?

Mr. COOPER. There is not any similar agreement, except that the gentleman will recall that we have always had a special trade arrangement between the United States and Cuba. We have a special relationship with Cuba just as we do with the Philippines as we know from history. Throughout the years we have always had a special trade relationship with Cuba. In this instance we have a special trade-agreement relationship with the Philippines.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of spending 6 happy years with the Bureau of Education in the Philippines. While I was there, I was constantly aware of the very cordial feeling that existed between the Filipino people and the American people. I have not had an opportunity to study this legislation, but I have a great deal of confidence in the men who have studied it, and who reported this measure out to the floor of the House. I am happy to support it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out line 1 through 22 and insert:

"SEC. 2. Revised Agreement Defined.

"For purposes of this act, the term 'revised agreement' means the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946, as such executive agreement is revised pursuant to the authority contained in section 201 of this act.

"TITLE II—REVISION OF TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

"SEC. 201. Authority to Revise the 1946 Agreement.

"In order to make revisions proposed by the delegations of the Governments of the United States of America and of the Republic of the Philippines in the 'Final Act of Negotiations Relative To Revision of the 1946 Trade Agreement Between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines' signed at Washington, December 15, 1954, as corrected, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the President of the Philippines revising the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946, so that such executive agreement, as so revised, will read as follows:

"AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES CONCERNING TRADE AND RELATED MATTERS DURING A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD FOLLOWING THE INSTITUTION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE, SIGNED AT MANILA ON JULY 4, 1946, AS REVISED"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 20, line 1, strike out "approval of this agreement," and insert "entry into force of the revisions of this agreement authorized by the Congress of the United States and the Congress of the Philippines in 1955."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 25, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 26, strike all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert:

"1. Upon the taking effect of this agreement, and upon the taking effect of the revisions thereof authorized by the Congress of the United States and the Congress of the Philippines in 1955, the provisions placing obligations on the United States: (a) if in effect as laws of the United States at the time of such taking effect, shall continue in effect as laws of the United States during the effectiveness of the agreement; or (b) if not so in effect, shall take effect and continue in effect as laws of the United States during the effectiveness of the agreement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 27, strike out lines 23 to 25 inclusive and on page 28, strike out lines 1 to 19 inclusive and insert:

"2. The revisions of this Agreement authorized by the Congress of the United States and the Congress of the Philippines in 1955 shall enter into force on January 1, 1956.

"PROTOCOL TO ACCOMPANY THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES CONCERNING TRADE AND RELATED MATTERS DURING A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD FOLLOWING THE INSTITUTION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE, SIGNED AT MANILA ON JULY 4, 1946, AS REVISED

"The undersigned duly empowered Plenipotentiaries have agreed to the following Protocol to the Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning trade and related matters during a transitional period following the institution of Philippine Independence, signed at Manila on July 4, 1946, as revised, which shall constitute an integral part of the agreement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 38, strike out lines 22 to 25 inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 202. Modification of text of revised agreement.

"The text of the revised agreement which is set forth in section 201 may be modified before the agreement authorized by such section is signed, but only."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 39, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 301. Proclamation; effective date of title.

"(a) Proclamation.—If the agreement authorized by section 201 has been entered into before January 1, 1956, the President of the United States shall so proclaim, and the revised agreement shall be effective in the United States in accordance with its terms."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 40, strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 302. Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

"The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (except section 506 (a) relating to termination of payments into Philippine Treasury, and except amendments and repeals made by such act) shall not apply during such time as the revised agreement is in effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 41, line 13, after "1930" insert: "which is inconsistent with this act or with the revised agreement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 42, line 3, after "United States", insert "which relate to customs or internal revenue matters."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 42, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 308. Technical amendment.

"Section 9 of the act of March 2, 1917, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 734) is hereby amended by inserting after 'the Philippine Trade Act of 1946' the following: 'or the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no further amendments to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK, having assumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6059) to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, pursuant to House Resolution 289, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to revisions of the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUED OPERATION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3253) to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3253, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill came about as a result of action taken by the United States Commissioner of Education in connection with a school located on Quantico Marine Base, Quantico, Va. That school has been in operation for several years. When Public Law 874 was passed, it provided for the operation of such schools. Among other things, it gave authority to the United States Commissioner of Education, where suitable educational facilities were found and it was suitable for the operation of the school, to close the schools on the base, and let them be absorbed by the local county or State school setup.

Last year it was under consideration by the Commissioner, and at that time I conferred with the Commissioner and urged that he not discontinue the operation of that school. He postponed action. This year he came up with the order discontinuing the school.

The committee regarded it as a rather serious matter, especially to the Marine Corps base at Quantico; so after it was brought to the committee's attention we called for hearings and had a very thorough hearing on the matter.

The committee decided that the circumstances did not warrant the closing of the school and the moving of 134 pupils out into the State of Virginia to a school that certainly at most could not be expected to absorb them for more than 1 year. That was admitted.

There are several hundred housing units being constructed near the school which the Commissioner expected to take care of the Quantico students. The committee was under the impression that the children from these units would more than fill the school, and the Commissioner could not give us any assurance that there would be any provision for these students next year.

The Marine Corps Base School at Quantico is a well-operated school. It is geared to the needs of the children of military personnel. By the way, their children are sometimes entered in 2 or 3 schools during the course of a year. It is necessary to have teachers who are familiar with that kind of procedure and familiar with the kind of problems that necessarily result from moving these Marine families all over the world.

Without going into all the details involved, let me say that we conferred with Marine Corps officials. They came before the committee and gave us detailed information on the matter. They opposed the closing of the school. The committee felt that there simply was no reason for closing the schools.

There were some little differences of opinion with 2 or 3 members, I believe, over the manner in which we dealt with the situation, but we felt that the only way we could prevent the closing of the school was by putting a provision in the law requiring that before closing one of these schools, the Secretary of the branch of defense involved, together with the Commissioner, determine whether there were suitable school facilities available to the base.

Some point was made as to the military's interference or connection with the school program; but, of course, we all know that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Air all are civilians, and a school is certainly closely related to the operation of any military base.

I might say also, Mr. Chairman, that the law under which this school setup is provided expires next year, and the committee just simply could not see any good, sensible reason for closing up that school and scattering those pupils out into territory that could not take care of them for more than a year. A transportation problem was involved, as well as many other problems; so the committee very promptly reported this bill out and I do not believe there is any controversy involved over the merits or necessity for this action so far as either the committee or the House is concerned. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLT], the author of the bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I will not take much time of the House because I believe our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], covered most of the important points.

There are really only 3 schools involved, 1 at Fort Knox, Ky., 1 at the Marine Corps Base at Camp Lejeune, N. C., and 1 at the Marine Corps Base at Quantico, Va. To close these schools would create a terrible hardship on the children, especially at the Marine Corps Base at Quantico, for they would have to go to 4 different schools in 2 counties. Quantico is really the Annapolis and the West Point of the Marine Corps, and these schools are very important to the welfare of the children on the base. To close these schools would be to cut out some of the fringe benefits we are offering to attract men to stay in the military service.

Under this bill the Commissioner could not arbitrarily close down any school. The matter must be considered and agreed to jointly by both the civilian secretary of the Military Department and the Commissioner and also they must consult with the appropriate State education authorities before closing down one of these schools.

As the gentleman from North Carolina said, there is no controversy on this bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I very strongly support this bill, H. R. 3253. It is necessary, in my opinion, to take care of several special situations which we did not quite envision when we passed Public Law 874 that has to do with education in those districts adversely affected by the impact of Federal activities.

I want to express myself, therefore, as being strongly in accord with the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the committee amendment printed in the bill as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 6 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong.), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In any case where education is being provided under an arrangement made under this subsection for children residing on an Army, Navy (including the Marine Corps), or Air Force installation, it shall be presumed, for the purposes of this subsection, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for the children residing on such installation, until the Commissioner and the Secretary of the Military department concerned jointly determine, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency, that a local educational agency is able to do so."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3253) to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on Marine Corps installations, pursuant to House resolution 281, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I assume that the gentleman will give us an explanation and submit to a few questions with respect to the conference report and that this thing will not be rushed through?

Mr. RICHARDS. I will say to the gentleman I will be glad to submit to any questions he would like to ask.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1071)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 10 and 11.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 24½, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(b) In section 402, which relates to the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, strike out 'not less than $350,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof 'for the fiscal year 1956, not less than $300,000,000'."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 5 of the House engrossed amendments, insert quotation marks at the end of line 9, and strike line 10 and all that follows through line 7 on page 6.

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(b) It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this Act shall be administered so as to assist other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world and to fulfill their responsibilities for self-government or independence."

And the House agree to the same.

JAS P. RICHARDS,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

REDUCTION IN MILITARY AUTHORIZATION

Amendment No. 1: The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the authorization for $1,133,000,000 for direct military assistance, a reduction of $145,000,000 from the Senate bill. The conferees were not disposed to leave in any item as a reserve for contingencies in view of the unsatisfactory explanations given both Houses as to the present status of the program.

The conferees were influenced by the gyrations in the estimates of unobligated balances made by the executive branch during and since the presentation of this bill in both Houses.

Since August 26, 1954, section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955 has defined "valid obligations" for use in any statement of obligation of funds furnished to Congress or any committee thereof. Thus this section 1311 was no mere technicality, to be applied solely to appropriations, no change in section 1311 has been requested by the agencies, and there has been ample time for the executive agencies to adopt this required procedure in presenting this program to Congress this year.

The conferees were shocked at the wholesale "reservations" reported to have been made in the Defense Department during the last few days of the fiscal year, in order to "save" their appropriations from "losses" under section 1311. The loss of $275 million through failure to obligate or reserve during this rush period is now being called a "saving" by the agencies.

All of the conferees believe that prompt study and action is necessary by Congress and the Executive to prevent precipitate, and probably unjustified, obligating of funds to avoid deauthorizing or rescission of appropriations. We believe it would be helpful and we urge that the Congress adopt procedures that will give immediate, rather than remote, control in gearing spending in a fiscal year more closely to the annual appropriations. Making annual contract authorizations for future spending, as was the practice for many years, instead of appropriations for future contracts, would tend to accomplish this purpose.

The committee of conference agreed that the annual mutual-security authorizing legislation should be submitted to the Congress earlier than has been the case in recent years, preferably by February 1.

SPAIN

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: The Senate receded from its disagreement to amendment No. 9, and the House receded from amendment No. 10. The conferees accepted the House figure of $92,000,000, an increase of $22,000,000 over the Senate figure of $70,000,000, and deleted the language earmarking $50,000,000 for Spain. The committee of conference, however, expresses its unanimous view that at least $50,000,000 of the total amount should, after satisfactory negotiation and agreement, be used for assistance to Spain.

GREECE

Amendment No. 11: The House receded from its amendment No. 11, but the conferees are unanimous that, subject to satisfactory negotiation and agreement, the defense support for Greece in fiscal year 1956 should not be less than that available in fiscal year 1955.

SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Amendment No. 20: The managers on the part of the House accepted the provision in the Senate bill requiring that $300,000,000 of the funds authorized be used to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of United States surplus agricultural commodities, with a clarifying amendment. The House amendment provided for a cumulative total of $600,000,000 of such exports including $350,000,000 for fiscal 1955 and $250,000,000 for fiscal 1956.

It was the judgment of the committee of conference that this increased requirement for the utilization of United States surplus farm products in the mutual-security program could be met without impairing the effectiveness of the program.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION AND NATO CIVILIAN HEADQUARTERS

Amendments Nos. 21 and 24: The Senate receded from its disagreement to amendments Nos. 21 and 24 which delete the authorizations for ICEM and NATO. The committee of conference emphasizes that the deletions were made because present law contains continuing authorizations of appropriations for United States contributions to ICEM and NATO and, therefore, further authorization is unnecessary. The committee of conference also emphasizes that the deletions do not constitute any reflection on the need for appropriations for ICEM and for NATO.

JOINT COMMISSION ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 35: The House receded from the language proposed in its amendment to the Senate bill. The United States presently enjoys close cooperation with the Philippine Government in many fields of activities including rural development. Information available to the committee of conference, which was not available when the House considered the section, indicates that both the American and the Philippine Governments now have serious doubts as to whether such a plan as that anticipated in the section is the best way to deal with this problem at the present time. The subject requires considerably more study and discussion before final decision can be made on an intergovernmental basis.

COLONIALISM

Amendment No. 46: The Senate receded from its disagreement to amendment No. 46 and accepted the House language on colonialism with a clarifying amendment which is in keeping with the purpose and objectives of the House language.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees think that we have brought back a good report. I believe there were 48 differences between the House bill and the Senate bill, and the Senate receded on 43 of them. Some of them were very minor and technical. The House receded on 2 and we had to give and take and get together on 3.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report carries the same cut that was made in the authorization request by the House. The Senate receded and concurred in the amendment that provided a cut of $145 million for military services. I believe the only other points of contention were the provision in regard to Spain and the provision in regard to Greece. The House receded on the provision in regard to Spain and also Greece, but the funds for defense support for Europe were not cut. The report said that it was the understanding of all the conferees that the addition made by the House to the defense-support funds for Europe would be used in Spain.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In the report the language seems satisfactory. It makes the position of the conferees clear. But the amount of money involved in the fiscal year 1955 which the report says shall not be less than that amount for 1956, was $26.2 million; is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. For Greece it was $26.2 million. It was provided in the report that it was the understanding of the conferees that the sum for Greece in fiscal 1956 could not be less than that.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is my understanding; it cannot be less than $26.2 million.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is the opinion of the conferees that it should not be less; dependent, of course, on negotiations and agreements.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Of course, it is pretty plain that it was the opinion of the conferees that it should not be less than $50 million subject to the same conditions, as Spain.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right. The amount originally programed for Spain was $28 million. The effect of the House amendment would add $22 million, making $50 million. The total amount of dollars authorized for defense support for Europe in the House bill was left intact, and it was stated in the report that the addition was to make it $50 million for Spain.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Should not the RECORD at this point show that the conferees, in discussing the funds for Greece, felt that the President should provide whatever is necessary to make the amount for the coming fiscal year equal that for the past fiscal year, by taking it out of his contingent fund?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the chairman, if I may, if the dollar limitations set in the conference report are about those that were in the bill passed by the House?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. ADAIR. Are they exactly the same—the dollar limitations?

Mr. RICHARDS. Exactly.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that this report represents the same dollar amount it had when it left the House of Representatives?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right; $3,285,800,000.

Mr. GROSS. It was not increased by virtue of the conference?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it was not increased. The Senate accepted our cuts.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I find some language here that is very interesting, language in the report:

> The conferees were shocked at the wholesale "reservations" reported to have been made in the Defense Department during the last few days of the fiscal year in order to "save" their appropriations from "losses" under section 1311.

The conference committee was shocked by revelations of what had been going on in the last few days of the fiscal year and yet the conferees did not cut this bill in view of that fact, or make any alterations moneywise to this bill?

Mr. RICHARDS. Our state of shock was caused not by anything in this particular authorization. This authorization is sound and can stand on its own legs. But the conference was shocked by the estimates, the varying estimates that were brought to us in regard to obligated and unobligated balances.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman was shocked by the fact that it was evident that they could not spend this money and they were reserving it and were going through, as the report says, various gyrations to lay claim upon this money that they could not possibly spend? And yet under those circumstances the conferees proceeded to vote the full amount.

Mr. RICHARDS. My friend should not put words in my mouth as to why we were shocked.

These words in the conference report stand for themselves. That is the unanimous opinion of the conferees. We thought we should give expression to our thoughts on this subject when this conference report was brought back here.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. On the question of who was shocked by what during the conference, I think the report makes it clear that the conferees were criticizing the bookkeeping on the program, not the mutual-security program itself. We are all supporting the program, and want it to succeed. But on the question of the power of the conferees to change amounts, is it not the fact that the amounts in conference were merely the differences between the two Houses? In each instance the conference accepted the lower figure, the figure that was proposed by the House. The conferees were without power to cut this any further. The conferees were quite aware of the fact that this bill does not appropriate a dime. It is merely an authorization bill for future appropriations with some limitations in it. We were also aware that the Committee on Appropriations will have a bill based on these authorizations on the floor, I understand, early next week.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. The language in the conference report is clear. The conferees of both the Senate and the House stand behind it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the committee of conference did have a responsibility and could have come in with a bill in which there was a reduction, and it would have been up to the House to accept or reject that conference report, would it not? There is nothing to prevent the committee from coming in with a substantial reduction.

Mr. RICHARDS. The conferees are limited to the amounts in conference. We expressed our opinion as to what improvements could be made in the administration of this act before next year. I think we have brought back about 95 or 96 percent of what the House passed.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In the closing minutes of the debate on the Tito amendment there was no longer any time for reply at the time the minority leader and the majority leader answered my arguments, and the gentleman from South Carolina interrupted to bring out the fact that there was only $42 million in this bill for Tito and Yugoslavia. I think I asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this question: Is $42 million the total actual amount in this entire bill for Yugoslavia?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, the impression I tried to give was that the sum you mention was the only amount specifically programed for Yugoslavia. There will doubtless be military funds in addition. The military funds involve restricted and secret information. I am sorry I gave the wrong impression.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The $42 million to Yugoslavia pertains only to economic aid?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. O'KONSKI. But there are also in the military-aid provision of the bill additional funds for Yugoslavia?

Mr. RICHARDS. No. There are additional funds that could be used for Yugoslavia; they will not necessarily be so used, but they could be.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I made the statement in support of the amendment that there is a possibility that out of this over $3 billion bill in economic aid and military assistance as high as $300 million of this money combined may go to Yugoslavia.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman was perfectly honest in what he stated the other day. That amount may be possible, but not at all probable. I think his estimate is too large.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The reason I rise to cure that point is that many Members of the House were under the impression that the total amount earmarked for Yugoslavia under this bill is $42 million. That is not the case at all. That relates only to economic assistance. It does not pertain at all to military assistance because there is practically no limit on the amount he might get in that respect.

Mr. RICHARDS. There is wide discretion in the President's hands. Of course, it all depends on the military agreements and programs which are revised from time to time.

The gentleman may be within the range of possibilities, but I think he is far afield as to the probabilities.

Mr. FULTON. We should not forget the carryover provisions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would like to ask just one other question. Forty-two million dollars originally in the bill, as it passed the House, was supposed to go to Yugoslavia. Fifty million dollars is earmarked for Spain. Now, you include as a result of the compromise with the other body after the conference and the report contains the suggestion that it is the unanimous opinion of the conferees that $50 million of this money go to Spain. But, is there any restriction or is there any requirement that the authorities actually do so? In other words, have you not opened the door where Tito might get more than $42 million out of this bill now with the way the conference report reads?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think so.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin, $40 million in this bill is new money earmarked for Yugoslavia. We must remember that there is a great carryover of about $8 billion, or $7.7 billion. Of that amount, there is about $5 billion planned and programed for Europe under goods or materiel from previous appropriations. In that carryover, there is an amount for goods for Yugoslavia. I am not sure of the amount, but I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct in his estimate of it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not think the point raised by the gentleman from Iowa should go completely unchallenged. I think the gentleman knows that in accordance with the rules of the House, there is no way that the committee of conference could offer new amendments to this legislation. Under the rules, the conference committee can only consider matters which are in disagreement between the two Houses, and when the gentleman makes the point that the conference did not cut this any more, I want to bring out the point that I do not believe there is any way that they could cut it because if they did, their action would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. There are $28 million for Spain. That has been raised to $50 million. So there is now $42 million more in the conference report than before; is that not correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know whether I understood the gentleman's question, but $50 million is no longer earmarked in the bill for Spain. The conference made no increase in the funds available above the amount in the bill that passed the House.

There is, however, an understanding on the part of the conferees that if satisfactory agreements can be made, that $50 million will be used for Spain.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is that the economic aid?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is for defense support—yes, economic aid.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that, because last year when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was in Spain, we talked to the Minister of Commerce, and we were surprised at the economic deficiencies in the economy of Spain, which it was so necessary to correct in order to enable them to provide necessary support for their own defense.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I would just like to inquire of the gentleman if the conferees were probably not shocked also when they found that one-half billion dollars of this money had been obligated on the last day, and which had been included in the bill last year.

Mr. RICHARDS. That was a subject over which the conferees had no jurisdiction in this meeting.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does not that just point up the fact that as long as we have a termination date, there is a tendency to obligate before the termination date is reached?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think there is any doubt about it. I think this practice that we have gotten into of having termination dates is bad.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield the the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think the Record should stand as giving the impression that there is $42 million definitely earmarked in this bill for Yugoslavia, because that is not the case. There is nothing definitely earmarked for any country, in the entire bill except Korea. Second, the figure programed or recommended by FOA for defense support for Yugoslavia is not $42 million. It is $36,500,000, as our committee report shows. It would be too bad to have the Record contain an erroneous figure which might handicap our own people in negotiating with the country in question.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct as to defense support alone.

Mr. JUDD. The correct figure is $36.5 million and not $42 million.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right; for defense support.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the conferees because they have retained the cuts that the House made. In explanation to the gentleman from Iowa, the conferees could just keep the cuts when the Senate had a higher amount. I especially want to compliment the conferees in keeping the $145 million cut sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys].

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. That amendment originally came from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] in the committee.

Mr. FULTON. So that what the conferees have done has saved the lower figure in each case, and they have gone as far as they could on the authorization in this bill.

The question the gentleman from Iowa is raising is a question directed to the appropriation of the particular funds. Of course, when the Senate had put in an amendment in their version, that anything over $200 million not obligated could be cut off, it was almost an invitation to the Department of Defense to obligate everything over $200 million. That is just what has happened the last day before June 30.

Mr. RICHARDS. I agree with the statement. If there had not been several estimates made by the executive department, so as to bring about a condition where we did not know where we were, that limitation on carryover might not have been left in the bill.

Mr. FULTON. The conferees did everything they could to maintain the position of the House on the authorization.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, we did, and we had to stay within the scope of what a free conference can do. That is, settle the differences between the two Houses.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might state to the gentleman that notwithstanding the fact you are under the impression they could carry over $200 million, in the last 24 hours they obligated in excess of $900 million, and they are carrying over only $33 million unexpended, a complete violation of law.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would like the chairman to answer this question: Why is it considered top secret or classified and put in such a category that you are unable to tell the Members of the House, each of whom represents 300,000 or more taxpayers, just how many planes we are giving to Tito? Why is it considered classified? Certainly the Kremlin knows. Everybody else knows that Yugoslavia under this plan will have the biggest airplane force in the world. Everybody knows it except the Members of Congress who are supposed to appropriate this money.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will tell the gentleman why.

First let me say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] in referring to $36 million does not include all the nonmilitary funds for Yugoslavia. The total program was $40.6 million.

Mr. JUDD. I said defense support, $36,500,000. The other $4 million is for direct forces support.

Mr. RICHARDS. The total program is $40.6 million. We will not quarrel about the different categories. The reason that we cannot spell out how many planes and what kind of planes and what they would cost in dollars is the same reason for our not telling the world what we are going to do with our own defense. The situation is the same.

The direct military aid to these countries is just as much a part of the defense of the United States, in the opinion of our committee, as are the authorizations for our own defense establishment. The Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces do not believe that we should tell the world whom we are going to help and how much military help we will give. We try to break it down by areas and by percentages as far as we can.

Mr. GROSS. With Yugoslavia infiltrated as it is with Communists, does not the chairman of the committee feel that the Kremlin, which is really our enemy, knows how many planes we are giving to Yugoslavia?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know, but let me point out that the Foreign Affairs Committee does not in one single instance determine whether information is secret or nonsecret. The administration presents this information to us in their programs. Some is classified in such a way that it can go to the public, and other information is restricted and secret in the interest of the security of the United States. That is the reason we are unable to give the gentleman the information he seeks.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see so many members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in favor of economy in this bill. We will welcome their support when the appropriation bill comes to the House floor. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question.

Mr. RICHARDS. It will be a pleasure, I assure the gentleman if for once we can find ourselves on the same side with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I will be delighted to welcome the gentleman's assistance on the appropriation bill.

I wonder why the conferees watered down the amendment with respect to colonialism? Is there something sacrosanct about the word?

Mr. RICHARDS. It was not watered down; I think it was strengthened a little. It is just a question of language. The Senate conferees proposed a change in language and added one line. The gentleman knows what the line is.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I call this to the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts in asking this question, because the gentleman from Massachusetts introduced quite a strong resolution which was overwhelmingly supported by the House, yet we do not mention colonialism in this bill. This is just a watered down version of the Four Freedoms.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think it is a watered down version at all; I think it is a very strong statement and supports the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why you do not use the word "colonialism" in this bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. You know, sometimes in conference committees there are disagreements on words, and that is the way the thing happened. I do not think it means much one way or the other.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman's statement with respect to gyrations, and so on and so forth, and perhaps mishandling of funds here is not just a selection of different words.

Mr. RICHARDS. Had I known of the gentleman's objection to leaving out this particular word I certainly would have tried to keep it in.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot settle for this bill on that basis at all.

Mr. JUDD. The added language does not water down the declaration. It says it is our desire not only to help other peoples "assume an equal station among the free nations of the world," but also to help them in their efforts to "fulfill their responsibilities for self-government or independence." Surely that makes the declaration stronger, not weaker.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I hardly understand why an additional authorization of $3½ billion is required from the Federal Treasury to provide for what is described as mutual aid to other countries of the world when we have a balance authorized and unexpended of $8½ billion.

According to statements made on the floor of the House by those who are familiar with the situation, the most that can be expended in any one year to carry out the program outlined by those in charge, is approximately $4 billion. In other words, we have a balance or backlog of authorized funds but unexpended sufficient to carry out the present program over a period of 2 years. It is my understanding it was planned that these expenditures amounting to $4 billion a year were to be tapered off or reduced so it would not be necessary to dip into our Federal Treasury as deeply as we have done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this bill should be held by the committee with instructions to look into the situation and find out whether there is really need and justification for spending so much of the American taxpayers' money in other countries of the world. In view of the size of our national debt and the heavy tax burden already laid against our people, I think we could do well by reducing this authorization by at least 50 percent. To do so would certainly not injure the defense program because there are more funds on hand now than can be reasonably spent for that purpose over the next 2 years. The same applies in respect to other requirements under the mutual-aid program.

I certainly do not want to do anything to weaken our efforts to make peace with people of other countries of the world. I think too little of these funds goes to the people. Too much goes to the heads of the governments. Be that as it may, there seems to be a good-sized accumulation of funds on hand right now that is unexpended, and that will not be expended for some time.

When we have a report from the Department of the Treasury stating our country has expended $50 billion to help foreign countries since the close of World War II, it makes one wonder whether there is a tapering off place in this program. A detailed report of this expenditure would be helpful.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, attention should be called to amendment No. 20 in the conference report, dealing with surplus agricultural commodities. The House amendment required that not less than $600 million of the funds provided for fiscal year 1955 and 1956 should be for aid in the form of such surplus commodities. It developed that about $381 millon worth of agricultural surpluses were used in the program in fiscal 1955. That would require only $219 million worth to be used in fiscal 1956.

It was recalled by the conferees that the executive branch did not favor my amendment which became section 550 of the 1954 act, when the amendment was offered 2 years ago to establish this whole program of using our surplus agricultural commodities in lieu of dollars and selling them to other countries for their currencies. Yet the program proved feasible and was operated most successfully by FOA, when the law required it. The authorization was increased last year from $250 million to $350 million and FOA was able to dispose of $381 million. It is recognized that some of the most acute needs have now been met, but the conference committee is confident $300 million is not too much for this next year and the conference therefore accepted that figure.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 120, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—262

Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andresen, August H.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carrigg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Cole
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
George
Gordon
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Hale
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hyde
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Meader
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Ray
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
St. George
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Westland
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—120

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Ashmore
Bailey
Barden
Bass, Tenn.
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Blitch
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Burdick
Carlyle
Cederberg
Church
Clevenger
Colmer
Coon
Crumpacker
Davis, Wis.
Dondero
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Gavin
Gentry
Grant
Gray
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Hand
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hull
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, N. C.
Kilgore
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Long
Lovre
McCulloch
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Moulder
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Passman
Phillips
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Saylor
Scherer
Scrivner
Sheehan
Short
Shuford
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Talle
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Weaver
Wharton
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Winstead
Withrow

NOT VOTING—52

Barrett
Betts
Boggs
Broyhill
Buchanan
Carnahan
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Dempsey
Dies
Dingell
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Fjare
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Halleck
Hébert
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Jackson
Kearney
Kee
Kilburn
McCarthy
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill
Mason
Merrow
Morrison
Mumma
Philbin
Pilcher
Polk
Radwan
Reed, N. Y.
Simpson, Pa.
Staggers
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Walter
Watts

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Betts against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mr. Polk for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Chase against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Fjare against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mrs. Kee with Mr. Broyhill.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. GRANT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALGER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 300, Rept. No. 1081), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5614) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DOMESTIC MINERALS EXTENSION ACT, 1953

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 301, Rept. No. 1082), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to extend their remarks on the conference report just before the rollcall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) entitled "an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 609. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 804) to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, to make the following changes, viz: On page 1, line 5, and in the first line of the title, respectively, of the engrossed bill, strike out "(e)" and in lieu thereof insert "(d)."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to ask what the program will be for the next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my intention to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday, because the only remaining order of business is a conference report which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will call up immediately.

Monday, while it is District day, I am informed there are no bills. The mutual security appropriation for 1956 will be considered Monday, and it is hoped that the bill will be disposed of on that day. If, however, it is not, it goes over until Tuesday.

Thereafter, H. R. 5168, the Farm Credit Act of 1955.

The State primary is on in Virginia on Tuesday. If there should be any rollcalls on Tuesday, they will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, if a rule is reported out, the minimum-wage bill; H. R. 7089, the servicemen's survivors' benefits; the social security amendments. H. R. 5614, a bill amending the Communications Act of 1934, and H. R. 6373, extension of the Domestic Mineral Program Act. Also, the housing bill if a rule is reported out.

The above bills may not necessarily be called up in the order listed. The usual reservation, that conference reports may be called up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman intend to ask permission to adjourn over until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. If the gentleman will yield, I will do that now.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last week the foot-in-the-door universal conscription bill was rushed through the House without a rollcall. I do not know why, in the light of what is now developing, time for that vote could not have been taken the first of this week. That bill may well affect the lives of thousands of young men, perhaps through the years millions of young men, but there was no time for a rollcall. Now if it is proposed to recognize the Thursday-to-Tuesday Club, I will feel constrained to object.

Mr. MARTIN. I may say I do not think the Tuesday-Thursday Club will be operating next week, not if we have any idea of getting through.

Mr. McCORMACK. In further reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] with reference to the housing bill is that if a rule is brought out that will be on the program next week also.

In reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], it is easy to stand up here and make the statement about Tuesday to Thursday. We all could make statements like that if we wanted to, but the facts do not support such a statement, because when I have a full week's program there are always 2 or 3 or 4 bills that have to be brought up under rules that are more or less controversial, and they have to be considered.

I think it is wise leadership whether on the Democratic side or the Republican side when they have a majority to schedule those bills for Monday. So there is no harm done; we are doing a legislative day's work.

So far as this week is concerned, and the matter of the rollcall, I am not going to argue with the gentleman from Iowa, but under the rules of the House, rules which have been in existence since constitutional government has existed in this country, if one-fifth of the membership demands a rollcall, it may be had. One-fifth did not stand. I can understand the gentleman's disappointment, and I am not going to argue with him, but the fact is that in accordance with the rules of the House an attempt was made to have a rollcall, and also in accordance with the rules of the House the necessary number of Members did not stand to support the demand for a rollcall. It was all done under the rules of the House.

So far as this week's program is concerned, we have had a very full week. There is no more legislative business this week. That is all I can say to my friend from Iowa.

As to this objection, and I am sure my friend is not going to object, and he has not indicated it, I may say, so that the record will make my position clear, but should objection be made and we met tomorrow, then tomorrow I would move to adjourn and if we met Saturday there would be an immediate motion to adjourn.

If objection is made to going over to Monday that would be the situation, but I do not expect it to be made by my friend the gentleman from Iowa, I will say that; I would gamble on it; if I were a betting man I would even give a little odds on it—and I am not encouraging an objection either.

Mr. GROSS. The point the gentleman from Iowa is making is that there was a terrible rush last Friday afternoon to close up the Congress so those who wanted to get away for a long weekend. Now we have just heard a statement that if a rollcall should be demanded on Monday of next week it would go over to Tuesday. Why could not a rollcall have gone over from Friday of last week to Tuesday of this week? When it is insisted upon by the leadership a rollcall is put over, and had it been insisted upon it would have put it over until Tuesday. Is not that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just sometimes.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend has stated a fact, but it is not a correct statement of the facts.

The gentleman exercised his right under the rules to demand a rollcall, and the other Members exercised their right under the rules not to sustain the gentleman in that demand. That is all there is to it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let the record of last week speak for itself. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to ask a question, I recall a statement the gentleman from Massachusetts made the other day.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had been hopeful that my friend from Michigan and I could get through today in a most pleasant manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman hopes what?

Mr. McCORMACK. That we can get through pleasantly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am sure we can. I will try to restrain myself this afternoon. May I ask whether the bill introduced today to end this strike which is causing so much discomfort in this city will be given consideration? Is there any prospect of getting that legislation before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is a much better parliamentarian than I.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My, my, my, Mr. Speaker, I want those words taken down. The statement is not accurate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1083)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect to the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

"Continental United States

"Technical Services Facilities

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $1,736,000.

"Black Hills Ordnance Depot, South Dakota: Family housing, $1,428,000.

"Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Kentucky: Operational and maintenance facilities, $509,000.

"Erie Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,933,000.

"Frankford Arsenal, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $855,000.

"Lordstown Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities, $875,000.

"Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado: Operational and maintenance facilities, $1,843,000.

"Red River Arsenal, Texas: Operational and maintenance facilities, $140,000.

"Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Research and development facilities and community facilities, $2,865,000.

"Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational and maintenance facilities, $347,000.

"Rossford Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $400,000.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Operational and maintenance facilities, $342,000.

"Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York: Community facilities, $129,000.

"Sierra Ordnance Depot, California: Operational and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

"White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Troop supporting facility, and research and development facilities, $1,247,000.

"Wingate Ordnance Depot, New Mexico: Operational and maintenance facilities, $632,000.

"(Quartermaster Corps)

"Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Storage facilities, $84,000.

"Belle Meade General Depot, New Jersey: Operational and maintenance facilities, $174,000.

"Fort Lee, Virginia: Troop housing, community facilities, medical facility, storage facilities, training facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,589,000.

"Memphis General Depot, Tennessee: Family housing, $99,000.

"New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Family housing, $568,000.

"Sharpe General Depot, California: Utilities and family housing, $337,000.

"(Chemical Corps)

"Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Troop housing, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,248,000.

"Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $92,000.

"Camp Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, $452,000.

"Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, hospital and medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,129,000.

"Pine Bluff Arsenal (including Midwest Chemical Depot), Arkansas: Land acquisition, $3,000.

"Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, $773,000.

"(Signal Corps)

"Decatur Signal Depot, Illinois: Operational and maintenance facilities, $303,000.

"Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Airfield pavements, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, troop housing, and family housing, $5,913,000.

"Lexington Signal Depot, Kentucky: Maintenance facility, and family housing, $538,000.

"Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Community facilities, $615,000.

"Sacramento Signal Depot, California: Troop housing, maintenance facility, and family housing, $715,000.

"Tobyhanna Signal Depot, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, $649,000.

"Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Community facilities, and family housing, $1,298,000.

"Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Community facilities, storage facility, and operational and maintenance facility, $695,000.

"(Corps of Engineers)

"Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational and maintenance facility, $62,000.

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Troop housing, community facilities, research and development facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, and family housing, $4,608,000.

"Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,822,000.

"Marion Engineer Depot, Ohio: Storage facilities and utilities, $1,146,000.

"(Transportation Corps)

"Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Utilities, $1,055,000.

"Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina: Storage facilities and utilities, $329,000.

"Fort Eustis, Virginia: Troop housing, community facilities, training facilities, medical facility, and operational and maintenance facilities, $6,597,000.

"New Orleans Army Base, Louisiana: Storage facility, $117,000.

"Oakland Army Base, California: Community facilities, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $1,923,000.

"Fort Story, Virginia: Utilities, $41,000.

"West Coast Ammunition Terminal, California: Land acquisition, $3,209,000.

"(Medical Corps)

"William Beaumont Army Hospital, Texas: Hospital and medical facilities, $586,000.

"Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Hospital and medical facilities, $549,000.

"Madigan Army Hospital, Washington: Hospital and medical facilities, $333,000.

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Hospital facilities, and research and development facilities, $3,557,000.

"Field Forces Facilities

"(First Army area)

"Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Troop housing, administrative facilities, and family housing, $7,275,000.

"Fort Dix, New Jersey: Community facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $6,698,000.

"Fort Jay, New York: Waterfront facilities, $731,000.

"Fort Niagara, New York: Storage facilities, $209,000.

"Fort Totten, New York: Utilities, $170,000.

"(Second Army area)

"Fort Holabird, Maryland: Troop housing, $612,000.

"Fort Knox, Kentucky: Troop housing, training and administrative facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,990,000.

"Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Community facilities, training and medical facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $923,000.

"(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $10,392,000.

"Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $15,659,000.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $12,377,000.

"Camp Gordon, Georgia: Community facilities, $261,000.

"Camp Jackson, South Carolina: Medical facilities, $5,000,000.

"Fort McClellan, Alabama: Community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $2,611,000.

"Camp Rucker, Alabama: Airfield pavements, and operational and maintenance facilities, $2,070,000.

"Camp Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $967,000.

"(Fourth Army area)

"Fort Bliss, Texas: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $4,645,000.

"Fort Hood, Texas: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $12,922,000.

"Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Troop housing and operational facilities, $805,000.

"Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Community facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $3,053,000.

"(Fifth Army area)

"Fort Carson, Colorado: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $7,487,000.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Hospital and medical facilities, training facilities, and operational facilities, $8,615,000.

"Camp Lucas, Michigan: Community facilities, $145,000.

"Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,657,000.

"Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Storage facilities and family housing, $1,528,000.

"(Sixth Army area)

"Camp Hanford, Washington: Waterfront facilities, $167,000.

"Fort Lewis, Washington: Troop housing, community facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $15,275,000.

"Presidio of Monterey, California: Troop housing and training facilities, $1,878,000.

"Fort Ord, California: Community facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,407,000.

"Presidio of San Francisco, California: Liquid fuel dispensing facilities, $144,000.

"United States Disciplinary Barracks, California: Community facilities, $184,000.

"Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Family housing, $709,000.

"(Military Academy)

"United States Military Academy, New York: Community facilities and utilities, $756,000.

"(Armed Forces special weapons project)

"Sandia Base, New Mexico: Family housing, $1,231,000.

"Various installations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $3,014,000.

"(Tactical installations)

"Various locations: Family housing, $8,135,000.

"(Rehabilitation)

"Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, $2,661,000.

"Outside Continental United States

"(Alaskan area)

"Big Delta: Troop housing and community facilities, and family housing, $3,638,000.

"Eielson Air Force Base: Maintenance and storage facility, $1,047,000.

"Ladd Air Force Base: Storage facilities and liquid fuel dispensing facilities, $266,000.

"Fort Richardson: Troop housing, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilities, $9,079,000.

"Whittier: Community facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $1,183,000.

"Wildwood Station (Kenai): Troop housing and community facilities, $469,000.

"Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, $1,656,000.

"(Far East Command area)

"Okinawa: Community, troop supporting, and medical facilities, operational, maintenance, and administrative facilities, utilities, family housing, and land acquisition and resettlement, $42,983,000, of which sum the total amount available for resettlement may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

"(Pacific Command area)

"Helemano, Hawaii: Family housing, $714,000.

"Camp O'Donnel, Philippine Islands: Utilities, $832,000.

"Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Storage and community facilities, $3,162,000.

"Waiawa (Waipio) Radio Transmitting Station, Hawaii: Community facilities, and family housing $363,000.

"(Icelandic Command area)

"Keflavik Airport: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, $3,793,000.

"Classified installations: Family housing, $5,799,000.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the acquisition of land and the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, in a total amount of $223,993,000.

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of $10 million.

"SEC. 104. Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) Strike so much thereof under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Field Forces Facilities' (Second Army area) in section 101 as follows:

" 'Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training buildings and facilities, research and development facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $11,411,000.'

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training buildings and facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $9,411,000.'

"(b) Strike so much thereof under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Technical Service Facilities' (Army Medical Service) in section 101 as follows:

" 'Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia: Operational facilities and research and development facilities, $731,000.'

"and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, and Forest Glen, Maryland: Operational facilities, and research and development facilities, $2,731,000.'

"SEC. 105. Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, is hereby amended by striking so much thereof under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading '(Signal Corps)' in section 101 as follows:

" 'Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Woodbridge, Virginia:'

"and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland:'.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

"Continental United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities and replacement of piers, $8,441,000.

"Naval shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock facilities, including plans and specifications, $2,200,000.

"David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research and development facilities, $14,302,000.

"Naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Land acquisition, $427,000.

"Naval minecraft base, Charleston, South Carolina: Site preparation, waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, training facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,800,000.

"Naval shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Waterfront facilities and sandblasting facilities, $4,553,000.

"Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Replacement of wharf, $308,000.

"Naval underwater sound laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Family housing, $66,600.

"Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Florida: Administrative facilities, community facilities, training facilities, helicopter facilities, ammunition storage facilities, waterfront facilities, research and development facilities, and land acquisition, $3,379,000.

"Naval shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Utilities, and drydock facilities, $946,000.

"Naval electronics laboratory, San Diego, California: Land acquisition, $143,000.

"Naval repair facility, San Diego, California: Utilities, $629,000.

"Naval shipyard, San Francisco, California: Waterfront facilities, steam test facilities, and land acquisition, $4,369,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Navy Department, District of Columbia: Family housing, $81,000.

"Naval station, Green Cove Springs, Florida: Utilities, $72,000.

"Naval station, Newport, Rhode Island: Personnel facilities, $1,583,000.

"Naval base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities, pavements, utilities, and land acquisition, $9,972,000.

"Naval station, Orange, Texas: Personnel facilities, $399,000.

"Naval station, San Diego, California: Utilities, $57,000.

"Naval station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California: Personnel facilities, and utilities, $3,147,000.

"Naval station, Tacoma, Washington: Waterfront facilities, $3,024,000.

"Naval station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oregon: Personnel facilities, $92,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"(Naval air training stations)

"Naval auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove Area, Texas: Airfield pavements, and land acquisition, $1,487,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Barin Field, Foley, Alabama: Airfield lighting facilities, $151,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Storage facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $1,953,500.

"Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Navigational aids, training facilities, and land acquisition, $664,000.

"Naval air station, Glynco, Georgia: Aircraft, station and equipment maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,886,000.

"Naval air station, Hutchinson, Kansas: Utilities, $81,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Texas: Aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, navigational aids, storage facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,686,000.

"Naval air station, Memphis, Tennessee: Utilities, $759,000.

"Naval air station, Pensacola, Florida: Airfield pavements, navigational aids, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, research and development facilities, ammunition storage facilities, land acquisition, and plans and specifications for aircraft overhaul and repair facilities, $3,453,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Port Isabel, Texas: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, fuel storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, security facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,544,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, navigational aids, maintenance facilities, communication facilities, training facilities, administrative facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, covered and cold-storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $24,361,000.

"(Fleet support air stations)

"Naval air station, Alameda, California: Aircraft maintenance facilities, seadrome lighting facilities, seawall, dredging, and land acquisition, $3,729,000.

"Naval air station, Atlantic City, New Jersey: Storage facilities, and utilities, $233,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, California: Family housing, $214,600.

"Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $3,200,000.

"Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, covered storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, security facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,400,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, California: Ordnance facilities, and land acquisition, $366,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities, community facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,041,000.

"Naval air station, Jacksonville, Florida: Airfield pavements, communication facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $2,224,000.

"Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Fuel storage facilities, and boathouse, $211,000.

"Naval auxiliary landing field, Mayport, Florida: Waterfront facilities, communication facilities, and security facilities, $738,000.

"Naval air station, Miramar, California: Storage facilities, training facilities, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,370,000.

"Naval air station, Moffett Field, California: Fuel pipeline facilities, airfield pavements, and operational facilities, $2,581,000.

"Naval air station, Norfolk, Virginia: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, and operational facilities, $4,660,000.

"Naval air station, Oceana, Virginia: Airfield pavements, storage facilities, personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and fuel dispensing facilities, $5,281,000.

"Naval air station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $1,062,000.

"Naval air station, San Diego, California: Training facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities and utilities, $2,748,000.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Florida: Family housing, $188,900.

"Naval air facility, Weeksville, North Carolina: Cold storage facilities, and maintenance facilities, $342,000.

"Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, and land acquisition, $1,958,000.

"Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Florida: Airfield pavements, and land acquisition, $1,087,000.

"(Marine Corps air stations)

"Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Airfield pavements, communications facilities, navigational aids, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,649,000.

"Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, navigational aids, airfield lighting facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $1,762,000.

"Marine Corps air station, El Toro, California: Airfield pavements, training facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,492,000.

"Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Edenton, North Carolina: Family housing, $1,421,500.

"Marine Corps air station, Miami, Florida: Land acquisition, $1,223,000.

"Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, California: Maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $2,305,400.

"Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina: Airfield pavements, medical facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $2,762,000.

"(Special purpose air stations)

"Naval auxiliary air station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Aircraft maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and operational facilities, $2,858,000.

"Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, California: Research and development facilities, $2,615,000.

"Naval air station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Research and development facilities, storage facilities, navigational aids, and aircraft maintenance facilities, $16,311,000.

"Naval air test center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, oil storage facilities, and utilities, $8,677,000.

"Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, California: Aircraft maintenance facilities, communication facilities, and research and development facilities, $926,000.

"Naval air station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Testing facilities, $270,000.

"Naval photographic interpretation center, Suitland, Maryland: Operational and photographic preservation facilities, $2,345,000.

"Various locations: Land acquisition, and obstruction removal, for flight clearance, $23,000,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval fuel depot, Jacksonville, Florida: Family housing, $15,200.

"Naval supply depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,041,000.

"Naval supply center, Norfolk, Virginia: Cold storage facilities, and warehouse freight elevators, $399,000.

"Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Utilities, and easement, $62,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Georgia: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $3,157,000.

"Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, California: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, security facilities, and land acquisition, $501,000.

"Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Personnel facilities, security facilities, and utilities, $1,059,000.

"Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,654,000.

"Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, California: Utilities, $648,000.

"Marine Corps clothing depot, Annex Numbered 3, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $30,000.

"Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Virginia: Covered and ammunition-storage facilities, medical facilities, training and personnel facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $8,857,000.

"Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California: Pavements, and personnel facilities, $120,000.

"Marine Corps training center, Twentynine Palms, California: Family housing, $47,300.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, South Carolina: Ordnance facilities, $193,000.

"Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Research and development facilities, $644,000.

"Naval proving ground, Dahlgren, Virginia: Land acquisition, $200,000.

"Naval ordnance aerophysics laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas: Research and development facilities, $1,111,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Earle, New Jersey: Refrigerated storage facilities, $59,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, California: Ordnance and ammunition storage facilities, $514,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nevada: Barricaded sidings, and utilities, $1,424,000.

"Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Maryland: Research and development facilities, and utilities, $1,107,000.

"Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, California: Community facilities, $375,000.

"Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Washington: Ordnance facilities, $376,000.

"Naval Ordnance plant, Louisville, Kentucky: Ordnance drawings storage facilities, $927,000.

"Naval ordnance plant, Macon, Georgia: Ordnance manufacturing facilities, $3,800,000.

"Naval underwater ordnance station, Newport, Rhode Island: Testing facilities, $370,000.

"Naval magazine, Port Chicago, California: Ordnance facilities, $241,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Saint Juliens Creek, Virginia: Utilities, $420,000.

"Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, California: Waterfront facilities, $1,029,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Arkansas: Barricaded transfer depot facilities, $765,000.

"Naval ordnance laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research and development facilities, $1,976,000.

"Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia: Ammunition storage and testing facilities, $113,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, $182,000.

"Naval station, Annapolis, Maryland: Personnel facilities, $307,000.

"Naval receiving station, Charleston, South Carolina: Community facilities, $553,000.

"Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Personnel facilities, $1,402,000.

"Fleet air defense training center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Training facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,942,000.

"Naval training center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, and personnel facilities, $4,338,000.

"Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Maryland: Personnel facilities, $780,000.

"Naval postgraduate school, Monterey, California: Personnel facilities, $119,000.

"Naval receiving station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Personnel facilities, $1,428,000.

"Naval retraining command, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Security facilities, $42,000.

"Fleet sonar school, San Diego, California: Training facilities, $2,753,000.

"Medical Facilities

"National naval medical center, Bethesda, Maryland: Plans and specifications for the Armed Forces Medical Library, $350,000.

"Naval hospital, Chelsea, Massachusetts: Family housing, $192,800.

"Naval hospital, Corona, California: Family housing, and conversion of existing structures to family housing, $256,800.

"Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois: Plans and specifications for certain medical facilities, $750,000.

"Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Retaining wall, $46,000.

"Naval submarine base, New London, Connecticut: Medical research facilities, $755,000.

"Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $60,000.

"Communications Facilities

"Naval radio station, Northwest, Virginia: Communication facilities, $436,000.

"Office of Naval Research Facilities

"Naval research laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia: Research facilities, and utilities, $163,000.

"Naval research laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex, Randle Cliffs, Maryland: Research facilities, and land acquisition, $52,000.

"Yards and Docks Facilities

"Naval construction battalion center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Waterfront facilities, and storage facilities, $5,397,000.

"Public works center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $2,510,000.

"Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, California: Maintenance facilities, $1,225,000.

"Various locations: Facilities for abatement of water pollution, including the acquisition of land, $15,149,000.

"Outside continental United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Fleet activities, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, $57,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Family housing, $2,485,000.

"Naval base, Guam, Mariana Islands: Administrative facilities, $1,835,000.

"Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $56,000.

"Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Personnel facilities, medical facilities, utilities, and family housing, $15,253,700.

"Fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan: Family housing, $6,540,800.

"Aviation Facilities

"Naval air station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $6,525,000.

"Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Operational facilities, and family housing, $8,589,800.

"Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan: Personnel facilities, and family housing, $1,978,800.

"Naval station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $91,000.

"Naval air facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, earthwork, personnel facilities, communication facilities, ordnance facilities, fuel-dispensing facilities, and utilities, $8,260,000.

"Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Fuel pipeline facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $2,977,300.

"Naval air facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Personnel facilities, $975,000.

"Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, Territory of Hawaii: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, and family housing, $3,227,600.

"Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska: Family housing, $2,613,100.

"Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Communication facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $4,411,000.

"Naval station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii: Communication facilities and operational facilities, $1,518,000.

"Naples, Italy: Operational facilities and storage facilities, $155,000.

"Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Cold-storage facilities, and family housing, $1,958,500.

"Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and airfield pavements, $3,721,000.

"Naval station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: Family housing, $522,900.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval supply depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Waterfront facilities and storage facilities, $5,427,000.

"Naval supply depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Cold-storage facilities, $1,318,000.

"Naval supply center, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $270,000.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Testing facilities, and railroad facilities and barricades, $1,132,000.

"Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, $66,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Fleet training center, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: Training facilities, $44,000.

"Medical Facilities

"Naval hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, $269,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Communication facilities, $439,000.

"Naval radio facility, Kami-Seya, Japan: Communication facilities and family housing, $2,564,700.

"Naval communication station, Kodiak, Alaska: Site preparation, communication facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $6,991,000.

"Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands: Communication facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $8,061,500.

"Naval communication facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $2,848,600.

"Yards and Docks Facilities

"Fifteenth Naval District, Canal Zone: Utilities, and acquisition of family housing, $3,069,000.

"Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities, $940,000.

"SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by the acquisition of land, and the construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and family housing, in the total amount of $151,342,400.

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of $6,000,000.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances and related utilities, equipment and facilities:

"Continental United States

"Air Defense Command

"Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Florida: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $11,577,000.

"Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $1,200,000.

"Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $1,808,000.

"Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and utilities, $213,000.

"Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Airfield pavements, troop housing, storage facilities, and family housing, $1,716,000.

"Glasgow site, Montana: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $4,706,000.

"Grand Forks site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $5,822,000.

"Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $3,402,000.

"Greater Milwaukee area, Wisconsin, airbase to be known as 'Richard Bong Air Force Base': Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $16,608,000.

"Greater Pittsburgh Airport Coraopolis, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $404,000.

"Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $1,501,000.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,029,000.

"K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, relocation of facilities, and family housing, $3,943,000.

"Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Airfield pavements, relocation of facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $2,042,000.

"McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Airfield pavements, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, $2,959,000.

"McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Airfield pavements, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $582,000.

"Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $1,423,000.

"Minot site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $5,339,000.

"New Castle County Municipal Airport, Wilmington, Delaware: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $504,000.

"Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,748,000.

"Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $6,076,000.

"Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, California: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,445,000.

"Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Washington: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,039,000.

"Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Airfield pavements, utilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $554,000.

"Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and family housing, $2,056,000.

"Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $5,526,000.

"Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, and messing facilities, $343,000.

"Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $112,000.

"Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton, New York: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,207,000.

"Traverse City area, Michigan: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $1,881,000.

"Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $1,263,000.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $2,511,000.

"Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $742,000.

"Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,107,000.

"Various locations: Utilities, land acquisitions, storage facilities, and administrative facilities, $14,196,000.

"Air Materiel Command

"Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $4,170,000.

"Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $15,803,000.

"Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Airfield pavements, and airfield lighting facilities, $2,386,000.

"Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,945,000.

"McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, and administrative facilities, $9,522,000.

"Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $3,205,000.

"Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $21,264,000.

"Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, $3,375,000.

"Searsport Air Force Tank Farm, Searsport, Maine: Fuel storage facilities, $133,000.

"Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Storage facilities, $205,000.

"Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Utilities, $305,000.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and administrative facilities, $12,001,000.

"Various locations: Storage facilities, $170,000.

"Air Proving Ground Command

"Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, research, development and test facilities, and storage facilities, $7,966,000.

"Air Training Command

"Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Training facilities, $98,000.

"Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Texas: Troop housing and messing facilities, and utilities, $914,000.

"Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Land acquisition, $3,000.

"Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Airfield pavements, troop housing, and land acquisition, $1,650,000.

"Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and medical facilities, $2,816,000.

"Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,403,000.

"Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $4,081,000.

"Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $349,000.

"Headquarters technical training, Air Force, Gulfport, Mississippi: Acquisition of land and facilities, $313,000.

"Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Communications and navigational aids and troop housing, $446,000.

"James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Troop housing and messing facilities, $883,000.

"Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Aircraft maintenance facilities and family housing, $1,525,500.

"Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $3,695,000.

"Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,217,000.

"Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $1,557,000.

"Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,516,000.

"McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, $104,000.

"Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $4,322,000.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, $1,153,000.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $956,000.

"Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, $549,000.

"Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $1,076,000.

"Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,247,000.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Witchita Falls, Texas: Messing facilities, $80,000.

"Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and family housing, $4,187,000.

"Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $478,000.

"Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $871,000.

"Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Shop facilities, and family housing, $2,410,000.

"Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, $1,045,000.

"Air University

"Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Troop housing, $275,000.

"Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $2,661,000.

"Continental Air Command

"Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Land acquisition, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,125,500.

"Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, $590,000.

"Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Airfield pavements, and personnel facilities, $758,000.

"Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Airfield pavements, $1,891,000.

"Wolters Air Force Base, Mineral Wells, Texas: Operational facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $331,000.

"Headquarters Command

"Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Personnel facilities, $520,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,098,000.

"Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,032,000.

"Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $7,073,000.

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $5,564,000.

"Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Florida: Operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, $818,000.

"Saint Louis Aeronautical Chart Information Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $861,000.

"Research and Development Command

"Location to be determined: Headquarters building, $6,000,000.

"Carabelle Test Site, Carabelle, Florida: Land acquisition, $1,000.

"Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $12,429,000.

"Hartford Research Facility, Hartford, Connecticut: Research and development facilities, $22,375,000.

"Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, research and development facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $4,965,000.

"Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada: Operational facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $555,500.

"Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and shop facilities, $905,000.

"Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $3,705,000.

"Mount Washington Climatic Projects Laboratory, Mount Washington, New Hampshire: Research and development facilities, $588,000.

"Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, and shop facilities, $7,600,000.

"Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities, $20,000,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative and community facilities, $4,214,000.

"Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $3,758,000.

"Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $7,379,000.

"Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and shop facilities, $1,770,000.

"Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $5,063,000.

"Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Airfield pavements, communications, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and shop facilities, $1,975,000.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, personnel facilities, and land acquisition, $5,929,000.

"Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and administrative facilities, $5,550,000.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisitions, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $10,208,500.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilties, community facilities, and shop facilities, and family housing, $6,629,000.

"Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $7,803,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, rehabilitation, land acquisition, personnel facilities, community facilities, and shop facilities, $11,155,000.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $12,380,000.

"Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $2,187,000.

"Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $4,753,000.

"Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $482,000.

"Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Airfield pavements, communications, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $5,435,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $4,428,000.

"Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $4,115,000.

"Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and personnel facilities, $2,396,000.

"Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $6,595,000.

"Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $5,317,000.

"Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $8,571,000.

"Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $3,542,000.

"MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $5,251,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $3,741,000.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities; utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, $5,961,000.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Utilities, and land acquisition, $128,000.

"Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $4,118,000.

"Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, New York: airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $21,988,000.

"Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $24,850,000.

"Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $9,646,000.

"Smokey Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenace facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisitions, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $8,773,500.

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $9,769,000.

"Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, $3,744,000.

"Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $6,657,000.

"Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $7,951,000.

"Tactical Air Command

"Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, $2,684,000.

"Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Oklahoma: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $6,800,000.

"Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $208,000.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, and administrative facilities, $559,000.

"Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Training facilities, and family housing, $2,570,500.

"Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and medical facilities, $2,403,000.

"Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, and family housing, $4,624,000.

"George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Airfield pavements, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,598,000.

"Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Airfield pavements, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,384,000.

"Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Airfield pavements, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $3,574,000.

"Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $6,603,000.

"Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $2,548,000.

"Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,589,000.

"Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $7,429,000.

"Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $7,035,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $387,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $100,382,000.

"Outside continental United States

"Alaskan Air Command

"Eielson Air Force Base: Medical facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $1,307,000.

"Elmendorf Air Force Base: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $23,275,000.

"Galena Airfield: Airfield lighting facilities, and storage facilities, $518,000.

"Kenai Airfield: Airfield pavements, $356,000.

"Ladd Air Force Base: Training facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,510,000.

"Naknek Airfield: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,863,000.

"Caribbean Air Command

"Albrook Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Communication facilities, $163,000.

"Far East Air Forces

"Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $42,017,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and harbor facilities, $4,978,000.

"Johnston Island Air Force Base, Johnston Island: Communication facilities, $182,000.

"Midway Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities and airfield lighting facilities, $303,000.

"Wake Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, and navigational aids, $2,991,000.

"Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $11,393,000.

"Northeast Air Command

"Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, and shop facilities, $23,601,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and harbor facilities, $9,739,000.

"United States Air Forces in Europe

"Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $234,996,000.

"Area Control Navigational Aids

"Various locations: Communications and navigational aids, $526,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $293,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, harbor facilities, and land acquisition, $98,552,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of $5,000,000.

"SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to provide an off-base roadway approximately two miles in length in the vicinity of the south boundary of Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, by the acquisition of land and the construction of permanent and related facilities and appurtenances at a cost not to exceed $350,000.

"SEC. 304. Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) With respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Strategic Air Command' in section 301 strike '$2,248,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$2,750,000'.

"(b) With respect to Matagorda Island Air Force Range, Texas, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Strategic Air Command' in section 301 strike '$607,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$847,000'.

"(c) With respect to Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike 'Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota' and '$6,494,000' and insert in lieu thereof 'Minot Site, North Dakota' and '$12,124,000', respectively.

"(d) With respect to Fargo area, North Dakota, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike 'Fargo area, North Dakota' and '$7,055,000' and insert in lieu thereof 'Grand Forks Site, North Dakota' and '$10,903,000', respectively.

"(e) With respect to Glasgow-Miles City area, Montana, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike 'Glasgow-Miles City area, Montana' and '$8,391,000' and insert in lieu thereof 'Glasgow Site, Montana' and '$10,660,000', respectively.

"(f) With respect to K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Michigan, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$8,556,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$9,949,000'.

"(g) With respect to Traverse City area, Michigan, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$8,635,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$10,267,000'.

"(h) With respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Training Command' in section 301 strike '$1,073,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$2,478,000'.

"(i) With respect to Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Training Command' in section 301 strike '$100,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$135,000'.

"(j) With respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Materiel Command' in section 301 strike '$4,303,000' and '$2,183,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$4,735,000' and '$2,615,000', respectively.

"(k) With respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Materiel Command' in section 301 strike '$5,847,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$6,849,000'.

"(l) With respect to Atlantic City Consolan Station, Atlantic City, New Jersey, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$72,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$285,000'.

"(m) With respect to Nantucket Consolan Station, Nantucket, Massachusetts, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$107,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$224,000'.

"(n) With respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$107,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$224,000'.

"(o) With respect to Point Conception Consolan Station, Point Conception, California, under the heading 'Continental United States' and subheading 'Air Defense Command' in section 301 strike '$72,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$232,000'.

"(p) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the amounts '$389,125,000' and '$398,954,000' and insert in lieu thereof the amounts '$405,176,000' and '$415,005,000', respectively.

"SEC. 305. Classified location: The authority granted by section 302, of the Act of July 14, 1952, may be utilized to the extent of $8,127,400 for the direct construction of family housing.

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. The Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to provide for a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, by the acquisition of land at a cost of not to exceed $1,000,000, and construction of buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost of not to exceed $54,500,000, of which not more than $8,500,000 shall be available for transfer to the National Capital Planning Commission and the Department of the Interior for acquisition of land for and construction to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the present site of the research station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Fairfax County, Virginia: *Provided,* That at such time as it is determined that construction of such headquarters installation at said research station will not be commenced or continued, said amount of $8,500,000, or the remainder thereof, shall no longer be available for obligation: *Provided further,* That at such time as the Central Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation authorized by this title, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to accomplish the demolition and removal of temporary Government building space in the District of Columbia of equivalent occupancy to that relinquished by the Central Intelligence Agency.

"TITLE V

"*General provisions*

"SEC. 501. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the establishment or development of military and naval installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act, and the Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to proceed with the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency Headquarters Installation as authorized by title IV of this Act, without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority under this Act of the Secretary of a military department to provide family housing includes authority to acquire such land as the Secretary concerned determines, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in connection therewith. The authority to establish or develop such installations and facilities shall include, in respect of those installations and facilities as to which family housing or the acquisition of land is specified in titles I, II, and III, and IV of this Act, authority to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent or temporary improvements thereon whether such lands are held in fee or under lease or under other temporary tenure.

"SEC. 502. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

"(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, $224,927,000; outside continental United States, $74,984,000; section 102, $223,993,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $533,904,000;

"(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, $299,690,600; outside continental United States, $107,191,300; section 202, $151,342,400; section 203, $6,000,000; or a total of $564,224,300;

"(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, $743,989,000; outside continental United States, $458,563,000; section 302, $5,000,000; section 303, $350,000; or a total of $1,207,902,000; and

"(4) for public works authorized by title IV: $54,500,000.

"SEC. 503. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 5 per centum in the case of projects within the continental United States, and 10 per centum in the case of projects outside the continental United States, but the total cost of all projects so enumerated under each of such titles shall not exceed the total of all amounts specified in respect of projects in such title.

"SEC. 504. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

"SEC. 505. Whenever—

"(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this Act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act; and

"(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress.

"SEC. 506. All contracts entered into by the United States pursuant to the authorization contained in this Act shall be awarded, so far as practicable, if the interest of the national security shall not be impaired thereby and if such award is consistent with the provision of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

"SEC. 507. Section 407 of Public Law 765, Eighty-third Congress, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 407. In addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters in foreign countries through housing projects which utilize foreign currencies to a value not in excess of $100,000,000 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

" 'The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel for the fiscal year 1956 and each succeeding fiscal year, amounts equal to the quarters allowances otherwise payable to personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided,* That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition.

" 'The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives quarterly reports, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the three-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.'

"SEC. 508. All housing units constructed under the authority of this Act shall be subject to the net floor area permanent limitations prescribed in the second, third, and fourth provisos of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375), or in section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), other than the first, second, and third provisos thereof.

"SEC. 509. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to acquire by purchase housing units which are located near military installations, which are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents, and as to which a mortgage is insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, subject to the outstanding mortgage thereon, and to assume the payments thereafter becoming due on such mortgage. The Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize appropriations available for the construction of military public works for the liquidation of any outstanding mortgage assumed by the Government.

"SEC. 510. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

"(a) $20 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

"(b) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

"(c) $1,700 per man for permanent barracks;

"(d) $1,400 per man for ten-year-life barracks; or

"(e) $5,000 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitation on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

"SEC. 511. As of July 1, 1956, all authorizations for military public works projects to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military, naval, or Air Force installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved prior to October 1, 1951, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except (1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in such acts in the titles that contain the general provisions, (2) authorizations for military public works projects as to which appropriated funds shall have been obligated in whole or in part prior to July 1, 1956, and authorizations for appropriations therefor, and (3) the authorizations with respect to military public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829).

"SEC. 512. Section 504 of Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with public works projects which are not otherwise authorized by law.'

"SEC. 513. (a) The first sentence of section 501 (b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes', approved September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 36), is amended by striking out 'used by such owners and tenants for residential or agricultural purposes,'.

"(b) The first sentence of section 401 (b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes,' approved July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606), is amended by striking out 'used by such owner and tenants for residential or agricultural purposes,'.

"SEC. 514. None of the authorization contained in section 101 of this Act for the construction of three-hundred-and-twenty-six-man barracks with mess shall be used to provide, with respect to any such barracks, for mess facilities other than a single, consolidated mess.

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations: *Provided*, That not more than one thousand housing units may be so leased and the rental cost to the Government for any housing unit may not exceed $150 per month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
OVERTON BROOKS,
DEWEY SHORT,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
HARRY F. BYRD,
FRANCIS CASE,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On June 27, 1955, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 6829, which was the fiscal year 1956 military construction authorization for the three military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency. On July 1, 1955, the Senate considered the House bill and amended it by striking all language after the enacting clause and inserting its own language.

The larger differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

In title I, the Army section of the bill, the House had permitted both dredging and land acquisition for the West Coast Ammunition Terminal in California, while the Senate version permitted only the acquisition of the land necessary for this installation. On the basis that the performance of the dredging at this time is not essential, the House receded.

During its consideration of the bill as submitted by the Department, the House inserted authority for the construction of a hospital at Camp Jackson, South Carolina at a cost of $8,000,000. The conferees agreed that this item should remain, but at the reduced figure of $5,000,000. The Senate therefore receded with an amendment.

In title II, the Navy title, the Senate inserted at the Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash., authorization in the amount of $2,000,000 to prepare plans and specifications for a new drydock which would be capable of repairing carriers of the *Forrestal*-type which had suffered battle damage. The House conferees considered this a desirable item and receded.

The three units of family housing for Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations which had been permitted to remain in the bill by the House were stricken by the Senate. The conferees agreed that this item should remain and the Senate therefore receded.

At the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, the House had stricken all construction authority except that relating to the provision of some water wells and a telephone system. The Senate permitted all of the construction requested by the Department which totaled $6,746,000. The conferees agreed that in view of the unsettled situation with respect to the water supply in that area, the House action should prevail and the Senate therefore receded. This last action occasioned several other changes in the bill since the family housing which had been originally requested for Camp Pendleton had been spread over several installations by the House. It was agreed by the conferees that all of this housing should be stricken from the bill and the House receded. The land acquisition for the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, had been permitted by the House but had been stricken by the Senate. In this instance the House receded.

On the basis of a long felt need the House had inserted in the bill provision for an air facility for the Naval Academy. This item did not appear in the Senate version. While agreeing that a facility of this kind at the Naval Academy is desirable, the conferees agreed that action toward its authorization should await further study on the part of the Navy Department and the House receded. The hope was expressed, however, that the Department would not delay its consideration of this matter, but should be ready to present its views in this respect when next there is submitted to the Congress a military public works bill.

At the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va., the Senate reduced the authorization in the amount of $500,000. This reduction related to the construction of a trunk highway. The House on the other hand had added $432,000 to the original request to provide an increase in the proposed size of a dispensary. The conferees agreed with the Senate action with respect to the highway and also with respect to the House action relating to the dispensary.

As passed by the House the bill precluded the acquisition of land at the Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. The Senate version would have permitted the land to be acquired. The conferees agreed that authority should not be granted for the acquisition of this land, particularly in view of the fact that a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee will shortly make an investigation of the land requirements for this facility and the possible combination of it with the previously mentioned West Coast Ammunition Terminal which is in the same area. It is not impossible that the Subcommittee's investigation will disclose that a unified operation between the Army and the Navy will be feasible from an operational standpoint and result in substantial economies.

The Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy this year recommended the construction of the air facility above mentioned and also the expansion of Bancroft Hall to provide needed quarters for midshipmen and expansion of the land area through fill from the Severn River. For the same reason noted above with respect to the air facility at the Naval Academy the House receded with respect to the Bancroft Hall and fill items which it had inserted in the bill.

In the Air Force title authorization for construction at the Portland International Airport, Portland, Oreg., was stricken by the House, while the Senate permitted it to remain in the bill. The House receded.

Certain classified construction totaling $14,196,000 at various locations was inserted by the Senate at the request of the Department of the Air Force and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. This item had not been presented to the House Committee during its consideration of the bill for the reason that it had not progressed at that time to a point appropriate for request by the Department. The conferees agreed that this involved essential construction and the House receded.

During its appearance before the House committee the Air Force made strong representations that the headquarters of the Air Research and Development Command should be moved to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. On the basis of the testimony received, the House passed the bill with an authorization for the expenditure of $6,000,000 to provide a Headquarters building at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The Senate, however, deleted this particular construction item from the Wright-Patterson authorization and inserted authorization for the construction of such a building at a "location to be determined." On the basis of the fact that this direly needed Headquarters will be provided under either version of the bill, the House receded.

Subsequent to passage of the bill by the House it was determined that there should be an increase in the B-52 production. This naturally required the provision of facilities to accommodate these additional bombers. The Senate therefore inserted additional authorization in the amount of $27,349,000 at several bases within the Strategic Air Command. The House receded with respect to each of these additions.

The Senate receded with respect to that section of the Air Force title of the bill which renders certain the authorization to construct family housing in the amount of $8,127,400 at a classified location.

It was the view of the House committee during its consideration of the bill that suitable quarters should be provided for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain of his immediate assistants. It therefore inserted a new title in the bill which would have provided such quarters and protected communication facilities at a cost of $300,000. The Senate version of the bill contained no such provision. While there was no disagreement among the conferees that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be provided quarters commensurate with his position, duties, and responsibilities, it was agreed that the House language should be stricken, and the House therefore receded. The conferees agreed, however, that an immediate study should be initiated by the Department of Defense directed toward the determination of an appropriate location for such quarters and all of the details in connection with it in order that an appropriate item can be presented to the Congress in the near future.

The House version of the bill contained an authorization for $50,000,000 for the construction of a headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency and also an additional $6,000,000 authority for the acquisition of the land necessary therefor. The Senate modified the language of the House to the extent that it provided for the acquisition of land at a cost not to exceed $1,000,000, and construction of buildings, roads, etc., at a cost not to exceed $53,500,000 of which latter sum not more than $8,500,000 would be available for transfer to the National Capital Planning Commission and the Department of the Interior for acquisition of land and for construction to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the present site of the Research Station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Fairfax County, Virginia. The conferees agreed on the Senate language, but raised the total authorized amount by $1,000,000.

The House language relating to the provision of housing in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies generated under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 was modified by the Senate to permit repayment to the Commodity Credit Corporation by the use of appropriations available for the payment of quarters allowances, the House version having provided for such repayment to be made from appropriations available for the construction of military public works. The House receded.

The conferees agreed to strike the House language which would have authorized the acquisition of Wherry Housing projects under certain conditions. That portion of the House language, however, relating to Title VI and Title IX housing remains in the bill.

The House accepted the Senate language relating to cost limitations for cold storage warehousing, regular warehousing, barracks, and bachelor officer quarters.

The Abernethy amendment was originally designed to assist persons dislocated because of certain federal acquisitions of real estate. This law was directed toward those most seriously affected by such acquisitions, that is, persons who had used their property for residential or agricultural purposes. A subsequent amendment of the law rendered this original concept certain by the provision of appropriate clarifying language. In this bill the Senate inserted language which would strike from the law as amended the following language: "used by such owners and tenants for residential or agricultural purposes." The House receded.

The conferees agreed to strike that language inserted by the Senate which would have required the Secretary of each military department or his designee to come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House with respect to the cost of construction and the real-estate actions pertaining thereto involved in certain authorizations granted by this bill. The Senate therefore receded. It should be pointed out that the striking of this language in no way affects title VI of Public Law 155 of the 82d Congress relating to coming into agreement with the Armed Services Committee with respect to certain real-estate actions.

The Senate inserted a provision in the bill which provided that none of the authorization contained in Section 101 of the bill for the construction of 326-man barracks with mess should be used to provide, with respect to such barracks, mess facilities other than a single consolidated mess. The House receded. The Senate version of the bill provided authorization to lease family housing facilities in the vicinity of tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents upon the making of an appropriate determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing in the area of such an installation. The language also provides that not more than 1,000 units may be so leased, and that the rental for any unit may not exceed $150 per month. The conferees agreed to permit this language to remain in the bill.

The bill as it passed the House contained the authorization of $2,368,998,900. The bill as it passed the Senate contained an authorization of $2,357,317,300. The bill agreed upon by the conference contains an authorization in the amount of $2,360,530,300. The conference amount is $8,468,600 less than the House passage, and is $3,213,000 more than the Senate passage.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
OVERTON BROOKS,
DEWEY SHORT,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent previously granted, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6829, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes to explain the conference report, and I should be glad to yield to any Member for any questions they may wish to ask.

Mr. Speaker, this is the report of your conferees on what is known as the public works bill. When the bill passed the House we authorized $2,368,998,900. When the bill passed the Senate it authorized $2,357,317,000. There is a difference on the part of the House of $8,468,000 and $3,213,000 on the part of the Senate.

There are some 400 items involved in this report. This is the public works bill for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It is a unanimous report filed by the conferees, an agreed conference, and I am satisfied when you examine the items as will appear in the RECORD you will conclude that the conferees did a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this $8½ million less than the authorization on the part of the House?

Mr. VINSON. Let me give the gentleman the figures, and I think these figures are highly important because it does involve a large amount of money. When the bill passed the House it authorized $2,368,998,900. When it passed the Senate it authorized $2,357,317,000. The bill agreed to by the conferees contains an authorization in an amount of $2,360,530,300. The amount in the conference report is $8,468,600 less than the amount in the bill as it passed the House, and an increase on the part of the Senate of $3,253,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. When the bill was previously before the House, I neglected to ask the gentleman the question as to what those housing units out at the Naval Observatory grounds are going to cost.

Mr. VINSON. Much to our disappointment, the Senate would not go along with the House, and that item was stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that makes it a little more palatable.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Can the gentleman enlighten me on this? Section 401 authorizes an additional $8.5 million for a highway to Langley, Va., if the Central Intelligence Agency should choose that site for a headquarters office. Does this section mean that Congress necessarily favors the Langley site for the CIA and is committed to appropriating the necessary funds?

Mr. VINSON. I would not say that the language is such that it would be mandatory on the part of Mr. Dulles to construct the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters on that site. But, I do think, if you read between the lines, you will see that at least the House conferees looked with favor on that area. Whether it is in that particular section or not I am unable to say.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should not want this occasion to pass without mention of one item in this conference report. I refer to the acceptance by the House conferees of a $2 million item put in this bill in the other body for the design and planning of a needed new drydock at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash.

I do want to express gratification that the House conferees accepted this important item. In particular I am indebted to our great colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. His personal interest in my behalf in the inclusion of a design fund for a new drydock in this military facilities legislation, is greatly appreciated.

Certainly we must have a drydock on the west coast where any battle damage and work of that nature on the outside of the hull of a *Forrestal*-class aircraft carrier could be done. The Naval Shipyard at Bremerton is a carrier repair shipyard. Since the new 60,000-ton aircraft carriers cannot go through the Panama Canal in the event of war the west coast must have new, wider drydocks.

The interesting feature of the new drydock is that it will be built out into the water rather than dug out of existing land. Actually, I understand the project will result in 28 acres of new filled land being added to the Navy Yard where space is short. The value of these 28 acres, at waterfront prices in this area, will go a long way toward offsetting the $28 million cost of the drydock.

For a long time I have felt the need of a larger drydock at the Bremerton Yard, and its urgency. I am certainly happy that this urgency has been recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting and proper at this time to say a word about the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services. I have heard many tributes paid to the chairmen of other committees, so I think that a word of commendation can be said about my very good and able friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CARL VINSON, who is chairman of the committee on which I serve—a man I have known and respected for many years. A man with whom I have frequently disagreed, but with whom I have always felt a strong bond of friendship and the deepest and most sincere respect. Accolades from one side of the aisle to the other are not too common on the floor of this House, notwithstanding our affection and realization of the ability of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. CARL VINSON, in his public career, has transcended the boundary marked by this aisle. He is a great American, a great chairman, a great legislator, and there are no political boundaries for one with these qualities.

Mr. VINSON has been known affectionately as "the Admiral." I call him "Admiral," "General," or any other term which will in some way reflect the leadership in military matters that were the purpose and reason for the tribute paid him on June 9 at the Marine Barracks here in Washington.

The traditions of the Marine Corps need no telling. But their traditions are only the guideposts for the kind of devotion and the all-permeating interest which Chairman VINSON has had toward all things military.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend to you Admiral VINSON, General VINSON, Chairman VINSON—a great man, a great American, and one richly deserving of the fine tribute paid him by the Marine Corps on June 9.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] that I feel most grateful for his very kind and complimentary remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE C. BATTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, line 10, after "refund", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—I understand that this and several other bills the gentleman will offer, have been approved by the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee [Mr. MILLER] of New York?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RODOLFO C. DELGADO, JESUS M. LAGUA, AND VICENTE D. REYNANTE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3363) for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, line 7, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum of any claim."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK F. GASKIN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, line 11, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL E. MILWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1745) for the relief of Paul E. Milward, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 7 on page 2 and insert "That Paul E. Milward executes a release of the judgment entered in the case of Paul Milward against Peter C. Penta, No. 175385, in the municipal court of the city of Boston, on or about January 6, 1953: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTICA BREWING CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co., together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY OF OHIO, INC.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "amended" over to and including line 4, on page 2, and insert "*Provided*, That in making such determination of the excessive profits of the Highway Construction Co., the Tax Court of the United States may take into consideration the affiliation of that company with any other company, but the findings of such court shall be limited to determining only the amount, if any, of the excessive profits of the Highway Construction Co. and such court shall have no authority under this act to determine the amount, if any, of the excessive profits of any company affiliated with such Highway Construction Co.: *Provided further*, That the Tax Court shall have jurisdiction to determine the excessive profits of the Highway Construction Co. under this act only if such company files a petition with such court for redetermination within 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the last day) after the date of enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) providing for the enrollment, with changes, of S. 804, a bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and so forth.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 804) to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, to make the following changes, viz: On page 1, line 5, and in the first line of the title, respectively, of the engrossed bill, strike out "(e)" and in lieu thereof insert "(d)."

The concurrent resolution was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MISUSE OF DUCK STAMP MONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 of this year, I addressed the House with reference to the duck-stamp situation in support of my bill, H. R. 2142. Since that time, many conservationists from all sections of the United States have written to me indicating that this legislation is of national interest rather than limited in scope. Recently I received some correspondence from Mr. Seth Gordon, director of the California Department of Fish and Game. I have been fortunate in obtaining a statement Mr. Gordon delivered before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 28 and 29, 1954. There is much information contained in Mr. Gordon's statement which should be of interest to conservationists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend this excellent statement to my colleagues:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS RELATIVE TO MISUSE OF DUCK-STAMP MONEY BY SETH GORDON, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., JUNE 28–29, 1954

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Seth Gordon, and at present am the director of the California Department of Fish and Game, with offices in Sacramento.

By way of further identification, it was my privilege to be numbered among the early promoters of the duck-stamp law. Later as the conservation director of the Izaak Walton League, Chicago, then as president of the American Game Association, with headquarters here in Washington, I had a material part in the campaign for the enactment of the law establishing the national refuge system, the duck-stamp law to provide funds to finance it, and other important national legislation dealing with the general conservation problem.

DR. NELSON'S WARNING IN 1919

The basis for the legislation under which funds are now being contributed by 2,350,000 sportsmen from one end of the country to the other, through the purchase of duck stamps, had its beginning back in February 1919 when the late Dr. E. W. Nelson, one of the Nation's foremost scientists, then Chief of the United States Biological Survey, while addressing a national conference on game and wildlife conservation at Ottawa, Canada, called attention to the fact that—

"Continued transformation on a large scale of marshy lands into farms in the Western United States and Canada is decreasing the resting places and feeding grounds of migratory wildfowl, and constitutes one of the most serious dangers to the future of these birds. If a sufficient number of sanctuaries are not supplied, and if the drainage and devotion to agricultural and other purposes of the marshy areas continue, migratory waterfowl will diminish despite every effort along other lines to conserve them."

That same year Dr. Nelson also discussed the entire problem with the game and fish officials of the entire Nation assembled at Louisville, Ky.

In April of the following year, in an article published in the American Game magazine, published by the American Game Association, he further stated:

"Unless combined State and Federal action is taken in the near future to reserve permanently the marshy areas and shallow lakes most suitable for wildfowl breeding and feeding grounds, a few years will see their elimination."

REFUGES AND HUNTING GROUNDS SUGGESTED

Dr. Nelson, recognizing the importance of sound conservation programs, as well as of public hunting areas, recommended that the suggested reservations for migratory wildfowl be of two classes "one in which no shooting shall ever be permitted, where the birds may have sanctuary and rest and breed unmolested; another series of reserves should be established as public hunting grounds, where, under the simplest restrictions the public shall have opportunity for good shooting and thus place it on a footing of equality with the owners of private shooting preserves. These areas, while shot over during hunting season, would be closed and become protected breeding and feeding places for wildfowl during the rest of the year, and thus help in increasing the supply."

It may interest the members of this committee to know that even back in that early period the danger of farm surpluses of various kinds was pointed out repeatedly in an effort to help stem the reckless drainage of millions of acres of land, much of which later proved valueless for crop production, which formerly had been the homes of waterfowl and other water-loving birds and animals.

CONSERVATION FORCES LED CAMPAIGN

Following the warnings from Dr. Nelson, the conservation forces of the country, under the leadership of the American Game Association, rolled up their sleeves and began organizing campaigns to help save the waterfowl breeding and feeding grounds, and to provide public hunting grounds for unattached shooters. Legislation for what was then known as the Federal license and public shooting grounds bill, including a dollar sticker to be bought by all waterfowl hunters, was introduced in 1920 and kept before Congress in one form or another each succeeding session until 1929 when the Norbeck-Andresen law, known as the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, was passed and signed by the President.

While the Norbeck-Andresen Act was pending session after session, Congress provided funds to acquire, by purchase, two of the country's most important waterfowl breeding and feeding grounds, namely, the Upper Mississippi Fish and Wildlife Refuge, running from Davenport, Iowa to Red Wing., Minn., and the Bear River Waterfowl Refuge in Utah.

When it seemed hopeless to obtain agreement upon the dollar "Federal License Plan," the conservation forces decided, with doubts and misgivings on the part of many, to get the basic law through without the license feature. Since the conservation of migratory birds benefits all citizens, and was pledged under a treaty with Canada, it was argued that Congress should very properly appropriate the necessary funds.

$8 MILLION AUTHORIZED FOR 10-YEAR PROGRAM

The bill in its final form authorized appropriations aggregating $8 million over a period of 10 years, "to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes by the acquisition of areas of land and any water to furnish in perpetuity reserves for the adequate protection of such birds; and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes."

BIOLOGICAL CHIEF MADE COMMITMENTS

While that bill was under consideration, the late Paul G. Reddington, then Chief of the United States Biological Survey, among other things, promised to use the funds as follows:

"As suggested in the report of this Department on the measure under date of January 11, 1929, the $75,000 proposed for the first year's expenses would be used in making a comprehensive survey of the most desirable sanctuary sites throughout the United States, and in developing a clear-cut, businesslike program for the establishment of the necessary sanctuaries along the migration routes."

It was Mr. Reddington's conclusion, based on information in the files of the Biological Survey, that Federal sanctuaries were needed in at least 125 concentration areas.

Concerning the proposed allocations for the second year, Mr. Reddington promised that—

"Practically all of the estimated amount of $200,000 (authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931) will be expended in accordance with the present plans * * * on the acquisition of lands found by the investigation made during the first year to be needed for sanctuary purposes * * * it is not planned to expend any of this $200,000 in the administration of sanctuaries during this year.

"During the third year under the $600,000 appropriation we estimate that we will use 95 percent for the acquisition of additional lands, including the construction of necessary improvements such as dikes, ditches, dams, etc., and approximately 5 percent for administering the areas already acquired. Subsequently and until a sufficient number of sanctuaries have been obtained to provide for the welfare of the migratory birds, it is the present plan of the department to use each year approximately 80 to 85 percent in acquisition and improvements, and not to exceed 15 to 20 percent for the employment of protectors to administer and patrol the sanctuaries."

Beginning with the fourth year, the amount authorized was $1,000,000 annually.

CONGRESSIONAL SPECIAL WILDLIFE COMMITTEES

Following the enactment of the Norbeck-Andresen Act, it became evident that unless far greater support could be found for this improvement undertaking, the whole program would collapse. Fortunately, a Special Senate Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources was organized on March 20, 1931 to make special studies of various proposed wildlife programs, which action was followed later by the establishment of a Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife in the House of Representatives.

Due to conditions which prevailed in 1930 and 1931, it was realized that while authorizations were one thing, obtaining actual governmental appropriations to carry out a program such as contemplated by the Norbeck-Andresen Act, was quite a difficult matter.

It was further found that since the Federal Government had committed itself to a migratory waterfowl restoration program, many of the States took little or no interest in the birds, except to fight for their full share of the open hunting seasons.

The American Game Association then came forward (September 1931) with a suggested $25-million bond-issue proposal, the bonds to be issued at the rate of $5 million per year "to purchase, lease, and maintain migratory bird breeding, feeding, and resting grounds," and to be retired from funds to be collected through a dollar Federal license to hunt migratory waterfowl.

The plan further contemplated that the States would contribute on a 50–50 basis in the acquisition of the areas, and when the purchases were completed the projects would be turned over to the States for administration under the general Federal regulations.

The entire purpose of this proposal was to reemphasize the magnitude and immediate urgency of the waterfowl needs. Those who proposed it were looked upon as visionary but well-meaning individuals. Due to the delays, land prices and everything else went up. Approximately twice the $50 million ($25 million Federal contributions, $25 million State contributions) expenditure then contemplated has already been made, and the job is far from completed.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS HELD

The Senate Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources began to hold hearings on various proposals and submitted a series of reports, also introduced the present duck-stamp bill, the primary purpose of which was to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 by providing funds "for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds; for developing and administering such areas; for the protection of certain migratory birds; for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder."

It will be noted that acquisition of areas was placed first on the list. The act provided that not less than 90 percent of the money was collected from duck stamps, being issued at $1 each, was to be used for the purpose of locating, acquiring, administering, etc., suitable areas for migratory bird sanctuaries under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929.

SPECIAL CITIZENS' COMMITTEE NAMED

While the Duck Stamp Act was before Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, early in January of 1934, set up a special three-man committee consisting of Thomas H. Beck, chairman, J. N. Darling, and Prof. Aldo Leopold to study the wildlife needs of the Nation. In their report of February 8, 1934, they recommended that a total of $50 million be expended for purchasing submarginal lands for wildlife restoration and that a minimum of $24 million be so allocated; also that 4 million acres be acquired quickly, under 1-year leases with options to buy, for migratory waterfowl and shore birds to secure some of the highly important lands at once rather than to do a piecemeal job.

HUNTERS VOLUNTEERED EXTRA DOLLAR

The new duck stamps, which first went on sale on August 14, 1934, at $1 each, during the 1935 fiscal year totaled $635,001. In a special Fish and Wildlife Service publication of 1947 concerning the stamps and listing the number of stamps sold each year up to 1946 (1946—$1,725,505), the Fish and Wildlife Service stated:

"In general, about one-third of the expenditures from the 90-percent allocation of duck stamp funds has been used for land acquisition; one-third for refuge development; and the remaining one-third for refuge maintenance and operation."

We trusted this public statement. Those of us who had participated in the campaign for the program were satisfied that, on the basis of the above formula, the dollars collected were being used wisely. Recognizing the need for more money, we went along in 1949 and agreed to collect another dollar from all migratory waterfowl hunters. The first year, 2,127,598 of the $2 stamps were sold. It is estimated that for the current fiscal year, the total number of stamps issued will exceed 2,350,000.

OUR FEARS AROUSED 1951

The several States cooperated to the best of their ability in this program, some of them more generously than others, but doubts began to develop in the minds of many of the State wildlife officials that the Federal Government was tapping the duck stamp fund for purposes other than intended. Badly needed areas were not being acquired as contemplated, much more drainage was being done annually, and land prices were going higher and higher.

Our fears and suspicions were more than aroused when Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker (who in his capacity as secretary to the Senate Special Committee on Wildlife Resources had helped to draft the duck stamp law) came before the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at Rochester, N. Y., in September 1951, with a summation of the manner in which the duck stamp money had been expended.

He reported that up to June 30, 1950, the amount collected from waterfowl hunters was slightly more than $23 million, and that 10 percent of this money had gone for administration and enforcement amounting to $2,300,000, which left $20,700,000 for the major purposes of the act.

In Mr. Shoemaker's address he stated:

"The expressed congressional thought behind the act was to acquire refuges along the various flyways in order to provide not only wintering, resting, and feeding grounds, but breeding areas in the northern tier of our States. As a corollary and of secondary importance to the act, such portions of this money as the Fish and Wildlife Service thought necessary could be used to maintain, operate and manage already existing refuges."

In the above statement, Mr. Shoemaker very clearly voiced the intent of all of us who participated in the campaign for this legislation.

His next comment almost floored every State official present. He explained what had become of the $20 million, and reported that up to June 30, 1950, only 184,636 acres of land had been purchased with duck stamp money at a total cost of $1,970,604, or an average of $10.67 per acre. He concluded with the statement, "this leaves a sum of $18,729,396 which went into phases of the waterfowl program other than acquisition of lands for refuges, which apparently was the real and major purpose of the Duck Stamp Act."

He further suggested that either Congress should be prevailed upon to provide more appropriations for the management and operation of the refuge program, or the price of the duck stamp should be increased, "with a proviso that the increase should be used in acquiring and developing more refuges along the flyways."

TAPPING SPECIAL FUNDS BREAKS FAITH

The report above gave the State wildlife officials and the sportsmen of the country cause for alarm. It looked as though the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Budget, or the Congress, or a combination of all four, had deliberately tapped the duck stamp fund for purposes never contemplated to avoid making appropriations from general tax revenues.

It is not unusual to find that budget officers and legislative bodies have an inclination to load onto special funds everything they possibly can "so long as it's within the law" in order to reduce general tax revenue appropriations to a minimum, a practice which ignores the "trust character" of such special contributions. It is a breaking of faith which should never be condoned.

LATEST REPORT WAS SHOCKING

When Mr. Shoemaker came before the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners at Las Vegas, Nev., early in May of this year, and gave us a further report on the duck stamp fund, State officials and sportsmen were shocked, to say the least.

In summary he reported that from the beginning of the issuance of duck stamps to the end of June 1953 a total of $29,542,253 has been expended from the duck stamp fund; that the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year ending this June 30 would be $5,406,456, or a total of $34,948,709; and that there is on hand an unexpended and unobligated balance of $890,841.56 from a grand total of duck stamp receipts since August 14, 1934, of $35,839,551.

Shoemaker's latest report indicates that out of this total $34,948,709 expended from the duck stamp fund, only $6,492,375 has been expended or budgeted for the purchase of lands for waterfowl management areas, including appraisals, titles, surveys, etc. We understand the Service had by then actually purchased only 209,329 acres, at $13.22 per acre, from this fund, far short of the acreage contemplated in 1934. The balance of the sum indicated was actually used up for various other purposes, including leases, etc.

Another startling fact brought out was that for every dollar paid to the owners of this acreage another 95 cents was expended to make the appraisals, negotiations, surveys, clearance of titles, etc., and that all the balance of the collections was used for other purposes simply because it was lawful to load all of these other activities onto the duck stamp fund, even though it was not in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law.

EARLY SPONSOR'S SEVERE CRITICISM

One of the early sponsors of the campaign for the duck stamp program to allow waterfowl shooters to contribute to the maintenance of their own sport wrote me just recently that the attitude of some of the principal policymakers in the Fish and Wildlife Service, in his opinion, has been detrimental to the whole concept of the original program, and that "back of the whole thing is the constant urge for more power by building up the Service and spending more money. The shooter is the enemy of the game; all he does is furnish the money. I know refuges that go in for picnic sites in a big way—concrete tables and benches and all ancient and modern inconveniences of tourist traps."

While this indictment may seem a bit severe, many of us definitely believe that the Fish and Wildlife Service has spent entirely too much duck stamp money to develop and embellish properties that were never acquired for the purpose of benefiting waterfowl. For instance, it might be wise for the Congress to inquire how much duck stamp money has been spent on such big game refuge projects as the National Bison Range in Montana, the Wichita Game Refuge in Oklahoma, and numerous others that might be mentioned, upon which it is alleged that duck stamp dollars were expended rather lavishly in former years simply because it was easier to get the money from that source than it was to obtain it from Congress direct.

OUR WESTERN PROBLEMS NEGLECTED

It is quite clear that the duck stamp money collected from the shooters has not been spent in the manner intended by Congress or the sportsmen who supported the legislation. It is also quite obvious that the fault does not lie wholly with any one of the four agencies involved, namely, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Budget, or the Congress, but that all four have been derelict in their duty and jointly responsible.

We in the West know what our needs are. We are convinced that much more of the duck stamp money should have been spent in the Western States to acquire and develop suitable waterfowl habitat areas before all of the few remaining marshes are drained and converted to agriculture. And we are certain that any further delay will make it practically impossible to acquire needed waterfowl management areas in a number of Western States, and especially California, because of the terrific demand for water.

We in California have been especially critical because of the slowness of the Federal Government's program. While the Lea Act appropriations temporarily helped out, the amount expended in relation to the importance of the Pacific flyway wintering grounds in California for the ducks, geese, etc., is much too small, especially if we take into consideration the fact that our 220,000 duck hunters now contribute $440,000 annually to the duck stamp fund.

EXAMPLES OF NEEDED DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL AREAS, CALIFORNIA

Proper development of waterfowl projects already bought in our State has been neglected, especially in areas where crop depredations are a problem. Two outstanding examples of the need for full development by the Fish and Wildlife Service are:

Sacramento Refuge: Of the 11,000 acres on the Sacramento Refuge, about 6,000 have been presently developed and approximately 5,000 remain in a native state. In this condition, the value of these undeveloped acres is limited to providing forage and resting areas primarily for geese during the period of winter precipitation. It is not felt that they serve the best purpose to which they could be devoted by better and higher type of development.

It has always been stated that funds are not available for such developmental work. Since this refuge, acquired about 20 years ago, is in the heart of the crop depredation area of the Sacramento Valley, it is felt that there is full justification for the expenditure of additional funds to bring it to its highest usefulness. No part of this refuge has ever been opened to public shooting, and there has been no valid excuse for failing to use duck stamp money for this purpose.

Merced Refuge: The Merced Refuge, comprising 2,500 acres bought with Lea Act funds, presently has about 900 acres developed, and for which there is a water supply over and above annual precipitation. The balance of the land is native grass and, after the start of fall rains and new growth of forage, provides feed and resting for various species of geese. This undeveloped acreage contributes too little to the solution of the crop depredation problem, to public hunting, or as habitat for ducks. Further and adequate development, including water, is highly desirable.

STATE DOING MORE THAN ITS SHARE

We in California have set up a fund of more than $4 million for the acquisition and development of additional waterfowl management areas. It is high time that the Federal Government meets its full share of the obligation. But if duck stamp moneys are diverted as they have been in the past, the original concept of the program will never be completed.

We strongly urge that a reasonable portion of the present $2 fee be earmarked for the acquisition of additional lands in areas where the last remaining marshes are rapidly being eliminated, and that they be held until such time as funds are available to develop them. Probably it will be found desirable to increase the cost of duck stamps further, but if this is done the entire increase should be earmarked for the original purpose of the program and not to carry a load of other operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service just because the law is broad enough to permit the raiding of the fund for functions which should be provided through appropriations from general tax revenues.

If this deplorable situation cannot be straightened out satisfactorily in the near future, the only alternative will be to urge the repeal of the duck stamp law, and request the Congress to appropriate funds to discharge this country's obligations under the treaties with Canada and Mexico.

The sportsmen of America are big hearted and generous, but they do not like to be cheated. And they won't accept repeated alibis for broken promises.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until tomorrow night at midnight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3383.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

A FREE WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I should like to preface my remarks on the strike situation by a comment on a free world and read an article from the Evening Star of last night, and an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, which came out yesterday and is on the stands now. It refers to the Kohler strike

Mr. Speaker, every session of Congress, billions of the taxpayers' dollars are appropriated and spent, so we are repeatedly told, to protect the people of a free world.

It would be wonderful if the Congress had the courage and the inclination to give to our own people here in the United States of America freedom from oppression, from extortion, freedom to earn a livelihood, which, it may be assumed, is essential. Or is there some magic in Federal legislation which will give each and all of us everything we desire, through the enactment of a law?

Are we dumb or do we lack courage?

As has many times been pointed out in the Record by me, racketeers and gangsters, ignoring all law, have practiced extortion, defied law enforcement officers, and exacted their tribute, not only from members of unions, but from the public generally. The violence at Kohler in Wisconsin is nothing new. It is inexcusable. A yesterday's AP news dispatch carried a story which reads:

Mayor in Peace Appeal After Kohler Mob Action

Sheboygan, Wis., July 6.—Mayor Rudolph Ploetz of Sheboygan hinged his hopes for labor peace and end of mob action which brought injuries to one man and the destruction of property on a meeting today with officials of the struck Kohler Co.

The mayor arranged the meeting last night after a crowd estimated at times as large as 1,000 persons took over the waterfront area when the firm attempted to unload a cargo of clay from a freighter. The company has been the scene of a strike for more than a year.

MOB BEATS UP A "SCAB"

The mayor appeared before the crowd last night to announce the meeting and urge members to go home. He also announced that Sheboygan County Sheriff Ted Mosch had taken over direction of law enforcement in the community. Sheriff Mosch said he would move officers into the city and that they would remain as long as needed.

After the mayor's plea, the crowd dispersed.

The dock area, along the Sheboygan River and 4 blocks from the downtown section, was roped off by police. Earlier in the day a man had been beaten in a mob action. The crowd surged about him shouting, "Here's a scab."

The victim, Roman Gruinwald of Plymouth, sought to flee the mob as fists flew. When he finally escaped, blood flowed from cuts and injuries to his face. He was identified as a nonstriking worker.

The mayor made his announcement about an hour and 15 minutes after the night's last reported incident. The crowd had milled about through the day in front of the home of James Holsen, also said to be a nonstriking worker. His house adjoins the dock area. About 9:15 p. m. his car was overturned and the windows in the darkened house broken.

The mayor said he would like to see the Kohler Co. "renege on its attempt to unload the clayboat for the sake of peace and security in Sheboygan."

Earlier last night Lyman Conger, company attorney, said the firm would make no further effort to unload the vessel and would not expose its people to what he called "mob violence."

STRIKE BEGAN APRIL 5, 1954

Local 833 of the UAW–CIO went on strike April 5, 1954, at the huge plumbingware firm in nearby Kohler. Union demands concern wages, pensions, and union security.

Robert Burkart, international representative of the UAW–CIO, said the union was adopting a "hands-off attitude" in the dockside dispute. He said people involved were "not acting under authority of the local."

Mr. Conger said he did not know what effect the disturbance would have on a National Labor Relations Board hearing investigating 11 unfair labor practices charges against the Kohler firm. The hearing is now in recess until July 20, when the company will begin presenting its arguments. Mr. Conger said none of the NLRB staff was in the city yesterday.

Then, when I picked up the July 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, I found an editorial, which I will read:

There's No Excuse for Goon-Led Picket Lines

A few weeks ago, in Philadelphia, people on their way home from work saw a group of 4 or 5 men armed with short pieces of pipe attack a man, beat him bloody and groggy, and walk off down the street without being interfered with. The victim had not attempted to rob anyone, made rude remarks to anybody's wife, or snatched a handbag. His offense was that as a truckdriver he had carried a load of produce to a plant which was being struck by a labor union. The strike at this plant was not called by any group of workers in the plant. It was siege by organized platoons of terroristic goons whose purpose was to force the employees into their union by coercion and violence. Needless to say, such scenes and organizational strikes are routine from one end of the United States to the other. Public authority has often seemed indifferent. In Philadelphia it was considered necessary to seek an injunction against assault and battery.

Nobody contests the right of workers to strike for better working conditions, more money, or any other objective which they feel justifies such procedure. The right to strike is protected by statute, and it would be hard to find an employer today who would contest it. However, the bulk of strikes today are not for more money or better working conditions. Many of them do not involve the workers in the plant being struck. The longest and most exhausting strikes are often little more than raids on the workers' payroll by predatory union organizations. In some instances, industrial plants have been picketed for months and even years while the employees are hounded, at their place of employment and even at home, by efforts of accomplished terrorists to dragoon them into a union which they have shown no desire to join.

One company which has managed to survive a UAW-CIO siege is the Kohler Co., of Wisconsin, whose plant was picketed for more than a year and actually shut down for 8 weeks by one of the most determined goon operations in the history of industrial strikes. Although some so-called economic demands were made, the real issue, as is usually the case, was compulsory unionism. The Kohler Co., however, stood its ground and has consistently refused to submit to coercion or to discuss any issues with the strike leaders as long as the violence and vandalism continued. At last accounts the strike was still going on, but so were operations at the Kohler Co. plant. Indeed, the company was able to report a net profit for 1954, although for 9 months of that year the plant was supposedly strike-bound. Furthermore, the company has made it clear that, when and if the strike is over, the company's loyalty will be to the employees who have stayed on the job to the end, not to the minority who joined the strike to force the others into an undesired union.

The mystery about all this to many citizens is what ever became of the National Labor Relations Board? The popular supposition was that after the passage of the National Labor Relations Act the question of which union, if any, should represent the workers in this or that industrial plant would be settled in an orderly fashion by an NLRB election. Nevertheless, 20 years after the passage of the law, we still see pickets parading in front of stores and restaurants, carrying placards claiming that the boss is unfair to organized labor, while in the window of the place is a sign declaring: "None of our employees are on strike. These pickets do not work for us."

To us, it does not seem to be a superhuman task to decide such questions of fact once and for all. Either the employees want to join the union or they don't want to join the union. If they want to, they can petition for an NLRB election. If they don't want to, what earthly excuse is there for perpetual picketing of the plant by ruffians with clubs and an abusive vocabulary in the hope of boosting membership by force and violence?

If any Member of this House can give me a sound, logical reason why the Congress has ignored the practices condemned in this editorial, it is my hope that he will take the floor, make public the reasons for the failure of the Congress to act effectively.

Is it not just a little silly, as well as absurd, to, day after day, talk about the free world and free people when, ever since 1937, here in the United States of America, men have been deprived of the opportunity to earn a livelihood?

The Kohler Co. should be commended for its determination and efforts to protect its employees.

We hear a great deal of talk about a free world, yet here in the Nation's Capital we have a strike which slows down and in some instances prevents the Government itself from carrying on its activities. The activities of the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and all the agencies of Government, are to a certain extent tied up by this strike.

No comment is made on the management of the company. I do not know anything about it. Perhaps, as some allege, the treasury of the company was raided by the gentleman who is being subpenaed by a committee from the other body. Perhaps the demands of the workers are justified. No comment is made whatever on the merits of the controversy, I mean, on the merits of any proposition involved in the controversy.

ARE WE A FREE PEOPLE WHEN DENIED THE SERVICES OF A PUBLIC UTILITY?

If we are to have what is so often referred to by internationalists as a nation of free people, we must have orderly procedure, equal justice under law, respect for the rights of every individual. In 1945, Washington had a transit strike very similar to the one which now is causing so much discomfort to so many.

In 1945, and again in January of 1947, bills were introduced which had either been enacted and enforced would have prevented much of our present trouble. In substance it was provided that, when there was a strike which affected the health, safety, or welfare of our country or of a city or community, then action should be taken to remedy that situation.

Ever since we outlawed the yellow-dog contract in 1935—and its opposite came into effect; that is, a contract calling for a union or a closed shop—and the two are the same with the exception of a 30-day waiting period which marks the union shop as distinguished from the closed shop—ever since labor was given, first, the Wagner law—written in part by an acknowledged Communist—and later the Taft-Hartley Act, members of certain minority groups have taken it upon themselves under the direction of ambitious, lawless leaders, not only to disregard the law of the land, not only to defy the police and law-enforcement officers and the decrees of the court, but to actively engage in illegal, violent acts in total disregard of their fellow citizens.

That procedure has not been followed in this strike. The employees of Capital Transit are to be commended for the reasonable law-abiding attitude they have taken in that phase of the strike. Moreover, their present objective of tying up the Capital Transit has been successful because the company has made no effort to operate either its cars or buses.

Under present legislation and procedure the employees of Capital Transit, the employees of an electric power producing company, those who operate the plant that supplies us with water—artificial heat or lack of it is not of great importance here in Washington, but in our country in the North, it is vital—those employees in those industries may go on strike and they cannot only inconvenience everyone, but they can in the end if they use customary methods do away with conditions and activities upon which the public health as well as our safety depends.

Just where would we be if the employees who operate the water system here in Washington went on strike? The system remained inoperative? No water to wash; to brush your teeth; to take care of the sewage; to drink? You say that cannot happen? Of a certainty it can. It probably will not happen, but it is a possibility.

We might not be able to get anything to drink except something other than water—milk—and the way the situation is now with this Virginia law they will not allow High's to sell milk some 18 cents less a gallon than the price they fixed. A fine example of not thought, but food control. I am straying off the strike situation now in the interest of my constituents who have cows and who are dairymen. But, going back to the strike here—how would you remedy it?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe a Virginia judge yesterday did rule that they could sell the milk at 18 cents less.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, well, that was just one of the judges. That was just a judicial decision; wait until it gets up to the high court. The gentleman does not want to predict what that court will do; does he?

Mr. GROSS. No, I certainly do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the dairymen of Virginia are determined people. They want Washington folks to drink and use Virginia milk and—and please mark this—pay the price fixed by a Virginia commission. Patrick Henry may have said: "Give me liberty or give me death," but the cow owners of Virginia say: "Drink Virginia milk and give us the dollars named by the Virginia commission."

Getting back to the strike here, is there any remedy? I think there is. Our trouble, in my judgment, grows out of the fact that under the Taft-Hartley Act, if you employ me and I quit work, I am still your employee entitled to all the benefits of the Taft-Hartley Act. You cannot fire me. You cannot hire someone in my place. In theory you may but in practice you cannot. If you do, then with my buddies I may go down to your place of business and close it so tight that even a breeze cannot get in or out. And no one else can work on the job. If someone tries that, he may get the treatment described in the Saturday Evening Post editorial just quoted.

What is my suggestion as to what should be done now here in Washington? If we will enact legislation—not to prevent a strike—let employees strike if they wish to—I think every man should be permitted to quit a job—but just enact legislation which after those on strike have been on strike for say 10 or 12 or 15 hours, I would give a man who wanted to go on strike time to go on home and talk it over with his wife—as to where the next grocery money was coming from and whether he wanted to continue on strike—but after he had been on strike, let us say for 10 hours, let him lose his status as an employee. Do you get the point? Special benefits and privileges—many in number and of great value—are given employees by the Taft-Hartley Act. When those special privileges are misused, abused, let the law require their suspension—just as when a son insists on abusing the privilege of driving the family auto. Dad says "Let the car stand in the garage until you can drive at a reasonable speed and get home before morning." Then the company would be required to hire someone else to operate its cars and buses.

What would you pay them? I would require the President or some top public official to appoint a commission of 5 members, 1 union man, 1 company man, and 3 representing the public. The public should have three votes not only because it outnumbers the others but also because the public safety and health are involved in a strike of this nature. Then the commission should decide what a fair wage should be. They should also decide something else. They should decide what a fair return for the stockholders should be on the investment.

One other question which the municipality now decides: What fare should be charged to those who wanted to ride on the Capital Transit system? The commission should also decide three things—wages, profits, and fares. The three decisions should govern—subject, of course, to court review on any issue of arbitrary or unreasonable determination.

Then I would have the company continue that program into operation; hire anyone it desired, regardless of membership or nonmembership in a union. Throw the jobs open to free Americans for once. If the new employees wish to organize, bargain collectively—fine.

You ask who is to pay for the cost? Where is the company to get the money? If the revenue was not enough to pay for the operation under the conditions just suggested, assess the balance on the taxpayers of the District. And if a Federal contribution is needed, a subsidy, let the Congress appropriate it. Then let the city or District cancel the present franchise, ask for bids from others interested—or get the bids before cancellation.

It all boils down to this: Are we to demonstrate—and I call this to the attention of our colleague, the great internationalist and statesman from Ohio, and who is listening so attentively, who does so much in every way for people all over the world—are we by our failure to cure this situation—to demonstrate by our inability to operate our own Government here in the United States Capital that we are either incompetent or lacking in courage? While so actively engaged in giving away our constituents' dollars, adding to the national debt, I wonder if we ever stop to think of the absurdity of a great Government like the United States permitting a situation like this to arise and to continue, day after day, where thousands—I do not know how many thousands—of Federal employees who must be on their jobs if the Government is to operate, cannot follow the customary way of going to work?

Frankly, is the situation not an absurdity, and should we not do something about it?

My suggestion is that you read that news item which has to do with the strike over in Wisconsin and the editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, and then, for 5 minutes, sit in silence, think of the situation as it exists in Washington, as after more than a year it is at Kohler's in Sheboygan. Are we so incompetent or so lacking in courage that we cannot come up with legislation to solve the problem?

Billions of dollars for the oppressed in Russia, for the hungry in India and China, for the naked in—where? No matter, just somewhere. But neither protection, justice, nor the right to work for the descendants of those who fought Great Britain to a standstill, gave us liberty and the right to happiness, both of which we throw away because—shall it be said—of our fear of the political power of a few, a very few, unscrupulous ruffians posing as labor leaders.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a statement by former President Herbert Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the career of my able and good friend, Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, as attorney general of his State, as lieutenant governor, and as a Member of Congress for 20 years, during which time he also has represented Ohio on the Republican National Committee of which he served as campaign director during the successful congressional campaign in 1946, constitute a record of achievement which stands as an inspiration to the young people who are interested in public affairs, but one of his outstanding accomplishments is his authorship of legislation creating both the first and second Commissions on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commissions.

In this connection, I wish to include a statement of June 30, 1955, by former President Hoover, who, as Chairman of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has rendered another signal service to America:

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER, JUNE 30, 1955

The real founder of both the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government of 7 years ago and of the present Commission was Congressman CLARENCE BROWN. He introduced and secured the passage of the legislation creating both Commissions. He served as a member of the first Commission where the authorities of that Commission were considerably limited. In the creation of the second Commission, Congressman BROWN made certain that these authorities be greatly enlarged among other things to include authority to make recommendations on policy questions. He has served again as a member of this Commission and his zeal for economy and efficiency in Government has been an outstanding service to the American people.

The first Commission concerned itself chiefly with reorganization of departments and agencies and their relations with each other. As we were limited in dealing with policies, the first Commission's proposals were directed to consolidating overlapping agencies; defining lines of authority; accounting; budgeting; and generally to removing the roadblocks to more effective organization with the consequences of reduced expenditures. Some 70 percent of its recommendations have been adopted during the past 7 years.

Somebody challenged our authority to deal with policy questions. The reports of the Senate and House committee to those bodies recommending the enactment of the legislation expressly state that a proposed difference between the first and second Commissions was that the new Commission would deal with functional and policy questions bearing on economy and efficiency.

In the course of its nearly 2 years' work, the Commission investigated 17 groups of functional activities. For instance, the Federal medical services are carried on by 26 different executive agencies; legal services by 54 different agencies; research and development by 29 agencies; lending, guaranteeing, and insurance by 104 different agencies; transportation by 22 agencies; agencies in competition with private enterprise by a dozen agencies; and so on. Each of these agencies were studied historically, their finance and their related importance. These studies, therefore, went much further than just the agencies in Washington. Most of them have decentralized installations, such as warehouses, purchasing centers, powerplants, and hospitals. Our task force members personally inspected hundreds of them. For instance, the Task Force on Food and Clothing visited 115 separate installations. In all, we covered over 95 percent of the expenditures of the Federal Government.

To do this, we organized 20 task forces of from 6 to 30 men, each with research and clerical staffs. The task forces comprised more than 350 professional men and executives, most of whom were chosen because of their previous experience in Government activities. They were from both political parties.

The Commission itself, in its reports to the Congress, did not always follow the recommendations of the task force, but amplified them from our own research staff and on some occasions modified them from the long public experience of the members of the Commission itself.

There are 350 recommendations in the Commission reports. Of these 145 are administrative—that is, they are within the authority of the Government departments and agencies to adopt if they wish. About 166 would require legislation, but many items are on the same subjects, so that fewer legislative bills would be required. Some of them could be applied under Presidential procedures. Already over 40 identifiable administrative recommendations have been adopted by the Departments. The Bureau of the Budget is setting up a unit to consider and advance others. The Department of Defense is also setting up an arrangement for the same purpose.

POSSIBLE SAVINGS IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The primary purpose of the Commission was to recommend methods by which savings could be made in the expenditures of the agencies of the executive branch without injury to the security or welfare of the country.

Most of the task forces have made estimates of such annual savings possible if their recommendations were accepted. It should be noted that not all of their recommendations were adopted by the Commission and in some cases the Commission made recommendations which went beyond those made by the task forces.

The following table shows the savings estimates listed in the task force reports:

Budget and accounting	$4,000,000,000
Depot utilization	253,000,000
Federal medical services	290,000,000
Landing, guaranteeing, and insurance activities	200,000,000
Overseas economic operations	360,000,000
Paperwork management, part I	255,000,000
Paperwork management, part II	33,300,000
Personnel and civil service	48,500,000
Real property management	185,000,000
Special personnel problems, Department of Defense	388,800,000
Subsistence (food and clothing)	400,000,000
Transportation	151,500,000
Use and disposal of Federal surplus property	[1] 2,000,000,000

[1] For the first 4 years; thereafter $1 billion per annum.

The following task forces indicated that great potential savings could result from their recommendations but made no dollar estimates:

Business enterprises in competition with private enterprise, business organization of the Department of Defense, intelligence activities, military procurement, water resources and power.

Any addition of these sums would be misleading because some of these estimates partially overlap, such as the savings estimated by the budget and accounting and surplus property task forces. Some of them represent savings based on business practices not entirely applicable to procedure required by law of Government agencies.

In any event, with all such discounts there are enough possible savings left to enable the balancing of the budget and reduction of taxes.

RECOVERY OF CAPITAL SUMS AND AUTHORIZATIONS TO THE TREASURY

In another direction, our various investigations developed the fact that a huge amount of Government capital, tied up in various quarters, could be recovered to the Treasury.

There are possibilities of recovery of Federal capital invested in certain Government agencies by methods tested out by experience which at some time would increase the efficiency and stature of these agencies by so doing. For instance, the Government in the past has subscribed the original capital of various lending or financial agencies under an arrangement whereby the beneficiaries of these agencies, by payment of a small premium on loans, have purchased the Government's capital stock. While these agencies have continued under Government regulation, they were gradually blended into the free enterprise system.

Such instances of this transition are the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal land banks, the Home Loan banks. The Banks for Cooperatives and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are under direction from the Congress now going through this process. We have recommended the extension of this principle to other agencies such as the Federal Housing Administration, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Rural Electrification Administration.

There are several agencies to which the Government has given authorizations to draw funds from the Treasury in larger sums than are needed for their activities.

We also recommended that certain lending agencies be more rapidly liquidated; this would result in more speedy return of an additional sum to the Treasury.

Our reports point out that the disposal of Federal enterprises competitive with private enterprise and the speedy disposal of all surplus personal and unneeded real property would return huge sums to the Federal Treasury. While real property can be disposed of at considerable proportion of the cost, personal property, mostly obsolete or scrap, would return only a minor percentage of cost. The task forces roughly estimate proceeds from the sale of such property at a possible total of $10 billion to be returned over a number of years.

Altogether a strong drive to recover investment, unnecessary liabilities, liquidation, and the realization of property assets should expedite benefits to the Treasury by somewhere about $15 billion.

We have proceeded with the idea that if we determined the essential facts and experience, the conclusions from them made recommendations inevitable.

We have engaged in no witch hunting of individuals. You will not find the name of any public official in our reports except by way of acknowledgment of their fine cooperation.

A large part of our wasteful methods in the Government arise from systems of administration which were efficient enough before the fabulous growth of the Federal executive branch by about 14 times the size of 25 years ago. Some of these faulty systems are due to obsolete legislation which obstructs progress. Some are due to the tenacity of Government agencies to the idea that their empires are sacrosanct. Some are due to the pressure groups that profit from the present setup of these agencies and resent all change.

The problems we deal with are mostly beyond the remedy of any single official. And I may say at once that there are many able and dedicated officials in Government who are struggling to unwind these tangles.

And I would add a word as to the great debt of gratitude that is owed to the 400 men associated in our work. They will have taken much time away from their own affairs for nearly 2 years to help solve some of the Nation's most difficult problems.

The final statement of the Commission is:

"The problems before the Commission have by no means been purely financial. In our recommendations we have sought six objectives:

"First, to preserve the full security of the Nation in a disturbed world.

"Second, to maintain the functioning of all necessary agencies which make for the common welfare.

"Third, to stimulate the fundamental research upon which national security and progress are based.

"Fourth, to improve the efficiency and eliminate waste in the executive agencies.

"Fifth, to eliminate or reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

"Sixth—and perhaps the most important of all—to strengthen the economic, social, and governmental structure which has brought us, now for 166 years, constant blessings and progress."

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. CANNON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6766) "making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission," etc., and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON).

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322); and

H. R. 3636. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, Island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xzanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 107. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato);

S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife Stefania Janicki;

S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand;

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 802. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1290. An act to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream.

S. 1318. An act to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1571. An act to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year;

S. 1633. An act relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska;

S. 1725. An act to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly;

S. 1993. An act authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol;

S. 2135. An act to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water supply feature of that reservoir.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 300. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5614, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 301. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6373, a bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 6829. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1083). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4308. A bill for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 6766. A bill making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1085). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 287. Resolution for the relief of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 290. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6987, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Sam H. Ray; with amendments (Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3063. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co., and certain others; with amendments (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6078. A bill for the relief of Alison MacBride; with amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6790. A bill for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 7201. A bill relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7202. A bill relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 7203. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the amount in controversy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 7204. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use receipts from lands being administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to maintain and improve such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 7205. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7206. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 7207. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 7208. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that (for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits) any insured individual who is totally and permanently disabled, and who has not less than 20 quarters of coverage, shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7209. A bill to provide for improving accounting methods in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 7210. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to establish more clearly the policy of Congress as to expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7211. A bill to enable and to expedite the business of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7212. A bill to protect the public welfare when injuriously affected by strikes in public utilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7213. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Antietam National Cemetery at Sharpsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7214. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7215. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7216. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 7217. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 7218. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 7219. A bill to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution designating the period from October 3 to October 8, inclusive, 1955, as National Fish Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 302. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 303. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. Res. 304. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending to Patrick B. McGinnis and the officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. commendation for and encouragement in their efforts to develop the services of the railroad for the betterment of this area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 7220. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 7221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 7222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Kare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7223. A bill for the relief of George V. Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

347. Mr. DIGGS presented a petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Michigan, regarding the Hoover task force report, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Work of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first part of testimony given by me on yesterday before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with Senate bill 728. The first part of the testimony deals with the general planning, as of this time, of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee regarding the problem of delinquency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER ON S. 728

Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before your committee and presenting certain pertinent facts and arguments as to why Senate bill 728, which was introduced by Senator HENNINGS, Senator LANGER, and me as members of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, should be passed.

Before discussing the merits of the various provisions in said bill, it might be well to give you a brief background discussion as to the juvenile delinquency problem in the United States which, we believe, makes legislation such as this a necessity.

The recent Federal Bureau of Investigation Annual Report shows that 72 percent of all auto thefts in the United States are committee by persons under 22 years of age and that 57 percent are committed by persons under 18 years of age. These are figures which should shock the citizens of the United States into a dynamic program to combat juvenile delinquency in the United States. This year, 1,200,000 juveniles have been apprehended as juvenile delinquents. If this upsurge is not corrected, by 1960, 1,700,000 juveniles will get into trouble with the law. This Nation cannot afford such a rise in juvenile delinquency.

The fight against juvenile delinquency must be a two-pronged fight. We must devote sufficient energy and resources not merely to rehabilitate boys and girls after they get into trouble, but, most important, to prevent their getting into trouble in the first place. There are certain other factors that we should consider in the increase in number of juveniles who get into trouble. This increase appears even more serious when it is realized that there are at least three juvenile offenders brought to the attention of the police for every child actually brought before the juvenile courts. Nor is this the whole problem. As Fillmore H. Sanford, then executive secretary of the American Psychological Association, pointed out to the subcommittee, "For every juvenile who actually engages in delinquent behavior—or who is caught in delinquent behavior—there are hundreds or thousands who may have delinquent tendencies or who fail in subtle and socially harmless but still dreadfully crippling ways, to make a full and creative adjustment to life."

Let us consider some other facts:

1. There is an increase in the seriousness of the acts committed by boys and girls. During each successive year since 1948, for example, a larger number of persons under 18 years of age have been involved in such offenses as burglaries, robberies, and automobile thefts.

2. Heretofore, juvenile delinquency has been thought of as a big-city problem and indeed it does manifest its most acute form in large metropolitan areas. It should be noted, however, that whereas juvenile delinquency increased 29 percent in the Nation between 1948 and 1952, the number of juvenile offenders appearing in courts serving populations of less than 100,000 increased 41 percent.

3. An increase in both the number of boys and girls committing offenses and in the severity of these offenses has been noted in every region of the United States. Although many individual communities seem excepted, communities reporting such increases range from rural and semirural to large urban centers.

4. Neither are more particular forms of delinquent conduct peculiar to one type of community or any one geographical region. Juvenile drug addiction would seem to represent the only exception to this rule, in that it is limited to communities where there is substantial traffic in illicit drugs. Gangs, commonly considered a big-city phenomenon, also appear in communities relatively small in size. While the pattern of juvenile delinquency varies from community to community, these differences do not appear to be directly related to size, wealth, or other obvious differentials.

5. Delinquency exists in all economic groups. Although physically deteriorated and socially disorganized neighborhoods, usually termed "slum areas," contribute disproportionately to the delinquency caseloads of police and juvenile courts, economically well-to-do communities also produce many juvenile delinquents. As a matter of fact, certain forms of delinquent conduct appear more prevalent in the latter type of neighborhoods.

It is also reasonable to believe, and it was so brought out in testimony, that in many instances delinquents from better neighborhoods are less likely to come to the attention of the police and courts. School authorities may be more inclined to permit parents of means to work out the problems of their children, for example, than parents with no financial ability and standing. The children of parents with available funds may be sent quietly to private psychiatrists or to boarding schools, and consequently, the transgressions of those children are not likely to be presented to the juvenile court.

The subcommittee has received through testimony and in the form of studies, publications, and correspondence, extensive information on the causes of juvenile delinquency. A complete analysis of these voluminous materials is not yet available. The following presentation represents but a preliminary digest.

Juvenile delinquency does not result from a single cause. Neither the illegal behavior of an individual nor the total problem of juvenile delinquency in society can be attributed to any one cause. One delinquent child has been strictly disciplined since birth. Another has been subjected to little or no parental control. Some delinquent boys and girls have suffered gross neglect. Others have been overprotected by their parents. Both delinquents and nondelinquent youngsters read comic books and watch crime programs on television. Delinquent behavior stems from a multitude of causal factors, and is always the product of many and closely interrelated influences or forces.

The causes of juvenile delinquency are not unknown, although much remains to be learned about how they operate in relation to a particular individual. Neither is the causation of delinquency so complex that an intelligent attack upon the problem cannot be launched.

No child is born delinquent, but he is subject to a wide variety of influences and conditions which tend to either lessen or increase his chances of becoming delinquent. He is subjected, first of all, to the profound influence exerted by his parents and immediate family. The child of parents who provide affectionate and consistent care, correct instruction and example, who can offer support and protection and yet give sufficient freedom for growth and development, has little need or inclination to become seriously delinquent. He has found the world a friendly place. He has not built up abnormal hostilities. He has learned to trust others. He feels worthy of love and respect. He faces new situations with at least some security and confidence. A solid foundation has been laid down for the development of normal self-discipline and self-control.

Not all children enjoy such family relationships. Some homes are broken by desertion or death. Some parents, though physically present, are, because of their own problems—financial lack, health, or emotional handicaps—unable to give their children the type of care and rearing outlined above. To some degree, and many times to a severe degree, such children are deprived of the love, care, guidance, example, protection, or freedom which they need for normal development. To some degree, depending upon the nature and severity of the deprivation, the development of normal self-control suffers.

But influences bearing upon a child's development are not limited to those within the family, and many delinquent boys and girls do not come from homes marked by internal conflict and abnormal family relationships. This seems particularly true of delinquents who grow up in deteriorated and blighted neighborhoods where many forms of crime and delinquency flourish. Such neighborhoods, it should be noted, are frequently occupied by minority groups which are denied the advantages and opportunities thought normal to American living.

Through both acts of commission and omission, larger society may and does contribute to the development of delinquency. The child who is denied acceptance and opportunity because of his race, religion, or nationality, for example, may learn to hate and rebel against the community, even though he has received affection and guidance at home. The child exposed to adult examples of vice and crime, reared in neighborhoods whose most influential and opulent residents are racketeers, may grow up into a life of crime despite the devoted efforts of law-abiding parents. So may the perfectly normal urge for achievement, for new experiences, for adventure and excitement lead to delinquency in a community which fails to make provision for meeting these needs through adequate school, work, recreational, and leisure-time programs.

The possible negative effects upon child behavior of certain other imponderable but pervasive influences should not be overlooked. The materialism of our age, with its emphasis upon getting ahead and financial success, subjects children to great strain and oftentimes frustration. Modern advertising, coupled with easy pay-as-you-go plans which tend to divert a disproportionate share of family income to keeping up with the neighbors may throw added strains upon family life.

Through TV, radio, movies, and comics, children are fed a heavy diet of violence and crime. Although it is claimed that law and order eventually prevail in these presentations, the life of the underworld is frequently glamorized in the process. Lawlessness and evil are overcome only by brute force. The witnesses have testified that the constant viewing of crime and horror in the various forms of mass media has a noticeable impact on youth and youth's behavior patterns. That it has some influence is manifest in the play and garb of children. The old western tradition of checking your gun at the door is now literally carried on in the elementary classroom. The subcommittee has had called to its attention instances in which youngsters are required to leave their play "shooting irons" outside the classroom, indicating the effect of mass media western programs upon such children.

6. Our investigations and hearings have shown that there are certain contributing factors to juvenile delinquency that needed special attention. For example, in some cities, excessive drinking of alcoholic beverages by juveniles was tolerated. Some restaurants and cocktail lounges permitted juveniles to drink without any attempt to check on the age of the persons involved. I need not elaborate on the impact that the drinking of alcoholic beverages has on youth, and it is a contributing factor toward the committing of delinquent acts. Testimony showed that one of the most sinister of all delinquency problems was that of narcotic addiction among children. An area where there is a concentration of population and one where there is easy accessibility to importation of narcotics, such as seaports and areas near the international borders, proves to be an area where the narcotic addiction among juveniles is most prevalent.

7. Indecent, lewd, and pornographic material reaching the youth of our Nation has been emphatically emphasized in recent hearings before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. A nationwide business, estimated at $350 million, is thriving today because of the inadequacy of our laws and the administration of those laws to cope with the problem. Our subcommittee has had much evidence presented as to the effect that such mass media as television programs, movies, radio, and horror and crime comics have on our youth and its relationship to the increase in juvenile delinquency in this country.

There is no doubt in my mind, nor could there be any doubt in the minds of the Members of the Congress of the United States, that juvenile delinquency has increased far out of proportion and that there must be undertaken effective means of combating it. I have heard people say that this is the job of the parent, of the school, of the immediate neighborhood. However, that is what may be known as a piecemeal approach to the problem.

A total community effort is the only answer to the crime problem. And there is not a single city today which is using all of its resources in combating crime and juvenile delinquency. Wherever one turns, the operation is a piecemeal one.

It is time for the piecemeal effort to be put to a stop and for constructive, well-coordinated programs to be put into effect.

It is interesting to note that not until 1945 did New York State Legislature pass the first law creating the official State Youth Commission. Very few States in the Union have followed the example, and those few States are the larger and richer ones. Even so, they agree that the financial burden on them is great. It is the concern of the Federal Government, for the protection of the youth of our Nation and the future of America, to present a nationwide program to help all of the 48 States to provide a well-coordinated program to combat juvenile delinquency. That is one of the principal objectives of S. 728.

The importance of the objectives of S. 728 is beyond question and I think that we can all agree on the importance of those objectives. The times demand that we take action to check the appalling nationwide upsurge in juvenile delinquency. There is a great unanimity of opinion which prevails as to the kinds of activities that should be undertaken by the Federal Government to assist in the problem.

To achieve the objectives which are, and should be, above controversy, we should approach this legislation with a determination that we shall not permit any differences over petty details to prevail over our concern for the well-being of tens of thousands of American children.

I am not urging favorable action on this matter from pride of authorship of S. 728, but I do have deep feeling concern that the Congress act promptly to pass legislation which would achieve the objectives which are so generally accepted.

It is, I believe, highly significant to note that the legislative branch, acting through the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, and the executive branch pursued their investigations in their own way but they both arrived at the same destination—recommending legislation to achieve the same objectives. I, therefore, call the attention of this subcommittee to the fact that you do not really have two separate proposals, but you do have two bills which seek to achieve essentially the same objectives. These two bills seek to achieve these objectives in the main through the same methods.

There are some details of method on which S. 728 and S. 894 differ but basically those differences, as I am sure you will find, are both aimed at the achievement of the same goals. Certainly, we are vitally interested in the end goal of saving young people.

Let us turn briefly to examination of the objectives that both pieces of proposed legislation would seek to achieve. Both bills would make funds available for three different but closely related purposes. I would like for you to look at these purposes in the light of problems found by the juvenile-delinquency subcommittee. Those are the problems that the legislation is designed to meet.

First, grants for training: S. 728 has provision for grants for training. S. 894 has provision for grants for training. Although there are slight differences in the method for the granting of funds to the States, the common objective of both bills is to get the money out to the States so that people can be trained to fight juvenile delinquency with the utilization of all available knowledge at their disposal.

Why do both bills emphasize the importance of training personnel? Because the training of greater numbers of qualified personnel to staff prevention and treatment agencies means it will be necessary to expand certain training programs and to launch new ones. Schools of social work, law schools, sociology and psychology departments all provide training which partially prepares people for work in the delinquency field. Almost without exception, however, the training offered needs to be supplemented in terms of content and, in some instances, in methodology to qualify personnel for certain functions within the field. Many institutions and police departments attempt to provide some on-the-job training and orientation and although such training is valuable, it is no substitute for the intensive and comprehensive training of persons assigned the crucial task of protecting and rehabilitating children in trouble. Federal funds are necessary to remove the bottleneck to improving the Nation's attack upon juvenile delinquency which has been imposed by the lack of trained and qualified personnel.

Second, both bills provide for grants-in-aid to the States to fight juvenile delinquency. That provision is in keeping with the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's findings after extensive hearings.

It was found that while juvenile delinquency has increased seriously and widely in every type of American community during the past 5 years, local efforts and programs to combat the problem fall far short of coping with it. Efforts in the local communities and States to enlarge existing programs and develop new ones to combat juvenile delinqency are seriously handicapped in several ways. There is ofttimes a lack of technical knowledge locally regarding what has and has not worked in other communities. Rapid strides have been made in technical knowledge which is not yet widely transmitted. Not only is the supply of qualified personnel insufficient to staff even the existing services, but communities often lack the ready means necessary to produce the financial support needed to expand or launch programs.

To break through this kind of stalemate, the Federal Government must launch a three-pronged attack. It must provide increased consultation or technical aid, it must give assistance in attracting and training personnel, and it must temporarily provide the "risk capital" needed for local organizations and agencies to launch and demonstrate the value of new services and programs.

Again, I want to emphasize that this objective is the same in both bills. The differences relate to the type of State organization required to administer the State plan. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's idea in S. 728 was that the administration of the plan must be in a State agency as widely representative of as many professions as are necessarily involved in the fight against delinquency.

Under the provisions of S. 894, it was thought the coordination and the avoidance of duplication could be achieved through a State advisory body.

These are essentially differences in the methodology.

Third, it is the third objective of both bills to provide for risk capital. The funds to be granted under such a program for demonstrations should be channeled to States through State councils or committees. These would be established by the governors or the legislators of the respective States for the purpose of cooperating in such a program. The State councils should include, but not be limited to, representatives of State and local agencies providing preventive and treatment services. The device of a State council or committee rather than an existing State agency is proposed here because a variety of types of agencies, organization, and disciplines would participate in planning and carrying out the program.

Although grants to a variety of State and local agencies might be approved by the State council, all such grants, to be most effective, should be predicated upon a State plan developed by the council and should be allocated according to needs and priorities stipulated in that plan.

It is not contemplated that the Federal Government underwrite existing programs. Rather, funds made available to States for utilization as risk capital should be used solely to launch and temporarily support new services only. It is realized that any program which protects children from the ravages of neglect and rejection or from exposure to vice and lawlessness helps prevent juvenile delinquency. It is, therefore, these kinds of protective services which are basic and fundamental. It is proposed that the risk-capital grants for demonstrations be directed to the establishment of services to achieve such purposes. It is further recommended that the program itself be limited in duration to no more than 10 years, but that its value be reexamined at the end of 5 years and a report on the desirability of its extension be made to the Congress at that time.

Again it is noted that both bills have the same objective. The difference lies in how the money is to be allocated to the States.

There are two other points that I want to stress in this matter. Both deal with administration of the proposed program. Both bills provide for an advisory committee. S. 728 spells out in considerable details the organizations to be represented on the advisory council. S. 894 leaves it entirely within the discretion of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the hearings and investigations held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, it became very apparent that there is much waste and duplication in the Nation's efforts to combat juvenile delinquency because of a lack of coordination.

An impressive array of national organizations and agencies are concerned and more or less active in combating juvenile delinquency. These include religious organizations and agencies; youth-serving organizations, such as Boy Scouts, Y. M. C. A., and citizens' groups such as PTA, women's clubs, consultative agencies which provide technical consultation to States and local communities on one or more phases of delinquency control, such as the National Probation and Parole Association, the Child Welfare League of America, The American Public Welfare Association, the Industrial Areas Project, the Family Service Association of America, and the Children's Bureau of the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the professional organizations with memberships consisting of persons whose profession is in some way related to the field such as the American Bar Association, the American Association of Social Workers, the National Council of Juvenile Delinquency Court Judges, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies. Forward movement in filling gaps and in extending present services is seriously handicapped by the lack of joint planning among the agencies concerned.

Where S. 728, in the printed copy as it appears before you, lists on page 3 a number of specific organizations which shall be represented by at least one Representative, S. 894 leaves the question of selection of the advisory committee as to professional background and affiliation entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has been suggested that this provision of S. 728 be amended to spell out various professional backgrounds of the personnel to be represented on the advisory group. Some believe that such a change would assure a broader representation of professional personnel with the wealth of experience essential to obtaining the greatest possible contribution from the advisory committee.

Title I of S. 728 provides for the establishment in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of an Office for Children and Youth, with the chief of the Children's Bureau acting as head of that office. There is no similar provision in S. 894.

The reason for such a change would be to place the Children's Bureau on the same level as other offices within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thus, the Office for Children and Youth would be in a more advantageous position in presenting many of the problems dealing with youth than the Children's Bureau within the Department.

Much of what is proposed in this bill can be done by departmental order. There does not appear on the part of the present Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare any inclination to take such action.

The benefit of this provision would be to bring about closer liaison between the Secretary and the Chief of the Children's Bureau, and to give the Children's Bureau the status it deserves as a single agency in our Government in the interests of our children in this great land of ours.

It is a shame that the press had to report recently that within a year the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not even spoken to the Chief of the Children's Bureau. In the planning of programs to help children, how can a Secretary under such circumstances plan intelligently on programs which would benefit children?

Title II of S. 728, as I have already mentioned, provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency. This advisory council, consisting of the Secretary, the Attorney General of the United States, or his designee, also includes 20 members appointed by the Secretary.

The purpose of the council is to review applications for special projects submitted to the Secretary under title V of this act, and to recommend to the Secretary for grants under such title. The purpose in creating this council is to get the expert knowledge of the leaders in the many fields concerned with juvenile delinquency, education, and related areas, who will be in a position to give valuable assistance to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in matters necessary to properly administer said act.

Title III of S. 728 provides for grants to the States to strengthen and improve programs. It provides a $3 million appropriation for the next fiscal year and for each of the following 6 years such sums as Congress may determine. The purpose of the appropriation is to provide to the States funds to strengthen and improve Statewide programs to combat juvenile delinquency. As pointed out earlier, very few States have State youth commissions established by law, hence there is the greater need for this bill.

Most of the States, however, do have some agency which can qualify under said bill to carry out the purpose intended.

Title IV of S. 728 provides for grants for the training of personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, or for the development of courses for such training, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships.

One of the glowing needs in the field of delinquency is the need for trained personnel in many categories in both the preventive and correctional aspects of the delinquency problem. There is much evidence in our investigations and hearings to bear out this point.

Title V of S. 728 provides for special projects for the purpose of demonstrating improved techniques and practices for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The object of this provision is to encourage special projects which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening of programs for the control or treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Title VI of S. 728 provides for certain activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would serve the purpose for which the bill was introduced. These include the following:

To make such studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports as will promote the strengthening of programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

To cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

To disseminate information as to studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports; and

To provide short-term courses of training and instruction in technical matters relating to the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, etc.

It is respectfully submitted that S. 728 will materially aid State and local programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency in the United States. Our hearings are replete with testimony showing that in order for juvenile delinquency to be properly controlled and treated, it must be done so on a systematic, all-inclusive plan, with the coordinated efforts of all interested groups from a National, State, and local level.

Gentlemen, in this matter we have a great responsibility. We must keep our eyes on the ball. The ball, in this contest, is the welfare of our children.

The Challenge to American Learning in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 23, it was my privilege to address the Wisconsin State Teachers College at Eau Claire, Wis., on the subject The Challenge to American Learning in the Atomic Age.

At that time I emphasized the importance of closer relations between the people of the United States and the peoples of Southeast Asia and of other relatively far distant areas, which we have too often overlooked in times past.

Our tendency has been to preoccupy ourselves with relations with our friends in Western Europe. While these Atlantic relations must ever be improved, we must seek to strengthen our ties with the peoples of the Pacific, the peoples of Eastern cultures, and, yes, of African and Middle Eastern cultures.

One of our most important means of doing so is through the medium of Asian-African representatives among 34,000 or so foreign students who are now receiving educational training in this country.

To my way of thinking, these foreign students represent one of the greatest assets, so to speak, of their countries, and one of the foremost means for us of conveying the truth about America to the world

I may say, incidentally, that on July 4, in London, the fifth annual International Student Conference opened, with delegates and observers from 53 countries represented. This is the free world student body which has completely "taken the play away" from the Communist-dominated International Union of Students.

I send to the desk the text of my address before the State Teachers College, followed by the text of a New York Times editorial on the foreign students and other exchanges as a good asset to free world foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of my speech and the Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LEARNING IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Address by Senator WILEY before summer session, Wisconsin State Teachers College, Eau Claire, Wis., Thursday, June 23, 1955)

I am pleased to address this fine audience.

I am particularly pleased, of course, to come home—to be back with friends and neighbors.

But it is a special honor to appear before this great institution of learning which has contributed so many outstanding leaders to Wisconsin and American education.

VARIOUS TOPICS OF POSSIBLE INTEREST

In contemplating my visit with you this morning, many thoughts had occurred to me as to what might be the principal phase of my address.

On the home front, on the foreign scene—your country and mine is challenged with such a tremendous variety of issues on which I might submit observations to you, that my scope could have been very broad indeed.

This is a new world in which we are living, a new world, as you know, of supersonic travel, a new age, an atomic age.

Now, what are some of the specific problems in this new world which I had in mind and to which I shall just make a passing reference, at the outset?

WILEY BILL FOR TAX CREDIT FOR SCHOOLING

Well, I had thought of referring in detail to a bill which I have offered which comes very close to a problem in your heart and mine.

It is the matter of encouraging more Americans to attend institutions of higher learning, by being financially able to do so.

Thus, I have offered bill S. 1778. It will provide a 30 percent tax credit in filing income tax returns—a credit against amounts expended to put students through institutions of higher learning.

You and I know that all institutions of higher learning these days involve a good deal of expense, even when the tuition problem is taken care of.

We know that the overhead costs of academic facilities—both public and private—have constantly increased and so rates must constantly rise to students.

We know that teachers however, are still underpaid, both in State institutions and in private institutions.

And, on another phase, we know that in this inflationary time, a great many of our students, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, are pursuing their studies at financial sacrifice to themselves and often to their parents.

In the light of all of these realities, I have offered this bill for a 30 percent tax credit. This is only a beginning toward tax liberalization. And it in turn is but one phase of a problem with which you and I are familiar. It is the problem of making sure that those who want to increase their learning, those who want to make themselves better citizens, those who want to enter professions—shall have the opportunity to do so.

STRENGTHEN WORLDWIDE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Well, friends, I thought of another subject of interest to you and to me. It is the matter of international exchange of teachers, students, and other specialists under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of these exchange programs.

I favor 100 percent the idea of exchanging more qualified Americans with more qualified foreigners, visiting each others' countries.

I want more of our teachers and students and specialists in labor, business, agriculture to visit overseas.

I want them to meet personally with foreign peoples and I want them to give those foreign peoples a truer understanding of what makes us Americans "tick."

FOREIGN STUDENTS—AN ASSET TO AMERICA

Yes; and I want more well-qualified foreign students and teachers and specialists to visit our own land.

In both instances, of course, there must be careful selection of applicants.

But, at the same time, the program should be expanded.

There are some 3,000 foreign students in our country today. They are and will be a great asset to their own nations, and they are a great asset to this country and to its enlightened foreign policy.

I wish that there were more of these foreign students here.

And I wish that more were done to help them feel at home, to have them meet average Americans at the grassroots in American homes and offices and factories and on American campuses.

I believe in person-to-person contact.

I don't have the slightest doubt of the favorable results of Americans going abroad and of foreigners coming here. This is provided, however, that a little advance thought goes into the arrangements, so that a true and accurate picture will result.

These, then, are two of the subjects which I might have discussed in greater detail today.

WE NEED MORE EXPERTS ON FOREIGN CULTURES

There is a third subject.

It is the need for more learners, more scholars in America interested in foreign places.

It used to be thought that a relatively rare individual who was interested in, let us say, the language of Laos or the culture of Cambodia or the religious sects of Vietnam—was an "ivy-towered" professor, a "highbrow" intellectual whose studies did not matter one bit to this Nation.

But now, our acquaintance with these and other foreign peoples has become a matter of life-and-death necessity for us and for the Western World.

SPECIALISTS IN NON-WESTERN AREAS

The fact of the matter is that we do not have enough specialists in foreign peoples and foreign cultures—particularly non-Western peoples and non-Western cultures.

Today, the ramparts of American defense are spread throughout the whole world. Today, the fate of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Southern Vietnam, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Nepal, India, and a vast number of other faraway places are matters of deepest interest to us.

It is not that we have to shoulder all of their problems or try to bear all of their burdens, because obviously we cannot, could not, nor would they want us to.

But we do want to extend a friendly hand, a helping hand.

We want to give them the benefit of American technical know-how. We want to help them banish age-old diseases. Tens of millions of people in India alone reportedly suffer from malaria, to cite but one of innumerable maladies.

We want to the extent that it is feasible to help the diseased and the weak and impoverished of Southeast Asia, to help pregnant mothers or tiny infants through the United Nations Children's Fund. We want to help uplift Southeast Asia's agriculture from widespread use of mere primitive sticks which scrape the soil, to the use of more effective types of implements, of seed and fertilizer.

But how can we help these diverse underdeveloped peoples, how can we even talk to them if we know next to nothing about them?

In all the United States there is but a handful of specialists who can talk, much less be fully acquainted with, let us say, the Thai people and the Thai culture.

The same is true with other peoples in some other relatively distant areas.

To fulfill this need, therefore, we need to encourage American scholarship. We need to increase the reservoir of specialists in foreign areas. We need to get away from the utterly obsolete and mistaken notion of ivy-towered professors or highbrow intellectuals who happen to be interested in once remote peoples and cultures who are now very, very close to all of us.

Yes, we need to accord American scholars the respect and esteem to which they are entitled, as they pursue their respective interests.

FINE WORK OF COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

On the language problems in particular, for quite some time, I have been in contact with the American Council of Learned Societies. It has given a great deal of consideration to this challenge.

Included, I may say, in the American council are a great many national organizations concerned with the humanities—with the languages and the literatures, philosophies and religions, history and the arts—the humanistic element in the social sciences.

This includes the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Anthropological Association, and others.

I do not presume to be an expert in any of these fields, but I do know that the council has done a most constructive job in spotlighting this problem of expanding the reservoir of our foreign specialists.

SOVIETS PREPARING DICTIONARIES IN 80 LANGUAGES

Not so long ago, I pointed out on the Senate floor material which had come to my attention from the council.

It included the stark fact that the Soviet newspaper Pravda had reported that the Soviets were at work in preparing dictionaries for 80 different languages. That is, the Soviets have been preparing dictionaries so that Russians could communicate in Punjabi, Telegu, Swahili, Zulu, and a vast variety of other African, Asian, and other tongues.

The reason the Russians are at work in these 80 languages is obvious. They know that they are in a war for men's minds throughout the world. And how can they stir up an African tribe, let us say, if they cannot overcome the language barrier between Russian and, let us say, Swahili?

By way of contrast, the American Council of Learned Societies has been so starved for funds as to be able, unfortunately, to work on only three language dictionaries such as English translated into Korean and Korean into English.

Now, this is a grave shortcoming which must be remedied

WE NEED MORE TRANSLATIONS OF ATOMIC ABSTRACTS

Every passing day, we are learning that we have got to communicate more and more with foreign peoples and in their own tongues. Take the field of atomic energy alone.

From all over the world scientific papers on nuclear power are being disseminated. Many of them (even from non-Russian sources) are, of course, being written in languages other than English.

How can we possibly take full advantage of these foreign scientific developments and how may foreign scientists make full use of our own findings—if they cannot read English or have abstracts of our papers readily and reliably translated into their tongues and vice versa?

In August, will occur the important atoms-for-peace conference in Geneva Switzerland. At my request, a Senate document on atoms-for-peace is being prepared. But the language barrier still remains a tremendous one which must be hurled for this or any other document to be effective. To achieve the goals of atoms-for-peace, vast numbers of scientists, engineers and technicans will have to be trained. But what is being done to handle the language gulf? Very little indeed unfortunately.

We must, however, be able to conquer more than the language barrier. There is a barrier of differing traditions, differing cultural outlooks, differing philosophies, differing religions.

WE MUST UNDERSTAND INDIA BETTER

Consider, for example, our relations with the great subcontinent of India. Here is a mighty people—of proud, rich, ancient culture—rising by its own bootstraps now from material conditions of serious shortcomings.

Here is a people determined to conduct a full-scale assault on the age-old material enemies of illiteracy, disease, poverty, malnutrition.

We wish them every possible success in this effort. They have made outstanding progress in their few short years of independence.

We have nothing but good will for the Government and people of India. We have a deep respect for the able, tireless Premier of India, His Excellency, Pandit Nehru. Admittedly, we have had our differences with him, and he with us. But we admire him as a great public servant and heir of the immortal saintly Gandhi.

Recently, we have witnessed especially significant activity on the world scene on the part of India's Ambassador Krishna Menon. Ambassador Menon is a man of strong convictions, who has at times held views likewise at wide variance with our own. But it is our earnest desire to work with him in the cause of peace and security and plenty.

To do so, to work cordially and effectively with him or any other leader of a free nation, we must understand them, as we ask them to understand us. We know far too little and tend to be far too implusive in our criticism at times of various foreign leaders.

You know, it is customary to speak of the "mysterious East." But there is nothing really mysterious about the East, if we will take the time and make the effort to learn about it and then to put ourselves in its shoes and gain an insight into its problems.

MORE ASIATIC CULTURE CENTERS IN UNITED STATES NEEDED

For better United States relations with India, for better United States relations with our good friends of Pakistan, and all the other lands of Asia and elsewhere in the world, we need more people-to-people interchange. We need increased understanding of one another.

To achieve this, we need more training and study centers of Asiatic culture in our land. We need more American universities and colleges establishing "chairs" in individual Asiatic or African or Middle Eastern regions and countries.

We need more seminars and institutes on Asia. One such helpful conference will take place on July 29 on the subject of south Asia at the University of Pennsylvania. We need more of the same all over America.

We Americans have tended to overconcentrate on Europe. It is natural that this pattern should have developed because, after all, we are descended largely from European forebears. But we can no longer afford this overconcentration on Western culture and Western peoples. Without in any way detracting from our links with the West, we must develop new links with the East.

GREAT PROGRESS AT BANDUNG

We will find that many Eastern leaders know far more about us than we about them.

For example, President Soekarno, of the great Republic of Indonesia, almost amazed some American observers at the recent Bandung Conference by referring expertly to the midnight ride of Paul Revere as a great landmark in colonial peoples' fight for independence.

He pointed out that the very opening day of the Conference—marked the anniversary of Paul Revere's ride back on April 18, 1775—which started the "first successful anticolonial war in history." Then the distinguished Indonesian President proceeded to quote Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's hallowed poem of the event.

The American observers who seemed surprised at this erudite reference should not really have been amazed. The Bandung Conference showed on that and other occasions that Indonesian leaders and Ceylonese and other leaders—particularly wonderful statesmen like the Philippines' Gen. Carlos Romulo—have a deep reservoir of admiration for us and know far more about us than some Americans tend to give them credit for.

Bandung was a magnificent landmark in free world relations, even though some Americans had held utterly erroneous ideas about it prior to its convening. Indonesia, the host country, is to be congratulated for its splendid contributions. I might cite, incidentally, that Indonesia has, in accordance with the U. N. embargo on shipment of strategic materials to Red China, faithfully turned down Peking offers for rubber and other items.

THE NEED FOR WELL-ROUNDED MAN

And now, my friends, I come to the last phase of my fundamental theme this morning.

The challenge to American learning is infinitely broader than simply increasing the reservoir of specialists in, let us say, Southeast Asia cultures.

The challenge relates right here at home.

Never before in American history have we needed more truly well-rounded citizens.

Never before have we needed more Americans who have a true understanding of modern civics, modern psychology, modern sociology, and modern education; and, yes, far more important, a true understanding of philosophy and of religion as well.

COPING WITH CRIME AND OTHER EVILS

Look at today's headlines. Look at the million juvenile delinquents getting into trouble with the law every year. What are we doing about it?

Look at the story of 7 million American youngsters living in broken homes, where the parents are either divorced, separated, or where one of the parents has died. What are we doing about it?

Look at the problem of slums in our major cities, or the $20 billion annual crime bill, or, say, the problem of traffic choking downtown areas.

Look at these or a hundred other sociological and other problems of our times and you and I see the answer why we need well-rounded citizens—citizens who have studied inside and outside institutions of higher learning and who will really do something with their education.

THE CHALLENGES OF NUCLEAR SCIENCE

Then, turn to the international scene. Contemplate the significance of the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb to this country. See how these new weapons have utterly changed past obsolete concepts.

And so, we need Americans who are truly acquainted with these swift-changing realities. We can ill-afford Americans still living in a horse-and-buggy age with horse-and-buggy prejudices.

Too many of our citizens think today, for example, that American leadership of the free world is a luxury, which can be dispensed with. But it is not a luxury, it is a necessity in this contracted world.

When my parents emigrated to this country, it took months to cross the ocean. Today, the ocean can be crossed in less than 4 hours.

When my parents landed on the east coast and proceeded to Wisconsin, it took weeks. Today, you can cross from New York not just to Wisconsin, but to San Francisco, in 3¾ hours.

Supersonic speed has utterly changed not only American defense but American living.

DANGER OF INTERCONTINENTAL MISSILES

We are in for still more revolutionary discoveries ahead.

We are approaching the age of intercontinental missiles, guided missiles, and ballistic missiles. Their war potential is obvious and grim. These missiles, it is believed, may travel 5,000 miles per hour. I repeat, 5,000 miles per hour, and may cover distances of 5,000 miles or more.

That means that if someone were to press a button at a launching site at the Arctic Circle in Soviet Siberia, a missile might start off to hit any area of the United States within 30 minutes thereafter.

See how this development can utterly change our defense concepts, for every nation is now literally in every other nation's backyard.

In Congress, we are preparing for an atomic-powered merchant ship. The Department of Defense is experimenting with an atomic-powered aircraft. We already have an atomic-powered underseas craft.

Atomic energy in ground transportation, atomic energy for home heating, radio-isotopes to cope with man's old-age diseases and with the diseases of livestock and plants—these are not just possibilities, these are breathtaking realities today.

THE NEED FOR ASPIRING MINDS

And, so, we need minds that are capable of grasping these developments and their deeper significance.

We need growing minds, aspiring minds, open minds, dedicated minds. We need more educated Americans. We need more scientists in this country. We need more engineers.

But what use will all our physical scientists be, all our engineers, all our technicians be if they develop mighty new instruments and if we don't know how constructively to use these instruments for the betterment of man?

So, we need more able social scientists, more people with a true understanding of the humanities, more people with a vital understanding of ethics and philosophy and religion.

We need more people who have received the real values of education, meaning more than the accumulation of facts by rote memory.

We need education in its truest sense—education of character, of soul, of mind.

We need people who, like yourselves, are eager to contemplate new ideas and trace them down to their lair.

We need people who are capable of real thinking, constructive thinking, fearless thinking, and not synthetic thinking, meaning thinking on the basis of irrational prejudices, obsolete stereotypes, selfish biases and outworn dogmas.

We need a truly educated man. We need a well-rounded man for the dynamic interrelated problems of our times.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the fundamental theme which I should like to leave with you today.

It has been a great privilege to address this outstanding audience in this fine institution of learning. I hope that I shall have a similar opportunity in the not too distant future.

[From the New York Times of July 4, 1955]

Overseas Students

In 1872 the Government of China sent a group of 30 teen-age boys to the United States for training. That, it is believed, was the first organized visit of foreign students to our shores. Since then, with the exception of periods of war, the number of foreign students and scholars coming to this country has increased with each year.

In its annual census of the foreign student population, which was recently made public, the Institute of International Education reports that during 1954–55 the United States played host to a record number of foreign students, 34,232. This figure exceeded by 400 the high mark set the previous year. And counting the number of foreign faculty members who came here to accept temporary posts, and foreign doctors who trained as internes or residents at United States hospitals, the total foreign exchangees nearly reached the 40,000 mark.

The value of these exchange programs is obvious. There is a pressing need to communicate with the peoples of other nations, to try to understand them and to learn about the cultures they have developed over the centuries. As Dr. Kenneth Holland, president of the institute, recently observed: "Exchange of persons is one means of communication. It is, in relation to the world's population, a small movement. Yet it is of vital importance, because it is face-to-face communication which enables us to gain direct, firsthand knowledge of each other."

The Illness of the Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record an editorial from a great liberal American newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, for July 5, 1955, entitled "Lyndon Johnson's Illness." This editorial highlights the effective leadership of our majority leader, and emphasizes the fact that, under the skillful direction of Senator Johnson, President Eisenhower has received far more support in enlightened matters of foreign policy than he ever enjoyed when the Senate was under the control of the President's own party.

I am glad that the editors of the Post-Dispatch, in praising Senator Johnson's resourceful leadership, have seen fit to refer to my own article about our majority leader in the New Republic for July 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lyndon Johnson's Illness

The serious heart illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson is just about as regrettable from the standpoint of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican side as it is from that of the Democratic majority of which the 46-year-old Texan is Senate leader.

When the 84th Congress met 6 months ago, Senator Johnson, thanks to the political revolution in Oregon, moved up from the minority post to majority leader. From the outset he and his fellow Texan, Speaker Rayburn in the House, have demonstrated the inaccuracy of the President's 1954 campaign prediction that Democratic Congress would produce a cold war with the White House.

On international issues the Democrats, under Senator Johnson's leadership, have given the President far better support than he ever got from his own party when the McCarthys, Jenners, Brickers, Bridgeses and other Old Guard men were able to throw their weight around as committee chairmen. In the early months of the present session the Democrats were the President's strong backers when Minority Leader Knowland was going off on his own repeatedly.

This also is at least partially true in the domestic field. Under the Johnson leadership the Democrats have advanced and enlarged some White House domestic proposals that were allowed to languish during Republican rule of Congress. Postal pay, Government pay, housing, minimum wage—these are only four of the domestic bills that might be cited.

Senator Johnson has looked out for Texas and Texas interests and at times these come into conflict with national interest as on offshore oil and natural gas price regulation. But it is not fair to blame him for every shortcoming among the Democrats as some progressives in politics find it easy to do. Senator Neuberger, of Oregon, sets this record clear in his timely article, Making a Scapegoat of Lyndon Johnson, in the current New Republic.

Senate Democrats have been harder hit by illness in this session than the Republicans. Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, missed much of the forepart of the session and Senator George, of Georgia, Foreign Relations chairman, has been away from Capitol Hill for more than a month. Fortunately, neither side has sustained a loss such as that of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, who died just 2 years ago this month, after having occupied the leadership post for a similar grueling 6 months.

The Social Security System—Activities of Representative Kean, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, there are few people, if any, in the Congress with a broader understanding of our social-security system—its needs, its shortcomings, and its background—than Representative ROBERT W. KEAN. We of New Jersey are proud of his distinguished service in this field and I commend to my colleagues an article from the Eagle magazine, published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which describes just a few of the activities of the Representative from the 12th District of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Michael Strauss)

Congressman ROBERT WINTHROP KEAN, of New Jersey, is an authority about lots of subjects. Among them are history, sports, and tariff questions. But the one that really makes his face light up is social security.

KEAN, a Republican, is now serving his ninth term in the lower House in Washington. He acknowledges he became vitally interested in the subject shortly after joining the Newark, N. J., Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Since then, he probably has worked harder on social security than any other legislator.

It was a long, uphill battle. KEAN finally realized some of his dreams when the present bill was passed. It provided coverage for 90 percent of our citizens, plus larger payments.

"One of the principal groups not covered at the present time," KEAN explains, "are self-employed doctors, lawyers, and dentists. But, I have always been and still am, for coverage for all. I feel no system can be entirely successful unless everyone is covered."

Social security always has been a pet of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. When the Democrats in Washington, under F. D. R., were nursing the idea, the Eagles, it has been said, already were thinking in terms 10 years ahead.

The same could be said of KEAN. Even before becoming a member of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1946, the New Jersey Congressman constantly was coming up with ideas and proposals. It is small wonder then, that today, there are some in Washington who fondly refer to him as "Mr. Social Security."

KEAN was one of the first to bring to light the inequities of social security as the law existed in the late 1940's. He pointed out that rising costs-of-living made the payments inadequate.

His was a long struggle. In 1951, KEAN's incessant efforts finally bore some real fruit. Benefits were increased immeasurably and the scope of coverage broadened. The self-employed finally were covered. But still left out in the cold were farmers and certain professionals.

When Eisenhower was a candidate for the Presidency, KEAN was called to meet him in Denver to discuss social security. This meeting pioneered a movement that last year included everyone—with the few exceptions mentioned—in the program.

Just how great have been strides may be judged from just one example. Today's law provides that if a man with average earnings of $4,200 dies leaving a widow with two children, the widow is entitled to $200 a month until the children reach the age of 18.

In addition to his work for liberalization of social security, KEAN also is noted for his tax-reduction programs. In recent sessions of Congress, he also had important roles in the Internal Revenue Service investigation and in the furtherance of the administration's foreign-trade program.

KEAN comes from a prominent banking family. He is a tall, distinguished figure with graying hair and mustache. He has a background that might lead some to believe he might not be aware of the problems of the underprivileged. But it is a known fact that the underprivileged never had a better friend.

KEAN's great success as a legislator comes as no surprise. It seems to be a birthright. Keans have been active in government since shortly after the first Kean came to these shores in the early 18th century. The original settler made his home in Beaufort, S. C.

His son, John Kean, was a member of the Continental Congress representing the Palmetto State. Eventually, John moved north and married a niece of William Livingston, New Jersey's first Governor in the United States.

Congressman KEAN's uncle John and his father Hamilton were United States Senators from the Garden State. His uncle served in the Senate from 1898 until 1910—his father from 1928 to 1934. The present Congressman has been in office since 1939. He represents New Jersey's 12th District.

KEAN, the father of 3 sons and 3 daughters, is a Harvard graduate. He played some football as a collegian with such Crimson gridiron greats as Charley Brickley and Eddie Mahon. He was a member of the Cantab squad that helped open the Yale Bowl.

During World War I, Congressman KEAN served as a first lieutenant with the Second Division. He was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross and Silver Star for bravery.

Although already an extremely busy man because of his great interest in legislative work, Congressman KEAN continues to look ahead. His plans for the future as a legislator include the following:

1. Social security for all.
2. Benefits based on 10 years of earnings.
3. Extra benefits for people who work past the age of 65.
4. The lowering of trade barriers.

Sound like a huge program? Congressman KEAN, it must be mentioned, looks toward it all optimistically.

National Handicapped Worker of Year—Bill To Establish Federal Agency To Assist Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would establish a Federal agency to assist the physically handicapped. The bill provides, through the agency, for extension of medical services, vocational guidance and counseling, educational training, and employment opportunities to citizens handicapped by physical or mental disability. I would like to point out to my colleagues the importance of this bill to our Nation in terms of untapped potential manpower by relating an experience which I had on yesterday.

Miss Evelyn Herala, National Handicapped Goodwill Worker of the Year, a resident of my Congressional District in Detroit, Mich., visited my office on yesterday. She was here in Washington, D. C., on an expense-paid trip, as winner of the Goodwill Industries' coveted title for which 107 candidates in the United States were named. Miss Herala came to Washington on July 2 and will leave today. She has represented the Goodwill Industries in a wreath-laying ceremony on July 4 at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. She has visited the President and Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan.

Miss Herala was born without hands and feet, yet today she is an employee in the promotion department of the Detroit Goodwill Industries, where she has worked since 1943. She walks and writes as freely as any worker in carrying out her office duties—which entail writing more than 1,000 words a day in letters, handling telephone calls, and managing employee recreational activities. She has artificial feet, but she has learned to use the stubs of her arms with amazing dexterity for writing, dialing the telephone, and caring for all personal needs, including housework, without the help of any other person. In addition, Miss Herala plays the piano and trombone.

This young lady was born of Finnish parents in Minnesota. At the age of eight, following her mother's death, she went to live first with relatives and then with a Mrs. Jennie Johnson, who took a very special interest in the child's development. At the age of nine, she went to school for the first time. She now holds a degree from Hamline University in St. Paul. Her major was in the field of sociology.

Miss Herala shares an apartment with a sister, Miss Hilda Herala, who came to Washington with her. Of the sisters, Goodwill Industries officials state, "they are both so unselfish, always trying to help someone else, they have little time to think of their own hardships."

I am certain that if my distinguished colleagues could witness the fashion in which Miss Herala has overcome seemingly insurmountable physical difficulties to make such a very useful citizen, each would be inspired to support the measure which I am introducing to assist handicapped people through a comprehensive program of rehabilitation.

Supplemental Budget Request, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a brief statement prepared by Congressman FJARE and myself for presentation before the House Appropriations Committee in conjunction with the supplemental budget request, 1956, for the White House Conference on Education.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST, 1956

(Statement to House Appropriations Committee by Congressman ORVIN B. FJARE and Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., July 6, 1955)

The education of our children is of supreme importance to the future security and well-being of this Nation. We are particularly interested in legislation and activities aimed at improving the quality of American education. All of us are aware that our schools are today faced with many problems, and that in many localities across the Nation these problems constitute a growing crisis in education. Teacher shortages, crowded and antiquated facilities, poorly organized school systems, and inadequate tax structures are but some of the difficulties which, when taken together with swelling school enrollments, may result in millions of our youngsters not receiving the education they need and the Nation so urgently requires.

Fortunately, these conditions are getting increasing attention from educators, parents, and interested citizens in every part of the country. The State and White House conferences on education comprise a national program designed to focus the attention of every citizen on these educational problems, and to seek solutions at all levels of government. The supplemental budget request before you seeks additional funds necessary for the successful completion of this program. We are pleased to have an opportunity to support this request.

Ever since the school system began, it has been left to the citizens of the communities and the States to determine what their educational needs have been and how much should be paid to attain these ends. Through our locally elected boards of education, our educators, and our State school officials, the citizens of this country have, in real fact, built a school system second to none in history.

The program of State and White House conferences on education is the best opportunity the American people have ever had to say what they think should be done to meet our educational deficits. Already in every State in the Union, in the District of Columbia, and in four outlying territories, governors have called conferences of educators and lay citizens to discuss what should be done to provide the kind and amount of education the children in those areas should receive. This program is, without question, the largest attempt of its kind ever made, and its success is well indicated by the 100 percent participation on the parts of the States and Territories. If there is a clear demonstration of pure democracy at work in our times, it is here—where every citizen has an opportunity to say what he thinks should be done.

The States and Territories have entered voluntarily into this program. The White House Conference on Education is called for later this year. Already some startling results have been shown. We are told that more than 3,800 conferences at the community and regional level within the States are being held in conjunction with State conferences, preparatory to the national meeting. Many more no doubt will be held. The interest in this program is extremely heavy.

We Members of Congress, who join in this statement, believe that the White House Conference on Education this fall should be a fitting climax to this nationwide study of school needs, and hope that you agree with us. In order that the conference may be broadly representative, as required by law, funds for travel of delegates to and from Washington are now being requested. This request, we are advised, is endorsed wholeheartedly by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the United States Commissioner of Education. It was forwarded only after serious consideration by the outstanding citizens who compose the President's Committee.

Many citizens—unable to pay their own costs to a national meeting—cannot attend the White House conference unless part of their expenses are met for them. They should be here to advise on the methods of meeting the Nation's school needs. Citizens from every walk of life and from every State and Territory will be asked to take part, to bring with them the opinions which exist toward schools within their own States. They come not as representatives of organized factions pleading special interests, but as citizens of their own communities and States pleading only that public interest. If it is the desire of Congress and the President to hear from all sides on the important issues facing our schools, it is necessary that persons of every economic standing and every section of our Nation take part in this program. Without part payment of their expenses, this broad representation, so important in this citizen study of education, cannot be obtained.

We earnestly request that favorable consideration be given this request for funds necessary to carry out this important program.

Humphrey Backs Move To Halt Industry's 5-Year Writeoffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 7182, to eliminate certificates of necessity. As most everyone knows this is the popular name given to the special tax treatment allowed certain corporations for amortizing the cost of construction deemed to be necessary for national defense or other public purposes.

Perhaps these special tax treatments were necessary at one time during emergencies to insure proper defense production, although it was recognized that such treatments were bound to permit abuses. The abuses certainly were forthcoming and regrettably the privileges obtained were largely made available to big corporations as opposed to their smaller competitors.

When the Congress passed the big Tax Revision Act of 1954 one of the major provisions in the act was the liberalization of depreciation allowances to conform to actual business practices and economic reality. It was partly due to the fact that the tax treatment of depreciation was not realistic that the need for certificates of necessity became necessary in order to get corporations to build plant facilities to turn out needed war production.

Actually when the depreciation allowances were liberalized last year the Congress at the same time should have eliminated the certificates of necessity as no longer being economically necessary. Furthermore, the emergency situation has definitely receded into what is more nearly normalcy. The Defense Department has set up its procurement on a more orderly and longtime basis which obviates the danger of a plant being built for a needed production for the immediate years at hand and then left idle and unneeded for the future years.

The abuses instead of being less seem to be more. Secretary Humphrey has estimated that there is a $3 billion revenue loss through this special tax treatment. Much of this loss can be recaptured by proper administrative procedures being adopted. However, the best way to proceed is to eliminate the law which is no longer necessary and which provides the vehicle for the abuses.

I might add that anytime the Federal Government sets up procedures or regulations affecting business the larger businesses tend to benefit, because they have the accountants, the lawyers, the rest of the needed personnel and overhead to analyze and conform to these procedures. The smaller concerns are the ones who are adversely affected. It becomes most important that when Government procedures and regulations set up for war or emergency purposes have outlived their usefulness they be immediately repealed. That is why I opposed the extension of the Renegotiation Act this year. It was no longer necessary and it worked a hardship on the smaller business concerns giving a competitive advantage to their big competitors. Much of the Federal machinery we established as the result of war needs has outlived its usefulness. It is time we got back to normalcy and orderly, longtime procedures.

I am enclosing an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 1955 which discusses the views of Secretary Humphrey on the certificate of necessity issue:

HUMPHREY BACKS MOVE TO HALT INDUSTRY'S 5-YEAR WRITEOFFS—ODM LAUNCHES QUICK STUDY OF TREASURY CHIEF'S PLAN—$3 BILLION REVENUE LOSS—DEFENSE ACT SPOON FEEDING

(By Henry Simmons and Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration, at the behest of Treasury Secretary Humphrey, is seriously considering cutting out or sharply curtailing the fast tax writeoff—a Korean war "defense measure" which has sometimes served other purposes than defense.

This special tax advantage has helped scores of United States concerns to expand plants the past few years, by permitting them to pay lower taxes during the early years of the life of new facilities.

The fast writeoff works this way: Last week the Erie Railroad Co. was authorized to write off in 5 years 85 percent of the $4,234,565 cost of new freight cars. This means in the coming 5 years, the railroad can "write off" or subtract $3,599,380—85 percent of the cost of the cars—from its taxable income, thus lowering its tax bill. Normally, the Erie would deduct the full cost of the cars over a 28-year period. This would make each year's writeoff, and subsequent deduction, considerably smaller; so short-range taxes would be higher than under the fast writeoff provision.

Behind the scenes, Mr. Humphrey is putting up a vigorous fight to end such fast tax writeoffs. He's represented as feeling the program is too costly in loss of revenue, and that the day has passed when such lures to expansion are needed.

UNEMPLOYMENT WEAPON

The program was written into the tax laws in 1950 and was put under the Office of Defense Mobilization. It was designed to spur expansion of the Nation's capacity to turn out steel, aluminum, petroleum, machinery, and dozens of other products and services for defense. But the ODM has also used it to push dispersal of new plants away from major cities that might be targets if war came. Another way the scheme has been used: To channel capital investment into areas where there is chronic unemployment.

From the time the first fast tax writeoff was awarded late in 1950 through June

15, 1955, Uncle Sam handed out a grand total of 19,933 tax writeoffs on facilities estimated to cost $30.4 billion.

These special expansion incentives have cost the Treasury nearly $3 billion in revenue in 5 years, including $1 billion in the fiscal period that ended last Thursday. According to Government tax experts, the program would lose another $1 billion in the year that began on July 1 unless Mr. Humphrey succeeds in his present campaign. But even if all new fast writeoffs were stopped today, the Treasury would feel the pinch for several more years.

NO CANCELLATIONS

That's because a fast writeoff is good for 5 years, beginning on the day the facility goes into full production. This means that many "certificates" issued back in 1951 and 1952 on plants not completed until still later would have years to run. Mr. Humphrey, of course, is only asking that ODM shut off the supply of new writeoffs. He isn't suggesting cancellation of benefits already awarded.

The Treasury declined to comment on Mr. Humphrey's project, but elsewhere it was learned:

He is concerned about the dent in Treasury revenue at a time when he's having trouble balancing the budget.

But equally important, according to Mr. Humphrey's argument in administration councils, is his belief that the tax writeoffs program has outlived its purpose. To continue it further, he reasons, would be to "spoon feed" companies in relatively normal times.

Mr. Humphrey argues, according to Federal mobilizers, that the fast tax writeoff program cannot be justified when there is no emergency and the United States has not embarked on a big mobilization expansion program.

HIGH LEVEL CONFERRING

Although the Treasury wouldn't comment on Mr. Humphrey's moves, Dr. Arthur Flemming, head of ODM, confirmed he has had "several conversations" with the Treasury boss on the question of continuing the fast tax writeoff scheme.

Right now, Mr. Humphrey's proposal is under serious study and there is a note of urgency about it. F. L. Parnell, chief of ODM's finance division, was called back to his desk from his vacation, to head up the special study that Mr. Humphrey provoked.

And Mr. Parnell is working under orders from Mr. Flemming to have his paper ready for discussion by July 13, when the Defense Mobilization Board holds its next regular meeting. This Board—headed by Dr. Flemming—is made up of top officials of the Departments of Treasury, Defense, State, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

It's too early, of course, to forecast the outcome of the proposal to cut off fast tax writeoff allowances. But Mr. Humphrey is known around town as a pretty influential fellow. Even if the program isn't wiped out, it looks like a good bet that it'll taper off somewhat.

SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT APPLICATION BACKLOG

The debate over tax writeoffs is no academic exercise. Even though the number of applications for tax deferments has already dwindled sharply since the Korean war ended 2 years ago, ODM still does a brisk business in dispensing amortization grants. As of last Wednesday, the agency had a backlog of 628 requests for rapid amortization on facilities which would cost $4.1 billion.

Among these petitioners are such well known corporate names as Bethlehem Steel, Boeing Airplane, Douglas Aircraft, Phillips Petroleum, St. Joseph Lead, Shell Oil, U. S. Steel and Boston Edison Co.

Moreover, the much discussed question of whether Uncle Sam ought to promote further expansion of primary aluminum production hinges on the decision in the tax amortization debate. The same goes for proposals in Government and industry for special tax aid to spur a boost in steel capacity. Even now the DMB is studying an ODM staff recommendation for a new aluminum expansion program supported by fast tax writeoffs. And the mobilizers are awaiting detailed figures from the Commerce Department on how much additional steel capacity would be needed if war comes.

For an example of how rapid tax amortization works, assume a company pays $20,000 for a machine that has a useful life expectancy of 20 years. Normally that company would have a choice between two principal methods of deducting the $20,000 from its taxable income. The firm could deduct 5 percent a year or $1,000 annually until the entire amount was amortized. Under an optional method, as liberalized in last year's tax revision law, the concern could write off up to two-thirds of the original cost in the first half of its normal life.

With a fast tax writeoff allowance for the same machine, the firm could deduct up to 100 percent of the cost during the first 5 years of its life, depending on the terms of its "certificate." In most cases, however, ODM authorizes lower percentage deductions for the first 5 years. The average runs about 60 percent of cost.

Assuming this hypothetical company got a 60 percent writeoff allowance, it could deduct $12,000 from its taxable income in 5 years. Without the certificate, the firm under the first optional method could deduct only $5,000 in 5 years. The other system would permit it to deduct $8,190 during this same period.

In either case the company would get a substantial tax advantage from its fast writeoff allowance. At the end of 5 years, it would have paid taxes on up to $7,000 less income. In the long run, of course, the firm's tax liability would be the same if tax rates remained unchanged. But already some companies have benefited long-range because of the expiration of the excess profits tax at the end of 1953.

Still more companies that have fast tax writeoff privileges would pay less in total taxes if corporate rates drop to 47 percent from the present 52 percent next April 1 as scheduled by present law. Of course it could also work the other way if the United States got into a war and taxes were raised again.

Although the actual annual revenue loss has been increasing, the number of new writeoffs ODM has been awarding has slackened sharply since the peak year of 1952. In that year ODM authorized 9,528 individual expansion projects for quick writeoffs of facilities with an estimated cost of $12.6 billion. By last year the figures had declined to 1,405 projects with a total estimated cost of $1.8 billion.

However, there have been recent signs that the tax amortization business is getting brisker. Certainly businessmen have shown a more lively interest in the scheme by stepping up their applications. Since the end of 1954, for example, the backlog of applications has jumped from 362 to 628 at the present time, and the rate of awards has if anything picked up in recent months.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, for reasons unknown, oil importers have thus far given no tangible evidence of their intention to comply with the specifications inherent in H. R. 1. Congress accepted the extension to the Trade Agreements Act with the understanding and assurance that the White House would, in lieu of a legislative quota, restrict imports of residual oil commensurate with the 1954 influx as related to domestic consumption. Senate Finance Committee members, working in direct liaison with the President, removed all ambiguities from the bill with the explicit assurances that the administration would carry out this obligation if promises made to congressional committees by top officials of importing oil companies were not observed.

Although H. R. 1 did not actually become law until June 21, it would appear that importers would long ago have arranged to revise their schedules as evidence of good faith. They have known for several years that excessive imports were upsetting the economy in coal and oil producing regions of the United States. They were apprised of the findings of the President's Advisory Council on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy in late February, at which time Cabinet members and the Director of Defense Mobilization made it known that imports of oil would have to remain at 1954 levels in order to prevent interference with mobilization base requirements.

Granted that the allurement of greater profits often outweighs duty to country when grasping international financiers are involved, the importing interests should nonetheless have perceived the advent of the foreign oil curb when the Senate Finance Committee made its compromise with the White House. Even this warning was ignored, however, and total oil imports for the first 6 months of 1955 were at a record high; residual oil imports led the increases, running at about 25 percent over the corresponding months of the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like Congress is going to have to make clear that the legislative branch of the Government will not stand by and permit this disrespect for our laws to be continued. We all know that the amount of imports in 1954 was entirely too high. Residual oil imports alone took 31 million tons of coal from our markets, deprived coal producers of $149 million of revenue, and robbed the railroads of $81 million in coal traffic. The consequent losses in Federal, State, and local taxes amounted to $39 million. This damage is to be duplicated in 1955 with the consent of the administration, but, from all appearances, even this inequitable arrangement is not satisfactory to importers.

Looking back over the record of the first 6 months of the 84th Congress, it is gratifying to realize that so many of our colleagues agreed with those of us who represent coal-producing States and stood with us in our attempt to enact a law that would place a 10-percent quota limitation on residual oil imports and on crude and other products. We have needed such a curb for the last 7 years, and we need it now. Despite the slight upturn in coal production since last January, there has been no lessening of the urgent necessity for such legislation.

Let me explain that there is still considerable want and suffering throughout the mining communities of West Virginia. Thousands of our miners and railroaders continue to search frantically for a means of survival. The surplus foods made available by the Government are helping to keep bodies alive, but they do not provide proper nourishment. Mothers and fathers are already concerned with the problem of how to clothe their children for the next school term. High-school graduates, their avenues of higher education blocked by the raging torrents of the foreign residual oil which has taken the jobs of their fathers and brothers, look in vain for an opportunity to obtain gainful employment.

Even those miners whose abbreviated workweeks have been extended as a consequence of the slightly elevated demand for coal in the past several months, have no assurance of continued employment. Equally disturbing is the fact that current production levels are still far below the point from which output could be accelerated sufficiently to meet emergency requirements. The recent exodus of high-ranking Government officials from the city of Washington in a simulated air alert was designed—at least partially—to call public attention to persisting world danger. It is ironic that responsible authorities could participate in such a drill without also giving thought to a situation that threatens the Nation's emergency industrial capacity.

Assuming that prevailing international tension requires that the United States be ready for immediate mobilization, how is it possible for Government officials to be so apathetic in regard to the present debilitation of large segments of the coal industry? It has long been established that a productive capacity of 500 million tons of bituminous coal per year must be maintained if the industry is to be ready to meet the demands of a world economy. Assuming that the output for the first 6 months of 1955 will continue for the remainder of the year, our mines will remain at least 50 million tons below mobilization base stipulations. Holding oil imports at the 1954 figures would not enable the coal industry to reach the required level, but it would at least contribute to more healthful conditions. It would also prevent the trade practices of international oil companies from further impoverishing the men, women, and children in our coal areas.

Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to serve notice on importing oil companies that incoming shipments will be studied very closely during the remaining weeks of Congress, because we who represent unemployed coal miners and railroaders refuse to permit these men and their families to be betrayed in exchange for foreign silver. A positive line has been drawn on imports, and Congress must insist that it be respected.

I have read recently of a statement by a large oil company official who contends that importers have not had sufficient time to cut back shipments to the prescribed limitations. While it may seem reasonable that a company with holdings all over the world would not be able to revise shipping schedules at a moment's notice, I recall that reductions were accomplished promptly when it was to the advantage of importers to do so. At times when the influx of residual oil from foreign refineries was so exorbitant as to embarrass even the most fanatic freetrader, it appeared that Congress would act immediately in protection of the American economy and security. When this threat to international oil company profits would arise the importers would quickly and effectively reduce incoming shipments—in the manner of a lawbreaking motorist who keeps his eye on the rearview mirror and takes his foot off the accelerator at the approach of a traffic policeman. The importers have known for 4 months that their activities have been detrimental to the Nation's security, as determined by a Cabinet committee. They have known since June 21, when the President placed his signature on H. R. 1, that they are breaking the law.

The Cabinet committee recommended that if imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils "exceed significantly the respective proportions that such oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to look like the time for appropriate action is at hand.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 11, 1955

Dr. James B. Boren, local Methodist minister, Wichita Falls, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, maker of seas and builder of stars, we thank Thee for the good earth with its robes of beauty and crowns of grandeur—for the rose, the purple, the gold, and the flame. Thy gifts are boundless and Thy love covers the earth like the waters that cover the sea. We ask Thy forgiveness when we harbor the dread of thirst when our wells are full.

We thank Thee for America—for the glorious history of the United States, for its landmarks of liberty, its citadels of freedom, for the spirit of "we, the people."

We thank Thee for its high resolves, for its ideals that push above the timberline, for its purposes grand and its thoughts sublime.

We thank Thee for those great men who put the ribs of steel in its ship of state, and for these today who are working here in these Chambers with diligence and sincerity to preserve those things that are dear to civilization.

We thank Thee for men who live above pygmy concepts and who dare to break the prison of the senses to become intellectually strong and spiritually sound.

Let Thy spirit descend upon us—not as a mysterious force to provoke, bewilder, or mystify, but like the gentle rain from heaven—to soothe and caress. Make us to know that the liberty that is known in this, our native land, is the one peak which rises above all the clouds, the one window in which the light forever burns, and the one star that the darkness cannot quench.

Keep our memories green and help us to take those ideals which have made this Nation great and press them in our hearts as we would flowers in a book. With each newborn day may our prayers be: "May we walk into this day with God." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 7, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 7, 1955, the following message was received from the House of Representatives on July 7, 1955:

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) providing for the enrollment, with changes, of S. 804, a bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, etc.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3253. An act to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations; and

H. R. 6059. An act relating to revisions of the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 609. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons;

S. 804. An act to amend section 201 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1290. An act to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954;

S. 1993. An act authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol;

S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3253. An act to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 6059. An act relating to revisions of the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 7, 1955,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Wilber Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be Secretary of the Army.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ERVIN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ERVIN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARINGS CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearings cases in that Commission as of May 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 1140

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting legislative action quieting title to certain small islands among the Florida keys

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas many out-croppings of rock or small keys ranging in areas of from less than one-tenth acre to less than 6 acres among the Florida keys in Monroe County, Fla., lying between Key Boca Chica, in township 67 South, range 26 west, on the west and the east end of Key Largo, in township 59 south, range 41 east, on the east, and being between the upland of the Florida keys and the channel of the bay or navigable waters opposite said upland, were left unsurveyed in 1873 and 1874, when the official surveys of Florida keys were made and approved by the Government, and no such outcroppings of rock or small keys are shown or noted on said survey; and

"Whereas the said outcroppings of rock or small keys were not in existence or were of no value and were only slightly above the surrounding waters, if they were in existence in 1873 and 1874 when said survey was made and approved and said small keys were never surveyed by the Government nor claimed by the Government as public lands of the United States until some of the small keys had been sold to riparian owners by the trustees of the internal improvement fund of Florida, so that they would be filled in and put upon the tax rolls, and after some of the small keys had been improved by riparian owners, all of which gave value to the said keys, the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, caused some of the keys so sold by the trustees of the internal improvement fund of Florida and some which had been improved by riparian owners, to be surveyed in 1953 and subsequently, as public land of the United States; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled in several cases that such islands, unsurveyed and lying between the upland which had been surveyed, and the channel, passed to the State as part of the submerged land when the State was admitted to the Union of the United States; and

"Whereas the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida claimed title to these small islands and have sold some of the said islands to the riparian owners all of which have been placed upon the tax rolls: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the State of Florida (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and requested to adopt legislation which will quiet title to these small islands in the State of Florida by providing that said small islands or keys shall have passed to the State of Florida when Florida became a State of the United States in 1845; that the United States district court of the southern district of Florida be vested with jurisdiction of actions brought by claimants of these islands against the United States to quiet title of said islands in such claimants: that some action be taken by Congress forthwith to stay sales of the said islands by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, pending this legislation: Be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent immediately to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and to each Member of the Florida delegation in the United States Congress."

An act of the Legislature of the State of Alabama (No. 47) entitled "Alabama Civil Defense Act of 1955"; to the Committee on Armed Services:

A resolution adopted by the Toledo (Ohio) Small Business Association, favoring the adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the American Institute of Architects, at Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the proposed alteration of the east front of the Capitol Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Coordinating Council for Amending the McCarran-Walter Act, New York, N. Y., transmitting a resolution adopted at a meeting held at Carnegie Hall, New York, relating to proposed amendment of the Refugee Relief Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 702

"Memorial to Congress, the United States Secretary of Interior, the Director of the National Park Service, and the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida urging that certain action be taken to establish a western gateway and set the boundaries of the Everglades National Park

"Whereas the Everglades National Park was conceived by the people of the State of Florida as a unique area for subtropic flora and fauna to be preserved and to be seen and enjoyed by all of the people of these United States; and

"Whereas in their original enthusiasm the planners of the Everglades National Park proposed extensive maximum boundaries, which were enacted into law by the United States Congress; and

"Whereas over a period of years a more practical evaluation of the said boundaries has been made because of the phenomenal growth of the State of Florida, and the necessity of its people in the southern part of the State to utilize lands for cities, resort areas, boating and fishing, minerals, agriculture, and the raising of cattle; and

"Whereas these practical evaluations of necessity have resulted heretofore in various agreements between Federal and State officials which would have the effect of placing boundaries smaller than those originally contemplated on the Everglades National Park; and

"Whereas some confusion has existed as to the present and future extent of said boundaries, which has had an adverse effect upon property owners and land valuations, and has resulted in many public hearings before the trustees of the Internal Improvement Board of the State of Florida, and has troubled the Florida delegation to the Congress of the United States, and the Legislature of the State of Florida; and

"Whereas the sale of State-owned land results in material benefit to the citizens of the State of Florida, including State aid to schools and education, and the State of Florida has already donated the sum of $2 million and more than 850,000 acres of land for the Everglades National Park, and the park now contains over 1,220,000 acres; and

"Whereas any further contemplated acquisition of land by the Everglades National Park would be in Dade and Monroe Counties, but principally in Monroe County, and would result in the loss of valuable farmland in Dade County, and would result in the loss to Monroe County of 90 percent of its land area, to the hurt and detriment of its citizens; and

"Whereas the legislative delegations of Monroe and Dade Counties are opposed to further extensive acquisition by the Federal Government of such lands for park purposes, believing the said park to be large enough to serve the purposes for which it was established; and

"Whereas portions of the Everglades National Park lie in an area which provide natural drainage for the Lake Okeechobee region of the State of Florida, and it is necessary for the safety of the citizens of that region and for the drainage and development of land to construct and maintain suitable canals for drainage, some of which must penetrate into areas within the said park; and

"Whereas lands have been made available in Collier County, Fla., at no expense to the State or the people for inclusion in the Everglades National Park; and

"Whereas there is at the present time but one entrance into the Everglades National Park, being by roadway from a point in Dade County, Fla.; and

"Whereas the people of the west coast of Florida are desirous of having an entrance or gateway into the Everglades National Park, so that more persons may be enabled to visit the park and so that tourist traffic along the west coast will become thereby stimulated and increased; and

"Whereas it is desired to conclusively set and determine the maximum boundaries of the Everglades National Park: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States, the United States Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service, and the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida are hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to take whatever action is necessary to accomplish the following:

"That the maximum and conclusive boundary of the Everglades National Park be established by law to be approximately the following:

"(a) The boundaries shown in act of Congress in Public Law 340, 81st Congress, 1949, with additions of certain State lands included in the park on February 22, 1950, as shown on attached map, outlined in green, plus

"(b) A gateway into the park consisting of lands in Monroe County, Fla., described as follows:

"Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 24 of Township 54 S., Range 30 E.

"Sections 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 of Township 54 S., Range 31 E.

"Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, and 26, Township 55 S., Range 31 E.

"Sections 18, 19, 20, 30, 31, and 32 of Township 55 S., Range 32 E.

"Sections 4, 5, and 6 of Township 56 S., Range 32, E., plus.

"(c) Such lands in Collier County as have been deeded in trust to the trustees of the Internal Improvement Board of the State of Florida, for further deeding to the United States Government for inclusion in the park, plus.

"(d) The island or key known as Duck Rock Key, a bird sanctuary.

"2. That the city of Everglades, Collier County, Fla., be declared to be the western gateway to the Everglades National Park.

"3. That access be permitted through the said gateway lands in Monroe County, as described in paragraph 1 (b), from the interior to private property on the coast.

"4. That since the park contains the natural drainage for a large section of south Florida from Lake Okeechobee, entry be permitted into the park for the purpose of constructing and continuing such drainage canals as are, or may be approved by the State of Florida or duly constituted political subdivisions, including a county or drainage district.

"5. That of those lands in Monroe County outside the boundaries described hereinbefore in paragraph 1 (c), already acquired by purchase by the Federal Government, known as the Patton Tract, and consisting of approximately 45 sections of land, there are 14 sections which already lie within the gateway described hereinbefore in paragraph 1 (b). That the 12 sections of land in the said Patton Tract lying to the west of said gateway be deeded to the State of Florida in return for the 12 sections of State-owned lands included in the said gateway. That the park be authorized to use the remaining 19 sections in the Patton Tract, lying to the east of said gateway, for the purpose of sale or trade to acquire title to the remainder of said gateway which is now privately owned, with power of condemnation if such trades or purchases cannot be made.

"6. That the private landowners within the gateway lands be granted a reservation of mineral rights for 25 years, or as long thereafter as oil, gas, or minerals are produced within the boundaries of the Everglades National Park; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial and the attached map be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state of the State of Florida to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Florida in the United States Congress, the United States Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service, and the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the pages of the journals of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several resolutions adopted at the recent convention of the Arizona State Department of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been recommended to the Congress of the United States that servicemen's indemnity coverage now be terminated; and

Whereas the American Legion stood alone during the past in urging the Congress to continue contract-insurance programs administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the great majority of the individual States of the United States of America, through agencies such as the Industrial Commission of Arizona provide by law the payment of death benefits to the survivors of civilian employees; and

Whereas these State administered benefits many times exceed death benefits paid by our National Government to the survivors of men serving their country; and

Whereas our men serving in the Armed Forces receive financial remuneration well below such responsibility in civilian life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Arizona, believes that our servicemen deserve and have earned the protection of their families to the extent that indemnity benefits will be payable in the event of their loss of life; and be it further

Resolved, That such protection be continued and that the national department of the American Legion and the Congress of the United States of America take such action as shall be required to bring about the rejection of such recommendations that would destroy the indemnity program. Further, it is our belief that the program of National Service Life Insurance as provided World War II veterans should be expanded to include Korean veterans and our men in service since the date terminating the provisions of World War II National Service Life Insurance.

Approved by the American Legion Convention on June 19, 1955, Tucson, Ariz.

CLAYTON B. ORTH,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the trial of Jose Montijo, Jr., by the criminal courts of France for an alleged crime committed in France while stationed in that country as a member of our Armed Forces reminds us that under the NATO status of forces treaty, our military personnel do not have the protection of our Constitution, while serving their country; and

Whereas it has been the heritage of our fighting men down through the years, to "have the flag protect them while they protected the flag"; and

Whereas under the provision of the NATO status of forces treaty our fighting men, through no choice of their own, are being denied the protection of the Government they are serving; and

Whereas in justice to the members of the Armed Forces of our country, the NATO status of forces treaty should be renegotiated, in order to give our men and women of the services the full protection of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Arizona, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., June 19, 1955, That the NATO status of forces treaty be renegotiated, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Arizona congressional delegates.

Approved by the convention of the American Legion, Department of Arizona, in Tucson, June 19, 1955.

CLAYTON B. ORTH,
Adjutant, the American Legion Department of Arizona.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas we of the American Legion are pledged to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas there is a dangerous loophole in our national Constitution, and this is being used by the forces, both within and without our country, whose effort is to destroy our Constitution with its safeguards to the freedom of the individual; and

Whereas there is a continuous and hidden movement in the United Nations to destroy our form of government, and place this country under the rule of the United Nations; and

Whereas the only protection we have against this movement is through an amendment to the Constitution of our country providing that no treaty or executive agreement can nullify any portion of our Constitution; and

Whereas Senator BRICKER has introduced legislation providing for such an amendment; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Arizona in convention assembled in the city of Tucson, June 16 through 19, 1955, That the American Legion commend Senator BRICKER for his effort to protect our Constitution and our form of government, and that we pledge ourselves to make every effore to secure passage of an appropriate constitutional amendment to that end; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the above resolution be sent to the congressional representatives of the State of Arizona.

Approved by the convention in Tucson, Ariz., June 19, 1955.

CLAYTON B. ORTH,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) has submitted its report on personnel and civil service to the Congress; and

Whereas said report contains many recommendations of vital interest to the Nation and such recommendations call for radical changes in law and procedure concerning the merit system of the Federal Government; and

Whereas since the Revolutionary War our Government has had for its policy preferential consideration in employment for its Nation's defenders and since we believe that this is the greatest Government on the face of the globe the policy of preferential treatment to veterans has certainly not harmed the Government service, but, on the other hand, has made it possible for those who gave of their time and substance to defend our Nation to have an opportunity to make up for some of the economic loss to themselves incident to such service; and

Whereas our veterans are selected for their mental and physical qualities to serve in the Armed Forces of the country, we believe that they have much to offer in civilian and peaceful capacities to further serve their Government in civilian occupations. We note that the country generally believes that our veterans have ability since a majority of those elected officials in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches are veterans; and

Whereas no one has presented any facts which would indicate that the Veterans' Preference Act has in any way deteriorated the Government service, but, on the other hand, the very interest of veterans in their Government has since 1883 made possible the present merit system which we believe is good; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the consensus of opinion of this convention of the American Legion, department of Arizona, that we go on record in opposition to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with reference to veterans' preference and other matters contained in the report on personnel and civil service which would in any way radically change any law now in effect for the protection of the merit system; and be it further

Resolved, That we advise Members of Congress that the American Legion is at all times ready and willing to discuss any factual material that is available or that may become available wherein the Veterans Preference Act could be considered detrimental to the Government service. We submit that the Hoover Commission Report on Personnel and Civil Service has not submitted such facts and since we have been unable to get them either from agencies in the executive branch or from the Civil Service Commission itself we are compelled to believe that such facts do not exist.

Approved by the American Legion convention in Tucson, Ariz., June 19, 1955.

CLAYTON B. ORTH,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION 1—DEALING WITH THE AMERICAN LEGION POSITION OPPOSING THE FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES REPORT OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Second Hoover Commission has filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate its report and recommendations in the field of Federal medical services; and

Whereas said report contains many unwarranted and unjustified attacks on the sick and disabled veterans of America; and

Whereas in addition to the official report, the accompanying task force report contains misinformed discussions and presentations critical of the existing structure of veterans benefits and services; and

Whereas the report would transfer the cost of disability compensation, pensions, and military retirement from their proper place as a delayed cost of war and make this an added charge to the Nation's health program; and

Whereas the Commission recommends the closing of 20 hospitals when at this time there are thousands of eligible veterans certified for hospitalization unable to secure proper medical care and treatment because of the lack of beds; and

Whereas the Commission believes that authority to evaluate the extent of disability should be vested in the Department of Medicine and Surgery when the complicated laws, rules, and regulations governing rating are a joint legal, occupational, and medical matter now exercised by the VA Department of Veterans Benefits; and

Whereas this Commission has branded the Nation's veterans as "goldbrickers" and implies that our sick and disabled veterans are a group of perjurers to our country which they defended and which they patriotically uphold and support; and

Whereas they have recommended that a system of socialized medicine be instituted in the United States by permitting veterans to use the VA hospitals and outpatient medical services and pay at a later date when and if able, and this program is an expanded, uneconomic, and costly program to the American taxpayer and unworthy of serious consideration by informed people; and

Whereas the Commission's proposal to require our service-connected disabled veterans to file an economic statement in order to secure hospitalization for disabilities other than their service-connected disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, for the above enumerated reasons, the American Legion express its disappointment and disapproval of these unfounded, uneconomic, and heartless recommendations and deplores the direct attack on our disabled veterans who have so courageously served to protect our freedoms; and be it

Resolved, That we call these matters to the attention of our Members of Congress and request their sympathetic understanding in the solution of the problems of the disabled veterans whom he committed to war service; and be it further

Resolved, That the case of America's disabled be placed before the Members of the Congress, with full confidence that the Members of that body will continue to reflect the generous attitude of the American people in connection with the care of our disabled.

Approved June 19, 1955, by the convention in Tucson, Ariz.

CLAYTON B. ORTH,
Department Adjutant.

AUTHORITY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING THE DAY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, later in the day, sundry reports on bills and resolutions from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On July 7, 1955:

S. 1290. An act to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954;

S. 1993. An act authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol; and

S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

On July 8, 1955:

S. 609. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; and

S. 804. An act to amend section 201 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2434. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yung-tsing Wong and Dr. Chi-chao Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT) (by request):

S. 2435. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States, or its agents, during the period January 1, 1939, to April 10, 1948, and to provide for payment of amounts so determined to such producers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2436. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of their Federal tax liabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2437. A bill to conform the rate of compensation for the position of Solicitor in the Department of Labor to the rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2439. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 2440. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG (by request):

S. 2441. A bill to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 2442. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation by non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2443. A bill to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2444. A bill to repeal section 1157 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2445. A bill for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2446. A bill to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of cotton that are in excess supply for unrestricted use at current market prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2447. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2448. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands; and

S. 2449. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Leonidas Camarinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 2450. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; and

S. 2451. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiicary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk 39 bills which were sent to me by the Hoover Commission with the request that, as ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee, I introduce. I have not had an opportunity to study them all in detail. It is entirely possible that even though I introduce them I might object to certain portions of them. I think it is of sufficient importance, in view of the great respect in which the Hoover Commission is held, that these bills be introduced and referred to the appropriate committees. I urge the committees to which they are referred to hold hearings at the earliest possible moment. I shall be willing and able to testify at the hearings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. McCARTHY (by request):

S. 2452. A bill relating to the transfer of funds by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

S. 2453. A bill to change the name of the Federal Housing Administration;

S. 2454. A bill prohibiting a member of the Home Loan Bank Board from being a member of the board of trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;

S. 2455. A bill to make the Small Business Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2456. A bill to change the name of the Public Housing Administration;

S. 2457. A bill to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act;

S. 2458. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2459. A bill to terminate title VII of the Housing Act of 1954 relating to urban planning and reserve of planned public works;

S. 2460. A bill to terminate the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to educational institutions for housing construction;

S. 2461. A bill to terminate certain functions of the Public Housing Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2462. A bill relating to the equities required with respect to home mortgages purchased under section 305 of the Housing Act of 1954;

S. 2463. A bill to provide for increasing the equities required for the insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2464. A bill relating to the retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 2465. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations issued pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; and

S. 2466. A bill to make the Rural Electrification Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2467. A bill relating to the transportation of personal motor vehicles for military or civilian personnel;

S. 2468. A bill to provide for a survey of the production of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. A bill extending the authority of the General Services Administration with respect to warehouses and other storage facilities operated by civilian agencies of the Government;

S. 2470. A bill to add a new title relating to real property management to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2471. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments;

S. 2472. A bill to establish general policies for mobilization purposes governing industrial properties of the United States;

S. 2473. A bill to make the Alaska Railroad subject to the Government Corporation Control Act;

S. 2474. A bill providing for a survey by the Comptroller General of the United States of the operation by the Department of Defense of commissary stores and post exchanges;

S. 2475. A bill to provide for a Commission on Naval Vessels;

S. 2476. A bill relating to the traffic management functions of the General Services Administration;

S. 2477. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees;

S. 2478. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus Government property under the control of executive agencies;

S. 2479. A bill to repeal section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress; and

S. 2480. A bill to provide for improving accounting methods in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2481. A bill relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, for personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2482. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine;

S. 2483. A bill relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes; and

S. 2484. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2485. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration through the establishment of a senior civil service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

S. 2486. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws;

S. 2487. A bill relating to the simplification of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2488. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

S. 2489. A bill relating to reduction in personnel procedure and preference of veterans; and

S. 2490. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 2491. A bill to provide for the erection of a marker in a national cemetery in honor of the memory of Lt. (jg.) Lorne Parker Pelzer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2492. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Sardis Reservoir near Harmontown, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, Mr. Hennings, Mr. Langer, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Neely, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Case of New Jersey):

S. 2493. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide equal benefits for surviving children of female employees as are provided for surviving children of male employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution designating the period from October 3 to 8, inclusive, 1955, as National Fish Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes.

This action is taken by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the bill is being introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Barrett], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible].

The bill proposes to achieve the objectives set forth in the enacting clause under two titles, in order to meet the divergent conditions and geographical considerations which I shall explain briefly. It is generally referred to as the small-projects bill.

Section 1 of title I sets forth that "The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the 17 western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations."

In major respects, title I is identical to H. R. 5301, reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in August 1954, but which failed of action in the Senate during the 83d Congress. Since this title relates only to the 17 western reclamation States, it is drafted as a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws. This title is a substitute for S. 164 and S. 405 of this Congress, which were referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs earlier in the current session.

Title I authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate contracts with irrigation districts or other public organizations for loans on projects, the cost of which shall not exceed $5 million. Any project for which a loan in excess of $500,000 is negotiated must be approved by act of Congress. The provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, requiring projects to be submitted to affected States in a river basin are to be observed except in the case of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment. In the latter case, the approval of the State or States in which such a project is located must be secured.

Title II of the bill was proposed and drafted by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. It is applicable to the 31 States outside of the reclamation area and to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. It is to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The purpose of title II, as stated in section 21 of the bill, is to "encourage State and local participation in the development of non-Federal projects similar to those described in title I and to provide for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Secretary, as described in said title I in the 31 States—outside of the 17 western reclamation States—and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Title II authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to negotiate contracts with any public agency which has "capacity to contract with the United States," in carrying out its purpose. In addition to the objectives set forth in title I which are peculiarly applicable to the reclamation States, title II extends the provisions of the bill to drainage, water storage, and saline water intrusion control. The purpose of extending the provisions as indicated is to meet conditions in the alluvial areas of the Gulf States where saline water intrusion is a critical problem, and also to aid drainage and water-storage projects outside of the 17 western reclamation States.

In general, the ground rules in connection with the negotiation of loans and the requirements for approval by the States and the limitations on the Secretary of Agriculture are similar to those required of the Secretary of the Interior in title I.

Each title authorizes appropriations not to exceed $100 million. Each Secretary is required to report to Congress currently on the receipt of each proposal for a loan and each proposal that has his approval. No contract shall be executed under either title until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract.

It is the intention of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report promptly on this bill and publication of the text in the Record is primarily for the purpose of giving all interested agencies and persons concerned information as to the revised measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2442) to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

Title I

Section 1. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of projects under the Federal reclamation laws and to provide for Federal assistance in the development of similar projects in the 17 western reclamation States by non-Federal organizations.

Sec. 2. As used in this title—

(a) The term "construction," in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete reclamation or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit or program the cost of which exceeds $5 million: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of $5 million in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: *And provided further*, That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed $5 million, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of $1,000 to defray, in part, the cost of examining the proposal.

Sec. 4. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail comparable to those included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the stream basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project, and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 percent of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution so required.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5: *Provided*, That if any affected State shall object, pursuant to opportunity therefor afforded under the terms of the act of December 22, 1944 (the Flood Control Act of 1944), or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of $500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project: *Provided further*, That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of two years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All projects works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 5 of this title.

Sec. 5. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 4 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first became available; and (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 160 irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

Sec. 6. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 5 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

Sec. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $100 million to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be executed until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

Sec. 9. This title shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

TITLE II

Sec. 21. The purpose of this title is to encourage State and local participation in the development of non-Federal projects similar to those described in title I and to provide for Federal assistance to non-Federal organizations under terms and conditions, so far as found practicable by the Secretary, as described in said title I in the 31 States (outside of the 17 western reclamation States) and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Sec. 22. As used in this title—

(a) The term "construction," in addition to its usual meaning under the Federal reclamation laws, shall include rehabilitation and betterment, drainage, and control of saline water intrusion.

(b) The term "Federal reclamation laws" shall mean the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(c) The term "organization" shall mean a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision thereof or a conservancy district, irrigation district, drainage district, water users' association, an agency created by interstate compact, or similar organization which has capacity to contract with the United States.

(d) The term "project" shall mean (i) any complete reclamation, drainage, water storage, saline water intrusion control, or irrigation undertaking or a complete, self-contained, and distinct enterprise which may be a unit of such a larger undertaking, or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, and (ii) any similar undertaking proposal to be constructed by an organization. The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds $5 million: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of $5 million in accordance with the provisions of sections 24 and 25 of this title, to organizations which qualify for the same and which are not applicants for a loan under this title: *And provided further,* That an organization shall be limited to a contract or contracts under the provisions of this title provided the total of the costs involved does not exceed $5 million, except as otherwise herein provided.

(e) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 23. Any organization desiring to avail itself of the benefits provided in this title shall submit a proposal therefor to the Secretary in such form and manner as he shall prescribe. Each such proposal shall be accompanied by a payment of $1,000 to defray in part the cost of examining the proposal.

SEC. 24. (a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail and any other information required by the Secretary; shall have been submitted for review by any States likely to be materially affected by the project.

(b) Every such proposal shall include a showing that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land (except public and other lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary and subject to disposition by him) and rights to the use of water necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and that it is ready, able, and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this title such portion of the cost of the cost of construction (which portion shall include all costs of acquiring lands, interests in land, and rights to the use of water) as the Secretary shall have advised is proper in the circumstances: *Provided,* That the contribution required of any applicant organization shall not be in excess of 25 percent of the costs of the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to reimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects and, in the case of rehabilitation and betterment projects, any existing irrigation facilities owned by the applicant organization may be pledged as all or part of any contribution so required.

(c) If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 25: *Provided,* That if any affected State shall object, or if the estimated cost of any project is in excess of $500,000, no such contract shall be executed until and unless the same shall have been approved by act of Congress, except as hereinbefore provided for rehabilitation and betterment of any existing project: *Provided further,* That prior to submission of any project proposal the Secretary shall afford the applicant organization an opportunity to comment in writing on the conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the project proposal and such written comment of the applicant organization shall be included in the matter submitted to the Congress. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this title, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 25 of this title shall have been executed.

(d) The Secretary shall give due consideration to financial feasibility, emergency, or urgent need for the project, whether the proposal involves furnishing supplemental irrigation water for an existing irrigation project, whether drainage benefits are involved, whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of existing irrigation project works, and whether the proposed project is primarily for irrigation or drainage. All project works and facilities constructed under this title shall remain under the ownership and control of the local contracting organization subject to the terms of the contract entered into pursuant to section 25 of this title.

SEC. 25. Any contract authorized to be negotiated under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 24 of this title shall set out, among other things—

(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated cost of constructing the project.

(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization and the time and method of paying the same to the organization. Said grant shall not exceed that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were being constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to nonreimbursable functions under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; and (2) interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed on that pro rata share of the loan which is attributable to furnishing domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power produced as an element of the project and incidental to its full development;

(d) provision for operation of the project, if a grant predicated upon its performance of nonreimbursable functions is made, in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the head of the Federal department or agency primarily concerned with those functions and, in the event of noncompliance with such regulations, for operation by the United States or for repayment to the United States of the amount of any such grant; and

(e) such provisions as the Secretary shall deem necessary or proper to provide assurance of and security for prompt repayment of the loan and interest as aforesaid. The liability of the United States under any contract entered into pursuant to this title shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out the same, and every such contract shall so recite.

SEC. 26. Upon request of an organization which has made or intends to make a proposal under this title, the head of any Federal department or agency may make available to the organization any existing engineering, economic, or hydrologic information and printed material that it may have and that will be useful in connection with the planning, design, construction, or operation and maintenance of the project concerned. As agreed upon, the reasonable cost of any plans, specifications, and other unpublished material furnished by the Secretary pursuant to this section and the reasonable cost of making and administering any loan under this title shall, to the extent that they would not be nonreimbursable in the case of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, be treated as a loan and covered in the provisions of the contract entered into under section 25 of this title unless they are otherwise paid for by the organization.

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this title, and shall report the same to Congress currently.

SEC. 28. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $100 million to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall advise the congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 23 and, previous to any appropriation, shall have reported to the Congress on each proposal that has his approval, but no contracts shall be excuted until the Congress shall have appropriated funds for the specific proposal covered by each contract. All appropriations authorized for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this title, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 31. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080) except in the case of projects solely for rehabilitation and betterment.

SEC. 32. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person, organization or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

IMPROVEMENT OF TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ALABAMA AND MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to adopt and authorize a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and its tributaries. This is a companion bill to H. R. 6934 introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative THOMAS ABERNETHY, of the First District of Mississippi.

I have given this project special study and feel that it is a sound and desirable project and offers a practical solution to the flood control problems of 595,000 people directly affected. The project has been considered by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and by the Chief of Army Engineers, and has received their approval.

Damaging floods which occur frequently in the basin covered by this project are a continuous problem of agriculture and industry in the area.

Take, for example, Columbus, Miss., which is located in this basin. The flood stage on the Tombigbee River has been equalled or exceeded 87 times in 60 years of record, an average of 1.5 times per year. Twenty-five of these floods were in the cropping season, and 5 of these were major in their destruction. At Columbus, 865 residents and 75 business establishments are in the flood basin on both sides of the Tombigbee River and Luxapalila Creek and continually subjected to unexpected and damaging floods.

The Corps of Engineers points out that flooding occurs on the principal tributaries on the average of 2 to 8 times a year, and on minor tributaries on an average of 5 to 14 times a year. The area covered under this project includes 534-900 acres. Two hundred thirty-seven thousand, six hundred acres of this total are along the Tombigbee River, and the balance of 297,300 acres along the many tributaries. More than 192,000 acres of this land have been cleared for cultivation and are producing cotton, corn, hay, and other important crops.

This agricultural land, as well as a number of industries in this basin, suffer serious financial loss each year as a result of floods.

This project, if approved, will provide needed relief to many people and will offer greater opportunity in production of agricultural crops and livestock.

This project will include channel clearing and rectification on 22 tributary streams at an estimated cost to the United States for construction of $14,-445,000 and provides that responsible local interests give satisfactory assurance that they will contribute financially in the development of this program.

I firmly believe this project will contribute greatly to a stronger economy in this area. I hope the Senate Public Works Committee will give it favorable consideration at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2447) adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN SURVIVING CHILDREN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a curious inequality in the Civil Service Retirement Act. Under the present law, the surviving children of male employees of the Federal Government are entitled to receive annuity payments based upon the Government service of their deceased parent. Yet, there are no such benefits available to the surviving children of female Government employees. The very fact that a woman with children has worked for the Government is a strong indication of financial need. Unless the law is changed, the tragedy of the death of a mother will continue to be compounded by financial distress because of the loss of her earnings.

The bill I am introducing today, for myself, my colleagues, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], would equalize the treatment accorded men and women in Government service and would provide equal protection for their surviving children.

The inequality in the law was brought to my attention by a woman who is employed in the Federal Government in Portland, Oreg. Her husband has had serious spinal operations. She herself is suffering from cancer which has not responded to treatment. This couple have a 6-year old son who is blind.

Surely her years of Government service should at least give her the assurance that if her young son loses her, he will receive the annuity benefits available to the surviving children of male civil-service employees.

I do not believe that our Government should ever allow itself to become so big that it does not pay attention to human values.

I believe this a clear oversight in the Civil Service Retirement Act which needs to be corrected quickly. I am one who as a matter of legislative policy, is opposed to discrimination based upon race, color, or creed. Nor do I believe that discrimination based upon sex can be justified.

During the war I wrote the unanimous opinion of the War Labor Board which held equal pay for equal work should be paid to women engaged on Government contracts.

Since I came to the Senate I have tried to have that principle become a matter of labor legislation applicable throughout the country. I believe discrimination based upon sex cannot be justified.

I have called attention to an unfair discrimination that cannot possibly be justified. It is discrimination on which, in the last analysis, of course, is based on sex.

I hope the bill which I now introduce, for appropriate reference, will receive early consideration by the appropriate committee. It is a bill which in my judgment is so sound that no argument can be presented against it. It is a bill which ought to go through the Congress quickly. Even though Congress adjourns 3 weeks from today, it is a bill which still could be acted upon in the 3-week period of time. Unless subsequently, between the time we adjourn and next January, we add a retroactive clause, there are bound to be women Government employees who will die and leave minor children, with retirement benefits not open to the children because of the rank discrimination which now exists against women Federal employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2493) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide equal benefits for surviving children of female employees as are provided for surviving children of male employees, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL FISH WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution relating to the designation of national fish week.

Commercial fishing is America's oldest industry, dating from the time of the earliest colonists who not only caught fish for their own consumption but who salted it and started America's first export business by shipping it to Europe.

This proud old industry in 1954 had a total catch of fish and shellfish of more than 4,700,000,000 pounds. While many persons may not be aware of it, the source of this catch included 42 States and Alaska. It is significant that even an inland State such as Tennessee contributed about 20 million pounds of fish and shellfish last year. The total catch represents a value of over $345 million to the fishermen. The fishermen's memorial statue in Gloucester, Mass., is a grim reminder of the fact that over 10,000 persons have lost their lives from this port alone. America's fishermen are a brave and hardy lot.

In the commercial fisheries we have one of the most healthful sources of protein foods in the seas, lakes, and rivers of the United States and only waits for the harvest by the fishermen. It represents a retail value of more than $1 billion in the American economy. Over 1,500,000,000 pounds were consumed as fresh and frozen last year; over 1 billion pounds as canned; 85 million pounds as cured; and almost 2 billion pounds were consumed in industrial products, a great part of which was used for protein for domestic animals throughout the Nation.

Any industry which requires, as did commercial fishing, over 560,000 people, 90,000 fishing craft, and almost 4,000 shore establishments for processing the catch, and having an investment estimated at more than $11 billion, is a mighty important part of our American economy.

The State of Washington is rightfully proud of its part in this great fishing industry. Our annual production of salmon, halibut, cod, oysters, dungeness crab, and many other species of fish and sailfish amounts to 150 million pounds, with a value to the fishermen of $20 million.

A total of 30,000 people are dependent upon this great industry, including 13,000 fishermen. Over 4,500 fishing craft, as well as new processing plants and other equipment in the State, represent a tremendous investment on the part of the people of the great State of Washington.

Many articles have been written about the increasing importance of food from the sea and that our Nation will become more dependent upon it as an important source of protein food. Our scientists have proved that there is a great untapped source of these products available. At present the average per capita consumption of fish and shellfish in the United States is only 11.2 pounds. It would seem plausible that we must make these products more readily available and more widely accepted by the consuming public for the future.

Fishery products are unique in that a person may enjoy the variety of delicious flavors and species with a different fish dish each day throughout an entire year. If one has not had our fine salmon or halibut from the Northwest, tuna from California, shrimp from the gulf, red snapper from Florida, rockfish and crabs from the Mid-Atlantic States, oysters from Long Island, cod, haddock, and lobsters from New England, whitefish from the Great Lakes, and the many fresh-water fish from our rivers and lakes to name just a few, he cannot appreciate the gourmet delights which are in store for him.

In order that this great American industry may receive its rightful share of attention, I introduce a joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) designating the period from October 3 to October 8, inclusive, 1955, as National Fish Week, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRADE DEVELOPMENT UNDER TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2253) to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF ALTERNATE ROUTE WITHIN GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on May 9, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] on behalf of himself, and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] introduced Senate bill 1917 to authorize the construction within the Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway No. 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes. The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Works. I have consulted the chairman of the Committee, and he has no objection to the re-reference of this bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the Public Works Committee may be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISHERY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on June 30 I introduced the bill (S. 2379) to provide for a fishery education and training program in the United States. Twenty-seven Senators joined as cosponsors of the bill when it was introduced. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has since requested that he be included as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that the next time Senate bill 2379 is reprinted the name of the senior Senator from Virginia be included on the list of cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask that it temporarily lie on the table. I wish to make some remarks and submit a request about it this afternoon, after the morning hour is over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, and temporarily lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) is as follows:

Whereas the Nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, are now ruled by tyrannical Communist governments imposed by force against the will of the people of such nations; and

Whereas the people of such nations earnestly seek the restoration of their freedom and rule by governments of their own choosing, and to these ends desire, pending the day of their liberation, to be represented by free, anti-Communist governments-in-exile; and

Whereas the United States now recognizes the Communist regimes in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania; and

Whereas the recognition by the United States of such regimes strengthens them and thus obstructs the restoration of freedom and self-government in such nations; and

Whereas the recognition by the United States of free, anti-Communist governments-in-exile representing such nations would advance the anti-Communist cause throughout the world, and thus would promote the safety, peace, and independence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should (1) withdraw its diplomatic recognition from the Communist regimes in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, (2) encourage and support the establishment of free, anti-Communist governments-in-exile to represent the people of such nations and of Albania, and (3) extend diplomatic recognition to such free, anti-Communist governments, pending the liberation of their respective people.

RIGHT OF FREE PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE], the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], and myself, I submit a resolution for appropriate reference, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 127) was received, read, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas millions of people in Europe and Asia are living in subjection to a totalitarian imperialism; and

Whereas the domination of free peoples by an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own; and

Whereas the people of the United States cherish a heritage and tradition of freedom and self-determination; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress give expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate proclaim the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that this resolution was drafted with the full knowledge and approval of the Department of State and the President. It is in keeping with prior statements of the President and Secretary of State relative to our concern over people who have lost their freedom.

ADMISSION OF SPAIN INTO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 21, I submitted on behalf of numerous cosponsors and myself, Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 for the purpose of urging the State Department to continue to use its good offices toward securing the earliest possible participation by Spain in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

At that time, I commented on the Senate floor that I expected to announce additional cosponsors of the resolution. I pointed out that unfortunately, my then imminent departure for a speaking commitment in my State, made it impossible for me to list all of my colleagues who I knew would be interested in joining in the sponsorship of this concurrent resolution.

I am pleased to state that in addition to the original 7 cosponsors, the following 11 Senators have asked that their names be included as cosponsors: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Martin], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

I now present a supplementary statement on the concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Wiley

I may say that in the few weeks which have elapsed since my original introduction of the resolution, I am more convinced than ever that its passage is necessary in the interest of the national security of our country. Its passage is advisable either in my version or in the somewhat different version offered on May 24, by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges].

The approaching meeting of the Big Four at the summit does not for one moment detract from the necessity of closing the ranks of the Western Alliance in greater unity and assuring the presence of all of our friends in the military planning councils of NATO. Indeed the Big Four meeting makes this more essential than ever before.

THERE IS NO VALID REASON FOR DELAY

As I stated in the Congressional Record, beginning on page 8804, I realize full well that the position of some of our United States diplomats is that the "climate may not now be right" among certain of our allies for accepting Spain in NATO. It is a fact that agreement will have to be unanimous if Spain is to be admitted into the organization. But if we are to wait indefinitely for a so-called perfect time for Spain's entrance, our procrastination will only be serving Russia's interests and not our own.

To some people who like to delay things indefinitely, the time is "never really right." They theorize that there are always "more ideal" circumstances than present ones.

But the fact of the matter is that in this dangerous world of ours, we do not have the luxury of waiting and waiting for "the best possible time." We must do things promptly—on a much faster basis than theorists might otherwise like.

LET DEAD PAST BURY DEAD

The fact remains that if certain of our allies allow themselves to remain preoccupied with obsolete animosities, dating from the wartime period, then we can hardly hope to make progress.

If we had allowed our own emotions to run away with our reason, then we might not have signed the Japanese Peace Treaty or a German Peace Treaty when we did, particularly because certain of our allies still had not gotten completely over their wartime animosities to Japan and Germany.

Fortunately, there was a clearheaded recognition that "the dead past had to bury the dead," and that we had to live with today's realities.

SPAIN'S ANTICOMMUNISM UNQUESTIONED

In the instance of Spain, we confront a government and a people with whom we Americans certainly have no quarrel. Indeed, we confront a bright opportunity for ever-improved relations with a vigorous nation whose anticommunism has, speaking very frankly, been far more decisively proven than in the instance even of some of our allies. We are confronted with a people of culture, of a valiant military tradition, a nation which has come up by its own effort and initiative from the civil holocaust of the mid-1930's.

I say that any government, any people whom we regard highly enough to invest hundreds of millions of dollars of good hard-earned American money for the construction of bases, any government whose word we rightly regard as reliable enough for us to conclude solemn agreements, as we gladly have with the Spanish Government, is a government more than worthy enough of inclusion in NATO.

And so I earnestly hope that notwithstanding so-called misgivings, doubts, and requests for delays that this concurrent resolution will be approved by the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH HAS RIGHT TO BE HEARD

I remind my readers that Senate Concurrent Resolution 34 was cosponsored by 14 Senators and my own Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 now by 18 Senators—representing already one-third of the membership of the Senate. Many other Senators have advised me that they will enthusiastically support the resolution, and this is particularly the case with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

On the House side some 30 companion resolutions have been offered by leading Members.

These facts speak for themselves. They speak for the reasoned judgment of Members of the Congress. We of the legislative branch have a right, indeed the obligation, to express these sentiments and we trust that our allies, for whom this legislative branch is even now once again appropriating vast sums, will give earnest consideration to our position.

I trust that the provisions of the mutual security authorization bill for the 1956 fiscal year, as regards Spain, will be promptly implemented by full appropriations, along with necessary provisions for making available appropriate surplus agricultural commodities to Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Was I included among the seven original sponsors?

Mr. WILEY. I am not certain; but if the Senator's name was not included among the seven original sponsors, I suggest that it now be added.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Wisconsin asked me to join with him as a sponsor of the concurrent resolution, and I replied that I would be delighted to do so.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Excerpt from remarks by him at the Republican Party Workshop Meeting for the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania, in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "The Nation's School Lunch Milk Program—A Vital National Asset," together with statement from the National Dairy Council on the same subject.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Remarks of the Honorable George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the television program "Youth Wants To Know," on Sunday, May 29, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Editorial entitled "Federal-State relations," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1955, and his weekly news letter dated July 5, 1955, on centralization of Government.

By Mr. MORSE:

Statement made by him before the Committee on the District of Columbia on S. 1505, a bill to provide relief for school teachers.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Federal Reserve Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on July 1, 1955, I gave notice that on July 11, 1955, public hearings would be held on S. 1427, a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and any other such bills as may be pending before the subcommittee. Because of other committee business, the date of beginning these hearings has been postponed until Wednesday, July 13, 1955.

I now give notice that all persons who desire to appear and testify at these and subsequent hearings on this subject matter are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8–3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Monday, July 18, 1955. Unless the committee shall otherwise order, requests received after that date will not be recognized.

RESERVE PROGRAM OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, about a year ago it was my happy privilege to appear on the platform with Gen. William E. Hall. Major General Hall is in charge of the Reserve program of the United States Air Force. At that time we discussed with reservists who were in attendance the present Reserve program in the Air Force and its future possibilities. Because we are on the eve of receiving a bill from committee which will concern the Reserves, I thought it would be valuable to the Members of this body to admit into the Record figures submitted to us by General Hall, showing the great strides which have been made in the Air Force program and in the Air National Guard during the past year. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a copy of the letter which General Hall sent to me, containing the figures to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of the Air Force,
Headquarters, United
States Air Force,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

Hon. Barry M. Goldwater,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Barry: Slightly more than a year ago you were the principal speaker at a meeting of Air Force reservists in the Interior Department auditorium, and I had the pleasure of sharing the platform with you in a general discussion of the expansion of the Air Force program for the Reserve forces. The revitalization of that program was just then gaining momentum.

A few figures have just come to hand which, because of your stout support of the Air Force Reserve forces, I feel will be of extreme interest. They reveal an improvement during the first 11 months of fiscal year 1955 which is beyond our boldest hopes.

For the sake of simplicity I am grouping below a few of the more salient facts about the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard into three broad fields of personnel, aircraft, and facilities.

Participation in Air Force Reserve training showed a spectacular rise between June 30, 1954, and May 31, 1955. Between them the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard had an overall increase in paid participation of 53 percent. This represents nearly 100-percent increase of officer participants and 35 percent airmen participants.

Exact figures for the 11-month period are as follows: Air National Guard participants rose from 49,845 to 61,385, with a present manning of 6,638 officers and 54,747 airmen. The paid participants in the Air Force Reserve increased from 23,318 to 50,101, with a May 1955 manning of 31,083 officers and 19,018 airmen.

In the Air Force Reserve, also, of course, are 199,156 officers and airmen in a nonpaid status. Mainly, they engage in general training and take extension courses. While not in so active training categories as the paid participants, they would be extremely important for augmentation of the Air Force in time of D-day mobilization.

The dynamic increase of participation in Reserve training has no doubt been stimulated to an immeasurable degree by improvement of the aircraft and facilities situations.

During the past year, the Air National Guard showed an increase of 560 jet fighters, 31 jet trainers, 8 twin-engine transports, and 46 twin-engine bombers. There was a decrease or phase-out of 570 piston-engine fighters and trainers. Total number of jet aircraft now assigned is 1,215, about 94 percent more than were on hand a year ago.

Combat wings of the Air Force Reserve are also in far better condition, aircraftwise. The Reserve was assigned 200 new jet fighters and 68 jet trainers in the last 12 months. A total of 139 piston-engine fighters and trainers were phased out. The Air Force Reserve received, in addition, 10 new twin-engine bombers and 129 transports. It has on hand, then, 325 jet aircraft and 400 conventional aircraft.

With respect to facilities, substantial progress is again disclosed. As of July 1, 1954, the Air Force Reserve forces were operating from 110 flying bases and had activated 107 nonflying locations. By May 31, 1955, the total had risen to 114 flying bases and 148 nonflying locations.

During fiscal year 1955, $15 million in new moneys was made available to the Air National Guard primarily for improving existing facilities and, in some instances, replacing temporary structures. The major construction program of the Guard was completed prior to fiscal year 1955.

In this same period, the bulk of $28 million previously authorized for Air Force Reserve construction was made available for construction of essential items at 16 flying fields and of two Air Force Reserve center buildings.

For fiscal year 1956, a total of $48,600,000 is being requested. Of this, $31,600,000 is needed for the Air Force Reserve program of construction at 18 flying locations and the building of an additional 25 Air Reserve centers. The $17 million required for the Air National Guard will be allocated to 18 flying bases and 11 nonflying locations.

By the end of fiscal year 1956, the facility inventory for both Reserve components will be 132 flying bases and 173 nonflying locations. The largest remaining construction effort will be for the Air Force Reserve in fiscal years 1957 and 1958, due to the realinement of Reserve wings and squadrons and expansion from 24 flying locations to 60 in order to meet the manning requirements of the Reserve's D-day mission.

This informal report to you, Barry, touches only the highlights of recent Reserve forces progress. There are many other very encouraging factors which are too detailed for inclusion in a letter. I hope you will agree from the foregoing, however, that the Air Force is moving steadily, and with most gratifying speed, toward its goal of combat-ready, fully manned, and equipped Reserve forces.

Sincerely,

BILL,
William E. Hall,
Major General, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces.

THE ILLNESS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Greensboro, N. C., Daily News of July 7, 1955, commenting on the illness of our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATURAL

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, stricken by a serious heart attack last weekend, is known in Washington as an instinctive "Senate type."

Like the late Senator Robert Taft, he has an innate understanding of the workings of the Senate's political machinery and a fair for Senate leadership. His popularity on both sides of the Senate aisle attested his devotion to the broader nonparty purposes of government. For that reason Senator JOHNSON's temporary withdrawal will hurt Democrats and Republicans alike.

It will hurt the Democrats because the Texas solon long ago discovered how to harmonize the liberals and conservatives of his party. A protege of Franklin Roosevelt, he had in recent years been criticized by the more enthusiastic Democratic liberals. But as a middle-roader, the Senator soon dissolved all doubts that he knew how to exercise not only politically wise leadership but also leadership in the best interest of the country. Already he looms as a possible vice presidential candidate in 1956 and a probable candidate for the presidency in 1960.

Senator JOHNSON's guidance will be missed by the White House because he often gave Ike better support than Ike's own party. JOHNSON's leadership gave Senator MCCARTHY his most shattering defeat in the recent effort to tie President Eisenhower's hands at Geneva. JOHNSON pushed the administration's tariff bill.

The art of political leadership seldom gets the recognition it deserves. What appears to be effortless grinding of political wheels from a distance usually is the result of long toil and carefully laid plans. Senator JOHNSON, like Bob Taft, is a "natural" at that kind of work. He loves it, and works long hours, sometimes 12 or 18 hours a day, to make it jell.

The South has given the United States Senate some of its brightest lights. LYNDON JOHNSON has already gone a long way toward proving himself one of the best products of a region which traditionally turns out good politicians and statesmen.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit of several days at home. During my visit, I was saddened by the news of the illness of my distinguished friend and colleague, the majority leader, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Everywhere I went, there was serious and heartfelt interest and inquiry about Senator JOHNSON's illness.

The people of Texas recognize the ability of LYNDON JOHNSON and his great service to their State and to the Nation. They appreciate the wonderful expressions made about him in the Senate last week. Especially, I found great satisfaction among the people at home because the Senate paused for prayer that God might will LYNDON JOHNSON a complete recovery. That is the earnest prayer of his colleague and the hope and prayer of the people of our State.

Many Texas newspapers have published editorials indicative of the deep feeling of our people for Senator JOHNSON and his family. I understand that an editorial published in the Dallas News has already been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that editorials relating to Senator JOHNSON, and published in Texas newspapers, be printed in the RECORD, as follows: the San Antonio News of July 5, 1955; the Dallas Times-Herald; the Abilene Reporter-News of July 5, 1955; the Houston Press of July 5, 1955; the Brenham Banner Press of July 6, 1955; the Kilgore News Herald of July 5, 1955; the Amarillo Daily News of July 5, 1955; the Waco Herald Tribune; the San Antonio Express of June 27, 1955; and the Beaumont Enterprise of July 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Antonio News of Tuesday, July 5, 1955]

HEALTH OF SENATOR JOHNSON MATTER OF NATIONAL CONCERN

All Texas hopes earnestly, indeed prayerfully, for the speedy and complete recovery of its senior Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. His high value to the State, his party, and the Nation renders his illness a matter of deep concern to Americans generally.

As the youngest and one of the best floor leaders ever to serve in Congress, the hard-driving but moderate-minded Senate Democratic majority leader has made legislative leadership history under unprecedentedly difficult conditions.

Despite the severe split in his own party, he has almost singlehandedly overcome the handicap of "divided Government"—a Democratic Congress and Republican administration—at a crucial point in national and world affairs.

Senator JOHNSON's "constructive opposition" to the Eisenhower administration has, in actuality, been support stronger than that accorded the Eisenhower program by the President's own party. Yet JOHNSON has achieved that without impairing his own party integrity. In fact, his overly strenuous efforts have strengthened his party's popularity and its prospects for reunification.

Senator JOHNSON's leadership has brought this session of Congress to a point where unusually early adjournment, with a record of constructive accomplishment, is possible without continuation of his detailed daily guidance. But his return to active duty appears essential to similar smooth sailing next session.

The effect which the serious heart attack that he has so regrettably suffered may have on Senator Johnson's future political career is, of course, indeterminable at this time. But it would be unrealistic not to recognize that the blow is a hard one to his recently brightening prospects for becoming the Democratic presidential candidate in 1956 or, much more likely, in 1960.

Strong health is essential to meeting the grinding responsibilities of the Presidency. Anything short of complete recovery would weigh heavily even against a man who certainly has every other qualification for that highest and most demanding of public offices.

Senator Johnson's friends have for months been anxious over the effect of the tremendous workload which he insisted selflessly on shouldering. That anxiety deepened since an operation earlier this year which found him, after 6 weeks' absence, working harder than ever.

Senator Johnson's example cautions again that America must learn to take better care of its men in public office, especially the overworked leaders of legislative bodies. They should be relieved of all burdensome routine, so as to devote their entire resources to the task of policymaking.

The public should not only condone but insist upon their taking advantage of every opportunity for relaxation. Let this be a lesson for those who begrudge President Eisenhower the self-sustaining diversion of his golf game.

Nothing is more gratifying to a newspaper, to its management and editors, than to support for election a political candidate who subsequently achieves in office the high stature of statesmanship attained by Senator Johnson. The record of State and national service which he has so far compiled is one of great pride to his supporters, and one to command the respect of all opponents.

The 46-year-old Texan, painfully stricken at the brightest point of a brilliant career of public service, has overcome many a tough obstacle in his course toward national leadership. May God grant him the strength to surmount this one.

[From the Dallas Times-Herald]

TIMELY WARNING

The illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson is unfortunate for the Nation even though it is much less serious than reports have indicated. As majority leader in the Senate, the Texas senior Senator is one of the key men in the national Government. He will be missed every day that he is kept from his office.

Fortunately, the Senator is young and strong, and the intelligence, commonsense and poise that make him so valuable a Member of Congress will enable him to take his illness in his stride and to be duly cautious about his health. Heart trouble for a man of the Senator's age often proves only a timely warning that the human body has its limitation.

Senator Johnson has always been a hard worker, and it is easy for a man of his type to assume too heavy a load. In the present Congress the majority leader has had a particularly tough job. Much of the credit for the statesmanlike behavior of the Democratic majority goes to Senator Johnson, who announced at the beginning that his party would not oppose President Eisenhower's program for mere partisan reasons.

For purely personal reasons, Senator Johnson's friends are distressed by his illness, but they know his strength and courage and they have no fears as to his recovery. They are only hoping that he will take this warning seriously enough to slow down and rest without worrying.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News of July 5, 1955]

DUTY TAKES ITS TOLL

The heart attack which laid Senator Lyndon Johnson low must not have been too great a surprise to his close friends and associates who know how much of time, energy, and devotion he has put into the job of leading the majority party in the United States Senate. Even a magnificent human machine like Lyndon Johnson has its limitations, and beyond a doubt he drove it with ruthless disregard of the consequences.

Washington dispatches spoke of his 12-hour-a-day schedule as majority leader—youngest man ever to hold that post in Senate history—but that wasn't the whole of it. Just living in the ceaseless pull-and-haul of Washington is enough to tax the physical and mental stamina of any man with any regard for his duties, and in the case of a conscientious public servant like Lyndon Johnson, who did not know how to say no to any legitimate plea for his time and energies, and who never learned any of the small arts of relaxation, existence became a ruthless treadmill when he was saddled with the chore, first, of minority leader in the 83d and then of majority leader in the 84th Congress.

From both sides of the aisles, and even from many who had opposed him politically, came expressions of regret at the ill turn of fate which chopped down the tall pine tree for, nobody knows how many, months to come. These expressions of regret were mingled with the highest praise for an outstanding job well done.

Lyndon Johnson and his friend and mentor, Speaker Sam Rayburn, publicly stated that if any stalemate developed as a result of the Democratic congressional victory of 1954, as predicted by President Eisenhower during the campaign, it would not be the fault of the Democrats. Both have made good on that promise, and both have helped pull the administration through many difficult legislative passageways, and out of many tight spots.

Lyndon Johnson has served his State, his country, and his party well; indeed, with brilliance and distinction. His fellow Texans have reason to be proud of him, and the country has good reason to hope and pray for his early complete recovery.

(From the Houston Press of July 5, 1955)

LYNDON JOHNSON

It is ironic that Lyndon Johnson was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussiong him as a "natural" as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. Johnson earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about Lyndon Johnson.

An urbane, wise and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. Johnson has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. Johnson's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the "loyal opposition." To the contrary. There is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. Johnson's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator Johnson will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the Brenham Banner Press of July 6, 1955]

THE SPECTATOR

PRAYERS FOR LYNDON—THE PACE THAT KILLS—TRIBUTE TO HIS FRIENDS—HIS GREATEST FIGHT

Many Brenham and Washington County friends of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson are responding to the appeal of his colleague, Senator Price Daniel, and are praying for recovery of the senior Senator of Texas. He lies critically ill in a naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., after a heart attack suffered last Saturday. He is definitely unable to resume his duties as majority leader in the United States Senate until next January. The future course of his political career hinges upon how complete a recovery he is able to gain.

Those of us who have known Lyndon Johnson for the last 18 or 20 years are shocked at his sudden collapse but not too surprised. A man cannot keep up the driving pace he has maintained during those years without suffering consequences. We first became acquainted with Johnson in 1937 when upon the death of Congressman J. P. Buchanan, he resigned his position as NYA administrator for Texas to enter the scramble for his seat in a special election. We observed the whirlwind tactics of the young politician aspirant then. He lost no time in announcing for the job as a "100-percent supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt." He would get up at the crack of dawn, campaign all day and as far into the night as feasible, and then come by the Austin American office, where we worked, to check up on the news and the progress of the campaign. We recall one time when he started at the Congress Avenue bridge and made his way door to door all the way up to the capitol, shaking hands with every storekeeper and every clerk and helper he could find. As a matter of fact, his ability to shake hands and get away with good grace was one of Johnson's political strong points. It enabled him to see hundreds if not thousands of voters in a day, whereas a less able campaigner would get stuck with long-winded conversationalists and could count a day's contacts only in the scores.

That first campaign for Congress was a dilly. There were 8 or 9 candidates for the office, many of them already well known. On the other hand, Johnson was not too well known to the voters and he had to become acquainted with them within the 30-day campaign. He did such a good job, however, that a week before the election we made a tour of the district, asking people whom they thought would win, and found the weight of public opinion favored Johnson. We predicted his election over the field. Although he finished the campaign in the hospital, having to undergo an appendix operation, he won handily and started his meteoric rise in the political world.

Although Johnson is only 46, tall, dark and handsome, he has been plagued with ailments at crucial points in his career. We recall one campaign for reelection to Congress when Johnson was laid low with gallstones. His faithful wife, Ladybird, took the stump in his behalf and made a very favorable impression on the voters. He was, of course, reelected. He has had recurrent trouble from the stones, but a checkup at Mayo Clinic early this year revealed he was in good physical condition.

However, Johnson's enthusiasm for his job and his desire to do all he can for his constituents have led him to overtax his physical makeup. Dutch Hohn can testify to that. We recall when Dutch was Washington County agent. He invited Lyndon down to tour the county and explain the newly enacted cotton allotment program. The two made a community-by-community tour of the entire county, speaking to groups wherever they could be found. The day was hot as blazes, but that didn't slow up the Congressman. He even stopped on the roadside to help a woman repair a flat tire. By nightfall, Dutch was pooped, but Lyndon was still going strong. Of course, since Johnson has become United States Senator, his duties have greatly increased. His responsibilities have been tremendous, but he has discharged them well, even at the possible cost of his own life.

Senator Johnson has always been wise in the choice of his aides and fortunate in the number and devotion of his friends. Many of them have worked incessantly in his behalf, paced by the Senator himself. We recently wrote about this in our column, commenting on the possibility of his being the next Democratic nominee for President. Only last week we received a letter from the Senator in which he said: "I appreciate what you said about me in your column on June 20, and I appreciate even more what you said about my friends. It is certainly true that my greatest strength is in my friends. I am the most fortunate man in the world in this respect."

But now, Lyndon Johnson has reached a point where he is beyond the help of his friends, anxious as they are to do whatever they can. They can only offer their prayers and hope for the best. It is up to Lyndon himself, the skill of the doctors, and Providence. But knowing Lyndon as we do—his joy of living, his desire to keep on helping his country and his friends, his determined will—we predict he will win this greatest fight of his life and return once more to the position of power and greatness to which his ability, his efforts, and destiny have brought him. At least that is our sincere hope.

[From the Kilgore News Herald of July 5, 1955]

THE PUBLISHER'S SCRATCH PAD

(By C. K. D.)

Friends throughout the Nation were shocked and disturbed at the news of the illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson.

The Associated Press bulletin reporting the Senator had suffered a heart attack reached the News Herald late Saturday night. The front page was made over to include the brief report, which coincidentally, ran just below the editorial from the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel which strongly recommended Johnson as the next Democratic presidential nominee.

Those who deal in political speculation suggest the possibility that the Senator's illness could remove him from his current position as one of America's top political figures. But these gentlemen may not be counting on the fighting spirit of Lyndon Johnson. It is well known that the attitude of the patient is a powerful influence in heart cases. And we have never known a person who has more of the optimistic positive, never-give-up spirit than Lyndon Johnson.

He has been working at a terrific pace as the majority leader in the Senate and, because of his effective leadership, can now rest and relax, comforted by the knowledge that his work has been done so well that his program will be carried on to a successful conclusion in the closing days of this congressional session.

Senator Johnson must be getting tremendous satisfaction from the praise he has been receiving from many sources, some of which had been quite critical in the past. In fact, friends have known that one of his chief goals has been to convince prior opponents that he is one of the best Senators Texas has ever had. * * * Scores of new supporters have been won over by the peerless performance of the tall, determined Texan.

One such tribute from a stanch enemy of the past came in a Dallas News editorial Monday, which wished the Senator well and said, in part: "Through hard work, commonsense intelligence of a kind one finds in Blanco County, Tex., tolerance and political know-how of the highest order, Senator Johnson has become one of the most influential men in the political life of the Nation. Like most other men who remain long in public service, he has not muffed many political plays, but he has built his record on consistent and constructive attention to the Nation's business. Often a critic of the Senator, the News recognizes his splendid service and joins his many friends in wishing him a speedy recovery."

The Senator's charming wife, our neighbor from Harrison County, has said that she will be grateful for prayers for her husband. And she asked that friends who want to send flowers contribute instead to the Heart Fund or some similar activity.

Scratch Pad is proud to be one of those who is known by Lyndon Johnson to be his friend "in sunshine and in sorrow" * * *. We join a host of others in wishing him a rapid recovery * * * Texas and the Nation need you, Senator.

[From the Amarillo Daily News of July 5, 1955]

GO FISHING, LYNDON

It is a tribute to Lyndon Johnson that nobody in Washington is worrying much about the Senate majority leadership for the remainder of the summer session.

The tall Texan had his work so well organized when he was stricken, and had planted his influence so firmly among his colleagues, that it doesn't really matter who sits in for him until adjournment. The Senate knows precisely how Lyndon Johnson would handle things these closing weeks and its Members respect him so profoundly that that's the way it will be.

This situation should encourage the Senator to take it easy the next few months. He has been going at a terrific pace.

What he should do is come back to Texas and go fishing. There's nothing that will unwind tension more smoothly and surely than cruising around a tree-lined lake full of hungry bass.

The Nation needs Lyndon Johnson. If being absent from Washington for a few months will help insure his presence when Congress meets again, then—when he is able to travel—all Texas should demand that he get down the old casting rod and disappear among the mossy lakes for a while.

[From the Waco Herald Tribune]

GET WELL, LYNDON

Friends and admirers of Senator Lyndon Johnson all over the Nation are hoping that his heart attack, suffered Saturday, will prove not to be a crippling illness.

Politically, Senator Johnson's illness is a severe jolt to the Democratic Party, for he is the one Democrat of national stature who has been able to rise above the deep factional strife of the party and lead the dissident elements into unity and productive action. Without Lyndon Johnson's keen, energetic, broad-gage leadership, the Democratic Party could be in grave trouble as it heads into 1956, a crucial election year.

For his constituents in Texas who have demanded and received peerless representation by Senator Johnson, the illness means incapacitation of a stanch friend, an able counselor, a wise Senator. They, being his kind of folks, know how to be patient and hope for the best and quickest convalescence.

For the Nation, facing an almost bewildering change in the international climate, the loss of Lyndon Johnson's firm leadership in the United States Senate even for a few months could be the most serious aspect of his sudden illness. It is largely due to Senator Johnson that the national posture of strength and vigilant firmness toward the Iron Curtain countries exists today. How the situation may develop without his presence in the Senate is a matter for some concern.

The Senator will appreciate hearing from his fellow Americans. Messages of encouragement and hope can make a marked difference in the speed of his recovery. It would be a solid contribution to the national welfare if all who care would write Senator Johnson a card or letter wishing him well.

[From the San Antonio Express of June 27, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON'S MERITED NATIONAL PRESTIGE

Texas' senior United States Senator is far removed from the position of a prophet who is honored everywhere save in his own land. Lyndon B. Johnson's fellow citizens in the Lone Star State would repay with appreciation and pride the service which he renders, and long has rendered, them even if that service had not gained for him a prominence and a prestige which are nationwide in scope.

It is—to borrow Newsweek's description—a "jolting" prestige: Senator Johnson is "the Texan who is jolting Washington." And that "jolting" is all to the good. It describes the majority leader's ability to get things done; to keep the Senate on the move—to achieve new records for promptness and for output in the matter of legislation passed by the Chamber.

That means quality, as well as quantity, of service. Its criterion—in keeping with the pledge and the pattern of senatorship which Johnson has given the Nation from the outset of his majority leadership—is the genuine need of the legislation which he steers through. That need reflects the general public, the national, interest—not merely narrow partisan advantage, played up with an eye to election results.

Thus it is no mean tribute which Gould Lincoln's column in the Washington Star (independent) pays to the importance and the steadfastness of Johnson's leadership. Under that leadership, "the Senate has been able to act efficiently and with a minimum of delay on many important measures—and is expected to act on more before adjournment of the session. * * * His motto is to see that legislation is fairly considered—and that it is for the good of the country."

That concept—too often dishonored in the breach—is 2,000 years old. It harks back to Virgil:

"The noblest motive is the public good."

Patriotic Texans like to see the observance of that standard nationally credited to a citizen whom they send to Washington to make the Nation's laws.

Meanwhile suggestions of Lyndon Johnson as presidential timber continue to multiply and to spread. Newsweek, for example, looks to 1960—at the same time making it clear that Johnson is too busy being majority leader to have time for convention politics. It is Johnson's "ambition to be one of the best Senators Texas ever produced and the 'best damn majority leader in history.' His presidential hopes, if any, are well concealed. Yet his name crops up more and more frequently in cloakroom conversation. As one colleague put it last week, 'After all, he's the ablest man we've got.' But he's also the most practical and realistic man they have, so he won't be running against Mr. Eisenhower in 1956. Come 1960, who knows?"

Perhaps nobody knows. But there are a lot of Texans and others who think and hope.

[From the Beaumont Enterprise of July 5, 1955]

A Fighter Knocked Down

LYNDON JOHNSON is a fighter and in that fact lies the greatest hope of his return to an active political life following the heart attack which struck him down a few days ago.

The senior United States Senator from Texas had just achieved a new summit in his career through his skillful handling of the slim Democratic majority in the upper House during the current session. It is tragic that with only a month to go before adjournment and rest, his heart ailment caught up with him.

Senator JOHNSON has served in Congress since 1937, when he became a Member of the House of Representatives from his central Texas district; World War II found him on duty with the Navy in the Pacific theater.

There was never any doubt that his life was devoted to public service and so it was that he met and defeated that shrewd, veteran Texas political warhorse, Coke Stevenson, for the Senatorship in 1948. It was the closest race for major office in Texas political history and one of the bitterest and hardest fought. Working almost 24 hours a day for votes, right up to the moment the polls opened, Mr. JOHNSON underwent a physical pounding that was enough to have left its mark on him permanently—young though he was.

Scarcely 40 when he assumed his seat in the Senate, he demonstrated quickly an ability at parliamentary generalship and human relations which made him party leader in the upper House in an amazingly short time.

So close was the Republican working margin in the Senate when President Eisenhower took office in 1953 that success of the new administration's legislative program depended as much on Democrat JOHNSON as it did on the then Majority Leader Robert Taft.

During the next 2 years and again in this present session, opening last January, Senator JOHNSON showed a sense of responsibility to the Nation first that won him the respect of the Republicans as well as the admiration and loyalty of all political shades of his fellow Democrats.

Inevitably his name has been mentioned with greater and greater frequency as a presidential possibility within the next 5 or 10 years. Some have seen in him the one capability for bringing together the warring liberal and conservative factions of the party.

At the age of 46 LYNDON JOHNSON has a long way to go. A Nation which needs his kind of leadership in its legislative halls will hope that the strength of heart he has shown in the political arena will serve to pull him through this greatest crisis in his life and restore him to full vigor.

THE LATE WILLIAM BRADLEY UMSTEAD, GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA—ADDRESS BY R. PERCY READE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, North Carolina was saddened beyond measure on November 7, 1954, when her brilliant and beloved Governor, William Bradley Umstead, fell to sleep. As one blessed by his friendship from our college days at Chapel Hill until his death, I am competent to bear this testimony: Bill Umstead exemplified, both in his life and in his death, to the highest degree, the ancient assertion that loyalty is the holiest good in the human heart. He was completely faithful to his family, his friends, his community, his State, his Nation, and his God.

On March 15, 1955, one of North Carolina's ablest advocates and finest citizens, R. Percy Reade, made an eloquent appraisal of the life and services of William Bradley Umstead in a memorial address, which he delivered before a joint session of the general assembly of North Carolina in the State capitol at Raleigh, N. C. Mr. Reade's selection for this task was a most fitting one. As one of his law partners and longtime friends, Mr. Reade knew Bill Umstead well and loved him much.

Since Bill Umstead was an honored Member of the Senate from December 18, 1946, to December 30, 1948, it seems appropriate that Mr. Reade's address should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial Address by R. Percy Reade at the Joint Session of the General Assembly of North Carolina Honoring the Memory of the Late Gov. William Bradley Umstead, Hall of the House of Representatives, State Capitol, March 15, 1955

Your Excellency, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, members of the Council of State, members of the general assembly, ladies, and gentlemen, we have assembled here tonight to pay tribute to the memory of a fallen chief, who succumbed in a struggle with the Grim Reaper while undertaking to secure for his beloved State a better tomorrow. It is fitting that the members of this general assembly, many of whom have heretofore been closely allied with him and who gave him unstinted support in carrying out his program, should pause in their deliberations to sponsor these exercises.

While I am deeply sensible of my inability to command language to adequately portray his fine qualities and his many contributions to the State and Nation, I deeply appreciate the privilege you have afforded me to pay feeble tribute to a great American, one of North Carolina's favorite sons, who for many years was my devoted and understanding friend.

William Bradley Umstead was born on the 13th day of May, 1895, on a farm in Mangum Township in Durham County. He was fortunate in his parents. His mother, Lulie Lunsford Umstead, was the daughter of a prosperous farmer in Mangum Township and was educated in private and public schools in Durham County and at Greensboro Female College. She was a schoolteacher, church organist, and a civic and religious leader in her community. His father, John W. Umstead, was a Confederate soldier, successful farmer, legislator, and was likewise a civic and religious leader in the community. For more than 20 years he was a member of the Board of Education of Durham County, most of which time he served as its chairman. Both he and his wife contributed greatly to the religious, cultural, and educational life of their section of the county.

The atmosphere of their home was conducive to right living and high thinking.

Young Umstead spent his early childhood on a farm and performed all of the duties incident to the life of the average country boy. He owned his own horse which he had raised from a colt. She later played a prominent role in his career and as a reward for her faithful service, was kept by him until she died at the ripe old age of 33 years, long after her young master had left the farm and had assumed responsible and important public duties.

After completing the ninth grade at Mangum School, William attended the high school in the city of Durham, after which he entered the University of North Carolina. In the summer months he raised tobacco to defray his expenses for the succeeding year. Weather conditions were so unfavorable in the spring of his junior year, he was unable to have a crop planted that summer. After reaching home, having no crop, he immediately sought and obtained employment at a sawmill. After working there for a few days, he entered into a contract with a bridge builder to furnish the sand needed in the construction of a bridge over Flat River near his home. In the performance of this task, his horse, Robbie, stood him in good stead. By the time college opened, his contract with the bridge builder had been performed and he returned to Chapel Hill that fall and was graduated with his class in June 1916.

While a student at the university he became an outstanding debater and student leader. He participated in intercollegiate debates and upon graduation won the coveted Mangum Medal, a prize awarded for the best oration delivered by a member of the graduating class.

Four years as a student at Chapel Hill broadened his vision and stimulated and encouraged in him a desire and determination to live a dedicated life. Passing years never diminished his love for his alma mater or his devotion to the memory of helpful, understanding professors who pointed the way in the search for truth.

He loved the University of North Carolina with passion and was never happier than when in its service. Years later, in recognition of his interest in it, he was chosen as president of the alumni association of the University of North Carolina, and in 1945, as a member of the board of trustees of the consolidated University of North Carolina; and when elected governor he became ex officio chairman of the board of trustees.

He is recognized by the university as one of the brightest jewels in the crown placed upon it by its many distinguished and illustrious sons and daughters.

The fall after his graduation he taught school in Kinston, N. C., until our entry into World War I, when he responded to the call to arms and entered the first officers training camp at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., where he was commissioned a second lieutenant. He was assigned to the 317th Machinegun Battalion, a part of the 81st or "Wildcat" Division, and served overseas. He was separated from the service in March 1919.

After his discharge from the Army he studied law at Trinity College (now Duke University) under Dean S. F. Mordecai, and was licensed to practice law by the Supreme Court in August 1920. In July 1921 he began to practice in Durham and soon took high place with the leaders in the profession.

In 1922 he made his first entry into politics. In the spring of that year, he and two other young lawyers engaged in a spirited contest for the nomination of prosecuting attorney of the Durham County Recorder's Court. Umstead was an easy winner and was elected that fall and again in 1924. In his bid for public office, he early demonstrated his popularity with the voters of Durham County.

So well did he perform the duties of the office of the prosecuting attorney, that when he sought the nomination for solicitor of the 10th judicial district, the voters rewarded him by nominating and electing him to a new position of trust and responsibility. He brought to the office of solicitor rare ability. He was skillful and adroit in the examination of witnesses, and in his argument before the jury, he was forceful and convincing. He was loved and respected by the judges, was popular with court officials and jurors, and his brethren of the bar had implicit confidence in every word he said.

He was happily married to Miss Merle Davis, of Rutherfordton, N. C., on the 5th day of September 1929. This union was blessed with a beautiful daughter, Merle Bradley, who from her birth was an ever-increasing source of pleasure and inspiration to her parents.

In 1932 Mr. Umstead was elected to the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District. He soon took high rank in Congress. He was a tireless and indefatigable worker. No detail of his office, however insignificant, escaped his individual attention. He was vitally interested in legislation as it affected the AAA, Farm Home Administration, rural electrification, and soil conservation. He succeeded in obtaining appropriations for greatly enlarging the facilities at the tobacco experiment station at Oxford, N. C., for the study of tobacco diseases. As a direct result of the studies made at the experiment station at Oxford, a new variety of wilt-resistant tobacco has been developed, which has resulted in restoring millions of dollars in value to the farms infested with tobacco wilt.

Probably the most conspicuous and outstanding service rendered by him while in Congress was as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy Department. In 1936, after the bill providing for appropriations for the Navy had been prepared and introduced, Mr. Carey, Congressman from Kentucky, who was then chairman of the subcommittee, died. Within 2 days thereafter Umstead was asked to handle the bill on the floor of the House. He immediately familiarized himself with the intricate and involved provisions of the bill and secured its passage. For two succeeding terms he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, had in charge the preparation and introduction of bills, and led the fight on the floor of the House for their passage.

After serving in Congress for 6 years, he voluntarily retired from public life and returned to Durham, where he again engaged in the practice of law.

In the spring of 1944 former Governor Gregg Cherry persuaded him to manage his campaign for governor. In the primary, Cherry was nominated and Umstead was then asked to accept the chairmanship of the State Democratic Executive Committee, which position he held until his resignation in November 1946.

When Senator Josiah William Bailey died in December 1946, Governor Cherry appointed Mr. Umstead as United States Senator to fill Senator Bailey's unexpired term, and he once more resumed the role of legislator, and his services in the Senate were characterized by the same qualities of statesmanship he had exhibited while a Member of the House.

He was a candidate to succeed himself in the spring of 1948. He was opposed for the nomination by the Honorable J. Melville Broughton, a greatly beloved former governor. After a spirited and hotly contested campaign, conducted by both candidates in keeping with the dignity of the office to which they aspired, Governor Broughton won by a relatively small majority. This was the first and only defeat Umstead ever met with in his political career.

In the campaign no bitterness was engendered. Umstead gracefully bowed to the will of the majority of the Democratic voters in the primary, and entered into the campaign in the fall of 1948 with as much enthusiasm, and campaigned as vigorously for Broughton's election, as if he himself had been the candidate. He had lost the nomination for the Senate in the spring of 1948, but he captured the hearts of the Democrats of North Carolina in the fall of 1948. He had exhibited that fine spirit of sportsmanship that challenges the admiration of friend and foe alike.

When Congress adjourned in the fall of 1948, Senator Umstead resumed the practice of law in Durham. However, he was not to remain in private life long.

In the spring of 1952 the Democrats of North Carolina chose him as their candidate for governor. His nomination for governor was overwhelmingly ratified by the people in the fall of 1952. More than 700,000 voters chose William Umstead to chart the course of the State for the next 4 uncertain years. They did so because of their confidence in his vision, his sincerity, and his incorruptible integrity.

People rejoiced that he had again been called to high service. They knew that he would take office, free and uncommitted, and that when the commission as Governor of the State of North Carolina and the great seal of the Commonwealth were delivered to him they would be received by clean hands. They knew also that when the term of his office to which he had been elected had expired, they would be returned untarnished to the people who gave them.

He was inaugurated as governor on the 8th day of January 1953. The transition from plowboy and driver of a sand wagon to prosecuting attorney of the recorder's court of Durham County, solicitor of the 10th judicial district, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, United States Senate, and Governor of North Carolina, came as a deserved reward for arduous, patient, intelligent, unremitting toil.

Within 2 days after Governor Umstead's inauguration he was stricken with a serious heart attack. For nearly 2 years, against ever-increasing odds, he carried on, part of the time from a sickbed in Watts Hospital, at Durham, and part of the time from a sickroom in the mansion in Raleigh. Twice after his first attack he was hospitalized. Against the advice of physicians and friends, a dogged determination drove him to the continued discharge of his duties and responsibilities as governor. Although he was under the constant threat of death, he continued his fight to carry out the promises he had made to the people of the State of North Carolina. Finally his frail body broke under the continued strain, and on early Sunday morning, November 7, 1954, he quietly passed into the Great Beyond. He had answered the call, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He had literally given his life in the performance of the duties he had assumed on becoming governor.

His death came as a stunning blow and cast a shadow over the entire State; men and women from every walk of life mourned the loss of North Carolina's first citizen. Flags were at halfmast all over the State. North Carolina wept. Beautiful funeral services conducted from Trinity Methodist Church in Durham were attended by vast throngs of friends from throughout the State. Streets and highways were crowded with men, women, and children, who stood with bowed heads and heavy hearts as they watched in silence the long funeral procession as it wound its way to the last resting place of Durham County's favorite son. He was buried in the cemetery at Mount Tabor Methodist Church, in Mangum Township, near his father and mother, on an elevation overlooking the scenes of his early childhood.

The story of William Umstead's life, is not told by a recital of the number of offices he held or the honors he received; it is only partially told by the things that he did in the public view. Many beautiful things have been written, and many beautiful things have been spoken of him, but nothing has been written and nothing has been said that is more beautiful than the life he lived.

It is worthwhile to live the kind of life William Umstead lived. His life was one of devoted service. It will always be an example and inspiration to generations yet unborn. He had a sublime Christian faith that found expression in his early connection with the church, his constant attendance upon its services, and his interpretation of the truths of the Bible as Sunday school teacher, his service to the church as steward and as chairman of its official board. This faith was the compass by which he charted his course, his anchor when the storms of life beat about him. It sustained and comforted him in all the vicissitudes of life.

By nature he was modest and retiring. He never claimed credit for things done by others. He was open, frank, and fair in all his relations in life. He adopted and applied to his own conduct the principle announced in the golden rule. The same high standards that governed his private life were strictly adhered to by him in public life. He was a man of charming and engaging personality, a delightful companion with a keen sense of humor, and warmth of friendship that bound men to him. At times he was stern, severe, and exacting, but only in regard to obligations to be discharged and duties to be performed. He applied the same rigid rule to his own conduct with respect to these matters that he exacted of others.

Governor Umstead was a man of the finest character and ability. He was sincere, courageous, loyal, dependable, honest, just, genuine, and patriotic. He worked unceasingly at whatever his hands found to do. He never sought to avoid the hard places or shift to the shoulders of others unpleasant duties. He hated sham and pretense and despised hypocrites and demagogues. He regarded men who would stoop to mislead the people for political advantage as public enemies. He would have chosen defeat at any time in preference to compromise. His public and private life was unblemished.

He had great capacity for friendship; the lives of many have been enriched by the charm of his friendship, and in their hearts his immortality will abide.

His death has brought to those of us who loved and labored with him through the years that are gone, an aching void that cannot be filled.

The Commonwealth is richer that he lived; it is poorer that he is gone.

While it is true that a man's life and the measure of its usefulness are not gauged by the length of days that he lives, it would seem to those of us who knew and loved him best that his going was all too soon.

"The broken shaft stands by the wayside; from the base to the point of cleavage the chiseling is that of a master hand, and the size and the perfect workmanship tells to the passerby how tall and beautiful it would have been if the years had bidden to place the crown and capital upon the completed column."

Able lawyer, wise counsellor, conscientious public servant, Christian statesman—affectionate, dependable, golden-hearted friend—God rest his gentle soul.

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the hearings on the proposed bills to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have now been completed. It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will be able to report a bill along the lines of the proposals contained in S. 1794, the amendments sponsored by myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

During the past few weeks, I have received a large number of communications from all parts of the United States urging speedy action on these amendments, along the lines proposed in my bill, and also those contained in S. 2113, introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], in conformity with the recommendations by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a selected group of the letters and resolutions I have received urging amendments to the Refugee Act be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTAMONT, N. Y., *June 16, 1955.*
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that you give your heartiest support to the proposed changes in the immigration law now being considered. These changes are in the best interest of our country, and are a realistic approach to an urgent problem. Suggest you give an affirmative vote.

HENRY L. TOMSUDEN,
State Chairman, New York Lutheran Refugee Committee.

BETHLEHEM, PA., *May 31, 1955.*
The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEHMAN: The credit rightfully belongs to you for the current sensible proposals for the improvement of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act. If it had not been for your forthright action in denouncing the administration of the refugee program, perhaps improvement might not have been suggested.

As a volunteer worker in refugee resettlement for the Presbyterian Church of Bethlehem since 1949, I have watched the deterioration of refugee legislation and administration with alarm. Parts of the McCarran-Walter Act are not worthy of this country.

We were all heartened when Mr. Corsi made his charges, for they were so true. The red tape is endless. Almost 1 year ago our Presbyterian committee sent in completed assurances for 2 families and still we have no definite word as to when any of these refugees will reach here. I do hope that changes in legislation may expedite Mr. McLeod's administration of the act. Please commend Mr. Corsi for his brave criticism of the handling of the refugee program and his courage to speak out against Mr. Walter's narrow views.

I hope that this country can continue to produce more men like Mr. Corsi, Mr. CELLER and yourself, who stand for fairness and equality. Your support of Mr. Eisenhower's long-range, excellent plans is commendable. Your approbation shows a keen understanding of the world's needs today. Your decisions are not based on partisanship but on what best serves the interests of the whole Nation.

In this connection, the legislative groups of the American Association of University Women and the Public Affairs group of the YWCA have all discussed the foreign-aid program. May we urge you not to let the Senate whittle any of the sum from the foreign military-and-economic aid plan.

I continue to be an enthusiastic backer of yours.

Very truly yours,
RUTH B. WISE
Mrs. Frederick Wise.

AVON, MASS., *June 11, 1955.*
Senator LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Am in accord with your bill amending Refugee Act so program will be speeded up.

REV. J. NORMAN CARLSON,
Massachusetts Lutheran Refugee Committee.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT CHAPTER,
AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (AVC),
Bronx, N. Y., June 11, 1955.
The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Chapter, American Veterans Committee, urges you to continue the fight for legislation to replace the McCarran-Walter Act and to vote for amendments to the Refugee Act of 1953 in order that fair immigration laws can be established.

We know that you are always in the forefront in all fights for liberal legislation, and really this letter should not be necessary, but we felt that we would like to go on record, telling you how we feel about this situation.

Very truly yours,
HARRY DAILES,
Executive Secretary.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 10, 1955.
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: We have just read with great interest your speech of April 25 introducing important and greatly needed amendments to the Relief Act of 1953.

Friends and others have been greatly handicapped in their efforts under the present law and administration. We want to express our approval and encouragement of your efforts.

Yours very truly,
MILDRED and NORMAN WHITNEY.

SYRACUSE POLISH COMMUNITY, INC.,
Syracuse, N. Y., June 21, 1955.
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: At the special meeting of the board of directors of the Syracuse Polish Community, Inc., held on Friday, June 17, 1955, at the Syracuse Polish Home, 915 Park Ave., Syracuse, N. Y., the resolution was unanimously adopted urging your support to the 10th-point recommendation made by the President Eisenhower to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

In order that well-merited preference can be given to honorably discharged veterans of the Polish Army and other allied soldiers that fought side by side with American Forces in World War II.

This matter is of great concern to us and your cooperation is urgently requested. Your efforts in this matter will be greatly remembered by us.

Respectfully,
WALTER L. SZCZEPANEH,
President, Syracuse Polish Community Home, Inc.
ALMA H. BOND,
Secretary, Syracuse Polish Community Home, Inc.

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR
AMENDING THE MCCARRAN-
WALTER ACT,
New York, N. Y., June 24, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: On June 9, 1955, a protest meeting against the McCarran-Walter law was held at Carnegie Hall in this city. The speakers were Edward Corsi, Senator Richard Neuberger, Congressman Victor Anfuso, Harold Riegelman, Luigi Antonini, Louis Hollander, Judge Thomas Dickens, and Judge Dorothy Kenyon. The enclosed resolution was unanimously approved by the meeting of over 2,500 persons.

The following is a partial list of the sponsoring organizations of this meeting: Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; Americans for Democratic Action; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Veterans Committee; Association of Catholic Trade Unionists; B'nai B'rith metropolitan council; Community Church of New York, social action committee; Cooks, Hotel and Restaurant Union, Local 89, AFL; Council for Community Action; District 65, Retail and Distributive Union, CIO; Ethical Culture Society, committee on discrimination; Government and Civic Employees Union, CIO; Hadassah; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL; Italian-American Labor Council; Italian Clockmakers, Local 48, AFL; Italian Evangelical Society for Relief to Italy; Italian Ministerial Association; Jamaica BWI Progressive League; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans; Musicians Union, Local 802, AFL; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York branch; New York Board of Rabbis; New York Teachers Guild, AFL; Palanese Club; Retail Drug Employees, Local 1199, CIO; United Furniture Workers, CIO; United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union, AFL; United Hebrew Trades; United Shoe Workers, CIO, Joint Council 13; Workmen's Circle.

We respectfully urge you to do all in your power to fulfill the spirit of the enclosed resolution.

Very truly yours,
COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR AMENDING
THE MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT.

RESOLULION

Whereas there are gathered on this 9th day of June 1955 in Carnegie Hall in the city of New York several thousand people representing persons of all faiths, creeds, and color, including official representation of over 50 major religious, civic labor, philanthropic and educational organizations, and as such believe we can speak for our fellow Americans who are wholehearted adherents to the highest principles in our American tradition; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned and alarmed by the discriminatory, unjust and inhumane immigration laws which have been enacted in recent years which have caused harm to our people and to our prestige abroad; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, speaking individually and for the Republican Party, and former President Truman, speaking individually and as a leader of the Democratic Party, along with numerous other major political leaders have all publicly called for the removal of the inequities and discriminatory features of our present immigration laws; and

Whereas the administration of the Refugee Relief Act under the Security Division of the State Department has become a public scandal and has required that President Eisenhower offer amendments intended to correct some of the defects in this act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act are welcome as far as they go but the dominant necessity requires that the administration of this act which is intended to be humanitarian be removed from the control of security officers who have neither the experience nor interest to see that it will benefit those for whom it was intended; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon Congress to hold immediate and public hearings on all bills which revise, amend, or repeal the McCarran-Walter Act, and to promptly enact an immigration and naturalization law which removes all vestiges of racial and national bias and violations of principles of fair play and justice which are evils basic in the McCarran-Walter law.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS,
New York, N. Y., June 13, 1955.
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am enclosing a copy of the resolutions adopted at our annual delegate meeting in San Francisco, May 29, 1955.

I am also enclosing a copy of our immigration resolution adopted in 1954 as I thought you would like to have both these resolutions along with the Open Door for Newcomers to use in connection with your recommendations for the liberalization of the Refugee Relief Act.

We indeed commend you for your forthright fight on housing legislation last week and you will be interested to know what we have said on that subject.

Sincerely yours,
FERN M. COLBORN,
Secretary, Social Education and Action.

IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

1. The United States immigration laws should be revised to reflect America's traditional belief in nondiscriminatory justice, and equality of opportunities. This calls for—

Elimination of the national origins quota system based on accident of birth, and substituting one comprehensive quota, based on reunion of families, right of asylum, domestic and foreign policy considerations.

Abolition of distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens.

Fair hearing procedures in exclusion and deportation cases.

2. The Departments of State and Justice should review their procedures, set up to implement the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with the aim of simplifying the procedures and encouraging the admission of refugees, in accordance with the objectives of the law. Provision should be made for group or agency sponsorship of refugees, in addition to the present individual sponsorships.

3. The United States Government should encourage more activity by the United Nations on the problems of refugees and surplus populations with a view toward minimizing barriers to the movement of people, simplifying immigration procedures, speeding the absorption process, and the general support and coordination of governmental efforts, in these directions. This will require also, appropriations to the United Nations for the resettlement of refugees in countries other than the United States.

THE OPEN DOOR FOR NEWCOMERS

The American way of life is based on principles contained in the preamble to the Constitution. These principles have made our country great. They are essential to the national welfare, to the maintenance of our democratic traditions, and to our position of leadership in the world. They include a recognition of the essential equality of human beings regardless of race, color, national origin, religious differences, economic status, or sex. All of us strive to implement these principles in our settlements and as individual citizens.

Because we recognize that national policy must be consonant with the principles in which we believe we specifically urge the following courses of action:

1. Modification of administrative regulations which prevent the speedy implementation of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

2. Revision of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 (McCarran-Walter Act) to reflect our faith in equal justice and equal opportunities for all.

3. Encouragement of fair-employment practices, both through legislation and moral suasion, and of equal educational and social opportunities for all, regardless of origin.

RETURN OF SENATOR GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks on the Big Four meeting, which is the subject of the address I desire to deliver this morning, I wish to express my deep gratification that once again the President pro tempore, the Senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is occupying the chair. I express my pleasure in having him with us again, and I am sure my colleagues are likewise delighted that he has returned.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 10 minutes, on the subject of the coming Big Four meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this summer has already been marked by one great milestone in history, namely, the United Nations tenth anniversary celebration. In 1 week, another historic event will take place. I refer to the coming Big Four Conference at Geneva. It will mark the first such conference in 10 years. It is the hope of millions of people around the globe that these two events may represent the beginning of a new, more hopeful and more successful era in the struggle for a better and more peaceful world.

As the opposing sides in the cold war of the last 10 years increase in power and armed might, and as new and more horrible nuclear weapons are perfected, so the urge to find some way to resolve international disputes by peaceful means grows ever stronger. It is the will of the people that the leaders of the world renew with all the vigor and imagination at their command their efforts to improve world relations and thereby lessen the ghastly prospect of nuclear destruction.

In the hearts and minds of men, there is new hope, accompanied by a powerful sense of urgency. The people seem to have refortified their conviction that in this great civilization of ours, there exist the genius and the power to prevent another war, the ability to keep this planet from going up in flames and smoke.

The Communists are aware that these feelings are charged with emotion. Their recent concessions and partial reversals and their new concentrated peace offensive are no doubt intended to play on the new yearning for peace which is stirring so strongly both here and abroad.

We do not know what this change in tactics by the Russians really means. We have learned to be very cautious in jumping to conclusions as to the motives of the men in the Kremlin. We must continue to be cautious. And above all we must continue to be strong.

It would be sheer folly to conclude that the Russians have changed their overall, long-range objective of world domination. But what they may be demonstrating is a new flexibility, which we have not seen in their actions since the end of World War II.

By this new, peaceful tack, the Communists hope to destroy the unity of the Western Powers and to neutralize as many non-Communist nations as possible. Ultimately they no doubt desire to eliminate democratic influence in Europe and Asia. In the short run, their new offensive is designed to divide and confuse the members of the Western Alliance.

It is vitally important at this time that all of us realize that the Communist ends have not changed. Furthermore, we are far from sure, in fact, that their means have changed. Future deeds will be necessary before we can be convinced of any real change. But having recognized these facts of international life, we can move forward with confidence, and without fear.

The actual results of the new offensive by the Soviets may be very different from those intended by the Russians. We must be prepared to look at these Communist moves in a more positive light. Of course there are new dangers, but there are also new signs of hope and greater opportunities for the West. As the Wall Street Journal has commented:

> A significant change in Soviet behavior is at least as full of opportunities for Western diplomats as it is of dangers.

The editorial went on to say that:

> While the Soviets may not sincerely want peace, they may have come to acquire a genuine fear of atomic war. Surely it is only commonsense that any such advantage for the West be pressed to the limit.

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, when the Senate was debating at some length various questions concerning the coming Geneva meeting, I was, unfortunately, absent. Therefore I wish to take this opportunity to give my complete support to President Eisenhower in the approach he has been taking toward the Big Four Conference. He has rightfully combined his expressions of hope and his determination to make progress toward real peace with words of caution and with the warning that we must not for 1 minute let our guard down. Our successes in the past few years in the cold war have been the result to a large degree of our ability to deal with world communism from a position of strength. The foundation of this strength is our military preparedness and our unity with our allies and friends throughout the world. We must not allow this position of strength and unity to be weakened. At the same time, we must support the President and Secretary Dulles in their determination to explore every honorable approach in our efforts to achieve real peace.

Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on two schools of thought which have developed concerning the Geneva Conference.

I have been greatly disturbed to find that there are some in America and abroad who do not appear to understand clearly the character of the coming Big Four Conference. The President has repeated several times, and on July 6 at his press conference he reiterated, that at the coming short meeting of the heads of state we shall not attempt to reach any substantive decisions. This conference is not going to negotiate any settlements. Its purpose is exploratory conversations to identify those world problems which today are the causes of world unrest, fear, and tension.

Mr. President, the original May 10 note of the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States proposing a meeting with the Soviet leaders made very clear what the purpose of the Conference would be.

I quote excerpts from the tripartite note which was delivered to the Soviet Foreign Ministry in Moscow. The three Western Powers said:

> We recognize that the solution of these problems will take time and patience. They will not be solved at a single meeting nor in a hasty manner. Indeed, any effort to do so could set back real progress toward their settlement.

The note went on to describe in the following words the character of the proposed Conference:

> In the limited time for which the heads of Government could meet, they would not undertake to agree upon substantive answers to the major difficulties facing the world. Such a meeting could, however, provide a new impetus by establishing the basis for the detailed work which will be required.
>
> For this purpose the heads of Government could devote themselves to formulating the issues to be worked on and to agreeing on methods to be followed in exploring solutions.

Again, on May 17, in his televised report to the President and the Cabinet, Secretary of State Dulles described in similar terms the purpose of the Geneva Conference. He said:

> We are to meet to try to find new paths, a new approach, new procedures, for solving some of these problems * * * and you (referring to the President) will not attempt yourself to solve them. * * * The heads of government, great as they are, are not going to be able to get together for 3 or 4 days, and find a substantial solution for some of these problems that have defied solution for so many years, or even for so many generations. * * *

This has been our consistent position with regard to the type of conference to be held next week, and there is no reason for any confusion about it.

A second school of thought has developed concerning the Geneva Conference. There are some in America, who, because of past mistakes and unfortunate experiences, oppose the idea of our going to Geneva this summer, on the ground that we shall inevitably come out on the losing side, that we shall be tricked, that because of our supposed naivete we shall fall victims to Communist shrewdness and skulduggery.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not believe that this will happen. If we remain strong militarily, if we in America remain unified, if we maintain our unity of purpose with our friends abroad, I believe we can go to Geneva with considerable confidence. I am not willing to admit that the Russians are better diplomats than we are.

The burden of the present arms race is a heavy one for us, but it is likewise a heavy one for the people of Soviet Russia. It may be that the Soviet leaders realize, as we realize, that domestic problems cannot be handled as effectively when nuclear war remains so great a threat.

In his television report to the President on May 17, to which I referred earlier, the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, demonstrated that the recent Russian moves have not in any way blinded him. On this point Mr. Dulles said:

> I don't think for a minute that they have got religion, or have been converted; but it just may be, as a practical matter, they may think they can get along better by conforming to some of these rules and practices which normally govern a civilized community. And I think that is a possibility which is at least worth exploring and that this meeting will give a further chance to explore it.

If progress is made at Geneva, if the Russian leaders show further signs of willingness to cooperate, it may be that the Geneva Conference will bring into motion new machinery for future discussions and possible agreements. This will take a great deal of time and patience. We must move very slowly. At Geneva, the areas of tension will be probed, and opinions will be exchanged. The people of the world who hope so fervently that progress toward real peace can be made must not be led to expect too much, too soon. The Soviets must not be permitted to distort the real purpose of this conference in the eyes of the world. It may be that the Russian propaganda machine is building a false picture of the character of this conference only to blame the Western powers if this false picture is shattered. We must not permit the Russians to pose as the only apostles of peace. Moving slowly and cautiously we may eventually obtain some further assurance against the immediate threat of war.

The President has expressed his hope that over a period of time progress will be made toward disarmament. We must—and I believe we are—putting new energy into studying all possible approaches to disarmament. Many suggestions over the years have been made. The pros and cons of all these proposals must be restudied and revalued.

As the President pointed out in his news conference, it is difficult to know whether world tension can be reduced before any disarmament may be considered, or vice versa.

The present causes of international tension are of various degrees of importance and difficulty. If we can make some progress in dealing with the smaller problems, the larger ones may be easier to solve.

It is vital that better mutual understanding between the people of Soviet Russia and the people of the West be further developed. Without this people-to-people contact we cannot even identify the areas of disagreement. This, indeed, is perhaps the first purpose of the Geneva meeting.

It is my belief that greatly stepped up exchanges of parliamentary, cultural, educational, journalistic, and agricultural delegations between Soviet Russia and the Western Powers would be most beneficial, and might eventually make it more possible to reach agreement in more basic areas of international tension.

On July 5 there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor a very excellent editorial on this subject entitled "People to People." The editorial recites some of the recent examples of Soviet-American exchange of cultural, sports and farmer groups and concludes:

> It is, of course, possible to expect too much from an exchange of tourists. Contact sometimes can engender friction instead of friendship. But the opening up of channels of communication from people to people is bound to have some salutary effect, even where a government so repressive as that of the Soviet Union is concerned.

Mr. President, as the administration prepares for the coming talks at Geneva, it is important that the American people understand the absolute necessity for maintaining patience and unity and for having confidence in our President and his advisers. We need to be reminded that exploratory conversations, if conducted with honor and from strength, are never an evil thing.

I believe we should back up President Eisenhower completely in his inspired efforts. This body has recently demonstrated its faith in him overwhelmingly.

We must not hope for too much from Geneva, but we also must not expect too little. We must be ever cautious, but not afraid. Maintaining our strength and our unity, we can look toward the coming months with hope, with renewed determination, and with a growing confidence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 5, to which I have referred, and an editorial from the New York Times of July 1, 1955, entitled "Americans in Moscow," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 5, 1955]

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

Sailing from New York after his 2-week visit to the United States for the 10th United Nations anniversary, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov had this to say:

"We have become convinced that here in the United States as well as in the Soviet Union there are many people—very many people—who wish the peoples to live together in peace and amity."

Mr. Molotov could accurately have gone further. He could have said that the overwhelming majority of the American people deeply wish lasting peace between their country and the Soviet Union.

Such a recognition would have had its counterpart in a remark made frequently among Americans in conversation. It runs to some such general effect as, "If we could just talk to the Russian people, we'd find that they don't want war either."

This careful distinction between people and government has more point in a dictatorship such as imposed by the Communists than in a country which has free and frequent national elections. Even Communist propaganda has been asute enough to attribute preventive war talk to certain groups rather than to either the American public or its responsible officials.

The remark of Mr. Molotov, however pro forma, gains weight from the fact that in this era of relaxed tensions more and more contacts are taking place not merely between Soviet and American officials but also between everyday citizens of Russia and the United States.

These contacts, however limited, are breeding mutual understanding. A huge young fellow, Paul Anderson, from Georgia, member of an American team of weight lifters, has made quite an impression in Moscow by raising a bar bell weighing over 400 pounds. The manager of an American chess team delighted his Russian hosts by a speech, alternately humorous and serious, ending with a prayer "that Russians and Americans for the next 10,000 years meet in combat no greater than chess."

In Iowa preparations are going forward for entertaining a delegation of 12 farmers from the Soviet Union who are coming to the United States at the suggestion of the Des Moines Register to observe methods of raising corn and hogs. In fact they will also see several other States. A similar group of American farmers will visit the Soviet Union.

Four Baptist Church officials plan to go to Russia in August, and the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America is studying the possibility of sending a deputation. A group of Quaker businessmen already are in the Soviet Union exchanging pointers on merchandising.

As of last year, the number of American visitors to the Soviet Union was almost twice as great as the number of Soviet visitors (27) received in the United States. It is to be hoped that new arrangements can be made for a visit of Russian student editors under better auspices than that which broke down over the issue of fingerprinting.

It is, of course, possible to expect too much from an exchange of tourists. Contact sometimes can engender friction instead of friendship. But the opening up of channels of communication from people to people is bound to have some salutary effect, even where a government so repressive as that of the Soviet Union is concerned.

[From the New York Times of July 1, 1955]

AMERICANS IN MOSCOW

An unusual number of Americans have been in Moscow recently. A few days ago a team of our topnotch weightlifters performed feats of strength to win the plaudits of the Soviet man in the street. Now our chess players—underdogs, but undismayed—are displaying American skill at the other end of the competitive spectrum.

This is all to the good, but it would be a pity if weightlifting and chess should exhaust American-Soviet contacts. Why can't Muscovites see Americans in Porgy and Bess, Oklahoma, or similar attractions? The Metropolitan Opera Co. might show the Bolshoi Theater troupe a thing or two about how to present Carmen or Tosca if given the chance. The number of stellar American cultural and athletic performers who could give Soviet audiences a sample of our attainments is virtually limitless if political and economic barriers can be removed.

Cultural and sports exchange is not a one-way street, of course. It would be a pleasure to watch the Moscow ballet and its performers like Ulanova dance here in New York. If David Oistrakh, the Soviet violin virtuoso, were to perform in Carnegie Hall there would be no lack of eager listeners, we are sure. Such examples could be multiplied.

Such exchange need not be justified on political grounds. Outstanding talent in any field is a rare commodity and all of us are the gainers by the opportunity to watch such talent in action, regardless of the national origins of the persons possessing this talent. Let us hope that the beginnings made to date will be expanded, and that the Soviet Iron Curtain—which has hindered such exchanges to date—will hinder them no longer.

NEGOTIATING THE ATOM—III

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, last Thursday I spoke briefly on the dangers and possibilities of the coming Big Four Conference in Geneva. It seems to me that the greatest danger lies in the deep desire of the American people for peace, which may lead us to give up too much, too easily, in return for too little. There is danger in optimism.

To be specific, there is danger that we may trade away our present atomic superiority without getting an adequate return. There is little danger that we will do this if we have a clear picture of the morals of strategic bombing.

The real brutalization of war took place before Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It took place when it was decided to win the war by killing defenseless men, women, and children by destroying the cities in which they lived. When the Germans bombed London and Coventry, when the Allies bombed Frankfort and Berlin, when we set Tokyo aflame with napalm, that was the time when war lost the last traces of humanity and became baldly bestial. The A-bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were merely more efficient forms of bestiality.

Let us not negotiate bestiality. Let us say unilaterally that we will not resort to the bombing of civilian populations except in reprisal for bombing by planes or guided missiles of allied or neutral centers of population. Let us publicly and unilaterally wipe this bestiality off our strategic plans.

By all means let us retain as our policy the tactical delivery by appropriate means of atomic war-heads on troop concentrations, communications, and supply depots. This is our counterbalance to the immense land forces which the Soviet Government has at its disposal. This is the means by which the threatened overrunning of western Europe can be arrested. It would be folly to trade away the safety of our European allies. Tactical use of atomic weapons must be retained until the whole mechanism of modern war has been liquidated in universal, controlled disarmament.

The possibility of using our tactical atomic superiority in political negotiation has been intelligently discussed by Colonel Leghorn, a Reserve Air Force officer. My fellow Senators are urged to read his article on that subject in the U. S. News & World Report for January 28 last.

Meanwhile, let us not negotiate away our atomic superiority for anything less than universal, complete, controlled disarmement.

Lord Bertrand Russell, Professor Einstein, and other scientists were right in emphasizing the horrors of atomic warfare in their manifesto published last Sunday. In my judgment, and in the judgment of many others besides, they were naive in urging agreements to end atomic warfare. Their and our end purpose is the same—universal, controlled disarmament. The road to this does not lie through an agreement to weaken ourselves vis-a-vis the Soviet. It lies by way of cooperative, balanced, progressive, planned disarmament.

DISPOSITION OF ATOMIC WASTE MATERIAL

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this morning an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald stated that the Atomic Energy Commission has announced a proposed set of rules to govern the disposition of atomic waste material to provide protection against radiation. These proposed regulations are to be discussed at a conference with representatives of State Governors at a meeting here in Washington this week.

The necessity of providing the most careful regulations for disposition of atomic waste cannot be overemphasized. Among the proposed regulations is one to authorize burial of atomic waste in a minimum of 6,000 feet of water. Before any such regulation is put into effect, I believe a very careful study should be made to make certain that if containers of such waste should escape from moorings in the future that the water would not be poisoned or fish contaminated. The Atomic Energy Commission should move very slowly in any matter of this type. There should be no possibility of atomic waste material which is still radioactive endangering our people or wildlife.

I ask unanimous consent that the brief article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 11 on this matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEC FRAMES A-CONTRACTOR SAFETY RULES

The Atomic Energy Commission yesterday proposed a set of regulations for protection against radiation. It includes a provision that atomic waste must be buried in at least 6,000 feet of water.

The proposed regulations establish certain standards for atomic contractors in the handling and disposal of atomic matter. They are designed to protect personnel and the public against radiation hazards.

The AEC said present scientific knowledge and experience show the requirements it outlined "will provide a substantial margin of safety." The proposed regulations will not go into effect for 30 days to allow time for written suggestions from the public.

The AEC also announced it has scheduled a meeting here Wednesday and Thursday with representatives of State governors to discuss the proposed regulation. In addition, the AEC said, the meeting will go into other aspects of the atomic program.

The regulations will apply to all persons who receive, possess, use or transfer atomic matter under a license from the AEC.

The regulations state that atomic waste cannot be disposed of except with specific authorization of the AEC. If the waste material is to be "disposed by burial at sea," it must be "taken to a depth of 1,000 fathoms or more" and buried so it will not rise to the surface.

Burial on land must be at a depth of at least 4 feet, in land devoid of edible plant life and not subject to erosion, and suitably marked and protected against unauthorized entry.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRICE OF NATURAL GAS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the official position of the State of Michigan in the matter of Federal regulation of the price of natural gas in the field entering interstate commerce is expressed in a letter from the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, to the Chairmen of the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees. I wish to call it to the attention of the honorable Members of the Senate for their consideration. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram to me from Governor Williams expressing his firm opposition to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 23, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: The Michigan Public Service Commission, after careful consideration, has concluded that it is against the interest of the people of Michigan to have any legislation passed to seek to divorce rates of natural-gas producers from the Federal regulatory process. This letter is to support that position and to bring this information to your attention as the position of the State of Michigan in this matter.

It has long since been determined that the natural-gas business is one affected by the public interest and it has been regulated as such. The State of Michigan, home and industrial users, have for many years purchased natural gas extensively. In 1954, interstate pipelines brought nearly 200 million thousand cubic feet of natural gas into the State of Michigan. The cost of this at present rates to the Michigan utilities is payment of over $50 million to the pipelines. If the cost of gas to the pipelines is raised even slightly, the impact on Michigan consumers is tremendous.

Naturally, the State cannot remain unconcerned inasmuch as this is a business traditionally concerned with the public interest. As a consequence, it is sincerely hoped that the Congress and Senate will see fit to continue regulation of natural-gas producers at the source as being in the general public interest.

This letter, it is known, arrives late in your deliberations, but is merely to confirm the position already long since taken by the Michigan Public Service Commission and several of the cities of this State.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

LANSING, MICH., *July 5, 1955.*

Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following wire was sent to Frank Bane, director, Council of State Governments: Without seeing the specific grant provisions of the compromise highway bill now before the House Committee on Public Works, I cannot comment on them, but I am unalterably opposed to any increase in Federal gas tax. Federal Government should leave this tax to the State—not increase it.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor of Michigan.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American people have come to expect to hear good sense from Adlai Stevenson. Thus it came as no surprise when, in his recent address to 15,000 members of the National Education Association meeting in Chicago, Governor Stevenson placed into clear focus the dimensions of the problems now facing public education in our country and offered constructive suggestions for facing up to those problems. We have learned to expect nothing less from Mr. Stevenson.

As the former Governor of Illinois, one of the most populous States, Adlai Stevenson spoke from years of experience with the task of reconciling the needs of education and the resources available to local government to meet those needs. He knows that public education, always jealously guarded as a function of States and local communities, has become the most important single public service for which those communities are now responsible.

Mr. President, I have recently come to the Senate from several years of experience with State government in a State which has struggled conscientiously, and on the whole successfully, with the task of providing for the education of its children. It is a great responsibility to help determine the future of the generations of boys and girls who are America's most precious resource and it is a responsibility which the teachers and the superintendents and the local school boards and State boards of education know how to discharge well—when they have the means with which to do the job. But right now, in many instances, they do not have the means. Governor Stevenson faced facts when he said that the need for new sources of revenue for the schools "is not a matter of opinion or of politics. It is a matter of plain arithmetic, and it is a matter of necessity."

Public finance is a dull subject, and surely many people have not stopped to figure out why education has outgrown the local tax resources on which it has depended. Yet the answer is not difficult. The kinds of taxes which increase proportionately with population and production—especially the income tax—belong primarily to the Federal and some State governments. And, as Mr. Stevenson pointed out, the property taxes on which our school districts have depended do not rise in step with population and community income. Add to that the fact that during this decade we have been blessed with the greatest continued growth in the number of new children reaching school age each year, and it becomes plain that unless new financing for school expansion is found very soon, public education will face a real crisis in many school systems throughout the country.

These facts have been widely studied and discussed for several years, and they are known to the Eisenhower administration. Yet that administration has recommended, in effect, that the school districts of the several States be thrown back on their own inadequate tax resources. The Eisenhower proposal carries the grandiose tag of a $7 billion school expansion program. But to meet that recognized $7 billion need the administration proposes only a Federal contribution of $220 million over 3 years, plus loans—not grants, but loans—of another $900 million; and these funds would be available almost exclusively to school districts too poor to interest the bankers. Mr. Stevenson strikingly pointed up the inadequacy of this gesture when he said that the President "recommended that Congress pass not a law but a miracle. For meeting this $7 billion need the President proposed grants of $66 million a year for 3 years. This is 33 cents a year to meet every $35 of admitted present, crying need."

As of the lending proposals, Mr. President, the school officials of the majority of States have made it clear that they will not be helped by any plan that urges them to extend further their indebtedness, to which their tax resources will not be equal.

In view of the obvious inadequacy of this so-called program, it is not surprising that we have heard little more about it recently, and that instead we are now to await another conference to discuss the problem once more. The futility of waiting for such another conference, however useful it may otherwise be, was pointed out by an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday, July 8, 1955, which praises Governor Stevenson's proposal that an adequate percentage of our annually increasing tax revenues be allocated to education until we have caught up with our children's needs. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Adlai Stevenson's address on Wednesday night to the National Education Association is a political tract in the best sense of the term. Sober, factual, and constructive, it lends strong support to Federal aid to education, which the President has included in the list of must legislation which he submitted to Congress; at the same time it makes effective political capital out of the President's failure so far to accomplish anything in behalf of Federal aid to education. Instead of the prompt, effective help to the public-school system which President Eisenhower promised when he took office, we still await a conference on education to be held at the White House next fall.

A White House conference will no doubt be useful in affording a forum for the exchange of ideas on a variety of educational problems. But how little it is neded as a basis for determining the urgency of Federal aid is plainly demonstrated by Mr. Stevenson's comprehensive summary of the problem. The essential facts are all well known. As Mr. Stevenson put it:

"Six million children went to school this year in firetraps. Seven hundred thousand children are on a split-session basis and get only half-day schooling. We are currently short at least 250,000 classrooms—which is room for 7.5 million children. * * * It is generally agreed that we need 180,000 more teachers than are presently available. Yet only 70,000 qualified teachers enter the profession each year. Somehow we must double the number."

These are hard facts. Mr. Stevenson is quite justified in scorning the inadequacy and deceptiveness of the administration's grudging proposals for loans for school construction—loans which, as he points out, are sufficient to cover only one-seventh of the needs the President listed and which are so hedged about with restrictions that they could never be used in any case. Mr. Stevenson himself proposes forthrightly that school needs be met by reserving a portion of the increased national income and tax revenues anticipated from the expanding American economy—by agreeing with ourselves, as he put it, to spend on education—until we have caught up with our children's needs—say, 20 percent of our Federal tax collections from our new national wealth.

This is not a subsidiary matter to be put aside until the country has better highways or until its Federal budget is in complete balance. We share Mr. Stevenson's assessment of it: "To look squarely at the issue of education is to face nothing less than the central question of whether civilization is to prove a fulfillment of divine and rational purposes—or a bitter mockery."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the meantime, teachers and parents can be glad to know that a more realistic approach to Federal aid to education is in the process of being worked out in the Congress. We may not yet know exactly what law Congress may enact. But when it comes, it is certain to be far closer to the principles proposed by Adlai Stevenson in his speech to the National Education Association.

In that speech, Mr. Stevenson gave high praise to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has long been a great champion of the cause of education. We know that this tribute was well deserved. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama will continue to give his best efforts to resolving what problems may remain in working out an equitable and effective program of Federal school aid. Although I do not have the privilege of serving on his committee, I should like him to know that I shall always be glad to lend any assistance I can toward making such a program a reality, so that boys and girls everywhere in America may have the education without which our democracy could not survive.

Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Stevenson's fine address to the National Education Association be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. An article in the New York Times of Sunday, July 10, 1955, by Mr. Benjamin Fine describes the favorable reception given Mr. Stevenson's speech. I ask that it also be printed in the RECORD, along with an article by Max K. Gilstrap, entitled "Stevenson's School Aid Plan Buoys NEA," from the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1955. Finally, an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of July 3, 1955, describes the leadership which several representative Oregon teachers have shown recently in their chosen profession. I think this editorial is appropriate in this connection, and I ask that it also be included with my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address, articles, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 9, 1955]

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S ADDRESS TO NATION'S EDUCATORS

I am grateful for your invitation to speak to you about our national educational policy. I don't feel altogether a stranger among so many school people, nor among their problems which I came to know intimately when I was Governor of Illinois. And I would be quite content if my administration in Illinois were remembered for nothing else save what was done in those years to fulfill the State's highest trust—the education of its citizens.

But if our school problems in Illinois were acute 5 years ago, they were only a reflection of a national concern which in the interval has grown still more acute. This enormous crowd here in the Chicago Stadium, which is more reminiscent of a political rally than an educational convention, is eloquent testimony that no single issue of domestic policy is more in need of clarification, public understanding, and bold action than education.

It is unfortunately true that educational inadequacy is less obvious to the naked eye than is the sight of a man out of work, of a factory shut down, or of a hungry family. Yet to look squarely at the issue of education is to face nothing less than the central question of whether civilization is to prove a fulfillment of divine and rational purpose—or a bitter mockery.

In a very real sense the central issue of education is the central issue of today: How a civilization which has reached, at least in America, unprecedented heights of material well-being and unlocked awesome secrets of the physical world is also to master the ways for preserving its spiritual and moral and intellectual values—for preserving, if you please, those very things that are the essence of civilization.

HELP PEOPLE WORK TOGETHER

In a narrower, more political sense the issue of education is how democracy can be made an instrument by which a people work together to mobilize the strength of the community to fight ignorance as effectively as we have fought every other enemy which has threatened us.

Yet crucial as these issues are, I would nevertheless emphasize, first that any discussion of education cannot be cast just in terms of national needs, or a national policy, or a national program. For education can serve the ends of democratic society only as it meets those of the individual human being. The essential condition of the system of free choice between conflicting ideas and leaders, which we call democracy, is that it be made up of all different kinds of people—which means that what we demand most of education is the development of informed people who are at the same time unique, different, unpatterned individuals. I think this means, in turn, that any national educational policy must encourage difference, experimentation, and flexibility in educational practice.

May I add that what has happened these past 2 or 3 years to make teachers think that we want our children taught only certain things in a certain way, just is not so.

It was an unprecedented historical coincidence that brought together the flames of war across the world; the atom's unlocking, and the emergence of aggressive communism that created dangers—at first not fully realized—of insidiously organized disloyalty. This coincidence of crisis induced the fever of fear, and there were unfortunately those among us who insisted on treating this fever in medieval manner by applying leeches to the bloodstreams of freedom itself. Public servants, particularly teachers, were regrettably the victims of these frightened attacks of scared people.

FEVER IS SUBSIDING

But the fever is now subsiding. We know about the precautions which are necessary against organized disloyalty, and we have also experienced the excesses of overcaution which are both unnecessary and dangerous. The Supreme Court has forthrightly rebuked the Government's abuse of education's Dr. (John R.) Peters. And the Senate has voted, despite administration opposition, to review the whole security problem.

This battle for freedom, of course, is not over—as freedom's battles are never over. But it is very important, I think, that teachers realize that America's confidence in itself is coming back after our unpleasant nightmare—and that we insist no less strongly than before that the teacher's job is to teach the way of inquiry, to prepare each generation to meet its new problems, to improve its new opportunities, to explore civilization's always new horizons, to open minds and not to close them.

A second principle underlying our national educational policy is that whatever control of public education is required should be exercised by local authorities. Our public schools take much of their strength from the millions of private citizens who are involved directly in their affairs—the boards of trustees, the parent-teachers associations, the room mothers, and all the others. Local control keeps alive continuous debate and the freedom to experiment. It insures a wholesome diversity in educational plans and practices. It helps to keep public education from becoming an instrument of stifling conformity and uniformity. Not sentimental attachment to tradition, but hardheaded good sense demands that by keeping control of education in the local community we keep the spreading branches of an ever-enlarging democracy always close to its roots.

MATTER OF PLAIN ARITHMETIC

Yet we have reached the point where the financing of education, as distinguished from its control, can no longer everywhere be taken care of entirely from local or even from State and local revenues. This is not a matter of more, or more expensive, education, nor is it a matter of opinion or of politics. It is a matter of plain arithmetic, and it is a matter of necessity.

The key fact is that by law most schools must rely very largely for their support on property taxes. But property tax revenues do not go up as the population and the community income and production go up. And the tax revenues which do rise in proportion—the income and excise taxes—have been largely taken over by the State and Federal Governments.

Our thinking about adequate financing of public education must still start from an insistence that it is first of all a responsibility of local and State governments; that they must make available the largest possible revenues to sustain our public education system. State and local governments have no higher duties and there are too many instances today of failure to do the duty courageously and imaginatively.

Yet it is obvious, overall, that some measure of assistance to public education from the Federal purse has now become necessary, and that this necessity will become increasingly acute in the next few years.

Two centuries of American history and experience testify that this need for Federal financial assistance can be met without the slightest degree of domination by the central government.

No such domination followed Congress' grant in 1785 of a section of every township in the Federal domain for the maintenance of public schools.

Nor has President Lincoln's approval of the land-grant college system resulted in Federal control.

The GI bill of rights has done great good. So has the Fulbright fellowship program. And there has been no accompanying Federal domination.

AID-TO-EDUCATION BACKERS

It seemed a fair conclusion some years ago when Senators and Representatives from both parties, notably Senators Lister Hill and Robert Taft, sponsored Government aid-to-education proposals, that there was at least to be no political division on party lines about Federal action in this field.

And in February 1953, just after he assumed office, President Eisenhower said: "Our school system demands some prompt, effective help."

Yet today, 2½ years later, when this need has become acutely critical, nothing has been done. Instead of "prompt, effective help," we await a conference on education to be held at the White House next fall. Now a conference is fine and it will dramatize the great significance of our educational system and its critical deficiencies. But it seems to me a pitifully inadequate excuse for years of doing absolutely nothing about America's No. 1 domestic needs—schools and teachers.

I do not mean to ignore the President's recommendation to Congress last February. We need, he said, $7 billion worth of new schools. But to help get them, he recommended that Congress pass not a law but a miracle. For meeting this $7 billion need, the President proposed grants of $66 million a year for 3 years. This is 33 cents a year to meet every $35 of admitted present, crying need.

The President's recommendations also included Federal loans for school construction to be repaid with interest. But the proposed amount was sufficient to cover only one-seventh of the needs the President listed, and when the fine print was read, it developed that even these loan provisions were so drawn that they could never be used.

It is, I think, interesting if disheartening to reflect that while proposing an effective grant of only $66 million a year for 3 years for school-construction aid, the President at the same time proposed a Federal grant for highway-construction aid—mostly on matching basis—of $3 billion every year for the next 10 years. This is $45 of Federal funds for highways to every $1 for schools.

I will resist the temptation to draw inferences from the unequal competition between automobiles and education in our Government these days, but I deny that this $45-to-$1 ratio between highways and schools represents the standards or the priority of values of the people of America.

INADEQUACY IS CITED

There is, however, no point in belaboring the inadequacy and deceptiveness of this administration's school program. The chief education officers of 40 States have said that it would be of no help whatsoever in their States. And Congress has long since buried the President's bill.

What then should our Federal school-financing policy and program be?

It should be to face, honestly and forthrightly, our educational shortages, to hold the States and local communities responsible for meeting all of these shortages they can, and then to allocate from the taxes we collect from ourselves whatever is necessary to do the rest of the job.

The figures on the shortages are well known despite the efforts in Washington to conceal them by confused and conflicting pronouncements. Enrollment in primary and secondary schools increased as much in the school year just ended as it did in the entire 20 years between 1930 and 1950. Six million children went to school this year in firetraps. Seven hundred thousand children are on a split-session basis and get only half-day schooling.

We are currently short at least 250,000 classrooms—which is room for 7½ million children. Extraordinary efforts by local communities throughout the country are improving the situation a little bit. But with a million and a half more school-age children every year now drastic measures obviously have to be taken—and there can be no excuse for further delay.

The shortage of teachers is in some ways even more ominous than the shortage of schoolrooms. It is generally agreed that we need 180,000 more teachers than are presently available. Yet only 70,000 qualified teachers enter the profession each year. Somehow we must double the number. We note the urging today in Washington for a strong military Reserve. It seems to me high time that we also pay attention to the schools' crying need not just for a teacher reserve, but for filling the large gaps in education's front-line trenches.

ASKS $400 MILLION A YEAR

To meet this appealing situation we must start, it seems to me, with immediate support of the proposals now before Congress for $400 million of Federal funds each year for the next 4 years for school construction to be matched by State funds.

While this program, together with the provisions for extending credit to certain school districts, will by no means meet the whole construction need, it would be a long American step in the right direction. And I hope that what is good for all will not be lost to all by any linking together of the school aid and desegregation issues which would delay realization of our hopes and expectations on either or both of these vital fronts. In the long run segregation and discrimination, like other obsolete heritages, will yield quickest to the general advance of education.

The need for more teachers—145,000 new teachers a year to man the teaching ranks and meet the deficit—also means more money, higher salaries to make teaching a more attractive profession, and more funds for educating teachers. Careful calculations indicate that a Federal grant to the States of approximately $50 million a year, if matched by an equal amount of new State funds, will at least break the back of this problem—instead of breaking the teachers' backs.

So much for the present. Over the longer run it may be best not to tie Federal assistance to specific purposes, such as school construction, but rather to make unrestricted cash grants to the States on a per pupil basis. State governments would then have much greater flexibility to distribute these funds among local school districts for whatever purpose would most effectively advance education.

A CONDITION TIED TO AID

In view of the financial difficulties of the States, I also have misgivings about making Federal grants to education permanently on a matching basis.

But in any event, to insure that Federal assistance is given only to those States which already make a proper effort to support public education, and to avoid the further risk that Federal aid might result in relaxed State and local effort, some stated minimum local effort should be required as a condition of Federal assistance.

Moreover, in the interest of narrowing somewhat the present wide gap in educational opportunity among the children of the various States, it seems to me that there are cogent reasons of fairness and good sense for higher per pupil assistance to States with the least ability to finance education as proposed by that great champion of our schools, Senator Lister Hill.

Finally, I would suggest a modest program of national scholarships to promising candidates who upon graduation would undertake to give some years to teaching. To encourage outstandingly competent teachers scholarships might also be awarded for special teacher training to graduate students, or for advanced work for already experienced teachers.

Just as we recruit promising young people for West Point and Annapolis, and for such professional fields as the merchant marine, science and engineering, we should now consider the same methods of attraction to our great public-school system. Moreover, the cost of such scholarships would be small; the return on our investment would be immeasurable.

Yet there should be no evading the fact that the composite program I am suggesting here will be expensive, and it is just a beginning. Beardsley Ruml has proposed Federal expenditures to salvage our public-school system of about $700 million next year, and possibly as much as $3 or $3½ billion a year 10 years hence.

These are sobering figures and demand the closest scrutiny. Yet they are no excuse for either economic alarm or political timidity.

TWENTY PERCENT OF NEW UNITED STATES WEALTH

It is said that our national income should be rising at the rate of $15 billion a year during the next decade. This will mean increased Federal Tax revenues, at present rates, of $4 billion a year. So what I suggest in effect is that we agree with ourselves to spend on education—until we have caught up with our children's needs—say, 20 percent of our Federal tax collections from our new national wealth.

Bad education isn't cheap, either. Its high costs are paid from other budgets—for poverty and sickness and unemployment and juvenile delinquecy. The question is not only, "What will an adequate education program cost?" The question is even more, "What is the cost of not having such a program?" I cannot imagine the American people responding with anything but eagernesss and enthusiasm to a proposal to give our children better education, which means a better chance and fuller education, which means fuller lives.

I have suggested here what seems to me the outlines—the elemental necessities—of our public educational system. Yet we all recognize that there is infinitely more to the problem than simply providing a classroom and a person with a teaching certificate for every 30 children between the ages of 5 and 17.

The larger challenge that we must meet together—as teachers and parents and public and private citizens—is to prove that mass education can also be good education.

Good school buildings are an asset—but they are not the essence of good education. The real heart of good education remains, as always, good teaching. We must, if we want to improve the quality of education, attract into teaching and hold there a far larger number of our ablest young people. Compensation must be geared to ability and performance and opportunity afforded for advancement to a high level based on merit as in other professions.

And above all, teachers must be freed of the shackles of bigotry and anti-intellectualism, and the indignities of loyalty oaths and unwritten blue laws which no longer apply to other citizens.

It is another accepted requirement for improving educational quality, I think, that we be clearer as to the tasks and priorities of our schools. Today they are being asked to perform not only their traditional jobs but, more and more, functions traditionally recognized as the obligation of the family, the church, the employer and other social institutions. Under pressure of this group or that, courses of study are becoming laden with activities whose educational value is at least subject to serious question.

TOO MANY ROLES

In growing and changing society, the primary tasks of the school must also grow and change. But we must be clear that if we expect the schools to do too much, if we expect the teacher to play too many roles, we are bound to be disappointed with the results. If our educational purposes are unclear, if the curriculum is chaotic and cluttered with distractions, if the teaching staffs are overburdened with an indiscriminate array of responsibilities well beyond their reasonable capacity to carry, we must expect that our children will be educated for mediocrity instead of for something better.

I do not mean to trespass upon areas of what I know to be strong—and healthy—controversy among you who are so much more experienced in this field than I. But it is our common concern that we recognize and that we resist the pressures to let mass education become education for mediocrity. The dangers of mass education seem to me as much our problems as are its necessities.

We are well advised, I think, to take very seriously the admonition that education for all may come to mean real education for none. The struggle is very real today between massiveness, standardization, conformity on the one hand, and on the other the spirit of individualism which has given freedom and democracy and life itself their meaning.

We must, then, work together to forge better tools for the ever enlarging job of educating fast growing numbers of our children for an always more complex life. Equally must we struggle everlastingly to keep education a process of enrichment—of the mind and spirit of the young American whose destiny is measured only by his wisdom.

[From the New York Times of July 10, 1955]

STEVENSON'S SPEECH FOCUSES NEW ATTENTION ON ADMINISTRATION'S SCHOOL AID PLAN

(By Benjamin Fine)

CHICAGO, July 9.—President Eisenhower's plea for congressional action at this session on his education program and Adlai E. Stevenson's sharp attack on that program focused new attention this week on the question of Federal aid to education.

Here are the essential points of the administration's program, Mr. Stevenson's criticisms, and the reaction of educators who heard Mr. Stevenson's speech at the annual convention of the National Education Association here.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS

Last February President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress offering the following program:

1. Appropriation of $750 million to be used over a 3-year period to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are unable because of their financial status to find a ready market for their securities at a sound interest rate.

2. Appropriation of $150 million to finance Federal participation in a school-building program through special statewide school-building agencies. These agencies would issue bonds through banking channels, build schools and lease them to school districts. Rentals paid by the school districts eventually would repay Federal and State advances to the program. After the bonds and advances were repaid, title to the schools would revert to the school districts. A $6 billion program over 3 years was envisaged.

3. Appropriation of $200 million for a 3-year program of direct grants to school districts which were unable, because of financial limitations, to participate in the first two programs. This money would be matched by State funds.

4. Appropriation of $20 million to be spent over 3 years on the administrative costs of State programs designed to aid local school boards in revising their financial structure.

The total Federal-State cost of this program would be $7 billion over 3 years. The Federal contribution would be $1,120,000,000 of which $900 million would be repaid.

On Capitol Hill the program ran into immediate trouble. A House education subcommittee produced a revised measure named for the subcommittee chairman, Representative AUGUSTINE KELLEY, Pennsylvania Democrat. The major provisions of this measure are:

‘1. Appropriation of $1.6 billion to be used for direct grants to school districts over a period of 4 years.

2. Appropriation of $750 million for use by the Government to buy school-building bonds at a low rate of interest from school districts which have reached the limit of their borrowing power in commercial channels.

3. Authorization for the Federal Government to buy $6 billion worth of bonds of State educational agencies to finance building of schools. The bonds would be paid off by the local school districts at a low rate of interest, after which they would own the buildings.

STEVENSON'S POSITION

In his address Mr. Stevenson, the 1952 Democratic presidential candidate, aimed his attacks at the administration's proposals, rather than at the substitute Kelley measure. These were his principal objections to the President's program:

President Eisenhower saw a need for $7 billion worth of new school construction but proposed grants of only $200 million over 3 years—$66 million a year, or "33 cents a year to meet every $35 of admitted present, crying need."

President Eisenhower's recommendations for Federal loans for school building "was sufficient to cover only one-seventh of the needs" and was so written that it could never be used.

These were Mr. Stevenson's chief recommendations:

1. Immediate approval of the proposal to provide $400 million annually to be matched by State funds for school construction.

2. Appropriation of $50 million annually for grants to the States for teacher education, to be matched by State funds.

3. A long-range program of unrestricted cash grants to the States on a per-pupil basis, allowing the States to distribute the money according to requirements of local school districts.

4. A program of national scholarships to promising candidates who would undertake, upon graduation, to devote some years to teaching. Other scholarships might be provided for graduate students and for experienced teachers.

Mr. Stevenson suggested a formula that would provide $800 million annually in Federal funds for public schools. He noted that the country gains $15 billion in new wealth each year, which yields $4 billion additional in taxes. The Government, he urged, should spend 20 percent of this annual increment for support of its public schools.

REACTION OF EDUCATORS

Reaction, in the main, was favorable, so far as public pronouncements at the convention were concerned. Many educators felt that the Stevenson program would go far toward providing a permanent solution to the problems of school facilities.

James A. Cullen, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., chairman of New York's delegation to the convention, called the Stevenson program "an answer to our cry for help."

Dr. Howard E. Wilson, secretary of the NEA's educational policies commission, said the Stevenson program "would do more to aid education and this country than any plan I have yet seen."

But, in spite of widespread approval of the Stevenson plan, the emphasis at the convention was on immediate action. It was clear that the educators would settle for the Kelley compromise measure, in order to get a start on construction of new schools.

Though there is extensive support for the idea of Federal aid to education, the outlook for the legislation at this session of Congress is doubtful. Some southerners have talked of attaching an antisegregation provision to any measure authorizing expenditure of Federal funds for school-building purposes. This, of course, would doom the proposal.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1955]

STEVENSON'S SCHOOL-AID PLAN BUOYS NEA

(By Max K. Gilstrap)

CHICAGO.—Adlai E. Stevenson's call for $800 million annually to aid the Nation's schools was warmly received by the National Educational Association.

The encouraging outlook for a bipartisan approach to the subject of education figured substantially in the national educational organization's pleasure.

Mr. Stevenson, spelling out his proposal for school aid in an address to 15,000 NEA members in a nationally televised speech at the Chicago Stadium, told the educators:

"It is said that our national income should be rising at the rate of $15 billion a year during the next decade. This will mean increased Federal tax revenues, at present rates, of $4 billion a year. So what I suggest, in effect, is that we agree with ourselves to spend on education—until we have caught up with our children's needs—say 20 percent of our Federal tax collections from our new national wealth."

Mr. Stevenson called on the Eisenhower administration to make good on its promises in this field, sharply defining what he indicated was its laxity in helping education. He said: "In February 1953, just after he assumed office, President Eisenhower said: 'Our school system demands some prompt, effective help.'

"Yet today, 2½ years later, when this need has become acutely critical, nothing has been done. Instead of prompt, effective help, we wait for a conference on education to be held at the White House next fall.

"Now a conference is fine and it will dramatize the great significance of our educational system and its critical deficiencies. But it seems to me a pitifully inadequate excuse for years of doing absolutely nothing about America's No. 1 domestic need—schools and teachers."

BOOST TO KELLEY BILL

Mr. Stevenson was heavily applauded at this point, and again when he called attention to what he said was the current need of at least 250,000 classrooms, which is rooms for 7,500,000 children, and the need for 180,000 more teachers, and then stated: "It seems to me high time that we also pay attention to the schools' crying need not just for a teacher reserve but for filling the large gaps in education's frontline trenches."

Some NEA observers credited part of the enthusiastic response to the fact that many of the teachers probably felt that the Democratic chief's remarks would serve as a possible prod to help along passage of the $1.6 billion Kelley school-construction bill before the House Committee on Education and Labor. They pointed out that Mr. Stevenson's approach to education and Mr. Eisenhower's present stand were not far apart.

"To meet this appalling situation (in education)," Mr. Stevenson said, "we must start, it seems to me, with immediate passage of the proposals now before Congress for $400 million of Federal funds each year for the next 4 years for school construction to be matched by State funds."

While applauding Mr. Stevenson's speech which brings their needs to the forefront in the Nation's thinking, NEA officials underscored their delight about the fact that it is now obvious there is bipartisan support and recognition of the following points: (1) that there is a national crisis in the matter of school needs and the attention that should be given them; (2) that there should be local and State control of whatever action is taken in regard to the schools; (3) that the localities and States should act now without delay to alleviate the serious school situation; (4) that the Federal Government should step in to help; (5) that the Federal Government should not exercise any domination as it renders assistance.

BIPARTISAN ISSUE

The NEA's welcome of support from both political parties derives from its traditional attitude that education is a bipartisan issue and is of such importance that it never should become a strictly political issue. Its officials see in the present efforts of both parties to help education a resumption of the previous approach when congressional committees of both Houses unanimously endorsed Federal aid for school construction. In the present bill before Congress they find basic ideas agreed on in the 83d Congress plus some of the best features of new proposals of the Eisenhower administration.

Educators of all party affiliations interviewed after Mr. Stevenson's speech were generally enthusiastic about his obviously thorough understanding of the educators and their problems. They liked Mr. Stevenson's emphasis on preserving the identity of the individual in national plans for education; also the point he made that financial assistance to education by the Federal Government be distinguished from its control at local levels and that it avoid partisan lines and that desegration and school aid not be linked together.

They also liked his idea of Federal grants to the States of approximately $50 million a year to be matched by an equal amount of new State funds for educating teachers and his proposal for establishing national scholarships.

Indicative of the enthusiasm Mr. Stevenson's speech aroused among the NEA was the remark of a Republican who was former State superintendent of schools. "Teachers are broad enough," he said, "to overlook the criticisms a titular Democratic chief directs against a Republican President. They are also fair and perceptive enough to realize that Mr. Stevenson has given us one of the most knowledgeable and helpful speeches on education we have ever heard."

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 3, 1955]

TEACHERS WHO LEAD

One often hears that education as a profession attracts only those individuals who lack the forceful, extroversive qualities so obviously required in business, politics, and other undertakings. But a glance at the record of Oregon educators this year should dispel that illusion.

An Oregon teacher, Miss Margaret Perry, of Monmouth, was named American teacher of the year by McCall's magazine in June, a tribute to her supervisory abilities outside the classroom as well as to her teaching. Miss Mathilda Gilles, principal of the Richmond Elementary School in Salem, is the new president-elect of the national organization of elementary school principals in the National Education Association. Mrs. Lucille L. Klinge, Lane County school superintendent, has been president during the past year of NEA's department of rural education.

The highest executive position to which a teacher can aspire is that sought for Miss Martha A. Shull, English teacher at Portland's Jefferson High School. She has wide support for election as first vice president of the NEA at the Chicago convention of that big organization next week. That position is the stepping stone to the presidency of the NEA, which has a national membership of more than 612,000.

We have a list of other Oregon teachers and school administrators in responsible positions in national organizations. But the above illustrations should serve to make the point: The State's educators are by no means lacking in the characteristics that make for success in leadership.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, with the end of June, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission finished its monumental work and passed out of existence. It is not my purpose to eulogize the Commission, though it deserves every praise, but to urge early action on its recommendations.

The Hoover Commission has filed 20 reports with the Congress. They contain more than 360 recommendations for improving and streamlining Government operations. Fifty of these recommendations—14 percent—can be put into effect by Presidential reorganization plan or by Executive order. One hundred and forty-five recommendations—40 percent—can be put into effect by the departments and agencies of Government on their own initiative. The remainder, about 167—46 percent—require legislation by the Congress.

There are various estimates as to the amounts which could be saved if the recommendations were adopted. The Commission itself cautiously and wisely refrains from fixing a figure, but asserts most emphatically that if a substantial portion of the program were put into practice, the Federal budget would be balanced and tax reduction made possible.

I have been bitterly disappointed in the rate at which these recommendations have been acted on both by Congress and the executive agencies.

Remember, the first Hoover Commission report was filed last February and they have been coming in regularly since that time, yet in the Senate, not a single hearing has been held and not a single piece of legislation has yet been considered by any committee. There is some encouragement in the fact that the Reorganization Subcommittee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, will start hearings later this week on one phase of the recommendations dealing with surplus property. I am informed that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has given thought to some of the recommendations during its consideration of the Housing Act Amendments of 1955.

Let us hope that this week's hearings of the Government Operations Subcommittee will mark the beginning of a serious, dedicated consideration of all the recommendations in the Hoover reports.

The executive branch has made somewhat better progress than Congress in this matter, although the rate of achievement still falls far short of what could be done for the American taxpayer. About 50 actions have been taken by various agencies to carry out administrative recommendations of the Commission and its task forces.

It is also gratifying to hear that the Bureau of the Budget is designating a separate official to spearhead the drive for consideration of the Commission recommendations, and that similar action is being taken in the Department of Defense.

I do not suggest that every recommendation by the Commission should be adopted. There is grave doubt in my mind concerning some of them, but certainly they should all receive full and prompt consideration. It is not surprising that some portions of the Hoover reports should arouse the opposition of strong groups and organizations in the country. If everyone were satisfied with all the recommendations we would know that the Commission had failed to do its job and that the reports were weak and ineffectual.

However, despite the fact that the Commission has made a searching review of some of the most sacrosanct precincts of Government, most of its recommendations are not controversial and there is no excuse for failure to put these into effect without delay.

We all know that the reports and recommendations of the Hoover Commission are only the beginning of the job—not the end. It will be a tragedy if they are allowed to gather dust in the archives of Government. They are a sharp challenge to both the executive and legislatives branches. Let us meet this issue squarely and give full and fearless consideration to every recommendation of the Hoover reports without further delay.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 28 of this year a distinguished New York clergyman, Dr. Julius Mark, senior Rabbi of the Temple Emanu-El, New York City, delivered a most impressive sermon entitled "This Delinquent Society."

This sermon dealt with a subject with which we are all deeply and somberly concerned these days, the subject of juvenile delinquency. It so happens, Mr. President, that a subcommitte of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee—a subcommittee of which I am chairman—is in the process of holding hearings on this subject in connection with certain legislative proposals which have been introduced to help meet the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Hence, I feel it appropriate to ask unanimous consent to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks this sermon, which might well serve as a backdrop or a theme for the hearings we are holding.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS DELINQUENT SOCIETY

(Sermon delivered by Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, New York City, on Saturday morning, May 28, 1955)

Yesterday was Confirmation Day. Our youth in the tens of thousands throughout the land, having completed their courses of study, confirmed the vow which our forefathers swore more than 3,000 years ago at the foot of Mount Sinai. It was a thrilling and exciting experience not only for those who participated, but for their families, their friends, their teachers, their rabbis, and for the numerous worshippers who had come to God's house to witness this moving spectacle and to renew their own faith in the glorious spiritual tradition of our people.

What sight is more inspiring than that of young people, dressed in white and blue robes of simplicity, bearing flowers which symbolize the fragrance of character and also the wondrous possibilities of youth, proclaiming with one voice as did our ancient forebears: "We will do and we will hear"? We will do—what? We will implement in our lives, to the very best of our ability, the sacred Commandants of old, the Ten Commandments which God Himself proclaimed unto the people of Israel—and which, through Israel, have reverberated in the hearts and minds of all humanity through the ages. We will hear. We will hear—what? We will hear the voice of conscience in our hearts—yes, down deep in our very souls—and do what in us lies not only to cultivate the way of life which will bring us the greatest happiness, but which will bring happiness, understanding and fulfillment to our fellow human beings.

Our youth have spoken—and I am convinced that they have spoken sincerely. They honestly mean to live worthily, usefully, blessedly. But our youth, we must always bear in mind, do not live in a vacuum. They are members of families. They are a part of society. Many influences are brought to bear upon them, influences which determine what they are going to be, and how they are going to live. For what they are and will be, will be resolved to a very large extent by the examples set for them by parents, by those with whom they associate, by the roles played in their lives by schools, synagogues, churches. Furthermore, what will happen to them will depend in great measure upon the influence directed upon them by the climate of the society in which they live. It must never be forgotten that no individual, no human being—be he child or youth or adult—lives unto himself alone. The life of every person influences and is in turn influenced by the society of which he is a part.

In recent weeks we have been shocked beyond description by news reports of the most appalling crimes perpetrated by some of our youth. Of these, perhaps the most ghastly was the cold-blooded and senseless murder of a decent, well-behaved boy by an unbelievably savage young hoodlum. People react in diverse ways to such tragic incidents. Some demand that the miscreant be punished severely, even to imposing upon him the death sentence. They complain that our youth are being coddled and that the policeman's club should be used more freely in the treatment of juvenile delinquency. Others self-righteously prefer to look the other way, assured that their children will be safe because they are made of better clay. Thoughtful men and women, however, recognize that juvenile crime which reaches the headlines is only the gruesome evidence of a serious condition which exists in our society, a condition which can be corrected only by intelligent planning and by courageous action.

First of all, what is juvenile delinquency? Many parents regard delinquency as any annoying act performed by someone else's child. Legally, a juvenile delinquent is a child, 16 years of age or under, who is guilty of an offense which if committed by an adult would be a crime. Between the ages of 16 and 18, such an individual would be considered an adolescent delinquent, and above 18 a criminal.

Now, the unpleasant fact must be faced that juvenile delinquency is increasing in ominous proportions throughout our country—in small cities, in rural areas, in larger cities, in urban centers, in the so-called better neighborhoods, as well as in slum areas. From 1948 to 1954 the percentage of increase in juvenile delinquency has risen by some 50 percent. According to a report made by the FBI, juveniles under 18 committed 54 percent of the auto thefts, 39 percent of all burglaries, 5 percent of assaults, and 4 percent of homicides during the year 1953.

In an exceeding valuable book entitled "1,000,000 Delinquents," Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, quoting United States Attorney General Brownell, writes that at least that many boys and girls—a million—under the age of 18, will commit crimes in the year 1955 to be serious enough that they will be picked up by the police. He adds that for each 1 apprehended, 3, 4, and sometimes 5 will not be arrested. The situation has become so serious as to endanger the very health of our society.

Now, the problem of juvenile delinquency, which has reached such grave proportions, will not be solved by following the panicky and hysterical counsel of those who advocate physical chastisement or incarceration in reformatories and prisons for the culprits. This seems to be the easy way, but it is not the right way, nor is it the effective way. We must bear in mind that delinqency is a disease and no disease can be cured by the use of a club. It is an extremely serious disease—much more serious and much more widespread than, say, infantile paralysis, which, compared to the million struck down by delinquency each year, claimed in 1954 less than 39,000, of whom 1,600 died. The cause of poliomyelitis has long been known. Only some 6 or 7 weeks ago its cure, or at least its prevention, was announced to a grateful and thankful mankind. Wouldn't it be wonderful if there could be developed a vaccine to immunize children against juvenile delinquency or adults against hatred and bigotry? Unfortunately, such a simple preventive is not possible—though the causes of juvenile delinquency are well known, as is also its cure.

Of primary importance in the development of wholesome children is a happy and secure home life. I do not believe that it is incorrect to say that the chief—though not the only one by any means—but the chief cause of delinquent children is delinquent homes. It cannot be sufficiently emphasized that children are likely to become emotionally disturbed and thus delinquent if they are denied the love, the affection, the understanding, and the sense of belongingness resulting from normal home life. Dr. and Mrs. Sheldon Glueck, the distinguished criminologists and well-known authorities in this field, write that 60 percent of delinquents come from broken homes and that 7 out of 10 families that raise delinquents fail to do things together that would result in a sense of sharing and belonging. They further declare that 8 out of 10 delinquents said that their mothers were not interested in their welfare and 7 out of 10 had no attachment to their fathers.

Children of privileged homes tend to become delinquent when deprived of the same sense of family cohesiveness that many children from homes in the poorer sections of our city are deprived of. These experts say, furthermore, that sometimes fathers and mothers who spend too much time in the service of what they consider worthy causes in the community unwittingly neglect their children—by failing to give them a sufficiency of love and thus a sense of security. In all social groupings neglected children may choose bad companions to win a sense of security and belonging.

Yes, my friends, broken homes and homes without love, homes without security, homes without a sense of family solidarity, homes marred by dissension and misunderstanding, make for juvenile delinquency. Good homes, on the other hand, prevent juvenile delinquency.

So do good schools. In school the major role is played by the teacher. It is well to have good physical facilities in the school—good buildings, good playgrounds, blackboards, books, etc.—but the most important influence in education and therefore the most important influence in the life of the child in school is the teacher. Now, it is wrongly assumed that the work of the high-school teacher is more important than that of the teacher in the elementary school. The result is that the status and the pay of the high-school teacher are usually higher than that of the elementary-school teacher. The fact is that the elementary-school teachers, when given the proper training and incentive, are in a better position to help the emotionally disturbed child than the high-school teacher. For by the time the child reaches the high school, his ways are pretty well set. A first-grade teacher, on the other hand, a teacher that has had the proper training and is decently compensated for her work, will prevent delinquency by discovering the predelinquent. Better trained teachers teaching smaller classes, with the assistance of a psychologist, psychiatrist, and social worker attached to the school system, will do much to save our youth.

Then, thirdly, religion. The church and the synagogue—when correctly understood and used by the parents—can and do play a major role in the prevention of delinquency. The house of God and the religious school must, however, not be regarded by parents as good places to which to send their children, but in which they have no personal interest. How naive can parents become when they say: "I sent them to church, didn't I? I sent them to Sunday school, didn't I? What kind of a church are you running? You must have a pretty bad Sunday school if my children are turning out this way."

Now, religious institutions, although they can be exceedingly effective and are effective in the training of character, cannot perform miracles. Such institutions can imbue the child with the highest concepts of morality and unselfishness only when his parents participate with him. Only then will the child consider these institutions important.

Fourthly, the influence of the community upon the child's growth and development. Good housing, it has been shown time and again, prevents delinquency. And recreational facilities, playgrounds and social centers, operated by trained personnel, are all unquestioned deterrents to delinquency. The work of youth organizations like the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA's, YWCA's, etc., all should be widely expanded so that more and more of our youth will come under their influence. The policy of the infiltration of street gangs by trained youth leaders that is being pursued by our own New York Youth Board is, to my mind, an excellent method of dealing with this problem. Yes, when the community influences are favorable, the child has a better chance to be the kind of citizen that his parents and that the community at large would want him to be.

Finally, it is well known that the moral climate of a community has its effect upon the youth. Stories of corruption involving important Government officials, shady business practices, stories of easy money and of gangsters who are glorified and become heroes, the effect of unwholesome movies, comic books, TV programs are not without their influence upon the young. Dr. Fine tells of a young thief who remarked to him: "Yes, I stole $150 from a gas station. So what? How much did Governor Hoffman steal from the people of New Jersey?" It is this attitude that is very easily developed in the minds of impressionable youth. "If they can do it, if they can get away with it, why can't I?"

I shall not go into the improvements that must be made in the various agencies dealing with our youth after they have become delinquent—the juvenile police officers, the juvenile courts, improved foster homes, detention homes, training schools, etc.—but desire merely to emphasize the need for improving those media which will prevent juvenile delinquency, namely, the home, the school, the church and synagogue, the community, the morale climate. To achieve this purpose, we must stop thinking in terms of delinquent youth, but rather in terms of our delinquent society. We know the causes. We also know the cure. Our problem is not that we demand that something be done by someone else, but that we express our willingness to accept whatever responsibility devolves upon us as members of society and to make whatever financial sacrifices that may be necessary in order to build a finer, healthier, and more worthy community life for the young people of our country. No task confronting us is more important, none more essential to the well-being of our society.

During the war a new expression, crash program, came into frequent use. It means that if something of the utmost importance, something involving the very life and death of our country had to be accomplished, then the question of financial cost was not to be considered at all. Thus, when it was decided to create an atomic bomb—even though no one was certain that it could be achieved—we did not hesitate to spend what was then, and still is, the astronomical sum of $2 billion. We said then, and we say now, that whatever the cost, it was worth it.

Something of the same spirit animated the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis when it embarked upon its dramatic program to stamp out this horrible disease. Untold millions of dollars were spent and will continue to be spent until this scourge is completely eliminated from the world. Who will say that its wasn't—and isn't—worth it?

Some such crash program, it seems to me, is required if we are to win the war against juvenile delinquency, a disease which is even more dreadful and more destructive than polio or any other physical ailment. Let us have more family counselors than we think we need. Let us build more and better schools and playgrounds than we think are necessary. Let us hire better teachers, more teachers and provide them with a wage to which they are entitled. Let us engage more youth directors than we believe we are going to need. The cost will go up into the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, but who will say that it isn't worth it?

At the present time juvenile delinquency is problem number one in America. It is infinitely more serious than any other problem which we are confronted. The very existence of our civilization depends upon its solution. It must be solved and it can be solved and it will be solved, when the citizens of our Nation become aware of the responsibilities devolving upon them. Yes, punishment is necessary when crimes are committed, whether by juveniles or by adults. But that doesn't solve the problem. It is the delinquent society which creates delinquency that requires our attention.

In the 21st chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy a very strange procedure is described in connection with what is to take place when a slain person is found in a field and his murderer is unknown. The elders and the judges of the city nearest the spot where the body has been found are required to offer a sacrifice, wash their hands over it and then say, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive, O Lord Thy people Israel, whom Thou had redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of Thy people Israel." In commenting on this unusual proceeding, one of the ancient rabbis asked: "Why is it that the good people, the respectable people, the elders and the judges are called upon to swear that their hands were guiltless of this crime? Why were not the cutthroats, the thieves, and the known criminals of the community made to swear that they did not perpetrate this crime?" To these rhetorical questions he provided the answer: "In order that we might always realize that not the bad people, but the good people are responsible for the evils of a community; the evils of life will disappear when the good folk assume the responsibilities which belong to them." Amen.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, to those of us who recognize the importance of the Latin American countries to the economic well-being of our Nation, the article which appeared in the July 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald is indeed frightening. This article is entitled "United States Is Losing Trade in Latin America." It goes on to state that Japan and Europe, including the Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into the trade of Latin America by offering lower prices and longer credit terms.

This assertion was contained in a United Nation's report which reviewed the economy of the Latin America countries for the year 1954.

Mr. President, the Department of Commerce reveals that our trade with Latin America has dropped by almost $250 million in the past 2 years, and there is every indication that with our little attention to the affairs of the countries to the south of us, and increased attention on the part of the countries of Europe and the Soviet bloc countries that trade between Latin America and the United States will unfortunately continue to fall off.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the above-described article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS LOSING TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., June 30.—Japan and Europe, including Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into United States trade with Latin America by offering cheaper prices and easier credit terms, a U. N. report disclosed today. Soviet bloc trading was sharply on the upgrade, it said.

A review of Latin American economies for 1954 was made public here in advance of the meeting of the U. N. Economic Commission for Latin America starting August 29 in Bogota, Colombia.

Agriculture increases in Latin America as a whole kept up with a population increase and industry spurted 8.4 percent over 1953, but there were gloomy notes in the review. Investment in Latin America showed a declining trend. Balance of payments surplus was reduced by more than $700 million.

During 1951 and 1953 imports of European rolling stock almost equaled those from the United States, the review noted. The United States also was losing ground in commercial vehicles, not only to Europe but also to Japan.

European exports to Latin America of machinery for the pulp, paper, and timber industries have more than doubled in 2 years, while those of the United States and Canada have fallen by 45 percent, the review said.

Japan was described as extremely active in textile-machinery sales.

Eastern Europe and Japan have provided strong competition in agricultural machinery, cutting considerably imports of United States tractors.

The United States still holds an edge in the sale of private automobiles and was showing recovery in agricultural machinery, oil drilling machinery and machine tools, the review said.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF SAME TRACTS OF PUBLIC LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows: On page 5, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after the words "United States" insert the words "subsequent to the location of the claim", and the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 7, 1955, pp. 10091–10101, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from residents of Langley, Va. The subcommittee did not know of the objection of the people of Langley, Va., to the possible location of the new CIA headquarters in that community.

I am not sure whether it has been finally decided that the headquarters will go to Langley, Va. I think, however, that certainly the people of that community should have an opportunity to be heard before the Appropriations Committee before any final decision is reached. The committee was unaware of the protest at the time the matter was being considered.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 8, 1955.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: We are residents and property owners of the Langley-Great Falls area of Fairfax County, Va., who are concerned over the possible construction of the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in the neighborhood. On April 7 of this year CIA announced publicly that it was giving up any plan to locate in Langley. Then last week, without notice, language was written into a military construction bill which indicated that CIA was still very much interested in Langley as a possible site. We believe there are serious considerations against locating CIA in Langley that should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

Langley is a unique residential area of one-family homes on large lots, country places, and farms. There are no apartment buildings and virtually no commercial development. A large Government office building will bring great pressure for mass housing, commercial construction, used-car lots, and other changes which will destroy the character of the area.

Fairfax County is already hard-pressed to provide water, sewerage, schools, roads, police, and other facilities for a rapidly growing population. Water and sewerage may be arranged for an office building itself, but the great population increase which will follow will throw an intolerable burden on the community. For example, the water table is already falling in the county, and new mass housing in an area of individual wells will lower the table disastrously and dry up many existing wells.

To erect a large office building on this river front property and to build a super highway to it in the name of the George Washington Memorial Parkway is directly contrary to the purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act. The Congress in 1930 authorized the acquisition of the river front property, including the entire Virginia shore of the Potomac from below Chain Bridge to a point above Great Falls, for a memorial to George Washington and for "the protection and preservation of the natural scenery of the Gorge and the Great Falls of the Potomac" (46 Stat. 482).

The Public Roads tract at Langley with 1½ miles of riverfront is the only substantial piece of United States property on the Virginia shore above Chain Bridge available for park purposes. Other such property is increasingly difficult to acquire. As with the more highly publicized Maryland shore of the Potomac, the interest of protecting the wilderness of the river and carrying out the statutory purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act must be balanced against the interest of providing access for the motorist. Neither consideration, however, suggests that large Government office buildings should be located on potential park land.

The McLean Citizens Association, drawing its members from the entire area, considered the problem at a special meeting and voted to opppose location of a CIA building in Langley. At a subsequent meeting the association recommended that park and recreation areas be designated for the area, including if possible the bulk of the Public Roads property at Langley. Of several sites now being considered by CIA, Langley is the only one in which the local citizens association has objected. In fact, other areas have pleaded with CIA to locate there and have offered free land and facilities.

No affirmative reason has been offered for location of a huge Government office building on potential park land, in the midst of an entirely residential area, against the wishes of the community and in the face of strongly pressed invitations to locate elsewhere. CIA has no need to have its employees work in rural residential surroundings. To locate in Langley would damage a unique community with no offsetting gain to CIA.

We are presenting our views in this letter to make clear that residents of the Langley area have not changed their opposition to a CIA building here. After the April 7 statement we assumed that the mattter was closed. If Langley is again to be considered by CIA, we wish to be heard. Surely such a controversial proposal, with its serious effects on long-established Federal park policy and on the orderly development of a community, should receive full and careful study including an opportunity for all viewpoints to be presented.

Respectfully yours,
BENJAMIN LEE BIRD.
G. BOWDOIN CRAIGHILL, Jr.
ROGER FISHER.
MANNING GASCH.
ANTHONY LEWIS.
SAMUEL E. NEEL.
CYNTHIA ZIMMERMAN.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a short statement which is a summary of the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6829, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

A tabulation showing a comparison of the authorization contained in this bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as has been agreed to in conference is as follows:

Comparative summary of military construction authorization bill (H. R. 6829)

	House	Senate	Conference
Army	$551, 105, 000	$527, 027, 000	$533, 904, 000
Navy	596, 140, 900	571, 620, 300	564, 224, 300
Air Force	1, 165, 453, 000	1, 205, 170, 000	1, 207, 902, 000
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff	300, 000		
CIA	56, 000, 000	53, 500, 000	54, 500, 000
Total	2, 368, 998, 900	2, 357, 317, 300	2, 360, 530, 300

The total authorization agreed to in conference is $3,213,000 more than had been approved by the Senate and $8,468,600 less than had been approved by the House.

Under the conference agreement the Army would receive $533,904,000 or $6,877,000 more than had been contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. This difference represents Senate agreement to add $5 million for hospital facilities at Fort Jackson, S. C. and to add $1,877,000 for cold storage facilities at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

The Navy would receive authorization in the amount of $564,224,300, which figure is $7,396,000 less than the Senate had approved. This net reduction derives from the Senate's agreeing to the addition of $81,000 for providing Navy family quarters in the District of Columbia and to the addition of $432,000 for a dispensary at Quantico, Va., with these additions being more than offset by reductions of $6,098,000 at Camp Pendleton in California; $123,000 at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.; and $1,688,000 for land acquisition at Port Chicago, Calif. The decision to reduce the authorization at Camp Pendleton results from a reluctance to provide additional facilities there until an adequate water supply for the base is assured. The land acquisition at Port Chicago was deleted, pending an on-the-site study by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to determine whether this land requirement can be coordinatd with a similar requirement of the Army in the same area. The relatively small reduction at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md. was made after the Department of the Navy advised that it no longer required this small item.

The Air Force portion of the authorization is $1,207,902,000, an increase of $2,732,000 over the authorization contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. The addition of $2,732,000 is to provide additional facilities at the Charleston Air Force Base, S. C. These facilities were originally scheduled for authorization next year, but were included in this bill in order to enhance the effectiveness of this important base at an early date.

The Senate had provided authorization for the headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency in a maximum amount of $53,500,000; $45 million of this sum as intended for the construction of buildings. If the headquarters installation were placed at Langley, Va., $8,500,000 would have been available for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If a site other than Langley were chosen, $1 million would have been available for the purchase of the necessary land. The House had provided $50 million for the building, and the Conferres agreed to add $1 million to the Senate allowance of $45 million for this purpose. Thus, the CIA is provided a maximum authorization of $54,500,000, of which $46 million is earmarked for the construction of a headquarters installation. If the Langley site is finally selected, an additional $8,500,000 is available for extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If the Langley site is not selected, this $8,500,000 is not available for authorization, but $1 million would be available for the purchase of land.

The House had provided an authorization of $300,000 for the construction of quarters and related communication facilities for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his assistants. The conferees recognized the desirability of providing suitable quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but no detailed justification for this construction had been ppresented in the Senate, and it was agreed that an authorization of this type should be separately considered. Only this morning a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services took testimony on an authorization for this purpose, and it is possible that a separate bill to authorize housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be reported in time for consideration and action at this session of the Congress.

There were two changes from the Senate version of the general provisions contained in title V. The Senate conferees agreed to accept a House provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to acquire housing units insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, in those cases where the housing units are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents. This provision, as it was originally inserted by the House, was intended to be complementary to a somewhat similar provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to assume, on application by the sponsor, mortgage obligations on the so-called Wherry housing units that had been insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act. The Senate bill did not contain the provision affecting the Wherry housing units. The House receded from its language authorizing the acquisition of Wherry housing units and the Senate accepted the House language authorizing the acquisition of title VI and title IX units.

The second change in the general provisions as they had passed the Senate relates to the provision requiring the secretaries of the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees on the utilization of certain classified and overseas construction authorization. This section represented a continuation of committee policy adopted originally in 1952. However, the construction requirements, cost estimates, and base agreements are much more firm and definite today than was true in 1952, and the Senate agreed to eliminate this provision.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report substantially follows the bill as passed by the Senate.

With reference to the matter at Langley, Va., we did not locate the CIA building at Langley. There was no testimony taken on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the county executive of the county of Fairfax, Va., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,
Fairfax, Va., July 7, 1955.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: It occurs to me that it would be appropriate to advise you of the position taken by the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, Va., relative to possible location of the Central Intelligence Agency's Office building near Langley in Fairfax County.

Our board has consistently welcomed the CIA to this location and has expressed a willingness to cooperate in every way possible in providing the facilities which this installation would require in order to make it possible for the Langley site to be chosen.

The board has officially agreed to provide sewage disposal for the installation and has cooperated with the city of Falls Church and the Virginia Department of Highways relative to supplying water and providing adequate highway facilities for same.

It is my understanding that a decision in connection with this location will soon be forthcoming and I am pleased to advise you of the position taken by the Fairfax County Board of County Supervisors.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
CARLTON C. MASSEY,
County Executive.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the members of the conference committee upon the action on the bill which the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi has presented. The able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi and his committee composed of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], performed a very fine service, and I wish to commend them for the excellent manner in which they handled the bill.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I should like to say that we are very appreciative of the consideration given to the hospital at Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is one of the finest installations for training troops, and the hospital will provide facilities which are very badly needed there. We are very grateful to the conference committee for their action in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to commend the three Senate conferees on the military construction bill for their success in retaining certain items in the bill. I wish to say something in behalf of the Charleston transportation depot; and I notice that there is $5 million allowed for Camp Jackson, S. C., for medical facilities. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is not Camp Jackson. It is Fort Jackson. It was made a fort several years ago.

Also, I notice that $427,000 has been included for the naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; $1,650,000 for the Marine Corps record depot, Parris Island, S. C.; $4,649,000 for the Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.; and $553,000 for community facilities at the Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C.

There are several other items pertaining to South Carolina, but I shall not go into them in detail now.

I thank the committee of conference for having included these items for South Carolina. I think they are much needed and can well be used in the defense of our Nation at this time.

MRS. LORENZA O'MALLEY (DE AMUSATEGUI) ET AL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THOMAS F. HARNEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2907) for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DONALD HECTOR TAYLOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 26) for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor, which was, in line 7, after "fee" insert "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide for the posting of a bond, as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LUPE M. GONZALEZ

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Lupe M. Gonzalez, and the said Lupe M. Gonzalez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment of the House is to merely cancel outstanding deportation proceedings rather than granting the status of permanent residence to the beneficiary.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNA C. GIESE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 244) for the relief of Anna C. Giese, which was in line 7, after "fee" insert "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The House amendment provides that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, which was, on page 1, line 5, strike out "Panagiatis Demitreos Zeras,".

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to delete the name of one of the beneficiaries inasmuch as he has departed from the United States.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MARION S. QUIRK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Marion S. Quirk, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "fee" insert ", under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to grant a waiver to the beneficiary of the bill, rather than granting the status of permanent residence. This waiver will enable the beneficiary to qualify for a visa as the husband of a lawfully resident alien.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. KILGORE. The House of Representatives amended the bill granting the beneficiary the status of permanent residence in the United States. Under the House amendment, the beneficiary will be able to proceed toward naturalization upon completion of the required residence provided in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of June 20, 1955, the House passed a bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen. On April 25, 1955, the Senate passed a similar bill with an amendment. Somehow, when the House considered its bill, it failed to take into consideration the similar, but amended, bill which had been passed by the Senate.

I have spoken to the acting majority leader and the minority leader about the matter, and they have no objection to the action I wish to propose.

I move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 4915.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I assure the Senate that the action which has just been suggested by the senior Senator from Louisiana has the approval of the minority leader and the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I had no knowledge of this matter; therefore, I must ask a question. What will be accomplished if the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The next procedure will be to have the Senate consider the House bill. It is my intention to move to strike from the House bill everything after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. THYE. Since this is merely a procedural matter, I have no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think it is fair to state that the language with which it is proposed to amend the House bill will be the exact verbiage contained in the bill which passed the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. As a matter of fact, the two bills were identical, but when the Senate considered its bill, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] suggested an amendment in the nature of a limitation on the bill. The bill provides, in part, as follows:

> After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection.

The amendment suggested by the senior Senator from Nebraska limited the time within which such supplementary advances can be made to the period ending July 14, 1959.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4915.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

> That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word "two" from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting the word "four" and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: "After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection, but no such loan shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business, then, under the order previously entered, the calendar will now be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wilber Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be Secretary of the Army.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, we of Michigan are especially proud that one of our most distinguished citizens has been selected for a most important post. Wilber Brucker was one of Michigan's youngest governors, and in that position he served with distinction. He has been active in community affairs in Detroit.

Mr. Brucker is a member of one of the leading law firms in Detroit. He enjoys an unusually high reputation, irrespective of political party, among the citizens of his State. When he was selected to serve in Washington as General Counsel for the Department of Defense, he served in that position with great distinction.

I wish to thank the Committee on Armed Services for the expedition with which they have considered and reported the nomination.

I wish to congratulate the President and the Secretary of Defense for submitting the nomination of Wilber Brucker to be Secretary of the Army, an office he will fill with distinction not only to himself but also to his State and Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before the call of the calendar is begun, I desire to yield to the junior Senator from Montana.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE FUTURE OF MAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before beginning my speech, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at the end of my address, an article entitled "The H-Bomb Danger," written by William L. Laurence, and published in the New York Times of July 10, 1955; an article entitled "A-Bomb Is 10 Nervous Years Old," written by Elton C. Fay, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 10, 1955; and an article entitled "Ghost Cities Seen After Atom Blast," published in the New York Times of July 11, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. MANSFIELD's address.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of history's recurrent tides for peace may again be flowing in the world today. In the United States, among our allies and possibly even in the Communist bloc there is a deep realization that a nuclear world war would mean only mutual destruction and there would be no victor. Advances of fantastic proportions have been made in the nuclear and thermonuclear sciences in the past 10 years. If utilized to the detriment of man, they could very easily erase these achievements and those of past centuries in a matter of days. We have harnessed a new energy, the atom, that can destroy cities and complete armies, against which there is little defense. Yet, if used properly, this new energy can be utilized for the benefit of mankind in industry, transportation, and power.

Almost a year ago I began to take particular note of these new problems and dangers confronting us with the advent of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. In April I compiled my views and thoughts in a speech to the Senate. My entire source of information at that time, as it is today, was from newspapers, magazines, quarterlies, and public documents. The results of my first efforts to analyze the situation evolved around a chronology of events occurring since the first atomic bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima in Japan at the end of World War II.

Today I wish to expand on the more recent developments, the program for the future, and some of the serious problems facing the policymakers of the world. There are three general areas which I wish to discuss:

First. Radioactive fallout.

Second. The position of atomic and hydrogen weapons in our military program and defense system.

Third. An effective program to preserve peace and to combat the threat of worldwide devastation in nuclear warfare.

Radioactive fallout is a shower of dust after a thermonuclear explosion. The mushrooming cloud in an atomic or hydrogen explosion is made up of dust particles which are spread by the winds after an explosion. They settle down over wide areas with the winds or they are carried down in rain or snow.

It was this dust that fell on the Japanese fishing boat that was contaminated by fallout 100 miles from the Bikini hydrogen explosion March 1, 1954.

According to reports, the fallout peril depends upon how much radioactive dust is created in the moments following the explosion. In an air burst, dangerous fallout dust is made up of fragments of the casing of the bomb and its vaporized mechanical components, plus the end products of the fission and fusion reactions. A wide range of chemical elements is involved, a field in which I am strictly an amateur.

Also, according to correspondence with scientists and newspaper sources, some stray dust particles floating in the air may become irradiated to a high degree. But the total amount of air burst dust is relatively small. The fallout hazard, as I understand it, is much greater with an explosion near or at the surface. Tons of earth and rock and other terrestrial objects destroyed by the explosion are sucked up into the great mushroom. Intense radiation transforms these particles into hot radiation emitters. The great force of the explosion blows the radioactive dust very high. The heavier particles may fall soon, while the light particles may stay in space for a long period of time. The radioactive hot particles which fall in a matter of hours after the explosion are the deadly menace.

The perplexing problem is, What effect do these experimental explosions have on the human race today, and what will be their effect in the future? It is generally recognized that the immediate fallout of radioactivity after a test explosion is dangerous and deadly in the immediate area. Inadequate answers remain to the problem of the long-range possibility of increasing the natural background radiation of the world as a whole. Another question unanswered is, How much effect does the fallout have internally on human beings? There have been opinions of one extreme to the other coming from scientists and public figures. Only recently have there been any official pronouncements coming from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Late in May, this year, a Yale physicist charged the AEC with giving what he called misleading information about the danger to mankind from atomic test blasts. He warned that the radioactive fallout from such blasts is producing genetic effects in mankind that will be showing up for thousands of years to come. The expression of these fears has diminished somewhat in recent weeks.

Prof. Milton S. Livingston, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, says that those people who say H-bomb tests are a danger to mankind and that they must be stopped are making these statements on an uninformed basis and that time will have to pull the picture into perspective.

Eminent scientists such as Dr. Ralph Lapp and Dr. H. J. Muller show concern about the long-lasting effect these experimental tests may have upon the human race in the future. However, they feel that we cannot jump to conclusions and it is important to have more complete information from authoritative sources.

Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner of the AEC, speaking at the alumni reunion at the University of Chicago, on June 3, 1955, said that "tests, therefore do not constitute any real hazard to the immediate health." Incorporated in his speech was a statement on the genetic question prepared by the Advisory Committee for Biology and Medicine to the AEC. The last two paragraphs of this report read as follows:

> No measurable increase in defective individuals will be observable at any time as the result of current weapons' tests, since the few radiation-induced defectives will not change measurably the number of about 40,000 defectives who will occur spontaneously among the 4 million births of each year in the United States. It may be pointed out that no significant change in the percentage of malformed children has been observed among those conceived after the war whose parents had been exposed to the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
>
> The foregoing conclusions apply only to the genetic effects of weapons' tests carried out at the present level and of foreseeable peacetime uses of atomic energy. The genetic effects of a generalized nuclear war would be one of many catastrophic consequences of such a disaster.

More intensive studies are needed and more information must be made available before any sound conclusion can be reached on the question of radioactive fallout.

In my April speech on atomic energy I expressed my concern about the theoretical cobalt bomb, its vast destructive power and its threat to all mankind. The C-bomb has never been tested. My concern over this mythical bomb has been minimized by the now numerous reports of the superbomb, or U-bomb. This new weapon was detonated in the March 1954 test on Bikini. This was no A-bomb such as was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945; nor was it an H-bomb such as was tested at Eniwetok atoll in 1952. It was a U-bomb triggered by fissionable uranium 235, fanned up by a fusionable hydrogen ingredient and finally split asunder by enormous fissioning of ordinary uranium 238. This has been verified by the recent report made by Dr. Libby of the AEC.

I believe that ordinary atomic bombs are measured by "kilotons" and thermonuclear weapons are measured by "megatons." A kiloton is equivalent to 1,000 tons of TNT; a megaton to 1,000,000 tons. It has been estimated that the Bikini explosion equaled 14 to 16 megatons.

According to Dr. Libby's recent report, the energy is released by fission rather than fusion. This indicated that ordinary, cheap uranium 238 was the major explosive content and was responsible for fallout over a vast area.

One of the most significant things about this newly released information on the H-bomb is that it means that Russia or any other nation capable of making atomic bombs can, with a little more effort, create superbombs.

This cheaper weapon is tremendously more deadly than a pure hydrogen bomb. The destructiveness of a hydrogen bomb is produced by heat and blast. By adding ordinary uranium to this weapon, the additional lethal radioactivity is created. Dr. Libby's report has confirmed, at long last, the speculations and deductions of eminent scientists like Dr. J. Rotblat, British physicist, and Dr. Lapp, as well as many others.

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from the information made available to the general public. The U-bomb is cheap. The weapon can be made in any size, because of its comparative simplicity and the cheapness of uranium 238. The only restriction on the size of the bomb is the method of delivery. One of the results is that the fallout persists for days, weeks, or months. In addition to its direct or external radiation effects, the weapon creates toxic products like strontium 90 and radioactive iodine in large quantities, which are internally damaging.

The information finally coming out is material which is vital in our civil defense setup. It has been almost 16 months since the superbomb was detonated. But for the fallout that sickened the Japanese crew 100 miles from the explosion site, the nonofficial scientific world might not have learned that the United States had achieved a vastly more powerful weapon.

Until Libby's talk to the Chicago alumni, AEC's comments on fallout had been pretty well limited to the much-publicized news release by AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss last February 15, 1955. In it, he finally and officially conceded the existence of fallout and described the pattern it took at the Bikini test. Admiral Strauss, however, did not discuss "persistence"—how long and to what extent fallout radioactivity can deny humanity a normal above-ground existence. This is the information which is necessary to have made known in order to prepare any type of defense.

Dr. Libby has now testified that fallout radioactivity becomes one-tenth as intense 7 hours after the burst, one-hundredth after the first 2 days, one-thousandth after the first 2 weeks, and one ten-thousandth after the first 3 months.

The AEC has been very reluctant in releasing official facts about atomic and hydrogen bomb tests, the aftereffects, persistence of fallout, or any recommendations for protection against the heat, blast, and radioactive fallout, products of these thermonuclear blasts. The first official facts about the March 1, 1954, blast were released by the AEC on February 15 of this year, almost a year later. In fact, the AEC denied the existence of the new superbomb until the recent Libby report. I fear that the administration has failed to take the public into its confidence. We must face up to the facts and adequate information must be available if we are to carry out any realistic program of defense.

The people must have all the facts possible so that they can understand the nature of the problems which confront them. We in America do not need a glossy coating on unpleasant material. If we are supplied with the necessary information, there will be no panic or hysteria. I think perhaps some of the lack of interest in our civil-defense program is due to the fact that people do not realize what we are faced with in the field of thermonuclear weapons.

I wish to voice my unqualified support for the United States proposal that the United Nations evaluate the effects of nuclear radiation and fallout from atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. In my previous speech, I spoke of such a plan. The proposal was originally suggested on March 6, 1955, by the Federation of American Scientists, a group of 2,200 United States scientists and engineers concerned with science's role in world affairs. This proposal is a major step forward. An assemblage of radiological information from all sources will make it much easier to answer the questions raised throughout the world about the possible harmful effects of nuclear tests.

This United States proposal was announced by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at the United Nations commemorative session at San Francisco. The proposed study is essential to insure that humanity is not endangered by these tests. A general study of this nature has already been undertaken by the Federation, with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

At this point I think it appropriate that I speak briefly about several problems involving our scientists—namely, security and the shortage of capable scientists and engineers.

In the May 27 issue of Science, a bulletin of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. M. Stanley Livingston said great difficulty had been met in finding scientists willing to talk in public about the problem of nuclear radiation hazards.

> This experience illustrates—

Dr. Livingston reported—

> one of the political dilemmas in which we find ourselves. * * * Those who know won't speak, and those who don't know cannot speak with authority.

Security regulations, fear of controversial issues, and administrative restriction on speaking by employees were cited by Dr. Livingston as the reasons why a scientific-political program was difficult to arrange.

It is unfortunate that in this Nation of ours men who attempt to voice an opinion run the risk of being accused of having Communist leanings or lack of professional competence. We are fortunate that there are a few who are willing to take the risk and express their particular viewpoint. Without these few, we would be lost, because solutions can be arrived at only after proper discussion. Insecurity in the field of science has a definite bearing on the appeal and inducements to bring new and fresh talent into the science and engineering fields.

In an address before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union would graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States. He warned that unless something was done at once, Soviet scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas.

In an article in the May 31, 1955, issue of the Washington Evening Star, Ben H. Bagdikian brought forth some very enlightening figures. The article cites a 1953 poll of science Ph. D.'s graduating from research universities, which showed them equally divided as regards where they would like to work—one-third each in Government, industry, and universities. In 1954—after the investigation of Fort Monmouth and the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer—a poll of Ph. D.'s showed that the 33 percent who previously wanted to work for the Government had dropped to 8 percent. The chief reason given for the change was security.

Our Nation cannot afford to discourage young scientists. At a time when its requirements for trained men are rising sharply, bachelor degrees in science have been dropping—20 percent in 1950–51; another 25 percent in the next year. In 4 years all bachelor degrees in science and engineering have dropped from 80,000 to 34,000. We cannot underestimate the quality of Russian scientists and engineers. If this trend is not diverted, we shall be threatened with the loss of the battle for scientific manpower. In addition, the Federal Government cannot afford to encourage public contempt of highly trained and skilled men in the sciences.

At a later date I plan to discuss more completely the matter of scientist and engineer shortages. Briefly, there are a number of things which can be done to give new life to the incentives in the science fields: encourage the study of science at the high-school level; better teaching methods and facilities; a correction of the selective-service laws; a Federal scholarship program to help worthy students meet expenses; and finally a better public relations and security program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me inquire, Mr. President, whether the Senator from Montana desires to finish his speech before yielding for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, Mr. President; I am glad to yield at this point for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, let me say that I think the Senator from Montana is making a very interesting speech; and, in particular, I think he makes a very interesting statement when he says we should encourage the study of science at the high-school level.

I wish to say to him that a few months ago, I was speaking before the Association of School Administrators, and I had been making as strong a plea as I could for the encouragement of the study of science at the high-school level. But the superintendent of schools in one of the communities came to me, and asked, "What would you do when you began to lose your high-school teachers?"

I asked him to explain what he meant.

He said, "The oil companies of Texas used to take a great many of the science teachers from the colleges and universities, because they needed them for their work; and they provided a very fertile field for the future activities of such scientists. But," he said, "now all the uranium promoters have hired those men, who normally were available to the oil companies." And he said, "My high-school science teacher was approached just a few weeks ago by an oil company, and was told that whatever his salary was, they would be happy to double it, because they had to have scientists."

If such companies continue to take the high-school science teachers, it will not be many decades—in terms of 4 years of high-school work—before we shall not have any trained scientists, because if the teachers of chemistry, physics, and mathematics are taken from the high schools, it will not be long before there will not be any university students who will know anything about those subjects, either.

The Russians are ahead of us, this year, in terms of the number of trained scientists who are being graduated from colleges and universities; but the Russians are six times ahead of us in terms of the number of persons who are trained in trade schools, and who will do the fashioning and the other mechanical work in connection with the production of nuclear and thermonuclear bombs and other devices.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana, who is a distinguished educator in his own right, that one of the most serious problems now confronting us arises from the raiding of high-school faculties by companies which wish to obtain the services of science teachers, whereas today we need more than ever before in our lives competent science teachers to train the new generations.

So, I suggest to this group that they set up a few simple laboratories where some of these things can be demonstrated. It costs only a few dollars to make a simple Geiger counter—not a really good one, but a simple one. Sufficient ores can now be obtained from various sources. I think it would be interesting to let those who are attending school find out how the Geiger counter works. Simple Geiger counters can be obtained for $8 or $10 apiece. However, the school boards have been asking, "What practical value do they have?"

Let me say that they have about the same practical value that the old box-type camera had. Nevertheless, the box cameras interested many young people in the use of photographic equipment.

So I am trying to say to the able Senator from Montana that I subscribe fully to what he has said; and I wish there were some way to develop a program by means of which to make sure that a sufficient number of science teachers will be at work in our high schools and colleges, and that there may be some way of giving them inducements to withstand the temptations which properly come to them from those who are interested in the development of uranium and oil, so that, day by day, we shall not lose the science teachers from our high schools, and thus complicate the development and future of those institutions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me at this time for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the interruption on the part of the Senator from New Mexico, the very able chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I know that what he says is true, and I also know that for a long time he has been interested in this program.

I am interested in learning from him—I had not received information to that effect—how those who are active in the uranium and oil companies are taking the science teachers away from the high schools. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico is aware of the fact that at the present time the Soviet Union is graduating far more engineers and subengineers than is the United States, and that the curve for the Soviet Union is up, whereas for us it is going down.

What eventually will happen to us when we run out of science teachers, and when our young people cannot have the science education they should have, and when the lure of dollars to science teachers has had its way?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish I could answer that question, because I worry about that far more than I do about a lack of ore for our program. I think the United States has been able to stimulate the production of uranium ore to such an extent that there is now enough to take care of our requirements in the foreseeable future. I think there are other substances coming into use which will guarantee our success in the future, but I see no possibility of keeping up with an industry which is changing so fast as is the thermonuclear industry if we are unable to retain science teachers in our schools.

The same situation affects the Atomic Energy Commission itself. The director of the reactor program, who was making a reasonable salary with the Atomic Energy Commission, moved to private employment at approximately three times the salary he was receiving from the Atomic Energy Commission. He could as well have received five times the salary he had theretofore received if he had wanted to demand it. The same situation applies throughout the Atomic Energy Commission.

I hope we in the Congress may give some thought, as I have tried to do privately, to what the Senator calls a correction of the selective-service laws. I think the selective-service laws might well be changed so as to grant some sort of preferred status to young men and women who are willing to be teachers in our schools, as well as to those who are taking places in the critical industries.

The Senator has correctly stated that we are far behind Russia in the education of engineers. Perhaps that explains why Rusia has been gaining on us so rapidly in the development of planes and in the development of various other items which I think are extremely important to our defense, and which I am not at liberty to discuss on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana 1 or 2 questions along the line of the able address he has been delivering. Does the able Senator not believe that the heart of our trouble may lie in the salaries which teachers are receiving? I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that the National Education Association, our largest group of educators, in its annual convention at Chicago last week, pointed out that they felt that at least $300 million was needed—perhaps from the Federal Government—to bolster teachers' salaries throughout the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was aware of that fact. Pay is an important factor, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has pointed out. Science teachers are even being taken from the high schools and paid at least double what they were receiving in their teaching positions. So that is a very important consideration.

I hope something can be done to make certain that we have well-paid science teachers and other teachers in our schools, and that, if necessary, the Federal Government will subsidize, through high school and through college, outstanding boys and girls who have extraordinary talents in the field of science. In return we could get from such superior students a certain amount of service in the armed services, or in defense industries related to the security of our country. I think it would be a good investment. I believe we shall have to look into the question of ways and means to help alleviate the shortage which places us at such a great disadvantage vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure the Senator from Montana knows also that the report of the National Education Association to the teachers of the Nation last week in Chicago recommended that $200 million be appropriated by the Federal Government each year to enable superior high-school students to go on to college—students who otherwise, because of family hardship and other economic reasons, could not go to college.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be a good investment in the security of America.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me it would.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator has given thought to the possibility that a great number of scholarships might be given to boys and girls who have done distinguished work in science in high school, with the thought that they would go on to college and become scientists. The Congress has encouraged several types of scholarships. The Fulbright scholarships are excellent. They have accomplished fine results. But we are now face to face with an extreme shortage of engineers graduating from our schools and with a tragic shortage in teachers. It seems to me that, if we were able to provide a system of scholarships for high-school seniors who have shown unusual brilliance in physics, chemistry, and mathematics, we might be able in some degree to catch up with Russia. Is it not strange that we now begin talking about catching up with Russia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five years ago we were ahead in practically every field. Now we are falling behind, and we shall have to pay a terrific price if we do not wake up to the potentials involved.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have been very much interested in the discussion which has been taking place this afternoon on the floor of the Senate. For a long time I have felt that the points which have been stressed by distinguished Senators need more stressing on this floor and in the country generally. We recognize that we are living in an age of great change. I have spoken before teachers' colleges in my own State on the need of what I call the new day. A few days ago I spoke on the subject of the challenge to American learning in the atomic age. My address was in line with the discussion which I have heard here today.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question or two?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the tremendous growth of scientific training and knowledge in Russia has originated since the end of World War II?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but it certainly has been accentuated and emphasized; and the capture of German scientists has helped to push the Russian advance in science forward to a great extent.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator will recall the first bill under which refugees were brought into the United States. Is it not a fact that 90 percent of them were farmers and unskilled workers?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is approximately correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also correct to say that during the period of time when the first law was in effect the Russians succeeded in capturing a great many German scientists?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the Russians captured a great many of them and exported them, so to speak, to the Soviet Union, where they are still contributing of their skill to the building up of Soviet science.

Mr. KILGORE. The Russians virtually kidnaped those scientists. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. If we had brought those scientists to America, we would now have a tremendous acceleration of our scientific education. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In part that would be true. We did bring a large number of German scientists to America, and they are still carrying on worthwhile activities in the field of science, and they have contributed greatly to the advancement of American science.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator not realize also that a great number of them were brought into the United States as farm workers? I know of at least nine such cases.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from West Virginia is in a better position to speak on that subject than I am.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana one other question. Is not one of the troubles of the United States an inability to understand the problems of the free countries of Europe?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would assume that to be true.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator from Montana not feel that if we could send people abroad—of course I am heartily in accord with bringing them over here too—to demonstrate in European countries the ways of American life, it would promote good feeling?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The suggestion has great merit.

Mr. KILGORE. I have a specific case in mind. I know of one grade school teacher who has been sent to England. Her position in this country is being taken by a grade school teacher from England. That exchange program will be in effect for 1 year. Does the Senator not feel that such an exchange redounds to the benefit of both countries?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There can be no question about that.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore such exchange programs have terrific value to the free world. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. For that reason we should support exchange and scholarship programs to the utmost. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, theoretically, the entire human race can for all practical purposes be eliminated for the small sum of about 40 cents per human, give or take a few cents either way. The authority for this statement is credited to Dr. Leo Szilard, a distinguished physicist, by columnist Stewart Alsop. This statement is somewhat misleading since it makes no allowance for the cost of delivery or the attrition of defense. It assumes, in effect, a deliberate, unopposed effort to commit global suicide, for which I presume the human race is not yet ready.

However accurate this statement by Dr. Szilard may be, it makes it very plain that this enormous scientific advance opens up the possibility of genuinely unlimited destruction at very low cost. Combined with the fallout phenomenon it basically transforms the whole world situation.

The second question which faces our policymakers, who must deal with these new advancements in science and warfare, is what part the atomic, hydrogen, and superweapons play in our overall military and defense program.

At the height of the debate over our foreign policy in the Formosa Straits, Secretary of State Dulles put forth a new policy, which was endorsed by President Eisenhower, namely, the doctrine of limited atomic war with tactical weapons. This approach seemed plausible at first glance, but further examination brings a considerable number of doubts to mind.

In 1949 this doctrine may have been a great deterrent to war, because of our great superiority in the development of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. We no longer have this great advantage. The Soviet Union has advanced much faster than predicted. We do not know whether they have the U-bomb, but we do know that they have tested the H-bomb. It is likely that they will have the superbomb in the near future if they do not have it already, because of the general simplicity in development of this new force, once the atomic bomb has been mastered, which they have done.

Tactical weapons used on military targets only is a wishful attempt at minimizing the dangers of nuclear warfare. Can we rely entirely on this increased precision and accuracy? These nuclear weapons, large and small, are subject to error, human and mechanical. Weather conditions can change at the last moment. Military installations are usually near towns and cities. A weapon large enough to insure the destruction of such a military target will almost inevitably take a toll of nonmilitary areas. To paralyze an enemy it would be necessary to hit the centers of industry, which are heavily populated.

We may use a small atom bomb on an aggressor, but we can expect retaliation. The enemy may not have perfected a tactical atomic or hydrogen weapon, so they will drop several large ones. The next step would be a thermonuclear holocaust out of which would emerge no victor.

I find little assurance in the possibility of limiting an atomic war once it is started.

We have geared our national-defense policy to nuclear weapons to such an extent that we are not really prepared to fight a nonnuclear war. We are cutting the budgets of our armed services, and reductions are planned in manpower. The consequences of a cut-rate defense policy can be disastrous. I am pleased with and wholeheartedly endorse the increase in the Defense Department's funds being granted for fiscal year 1956.

At this point I wish to take the opportunity to commend my colleagues in the Senate who have taken it upon themselves to warn the people against complacency about our air superiority over the Soviet Union. Extended debate and testimony indicate that we are not necessarily in the lead in every respect in air superiority. Our advantage today is in means of delivery; but Stewart Alsop reported on May 16, 1955, that the Russian type 39 and type 37 do the same jobs as our B-47's and B-52's with half the number of engines. This means that the Soviet engineers have developed jet engines with twice the thrust of any yet achieved in this country. All indications are that we are neck and neck in the race to develop the intercontinental missile. Perhaps our greatest asset is our industrial capability and an advantage in offense and defense due to our air bases around the world.

A revulsion to the use of nuclear weapons is developing throughout the world. It is not very different to that which eventually resulted in the banning of poison gas and bacteriological weapons after the First World War. When that revulsion is added to the prospect of mutual annihilation, it may be that atomic weapons may also be headed for outlawing. If that should be the case, we are playing into the hands of the Russians by relying almost exclusively on nuclear weapons in our plans for massive warfare.

Recently Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, military analyst of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, called for the abolition of nuclear weapons, and proposed in effect that the NATO countries, which have 160 million more people than the Communist bloc, match the armed strength of the Russian and satellite forces.

Phillips said that "a nuclear war is so destructive that no one could possibly win." He continued:

> Such a war has no relation to any war that ever has been fought before. It is necessary to prevent it before mankind destroys itself. A single thermonuclear bomb today can release more explosive energy than has been used in all wars since gunpowder was invented.

The greatest problem we face in the future is setting up a worldwide program for the advancement of peace and an operative disarmament program. It seems much more difficult, however, to chart a positive and constructive future than the negative one we have been following up to this time.

As Albert Einstein once said:

> Every step appears as the unavoidable consequence of the preceding one. In the end there beckons more and more clearly general annihilation.

Man has developed the means to destroy himself. A satisfactory nuclear disarmament agreement may take years to reach. Our first objective should be to get on at once with the discussions which may lead to an agreement.

In considering the possibilities of an arms control program there are several things which must be considered. Huge bomb stockpiles in themselves are no longer of any great advantage because of the unlimited destructive power of these superbombs. As Dr. Libby said in his report, thirty 10-megaton U-bombs could blanket the entire continental United States with radioactive fallout and, of course, cause enormous blast, burn, and localized radiation in the immediate areas hit.

The value of numerical superiority in nuclear weapons has declined considerably. The American lead in the stockpile of atomic and hydrogen weapons is of less significance today. If the enemy has enough bombs to destroy us, there is little advantage in our having enough to destroy him 3 or 4 times over. Scientists moreover now believe we are approaching the ultimate weapon in the IBM—the intercontinental ballistic missile—which will soar through the stratosphere to bring death and destruction from blast, radiation, fire, and fallout. The earth is of a limited size and the IBM is believed to be virtually unlimited in distance and destructive powers.

International inspection, as first proposed in the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan, no longer provides foolproof knowledge of a nation's nuclear buildup. With natural uranium as the basic ingredient, only a minimum amount of the costly uranium 235 and plutonium need be produced and could easily be hidden. There will be no need for many huge power sources, no need for enormous gaseous diffusion plants, such as that at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

As so pointedly stated by Washington Post and Times Herald columnist, Chalmers Roberts, leaders on both sides of the Iron Curtain are beginning to alter their thinking and policies because of the nuclear facts of life.

It has become quite obvious that absolute control of all fissionable material—including each and every weapon—is now impossible. It is impossible because it has become relatively easy for any nation which has mastered the original technique to manufacture fissionable material and to create A- and H-bombs.

There have been a number of proposed disarmament programs. It is generally agreed that in this day and age, a relative, rather than an absolute, program of controls over all types of arms and armed forces might be obtainable. A prerequisite to any effective arms control would have to be a relaxation of world tension. There is some indication that there may be a general relaxation of tensions at the present time. That possibility will be put to a test at the forthcoming summit meeting of the Big Four.

Any effective arms control plan may also require a ban on nuclear tests. There are arguments pro and con in this respect. Continued tests of nuclear weapons are probably of less value to the United States than they were several years ago, prior to the testing of the H-bomb. Now our scientists and defense officials are primarily interested in greater weapon efficiency. Continued tests would be more useful to nations who have not progressed so far in nuclear weapons as has America. Tests would be necessary for all countries which are attempting to develop the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Are we now operating under the morning hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have passed the morning hour, and I have about 5 more minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understood we were supposed to take up the calendar. But I do not want to object if the Senator expects to speak only 5 minutes more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The morning hour has been concluded.

Mr. President, as I have said, the IBM is believed to be the ultimate in weapons and it is the goal which the United States must reach first, unless an effective arms control can be perfected.

A ban on tests would introduce an element of uncertainty into the development of guided missiles. The scientists could not be sure that the missile would perform as calculated. Concealment of tests might be possible in deep mines, though it would limit their usefulness. I seriously doubt that anyone could conceal an H-bomb explosion.

One of the greatest problems in any arms-control program would be the question of how to make use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and at the same time eliminate bombmaking potentialities.

In addition, it is necessary that reductions in conventional weapons proceed along with nuclear disarmament. If arms control were limited to nuclear weapons, the Soviet would hold a decisive advantage with its massive ground forces and new advancement in airpower.

Our country has been the target of much harmful propaganda abroad, because of the shift in winds at the March 1, 1954, H-bomb test at Bikini and the accidental injury to Japanese fishermen and some of the Marshall Islanders. It is clear that we will suffer further harmful propaganda if we continue tests without having the approval of friendly and neutral nations. So long as we must compete with the Soviet Union in the race for superiority in thermonuclear weapons we must continue to test these weapons.

Therefore, I wish to emphasize again that a United Nations study which would confirm the AEC assurances that well-safeguarded tests in small numbers would not exceed the danger threshold would do much to quiet fears among our allies and friends.

Ambassador Lodge could not have chosen a better way to relieve fears about radioactive fallout than to propose a survey through the United Nations. I sincerely hope that the administration will press for support of the Ambassador's proposal before the United Nations in September.

In the the meantime it would be most appropriate for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to begin consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, a resolution favoring United States participation in a scientific commission within the United Nations to study certain effects of nuclear explosions. This resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors. Before adjournment, I feel that it would be a big help if the Senate went on record overwhelmingly in favor of his resolution.

In conclusion, let me say that it would be foolish of us in America to relax any sound nuclear and military preparations until we can actually bring the Communist bloc nations to terms by getting them to agree to accept conditions under which there can be really effective international control of armaments of all kinds.

A fitting statement to end my remarks is credited to Albert Einstein. When asked what he felt the weapons of world war III would be, he replied to the effect that he did not know what weapons would be used in the next world war, but he was sure that the weapons used in world war IV would be rocks.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have not heard all of the very interesting speech of the Senator from Montana, but I have come to the conclusion that he is making no distinction between the strategic use and the practical use of atomic weapons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not discuss weapons in that sense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, let me raise a question with the Senator. Would he feel that it was worth while for the United States unilaterally to state that it would not bomb cities and population masses except in retaliation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the question has some merit, but I should like to think it through before I should be prepared to give a definite answer.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I suggest that the Senator might, if he has the time, read the 4-minute talk which I gave earlier today which proposes a separation in policy of strategic bombing against civilians and of the tactical use of atomic weapons against armed forces, military depots, transportation, and so forth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be most happy to read the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, as I always do when I do not hear them. If the Senator is referring to the idea of limiting atomic weapons, I think he is flirting with a mirage, because I do not think there is such a thing.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator, then, sees no difference between destroying populations and directing atomic missiles at troop concentrations and troop facilities?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. The Senator misinterprets my statement. I cannot see how we can pick out a target and call it a military or a tactical target, or whatever we may like, and be absolutely certain that what we are going to hit will be a military target, and that villages and cities, and so forth, will not be hit at the same time.

Mr. FLANDERS. The same is true of artillery fire against moving forces in a war of movement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; but, of course, artillery fire does not involve fallout, burns, and so forth, as in the case of U-bombs.

Mr. FLANDERS. Atomic warheads are of limited range but can be concentrated——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have very little information about atomic warheads. I have heard the term. I understand there is some question about their efficiency. But my knowledge of that subject is very limited.

Mr. FLANDERS. The atomic cannon is probably outmoded, and the delivery of atomic missiles either by guided missiles, by rockets, or by tactical bombing has replaced the artillery delivery of such missiles. But is it not an important point to consider that, in the first place, the whole sentiment of mankind is against the destruction of civilian populations by atomic means, and we might say, by any other means, although that really was not recognized in World War II by ourselves or anyone else?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. And the ultimate brutalism of war came when all parties decided to win a war by killing civilian populations as well as soldiers. The atomic weapon is a more efficient means of doing it, but it is brutal, however it is done.

This is the point I should like to raise with the junior Senator from Montana. We speak about increasing our Armed Forces. It is said that they are now at too low a level, or that our Armed Forces have been weakened. Is it possible to conceive of any appropriations for armies of any size, which would not be crippling to the United States and to our allies, if they were for armies for land warfare which were capable of successfully rolling back the masses of manpower which the Soviet Government is able to bring into the field?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is true that the Soviets have a decided advantage in manpower. I understand that since the end of the war the Russians have not changed their divisional strength one iota, but that instead of simply having 175 divisions, with few of them motorized and mechanized, they now have 175 mechanized and modernized divisions; that the satellite states have 85 divisions, not quite so good as the Russian divisions, from the viewpoint of modernization; and that the Communist Chinese have approximately 4,500,000 troops. This indicates, of course, a great preponderance in land strength in relation to the Western or free world.

No, at present we could not begin to equal them in manpower because of the tremendous reserves upon which they can draw.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am suggesting to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, that we may well deny any intention of using strategic bombing except in reprisals—that is, bombing against populated cities and populations—but that it may be necessary for us, in order to deal from a position of strength, to retain the power and the right to use tactical bombing in land warfare against ground troops. It may be that that is where our only strength lies, and that we must not give up that possibility; and that if we do not give up that possibility, then we shall be in a favorable position to negotiate for a more general disarmament.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's statement may be a correct one; he has studied the subject far more than I have, and he knows much more about it than I do.

I shall read his speech with a great deal of interest, then I shall try to discuss with him my reactions to it. I am sorry I did not hear it when he delivered it this morning.

EXHIBIT A

THE H-BOMB DANGER: AN ANALYSIS OF SCIENTISTS' WARNING FINDS IT IS OLD AND OMITS MUCH

(By William L. Laurence)

There appears to be nothing new in the statement of the nine scientists that "neither side can hope for victory in a nuclear war" and that "there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race by dust and rain from radioactive clouds."

Early in 1950, shortly after President Truman had directed the Atomic Energy Commission "to continue with the development of the so-called hydrogen or superbomb," the late Albert Einstein made the following statement:

"The hydrogen bomb appears on the public horizon as a probably attainable goal. * * * If successful, radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere, and hence annihilation of any life on earth, has been brought within the range of technical possibilities."

As early as 1947, long before the hydrogen bomb was even mentioned in public, Prof. Edward Teller, the principal architect of the hydrogen bomb, said that "the effects of an atomic war fought with greatly perfected weapons and pushed by utmost determination will endanger the survival of man."

SZILARD WAS SPECIFIC

Prof. Leo Szilard, one of the pioneers in the development of the atomic (fission) bomb, was even more specific. Speaking over the radio at a University of Chicago Round Table, in February 1950, he estimated that the fusion of 400 tons of heavy hydrogen (deuterium) would be sufficient to "kill everybody on earth."

One ton of deuterium, if completely fused in a hydrogen bomb, would explode with an energy of 1 megaton, or million tons of TNT. It would liberate 125 kilograms of neutrons. Hence the fusion of 400 tons of deuterium would be the equivalent of 400 million tons of TNT and would liberate as much as 50 tons of neutrons.

However, what the scientists' statement apparently ignores is the fact that the predictions made by Einstein, Teller, Szilard, and many other nuclear scientists are predicated entirely on a special type of hydrogen bomb, the so-called cobalt bomb, which consists of a hydrogen bomb encased in a shell of cobalt.

In such a bomb, and in such a bomb only, the neutrons liberated per megaton of explosive energy would create a deadly cloud of radioactive cobalt equal to the radioactivity of some 5 million pounds of radium. The explosion of a quantity of deuterium equal to 400 million tons of TNT, if encased in shells of cobalt, would thus liberate in the atmosphere a deadly radioactive cloud equal to 2 billion pounds (1 million tons) of radium.

Such an astronomical quantity of radioactivity, traveling around the earth, would indeed be enough to kill everybody on earth.

EFFECT ON THE ATTACKER

However, as Dr. Teller himself was the first to point out, "one limitation to such an attack (the use of a cobalt bomb) is the boomerang effect of these (radioactive) gases on the attacker himself. The radioactive gases would eventually drift over his own country, too." He warned, however, that instead of using cobalt, which has a radioactive half-life of 5 years, the attacker could choose an element that has a much shorter radioactive decay period.

"With the proper choice," Dr. Teller said, "he (the attacker) could insure that his victim would be seriously damaged by them (the short-lived radioactive gases) and that they would have decayed by the time they reached his own country."

As against this danger, there is, of course, the deterrent effect of the victim retaliating with similar short-lived radioactive clouds.

Here we come to the very heart of the problem, which again the Russell statement ignores—the deterrent effect of the fission as well as the fusion bomb against any temptation by an aggressor to unleash a nuclear war against a victim.

It was Sir Winston Churchill, in an address at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boston, on March 31, 1949, who first pointed to the deterrent effect of even the antediluvian fission bomb of those days:

"I must not conceal from you tonight the truth as I see it," he said. "It is certain that Europe would have been communized like Czechoslovakia and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States."

Since then we have developed fission bombs at least 25 times as powerful as the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs, and a wide variety of tailormade tactical atomic weapons designed for use against armies in the field. These, both statesmen and military leaders agree, have served to neutralize the advantage of the vast superiority in numbers possessed by Russia and China.

It is also widely recognized that the deterrent effect serves mainly to discourage the aggressor. For the aggressor has the choice of whether to attack or not to attack, and it is therefore not regarded as likely that anyone in his right mind would choose to attack in the full knowledge that the price he would have to pay would be much greater than any possible gain he may expect.

The London statement also fails to take into consideration the fact, recognized by few even among nuclear physicists, that the normal hydrogen bomb gives off little dangerous radioactivity.

FUSION BOMB MATERIALS

There are three types of materials that can be used in a fusion bomb. The most common is deuterium, or hydrogen of an atomic mass of 2, which exists in all the earth's waters in a ratio of 1 part in 5,000. Another is tritium, or hydrogen of atomic mass 3, which does not exist in nature and is very expensive to produce. A third element is light lithium, of atomic mass 6, which must be separated from heavy lithium of atomic mass 7. The heavier lithium constitutes 92.5 percent of all lithium found in nature.

All these elements, used singly or in combination when fused in a thermonuclear weapon, give off only neutrons as a byproduct. These neutrons enter any element in their vicinity. Hence, when the casing of the fusion bomb is ordinary steel, the vaporized steel does not constitute a dangerous radioactive element, according to the best informed nuclear authorities.

The neutrons may also enter nitrogen atoms in the atmosphere and transform them into radioactive carbon of atomic mass 14. Such radioactive carbon has a very long radioactive decay period of nearly 6,000 years and the amount of such carbon that would be created is also not considered by top nuclear scientists as constituting a very serious danger to life.

Recently there has been reckless speculation about a so-called U-bomb, in which the element used is the abundant uranium of atomic mass 238. According to this speculation, the hydrogen bomb is not actually a fusion bomb, but a contraption described as a fission-fusion-fission bomb in which the principal explosive force comes not from fusion of light elements but from the fission of large quantities of uranium 238.

Authorities of the highest competence have assured this writer that no such uranium bomb exists or could exist, as a fundamental law of nature makes it impossible. This law is that uranium 238 cannot sustain a chain reaction.

Recently there has also been concern over the mention made by Dr. Willard F. Libby, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, of a "10-megaton fission bomb," which was taken to mean the uranium-238 "fission-fusion-fission" bomb. In this case also the writer has been authoritatively assured that no such fission bomb actually exists, and that Dr. Libby merely mentioned it as a hypothetical weapon to illustrate a point.

All leading statesmen and military authorities agree that the hydrogen bomb, as well as the strategic and tactical fission bomb, have served, and will continue to serve, as the major deterrent against global war, and that they must be expected to continue to serve as the shield of mankind against aggression, a shield much more powerful than any statement signed by any number of scientists, no matter how prominent.

EXHIBIT B

A-BOMB IS 10 NERVOUS YEARS OLD

(By Elton C. Fay)

Ten years ago this week, man terrified himself by winning a monumental scientific victory.

He produced an atomic weapon.

Now he has lived with it for a nervous decade, watching its mounting power and numbers dominate political decisions, remake the art of war and threaten him each day with extinction.

The United States made the weapon first because it won a race with Nazi scientists. For 5 years the weapon belonged exclusively to the United States. No one expected it would remain forever exclusive, but Russia learned its secrets far faster than was forecast.

Today atomic weapons exist by the thousands, a family so diversified that one number can be used merely to blow out an enemy airfield or another to vaporize the biggest city.

Their blasts can wipe out great masses of humanity in an instant and threaten countless others with lingering death from radioactivity, spreading out over thousands of square miles. They can unleash heat greater than that of the sun itself.

The atomic weapon age opened at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on July 16, 1945, like a Wagnerian opera. Pitch darkness, storm, lightning pealing thunder greeted the band of men who came to the desert at night to test their weapon. It was an omen for the anxious decade ahead.

The band of scientists and military men who gathered on a lonely corner of the sprawling Alamogordo Air Base 120 miles southeast of Albuquerque, was small by comparison with the tens of thousands who were to conduct tests in later years, but their names now are famous.

Heading the Manhattan District, the very name of which was high secret, was Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, with Brig. Gen. Thomas F. Farrell as his deputy. Both were Army engineers.

The command was military, but much of the personnel was civilian—men like Drs. Robert Oppenheimer, Vannevar Bush, R. F. Bacher, James Conant, Enrico Fermi, Alvin C. Graves and K. T. Bainbridge. Since 1940, these scientists had been working toward the goal of creating explosion by fission of atoms.

Now all the years of calculations of theories, of laboratory tests, of refining uranium, of building huge and secret plants were past. The moment for proof had arrived.

Four nights before, in an old ranch house, the scientists had started putting together the components of the first bomb, the explosive charge, the rudimentary trigger. What they assembled represented a $2 billion Government investment.

Two days before scheduled shot time, they had hoisted the bulky, instrument-festooned gadget to the top of a steel tower. The time set for the detonation, "S-hour" (shot hour), was 4 a. m., but when that hour arrived a violent thunderstorm was whipping the area. The timetable was reset to 5:30 a. m.

The closest observers were stationed in a timber and earth dugout almost 6 miles from the bomb site, where the controls for the test were situated. At another point, nearly 10 miles distant, Groves, Bush, and some of the other top officials took their stand.

The storm had rumbled away into the distance. The count-down began, first measured in minutes, then shrinking to seconds. Tension gripped the men who had built the bomb.

A timer chanted the moments over a loudspeaker—"Minus 5 seconds, 4, 3, 2, now."

Then came a swiftly mounting unearthly white light, the punch of a racing shock wave and the grumbling roar of the explosion.

Success. Success that exceeded estimates.

What did some of those atomic pioneers think about in that moment of victory?

Groves, now a retired lieutenant general, says:

"My first reaction when the explosion occurred was naturally one of pleased relief. But I did not, as did most of my scientific associates, I believe, regard it in any way as the climax. It was more of a 'Well, we're over that hurdle' feeling.

"After a moment of interchanging congratulations with Dr. Bush and Dr. Conant and a few others, I turned my attention to the immediate problem of making certain that the fallout danger was under control and that the press reports of the explosion were localized to the maximum extent possible.

"As to my retrospective views, I doubt if they are much different from my feelings at the time. I feel now as I did then, that the means of waging war had been revolutionized and that war would now be too terrible for any nation to engage in if its enemy had atomic weapons in quantity and the means to deliver them."

Farrell, now a retired major general, remembers:

"I do not expect to be so moved again until I approach the gates of heaven. The scientists who knew all about the atom were as deeply affected as we unlearned ones to whom all this was new and strange.

"I thought we now have a sure and rapid means of ending the war in the Pacific. The whole business of war will be revolutionized. We should now get on with the business of making ready and delivering these weapons to the enemy and ending the war.

"This great new source of energy will impose an awful responsibility on those who control it.

"Now, 10 years later, I think: The world still has the choice of using this force for good or evil. The revolution in making war has not yet been fully realized. The potential for damage of the new weapon is so great that it may become self-controlling. Who will want to start the kind of a war in which there will be no victor—only vanquished?"

Dr. Graves recalls that as the explosion came he thought:

"Gosh, it worked.

"No, I didn't really expect it not to work, but * * *."

The scientists not only expected the thing to work, but foresaw with slide rule precision many of the characteristics of the first explosion caused by the fission of atoms.

It was a blast for which there were no precedents. Until that hour in the desert, all man-made explosions had traced from the ancient feat of the Chinese in producing detonation by molecular rearrangement.

Although the scientists foresaw the fallout peril and other characteristics of the explosion, they appear to have been deeply conservative in their estimates of the energy to be released. Their specifications called originally for an explosion equivalent to about 1,000 tons of TNT. The physicists scaled this up a little in their computations but they apparently did not reach the 20,000-ton figure which the bomb actually attained.

Not for another 9 years were the weaponeers to err so widely in computing explosive power. The 1954 test explosion of a thermonuclear device at Bikini Atoll was reported to have been about double the power expected by the designers.

For several years after Alamogordo's "trinity" test, the use of two bombs on Japanese targets and the 1946 tests against naval ships at Bikini there was belief that the minimum size of an atomic bomb had to be 20,0000-ton (20-kiloton) energy, with doubt about building up beyond that range.

This is forgotten now. Nuclear fission explosions ranging from a single kiloton to 100 kilotons have been detonated at the Nevada proving ground. In the remote Pacific proving ground at Eniwetok, tests running up to half a million kilotons presumably have been carried out.

These, of course, are the mere conventional fission explosions—little things when measured against the H-bomb.

The H-bomb is miscalled. Actually, hydrogen is only one of the elements which appear in the production of atomic fusion, thermonuclear explosions.

The atomic weapons: Fission and fusion—which exist or are close to perfection today fall into two classes:

1. Tactical bombs, missiles, rockets and cannon projectiles, for use against troops on the battlefield, ships at sea, enemy plane formations or specific military targets such as supply dumps, transportation centers or naval or air bases.

2. The weapons of strategic destruction, capable of wiping out vast areas.

There is no practical limit to the power of a thermonuclear bomb except the dimensions of its casing and its transportability. In a preliminary test of thermonuclear explosion in 1952, using a device much smaller than the 1954 weapons, an island of the Bikini Atoll was wiped out, leaving a crater a mile wide and 175 feet deep in the ocean floor.

It was the 1954 test which focused new and worried attention on the radioactivity aspects of atomic explosions. Unexpected wind direction, together with apparently unexpected force of explosion, sent radioactive clouds drifting beyond predicted limits. Japanese fishermen were contaminated. There were protests from abroad and growing concern at home.

The Atomic Energy Commission eventually admitted that about 7,000 square miles of territory downwind from the explosion was so contaminated that survival of any persons who might have been in the area—all had been removed—would have depended on whether the people were removed promptly or could have taken cover against the fallout.

Fallout is a byproduct of the major mission of atomic explosion, blast effect. But the major atomic nations have adapted radioactivity as a separate weapon, applied directly and without the aid of atomic detonation.

Radiological warfare is now a division in itself, akin to chemical and germ warfare and capable of delivery in somewhat the same manner. Radioactive materials can be packaged in artillery shells, guided missiles or rockets and fired like any chemical shell. Upon impact or mid-air detonation, a conventional explosive charge spreads the deadly product. Radiological material also can be sprayed from aircraft or delivered in stealth by saboteurs.

These are the terrifying children of a weapons age now 10 years old. Although muted by an uneasy peace, their voices speak loudly above whispers that atomic energy can bring a better life for all humanity.

They hastened the end of one great war and may have helped prevent an even deadlier conflict. But unless and until man becomes certain that war has been eliminated, he will be haunted by fear that the foundation of his own extinction may have been laid in the desert sands in Alamogordo.

EXHIBIT C

GHOST CITIES SEEN AFTER ATOM BLAST—PETERSON SAYS RAYS CAN MAKE ATTACKED SITES UNLIVABLE—ASKS EVACUATION FUNDS

WASHINGTON, July 10.—The Civil Defense Administrator, Val Peterson, has informed Congress it is entirely possible atomic bombing would make it impossible ever to reenter some American cities.

He also indicated civil-defense planners were thinking in terms of hydrogen bomb attacks that would wipe out everyone in a diameter of 10 miles or more. This would mean a shattering blast equal to 20 million tons of TNT.

Mr. Peterson gave his grim statistics to a secret session of a House appropriations subcommittee considering his request for $16,050,000 in extra civil-defense funds. Mr. Peterson's testimony, given June 29, was made public today.

He said $10 million of the money would be used to speed planning for the evacuation of 92 key target cities. Another $2 million would go for research on such matters as new home-warning devices, operating through ordinary telephone or power lines.

Underscoring the gravity of the problem, Mr. Peterson cited New Orleans as an example of a city that atomic bombing might forever bar to human habitation. He also said atomic bombs might set off a tidal wave in Lake Michigan that would sweep over Chicago.

RADIOACTIVE MIST FEARED

He referred to the danger that nuclear explosives dropped into ocean, lake, or river waters might spray adjoining cities with a deadly radioactive mist that might linger on indefinitely.

The civil-defense chief said it would be impossible to protect people in a target area against bombs of the magnitude now envisioned by his planners.

But he said the facts indicate strongly that there can be sufficient advance warning to evacuate target cities successfully provided sound plans were made in advance. Some committee members expressed doubt on this point.

Mr. Peterson said defense officials believed they could count on 2 hours' advance warning now and from 4 to 6 hours when work was finished on the new distant early warning network now being built across the northern wastelands in cooperation with Canada.

He said he believed even such big cities as New York and Chicago could be evacuated in that time.

CRATER COULD SWALLOW CITY

Mr. Peterson said too little was known about the deadly radioactivity stirred up by the atom and hydrogen bombs. But he added:

"It is entirely possible that some cities, when bombed, we may never reenter again. As an example of that, I would give New Orleans."

He said New Orleans was built on only 2 or 3 feet of dirt resting on water. He said a bomb dropped there would create a crater a couple of hundred feet deep and a mile and a half across that will immediately become a lake regardless of what has been there previously.

"In addition to that, the tides they will get may have an effect on the flow of the Mississippi River there. * * *

"The persistence of radioactivity there may be so great that you won't be able to go in there not alone for days, but you will not be able to go in there for months and years. And you might have to write some of those places off.

"That we do not know for sure."

Mr. PAYNE subsequently said: Mr. President, when my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was speaking, I happened to be occupying the chair as Presiding Officer. I had intended to make a few comments in connection with the very able and cogent remarks which he addressed to this body. I hope Senators who were present and heard his remarks will weigh them very carefully, and that Senators who were not present will read the RECORD, because of the careful and thoughtful treatment accorded the subject by the Senator from Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that the comment which I had intended to make at that time be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for the service he has rendered today in discussing so thoroughly the realities of the hydrogen age.

The Senator has spoken convincingly and clearly of the possible dangers which confront mankind. I am sure that every Member of the Senate, after hearing his speech, will agree that nothing is more important than that we adapt ourselves and our foreign and military policies to the potential for self-destruction which man has created. We must not fail in such an approach.

I, too, have long been interested in possible steps which this Nation could take to adapt itself to the nuclear age and, more important, to peacetime testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. It was my feeling that a United Nations study of the effects of radioactivity on living things might well be one way to lessen mankind's anxiety as well as to prevent possible harm from being done. In this way it might also be possible to pave the way for future international cooperation in solving this problem, which is common to every nation. With that objective in mind, I introduced on April 13, 1955, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, calling on the President to work to initiate such a study.

The response to that resolution was gratifying, with 27 other Senators joining me as cosponsors. I was certainly happy when the Senator from Montana, a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was among those cosponsoring the resolution.

I was pleased also when Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge recently placed the United States on record in favor of such a study. I agree with the Senator from Montana that now, in order to show the entire world that the United States is fully behind this proposal, the Senate itself should act quickly to approve a resolution endorsing this approach.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The call of the calendar will now be proceeded with, beginning where the last call ended.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was announced as first in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nevada withhold his request that the bill be passed over?

Mr. BIBLE. I withhold my request.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada. The Senator from Nevada serves with me on the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I feel quite certain he will join with me in the remarks I am about to make. I should also like to have the attention of the acting majority leader for a moment.

This bill has been approved by the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the District of Columbia. It is a bill which really has been written under the direction of the leadership of the two parties. It meets with the objections set forth in the veto last year of a similar bill. Last year the bill was vetoed only because the President believed that it was in violation of the Hatch Act; and the President was right about that, if the technical provisions of the Hatch Act were to be applied.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. My understanding is that the bill is the unfinished business, and is to be taken up following the call of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to its being taken up for debate, but I think the Senate ought to have as its unfinished business a matter which really needs to have much more debate than this bill will call for. I do not like to see it passed over on the call of the calendar, when I believe it would automatically pass, if it were not the unfinished business.

I suggest that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, and that in the meantime an effort be made to have a more controversial bill made the unfinished business for consideration later this afternoon. Then, when the call of the calendar has been completed, the Senate can take up the bill we are now discussing. I shall be very much surprised if any Senator will be heard to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Oregon that the bill, if it be objected to at this time, will go to the foot of the calendar and will be called up automatically when the call of the calendar has been completed.

Mr. MORSE. It will come up as new business, not by unanimous consent.

I wanted to make my statement because I think the bill is one which should be disposed of today. Considering the short time remaining in this session of Congress, I do not believe the committees of the two major political parties should be denied the opportunity to have the bill passed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I renew my objection. I understand that the acting majority leader and the minority leader have scheduled the bill as the unfinished business. It was for that reason that the request was made that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR INSURANCE LOANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1758) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance loans, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments on page 2, line 22, after the word "mortgage," to strike out "heretofore," and at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "heretofore," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000 and the following), is further amended as follows:

Title I of the act is amended by the addition of the following new section 16:

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary is authorized to insure and to make commitments for the insurance of loans made for the purposes specified in this title (including those made in accordance with the act of October 19, 1949) and to take as security for the obligations entered into in connection with such loans first mortgages on the farms with respect to which such loans are made and such other security as may be required by the Secretary. Such mortgages shall create a lien running to the United States for the benefit of the fund, notwithstanding the fact that the note may be held by the lender or his assignee.

"(b) Loans insured under this section shall be subject to all provisions of this title, except as otherwise provided in this section, and with respect to such loans, the terms used in this act shall have the following meanings as the context requires:

"(1) 'Mortgage' shall mean 'loan' or 'the instruments relating to a loan';

"(2) 'Insured mortgage' shall mean 'note endorsed for insurance';

"(3) 'Mortgagor' shall mean 'borrower' or 'obligor on the note';

"(4) 'Mortgagee' shall mean 'lender' or 'holder of insured note.'

"(c) Any mortgage insured or any loan made under this act may be converted to an insured loan under this section at the discretion of the Secretary, and any expenses in connection with such conversion may be paid out of appropriations for administrative expenses.

"(d) In connection with loans insured or converted under this section (1) the holder of the insured note shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as provided in section 13 (a) only in accordance with an agreement pursuant to section 12 (j) or when the assignment of the note is required by the Secretary, and (2) notice of default to the lender under section 12 (f) shall not be required."

SEC. 2. Section 12 (f) (1) is amended by striking the word "promptly" in both the first and second sentences, by inserting after the word "default" in the second sentence the words "in the payment of principal or interest," and by striking the word "it" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "him."

SEC. 3. Section 12 (f) (2) is amended by striking the word "promptly."

SEC. 4. Section 13 (a) is amended by striking the words "section 12" in the first sentence, inserting in lieu thereof the words "this title," and by inserting the words "in the payment of principal or interest" after the word "default" where it first appears in the first sentence.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill was considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It would simplify and reduce the costs of administering farm ownership loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act by—

First. Providing that mortgages be made directly to the Secretary of Agriculture to secure insured loans;

Second. Providing for conversion of insured mortgage loans and direct loans to this new type of direct mortgage insured loan;

Third. In the case of these direct mortgage insured loans, eliminating the borrower's default as a ground for collection of the loan from the insurance fund and eliminating the requirement for notifying lenders of such default;

Fourth. Eliminating the requirement of promptness by the Secretary in remitting collections, advising lenders of borrowers' defaults and paying the amounts defaulted; and

Fifth. Making default in payment of principal or interest the only kind of default entitling holders of old type insured mortgages to notice or to collection of their loans from the insurance fund.

The committee amendments would permit loans made or insured after enactment of the bill to be converted to the new direct mortgage insured loan. The bill as introduced provided for such conversion in the case of loans made or insured prior to enactment of the bill.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPANSION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 75) directing a study and report by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture proposing an expansion of the tobacco production, utilization and marketing research program, with primary emphasis on basic research, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 5, line 1, after the word "tobacco", to strike out "and tobacco smoke"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(1)"; and after line 18, to strike out:

(2) Pattern of tobacco consumption and smoking habits. Initiation of studies to determine the pattern of tobacco consumption in the United States and the smoking habits of the population.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Administrator") is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and submit to the Congress by January 1, 1956, a proposed continuing program of new and expanded tobacco production, utilization, and marketing research, with primary emphasis on basic research, for orderly implementation over a 5-year period, adequate to meet the needs mentioned in this joint resolution and such other needs as he may deem advisable, including without being limited to the following categories of research:

PRODUCTION RESEARCH

(1) Production quality investigations: Initiation of basic studies to determine more of the underlying principles associated with the most efficient production of better quality tobaccos.

(2) Tobacco disease increase and overlap: Expansion of the program to develop varieties with multiple resistance to overlapping diseases for local adaptation in areas where it has not been possible to conduct work and in areas where resistant types now developed do not withstand the attack of new disease combinations or disease strains that are localized.

(3) Nematodes affecting tobacco: Expansion of investigations of nematode diseases of tobacco, particularly to identify the forms prevalent in the various tobacco producing regions and determine the disease significance of each of these forms and their full host range to make possible proper control by crop rotation.

(4) Biological control of insect pests: Expansion of research to develop methods of utilizing parasites, predators, and insect diseases for the control of insect pests of tobacco.

(5) Improvement in methods of applying insecticides with ground equipment: Initiation of research on the improvement of methods for applying insecticides to tobacco with ground equipment.

(6) Improvement in design and operation of tobacco curing equipment: Investigation of design and operation of all methods of curing, including oil, coal, gas, and wood burning tobacco curers, to reduce or eliminate odors and soot deposit occurring in some cured tobacco.

(7) Mechanization of production: Initiation of research toward more mechanization for the economic production of tobacco, with special emphasis on harvesting.

(8) Lamp specification for farm tobacco sorting: Initiation of research to establish specifications for electric lamps to be used by farmers in sorting tobacco.

UTILIZATION RESEARCH

(1) Analytical methods and compositional studies: Initiation of basic research to iso-

late and identify the constituents of tobacco and its combustion products, including, without being limited to, studies (a) to apply new techniques to the development of improved analytical methods for determining the components of tobacco; (b) to isolate resinous components of tobacco and determine their relationship to such quality factors as aroma, flavor, and burn; (c) to fractionate the polyphenols of tobacco, identify the individual compounds, and determine their role in the production of aroma and other quality characteristics; and (d) to isolate and identify the nitrogenous compounds of tobacco and determine the changes they undergo during the processing of tobacco with a view to the development of improved processing methods and improved quality of tobacco.

(2) Fermentation of tobacco: Initiation of studies of changes occurring in the fermentation of tobacco and of the identification of the agents responsible for such changes.

MARKETING RESEARCH

Control of insects attacking stored tobacco: Expansion of research on insects attacking stored tobacco.

SEC. 2. In preparing his report on expansion of the research program, the Administrator shall include data on his estimates of the funds, personnel, and facilities which would be necessary to carry it out. He shall consult with the State experiment stations' committee on organization and policy as to the needs and functions of State agricultural agencies and institutions in carrying out this program, and jointly with them recommend what he and they deem to be the most effective division of the research functions and projects among the several Federal and State agencies and institutions which are now or may be engaged in agricultural research work. He shall also examine and report on the extent to which other institutions, such as public and private nonagricultural universities and colleges, may effectively participate in the program under contract with the Federal Government. The Administrator may conduct such hearings and receive such statements and briefs as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Directing a study and report by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture proposing an expansion of the tobacco production, utilization, and marketing research program, with primary emphasis on basic research.

Whereas the entire agricultural research program of the United States is vitally important to our agricultural progress, helping make it possible for our farmers to increase their efficiency while cutting costs of production of all crops; and

Whereas tobacco production ranks fifth in importance in farm value and twelfth in acreage of all farm crops harvested in the United States; and

Whereas tobacco production is becoming a hazardous financial undertaking for farmers because the returns depend so much upon the particular leaf qualities which meet manufacturing and consumer demands; and

Whereas from the seedbed to the completion of the curing process the grower is confronted with complex cultural, disease, and handling problems which have a direct influence on the quality and value of the crop he produces; and

Whereas the knowledge of the chemical components that make up the conglomerate materials of tobacco is very limited, since most of these components have not been separated and identified: Therefore be it

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 899) to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have examined the bill very carefully. It is a bill under which the beneficiary will pay for the land the same price as is required of others under the homestead provisions of territorial law. This is simply a case in which there was obviously a misunderstanding as to the rights of the individual in the first place. An attempt has been made to correct the misunderstanding. He is not getting something for nothing, but is paying under the homestead territorial law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 899) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 12, 1914—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3338) to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to make a very brief explanation of Calendar No. 712, House bill 3338, inasmuch as I am the one who asked the acting majority leader to make objection to the bill. I wish to have more time to study the bill, and that is why I asked that it go over.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to page 2 of the Senate committee report, on which there appears a letter from Mr. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The next to the last paragraph reads:

> We recognize that enactment of the proposed bill would also have the effect of authorizing the leasing of the entire railroad for a period of 50 years. Although this Department has no immediate plan to lease the Alaska Railroad to a private operator, it is likely that, if such an arrangement were to be made, a private operator would be disinclined to lease the railroad for a period of less than 50 years.

Mr. President, I am engaged in investigating some of the contractual activities of the Department of the Interior under the present Secretary of the Interior, and I have gone far enough in my inquiry to satisfy me that so many of the Secretary's policies have been against the public interest that I do not propose to have him granted any additional powers, at least until after the investigation is completed.

I wish to repeat a statement I made earlier that I think there should be a Senate investigation of all the contracts the present Secretary of the Interior has entered into since he has occupied his office. Such an investigation ought to be conducted by the Senate of the United States. Until such an investigation is made, I shall look with suspicion upon any attempt to increase the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to grant leases and contracts.

ABOLITION OF OLD KASAAN NATIONAL MONUMENT, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 4046) to abolish the old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of House bill 4046.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill, I should like to make the following explanation:

The purpose of H. R. 4046 is to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, located in southeast Alaska, and to restore the lands to the Tongass National Forest, which entirely surrounds them, for administration. The bill was initiated by the Department of the Interior and introduced at the Department's request.

Old Kasaan National Monument, containing approximately 38 acres of land, was established by President Woodrow Wilson's Executive order of October 25, 1916—Thirty-ninth United States Statutes at Large, page 1812. It was ordered set aside as a national monument at that time so that remnants of an ancient aboriginal Indian village might be preserved. This village had been abandoned in 1900 and inhabitants having moved to a nearby cannery site. Remaining were some houses, totem poles, and a burial ground.

In more than 38 years funds have never been made available for administration of the area as a national monument. The Department of the Interior advises that the structures have largely disintegrated and that the area is no longer suitable for retention in the national park system. The Department of the Interior, therefore, recommends that the lands be returned to the national forest which completely surrounds them, and the committee concurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection to its present consideration, but I should like to ask several questions.

There being no objections, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4046) to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if the land involved is timbered land.

Mr. BIBLE. It is basically timbered land; yes. It is in the forests.

Mr. MORSE. The land would then become a part of the national forest and be subject to the same rules and regulations covering other national forests, would it not?

Mr. BIBLE. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. There is no plan to transfer the land to any private concern or individual, is there?

Mr. BIBLE. There is not.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4046), was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITY OF REFUGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5300) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which considered the bill, I should like to state that the purpose of H. R. 5300 is to preserve, as a national park, the historic and scenic area in the Hawaiian Islands known as the City of Refuge. It consists of some 180 acres on the Island of Hawaii, and is partially enclosed by walls of enormous lava blocks, believed to have been built in the 12th or 13th century.

The site is one of outstanding significance in the social and spiritual development of the peoples of the Hawaiian Islands centuries before the coming of the Europeans. Here was established a place where the weak and the oppressed, and criminal, political, and military fugitives could find sanctuary.

Thus, it symbolizes the spirit of social justice, clemency, and tolerance among the early inhabitants of what is now a part of the United States in the Pacific.

The committee was informed that for the first several years probably not more than $15,000 annually will be required for park purposes. When fully developed, expenditures of perhaps $40,000 annually may be required. A great part of the 180 acres will be donated, and the Governor of Hawaii is authorized to acquire lands for the park at the expense of the Territory.

The popularly elected Delegate from Hawaii, Mrs. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, appeared at the hearing held by the Senate Interior Committee and urged enactment of the legislation, as did representatives of the National Park Service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that what the bill proposes to do is establish a national park out of the land?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. And the Federal Treasury will pay for what—for the land, or is it already Federal land?

Mr. BIBLE. The Federal Government will pay nothing for the acquisition of the land. It will simply pay for the maintenance of it, as I detailed in the statement I made. It is estimated that for the first several years the cost of maintenance will be $15,000 annually, but it is possible that when the park is fully developed, expenditures of perhaps $40,000 annually may be required.

Mr. MORSE. If the land should be made a park, and if later Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as a State, who would own the park?

Mr. BIBLE. It would be a part of the national park system.

Mr. MORSE. It would be a part of the Federal national park system?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I not only do not object, but under the circumstances highly recommend the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5300) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

The bill (S. 689) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is hereby amended and incorporated as chapter XVI of such act, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER XVI—FARMER-DEBTOR RELIEF

"ARTICLE I—CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 901. The provisions of this chapter shall apply exclusively to proceedings under this chapter.

"SEC. 902. The provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, apply in proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, provisions relating to 'bankrupts' shall be deemed to relate also to 'debtors,' and 'bankruptcy proceedings' or 'proceedings in bankruptcy' shall be deemed to include proceedings under this chapter. For the purposes of such application, the date of the filing of the petition in bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the filing of an original petition under section 922 of this act, and the date of adjudication shall be taken to be the date of approval of a petition filed under section 921 or 922 of this act, except where an adjudication had previously been entered.

"ARTICLE II—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 906. For the purposes of this chapter, unless inconsistent with the context—

"(1) 'claims' shall include all claims of whatever character against the debtor or his property, whether or not such claims are provable as debts under section 63 of this act, and whether secured or unsecured, liquidated or unliquidated, fixed or contingent;

"(2) 'unsecured creditor' shall mean the holder of any unsecured claim;

"(3) 'secured creditor' shall include the holder of any secured claim, and any purchaser at a judicial or official sale to whom the deed was not delivered at the time the petition was filed to the extent of the money paid or credit received by such purchaser;

"(4) 'debtor' shall mean a farmer who files a petition under this chapter;

"(5) 'debts' shall include all claims;

"(6) 'executory contracts' shall include unexpired leases of real property;

"(7) 'farmer' shall mean an individual, or a partnership, or a corporation where actual farmers own at least 75 percent of its capital stock, and which farmer is primarily bona fide engaged in producing products of the soil, or in dairy farming, or in the production of poultry or livestock, or in the production of poultry or livestock products in their unmanufactured state, and the principal part of whose gross income is derived from any one or more of such operations, whether so engaged personally or as a tenant or by tenants, and shall include the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of any such deceased person so engaged at the time of his death in one or more of the foregoing operations: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this chapter shall not be available to a farmer whose sole interest in property, as hereinafter defined, is that of tenant;

"(8) 'individual' shall include common, joint, community, and entirety owners, provided that as to encumbered property all of such owners join in the petition so that the court will acquire jurisdiction over all interests in any affected encumbered property;

"(9) 'petition' shall mean a petition filed in a court of bankruptcy or with its clerk, by a debtor praying for the benefits of this chapter;

"(10) 'period of redemption' shall include any State moratorium, whether established by legislative enactment or executive proclamation, or where the period of redemption has been extended by judicial decree or as provided elsewhere in this chapter;

"(11) 'property' of a debtor shall include all his property, real and personal, wherever located, of every kind and nature, including but not limited to his interests in contracts for purchase, contracts for deed, conditional sales contracts, rights or equities of redemption, rights under trust deeds given as security, rights within a period of redemption which has not expired, rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, rights existing in case of sale which has not been confirmed or where a deed pursuant to sale has not been delivered; and

"(12) 'integral part or parcel' of a debtor's property shall not include only a portion of any contract lienholder's security.

"ARTICLE III—JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COURT

"SEC. 911. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the court in which the petition is filed shall, for the purposes of this chapter, have exclusive jurisdiction of the debtor and his property, wherever located.

"SEC. 912. Prior to the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers, where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication.

"SEC. 913. Upon the approval of a petition, the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the court and of its officers, where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 914. Upon the approval of a petition under this chapter, the court may, in addition to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties hereinabove and elsewhere in this chapter conferred and imposed upon it, permit the rejection of executory contracts of the debtor, upon notice to the parties to such contracts and to such other parties in interest as the court may designate.

"SEC. 915. Whenever notice is to be given under this chapter, if not otherwise specified hereunder, the court shall designate the time within which, the persons to whom, the form and manner in which the notice shall be given, and the contents of the notice. Any notice to be given under this chapter may be combined, whenever feasible, with any other notice or notices to be given under this chapter.

"SEC. 916. The judge may transfer a proceeding under this chapter to a court of bankruptcy in any other district, regardless of the residence of the debtor, if the interests of the parties will be best served by such transfer.

"SEC. 917. Where a petition is filed by the executor, administrator, or personal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, the consent of the court in which such estate is pending shall not be required.

"SEC. 918. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the jurisdiction of appellate courts shall be the same as in a bankruptcy proceeding.

"ARTICLE IV—PETITION, APPROVAL, AND STAY

"SEC. 921. A debtor may file a petition under this chapter in a pending bankruptcy proceeding either before or after his adjudication.

"SEC. 922. If no bankruptcy proceeding is pending, a debtor may file an original petition under this chapter with the court in whose territorial jurisdiction he has resided or the principal part of his farming operations have occurred for the preceding 6 months or for a longer portion of the preceding 6 months than in any other jurisdiction. The filing of such petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $45, to be distributed by him as in the case of a bankruptcy proceeding.

"SEC. 923. A petition filed under this chapter shall state—

"(1) that the debtor is insolvent or unable to pay his debts as they mature and that he desires to avail himself of the benefits of this chapter; and

"(2) the nature and status of all pending proceedings affecting the property of the debtor known to him and the courts in which they are pending.

"SEC. 924. The petition shall be filed in triplicate and at the time it is filed, or within 10 days thereafter, the debtor shall file in triplicate—

"(1) a statement of the executory contracts of the debtor;

"(2) the schedules and statement of affairs, if not previously filed, including a statement of rights of redemption which have not expired and rights under trust deeds which have not become absolute, and of deeds which have not been confirmed or delivered, and the property affected thereby;

"(3) where a petition is filed by the legal representative of the estate of a deceased debtor, copies of his appointment by the probate court, of which the original shall be certified;

"(4) his claim of exemption;

"(5) if he does not desire to retain possession of all of his property, a statement of the unexempt property, or such integral part or parcel thereof, and of the encumbered exempt property, possession of which he desires to retain for the purposes of the proceeding under this chapter; and

"(6) the offer, including the terms of payment, of a fair and reasonable rental to be made by him for each separately encumbered portion of his property, and for his unencumbered unexempt property, of which he desires to retain possession. All rental shall be payable from the date of the filing of the debtor's petition.

"SEC. 925. In determining the rental to be offered, the debtor shall give due consideration to the market value of the debtor's property, the customary rental value of property of the same general character located in the community in which the debtor's property is located, the actual net income and earning capacity of the debtor's property, its depreciation or deterioration by reason of use or age, and such other factors which may be essential in arriving at a fair and reasonable rental value, and shall give due consideration, in fixing the periodic payments quarterly, semiannually, or annually, in advance or at the end of such period, to the availability of farm income.

"SEC. 926. Upon the filing of the petition by a debtor and upon compliance by the debtor with section 924 of this act the judge shall enter an order approving the petition if satisfied that the requirements of this chapter have been complied with or, if not so satisfied, dismissing it for want of jurisdiction.

"SEC. 927. A petition shall not be dismissed under section 926 of this act because of the distressed financial condition of the debtor, or because there is no reasonable expectation of his financial rehabilitation, or because he may have no equity in his property above the encumbrances and other liens against it, or because of any other ground of like nature.

"SEC. 928. In addition to the applicable relief of section 11 of this act and the relief elsewhere provided under this chapter, the filing of a petition by a debtor shall, for the purposes of a proceeding under this chapter, operate as a stay of a prior pending bankruptcy, mortgage foreclosure, or equity receivership proceeding and of any act or other proceeding to enforce a lien against any of the debtor's property, including the sale of any of the debtor's property under the terms of any mortgage, pledge, or deed of trust, and of the commencement or continuation or of any act, suit, or proceeding against the debtor or his property until dismissal of the petition under section 926 of this act, or, if not so dismissed, then until further order of the court or until final decree dismissing or closing the proceeding under this chapter: *Provided, however,* That any exempt property of a debtor, whether or not encumbered, which he does not desire to retain in his possession, shall be wholly excluded from the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court without any order of the court other than the order setting aside the exemptions.

"SEC. 929. As to any property of the debtor, where, at the time of the filing of the debtor's petition, any legal or equitable action is pending, or steps toward selling under a power of sale in a mortgage or deed of trust have been taken but the sale has not become absolute, or a sale had not been confirmed, or a sale has been confirmed as provided in section 930 of this act, or the deed has not been delivered, or any executory contract has not been terminated, or the period of redemption has not expired, the plaintiff may dismiss such pending action without prejudice, or such pending action, such right to exercise the power of sale, such confirmation of sale, all proceedings and acts following confirmation of such sale as provided in section 930 of this act, the delivery of such deed, or the termination of such contract, shall be stayed or the period of redemption shall be extended for the period necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter, and until the termination of such stay the rights of any affected creditors and purchasers shall remain in the status which existed immediately prior to the filing of the petition, except as otherwise provided in this chapter. Any action taken in any of the matters mentioned in section 928 or in this section of this act after the filing of the petition and without prior approval of the court shall be of no legal force or effect, and the affected parties shall be restored to the status and to all legal and equitable rights they had immediately before the petition was filed.

"SEC. 930. Where any of his property, possession of which the debtor desires to retain, has been sold under a sale that requires confirmation, but which has not been confirmed, the court shall make an order authorizing the interested parties to proceed with the confirmation of the sale by the proper court for the sole purpose of determining whether such sale should be confirmed and thereby fixing the rights of the purchaser and secured creditor for the purposes of this section. If the proper court refuses to confirm the sale, all further proceedings pertaining to said sale shall be stayed as provided in sections 928 and 929 of this act. Where any sale has been made prior to the time of filing the petition, but such sale had not been confirmed until after the filing of the petition or the deed had not been delivered, the purchaser at such sale, to the extent of the amount paid on the purchase price, shall be considered a secured creditor, and payments to be made by the debtor under an extension proposal in payment of claims against the property so sold shall be paid in redemption from such sale. Any redemption under this chapter shall be subject to any prior liens. The amount necessary to redeem shall be the amount bid at such sale, whether or not the purchaser has paid the full amount of his bid. If the purchaser has not paid the full amount of his bid, such purchaser shall be the claimant as to the amount paid by him, and the affected secured creditor shall be the claimant as to the difference between the amount so paid and the amount bid. The secured creditor who has caused such sale to be made shall be deemed an unsecured creditor as to any excess of the debt over the amount of the bid and such excess shall be deemed to be allowed as an unsecured claim.

"SEC. 931. Any sale that would have foreclosed junior lienholders had the debtor's petition not been filed shall, nevertheless, foreclose such junior lienholders, and no such junior liens shall reattach after the debtor reacquires title.

"ARTICLE V—PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO APPROVAL OF PETITION

"SEC. 932. Upon approval of a petition, the judge may refer the proceeding to a referee appointed, qualified, and acting under chapter V of this act.

"SEC. 933. Upon the approval of the petition, the court shall promptly call a meeting of creditors upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors.

"SEC. 934. The notice of such meeting shall specify the purposes of the meeting, which shall include a determination of the cause of the debtor's distress, the setting apart of the debtor's exemptions, and the approval or fixing of the rental to be paid by the debtor upon the property to be retained by him.

"SEC. 935. The notice of such meeting shall also be accompanied by—

"(1) a summary of the scheduled liabilities;

"(2) a list of the names of the 10 largest general unsecured creditors and the 10 largest secured creditors, their addresses, and the scheduled amount owing to each of them, and, in the case of the secured creditors, the nature of the security held by each of them;

"(3) a list of the names of the unsecured creditors, entitled to priority, their addresses, and the nature and amount of the priority owing to each of them, as scheduled;

(4) a brief summary of the debtor's claim of exemptions; and

"(5) a brief summary of the property, possession of which is requested to be retained by the debtor, and the rental and terms of payment thereof offered by the debtor for each separately encumbered parcel of his property, and his unencumbered unexempt property.

"SEC. 936. At such meeting of creditors and at all adjournments thereof, and at all hearings under this chapter, the judge or referee shall preside.

"SEC. 937. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, the court shall examine the debtor or cause him to be examined, and hear witnesses on any matters relevant to the proceedings.

"SEC. 938. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, the court shall determine whether the debtor's distress is due to causes beyond his control, or is due to causes within his control, such as bad personal habits, failure to attend to business, diverting farm income to nonagricultural expenditures, and extravagant operations. Causes beyond the debtor's control shall include, but not be limited to, national emergencies, or declines in the agricultural market, or acreage reductions under the law, as a result of any of which the farmer-debtor cannot operate at a profit, or local emergencies, or drought, freeze, fire, flood, hail, or insect damage, any of which would make farming operations at a profit impracticable. If the cause is determined by the court to be beyond the debtor's control, the court shall enter an order granting the debtor a moratorium for the duration of the emergency, without expressly limiting the moratorium to a term of years. If the cause is determined by the court to be within the debtor's control, the court shall proceed as provided in section 1016 of this act.

"SEC. 939. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, if a moratorium is ordered, the court shall enter an order approving the rental offered by the debtor for each separately encumbered portion of his property and for the unencumbered unexempt portion, if any, unless a written objection to any portion of the rental offered for encumbered property has been filed by a secured creditor as to any separately encumbered portion, or unless a written objection to the rental offered for unencumbered property has been filed by an unsecured creditor, in which event the court shall hear and determine such objections and shall enter an order approving or disapproving the portion of the offered rental as to which objections have been filed. In case of disapproval, the court shall determine the fair and reasonable rental value of the specific portion of the debtor's property and the terms of payment based upon the factors provided in section 925 of this act. Such rental shall be paid into court and shall be used as follows: The first 10 percent thereof shall be deposited by the court with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided by section 72 of this act to be deposited equally in the referee's salary fund and referee's expense fund. The remainder shall be used, first, for the payment of any compensation or reimbursement for such costs and expenses, if any, as may be allowed by the court under the provisions of sections 1023 and 1038 of this act; second, for the payment of taxes, insurance, and repairs on the property for which the rental was paid; third, shall be paid to and applied on the claims of the secured creditors who have claims against the property for which the rental was paid, as their interests may appear; and, fourth, any excess rental from encumbered property and all rental from unencumbered property shall be paid to the unsecured creditors as their interests may appear. A person aggrieved by the rental order may, within 10 days after the entry of the order, file a petition to review the same in the manner provided in this act.

"SEC. 940. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, if jurisdiction is retained under this chapter, the court shall set apart the exemptions of the debtor: *Provided, however,* That the court shall supervise and control the encumbered exempt property to be retained by the debtor for the purposes of the proceedings under this chapter.

"SEC. 941. At such meeting of creditors, or at any adjournment thereof, in the event the debtor has not elected to retain possession of all of his unexempt property, the court may appoint a trustee to administer such property not retained by the debtor. No individual shall be eligible to appointment as a trustee unless he is (a) a resident of the county where the principal part of the debtor's property is located; (b) familiar with agricultural conditions therein; (c) not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farmers or transactions in agricultural commodities, or of furnishing agricultural supplies; and (d) not a relative of, or associated in business with, any creditor.

"SEC. 942. When a moratorium has been ordered, the creditors shall have the right not more often than at 2-year intervals from the date of the order granting the moratorium to a hearing on the question as to whether the emergency has ceased. Such hearing shall be had upon petition of any creditor after 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors. The order granting the moratorium shall remain in full force and effect if the court makes an order determining that the emergency still exists. If a determination is made by the court that would result in a moratorium of more than 4 years from the date of the order granting the moratorium, any creditor may appeal from such order if made by a judge, or, if made by a referee, may within 10 days after the entry of such order, file a petition for review as to the existence of the emergency. The determination by a judge on review shall be subject to appeal. If a judge, after a review, or an appellate court, on appeal, determines that the emergency still exists, such determination shall continue the moratorium in full force and effect: *Provided, however,* That thereafter at 1-year intervals from the date of any determination by a judge after a review or by an appellate court on appeal, until it is finally determined that the emergency has ceased, any creditor may present the same question to the court on petition and notice as in this section provided, and shall have the right to a review or an appeal from any order thereafter made by a referee or judge determining that the emergency still exists. Upon a final determination that the emergency has ceased, the moratorium shall terminate.

"SEC. 943. After the entry of any order by a referee, any person aggrieved may file a petition to review the same in the manner provided in section 39c of this act.

"SEC. 944. During the moratorium the debtor shall have authority to manage and operate the property of which he has elected to retain possession, subject, however, at all times to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. The court may require the debtor to file reports of the farming operations at such intervals as it may designate and in such form and containing such information as it may prescribe.

"SEC. 945. Upon its own motion or upon application of any creditor, the court may, after hearing upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors, require the debtor to make payments into court in addition to the fixed rental as provided in section 939 of this act and, in fixing the amount and periods of such payments, the court shall give due consideration to the interests of creditors and to the debtor's ability to pay, with a view to his financial rehabilitation.

"SEC. 946. The court may at any time during the proceedings, either upon its own motion or upon application of the debtor or any creditor, at a hearing upon at least 10 days' notice by mail to the debtor and all creditors, order the debtor to sell any unexempt perishable products of the farm if it appears necessary to protect the estate from loss, and any unexempt personal or real property not reasonably necesasry to the farming operations of the debtor, except heirlooms and personal gifts in the discretion of the court, despite any order of the court retaining the debtor in possession thereof: *Provided, however,* That in the case of perishable property, the court may, upon cause shown, shorten the period of notice or order the sale without notice. Any such sale shall be for cash and the debtor shall immediately turn such cash over to the court to be held as an asset of the estate, subject, however, to such liens as may have existed against the property so sold.

"ARTICLE VI—TITLE, RIGHTS, DUTIES, AND POWERS OF DEBTOR

"SEC. 956. Except as provided in this chapter, and for the purposes of this chapter, a debtor shall, with respect to the property retained by him under section 924 of this act, and during the period of its retention by him, have all the title and exercise all the powers of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act, subject, however, at all times, to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe for the protection of the property or the conservation of the security. A debtor may manage and operate such property in the manner and subject to the conditions as provided in this chapter.

"SEC. 957. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the rights, privileges, and duties of the debtor shall be the same, before the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication and, upon the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 958. Except as provided in this chapter, a debtor shall not be adjudged a bankrupt under this chapter without his consent in writing filed with the court.

"ARTICLE VII—TITLE, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF TRUSTEE

"SEC. 966. A trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, shall administer all of the unexempt property of the debtor, or unexempt property belonging to his estate, other than the property possession of which the debtor elects to retain under section 924 of this act.

"SEC. 967. A trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, shall, as to all property administered by him as provided in section 966 of this act, be vested with the title of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act.

"SEC. 968. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, a trustee, upon his appointment and qualification, with respect to the property administered under section 966 of this act, shall be vested with the rights, be subject to the duties, and exercise the powers of a trustee appointed under section 44 of this act.

"ARTICLE VIII—CREDITORS AND CLAIMS

"SEC. 978. Proofs of claim of secured and unsecured creditors may be filed in the court of bankruptcy where the proceedings are pending, or with the referee if the case has been referred, at any time within 6 months after the date of the first meeting of creditors. The proof shall be sufficient in form if made under oath, setting forth the nature and amount of the indebtedness, and, when based upon a written instrument, if the instrument or a certified or photostat copy is included or attached showing what securities are held, if secured. Section 57d of this act shall apply to claims so proved.

"SEC. 979. Where not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the rights, duties, and liabilities of creditors and of all other persons with respect to the property of the debtor shall be the same, before the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding before adjudication and, upon the approval of the petition, as in a bankruptcy proceeding upon adjudication.

"SEC. 980. In case an executory contract shall be rejected pursuant to the provision of the court given in a proceeding under this chapter, or shall have been rejected in a prior pending proceeding, any person injured by such rejection shall, for the purpose of this chapter, be deemed a creditor. The claim of a landlord for damages for injury resulting from the rejection of an unexpired lease of real estate or for damages or indemnity under a covenant contained in such lease shall be governed by the provisions of clause (9) of sudvision a of section 63 of this act.

"SEC. 981. If the time for filing claims in a pending bankruptcy proceeding has expired prior to the filing of a petition under this chapter, unsecured claims provable under section 63 of this act, and not filed within the time prescribed by subsection n of section 57 of this act, shall not be allowed in the bankruptcy proceeding when reinstated as provided in this chapter.

"SEC. 982. Upon the entry of an order under the provisions of this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed and claims not already filed, including claims of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof, may be filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors, held pursuant to section 55 of this act, or, if such date has previously been set, then within 6 months after the mailing of notice to creditors of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with.

"ARTICLE IX—EXTENSION

"SEC. 986. Within 60 days after a final determination under section 942 of this act that the emergency has ceased, the debtor may file with the court a notice of election wherein he may elect an extension.

"SEC. 987. If the debtor elects an extension, he shall file with his notice of election an extension proposal, together with a copy thereof for each affected creditor, which proposal shall provide for full payment of his secured claims amortized over a term of years, which term of years shall be based upon the earning power of the property that is security for the debt as determined by the court, but not exceeding the greater of 10 years or the original term of years, payable in equal quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments, plus interest at the contract rate, or 5 percent per annum, whichever is the lesser, and such extension proposal shall provide for payment of unsecured debts, for which claims have been filed and allowed or are allowed under section 930 of this act, to the extent and on the terms which the debtor believes he will have the ability to pay from his future income. The extension proposal shall identify the related lien or liens, shall describe the property which the debtor wishes to redeem, which description may be incorporated by reference to the recording data of the related lien instrument, and shall set forth the amount to be paid in redemption of the property, the interest rate and terms of payment, as well as the persons to whom payment is to be made.

"SEC. 988. Upon the filing of such extension proposal, the court shall give a 10-day notice by mail to the debtor and all affected creditors of a hearing on such extension proposal and shall include a copy thereof with each notice. If no written objections to such extension proposal are filed at or before the hearing, the court shall confirm the proposal. If written objections are filed, the court shall consider the written objections or hear the objecting party and shall enter an order in accordance with the proof, approving the proposal as submitted, or modifying it as to the objecting party and approving it as modified. The extension proposal, when approved by the court, shall have the full force and effect of a binding contract for redemption between the affected parties. After the approval of an extension proposal, the debtor shall make all required payments directly to the persons entitled thereto. The debtor shall be discharged as to all unsecured debts or parts of debts not provided for in the approved extension proposal. Upon the recordation of a certified copy of such order in the proper office in the county or parish in which the land is located, it shall constitute constructive notice of the debtor's right to redeem the affected property, and any unconfirmed sale may be confirmed and any deed to which a purchaser is entitled may be delivered and recorded. Any such deeds executed after the approval of the extension proposal shall expressly state that the conveyance is subject to the right of the debtor, naming him, to redeem the property. Any deed executed but not delivered before the time the petition was filed shall vest title in the grantee subject to the debtor's right of redemption regardless of the failure of the deed to so provide.

"ARTICLE X—DISMISSAL, TRANSFER, AND ADJUDICATION

"SEC. 1015. The court shall, during the moratorium, upon the written application of a debtor, without a hearing and based solely upon such application, transfer the proceeding to a proceeding under chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act.

"SEC. 1016. If (a) under the provisions of section 938 of this act, the court finds that the debtor's distress is due to causes within his control, or if (b) the debtor defaults in the payment of rental or defaults under any other order made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, the court shall promptly give him written notice to cure the default within 60 days after the date of such notice, and if such default is not cured within said 60 days, or if (c) within 60 days after a final determination under section 942 of this act that the emergency has ceased the debtor had not filed an extension proposal, the court shall—

"(1) where the petition was filed under section 921 of this act, enter an order dismissing the proceeding under this chapter and directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with pursuant to the provisions of this act; or

"(2) where the petition was filed under section 922 of this act, enter an order, upon hearing after notice to the debtor, the creditors, and such other persons in interest as the court may direct, either adjudging the debtor a bankrupt and directing that bankruptcy be proceded with pursuant to the provisions of this act, which adjudication shall be mandatory if a trustee has been appointed and has not completed the administration of the property, title to which had vested in him, or, if adjudication is not mandatory, dismissing the proceeding under this chapter, whichever in the opinion of the court may be in the interest of creditors: *Provided, however,* That where a petition was filed under this chapter during a redemption period, or prior to confirmation of a sale, or prior to delivery of a deed, the affected property shall be dismissed from the proceedings although jurisdiction is otherwise retained, and the purchasers of such property shall be reinstated to the rights they had when the petition was filed, and the debtor shall have the right to redeem during the time thereafter that had not expired under any redemption right when the petition was filed.

"SEC. 1017. Upon the entry of an order directing that bankruptcy be proceded with—

"(1) in the case of a petition filed under section 921 of this act, the bankruptcy proceeding shall be deemed reinstated and thereafter shall be conducted, so far as possible, as if such petition under this chapter had not been filed;

"(2) in the case of a petition filed under section 922 of this act, the proceeding shall be conducted, so far as possible, in the same manner and with like effect as if a voluntary petition in bankruptcy had been filed and a decree of adjudication had been entered on the day when the petition under this chapter had been filed; and

"(3) (a) the trustee theretofore appointed and qualified, if any, shall be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor remaining under the jurisdiction of the court, title to which had not previously been vested in him, as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with; and

"(b) the trustee, if not theretofore appointed and qualified, shall, upon his appointment and qualification be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor remaining under the jurisdiction of the court as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with; and

"(c) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor after filing under this chapter and before the date of the entry of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall, unless and except as otherwise provided by the court, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced by any payment made thereon; and

"(d) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts incurred by the debtor after the filing of the petition and before the date of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, and of all persons with respect to the property of the debtor, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall control.

"SEC. 1018. Concurrently with the approval of an extension proposal the court shall enter a final decree discharging the debtor as to all debts dischargeable under this chapter, discharging the trustee, if one has been appointed and qualified, and closing the estate: *Provided, however,* That if a trustee has been appointed and qualified as provided in this chapter, and his administration of the property, title to which had vested in him, has not been completed, including payment of his fees and expenses, the final decree herein required shall be entered after such property has been fully administered by the trustee and his fees and expenses have been paid.

"ARTICLE XI—COMPENSATION AND ALLOWANCES; PRIORITIES AND DISTRIBUTION AMONG CREDITORS

"SEC. 1022. A trustee appointed under this chapter shall receive out of that portion of the estate administered by him—

"(1) as full compensation for his services after they are rendered, such reasonable sum as the court may allow, not to exceed 2 percent upon the moneys disbursed or turned over by him to any persons, including the lienholders;

"(2) such reimbursement for the actual and necessary costs and expenses incurred by him in a proceeding under this chapter, as the court may allow.

SEC. 1023. Where a petition is filed under section 921 of this act, the court may allow, if not already allowed, reasonable compensation for services rendered and reimbursement for proper costs and expenses incurred in such superseded bankruptcy proceeding, as authorized and prescribed in this act.

"SEC. 1024. Upon the dismissal of a proceeding under this chapter after a moratorium has been ordered and prior to the payment of any rental or by reason of the failure to pay a rental installment, the court may, as a condition to such dismissal, require payment by the secured creditor or secured creditors, as their interests may appear, of an amount equal to 10 percent of the installment of rental then in default, which payment shall be deposited with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided in section 72 of this act to be deposited equally in the referee's salary fund and referee's expense fund.

"SEC. 1025. The filing fee of $45, the fee to be paid out of rental, and such fees as may be paid under section 1024 of this act, shall be the only payments required of the debtor or the creditors toward the referee's fees, costs, and expenses under this chapter, except that the court may require as a condition precedent that the debtor or any creditor who may petition for any hearing other than the hearings expressly provided for in this chapter shall pay into court the sum of $10, plus 20 cents for each copy of the notice of hearing mailed to the debtor and the creditors if the court prepares such copy, or 10 cents for each copy if prepared by the petitioner, the petitioner to have the option as to preparation of the notices, and such payments shall be deposited with the clerk and transmitted by him as provided in section 72 of this act to be deposited in the referee's expense fund.

"SEC. 1026. The debtor and each creditor shall pay all of his own costs and expenses, including attorney fees, none of which shall be allowed or paid out of rental money or the estate.

"SEC. 1027. The net funds of the estate administered by a trustee after payment of the trustee's fees and expenses, if any, as provided in section 1022 of this act, and any funds paid into court under the provisions of sections 945 and 946 of this act shall be distributed, from time to time, as may be ordered by the court, among the secured and unsecured creditors, as their interests may appear. Where partial distributions occur, proper adjustment shall be made in the final distribution, or sooner when practicable.

"SEC. 1028. Upon the entry of an order in a proceeding under this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, the actual and necessary fees, costs, and expenses thereafter incurred and allowed in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding shall be determined in the manner provided in chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act and shall be given priority over any unpaid fees, costs, and expenses incurred prior to the entry of such order.

"ARTICLE XII—PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 1036. A petition may be filed under this chapter notwithstanding the pendency of a prior mortgage foreclosure, equity, or other proceeding in a court of the United States or of any State in which a receiver or trustee of all or any part of the property of a debtor has been appointed or for whose appointment an application theretofore has been made.

"SEC. 1037. As to any such property, possession of which the debtor elects to retain, the debtor, upon approval of his petition, shall become vested with the rights, if any, of such prior receiver or trustee in such property retained by the debtor, and with the right to immediate possession thereof, and shall also have the right to immediate possession of such property in the possession of a trustee under a deed of trust, a mortgagee under a mortgage, or a pledge, under a pledge of personal property, the possession of which is essential to the debtor's operations, possession of which he elects to retain, subject, however, at all times to the supervision and control of the court and to such terms and conditions as the court may from time to time prescribe, and subject to existing liens regardless of the lienholder's surrender of possession: *Provided*, That the trustee, appointed and qualified under this chapter, shall become vested with all such rights as to any such property which is unexempt and of which the debtor has not elected to retain possession as provided in section 924 of this act.

"SEC. 1038. The court shall make such provision as may be equitable for the protection of the obligations theretofore incurred by a receiver or trustee in such prior proceeding and for the payment of the reasonable costs and expenses incurred therein as may be allowed by the court.

"ARTICLE XIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1041. All statutes of limitations affecting claims provable under this chapter and the running of all periods of time prescribed by this act in respect to the commission of acts of bankruptcy, the recovery of preferences and the avoidance of liens and transfers shall be suspended while a proceeding under this chapter is pending and until it is finally dismissed.

"SEC. 1042. Unless otherwise directed by the court, all notices required by this chapter may be given by mail to the parties entitled thereto to their addresses ascertained in the manner prescribed for other notices in section 58 of this act.

"SEC. 1043. A previous discharge of a debtor or confirmation of an arrangement under other provisions of this act shall not be ground for denying him the benefits of this chapter.

"SEC. 1044. No income or profit, taxable under any law of the United States or of any State now in force or which may hereafter be enacted, shall, in respect to the adjustment of the indebtedness of a debtor in a proceeding under this chapter be deemed to have accrued to or to have been realized by a debtor by reason of a modification in or cancellation in whole or in part of any such intebtedness in a proceeding under this chapter: *Provided, however*, That if it shall be made to appear that the proceeding had for one of its principal purposes the evasion of any income tax, the exemption provided by this section shall be disallowed.

"SEC. 1045. Until the Supreme Court of the United States has promulgated general orders and official forms governing this chapter, General Order 50, and the official forms heretofore made shall, insofar as not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, be applicable to procedure under this chapter.

"ARTICLE XIV—EFFECT OF CHAPTER

"SEC. 1051. A petition may be filed under this chapter in a proceeding in bankruptcy which is pending on the effective date of this amendatory act, and a petition may be filed under this chapter notwithstanding the pendency on such date of a proceeding in which a receiver or trustee of all or any part of the property of a debtor has been appointed or for whose appointment application has been made in a court of the United States or of any State.

"SEC. 1052. As of the day preceding the date on which the provisions of this amendatory act become effective, an allocation shall be made by the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy of all filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and of all expense funds, due the then existing conciliation commissioners for services rendered and expenses incurred in the cases pending before them, whether as referee or conciliation commissioner under this act. The balances of such filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and the expense surpluses shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States by the conciliation commissioners and the clerks, to be deposited to the credit of the respective salary and expense funds as provided in paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act. All cases then pending before conciliation commissioners shall be re-referred, and no additional filing fees shall be required, blut additional salary and expense charges may be assessed in such cases in such amounts as the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy may deem equitable, taking into consideration the provisions of this chapter.

"SEC. 1053. The provisions of section 75, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States', approved July 1, 1898, shall continue in full force and effect with respect to proceedings pending under that section upon the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this amendatory act shall govern in such proceedings so far as practicable."

SEC. 2. Clause (2) of section 35 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) not holding any office for proft or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State of subdivision thereof other than special master under this act: *Provided, however*, That part-time referees may be commissioners of deeds, United States commissioners, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or retired officers and retired enlisted personnel of the Regular and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, except the National Guard disbursing officers who are on a full-time salary basis;".

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) A referees' salary fund and a referees' expense fund shall be established in the Treasury of the United States, and the amounts of the various fees and allowances collected by the clerks for the services of referees and for their expenses, including the fees, allowances, and charges for their services and expenses as special matters under this act, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for the account of such salary fund and expense fund. The salaries of the referees in active service shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such salary fund, and the expenses of referees, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such expense fund, by the United States. Any deficiencies of such salary fund or expense fund shall be paid out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and appropriations to pay such deficiencies are hereby authorized: *Provided, however*, That there shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States in any subsequent year so much of the surplus, if any, arising in the salary fund or expense fund, respectively, as may be necessary to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for payments made on account of such respective funds in any prior year."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subdivision d of section 40 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any referee who has retired or been retired under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subdivision d may, if called upon by a judge of a court of bankruptcy, perform, without compensation, such duties of a referee or special master under this act, within the jurisdiction of such court, as such referee may be able and willing to undertake: *Provided, however*, That when so acting, compensation for his services shall be allowed and paid or deposited and his expenses shall be allowed and paid, as in the case of an active referee."

SEC. 4. Clause (2) of section 51 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) collect the fees of the clerk and trustee and the fees for the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act in each case instituted before filing the petition, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this act, and collect the various other fees, allowances, and charges for the services of referees and for their expenses, including their services and expenses as special masters under this act;".

SEC. 5. Section 72 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 72. Limitation of compensation of officers of court: No receiver, marshal, or trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow him, any other or further compensation for his services as required by this act, than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act.

"No referee shall receive any compensation for his services under this act other than his salary; and allowances made to a referee for compensation or expense while acting as a referee or special master under any chapter or section of this act, shall be paid to the clerk, and by him transmitted to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referee's salary fund and referees' expense fund, respectively."

SEC. 6. (a) If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such individuality shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

(b) Article and section headings shall not be taken to govern or limit the scope of the articles or sections to which they relate.

(c) Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

THE DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—RESOLUTION PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The resolution (S. Res. 124) opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF BENITO QUINTANA SEARA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Benito Quintana Seara (A-4363045) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

SHIMA SHINOHARA

The bill (S. 183) for the relief of Shima Shinohara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shima Shinohara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

KERSON HUANG

The bill (S. 619) for the relief of Kerson Huang was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kerson Huang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SHIGEKO NAKAMURA

The bill (S. 642) for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shigeko Nakamura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

ZELDA BAUMZVEIGER

The bill (S. 649) for the relief of Zelda Baumzveiger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zelda Baumzveiger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS (VASILIOS T. BUZUNIS)

The bill (S. 663) for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

PAK-CHUE CHAN AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1106) for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Che Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BENJAMIN BARUCH MINTZ AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1238) for the relief of Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

NOURITZA TERZIAN

The bill (S. 1249) for the relief of Nouritza Terzian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nouritza Terzian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEPH G. FERRARA

The bill (S. 1416) for the relief of Joseph G. Ferrara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph G. Ferrara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For context of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1955, p. 6485.)

BRUNO MICHAEL KIURU

The bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVAGELOS B. TZARIMAS

The bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

MIRA DOMENIKA GRGURINOVICH

The bill (H. R. 1218) for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EBOLYA WOLF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Ebolya Wolf, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ERICH WOLF, ALSO KNOWN AS LADISLOV WOLFENSTEIN

The bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VASSILIKI D. PAPADAKOU

The bill (H. R. 1405) for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER ANTONINA ZATTOLO AND SISTER ANTONINA CALI

The bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY KRAEMER

The bill (H. R. 1407) for the relief of Henry Kraemer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATERINA RUELLO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Caterino Ruello was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go over to the next call of the calendar.

HELGA KUTSCHKA

The bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of Helga Kutschka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREAS KAFARAKIS

The bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCETTE HELENE ADAMS

The bill (H. R. 1651) for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOJCIK FAMILY

The bill (H. R. 1655) for the relief of the Wojcik family was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

REV. ZDZISLAW ALEKSANDER PESZKOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 1684) for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUIS DERIBERPREY

The bill (H. R. 1869) for the relief of Luis Deriberprey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUISA GEMMA TOFFANI, ROSA SOMETTI, BIANCA CARPANESE, AND MARGHERITA BRUNI

The bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPE TUMBARELLO

The bill (H. R. 1897) for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPA CURRO TATI

The bill (H. R. 1935) for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS ATHENA KITSOPOULOU

The bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HILDEGARD HERRMANN COSTA

The bill (H. R. 1964) for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Hermann Costa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIETRO MURGIA

The bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Pietro Murgia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GLORIA FAN

The bill (H. R. 2360) for the relief of Gloria Fan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT V. BLEDNYH

The bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGEL MEDINA CARDENAS

The bill (H. R. 3852) for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 125) amending Senate Resolution 62, 84th Congress authorizing a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE obtained the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, that was the request I was about to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Resolution 125 will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

IWAN BONK AND TACIANNA BONK

The bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMIL ARENS

The bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of Emil Arens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAKEKO ANN O'NEILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 438) for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "of", to insert "section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Takeko Ann O'Neill shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Thomas A. O'Neill and Eileen O'Neill, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD AND LILY ELSIE WHITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 603) for the relief of Edward and Lily Elsie White, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a comma and "upon payment of the required visa fees", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward and Lily Elsie White shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABBAS MOHAMMAD AWAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 678) for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Abbas Mohammad Awad. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Abbas Mohammad Awad shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONCETTA SPERANZA TAPP, WIDOW OF FLOYD WILLIAM TAPP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1110) for the relief of Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, who was killed December 15, 1953, in Italy while serving with the United States Armed Forces, who would be entitled to nonquota immigration status as the wife of a United States citizen but for the death of her husband, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

> A–7210454, Ciundziewicki, Stefan.
> 0200–126849, Franges, Oton.
> 0300–463178, Lee, Marcelle Chang.
> A–6953081, Lin, Shao-Chi.
> E–7314, Muzayin, Sion.
> E–7316, Muzayin, Violette.
> E–7318, Muzayin, Widad.
> 0300–446252, Muzayin, Larine.
> 0300–446254, Muzayin, Josef.
> A7298030, Negulescu, Paul.
> A–7383367, Sepsy, Hajna, formerly Ruttkay.
> A–6937543, Tang, Lloyd Wei-Zing, Chi-Cheong.
> A–6534328, Yang, Georgiana Hwei-Ying.
> 0500–42757, Yeh, Chien-Kuan.

(For context of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1955, p. 6475.)

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MARIA LOUISE ANDREIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "sections", to strike out "101 (a) (27) (A)" and insert "203 (a) (3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ERNEST TOMASSICH AND YOKO MATSUO TOMASSICH

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, after the word "available", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

> *Provided,* That in the case of Yoko Matsuo Tomassich, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ELEANOR RAMOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Eleanor Ramos which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL ICHIKAWA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 188) for the relief of Paul Ichikawa, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "the minor child"; and in line 6, after the word "natural-born", to insert "minor"; so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul Ichikawa shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Earle Kier, citizens of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD KROPFITSCH PELLOSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 607) for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)"; and in line 10, after the word "Justice", to strike out "have" and insert "has", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice

has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JIRAIR MAZARTZIAN, HIS WIFE AND CHILDREN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1056) for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their children, Mario Mazartzian and Aram Mazartzian, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "their", to strike out "children" and insert "child"; and in the same line, after the name "Mazartzian," to strike out "and Aram Mazartzian", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their child, Mario Mazartzian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their child, Mario Mazartzian."

PURITA RODRIQUEZ ADIARTE AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1242) for the relief of Purita Rodriquez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Purita", to strike out "Rodriquez" and insert Rodriguez", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt was announced as next in order.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment which has been reported to this joint resolution agreed to, and at that point I shall have a statement to make on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 13, after "(47 Stat. 799)", to insert a comma and "and including the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., created by the act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52), as amended", so as to make the joint resolution read:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio, and 8 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 2 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
>
> SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission, after announcement to the American people of its creation and purpose, to prepare plans and a program for signalizing the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt in the year 1958, including plans for the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital," approved May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163), as amended by the act approved February 11, 1933 (47 Stat. 799), and including the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., created by the act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52), as amended. In preparing such plans and program, the Commission shall give due consideration to any plan which may be submitted to it, and shall take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by State or civic bodies. If the participation of other nations in the commemoration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the State Department.
>
> SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.
>
> (b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 216, 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (22 U. S. C. 1584); nor shall any member of the Commission by reason of his status as such be deemed to be an "officer of the Government" within the meaning of the act of April 27, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 101).
>
> SEC. 4. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.
>
> SEC. 5. When the Commission has approved a plan of celebration, it shall submit it, insofar as it relates to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts for its approval.
>
> SEC. 6. The Commission shall, on or before March 1, 1956, make a report to the Congress in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted.
>
> SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $10,000.
>
> SEC. 8. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than October 27, 1959.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on the day when Senate Joint Resolution 63, a resolution to establish the Theodore Roosevelt Commission, was reported to the Senate, there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 273, which had passed the House on July 5.

I shall ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration on House Joint Resolution 273, and that it be considered at this time, in lieu of Senate Joint Resolution 63.

This resolution would establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

The resolution proposes to establish a commission, to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio; 8 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; 2 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and 2 Representatives from the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House.

The Commission shall have the duty of preparing appropriate plans and a program for signalizing the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. The Commission is required to report to the Congress by March 1, 1956, to permit the enactment of further enabling legislation. Any expenses of the Commission are to be appropriated by the Congress. The resolution further authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $10,000, in order for the Commission to start planning the scope of its activities for the celebration.

On June 22, 1955, a public hearing was held on this proposed legislation by the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

The committee believes this resolution has a meritorious purpose.

Mr. President, our purpose is not to have two joint resolutions on the same subject pending in the two Houses. The purpose of the committee, with the concurrence of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who introduced the Senate joint resolution, is to have the Senate pass the House joint resolution, which conforms with the text of Senate Joint Resolution 63 as it has now been amended.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to concur in all the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said, and I desire to thank him for his efforts in connection with this measure.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 273, which is identical with Senate Joint Resolution 63, as now amended; that the Senate now proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 273, and that it be ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered, and House Joint Resolution 273 is passed.

Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 63 is indefinitely postponed.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (H. R. 3813) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although, of course, I shall not object, inasmuch as I am in full sympathy with the purposes of both House bill 3813, Calendar No. 769, and the next bill on the calendar, House bill 4754, which is Calendar No. 770—I wonder whether we may be assured that the views of the affected party have been expressed, inasmuch as from the report we find there has been no expression from the American Legion in the case of either Calendar No. 769, House bill 3813, or Calendar No. 770, House bill 4754, which relates to redefining eligibility for membership in the AMVETS, the American Veterans of World War II.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the first of these bills relates to the American Legion.

This proposed legislation would amend the act incorporating the American Legion, so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein. The American Legion was incorporated by act of Congress on September 16, 1919. Under the American Legion charter at present, veterans who served in the Armed Forces from June 25, 1950, to the date of cessation of hostilities of the Korean conflict, are eligible for membership in that organization. This bill makes the cutoff date for membership definite, July 27, 1953, the date the truce went into effect, in place of the less definite provision, the date of cessation of hostilities.

The committee is of the opinion that this clarification is meritorious and, therefore, recommends favorable consideration of H. R. 3813 without amendment.

So it is proposed to extend the cutoff date, in order to include Korean veterans; and a new cutoff date would be established. As I understand, that is the principal item.

I have in the file a letter from the director of the Washington headquarters of the American Legion urgently requesting that this bill be passed, because it is desired by the American Legion to extend its membership and other benefits to veterans of the Korean war, up to a certain cutoff date. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1955.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, Senate Juciary Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The national organization of the American Legion is very much interested in the bill H. R. 3813, which amends our national charter in that it redefines eligibility for membership.

This bill passed the House on May 17, 1955, and was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 19, 1955, according to page 5597 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19.

The bill is not controversial. It does not call for any Federal appropriation.

Anything you can do to expedite favorable action on the bill will be deeply appreciated by us.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut understands that the American Legion endorses this particular bill.

Mr. KILGORE. It is sponsoring it.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3813) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN AMVETS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4754) to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, and may I inquire whether or not the AMVETS organization is sponsoring or favoring the proposed legislation?

Mr. KILGORE. Let me read to the Senator a letter from John R. Holden, national legislative director of the AMVETS, dated March 31, 1955, and addressed to Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of the House of Representatives.

AMVETS,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1955.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALTER: On behalf of AMVETS everywhere, I want to thank you most sincerely for your cooperation in introducing H. R. 4754, a bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS. We would appreciate very much any further action you might take to facilitate the enactment of this bill into law.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLDEN,
National Legislative Director.

Mr. President, this bill proposes to amend the Federal charter of the American Veterans of World War II so as to make Korean veterans eligible for membership in the organization knowns as the AMVETS, or American Veterans of World War II.

The organization known as American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—was chartered by act of Congress July 23, 1947, 67 Statute 407. Under the present charter, Korean veterans are not eligible for membership. This bill simply broadens the charter of the AMVETS organization so as to allow servicemen who participated in the Korean conflict to become eligible for membership in that organization.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—RESOLUTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 123) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL WEATHER FORECASTING

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 82) requesting a report to be made to the Senate Agriculture Committee by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture as to steps taken to improve and expand horticultural and agricultural weather forecasting services, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to insert "and Forestry"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "May 1, 1955" and insert "January 16, 1956"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "operations", to strike out "(2)" and insert "and (ii)"; and in line 5, after the word "and", to strike out "(3) that" and insert "(2)", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That (1) the Secretary of Commerce is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the earliest practicable date not later than January 16, 1956, as to (i) what steps have been taken since the transfer in 1940 of the United States Weather Bureau from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Commerce, to expand and improve horticultural and agricultural forecasting services to the extent necessary to provide farmers with (a) adequate forecasts for their specific localities, (b) more frequent forecasts covering periods of 3 to 6 days, (c) seasonal forecasts, (d) forecasts containing more meteorological details, and (e) such other weather forecasting services as may be necessary to assist farmers in planning their operations; and (ii) what plans have been made by the Secretary of Commerce to meet any deficiencies that may have been observed; and (2) the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to report to the Senate Agriculture Committee his recommendations for an adequate forecasting service for the Nation's farmers.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

The bill (H. R. 122) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the consideration and passage of the bill, inasmuch as the committee report is very brief, and inasmuch as the commodity which would be included within the Commodity Exchange Act, namely, onions, is produced in many places in large quantities, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 766) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 122) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill would add onions to the commodities subject to futures trading regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act; and is the same as H. R. 6435 as reported last year by your committee. H. R. 6435 was passed by the Senate with a floor amendment relating to coffee, which was not accepted by the House.

"REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON H. R. 122

"Your subcommittee to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 122) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, having considered the same report thereon with the unanimous recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

"H. R. 122 would add onions to the list of commodities covered by the Commodity Exchange Act. The principal effects of this would be to require registration of exchanges, commission merchants, and floor brokers dealing in onion futures, and to provide for regulation of onion futures trading to prevent such undesirable practices as price manipulations and corners. A similar bill was passed by the Senate during the 83d Congress.

"The favorable report of the Department of Agriculture on the Senate companion bill, S. 1538, is attached as a part of this report. There was no opposition to the bill.

"Spessard L. Holland,
"*Chairman.*
"Earle C. Clements,
"George D. Aiken,
"John J. Williams."

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1955.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

Dear Senator Ellender: This is in reply to your letter of March 24, with which you referred S. 1538 for consideration and report.

The Department recommends the enactment of S. 1538.

This bill would amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, by adding onions to the list of commodities in which futures trading on commodity exchanges is subject to regulation under the provisions of that act.

It should be kept in mind that owing to the perishable nature of onions and their susceptibility to wide price fluctuations, regulation of futures trading in onions under the Commodity Exchange Act could not prevent the wide seasonal price swings traditional in the marketing of onions. Nevertheless, the enactment of S. 1538 would place the Department in position to ascertain the facts as to what actually takes place in the onion-futures market. It would also enable the Department to deny trading privileges to persons found, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to have manipulated onion prices or to have engaged in other trading practices prohibited by the statute. Also, information developed under authority of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended by S. 1538, could provide a factual basis for determining whether trading in onion futures is in the public interest or whether the Congress should consider legislation directed to the substantial curtailment or the prohibition of such trading.

The Department estimates that the enactment of S. 1538 would necessitate an additional annual appropriation of approximately $40,000 for the enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

True D. Morse,
Acting Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in brackets, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

"COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

"Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this act 'contract of sale' shall be held to include sales, agreements of sale and agreements to sell. The word 'person' shall be construed to import the plural or singular, and shall include individuals, associations, partnerships, corporations, and trusts. The word 'commodity' shall mean wheat, cotton, rice, corn, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, grain sorghums, mill feeds, butter, eggs, [onions], Solanum tuberosum (Irish potatoes), wool, wool tops, fats and oil (including lard, tallow, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil and all other fats and oils), cottonseed meal, cottonseed, peanuts, soybeans and soybean meal."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2253) to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the calendar. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

ELECTION OF DELEGATIONS REPRESENTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT, AND THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, fighting for a losing cause, or for a cause that has almost been lost, inspires men like myself to greater effort.

For some years in this body such a cause has been the fight for public power as opposed to private monopolies. The position of one faction of the Republican Party has been a militant, active, aggressive, wholly independent fight in behalf of the users of power and electricity in the cities, and villages, and hamlets, and of REA for the farmer, while the other faction of the Republican Party has been the militant, aggressive friend of the private utilities companies, and the large corporations that finance them.

This fight within the Republican Party has resulted in one faction following the policies of former Presidents Grant, McKinley, Harding, and Hoover, while the other faction of the Republican Party has just as militantly followed great conservation for the people, the policies of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris.

The line of demarcation between these two factions is cleancut, open, and above board, as shown by the votes of the present Senators in this body and those who have preceded us.

I am proud that during the 15 years I have been a Member of the Senate I have never deviated from being a follower of the Republican principles laid down by Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the name of the Senator from North Dakota, WILLIAM LANGER, should be added to the list of Republicans who over the decades have never let the people down in the fight to protect their interests in the natural resources of the United States, in the fight to develop those natural resources, and the fight to develop public power.

I commend the Senator from North Dakota for the great statesmanship, as the record shows, he has exhibited in the fight for the development of public power in the interest of the people of the country.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I have followed those principles, not only because I believe they are right, but because I believe they are in the interests of the rank and file of the people of this country, and I militantly fight for them. I have no quarrel with those who honestly believe that large cartels and monopolies are necessary for the best interests of the United States; I just frankly do not agree with them unless these cartels and monopolies are good for the people regardless of size. I never have agreed with them, and I never will.

As a Republican I have that right, just as any Republican who belongs to the other faction has his rights.

Mr. President, when I became chairman of the Judiciary Committee on January 3, 1953, I appointed the Subcommittee on Antimonopoly and appointed myself head of that subcommittee. The Republicans controlled that subcommittee, and at that time they controlled the Congress.

The Judiciary Committee reported out favorably a recommendation for an appropriation of $75,000, with which to give my subcommittee funds to investigate the monopolies which are feeding off the lifeblood of the common people of this country. Month after month went by and that resolution was not favorably reported by the Committee on Rules.

During the long weary months I appeared twice before the Republican Policy Committee, first headed by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and then by Senator Homer Ferguson. Each time I was rebuffed and the money denied me. Several billion dollars were appropriated each year for foreign aid, both military and for technical assistance—for building dams and powerplants in foreign countries—but no money was given our subcommittee to protect the interests of the laborer, the farmer, and the small-business men in the United States. Mergers increased and monopolies and cartels grew stronger, but all my pleadings were without avail.

At the end of about a year, Mr. President, I appeared before the Rules Committee and offered to take $37,500, or one-half of the amount originally requested, for the 1 remaining year. Finally the Rules Committee reported that sum to the floor of the Senate.

The Republican Congress refused to pass the resolution, with the result that on the 20th day of August, the day the Senate adjourned, I delivered the following speech upon this floor. I repeat it for emphasis:

> Mr. President, the leadership has refused to appropriate for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, any funds with which to hold hearings on monopolies, trusts, cartels, or measures looking to a better enforcement of the antitrust statutes. The hearings will be held anyway. When I became attorney general of my State I gave up all my law work. When I became governor, I again gave up my law practice in its entirety. When I became a United States Senator I no longer practiced law and in my 13½ years here I have had only two cases, both for very deserving persons and in one of which I charged no fee at all.
>
> Owing to the fact that the Republican leadership has refused to give our Antimonopoly Committee any money which was unanimously requested by the 15-member Judiciary Committee, and has held up the request first in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and then by the Republican Party Policy Committee of the Senate, the Senator from North Dakota will violate a rule he has never violated since taking public office. Although I am a United States Senator, I am announcing tonight to the world that I will accept four lawsuits between now and January in cases in which the United States Government is involved neither directly nor indirectly, and all the money that I get from those lawsuits that is necessary to be used, after we have exhausted the funds now in the full committee, will be used to conduct those hearings all over the United States of America.
>
> Let the chips fall where they may. I am serving notice now on those who have voted to send $13 billion of American money all over the world, and deny the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee enough money with which to conduct hearings, so that the subcommittee can investigate public power and other monopolies and the alleged monopoly in the manufacture of farm machinery and a score of other matters like the monopoly on medicine, on farm and small business that should be investigated. That will not stop the senior Senator from North Dakota, just because the money which he needs has been denied the committee. These investigations will take place as far as possible. I regret very much if it hurts any Senator between now and election time, but my duty is to the people, the people who suffer from these disgraceful, greedy unconscionable "gougings," and in that job I shall not fail them, if I am alive.

Mr. President, on March 1, 1954, out of the small amount of money which every Senator is allotted as a Senator, I hired Sidney A. Davis, an attorney of vast experience, who had formerly been in the Attorney General's office in the antitrust division, as my administrative assistant. I did this in a desperate effort not only to get justice for the farmers, laborers, and small-business men, but to help the Republican Party.

The subcommittee held hearings in various cities, among them Minneapolis, Minn., and Grand Forks, N. Dak., where we commenced the investigation against the monopolies of the grain trusts. At Topeka, Kans., and at Raleigh, N. C., and in the city of Washington, D. C., we had long hearings endeavoring to wipe out the small-loan sharks charging 200- and 300-percent interest and in North Carolina, in one case, the sworn testimony shows 5,280 percent, and there were many cases where from 400 to 500 percent was charged.

We succeeded in getting a small-loan act passed in the State of Kansas, wiping out these small-loan sharks. The small-loan sharks are still operating in nine States, and these vultures continue to operate and are operating today because appropriation requests were denied.

Mr. President, I want the Republican Party to get all the credit for keeping the small-loan sharks in operation in nine States. Those loan sharks are still gouging the poor people, who cannot get loans from a bank. They are still charging 200-percent or 300-percent interest, according to the sworn testimony given before our subcommittee. A certain faction of the Republican Party can be proud of that. It can be proud of helping the small-loan sharks to stay in business and to continue to operate in those States.

In the investigation of the monopoly in electric power and light, I have been honored by many of my colleagues rising on the floor of the Senate and paying tribute for the fine job that was done, particularly in the Dixon-Yates matter, which investigation was inaugurated and carried out militantly as long as I was chairman of the subcommittee.

In retrospect today, what has been the result of the opposition to investigations of conditions on the part of the Grant-McKinley-Harding-Hoover faction of the Republican Party? I will analyze what has happened.

I do this for one reason only. It is because yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] appeared on a television program, he was asked by Mr. Jack Bell, of the Associated Press, whether the investigations in the Dixon-Yates matter had had any effect in the congressional elections of last year.

First, the Grant-McKinley-Harding-Hoover wing of the Republican Party made itself so obnoxious to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he was practically forced out of the Republican Party—and I shall say more about that shortly.

Second, my distinguished friend, Homer Ferguson, then Senator from Michigan, who offered the amendment which was adopted to what really was the Dixon-Yates matter, was defeated for reelection in the State of Michigan, and his opposition used the Ferguson amendment to the Dixon-Yates matter with deadly political effect.

Third, in the State of Illinois, where the farmers in upstate Illinois have consistently voted Republican to overcome the large Democratic vote in Cook County, which contains Chicago, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS—who fought the Dixon-Yates deal—had a much larger percentage of votes than any Democrat had received there in years, and the Republican candidate was defeated.

Yet some people ask whether Dixon-Yates had any effect in the last election.

Fourth, one of the finest men in this body, and a man for whom I have the deepest affection and the highest respect, was defeated for Governor in New York by, among others, the votes of upstate farmers of New York because of his position in the Niagara-Mohawk controversy involving electric power. The State of New York today has a Democratic Governor.

Fifth, we return to Senator WAYNE MORSE, elected as a Republican, and who during all his career has fought for the principles of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris. He was publicly condemned by the then Governor of Oregon, Douglas McKay, now Secretary of the Interior. Among the various statements given over the radio was the following:

> Senator MORSE has now turned up as one of the leaders in this diversionary attack to strip the Republican ranks. He has taken off his mask of Republicanism and joined his true political comrades, Harry and Adlai and the rest of the New Deal crowd. I doubt if they will like him any better than the Republicans do. He may stay with them until election day, next Tuesday, but soon after that he will probably begin to promote himself as the leader of a new and independent splinter party, headed by himself and the unspeakable Senator LANGER, of North Dakota. You will remember that these two men teamed together as the only Republicans in the Senate to confirm Truman's appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. MORSE and LANGER are birds of the same feather and when they finally fly out of the Senate, I am sure both Democrats and Republicans will be glad that they have gone to roost in the dark forest of oblivion.

Mr. President, I say today to Secretary McKay, try as he and his private utility and large corporation friends may, they cannot force me out of the Republican Party. I claim that I am a 10 times better Republican than is McKay. I say he and his private utility and investment cohorts are a disgrace to the Republican Party. Long, long, long after Secretary McKay has been forgotten, Senator WAYNE MORSE will be remembered as a real friend of the common people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish, if I may, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask one question.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The last comment of the Senator from North Dakota really disposes of any comment I would make, but I wish to call his attention to the lesson which my mother used to teach me, over and over, when I felt that some unfair criticism had been made of some friend or of some member of the family. She used to teach me the old maxim, "Always consider the source." Considering the source of this particular criticism, let me say that it is not worth wasting breath on.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, naturally, resenting the treatment he received, Senator MORSE supported RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a Democrat.

The Republican candidate for President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, appealed personally to the people of Oregon, and eight Republican Senators canvassed the State of Oregon in behalf of Mr. Guy Cordon, who had voted for the Dixon-Yates deal. The chief issue in that fight was public power, and Mr. NEUBERGER was elected and Mr. Cordon was defeated.

Surely one would think the Republican Party—with a popular Republican President in the White House—should have won that election, and yet we saw a repetition of what had happened after the Republicans were in control of the 80th Congress and were voted out after 2 years, and Mr. Truman was elected President and Mr. BARKLEY Vice President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am prompted to interrupt the Senator because my name was brought into his very able comments regarding the remarks of the Secretary of the Interior, and I should like to tell the Senator from North Dakota why my distinguished senior colleague was so influential in Oregon during the last campaign. The basic reason is that the voters of Oregon—and may I say particularly the Republican voters—realized that my colleague was upholding the best traditions of the Republican Party, whereas Secretary McKay was repudiating the traditions of the Republican Party. By that I mean the progressive traditions of the Republican Party which the Senator from North Dakota has upheld so well.

In Oregon we had an illustrious Republican Senator with whom I know the Senator from North Dakota was acquainted as a personal friend. His name was Charles L. McNary. For many years he was the Republican floor leader in this body. He was a champion of public power. He was the original sponsor of the great Bonneville power project for which he began working as early as 1921, but in which he was not successful until Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House. As early as 1935, when the Bonneville Dam project was just getting under way, Charles L. McNary sponsored a bill to provide for the marketing of that power, with a public-power preference clause in the bill.

He always stood for the public-power preference clause, for which the senior Senator from North Dakota has fought so valiantly. Yet many members of the present Republican Party in Oregon, led by Secretary McKay, have denounced the public-power preference clause as "creeping socialism." That is the reason, I may say, why the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the last election was able to persuade a vast number of people in our great State that we who champion Hells Canyon high dam and the public-power preference clause were supporting the traditions of Charles L. McNary, and that Secretary of the Interior McKay was not upholding the traditions of Charles L. McNary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I express my very deep appreciation to the senior Senator from North Dakota for the remarks he has made which are personal to me. I think the Senator realizes that when any colleague says the kind things which the Senator from North Dakota has said about me, his remarks are appreciated.

However, I do not address myself to those matters of personality; I address myself to the great issue to which the senior Senator from North Dakota is addressing himself, namely, the issue of doing whatever we can, in both parties, for the protection of the natural resources of the country for the benefit of all the people, because if ever there was a nonpartisan issue, it is this.

In our history there have been great Republican leaders and great Democratic leaders who have recognized that it is the clear duty of every Member of this body to protect those interests.

I have gained great inspiration from the senior Senator from North Dakota during my 10 years in the Senate in following his leadership on the issue of natural resources; and I have followed his leadership, along with the leadership of other Members of the Senate, who have recognized the importance of our protecting the natural resource wealth of the United States for the benefit of all the people.

In my judgment, it is a sad reflection upon the State of Oregon that we have as Secretary of the Interior a man who has made the sordid, sorry record which Douglas McKay has made as Secretary of the Interior, in entering into contract after contract which has given away the rights of the American people in their resources.

That is why I said earlier this afternoon that such contracts as are involved in this discussion ought to be investigated. Too many contracts under this administration are being manipulated by big interests for the selfish interests of big business.

Consider the Bonneville contracts with private utilities, including COPCO. Consider contract after contract which the Secretary of the Interior has initiated. It is a national scandal. These activities are honeycombing the administration with scandal, and Dixon-Yates is but an example of it.

Consider, for example, the conduct of the Secretary of the Interior in placing in charge of the so-called voluntary oil agreement an official from a big oil company. It was an appointment which was not in the public interest. Judge Barnes, of the Department of Justice, testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency the other day that he would not have followed the course of action which led to the appointment of this oil official. In this instance we see another example of the incompetency of the Secretary of the Interior in performing the duties of his office.

I commend the senior Senator from North Dakota for pointing out that the failure to go ahead with the antimonopoly investigation has denied to the American people an opportunity to have these matters investigated. One of the matters which should be investigated is the Ebasco corporation, which has flourished so well under the McKay administration.

I commend and compliment the senior Senator from North Dakota for the remarks he is making on the floor of the Senate. Republicans and Democrats together ought to join forces in seeing to it that there is brought to light, by a thorough investigation, the whole policy of the Department of the Interior in the field of private utilities. What has happened—and I think the President is entitled to protection from it—is that the President of the United States is being ill advised on issue after issue, just as he was ill advised on the Dixon-Yates contract.

I close by commending the senior Senator from North Dakota for the courage and forthrightness he has displayed on the floor of the Senate in his efforts to protect the interests of the people in the natural resources of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am always happy to be associated with the fighting senior Senator from Oregon and now the junior Senator is strongly with us, too. As I said before, I do not know of a Member of the Senate who has the interests of the common people more at heart than does the senior Senator from Oregon.

Certainly one would believe that Mr. Eisenhower—who in his campaign speeches time and again praised the Rural Electrification Act, and promised to extend it; Mr. Eisenhower who as a candidate had gone to Tennessee and spoken in favor of Tennessee Valley power, and scanning the election returns—would have known the will of the rank and file of the Republicans—in fact, of the people of this country. But apparently he does not.

Referring briefly to the warning that I gave in my speech on the 20th day of August 1954, every Senator upon this floor knows that I kept that promise given, and that I kept it in private speeches and in speeches over the radio and I am stating now again, so that there may be no public misconception of my position, and of those Republicans who are opposed to the monopoly and cartels, that we shall continue this fight in the coming campaign and if necessary in the campaigns to come—win, draw, or lose.

Mr. President, the testimony introduced before my subcommittee, and it was made public upon this floor, showed that the monopoly in the electric-light monopoly headed by the Dixon-Yates outfits and companies was set to enslave thousands of consumers of electric power, both in the cities, towns, and hamlets, and upon the farms.

The record of witnesses under oath showed the Dixon-Yates outfit to be a bunch of public-be-damned scoundrels who had violated laws, who had connived in wrecking REA cooperatives, who had intimidated State public officials, who had by crooked manipulation at election time defeated opposing candidates, who—in fact—in New York City where they maintained their offices, were so influential as to be almost stronger than the Government itself.

Mr. President, in a condensation of this fight, I have today written a letter to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who succeeded me as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This letter is as follows:

> JULY 11, 1955.
>
> Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
> *United States Senate,*
> *State of Tennessee,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: As you know, while I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee we were investigating rural electrification and had gathered data showing the conspiracy on the part of the private utility companies to wreck, hamstring, bankrupt, and wipe out of existence the farmers' REA cooperatives, plus an attempt to take over the plants in various towns and cities, and thereby raise the price of electricity and power to the consumers in these towns and cities.
>
> Because of the fact that the Congress refused to appropriate funds for a thorough investigation of this conspiracy, we were only able to hit the high spots, particularly in Mississippi, Arkansas, west Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and some other States.
>
> To my astonishment, the Hoover Commission has made recommendations which, if carried out, will paralyze and kill the rural electrification.
>
> Almost as soon as the members of the Task Force on Lending Agencies of the Hoover Commission were appointed, the REA cooperatives requested a hearing, as it related to the rural electrification, and the proper representatives requested an opportunity to be heard regarding the functions of REA. They were Clyde Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and Clay L. Cochran, director of the legislative research and management department, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which is the national association of REA-financed electric borrowers, of which there are over a thousand, who were advised by the Task Force of the Hoover Commission that there would be no opportunity for them to be heard.

All they asked was a chance to be heard. Here were representatives of nearly a thousand REA organizations. They said all they wanted was a chance to be heard, when the Hoover task force ran true to form—the task force of the same Herbert Hoover who nearly wrecked the economy of the country when he was President. The representatives of the REA organizations wanted an opportunity to be heard. Imagine a group of men, who were not elected by anybody, who are creatures of this Congress, saying to a thousand REA representatives, who represent several million people, that they were not going to give them an opportunity to appear before the Commission which was investigating into REA and its financing.

I continue reading from my letter to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]:

> The attitude of the staff director, Mr. Theodore Herz, was such that it was obvious that Mr. Herz was not interested in the efficiency of any of the matters that should have been of vital interest to him in his official position. Summed up, his attitude was that he thought the rural electric systems were being subsidized and that the REA should be abolished as soon as possible.
>
> In view of the testimony of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, who testified before our subcommittee on Friday, the man secretly selected by the administration, it must be increasingly obvious to all of us that there is a cold blooded, well financed, secret attempt on the part of the administration to put every REA cooperative out of business, to wreck the REA, to kill the work of many years on the part of the farmer and to turn the industry of several billion dollars over to the private utility companies for a few cents on the dollar.
>
> I believe it is the function of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee, known previously as the Langer-Kefauver committee, and now as the Kefauver committee, to subpena and place under oath and secure the testimony of men responsible for this undertaking which is one of the most brazen, most insidious, most diabolical, in my opinion, attempts that has ever been made to wreck a free people.

Namely, REA.

Who are the men on this Commission whom I am asking the Senator from Tennessee to subpena? Who form the task force appointed by the administration? President Eisenhower said he was for REA. When he was running as a candidate for President he said he was for TVA. Did he put a single friend of REA on the task force? Did Herbert Hoover do so? Let me read who the men on the task force are.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rose to ask the Senator to do exactly what he is about to do. I rose to ask the Senator to read into the RECORD the names of the personnel of the task force, because he will recall that a little over a year ago I stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed appropriations for that task force, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I said, in effect, "All you have to do is look at the men who are on the Commission. They are all men out of the private utilities field or men who represent private utilities. The President did not put on the task force any men who represented the REA view." It was a stacked task force, just as commission after commission in this administration has been rigged and stacked.

Mr. President, do not forget that although we are a government by law, it makes a lot of difference who the men are who administer a government by law. We will not have government by law if men who are biased, or who are special pleaders, or who have a special selfish economic interest are selected to carry out the objectives of a particular commission. The Senator from North Dakota did very well in pointing that out.

Who is Adolphe Wenzell? He is one of the dollar-a-year men who has been placed in a strategic position in this administration. In that capacity he was able to serve his selfish economic interests. It is part of the scandal that honeycombs the Eisenhower administration. In this instance he was used at least as an adviser and consultant for the Bureau of the Budget. He prepared a vicious report against TVA. We are dragging out in the committee hearings the fact that he was writing reports to the effect that he thought the TVA was galloping socialism.

Mr. LANGER. At the same time he was vice president of the First Boston Corp., which was financing the Dixon-Yates project.

Mr. MORSE. He was vice president of the First Boston Corp., which was bound to benefit from the program undercutting TVA which was being put into effect.

I think it is well that we warn the American people to look at the personnel being put in departments and on commissions by this administration. The President should be judged by the self-serving personnel he has been appointing. As a critic of the President on many occasions, I do not think it is fair to any President to let him be so ill-advised as the present President has been ill-advised when it comes to matters of appointments.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I am glad he knows who the men on the task force are, because if he did not know, I was going to hand him my handkerchief so he could weep when I mentioned the names. But I shall read their names and give their connections. These are the men who were appointed. These are the men I called upon the Senator from Tennessee to subpena and put under oath, so that we might find out exactly what kind of outfit it was that made the recommendations for the Hoover Commission, which would put the REA's out of business.

Here they are: Paul Grady, chairman of the task force; partner in Price Waterhouse & Co.; served as chairman of the same task force of the first Hoover Commission. Price Waterhouse & Co. are accountants for Purcell Smith's National Association of Electric Companies and a lot of utility companies—the same Purcell Smith who is head of the lobbyists in Washington, employed at a salary of $65,000, and whatever expenses he incurs.

Who is the next fellow? I am glad the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has arrived, because I think that at heart he is sympathetic with my faction of the Republican Party, in spite of the fact that he is in the Republican leadership. I am glad to have him know who was on the task force of the Hoover Commission which was out to wreck REA.

The next gentleman was Paul Bestor, insurance executive; Prudential Insurance Co., 1943–47, vice president, 1940–47; president, Trust Company of New Jersey, Jersey City, since 1948.

It will interest Senators to know that the First Boston Corp., in a public utility deal in Ohio, got a commission of $150,000. Commissions over the country run into millions upon millions of dollars. These are the men who are selected by the administration to investigate the lending agencies of REA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think it would be of interest to the American people to know also how much insurance money is loaned to private utilities, and therefore show the interlocking relationship between insurance companies and private utility companies?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend that I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], chairman of the committee, is already having a study made to bring out those facts for the benefit of the American people.

The next member of the Hoover Commission task force was George Laurence Bliss, lending business executive; president, Century Savings & Loan Association, New York City, since 1941.

It is really surprising how many of these fellows come from New York City and Wall Street.

The next gentleman is Henry Taylor Bodman, banker and corporation director; general vice president, National Bank of Detroit, Mich., since January 1950; director, Detroit Steel Products Co.; director, Detroit First Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; director, Universal Products Co., Dearborn, Mich.

The next gentleman who was supposed to investigate the lending agencies of the REA is William Wilson Campbell, banker and corporation director; president, National Bank of Eastern Arkansas, Forrest City, since 1923; board of directors, Federal Reserve bank, Memphis; director, Arkansas Power & Light Co.—one of the most vicious among private utilities in the United States, when it comes to wiping out rural cooperatives, as shown by the sworn testimony given before my subcommittee when I was head of the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The things they did absolutely beggar description.

The next gentleman who is on the Hoover task force is Albert L. Cole, general business manager, Readers' Digest Association; Frank A. Munsey Publishing Co., New York City, 1910–15; joined Popular Science Publishing Co., New York City in 1915; president and publisher, Popular Science monthly and Outdoor Life magazine, 1929–39—director since 1924; director, McCall Corp.; director, Greenwich Trust Co.

The next is Clifford D. Cooper, industrialist, president, Horning Engineering Co., Los Angeles, since 1950.

The next one is Gardner Cowles, publisher, banker, and corporation director; president, Des Moines Register since 1943; president, Register Tribune Co., Cowles Broadcasting Co., Cowles Magazines, Inc.—publisher of Look magazine; board chairman, Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co.; Massachusetts Broadcasting Corp.; director, United Airlines, Bankers Life Co., Iowa-Des Moines National Bank and Trust Co.; director, R. H. Macy & Co.

The next one is Preston Hotchkis, insurance executive and uility director; director, Blue Diamond Corp., Ltd., California Trust Co., Pacific Mutual Life Insurance. Does that sound familiar to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, who comes from the Pacific coast?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As we read the background of the members of the Hoover Task Force, is the Senator from North Dakota at all surprised that one of its recommendations was to increase the interest rates to the REA and, really, to cut off the source of Federal loans to the REA, and have all that work done by bankers? Not so many years ago the farmer REA's could not get any assistance from the private utilities, and could not get any assistance from the bankers. Now that the farmers have done this magnificent job through the REA program, a task force made up principally of financiers wishes to stop the program and prevent the expansion of the REA's on the basis of the low-interest-rate charges the Government can make available to them. Is the Senator from North Dakota at all surprised at that course of action?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I could almost tell what the report would be before I read it. They want to end the 2-percent interest rate the REA's have been paying. They want to change that rate to 5 percent, and they want to have all the loans made by the private banks and insurance companies. There is no question as to what these men want. They want to wreck the REA in the United States; and they will do so unless the Congress wakes up and takes the necessary action.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, just as they will wreck the TVA unless at this session of Congress we provide some very clear checks to protect the TVA. The way to begin, in my judgment, is to bring to an end the kind of job that Wenzell was almost able to perpetrate when he was slipped in as a dollar-a-year adviser to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; indeed.

Mr. President, I did not finish reading the list in the case of Mr. Hotchkis. Not only is he a director of the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., but he is also a director of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Yosemite Park & Curry Co.; Grand Central Garage Co.; executive vice president, treasurer, and director, Fred H. Bixby Co., Long Beach Calif.

Then there is also Mr. Arnold B. Keller, Sr., business consultant and corporation director, with International Harvester Co. since 1913, treasurer since 1932, director since 1936. Vice president and treasurer since 1941, senior consultant since 1946; director, Chicago District Electric Generating Co., Continental Casualty Co., Continental Assurance Co., Gary National Bank, Associates Investment Co., C. M. St. P. & P. Railroad Co.; director, United States Life Insurance Co.

There is also Allan Sproul, banker, and president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York since 1941.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In view of the list the Senator from

North Dakota has read, is he at all surprised to find that this group desires to raise the interest rates in the case of the REA, and wishes to raise the interest rates in the case of agricultural loans, and also recommends an increase from 3 percent to 5 percent in the case of distress loans? Furthermore, when we examine the list of those who have been appointed to the President's Cabinet, do not we find substantially the same type of persons, with the same ideas, and the same objectives with regard to the administration of the Government?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; the same general pattern seems to run throughout. All of them run true to form. The big fellows are on one side; and the poor, common people are on the other.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from North Dakota in the position he is taking. If this Congress does not wake up and immediately take the necessary action, we can well imagine what will happen in the future, insofar as the REA is concerned: Those who oppose it will succeed in increasing the interest rate from 2 percent to even 4 or 5 percent, and that will wreck the REA throughout the United States. Does not the Senator from North Dakota agree that is true?

Mr. LANGER. There is not the least doubt of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has referred to the fact that a great many of the persons who have been trying to handicap or wreck the REA come from New York. I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota knows that day after tomorrow, Wednesday, there will be a hearing before the Senate Public Works Committee, for the purpose of considering the giving of authority to the State of New York to develop one of the few remaining great waterpower resources of the Nation, in addition to Hells Canyon, namely, the Niagara—which, with 1 or 2 others, is among the greatest waterpower resources remaining in this country. I think Niagara probably will generate more power than any one of the others.

At the hearing we shall be considering a bill which some of my associates and I have introduced, and that bill provides authority for this waterpower development by the State of New York, but under safeguards to protect the interests of the REA, the consumers, the municipalities, and all the public bodies of both the State of New York and adjacent States.

If the distinguished Senator from North Dakota follows the record of those hearings or, more happily, if he attends the hearings, he will find the men to whom he has just referred, or men just like them, with exactly the same interests, appearing in opposition to the bill; and he will find that they have a firm desire and determination to have these great resources, which are God-given, turned over to only 5 power companies in the State of New York, which would develop them, not in the interest of the 16 million persons who live in New York State and the several million other persons who live in the adjacent States, such as Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, but in the interest of the relatively few stockholders of those companies. So the policy and the pattern are exactly the same as the policy and pattern being followed, and which have been followed, in the desire to tear down and destroy the TVA.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from New York, that on a great many occasions, when speaking in North Dakota, it has been my pleasure to refer to the wonderful assistance the distinguished junior Senator from New York has rendered on the floor of the Senate to the farmers all over the great Northwest. The distinguished junior Senator from New York has friends out there by the thousands, who appreciate the fine fight he has made in the Senate, and also the fine work he did along the same lines when he was Governor of the great State of New York. The junior Senator from New York is one of the best friends the rank and file of the people of the United States have.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to reply to the Senator from New York, because I happen to be one of the authors of the so-called Niagara bill, to which he referred. I think we ought to get the fact straight in the RECORD.

In the first place, the Niagara development to which the Senator from New York has referred includes the Niagara River; and the five companies he is discussing have been developing power on that river for 60-odd years. They are there now. Their properties are there now. They have been furnishing electric power to the entire Niagara frontier, including the great city of Buffalo. They have been serving a population of 2 or 3 million. They have been doing so for fully 60 years. Their plants are now in existence. They have been doing a satisfactory job. There have been no complaints. Their rates are controlled by the State of New York. Therefore they cannot increase them or decrease them without the approval of the New York State officials.

The able Senator from New York wishes to place alongside these private enterprises the State of New York or the Federal Government. The pattern would then be that on the one hand there would be private enterprises developing power. Alongside them would be Government-owned plants. Under those circumstances, if we cannot permit private industry to increase its existing facilities, with which it has been doing a good job for 60 years, there will never be any excuse for private enterprise producing electric power in the United States.

I voted for, and will continue to vote for——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield further. The Senator from Indiana can discuss this subject on his own time, after I have concluded.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from North Dakota gave the able Senator from New York plenty of time to expound his philosophy.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will ask me a question——

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator did not say that when the able Senator from New York was speaking.

Mr. LANGER. I have been pretty fair to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the Senator has, but I merely wished to make certain——

Mr. LANGER. I did not yield for the purpose of a speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did not the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New York for a speech?

Mr. LANGER. It was not a speech. He complimented the Senator from North Dakota. If the Senator from Indiana wishes to compliment the Senator from North Dakota, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to compliment the Senator from North Dakota. I think he has done some wonderful things.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota and to the able Senator from New York that I think they are mistaken if they wish to see built by the State or by the Federal Government a hydroelectric plant alongside a private enterprise plant which has been in existence for 60 years, which is doing a good job, and about which no one is complaining.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wished to keep the record straight. The intimation by the able Senator from New York was to the effect that no power had ever been developed at Niagara Falls, that this development was something new. It is not new at all. Private enterprise has been developing power there for 60 years, and has been doing a good job. Private enterprise has been supplying Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Lockport, and a great area in western New York, with all the electricity they needed. Why do Senators wish to put the Federal Government or the State government in there alongside private enterprise?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will inform my friend from Indiana——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to conclude the reading of my letter to the Senate from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

> These are but a few of the men who should be subpenaed. I have no doubt but that you with your well deserved reputation for

honesty, patriotism, and love for the underprivileged and helpless will as usual work and fight to get justice and bring the bunch who have been secretly and cunningly working in the dark to stab the farmers, laborers, and small-business men in the back out into the broad daylight so that the American people will know the facts. The American people know you as one of their great champions for the right—an efficient, fearless champion who is unafraid and I pledge you my full cooperation both as a citizen and as a member of your subcommittee.

It would please me very much if I might have an early answer to my request.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

William Langer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that at the present time in the State of New York there is no public-power yardstick?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That being true, does the Senator know at what rate private companites are selling power to the REA in New York, and the rate which is charged in South Carolina, or anywhere else within 200 or 300 miles of TVA? Does the Senator know that the rate to the REA in South Carolina is less than one-half the rate charged in New York at the present time because there is no public-power yardstick with which to measures rates? Even private companies sell power in South Carolina for half the rate charged in New York.

Mr. LANGER. A full exposition of the situation by States was placed in the Congressional Record not long ago by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator know that power is sold on the American side of the Niagara River at more than twice the rate charged on the Canadian side of the river, less than 10 miles away? In the one case the power is developed under private operation. The other is a Government operation.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator for furnishing this information, which he undoubtedly obtained while he was Governor of New York State.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator know that in Canada the power-producing facility pays no taxes? Does he also know that the price of almost everything else in Buffalo is higher than in Canada? There is nothing unusual about prices being different in Canada, as compared with those in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. All the Senator from North Dakota knows is that the private power companies collect from the consumer all the taxes they pay and all the graft they pay out. It was shown in the investigation of the Arkansas Power and Light Co. that men were employed at $25 a day to go out and work at election time. Twenty-three lawyers were employed when one lawyer could have done the work. They were employed for the entire year. The consumer paid for the whisky which was bought, and the $200,000 country club which was maintained for purposes of entertainment. All those things were charged to the consumer, according to the sworn testimony before our committee.

Mr. President, this fight in behalf of the farmers, the laborers, the small-business men, to keep them from being charged exorbitant rates for power and light, this fight to get power for millions of farmers of today who have no light and power, will continue; and whether the Republican faction opposed to me likes it or not, I shall endeavor to make it an issue in every way I possibly can in the coming election.

Of course, our faction of the Republican Party—for the benefit of latecomers to the Senate Chamber, I may say that is the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Robert La Follette, Sr.-George Norris Republican faction, as opposed to the Grant-McKinley-Harding-Hoover faction—will have only the funds made available by the farmers, laborers, and small-business people and we cannot hope to match the massive campaign contributions made by the private utility companies and the investment concerns.

In a continuation of this fight, I have set aside as money not belonging to me, the increase in pay to me as a United States Senator by an increase in Senators' salary.

When the increase was voted I felt I was not entitled to it and I voted against it because the people of North Dakota had elected me to a 6-year position at $12,500 plus $2,500 for expenses, or a total of $15,000. Therefore, when the bill was passed I wrote to the Financial Clerk of the Senate, Robert Brenkworth, in an endeavor to assign a portion of my salary to the crippled children's home at Jamestown, N. Dak. Mr. Brenkworth wrote me and I have his letter, that under the law it was impossible to do this; therefore I have been obliged to pay income tax on the whole $22,500. But I am keeping close account and I intend to use the difference between the $15,000 and the $22,500—less my income tax on the additional $7,500—in this fight with the faction of the Republican Party devoted to the cause of getting cheap light and power to the farmers, laborers, small-business men of this country.

In that fight I know that the Republican faction following Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris, will need the enthusiastic and earnest support of the consumers, and I believe we will get it.

When we adjourn this session, the adjournment now being scheduled for July 30, I hope that I may have invitations to speak in behalf public power in every State in this Union.

I hope I will receive such invitations from Democrats, as well as from some Republicans on my side of the aisle who believe in public power.

I urge that meetings be held by every REA cooperative in the United States. I urge that cities and towns having municipal plants, rally to the cause to prevent their being devoured by the monopolies. I urge that a fighting, crusading, campaign be put on against those who are against the people on behalf of those who are for them, regardless of political beliefs.

I urge every voter to ascertain for himself just where the candidate for whom he is asked to vote, stands on this all-important question of public power.

In conclusion, I urge any of my colleagues, Democratic or Republican, who share the views of the Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., George Norris faction of the Republican Party, to help me get invitations to speak in their States. There will be no charge for speaking, or any honorariums, but I hope that the meetings will be well advertised, so that we can get great, enormous crowds, running into thousands of farmers and small-business men and laboring people and consumers, and really talk to them, and not merely talk to four or five thousand people. We want to get out huge crowds, so that we can carry the message to them. I hope the meetings will be well advertised, so that we can get the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to the people from one end of the country to the other before election time.

I want the candidates who run on the Republican ticket, supported by the faction known as the Grant-McKinley-Harding-Hoover faction of Republicans, to get out and defend the Hoover Commission task force report, and to tell the people why the interest rates ought to be increased from 2 percent to 5 or 6 percent. I want them to tell the people why our Government, which is building dams all over the world, refuses to build steamplants in this country, and why it refuses to have public transmission lines built in this country, and why it fights against them even when there are often no transmission lines within hundreds of miles.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In behalf of the Abraham Lincoln-Robert La Follette-Theodore Roosevelt-George Norris wing of the Democratic Party in the State of Oregon, I herewith extend to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota an invitation to come to Oregon and to other parts of the Northwest to speak. In the Northwest two very distinguished friends and advocates of public power will be running for reelection in 1956. They are the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson]. I know that the ringing voice of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, when it is heard throughout the Northwest, will be of great aid to these distinguished advocates of public power. I can promise him that we in Oregon will welcome him with open arms.

Mr. LANGER. First, I will want to find out whom Douglas McKay will be running on the Republican ticket in Oregon. It may be that his faction will nominate a man who is a much greater friend of public power than even Wayne Morse.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from North Dakota believe that the age of miracles has returned?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know. However, I want to give him a chance, and I also want to find out first whom McKay will run against WARREN MAGNUSON. The able Senator from Washington, great advocate of public power, that he is, may find himself opposed by an even greater advocate of public power than he is.

Mr. NEUBERGER. For the information of the senior Senator from North Dakota, let me say that ever since Mr. McKay became Secretary of the Interior, I do not believe he has been close enough to an advocate of public power to communicate with him even by smoke signals.

Mr. LANGER. I will be speaking out there in favor of public power, and I will let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that we will welcome him in Oregon to speak on the issue. I care not what position he may take on candidates. I say to the Senator to come out and speak as he has spoken on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the public power yardstick, and he will be welcome. We will let the parties decide whether they want to endorse the principles he advocates.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana; and I shall be happy to go to Indiana, too.

Mr. CAPEHART. First, I should like to question the Senator from North Dakota about a few things, before I invite him to come into Indiana. I do not quite understand the able Senator's position. In Indiana the farmers are perfectly satisfied and happy with REA. It has been extended. In Indiana about 98 percent of our people have electricity. We are happy in Indiana, and we are satisfied. The REA is happy and satisfied.

The other day I attended a breakfast in Washington with representatives of the Lebanon, Ind., REA. They came to town to pay off in full their commitment to the Government. I believe it is the second cooperative in Indiana which has paid off its commitment in full. They are all great friends of mine. They are great boosters of mine.

Mr. LANGER. Do they know how the Senator voted on Dixon-Yates?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know what Dixon-Yates has to do with Indiana or with North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. That is why the people of Indiana need to hear my eloquent speeches.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not too certain that they need the Senator's eloquence. I know the Senator is very eloquent, but I am not too certain that the people of Indiana need it. In fact, I doubt that the Senator from North Dakota understands the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. LANGER. All I did was to preside over long hearings on it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Has the Senator read the contract?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will dig into the records, he will see all the corruption and all the attempts to stab in the back and all the secrecy, and even the attempt to fool the President of the United States. My judgment is that he has been thoroughly misinformed on it.

Mr. CAPEHART. We would be happy to have the Senator come to Indiana. However, honestly, I do not believe the REA would be interested in the Senator, because the REA is perfectly satisfied and happy. I am afraid the REA's would not know what the Senator was talking about if he came and spoke negatively about the REA's. Our REA's are perfectly happy and satisfied. The people have electricity and they pay fair rates, and they are getting all the power and all the lines and all the poles they need. They are very happy. They would be amazed if the Senator spoke negatively about the REA's. The people of Indiana would be amazed to hear the Senator from North Dakota say that there was anything wrong with the REA or that REA was not functioning properly, or that the people were not getting all the power and electricity they need. I am afraid the Senator would frighten them. What is wrong in North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will remain in Indiana when I make my eloquent speeches there—provided I am invited to speak there—he will hear me tell the farmers that the interest rate was 2 percent when they made a loan and how this administration is trying to make it 5 or 6 percent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Two percent? When was it 2 percent?

Mr. LANGER. The rate was 2 percent when they made the loan, and the distinguished Senator from Indiana is advocating 5-percent or 6-percent interest.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the able Senator from North Dakota wishes to be honest.

Mr. LANGER. Of course I wish to be honest.

Mr. CAPEHART. And I am sure the Senator wishes to tell the truth.

Mr. LANGER. Of course I am telling the truth.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Indiana is not advocating any such rate of interest; he has never advocated any such thing, and he has never voted for any such thing.

Mr. LANGER. What about the Hoover Commission?

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator going to pin the Hoover Commission on me?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly. Of course, I am going to pin the Hoover Commission on the administration and because the Senator belongs to that faction of the Republican Party, the McKinley, Harding, and Hoover faction.

Mr. CAPEHART. I belong to that faction?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who told the Senator that? Is that more of the misinformation that comes from the able Senator?

Mr. LANGER. Read the Hoover Commission's report.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not write it, and I know of no Republican Senator who did write it. The President of the United States did not write it. It is a report written by the Hoover task force.

Mr. LANGER. Did not the distinguished Senator from Indiana vote for Dixon-Yates?

Mr. CAPEHART. If I had a chance, I would. Did we vote on Dixon-Yates here? If I had a chance to vote on it, I would.

Mr. LANGER. I think that is all I have to tell the people of Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I have stated, we are perfectly happy with REA in Indiana. Let me tell the Senator what is going to happen to REA under the administration of President Eisenhower. It is going to get more money. It is going forward faster than it ever has before, and it is going to be helped and encouraged, just as it has been for the past 3 years.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my friend that those are the exact words of Dwight D. Eisenhower on October 4, 1952, at the State College in North Dakota——

Mr. CAPEHART. And that is exactly what has happened.

Mr. LANGER. He said he was going to help TVA also. The only trouble is that he said one thing and did another.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is not true. The able Senator is just as incorrect as he can be. The Hoover Commission report has not been accepted. It has not been put into effect. It is purely the recommendations of the task force.

I am not going to vote to increase the interest rate from 2 to 5 percent. I am not going to do all the things recommended by the task force.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator stand with the Senator from Oregon and me?

Mr. CAPEHART. If I think the Senator is right I will be with him. I am not going to try to be consistent for consistency's sake, as some of my friends do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that at the time the Eisenhower administration came into office 90 percent of the farms of America were already electrified on the 2-percent program?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly, that is true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know the facts, but I think it was a very large percentage. I know of no one in this administration who wishes to do anything other than to help and encourage the REA and see that more farms receive electricity.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the Senator from Indiana as I do, I do not think he would vote to have the REA's go to private bankers to obtain loans if he understood the true situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not care whether they go to private bankers, so long as they get decent interest rates. I do not care whether they go to private bankers so long as they get what they deserve.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Indiana says he knows of no proposal by this administration to do anything against the building up of the REA. Does not the Senator from Indiana know that on every occasion on which they have had a chance they have opposed the preference clause?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think that is a true statement of fact.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall have to send the Senator some statements from the Department of the Interior. I presume they speak for the President.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by "preference clause"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not the Senator know what the preference clause is?

Mr. CAPEHART. I know, but there may be others who do not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The clause provides that in the development of power there shall be a preference given to public bodies, which include REA. That has been opposed, so far as I know, on every occasion by this administration since it has been in office. I shall be glad to list the occasions for the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's recollection is as good as mine, and mine is as good as his. I have never opposed it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The opposition may come from the Secretary of the Interior. It may come from a gentleman in North Dakota who is opposed to public power, but the warp and woof of the administration has been against the preference clause in many instances. That hurts the REA.

Mr. CAPEHART. The REA is getting along fine. Let us leave it alone.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I hesitate to call for the regular order, but I have been waiting for the floor for 2 hours, and I shall have to insist on the regular order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to interrupt me, I shall yield only for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. When the Senator from Indiana says he is not opposed to the preference clause I wonder why he is opposing my Niagara Falls bill, which gives preference to the REA and municipalities, and why is he pushing his own bill, which completely vitiates the preference clause?

Mr. CAPEHART. In Indiana all the power consumed by REA is produced by private power companies, who sell it to the REA, and it is, in turn, sent over the REA lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has the floor, and may yield only for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the Senator from Wisconsin has not invited me to come to Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is invited.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be very glad to go to the State of Wisconsin. I hope I shall have an invitation to go to New York State. I have already promised to go to South Carolina at the invitation of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator knows, without any assurance on my part, that I would welcome him with great heartiness to talk on the issues. We are fighting for the Nation and not for or against any particular candidate.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the State.

DESIGNATION OF PIKE CREEK IN KENOSHA, WIS., A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1250) to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream, which was, to amend the title so as to read: "An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha, Wis., a nonnavigable stream."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE PROPOSED HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last weeek I urged President Eisenhower to take the occasion of his "second look" at the Dixon-Yates power contract as an opportunity to review also his administration's activities in connection with the great Hells Canyon Dam site on the Snake River.

At that time, I pointed out that the Eisenhower administration's failure to defend the public interest in a great natural resource at Hells Canyon was a worse blot on its record than the Dixon-Yates fiasco. The administration's decision not to oppose the license applications of the Idaho Power Co. for dams in the Hells Canyon area stands as a clear display of its attitude toward natural resources. Relinquishment of the Hells Canyon Dam site to the Idaho Power Co. can be proof that this administration is ready and willing to permit exploitation of a great power resource for private profit, even though the private project would develop only a portion of the potential.

The course which the administration has chosen to follow in development of natural resources will severely cripple efforts to obtain the greatest possible benefits from such power sites as Hells Canyon. This was emphatically exposed in the recent recommendations of a Federal Power Commission examiner on the Idaho Power Co.'s license applications. He recommended that the company be given a license for the Brownlee Dam, which would produce 221,000 kilowatts of firm power. But he also pointed out that the Federal Hells Canyon project is the potential source of 1,122,000 ultimate kilowatts of energy.

Why should the Eisenhower administration ask the Nation to accept a power policy which results in about 20 percent development of our resources?

That is the same question which the capable and experienced editor of the Rocky Mountain region's most influential newspaper asked in a recent open letter to President Eisenhower. He asked:

> Is this administration willing to carry on large, feasible public-power projects in whatever region where the demand is clearly established and where no reasonable alternative to action by the Government is demonstrable?

He pointed out that the question applies "with desperate urgency" to the administration's position in regard to Hells Canyon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the open letter of Mr. Robert W. Lucas, editor of the editorial page of the Denver Post, together with a subsequent editorial from the Denver Post, warning the administration of the political consequences of its betrayal of the public interest at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of July 2, 1955]

OPEN LETTER: PUBLIC POWER BLOC WANTS THE CREAM

(By Robert W. Lucas)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a newspaperman in a western region that is holding its breath over certain Federal policies in resource development, I hurried to Washington this week to find out what I could about disquieting reports on the fate of "our" projects (the Upper Colorado and the Frying Pan-Arkansas). They're "your" projects, too. You asked again Wednesday that Congress approve them. So we both have an interest in what happens to them.

I picked up some important information. You already know that a coalition of skeptical nonwestern members of both the House and Senate are opposing the two western projects that you are so strongly committed to. The so-called antireclamation bloc in Congress is far from inactive.

It is, moreover, being supported by our friends from California.

There is another group mobilizing to block those projects, Mr. President. I refer to the public power boys, particularly in the Senate, and headed by six Democrats from Oregon, Washington, and Montana. They have all been voting with us until recently. Now they are annoyed and are threatening to bolt. Why? Well, they say they are not going to stand by and let your administration deliver the cream of hydroelectric power sites to a private utility at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, and then commit the taxpayers to paying for "skimmed milk" development on the Colorado.

This is not the time or place to set down a detailed review of all the history and current findings of fact about the Hells Canyon issue. But because I have implicit faith in your willingness to be constructive about such things, I urge you personally to go into the decision of your own Federal Power Commission's examiner in the Hells Canyon case.

Stated briefly, the examiner found (1) that the petitioning utility, the Idaho Power Co., could not produce massive quantities of power needed in the Northwest at a rate which would permit either its sure absorption by the existing market or which would justify the borrowing of some $190 million to build the necessary dams; (2) that the only feasible alternative, insofar as the utility is concerned, would mean only a fraction of the power output possible from that area of the Middle Snake; (3) that a high dam, built by the Federal Government at Hells Canyon, and enjoying the special advantages of Federal credit and tax immunity, represents the only way that great additions to the region's power supply may be promptly made.

Now, if the Power Commission rejects its commissioner's findings and recommendations and grants, instead, a license for a plan which might prove to be an unrealistic private development on the Middle Snake, it will be running 2 risks: The first is that the examiner was right in his predictions of financing difficulties — particularly if the utility undertakes the construction of all 3 dams in 1 package. In that event, "adequate, comprehensive development" of the Middle Snake would be further deferred. The second risk is that neither the Commission nor the courts can force the Idaho Power Co. to proceed faster than the facts of its financial obligation will permit. That is as it should be, of course. But again it would not bring about the prompt expansion of the basic power supply in a region which will need it within a very few years.

I urge you to review your administration's policy on this subject. My point is to avert any real inconsistency of program which could, in fact, frustrate the success of your whole resource program—including that in the Rocky Mountain States.

Another and equally compelling reason why you should review the matter at this time is this: The Hoover Commission report on resources and power has put in sharp focus a great national controversy over Federal policy in this field. Many aspects of that controversy are present in the Hells Canyon case. A major question is before you and the country: Is this administration willing to carry on large, feasible public-power projects in whatever region where the demand is clearly established, and where no reasonable alternative to action by the Government is demonstrable? That question applies with desperate urgency on the Middle Snake.

It is obvious that your loyal opposition, the Democrats, are willing and (perhaps) capable of converting the Hells Canyon dilemma into a real, live political issue. That is their intention. They would like to pump the vitality into Hells Canyon which so long energized their politics through the vehicles of Muscle Shoals and TVA. To that extent the cry of Hells Canyon is a partisan one. If that were all—you would, it seems to me, be justified in ignoring it in favor of your resolute preference for less Government and more investor participation in power development. But I don't believe that is all in this case. At least I would urge you to satisfy yourself on that score before lasting harm is done to the effort you are making in behalf of some water resource development.

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, who is undoubtedly the most influential Republican Senator from the upper basin States, has raised objections within the Senate Interior Committee to the Hells Canyon bill, S. 1333. But his objections, however sincerely conceived, do not stand up under the test of examination. Their real effect is only to block development of the Snake at precisely the time we are launching upon the admittedly costly development of the Colorado, the Arkansas, and the Frying Pan. While it is no pleasure to say it, his untenable position weakens his strategic value to your program—whatever impact Mr. MILLIKIN's acknowledged prestige may have on the Rocky Mountain legislation in its first or authorization stage.

I mention these things because of the strongly favorable impressions that your moderate and steady administration of public affairs seems to be having on the people. Not everything you have done has come off without adverse reaction, of course. But the feeling is common that, when you are fully and thoughtfully advised, you react dependably in the interest of the many and not the few. The Nation's prosperous economy, its relative domestic tranquillity, and the relaxing tensions in international affairs are all in part tribute to your leadership.

[From the Denver Post of July 6, 1955]

A FAIR WARNING AT HELLS CANYON

Careful reading of the Federal Power Commission examiner's decision in the Hells Canyon Dam case reveals that there is more than a "public versus private power" issue involved. At issue also is the competence, integrity, and independence of the FPC's engineers.

Believe it or not, the professional witnesses in the employ of the Commission have estimated the capital costs of building the Idaho Power Co.'s proposed three dams on the Middle Snake River as being 40 percent higher than the estimates of the utility's own engineers and those of the Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., one of the largest heavy-construction firms in the world. That is an incredible difference of opinion, arrived at from substantially the same set of facts.

William J. Costello, the FPC's examiner, described the matter of cost estimates as being of "transcendent importance." Only by accurately estimating the capital costs of the petitioner's projects could the FPC forecast what power rates would be necessary to return those costs, plus a satisfactory return on invested capital. Mr. Costello pointed out that "even if [the Idaho Power Co.] were to accept a license which required the building of the 3 proposed projects in a minimum of 9 years * * * if the market for the power was not evident, there would be little difficulty under the act in amending the license to eliminate one or both of the excess and unneeded developments." Blooey would go all the tall talk about great power production from private sources.

The FPC engineers estimate the capital cost of the 3-dam plan at $191,328,000. That is $53,328,000 greater than the estimate of the Idaho Power Co. Mr. Costello accepted the higher figure. He interpreted that as meaning that the power costs would have to be 6.6 mills at the market. And he said there is no market in the Pacific Northwest for firm power at that figure, beyond the requirements of the company itself—which requirements are but a fraction of the three-dam plan's total output. The plot begins to thicken.

Mr. Costello said, "This matter is not being considered under the delusion that Idaho Power Co. intends to rush headlong into financial chaos and this decision will head the company off from ruin." (He can say that again.) He added, "Neither this Commission nor any other governmental regulatory body could lawfully and effectively require construction of a hydroelectric project, a market for which did not exist." Oho. Now we're getting somewhere.

In other words, Mr. Costello said that if, after granting Idaho Power a license to build 3 dams, work is started on 1, and economic circumstances are proven that warrant the deferment of the other two, nobody can force Idaho Power to deliver on the 3-dam license. More important still, the examiner asserts that capital costs and probable power rates do not justify the issuance of a 3-dam license anyway.

The Idaho Power Co. and its friends will doubtless insist that its cost estimates, and those of Morrison-Knudsen, are the more accurate. If they prove not to be however, Idaho Power can petition for an amendment to its license, but after it has preempted the Middle Snake site and eliminated it as the location for the high dam.

The FPC examiner supported the engineers of the agency. But he acted in a manner that would bring about results exactly similar to those which he said would probably follow were he to decide in favor of the petitioner's license for 3 dams. And he did so because of his own decision that partial development of the Snake would be better than no development at all.

Now, Congress created this quasi-judicial agency and gave it authority under the Water Power Act of 1920. It projected its authority over the navigable waters of the Nation through an independent agency, with a mandate to exercise that authority in behalf of full and comprehensive development of water resources. Congress itself controls the only alternative to the proposals advanced by the Idaho Power Co. Congress, then, should decide whether the Snake should be developed fully, partially, or not at all—once all the facts are in, as they now are.

If a majority cannot be organized in Congress to provide what the Federa Power Commission's examiner has found to be the only feasible way to produce massive quantities of marketable power, then are the great power resources of that river to be given away for piecemeal development by a private company? And is that to be done upon the unsupported promise of the utility to do something which it cannot do, or does not intend to do? Will the Congress actually allow that to happen?

The answer to the latter questions returns us to our opening statement: A great issue in this controversy now is the competence, integrity, and independence of the FPC's engineers. The Eisenhower Department of Interior has more than once offered to abide by the FPC's decision, providing it calls for "adequate" development. We think that all of those who are accessories to what is beginning to look like a conspiracy against feasible development of the Snake—if such a conspiracy should prove successful—should be warned of the political consequences of their act.

WITHDRAWAL OF THE RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request of considerable importance. I have been informed that a number of

Senators wish to comment upon the request and, undoubtedly, to object to it. For that reason, I think it would be unfair for me to make the request until more Senators are present.

So I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor temporarily to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning I submitted a resolution, which I ask to have read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 126), as follows:

> Whereas the nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, are now ruled by tyrannical Communist governments imposed by force against the will of the people of such nations;
>
> Whereas the people of such nations earnestly seek the restoration of their freedom and rule by governments of their own choosing, and to these ends desire, pending the day of their liberation, to be represented by free, anti-Communist governments-in-exile;
>
> Whereas the United States now recognizes the Communist regimes in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania;
>
> Whereas the recognition by the United States of such regimes strengthens them and thus obstructs the restoration of freedom and self-government in such nations; and
>
> Whereas the recognition by the United States of free, anti-Communist governments-in-exile representing such nations would advance the anti-Communist cause throughout the world, and thus would promote the safety, peace, and independence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should (1) withdraw its diplomatic recognition from the Communist regimes in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, (2) encourage and support the establishment of free anti-Communist governments-in-exile to represent the people of such nations and of Albania, and (3) extend diplomatic recognition to such free anti-Communist governments, pending the liberation of their respective people.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I always dislike to enter an objection to a unanimous-consent request by my friend from Wisconsin, but there are very definite reasons why such an objection should be made. If my friend will bear with me for a moment, I should like to state the reason why I shall object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Previously today there was submitted to this body a resolution which certainly has the same objectives, or at least a part of the objectives of the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin. It was submitted by the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and was joined in by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE], the ranking minority member of that committee [Mr. WILEY], and the acting majority leader, myself. That resolution was referred to the appropriate committee, and properly so, I think.

In my judgment, the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin should be heard and considered by the same committee. So far as I am concerned, although I am not a member of the committee, I think the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin should be considered at the same time the resolution of the Senator from California is considered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Having the assurance from the very able acting majority leader that he would favor having this resolution considered at the same time as the Knowland-Clements-George resolution—and I understand that the foremost ranking Republican Member on the floor feels the same way about it—if that is correct I would have no objection——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I shall certainly use my influence to have the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin considered along with the resolution introduced by the Senator from California and other Senators.

Mr. McCARTHY. Having that assurance from the two able Senators, and since I think the resolution is of sufficient importance to be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and ask that the resolution be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, today I have submitted a resolution dealing with the Communist satellite nations. I had asked for its immediate consideration, but I have withdrawn that request at this time. I am hopeful the Senate will see fit to undo some of the damage which was done by the defeat of Senate Resolution 116, and in the process, will take the first steps in charting out purposeful, meaningful and realistic programs for rolling back the Communist tide. When I say I am hopeful that we may take these first steps, I do not imply that I am optimistic that we will take them—which, for reasons that will be made clear a little later, I cannot be.

Before discussing the resolution, I want to make a few preliminary remarks. I do this because I am anxious that neither my position nor my purposes be misunderstood.

First, I believe that the free world's struggle for survival against world Communism is going very, very badly. I believe that the decision to go ahead with a Big Four meeting is both a symptom and a cause of the ever-worsening international situation. It is a symptom because it is evidence we have been bamboozled by false Soviet peace propaganda; it is a cause because it lends credibility to Soviet peace overtures, and thus contributes mightily to the success of Soviet attempts to persuade the free world to tear down its defenses and make new concessions to its mortal enemy.

Mr. President, nothing that has happened in the past three weeks would cause me to alter a single word of the appaisal of the Big Four meeting I offered on the Senate floor on June 16. On the contrary, the contrast between the administration's never-never land of "opening horizons" and "new dawns," and the real world of ruthless, unswerving Communist imperialism, has never been more vivid. Mr. Molotov, in San Francisco, demands Red China's admission to the United Nations, the surrender of the off-shore islands and Formosa, the dismantling of Western defense alliances, the abandonment of American overseas bases, and adds, if you please, that when these things have been accomplished, we may achieve our "mutual" objective of "peaceful coexistence." A week later, Mr. Eisenhower solemnly advises the representatives of the press that it is "obvious" that "something has changed about Soviet policy"; and he adds that he is more encouraged than ever that Geneva will be a grand success.

So, I must repeat what I said 3 weeks ago. That our perverse insistence on relaxing our vigilance in the face of unrelenting Communist pressures on the free world's defenses augurs another round of appeasement.

Second. I believe that the fight against communism will never move ahead until the free world conducts significant offensive operations of its own. This means we must develop positive, dynamic programs designed to accomplish the liberation of Communist-controlled areas. Unless we are prepared to bring to bear against Communist territories the same powerful, unrelenting pressures as the Communists, day-in day-out, bring to bear against free world territories, we cannot hope even to hold our own. And unless the pressures we exert are more powerful and more extensive than those exerted against us, we certainly cannot hope to move ahead. These principles are as valid in politics as they are in war.

Negative, defensive policies, like "containment" or "coexistence" or what have you, invite ultimate defeat. We need programs calculated to gain ground, even if little by little. If such programs are not undertaken, the American people should understand that the expenditure of their wealth, their young men, their liberties, and their honor has the function of merely buying a little time—of postponing the day of their final agony.

Third. I believe that the United States Senate, in the field of foreign affairs—as in the domestic field—is a sovereign body, whose powers and responsibilities are limited by the Constitution and by the American people, and by no one else. Under our Constitution, the Senate is not required to relegate foreign policymaking to the President, as his exclusive domain. The Senate has independent responsibilities here: Should it believe the President is conducting our international affairs unwisely—should it believe, for example, that his policies are not combating communism as effectively as it might be combated—it is the Senate's clear duty to take the initiative, and, within the limits of its powers to do so, to set our course straight.

The Senate, along with the House, is commanded by the Constitution to "provide for the common defense." The Senate, along with the House, has the power to declare war. The Senate is commanded to advise the President in the making of treaties; and its consent must be secured for any treaty that is made. Moreover, the grant of power to the Executive even when considered alone, cannot possibly be interpreted to give the President exclusive power to make our international policies. The President's own power to act in the foreign-affairs field rests on just two clauses: First, "he shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties"; and, second, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—he—shall appoint Ambassadors."

The Constitution, in other words, forbids Senate abdication to the President in foreign-policy matters. The Senate has both the duty and the right, Mr. President, to make its views known and, within the limits of its powers, to see to it that they are respected. The Senate can continue to "play dead" in the foreign-relations field—as it has seen fit to do for over 20 years now—only by continuing to flout the Constitution of the United States.

This does not mean that the Senate should pick quarrels with the President; but it does mean the Senate should, every so often, do some independent thinking. It does not mean the Senate should refuse, in the course of its deliberations, to solicit the President's views; but it does mean the Senate should reserve for itself the prerogative of making up its own mind.

I am saying that the Senate should subject our international policies to critical, independent analysis—instead of simply rubber-stamping the Presidential wish, as passed down to the Committee on Foreign Relations, or as made known to the floor leader. The Senate should worry less about "tying the President's hands," and more about the fact that the President has not only tied the Senate's hands, but has bound it head and foot, and stuffed a gag in its mouth, to boot. The time has come for the Senate to reassert its independence, and to stop performing like a well-trained seal.

Fourth. I believe that it is good, from time to time, to haul out into the open, issues about which there may be serious and profound disagreement throughout the country, but which, for any of a number of reasons, never get clearly posed in the bills on which Senators and Representatives vote in the course of a legislative session.

The reason it is desirable is this: Our democratic system of government depends on popular mandates—a set of instructions formulated by the people every 4 years for the guidance of their national representatives. The mandate—theoretically at any rate—is to be found in the platform and the campaign speeches of the winning party. But it often happens that the popular mandate gets lost in the political shuffle, soon after election, and gets lost in such a way that no one is quite sure it really has been repudiated—or, at any rate, can prove it has been repudiated. The Roosevelt administration between 1933 and 1936, repudiated virtually every plank of the 1932 platform on which it was elected; yet practically no one took the trouble to point out this fact to the American people until the 1936 election. The Eisenhower administration's repudiation of the liberation plank of the 1952 Republican platform is another case in point. No one, who stops to think about it, will deny that that plank has been repudiated—by the executive branch, to say the least, and by the Senate in its vote 2 weeks ago; yet this fact has not been made clear to the American people.

The usual method for concealing the fact that a mandate is being ignored is to continue to give lip service to campaign promises, but to refuse to take any action in their behalf. Thus the Roosevelt administration continued to prate about economy and efficiency in Government long after it had put into law such grotesque and wasteful monstrosities as the NRA and the WPA. Thus, too, the Eisenhower administration continues to "express its sympathy" for the captive peoples long after it has, in reality, committed itself to coexistence with the Communist empire along its present lines.

I take the position that the American people may, conceivably, hold the same views about liberation that they held in 1952, and may be interested in knowing whether these views are considered obsolete by their elected representatives in Congress. If it turns out that their Government's views are markedly different from their own, the American people may want to make their views felt, and in any event may begin to form new ideas about whom they want to put up in their nominating conventions and whom they want to vote for in 1956.

A prominent eastern columnist in his discussion of Senate Resolution 116, charged, in effect, that the "essential formula of McCarthyism" was to ask Senators to declare themselves on issues that may deeply concern the "misled" people of this country. If this be "McCarthyism," then make the most of it.

Fifth—and now I speak only to members on this side of the aisle—I urge the Republican Party, with all the earnestness and fervor I can muster, to revive the liberation plank of its 1952 platform. Let me, once again, remind the Senators of my party of our solemn assurances to the American people.

This is the contract which we made with the American people in 1952. I quote verbatim:

> The Government of the United States under Republican leadership will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings, such as those of Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements. It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.
>
> We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of "containment" which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

Let me reread that sentence:

> It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of "containment" which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

In my judgment these promises were the noblest of all those put forward in 1952. They, more than any of the others, made me proud to be running on the Republican ticket. They, more than any of the others, clearly divided us from the Democrats—and because they bespoke our entire approach to the crucial issue of foreign policy, were probably more responsible than any of the others for our election.

Possibly, Republicans have already made up their minds to repudiate that promise. Another eastern columnist, whose name is not fit to be printed in this record, chortled that the importance of the Senate's action on Senate Resolution 116 was that the liberation plank of the Republican platform had been knocked flatter than a tornado-struck town in Kansas. Certainly, there is nothing the leftwing columnists would like better than to have the Republican Party abandon this plank, for they are anxious for this issue never again to get before the American people. Perhaps, for the first time in his life, our columnist friend was right; but I urge Republican Senators to do their utmost to keep his uninterrupted record of distortions and misrepresentations uninterrupted.

Sixth. Let me say that my expectations as to what will happen to the resolution I have just submitted are necessarily influenced by what happened to Senate Resolution 116.

As originally submitted, I thought the chances were slim of Senate Resolution 116 getting a favorable vote. But since a favorable vote was not inconceivable, and since I thought it was imperative to get a prior Soviet commitment to discuss the satellite countries, I urged its adoption in that form. However, after the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was obvious that it had no chance of passing.

It became obvious, then, that the Democrats, en bloc, would vote against any resolution that called firmly and unequivocally for a halt to appeasement. It was obvious that the Eisenhower Republicans would do likewise.

I, therefore, amended the resolution, eliminating the precondition clause, so that the Senate would simply express its hope that the President would bring up the question of the satellites at Geneva. In my mind, the resolution was less useful in the amended form, but I felt sure it would pass. It was inconceivable to me that the Senate did not hope the President would discuss the satellites, and I could not forsee that the day had come when the United States Senate would be too timid to express its hopes in public.

I had not, however, reckoned with the possibility that the Republican Party would disintegrate at the whisper of the Presidential wish, or that the Democrat party, en bloc, would subordinate sound policy to its very natural wish to force Republicans to eat their campaign promises. Nor did I foresee the lengths to which the Senate would go to avoid standing up and being counted on the amended resolution. I could not believe that the Senate would take refuge in the ultimate discourtesy of refusing to give a Senator the yeas-and-nays on an amendment to his own resolution. But we saw that fantastic picture unfold 3 weeks ago. I hope I shall never see it again in the Senate. It was a disgrace to the Senate, and a disgrace to every Senator who took part in it.

But now I am the wiser, and I cannot today permit myself the luxury of optimism. There is no way this resolution could possibly be construed to tie the President's hands; but I have learned not to underestimate the resourcefulness of some Members of this body when they are looking for excuses for not facing issues. All I can do is request Senators to give earnest thought to the proposal I am about to make, and to measure it by its merits.

So much by way of preface. Let me now discuss briefly the resolution I am offering today.

A policy of seeking the freedom of the enslaved peoples, which consists of nothing but verbal expressions of concern for the plight of these peoples, is, quite simply, a farce. We will make no real progress toward the goal of liberation, nor will we succeed in convincing either the slaves or the tyrants that we mean business, if we content ourselves—as we have in the past—with pious statements, dripping with humanitarian concern for oppressed peoples, but containing not the slightest hint of concrete measures for unhorsing the tyrants.

If we continue to issue such statements, whether in state-of-the-Union messages, congressional resolutions, or what have you—and refuse to back them up—we invite the world to think we are hypocrites. We invite them to conclude what they already suspect—namely, that the American Government's concern for oppressed peoples is a cheap politician's concern about how Americans of Eastern European descent will vote in the next election. I remind Senators that the conscience of the world is still smarting from the revelation in the Yalta papers that Franklin Roosevelt unabashedly asked for a promise of free Polish elections, however unenforceable it might be, because, in his own words, it would help his political situation at home.

Of course, if another resolution expressing sympathy for the captive peoples is submitted, I shall vote for it. I shall vote for the Knowland-Clements-George resolution, which was submitted this morning. It was submitted, perhaps, for the purpose of offsetting the very bad impression which spread throughout the world a few weeks ago, when Senate resolution 116 was defeated. But my point is that this kind of resolution is not enough. Such statements are empty and are absolutely painless for the Communists. Indeed, the fact that such statements are issued, while positive measures are either turned down or ignored, underscores the fact that they are empty and that there is nothing in them to which the Communists need give a second thought.

Now, what measures might be taken in order to convert our policy from one of empty words into a concrete plan of action in behalf of the freedom of the captive peoples?

As a matter of immediate necessity, one action stands above any others: The United States should immediately withdraw diplomatic recognition from the Soviet puppet regimes in Eastern Europe. It is, on the face of it, absolutely contradictory to talk about seeking the freedom of the captive nations as long as we recognize a series of Communist gangs, handpicked for the job by the Soviet Union, as constituting the official governments of those nations. The fact that we express sympathy for the captive peoples, while we officially recognize the pretensions of their oppressors, merely advertises our hypocrisy. What sort of hope do we hold out to the captive peoples when we tell them that we regard their Communist masters as their official representatives? There is very little possibility that the captive peoples will be able to throw off their chains while the United States recognizes the puppet regimes; and the whole world knows it.

Therefore, the first part of my resolution calls for the withdrawal of American diplomatic recognition of the satellite regimes.

Before any Senator decides he is against this action I should like him to remember that each one of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe was imposed against the will of the peoples involved by a combination of external military intervention and internal subversion instigated by a foreign power.

This one-two Communist punch brought Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to their knees in 1940; Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia in 1945; Hungary and Poland in 1947; and Czechoslovakia in 1948. The Communist take-overs in the Baltic States and in Albania are the only ones the United States has not officially recognized.

Now, my point is this: The very reasons that make it wrong to recognize the Communist regime in China—which I am led to believe the vast majority of the Members of this body are against doing—make it wrong to recognize the Communist regimes in Europe. What conceivable line of reasoning can justify withholding recognition from Communist China while granting recognition to, say, Communist Rumania—or any other Red regime? If there are compelling distinctions between the two situations that have escaped me, I invite the Senators to point them out.

Or again, why should we recognize the Communist take-over in, say, Rumania, and refuse to recognize the Communist aggressions in the Baltic States. Are Senators not aware that, despite the formal incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, the Governments of Latvia and Lithuania maintain fully accredited Legations right here in Washington, and that Estonia maintains an accredited Legation in New York? Why should we discriminate between aggressions? Is the argument that the rulers of Rumania and Poland gained power through the freely expressed wishes of the people, and that the rulers of the Baltic States did not?

My resolution does not call for severing of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union itself. Let it be understood, however, that I favor withdrawing recognition from the Soviet regime just as strongly as I favor withdrawing recognition from the puppet regimes.

The Soviet Government, too, was forcibly imposed and is forcibly maintained against the will of the Russian people—and, to boot, is directing a worldwide war against the United States. Moreover, I consider it a monstrous affront to the Russian people that we should sit down this month and deal with their oppressors rather than representatives of the Russian people themselves. I do not urge breaking relations with the Soviets today because I am anxious for this resolution to pass. If the Soviet regime were included, I assume some Senators would vote against the resolution on the grounds that the United States is committed to a series of negotiations with the present Kremlin leaders—and that it would not do to break relations with the men to whom we are about to make important international concessions. Nonetheless, I intend to ask the Senate to take a stand on this question in the near future.

I am, of course, acquainted with the traditional argument that we ought to have diplomatic relations with the satellite countries so as to be able to maintain listening posts behind the Iron Curtain. But the fact of the matter is that our diplomatic missions in Communist countries are, for all practical purposes, prisoners within the Embassy walls—which can hardly be said of Communist missions in this country.

The fact that the Red puppet governments are maintained against the will of the peoples involved is reason enough for us not to support them. For when we give diplomatic sanction to these Communist tyrannies, we strengthen their hold on the captive peoples, and thus commit an affirmative act of immorality. But, beyond this, we have an obligation sounding in honor. The Communist regimes in Eastern Europe were installed as the result—directly in the cases of Poland and Yugoslavia, and indirectly in the others—of American connivance with the Soviet Union at Yalta and Potsdam. We have a duty to undo that wrong—a duty that can never be discharged as long as we recognize the Communist governments.

The second part of my resolution suggests a way of getting an active program of liberation under steam.

The United States should encourage and support the efforts of the emigree leaders of the satellite nations to establish free governments-in-exile, representing the peoples of these nations during their ordeal in slavery. The United States should then extend to the governments so established diplomatic recognition as provisional governments, pending the day of their peoples' liberation.

It is not enough to withdraw recognition from the Communist regimes; the fighters for freedom in the enslaved nations must be given a standard around which they may rally—a government of their own that is both a symbol of their aspirations to freedom and a practical instrument for bringing those aspirations to fruition.

The precedent for giving official recognition to the resistance leaders of enslaved countries was set in the Second World War when the Allied Powers recognized the several governments-in-exile located in London. No one, I think, will deny that the peoples of Norway, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia were given a new will to fight, and that their underground movements were given increased organization, efficiency, and numbers as the direct result of our support of their governments-in-exile. Let us fight the war against communism with at least as much purposefulness, resourcefulness, and imagination as were employed in the war against nazism.

What are some of the advantages of governments-in-exile—beyond the obvious one of inspiring the captive people to continue fighting? They will be able to direct and organize resistance movements on the continent. They will be able to wage a more effective propaganda war. They will be able to take care of refugees and put them to work in the liberation movement. Most important of all, they can organize and train, under military leaders of their own nationality, fighting battalions—possibly, if the flow of refugees is great enough, whole armies—for eventual service in the liberation of their homelands.

Where should the governments-in-exile set up shop? It was not by accident that London was the seat of the exiled governments during the last war, rather than, say, Washington. London's nearness to the occupied countries immensely facilitated liaison between the governments and the captive peoples. One again, the desirable location is near the front lines—and I wonder if the people of West Berlin, who have so gallantly defended their own freedom, might not think well of dedicating a portion of their city as an international haven for those whose aspirations to freedom have not yet been realized. Berlin would be an ideal site, a citadel of light on the edge of darkness. It would be an ideal location for communicating by radio with the captive peoples; for helping refugees to escape, for organizing undergrounds, and above all, for directing overt liberation operations should the opportunity arise.

The United States should, as I say, extend diplomatic recognition to the governments-in-exile; but we should also give them financial and technical assistance. The emigrees will have few funds of their own; so we should furnish quarters for them, and the equipment they need to carry on the fight. We must include these governments in our foreign-aid programs, along with the other free governments of the world.

We must not, of course, overlook the very real possibility that once the United States and the other free nations have approved in principle the establishment of such governments, more than one emigree group from a single nation will come forward, asking recognition. We should not overlook this possibility, but neither should we allow it to discourage us. The Allied Powers faced precisely the same problem during the Second World War, the most conspicuous example being the question of which French faction to recognize. We had to decide between General De Gaulle and General Giraud; we made the choice, and in the end there existed a large measure of cooperation between the groups.

The difficulties here are not insurmountable if we adhere to three principles: First, encouraging and fostering cooperation among the rival groups; second, if the divisions persist, recognizing that group that in the judgment of our intelligence agencies and the Department of State is most representative of the free, democratic elements in the particular captive nation; and third, insisting upon the provisional or interim status of the government we recognize—insisting, that is, that the country's permanent government will be selected by free elections when the country is liberated.

We must, at the same time, be careful that the exiled governments do not become, either in appearance or in fact, the puppets of the United States. After we have withdrawn recognition from the Communist regimes, and after we have indicated our support in principle of the establishment of free governments in exile, the initiative must be taken by the emigree groups. Thereafter the actions of the United States should be confined to diplomatic recognition of the group, assuming there are more than one, that is most representative of the free peoples, and to giving the government so recognized financial and technical assistance. And I repeat, we must make it crystal clear that our recognition is provisional—that the men who will one day take the reins of government in the captive nations are not necessarily those of whom the United States approves—but men who will be selected by the peoples themselves in free elections.

One often hears the argument that it is futile to hope that the captive peoples will ever be able to throw off their chains. If left to their own resources, this is undoubtedly true. But let us not forget the East German uprising of 1953, and how abysmally inadequate the West was to that challenge. If the free governments in exile should, within the next year or two, become going concerns, and if they should organize armies recruited from escaped patriots, is it too much to hope that the next "Berlin uprising" will be given enough outside military support to grow into successful revolution?

Let us, for the first time in 30 years, strike terror in Communist ranks. Let us justify the sorely tried faith of the captive peoples in the United States of America. Let us prove that we are deadly serious about ridding the world of the Communist curse. Let us, Mr. President, make the liberation policy, overwhelmingly endorsed in 1952 by the American people—let us make that policy live.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was not present. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall try not to delay the Senate too long this evening, but I wish to make a few remarks with reference to an amendment to the Defense Production Act, which will be considered by the Senate within the next few days. A lot has been said recently about a danger in connection with the so-called dollar-a-year men. While I think we should see that the Government is always properly protected, we should be careful lest we find ourselves guilty of unintentionally rendering a blanket indictment against scores of dollar-a-year men who, during World War II, the Korean war, and today, rendered practical service to the Government. I think we should pay our respects to the loyal services which they have rendered the country and should recognize that the overwhelming majority of those men were motivated by honest intentions. We should recognize that to the best of their ability they performed their services to the Nation.

At the same time, Mr. President, I think we should recognize that in regards to this group, as well as other groups, we, as Members of Congress, have to be careful that the laws are such that the Government is protected. We must recognize that as in all groups there can be those who forgot that they came to Washington to accept a public office on the basis that it was a public trust. When such happens we should be specific in our charges and point out exactly wherein they were wrong. I think we should spell out the names of the individuals, dates, and transactions, and if there are suggestions of bribes we should stand ready to state the amount of money they received. We have a responsibility as Members of Congress to see that we are specific in our charges lest the innocent in their group be injured.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss today a case about which something has been hinted recently in the press. In fact, consideration of the Defense Production Act last week was withdrawn because of a letter which the committee received from the Comptroller General involving a former Deputy Administrator of the Defense Procurement Agency. This individual is Mr. Howard I. Young. I notice in the press that he has denied that he had any connection whatever or anything to do in his official capacity with any contracts which were negotiated with companies in which he had a financial interest. I also note that he is scheduled to come before the committee within the next few days, at which time he will be given an opportunity to answer the allegations made against him.

I think we and the country should withhold judgment until Mr. Young has had an opportunity to explain his side of the transaction. At the same time, I feel there are certain angles to the case which should be placed in the RECORD in order that when he appears he will know the charges with which he is confronted and can, perhaps, be in a better position to answer.

There are indications that perhaps Mr. Young did know about some of the transactions which were taking place with companies with which he was affiliated.

There is a law which prohibits any official, either paid or nonpaid, from exercising in his official capacity the right to negotiate a contract with a concern by which he is financially benefited.

I shall refer particularly to the authority vested in the President of the United States in the Defense Production Act of 1950—Public Law 774, 81st Congress.

Under date of November 21, 1950, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, issued Executive Order 10182, under the authority of that act. This executive order is contained in volume 15, No. 228, of the Federal Register of November 23, 1950, page 8013. I quote briefly from this executive order, as follows:

> PART I
>
> SEC. 101. (a) The head of any department or agency delegated or assigned functions under the act pursuant to Executive Order No. 10161, of September 9, 1950, is hereby delegated the authority provided by subsection 710 (b) of that act to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation. The authority delegated by this subsection 101 (a) may not be redelegated.

I now quote from part II of the same executive order, as follows:

> SEC. 201. Any person employed under Part I of this order is hereby exempted, with respect to such employment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of Title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as specified in the following subsections:
>
> (a) Exemption hereunder shall not extend to the negotiation or execution, by an appointee under this order, of Government contracts with the private employer of such appointee or with any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest.
>
> (b) Exemption hereunder shall not extend to making any recommendation or taking any action with respect to individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance on appeal or otherwise, under the provisions of the act made by the private employer of the appointee or by any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this Executive Order 10182, issued by President Truman under date of November 21, 1950, be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Executive Order 10182 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 3. THE PRESIDENT—EXECUTIVE ORDER 10182, PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS UNDER THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND PRESCRIBING REGULATIONS FOR THEIR EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATUTES

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Defense Production Act of 1950, approved September 8, 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.), hereinafter referred to as the act, it is hereby ordered as follows:

PART I

SEC. 101. (a) The head of any department or agency delegated or assigned functions under the act pursuant to Executive Order No. 10161, of September 9, 1950, is hereby delegated the authority provided by subsection 710 (b) of that act to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation. The authority delegated by this subsection 101 (a) may not be redelegated.

(b) Such heads of departments or agencies are further delegated the authority provided by subsection 710 (c) of that act to employ experts and consultants, or organizations thereof.

(c) Such heads of departments or agencies are further delegated the authority provided by subsection 710 (d) of that act to utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and to utilize and establish such regional, local, or other agencies, and to utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

SEC. 102. The head of any department or agency delegated authority pursuant to subsections 101 (a) and 101 (b) of this part shall be guided in the exercise of that authority by the following policies:

(a) So far as possible, operations under the act shall be carried on by full-time, salaried employees of the Government, and appointments under this authority shall be to advisory or consultative positions only.

(b) Appointments to positions other than advisory or consultative may be made under this order only when the requirements of the position are such that the incumbent must personally possess outstanding experience and ability not obtainable on a full-time, salaried basis.

(c) In the appointment of personnel and in assignment of their duties, the head of the department or agency involved shall take steps to avoid, to as great an extent as possible, any conflict between the governmental duties and the private interest of such personnel.

SEC. 103. The authority delegated by subsection 101 (c) to utilize at the regional and local levels voluntary and uncompensated services is not subject to the policies prescribed in section 102. Such authority may not be exercised, however, to fill positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

PART II

SEC. 201. Any person employed under part I of this order is hereby exempted, with respect to such employment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as specified in the following subsections:

(a) Exemption hereunder shall not extend to the negotiation or execution, by an appointee under this order, of Government contracts with the private employer of such appointee or with any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest.

(b) Exemption hereunder shall not extend to making any recommendation or taking any action with respect to individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance, on appeal or otherwise, under the provisions of the act made by the private employer of the appointee or by any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest.

(c) In the case of appointments under subsections 101 (a) and 101 (b) hereof, exemption hereunder shall not extend to the prosecution by the appointee, or participation by the appointee in any fashion in the prosecution, of any claims against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during his employment under this order, during the period of such employment and the further period of 2 years after the termination of such employment. In the case of appointments under subsection 101 (c) hereof, exemption hereunder shall not extend to the prosecution by the appointee, or participation by the appointee in any fashion in the prosecution, of any claims against the Government growing out of any matter with respect to which the appointee was personally concerned in his official capacity during his employment under this order, during the period of such employment and the further period of 2 years after the termination of such employment.

(d) In the case of appointments under subsections 101 (a) and 101 (b) hereof, exemption hereunder shall not extend to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service hereunder from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment hereunder.

(e) Exemption from sections 434 and 1914 of title 18, United States Code, shall not extend to persons appointed as experts or consultants under subsection 101 (b) hereof.

PART III

SEC. 301. Appointments under subsection 101 (a) of this order shall be supported by written certification by the head of the employing department or agency:

(a) That the appointment is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of the act;

(b) That the duties of the position to which the appointment is being made require outstanding experience and ability;

(c) That the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position; and

(d) That the department or agency head has been unable to obtain a person with the qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time, salaried basis.

SEC. 302. The heads of the departments or agencies making appointments under this order shall file with the Division of the Federal Register (for public inspection but not for publication) a statement including the name of the appointee, the section of this order under which he was appointed, the employing department or agency, the title of his position, and the name of his private employer.

SEC. 303. All appointments under subsections 710 (b), 710 (c), and 710 (d) of the act shall be made under the terms of this order after the date hereof, and appointments heretofore made under those subsections of the act shall be deemed for all purposes to have been made under this order upon compliance with the preceding sections of this part.

SEC. 304. At least once every 3 months, the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission shall survey appointments made under this order and shall report his findings to the President and make such recommendations as he may deem proper.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 21, 1950.*

(Contained in vol. 15, No. 228, Federal Register, Nov. 23, 1950, p. 8013.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, under this Executive order, as promulgated by Public Law 774, 81st Congress, any employee, paid or nonpaid, is prohibited from taking part in the negotiation of a contract with an organization with which he is affiliated or by which he will financially benefit.

I discuss briefly the zinc program as carried out under the Defense Production Act, and the stockpiling program under the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, of which Mr. Young, as Deputy Administrator and direct assistant to Mr. Jess Larson, was responsible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement outlining the expansion and contraction of the zinc program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ZINC PROGRAM

The main function of the Defense Production Act of 1950 and of the top planning agencies charged with its administration has been to insure, with the least impact on the domestic economy, adequate supplies of strategic and critical materials for present defense needs and a sufficient reserve for future contingencies.

Zinc was deemed strategic and critical for national defense, but was placed in the low-urgency category on the list of materials requiring urgent defense action. However, in late 1950 and early 1951 the zinc shortage did require controls and allocation.

Zinc ores and concentrates, which are smelted to form metallic zinc, are produced in the continental United States, Canada, Mexico, South America, and also in countries across the Atlantic and Pacific. For many years the American zinc industry was protected by tariffs. Because of national-defense needs, Congress expressly recognized by the act of 1950 the importance of foreign sources and did not require zinc or other metals to be obtained exclusively from American sources regardless of cost. ODM and DPA, on recommendation of DMPA, made the policy decisions for obtaining particular metals from domestic or foreign sources. American sources alone have been unable to supply the necessary requirements for national defense and civilian consumption. In case of emergency, when material in the stockpile would be used, the United States could be self-sufficient with the aid of zinc from neighboring Canada and Mexico.

DMPA had the responsibility of providing adequate supplies of zinc and other needed materials. The Administrator of General Services Administration (then Mr. Jess Larson) also headed DMPA. The Deputy Administrator of DMPA was Mr. Howard I. Young, president of American Zinc, Lead and Smelting Co., and president of the American Mining Congress. As DMPA was represented in key Government policy committees handling vital programs such as production expansion, stockpiling, national and international allocations, subsidy payments and ceiling prices, Mr. Young attended these committee meetings with Mr. Larson. He also attended as chief representative of DMPA when Mr. Larson's other duties prevented him from attending.

THE ZINC SITUATION FROM KOREA TO LATE 1951

After the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, as industrial consumers sought to accumulate stocks as defense contracts were placed, and as the Government sought to accelerate stockpiling, the price of zinc advanced. In 1951 domestic mines produced 681,000 tons of zinc, exceeding by 23,000 tons the average production during the peak period from 1943 to 1947. In January 1951 a ceiling price of 17.5 cents per pound was placed on slab zinc, and in October 1951 it was raised to 19.5 cents. The price of zinc on world markets had meanwhile risen even higher, due at least partly to Government purchases for stockpile and expansion programs administered by the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA).

As world inventories were increasing and production had reached an all-time high, GSA early in 1951, on instructions from the Munitions Board, stopped buying zinc for stockpile because the revised stockpile objective had been reached by deliveries or purchase commitments. In mid-1951 zinc inventories from World War II were alone sufficient to provide nearly 70 percent of the existing stockpile objective.

The Defense Minerals Administration (DMA), Department of the Interior, which preceded DMPA in handling the program for expansion of production of strategic and critical materials, submitted a final report on November 2, 1951, recommending that the zinc expansion program be curtailed. The report stated that the apparent short supply of zinc was temporary and exaggerated as European buyers were outbidding American smelters on a free world market, and recommended that the aggressive Government buying program in world markets be discontinued, as substantial mine expansion in South America, Canada, and elsewhere would ease the world situation by 1953, and that the duty on zinc be suspended to make more readily available foreign imports at lower prices. DPA was asked to revoke its previous authorization providing funds for purchasing zinc at premium prices to be resold at a Government loss of approximately 1.5 cents per pound.

DMPA EXPANSION PROGRAMS

Soon after issuance of the last DMA report on zinc, Mr. Young, the newly appointed Deputy Administrator of DMPA, in a press release on November 15, 1951, described the projected zinc supply "as being extremely serious when you look at it against the policy of supplying not only the mobilization effort but keeping the national economy going at the highest possible level as well." Industry officials were likewise informed that DMPA was in the process of formulating a zinc program which would be released in the near future.

From November 1951 to March 1953, DMPA, under the guidance of Mr. Young, submitted to DPA a series of zinc-expansion programs which cannot be easily reconciled with facts showing the continuous easing of the zinc situation, both domestic and international. Although the zinc stockpile goal had previously been set and was well under control, DMPA began submitting to ODM and DPA general overall programs for further expansion of stockpile objectives and for extension of the scope of borrowing authority under the Defense Production Act to subsidize zinc producers in various ways. Before June 1952 it was apparent that DPA had not become convinced of the urgency of his repeated proposals.

On November 19, 1951, DMPA submitted to DPA its first program for zinc expansion, which began a series of attempts to obtain a long-range expansion goal supported by appropriate borrowing authority. It was emphasized that the policy of DMPA would be to obtain zinc primarily from North American sources and from producers capable of supplying zinc at an early stage. DPA on January 8, 1952, issued its expansion goal order authorizing an expansion goal for 1955 of 1,320,000 tons of zinc production capacity, thereby increasing the annual capacity by 242,000 tons, but without granting overall borrowing authority to DMPA for the entire program. Instead, DPA approval was limited to particular projects, many of which had been previously certified in the period from March to July 1951.

That the zinc situation was steadily easing was demonstrated by a series of noteworthy developments early in 1952. Between August 1951 and March 1952 only 15,000 tons of zinc were diverted from stockpile to defense orders. In January 1952 a Presidential directive had authorized withdrawal of 15,000 tons for the same purpose, but only 90 tons were actually withdrawn.

On February 12, 1952, DPA granted a DMPA request to allocate funds to make subsidy payments assuring zinc producers a ceiling price of 19.5 cents per pound. ESA did not object to a proposal by Mr. Young on January 29, 1952, that a program be approved allowing DMPA to make contracts for periods not exceeding 2 years at guaranteed prices from 2 to 6 cents over existing ceiling prices.

Softening of zinc market

The tariff was suspended by Congress in February 1952 (66 Stat. 7), and the drop in world prices below the United States ceiling price resulted in increased imports of zinc ores and concentrates—48 percent over 1951; total imports of 448,700 tons in 1952 reached a record second only to the peak war year of 1943.

The price of zinc began to decline below ceiling as the situation steadily eased in 1952. DPA rejected another expansion program submitted on April 16, 1952, by DMPA to increase the supply to 1,300,000 tons a year and to authorize contracts not to exceed 17.5 cents for expanded production.

In May 1952 DPA regarded its expansion goal of January 8, 1952, as more than sufficient to meet anticipated future requirements and DMPA's request for additional tonnage as unrealistic. Periodic directives for short-term stockpile purchases which had not varied since June 20, 1951, were further reduced in May and June 1952.

NPA Allocation Order M–9 was liberalized May 15, 1952, and revoked June 27, 1952, as zinc was then easily obtainable.

In June 1952 the market price declined to 15 cents. Increases in inventory and further price declines to 12.5 cents caused domestic production to decline to 604,000 tons in 1952, even though domestic production mine potential was 720,000 tons.

Because of the steady decline in zinc prices and the consequent adverse effect on American industry, Mr. Young recommended further aid to domestic producers, but ODM and DPA withheld broad program approval. Approval continued to be limited to particular projects.

The Office of International Trade eliminated export quotas on July 3, 1952, and 66,000 tons of zinc and zinc ore concentrates were exported from this country in 1952. Trading in zinc futures, which had been suspended since July 1951, was resumed on the New York Commodity Exchange on July 23, 1952. Supply and demand could now operate freely in domestic and international markets.

An expansion program emphasizing the hardship suffered by the domestic mines, due to curtailment of domestic zinc mining production, was submitted to DPA by DMPA on July 18, 1952, when the market price was 15 cents.

Curtailment of expansion

In a meeting attended by DPA, DMPA, ODM, and MB representatives, Mr. Young complained that DMPA had been placed in an embarrassing position because its new zinc expansion program had not been approved and DMPA was morally obligated to make purchase contracts with people involved in exploration work for the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, Mr. Young began his employment with the Government on September 13, 1951, when he was appointed as Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, under Mr. Jess Larson. He held that position until May 14, 1953.

During the period of Mr. Young's tenure as Deputy Administrator of DMPA, the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of which he was president, had a material interest in the stockpiling program. Of the total domestic zinc tonnage to be generated under expansion contracts, American Zinc alone was to smelt 47 percent of the concentrates. That company controls approximately 10 percent of the domestic zinc smelting capacity. The Government bore the financial risk incident to the production of concentrates for the smelters. Although DMPA, under Mr. Young's direction, failed in its repeated efforts to obtain DMPA's approval of a broad zinc expansion goal with authorization for blanket borrowing authority, it was successful in obtaining DPA's approval of individual zinc projects totaling $74 million, resulting in an estimated net loss to the Government of $8 million from its purchase and resale of zinc. While the Defense Production Act contemplated losses when required by the critical need for strategic metals, such losses for zinc, which always remained near the bottom of the priority list and was in relatively easy supply, could less easily be justified.

During Mr. Young's tenure of office as Deputy Administrator of DMPA, from September 1951 to May 1953, he gave varying reasons to justify the succession of zinc expansion programs. In the early stage—late 1951 and 1952—emphasis was placed on needs for defense production and civilian requirements. When the market broke in the spring of 1952—prices declining from 19.5 to 15 cents—and defense and civilian requirements had been met, expansion was justified on the basis of hardships encountered by domestic producers due to falling prices and foreign importations. Later DMPA recommended subsidizing domestic producers by paying the difference between the ceiling price of 19.5 cents and the market price. In the spring of 1953, when the market price declined to 11 cents, expansion was justified because of alleged moral commitments made to contractors sometime previously. These reasons failed to convince ODM and DPA, but Mr. Young persisted in making additional contracts.

In August 1952, when the zinc market was 14 cents a pound, the General Services Administration purchased from the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., 1,167 tons at 15½ cents a pound, or 1½ cents above the market price. This was at a time when Mr. Young held his official position as Deputy Administrator to Mr. Larson. At the same time other purchases were made from domestic surplus and foreign producers.

As a member of key Government committees, it was Mr. Young's duty to help formulate national defense policy in the fields of stockpiling, allocation, industry, expansion, ceiling prices, and so forth.

As president of American Zinc, through these extra purchases he obtained added sources of zinc concentrates to feed the smelters of his company. He also served as president of the American Mining Congress.

His varied activities, which cannot always be completely reconciled, stem from the fact that he was serving in this triple capacity; service to three masters, with equal loyalty to each, became plainly incompatible.

I shall now refer to three contracts in particular which were carried out under Mr. Young's jurisdiction.

The first was with the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc. Government subsidies in this instance were paid to the company when the market price of zinc concentrates was below the ceiling price. These subsidies were paid after American Zinc had advanced money to the company and had contracted to buy its concentrates. Government financial aid was requested and approved soon after Mr. Young became Deputy DMPA Administrator. Zinc concentrates sufficient to produce about 700 tons of slab zinc were sold to American Zinc, and the period of subsidies was extended by Mr. Young's delay in approving termination of the contract. The General Accounting Office is now asking the General Services Administration to justify these subsidy payments.

In June 1952, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency (DMPA) entered into a subsidy contract with the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., Baxter Springs, Kans., for the annual production of 3,000 tons of zinc concentrates from the Brewsterland mine in Ottawa County, Okla. Under the agreement, DMPA was to pay the contractor a premium price of $12.86 per ton of zinc concentrates, graded at 60 percent, to compensate for an alleged hardship to the contractor due to the ceiling price imposed under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Howard I. Young was appointed Deputy Administrator of DMPA on September 13, 1951, and while holding this position remained president of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., Inc., the parent corporation of the American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

On December 15, 1950, prior to his appointment as Deputy Administrator, DMPA, Mr. Young signed a contract for the American Zinc Co. to purchase all zinc concentrates produced by W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., in the tri-State district, during the period December 15, 1950, to December 14, 1953.

The total investment in W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., by the stockholders was $32,700, of which $22,500 was in stock and $10,200 demand notes. From January to September 1951 the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. advanced $70,000 to W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc. By January 1952, $36,000 of the advance had been repaid.

During January 1952, Mr. W. J. Worley, president of W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., advised Mr. Young that Government aid would be necessary if production was to continue. Negotiations were started which resulted in the signing of a subsidy contract on June 27, 1952, by the Administrator, DMPA, despite the uncertainty within DMPA as to justification for an over-the-market price contract of this type due to the improved condition in the zinc market. Memorandum in DMPA file dated January 31, 1952, to Mr. Young, advised that there was not a critical shortage of zinc, and on April 18, 1952, another memorandum to Mr. Tom Lyon, Director, Domestic Expansion Division, also stressed the improved condition of zinc supply.

The contract, which was made retroactive to February 1, 1952, was to extend through December 31, 1953. A total borrowing authority of $196,000 was authorized. The amount was later reduced to $96,000 after a request by the contractor was granted to reduce the contract quantity.

Subsidy payments of $18,064.90 were made to the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., for the production of 1,473.25 tons of zinc concentrates, all of which have been sold to Mr. Young's company, American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.

On August 5, 1952, Mr. John G. Ford, Director, Contract Negotiations Division, attempted to terminate the contract, but Mr. Young delayed this action by saying that termination would be completed after the contractor received payment for vouchers covering February through June 1952 production. The contract was eventually terminated by the Administrator, Mr. Jess Larson, on November 18, 1952.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 provided that if under generally fair and equitable ceiling prices there will result a decrease in supplies from high-cost sources, provisions may be made for subsidy payments. The zinc concentrates subsidized under this contract were sold at prevailing market prices ($135 or lower), which were lower than the contractor's authorized ceiling price ($139); therefore, in this agreement it was market price and not ceiling price that would have caused a decrease in supplies. The General Accounting Office has asked the Emergency Procurement Service, GSA (successors to DMPA), to justify the subsidy payments.

The American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. was directly interested in the profits of the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., insofar as they affected the repayment of their advances and the continuance of the mine in operation so as to remain a source of supply of zinc concentrates for American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.

Mr. Howard I. Young, notwithstanding his affiliation with the American Zinc, Lead, & Smelting Co., approved the subsidy contract and later impeded its termination.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that a report on the transactions involving the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., the parent company of American Zinc Co., of Illinois, advanced the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., $70,000 during the period January 1951 through September 1951 with a $34,000 unliquidated balance remaining in January 1952, the time negotiations began for a subsidy contract from the Government. The total investment of the stockholders of the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., was $32,700 and consisted of $22,500 invested in stocks and $10,200 as a loan supported by demand notes. This was less than half of the total investment of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. in the corporation. Even though American Zinc had received payment for more than half of their loan, the unliquidated balance was still greater than the total investment of the stockholders at the time negotiations were started for the subsidy contract. The subsidy was granted so that W.

M. & W. Mining Co. would be able to continue in operation. By the continued operation, under the subsidy, more time was provided for the liquidation of the $70,000 advance and at the same time American Zinc was provided an assured source of supply of zinc concentrates at a favorable market price.

On September 15, 1951, Mr. Young became Deputy Administrator of DMPA and while serving in this capacity did not relinquish his affiliation with the American Zinc, Lead, & Smelting Co. In fact, during the years he was Deputy Administrator, September 1951 to May 1953, he received from the company an annual income of over $79,000 a year and over $238,000 for the 3 years.

It is apparent that Mr. Young was directly interested in the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. which has an investment in the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc. Various questions were raised in regard to the proposed contract, including the fact there was some doubt about the justification for an over-the-market subsidy price for the production of zinc due to the improved zinc supply. Mr. Young recommended the contract. When the contractor encountered difficulty in receiving payment on his invoices, Mr. Young took a personal interest in attempting to expedite them. Furthermore, when others in DMPA recommended that the contract be terminated, Mr. Young delayed the termination.

Subsidy payments totaling $18,064.90 were made to the contractor with the authority quoted as the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order No. 10161, as amended. This subsidy was to provide the difference between the ceiling price for the product and the contractor's production cost, plus a reasonable allowance for depletion, depreciation, and profit. The estimated costs with allowances were established at $151.86 per ton for zinc produced prior to effective date of the contract; actual operating costs for period of the contract were $120 per ton; while the established ceiling price was $139 per ton. A comparison of the estimated costs, actual costs, and ceiling price raises the question whether the contract was justifiable under the statutory requirements.

TERMINATION OF THE CONTRACT

The audit report was sent to the Director, Contract Negotiations Division, from the Comptroller by memorandum dated November 4, 1952, which reported that the contractor's costs per ton of zinc concentrates were lower after February 2, 1952, than the figures used in arriving at the negotiated contract cost (the calculation was based upon production prior to February 1952); also the auditors recommended the contract be terminated because it was not in the best interests of the Government to continue the subsidy payments for zinc concentrates.

Mr. Sherman prepared a memorandum dated November 10, 1952, for Mr. John G. Ford's signature which advised Mr. Medley, the Comptroller, that Mr. Young, Deputy Administrator, stated August 7, 1952, that action on termination of the contract would be taken as soon as payment had been made to the contractor for February through June 1952 production, and on November 4, 1952, the Deputy Administrator was notified that checks covering such payments were being forwarded to the contractor.

Following this memorandum, action was taken to terminate the contract. The termination letter prepared on August 5, 1952, by Mr. M. C. Robinson, negotiator, Contract Negotiations Division for Mr. Young's signature, was rewritten by Mr. J. Liebert, the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Administrator, on November 14, 1952, for the Administrator's signature. The file did not indicate the necessity for preparing the second letter from Mr. Larson's signature, nor the reason for Mr. Young's failure to sign the earlier draft of the letter.

Mr. Liebert's letter was signed by the Administrator on November 18, 1952, and termination became effective January 22, 1953.

The contractor requested the notice of termination be reconsidered. Mr. Sherman prepared a letter for Mr. Larson's signature in which the request was denied because there was no legitimate reason for continuing the subsidy payments in that the subsidy was to provide the difference between the ceiling price for the product and the contractor's production cost, plus a reasonable allowance for depletion, depreciation, and profit; the contractor's costs with allowances was established at $151.86 per ton on the basis of data furnished the agency by the contractor for production prior to February 2, 1952; actual operating costs reported by the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., covering the period of the contract (since February 2, 1952), were found to average $120 per ton; the established ceiling price for the concentrates was $139 per ton, resulting in a subsidy of $12.86 per ton of 60 percent concentrates, whereas the operating costs, having averaged $120 per ton, were much lower than the ceiling price. Therefore, there was no legitimate reason for continuing the Government support of this production.

Several more letters were written requesting reconsideration of the cancellation with the final denial being made by DMPA on February 5, 1953. The contractor did not dispute the $120 per ton average operating cost, but stated that at no time did the market price equal the operating cost, less allowances, and only the subsidy received by the company enabled them to continue operations.

LEGALITY OF PAYMENTS MADE UNDER THE CONTRACT

The W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., received subsidy payments, totaling $18,064.90, for 1,473.25 tons of zinc concentrates produced during the period February 1, 1952, through January 22, 1953. These payments were made from November 11, 1952, through March 23, 1953, even though there was some question within DMPA as to whether there was a legal basis for making them. In respect to subsidy payments, the Defense Production Act of 1950 provides:

"SEC. 303. '(c) If the President finds—

"(1) That under generally fair and equitable ceiling prices for any raw or nonprocessed material, there will result a decrease in supplies from high cost sources of such material, and that the continuation of such supplies is necessary to carry out the objectives of the act [sec. 2061–2166 of this Appendix]; * * *.

"He may make provisions for subsidy payments on any such domestically produced material other than an agricultural commodity in such amounts and in such manner (including purchases of such material and its resale at a loss without regard to the limitations of existing law) and on such terms and conditions, as he determines to be necessary to insure that supplies from such high cost sources are continued, or that maximum production or supply in such area at stable prices of such materials is maintained, as the case may be."

Thus the subsidy program is contingent upon a finding that low ceiling prices result in a decrease in supplies. On January 22, 1952, the Administrator of DMPA, in proposing a zinc subsidy program to DPA, found that the established ceiling price for zinc would result in a decrease in supply from high-cost sources; and that the continuation of such supplies was necessary to carry out the objectives of the act. The Defense Production Administration approved this program. On June 27, 1952, the Administrator of DMPA found that, because of high cost at the Brewsterland Mine of W. M. & W. Mining Co., operations could not continue under ceiling prices established for zinc concentrates unless a subsidy was granted. Also, he found that the Government considered that the continuance of the maximum production of zinc ore from high-cost sources was in the best interest of national defense.

In the case of concentrates produced by the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., the market price (the sales price) was always lower than the authorized ceiling price established by the OPS. In fact, the highest the market price for 60 percent zinc concentrates had ever reached was during the 7-month period, November 1951 through May 1952, when it was $135 per ton; whereas, the ceiling prices as established by OPS on September 5, 1952, and effective October 2, 1951 was $139 per ton; hence market price and not ceiling price would have been the governing factor in causing a decrease in the contractor's production.

SUBSIZED ZINC CONCENTRATES SOLD TO THE AMERICAN ZINC, LEAD & SMELTING CO.

According to the supporting documents attached to the invoices of the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., all production on which subsidy payments were made had been sold to the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. at the going market price, which was always below the company OPS ceiling price.

INTEREST OF AMERICAN ZINC, LEAD & SMELTING CO. IN THE W. M. & W. MINING CO., INC.

Contract between American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. and W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.

On December 15, 1950, Mr. W. J. Worley, president of W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., contracted with Mr. Howard I. Young, president of the American Zinc Co. of Illinois, a wholly owned subsidiary of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of St. Louis, Mo., to sell all their Tri-State District production of zinc concentrates to American Zinc. Also, the agreement provided: The life of the contract to extend from December 15, 1950, to December 14, 1953; price was the market price in the Joplin or Tri-State District as quoted in the weekly publication, Metals and Minerals Market; if either party found that operation under this agreement became unprofitable, either could terminate the contract after conferring with the other; in the event either party resumed operations, the agreement became operative again; the seller had the right to negotiate with the Government to expand production, and to the extent of delivery under such contract the seller was excused from delivering to the buyer; however, both parties would negotiate in good faith to have the buyer convert such concentrates to metal required for delivery to the Government.

This contract was signed 9 months prior to September 13, 1951, the date Mr. Young was appointed Deputy Administrator of DMPA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out that during this period Mr. Young was president, director, and holder of a large block of stock in the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. He remained in that position until the termination of his connection on May 14, 1953. The records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that he received salaries, fees, commissions, bonuses, and shared in profits of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. during his tenure with the Government as follows:

For the year ending December 31, 1951, he received $79,358.10.

For the year ending December 31, 1952, he received $79,585.50.

For the year ending December 31, 1953, he received $79,600.

As evidence that there was some knowledge on the part of Mr. Young of this contract during its negotiation, the telegram of June 27, 1952, was addressed to Mr. Young as an official of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. The letter of August 5, 1952, indicating cancellation was prepared for Mr. Young, but he refused to sign it, the contract not being canceled until November 18, 1952. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a series of agency correspondence.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

June 27, 1952.

Mr. Howard I. Young,
American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Fowler letter on lead sent special messenger this morning to Office of Defense Mobilization. W. M. & W. Mining Co. contract on Larson's desk for signature.

Tom Lyon,
Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

August 5, 1952.

W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.,
Miami, Okla.

Gentlemen: You are hereby notified that under the provisions of its article VII, contract No. GS-OOP(D)-18006, between W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., and the United States of America, dated June 27, 1952, and effective February 1, 1952, the Government elects to cancel the contract.

This letter provides you with the 60 days notice called for in article VII of the contract, which is canceled, effective close of business, 60 days from the date of your receipt hereof.

Sincerely yours,
Howard I. Young,
Deputy Administrator.

November 18, 1952.

W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.,
Miami, Okla.

Gentlemen: You are hereby notified that under the provisions of its article VII, Contract No. GS-OOP(D)-18006, between W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., and the United States of America, dated June 27, 1952, and effective February 1, 1952, the Government elects to cancel the contract.

This letter provides you with the 60 days notice called for in article VII of the contract, which is canceled, effective close of business, 60 days from the date of your receipt hereof,

Sincerely yours,
Jess Larson,
Administrator.

September 3, 1952.

Mr. Wilbur J. Worley,
President, W. M. & W. Mining Co.,
Miami, Okla.:

Tighe Woods, the new Administrator of OPS, has advised that the approval of your floor price would clear all OPS departments and leave his office either Friday of this week or Monday of next. Exceedingly regret unavoidable delay, partly of which has been on account of the change of OPS administrator that has recently taken place. Please wire me on Wednesday of next week if this has or has not been received.

Howard I. Young,
Deputy Administrator.

Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C., September 5, 1952.

Mr. Howard Young,
Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency, Washington, D. C.

Dear Howard: In accordance with our telephone conversation, I am sending you a copy of Order No. L-13 issued to the W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., Baxter Springs, Kans.

Best regards,
Sincerely yours,
Tighe E. Woods.

W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.,
Baxter Springs, Kans., September 12, 1952.

Mr. John G. Ford,
Director, Contracts Negotiation Division, Defense Materials Procurement Agency, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Ford: We are furnishing you herewith a copy of the letter order establishing a ceiling price for zinc concentrates for W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc., under General Overriding Regulation 25.

This is in compliance with wire request of Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator.

Very truly yours,
W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.
By W. J. Worley, *President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator for the speech he has made on the floor of the Senate, but I wish to bring to his attention a problem which concerns me very much, because I do not know what all the facts with regard to the Young case are. I do share the point of view of the Senator from Delaware that many fine businessmen, both during the war and since the war, have come to Washington and made available to their Government, as patriotic men should, the benefit of their expert knowledge. I also agree with the Senator from Delaware that no group should be condemned or criticized as a group, but when criticisms are due they ought to be directed to specific cases.

The Senator has called attention to the Young case. I do not know what all the facts are in the Young case, but the problem I wish to present to him is that when the Comptroller General and his very able investigators presented the Young case to the Banking and Currency Committee, it was presented in executive session and under assurances from the committee that it was going to be in executive session. Because of one newspaper story, Mr. Young's name became public knowledge. A member of the committee then took the position that Mr. Young should be invited to Washington, if he cares to come, to testify before the joint committee. I assume the hearing will be a public hearing, and I think that now under the circumstances it should be. Yet if I have ever seen a group of investigators present a thoroughly prepared, documented case, the investigators who appeared along with the Comptroller General presented one.

Now the Senator from Delaware is presenting an additional documentation on the floor of the Senate. So in a way we find that the Government's case, as far as the Comptroller General's investigators are concerned, is now really behind the doors of an executive session. I raise the point because I think what we are going to have to do is free the record from executive session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say to the Senator from Oregon that what I have put into the Record is already available to the committee. It is not a question of violating any committee secrecy. I am not a member of your committee. I have not discussed this case with any member of the committee or any member of its staff. The information which I obtained is that which could be readily obtained by any Member of the Senate who sought to direct questions through the proper channels. Of course in directing these questions he would have to have a reasonable background of the case.

I am presenting the information not in violation of any confidence. I feel that it should be presented in all fairness to Mr. Young, against whom certain inferences have been drawn, as well as to all the other dollar-a-year men. We have had statements made on the floor this afternoon in which it was hinted or inferred that most of these dollar-a-year men are guilty of bribery, fraud, or corruption. The speakers did not identify any cases but spoke only in general terms. I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe we should be careful in such statements. I am sure the Senator from Oregon will agree with me on that. At the same time I do not think it is fair to any individual, regardless of what I may think about him, to ask him to come down before a committee and have him try to answer questions without knowing the charges. The information should be available not only to Mr. Young but to every Member of the Senate and to the American people. The letters I am placing in the Record have likewise been referred to the Senator's committee, and are included in the report.

Substantially—as nearly as I could do so—I have refrained from expressing any opinion of my own; in short, I have proceeded in the same way that I have proceeded in all the other cases I have presented: I have used almost verbatim the language of the Comptroller General and of the other agencies involved. I always check with the agencies involved first.

As the Senator from Oregon has said, I think we have in the Office of the Comptroller General an able administrator, and he has one of the ablest staffs. My experience has convinced me that that staff has done a marvelous job not only in this case but in many others in calling such discrepencies to the attention of the Congress. We in Congress should pay some attention to the cases when they are called to our attention.

Twice during the past 6 or 8 weeks I discussed features of the stockpiling programs. I did so because of my interest in the procedure being followed; and from that interest I developed information as to the procedure which has been followed in this case. I think the information obtained in this case is identical with that which has been presented to the Senator's committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Curtis in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Delaware completely misunderstands me if he thinks that in anything I have said I have charged him with betraying my confidence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not interpret his remarks as criticism. I understood that he was merely making a statement in connection with my remarks and I appreciated his support.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question of the Senator from Delaware. However, before doing so, and in order that there will be no misunderstanding of the Record when it is read tomorrow, let me make very clear for the Record that I highly commend the Senator from Delaware for presenting to the Senate today all the material and information he has presented this afternoon. It seems to me highly proper that he do so, particularly in view of the fact that the press has already carried articles regarding the procedure which has been followed thus far.

I wish to join the Senator from Delaware in commending the staff of the Office of the Comptroller General and also the Comptroller General himself. I have read many of their reports; and, as I said the other day, and as I told the Comptroller General, they have restored my faith in the absolute impartiality and dedication to the public service on the part of Government career men; and I respect their devotion to that service. In my opinion, the Comptroller General and the staff have done a magnificent job in the documentation of the case.

The question I wish to ask is this: In view of the newspaper discussion of this matter and in view of the fact that announcement has been made that the joint committee will hear Mr. Young, does the Senator from Delaware agree with me that now the only fair course of action we can follow is to ask that the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee no longer remain executive hearings, but that the report of the Comptroller General now be made available to the public, for I believe that with that report before the public, the public will for the first time be able to judge whether Mr. Young's replies are meritorious.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon is correct. Likewise I do not find fault with the Banking and Currency Committee in what it did.

Unfortunately, there have been inferences to the effect that perhaps there has been something shady in the case of the actions of all dollar-a-year men. I think such an inference is most unfortunate. I am sure that among that group we shall find—just as we find in our lodges, individual churches, and associations—certain men who do go wrong; and, of course, they should be called to task. But at the same time we should not lose sight of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the dollar-a-year men have come to Washington and have served the Government at great sacrifice to themselves. They as well as the overwhelming majority of all Government employees try to do an honest and efficient job.

Certainly we need their advice but unless we provide some protection for them, we shall not be able to obtain their services. However, at the same time we must guarantee to the American people that we are not sitting back and saying that just because these men are "big," we will not criticize anything they do. If they do a good job they should be complimented. If not, they should be called to account by specific cases, not as a group.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Delaware has expressed views which I share. If there is any difference between us—although I do not know that there is—it will be over the principle of the Morse amendment, which simply provides that for obtaining the services of these men for the Government in advisory and consulting capacities, but that they not be placed in policymaking, administrative positions; that, instead, a career man be placed over the staffs, so that the decisions regarding policymaking and administrative direction shall be made by paid employees of the Government, and these other men shall be brought in to advise and consult and give us the advantage of their points of view.

I think such appointments can be surrounded with all the prestige and honor necessary to make it possible for the Government to secure the services of such men, and without adopting a procedure which always presents the danger of abuse. I think the abuses have been relatively few, but I do not believe we have adopted a procedure which prevents such abuse.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon entered the Chamber, I had submitted an Executive order which was issued by former President Truman, after the Defense Production Act was passed, at which time the administration provided that the agencies could call in such nonpaid persons; but it was also spelled out very clearly that they were not to be exempted from the application of certain criminal statutes, if in their official capacity they negotiated contracts with concerns in which they had any interest whatsoever.

In my opinion, in the case of these persons, there is a moral and a legal obligation—it matters not whether they are paid or are not paid by the Government—not to use their connection with the Government to enrich themselves or their companies. They should disassociate themselves from any negotiations with a company with which they are affiliated. Certainly, that is the intention of the law, as I understand it.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope Mr. Young can clear up this situation. Next, I wish to discuss the contract involving the Mid-Continent Mining Corp., of St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, a summary of this contract and advance payments.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mid-Continent Mining Corp.

Howard I. Young, president, director, and a substantial stockholder of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., was also Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency (DMPA), later the Defense Materials Division, Emergency Procurement Service (EPS), General Services Administration (GSA). American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. operated smelters to produce zinc from concentrates obtained from various producers.

Maynard F. Clough, of St. Paul, Minn., is president, director, and controlling stockholder of Mid-Continent Mining Corp., organized to acquire a lease on a mine that previously was operated to produce concentrates from zinc carbonate ores. When the lease was acquired only zinc sulfide ores remained, which were less valuable and more difficult to reduce to metallic zinc.

In December 1951 Mr. Clough, at Mr. Young's suggestion, applied to DMPA for a floor-price contract and financial assistance to construct and operate the mine and concentrating mill. DMPA employed Robert S. Butler, a mining engineer, on Mr. Young's recommendation. His first assignment was to report on the Mid-Continent application.

Even though Bureau of Mines engineers had reported adversely on the technical and economic feasibility of the Mid-Continent proposal, Mr. Butler recommended a floor-price contract for 7,400 tons of metallic zinc; an advance of $500,000 to equip the mine and construct a concentrating mill, with production to repay the advance; and concluded that Mid-Continent was competent to complete the project. Prior to completion of his report, Mr. Butler had been offered by Mr. Clough and with Mr. Young's approval, a position at twice his Government salary as superintendent at Mid-Continent.

Because of adverse reports on Mid-Continent's financial condition, Mr. Clough's past business record, the marginal character of the Alice mine, and as zinc was no longer in short supply, key DMPA officials opposed financial aid to promote this venture. However, Mr. Young prevailed upon DMPA to finance Mid-Continent and contract to purchase zinc above the market price.

A contract was executed August 21, 1952, retroactive to July 16, 1952, between DMPA and Mid-Continent to purchase 7,400 tons of slab zinc at a subsidized price of 16 cents per pound and to guarantee a bank loan of $325,000. Mid-Continent was to produce zinc concentrates and arrange for smelting; provide capital or credit of $75,000 for additional facilities if expansion cost exceeded $325,000; obtain a loan not to exceed $325,000 from a bank or financial institution to construct and equip a concentrating mill of not less than 400 tons per day capacity.

American Zinc contracted, on July 21, 1952, to purchase and smelt Mid-Continent's zinc concentrates; to sell slab zinc under Mid-Continent's contract to the Government or in the open market for its account; to provide $75,000 if the $325,000 borrowed through DMPA was insufficient to complete the proposed mill.

Mr. Clough applied for a loan with the Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis at the suggestion of Mr. Young, a member of its board of directors. DMPA failed to prevail upon the bank and Federal Reserve of St. Louis to forego its usual investigation, formal report, and recommendations, and the loan application was withdrawn. A loan application was pending with the First National Bank of St. Paul, which insisted that Mr. Clough divest himself of stock control and disassociate himself from the management of Mid-Continent. Mr. Clough transferred his stock to his wife, but continued in control. Detailed safeguards and precautions were established regarding the use of borrowed funds guaranteed 100 percent by DMPA, but this application was withdrawn in September 1952 because Government financing was available.

The contract between DMPA and Mid-Continent was amended October 2, 1952, to provide for a Government advance of $325,000. No explanation has been found to justify a Government advance under the Defense Production Act of 1950 where Government-guaranteed private financing was available. This money was spent without completing the plant and leaving substantial debts.

Safeguards recommended by DMPA officials to protect the interest of the Government in financing the venture were not adopted and controls to insure performance of the contract were not installed.

Mid-Continent could not obtain electric power and was obliged to install an electric powerplant at an unanticipated cost of about $120,000. The contract provided for a concentrating mill of the capacity of approximately 400 tons per day, but Mr. Clough purchased equipment from Mr. Young's company for a mill of 1,200 tons capacity at an additional cost of approximately $60,000.

Because of wasteful and inefficient administration, Mid-Continent was unable to complete the mill. Mr. Clough applied May 12, 1953, for an additional advance of $75,000. Based on reports by American Zinc engineers, its contract-negotiation division, and its mining engineer, V. A. Brussolo, DMPA refused further financial assistance. Mr. Brussolo found that the mine contained approximately 190,000 tons averaging 2.5 percent zinc content and estimated that an additional $240,000 would be required to put the mine in operation. His report conflicted with earlier representations by Mr. Clough, who estimated that $75,000 would suffice. American Zinc refused to honor its $75,000 commitment to Mid-Continent.

Mr. Clough alleged bias and prejudice by DMPA and GSA officials in refusing the advance. At the request of GSA the matter was fully reviewed by Judge W. Calvin Chesnut, who rendered an opinion on November 10, 1953, that the Government was under no legal, equitable, or moral obligation to provide further financial assistance to Mid-Continent.

Notwithstanding this opinion, GSA negotiated with Mr. Clough for settlement of various claims related to construction at the mine for amounts in excess of $100,000. The General Accounting Office has advised GSA that specific statutory authority would be required to relinquish contractual rights vested in the Government.

The facts show that DMPA decisions on the technical propriety of the project, the financial responsibility and integrity of the company's management, and the necessity for the project were not in the best interest of the Government in its zinc program but were influenced by Mr. Young and his interest in Mr. Clough.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two memorandums, one dated December 14, 1951, signed by Mr. R. A. Young, and the second memorandum dated January 31, 1952, prepared for Mr. Howard A. Young as Deputy Administrator, both dealing with the Mid-Continent contract.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ZINC COMPANY OF ILLINOIS,
St. Louis, Mo., December 14, 1951.

Mr. MAYNARD F. CLOUGH,
Care of Mr. Jas. E. Bacon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLOUGH: Confirming my telephone conversation with you and Mr. Bacon, I understand you are entering into a contract with DMPA under which you will produce some 30,000 tons of zinc concentrates assaying approximately 60 percent zinc, from which will be recovered approximately 15,000 tons of slab zinc.

This letter will confirm my advice to you that if you execute with the Defense Materials Procurement Agency the floor purchase contract, which gives them the option of taking any part of the slab zinc produced during your contract and provides further that you may, at any time, call upon them to take all of the metal produced from your concentrates at a price of 19.5 cents per pound should the open market price become lower, we will enter into a contract with you to take your entire zinc concentrate production making the metal available to the Government under the terms of your contract.

The mechanics of accomplishing this will be as follows:

We will make a contract to purchase your concentrates based on the "going" market price of zinc, with a minimum settlement price to you of 19.5 cents. We will include in this contract a clause that if the Government calls on you to sell to them metal at the market price, we will sell them the resultant metal from your concentrates. If the open market price goes below 19.5 cents per pound, you would agree to invoke your right to ask the Government to take the resultant metal at 19.5 cents and the Government would purchase such metal from us at this price.

If you are successful in arriving at terms with the Government and can furnish us with a copy of the proposed letter of intent between you and them, we will then give to you a formal contract embodying the foregoing provisions.

Very truly yours,

R. A. YOUNG,
Vice President.

JANUARY 31, 1952.

Mr. HOWARD I. YOUNG,
Deputy Administrator.
MAX MEDLEY,
Comptroller.
MID-CONTINENT MINING CORP.:

Lou Brooks, of my staff, has brought to my attention a proposed contract with the subject corporation covering the production of zinc which contemplates a $400,000 advance for construction of facilities.

An anaysis of the balance sheet of this company as of January 25, 1952, indicates current assets of approximately $3,516 and fixed assets of $885,208, for a total of $888,724. Included in the fixed assets of the corporation is an item "Alice Mine Reserves (estimated) $875,000." This item apparently represents an estimated value of undeveloped reserves under lease and does not represent tangible fixed assets value upon which to develop financial evaluation. The liabilities of the corporation amount to about $35,152 of which approximately $32,350 represents loans from corporate officers. The "estimated" net worth of the corporation is indicated at $853,572. If the Alice Mine reserves estimated valuation of $875,000 is eliminated from the assets of the corporation, which, in my opinion should be done, the corporation shows a deficit position of some $21,400.

I understand this corporation was formed in April 1951 for the express purpose of developing this project. It is needless for me to say that the degree of risk in advancing $400,000 to a corporation of this type is extraordinary. I also understand that the zinc situation is such that there is no critical shortage of supply and, in fact, the stockpile objective has been met.

I am informed that the American Zinc, Lead and Smelting Co. will guarantee working capital to the extent of $100,000 to finance operational costs of this project and will perform the smelting and refining of the ore to be produced from the ore bodies covered under this project.

If the balance sheet of the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. reflects the true financial condition of the corporation, then it would seem that any needed financing could be easily obtained through established banking channels. If this is not feasible and the real value of the undeveloped reserves approaches the amount included on the corporation's balance sheet, then a guaranteed loan would seem to be a more appropriate method of financing rather than an outright Government advance. As you realize, the guaranteed loan rates provide us with expert analysis of the risk involved by the Federal Reserve bank for the district in which the properties are located, which, in my opinion, surpasses the adequacy of the financial analysis facilities immediately available to us here.

It would appear that this would be the most prudent and businesslike way in which to proceed. In addition, the use of the guaranteed loan technique has its budgetary advantages since it does not require the advancing of Government capital since it results in the utilization of private capital already in circulation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I next ask that a memorandum dated July 21, 1952, showing the connection between Mid-Continent and American Zinc Company of Illinois—a subsidiary of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.—be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ZINC COMPANY OF ILLINOIS,
St. Louis, Mo., July 21, 1952.

Mr. MAYNARD CLOUGH,
President, Mid-Continent Mining Corp.,
West Plains, Mo.

DEAR MR. CLOUGH: We have this day entered into a contract with you for the purchase of zinc concentrates from your property near West Plains, Mo. We understand you have entered into a contract with the United States Government whereby the Government is to make available to you up to $325,000 for capital investment in your venture.

This is to inform you that if the $325,000 is not sufficient to provide you with the funds needed for your capital investment in the venture, that we will, upon request by you after you have fully expended the $325,000 received from the Government for capital investment, advance to you up to $75,000, as cash or credit, to be used for the same purpose and/or working capital.

This $75,000 will be evidenced by promissory notes which will bear interest at 6 percent per annum and will be payable in full not later than 2 years after date.

When you begin production of concentrates we will deduct from funds due you on each dry ton of concentrates delivered to us under our contract with you, $5 per short dry ton which shall be credited toward any advances made by us to you in line with the terms of this letter.

It is understood that you may, at any time, pay us sums over and above the $5 per ton of concentrates and may pay the loan in full at any time you desire prior to the due date above stipulated.

It is understood that none of the interested parties will withdraw any funds as corporate officers and/or dividends from the operation until such sums are paid in full.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN ZINC COMPANY OF ILLINOIS,
By R. A. YOUNG, *Vice President.*

Accepted:

MID-CONTINENT MINING CORP.
By MAYNARD F. CLOUGH.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, altogether Government advances totaling $325,000 were made to this company, even though certain DMPA and GSA officials objected because the financial condition of the company was bad and the zinc situation was no longer critical. Due to failure of this project, the Government lost this money and stands to lose $100,000 or more by reason of proposed GSA settlements to which the Acting Comptroller General has objected. I incorporate this correspondence in the RECORD because I think Mr. Young, when he comes before the committee, should explain this correspondence with the companies with which he was affiliated, and from which he was drawing $80,000 a year. I think he should explain just how he reconciles the correspondence with his statement that he did not have any knowledge of the contracts which were being negotiated.

The third contract—which I shall later discuss—is the one dealing with the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., Baxter Springs, Kans., and point out the connection of this company with the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., but first I call attention to this record which shows how Mr. Young was involved throughout this Mid-Continent contract.

The loan and contract had been rejected at various levels as unnecessary. Yet it seems that a new employee, Mr. Robert S. Butler, a mining engineer, was sent upon Mr. Young's recommendation to reinvestigate the application. During the course of the investigation, Mr. Maynard Clough, of St. Paul, Minn., president of the company, apparently offered this Government agent a position with his company at twice his Government salary after the report was finished.

The implication is that Mr. Young knew about that and approved the offer. The offer of employment was subsequently rejected because it was pointed out that criticism could develop in the agency if such procedure were followed.

Nevertheless, the offer was made, and, whether or not as a result of it, a favorable report was received. The company, whose request had previously been rejected, was given an advance of $325,000. All of that has been lost by the Government.

This particular company had a contract with the American Zinc Co., of which Mr. Young was president, to handle the future output. I have inserted a series of correspondence pointing out the connection with Mr. Young and his company in this transaction.

I now discuss the case involving the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., with respect to which I think Mr. Young should likewise be put on notice. I ask unanimous consent that the background information with respect to this case be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, along with an explanation of the operations describing that particular transaction.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR MINING CO., INC.

Certain officials of DMPA and other agencies objected to an advance of Government funds to this company because its financial condition was bad and the national zinc supply had greatly improved. However, $45,000 was advanced to the company to expand its production of zinc ore. The advance was dependent upon a smelting agreement with the American Zinc Co., of Illinois, a wholly owned subsidiary of American Zinc, Lead, & Smelting Co. The Government's option to take delivery of slab zinc was never exercised but the agreements did assure the American Zinc Co. a source of supply for zinc concentrates. About 600 tons of slab zinc were produced. The MacArthur Co. was insolvent and in the receivership proceedings that followed DMPA was unable to recover any of the advance.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., filed an application on December 11, 1950, with the Department of the Interior, Defense Minerals Administration, for a loan of $60,000 to increase its production of zinc-bearing ore from the property known as the MacArthur Mine located near Baxter Springs, Kans. The application was referred to the United States Geological Survey, Department of Interior, whose field team, after a survey of the mine, reported it could not approve the program suggested in the application, but presented an alternate plan of operations which included a favorable recommendation on the application for the loan.

When the case was sent to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a credit investigation, an unfavorable report resulted stating the loan should be denied in view of the weak financial condition of the MacArthur Mining Co. However, the Defense Minerals Administration recommended favorable action on this loan to Defense Production Administration under section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, but before the loan was approved, the method of processing the application came under the Defense Materials Procurement Agency and the General Services Administration. The MacArthur Mining Co. then filed another application requesting an advance of $45,000 against production of zinc ore under a contract to be negotiated with the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

The comptroller's office, General Services Administration, indicated that the application should be rejected in view of the financial situation of the MacArthur Co., and the fact that its president would not agree to certain conditions considered essential to making this advance. However, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency continued the negotiations and on Dec. 4, 1951, entered into a contract with the MacArthur Mining Co., although information in the files shows that zinc was not in short supply.

This contract contained an option for the sale of slab zinc to the Government and provided for an advance of $45,000 to assist the MacArthur Mining Co. in doubling its production of zinc-bearing ore.

As a prerequisite for the advance, the Comptroller, General Services Administration, required the MacArthur Mining Co. to enter into an agreement with the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. of St. Louis, or another company mutually satisfactory to the Government and MacArthur, under which the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Company, or such other company, was to purchase zinc concentrates from the MacArthur Mining Co., and act as agent for the MacArthur Mining Co. when slab zinc was sold to the Government. Although other large smelters were located nearer the MacArthur Mine, the required agreement was later entered into between the MacArthur Co. and the American Zinc Co. of Illinois, a subsidiary of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. of St. Louis, Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, was president and one of the principal stockholders of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. of St. Louis, owner of all the outstanding stock of the American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

Negotiations for the agreement between the MacArthur Co. and the company controlled by Mr. Young had been settled prior to the date of the Government contract. Under its agreement with the MacArthur Mining Co., the minimum increase in the gross sales of slab zinc of the American Zinc Co. would have amounted to $525,000, with a probable increase in gross sales of more than $700,000.

In May 1952 the mine was operating only at the break-even point. Due to the lack of proper machinery, and difficulties encountered in trying to open an additional shaft, the rate of production declined in April and May of 1952. The market price of zinc also dropped from 19½ to less than 16 cents a pound in June 1952 and, as a result, the MacArthur Mining Co. was unable to continue operations.

The Beck Mining Co. under an agreement with MacArthur Co. took control and tried to make arrangements with the creditors to keep the mine operating. However, the plan proved unsatisfactory and on June 27, 1952, the United States district court appointed a receiver for the MacArthur Mining Co.

Auditors from the General Services Administration examined the financial records of the MacArthur Co. in July 1952 and found that the company was insolvent on June 28, 1952, and also on November 30, 1951, prior to the date the Government made the advance payment of $45,000 on December 12, 1951.

Due to the low price of ore, the court-appointed receiver discontinued operations and had the plant dismantled. On November 30, 1953, the court found that the assets of the MacArthur Mining Co. consisted of $10,548.81, plus a potential claim against the United States in connection with other mining operations conducted during World War II. Since the Director of Internal Revenue and the State of Kansas had preferred claims for taxes in excess of the value of the assets, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency did not receive any payment on the advance.

The Government's loss of the entire amount of the advance is directly attributable to the persistence of the Defense Material Procurement Agency to pursue the project, at a time when the emergency need no longer existed and notwithstanding the adverse financial reports furnished by the General Services Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

During the processing of the loan application, RFC recommended disapproval of the loan application for $60,000 of the MacArthur Mining Co., and Louis Brooks of the Comptroller's office, GSA, reported that the financial condition and prospects of this company were such that repayment of an advance of $45,000 was doubtful. Also, Gunnard E. Johnson, Acting Chief, Lead-Zinc Branch, DMA, recommended denial of the loan to the company because of the findings of the Geological Survey field team and the RFC examiner.

The first two reports were made on the basis of a financial analysis of the company from a credit standpoint taking into consideration its existing indebtedness, working capital position ,estimated profit margin, proven efficiency of operations, and other factors which would reflect the ability to repay an advance of funds or a loan. In making the advance of $45,000, DMPA disregarded the findings made in these reports.

The only report found that was favorable to the loan for the MacArthur Mining Co. was issued by the region 6 field team, United States Geological Survey (exhibit 2). This report set forth an alternate plan which showed that if all the indicated ore were mined at an estimated cost, made possible by the installation of certain mechanical equipment, the company could repay a loan of $60,000 and still show a profit. As a basis for advancing credit this report was of little value, since consideration was not given to the financial position or other information concerning the company essential to establish the risk involved in advancing it funds. Actually, the audit later made by GSA (exhibit 15, p. 4), showed that the company was insolvent on November 30, 1951, just prior to the time the advance was received by it in December 1951. Furthermore, the report of the field team clearly shows that in the calculation of the estimated profit, on which the loan approval was based, no provision was made for a decline in the price of zinc, or for other contingencies. The recommendation for the loan was made on the assumption that a guaranteed price of $115 a ton for 60 percent zinc concentrates would apply to all production, whereas the DMPA contract was applicable only to the production in excess of the average daily rate, or one-half of the ore to be produced. It was evident that in a marginal operation of this type a drop in the price of zinc or an unexpected increase in production costs would force the company out of business.

The evidence shows that the financial standing of this company did not warrant an advance of funds. Furthermore, it is not apparent that the need for zinc was so great at that time that it was necessary, or even intended, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, for the Government to assume the risk inherent in furnishing financial assistance to this company. It appears that under normal procedure, the contract and advance payment made in this case could not have merited the approval of DMPA.

At the time negotiations were going on between DMPA and the MacArthur Co. for the contract providing for the advance of Government funds, this company was also conferring with the American Zinc Co. of Illinois in respect to a tie-in agreement which would enable the MacArthur Co. to deliver slab zinc to the Government, if so required, under its contract with DMPA. Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator of DMPA, was also the president and a principal stockholder of the company which owned all the outstanding stock of the American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I likewise have a series of correspondence between the agencies, some of which Mr. Young was affiliated with, along with certain memorandums to Mr. Young. I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. I shall ask that the series of correspondence showing Mr. Young's and his companies' connection with the contract be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT,
November 3, 1951.

To: Mr. John Ford.
From: Howard I. Young.
Subject: MacArthur Mining Co.

Is there any good reason for the delay that has occurred in connection with the MacArthur application for loan. The original application was received in September 1950 and the final agreement has not yet been prepared.

I hope you can expedite this so that we may advise MacArthur definitely whether we are going to give them the assistance we need.

HOWARD I. YOUNG.

AMERICAN ZINC CO., OF ILLINOIS,
November 27, 1951.

MACARTHUR MINING CO.,
Baxter Springs, Kans.

GENTLEMEN: This is to confirm our understanding that beginning February 1, 1952, and continuing through March 31, 1954, you will sell to our company 250 tons of zinc concentrates per month. The price which we will pay you for these concentrates will be $117.50 per short dry ton, 60 percent basis, with usual grade adjustments, in bins, at your property. Should the Eagle-Picher Central Mill price for concentrates week of shipment from your mine by us be in excess of $117.50, we shall settle with you on the higher price.

If you give us 30 days notice prior to shipment of concentrates, we will agree to sell and deliver to the General Services Administration, in the month following month of shipments of concentrates from your mine, 1 ton of prime western zinc metal for each 2 tons of zinc concentrates which you sell and deliver to us during such month. This sale will be made only if General Services Administration exercise their option in your contract with them to buy such metal.

At any time that the East St. Louis price goes below 17.50 cents per pound, General Services Administration will buy from American Zinc 1 ton of prime western slab zinc for each 2 tons of concentrates sold by you to us up to 125 tons of prime western metal a month on the 17.50 cents basis.

If you will be kind enough to sign and return the attached copy of this letter and also have General Services Administration place their approval and acceptance on it, this would serve as a contract between us.

Very truly yours,
AMERICAN ZINC CO. OF ILLINOIS.
By R. A. YOUNG, *Vice President.*

Accepted:
MACARTHUR MINING CO.
Approved and accepted:
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

DECEMBER 10, 1951.

MR. JOHNSTON RUSSELL,
Director, Defense Accounts Division
PHIL JORDAN,
Director, Credit & Finance Diviison,
MacArthur Mining Co.:

There are attached for your action and records the following documents pertaining to the above-cited Letter Agreement dated December 4, 1951:

1. The original and one executed copy of an agreement between the Comptroller, GSA, and the Company, dated December 5, 1951, giving the terms and conditions under which the advance payment will be made.

2. One executed copy of an agreement between the company and the Baxter State Bank, dated November 26, 1951, pursuant to the requirement of paragraph 6 of the agreement referred to in paragraph 1 above.

3. One executed copy of an agreement between the company and the American Zinc Co. of Illinois, dated December 6, 1951, pursuant to the requirement of paragraph 7 of the agreement referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. One executed copy of an assignment of lease of the MacArthur Mine by the company, dated December 6, 1951, pursuant to the requirement of paragraph 9 of the agreement referred to in paragraph 1 above.

5. The original of a request for advance of $45,000, dated December 6, 1951, pursuant to the requirement of paragraph 4 of the agreement referred to in paragraph 1 above.

6. One copy of an interest-bearing demand note from the company, dated December 12, 1951, pursuant to the requirement of paragraph 4 of the agreement refererd to in paragraph 1 above.

The above described documents are in satisfactory form, and Mr. John Ford has approved the disbursement of the advance. Accordingly, it is requested that you advance $45,000 to the MacArthur Mining Co., box 356, Baxter Springs, Kans., making the payment effective December 12, 1951, if possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Without taking the time of the Senate to read the entire correspondence, I refer briefly to only one letter, a letter dated December 10, 1951, which was forwarded to the director of the Defense Accounts Division, with which was enclosed "one executed copy of an agreement between the company and the American Zinc Co., of Illinois, dated December 6, 1951, pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 7."

I call attention to this as an indication that the MacArthur Mining Co. was required first to make a contract with Mr. Young's company before receiving a Government order.

Mr. President, I say again that certainly there is a question which is raised that perhaps Mr. Young did have something to do with the awarding of the contracts and that there may have been some collusion or some conflict of interest. At the same time, if there are any other men—whether they be dollar-a-year men or other officials of the Government—who are in this position they should be called to the attention not only of Congress but also of the American people. They should also be called to the attention of the Department of Justice if some wrongdoing is discovered.

If we have any reason at all to believe that there is a conflict of interest on the part of any official we should be specific. Unless we can do so, it becomes all of us to withhold our blanket indictment of the dollar-a-year men as a group.

In this case we have a man holding a high position negotiating contracts involving companies from which he was drawing salaries and fees of approximately $80,000 per year. Furthermore, these contracts and advance payments were approved by him over the objections of other agency officials.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make some corrections of typographical errors in the bill now pending before the Senate, H. R. 191, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

On page 23, line 8, "watch represents" should read "watcher presents."

On page 27, line 16, the word "making" should read "marking."

On the same line, the word "Where" should read "When."

On page 27, line 18, the word "Make" should read "Mark."

On page 28, line 8, the word "making" should read "marking."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The corrections will be made.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill at the beginning of the session tomorrow. I hope it will be readily passed. The Record should show this evening, for the benefit of Senators who will read the references to this bill, that it comes to the Senate with the unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia and with the bipartisan support of the District committees of the Republican and Democratic parties of the District of Columbia. The bill ought to be passed very quickly by both Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Kenneth J. Smouse, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers' League, which, he says, presents the view of the Oregon Wheat Growers' League as to the meaning of the vote on marketing quotas. In the letter he says:

The Oregon Wheat Growers League,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 29, 1955.
The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Now that the Nation's wheat growers have voted for marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop, many people are interpreting the meaning of the vote. Since the interpretations differ so widely, I would like to present to you on behalf of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, the thinking behind the marketing quota vote as we see it in our area.

Actually, the grower had no choice. He could not afford to vote down the support rate of about $1.81 per bushel, even with severe allotments and penalties, for a much lower loan rate, no penalties, and possibly no allotments. The chance was too great for creating a chaotic condition in the market place. The growers were less inclined this year than last, to gamble away a program which has given them a reasonable degree of stability over the past 10 years.

Some analysts have said the growers vote indicated approval of the flexible price support system. We can find no evidence to support this contention. In fact, the reverse is true. The growers are not happy with severe acreage cuts combined with a lowering support price but they fear low priced wheat at a time production costs are rising. Most growers believe that once the price of all wheat is forced to a low level based on the secondary uses of feed and export, it will be difficult if not impossible to obtain a higher price for wheat used for human food.

If the grower could see how a low price on all wheat would remove the surplus while returning him enough money to stay in business, he would have voted against quotas. It is little consolation to the growers to know the surplus of wheat can be moved over a period of years at a low enough price if during the process he is forced out of business.

The marketing quota vote was simply a matter of mathematics. When the wheat grower took out his pencil and figured his income based on $1.81 wheat, with some return from diverted acres compared to a minimum of $1.19 wheat (realizing it would probably not go that low due to the price of feed grains) with no penalties for excess production, his figures told him to vote for marketing quotas this year.

We hope our comments will be of some value to you. A much more detailed commentary could be given but the most important factors affecting the quota vote are those which have been listed.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
Kenneth J. Smouse,
President.

I add to his letter this comment: The wheat problem in my State, as in all wheat States, is an exceedingly serious one. The Senators from Washington, and my junior colleague and I have introduced a so-called two-price wheat bill, based upon the underlying principles of the old McNary-Haugen Act. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] has introduced a similar bill. We have been given assurance by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that in addition to the hearings which he so kindly held, some field hearings will be held during the recess period, so that when the Senate reconvenes next January a record will be made on the Morse-Neuberger-Jackson-Magnuson bill.

I wish to say to the wheatgrowers of my State that unless someone can come forward with a better plan which will protect the stability of the price of wheat to a greater degree than our bill does, I shall continue to do everything I can in the next session to secure a favorable vote on our bill.

I also wish at this time to thank the Oregon Wheatgrowers League for the cooperation it has extended to me in connection with the problem. In fact, the bill is their bill; indeed, the bill was written primarily upon the recommendation of their own legislative committee. The legislative representatives they sent to confer with the junior Senator from Oregon, the Senators from Washington, and myself had more to do, really, with the terminology of the bill than did any of the Senators. All we did was to examine the legislative representatives of the Wheatgrowers League, to satisfy ourselves that the proposal was meritorious, and then, in keeping with our responsibility as elected representatives of the people of our respective States, we introduced the bill and urged hearings on it.

I have made a very careful study of the wheat situation as I find it in my section of the country, and I am convinced that we are offering a sound legislative proposal and one which will bring greater price stability to the wheatgrowers of my State. I hope that between now and next January the record can be completed so that a vote can be taken on the bill.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE SALK POLIO VACCINE PLAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have here an article by James C. Spaulding, of the Milwaukee Journal, concerning the old polio vaccine problem. The heading of the article is "Secrecy, Deception Hurt Vaccine Plan." I wish to associate myself with the observations which Mr. Spaulding has made in his article, and to state that within the next few days I intend to discuss the same subject matter in more detail. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Secrecy, Deception Hurt Vaccine Plan—National Polio Foundation and United States Health Service Hid Vital Data, New Reports Show; Doctors Didn't Know About Troubles in Manufacture and Testing

(By James C. Spaulding)

A policy of secrecy and deception has been followed by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the United States Public Health Service in the polio-vaccine program.

As a result, the Nation's physicians—particularly those in public-health work—were prevented from learning vital information about trouble in making and testing the vaccine.

If this information had not been hidden, mass medical opinion might have forced the national foundation and the Public Health Service to take steps that would have prevented any of the vaccine from causing cases of polio. The vaccination program would not have broken down.

REPORT MADE BY SCHEELE

The policy of secrecy and deception toward doctors has been revealed by an examination of statements made by spokesmen of the foundation and the health service, and by recent reports on the vaccine program issued by Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele.

Dr. Scheele, who heads the Public Health Service, was forced finally to give information on vaccine difficulties because of polio cases caused by vaccine made by Cutter Laboratories, Berkeley, Calif., and probably by Wyeth Laboratories, Marietta, Pa.

Many of the recent revelations still are not known to most doctors because the facts have not been published in medical journals.

STARTED IN 1954

The secrecy and deception about the polio vaccine started before the 1954 field trials. For example, the national foundation, which ran the trials, kept secret from doctors that:

Live virus was detected in 4 out of 6 supposedly finished and safe lots of vaccine.

Three pharmaceutical houses making vaccine for the trials each made 2 or more lots in which live virus was found; only 2 manufacturers finally supplied all vaccine for the trials.

The Public Health Service Laboratory, Dr. Jonas Salk's laboratory and the laboratories of the manufacturers got widely varying results when they tested the vaccine for safety.

On 11 lots of finished vaccine, supposedly safe but found instead to contain live virus, tests of the 3 laboratories agreed on only 2 of the lots.

The testing and manufacturing difficulties were found to be so great that the Public Health Service Laboratory staff began to wonder whether vaccine could be produced on a large scale.

NEWSMAN HINTED ALL WAS NOT WELL

The only hint doctors received that all was not going smoothly came when Walter Winchell—tipped off by a scientist—said that the vaccine "may be a killer."

Dr. Hart E. Van Riper, medical director of the national foundation, then admitted that four batches had failed to pass tests and had been eliminated.

"This demonstrates," he said, "the validity of the tests and the safety they assure the public."

Actually, the contrary was true. Finding live virus in the four finished batches had been unexpected. This caused consternation. It indicated that Dr. Salk's laboratory method for killing live virus had not worked on a large scale.

TESTS NOT EFFECTIVE

It also showed that the safety tests themselves were not effective, because safety tests made one step before had not detected the live virus.

There is no reason to believe that Dr. Van Riper did not know this. But physicians generally, and the Public Health doctors who were to direct the field trials, were never told.

After the Winchell broadcast, Dr. Salk said.

"There is absolutely nothing to be concerned about."

The field trials were allowed to proceed despite the fact that 6 out of 8 finished lots made by 1 manufacturer were found to contain live virus. None of this company's vaccine was used in the trials.

REPORTED ON APRIL 12

Results of the field trials were evaluated by Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., and a team of workers at the University of Michigan school of public health. Their report was issued April 12 at Ann Arbor.

Doctors had no opportunity to study this report before the immunization program began. The vaccine was immediately licensed.

It was more than a month after the 1955 program started before the Francis report was published in a medical journal.

Then some of the impressions about the effectiveness of the vaccine, as interpreted in the report, began to be challenged. These impressions persist, however, because of haste and failure to provide time to discuss the report.

LITTLE PROTECTION FOR 6 YEAR OLDS

Dr. Francis said in his report: "It may be suggested that vaccination was 80 to 90 percent effective against paralytic poliomyelitis." This is the figure doctors and the public accepted as an indication of the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine, based on the field trials.

The fact is, as examination of Dr. Francis' figures shows, that 6-year olds in the trial received little protection from paralytic polio.

Dr. Scheele himself noted this in his recent report read to the American Medical Association (AMA) at Atlantic City, N. J.

"The downward trend (in effectiveness) from 9 to 6 years was striking," he said, "and the 6 year olds received little protection."

The figures show that this protection ranged from 16 to 30 percent, depending on whether the vaccinated children were compared with youngsters who received shots of an inactive material or got nothing at all.

In the fanfare accompanying the release of Dr. Francis' report at Ann Arbor, the National Foundation and the Public Health Service neglected to tell doctors that multiple testing—a main feature of the field trial program—was being dropped.

Several public health doctors said later that they would not have started shots this year had they known.

Secrecy and deception also characterized public health service handling of the polio outbreak that followed injections of Cutter vaccine. When the first 6 cases were reported, Dr. Scheele said, "it seemed likely, though not immediately provable, that the cases were significantly associated with vaccination."

QUESTION WAS RAISED

That raised the question, he said, "was there any likelihood that a similar association might appear with the vaccine of other manufacturers?"

That is what Dr. Scheele revealed in his report to Welfare Secretary Hobby a week ago. But that is not the way he told it to the Nation's doctors and parents, even though he knew it from the start.

Dr. Scheele went on the air then and said he had "complete confidence" in the vaccine. He urged doctors to continue the inoculations.

On these assurances, the program was continued. There followed a second outbreak, similar to the Cutter outbreak, apparently caused from vaccine made by Wyeth.

In his report to Mrs. Hobby, Dr. Scheele came close to admitting this.

UNITED STATES IMPOSED MORE RIGID STANDARDS

"Evidence is not conclusive, but suggests there may have been a similar association (like the Cutter cases) with a few cases following the use of Wyeth vaccine," he wrote.

Facts obtained from other reliable sources are that at least 12 cases occurred because of vaccination of children with one bad lot of Wyeth vaccine.

In addition, there were at least nine polio cases among family contacts of children who got vaccine from this lot but did not come down with polio themselves.

Dr. Scheele, however, told the AMA at Atlantic City that "vaccine produced by 4 manufacturers has been used on about 5 million children with no untoward results." He included Wyeth in the four.

Earlier this month, the Public Health Service announced that it was imposing more rigid standards of manufacturing and testing the vaccine. A few days later it announced the release of 1 million doses for immediate use.

Reporters asked Dr. Scheele whether the 1 million doses met the new standards. His answer seemed to say "yes," but a careful reading reveals that it was a roundabout way of saying "no."

What Dr. Scheele said was that the million doses "met the retesting procedures for vaccine that has already been produced." The retesting, it turned out, referred to an examination of manufacturers' records that the Public Health Service was supposed to be making all along.

The evasion succeeded for a few days. Wire service stories indicated that reporters had been given the impression that the vaccine was made under the new, rigid standards. Interviews with other polio vaccine experts later disclosed that was not possible.

One reason the foundation and the health service may have felt it unnecessary to take doctors into their confidence was their faith that nothing could go wrong with the vaccine.

SAW QUESTION SETTLED

They believed, as did Dr. Salk, that laboratory work and experimental studies had settled the safety question finally.

Dr. Salk made this clear at Ann Arbor April 12. He said then that the vaccine could be treated five times as long as was necessary to reduce infectivity beyond the measuring point, yet the vaccine would still protect against polio.

"With a margin of safety of this magnitude," Dr. Salk said, "it might be said that this aspect of the problem demands little, if any, further attention."

If physicians generally had been allowed to examine all information about making and testing the vaccine, they might not have been as convinced as Dr. Salk.

OPINIONS VARIED

The need to let all doctors know the facts is illustrated by differences of opinion among those who were informed.

Ten days ago, for example, Dr. Salk told the AMA that "the hypothesis that * * * antibody in the * * * blood is * * * effective in reducing the likelihood of paralysis by the poliomyelitis virus is now well supported by the great volume of * * * evidence * * *."

But on the same day Dr. Scheele told the same audience hardly an hour later that "the relationship between antibody development and protection against poliomyelitis is still unknown."

Dr. Scheele contradicts himself as well. He told the AMA that "safety tests for the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine were conceived primarily to detect mass contamination * * * and were not devised to detect small amounts of residual live virus."

SCHEELE AND SALK NOT IN AGREEMENT

But in his report to Mrs. Hobby 3 days later he said the safety "mass contamination * * * as well as small amounts of residual live tests were designed to detect virus. * * *"

Drs. Salk and Scheele indicated in their recent reports that they are not in agreement on how safe the vaccine should be. Dr. Scheele said:

"It is erroneous to assume that 100 percent safety can be assured, but it is believed that recently revised requirements for manufacture and safety testing of * * * vaccine assure * * * potent material as safe as present tests for virus detection can make it, and that the risk of such vaccine transmitting poliomyelitis is negligible."

Dr. Salk said "any risk that is involved, so long as it is recognized, must be corrected, whatever may be its cause."

The public health service showed that it accepted Dr. Salk's thesis that the safety problem "demands little, if any, further attention." That was what the health service gave it.

The health service discarded the system of multiple testing used for the field trials. It substituted a system of reviewing the manufacturers' records (protocols) of production and testing.

SCHEELE WAS SURPRISED

But the service did not even insist on looking at all the protocols. In a recent report, Dr. Scheele expressed surprise that the vaccine makers did not submit protocols on lots of vaccine that turned out bad.

But since lots were numbered serially, and some numbers were missing, it was only reasonable to suspect that something had gone wrong with the missing lots.

What had gone wrong was revealed—after the Cutter incident—when the health service began checking all the protocols.

To understand the trouble manufacturers were having this year before the program started, it is necessary to know the major steps in making and testing vaccine.

Strains of the three main types of polio virus are grown in separate lots in cultures of monkey kidney tissue. Then those lots, containing different virus types, are cooked individually with formaldehyde to kill the virus.

VIRUS IS KILLED

After all the virus in the separate lots is killed, tissue culture tests are done to see if any live virus can be detected. If it cannot, the three lots of different types of killed virus are pooled to make the final vaccine.

As a last step, that mixture again is tested. This is only a precaution, since earlier tests presumably would assure that no virus slipped through alive.

The records which manufacturers failed to submit to the health service showed that things did not work out that way. The records revealed that:

In 809 lots of vaccine containing one type of supposedly killed virus, testing showed that 11 percent contained live virus.

From the remaining lots in which no live virus was found, manufacturers made 127 lots of complete vaccine, containing all three types of supposedly killed virus.

But on final testing of the 127, there was 13.4 percent—or 17 batches—in which live virus particles were found.

Furthermore, results of individual manufacturers varied widely. One manufacturer found that one-third of final lots contained live virus. Another found none. Others found from 4 to 23 percent of final batches had live virus.

DIFFICULTY KNOWN, WHY A LICENSE?

One question often asked since the vaccine program broke down is why the Public Health Service licensed the vaccine when the difficulties in making and testing it were known. Dr. Scheele's answer, given in his most recent report, is:

"Although the record of satisfactory inactivation of the virus had at first been poor for the three initial producers, it appeared that improved techniques in processing had by this time corrected the difficulty. * * * The advisory group unanimously recommended that the vaccine be licensed."

TELL OF ADVISORY GROUP

One of the things doctors were not told was that the advisory committee was made up almost entirely of scientists who were receiving money from the national foundation, which exerted pressure to go ahead with the program.

That raises the question of whether committee members could exercise independent judgment on the safety question. Some Public Health doctors think they could not.

Members of the vaccine advisory committee had doubts—but expressed them only privately—about the safety of the program.

If what they knew had been common knowledge among doctors, it is likely that the medical profession would have insisted long before this that certain precautions be taken.

WILL CHANGE STRAINS

One such step—substitution of a less deadly strain of type I virus for the Mahoney strain—is to be taken soon.

Last month State public health officers met at Atlanta, Ga., expecting to be told what had gone wrong with the vaccine program.

Instead, a Public Health Service scientist told them he was not authorized to disclose what had happened. If he did, the scientist said, it would jeopardize the investment of the pharmaceutical firms in the vaccine program.

In view of this failure to inform the Nation's public health physicians, Dr. Scheele's concluding statement at the AMA meeting is surprising:

"Decisions on the use of the vaccine remain the responsibilities of individual physicians and health officers," he said.

MRS. LENA M. PHILLIPS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on May 20, 1955, death came to one of Kentucky's most famous women, Mrs. Lena M. Phillips of Nicholasville, Ky. Mrs. Phillips, founder of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, passed away at the age of 74 at Marseilles, France, while en route to Beyruth to represent the American Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs at an international conference. A lawyer, a business woman, and an untiring volunteer for humanitarian work, she will be sorely missed in the years to come by those inspired by her great example.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Shelbyville Business and Professional Women's Club, Shelbyville, Ky., in memory of Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. LENA MADESIN PHILLIPS

Whereas Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, a Kentucky-born woman lawyer who founded the International Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs died at the age of 74, in Marseille, France, May 20, 1955, and the funeral was held in the Anglican Church of Marseille, with burial, at her birthplace in Nicholasville, Jessamine County, Ky., on June 3, 1955; and

Whereas, in the performance of her services Dr. Phillips left New York May 6, 1955, aboard the liner *Excambion*, to attend a meeting of professional women in Beyruth, to represent the American Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and having become ill at sea on May 9, entered the hospital at the port of Marseille, France; and

Whereas the Honorable Lena Madesin Phillips was born in Nicholasville, Ky., the daughter of a former Jessamine County judge; she was an honor graduate of the College of Law of the University of Kentucky in 1917, and in 1940, received an honorary doctor of laws degree and practiced law in Lexington, Ky., and in 1918 moved to New York to practice law where she had taken charge of national YWCA program for business and professional women; and

Whereas during World War I Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips developed a plan by which women in various business and professions could be effectively mobilized for wartime service, and from this emergency organization grew the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of which she became its executive secretary in 1919; and

Whereas Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips pioneered and founded the worldwide International Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and served as its president since 1930; and prior thereto, as president of the National Federation of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., from 1926 to 1929; and all her life Dr. Phillips was an active spokesman for "more equable treatment and more just recognition" for women; and

Whereas Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, a truly pioneer and spirited lady of Kentucky, who has solicited each member to give her share to a home worthy of our national federation, gave us her last words: "Let us finish what we have undertaken as a token of gratitude for the past, faith in the future, responsibility to the present": Be it

Resolved, That the members of the Shelbyville Business and Professional Women's Club, with deep respect to the memory of their beloved pioneer leader, Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, herewith send their sincere sympathy and a copy of the within resolution to her surviving nephew, W. H. Denman, of Nicholasville, Ky.; and that this resolution be incorporated in the minutes and become part of the permanent records of the Shelbyville Club and a copy be sent for publication to the local and Jessamine County, Ky., newspapers and also to the respective presidents of both the State and National Federation of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; and a copy of said resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of National Defense at Washington, D. C.; and that this resolution be published in the club's publications, i. e., the Kentucky Cardinal and Independent Woman.

This 13th day of June 1955.

MARTHA A. HEDGES,
President, Shelbyville Business and Professional Women's Club, Shelbyville, Ky.
ERNESTINE NOLAND,
MARIAM CARDWELL,
Resolutions Committee.
VICTORIA V. GILBERT,
Author of resolution.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its labors today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for information of the Senate, I should like to say that should the House complete action on the public works appropriation conference report today or tomorrow, as soon thereafter as the report can be taken up in the Senate, it will be brought before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I assume that, if at this hour the conference report should come from the House we would not take it up tonight. There are several Senators who would want to take part in the discussion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure my friend it will not be taken up until we have a quorum call and all Members are notified.

It is my judgment that tomorrow the only two items which will be scheduled are Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 1835, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, and Calendar No. 702, H. R. 191, an act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

Should there be other measures which are reasonably noncontroversial, they may be taken up.

I should also like to state that it is my judgment that Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, will not be taken up until next Thursday.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate a bill known as S. 1835, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, and I wish to say that I am in sympathy, in general, with unemployment compensation, its purpose, and its function. Yet I think it is well to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year there were extensive hearings held on amendments of the Unemployment Compensation Act as it obtained at that time. A bill was passed which substantially and basically amended the act, and the amendments went into effect on the first of this year. Those amendments have not been effective more than 6 months. There are some aspects of Senate bill 1835 to which I think the Senate's attention should be invited.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared commenting on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA CONCERNING S. 1835

In regard to S. 1835 it is my sincere belief that several provisions of the bill should be given careful consideration.

At the outset be assured that I am in complete sympathy with unemployment compensation, its purpose and its function. It is a long step toward stabilization of our national economy; it is humane, it is vitally necessary and it spreads the burden of unemployment by placing its cost on the shoulders of the entire community.

First, let us look at the maximum benefits provided by S. 1835. The bill provides for a maximum weekly benefit of $54. Any worker earning a gross weekly wage of $80 for a 13-week base period would receive $46 as a weekly benefit amount. This is 57.5 percent of his gross weekly wage. If he has a wife and two children and claims standard exemptions under the income tax law, his take-home pay would be about $75 per week. Thus the weekly benefit amount of $46 is about 61⅓ percent of his take-home pay.

The maximum weekly benefit in the State of Maryland is $30 and in Virginia $24; the District of Columbia is bounded on all sides by these States and to provide for such a variance in the weekly benefits would create severe problems. Such a high weekly benefit cannot be reconciled with any State law or with the national average weekly benefit of $30.30. In fact, the highest weekly benefit in the Nation is found in the State of New York and Wisconsin in the amount of $36 which is a far cry from the $54 provided in the subject bill.

The high level of the maximum and the fact that benefits are computed on gross earnings (the amount of wages before withholding tax is deducted) also have another effect. The proximity of benefits and net earnings can, in many cases, tend to militate against achievement of the programs' goals. In this connection, President Eisenhower in his economic report transmitted to the Congress January 20, 1955, stated:

"The Federal-State Employment Service has an important part to play in reducing unemployment. While the Employment Service cannot allocate jobs it can help fill vacant jobs quickly and well. As recommended in the budget message, the system should be strengthened to meet this need and to insure the best use of scarce manpower in any future national emergency.

When benefits paid come so close to net earnings of workers on the job, the moral hazard incurred is such that one wonders whether the Employment Compensation Act will help fill vacant lots quickly and well or whether it will work in the other direction.

It is true that the President in his economic report of January 20, 1955, stated: "That the District of Columbia should have an employment insurance law that could be a model for the States." It should be pointed out, however, that the statement does not in any manner allude to a maximum weekly benefit of 67 percent of the average gross weekly wage of all people employed within the District. In fact, his statement mentions desirability of eligibility for payments that at least equal one-half their regular earnings. It should also be noted that S. 1163, the so-called administration bill, did not include any provision for increasing benefits.

Again I want to emphasize that this statement is not a negative one. It is not my purpose to detract from the many beneficial effects of unemployment compensation. The fact remains, however, that in 1954 a thorough and extensive study and revision of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act was made and enacted into law. A substantial increase of benefits—to $30 maximum—was made so as to approximate the national average. Other amendments of the old law were made. The 1954 act became effective January 1, 1955. In 6 short months its full impact by way of benefits payable as well as in other respects cannot be fully judged.

It is submitted that the 1954 revision should be allowed to function for a reasonable period before further revision is made. Further, that if any changes are to be made they should be restricted to those specifically referred to in the President's January 20 message when he referred to the new law as making it more difficult for unemployment persons to receive benefits for the maximum period and hence that "this weakness should be remedied by providing 26 weeks of benefits for all persons who qualify and who remain unemployed that long. The disqualification provision of last year's law should also be reviewed."

Mature and seasoned consideration along these lines would be entirely in order and would achieve the President's expressed goals without doing violence in any way to a wholesome and a beneficial unemployment-compensation program.

THE TERMINATION OF THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the announcement has just been carried over the press service wires that President Eisenhower has ordered steps to be taken to terminate the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Dixon-Yates contract has become President Eisenhower's Achilles' heel. The contract was conceived in secrecy, nurtured in duplicity, and now is to be terminated with the administration in full flight.

The Dixon-Yates contract has been the bellwether of the administration's so-called partnership power policy. This so-called partnership power policy is not a partnership between the Government and the people, as it has existed for the past two decades; instead, it is a partnership between the administration and the private power trust. Having started running from that policy and having abandoned its bellwether, the administration will be on the defensive and in full flight from its so-called partnership power policy from now until November 1956.

The execution of the Dixon-Yates contract was made possible by the unprecedented action of President Eisenhower himself. The same corporate interests had made a similar offer to TVA. The TVA board of directors examined it and rejected it. Three of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission, also, examined the Dixon-Yates proposition and rejected it. No one would take the responsibility for inaugurating it.

The proponents of the contract finally went all the way to the highest office in the land; and after a conference of the first team, President Eisenhower personally ordered that the Atomic Energy Commission, an independent agency, be directed to negotiate a contract with a specified concern, the Dixon-Yates outfit.

Not only did he order the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate the contract with the specified concern, but he also directed that the contract be negotiated according to the terms which the the Dixon-Yates people had submitted.

So it can be seen that that was a second unprecedented feature of this act by the President. Not only did he order that a contract be negotiated with a specified concern, but he also directed that it be negotiated according to the terms of the proposal which the concern had already submitted.

There was a third unprecedented step. One of the terms of this contract, dictated by the President, involved the complete reimbursement of all Dixon-Yates taxes. There is no project of this administration with which the President is so personally and so closely identified as the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Yet the President, when he was a candidate, some 24 hours before election day, sent a message to the people of Tennessee, through the Scripps-Howard newspapers at Knoxville and Memphis, stating that if he were elected President TVA would be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It was to Memphis, Tenn., that Candidate Eisenhower sent his public pledge of maintaining the TVA at maximum efficiency.

It was to Memphis, Tenn., newspapers, as well as to the newspapers of Knoxville, that he sent the telegram to which the able Senator has referred, on the day of election, pledging his word and pledging his administration, should he be elected, to the continuation of the TVA program.

Mr. HILL. It was his express order which brought about the signing of the contract, over the refusal of the TVA Board and over the objection of a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. It was his personal order. Dwight D. Eisenhower is responsible for the Dixon-Yates contract. In the view of the junior Senator from Tennessee, Dwight D. Eisenhower is personally and officially culpable for the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. HILL. I may say that the Dixon-Yates contract was conceived in iniquity and perpetrated with deception. I am glad that President Dwight D. Eisenhower has been forced to cancel it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Alabama. There were other unprecedented steps in behalf of the Dixon-Yates deal which was spearheaded by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It was the President who personally appealed for the waiving of the 30-day requirement. It has been President Eisenhower who has repeatedly personally defended it. It has been President Eisenhower who has personally used the highest office in the land to castigate those of us who have opposed the Dixon-Yates contract, and who has accused us of playing politics.

Finally, it is President Eisenhower who has personally taken full flight and has ordered steps to be taken to terminate the contract.

I now want to raise the question of the most serious implications of the whole deal, that is, the misuse and the prostitution of the Atomic Energy Commission to a purpose unrelated to its program. Where does this leave the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission? Let me disclose what he has said—a man who held up his hand and took the oath of office as chairman of an independent Commission of the Government a Commission which has statutory responsibility for the administration of the program. I quote from a statement he made on December 17, 1954, as follows:

> I think it is fair to say that the Commission would not have initiated this except at the request of the Bureau—

Referring to the Bureau of the Budget—

> and would not have completed the contract other than upon the direction of the President.

Is there any doubt, then, as to who is responsible for the Dixon-Yates deal? The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission says the President is responsible for it. Since then, Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has defended the contract as being necessary for the atomic energy program. Where does the order for its cancellation now leave him? Will he take another order? What kind of man is this who is the head of the Atomic Energy Commission?

What confidence can Congress place in an independent agency the head of which will allow it to be used and misused, for whatever purpose some political figure may have in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call the attention of my colleague to the Associated Press ticker dispatch which states that the President's decision was announced before either the Dixon-Yates group or the Atomic Energy Commission had been notified.

I do not know in what shape the announcement leaves Admiral Strauss. He had said that the contract was very necessary for the atomic energy program.

If my colleague will indulge me, I should like to make a few observations.

First, today is the first time the officials of the city of Memphis have been requested to confer with the President and the Bureau of the Budget concerning their power needs. I think the fact that the cancellation comes allegedly as a result of Memphis having its own power program shows that the administration was simply "kidding" the American people, when it tried to put over this farce with the statement that it was necessary to give this unprecedented, outrageous contract to Dixon-Yates in order to furnish electricity for the Atomic Energy Commission. The administration itself now plainly admits that the deal had nothing to do with power for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GORE. May I interrupt to ask if it is not strange that this contract, which was so essential to the atomic energy program, has now been ordered terminated, without so much as an official notice to the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is only one of the strange things about this entire matter. I wish to say that in my opinion the contract was wrong and iniquitous. I am glad to see it has finally been canceled, because it is going to save the taxpayers a lot of money.

I hope the cancellation will result in performing another good. I hope the standing of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has been assailed unsuccessfully may be restored, and that the Atomic Energy Commission can get out of the business in which it had no right in the first place.

I wish to say to my distinguished colleague, who has fought so valiantly against the contract, and for the protection of a very successful and economical power agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, that I think the contract had to be canceled, because it was becoming more scandalous and more smelly all the time. Like a dead fish, the longer it kept hanging around, the worse it smelled. That was the situation with respect to the contract. It could not be defended in view of the many revelations of secret dealing being disclosed in connection with it.

I do not view with any joy the fact that the city of Memphis is going to build its own plant, and become dismembered from and taken out of the TVA system. I think it is a shame, in view of the fact that the President of the United States, as a candidate, went into the area of the TVA and told the people that the TVA was going to be operated at maximum efficiency, and that it was to continue to serve that great area. Can it be that the administration is now gleeful over the fact that the city of Memphis is to be taken out of the TVA's system, as a result of violations of the President's own campaign promises?

This partial dismemberment of the TVA system is very sad to me. I hope that happier days will come in the future, and that an executive policy will not again be conceived in the dark, and carried out by people who are antagonistic to this great agency, which was put into operation by Congress. I hope the damage which has been done may be repaired, and that even though the city of Memphis may have to build its own plant now, it may later be brought back into the TVA system, in line with the congressional enactment of 1939.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks of the able senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to my colleague on the committee that no one appreciates more than I do the very vigorous and aggressive way in which he has handled this matter. I say to him also that when he refers to the individual responsibility of Commissioners, I hope he will join with me in trying to make sure that the Commissioners this time exercise their proper functions in seeing that no settlement is made with Dixon-Yates. They were warned, and warned, and warned, that the contract could not go through. The Commission had dates on which it could cancel the contract. I think it can still cancel the contract without cost. I think it would be tragic if any settlement whatever were made with the Dixon-Yates group.

I express the hope that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which I think performed its functions in a very satisfactory and pleasant manner when it was not torn to pieces by sectional difficulties, may now proceed to have a relatively full period of productive life. As I am sure the junior Senator from Tennessee will admit, it was extremely unfortunate that every time a matter came before the Joint Committee it had to be measured by what its effect might be on Dixon-Yates. We had to weigh everything in the light of that problem. Perhaps now we can settle down and do the work Congress intended that we do, without that battle constantly stirring us up.

Mr. GORE. First I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his generous remarks. Next, I wish to join with him in the hope that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are through with this unfortunate, unseemly, improvident experience. Thirdly, I desire to express grave doubt that the wounds and the damage can be quickly erased, because the confidence of the Congress, of the Joint Committee, and of the people of the country in the integrity of the Atomic Energy Commission has been shaken, since it prostituted itself and allowed itself to be misused.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I think he knows, legislatively I have been identified with the Tennessee Valley Authority and the great project in that valley ever since World War I. When that great conflict ended, and the nitrate plant which had been begun at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of powder for use in time of war, and fertilizer for agriculture in time of peace, was uncompleted, we in the House of Representatives, where I was then a Member, fought to complete that plant and establish an industry in that area which would serve our country in time of war and our agriculture in time of peace.

It took a long time to move forward with that objective, and we did not get anywhere until the advent of the Roosevelt administration, during which the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, and it has resulted in great improvements in that entire valley.

Any man who ever saw that valley prior to the great changes made there, and who could travel over it now and see the great development and improvement in agriculture, homes, highways, and industry, would not describe it as creeping socialism. To me, that very description, I say with regret, gave a sort of pattern of what this administration's attitude would be toward the development of our great natural resources.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is no more creeping socialism than is the development of our rivers and harbors, which has been a governmental function during the entire history of the Nation. The Tennessee Valley Authority is no more creeping socialism than is the building of airports in the United States by the Government of the United States and the States, in order that there may be adequate facilities for air travel. The Tennessee Valley Authority is no more creeping socialism than is the development of our arid lands and reclamation projects throughout the great West. Those projects are creeping socialism if the Tennessee Valley Authority is. We have all favored such projects, and we have favored great projects like the Grand Coulee Dam, the Hoover Dam, the great Central Valley project in California, and many others. Such projects would be as much subject to the charge of creeping socialism as is the Tennessee Valley development.

Mr. GORE. None of them is creeping socialism.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was something sinister about the Dixon-Yates contract from the beginning. I realize the word "sinister" is a bad word, but it was sinister, somehow or other, in the way it came about. It crept up on the people and the Congress of the United States. I am glad the contract has been canceled.

I am sorry about the circumstances which developed in the beginning, so the contract had to be canceled; but I do not think the cancellation has shown any change in the leopard's spots. The cancellation was brought about because it had to be made, in the very nature of things; this matter could not decently be handled in any other way.

But even a few days ago, before the committee presided over by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], Mr. Wenzell, from Boston, when testifying before the committee, said he still thought the TVA should be sold to private enterprise.

So far as I am concerned—and I say it without hesitation, without embarrassment, and without apology—I wish there were a Tennessee Valley Authority or a similar authority in every river valley in the Nation. We know there never can be unless it is done under the supervision of the Government of the United States, because no private power company will do more than build here and there a dam, which it needs for its own purposes; and such a project does not result in the development of a great region.

So, Mr. President, I feel a sense of relief, in a way, because the contract has been canceled; but, notwithstanding the cancellation of the contract, I also feel a sense of insecurity—a word which I believe to be a very mild one to be used in these circumstances—with respect to the development of natural resources all over the Nation. For instance, the change in the dam in the Snake River Valley, which had already been projected, follows the pattern as to the type of service we may expect under present circumstances.

I wish to congratulate both Senators from Tennessee, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and all other Senators who have had anything to say or anything to do in reference to this indefensible contract and the indefensible, cynical attitude of our Government toward a great project which has meant new life, new hope, new prosperity, and new appreciation of the functions of our Government in a great region, which not only has benefited the people of 10 States, but by its example, has benefited the people of all the other States of the Union.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the able junior Senator from Kentucky warmly and deeply for his generous remarks, for his eloquence today, and for his many valiant stands for the development of a program which has meant so very much to many, many people in the region of the great Tennessee River.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the President grossly exceeded his legitimate authority when he directed the Atomic Energy Commission, an independent agency, to execute the contract, even though there was protest on the part of some of the members of the Commission?

Mr. GORE. I find no provision of the atomic-energy law which confers any such authority upon the President of the United States; and I find no provision of the atomic-energy law which by the remotest construction would justify having the Atomic Energy Commissioners yield their independent responsibility as members of the Commission, the duties of which they had sworn to administer and uphold.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that this case follows a pattern deliberately calculated to destroy the TVA, and to weaken, if not wholly destroy, many of the other similar power developments in the United States?

Mr. GORE. I have so thought since I first heard of the contract. It has been only in the last few days, however, that concrete evidence has finally been produced, at great effort, pulled from the files of the administration, to show indisputably that the long-range plan was the "liquidation" of the TVA. I read the blueprint which Mr. Wenzell had prepared for the administration, and the steps the administratian was carefully following.

Yes; I think it was a plan to destroy the TVA. Furthermore, the administration was not content with forcing the city of Memphis out of the TVA distribution area; but for the last several days it has been trying to bludgeon the TVA and the city of Memphis into taking positions which would isolate the city of Memphis in the electric power field. Heretofore, the basic policy of the TVA has been integration and cooperation with the local efforts. In this case, under "the new order" we find the great city of Memphis, to which the Candidate Eisenhower went to make his pledges, the first segment of the TVA to be hacked out of it. It is ironical, indeed, that the people who, on that autumn afternoon, went to hear the candidate make his pledge, are the first victims of his turn-around.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a brief observation?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was deeply impressed by, and was in full accord with, the remarks made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who now is presiding over the Senate. If this is a pattern to destroy public power, to turn it over to private utilities—and I firmly believe it is a part of such a pattern and a part of such a campaign—is it not logical that even though, by reason of the great public outcry, the contract now has been canceled, we should be deeply distressed, highly suspicious, and greatly fearful, as the Senator from Kentucky has said, as to what may happen in the future? It seems to me that the prospect is a frightening one, and is one against which, in my opinion, we cannot protect ourselves unless we arouse public interest in support of what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and other Senators have been fighting for in connection with this matter.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator from New York.

I wish to call his attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission is the agency which entered into the contract. Yet, Mr. President, in the law establishing the Atomic Energy Commission I find no more provision conferring on the President of the United States any authority to dictate the execution of a contract that I find in that law authority for the President of the United States to dictate the cancellation of a contract. In short, I find no more excuse for the members of the Atomic Energy Commission to surrender, by means of the termination of a contract, their independence and their responsibility under the law, than I find to exist in the case of the execution of a contract. Mr. President, this is an unfortunate chapter in the history of America; it is a sorry story.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me congratulate and thank the two Senators from Tennessee for making this fight, and let me also thank the other Members of the Senate who stood shoulder to shoulder with them and participated in the fight. I think this is an issue which transcends description, and I wish to express my profound thanks to the Senators who have carried on the fight so valiantly.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. If this movement had been allowed to go on unchecked, it might easily have changed the entire economic and social life of this country.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Does the Senator have any notion that this order would have come about today had we not continued and pressed the fight?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no such idea. There would not have been a chance in the world.

Mr. GORE. Let me read again from the news-ticker item:

> Brownell put in that it was Eisenhower's "original intention" to let Memphis build its own powerplant.

"Brownell put in"—he is good at "putting in." To what extremes they will go to try to excuse themselves for this sorry deal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to add my word of congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee, who now occupies the floor, and to his senior colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER]; also to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators who have carried on the struggle.

The fight they have made is far more important than the public realizes as yet. As the junior Senator from Tennessee has just said, a policy was adopted with respect to the attitude of our Government toward public and private power. The Tennessee Valley Authority was condemned as creeping socialism, as the former Vice President has just said. The utility grabbers were described as normal American industry, when they were nothing of the kind.

Mr. GORE. They were described as local enterprise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Local enterprise; free enterprise.

Mr. GORE. Meaning their own enterprise and that of Wall Street.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the examination of Mr. Wenzell this afternoon, it was brought out that he was fully aware that the Middle South and Southern Companies were holding companies and that the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., otherwise known as the Dixon Yates Co., was a subsidiary of both of them. He testified that he knew of his own knowledge that the Middle South Co. had half a dozen wholly owned subsidiary operating companies, and that the Southern Co. had other wholly owned subsidiaries. This was a new subsidiary, to be owned by both of them, the majority interest to be in Middle South, and the minority interest in Southern. The enterprise was being supported by the executive branch of the Federal Government, although the record before the Securities and Exchange Commission showed that this operating subsidiary had an equity of only $5½ million in an enterprise which was to cost more than $100 million.

Mr. GORE. I interrupt to point out to the able Senator that not only is what he has said true, but before the corporation was even created the President ordered that the contract be negotiated with it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The charter of the corporation was written in New York City. It was notarized in New York City. The incorporators were three gentlemen whose names appear in the charter, all having the same address in New York City, 120 Broadway. Each of them had 1 share of stock, the capital stock being of $100 par value. In one of the articles of the charter it was recited that the corporation would begin its business with a capital of $300.

Mr. GORE. And receive a contract, at the President's personal dispensation, involving more than $500 million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly. I do not wish to occupy the floor unduly, but I desire to point out that this is a revelation which must be followed up. It is a warning that an invisible government will take over the affairs of the people of the United States unless the leadership of the Senators from Tennessee and the Senators from Alabama is followed by other Senators and by Members of the House who are watching the results of efforts being made today behind closed doors. Senators will remember what was predicted during the campaign of 1952 in one of the issues of the United States News and World Report. It was predicted that one of the objectives of the Republican Party, if elected to power, would be to sell the great institutions which had been built up by the Government of the United States to win the war. The movement was on, particularly, to dispose of public power.

Everything that TVA did, everything that the Government did for the Central Valley of California, everything that was done for the great reclamation projects and the public power projects of the Army engineers, and all the plans looking toward dams like the proposed dam in Hells Canyon, were before the public. The Congress of the United States, through the Appropriations Committees in both Houses, and through the Public Works and Interior Committees in both Houses, constantly held the spotlight upon everything that was being done to carry out the program of public power.

However, it required the Senators from Tennessee and the great Senator from Alabama, who made his speech upon the floor of this body, to reveal what was being done, after the most strenuous effort on the part of the executive branch of the Government to conceal the facts.

A fight is in progress against invisible government. My heart will be with President Eisenhower as he goes abroad to Geneva to attend the conference "at the summit." I have no particular confidence in the Soviet Government or in its expressed desire to end the cold war or to initiate a period of peace. However, I feel that if we are to retain popular government in the world we must be careful, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, to prevent the commission of any more crimes of this kind, through secret efforts behind closed doors, with names concealed, and with representatives of financial institutions dealing in bonds admitted to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Atomic Energy Commission secretly, their presence not being revealed to the Congress.

That emphasizes, I think, the battle between public government, in the public eye, and the invisible government which financial interests would try to erect in the United States if they were not prevented from doing so. It is for us to do the preventing.

I wish to pay my compliments to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senators from the TVA area, whose diligence and ability made possible the revelation of this startling raid upon the interests of the masses of the people.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able junior Senator from Wyoming. However, I must say to him that it is not entirely to the Senators from the Tennessee Valley to whom credit should be given for the cancellation of the contract. Credit also extends to the many Senators and many Representatives from without the Tennessee Valley, who recognized in the contract an unsavory nature and an assault upon the public welfare. It was in this Chamber that many Senators fought through the hours of the night against the principle of the Dixon-Yates deal. That fight was made by Senators far removed from the Tennessee Valley. They stood and fought. I remember coming into the Chamber at daybreak, after snatching a little sleep during the night, and finding the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] raising his voice against this contract. I use the Senator from Washington as an illustration only, because he represents in part a State as far away from the Tennessee Valley as any of our States. Many Senators and many Representatives have fought against the contract, and many members of the press have constantly held this unsavory contract before the public.

Senators have referred to the revelations. Those revelations are only now beginning. We have not yet uncovered all of the covert activities. I hope the junior Senator from Wyoming, the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from North Dakota will persist until the full story has been revealed.

Among those who fought through so many hours on the floor of the Senate is the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I now yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind. Rather than take time in my own right, I should like to make some observations, as a part of the Senator's remarks.

Of course, I congratulate the junior Senator from Tennessee, and the senior Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to whom the able Senator from Oregon has referred, stood at his desk, when he was not physically able to make a long speech, and spoke for 5 hours, and in that way provided magnificent leadership in this fight.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite right. I wish to stress my very sincere commendation to the three Senators I have named, along with many other Senators, but particularly to the three Senators. They have given to us the inspirational leadership and direction during the past year which has resulted in the scandalous nature of the Dixon-Yates contract being focused upon the attention of the American people. I agree with the Senator that the President of the United States had to surrender this afternoon and recommend the cancellation of the contract.

I have never taken the position that the President of the United States acted illegally in any course of action he took with regard to the Dixon-Yates contract; rather, it is my opinion that he acted extralegally. He made an inexcusable mistake in administrative policy, which resulted in serious detriment to sound public policy. It is not in the interest of good government for any President of the United States, at any time, to seek to give orders and direction to an independent agency. Not only that, but the President sought to give direction and orders to an independent agency created by Congress, and to determine policy and to administer policy in the field of atomic energy. As one Senator stated earlier this afternoon, the Atomic Energy Commission probably holds in its control greater responsibility with respect to the future of mankind than any other agency of government anywhere in the world.

I have always felt that the President of the United States was ill-advised in this instance.

I think it is a shame when the President is ill-advised. I think it is a shame that the President was so ill-advised that at the time he ordered and directed the negotiation of the Dixon-Yates contract he apparently was totally unaware of the fact that a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission—and that majority did not include its Chairman—were on written record, filed with the Bureau of the Budget, in opposition to the Dixon-Yates contract. The President was unaware that the two members of the board of directors of TVA—the third position being vacant at the time—had also filed a written memorandum in opposition to the contract.

Something is sadly lacking in administrative procedure when a President of the United States is not even informed about such important controlling operative facts as were involved in these two memoranda.

In spite of that record against the proposed contracts in the files of the Bureau of the Budget, someone persuaded the President to order and direct the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate the contract.

Of course I believe it will lead to malfeasance in government and to serious evils in the administration of government if the present President or any President in the future does not stop such a course of administrative policy. It cannot be reconciled with our system of checks and balances. I do not believe a President of the United States can ever justify stepping in and ordering and directing such a policy formation.

However, it does not follow that the President violated any law in doing so. I believe he exercised inexcusably bad judgment, and I also believe that he established a very dangerous administrative precedent when he took that course of action.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, like the senior Senator from Oregon, I have never asserted that the President acted illegally in ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate the contract against its will. I have expressed the gravest doubts as to the propriety and wisdom of his act. I have expressed the deepest of misgivings with respect to the supine surrender of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with that observation.

Mr. GORE. If the President of the United States could do this to the Atomic Energy Commission, could he not do the same thing to the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. MORSE. Undoubtedly, he could.

Mr. GORE. Or to the Federal Communications Commission, or to all the other independent agencies, upon the quasi-judicial character of which and the independence and probity of which Congress and the country have to depend?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. He will recall that earlier this year I was protesting an interference with the Civil Aeronautics Board, a part of the responsibility for which the Congress, however, has to share, because I think we have been delegating too much to the executive branch of the Government. In future legislation Congress must make it clear that we stand against interference in the exercise of duties and judgments by independent agencies of the Federal Government even though that interference may come from the President of the United States. I think that is very important.

Although I am gratified that the contract has been canceled, I am not rejoiced. In fact, I think, speaking introspectively, I could best describe my emotions tonight as emotions of sadness and concern for the future. I have these feelings of apprehension despite the great work done by the Senators from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], ably assisted by other Members, such as the Senators from Alabama, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]——

Mr. GORE. And the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I only played my little part. Assistance was given by other very able colleagues of the Senator from Tennessee.

As a result of the combined efforts of those who constantly pounded away on the scandal, month after month, we have finally forced a cancellation of the contract. Nevertheless, that does not end the problem, as I see it.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that we are confronted with other economic forces which are at work in our country today, I fear, to set up within the framework of democratic government an invisible government which I am inclined to call the corporate state, or the monopolistic state. I may say that whenever we get into such a situation that monopoly has its fingers around the economic throat of America, then we will have economic fascism controlling its economic life. If economic fascism should ever control the economic life of our country, we would discover that it also controls the Government, because, after all, political and economic life cannot be separated. There must be economic democracy as well as political democracy, if the people are to have economic and political freedom. It is as simple as that.

But I stand on the floor of the Senate tonight, Mr. President, with a heavy heart because I am deeply fearful of the development of economic fascism through monopolistic control of the economic life of our country. We must stop it. In my judgment, we have seen in the Dixon-Yates incident only one little bit of evidence of what I fear is going on throughout the economy of the Nation.

I can remember that about a year ago there was an attempt on the floor of the Senate to rush action on the Dixon-Yates matter in 1 day. There was a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on it on the same day it came from the House.

A very small group of us—and I wish again, as I did then, to thank the junior Senator from Tennessee for his leadership in that fight, which was a well-organized fight—for 13 days and some nights during the 13 days stood on this floor. I can remember that some of us on several occasions talked the night through because we thought it so important that we get at least some safeguarding amendments to the bill which would protect the interest of the public from the turning over of their whole atomic energy program to private monopolistic control in this country. We succeeded in some respects. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, I did not think we went far enough. I was prepared to talk until Christmas time, if necessary, to prevent the passage of a bill which I thought was unsound. Subsequent events have proved that we were right. Had we prevented the passage of the bill we would not have experienced some of the things which have happened since. But that is water over the dam, so to speak.

What I wish to point out is that I do not think we have yet solved the problem which confronts us as a Congress. I think it is important that we survey very carefully the contracts which are being let by other departments and commissions. I think that with reference to a great many of these contracts, big business, operating on a day and night basis, can be shown to have had some part to play in their development. For example, the colleague of the Senator from Tennessee has brought out effectively in his committee hearings in recent days, the part played by Wenzell in his subtle and behind the scenes—yes, subversive—attack on TVA; the part he played in developing the Dixon-Yates program as a means of scuttling the TVA program. Remember that this is the Wenzell of the Boston Corp., which is nothing but a Wall Street house of finance.

Mr. President, I hope and pray—and I use the word "pray" in its dictionary meaning—that the President of the United States will have learned a lesson from this very sad experience, and that he will order, through his various departments, a very careful scrutiny of contracts which have been let and which are being proposed to be let to great business combines in this country which might lead to monopolistic control. I hope he will take a look at the whole program, including the Hells Canyon Dam project, because I say, most respectfully, to the President of the United States, that in the Hells Canyon Dam project there is another situation in which a powerful monopolistic combine is seeking to take away from the American people a heritage in a great natural resource which should be developed for the benefit of the people of the United States.

It is a matter of sadness with me to express, as I did months ago, and as I did during the 13-day debate last year on the whole Dixon-Yates matter, my complete lack of confidence in Admiral Strauss, the head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In view of what has been brought out in the hearings, I think something should be said about the part he played. He has not come clean with the committee. He purported to give us a chronological statement of visits, but he did not disclose that Wenzell was one of the visitors.

His testimony during the past year has, in my judgment, destroyed any right on the part of the Congress or the administration to have any confidence in him. I am sorry to say that, but that is the way I feel about it. He made his record; I did not make it. I think his part in pushing through the Dixon-Yates contract disqualifies him for further service on the Atomic Energy Commission, because, in my judgment, he yielded the independence of that Commission, and I think it is perfectly clear from the evidence which has been brought out by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that he did so.

I think now is the time, if the President wishes to restore public confidence in the atomic-energy program, for him to bring about a housecleaning and to see to it that we do not have to do further congressional business with the Chairman of this Commission—a man in whom a great many of us have lost confidence.

I close by saying that these things happen in government. They have always happened in government in varying degrees. It was not so long ago that we heard on the floor of the Senate a great amount of criticism because of mink coats and deep freeze scandals on the part of some of the underlings in the Truman administration being brought to light. But I am satisfied that that was petty larceny on the part of individual Government officials compared with the grand larceny represented by what they were trying to get by with in the Dixon-Yates contract and what they are trying to get by with in connection with some other contracts.

I say it is a sad thing to have going on, no matter what administration may be in office, whether it be a Democratic administration with petty scandals involving mink coats and deep freezes, or the Eisenhower administration, with its scandals of grand larceny proportions, much of it within the legal technicalities of the law. We must never forget that the people are losing just as much by deals within the technicalities of the law as would happen if the administration were engaged in the kind of extra-legal grand larceny which took place at the time of Teapot Dome.

I think that now that the contract is to be canceled, the Eisenhower administration owes it to the American people to make it perfectly clear that it is going to order a complete investigation of the whole contract-letting procedure which has been followed since the administration came into office, to the end that the American people can be assured that any tendency toward the development of monopolistic control of our economy will be brought to an end, because it ought to be brought to an end if we are to preserve economic freedom, with corresponding political freedom, for the American people.

Mr. GORE. The able, distinguished, and brilliant senior Senator from Oregon not only has contributed generously today of his thoughts and his talents, but also throughout the debate on the contract he has been one of the strong pillars in opposition to it. I remind him that the Dixon-Yates contract is but an example, and a sorry example, of the administration's power policy.

We have won a magnificent victory in forcing the cancellation of the contract. We have suffered a serious loss, however, in doing so, because we have witnessed the first major dismemberment of the TVA service area; and it is that integrated, diversified service area which, in large part, has made the low power-rate structure possible.

Just as the Dixon-Yates contract is an example, so also is Hells Canyon another example. Now that the administration is in flight with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract, I will join with the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators in pursuit of the Hells Canyon project, too, until the administration is in flight.

I wish to say, in the philosophical vein in which the able Senator from Oregon spoke, that I have never at any time, for the slightest moment, suspected any venality on the part of the President in this matter. President Eisenhower is a big man, a man above even such a thought. I believe the wrong has occurred—and I say this in the utmost sincerity—as a result of his action in placing implicit faith in, and in turning over the policymaking function of his administration almost exclusively to, the representatives of vested interests.

I can fully believe that a man like Mr. Wenzell is sincere in his recommendations about the TVA. I am prepared to believe that other persons in the Government are sincere believers that their views are commensurate with the public welfare. But, Mr. President, a man can be sincerely and enthusiastically wrong. I believe it is in that field that President Eisenhower has erred so grossly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will yield for a few questions, so that we may have established a body of facts on this point.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my belief that the company which owns the holding companies to which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] referred, and which ultimately, therefore, controls the group sponsoring the Dixon-Yates contract, is the Electric Bond & Share Co., of New York, or its successors?

Mr. GORE. I am not prepared to say that it is owned by them entirely, but it is largely, if not entirely, held by that group.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The record of Electric Bond & Share Co. in the 1920's and the early 1930's was quite thoroughly developed at that time, was it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed. It was in the 1930's that the city of Memphis, in a public referendum, voted by a ratio of 18 to 1 to free itself of this same corporate interest. It was this same group to whom the President attempted to deliver back the responsibility for supplying power to the people of Memphis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The so-called Ebasco company is merely an abbreviation for Electric Bond and Share Co., is it not?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We in Illinois have had some experience with Ebasco company, because they constructed a power plant on the Illinois side of the river, opposite the Paducah atomic-energy plant. As a matter of fact, the costs of the Ebasco plant were some $56 million in excess of the amount which was originally set as the cost of construction. Furthermore, the delays were of many, many months' duration. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is very true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should first like to complete the record; then I shall yield.

While it is true that some of the added costs and some of the delays were caused by labor practices which have resulted in the conviction of two labor leaders, one of them quite prominent in southern Illinois, still is it not also true that not all of the increase in costs was attributable to this cause?

Mr. GORE. I have never thought all the increased costs were so attributable; nor does the record so indicate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from Illinois also, in order to clear the record, be prepared to state when the Ebasco contract was entered into, and under what administration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it was entered into under the Truman administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think what I am about to say has a bearing on the subject. After all, birds of a feather not only flock together; they also live together.

The address of Ebasco is 2 Rector Street, New York, and the address of Middle South Utilities is 2 Rector Street, New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the address of the organization which succeeded the Electric Bond & Share Co.?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have that information.

Mr. GORE. The address of Dixon-Yates is 2 Rector Street, New York; and the address of the accountants used by Dixon-Yates is 2 Rector Street, New York. They all occupy the same office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my good friend from California that I am glad he brought out that point. I would be just as much opposed to what Ebasco stands for and is employed to do—and, in my judgment, it is really a modern corporate device for getting around the type of corporate evil which existed at the time of the Insull fiasco—if it were born in a Democratic administration and allowed to live on and commit its depredations during a Republican administration, as I would be if it were born in a Republican administration and allowed to live on during a Democratic administration.

Mr. GORE. I say in all sincerity that I hope this will be a lesson to President Eisenhower. I hope he will learn by this example that it is not in the public interest to delegate so many policy-making functions exclusively to big money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that what is ethically deplorable in the Wenzell case is that at the same time Wenzell was serving as consultant to the Bureau of the Budget in the Dixon-Yates matter, and was presumably, therefore, a Government employee, he was also a highly paid official of the First Boston Corp., and was giving to the Bureau of the Budget information and advice which would have been beneficial to the First Boston Corp. had the plans gone through as it was originally intended they should?

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the sworn testimony before the Antimonopoly Subcommittee, I have read the sworn testimony before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and I have conducted some examinations myself in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I cannot see by what measure President Eisenhower can still defend the role of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell as being proper. Each time when Mr. Wenzell signed in at the Atomic Energy Commission, supposedly serving as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget, he signed the security slip as a representative of the First Boston Corp. Where there is a conflict of interest, one cannot serve two masters. Where there is a conflict of interest, a lawyer cannot represent both clients.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not really one of the first principles of legal ethics that one cannot serve what are termed adverse interests; that a lawyer cannot serve a plantiff and defendant at the same time; that he can serve only one set of interests as attorney, and the other set of interests must be represented by another attorney? In an adjustment of the conflict, each attorney can serve the best interests of his particular client. It is believed that in that way better justice can be obtained than if one man, under the same hat, served both interests.

Mr. GORE. If a member of the bar undertakes such a performance, he is subject to disbarment. Yet by some strange measurement, the action of Mr. Wenzell is adjudged to be proper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. In the next day or two the Senate will be considering the Defense Production Act. Some of us were successful in writing into the Defense Production Act the provision that dollar-a-year men—namely, men paid by private companies but serving the Government—should not occupy positions of responsibility in governmental agencies. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if the Wenzell experience does not indicate the need for such a provision as the one I have mentioned?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so; indeed so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, there is some question as to whether the provision which the Democratic members of the Committee on Banking and Currency wrote into the Defense Production Act is stringent enough, because it bars them from positions of administrative responsibility, whereas Mr. Wenzell had no administrative responsibility, but was in effect making policy.

Mr. GORE. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget testified that during a considerable period of Mr. Wenzell's service he had no other expert in the field in which Mr. Wenzell was working. It is clear that although Mr. Wenzell was not officially holding a policymaking position, studies and reports which he presented and opinions he pressed were accepted by the administration. To that extent he did participate in the making of policy. I believe that is now clear from the testimony which has been adduced.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the evidence will show that in the Department of Commerce at the present time some 29 dollar-a-year men are occupying responsible positions; that in 15 cases such men are the heads of industry branches, that 3 dollar-a-year men, so-called—those serving without compensation, but paid by private concerns—are in the Office of Defense Mobilization. Those men are in responsible positions.

Mr. GORE. Let me say again that those gentlemen may hold their opinions sincerely, they may be patriotically motivated, but one can be enthusiastically and sincerely wrong, and his views may be contrary to the public interest; and it should not be on that group exclusively that this administration should depend for its advice and policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not merely a question of their being wrong—we are all liable to be wrong—but as a great ethical teacher, the Saviour of mankind, said, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other."

Mr. GORE. I endorse what the Master said in that respect and in all others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask a few further questions about Mr. Wenzell? Is it not true that Mr. Wenzell frequently visited the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to this matter?

Mr. GORE. The record so shows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he took part in a number of important conferences, did he not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At those conferences Admiral Strauss was present, was he not?

Mr. GORE. At some of them; yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that Admiral Strauss, in the chronology which he submitted, omitted any mention of Mr. Wenzell's name, or any participation by Mr. Wenzell?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that Admiral Strauss said he could not remember Mr. Wenzell being present at the conferences?

Mr. GORE. I do not recall. That may be true. I am unprepared to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe it is true. Was that not a very grave omission on the part of Admiral Strauss?

Mr. GORE. There have been grave omissions on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall come to the action of the Bureau of the Budget in a moment.

Mr. GORE. I think it was a grave omission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Tennessee feel that the antimonopoly subcommittee, under the chairmanship of his colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, should summon Admiral Strauss to the stand, and ask him to testify as to how it happened that the name of Mr. Wenzell was omitted from the chronology?

Mr. GORE. I think Mr. Strauss should be questioned. I think Mr. Dodge, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, should be questioned. I think Mr. Wood, head of the First Boston Corp. should be questioned. There are many persons who should be searchingly examined, in order to arrive at a determination of the genesis of the Dixon-Yates deal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask some questions about Mr. Hughes, who is now Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I am not certain he was the Director at the time under discussion. Did Mr. Hughes testify recently that he did not know that the First Boston Corp. was to be the financial agent for this group?

Mr. GORE. I heard Mr. Hughes so testify.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that Mr. Arthur H. Deane, who is at present one of the senior partners in Sullivan and Cromwell, now attorneys for the First Boston Corp., said that he thought everybody knew that the First Boston Corp. was the financial agent for the Dixon-Yates group?

Mr. GORE. I believe he said he thought everyone in Government and financial circles knew it. He did say that he did not think it was a secret.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that the present Director of the Budget should profess ignorance on this point?

Mr. GORE. I thought that very strange.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Tennessee think that the Director of the Budget should be asked to explain his ignorance on this very important matter?

Mr. GORE. The Director of the Budget has already been asked to explain it, and he asserted that he did not know that the First Boston Corp. was financial agent, and still did not believe it. After more evidence is adduced, it might be well to make further inquiry of Mr. Hughes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been very active in trying to bring to light the record in this matter. Has he had any cooperation from the administrative agencies in bringing out the facts concerning Mr. Wenzell's part and the proposal of Mr. Wenzell and other groups for the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. GORE. I must say, if one can call it cooperation, it has been very reluctantly given.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator call it cooperation?

Mr. GORE. In all fairness, I could not call it that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say to the junior Senator from Tennessee that I think he, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who I think in a speech on the Senate floor first revealed in part the role of Mr. Wenzell, deserve the congratulations and thanks of the American people. Unpleasant as the task may be, I hope that further facts may be brought out.

Mr. GORE. I thank the senior Senator from Illinois.

Again, Mr. President, I must say that I cannot claim major credit for this victory on behalf of the Senators from the Tennessee Valley. I would again recall the magnificient contributions of many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and the valiant fights which have been waged by the many loyal and patriotic Members of the other body; and I would not omit expressing appreciation for the fine efforts made by our stricken Democratic leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, I should like to close by saying that I am genuinely glad that the contract has been terminated before President Eisenhower goes to the Geneva conference. It is with the united support of the Senate and, I believe, of the country, that he goes to that conference. It is well that he has rid himself of this albatross before he departs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, obviously at this late hour in the evening I do not intend to delay the Senate for a prolonged period of time. I had not intended to speak tonight. However, in view of some of the statements which have been made, I think, for purposes of historic accuracy, a brief statement should be made.

In the first place, Mr. President, in the Constitution, in section I, it is stated that the executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States of America.

Reference was made by my good friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to a hope on his part that there would be a TVA in every river valley of the Nation. I think every Member of the Senate is certainly entitled to that viewpoint. I do not happen to agree with it. I think there is a vast difference between the TVA organization, as it was set up in the valley of the Tennessee, and some of the great public works projects which have been carried on in other sections of the Nation. I have personally visited the TVA area. I was impressed by much of the work which had been done there in the fields of flood control, power development, irrigation, and the carrying on of other activities which certainly have been of value to the people of the Tennessee Valley.

I wish to say that I think the President of the United States made it very clear that he was not in favor of liquidation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, but that he did believe it was a matter of basic national policy to decide whether for an unlimited period of time, without restraint of any type or character whatever, the Federal Government, as such, had an obligation to go on building additional steam-powered generating units.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. O'MAHONEY] probably knows as well as does any other Member of this body, in the development of the public power projects, the Federal Government relied upon certain of the constitutional provisions regarding the control of navigable rivers and certain other phases of our constitutional system. Then, in order to firm up the power developed by the hydroelectric resources, there has been a point of view, which I think has some merit, that steam plants can be developed at least to firm up the hydroelectric power. But I doubt very much whether in firming up hydroelectric power, such a case can be made, when, according to the testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, at the present time the steam-powered generating capacity in the Tennessee Valley Authority is more than 60 percent of the total capacity, and by the year 1958, if I am not mistaken, will be in excess of 70 percent of the total generating capacity.

Mr. President, I think President Eisenhower quite probably thought this was a matter involving a basic national policy, and that if we were to engage in an unlimited development of steam-powered generating facilities in the Valley of the Tennessee, then did not the people of New England have the right to obtain Federal funds for the construction of powerplants there, or did not the people of the Deep South or the people of the Midwest or the people on the far Pacific coast have a similar right, and that determination should be made as to the extent to which the Federal Government should go in regard to the building of steam-powered generating facilities, as distinguished from the firming up of power developed by hydroelectric resources.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there has been some discussion, on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere—and quite properly, I think—regarding the dangers of monopolistic practice. However, I think some case can be made—although all men may not agree with it—to the effect that certainly in the power field in the valley of the Tennessee there is a degree of monopoly which at least makes it questionable whether it should be extended to all sections of the Nation; because in other sections, at least where public resources have been developed—and I have supported such development in many areas, as the distinguished presiding officer knows, even in the case of the building of transmission lines, where I felt that was necessary in order to get the power from the point of generation to the load center—there has also been room for the development of private powerplants and the development of private industry, when well regulated and well managed, whereas in the case of the valley of the Tennessee, when I was there, the authorities were quite frank in saying that in the contracts they negotiated, they provided for complete exclusiveness, which, perhaps, if done in other sections of the country, might be subject to congressional investigation as being a monopolistic practice.

As I say, Mr. President, we have had this great experiment in the valley of the Tennessee. Certainly I am sure the President of the United States does not want to see it liquidated or dismantled. But, by the same token, I think there is involved a grave matter of national policy as to how far we wish that extended, and whether, in fact, we wish it to be a Federal experiment in power development to be extended throughout the 48 States of the Union, and to cover every foot of ground of our country. I think that is a basic policy for the people of the United States to pass upon, before we embark upon it.

Mr. President, when the President of the United States was informed that there would be a shortage of power in the valley of the Tennessee—and there is a growing need for power there, as there is in other sections of the country—he did not want, either in its industrial activities or in its domestic uses or in its agricultural uses, the valley of the Tennessee to suffer because of any such shortage of power. Therefore, as a temporary expedient, until the Congress of the United States should pass upon the broader national policy, he suggested a separate power contract as a possibility.

As a matter of fact, when a group had come from Tennessee and, I think, even from the city of Memphis, the President at one time had suggested that Memphis itself might do what Memphis has finally decided to do. But at that time it was indicated to the President of the United States that Memphis and its officials were not interested in following such a procedure.

Mr. President, at the meeting today the President said he was delighted to see Mayor Tobey and to learn of the decision of Memphis to build a powerplant capable of meeting the requirements of the Memphis area.

The President said that he had favored construction of such a plant by the city of Memphis from the beginning as the alternative to the construction by the TVA of another steam plant. The President told Mr. Tobey that he saw no more reason to spend Federal funds for the construction of another steam plant to provide power in the Tennessee Valley than in the valley of the Kansas River.

The President said it was only after being informed that the city of Memphis could not undertake to build such a plant, that the Dixon-Yates project was developed. It was developed, he said, as a means of assuring that Memphis would not suffer a power shortage as a result of the siphoning off of additional power by the Atomic Energy Commission.

At the conclusion of the reading by Mayor Tobey of his statement, the President said that the Federal Government would immediately take steps to terminate the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. President, I think the President of the United States has acted in conformity with what he believes to be sound national policy. Of course, for varying reasons, men may take different points of view regarding an action which has been taken. I think the President of the United States has stated very clearly what his objective has been. I think it is a matter which our great policy-determining body, of which we in the Senate are one arm, the other arm being the other part of the legislative branch of the Government, will ultimately have to pass upon; and, of course, in the final analysis, it is a great issue upon which the American people will have to pass.

How far are we to expand the Federal Government into the power business? Are we to do it to the exclusion of all private industry? How far are we to go in subjugating even municipal utility plants or local regional utility plants to the vast power of the Federal Government?

Some statements were made earlier in the afternoon to the effect that a great danger arose in some of the European countries because they became corporate states. I think we all must be alert to that danger. I also call attention to the fact that the great corporate states of Europe, under fascism and under nazism, were, in form, national socialism. Ultimately they were permitted to develop into vast corporate structures. Then they moved from that status to the situation in which the state took over and became the owner of the corporate structure. Thereby the state itself fastened its hold and control upon the life and economic existence of every worker and every individual within the state.

So we must guard against the national socialism, which would find an easy out, perhaps, in socializing a great part of our national economy.

I am not in favor of taking that route, and I doubt whether many other Members of this body or Members of the other body, or the American people, want to follow that route, which has led to disaster in other sections of the world.

There is room for an honest difference of opinion concerning the matter of policy. I think these questions can be debated without rancor, and without questioning the motives of the President of the United States, or of other men of great ability who have served the cause of our country.

I do not believe this contract can properly be charged, as it was today, with being as bad a contract as was indicated. As a matter of fact, I think it was a far better contract than those negotiated under the prior administration.

I would be less than frank if I did not say that I doubt very much the advisability of the procedures which were used in connection with this case. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I think it was unfortunate that the Atomic Energy Commission was brought into the case at all. I think it would have been far better if it had been handled by the Tennessee Valley Authority itself. I think it could have been done in that way, and at the same time, the President could have maintained what I think is a perfectly sound position, namely, that the public policy ought to be established first, before the Federal Government continues to build steam plants. It could have been done in that way, because the law itself gives first priority, in the matter of power in the Tennessee Valley area, to the national defense needs.

That could have been done in what might have been a very arbitrary manner, because the Atomic Energy Commission could have asked for whatever additional power it needed. The Congress—not only a Republican Congress, but a Democratic Congress, as well—has refused to vote funds for additional steam facilities. So if the Congress of the United States refused to vote the funds, and the power was not created in that way, and, by the same token, the Federal Government had the right, under the priority and preference clauses, to demand additional power, the valley of the Tennessee would have found itself in a greatly squeezed position. It would have had more power taken from it, and there would have been no power coming in, which would have been detrimental to the industrial, agricultural, and domestic uses of the valley of the Tennessee. It was to avoid that type of situation that the President of the United States—I believe in good faith—suggested this alternative.

This may not have been the only alternative. There might have been additional alternatives. We know that there were. Congress might have said, "Yes; we will go on for an unlimited period of time, building additional steam plants We will do it in the valley of the Tennessee, but we will do it nowhere else. We will not do it in New England. We will not do it in the Deep South. We will not do it in the Midwest. We will not do it in the far East. But so far as the valley of the Tennessee is concerned, it will have an unlimited blank check. It can call upon us for unlimited steam-power development."

That is an alternative which could have been used, but I respectfully suggest that both a Democratic Congress and a Republican Congress have refused to do precisely that. There may have been some other alternatives. I shall not take the time tonight to discuss them, except to say that I think men may honestly differ in the matter of public policy without having their integrity challenged.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment very briefly on one point which my friend from California has raised.

He speaks about the danger of the development of a socialistic state in this country because of the development of a public-power program. He uses, as an historic example, the development of Communist and Nazi regimes in Europe. I point out to my friend from California a very great difference. Under any so-called national socialist regime or Communist regime there is no private enterprise.

In contrast, the development of the natural resources of our country in the hydroelectric areas has been a great stimulus to the strengthening of private-enterprise institutions.

Let us keep in mind the fact that there is no possible danger of the development of any power monopoly by the Federal Government, but there is a very real danger of the development of a power monopoly by the private utilities of the country. In round numbers the private utilities in the United States today develop more than 80 percent of the power. According to the latest figures I have seen, a little less than 18 percent of the power is developed by so-called municipal or Federal plants.

What we have in this situation is not any danger of development of Federal monopoly, or the development of any State socialism, or the development of communism. We have here a very sound doctrine of the Federal Government doing for the people what they cannot do for themselves, and doing it in a way which strengthens the whole private-enterprise system of the country.

Constantly in the debates in the Senate we hear references to monopoly as private enterprise. A private utility is not a private enterprise. It is a private monopoly. It is a business structure which requires careful regulation by government, because it is not subject to competition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suppose, in various areas of the country that the regulations of State regulatory bodies may be good, bad, or indifferent, and that men may honestly differ on that score. But at least I believe that in most, if not all, the States of the Union, the State regulatory bodies are supposed to have certain standards in order to establish rates for public utilities, in an exchange, more or less, for the fact that they do enjoy a monopoly, and therefore are not competitive, in the sense that we normally think about competitive private business.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct, but that does not make a private utility a private-enterprise establishment. To the contrary, it is recognized that there is a constant potential danger when we establish a monopoly; and the Government must exercise its protective powers in order to see to it that the people are not exploited.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California would not differ in the slightest degree on that point.

We also know that there is a difference between a privately owned public utility—albeit a monopoly, and properly regulated, as it would have to be because of the danger of having it unregulated, which danger would be all the Senator has indicated—and a publicly owned utility. The privately owned public utility is a taxpayer to the State, to the county, to the city, and to the school district, as the case may be—and that varies from State to State, probably, depending upon the exact form in which the taxes are levied, whereas a public-owned public utility, which offers certain advantages and in many instances a lower rate, does not give the same taxpayer support to the local community or to the State in the same degree.

Mr. MORSE. On that point the Senator from California and I decidedly differ as to the taxing results of a private utility and of a public utility. I respectfully submit that the mathematics are overwhelmingly in favor of my position in this argument, namely, that TVA, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, or any of the other great public power developments produce for the Treasury of the United States and for local communities many times the tax returns that would be produced by smaller privately owned utilities in the same locality. That is the point of the argument I arose to make.

There is no danger of this program developing into any form of national socialism, or into a Nazi program or a Communist program, because we are dealing with a very important arm of the private-enterprise system, with the Government coming to the assistance of and strengthening the private-enterprise system. These programs bring into various communities private enterprises which would never come there otherwise in any such strength, if we were to let the private utilities skim off the cream of the profits of a river development with low-head dams and small private-utility development where the situation calls for a major multipurpose development.

What we have here, in my judgment, is the American system put to work in one of its best forms. We have the Federal Government providing private enterprise in a given area with the cheap power it needs, so that private enterprise can flourish and pay tax dollars into the local, State, and Federal treasuries. That happens to be the tax record of these developments.

I care not what part of the country we mark off for a comparison between the tax dollars which result from the skimpy development that goes along with the so-called low-head dams, and the very great development that goes along with the multipurpose dams. No matter where we look, we can find the beneficiary of the multipurpose dam. The beneficiary happens to be all the people of the United States. They benefit by way of increased tax dollars.

I wish to stress that point, because the Senator from California and I have an honest difference of opinion on the subject. It represents an entirely different approach to the problem of developing the natural resources of our country.

We differ over steam plants. It is my position that when we bring about a great development such as TVA, and have invested the taxpayers' dollars in it, it is sound economy to see to it that we maintain that development in its most efficient form of operation. That is why steam plants are needed.

I should like to say a word about the Northeast. Earlier this afternoon a little discussion occurred with reference to the Niagara project. I am in favor of developing a public power yardstick in the East. When such a yardstick is established, an end will be brought to the highest electric rate paid by any area in the United States. Why are the rates in the Northeast so high? It is not because there are not great power resources in the Northeast which could be developed, but because the Northeast does not have great Federal power projects. I am in favor of providing some competition to the private utility monopolistic combine in the Northeast That is a part of the argument.

We can differ as to whether this approach should have been made through TVA or whether it should have been made through the Atomic Energy Commission. Certainly it should not have been made through the Atomic Energy Commission. The Atomic Energy Commission should not have been dragged into this political arena. When the President ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to make this contract, Congress had no other course of action to follow but the one it followed. It became necessary for us thoroughly to investigate the matter and to bring to an end this kind of interference with an agency which, in my judgment, should not have been interfered with by the White House.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Now that all Senators who have spoken today on this subject have agreed it was an error to bring the Atomic Energy Commission into this matter, can the Senator not foresee that at least some good can come from this unfortunate incident in our history, the good being a chastened Atomic Energy Commission, with the hope that the Commissioners will exercise the independence and the responsibility conferred upon them by law?

Mr. MORSE. I hope that will be one of the beneficial results. However, time alone will prove whether the Senator from Tennessee is right about that. I seriously doubt that it will be the result until a personnel change is made within the Commission, to which I have previously alluded.

I close with one final comment on what my friend, the Senator from California, had to say. Again, Mr. President, I always try to look upon the effect of a policy, whether it is a congressional policy or an executive policy, upon our system of checks and balances. I wish to repeat tonight that, after all, governmental safety and the rights and the other liberties of the American people will always be dependent upon the extent to which we in Congress, when we are involved in a conflict with the Executive, make certain that the system of checks and balances is rigidly followed.

I do not agree that a President of the United States is justified in taking the position that, unless a municipality proceeds to supply itself with power as the President thinks it should, his course of action is a sound public-policy course of action. I do not believe it is good for our system of checks and balances; in fact, I do not believe it is good for our Federal-State relationship for a President, in effect, to say to Memphis, Tenn., "Unless you proceed to build a power plant, I am going to direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build a plant, and put you in such a position that you will have to buy power from that plant rather than from TVA."

That is what it boils down to. It is not in keeping with our system of checks and balances. Therefore, I think we were right in Congress—or at least those of us who followed through in this connection—in taking the position that his action involved an interference on the part of the President of the United States with municipal affairs.

I do not believe it is good to permit a President to participate in that kind of local interference. No matter how we approach the problem, I believe the President was wrong. He was wrong in directing the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into the contract. He was wrong in saying, in effect, to the city of Memphis, "Unless you do this, we are going to direct a contract to be let with the Dixon-Yates organization."

Therefore, we get back, it seems to me, to the old principle for which we fought so hard a year ago, namely, that the responsibility at all times for determining this policy lies in Congress. The President should have waited until Congress had determined the policy. Then, if he did not like it, he should have determined whether he could garner enough votes to sustain a veto. I do not believe he should have exercised the arbitrary Executive power that he exercised.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). If no Member of the Senate desires to be recognized at this time, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 11, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Wilber Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be Secretary of the Army.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated.

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 11, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who art worthy of all adoration and allegiance, may we enter upon this new week resolved and determined to surrender ourselves in courage and confidence to Thy holy will.

Thou alone canst enable us to meet victoriously the duties and demands which daily vex and baffle our minds for Thou art all wise and all powerful.

Grant that we may strive with every means and capacity at our command to build a Nation that is obedient and responsive to Thy divine law.

Show us how the life of our Republic and the legislation which we are enacting may be touched and permeated with more of spiritual significance and fineness.

May we always seek to blend the lofty spirit of religion, the spirit of justice and righteousness with our politics, for in so doing our national life will be nobler and more fruitful for the welfare of humanity.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who rules men and nations with the scepter of love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 7, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 787. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes; and

S. 1210. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, July 7, 1955, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

And on July 8, 1955, sign enrolled bills of the Senate and House as follows:

S. 609. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons;

S. 804. An act to amend section 201 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

AMENDING SECTION 3 OF TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL TO BE CONSIDERED THURSDAY, JULY 14

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to take up the supplementary appropriation bill on Thursday next.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill will be reported tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON. It will be reported tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. And that it will give the membership time to check it over and see what it contains.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. Hearings are already available.

Mr. TABER. That will be all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the gentleman wants this bill programed for Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. If agreeable to the House, the 3-day rule to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman did confer with me and my inquiry is made so that the membership of the House will understand that this bill will come up on Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. We expect to report out the bill tomorrow which will allow a day for the Members to look it over and we would like to take it up on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 7201 and 7205.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on July 26 and on July 27, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN MATTERS

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. R. 304, Rept. No. 1089), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee:

(1) The transportation and distribution of mail, including—

(A) the transportation of regular mail by air;

(B) the discontinuance of post offices and rural routes; and

(C) the utilization of common carriers and other facilities for the transportation of mail;

(2) Actions taken and procedures followed with respect to the classification and ap-

pointment of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service;

(3) General administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(4) Fiscal administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(5) The mailability of articles and printed matter generally, including, among other things, the mailing of unsolicited articles with requests for payments or contributions;

(6) The application and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including—

(A) the operation and effect of Executive Order No. 10577, dated November 22, 1954, and effective January 23, 1955, relating to the establishment of a new appointment system for the competitive civil service;

(B) the operation and effect of the provisions of the Federal Employees' Uniform Allowance Act, as amended, the provisions relating to premium compensation contained in the Federal Employees' Pay Act Amendments of 1954, and other provisions of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.);

(C) methods of, and limitations on, (i) job classification, (ii) appointments, (iii) assignment of positions to schedules A, B, and C, (iv) distribution of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, and (v) separation of employees; and

(D) the desirability and effect of the limitations imposed by law on the performance of personal services within the Federal Government and the extent to which such limitations have caused the Federal Government to enter into contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of administrative and management services;

(7) The operations of the United States Civil Service Commission;

(8) Administrative actions and procedures pursuant to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(9) Practices and procedures of the United States Civil Service Commission and the departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government relating to the examination of applicants for civilian positions in or under the Federal Government;

(10) Actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigation and study, conducted by the committee under authority of House Resolution 32, 83d Congress, with respect to dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(11) Dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of positions, number of positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate; and

(12) The organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That no such investigation or study by the committee shall duplicate any investigation or study which is being conducted by any other standing committee of the House of Representatives.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Barden
Barrett
Buchanan
Burnside
Chatham
Chenoweth
Christopher
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Dorn, S. C.
Eberharter
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Gathings
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gubser
Hayworth
Hébert
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holt
Hosmer
James
Johnson, Calif.
Kearney
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDowell
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Morrison
Mumma
Nelson
Norblad
Osmers
Perkins
Phillips
Polk
Powell
Prouty
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Rogers, Colo.
Sadlak
St. George
Scudder
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Taylor
Tuck
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Younger
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING SESSION TODAY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon while the House is in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine may sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] will be recognized 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill under consideration requests funds to continue the mutual-security program for another year. For the benefit of the new Members of the House, it may be apropos to mention the several names under which the foreign-aid program has operated during the postwar years:

First, 1945 through 1947 it was known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency—UNRRA.

Second, 1948 through December 29, 1951, it was known as the Economic Cooperation Administration—ECA.

Third, December 30, 1951, through July 31, 1953, it was known as the Mutual Security Administration—MSA.

Fourth, August 1, 1953, through June 30, 1955, it was known as the Foreign Operations Administration—FOA.

Fifth, the new name for our foreign-aid agency, effective July 1, 1955, is the International Cooperation Administration—ICA.

In all probability, this new name will be good through the 84th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, my position at this time reminds me of a school controversy that prevailed years ago down in the grand old State of Louisiana. In a particular school there were two stubborn factions, one believing and arguing that the world was round, the other faction believing and arguing that the world was flat. Finally, one day the argument reached a climax and the school found itself without a principal. So it became necessary for the school board members to interview applicants so as to secure a new school principal. After many applicants had been interviewed and eliminated on account of their position on the question, another young man was called in for an interview and the question was put to him squarely.

"Mr. Jones, do you believe that the world is round or flat?"

The alert applicant immediately replied, "Gentlemen, I am prepared to teach the subject either way."

Mr. Chairman, on account of my past record with respect to foreign aid, no doubt many of my friends in the House are wondering if I am not in the same position.

Mr. Chairman, the estimate of appropriations for the programs covered by the Mutual Security Act of 1955, as submitted to the Congress, totals $3,266,641,750. The estimate includes language to continue the availability of balances remaining unexpended as of June 30, 1955, as authorized in the basic legislation.

We are recommending an appropriation totaling $2,638,741,750 for fiscal year 1956, a reduction of $627,900,000 in the budget estimates. Also, a reduction of $21,366,750 was made in the estimated balances reported as unobligated on June 30, 1955.

A reduction of $420 million was approved by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations on the basis of a written understanding between responsible officials of the Department of Defense and the committee that $420 million of the estimated unobligated balance of $932 million as of June 30 should not be released by the Bureau of the Budget for reservation by the Department of Defense.

In the hearings before the subcommittee, we were told at one point that the unobligated balance on June 30 would be $100 million. At a later date the witnesses stated that the unobligated balance would be $620 million, and at a still later date, it was admitted that the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1955, would be $932 million.

However, after we received a letter of agreement from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense that $420 million should not be released by the budget for reservation, other officials of the FOA and the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense prevailed upon the budget to permit them to obligate all of the amount with the exception of approximately $33 million.

In the last hour of the last day of the fiscal year, by some means or method, the FOA managed to place in the reservation category hundreds of millions of dollars which would be in direct violation of the law if it were not for the fact that they claim a reservation is not the same as an obligation. On that basis, it is obvious that a great majority of the reservations made by FOA are nothing more than unobligated balances.

DIRECT FORCES SUPPORT

For this item the budget estimate was $317,200,000. Your committee recommends an appropriation of $305 million, which is a reduction of $12,200,000. It should be pointed out that of the total of $690,700,000 made available to date for this purpose, there remained unexpended as of April 30, 1955, the sum of $544 million, which is nearly 80 percent of the total availability.

DEFENSE SUPPORT FOR ASIA

For this item the budget requested a new appropriation of $827,800,000, plus a reappropriation of an unexpended balance of $25 million. The committee was advised that as of April 30, 1955, there remained unobligated for this portion of the program for Asia the sum of $1,560,800,000, and on the basis of these large unused funds, the committee reduced the budget request by $52,800,000.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR ASIA

The budget estimate for this area is $71 million, of which $1 million is for Nepal and the remainder for India. The committee was advised that as of April 30, 1955, the unexpended balance for India for this purpose was $105 million, plus. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $10 million.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The estimate for this purpose amounts to $146,500,000. In view of the very large unexpended balance in this program as of April 30, 1955, amounting to $189 million, your committee recommends a new appropriation of $125 million for fiscal year 1956, a reduction of $21,500,000 in the budget estimate. It should be noted, however, that the committee recommends an increase of $16,603,000 over the amount available for this program for the last fiscal year.

THE PRESIDENT'S FUND FOR ASIA—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The committee recommends $100 million for this fund for fiscal year 1956 which is a reduction of $100 million in the budget estimate. It should be pointed out that the amount of funds requested was based on the amount provided in the authorizing legislation and that the authorization legislation provided for the availability of these funds through June 30, 1958. Further testimony was presented to the committee to the effect that only $100 million of this amount requested would be obligated during fiscal year 1956.

I think it should be directed to the attention of the committee that in another section of the bill the President is given another $100 million to be spent for economic aid wherever he chooses. Of course, you are familiar with the provisions of the law giving the President the right to transfer 10 percent of any unexpended funds from one program to another and from one section of the world to another.

Mr. Chairman, your committee was advised that the estimated unexpended balance as of June 30, 1955, for the mutual security program would amount to $8,717,100,000. Add to that amount, the new appropriation requested in the bill under consideration, making the total amount available for the MSA program for fiscal year 1956, $11,355,841,750.

With this startling sum, it would be almost impossible, that is, with proper management, for the new officials to obligate and expend wisely this large sum.

Mr. Chairman, the following is a very gloomy and disheartening quotation. I quote:

> It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time.
>
> In France the political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe; while all the energies, resources, and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried, and are yet to be tried more sorely, in coping with the disturbed relations in China.
>
> It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel an indifference—which happily, no man pretends to feel—in the issue of events.

May I state that the quotation just given was an excerpt from Harper's Weekly, volume I, page 642, of the issue dated October 10, 1857—98 years ago—under the administration of President Buchanan and during the 34th Congress.

It should be obvious to the Committee that the small reduction that your committee recommends in the budget request will not destroy the MSA program; neither will it correct the condition that has existed for centuries.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will support your committee's recommendations. Your committee believes that your support of our recommendations will assist greatly in rectifying many of the irregularities and much of the inaccurate reporting by the officials charged with the responsibility of operating the foreign-aid program.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PASSMAN. I should be happy to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. As I understand it, there is not any question that the gentleman is against the bill in its entirety?

Mr. PASSMAN. I trust the gentleman will reserve his opinion until we have concluded the bill. I do not think I spoke as though I were against the principle of this program. I do not think either the subcommittee or the full committee would have stood with me if I had not been fair and impartial in conducting the hearings in the committee and in arriving at the amounts we have recommended here for the consideration of the Committee. If the gentleman wishes to predict how I am going to vote, of course, that is his prerogative.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman made a statement, and a similar statement is included in the report, that there were written commitments made by responsible officials of the Department of Defense with reference to this matter of reservations. The gentleman knows that this bill was being shaped up in his committee at the same time that the concluding phases of the authorization bill were taking place on the floor. I conferred with him and was conferring with Defense officials on this matter. If it is proper, I would be very happy, if the gentleman felt it was within his province to do so, to have him tell us who it was who made the commitment and in what form and on what date, because I have been watching from afar some of this that went on and would like a little more definite information.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall be very happy to clear that up for the gentleman. It is to be regretted that it is necessary to embarrass certain officials in the office of the Secretary of Defense and in the FOA. But let us see if we cannot analyze this honestly and sincerely. On the 28th of June, FOA officials found that they had approximately $932 million unobligated and unreserved. I think the mutual-security law states that this agency may obligate only 25 percent of the total annual appropriation during the last 60 days of the fiscal year. They were stuck with $932 million. We did not ask these people to come down and appear before our committee. They came down on their own. They said, "We have saved some extra money. If you will permit us to obligate $312 million, then we will be very happy to give you a letter that $420 million should not be reserved or obligated."

They knew that the authorizing legislation would provide a carryover of $200 million. They felt that by salvaging $312 million they would be perfectly willing to give up the $420 million.

On the floor of the House on June 30, while I was in here listening to the debate, they called me from the Bureau of the Budget and said, "We have certain officials here." Another gentleman called me in conference over in the other body and said, "This Bureau of the Budget is trying to get us to agree to this." So finally they called me and said, "Sir, the gentlemen are down here. They would like to obligate these funds." I said, "How about the letter we are going to get?" They said, "We don't know anything about the letter whatsoever."

Here are the facts. They got a ruling from somewhere that a reservation need not be construed as an obligation. When they were given that interpretation of the law they rushed out and reserved several hundred million dollars during the last hour of the last day of the fiscal year 1955. Furthermore, under that action they obligated in excess of 42 percent of the entire fiscal year's appropriation in the last 60 days of the fiscal year.

This letter is from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. I know it is going to be claimed that the signer had no right to make the commitment, yet this gentleman knew that there was $932 million not obligated or reserved. I am reasonably sure that all of the officials of the Foreign Operations Administration knew what this man was doing, and said "You go down and get the $312 million and give the committee the $420 million if necessary."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. There was $200 million of that $900 million that would have been carried over under the authorizing legislation?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. Then if they got $312 million more, that would be $512 million they could carry over, and they would lose only the $420 million?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. However, they reserved all of it except $33 million, because they got a ruling that a reservation is not an obligation. So they completely ignored the agreement they had made with this committee and had given us a letter to that effect. Their proposal was, "You give us $312 million, the legislative committee gives us $200 million, and then we will be very happy to release $420 million."

Mr. JUDD. Read the letter.

Mr. PASSMAN. I was trying not to embarrass the gentleman, but I am trying to defend the action of the committee. The man's name is R. S. Moore, major general, United States Army, retired, Special Assistant to the Comptroller, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GARY. Will the gentleman read the letter?

Mr. PASSMAN. Very well.

> This is to make of record Mr. Shaw's and my understanding of the agreement reached yesterday, the 28th of June 1955, by the three members present in connection with the apportionment request of the Department of Defense for Military Assistance Funds now pending in the Bureau of the Budget.
>
> In substance the agreement was as follows:
>
> (a) Unapportioned funds now held by the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of $420 million should not be released by the Bureau for immediate reservation by the Department of Defense to support common item orders on the military departments to deliver approved program items prior to June 30, 1957, even though this procedure is authorized in accordance with section 110, Public Law 778, 83d Congress.
>
> (b) That no objection would be interposed to the reapportionment by the Bureau of the Budget of approximately $312 million included in the apportionment request now pending which represents funds which were previously allocated to the military departments for direct obligation against shipbuilding, offshore procurement, facilities assistance development of advanced weapons and other similar purposes, of approved programs and which are now to be reserved before the end of the fiscal year for common items required by the program.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. There are those of us in Congress who are deeply interested in United States major military programs for bases abroad going ahead as they are planned, and in accordance with commitments. We are also interested in cutting the foreign aid program where we can reasonably do so. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and some of us from the Foreign Affairs Committee including myself, have been so interested in the foreign aid program, we went to the Department of Defense to study the figures.

It was my amendment which was joined in by JOHN VORYS that cut $145 million out of the original Executive's request for authorization on foreign aid for the coming year, of $1,278,000,000 for military assistance.

Can you tell us for the House and for its consideration, whether this new proposed cut by the Appropriations Committee will be a cut which will result in efficiency and will not cut the ground out from any major military programs this country is interested in abroad nor will it cause us to let down on any United States obligations and commitments that have been given to any other nations and peoples?

The real point is this. President Eisenhower is going to the Big Four conference within a few days, and the question is: Will Congress be cutting the ground out from under the President by drastically changing any military or strategic program?

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say that we will not. Also, concerning the $145 million the gentleman referred to they came before our committee and said, "We have no program for this." They referred to it as a kitty that they might be able to program at a later date.

Mr. FULTON. That is why my amendment cut it in the authorization legislation for foreign aid in 1955, which the Congress adopted.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to this question of obligating money at the last minute, I want to read to the members of the committee the testimony of Mr. Hensel:

> Mr. HENSEL. Unfortunately the one thing that happens to this program is that it never stays static and your estimates have to vary because of events.
>
> I do not have that Senate report in front of me, but I know what they took it from. They took it from my testimony, and if they stated it just as you stated it they left out my "if" clause. I said if we got all the allocations from the Bureau of the Budget we would be able to obligate or set aside, which has the same effect of any obligation under section 110 and 1311, all but $100 million.
>
> We have not gotten the allocations from the Bureau of the Budget and the time is just too late, and the $620 million is our honest estimate of today.

Then a little later, they have this $300 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. Three hundred and twelve million dollars; the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Then he went on to say this:

> Frankly, with this shorter period I would not want to obligate any more than what we have contemplated under this last estimate even if I could. I would not want to rush into it.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That is the testimony of Mr. Hensel.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to have to conclude; but make no mistake about it, the amount of money the committee is now recommending will be more than the total amount they obligated out of fiscal year 1955 funds.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Insofar as military funds are concerned and military assistance, is it not true that there is an unexpended balance on hand now of $6,767,200,000 and that we are adding to that an additional $705 million, which will make the military funds available in the fiscal year 1956 approximately $7,472,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In connection with the discussion which was just held with respect to this balance of money within the last 60 days of the fiscal year, I note on page 165 of the hearings the testimony is to the effect that they were to obligate about $73 million for the INFRA-structure program in the last 60 days, which amounts to 73 percent of last year's appropriation and well over 50 percent of the carryover, plus the appropriation, which on its face shows a violation of that 25 percent provision, as I understand it. Yet, as far as I can tell, the committee took no cognizance of that admitted violation of the 25 percent provision in the markup of the bill. Does the gentleman have any recollection on that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I have a recollection. We took very decided action and paid very special attention to it. We provided in the bill that not more than 20 percent of the appropriation and of the availability could be obligated or reserved.

I am emphasizing the word "reserved" in the last 2 months of the fiscal year. That action we took because we did not want to be fooled again.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Was it not 25 percent within the last 60 days?

Mr. TABER. Twenty-five percent in the 1955 bill, but it was 20 percent in the 1956 bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. It is my understanding that the item of the committee said "obligated and/or reserved," so that there would not be any way to get around it.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, so that that would be an absolute prohibition.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This provision in this bill cannot affect the showing in the record that they did violate the provision that existed in last year's bill. I can find no evidence in this year's appropriation that this has been reduced. It is an intrastructure in any way, to take cognizance of the present year's appropriation.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say the FOA reserved 45 percent of the total 1955 appropriation during May or June.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and that was in violation of what was the intent of the committee a year ago.

Frankly, I am in support of this bill as it stands. Every item was worked out so that we had a general agreement insofar as I was concerned on the amount of each item that was there. Frankly, some of them I do not like, but I agreed to them and that is it. But I just want to call attention to this fact: We gave them in this bill $704 million. They have reserved, and that is a kind of a block that represents what used to be called "unobligated," $2,708,000,000. The total of those figures is $3,400,000,000 for the military picture, and that is just as much money, within $500,000 as they had available last year. That is the situation with which you are confronted. So you may see how we get into trouble and how you get into trouble, I am calling your attention to page 259 of the hearings, where they were requested to place in the record a table showing completely what they had deobligated. The total amount that was available to them when they started the fiscal year to obligate, was $5,449,000,000. I do not know how much they spent the first 6 months. I do not have a record of it, but they came to January 31 there was an unobligated balance of $6,225,374,383, or $800,000,000 more than they had available on the day they started.

When we got down to the 31st of March there was an unobligated balance of $6,522,000,000, or $300 million more than they had available unobligated on the 31st of January. You cannot figure they operated their setup on disbursements and obligations of less than a billion dollars in the first 6 months. That means that the "deobligations" were at least $1,800,000,000; perhaps they ran to $2,500,000,000.

With the kind of setup they have, you have got to expect a cleaning up of the situation from a fiscal standpoint so that it will bear the light of day, and I am expecting that to come under the guidance of Mr. Hollister and Assistant Secretary Gordon Gray.

That will mean that they will have deobligations of at least a billion dollars and that those funds will be available for embarking upon new programs. Lots of these programs they get in mind and initiate fall through. The result is they build up their unobligated balances to a point where they have a lot more available than we ever dreamed they would have.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Do I understand rightly that if they had allowed the $420 million of unobligated funds to lapse, the committee then would have been disposed to give them the budget estimate for the new year?

Mr. TABER. Or approximately that; I would not say there would be nothing that would be cut.

Mr. JUDD. I mean this one item of military assistance.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. But when at the last moment they went ahead and reserved this $420 million, instead of allowing it to lapse, the committee cut an equivalent amount out of the new money for the fiscal year?

Mr. TABER. That is it.

Mr. JUDD. That is the way the figure cut was arrived at?

Mr. TABER. That is just the way the figure was arrived at.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Looking over the hearings the other day I remember reading that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] and other members of the committee asked for a statement on what the items were that are not obligated or reserved that made up the $620 million. I cannot find the page now, but someone said "It is here"; and somebody else said "I have not seen it." Now, is that list anywhere in the hearings? Is it available in the hearings or at the committee table?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say it has not been available as far as I know.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Louisiana has not seen it.

Mr. PASSMAN. We had reservations only.

Mr. DENTON. If the gentleman will yield, I asked for the list, but I have not seen it yet.

Mr. TABER. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution. The gentleman has never seen it. I have been interested in seeing it. Frankly, I was surprised when I found this table in the record indicating the deobligations, because I inspired that request, but when I came to check it through and found that it was not within 90 percent of being right I was disturbed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The report refers to the chaotic fiscal situation surrounding the administration of the program. Who has been in charge of this program?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Murphy has been in charge of the financial end of it. He has been the chief fiscal officer of the FOA for several years.

Mr. YATES. Is he in charge of the military-assistance program?

Mr. TABER. He has been in charge of the whole FOA financial setup.

Mr. YATES. Is he under Harold Stassen?

Mr. TABER. He was before the 1st of July.

Mr. YATES. When Mr. Stassen resigned?

Mr. TABER. Yes. But my understanding is—I think I am telling it correctly—that Mr. Hollister, the new man in charge of the overall picture, has arranged with a certified public accountant from one of the largest setups in the country, who has just retired but who is in physical condition to carry on—he retired because he reached 65—who is known as an outstanding leader in that field, to take charge of the accounts, to try to put them where they will be able to give a statement as to what the real condition is so that an ordinary Member of Congress and an ordinary accountant can understand it.

Mr. YATES. Did Mr. Stassen appear before the committee and testify concerning the chaotic condition?

Mr. TABER. He appeared before the committee for a little while one day, as I remember it, although he might have been there at another time. Was he there at any other time?

Mr. PASSMAN. Governor Stassen came back the second time.

Mr. TABER. I did not happen to be able to be in the committee at that time.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I do not think it is fair to put the blame on Mr. Murphy in this situation because he does not in his position have authority to make reservations or to make obligations. The man who is in direct charge of this program would, I presume, make the final decision and that is Mr. Hensel. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Except for this: Mr. Murphy was the fellow in charge of the accounts. When he was asked for a statement as to what had transpired in the past, he would be the one rather than Mr. Hensel who would provide the information.

Mr. YATES. Who is in charge of the program? Was not Mr. Stassen in charge of the program?

Mr. TABER. Up to the 1st of July.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have received a copy of a letter delivered by hand, dated July 11, 1955, from the office of the Special Assistant to the President, Mr. Stassen. In that letter he refers to a matter that causes me some concern because I want to favor whatever the Appropriation Committee feels is right on cuts. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and I have been able to make all the cuts we could where practical in the program. But his statement at the bottom of the letter, I would like to have the gentleman's comment on because there are rather serious questions involved.

Mr. TABER. What page?

Mr. FULTON. At the bottom of page 1. It states:

> It is not true, as the report of your committee has stated, that through readjustment of unobligated balances the program could be continued in an undiminished manner during the coming year.

Skipping to the next page it says:

> This cut would prevent meeting these requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes. I think I must answer the question now. If the gentleman had been listening to what I was saying——

Mr. FULTON. I was.

Mr. TABER. He would have realized how it would be possible last year for this organization to proceed and take care of almost anything. Last year it appears from papers I have read from here this morning that they had deobligations of upward of $1,800,000,000, yet they reported only $187 million.

Now, it is absolutely impossible for it to be worked out any other way. That means that with the same amount of money, that is, with this $2.7 billion of reserves and $700 million of new money, they have practically the same amount for the military setup that they had last year or within $500,000, and the deobligation based on the past, and that is the only way you can do it. And, we know that their obligations and their reserves are not firm; that they will have at least a billion dollars available to them in deobligations and returns from the reserves and that they will have all that money available to them to operate on. We might just as well face the facts, and those are the facts.

Mr. FULTON. Then, the gentleman disagrees completely with the Committee on Appropriations with the statement on page 2 of the letter of July 11 to the gentleman that in the latter case a delay of almost a year can result. The gentleman says no delay will result.

Mr. TABER. No delay will result, and that is based on the experience which I have detailed here completely, and it is absolutely irrefutable.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into other items in the bill unless there are some questions, because I believe the committee has done a good job and has met its responsibility as best it could, and I believe the program under the new leadership will go ahead and become a credit to the United States.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have gone over with interest the section of the report of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with military assistance which begins on page 4. The facts set forth in the few paragraphs of that section constitute the final chapter of the extraordinary story of the unexpended balances of military funds.

The earlier chapters of this story were revealed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in successive installments during the consideration of the authorizing legislation by our committee. A synopsis of these earlier chapters is contained in our report on the mutual-security bill, House Report No. 912, page 41.

I want to emphasize that the limitations contained in the mutual-security authorization as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and passed by the House would have resulted in a cut of $400 million, almost the same figure as the reduction recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, on the basis of facts available to our committee when our report was filed. We did not then know that the estimated unobligated balance would rise still higher than the latest figure available to us and we certainly did not know that the executive branch would obligate $600 million on the last day of the fiscal year.

When the Foreign Affairs Committee began its consideration of the mutual-security authorization on May 25, we were told that the estimated unobligated balance would be $100 million. On June 2 the authorization bill passed the other body with a limitation that the unobligated carryover could not exceed $200 million. Then on June 13 our committee received information that the unobligated carryover would exceed the $200 million limit in the Senate bill and we were urged by the executive branch to remove this limit to prevent a cut in the authorization.

On June 21, just before the Committee on Foreign Affairs completed its markup of the bill, we were told that the unobligated carryover of military funds would be some $600 million. The reaction of the committee is stated in this paragraph from our report which I quote:

> Rather than rework its authorization at so late a date in recognition of this increased availability of funds for commitment in 1956, the committee decided to retain the $200 million limitation in the Senate bill which apparently will bring the 1956 funds more nearly into line with the original estimates.

Let me repeat the statement I made earlier that had the unobligated carryover really been only $600 million, and had the officials of our executive branch not worked out some means of obligating over $600 million in a single day, the limitation on carryover in the bill reported by the committee would have resulted in a cut of $400 million.

I might add further that just before the bill came to the floor, we received further information that the unobligated balance would exceed $800 million. The climax of the story is now available in the report of the Appropriations Committee, as I have already indicated.

I believe that the reduction of $420 million recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is fully justified. In fact, I believe that the committee had no reasonable alternative.

Mr. Chairman, while we are around here talking about unobligated balances and carryovers, and so forth, I would like to make a general observation about that. From the best figures I can get, effective at the end of the first quarter of this year there are about $101 billion in unexpended balances in all the departments of Government; about $56 billion or $57 billion of defense money unspent; from $8 billion to $10 billion unexpended balances in foreign-aid programs. It is common practice. It does not apply alone to the foreign-aid program.

Mr. Chairman, something has to be done by the Congress. I do not know whether the answer is to go back to the old contract authorization or not. I do not know what the answer is. But there has got to be some kind of different bookkeeping established. I am afraid that the definition of "obligation," as written out, I think, by the Committee on Appropriations last year, does not quite meet the bill. I do not know what the answer is.

I disagree with some of those cuts that made up the $627 million. But the Committee on Appropriations, generally speaking, has done a good job and I did want to make my position clear as to the $420 million.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that in our committee we thought that unobligated money in the amount of some $420 million would lapse into the Treasury?

Mr. RICHARDS. All except the $200 million.

Mr. JUDD. Now, they have come up with this other term "reservation." They use it part of the time as synonymous with obligation; at least, they insist it prevents recovery into the Treasury. But when it comes to the 25-percent prohibition, they do not use them synonymously; they can "reserve" as much as they wish. Mr. Hensel said:

> I struggled and used to argue with my lawyers and staff that we ought to make no difference between reservation and obligation, but they have talked me out of it.

When they were before our committee, did we not think that the two still meant the very same thing?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right. Here is the wording we used in the conference report after we had passed this bill and heard that some of this was going on. The House insisted on this language being in the conference report:

> The conferees were shocked at the wholesale "reservations" reported to have been made in the Defense Department during the last few days of the fiscal year, in order to "save" their appropriations from "losses" under section 1311—

And so forth. The reason I asked for this time is that I wanted to show the good faith of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in regard to this matter, and if there has been any wool pulled over anybody's eyes we were not a party to it.

I am concerned about what is going to happen in the future. I do not know whose job it is; certainly it is not that of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to work this thing out—that is, the bookkeeping or the formula concerning obligated funds and expenditures of funds and what latitude shall be given in regard to appropriations already made.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. How does the gentleman feel about the $10 million cut to India?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The Committee on Appropriations cut the appropriation for India by $10 million. How does the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. RICHARDS. I stick to the Foreign Affairs Committee figure.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. There has been some discussion here about responsibility; and when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had the floor, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] asked him some questions which indicated that there was some doubt in his mind as to whom had the actual administration of these funds. Am I correct in understanding that the $420 million which was cut by the Committee on Appropriations came under the jurisdiction of the Pentagon?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. DONOVAN. And Mr. Stassen and the FOA had nothing whatsoever to do with that?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Hensel of the Pentagon presented that case to us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman stated Mr. Hensel presented the case. Who was in charge of the program, though?

Mr. RICHARDS. In overall charge of the program——

Mr. YATES. Of the military aspects of the program.

Mr. RICHARDS. In overall charge of the presentation of the program was Governor Stassen. The military presentation was made by Assistant Secretary of Defense Hensel.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. VORYS. On this question of who is in charge of what, I think it should be stated that the Mutual Security Act itself provides that a whole series of functions are to be performed by the Department of Defense and that Mr. Hensel was Assistant Secretary of Defense for the mutual-security program, that he had his own auditors and his own fiscal officials, and that while Mr. Stassen had duties in connection with the presentation of the matter up here it was Mr. Hensel and General Moore and Mr. Shaw who presented, at least to our committee, the fiscal situation in the Department of Defense in which this $420 million, $600 million, and $913 million gyration is involved.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, is not Mr. Charles E. Wilson in charge of the program rather than Mr. Hensel? If he is Assistant Secretary of Defense, to whom is he assistant if not to Mr. Wilson?

Mr. FORD. If I may reply to the gentleman, the job Mr. Hensel held had a far closer tie to the position Mr. Stassen held rather than the actual position held by Mr. Wilson.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Hensel is assistant to somebody, I assume Mr. Wilson, is he not?

Mr. FORD. That is right, according to the charts, but the actual working relationship was with Mr. Stassen, not with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. YATES. Should not the responsibility be with the man on the highest level, either Mr. Stassen or Mr. Wilson?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman wants to quibble about the line of authority, perhaps yes, but the working relationship was between Stassen and Hensel and not between Wilson and Hensel.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, all of us appreciate the dangers with which we are confronted in the era in which we are living.

We are confronted by the military power of the Communist Government of Russia and its captive nations and by worldwide subversion and propaganda in the search for world domination by the leaders of the Kremlin.

One-third of the world's population is under Communist control.

Another one-third, more or less neutral today, may well determine the fate of the entire free world.

Our best assurance against possible disaster is to be found in a powerful, understanding and cooperative free world.

Military assistance, properly administered, can contribute to essential power.

Technical assistance, properly administered, can contribute to essential understanding and cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this program today, as I have done in the past.

I support it because I believe in its objectives, and because I see no alternative.

I am supporting it because I believe despite its shortcomings, its waste and extravagance, its lack of efficiency over the years, it has far more than paid for itself in Europe.

When I think back to 1947 when I visited some nine different countries overseas, and recall the conditions that prevailed at that time, I am constrained to believe that this program has helped to make possible what seemed at that time almost impossible.

I am supporting this program because I hope it will also prove effective in Asia and elsewhere where the cold war is now most acute.

I support it in the light of progress made in Europe and in other parts of the world; in the light of the recent change in tactics by the Communist Government of Russia; and in the light of the approaching conference in Geneva, with its worldwide importance.

This is no time, Mr. Chairman, to indicate to others any slackening in our determination to win through to victory in the cold war.

The policy, as we all know, as far as the fiscal year 1956 is concerned, has been already determined by action of both houses of the Congress on the applicable authorizing legislation.

The world today knows that this program has been approved only a few days ago by the largest majority, I think, it has ever received.

The question before us at this time is simply a question of dollars and cents. It is a question of how much should be made available at this time within the ceilings which have been authorized to properly implement the program.

As has been pointed out, your committee recommends an overall appropriation of $2,701,275,000, if we include unobligated balances, $649 million below the budget estimate, $2,748,000,000 below what was made available in respect to the current fiscal year.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD, a copy of the table appearing on page 3 of the committee report:

Item	Available, 1955	Estimates, 1956	Recommended, 1956	Bill compared with—	
				Available, 1955	Estimates, 1956
Military assistance:					
Appropriation	$1,020,973,387	$1,125,000,000	$705,000,000	−$315,973,387	−$420,000,000
Unobligated and unreserved balance	2,422,512,729	33,900,000	33,900,000	−2,388,612,729	
Total	3,443,486,116	1,158,900,000	738,900,000	−2,704,586,116	−420,000,000
Direct forces support	365,760,000	317,200,000	305,000,000	−60,760,000	−12,200,000
Defense support:					
Appropriation	1,162,577,808	1,000,300,000	947,500,000	−215,077,808	−52,800,000
Unobligated balance	32,200,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	−7,200,000	
Total	1,194,777,808	1,025,300,000	972,500,000	−222,277,808	−52,800,000
Development assistance	164,600,000	182,000,000	172,000,000	+7,400,000	−10,000,000
Technical cooperation	126,354,621	172,000,000	150,500,000	+24,145,379	−21,500,000
Other programs:					
Appropriation	130,834,000	470,141,750	358,741,750	+227,907,750	−111,400,000
Unobligated balance	23,563,250	3,633,250	3,633,250	−19,930,000	
Total	154,397,250	473,775,000	362,375,000	+207,977,750	−111,400,000
Undistributed unobligated balance		21,366,750			−21,366,750
Total mutual security:					
Appropriation	2,971,099,816	3,266,641,750	2,638,741,750	−332,358,066	−627,900,000
Unobligated balance	2,478,275,979	83,900,000	62,533,250	−2,415,742,729	−21,366,750
Total	5,449,375,795	3,350,541,750	2,701,275,000	−2,748,100,795	−649,266,750

I think this is a particularly helpful table giving, as it does, a majority of the overall figures in the situation under consideration at this time.

I want, however, to make 2 or 3 observations in reference to the table.

In the first place, you will notice that the 1956 figures in columns 2 and 3 of the table do not take into account the sums we have been talking about that have been placed in reserve for military assistance; sums aggregating as of the first of the month over $2,704,000,000, a figure which was less by $614 million on June 29, than it was on June 30, the last day of the fiscal year, for the reasons that have been pointed out.

Obviously, these reserves are in large measure not firm obligations. Obviously, they are in large measure available in respect to the fiscal year 1956, which began 11 days ago.

The extent to which they are available is not entirely clear.

If, however, we add the $2,704,000,000 in reserve to the $738.9 million recommended in this bill for military assistance, we arrive at a total available for military assistance in fiscal 1956 amounting to $3,443.2 million, as compared with the figure for the current fiscal year of $3,443.4 million, almost identical figures, on this basis, for the 2 years.

If we add the $2,704,000,000 in reserve to the $2,701,000,000, the total carried in this bill for all activities, we arrive at a total available in fiscal 1956 of $5,405,500,000 as compared with the total available in the current fiscal year of $5,449,000,000, or just about $44 million less on this basis than in the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to accept the argument made that all these reservations are firm obligations, then we are confronted with the fact that obligations plus reservations for the month of June amounted to over $1,085,000,000 as compared with an average for the previous 11 months of $207.3 million; that obligations plus reservations for the month of May amounted to $451 million, and that, therefore, total obligations plus reserves for the last 2 months of the fiscal year amounted to $1,536.7 million or 45 percent of the funds made available for military assistance under the act of last year. This, despite the fact that section 108 of that act provides and I quote: "That not more than 25 percent of any funds made available by this act shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that these reserves were, in fact, obligations, there would have been no authority to place in reserve the $420 million which your committee recommends for deletion.

This is entirely apart from the matter of the written understanding referred to specifically in the committee report, to the effect that $420 million of unobligated funds would not be released for immediate reservation by the Department of Defense during the closing hours of the last fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I call attention also to the fact that the great bulk of the 1956 funds are going to be used, directly or indirectly, for military assistance.

If we add the sums carried in this bill for military assistance, for direct forces support, and for defense support, we arrive at a total of $2,016 million. If we add the amount held in reserve, we arrive at a figure of $4,720 million for this purpose.

This means that 74 percent of the new money, or 87 percent of the total, if we include the reserves, is to be used, directly or indirectly, for military assistance.

Only $685 million carried in this bill is available for other purposes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the shift in emphasis from aid to Europe to aid in other parts of the world.

There is practically no economic aid whatever here for any of the original Marshall plan countries.

Of the new money a maximum of $400 million, or 15 percent, is said to be intended for Europe.

This leaves a balance of $2,300 million, or 85 percent, for utilization in Asia, in the Near East, Africa, and in Latin America.

The recommendations of your committee by program are spelled out in some detail in the committee report.

In addition to the $738.9 million for military assistance, the report recommends $305 million for direct forces support in 9 countries, mostly in Asia; $972.5 million for defense support in 14 countries, mostly in Asia; $172 million for development assistance in 11 countries in the Near East—Africa, in Asia, and in Latin America; $125 million for technical cooperation to provide relatively small amounts for a good many countries in the Near East—Africa, in Asia, and in Latin America; and $362.3 million for other programs, which include $200 million for discretionary allocation by the President, and $33.5 million for administrative expenditure.

Of the total reduction of $649.2 million, $520 million is in respect to two major items. The basis for the cuts are detailed to some extent in the report and I shall not go into them further at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I did not vote for all the reductions made by the committee. In the light, however, of the $100 million fund available to the President for worldwide application for any purpose under this act; in the light of the additional $100 million fund available to the president for Asian economic development within his discretion; in the light of the 10 percent transferability between appropriations under this act; in the light of the $2,704,000,000 in reserve for military assistance, and of the $8,717,000,000 of unexpended balances in the pipeline, I frankly do not believe that the amounts recommended to be withheld at this time will in any way cripple the program in fiscal 1956.

If there is additional evidence or any real basis for complaint, the opportunity for review is, of course, available at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in fighting a cold war. Every possible ally is vital.

This overall program, in my opinion, properly administered, is vital to our own national defense and to the defense of the entire free world.

I am confident that the House will vote the funds which are essential, particularly in view of the pending conference at Geneva, where our whole position depends upon a united front.

May I say, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the President has recently appointed Gordon Gray, formerly Secretary of the Army and President of the University of North Carolina, as Assistant Secretary of Defense, in charge of military assistance under this program.

He has also appointed John B. Hollister, formerly a Member of this House, an outstanding lawyer, as Director of the International Cooperation Administration in the State Department in charge of the economic phases of this program.

I have great confidence in them both. I predict that under their leadership we shall see great progress made in eliminating the shortcomings which have rightfully subjected this program to criticism over the years since its inception.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state how much is in this bill for offshore procurement?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the figure in mind. Perhaps some other member of the committee can tell the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. There is no special appropriation made for offshore procurement.

Mr. PASSMAN. There is no appropriation for offshore procurement.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea how much is in the carryover program for offshore procurement and for what purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the figure in mind. I think perhaps some other member of the committee may be able to throw some light on the matter.

Mr. GROSS. Somehow or other I gained the impression that there is $51 million to be expended on offshore procurement for shipbuilding. Could that be possible?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think not. On the contrary, I think the record shows that there has not been a cent spent for shipbuilding, offshore, in the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa is interested in knowing what you propose to do next year in respect to offshore procurement. On page 95 of the hearings I find this:

> Mr. Hensel. Yes; it does, $19 million offshore procurement and $51 million, Navy shipbuilding, Zone of the Interior. The $70 million jibes with those two figures.
>
> Mr. Comer. Parenthetical numbers.
>
> Mr. Taber. That is Navy shipbuilding and offshore procurement?
>
> Mr. Hensel. Offshore procurement.

I would like to know what all that means.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If I heard the gentleman correctly I think that most of the $70 million referred to is for the Zone of the Interior, is it not?

Mr. GROSS. What is the Zone of the Interior? The gentleman from Iowa does not know what they mean by "Navy shipbuilding, Zone of the Interior" carried under an item pertaining to offshore procurement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume that is for construction within the continental United States.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I would like to know, whether it is or is not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The committee and the Congress expressed itself very strongly a year ago against offshore procurement in the field of ship construction. I assume that the policy prevailing in this respect in fiscal 1955 will continue to prevail.

I am advised that no specific request has been made for this purpose in fiscal 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Morano].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if this program, as has been reported, carries the full authorization for the United Nations technical assistance program?

Mr. TABER. The full budget estimate.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to approve the full amount of $24 million for an 18-month contribution by the United States to the U. N. technical assistance program. This is the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee after thorough consideration. I believe that any attempt to reduce this amount on the floor of the House by the device of a one-third ceiling would be extremely unwise and unfortunate.

I believe that this U. N. technical assistance is good for the United Nations, and that it is important. It is also good for other countries, and that is important too. But, above all, I think it is a good program for the American people and that is something that especially interests me.

The United Nations technical assistance program is making a long-term investment for the American people in other countries. It is building up future relationships which will benefit us in the years to come.

What does this program of technical assistance actually accomplish? It helps eradicate disease, so that the peoples of other lands can have the physical strength to assist themselves and improve their countries economically and socially; it drains swamps and irrigates deserts, thereby increasing food supplies in countries which hitherto have known nothing but the curse of famine.

This U. N. program goes along side by side with our bilateral technical cooperation program. The two programs do not duplicate each other; each one lends strength to the other because each one can do some things that the other cannot do or does with more difficulty. Out in the field and at headquarters, there is a steady watch kept to see that good coordination exists and that there is no duplication. In the countries where this work goes on there is a constant exchange of information and a good deal of consultation between the United States and the United Nations people.

The United Nations belongs to the countries of the world who are contributing to it and receiving benefits from it. When we do this kind of technical assistance work through the United Nations, we avoid many possibilities of misunderstanding. The countries participating in this program think of it as their own, something they have a voice in, a service organization to which they belong and which can help them to help themselves.

Now, I think there is one thing we have to watch. This technical assistance program has proved itself by its operations during the past 5 years. It has proved itself to be a fine program worthy of support. So, there are not many people who now presume to attack it directly. But what we have to watch out for is the kind of indirect attack which might result in impairing the efficiency and usefulness of the program to an extent way out of proportion to the amount of money that might be saved by reducing our contribution.

That is why I believe it would be most unwise to impose a ceiling of 33⅓ percent on our contribution to the technical assistance program. The effect would be to undo all the good work of the Appropriations Committee in recommending that our contribution be put on a sound basis of 18 months so that the United Nations can plan its work in this field properly.

I have no desire to change the present law which wisely limits United States contributions to the assessed budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to a maximum of one-third of the total assessments against all members. This is sensible and fair and should not be changed. But let us not confuse this sort of legitimate limitation with the kind of arbitrary limitation involved in imposing a one-third ceiling on programs, such as the U. N. technical assistance program, which are financed on a voluntary basis and to which the one-third limitation has never before been applied.

We must not forget to take into account the very substantial contributions which governments of underdeveloped countries make to the local costs of projects in addition to their contributions on a regular basis to the central fund. These local contributions are funds which otherwise would not be used for technical assistance. For 1955, these local contributions are estimated at $60.3 million, or no less than 68 percent of the total cost of the program. When these local contributions are taken into account, the proposed United States contribution for 1955 is about 17 percent of the total program. But the proposed one-third ceiling on the United States contribution would not take this situation into account. The result would be that we would be cutting down these substantial contributions which governments of underdeveloped countries have been making to the local costs of projects.

I would like to make one other point. Let us approach this question of reducing the proportion of American contributions in a businesslike manner. Let us not, through hasty action, imperil the successful operation of this program. Let us remember that reductions to a program such as this should be made gradually—and that is exactly what we have been doing. In the beginning of the program 5 years ago, the United States contributed 60 percent of the central fund. As the economies of the other developed countries improved, it was possible for them to increase their contributions and the United States was able to begin to reduce its percentage share of the total program. For 1954, the United States contribution was down to approximately 55 percent of the central fund. For 1955, it is proposed that we contribute about 53.6 percent. For 1956, it is proposed that the United States contribution be reduced to 50 percent of the central fund. This, I submit, is the sensible and prudent way to go about reducing the percentage of our contribution.

For these reasons, I will support the full contribution of $24 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the 18 months beginning July 1, 1956, and I will oppose any effort to reduce this amount by imposing a ceiling of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, it has been a distinct pleasure for me to work with this subcommittee on appropriations for the mutual-security program. I do not think I have ever seen a committee that approached a matter on as fine a nonpartisan basis as this committee did in connection with its effort to arrive at the proper amount that ought to be appropriated for our foreign-aid program.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and I came to Congress at the same time. As a matter of fact, we were both freshmen during that famous or infamous, according to the way you look at it, 80th Congress. I have always had a great respect for him and have admired him a great deal. We were reminiscing the other day about the first time we ever met. I believe it was down at the White House when the President had all of the freshmen Congressmen down there, the Democratic Congressmen at least, because Harry Truman was President at that time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I was interested in the remark the gentleman made about the 80th Congress, being famous or infamous.

Mr. LANHAM. Famous or infamous, according to the way you look at it. It all depends upon the point of view.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman knows it was a very famous Congress in which he played his usual active part, because it was the Southern States Congressmen who joined forces with the Republicans during that session to defeat the things that were bad for America, which President Truman had recommended. I want to compliment the gentleman and all of the southern Congressmen for that fine patriotic job of supporting the Republicans in that most famous of all sessions. History will record that it was the finest, the best, and the most wonderful Congress that has ever held a session in this United States Capitol.

Mr. LANHAM. Without agreeing with my good friend from Iowa, I will say it was a famous Congress because in it there was a group of young southern Congressmen who came here for the first time—and a group of young Republican Congressmen also. I see my good friend from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] back there, who came here at the same time. They also came to that famous or infamous Congress as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and I did at that time. But, as I say, I have always had a very high regard for OTTO PASSMAN. But I did not know him really until I had the privilege of serving under him as chairman of this subcommittee.

I have found that not only is he a splendid southern gentleman, and that is saying a lot for him, but he is persistent in his search for the truth, he is able, and he presided over this committee with the utmost fairness. He was put in a rather unfavorable position because of the fact that in the past he had opposed this program. As a matter of fact, before our committee—I am sure he will not mind if I repeat this here—he said that he was not only behind the 8 ball but he was behind eight 8 balls because for 8 years he had opposed and voted against this program. In spite of that, he set out to do a good job, to be fair as he presided, and he did just that thing, and with the help of the distinguished gentleman from New York and the other Members on that side, he made every effort to find out, if he could, just what the unexpended balances were so that we could intelligently determine how much should be appropriated this year. He was fair and courteous to the witnesses; he was patient and courteous to all members of the committee, and I want to say that as he defended this bill and the work of this subcommittee before the full committee, you would have thought he had been in favor of this program all his life. And, I think it is a tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana that after hearing all of the evidence, after listening to the witnesses, he was fair enough and his mind was open enough that he himself was convinced that we could not at this time discontinue this program, after he was convinced our whole effort was to find out how much money ought to be appropriated to carry this work forward.

Now, I think it is not necessary as I come before you today to say anything about the necessity for the continuation of this program. The House has adopted it and the Senate has adopted it. We mean to carry forward. We cannot turn back at this time. Taking into consideration our foreign aid program, the $50 billion that we have spent in Europe, some of it wasted, yes, because inevitably in a program of this sort some money is wasted and some does not bring the result that we expect, but by and large the Marshall plan program and all of the programs that have followed have been successful. And, today we see Russia, in a sense, in retreat. We are winning the cold war, and do not mean to stop now. And the chairman of this subcommittee was convinced of that, and he joined with us or rather led us in attempting to arrive at the proper amount that we ought to appropriate for this program for the new year, for the year beginning July 1.

Now, I did not agree with all of the cuts that were made in this program. I would not have voted and did not vote for the cut of $100 million to the President to use as he sees fit in Asia. I think now that most of our attention must be turned to Asia. I think the future of the free world probably depends upon what we do in Asia. It is up to us to win over the people of India and the other people who are now free. Maybe you think they are not our friends. There are things at times we do not agree with as to what some of their leaders may do, and it may appear that they are siding with the Communists, but today the people of India are free and the people of many of the countries of southeast Asia still are free, and in order to win in this struggle, if we win eventually, we have got to win those uncommitted peoples of Asia. I, for one, am willing to risk your President and my President with $100 million if he can use it to good purpose in Asia, but I am going to go along with the committee on this cut, because I think the President can get along without it, and if the President does need it, then we will in a supplemental appropriation give him the funds. Then, when the bill goes to the so-called upper House, why, you know what they are going to do to it. They are going to "up" it, just as they always have. So why should we do it here? I am going along with the committee on this bill, although as I say, I did not agree with all of the cuts that were made.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. As an eminent legal scholar, which the gentleman certainly is, I wonder if he is able to cast any further light upon this distinction which has been brought before the Committee today, that is, the distinction between funds which are reserved and those which are obligated. Can the gentleman help us any in that field?

Mr. LANHAM. I think when we discuss that, it is sort of the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. And, without criticizing Mr. Stassen, for I think he has done a fine job, and without criticizing Mr. Hensel, I do think they did not fully know what was going on. Their bookkeeping was not good.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman feel, for the sake of clarity and understanding, that it would be well if we could, to pin down specific definitions of those terms?

Mr. LANHAM. I understand this committee tried to write a definition last year. Whether they succeeded, I do not know; I was not a member of the committee at that time. But the bookkeeping ought to be revised. It ought to be possible for the House to know what these unobligated balances are. I understand that on the 30th day of last month, there were four different answers sent to the committee on what the unobligated balances were. And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is right. There ought to be a clearer understanding of the meaning of the words obligation, reservation, set-aside, and allocation—words that are used almost interchangeably and without any real distinctions between them.

I hope this Committee will go along with the Committee on Appropriations on the cut of $420 million because there was no excuse for the way the committee was treated by Mr. Hensel and Mr. Stassen at the 11th hour of the last day of the fiscal year, in view of the statement made by Mr. Hensel before our committee, which I read a few minutes ago to the House, that he would not rush out at the last minute and commit unobligated funds, that he would not do it if he could; yet he did.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman served with distinction on the Committee on Foreign Affairs last session.

Mr. LANHAM. And with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. VORYS. I am not going to embarrass the gentleman by asking him which committee assignment he likes best, but I am going to say merely that we miss him on our committee.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman very much and can assure the members of that great committee that there is no more interesting or important committee of the House. I am just happy that I was assigned to the subcommittee on the mutual security program when I was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. I appreciate the frank and candid statement of the gentleman. Could the gentleman tell the Committee, and definitely, without any embarrassment to himself, what those other cuts are that he thinks could well not have been made?

Mr. LANHAM. There were a few small cuts that did not amount to very much. At the moment I cannot say what they were. But as to the $100 million cut, that I felt should not be made. Personally, I would have voted for the additional money for Spain, but we could not. The committee could not do it at the time, because we had no authorization to increase the appropriation for that purpose.

I hope the committee and the House will go along with this subcommittee. I think we have a good bill. After the upper House has finished with it, and the conference committee has acted upon it, I am sure we will have sufficient funds to back up the President as he goes to Geneva to meet with the others at the summit. And our prayers go with him as he goes to this important conference.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the record clearly shows that over the years I have supported this program both as to authorizations and as to appropriations. I feel that the action we have taken in this committee for fiscal 1956 is in conformity with a good program for the next 12 months. This general statement does not mean, however, that I endorse or support every change that was made in the budget figures as submitted to the committee. I simply say that when we got all through with the whole package, after the subcommittee had held hearings and made certain decisions, I supported the final conclusion.

There were in several instances revisions downward that I think were unwise. My personal view on the President's fund for Asian economic development conforms to that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

This committee, particularly this subcommittee, made an honest and sincere effort to get facts upon which we could make sound decisions. Either by inadvertence or for some other reason these facts were not properly and intelligibly given to us. As a consequence, the committee felt that it had to take certain action. We had no alternative in conscience.

I support entirely the position of the subcommittee with reference to the $705 million in new funds plus $33,900,000 in reappropriation of unobligated funds for military assistance. I support the disallowance of the $420 million for military assistance.

I think it is exceedingly unwise for certain people in the executive branch of the Government to condemn and criticize certain members of this subcommittee for the action which was taken. I know that some members of this subcommittee who for years opposed in whole or in part this program in the last 2 years bent over backwards to be helpful. At the present time to have certain individuals on the subcommittee by innuendo or implication criticized when the blame truly rests on the agency is in my judgment not playing square. Why do they not accept the blame, appeal the decision to the other body, and then let us work out a solution in the conference?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. This difference of opinion causes some concern to those of us who are interested, as of course we all are, in the defense of this country. For example, here is this statement by Mr. Stassen that the cut of $420 million would result in an inability to fulfill urgent needs in countries where military requirements have been discussed and agreed upon and where countries have taken steps to meet commitments on raising forces, granting bases, and so on. I would like an authoritative and specific statement on that from the committee, if we could have it, that that is not correct, because I would like to favor the committee's position of reducing the previous amount where we can, but in the face of an assistant to the President saying to us that it may be breaking down specific United States commitments on strategic needs, I would like that explanation if somebody on the committee can give it.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman has served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a good many years, at least 6 or 7 to my knowledge. I have served for 3 years on the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid of the Committee on Appropriations.

There is a book on the table over there for fiscal year 1956 appropriations for foreign aid, military and economic. If the gentleman will look at that book, some of which is classified, he will see certain programs outlined, country by country, some of them itemized down to the last rifle and the last bullet. A year from now it would be interesting to compare results with what was proposed. There would be little similarity.

That is not necessarily wrong, but when they come up this year in the last couple of months and outline all this great detail and say, "If you change that, the program is going to have the heart cut out," and then a year from now when we go back to review what they did with the money we gave them they say, "Well, the program was changed, circumstances were revised, and so forth," they are not being consistent.

The point is this. Some contend we have upset and disrupted the policy, because they had a firm program. Well, the facts are that the program is not firm. They will be the first to admit that the programs are subject to revision and amendment depending on world conditions. They can and do adjust the program and the Congress should have the same right without being criticized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I know the gentleman from Michigan is very familiar with the fiscal operations of the FOA. I would like to get a little clearer picture of these fiscal operations. Is it not true at the present time the Foreign Operations Administration has unexpended balances of over $8.7 billion?

Mr. FORD. According to the figures given to our subcommittee, that is approximately correct.

Mr. LAIRD. And will we by this bill add another $2.7 billion to that unexpended balance of the Foreign Operations Administration?

Mr. FORD. That is correct, I believe.

Mr. LAIRD. Is it not also true that the first 6 months of this past fiscal year the deobligations of the Foreign Operations Administration far outdistanced the obligations of FOA?

Mr. FORD. I think that is correct; yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Is it true that the obligations of the FOA last month were far greater than in the entire first 6 months of the fiscal year 1955?

Mr. FORD. I believe that is true, if you include reservations.

Mr. LAIRD. It would seem to me that we, in Congress, should be interested in getting this program on a somewhat businesslike basis so that a "firm shop" can supervise these funds which we have made available to our friends throughout the world. I cannot see how we can ever get a "firm shop" if we proceed in the manner we are in this bill. How can we ever get this program on a businesslike basis if we continue giving more and more funds? It would seem to me that we could get along appropriating this year not in excess of $1 billion in view of the fact that deobligations have outdistanced obligations of the funds under this program during a major portion of fiscal year 1955. The FOA has gone out and tried to obligate everything they could, from the kitchen sink on down, this past month. This happens because we have made too much money available in the past appropriation bills.

Mr. FORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I do not happen to agree with some of the conclusions he has stated in the last 5 minutes he has used my time, nor do I agree with the action taken by Mr. Stassen and Mr. Hensel in the last day or two of the fiscal year. I think the program can and should work well. It has achieved considerable success in many areas of the world over the past few years. However, I think they can and must improve their day-to-day operations fiscally over the record of the past 7 or 8 years. Some considerable improvement has been made in the last 2 years, but there is ample area for even better fiscal operations.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. FORD. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not just inescapably true that, when they come up in the month of May or June and present a detailed program of what they are going to do, and then as soon as they get the money they actually carry out a greatly modified and sometimes almost unrecognizable program, it means either that they did not know what they were talking about when they presented their program to us or else they were not quite on the level when they represented it as a genuinely firm program? It has to be one or the other.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is entirely accurate.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am trying to rationalize this situation with respect to the infrastructure appropriation which I asked about a little earlier, and I do not feel I got the information we ought to have on that program.

Mr. FORD. Let me say to the gentleman, as he knows I was sitting on two subcommittees—the Military Construction Subcommittee and this particular subcommittee. I was not at the hearings at the time the presentation was made on the infrastructure program so I am not qualified to give him an answer on that particular point. If there is someone else on the subcommittee who was there, I am certain the question can be answered. I was attending a Military Construction Subcommittee hearing when this infrastructure presentation was made.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Perhaps this matter did come up in the executive session. But the problem I have in my mind is this: Under existing law, they were permitted to obligate only 25 percent of any funds in the last 60 days of the fiscal year.

Mr. FORD. It was 20 percent; was it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think under existing law, it was 25 percent or is 25 percent, but now the bill provides 20 percent.

The hearings show on their face that they attempted to obligate $73 million in the last 60 days of the year when, if you consider their carryover, plus the new appropriation, legally they could obligate only $35 million, and if you take care of the new funds, or $100 million in the current fiscal year, they could obligate only 25 percent. In other words, they went 50 percent one way and much more than 50 percent of the total available money if you take the other. Yet in the bill now before us there is a carryover of every single dollar that was requested for the infrastructure program for this year. Where you have a patent illegal obligation in the last 60 days on its face, I cannot understand the committee giving them every dollar they asked for in the bill we have before us.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield. I presume the gentleman may throw some light on the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARY. As a matter of fact, the 25-percent limitation did not apply to these particular items. It applied to the fund as a whole. There was no specific limitation as to each item in the bill.

We are committed to a program of some $321 million in the infrastructure program. We have put into this bill $122 million to carry forward that program to which we are already committed.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I would like to ask two questions which may not be proper, which might be called classified, but which would be helpful to those of us who do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I refer to what the gentleman said a few minutes ago. Is it possible to say how much of the funds appropriated for the last fiscal year were used wisely and soundly, and how much, in the opinion of the committee, was not used wisely and soundly?

Mr. FORD. As far as I could tell, I think the program was generally administered quite well. I cannot state that this Army tank was wisely allocated, or that gun was unwisely allocated. I think the general, overall management was in good hands, but I do not believe they made a completely fair presentation to the committee on what their financial picture was in the last few days of the fiscal year. I hope and trust the bookkeeping problems will be straightened out. At this point I must state, in my opinion, John Murphy, of FOA, was not at fault in this situation.

Mr. HESELTON. May I say I think the gentleman's position over the years has been so well established that he carries very great weight with those of us who know him and appreciate the sincerity with which he approaches the very difficult problems that face the committee and the Congress in this instance.

May I ask this further question, and again it may not be proper to answer, but if you could be made available so that the Members could look at it, it would be helpful: Has the committee made any determination as to what countries have received funds and used them wisely, and what countries have received them and not used them wisely?

Mr. FORD. In the military assistance part of the program we did not delete any line items in their so-called program. We simply made a gross reduction of $420 million in new funds, leaving $705 million for the current fiscal year, plus the reappropriation of $33,900,000 out of previous funds which had not been obligated. We have simply said that this is the amount you can have available for fiscal 1956; you adjust your program to the over-all total.

Mr. HESELTON. Then it is up to the Administrator properly to handle the funds as between the American taxpayers and those we want to help?

Mr. FORD. That is entirely correct.

In my remaining time may I comment on what the subcommitee has proposed.

In the case of direct forces support we made a cut of $12,200,000 out of a requested amount of $317,200,000.

In the item Defense Support for Europe, we gave the full budget amount which was $70 million. In the case of defense support for the Near East and Africa we gave the total requested, $102,500,000.

In the case of Defense Support, Asia, the administration requested $827,800,000. The committee made a reduction of $52,800,000. This is one area where I, to some extent disagreed with the subcommittee, but Members should look at the record. They had unexpended on April 20, 1955, $1,056,800,000. In addition, they recaptured, which will be available for other uses, I think around $200 million worth of military equipment in that area of the globe.

For the developmental-assistance program for the Near East and Africa the committee gave the full amount, $73 million.

Developmental assistance for Asia: The committee reduced it $10 million.

The request was $71 million. The $10 million reduction is earmarked for India. This means that India will get $60 million rather than $70 million for fiscal 1956.

For developmental assistance, American Republics, the budget requested $38 million. This committee has authorized the full amount.

Technical cooperation: A reduction of $21,500,000, but the total approved is $16,603,000 more than the agency had during fiscal 1955. It must be admitted the sum of $125 million for technical assistance is sizable.

I regret time does not permit me to discuss all aspects and items in the bill. I must say, however, that from the facts presented to the subcommittee, in my opinion the committee's recommendation should be supported.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations brings to the floor of the House for your approval the mutual security appropriations bill for 1956.

Our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] possesses the ability, knowledge, and understanding for such an assignment, and it has been a pleasure serving with him on this subcommittee. We were fortunate to have as our staff assistant, Jay B. Howe.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend appropriations totaling $2,638,741,750, for fiscal year 1956. This is $627,900,000 less than the budget estimate, and we further recommend a reduction of $21,366,750 in the estimated balances reported as unobligated on June 30, 1955. The new money amounting to $2,638,741,750 added to the unobligated balance allowed of $62,533,250, makes a total for 1956 of $2,701,275,000. This amount is more than ample when you consider that we have the sum of $8,717,100,000 obligated and unexpended in the mutual security program. If it became necessary this program would carry itself for nearly 3 years without any new appropriations. This bill provides for $705 million for military assistance; $305 million for direct forces support; $947,500,000 for defense support; $172 million for development assistance; $150,500,000 for technical cooperation; $358,741,750 for other programs, making the total $2,638,741,750 of new money, and with the unobligated balance amounting to $62,533,250.

I know that a great many people in this country regard our foreign aid program as a futile effort to buy friendship. Friends cannot be purchased, and our mutual security program would be a complete failure if based on this premise. It is imperative that we understand that the safety of this country no longer depends merely upon our Armed Forces, but upon the combined military power and political and economic stability of the free world as a whole. It is admitted that some of our friends and strongest allies who have benefited the most have proven a disappointment, and no better proof can be offered than the Korean war. It is further admitted that our mutual security appropriation each year would be sufficient to balance the budget, but we should remember that we are today appropriating $31,882,815,726 for defense. Without foreign aid this amount would necessarily increase because the day we decide to fortify behind the two oceans our armed services strength will exceed the 2,666,000 now provided for under the above appropriation. Our Army alone would be five times as large as it is today, and universal military training and selective service would face the majority of the men and women in this country. We must also remember that it is cheaper to finance foreign forces in their own country than to maintain an equal number of United States divisions far from home.

Total United States budget expenditures for fiscal year 1956 are estimated at $62,400,000,000. Our foreign aid program is certainly only a small part when you consider the benefits received. The major cost of production against war in our budget for 1956 requires 67 percent of the total set forth above.

The American people are entitled to complete and frank answers concerning our foreign aid programs and the day of secrecy has passed. This is one of the reasons why our people generally do not believe in this program. Our people are entitled to know the true answers and to have more information than fine statements that this program is an indispensable part of a realistic and elightened foreign policy with the objective being a just, prosperous, enduring peace. The American people know what our objectives are in making this money available, and they are also entitled to know the reasons advanced by responsible leaders of foreign nations for asking for our money and just what they intend to do with this money. Our people are taxed for this program, therefore, all of the secrecy of the past concerning the use of this money must cease. Another reason advanced against the continuation of foreign aid is that the leaders of the countries assisted know of our aid, but the people in these countries generally do not understand just what we are doing for them. A number of incidents have occurred throughout the world recently which prove this statement. In a number of countries the press and radio carefully avoid any mention of our assistance, and to me this is an outrage. Leaders come and go, but the people remain. If our money is acceptable by the leaders surely the people in the country assisted should be acquainted with the facts. We only want these people to know of our friendship, and do not expect subservience. Since April of 1917 we have expended $128 billion in foreign aid. Forty-five nations have participated and 39 percent of this amount was received by England. Since the end of World War II the United States has dispensed foreign aid per calendar year as follows: $4,999,000,000 for 1946; $6,221,000,000 for 1947; $5,465,000,000 for 1948; $6,545,000,000 for 1949; $5,109,000,000 for 1950; $4,837,000,000 for 1951; $5,006,000,000 for 1952; $6,405,000,000 for 1953; $4,669,000,000 for 1954.

It is true that we have expended $128 billion for foreign aid, and our national debt of $276 billion amounts to more than all of the rest of the world put together, but as we continue our struggle for peace we must remember that the gross tabulation of monetary cost to the United States of World War I amounted to $66,592,966,000; World War II cost $449,678,266,000; Korean war cost $150,878,533,000, making a total for the three wars of $677,149,765,000.

The free world is today threatened by the most dangerous aggregation of aggressive power in our entire history. The Soviet Union and Communist China today maintain the largest collection of men under arms ever assembled in peacetime. They possess nuclear weapons and great quantities of basic natural resources. Since the close of World War II Red armies stationed in eastern Europe prevented free elections and forced 10 once free nations to become slave states; attempted same procedure in Turkey, Greece, Italy and France; in 1948 used threats of force and took over Czechoslovakia; in 1948 attempted to take over the city of Berlin by blockading land transport routes, inspired armed bands in Philippines, Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia; aided Chinese Communists in 1949; 1950 Communist armies from North Korea crossed 38th parallel; 1951 Chinese Communists acquired Tibet; 1954 Communist led forces gained control of North Vietnam.

When we compare our Armed Forces with that of the Communist World we see the difference. They have nearly 9 million men under arms. To maintain such an army would place a tremendous burden upon the people. With nuclear weapons and present day airpower we must have a strong network of sea and air bases scattered throughout the world. Foreign aid is essential at the present time, and we must keep our friends in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In my opinion the Soviet Union has overextended herself in the past 3 years, and the sudden change in attitude of the past 4 months is a play for time. Russia has a mutual security program. Nine of the 12 Communist-ruled nations are contributing $750 million in materials, machinery and technical assistance to North Korea today. The Communists hope that we will again disarm and return to the pre-Pearl Harbor days. We must be ever vigilant and continue our efforts for peace by remaining militarily strong. We only have 6 percent of the world's population and the Communists have 35 percent of the total population. Notwithstanding our great economic resources we still must rely upon foreign countries for many essential commodities.

Millions of dollars of foreign aid money has been wasted. Now is the time to check this waste. We attempt to correct this matter in this bill. Under this bill no economic aid of any kind is being requested for any of the Marshall plan countries in Western Europe. Our foreign aid program saved Western Europe. Asia is the focal point of present Communist pressure, and here we shall have a long range struggle of freedom against oppression. For the past 4 years the need has been great in Asia. In Asia we have fertile territory for communism. Here we have an epidemic death rate; illiteracy ranging from 70 to 90 percent; average income close to zero with life lived at the levels of 1,000 years ago. We will use 68 percent of our nonmilitary foreign aid funds in the countries of free Asia during 1956. The shadow of communism hangs over 15 Asian nations, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, South Vietnam, Indonesia, Philippines, Nationalist China, Korea, and Japan. All of these countries are alert to the lure and dangers of Communist subversion. Seven hundred and seventy million people reside in these countries. Ten of the 15 countries of free Asia were colonies of other nations before World War II. Their political freedom is the consummation of a dream of many generations. Their military and economic strength are valuable to the United States and to the Free World. Our safety is related to their safety and we are tied close economically. Russia is striving to take over this huge territory of vast resources and vast population.

We must take a new look at our foreign-aid program and our defense expenditures. All waste must cease and we must remember that in our own country our highways and waterways need repairs and extensions; our educational system needs improvements in physical facilities; our national parks should be fully developed and our hospitals are in need of further improvement. Further reductions should be made when possible.

This bill covers many fine programs. We recommend the full amount requested for the United Nations children's fund of $14,500,000; the United Nations technical-assistance program of $24 million; escapee program of $6 million. We recommend $1,500,000 for ocean freight on voluntary relief shipments and $10 million for ocean freight on surplus agricultural commodities. We further recommend $1 million for the United Nations refugee fund to be used in solving location problems of the many refugees originating for the most part from World War II.

Our most important step toward mutual security was the creation of the United Nations, and, as provided for under its charter, we must save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The United States occupies the top position as far as leadership of the world is concerned and we must temper this leadership with love, Christianity, understanding, and vigilance. We must remain strong spiritually, economically, and militarily in order to preserve our freedom and the peace of the world.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

At this point I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Bailey].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the gentleman's enumeration of the many good programs contained in this appropriation bill. Will the gentleman agree with me that it is a good program to meet the shortage of classrooms throughout the United States?

Mr. NATCHER. I certainly do. I want to say further to my good friend from West Virginia that today in this country we have need of additional highways and waterways. The distinguished gentleman recalls that some 2 weeks ago I took the floor of the House and made the statement that I believe that our public-works program is just as important to Michigan, Florida, Kentucky, West Virginia, and all the other States as is our mutual-security program. So I say that I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us stick to the humanistic angle, our boys and girls.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that when this bill passes here today we will have set up $11,355,000,000 to spend. If that figure is incorrect, I wish some member of the committee would correct me.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GAVIN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Add to that $841,750,000 and the gentleman's figures will be correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Then we will be up to around $12 billion, and there are but few Members on the floor of this House concerning themselves with that gigantic, collossal program of spending.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like at this point also to point out that at no time under this program has the administration been able to spend more than $4.5 billion in any fiscal year.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman opposed to this bill? I have not been able to learn.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman repeat that question?

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman opposed to this bill?

Mr. GAVIN. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time, as much as I like my very good friend from South Carolina whom I admire very much.

Lately our foreign policy has undergone an agonizing reappraisal. A similar reappraisal will have to be made of our foreign economic programs. For we and our constituents know that the time has come to put an end to our excessive 'round the world handouts.

Lately we have carefully screened every appropriation that affects the welfare and well-being of our own people. A similar screening of the current foreign aid request should be made to see if we cannot effect some economy by reducing foreign spending.

We argued here for days on a $12 million or $14 million differential in a pay increase for our postal employees. We spent days and days on that legislation. Here are billions involved; nobody appears to be much concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I seem to recall, and I believe the gentleman does, that we had a bill before the House not so long ago providing for a rather meager appropriation for disaster relief, for hardship relief in this country, and one of the strongest supporters of this proposed legislation here and the authorization bill, voted "present" on that bill. I wonder if he will vote "present" on this.

Mr. GAVIN. I have not any idea how he will vote. I certainly would like to see an interest on the part of the House in these gigantic programs of spending.

The House recently authorized approximately $3.3 billion of continued aid for fiscal 1956, and the bill before us today is the request for the appropriation. The major portion of this aid will now go to Asia. The primary purpose of this aid program, which the Congress is now being asked to continue, was to give assistance for the relief and recovery of war-devastated areas. In fiscal 1956, the total asked for that type of economic program is the large sum of $712 million to be added to the $1.2 billion as yet unspent. The rest of the money will be diverted into defense purposes that we are helping to underwrite. The cuts—$649 million—that have been made in the appropriation bill before us today should stand.

Essentially I am against this continuing program of foreign assistance. I will set out my reasons very plainly.

At the end of the war we began with UNRRA. Soon we had aid to Greece and Turkey. We continued with interim aid and then the full glory of the Marshall plan burst upon us. The Marshall plan has gone through successive stages: namely, the European Cooperation Administration—ECA; the Mutual Security Agency—MSA; the Foreign Operations Administration—FOA; and now we have the International Cooperation Administration—ICA. The continuation of these agencies seems to have no end. We start with Hoffman, carry on with Harriman, continue with Harold Stassen, and we will now have a new man—Mr. John B. Hollister.

The number of agencies has increased and Government employees are being shifted from agency to agency, at home and abroad. At one time we had 1,400 officials in Paris disbursing foreign aid alone.

My contention is that economic recovery of these countries is complete and the grants of funds for these programs should be discontinued. First of all, we worked on a continental plan for Europe. The emphasis has now shifted to a Pacific-Indio plan, and no doubt we will very soon be asked to underwrite a global plan for which I do not even have a name. The sad part is that all of these programs began without a positive blueprint. They were feeler programs and once the tentacles found a soft spot the programs bloomed and blossomed, and year by year we in Congress are asked to underwrite the expenses of each new program. The programs blossom under a new guise every so often, but they do not die off.

My contention is that our major foreign-aid programs have outlived their usefulness. We assisted the war-devastated countries of Europe to an effective recovery, and as the specter of Communist confusion began to grow larger in Europe we asked our friendes to join us in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—to join us in the European Defense Community—EDC. The results show that we pay largely for the protection of Europe. We have underwritten the cost of NATO to a large extent.

I am forced to say that the efforts of our allies do not correspond with their capabilities. For example, France spend only 10 percent of her national income for national defense; Britain, 11 percent; the Netherlands, 7 percent; yet we have spent in the past up to approximately 25 percent of our national income at home and abroad for defense. Surely, if our friends in NATO and EDC believed in these organizations for their own protection as much as we do, then they would make sacrifices for it the same as we do. I am afraid that we have built a cardboard West wall whose steel framework is provided by the American divisions. A similar position is rapidly taking shape in the East wall in southern Asia. where the American Fleet, the American Air Force, and the American Army seems to form the backbone of defense against Communist infiltration.

The country that is giving the major amount of aid to foreign countries at the time enjoys the distinction of having the largest Federal debt, approximately $280 billion. In 1953 this debt comprised 74 percent of our gross national product for that year. Compare this debt with the debts of countries that we are aiding, and check the relationship of their debt to their gross national product. They were as follows:

	Percent
Norway	53.3
Germany	32.0
France	37.5
Spain	26.0
Belgium	67.0
Turkey	22.0
Japan	12.0
Philippines	10.0
Brazil	7.0
Mexico	4.0

Most of these countries claimed that they could not finance their own economies. Britain has balanced its budget. My answer is that we should balance our budget, and give some relief to the long-suffering American taxpayers who have generously and willingly assisted these foreign countries and are now asking them to carry their burdens themselves since they are well able to do so.

Most Americans still seem to think of Europe as an impoverished, war-ravished country, forgetting that 10 years of steadily-increasing production have intervened since the end of World War II. Europe does not need any further aid. Western Europe's trade with the rest of the world in 1954 was 128 percent above that of 1948, and 69 percent above that of 1938. Imports from the outside world were 24 percent above that of 1948 and 11 percent above that of 1938. Exports were 83 percent above those of 1948. Western Europe's exports to the dollar area alone were 30 percent above 1948.

Consumption per capita in Western Europe reached the 1938 level by 1950, and by 1954 was 12 percent above prewar. In 1954 the industrial output in Western Europe was 50 percent higher than in 1938 and agriculture production was 30 percent greater. In 1951 Western Europe planned for an annual increase of 4.5 percent in gross national product during each of the next 5 years. This figure was reached both in 1953 and in 1954.

With the vast amounts of money we have spent in Europe there does not seem to be an indication, specifically in France and Italy, that Communist influence has diminished. Both of these countries still have large blocs of Communist voters and the tendency is for trade unions to be largely controlled by Communist sympathizers. In addition, socialistic tendencies have gone on apace.

It seems to me as if the Soviet leaders are sitting on the sidelines watching the United States spend its substance in Europe to build up the industrial potential of various weak nations, and then wait long enough until these nations will fall in their laps like ripe plums. The thinking of free Western Europe I believe can be defined as a socialistic neutralism versus the opposing Communist forces. On the other hand, we have shifted our attention to Asia, and it seems to me that we are falling into the very same trap. On the one side we have the Moscow-Peiping axis characterized by its attitude of uncompromising belligerence and on the other side we have the New Delhi-Bandung axis characterized by its attitude of neutralist obstructionism.

Lately we have heard much in both Houses of Congress concerning extension of the trade-agreement program. Many of us are concerned, however, with the ever-increasing competition being offered by overseas products, competing at far lower prices with our domestically produced goods. We built the European factories; we financed their productivity teams to copy our mass-production methods; and now we are saddled with the products made by cheap labor. We did this with industrial products in Europe and now we are on the verge of doing it for agricultural products from Asia. I question the wisdom of subsidizing our competitors to put our own producers out of business.

Much has been written about the dollar gap and the buying we have to do in foreign countries if we wish to sell to them. The onus of proof that a dollar gap can be solved has been placed upon the United States. Apparently we are to be the ones who have to give to settle payments difficulties. It has been said that these difficulties are a matter of trade. However, it seems that the fluctuations in the balance-of-payments picture for the European Continent facing the United States and Canada is a permanent one, and that foreign aid to make up the deficit is not the solution.

I draw your attention to the fact that we are very strict in this country on income-tax matters. For years we have been hearing of the tax reformations that were to occur in Italy and France. However, little is ever done. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. We know full well that these people of means do not pay their just share, simply because these countries have failed to reform their tax laws and they do not enforce those they have on the books. Can we, in all honesty, ask our people to carry the burden of taxation as we have in this country, when other countries, who ask and practically demand aid from us, do not take similar steps of tax enforcement? I do not think that our United States taxpayers' money should be spent in Europe until foreign beneficiaries of our aid have similar laws, penalties, and tax-collecting procedures as we have.

In the kindness of our hearts we have expended nearly $50 billion net in Europe and elsewhere during the last 10 years. We did this to set them, as it were, on their feet again. With this money they have rehabilitated their farms; factories have been renovated; their ports have been modernized; transportation systems have been renewed; housing has been provided. All in all, the tangible benefits of that aid are to be seen. If we had spent similar amounts of money in our country, would we not not see the benefits also? I see our own highway system in urgent need of expansion; I see a school system lagging far behind in the provision of new classrooms; I see slum areas of our modern cities, which should be razed and improved; I see vast irrigation programs not begun, and conservation programs not yet started. All in all, a great need is upon us and we do not have the money to provide for it. I do not begrudge the aid that Congress has given foreign countries, but I think the time has come when these countries should begin to help themselves. Today the Congress should look after balancing our own budget and give tax relief to American taxpayers.

Finally, let me say that since 1945, Congress has appropriated approximately $400 per capita in gross foreign aid. It is the taxpayer in this country who has borne this burden. It seems to me that large amounts of aid could be given to foreign countries in the shape of lending through private enterprise, and where the recipients would be expected to repay the loans. Congress seems to have developed an extraordinary sensitivity to anything that happens abroad, yet does nothing about the depressed areas in our own country—the coal areas of Pennsylvania for an example. Should we undertake to settle their problems and their fears, and take little note that we have thousands of unemployed in the distressed coal areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia? It is time for a further reappraisal and careful screening of the foreign spending program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana, on the way he has conducted the hearings on the mutual-security appropriation. He was courteous and patient. He was well informed on the subject matter. Considering the limited time the committee had to study this matter, he was very thorough. It was very helpful to me, a new member of the subcommittee, to serve on it with so many distinguished members who had long years of service on the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the full committee was a member of the subcommittee, as was the former chairman of the full committee. At least five of the members were chairmen of other subcommittees. Indeed, it was informative and inspiring for me to work with these distinguished colleagues.

I have always been a strong advocate of a foreign aid program, and when I was appointed a member of this subcommittee, I had the intention of doing all I could to defend the request for appropriation. But I had heard the testimony of the witnesses before the subcommittee for only a short while when I was disillusioned and shocked at the facts disclosed.

This project deals with foreign aid in 69 countries and covers 34 projects. The original request was for $3.4 billion and there was $8.7 billion carried over from previous appropriations. Yet, the justification and report of the Foreign Operations Administration was submitted to Congress so late that this subcommittee had only 2 or 3 weeks to consider this complicated subject. Generally, the Appropriations Committee does not begin hearings on an appropriation of this nature until the authorization bill is passed. But in this case we had started hearings long before the Foreign Affairs Committee had reported and Congress approved the foreign aid authorization bill.

It developed in the testimony that there were large sums appropriated by previous Congresses which were still unspent. The witnesses were extremely reluctant to give us the facts in regard to these sums. I felt it was like cross-examining a hostile witness or pullling eye teeth to ascertain these facts. The Administrator first told us he thought the sums unexpended and previously appropriated were approximately $6½ billion. When the figures finally were presented to the subcommittee they showed the sum was $8.7 billion. It was attempted to excuse this condition by stating that these funds were in the pipeline and were obligated and reserved.

I personally did not hear any testimony stating for what projects these funds were obligated and reserved. I also had great difficulty in determining just what was meant by "reserved." But I believe it is correct to say that a reservation of funds certainly did not involve a binding agreement to expend them. It might have been a statement to some foreign country or another branch of the Government that money would be spent for a certain purpose. I came to the conclusion that it need not be anything more than an interoffice memorandum.

But whatever the term "reserved" might mean, it developed there were large unexpended sums of money in the mutual security and military portion of the program which were neither obligated nor reserved. As of April 30, this sum was stated to be a billion and half dollars. We had great difficulty determining during the hearings just how much was still unobligated, unreserved, and unspent in June. The budget was drawn up on the theory there would be $100 million of such funds on June 30. However, it developed at the time the witness appeared before the subcommittee that this sum was $620 million. In answer to a question by one of my colleagues on the subcommittee, Mr. Hensel stated that the request for $1.4 billion for the military-aid program was based on the theory that $100 million would be unexpended as of June 30, and that the appropriation for $1,400,000,000 could be reduced by the difference between $500 million and the amount unexpended, unreserved, and unobligated on that date. That sum was $34 million on that date and we reduced that appropriation by less than the amount of the difference.

Word was sent to the committee after we had closed our hearings that $312 million, in addition to the $620 million of military-aid funds already mentioned had been discovered which was unspent, unobligated, and unreserved. This made a total of $932 million of such funds that the Agency had on hand.

An agreement was then made with the committee by FOA that it would obligate or reserve this recently discovered sum of $312 million, but that the sum of $420 million would not be obligated and would revert to the Treasury. The remaining $200 million would be carried over or reappropriate, as provided in the authorization bill.

In violation of that agreement, the FOA reserved $612 million on the last day of the fiscal year. During the month of June, this agency reserved, spent, or obligated over $1 billion, while its average rate of commitment of funds had been approximately $207 million per month.

This appeared to be not only a violation of the agreement with the subcommittee, but a reckless disregard of the rights of the taxpayers, and a determination on the part of this agency to obligate these funds at all costs. Certainly, this much money could not have been obligated or reserved intelligently in 1 day. The sum of $420 million which the agency had agreed would revert to the Treasury was deducted by the Committee from the Agency's request for foreign military-aid funds.

I have always been an advocate of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I live on the perimeter of the territory served by that Agency and have been privileged to observe its beneficial results. However, we have many people in this country who feel the TVA program is "creeping socialism" and it has recently been characterized as "galloping socialism." During our hearings, it developed that hydroelectric projects, or foreign TVA's, had been developed with American funds in France, Italy, Spain, Korea, India, and Formosa. These projects were operated by the Government in those areas. It was also disclosed that more TVA's are planned in the Nile and Jordan River Valleys, to be built with United Nations funds to which the United States has contributed.

On June 27, I addressed a letter to the Administrator, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen, asking that he give me the names of the countries in which hydroelectric projects had been built or planned to be built with American funds and whether they are being operated by the Government or by private utilities. Up to the time when he left office on June 30, I had not received an answer to my letter. I then addressed a letter to the new Administrator on July 7, and on Friday, July 8, I was told that such facts were available up to a year ago, but they were not brought up to date and they were bringing them up to date for my benefit and I would receive them by today. I have not as yet received them.

However, I understand there are approximately 20 places where the United States is financing TVA's in foreign countries. As I have said before, I favor the TVA program, but I fail to see how people who denounce it as galloping or creeping socialism at home can favor these projects in foreign countries financed by American funds. If they feel TVA is so bad for America, why do they want to take American taxpayers' money to spread what they call creeping or galloping socialism all over the world?

We were continually told in the subcommittee hearings that the Marshall plan had been a great success in Europe and, therefore, the same remedy must be applied in Asia. This, to me, is like saying "Quinine cured malaria, therefore, we must give it to a man who has tuberculosis or cancer." The situation in Europe was entirely different from that in Asia.

After World War II, Europe was prostrate. Her industries and commerce were destroyed by the war; her currency was impaired either by inflation or other means. She did not have capital for rehabilitation. Through the Marshall plan, we supplied these funds and the result has been very satisfactory. So much so, that the economy has recovered to where production is 150 percent of what it was before World War II.

Only about $70 million is appropriated for Europe for economic recovery in this bill, and that is practically all for Spain and Yugoslavia. However, that does not mean we are not spending funds for economic recovery in Europe. We are spending in those countries funds previously obligated, notwithstanding the splendid recovery Europe has made.

An entirely different situation was presented in Asia. The continent was not devastated by war in the same way Europe was. Her problems are age-old. They are poverty, overpopulation, exploitation, and social maladjustment. But one thing has happened in Asia, and that is, that the Asians have determined to throw off the yoke of colonialism. Somewhat the same situation prevails there as prevailed in America in 1776. The Communists have moved into the vacuum and are exploiting this feeling. It seems to me that America must give these people some alternative to colonialism and communism, if we are to be successful there on that continent.

I do not think building a grain elevator, a steamplant, or a TVA in India, or in any other Asiatic country, is the answer to the problem. I will support the technical-assistance program and development aid, not because I think it will help us militarily, but because it is the Christian and humanitarian thing to do. If we hope to make friends by a lavish expenditure of money, I am afraid that is a vain hope. Mercenary friends have never proved of much value to anyone in an emergency. The point I am trying to make is that this is not a war-emergency program, but that the United States is endeavoring to act in accordance with its long tradition of being humanitarian.

When we assist in the health program in Asia, or in the agricultural program, we are performing exactly in the same manner as our health agency does when it does health work in our country, and as the Agriculture Department and the county agents do in this country. The same can be said for our work in commerce, industry, mining, manufacturing, education, and government. But in all cases when agencies operating such programs at home come before the Appropriations Committee they do not ask for blanket sums, but they give us a justification as to why they need the money and how it will be expended.

We are told by the Secretary of State and have been told by the former Administrator of the foreign-aid agency that there is no relief in sight for the American taxpayer for expenditures for economic aid in Asia, and for military expenditures. This program should be placed on a sound financial basis. It is not good government to have such large sums of unexpended funds. It causes recklessness in expenditures and causes Congress to lose control of the purse strings.

I think we must recognize the fact that this program is very unpopular in many places. I feel it is in the district I represent. Continually more opposition is aroused to this program in Congress. Our Government probably owes more money than is owed by all the countries we are helping combined. We are operating with the biggest peacetime deficit in the history of the United States.

They tell me that one of the programs we had under the technical-assistance programs was to teach foreign countries how to balance their budgets. Someone said we should have a reverse point 4 program and some of the foreign countries should teach America how to balance its budget.

The American people are taxed possibly higher than any other country in the world. It is rather shocking to see the small amount of taxes, especially on the wealthy, that are levied in some countries to which we grant aid. In short, if this agency does not show more consideration to the American taxpayer in handling foreign-aid money and be a little more cooperative with the Congress, it might find that Congress will not approve this program.

We were told by the Defense Department official in charge of the foreign military-aid program that if Congress granted no additional appropriations to it, the program could still operate for 3 years. That is not a healthy situation.

As one who is interested in the foreign-aid program, I hope that this agency's shortcomings will be thoroughly explained and corrected. I certainly hope this agency will present its estimate to Congress at a much earlier date, and that, when it does so, it will justify its expenditures—and not merely make a hysterical appeal that there is an emergency and that America must be strong.

I hope that they will give Congress a full accounting of the unobligated funds, and that they will bring their expenditures up to date. We expect other agencies to do that. We want the foreign-aid program's finances put in better order.

Your committee with this bill has made a start in that direction. I hope that the bill will be approved substantially as written by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to point out with regard to the gentleman's reference to the $100 million unobligated balance answer of Mr. Hensel that that answer was given on May 10, 1955, in reply to an inquiry by a Member of the other body, either Senator SMITH of Maine or Senator SMITH of New Jersey, and is definitely a matter of record. On June 17, 1955, Mr. Hensel and his staff came before our committee and it was established that the figure was not $100 million as he had informed the other body but $620 million. He gave the following testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, on May 10:

> Senator SMITH. I hope we are privileged to reflect to our colleagues on the floor that you have helped on the so-called unexpended balances. Your statement that you read this morning states that:
>
> "All but $100 million should, in our opinion, be obligated, as that term is now statutorily defined, by June 30, 1955, assuming all required program approvals and allocations."
>
> Mr. HENSEL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator SMITH. That means the whole story this year of unexpended balances is answered.
>
> Mr. HENSEL. Well, they will still be unexpended, and I want to make clear to you that I retain a certain amount of flexibility in being able to divert items covered to other countries.
>
> Senator SMITH. But they will be definitely obligated?
>
> Mr. HENSEL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator SMITH. And our colleagues could not say that you have too much available.
>
> Mr. HENSEL. That is right.
>
> Senator SMITH. That is the problem in the Appropriations Committee, of course, but it looks to me as though this meets it.

On June 17 he testified as follows before our committee:

> Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Hensel, I may ask this question: Under "military assistance," page 40 of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the report indicates that all but $100 million would be obligated by June 30.
>
> Mr. HENSEL. Yes.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. The actual figures presented to this committee reflect that the unobligated and unreserved balances will be $620 million as of June 30. That is on page 30, section 1.
>
> Mr. HENSEL. Yes.

Mr. DENTON. Then after we closed our hearings it seems they found $312 million they did not know anything about or else they had not told us about; and that added to the $620 million makes $932 million.

Then there was their agreement that they would obligate $312 million; $420 million would revert to the Treasury; and $200 million would be carried over. In violation of that agreement they obligated $612 million on the last day of the fiscal year, and they obligated and reserved over a billion in the last month. It looks to me as though that is playing fast and loose not only with the Members of Congress but with the money of the taxpayers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to this "creeping socialism" business mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, had not the gentleman been under the impression that beginning on the 20th of January 1953, when the Republican administration came into power, we were not going to have any more creeping or galloping socialism?

Mr. DENTON. According to some people's definition it must be galloping all over the world, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will agree there is this difference: In the United States it is possible to get private capital to construct these projects, whereas in most of these countries there simply is not the private capital?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. If you would provide Dixon-Yates contracts over there, as has been done in this country, you would not have any trouble finding private utilities all over the world making the investment.

Mr. JUDD. Private capital is not willing to go into these countries and make the investment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Indiana could tell the gentleman from Minnesota an experience of a constituent of his in the matter of providing investment in a foreign country, could he not?

Mr. DENTON. Perhaps so.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. May I say that I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, it is well known in the House that I have opposed the foreign-aid program by any of its various names over the years. My opposition commenced as early as the British loan and continued through the so-called Marshall plan down to date.

However, I do not believe that it is the function of the Appropriations Committee to veto policies already agreed upon by the Congress. Rather, it is our duty to study with care the moneys involved without reference to our belief in or opposition to the policy established by law.

Although I can say that from my personal viewpoint most of the money involved in this bill should not be spent, I am by and large reasonably satisfied that the committee did the best job it could within the limitations of time on a program whose best friends will admit is both expensive and wasteful.

However, we have reduced the budget requests by some $628 million, most of which is concentrated in a cut of $420 million from unobligated funds, which has already been fully explained by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and another cut of $100 million in the President's discretionary fund for Asia, which in my judgment was fully justified.

In cutting the Asian fund three things must be kept in mind:

First. That the $100 million allowed by the committee is as much as anybody thinks will be spent in the coming fiscal year;

Second. That in addition to this blank check appropriation, the President has a worldwide discretionary fund of $100 million, which can be used here as well as elsewhere; and

Third. That the President can transfer funds from one operation to another up to 10 percent, and 10 percent of this bill spells a lot of money.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it appears that both of these major cuts are fully justified and should be sustained by the House.

To indicate my general satisfaction with our work is not, of course, to say that I am entirely happy with everything that has been done. For example, we are appropriating a large sum for military assistance to our former enemy, Japan, and I am by no means sure that Japan has the right under its own constitution or our treaty with it to establish a military machine. In the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, we are making available in this bill a great many millions of dollars to help reestablish the army and air force of another former enemy, and everybody knows that as of today the German Parliament has not yet passed a bill authorizing such a military establishment. Indeed, the only bill under present consideration, as I understand it, is a bill permitting the voluntary recruitment of 6,000 commissioned officers, and whether and upon what terms the German Government will authorize a complete military establishment is something in the future, and therefore should be appropriated in the future.

I am frank to say that I am not happy with the appropriation for the Communist country of Yugoslavia because I am far from confident that our jet planes given them will be used for the security of the United States in the event of trouble.

I am persuaded that the scores of millions that we are pouring into the Indochina area, plus $180 million worth of our equipment left there after the Indochina war, will prove in the long run to be a waste of money.

With complete recognition that Great Britain's Royal Air Force is of great importance and great dependability, I am not persuaded that we must modernize it with United States dollars. England is producing better than 150 percent of its prewar record and has moderately reduced its taxes. It is closer to a balanced budget and has far less relative debt than we. England is just as much interested in world stability and world peace as we are, and I believe just as able to help herself as we are to help her.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is not the present opportunity to discuss all these details and I congratulate my colleagues on the cuts they did make rather than criticize them on the cuts they did not make.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize two very important points which are referred to in the report of our committee: One point is contained in the opening paragraph of the report, which reads as follows:

> One of the problems which faces this committee in its consideration of estimates of appropriations for the mutual-security program each year is the timing of the budget estimate. The Congress and the committee for the past several years have been handicapped in their attempt to give full consideration to the large and varied items of expense encompassed by the mutual-security program because of the delay in submission by the administration of both the authorizing and appropriating legislation.

That is a masterpiece of understatement. It is a serious reflection on the legislative process to take a detailed and complicated bill involving billions of dollars and attempt to give it adequate consideration in the closing days of the congressional session. If we had this bill a month earlier than we did, we could have saved millions a day for every extra day of hearings afforded.

The second point I wish to emphasize is the committee's reference to the fantastic obligating, deobligating and reobligating funds. The House managers in their conference report referred to this as the "gyrations" in the estimates of unobligated balances. The House managers also said:

> The conferees were shocked at the wholesale reservations reported to have been made in the Defense Department during the last few days of the fiscal year, in order to save their appropriations from losses under section 1311. The loss of $275 million through failure to obligate or reserve during this rush period is now being called a saving by the agencies.

Our committee had various estimates of unobligated balances in the last few days of our hearings ranging from $100 million to $900 million. This is not a very close guess. In this Department "obligations" is a very flexible term. The truth is that there is more money unobligated in this program than can be spent in the next couple of years and enough moneys actually unobligated to keep it going very comfortably.

UNITED NATIONS CONTRIBUTIONS

However, Mr. Chairman, I now desire to address myself to a different phase of the program, and that is United States contributions to the United Nations programs covered in this bill. I have heretofore frankly admitted my opposition to the foreign-aid program; however, I have just as consistently supported our contributions to the international activities carried on by the United Nations. This is perfectly logical, Mr. Chairman, because what I object to is our established habit of picking up the whole check. I do not object to our participation in world affairs and doing our fair share, even though the activities of the United Nations are frequently disappointing.

The amendment which I propose to offer will seek to limit the contributions by the United States to one-third of the total world bill rather than the 50, 60 or 70 percent we are now paying. This would apply primarily to the United Nations technical assistance program in which we now pay more than 60 percent, the so-called Work and Relief Agency, which is for the Arabs displaced from Palestine, in which we pay some 65 percent, and to the children's fund in which we pay more than 60 percent. I have no doubt but that the children's fund does good work and work which appeals strongly to us all from a humanitarian standpoint. However, when I observe that the United States pays some 61.6 of the total cost as contrasted for example to prosperous Belgium's share of 0.74, the Netherlands 0.29, France 3.64, and even the United Kingdom's 4.12, I am persuaded as usual we are being taken for a ride. Those of you who, like myself, wholeheartedly support the thought that the United States should do its full share in world affairs certainly should not object to fixing that reasonable share at not to exceed one-third.

Our negotiators have given no consideration to any factor except our gross national product as related to the gross national product of other nations, and this is based on inadequate figures. Strangely enough they have given no thought to the relative tax burdens borne by the United States citizen, and no thought to our strangling national debt which is far larger than that of any other country in the world.

All I shall seek to do by this amendment is not to curtail or to in any way cripple the United Nations program but merely to restrain by some rule of reason our share to a fair and reasonable percentage, and I sincerely hope that when the amendment is offered, it will receive the support of the House.

The Members will recall the persistent effort along these lines of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I am trying to put those efforts into effect with respect to this particular bill.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, allow me to make a reference to the perceptive and intelligent work done over a period of years by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith]. As you know, he has been quite ill, and it was a thrill to see him a few days ago, not yet fully recovered and risking his health in a further effort to throw light in some of the dark corners of this whole foreign aid program.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to say this, that our national debt is not only greater than that of any other nation in the world, but it is greater than those of all the other nations of the world put together.

Mr. HAND. I am sure that is an accurate statement and is something we ought to pause to realize.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Passman and Mr. Gross.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 83.

So the motion was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we did not get a rollcall for I believe I have facts which would interest all Members. I have the highest regard for the chairman of this subcommittee both as a man and as a Member of Congress. He has my sympathy in the job he has of steering this bill through the House. However, I truly believe the further expansion of funds for foreign aid, with a present carryover of six to eight billion dollars, by $2,700,000,000 will ruin us.

May I say the best arguments for the amendment I shall offer later have been made by the subcommittee itself.

If ever there has been evidence of the fallacious policy which we, in the Congress, follow, it has been given by my friends in presenting this bill to you. Where formerly we used to give authority to contract obligations and then we paid those obligations as they fell due, for the last several years, this committee and others have been appropriating the full amount that the contract might call for. In other words, to make certain that they would spend what we were afraid they might spend, we have been giving them the full amount of money to start with. As a result, in this activity alone, according to one set of figures there is about $6 billion of carryover funds, and according to another set of figures, there is about $8 billion, and according to still another set of figures, part of it is just reserve funds and another part is committed and another part is obligated. Be that as it may, the foreign-aid officials can juggle it around all over again and the foreign-aid group has not given the Congress any firm report on its obligations, as it is required to do by law today. We have not had that. My amendment is very simple. If we will follow up the course I suggest, we can see how much money they have actually spent each year—and they have actually spent far less each of the past few years than the $8 billion that they carry over. You have heard every advocate of the $2,700,000,000 in this bill say that in the last days they reserved hundreds of millions of dollars and obligated so many hundreds of millions of dollars and you know what is involved in it—they simply tied enough strings on it so that they can ask and are asking this Congress for new money to the tune of $2,700,000,000. My amendment is simply this—that this Congress carry out the request of the President in his message, and that this Congress carry out the recent authorization bill—by doing what? By reappropriating from the carryover of the funds an amount equal to what is in this bill. Then you will begin to bring about a correction in this policy which is about to wreck this country. The policy that I have been talking about is also running us into trouble with military appropriations, for we follow the same shortsighted policy there.

Our Appropriations Committee has been conducting investigations since the first of the year. Such report is in the supplemental appropriation hearings released today. This investigator's report shows what we have done to the American farmer, laborer and middleman through the foreign aid program in the field of agriculture. Through foreign aid we have spent about $23 billion on increasing foreign agriculture. Why, we have made grants through the Export-Import Bank and we have made loans through the International Bank to develop lands in foreign countries. Listen to this, my colleagues, because this is almost impossible to believe, but if you read this investigator's report you will see we have used our money to put foreign lands into production. Then, under our tax laws, we have given tax concessions to American business interests to go into these foreign countries and develop them. Then, under the technical assistance program, we have gone into those countries and taught them how to produce those very things that we are troubled with in this Nation. Then, as a matter of domestic policy, we have held our wheat, corn and cotton off the world markets at truly competitive prices so that American business interests in these foreign countries could have those markets. As we have held those commodities off the world market, we have counted them, and the Department of Agriculture has reduced the farm income drastically, following the law, by counting those commodities to reduce acreage. As a result, according to a survey by the Department of Agriculture, with respect to cotton alone this year, an order of the Government put 55,000 farm families out of work in the United States. They reduced 130,000 small cotton farmers below $1,000 a year annual income. What else? The present situation is so serious that our President has sent down a message to help the small farmers. And then we had Public Law 480 to give away the very commodities we took off the market by setting other folks up in business.

I spent the morning with United States Department of Agriculture officials including the new sales manager for the Commodity Credit Corporation, a position my subcommittee insisted on creating, trying to help work out some basis on which the $4 billion the United States has held off world markets will be moved back in. As we do that we are bound to meet the competition we ourselves have set up by this foreign-aid program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bentley].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to a thing that is contained in this figure of $705 million, on line 6, page 2; that is, an amount of approximately $100 million that you might say honestly and effectively is being used for the purpose of subsidizing the British aircraft industry.

Last year we had that amount spelled out as about $75 million in the authorization bill. The House took care of that by eliminating that on the floor, but it was restored in the other body and maintained in the conference.

A few weeks ago, when we had the authorization bill before us, I introduced an amendment to take care of that $100 million figure, in which is included the figure for subsidizing the British aircraft industry. The amendment was not permitted to be introduced, through a point of order.

I would like to read briefly a few remarks from a report filed by the staff of the Overseas Economic Operations Task Force of the Hoover Commission entitled "Present Status of the British Aircraft Program," dated January 11.

Mr. Van Rensselaer, staff director, Overseas Economic Operations Task Force, says:

> There are presently available approximately $200 million of appropriated but not yet finally committed fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1955 funds which have been conditionally committed or earmarked for the purchase or financing of the Javelin and Swift fighters, the Canberra light bomber and one or more of the medium bombers.

With respect to the Javelin fighter, which under the guise of offshore construction I understand we are financing, I have before me a clipping dated about a week ago, July 3, 1955, from the London Sunday Express from which I would like to read a paragraph:

> Another crisis is looming over Britain's air defense. This revolutionary Javelin delta-wing fighter, on which rested one of the RAF's chief hopes of repelling an atom-bomber attack, is displaying serious defects, and in its present form could never be put into front-line service.

So much for the present status of some of the planes for which we are being asked to appropriate money this afternoon.

I would like to call attention to a report made by the investigational division of the Committee on Appropriations of the other body approximately a year ago. In its conclusions and recommendations in this particular report, which is entitled "United States Aid to British Aircraft Program," I would like to read the following:

> Foreign aid is being used to build up and fortify the productive facilities of other countries to the detriment of United States strategic industries. Specifically, United States taxpayers' money is being used to support, directly or indirectly, the British aircraft industry which is heavily subsidized by the British Government.

Point 4:

> The effect of the grants-in-aid to the Royal Air Force was to release British budgetary funds for the continued subsidization of the commercial jet development program.

Following the many recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations investigating division it says:

> If high policy decrees that United States grant aid should be continued in support of the British military air budget, it would be desirable to explore with the appropriate technicians and policymakers the possibilities of supplying the British Government with the airframes of our latest types of fighters in which British-make engines could be readily installed. This formula, if feasible, would appear to be preferable to the present program for the following reasons: (1) The combination of United States airframes and British engines should result in truly supersonic fighters far superior to the Javelin, Hawker, Hunter, and Swift. (2) United States grant aid would not be used to build up production lines in the United Kingdom to turn out planes that are not comparable to the suggested United States-British combination versions. (3) United States taxpayers' money would be used to strengthen our own aircraft industry and make jobs for American workers instead of contributing to the British program for civil jet expansion.

If it is the will of the committee to continue putting $100 million into the British aircraft industry for the purpose of allowing their aircraft industry to be subsidized so that the British can come over here and conclude contracts with some of our commercial airline companies for the use of commercial jet transportation instead of buying American transports, that is perfectly all right. But I feel certain that the committee would want to know what it is doing with this amount which is, incidentally, a classified amount, but which is contained in the $705 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I imagine everyone in this chamber is fully aware of my previous connections with this program. I have had the privilege of being identified with it since it was first inaugurated.

At the outset let me pay my respects to our very able chairman of this subcommittee. It has been said that he is in a tough spot, having opposed the program on previous occasions. I am certain, however, every member of this committee will agree that no one could be fairer than the gentleman from Louisiana has been in handling this program. He has delved in every phase of the program and he has attempted to find what funds are available for next year and to see that the funds necessary are appropriated, and no more. He has done an excellent job.

I want to say to you that I personally feel this is a fair bill. I have advocated this program on the floor of the House for many years.

I was in Europe at the time the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] was, in 1947. I remember the condition that prevailed there at that time: Practically all of Europe was in ruins, homes had been destroyed, cities devastated, fields laid waste, and there was no hope in the land. They said very freely at that time that if Europe was to be saved it could be saved only with the assistance of the United States of America. I am glad to say that the United States went to the assistance of that stricken land.

I was back in Europe with the Richards committee in 1951. Conditions were much improved, but I remember at that time that there were clamors in the United States for the reduction of this program, and we went over to talk to then General Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. I remember very distinctly as General Eisenhower spoke to our committee one member asked: "General, in your judgment, what would have been the effect had the United States not embarked on this aid program?"

Without hesitation General Eisenhower said:

> In my judgment, with the possible exception of Spain, I do not believe there would be a single free country in Europe today. Every country in Europe would be behind the Iron Curtain.

It will be recalled that General Gruenther succeeded General Eisenhower in that important command. Just a few days ago as General Gruenther appeared before our subcommittee I recalled to him General Eisenhower's statement and I asked him if he concurred in it. He said he thought there was no question about it. The foreign-aid program of the United States unquestionably saved Europe.

I recall further, however, that in 1952 as we talked to General Eisenhower one of the members of the committee suggested to him that the people of the United States were getting rather weary of unbalanced budgets and large expenditures; consequently they asked him when in his judgment we could begin to reduce this program. He was vigorously urging us at the time to continue it, and not to cut the amount President Truman had requested. "This is the crucial period," he said, "whatever you do, do not cut this program at the present time."

So we asked him when he thought we would be able to cut it. He said, "That is problematical, but I would say that certainly by the end of 1954 we will have reached a point when we can begin to cut it down."

Mr. Chairman, 1954 has passed. We are now appropriating for 1956. Very frankly, I think the time has come when we should cut this program, which is exactly what our committee has recommended.

The committee has not tried to cripple the program. What it has done is to try to begin to taper off the expenditures which must be gradually reduced and finally eliminated.

We have cut this program $620 million. I am not going into the items that make up those various cuts and I am not going into a discussion as to the unobligated and reserve balances here, although I think there is this distinction, may I say for the benefit of the gentleman from Indiana who asked the question a few moments ago. He asked, "What is the difference between the reservations and unobligated balances?"

The facts are that this whole program is fluid. It has been fluid from the beginning. Congress purposely made it fluid. It is customary for this body on programs of this kind to authorize the United States to participate in them, and then, thereafter, you do not have to have continuing authorizing legislation, but in order that we might review this program each year and make such changes in it as the facts might justify we have only authorized it for 1 year at a time. There has never been an authorization program for more than 1 year. That in itself makes the program fluid because the Congress can change it at any time when the authorization or the appropriation bill is before this body.

Mr. Chairman, in order to work out a program, however, it is necessary to map out a long-range program, extending beyond a year. For example, suppose the military authorities determine that a jet air force is needed in Indochina.

It takes a long time to get a jet air force into operation. In the first place, you have to get the agreement of the government with which you are dealing. Now, we obviously cannot make an agreement with that government unless we know that the funds are going to be available. Therefore, they come before the Congress and include in their appropriation an estimated amount for this jet air force which the military has determined is essential. Then we begin to enter into negotiations with the country for that air force. Then arise questions of the training of necessary pilots and various other matters before we can even get to the point of entering into contracts for the planes. That money is actually committed when we enter into an agreement with that country. We are committed to spend whatever amount is necessary to build that air force. Then we go ahead with the planes. The money is not considered actually obligated until the planes themselves are delivered. It is reserved when orders are placed with the military authorities.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would just like to express my gratitude to the gentleman for that explanation, which is very helpful.

Mr. GARY. Thank you, sir.

Frankly, reserve funds, we must admit, are not firm commitments. They are commitments, but this program is subject to change at any time. The agreements are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians that cannot be changed. They can be changed, and if, for some reason, later on it is decided that this venture is improper, the entire funds can be deobligated and the funds are there to be obligated for some other purpose, and that is the difference.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a fact that when contracts are signed, the funds are obligated rather than before they are delivered? For instance, once things are delivered under contract, how can they be deobligated at that time?

Mr. GARY. Insofar as direct contracts made by the FOA are concerned, the funds are obligated when the contracts are made, but with respect to the common items ordered through the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I understand they do not consider the funds obligated until the items are delivered.

Mr. JUDD. I do not see how they could be deobligated after they are delivered.

Mr. GARY. The reason they are not firm obligations is because the military has been operating under the policy of letting contracts for large numbers of planes. Now, when we were in the war in Korea, when those planes were delivered, they may have been ordered for Europe, for part of the NATO forces, but if we needed them for Korea when they were completed, instead of sending them to NATO, we gave priority to our own military needs, and those planes ordered for Europe were sent over to Korea instead of being sent to Europe, and to that extent they would be deobligated.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it the gentleman's opinion, then, considering the 25-percent limitation that applies to the last 2 months of a fiscal year, that in connection with the terms "reserve" and "obligated" those funds should be lumped together when we are considering that 25 percent?

Mr. GARY. Yes, I think so. That unquestionably was, in my judgment, the intention of the committee.

Mr. ADAIR. Then, the gentleman would feel that to reserve this great amount in the last days of the fiscal year was not a very proper thing to do?

Mr. GARY, I unquestionably say so.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The point I am making is this: No one had ever heard of reservations until this year. Heretofore they had all been considered obligations. Reservations are a result of section 110 of Public Law 778.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am afraid I need a little more enlightenment. I understood that the term "reservation" under the statute referred to common use items that were procured by the three departments and were then purchased, as it were, for mutual-security purposes; that the term could not be applied to what they called direct citation items where there were actual contract obligations. The gentleman's definition of "reservation" does not bear out my understanding. Am I then in error?

Mr. GARY. I would not say so. Frankly I will say to the gentleman I do not know exactly what the military considers reservations. I think the term covers a multitude of sins. But I was trying to point out the difference that had been made between obligations and reservations, that they did not call them obligations, as I understand, in dealing with these commitments that they made within the last 60 days. And they had a ruling that they could use reserve funds or reservations.

Mr. VORYS. I understood that a reservation could only be made for an item that was to be acquired from 1 of the 3 services, Army, Navy, or Air Force; that the reservation could only be made at a time that delivery was about to be made. That was the statutory definition and that was the definition in the regulations. Am I correct in that?

Mr. GARY. I think that is correct; yes, sir. I think that is absolutely correct. But I think a different meaning was given to it by the administration.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I cannot believe that the definition of obligation that the gentleman is giving is quite correct because, for example, we have some $8 billion of carryover which is all obligated. Why is it carryover? Because the material has not yet been delivered. If it were obligated only when it was delivered, then there would not be this $8 billion of carryover.

Mr. GARY. Under that definition there would not be; that is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that shortly the Harris bill, which would exempt natural-gas producers from Federal regulations, will come before the House for debate. I want to go into the details of this important bill, the events leading up to it, and my reasons for stating that our national welfare and our national defense are threatened unless we pass it. An awful lot of verbal wind and noise, some honest misunderstanding and some deliberate misrepresentations surround this bill.

On June 21, 1938, the Congress passed the Natural Gas Act giving the Federal Power Commission certain basic jurisdiction in connection with the transportation of natural gas. This is a rather long bill, and I shall not quote its full text but I should like to read the exact language of section 1 (b):

SECTION 1 OF THE GAS ACT

> "The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

Mr. Chairman, I want to underscore these last lines of the act's language for the purpose of emphasis. Natural-gas producers assumed from this language that the Federal Power Commission had no jurisdiction over the price of gas at the wellhead. The Federal Power Commission took the same position. For 16 years—until 1954—this was the law of the land.

Last year, the United States Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 3, upset the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The Court ordered the Federal Power Commission to fix the price of gas at the wellhead. It held that that was the intent of the Congress in passing the Natural Gas Act, although to me, and many others who have studied this problem, the language of the act, which I have just quoted, seems unmistakably clear and can be interpreted as meaning only one thing—the Federal Power Commission has no authority to meddle into the price of gas at the wellhead.

The Court's decision is now the law, and we must abide by it despite the fact that it has thrown the gas industry into an uproar, with economic consequences that are affecting and will continue to affect the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one remedy and that is passage of the Harris bill. That is the only answer to last year's Supreme Court decision.

In a frenzied propaganda drive, led by Mayor Clark, of Philadelphia, many intelligent and well-intentioned men and women now believe that passage of the Harris bill will boost the price of natural gas. Actually, just the opposite is true. Mayor Clark, an astute and headline-hungry politician, appears to be more interested in creating a political issue designed to be locally helpful to him than he is in the consumers in the Philadelphia area.

An economy of scarcity cuts down production and thus raises prices. Continued Federal control of natural gas prices at the wellhead leads inevitably to an economy of scarcity. For 16 years prior to last year's Supreme Court decision, the natural-gas industry flourished. It was growing by leaps and bounds. Only 35 years ago natural gas supplied less than 4 percent of the energy used in the United States. It now supplies almost 25 percent, serving 27 million customers in our homes and in our industries. In the past 16 years the price of natural gas for home cooking has dropped by almost 7 percent, while the cost of living has almost doubled.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out here that the natural-gas producer receives less than 10 percent of the total consumer cost of gas, despite the fact that he is called on to take enormous financial risks. On the average he drills 8 dry holes before he hits 1 that brings forth gas and oil. These gas wells cost on an average of $100,000 each, and some go even higher.

The risks involved in this business are increasing every day. Drilling costs are getting higher, and even when he does find gas the producer must compete on a price level with a pipeline company. On an equity basis alone you would imagine that the producer would get a price for his gas based on his production costs, plus his losses. Such is not the case. He takes the market price or he takes nothing, and the market price is arrived at by spirited competition and negotiation between the producers and the pipeline companies.

The natural-gas industry is divided into three parts: the production and gathering of gas; its interstate transmission by pipelines; and, finally, its distribution by local utility companies. Even before the Supreme Court handed down its decision last year two important segments of the gas industry were already strictly regulated. The Federal Power Commission controlled the pipeline companies, and State and city public utility commissions regulated the local distributor. Ninety percent of the consumer's gas prices, therefore, were under careful control and regulation at all times since passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938. Less than 10 percent of the consumer's gas bill—the share received by the gas producer—was not regulated.

ANNUAL GAS BILL TO CONSUMERS

The average gas bill for residential consumers in this country was $70.19 for 1954. Of this amount, the producer received about $7, less than 60 cents a month—or about 2 cents a day—less than the cost of a postage stamp.

The balance of $63.19 the consumer pays is the freight for its transmission through the expensive pipelines, costing millions of dollars, which carry it to the users, and the added cost of distribution after it reaches the city through the various gas utilities to the burner tips. It is ridiculous to talk about keeping controls on the little amount the producer, who makes the gas available, gets. The producers do not own the pipelines.

So, all of the noise about gouging the public—and runaway prices of gas—and all of the inflammatory statements on this issue—all of them misleading statements—involve less than 1½ cents a day, which goes into what the professional bleeding hearts call "the grasping hands of the selfish interests," many of whom have gambled millions of dollars looking for gas and oil.

If we kill the spirit of adventure—which is so typically American—the desire to get ahead—as we are doing by the Federal control of natural gas prices at the wellhead, we are endangering our economy and our national defense. Oil and gas played a major part in our victory in World War II.

We cannot afford to discourage venture capital—the kind of money required for locating, drilling and producing gas and oil. It takes men of vision and courage to get into this business, and we would be making a serious mistake by making the production of gas a public utility, subject to the bureaucratic red tape and restrictions of Washington. There is already evidence available to show that unless we rectify and change, by law, the Supreme Court's decision there will be a sharp downward trend in the production of gas. You cannot expect wildcatting—which is so necessary in the gas and oil business unless there is a reasonable market price for what is found. This is a truism that applies to prospecting for all other natural mineral resources.

PRICE HAS DROPPED TO THE CONSUMER

Mr. Chairman, as I have already pointed out, the price of gas to the consumer has dropped by almost 7 percent in the past 16 years. He was protected by the law of supply and demand and by almost brutal competition. The Harris bill goes even further—it has a built-in protection for the consumer. Let me read you that section of the bill:

SECTION 5 PROTECTS CONSUMER

> When an increase in any rate or charge for natural gas is filed with the Commission by a natural-gas company, and is based in whole or in part upon any contract, executed or renegotiated after the date this subsection takes effect, for the purchase of natural gas from a person other than an affiliate, the Commission shall determine, unless there has been a prior determination under subsection (c) of this section, whether the price at which the natural-gas company has contracted to buy such natural gas is the reasonable market price thereof at the point at which the gas is delivered into the transportation facilities of the natural-gas company in or within the vicinity of the field, or fields, where produced. After such determination, the natural-gas company shall be allowed to charge as an operating expense for natural gas purchased under the contract only such part of the contract price as does not exceed such reasonable market price. In determining the reasonable market price of natural gas under the provisions of this section 5, the Commission shall consider, among other things, whether such price has been competitively arrived at, the effect of the contract upon the assurance of supply, and the reasonableness of the provisions of the contract as they relate to existing or future prices.

Mr. Chairman, that one paragraph of the Harris bill should be enough to refute public statements made by some so-called liberals, who are not members of this body, that passage of this bill will boost the price of gas by $600 million a year. That is utter nonsense, and those who are making the charges should know it. They are making an emotional appeal to the consumers—the great masses of people in this country—who obviously do not have the time to study such matters as the Harris bill.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITTEE

Realizing the importance of oil, gas, coal, and other minerals to the defense of our Nation and to its industrial strength, President Eisenhower, in July of last year, appointed a Cabinet-level committee to make a careful study and analysis of these minerals, and other resources, known as the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, better known as the Cabinet committee.

Now, this Committee had various task forces studying this problem for many months, and they strongly endorse the principle behind the Harris bill on the grounds of national defense. This so-called Cabinet committee was headed up by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Committee retained the services of some of the most outstanding scientists, economists, and industralists and some of the ablest leaders in the gas and petroleum field, to make this important study.

On February 26 of this year, the Cabinet committee issued a report, in part, stating:

> The Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

Their reasoning behind this statement was sound. They discovered that men with money and the know-how simply will not risk it, if they have hanging over them the threat of Government control of gas prices in the field.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me, and I believe you will agree with me, that when this comprehensive study was made under the direction of the members of the Cabinet assisted by task forces selected for their experience and ability in these fields, that the recommendation of this Committee ought to be accepted by the Members of this Congress, as a factual verdict, clear of any influence or prejudice, and should cause the Members of this House to feel, as the Cabinet-level committee recommended, that in the interest of national defense and the building up of the industrial strength of our country, we should take their advice, along with our own good judgment, and remove these controls that are stifling, and will continue to stifle, the gas industry of the Nation.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

It is most unusual to find an executive agency asking the Congress to take away some of its powers. On the contrary, as we in the House know, most agencies constantly seek more power, personnel and money. But, what do we find at the Federal Power Commission? We find that the Federal Power Commission does not want authority to control the price of gas in the fields.

In a letter dated March 21, 1955, Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, told Chairman PRIEST, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, why the Harris bill should be passed. This is a very long letter. I think I should quote here some of its more important excerpts:

> We support this proposed legislation because we firmly believe that such legislation will, in the long run, result in the greatest good to the largest number of people of this country.
>
> We are firmly convinced, from every aspect of public interest, and particularly that of national defense, that Congress should not single out natural gas as the only one among those fuels over which an artificial ceiling should be placed.

The authorities I have just quoted should be enough to support the case for the Harris bill. Certainly, their statements—made after a long and serious study of the problem—should be sufficient to justify the passage of this legislation by an overwhelming vote by the Members of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MUTUAL SECURITY

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 665, approved August 26, 1954, as amended by Public Law ——, 84th Cong.), as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to make a few observations, to express some of my opinions on the present cooing policy of the Communist leaders. For some reason or reasons, it is obvious that the Communists desire a relaxation of tensions. Lest we forget, I want to review some of the historical efforts of the Communists in that same respect in the past, for historically we must remember that this same relaxation of tensions was desired by the Bolsheviks in 1917 under the policy of peace, land, and bread. Again in 1935, with the growing threat of naziism under the policy of the united fronts with all anti-Fascist elements. Upon the death of Stalin in 1953, the same effort was made by the Communists under the Communist new-look peace offensive. Later we find a policy of peaceful coexistence which is operating in the world of today. Yet, while they were going ahead in bygone years with their so-called peace offensives, they were doing everything they could to infiltrate and subvert governments of other peoples and during that period of years, a number of governments and peoples have been taken over. So it is well for the American people and all other free peoples in the world to realize that this is nothing but another move; that this is nothing new so far as Communist leadership and their efforts are concerned—that they have tried it on at least three or four occasions in the past, lulling the people of the free world, as they are attempting to do now, into a feeling of contentment and complacency with the result that we will lower our guard and thus enable them to continue their advances.

This Communist policy of peaceful coexistence is perhaps as old as world communism itself. Stalin spelled it out most concisely when he stated that the very survival of communism depends on whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable until communism has gained decisive power. The actual technique of a peace offensive was perhaps best revealed by Manuilsky, one of the leading Communist revolutionaries. In a much-quoted address to the Lenin School of Subversive Warfare, Manuilsky stated:

> War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack * * * to win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record * * * the capitalist countries, stupid and decadent will * * * cooperate in their own destruction.

While I have no objections to conferences at the summit level, or any other level, I think we should keep our guard high. We should realize that this is nothing new but is a part of the Communist technique. As long as the Communists have the intent of bringing about world revolution and world domination, we must keep our guard high. We must always be on the watch and ever alert.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that for us to relax our vigilance or tensions, as so many are asking for, while the cause of tension, Communist aggression, still continues to exist, would be asking for what could turn out to be the sleep of death?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that. My only purpose was to keep alert, to show that this is nothing new, to keep our guard high, to make every effort as long as the Communists are adhering to world revolution, which means world domination, to show that until this is done they have not changed their intent and purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it the gentleman will agree with me that as far as our own Government is concerned there has been no indication of letting down our guard at all. On the contrary, the whole insistence has been on keeping up our guard.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not made the slightest initimation in that regard, and I do not. I simply rose to refresh our memories that this is nothing new, that on several occasions in the past when some internal conditions required it within the Soviet Union, such peace efforts were adopted by them as a policy of expediency, but they always followed their intent and their determination of world revolution and world domination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachussetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCormack was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As I remember it, the gentleman from Massachusetts was chairman of a committee of this House to investigate subversive activities of Communists and others at one time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; in 1934.

Mr. MASON. And following that this Nation recognized Russia and accepted Russia as a member of the decent nations of the world. Would you not say that that was a mistake, and that is where we started this coexistence business, which never can and never will work?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not state that that was when this coexistence business started. I will agree with the gentleman that it can never work as long as the Communists adhere to their policy or intent of world revolution and world domination. I might say to the gentleman I was not one of those who favored recognition of the Soviet Union at that time. Several years later I made a motion, when the State Department appropriation bill was pending, that no part of the funds should be used to maintain an embassy in the Soviet Union, and it came within a few votes of being adopted in Committee of the Whole. But I say there is no use going back and reviewing the past, because there is so much that we could review, and we might honestly disagree.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. You say there is not much use in going back, but Russia promised us when she was recognized that she would not do this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. MASON. And she has broken that promise.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. MASON. She has broken every promise since, and of course we judge the future by the past.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. MASON. Are you or am I going to place any confidence in any promises that Russia will make under the present regime?

Mr. McCORMACK. As long as the Soviet Union adheres to the policy of world revolution and world domination, of internal subversion of other governments——

Mr. MASON. That is the only policy she has ever had or ever will have.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree. As long as she adheres to the policy of world revolution and world domination, I cannot accept any of her promises.

Mr. MASON. Neither can I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] has again expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, one week from today in Geneva, Switzerland, the President of the United States will meet with the Prime Ministers of Britain, France, and Soviet Russia for the announced purpose of relieving tensions in the world and to at least explore the possibility of the beginnings of an era of peace.

What I have to say today I hope will not be understood as an effort to encroach upon the power of the executive department in matters of foreign affairs and foreign relations.

Although I believe it is important to observe at this point that while under our Constitution there is a division of powers, there is no division of responsibility where the security and the welfare of the American people are involved.

Proof of this is the fact that tomorrow leaders of Congress meet with the President to discuss with him from the standpoint of congressional responsibility the subjects which are to be covered at the Geneva meeting.

It is with a sense of this responsibility that I make these remarks this afternoon.

As one in the congressional ranks, my purpose this afternoon is to let the congressional leaders who will represent me tomorrow know my interests and convictions today.

For several weeks since the so-called summit conference has become a certainty it appears to me that there has been a studied effort made to silence all in this Congress, and, indeed, outside of it, who express any misgivings about the success of the meeting or who make bold enough to suggest that certain subjects should be discussed at it.

This campaign of silence has been tremendously successful, and in its name all manner of intellectual crimes have been committed on the approaches to the summit.

This raises the moral question as to just how high is this summit.

We have been asked not to condemn Soviet Russia as an aggressor for her dreadful aggressions of the past 35 years which continue to the present moment.

We have been told that we must not speak out loud about the plight of a large number of innocent Americans who are locked up in Chinese Communist jails.

We have been cautioned not to raise our voices concerning the shooting down of our aircraft while over international waters.

And we have tied our tongues about the recent expulsion of three of our Embassy officials in Moscow.

A silence that suppresses truth cannot improve the atmosphere of a conference called to make peace.

Such a silence can only reduce our moral strength which is our greatest weapon.

Such a silence can only encourage the malefactors who disturb the peace of the world. For they may be led to believe that they have sufficiently frightened us so as to have successfully deadened our interests in justice and freedom.

Putting aside but not forgetting that the Communists have never yet kept an agreement which they have made, let us remember that we have been at the conference table with them before. From the Litvinoff agreement in 1933 to the Korean armistice of 1953, there is an uninterrupted record of broken agreements.

At all of these conference there were those who believed that by avoiding the fundamental questions and by simple professions of good faith plus toasts and social tricks all would be settled and the problems of the troubled world would be resolved.

This is the time to remember that good faith without good works can never settle the problems of peace and of war.

This is the time to know that a Khrushchev reeling about the rooms in Belgrade is an unsteady guarantee of better times and universal good feeling.

For the acts of aggressive Communists are the real and the only cause of tension in the world. And I cannot understand how the conference in Geneva can be expected to succeed in any respect if these matters are not recognized as the basic cause of trouble in the world.

That is why this afternoon I ask our congressional leaders on the morrow to impress upon the President the urgency of recognizing these basic problems at Geneva.

There can be no peace in Europe as long as the aggressive occupation of the once free captive nations by Communist Russia countinues.

This seems to me to be so fundamental to the problem of peace and war in the world that I cannot understand the thinking of those who would avoid it or who appear unwilling to face it.

A committee of this House made a full investigation of the aggressive conduct of Soviet Russia and submitted a documented report to the House of Representatives. No responsible person has ever denied any of the facts contained in these reports. And as the President approaches this important conference, the information which a committee of this House obtained should be called to his attention.

Surely there can be no possibility of a peaceful settlement in Asia as long as innocent American citizens are illegally held for purposes of political blackmail by the Chinese Communists.

And I believe that I speak for the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress and a vast majority of Americans when I respectfully suggest that until and unless these Americans are released, no conversations concerning a settlement in the East should be considered or undertaken.

For several months, as a Member of this House who has a constituent under a life sentence in Communist China, I have patiently waited for the fruits of backroom negotiation.

I have conferred with the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, with officials of our State Department, and I have informally conferred with other Members of this House who are also deeply concerned about constituents in their own districts who are held by the Chinese Communists.

The restraint which we have exercised with respect to this problem must not be understood as any agreement on our part to see our Government engaged in conversations about Asia until these Americans come home.

Thus, the immediate release of these prisoners becomes an absolute condition for any conversations with respect to that part of the world.

While we have been silent about continued Communist aggression and about the illegal imprisonment of our citizens, the Communists have successfully substituted as subject matters for discussion so-called disarmament and increased trade with the Communist world.

It would be folly that approaches treason for the Government of the United States to make any agreement concerning disarmament with the Communist world at this place, at this time and at this hour.

No amount of inspection or so-called control will ever make a foundation for an honest disarmament program. Essentially, disarmament is a matter of mutual trust, good faith, a will for peace, and national honor. The Communists have none of these qualities.

Whatever may be said for the risks involved in new political agreements with the Communists who have never kept any agreements, it is unthinkable, under existing circumstances, that any responsible government would make or rely upon a military disarmament agreement with them.

It is Winston Churchill who said that only our superiority in atomic weapons has saved us and the rest of the free world in the last several years from destruction at the hands of the Communists.

Much as disarmament is desired, it seems good sense to suggest that this is the last agreement that may be considered but certainly not the first.

This is a classic example of the cart before the horse.

We may take up disarmament when the Communists stop aggression and release the once free but now enslaved and imprisoned people of the world.

Those who advocate increased trade with the Communist world as a possible fruit of the Geneva conference overlook the fact that all efforts for international economic cooperation are doomed to failure in the absence of previously established harmony in the political field.

Worse than this, the history of all such efforts not founded on harmony in the political field has had detrimental and sometimes disastrous results for the United States of America.

The Communists are interested in more trade with the free world because they want to build up strength for use against us and not because they view increased trade as a bridge for better understanding between nations.

Like disarmament, trade must wait on the more important settlements. If we make concessions on the question of increased trade without first obtaining a fulfillment of those first and fundamental conditions, namely, the abandonment of aggression and the release of prisoners and slaves, we will have only compounded our difficulties.

Economic concessions by way of increased trade should not precede the political settlement. They should be either part of it or follow it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our congressional leaders who meet with the President tomorrow will speak up and tell the President that there are many among us who share the sentiments and hold the views and opinions that I have expressed this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, some ask how high is this summit? My answer is as high as we make it.

There is within our reach the opportunity, maybe the last, to bring to the highest point yet attained the ageless effort to achieve peace under law.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want our congressional leaders to tell our President tomorrow that we of the Congress with the people of this Nation, understand the great burden he carries as he journeys to Geneva.

That burden will be easier to carry because it holds the hopes and prayers and faith of all our people. As we approach the summit, about all we have is hope and faith and prayer, but these are enough to warrant yet another try for peace and justice in the world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to compliment the gentleman upon his thesis that he has been presenting to us. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman and the theme of his speech.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the message he has just conveyed. Also I might mention that the gentleman from Connecticut was the No. 1 prosecutor under Justice Jackson at the Nuremberg trials. His official title was chief trial attorney and he successfully convicted a band of Nazi tyrants who failed in their ambition to enslave the world with the same blueprint as the Kremlin is inflicting on the free world today. I know of no one who has a more extended and experienced knowledge of tyranny and tyrants than has the gentleman from Connecticut. Further, he was a very valuable member of a committee in the last Congress which held hearings in Europe and in this country, known as the Communist Investigating Committee, and rendered great service on that committee. That committee heard the sworn testimony of over 330 witnesses who had sacrificed, suffered, and fought communism on both sides of the Iron Curtain during the last 20 years.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, those who heard the debate on this bill making appropriations for foreign aid will recall that practically every speaker pointed out that the carry-over fund in the mutual security operation varies from an estimate of about $6 billion to more than $8 billion. That amount of money is several times the amount that will be actually expended and delivered in any one year, judged by experience over the last few years. That means that we are asked here to appropriate approximately $3 billion again, or close to it, when the very operation to which this money will go has a carryover fund in excess of $6 billion to $8 billion, which they can rearrange, rereserve, unreserve, deobligate, or do almost anything else with.

Now, it has been stated by the proponents of this measure that it is next to impossible to get the folks handling this program to tell you exactly how much money they do have. The hearings will disclose that in periods shortly before the end of the fiscal year they attempted to commit, to obligate, or reserve in excess of $1 billion. Why? To tie strings on it so that they could ask Congress for these billions of dollars of new and additional money. It is admitted in the hearings that many of these hundreds of millions of dollars will not be used for the first purposes for which they were set up. It is admitted that this is a fluid program. It is admitted that the Mutual Security Agency or the group that now handles it under this bill has the right to deobligate, the right to dereserve, the right to decommit.

Now, since they will not spend anything like the six or eight billion dollars they already have and since they have full authority to shift those funds from the places where they were set up for to the places where they are needed, I plan to offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk now, which would reappropriate from funds heretofore appropriated funds to carry out the program that is in this bill. I am certain that this committee is going to make a point of order against that amendment. I went to members of this committee who talked to me about the problem that they had and urged them to carry out this year's new commitments from this carryover fund, and then we will begin to bring some order out of chaos. Now, I have reason to believe that a point of order will be made, and it may be that it will be sustained, but if this committee is not willing that these funds for the new program be used out of the six or eight billion dollars, which they cannot keep an account of, then the thing to do would be to defeat the appropriation bill, and then this foreign-aid group has ample authority with funds in their hands to carry out the authorization bill which we passed the other day. In other words, by defeating this appropriation, you definitely are not preventing the use of a sum equivalent to this to carry out the authorization bill that this Congress passed only a few days ago.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the gentleman's amendment and the defeat of the bill would have identically the same effect?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will express it this way. If the gentleman is sincere—and I know he is always sincere, if he agrees that they would not expend during the coming fiscal year more than those six or eight billion dollars that they have as a carryover, and they will not, I think the gentleman would agree that with my amendment or with the defeat of this bill, as long as they have a carryover of six or eight billion dollars, they have ample authority to decommit, deemphasize, dereserve, or whatever it takes to carry out the authorization bill that was passed here the other day during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that there are in this program many items that have a long-lead time, many programs where the money must be committed 2 or 3 or 4 years in advance for that reason? Is that not true also of the military, of which subcommittee the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi is a member?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true under the policies the Congress has let them follow. And that policy is just about to bankrupt this country, in my opinion. That is true only because of actions of this Congress. We should have been able to keep a proper financial record of this program. We could have authorized the agency to enter into contracts. Then we could have paid what we owed on those contracts each year, and we could have made them show us what we owed and what progress they were making. We could have this six or eight billions of dollars in the Treasury for they have not owed it to the point of payment being due, or they would not still have it. What is this committee doing now? It says that because we might possibly over a period of years need a billion dollars, we shall hand somebody a billion dollars, because it might take that much money. In effect, we give them contract authority, and then we give them billions of dollars in advance, to the full amount of the contract authority; it looks like so we know darn well that it will take that much.

That is the fallacy of this approach. It is true also of the military. They come before us and say they want a large number of military planes. The contract for those planes may last 5 years. But under the present policies of this Congress, we compel them to take the money for the total cost of the contract, even though the contract may be canceled at the end of 1 year.

Let me repeat, they have got more money now, twice as much money now as they can spend in any one year. I am talking about spending. But they say, "We made commitments. We have reservations." But they tied many of those strings just before they came down to Congress to get new money. But remember they have the right to decommit it, to deobligate it, to transfer it.

Now let us see if they are right about it, if this committee is right in saying we have made these commitments. If they are right in saying that we made these same obligations—and that is not what they said; what they said was, "We worked for weeks on this thing, and we cannot honestly tell you what they have done, because they told us a half dozen different stories." And I have heard from two committees different versions.

But if there is a firm obligation, do you not know that this Congress is going to carry out its obligations? The fact that you have obligations does not mean that you have got to give them six or eight billion dollars carryover and some $3 billion more to go with it, because, if so, we lose all control. So that when you give them all that money, do not complain when you cannot exactly keep track of it. They cannot keep track of it themselves. I say that for this reason. There are certain reports that are supposed to come to this Congress under the law. We still do not have them, because this organization, this agency, cannot give them to us.

I have this amendment at the Clerk's desk, and now I want to come to another point that is very much involved in this, to show you where this foreign aid leads. I was in Europe in the month of October. Europe has recovered more than 150 percent. They just do not believe that we borrowed this money to give to them. And that is going to be the attitude in other places. They really will not believe it. I have an investigator's report, which is to be found in the hearings on the supplemental bill, which Members can get from the Committee on Appropriations, which shows this. In the field of agriculture, we have provided money to develop lands in foreign countries, to build dams and reservoirs, to clean up land, and so forth. Then we have given American interests tax benefits if they would go in there and develop those lands. And they are producing commodities the same as the Commodity Credit Corporation now owns more than $4 billion worth on which we pay more than $700,000 a day storage. Then what do we do? As a matter of Government policy, we hold our commodities off the world markets. These American financial interests develop these countries, getting tax concessions and also technical assistance to show the local people how. We hold our commodities back so they can have the market. Then, as we hold them back, we count those commodities and reduce the acreage of our farmers in this country even to the point of putting many out of business. The Department of Agriculture's own survey shows that 55,000 small cotton farmers here were put out of business this year as a result of acreage cutbacks. It shows that 130,000 farmers were reduced below $1,000 in income. That is not the end. It gets so bad that our President asked Congress, and I will bring the bill in next week, to help the small farmer in the United States whose production we moved overseas right through this thing here. And that is not the end of it. Then we passed Public Law 480 to give away all these commodities which we put somebody else in the job of producing. We held them back so they could have the market. Now under the foreign aid we increase foreign production still more and give them money, so we can give them United States commodities we held off world trade for their profit.

If there is any round robin where you dig your own grave and pull the dirt in on top of you, this is it. But whether you agree with me about that or not, you should read those hearings. If you do not agree with me and if you are 100 percent for foreign aid, as long as the carryover is six or eight billion dollars, as long as they do not have any reason to expect they will spend anything like half that in 1 year, it is sound to say that this work in this bill shall be taken out of this carryover of funds. Then we are beginning to bring order out of chaos, and we could at least tell where we are going moneywise.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are several items in the bill which I regert the committee cut. One is the item in the budget estimates of $12.5 million for the intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. The committee cut that to $10 million. It is estimated that this will mean a reduction of 25,000 in the number of refugees and others in Europe who can be resettled in this new fiscal year.

It comes at a time when an urgent situation has arisen where it would be of the greatest advantage to have those additional funds available, or else additional funds for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. I refer to Austria where there still are between 30,000 and 35,000 refugees from Russia and Iron Curtain countries. Under the Allied occupation of Austria, they were safe. Now Austria is being given her independence and the refugees are living in the utmost fear that the same thing will happen to them that happened at the end of the war to many refugees who had came over from the Soviet Union and East European countries and after Potsdam were shipped back to Communist enslavement. We seek to assure them, but we will no longer be in control in Austria and they live in apprehension.

It is made worse by the fact that at this moment there is a Soviet repatriation commission that is visiting all of the camps telling them, "You have been let down by the West. You still live here semidestitute in camps, you ought to come back to your homes and relatives in the Soviet Union, or Hungary, or Poland, or Czechoslovakia. All is forgiven. All will be milk and honey."

Mr. Chairman, there is no denying the fact that this appeal is getting results. The Voice of America assures people behind the Curtain that if they defect and come over to our side, we will take good care of them, they will have good treatment, their freedom and their personal liberties will be protected. Thousands are still coming over, but the number is decreasing and the number of those who are returning in disillusionment is growing. The Soviets are spending huge quantities of money in this so-called redefection program. Every refugee who comes over to the West and loses hope and in despair goes back to the Communist side of the Iron Curtain is a tremendous victory for them. This is no place or time to reduce our help. These refugees in Austria constitute an emergency situation and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration or the United Nations Refugee Fund ought to have more funds, rather than less, to deal with it quickly and vigorously.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. What motion is before the Committee that the gentleman is speaking to?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has moved to strike out an appropriate number of words.

Mr. MASON. I did not hear that motion made.

Mr. JUDD. If I forgot to make it, I am sorry for that technical error. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion now, to strike out the last word.

My point is that here is a cut in the bill which I hope the Senate will restore so that it will be possible for our Government to go into those camps on a somewhat crash basis and find means of resettling promptly all of the 30,000 who can be resettled. This is one of the times when it is important to move with speed.

While I understand what motivated the committee in making the reduction, and I shall not offer an amendment here to restore it, I want the RECORD to show that the House recognizes the unusual importance of this particular group of refugees. I believe the House will agree to any increase adopted by the Senate for this purpose. The United States Government ought to make a special effort to help these anti-Communist refugees move to places of greater security and opportunity, not only for the sake of those individuals but for the psychological effect on all the people, especially our friends, in the countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain who are not quite sure at this moment just what their future is.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, I wish to state that that is just another example of the way the Soviets are outsmarting us. While they are putting ads in the papers throughout the world asking people who have escaped from communism to come back home and all will be forgiven, we are doing exactly the opposite. We have three young men who made the mistake of staying behind the Iron Curtain. They are on their way home right now. They had to borrow money in order to get home. They are boys who volunteered for service in defense of their country when they were only 16 years old. They were sent into combat and captured when they were 16½ years old. When they get back to the United States of America in spite of the fact that they said they would rather stay in America in jail than live under the Communists in China—they are going very likely to be court-martialed and prosecuted. It is just another example of the way the Soviets are getting a propaganda gain on us because they know how and we do not.

I want to submit for your consideration this thesis: Every foreign-aid bill the United States of America has adopted since 1919 has led to death and destruction for the United States of America. This foreign-aid program is no different. I would like to start with Germany, in 1918 to 1935. I wonder how many of you read the debates in the Congress during those years and how many of you read the State Department papers that were wrapped up in a nice little red book that they sent to your offices? How many of you read the communiques exchanged between the German Government and our Government from 1918 to 1935. Everyone of those communiques says, "Send us more money into Germany and save us from the Bolsheviks." They did not use the word communism then—it was the Bolsheviks. And we sent them the money. We had the Dawes plan. We had the Young plan and I remember in 1930 and 1935 when we had as many as 10 million unemployed in the United States of America, we were building steel plants and we were building Stuka bomber plants and stadiums in Germany. Sure we saved the German people from the Bolsheviks, but we gave them Adolph Shickelgruber. Our foreign-aid program in Germany led to nothing but death and destruction for the United States.

From 1933 to 1936, when we recognized Russia, we sent them boatload after boatload of farm machinery and industrial equipment and the Soviet Union under the first 5-year plan was built up by technical experts we sent there. If it had not been for the first 5-year plan and the help received from the United States of America, communism would never have survived—or bolshevism at that time—in the Soviet Union. We saved bolshevism for Soviet Union. There again the American foreign-aid program lead to death and destruction for the United States.

In 1935 to 1939, we were shipping scrap iron and high-octane gasoline to the Japanese trying to buy their friendship by the carload. They had enough high-octane gasoline and enough scrap iron from the United States in 1939 that they could fight the war for 1 year without doing anything by themselves for fuel or scrap iron. Much of that scrap iron is in the bellies of dead United States soldiers.

Then from 1940 to 1946, we started the lend-lease program and here we really made the enemy that we are facing in the world today. With $13 billion we took good care of Uncle Joe before we took care of our own interests at that time. It was under this lend-lease program that we also made Communist China strong. That is where Mao came into power with our lend-lease equipment. They had better equipment and better guns and better tanks than we ourselves had. It was this time also when Ho Chi Minh, who conquered China, came into being with the aid of the American equipment handed out under the lend-lease program.

In 1946, we started the UNRRA program. If the Communists believed in God, they would get down on their knees and thank God for the UNRRA program because we did more to help them entrench communism behind the Iron Curtain with UNRRA than any program that they could possibly conceive of themselves.

Then we had the Marshall plan in 1947. Do not be mistaken. When the Marshall plan was first enunciated, we invited the Soviet Union to come in and get their billions. Originally, the Marshall plan called for a foreign aid program of $10 billion a year and we invited and begged the Soviet Union to come in and take part of it. In other words, the original Marshall plan was to give it to everybody who would come and help themselves. But the Soviets turned us down. Then we started the mutual security program and said now we are going to give money only to those who fight against communism. Now we have even changed that. We now have a program saying we will give the money to anybody who is not only against communism, but anybody who said that they hated communism just a little bit less than they hate us. So now we are giving $300 million in this bill of unappropriated, unexpended funds to the biggest and smartest Communist of them all, namely Marshal Tito. I say for your consideration that every foreign aid program adopted by this country has led to death and destruction for America, and so will this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN:
>
> On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "appropriated" and substitute the word "reappropriated."
>
> Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "not otherwise" and substitute the word "heretofore."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. He attempts to appropriate money heretofore appropriated and programed, and it goes beyond the scope of the present legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that a rule was had on this bill on legislation included in it. It is my understanding that money now in the Treasury to the credit of the foreign-aid program is not all expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The legislation under consideration is not here under a special rule. If the gentleman does not care to be heard, the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have nothing further to add, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). Rule XXI, clause 5, is very plain. It provides that—

> No general appropriation or amendment thereto shall be received or considered if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations.

It seems to the Chair that this language very plainly deals with the amendment that has just been offered, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, on page 2, line 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 2, line 1, after the words "Public Law", insert "138."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to get into the bill the number of the public law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Military assistance: For assistance authorized by section 103 (a) (2), including not to exceed $23,250,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the purposes of title I, chapter 1, and section 124, $705 million, of which $122 million shall be available for infrastructure as authorized by section 104 (a); and in addition not to exceed $33,900,000 of unobligated and unreserved funds heretofore appropriated under authority of section 103 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, are continued available until June 30, 1956, for the purposes of section 103 (a) (2);

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. Am I supposed to wait until the end of the section, or should I offer it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is being read by paragraphs.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 2, line 13, change the semicolon to a colon and add: "*Provided*, That no funds appropriated in this act shall be available for assistance to any nation that has received assistance under the first sentence of section 122 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to apologize to members of the committee for not having been able to discuss this amendment with them earlier. I mentioned it in the remarks I made in general debate.

Incidentally, I would also like to say something that I omitted to say before. I think the members of the Committee on Appropriations and this particular subcommittee have done a very commendable job on the whole with respect to this bill. But there is this question of subsidizing the British aircraft industry, which I want to bring up at this time.

My amendment says that no funds appropriated in this act shall be available for assistance to any nation that has received assistance under the first sentence of section 122 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

That first sentence is:

> SEC. 122. Production for forces support: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955, to be made available on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify, not to exceed $35 million for manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft required by United Kingdom forces for the defense of the North Atlantic area.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, it means that if my amendment were adopted it would strike out appropriations for the program which we are presently continuing, and which we are presently considering, for British military aircraft.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman said it would strike out appropriations. As I understand the gentleman's amendment it does not strike out any appropriations provided in this bill but merely provides that none of it shall be used for British budgetary support of this airplane program that the gentleman described during general debate.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman is right. I appreciate the gentleman's correction.

Mr. VORYS. It is substantially the same amendment that the House adopted last year, and I am for it.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and I certainly appreciate his correction, because it does not strike out any appropriation, it merely means that no appropriation of any funds under this legislation today will be made available for budgetary support of the British military aircraft industry.

I read a few moments ago from a Hoover Commission report, or rather from a report prepared by the staff director of the overseas task force of the Hoover Commission. I would like to continue to read from the report of the Hoover Commission entitled "Report on United States Aid to the British Aircraft Industry." It says:

> An inquiry has disclosed that even assuming the best possible performance in the British production program, the United States, out of existing excess plant facilities, could equal the scheduled production dates for the British fighters to be purchased offshore with the same number of F-86's.

The director of this task force raises this one question in making this report. The staff director of the Overseas Economic Operations Task Force asks:

> Does not United States interest in getting the best possible planes for the Royal Air Force, as well as a desire to conserve taxpayers' money, suggest the need for a complete and impartial review of our participation to date in the British aircraft program by some appropriate committee of Congress before any further commitments are made?

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that no such review has been made by the Appropriations Committee, and no review has been made by the Foreign Affairs Committee. So far as I know with the exception of one report filed by the Senate Appropriations Committee, from which I quoted before, no report has been made at all. And as I said, the Senate Appropriations Committee report from which I quoted before is the only review to this date of the British aircraft industry that has been made by any congresisonal committee. It finally recommends that it would be well to explore with the British Government the possibility of using American airframes made by American airplane manufacturers; and if we have to have cooperation with the British, then go ahead and put British engines into them. The British airframe manufacturers, according to clippings I heretofore read with respect to the Javelin clearly indicate that the British airplane construction program is in a very unhealthy situation.

I think we ought not to make any more money available for this program until we have had a chance to review the entire program.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to urge his point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENTLEY) there were—ayes 76, noes 66.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. BENTLEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to page 2, line 7, of the bill, concerning the word "infrastructure," may I ask the Chairman if there is anything in the rules or precedents which requires the use of a good American word?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there is nothing in the rules requiring it.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Control Act expenses: For carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as authorized by section 410, $1,175,000;

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is sound and should pass.

Though the financial hands guiding the bill seem to hold reins loose and not taut, the horse is before the cart and both move in the right direction, up the hill to better days and not down the hill to dark valleys and cold caves.

The hearings before the subcommittee read, in parts, like a narrative. I liked several statements on economic aid by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and by Mr. George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs. Their statements, in particular, lay a firm foundation in justification of the bill. Stone by stone, each of the other witnesses add to this pyramid a love that will live in the hearts of men and nations for ages to come, provided we have the courage to cheer them on, especially if occasionally some stones seem to slip from their hands.

On pages 6 and 7 of the hearings, Mr. Dulles discusses the need for economic aid. His remarks on page 7 are brilliant. He shows how organized man, through history, has trampled and tattered individuals to satisfy craven aspirations, and that the role of man through history has been to reach the summit and face the sun, not by the whip, but by bringing the forces of organized man to his service, be they big family, big church, big business, big labor, big government, or big world. So it goes.

On page 338, in answer to a good question, Mr. Allen seems to hold the fate of the bill in the palms of his hands when he rather soundly cites a basic justification for the program in India; as Mr. Dulles did, on page 7, for the program in Yugoslavia; situated as it is, at the soft underbelly of Europe; while India sits astride the route Stalin planned for Communists from China to Paris, via the Mediterranean Basin, North Africa, and Spain. To me, the twin testimony of Mr. Dulles and Mr. Allen comes close to the knuckle of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, too, to contemplate how this bill, knowingly or not, goes after the soft spots in the society of men and nations as pointed out by Norman Angell in the early 1900's in his book The Unseen Assassins. The book called the shot on World War I, just as a revision of it in the early thirties called the shot on World War II. This bill appears to call the shot on peace for the balance of the century. It does something. The bill says that men can whip war in peace and that the more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war if war there must be.

I am listing below now, Mr. Speaker, excerpts from remarks by Mr. Dulles, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Angell, as well as a preface written by a gentleman for an armistice address in which he used a chapter from Unseen Assassins to illustrate his point. They justify my faith, at least, in the merits of the bill and its passage by the House.

On page 7 of the hearings, Mr. Dulles says:

NEED FOR ECONOMIC AID

> From an economic standpoint, the pressure comes very largely from the fact that the Chinese Communists are developing an industrial economy and are making very considerable capital improvements in the way of new roads, railroads, ports, airfields, and the like, and some actual industrial plants. Now that kind of thing is done in a Communist country at great cost to the individual liberties and freedom. In Russia it has been very largely done by slave labor; many hundreds of thousands and probably millions of people have literally died in conditions of slave labor to build this capital plant of which the Soviet Union boasts and there you have considerable progress in that respect.
>
> The same thing is going on in Communist China and it is extremely important for the non-Communist countries to find ways whereby they can develop their economies. They are impressed by the developments going on in the Communist countries. They forget the people that died. They are dead and buried and forgotten. What remains are the plants themselves, the railroads, or whatever it may be. Those are visible; visitors go to see them just like they go to see the pyramids of Egypt. They do not think very much when they look at the pyramids of Egypt about the hundreds of thousands of people who died under the lash to lift those great stones. They are dead and gone years ago. What you look at and admire today is the pyramids.
>
> (Discussion off the record.)
>
> Secretary DULLES. Now all of those despots have been able to squeeze out of the people capital developments, monuments, and the

like. We have to find some way whereby free peoples can also develop their economies, and the whole emphasis of this year's program is upon the economy there.

Roughly speaking, one-half of all the funds sought is for straight military assistance; roughly speaking, another quarter, about 28 percent, is for defense support. That is for helping the economies of countries that are maintaining a military organization which our military people think is in our interest, but which is beyond the capacity of the people to support unless they get some sort of financial assistance. And then the balance of the funds, about 22 to 23 percent, is economic assistance which is not directly related to any military operation. Of that, almost all is in Asia and is designed to help promote the overall economies of Asia, so as to give the people there hope that out of a free economy they can have some sort of capital development comparable to what is going on in the Soviet and Chinese Communist world.

Mr. Passman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

On page 338, 339, and 340, Mr. Allen and another add:

BASIC JUSTIFICATION FOR PROGRAM IN INDIA

Mr. Wigglesworth. I want to ask Mr. Allen one further question, coming back to the matter that we discussed this morning—India.

I am going to put you in my position and assume that you are on the floor of the House some days hence, explaining this bill to the House. We will assume that someone has offered an amendment to eliminate this $85 million for India on the ground that he is opposed to aid to a country that is not affirmatively with us, whose leader when he speaks or acts from time to time indicates that he is apparently actually against us, and that as a matter of policy the Member offering the amendment thinks the payment to India is ill advised. What is your response in defending the overall request for India?

Mr. Allen. Mr. Wigglesworth, that is a basic question which goes to the heart of this whole thing. I am glad you put it so succinctly. Your question has been asked in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, and I expect that it may be asked on the floor of the House when the enabling legislation goes through and again when your report is made.

Different persons may have different reasons for supporting a particular program. My own basic approach is that our technical assistance and economic aid programs are in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. Wigglesworth. Why?

Mr. Allen. Because it is unhealthy for the United States to live in a world where there are wide divergencies of standards of living between our own country and that of other countries. I do not favor a leveling down program by any means. Quite the contrary. I favor a policy of trying to do what we can to improve the standards of living in the free world so that these great differences that exist and which create bitterness and jealousy as long as they last will tend to be alleviated; at least we should show we are interested in helping to do something about the problems of underdeveloped countries. That reasoning applies to the whole aid program. I am well aware that a lot of countries need aid and that since we have a limited amount of money you may ask why we should give $85 million to India when the money could be advantageously used elsewhere. My position is this. There are two great undeveloped countries in the world, China and India, with almost half the world's population. India is the only one not behind the Iron Curtain. A lot of attention is being paid to whether China is going to make progress faster than India, and vice versa. If somebody proposed on the floor that the $85 million for India be wiped out because we do not like what the Prime Minister signed at Moscow last week, he would be taking a rather heavy responsibility. He would be saying, in effect, wipe India off, India is gone. I do not agree with that.

Mr. Wigglesworth. What do you mean by "India is gone"?

Mr. Allen. India has gone to the other side.

Mr. Wigglesworth. In other words, you think the action just suggested would tend to drive India to the arms of the Soviet while we still have a chance?

Mr. Allen. No, sir. I say that anyone who proposed eliminating this item would assume the attitude that India is finished as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Passman. Will the gentleman yield? In the statement that you read this morning, quoting from Nehru, did he not state that if we discontinued this, their policy and views and objectives would be the same?

Mr. Allen. That is the statement he made.

Mr. Passman. Evidently he did not mean what he was saying, if it would drive them behind the Iron Curtain if we did not allow this money.

Mr. Allen. I am not saying that it would drive them behind the Iron Curtain. I say we would give up our efforts to help India, and if our energies and efforts were discontinued, there would be nothing to counteract the pulls in the other direction, and those pulls might be very serious, no matter whether Nehru or anybody else wanted to go that way or not.

I have just been shown a statement made by Nehru on March 31 of this year.

"The functioning of the Cominform is an interference in other countries' affairs and is not compatible with the policies of noninterference."

Nehru told the Indian Parliament on September 29, 1954:

"International communism has given rise to fears which cannot be ignored. The fears arise, not to the official activities of Communist governments but what they might do sub rosa through the activities of the Communist parties which seek to interfere with the internal affairs of the countries concerned."

That is not a statement of a man who has signed up with Moscow.

There are other statements which can be quoted. I cite this as a basis for judging that this is still an area we can work with.

Furthermore, I do not want to cast any reflections on any other country, but, dollar for dollar, I can support aid to India more enthusiastically than for any other underdeveloped area I know anything about, if the question of how the money will be spent is the criterion. India has a good development scheme, a going concern, good technicians, and a good government organization which is trying to do something about the standard of living of the people.

There are many underdeveloped areas which we would like very much to help, but which do not have enough substance to tie on to. No amount of dollars would improve the situation. You have to have something to work on, and you have that in India.

Mr. Wigglesworth. When you revise your remarks, if you care to amplify your answer, I wish you would feel free to do so, because this is a question which I am sure will come up on the floor.

Mr. Allen. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Seager. May I add a footnote to what the Secretary has so well stated?

I think we ought to bear in mind that there is a show window of a kind being developed in Red China by totalitarian means, and there is another kind of show window in the form of this developmental program in India, with specific reference, perhaps, to the community development area, which is moving forward in India.

The eyes of South Asia are focused on India.

We have associated ourselves with this, and we are recognized as having played our part in the development of such a show window under a democratic form of government.

If the Indian experiment wins out and attracts more disciples than the Red Chinese show window, then I think we shall have been abundantly satisfied with what we have done in India through our association with them in this work.

I think that that is also something which might be brought out when you are questioned on the floor, sir.

Mr. Allen. Let me make an additional statement right there.

Soviet Russia is just starting a technical-assistance program in India. If they go through with the steel mill, they will have a considerable economic-assistance program in India.

They may learn some hard facts of life which they have not run into yet.

Radio Moscow has been indulging in the liberty of saying every day that the United States is a wicked, imperialist country which demands that anyone who takes aid from the United States must stand up like a puppet and be counted.

When India starts taking Russian technical assistance and economic aid, will Nehru stop making statements about the activities of international communism? I doubt it; for if he does, he will be labeled a Soviet puppet. I don't know whether Moscow will be able to take criticism or not from a country which receives its aid. We can take it, but I am not certain Moscow can.

Mr. Wigglesworth. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The foreword to an armistice address in 1932 follows. The address was based on a chapter from Unseen Assassins entitled "Patriotism Versus Welfare." If time and space allow, a portion of the chapter will also be cited:

FOREWORD

One of the profound convictions of the World War period is today almost forgotten. We no longer believe that it was a war to end war.

How remote, how fantastic this idea now seems. And yet it buoyed up millions. I was myself naive enough to believe it. And it seemed to me a goal worth fighting for. To the degree that it indicated that the peoples of the earth were determined to suffer no more wars, it was one of the most constructive and wholesome outcomes of the period.

In what sad contrast stands our present disillusionment. In place of the conviction that all wars are futile waste, we now find an almost universal abandonment of this belief and, in its place, a fatalistic conviction, apathetically accepted, that war must continue.

Our attitude of resignation is unruffled by the consequences. It is a commonplace that material advances have made progressively more and more catastrophic the damage resulting from each successive war and that it is to be anticipated that the intensity and extent of human misery to result from the next war will surpass all precedent. This realization is, however, no deterrent.

Some writers have intentionally depicted in detail the bestiality of war—its misery, its injustices, and its mutilations. Their purpose has been clear—to strip away its glamor its flag waving, its martial music, and present it in such light that no one would wish to participate, thus reducing the likelihood of its recurrence. But their efforts have been ineffective and will always be so. What man of spirit and character, his passions aroused and feeling himself the champion of a righteous cause, has ever been deterred by the thought of difficulties ahead? Each fresh obstacle strengthens his determination and makes him the greater hero in the eyes of himself and others. In time of danger do any but the craven prefer desk jobs to front-line service? If war is to cease, it will not be through magnifying its hardships.

To be sure, there are some few, perhaps fortunate, individuals who feel that the last important war has been fought—that international rivalries and hatreds will, in some manner not specified, be adjusted by moral, spiritual, or ethical forces. They agree that a few armed conflicts of lesser magnitude—like the present Japanese invasion of China—may occur, but contend that in larger and more important issues involving the European powers, the contestants will be willing to compromise their hatreds and rivalries.

Surely here the wish is father to the thought. Is it reasonable to believe that moral forces, unable to prevent minor conflicts, will be strong enough to avert major catastrophes? If a bucket of water is too little to extinguish a grass fire, is it intelligent to rely upon it to quench a forest conflagration?

Besides, what are these intangible moral forces upon which such reliance is placed? Are they something new? They are as old as history. They are the weapons now being used by the League of Nations with constantly increasing effectiveness and, in the training of the peoples of the world to understand and use them in concert lies, perhaps, our release from Armageddon. But that is in the far future. The potential power of the League of Nations is not its actual power. Today, in disputes of even secondary importance, it is impotent to control the forces in conflict. Those optimists who refuse to face facts and deny the probability, even the inevitability, of additional wars of the first magnitude, are living in a fool's paradise.

Does all this mean that human society can never escape from recurrent warfare? I believe the reverse may be true. In any case, if civilization is to survive at all, the human race must learn to eliminate war.

There exists the ever-present danger that majorities will continue to be led by militant minorities, as in the past, a danger accentuated by the development and refinement, during 1914–1918, of an engine of war which ranks in importance with the conquest of the air—I refer to the machinery of propaganda. Never before has the organized and directed leadership and control of public opinion been so systematically managed. During that war the contestants undertook and succeeded in dictating not only the information furnished their respective nations, but their opinions, their sympathies, and their antipathies. The technique of arousing the hatreds of whole peoples against their neighbors was mastered and individual reason submerged. What was done so successfully then can be done again.

This is the more easy because the combative spirit is deeply rooted in our nature. One tale of injustice or atrocity, cleverly told, can arouse us to unreasoning passion. The whole history of mankind is one of struggle, not of conciliation. For century upon century man's success has been measured by his material triumph—first over nature and more recently over his neighbor. In comparison, his heritage of success through cooperation with his fellow man is insignificant.

This raises the question as to whether patriotism should be regarded as a cohesive or a disruptive element. On the one hand, it is an excellent example of cooperative action by all the citizens of a given country in their common interest, and therefore desirable. On the other hand, it is common knowledge that nothing is so provocative of international discord as ardent nationalism. This leaves the individual in a quandry.

What, then, is our patriotic duty to our country? We are brought up to revere patriotism and honor those national heroes who were patriots. But patriotism means (or so we are taught) that the interests of our particular nation must be secured before all else, even by the use of force. If it so happens that another nation desires also to secure the same benefits and its nationals are equally patriotic, conflict inevitably ensues. It is noteworthy that the question of right and justice does not here enter at all. What, then, is the distinction, if any, between patriotism and undiluted self interest on a national scale?

The answer lies, it seems to me, not in a denial of patriotism, but in an analysis of its elements. Patriotism is merely the modern development of the cohesive force which has been operating through the whole course of the development of our civilization. In the infancy of mankind it caused the family to combine forces for mutual help and protection. The tribal grouping proved stronger than the family alone and the tribe in turn was later supplanted by the Nation.

Here two elements are at work. The most noticeable is, of course, the greater offensive strength of the larger combination. Because of our combative natures, we think of larger groupings first in terms of their greater effectiveness as offensive organizations. Their might in conquest of defense is the point stressed. But there is a second factor in this sequence of larger and larger groupings, which, I believe, is of superior importance. This is the element of cooperation. For each of the successively larger integrations from the family to the Nation has required a larger measure of cooperation among the constituent individuals. And it is just here that the essential good embodied in the conception of patriotism lies hidden. This same cooperation must be freed from the restricting bonds of narrow nationalism and practiced as between nations. Let us scrap the existing conception of patriotism as something good for ourselves, to be secured at the expense of the other fellow, and substitute a larger conception in which the greater good of all concerned is the objective. A patriotism that seeks the enhanced welfare of the whole human family deserves our support. A patriotism that condones the forceful coercion of other nationals for one's own interests and against theirs, without regard for the essential justice of the case, is unsocial and unsound. In unvarnished words, this latter construction of patriotism means "might makes right," a principle of conduct renounced long since as between civilized individuals, but still in force as between nations.

It would thus follow that action in the name of patriotism should be carefully scrutinized. That calling for an expansion of cooperation for the general welfare, whether within or without the national group, is good; that containing a denial of the just interests of others, to be secured by coercion and not by cooperation, whether within or without, is evil.

Unfortunately this definition is not yet accepted. The idea that a good citizen should be so unpatriotic as to withhold his support from the attainment of some national objective, for the inconsequential reason that it violates the equal rights of another but weaker nation, will be heatedly rejected by all 100 percent nationalists. We are all so accustomed to. taking what we are able to take (on a national scale) without troubling to consider any other factor, that it is distinctly annoying to have it suggested that we should stop to consider either the rights of others or the welfare of society as a whole.

This reconsideration of the ethics of patriotism—so logical and yet so upsetting—can gain acceptance only through education, a long process of public enlightenment. The dethronement of the existing popular conception of "my country right or wrong" and a realization of what elements in it are sound and should be retained and what other elements are unsound and should be discarded, will only come when many people have been stimulated, provoked or infuriated to the point of thinking for themselves.

This is one of the many reasons which have impelled me to reprint the following powerful chapter from Norman Angell's The Unseen Assassins. The charm of his exposition is as irresistible as his logic is inescapable. His discussion of the European situation is illuminating and his general conclusions helpful in our estimate of the future. It is my hope that all who read this chapter may not fail also to read of book of which this is only a part.

MELBERT B. CARY, Jr.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say it seems to me, that this bill, as implied in my opening remarks, addresses itself to those values it is the object of our political societies to promote: health, wealth, and happiness, via the hearts of men and nations to the end that war to attain them becomes unnecessary. If the stones slip, we must try and try again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for expense of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects in excess of an average of 5,000 pounds net but not exceeding 9,000 pounds net in any one shipment, but the limitations imposed herein shall not be applicable in the case of employees transferred to or serving in stations outside the continental United States under orders relieving them from a duty station within the United States prior to August 1, 1953.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 9, after line 9, add the following: "*Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure so long as the funds heretofore appropriated for such purposes and unexpended by the Mutual Security Administration exceed $3 billion."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it attempts to reappropriate money previously appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am ready for a ruling, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, the amendment provides a very definite limitation to this appropriation. In the opinion of the Chair it is merely a limitation and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I repeat to the membership that the statements of the hearings, the statements of the report, the statements of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and all of the debate sustain the fact that this Congress cannot tell how much money this foreign-aid group has. You cannot tell how much has been obligated or committed or even reserved, or as some express it, how much has been obligated and deobligated, obligated again and again deobligated, as many as seven times.

In the past, each and every year, we have given to foreign aid the total amount of what the total program would have been if they had done all of it. As a result, they have this carryover fund of approximately $8 billion.

Their own testimony shows that as of this date they can say they will not carry out a great many things for which they got this other money. Estimates by this committee—and I sympathize with them because I tried to get some firm figures out of mutual security, for a special committee that I have—but the estimates as to what they have carried over to which they have tied strings, in order to try to ask for new money, run from $6 to $8 billion.

Mr. Chairman, while I personally expect to vote against any additional funds, my amendment merely says this: It merely provides that you carry out the President's commitment; that you carry out the authorization that we passed last week from the Committee on Foreign Affairs; that you carry out the programs in this appropriation bill. But until that $6 or $8 billion they already have is used to the extent of reducing the carryover down to $3 billion, they shall not use this money in this bill.

You can carry out the Asian program; you can do everything that is in the bill. But use your old money until you get down to at least $3 billion. Now, if that is not sound, I do not know what sound is. Such a course will save money, as much as is in this bill, but you do not jeopardize the next year's operations in the least.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. I respect my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. But if you want to kill the program, let us kill it in the right way. Let us bring a bill in which says that effective as of this date there shall be no further foreign-aid program. I do not believe in trying to kill it indirectly, as proposed by this amendment.

I want to say this to the Committee. I agreed in the beginning to be fair and impartial in conducting the hearings and in defending the bill on the floor of the House. I think the Committee has gone just as far as it can without actually crippling this bill.

It was the Congress that authorized section 110 of Public Law 778 permitting reservations. And if you will refer to the hearings you will discover that there is only $62½ million of unobligated funds being carried over. All of the other amounts have either been reserved or they have been obligated.

It is not an easy task to oppose the amendment of my friend from Mississippi. But I do plead with this Committee to vote down this amendment. This is not the way to kill the foreign-aid bill. If the gentleman wishes to bring in a bill directly through the legislative committee, that would be a different matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. By reducing the budget balances to $3 billion, I cannot see that this would kill this bill. The gentleman has spent many weeks trying to pinpoint how much they had, and here they try to tie strings on it at the last minute. The minute they use the funds to carry out all their obligations, the minute it gets down to $3 billion in the bank, then they can use the funds in this bill. Until they are down to $3 billion they do not use these new funds; but if they are, in all frankness, they may use this money.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is a very able member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. That is not the way he operates that subcommittee. He knows as well as I do that there are long lead times on many of these items and it is necessary to make these commitments some 3 or 4 years in advance. We have had only $62,500,000 unobligated. The remainder of the money has been either reserved or obligated. The committee took the $420 million in controversy out of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What does the gentleman mean by the reserved money? Is that obligated money or is it unobligated?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a matter of interpretation. Under Public Law 778, section 110, reservations are considered to be commitments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Just what does it mean?

Mr. PASSMAN. It simply means it has been reserved for some program this Government has committed itself to carry out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The effect of this amendment would be that none of the programs in connection with the Asian picture could be moved on as is necessary if we are to maintain the position of the free nations over on that side of the world. There are some of those things in connection with supplying things to the military in Europe that could be operated, but on those broad programs the other way it would be impossible.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I point out to my friend from New York, that under the present law this foreign-aid group has the right to deauthorize, to decommit, to deobligate, and to shift funds. The very debate itself shows that the committee has seen case after case of it. There is absolutely no restriction on the money they now have, being used to meet the purposes of this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi he has made a very good case to the American people. I am on his side as it pertains to agriculture. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that a good many of these funds are committed for very definite programs. Many of them are 70 percent or 80 percent completed. When this committee found they had very large unobligated balances, we by unanimous vote declined to allow $420 million. As far as we could determine, the other funds were reserved or obligated. I think the gentleman understands that. I do not wish to argue with the gentleman, because I think he is in sympathy with my views.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I read the amendment again?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am familiar with the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the six or eight billion dollars is used up for all these things to which the gentleman refers, if they have only $3 billion left, then the funds in this bill would become available.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows as well as he knows his name is JAMIE WHITTEN that these funds are obligated. I do not know why he wants to confuse the issue. It is all right to be against the bill. But if you are going to carry this program out on an orderly basis then this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, we have spent too much time today on the hole in the doughnut and not enough time on the doughnut. We have talked about the $650 million that is out of this bill and not the dreadfully critical, imperative importance of the $2.7 billions that is left in there. We have criticised some of the bookkeeping. I have joined in this criticism. We have not said enough about the enormous importance to the security of the United States of what is left in here, and of this whole program that has been going on. This amendment will work simply to wreck the future program because if it passes, you have to stand still until you back up, and you cannot do that very well. It will mean, for instance, that the aid which Korea and Formosa and Viet-Nam need in order to keep their heads above water in an immediate struggle with communism—those countries will go under. It means that Pakistan, Greece, and Turkey, to give you a few examples, will not get the things that they need in order to stand up in this struggle in a cold war, which is a very warm cold war in many places. We have forgotten today some of the enormous results that have come from this program through the years. Through this program we have not had a war. Europe has recovered. There was a time when we thought Greece and Turkey would be overrun. They are not overrun. There was a time when we thought that Formosa was going under, but it has not gone under; when we thought South Viet-Nam was going under, but it has not gone under.

These are some of the results of this program. I could mention many others, but I want to call to the attention of my brethren from the agricultural areas one thing that has happened as a part of our foreign-aid program. I have been trying through the afternoon to get the most up-to-date figures that I could on the total amount for all agricultural products financed through Government aid since the end of World War II.

The total is made up as follows:

Lend-lease	$691,000,000
Post-UNRRA and interim aid	1,628,000,000
ECA-MSA and other economic and technical assistance	5,536,000,000
Civilian supply (distributed by the Army)	3,250,000,000
Department of Agriculture donations	148,000,000
Total	11,253,000,000

These figures are from a table entitled "United States Government Grants, July 1, 1945–December 31, 1954." Therefore, the above figures would not include the last 6 months when sales would have been made under Public Law 480, by FOA.

A footnote to this table states that the $11,253 million is free alongside ship cost—f. a. s.—and to get the actual cost to the Government, 18 percent should be added to this figure. It would, therefore, bring the figure up to $13.3 billion actual cost to the Government.

That gives you an idea of the extent to which this foreign-aid program has been an agricultural support program for United States agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. We have heard from the gentleman for 25 minutes, and I just want the members of the committee to hear me for 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to attempt to respend money that has already been programed for spending and that is going to be spent for something already planned. It would preclude any ordering of these long lead-time items which are of such vast and critical importance in our military buildup. This military program, as Admiral Radford has said, is part and parcel of our own security. Insofar as American economy is concerned, this mutual security program amounts to this: It costs us $5,900 to have an American man in service overseas and that is without a gun in his hand. This foreign-aid program costs $747 per soldier for the forces that are placed where our Joint Chiefs say men should be placed in the interest of our common defense. That is how much this program costs per year to have a man there with a weapon in his hand. So when you want to talk about economy in our national security, remember you get a man in place for $747 per year with this program, with a weapon in his hand, as opposed to moving out an American and having him cost us $5,900 before he has a gun in his hand. I do not want Americans to have to do all of the fighting for the cause of freedom all over the world, and that is why I am for this program and opposed to this devastatingly crippling amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out that this problem of trying to handle some individual action as something separate, we have given through foreign aid many millions in American commodities. What we do not realize today is that with foreign aid we put that same production in foreign commodities, and hold our commodities off world markets, and then turn around and give them more aid through foreign aid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. I agree thoroughly with him. We are subsidizing our competitors. That is not a good business practice, it seems to me.

I always dislike to follow my good friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who seems to be so sincerely dedicated to the proposition that the fruits of American labor belong to everybody but Americans. He makes such a pretty and high sounding argument in favor of every country but ours that I am somewhat embarrassed by taking issue with him.

However, I am one of those who is dedicated to the idea that the American people have a right to keep what they make, and not to throw it all over the world. The power to tax and to appropriate public money is, in my opinion, not to be taken lightly. It is, perhaps, our most serious responsibility as Members of this body, and we should exercise this power with the utmost discretion.

I remind you also that at the present time the Committee on Public Works is in the midst of a prolonged debate over whether or not we are going to raise additional revenue with which to finance our highway program. Why is that argument not ever brought up when we are taxing the American people to throw it away overseas? How can we justify special taxes for building highways for Americans, when we build highways for everybody all over the world without imposing special taxes?

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has offered an amendment which makes plenty of sense to me. As I understand his amendment, it says that they will spend the money already appropriated, which is not obligated and which is unexpended, and when that balance gets down to $300 million, the funds in this bill will be released. How can that hurt our program? How can that kill this bill?

It is time to consider—for a change—the plight of the long-suffering Americans who pay through the nose in taxes for these international joyrides.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my 2 minutes to the hole in the doughnut, referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 50, noes 139.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of the House know that this program does not cost the citizens of this country anything? I should like to read to you from page 13 of the hearings. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] addressed a question to the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. He asked this question:

> Assuming, Mr. Secretary, that a billion dollars was appropriated for mutual security, what proportionate part of that money remains in the United States and what proportionate part is received by citizens of the United States?

Secretary Dulles said:

> Every dollar of that billion dollars is directly and immediately, or indirectly, spent in the United States—every dollar.

And that second "every dollar" is his emphasis, not mine.

> The industries of the United States and the people who work in the United States in those industries are profiting very greatly by this; because, as I say, the dollars are spent here.

So this does not cost you anything. You are just appropriating money to be spent right here in the United States, according to that great Secretary of State, John Foster (Acheson) Dulles.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. In other words, the underlying philosophy is to borrow money, pass it on to our great grandchildren, so as to increase purchasing power in our enlightened and unselfish generation.

Mr. GROSS. That seems to be the philosophy of some of our enlightened leaders.

Mr. DIES. May I compliment the gentleman upon the very valuable work he does on the floor of the Congress, the tireless effort he makes in finding out the facts.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. But let us turn to page 83 of the hearings and we get a little different slant on this thing from Mr. Struve Hensel, an Assistant Secretary in the Defense Department. He does not quite agree with Mr. Dulles. He says that, for instance, under "infrastructure"—that European-coined, imported word that has crept into legal usage here—we do not get all our dollars back on infrastructure, or spending on International Military Headquarters.

Elsewhere in the testimony Mr. Hensel indicates that we do not get it all back on offshore procurement either.

He tells us elsewhere in the hearings that he saved some plants over in Italy from unemployment. He said 1,200 workers were threatened with being thrown out of work in one Italian plant so he rushed some money in and saved the situation.

I wonder how fast he would rush some offshore procurement money into the Third District of Iowa if some factory was being faced with a shutdown?

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I join with the gentleman from Texas in complimenting the gentleman from Iowa for the splendid record he has made. But let me further inform the gentleman that all over these United States, Ordnance has closed plant after plant adding to the unemployment rolls of this country, and has set up the same plants with the same hardware all over this world. Certainly we are not getting any of that employment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right on that subject?

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield at this time; I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes on the floor today attended with a great deal of argument over the meaning of "reserved funds." I have had a difficult job trying to find out just what this word "reservation" means.

Let us go back to the committee report of a year ago when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was chairman of the Appropriations Committee; let us go back to that report and read a few sentences from it. On page 6 of that report you will find this statement:

> The Departments of the Army and Air Force are carrying, in apparently what amounts to memorandum form, so-called "equity" accounts.

And that word "equity" is in quotation marks. Last year it was "equity accounts." This year it is "reservation accounts," or just "reservations."

Let us see what the committee had to say last year about this matter of June buying, rushing out to dump money before the end of the fiscal year. The report says:

> The finger points clearly to various forms of "June buying" to get rid of "hot money" as basis for support of 1955 requests, a practice long condemned by the committee and on which, as late as April 26, the Director of the Budget issued a directive to agencies cautioning against such practice late in the fiscal year.

That is a scorching denunciation of Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen. A year ago he was doing the same thing that was attempted this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. It was not sufficient to warn Stassen last year that he was dealing in hot money, getting this money committed.

Let us go on:

> With the knowledge in FOA that available administrative funds were not all planned for use, there being a forecasted balance of about $1.2 million, the committee has little choice but to conclude that this was a flagrant and deliberate case of taking advantage of unused funds before midnight of June 30. It is another of those cases where not only the Treasury but the confidence so essential to our whole process of handling public funds suffers.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of that denunciation and warning a year ago, they came back and repeated the performance again this year. I say to you it is time that we boil this thing down to essentials, it is time that we cut this spending down. When these administration officials failed to heed last year's warning the committee should have cut out every single dime of new money in this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. This is not the only agency, however, that does that. In the Government that is pretty much the accepted practice. The boys in all the agencies have to get rid of the money they have not expended.

Mr. GROSS. But we happen to be dealing with this bill today and the same people a year ago were thumbing their noses at us. They are right back again this year doing the same thing. When is this process going to be halted? Apparently they cannot uderstand the English language as set forth in this report of July 1954. The only thing to do this year is to deny them this new money.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman from Mississippi raised a very interesting question a while ago when he pointed out that in the new highway bill it is insisted that we ought to impose a tax in order to raise the money. With that principle I am in agreement. But he asks, Why should that not be required in this foreign giveaway bill? Now, why do some of the proponents not offer additional facts or some justification so that our children will not have to pay for it, to show our good faith in handing out largesses and bounties. Would that not be a wonderful opportunity on our part?

Mr. GROSS. The people who are demanding this program have not the courage to face up to the tax issue and raise the money now while it is being tossed out all over the world. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. The American people would demand the answer to a lot of questions if they had to hand over $3½ billion in taxes next year to provide just the new money for foreigners.

Now, turning to page 545 of the hearings of the committee on this bill, in dealing with the United Nations Technical Assistance fund, what did the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] say? He stated:

> I tell you what I am going to do. I am going to recommend that the committee send a certified public accountant up to examine the whole setup because from what you are giving us you cannot tell a blooming thing about it. I do not see how we can make an intelligent appropriation without having an examination of your accounts to find out just what they mean, and have it in such a way that we can understand it.
>
> We take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That does not mean we can bring in appropriations for things we cannot get a picture of and cannot find a way to explain. How can we go out on the floor and explain a picture of that kind to the House so they would have any idea of what they were doing? It is our duty when we go out there to know something about it. Am I wrong?

A few minutes ago the House adopted that provision of the bill to provide $24 million for the United Nations Technical Assistance fund despite the fact that, so far as I can read these hearings, proper information was never given to the committee to warrant appropriation of this money. That is the kind of a bill you are voting on here this afternoon. I have offered no amendment to it, because it would have been a sheer waste of effort. I shall vote against the bill because it is predicated neither on reason nor common sense.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 103. Payments made from funds appropriated herein for engineering fees and services to any individual engineering firm on any one project in excess of $25,000 shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives at least twice annually.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening carefully to the words of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] when he was talking about this new problem of redefection with reference to an attempt by satellite states to bring back to Soviet Russia and behind the Iron Curtain refugees who are now on our side. Now, I have never before in my appearance down here attempted to read or presumed to read to the House any written statement, but this deals, as you can surmise, with a subject of such acute delicacy that I am going to read these paragraphs rather than attempt to extemporize upon such a subject. And it deals with such a matter that I think you should listen to.

By the way, this deals with newspaper ads that have appeared in Washington, Chicago, Far West, Boston, and New York papers within the last several weeks, and I understand that a number of ads placed by certain satellite embassies in Washington have anticipated this and similar debates.

> For a considerable length of time I have been informed by the Slovak political exiles grouped in the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia that an American political defeat appears to be building up among thousands of refugees from the Soviet Union and satellite states, and that a wave of political "redefection" of the anti-Communist refugees is in the making, which, if not checked in time, will portend our own failure in the cold war.
>
> To make this American political defeat comprehensible, I wish to inform the distinguished Members of the House about the facts as they were reported to me.

Now, with this debate or meeting approaching at the summit, I emphasize this for your interest to indicate the state of mind with which certain of the consultants are approaching this summit meeting, and these things are going on today, last night, and tomorrow.

Much material on these secret activities already has been received. The European head of this counteraction organization has an abundance of documented material to show us about this new Communist movement here and in western Europe. This is evidence of clear collaboration of American Communists in these great American cities.

This is no accident. This is no mere gesture. This is a tremendous political weapon against the United States.

Unfortunately, some of these funds in this bill have been cut, funds which have to do with the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration of which my friend from Minnesota spoke. He spoke of Austria. There you have a condition of near panic, of uncertainty existing today. The same exists in all of these other satellite areas. The Reds are striking while this iron is hot, while we want to play footsie at the summit.

At first, the Slovak exiles reported about the activities of a secret Communist organization called HEPND which means movement of the exiles for the return home. Existence of this new Communist organization and its secret activities was confirmed in reports from New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and other large cities. Much material on these secret activities of HEPND already has been received from Dr. Stefan G. Lukats, European head of the office of the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, while the evidence concerning the collaboration of our American Communists in cities like Chicago was documented with material received by Dr. Michael Zibrin in Chicago—and by Czech exiles grouped around the anti-Communist monthly Bohemia published in Munich, Germany.

Besides the clandestine operations of the HEPND, the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia, according to Col. Jan Bukar, underground intelligence expert, currently stationed in Washington, has recruited approximately 1,000 new Communist spies and agents in order to help achieve the American defeat in the cold war.

According to all these reports, hundreds of refugees in Austria, Germany, and even in Italy are receiving letters asking them to join the secret action or movement of the exiles for the return home. Since all letters have the same contents, it is apparent that this is a centrally organized action of the Communist underground in the free world, and since the letters, as documented by Dr. Lukats and Dr. Zibrin, are coming from such cities as Chicago, New York, and Cleveland, it is certain that the United States of America is a part of that Communist underground.

With this action the Communists try to make it appear that since it is directed towards the refugees, it is originated by the refugees themselves.

The addresses of the recipients are precise, showing that they are being obtained from a central planning spot within that Communist underground, a spot which undoubtedly has most reliable information. These letters are reaching even the United States Army labor battalions, which, it is known, are recruited from the nationals of the satellite states. Such labor units are in Kaiserslautern, Ingolstadt, and elsewhere; but these letters are reaching the refugees also in their private homes and in the refugee camps.

The aim of this mass movement is first, to create interest in the minds of the exiles for a return home; second, to indicate how to register for a return home by simultaneously promising loyalty to the Reds.

The Communists evidently are capitalizing on the prolonged stay of the refugees in Germany, Austria, and Italy due to the slowness of their processing in reaching America and other overseas countries.

How this clandestine Communist campaign affected the Czech and Slovak refugees up to now is seen from the newest report which I received according to which, during the first half of June from Germany alone, returned to Communist Czechoslovakia 37 refugees, 36 Czechs and 1 Slovak.

The number of those who already returned is perhaps not appalling. But if we imagine that every fugitive who returned to Communist-oppressed Czechoslovakia is a resounding moral and political victory for communism, and by the same token a great defeat for ourselves—then we have to think what to do about it. Every refugee who returns to Communist Czechoslovakia is given the platform of a press conference to attack the West, particularly America, and to refute the hopes of the oppressed inside the Soviet states for a liberation.

Thus, the effects of millions of dollars which we poured into the Voice of America program and other psychological warfare media to widen the gap between the Red masters and their oppressed victims are canceled out by the flow of repentent and redefected refugees who are turned into the most successful tool of Communist propaganda in the cold war.

The resistance movements behind the Iron Curtain and the morale of all our potential friends there are first to suffer. Their hope for ultimate release and liberation from the greatest prison of all ages becomes dim, because their potential liberators are discredited.

Why? Caught between miserable living conditions in the camps and near-hopeless prospects to reach America or other overseas countries, and between temptations of a sweet Communist campaign for a return home, many refugees gamble on the promises of Communist blandishments and are returning home.

To make this return more attractive, the President of Communist Czechoslovakia, Antonin Zapotocky, issued on May 9, 1955, an amnesty, while on June 2, 1955, a special reception committee formed in Prague, headed by Dr. Miroslav Klinger and assisted by practically all political parties in Czechoslovakia, to help the redefected fugitives. In addition, the Communist broadcast is daily asking the refugees to return without fear, and in Germany a repatriation commission is becoming very active. To extend this movement for return home to all parts of the free world, and to make it known to all former Czechoslovak citizens, the Communist embassies are placing ads in the newspapers of the countries to which they were accredited, and this explains why last week all Washington and other American newspapers carried such ads to encourage refugees here to return to the homeland. In this respect it was unfortunate when some spokesmen of the Council for Free Czechoslovakia branded this Communist campaign as applying more to "the common man than to political refugees." In our fight against communism the common man and the political refugee is of equal value because communism is not concerned about 1 or 2 political refugees but principally about the masses of men, which as we know are composed of common men.

Because of this cleverly conducted campaign, Dr. Miroslav Klinger, head of the reception committee in Prague, declared only recently that his committee is working on some 200 new applications for return and that he expects many more to come.

Simultaneously with the Czechoslovak Communist campaign for the return of refugees is running a similar campaign for the return of Hungarian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian refugees, as seen from an article in the New York Times, April 26, 1955.

In view of this disastrous situation, may I ask whether it is not too late for massive countermeasures to offset this redefection campaign? Shall we let communism have its triumph without even lifting our fingers to save at least part of our tremendous investments in psychological warfare? Shall we allow the withering away of a resistance movement and the moral defeat of all our friends behind the Iron Curtain?

In my view it would be un-American if we would not try at least to avert this Communist victory.

Therefore, I propose a challenge to President Eisenhower to speak up on behalf of the administration what it intends to do in this serious situation which concerns not only the refugees but our own national goals.

I also propose a challenge to our psychological warfare authorities: What excuse had they to ignore this situation up to now and what do they intend to do?

I also will ask the President to immediately allocate necessary funds in order to meet the urgency of moral and material aid to the refugees.

This is my call for our political wisdom in order to defeat this most recent Communist trick.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to announce that it is the desire of the leadership on both sides to conclude this bill tonight. I thought the Members would like to know that in order that they may govern themselves accordingly in the matter of requesting additional time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the committee. I call the attention of the committee to the provision inserted in the authorization act, the Mutual Security Act of 1955, with respect to direct-forces support. I want to read this language, and then ask a question concerning the appropriations under that authorization:

> The President may, notwithstanding the provisions of section 501, consolidate all or

> any part of appropriations made pursuant to this section with appropriations made pursuant to section 103. Programs authorized by this section may be administered in accordance with the provisions of chapter I or chapter III of this title.

For direct-forces support in the bill before us there is provided $305 million. For military assistance there is provided $705 million. That is a total of $1,010,000,000 for the two sections which we gave the President authority to consolidate.

My question is, How much of the unexpended balances, the carryover, are in this pool which, according to the recent Mutual Security Authorization Act, we authorized the President to treat as one?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the total unexpended balances as of April 30 in this program are $544 million for direct-forces support.

Mr. MEADER. And how much for military assistance?

Mr. PASSMAN. $6,767,200,000.

Mr. MEADER. So, if you add the unexpended balances, the amount for military assistance to the six-hundred-million-odd dollars in direct forces support, you get well over $7 billion or about $7,300,000,000?

In other words, when we gave the President the authority in this recent authorization act to transfer funds from direct forces support purposes to military assistance and vice versa, we built up a pool well in excess of $8 billion on which there is complete interchangeability. Am I correct in my understanding of the application of the law?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is correct. The President issued an Executive order on the 9th of May of this year, which this language makes permanent, directing in substance that the Defense Department administer the program of direct forces support in connection with the military assistance program under chapter I. That is, it is authorized and expected that hereafter direct-forces support will be handled by the Pentagon instead of by the Foreign Operations Administration. Such support has to do only with those commodities and supplies that wind up in the hands of soldiers. After years of separate operation, it was considered advisable, certainly more workable, to put direct-forces support and the furnishing of military hardware and training together, because they both operate immediately and directly to the end of building up the strength and efficiency and effectiveness of military forces.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman, if that is the case, why we did not come in here and put them all together in one appropriation rather than set up two separate appropriations, and then provide that the funds be transferred from one to the other.

Mr. JUDD. In the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that was discussed, but because the President had made this decision only in May, it seemed advisable this year to go along with the same pattern we had followed heretofore, with the understanding or, rather, expectation that next year they will be put in one package.

Mr. MEADER. Can the gentleman answer whether or not the $180 million provided for direct-forces support to Korea could be transferred from that fund and Korea get nothing for that purpose and it all be spent by Yugoslavia?

Mr. JUDD. No, not all of it, but the President has authority under the basic law to make transfers between geographical areas as well as between programs. A certain percentage could be transferred from the Far East to Europe, or Korea, to Yugoslavia, or vice versa.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman from Louisiana one further question: Was he clear that I was asking whether or not the language I have referred to in regard to transferability applied only to the appropriation of approximately $1 billion in the two items in this bill, or whether it would apply in his opinion to unexpended balances which are carried over?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think it would be up to the legislative committee to interpret that language, or the gentleman could interpret it himself. We are dealing only with the appropriation and not the language of the authorizing legislation.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman would prefer not to express an opinion as to whether or not this transferability provision is retroactive as to carryover funds?

Mr. PASSMAN. Inasmuch as it deals with the authorizing legislation I would rather the gentleman would interpret it himself.

Mr. JUDD. It is my understanding that it is retroactive and includes all of the funds remaining in the two appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 105. None of the funds provided by this act nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of assistance under this or any other act shall be used to make payments on account of the principal or interest on any debt of any foreign government or on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; nor shall any of these funds be expended for any purpose for which funds have been withdrawn by any recipient country to make payment on such debts.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 10, line 15, change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "Nor shall any of these funds be used for technical or other assistance for agricultural production of commodities exported by such country."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. It would impose additional duties, and it is not within the scope of the bill being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not agree with the gentleman. The Chair firmly feels that this is a limitation within the rules. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to take the floor again. I feel my friend from Louisiana has done a fine job under all the circumstances in holding the amount in the bill down. I do not have his position of responsibility in handling the bill on the floor. I feel deeply if we do not stop further increases altogether, we are ruining ourselves economically. We, in this country, have about $4 billion worth of farm commodities on which we pay $700,000 or more storage every day. We have those commodities because we would not offer them for sale competitively but have held them off the world markets, letting those markets go to foreign countries. In this bill there are millions of dollars for Central America, and Central America has been increasing its production of the very commodities that we are having trouble with in the United States, as much as sixfold in the last 5 years. This situation of spending our money producing in foreign countries farm commodities for them to export has reached the point where, and let me read what our President said in his message only a short time ago:

> In this wealthiest of nations, where per capita income is the highest in the world, more than one-fourth of the families who live on American farms still have a cash income of less than $1,000 a year. They neither share fully in our economic and social progress nor contribute as much as they would like and can contribute to the Nation's production of goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, I have just completed days of hearings on your President's message to help 1,500,000 American farmers making a gross income of less than $1,000 a year. What does this amendment of mine do? It says that we will not use American dollars to help promote agricultural commodities in foreign countries for export. If you expect me to come in next week, and as I shall, trying to help the small American farmers, 1,500,000 of them making less than $1,000 a year, will you not help me and the farmers themselves by putting this restriction on these funds saying that you are not going to take those dollars to increase exports from those countries that are now responsible largely for the $4 billion worth of commodities we have on hand? I am surprised at this subcommittee headed by my friend and the fine members of that subcommittee. Of course, I know that they have a very unpleasant task to do. I cannot conceive of them opposing this amendment saying that they are for these 1,500,000 small farmers who your President says are making less than $1,000 a year.

Let me present to you what our committee investigators have found:

> INTERIM REPORT ON INCREASES IN FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION
>
> Recognizing these facts this committee at my urging asked for an investigation of (1) increased foreign agricultural production in the past 5 years, (2) United States interests furnishing financial support to foreign agricultural production, (3) special tax concessions on income from production in other countries, (4) financial interests of members of advisory groups, (5) foreign-aid funds used to encourage agricultural production, and (6) special concessions of foreign countries to encourage exports.

We have just received a special interim report on this study, which I wish to read into the record at this point:

“POINT I

“The increase in agricultural production in foreign countries during the past 5 years, with particular reference to the basic commodities receiving United States price support.

“Twenty-eight countries which showed substantial increases in production of one or more of the price-supported basic commodities (cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco) were selected for special study. An analysis sheet for each country (as well as for the United States and the world) was prepared showing production, acreage, yield per acre, and exports for each commodity for the following periods:

“Five-year averages 1935–36 to 1939–40 and 1945–46 to 1949–50.

“Annual data for the years 1950–51 to 1954–55, inclusive.

“The percentage change between 1950–51 and 1954–55.

“Estimates for 1955–56 were available.

“Data were assembled by the appropriate divisions of the Foreign Agriculture Service. Some test checks of the accuracy of the figures have been made. A number of meetings have been held with officials of various divisions of the Department of Agriculture and with trade associations to discuss increased production and trends in foreign countries.

“For this report, analysis sheets for five of the countries, Mexico, Iran, Turkey, India, and Pakistan, were selected for inclusion. They appear as exhibits 1 through 5 at the end of the report. (Analysis sheets on the other 23 countries are available at the office of the director of the staff.)

“Mexico was included because of the substantial increases in cotton and other agricultural products in that country in recent years, much of which may be attributed to private interests in the United States. Iran, Turkey, India, and Pakistan were included because they also have sharply increased production of cotton and other crops in recent years while receiving large foreign-aid grants from the United States.

“A detailed analysis of the foreign-aid program in Iran appears in this report (see pt. 5) and similar data for Turkey, India, and Pakistan will be included in the final report.

“A few examples of preliminary findings to date are given below:

“ ‘Cotton

“ ‘The greatest increases in production and the greatest potentials for future competition with the United States are Mexico and the Middle East countries of Turkey, Syria, Iran, Iraq.

“ ‘In Mexico cotton production has increased from a prewar 5-year average of 334,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 577,000 bales and to 1,780,000 bales in the crop year 1954–55. Cotton exports have increased for the same periods from 105,000 to 343,000 to 1,150,000 bales.

“ ‘It is reported that Mexico started its program for expansion in irrigation facilities in 1947, and is proceeding approximately on schedule. It is anticipated that the program will be completed in 2 or 3 years, at which time the limit of appreciable expansion will be reached. The Yaqui River project is expected to increase irrigation substantially in the northwestern section.’

“In the Middle Eastern countries of Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Iraq cotton production decreased from a prewar 5-year average of 459,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 390,000 bales and then increased to 1,260,000 bales in the crop year 1954–55. Cotton exports for the same periods decreased from 157,000 to 85,000 and then increased to 684,000 bales.

“ ‘It is believed that there will be continued increases in cotton production in the Middle East.

“ ‘Cotton production in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala has increased steadily from approximately 50,000 bales 4 years ago to an estimated 300,000 bales in 1954–55. A further increase of about 100,000 bales is expected in 1955–56, and potential annual production estimates after several more years of development range from 700,000 to 900,000 bales.

“ ‘In Peru cotton production has increased 25 percent during the past 5 years to 505,000 bales in 1954–55. During the same period exports, which are a large proportion of production, increased 25 percent. However, it is reported the Peruvian Government holds cotton and sugar production (the most profitable crops) under strict control in order to insure the production of adequate food crops.

“ ‘In Argentina cotton production has been fairly stable over the past 10 years, the 1954–55 crop being 500,000 bales. Exports normally amount to about 40 percent of production. It is anticipated there will be no expansion during the next 5 or 10 years although there is a potential for large increases.

“ ‘In Brazil cotton production has been stable for the last 5 years. The 1954–55 crop was 1,600,000 bales, some 350,000 bales less than the 5-year prewar average. Exports have borne little relation to production. It has been reported that Brazil has a policy of encouragement of industry which acts as a deterrent to expansion of agriculture and therefore no significant change is anticipated in cotton production.

“ ‘In Egypt cotton production has been fairly stable for the past 10 years, the highest yield being 2,047,000 bales in 1952–53. The 1954–55 crop was 1,598,000 bales. A large proportion of the production is exported. The staff has been informed that the Sudan has a potentiality for expansion if wells and irrigation are increased. However, the necessary machinery and equipment are expensive and no substantial increase in production is anticipated in the near future. It has been reported that German interests are considering the investment of capital in this project.

“ ‘In other African countries cotton production has been small and fairly stable. The staff has been informed that there is little chance for substantial expansion.

“ ‘In India during the past 10 years there has been a gradual increase in the production of cotton, the 1954–55 crop being 3,900,000 bales. Exports are negligible. It has been reported that some 600,000 bales of American-type cotton are imported, principally from East Africa as the price has been lower than the United States price, the result being that the United States is a residual supplier.

“ ‘In Pakistan cotton production has been stable for the past 5 years, the 1954–55 crop being 1,245,000 bales. During the last 4 years, a large proportion of the production was exported but exports for the current year were only 630,000 bales. The staff has been informed that although increased acreages are needed for production of food products for home consumption it is planned to maintain or expand exports of cotton through increased irrigation and improved cultural practices.

“ ‘The production of cotton is of minor importance in friendly countries other than those discussed above.

“ ‘The following information on the world situation with respect to synthetic fibers was received. World production last year was the equivalent of approximately 11 million bales of cotton and this year is expected to be the equivalent of about 14 million bales; United States production of synthetics has not changed substantially during the last 4 years. Cotton has held its own on a per capita basis; the price of cotton has a definite effect on rayon production and consumption, but the recent expansion of the other higher priced synthetic fibers such as nylon, orlon, and dacron has been largely independent of the price of cotton.

“ ‘Wheat

“ ‘World wheat production increased from an annual average of 6 billion bushels in prewar years to 6.6 billion bushels in 1950–51. It continued to rise to 7.4 billion bushels in 1952–53 and 7.3 billion bushels in 1953–54. Lower yields and a slightly lower acreage resulted in somewhat less wheat production of 6.8 billion bushels in 1954–55.

“ ‘As compared with the 5-year prewar average world wheat acreage was 9 percent higher and production was 14 percent higher in 1954–55.

“ ‘In the United States with acreage allotments and marketing quotas in effect farmers harvested 3 million or around 6 percent fewer acres of wheat in 1954 than in 1935 to 1939. With higher acre yields they produced around 211 million bushels or 28 percent more wheat, however, in 1954 than in 1935–39.

“ ‘In the 3 other major wheat exporting countries—Canada, Argentina, and Australia—around 6 million fewer acres of wheat were harvested in 1954–55 than in the 5 prewar years 1935–36 to 1939–40. Higher acre yields resulted in the production of about 37 million bushels or 5 percent more wheat in these countries in 1954–55, however, than was produced in 1935–36 to 1939–40.

“ ‘These acreage and production data indicate that the relatively high level of world wheat production in 1954–55 was not the result of expansion in the major wheat exporting countries.’

“Sharp increases in wheat acreage and production have been recorded in a number of the European and Middle Eastern countries which have received substantial foreign-aid grants in recent years.

“France, although reducing slightly the acreage devoted to wheat in 1954 as compared with the 1935–39 average, produced over a third or 100 million bushels more wheat in 1954 than in the prewar years.

“Turkey has almost doubled her wheat acreage since the 1935–36 to 1939–40 average and more than doubled her total production in 1953–54. Unfavorable yields in 1954–55 resulted in a sharp drop in wheat production as compared with a year earlier yet it remained a third higher than in the prewar years.

“Greece although on a net import basis has increased her wheat acreage 20 percent and production by 50 percent as compared with prewar years.

“Most Latin American countries, as a part of their programs to increase home food production, have expanded their wheat acreage and production. The acreage in wheat in Mexico has increased 50 percent while production has more than doubled since the period 1935–36 to 1939–40. Although wheat is a minor crop in Peru the acreage has increased 50 percent and production has almost doubled as compared with prewar years.

“In the interests of maintaining self-sufficiency wheat production is expected to continue at recent high levels in most countries which are now on a net import basis. No definite trends are in evidence in the more important foreign wheat exporting countries.

“World tobacco production increased from an annual average 6.5 billion pounds in the 1935–39 period to 7.8 billion pounds in 1954 or an increase of 20 percent. During this same period the world acreage devoted to tobacco production increased from 7.5 million acres to 8.6 million acres or an increase of 15 percent.

“United States production of tobacco increased from 1.5 billion pounds in the period 1935–39 to 2.2 billion pounds in 1954, an increase of 47 percent, in spite of the fact that the acreage devoted to tobacco in 1954 was slightly smaller than the 1935 to 1939 acreage.

"Canada and Southern Rhodesia are among the more important countries from the standpoint of tobacco production increases. In both of these countries the expansion has been encouraged by long-term contracts offered by British tobacco companies.

"Increases in acreage and production from 1935–39 to 1954 are as follows:

	Percent increase in acreage	Percent increase in production
Canada	91	135
Southern Rhodesia	250	360

"Japan has increased her tobacco acreage from 92,000 acres in 1935–39 to 172,000 acres in 1954, and from a production of 149 million pounds in the prewar years to 256 million pounds in 1954.

"Turkey has increased her production of tobacco sharply from 128 million pounds in the prewar years to 206 million pounds in 1954 and acreage from 194,000 acres to 323,000 acres during the same period.

"Italy also has increased both acreage and production of tobacco over 50 percent during the same period.

"Brazil, by far the largest tobacco producer in Latin America, has increased her tobacco acreage from 250,000 acres in 1935–39 to 430,000 acres in 1954. Tobacco production in Brazil increased from 203 million pounds a year in the 1935–39 period to 296 million pounds in 1954, an increase of 46 percent.

"Colombia almost doubled both tobacco acreage and production in the same period, and Mexico more than doubled her production, with about 50 percent increase in acreage.

"Tobacco production has declined in India, Pakistan, and Iran.

"Flue-cured tobacco usually accounts for about 80 percent of all United States exports. World production of this type of leaf has shown striking increases. The acreage of flue-cured tobacco in the major present and potential competing countries increased from 384,000 acres to 1,045,000 acres, 172 percent, between 1935–39 and 1954, and production increased from 370,600,000 pounds to 986,100,000 pounds, 166 percent, during the same period.

"Tobacco production is expected to increase further in the sterling-area countries where British interests are stimulating increased production. Further increases in acre yields also are expected in most countries, especially in Latin America.

"'*Peanuts*

"'The principal peanut-growing countries of the world are India, China, French West Africa, Nigeria, and the United States. The major portion of world exports is made by the African countries and goes principally to Europe, France, and the United Kingdom.

"'A significant distinction between peanuts and other United States price-supported crops is that peanuts produced in foreign countries compete with fats and oils such as cottonseed and soybean oil rather than peanuts as such. Exports of foreign countries are predominantly in the form of peanut oil or peanuts, shelled or unshelled, to be crushed into oil by the importing country. One exception to foreign exporting countries is Mexico, which has been exporting peanuts for edible use in small but steadily increasing quantities. The United States raises peanuts for domestic edible purposes, not for export. If the production exceeds local edible requirements such excess is either crushed for domestic consumption or exported for crushing.

"'At present (May 1955) there is apparently no problem in connection with overproduction of peanuts in the United States. Not only have all peanut stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation been disposed of but Presidential Proclamation No. 3084, dated March 9, 1955, liberalized restrictions on imports. Further, recommendations have since been made to the President by the Tariff Commission that quota limitations on imports be removed through July 1955. Information has been received that difficulty is being encountered in locating peanuts of satisfactory quality for import.

"'The United States does not generally import peanut oil but due to the 1954 drought some is being imported this year under an annual quota of 80 million pounds. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that perhaps 40 million pounds will be imported by June 30, 1955.

"'*Corn and rice*

"'World production of both corn and rice have increased substantially since the prewar years and since 1950–51. From 1950–51 to 1954–55 the world increase in corn production was 6 percent and the world increase in rice production was 13.5 percent. An analysis of the country-by-country trends in the production of these crops as well as a more comprehensive analysis of the increases in production of the other price-supported crops will be included in the final report.'"

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third time the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has attempted to destroy this bill by some amendment which would have just that effect. I am not going to express my personal feelings on this legislation. Rather I shall point out that, if this amendment should be adopted, the technical cooperation or the point 4 program will be destroyed. Make no mistake about that. How are you going to be able to determine what these nations receiving this aid are going to produce or what part will be for export and what part will be for domestic consumption.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to point out that the amendment does say where those countries are exporting such commodities.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that, if he wants to kill the program, let him do it through the legislative committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I am not going to express my personal feelings on the overall program. I would be less than honest not to admit that you could not stop this program now without doing great damage. I was against the program in the beginning. I have voted against the program. I voted against the authorization bill the other day. But, inasmuch as this House worked its will and inasmuch as the other body said we must continue this program, of course, I am supporting the very minimum amount. We reported out a bill which was almost unanimous so far as the subcommittee was concerned.

Let me say for the record, I am going to vote for this appropriation bill if we have a rollcall vote. Otherwise, I would not be worthy of the honor of being a Member of Congress, having defended this bill in subcommittee, in the full committee and on the floor. We took out what we thought we could and brought out the very least amount possible to continue this program until such time as the Congress in its wisdom sees fit to discontinue it. I certainly hope the committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. FORD. This amendment is a totally impractical amendment, from an administrative point of view.

Mr. PASSMAN. It certainly is.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Louisiana has done a very admirable job in defending the action of our subcommittee. I hope and trust that the House as a whole will understand his difficult position and support him, not only because of the good job he has done but because this amendment is totally and completely impractical.

Mr. PASSMAN. I hope the committee understands that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I just want to add a word to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has said. I know the views of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] on the entire foreign-aid program, and while I have differed with him, I want to commend him for the manner in which he has defended this bill and has handled it on the floor. It would have been much easier for one with my views to have done it. He is deserving of our gratitude.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I wanted to say exactly the same thing. I do not like the cuts. I do not like the European cut. I do not like the Asian cut, but I see the gentleman's work as chairman of this subcommittee, and knowing his views, I would like the House to know that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] is giving one of the most outstanding exhibitions of statemanship that I have ever seen in this House.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this paragraph engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND:

Page 12, after line 10, insert the following: "SEC. 109. No funds contained in this act shall be used to pay a contribution of the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any United Nations organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act."

And renumber the following sections.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly conscious of the hour and I shall try to be as brief as possible. I think the amendment is good. It merely states that in these international undertakings under the United Nations we feel we should not be called upon to pay more than a reasonable amount, and it sets forth what that reasonable amount is—not more than one-third.

The gentleman from Louisiana has in the past opposed the Foreign Relief Act that is now before us. At the same time I think he is one who has consistently proposed and been in favor of that section of the bill which had to do with our participation with the United Nations in international activities. But I think he would agree with me that our participation should be a reasonable participation in any worldwide effort such as the United Nations undertakes for creating better conditions of peace and stability. So I want him to believe me when I say that in offering this amendment to limit our participation in the total cost to one-third, I do not want to cripple his program but only want to put it on a reasonable basis of limiting the amount we have to pay to a reasonable figure. In one of the United Nations subsidiary organizations we are paying 61 percent of the bill. In the Relief Works Agency program we are paying more than 60 percent of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Children's Fund, which I want to speak briefly about particularly, because obviously I am not opposed to that. I know it has done excellent work and it is the kind of work which appeals deeply to our humanitarian instincts. We are paying more than 60 percent of the entire cost of the program.

Let us consider for a moment what some of the other countries are paying as their share of this particular program. The Netherlands—and nobody would suggest that the Netherlands is not a prosperous, stable country; they are paying less than one-half of 1 percent.

Belgium, which before the program started was enjoying over a 100 percent of her prewar prosperity, pays one-half of 1 percent. I am sure the gentleman does not want us to go entirely on the theory that the other countries will pay what they wish and we will pick up the check for the balance. I think it is asking too much to ask us to carry two-thirds of the cost of these programs.

My amendment is one which offers to pay a reasonable amount, and it seems to me that the reasonable amount is not to exceed one-third. The amendment is fair, it does not curtail or cripple the program, but simply puts more sense into the responsibilities for the program as far as we are concerned.

I urge favorable consideration and hope you will adopt the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask uanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the United States contributions to regular assessed budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are now limited by law to a maximum of one-third of the total assessments against all members.

The items that we are dealing with at the present time relate to the voluntary programs where no nation can be forced to contribute but where each nation contribute according to its own desires.

There are a number of citizen organizations in the United States that are advocating these contributions, particularly to the Children's Fund.

I have here a chart. While it is true that the United States is contributing approximately 60 percent to UNICEF, this amount is dropping. It started at 70 percent; it has been gradually dropping until now it is 60 percent, and it is estimated that next year it will be less than 60 percent. That fund, however, constitutes only 30 percent of the total funds spent in UNICEF's work. When the United Nations goes into a country to spend these funds for the children it requires the country in which the work is done to contribute a part of the funds. When you consider these contributions, the contributions of the United States to the total funds for all these purposes is only 18 percent. As shown by this chart the total contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund for the calendar year 1954 were $46.1 million. Of this amount the United States contributed $8.3 million, or 18 percent; other governments contributed $5.3 million, or 12 percent; the local governments of the countries in which the funds were spent contributed $32.5 million, or 70 percent.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. In the case of the United Nations technical-assistance program, is it not true that the local contributions amount to $60 million, making our contribution actually only 17 percent?

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct. Our contribution to that fund is less percentagewise.

Mr. MORANO. By 1 percent.

Mr. GARY. By 1 percent. It would appear from the report that you have before you that we have increased these technical-assistance funds, but that is not true. For example, the United Nations' program shows an increase of $7½ million for next year, but, as a matter of fact, the appropriation of $24 million is for 18 months rather than a 12-month program. The reason for that is that at the present time the United Nations is operating on a calendar-year basis. The United States Government operates on a fiscal-year basis. Therefore, in order to get the appropriation on a proper annual basis, the Appropriations Committee directed that this year the State Department bring in a request for 18 months, which is the request that we have before us. The same is true of the children's fund. Last year we appropriated for the children's fund $12,500,000. This year we are appropriating $14,500,000, but that is for a period of 18 months rather than for a period of 12 months.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I would like to ask the gentleman one question, and that is whether he thinks it is fair and equitable for the United States to contribute 66 percent toward the children's fund and have the Netherlands and Belgium put together contribute less than 1 percent?

Mr. GARY. As long as it is a voluntary fund, I do not think we have anything to do with what the others contribute. In other words, if I contribute to the community chest, I contribute what I feel I can and each and every person contributes to the fund in identically the same way.

Mr. HAND. I think we can only afford to contribute one-third.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman who just left the floor, Is the World Health Organization included in this?

Mr. GARY. It is not. There we contribute 33⅓ percent.

Mr. GROSS. Is that one of these voluntary propositions?

Mr. GARY. That is an assessed fund.

Mr. GROSS. That is not one of these voluntary organizations?

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of these organizations where the other nations can vote indirectly to impose a tax upon the people of the United States. That is right, is it not?

Mr. GARY. That is one of the organizations whose budgets are fixed by the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Where they are fixed by the member countries that can vote to increase our assessment.

Mr. GARY. The United States is a member of the organization and has a say in fixing the assessments.

Mr. GROSS. They can vote to increase the assessments on the part of the United States and that is exactly what they did do.

Mr. GARY. But the Congress has provided that the contribution of the United States to such an agency shall not be more than 33⅓ percent of the total contribution from member countries.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Can any American children qualify for aid under this program in spite of the fact we appropriate more than 60 percent of the money?

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Virginia answer that question?

Mr. GARY. I did not hear the question.

Mr. GROSS. Repeat the question.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Can any American children qualify for aid under this program in spite of the fact we contribute 60 percent of the fund?

Mr. GARY. I think the program is for children in the countries that need aid.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The children in America do not need aid?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Virginia mentioned a moment ago that this was a voluntary program and as a result it was none of our business what the others contributed. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia what is voluntary about paying taxes, and how can he make it a voluntary program under those circumstances.

Mr. GARY. It is voluntary whether we contribute to the United Nations Children's Fund. We do not have to contribute one penny unless we want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. I find in the hearings a technical exchange program. Who administers, may I ask some member of the committee, the technical exchange program? Is that a United Nations subsidiary or United States technical assistance program?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am sure the gentleman understands that we have two programs, the United States program and the program of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Which one is this?

Mr. PASSMAN. Which one is what?

Mr. GROSS. Which one is the technical exchange program?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a United States program.

Mr. GROSS. That is a United States program?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is the one where we find the American taxpayers financing a team of so-called experts to go over to Denmark to show them how to set up self-service stores?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that that is part of the program, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to read what the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana had to say in the hearings on that.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not defending all phases of this program. My defense is of the overall program today, not these little things the gentleman is picking out of the hearings. But, if it will make the gentleman feel better, go ahead and read my interrogation.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sure we will be asked this question on the floor and that is why I am asking it now.

> What would be the advantage, and just why do we have to pay the salary of anyone to go to Denmark to train the Danes in establishing and operating a self-service store, when according to my understanding, they were the originators of it? They originated that type of store, did they not?

And Mr. Van Dyke, whoever he is—perhaps he is up in the gallery now. I notice it is full of the people who fatten off of this program—had this to say:

> The report I have shows in 1950, they had only a handful of self-service stores. Now, the facts are that the retail teams to which I have alluded have been there on one or two occasions and as a result of their visits, primarily, I am told, the self-service idea has caught on and there are some thousand now.

So, we sent teams over to teach the Danes, the people from whom we copied the cooperative plan in this country—spending the money of the taxpayers of this country to teach them how to operate stores. What a wonderful business we are in with this legislation.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman understands that the amendment which is pending before the Committee has no reference to that program at all. That is the United States program that the gentleman is talking about. The amendment refers to the United Nations program.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I appreciate that, but it all dovetails into the same picture, the same beautiful picture, of exploring every nook and cranny in the world and trying to find some place to spend the taxpayers' money. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is now organizing a junket to go to Ceylon to find out if there is something for Ceylon that had not been done that the American taxpayers can do.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is a statesman and a fighter for economy in American Government. I hope that the gentleman will not prolong this program too long, because things are so bad in Europe, there is so much starvation in Europe, that right now the State Department has 50,000 applications for passports from American citizens to go to Europe and enjoy life.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The telephone lines are swamped here in Washington with calls from people who want passports to go over there and spend their vacations starving with the Europeans.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the distinguished gentleman from Iowa complaining that the Eisenhower administration is frittering way the taxpayers' money?

Mr. GROSS. That is the general idea.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to stop and take a good look at the programs that would be affected by this amendment. There are three main ones from the standpoint of money involved. One is the Children's Fund. One is the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund. The biggest, involving more than all the others put together, is the program for relief of the 800,000 or more Palestine refugees.

Mr. Chairman, these are programs that the United States would be carrying on, even if no other country gave a dime, because that is just the kind of country we are and the kind of people we are. We care about human beings in need.

We initiated most of these programs and it has been a great mark of progress that other countries, as they have recovered, are each year making larger contributions from their own improved economies. So actually when it is said that it is not fair and equitable for us to be giving more than one-third, the fact is we are giving less than we would be giving for these same needy people, if we were to adopt the proposed amendment and others pulled out or failed to make up the additional amounts. It would certainly cost us more if we were left practically alone to do the job.

I am one of those who has fought for the United States not providing more than one-third of the budgets of most U. N. organizations.

But the problem in these particular organizations arises from the fact that there are two sources of funds for their programs. One is the contributing countries, like the United States and others, who give money into a central fund for the less favored or underdeveloped areas. Our share of this central fund is still 50 to 60 percent in some instances.

But it is not the only source, or even the largest source of income; the other source is the recipient countries themselves. The countries from the outside like ourselves, contribute money. But the countries that receive from that fund also contribute. It may be money in their own currency for operating the program in their country. It may be for buildings and transportation and personnel—teachers, technicians, doctors who help to administer the tuberculin shots, supervisors and cooks to run the hot-lunch program, and so forth. The contributions made by the recipient countries in the case of both the Children's Fund and U. N. Technical Assistance Fund amounts to more than twice the outside contributions to the central fund. If you add those contributions by the recipient governments to the contributions that we of the contributing countries make, then our share is already way below 33⅓ percent. It is down to 17 percent of the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund and 18 percent of the Children's Fund, although our share is considerably larger in the case of the Palestine refugees.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop and consider for a moment not how little the others are giving, but how much more they are beginning to give from more limited resources. And suppose other countries did not give anything. Every person here knows that the United States would be giving more, not less, to carry on these programs that are for half starved or ill children, or for destitute refugees in Korea or the Near East, or for other unfortunate human beings around the world.

This is the nubbin of the problem. Is the United States by this too drastic amendment going to undermine the foundation of some of the best programs we have supported and which in many cases we ourselves first put into operation?

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be voted down. I understand the purpose of it, but it is not well adapted to these particular organizations because in its percentage requirement it does not take into account the contributions, the enormous contributions made by the countries who are on the receiving end. The amendment if adopted would not force others to give more. It would just mean that those in need would get less.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with every word of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] with regard to the pending amendment.

This very amendment was considered in the full Committee on Appropriations and was defeated. I do trust that the House will not wreck the best part of our international program; the United Nations Children's Fund, ICEM, UNREF, and the others. The action proposed by the pending amendment would mean the withdrawal of American participation in these worthwhile programs. I am sure the House is not going to adopt this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Surely there can be no difference of opinion in this House as to the worthwhileness of these programs. Let us continue our support with orderly reduction of our share as others are able and willing to contribute more.

I am confident the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Hand].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hand) there were—ayes 84, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Murray of Illinois: Page 12, after line 10, insert the following section:

"Sec. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to make grants or loans, or otherwise to furnish assistance, to any country the government of which the Secretary of State believes to be substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief. I think the language of my amendment speaks for itself, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Walter). The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois imposes on the Secretary of State additional duties, and, in the opinion of the Chair, the imposition of those additional duties constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 109, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY and Mr. LONG objected.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the remainder of the bill conclude in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the remainder of the bill close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I have not attempted to vote for any of the crippling amendments, but I do want to voice my objection to this measure which continues the giveaway program to foreign countries. As many of you know, I have always been opposed to this particular bill and all amendments thereto. No doubt Russia today would be very pleased to know what is taking place here on the floor. This sort of thing, the dissipation of our wealth, is what Russia likes to see, and we have consistently played into their hands. If you scatter your shots and scatter your men, you will never win a war. I think nearly everyone admits that a lot of this money is absolutely thrown away.

The ramifications of our so-called mutual-security program, another name for the extravagant and wasteful foreign-aid program, are many indeed. Briefly, a glance at the overall picture brings out an idea of where our borrowed money goes. There are such items as development assistance to American Republics, then we branch off to Asia, where we find something about the nonmilitary assistance programs in Afghanistan, Ceylon, and India. I note that there is a program in India for drilling deep wells. To my way of thinking our American citizens, especially since they are footing the bill, should come in for a share of deep wells where needed.

In the Far East we can find nonmilitary assistance programs in Laos, Cambodia, Viet-Nam, Formosa, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Philippine Islands, Thailand. In the Near East we find our money going to the Arab States, Israel, Egypt, Greece, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, and Libya.

It is interesting to look briefly at some of the activities our borrowed money goes to support and develop. Remember somewhere there is supposed to be some sort of justification for this type expenditure. Remember, too, the money we spend is borrowed money. Money we are working to pay back and money represented in your income-tax payments. On the list of activities there is something about purse seine fishing, irrigation, training, poultry husbandry training, crop and livestock development, agricultural machinery, industrial design, industrial audit, forest research laboratory, Pakistan railways, production engineering development training program, preplanning of construction, electric-power system training, telecommunications training, methods of training management development, and so forth.

I have mentioned a few of the items our money is being spent for in the more remote countries of the world. Bear in mind that our money goes elsewhere in the world. To name each country would take too much space, but I will give you the number of countries in each general area of the world. In the Near East, Africa and south Asia there are 45 countries; in the Far East, there are 18 countries; in Latin America there are 29 countries, island possessions, etc., receiving aid; and in Europe there are 14 countries—a total of 106. It makes a person dizzy to read all the charts and graphs prepared to show where our money goes and for what purpose. I am of the opinion the program, while in itself unwieldly and bulky, is deliberately confused to avoid a forthright understanding by the average citizen of what goes on.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the program, beyond the vague objectives and purposes of the program itself, lies in the question of why should the United States undertake to tutor and educate the world?

What obligation do we have, what justification do we have, what, actually, right do we have to try to impose our thinking and our methods on others—most of whom can trace a history far beyond our own. The thought occurs to me that if we disrupt age-old customs and habits and introduce new methods where do we stop it? New production methods call for new industrial methods, and new industrial methods lead into new distribution methods and so on. Employment will be affected, imports and exports will be affected, new sources of materials will have to be explored, and, in short, a veritable chain reaction will develop which we, as instigators and the responsible factor, will be unable to escape. It seems to me that we have a bear by the tail already—we should not continue to hold on, yet we dare not turn loose, and the situation cannot improve.

Despite the seriousness of the matter, I found one section of the hearings on mutual assistance downright amusing. The discussion involved the spending of large sums in Denmark for training in the field of food stores. A portion of the program calls for sending experts to Denmark to train the Danes in the operation of self-service food stores. The fact is that the Danes originated the idea of food store cooperatives and we now find ourselves in the ridiculous position of spending borrowed money teaching the Danes methods they taught us in the first place. I fear this type of thing is all too prevalent.

In Western Europe, the foreign countries probably closest to us economically and culturally, the field of activities cover such items as management development, marketing and distribution, community self help, development of competitive business practices, housing, government administration, collective bargaining techniques, manpower utilization, agricultural training and extension, strengthening free trade unions, scientific training projects, and arranging and supporting of self-financed projects, How about that list of activities? Not only are the categories vague, but also difficult to tie in with any sound reason for stripping our coffers and burdening our taxpayers.

An item under the "United Nations expanded program of technical assistance" I see where the food and agriculture operation sent a British hides and skins expert from Tanganyika to Ethopia to advise that country how to improve its hides and skins industry. You and I foot the bill for that sort of nonsense.

In another section, I see where we are teaching the Japanese how to grow rice—something they have been doing for quite a long while. Without a doubt there have been improvements in both rice strains and methods, but I fail to see why we should go to Japan with the taxpayers' money and try to teach them something they have been doing for years in their own country, in their own style and in accordance with their system. The average farm holding is less than 3 acres. There is nothing to prevent them from coming to us at their own expense to learn our system.

I could continue to cite the nonsensical aspects of this vast and expensive, and wholy unjustified spending program, for, to my mind, the whole thing fails to make sense. But I have given you a sampling of what goes on and at a cost amounting into the billions. Where this will end apparently no one knows for by the very nature of the operations one thing leads to another and so on through an ever expanding plan.

What do we gain from this? Well the principal gain is a budget out of balance and quasi-friendships which are no stronger than the everchanging minds of the leaders of the various countries. Our Nation represents only one-sixth of the world's population yet we are spending ourselves into bankruptcy trying to feed, tutor, instruct, and support some 106 foreign nations. It is well to be a good neighbor and try to help the less fortunate—you and I would help our friends and even a stranger in trouble to the extent of our ability and in accordance with our means. But it is doubtful if we would be constrained to borrow money to risk bankruptcy to give aid to a doubtful friend, or even a proven friend, especially if that friend were actually in better shape than we are. Remember our national debt of some $280 billion, and our per capita debt of between $800 and $900—that is for every man, woman, and child in the United States. I don't know of any foreign country in that bad shape financially.

Finally, I am a firm believer that charity should begin at home. We have a lot to be done in our own country for our own people and I feel we should come first. Our roads need improving, our drainage, flood control, and reclamation programs should be stepped up, and our agricultural and industrial economy can stand improvement. I say let us take care of America then if there is a surplus that exists without burdening the taxpayers we can give some thought to other sections of the world. The quicker we come to our senses and stop trying to buy friendship and meddling in the affairs of other nations, the better off we will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi), the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. DOWDY.)

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: After line 10, page 12, insert a new section to be numbered section 108 (a) to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be expended which would result in increasing the amount of the public debt of the United States of America."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the reading of the amendment it is merely a limitation.

Mr. DOWDY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I perhaps shall not take the entire 3 minutes on this amendment, but I do want to make a short statement.

We have heard so much talk during the last 2 years about the wishes and promises to balance the budget, that I offer this amendment to accomplish that end. This amendment, if adopted, would go far toward attaining a balanced budget. I could develop this much further, but not in 3 minutes. All my amendment does is to require that the funds be not raised by borrowing and deficit spending.

A few days ago you will remember a report came to the House about the shock that resulted to certain people when they learned of recent mishandling of these foreign aid funds. I have heard that shock treatment is very beneficial in certain cases. If this amendment is adopted that shock treatment will extend much further than you realize, and may be of great good. In the first place it will reach into the executive branch when they find how much more taxes they will have to recommend be placed upon the people of the United States, and result in sanity in this program.

The statement has been made that the platform of both parties supported foreign aid and that, therefore, everybody in the United States wanted foreign aid. With both parties supporting it the voters actually did not have a chance to express themselves, and it is by no means universal that all the taxpayers want to dig up their money to be given away to foreign nations.

But this shock which I spoke of will extend to the Members of the Congress of the United States in both Houses when they wrestle with the question of levying taxes to get the money to pay for this program, and it will hit with special impact those who vote for foreign aid when our budget is so unbalanced. Now this program is a mortgage that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will have to discharge. Many could not bear the shock of voting for taxes for this purpose now, so they will vote against my amendment.

It will shock the people who have to pay the taxes, when they find out what this bill actually costs each taxpayer.

And, of course, if the amendment is adopted I will receive my shock, because I will be so surprised.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the tleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I am sure both sides are for it, Democrats and Republicans alike, because they are on record in favor of a balanced budget and against deficit spending.

Mr. DOWDY. Certainly, it is just fiscal responsibility and every Member should be for it. Every Member who votes for this program should certainly be willing to vote the taxes to support it.

Mr. DIES. I think the committee will concede the amendment.

Mr. DOWDY. Surely they ought to, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If they are against inflation they will vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you; at least they should do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is advocating fiscal responsibility on the part of both parties, is he not?

Mr. DOWDY. He is, on the part of all parties, and this would help make it possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not see how anybody could vote against it.

Mr. DOWDY. This a way to fiscal responsibility, and the only way.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is the most wise legislative proposal that has been introduced in the 84th Congress, but I will drop dead of shock if it is adopted.

Mr. DOWDY. I will too. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that we know what we are voting this evening. This a bill which contains spending authorization for $13 billion. This is brought about because of prior spending authority of past sessions. The FOA is a freewheeling operation which has clearly shown no respect for the will of Congress. An obligation on the part of the Foreign Operations Administration clearly is not an obligation, because they can change it around at their own will any time they desire. In the first 6 months of fiscal 1955 FOA deobligated more funds that it obligated.

I think if we are going to have a tight management of the Foreign Operations Administration in helping our friends throughout the world we certainly should not be appropriating more than $1 billion in new funds today.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is just another attempt to kill the program indirectly rather than directly. As I understand the amendment, it provides that no part of any funds contained in this bill may be used which will increase the public debt of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, how can we know whether this appropriation will increase the public debt or whether an appropriation we make for our own economy will increase the public debt? It would be impossible to determine what appropriation you would apply to determine whether or not the public debt has been increased.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been sufficient debate on the amendment. I trust the committee will recognize that this is another attempt to kill the bill and will vote down the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House has given one of the greatest exhibitions today of responsibility I have ever seen in my many years, under the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana, who certainly is entitled to every credit. We know his views, but he has come in here as chairman of the committee fighting for the committee and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] well said, he has shown himself to be what he is, a great statesman. The bill has gone through in excellent shape and I join with him in urging defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 62, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, we now have under consideration the mutual security appropriation bill, 1956. Appropriations are contained in this bill totaling $2,638,741,750 for fiscal year 1956, a reduction of $627,900,000 in the budget estimates. In addition, a reduction of $21,366,750 was made in the estimated balances reported as unobligated on June 30, 1955. The total unexpended balance as of June 30, 1955, for this program was estimated as $8,717,100,000.

Programs included under the general head of military assistance are designed to provide military equipment and training required by certain friendly countries to develop or maintain specific military and related units at a level of effectiveness. Provision is also made to give the military and related forces of certain countries direct support which is additional to the regular military assistance which those forces are also receiving. Furthermore, the bill contains appropriations for defense support to certain countries which are receiving military assistance, funds to promote economic development to create or maintain economic or political stability, and to provide technical cooperation for programs to share our knowledge, experience, techniques, and skills with the peoples of less developed areas of the world for the purpose of helping them to further their economic development and increase their standard of living. These programs consist largely of advice, teaching, and training. And there are also some special funds to meet unforeseen circumstances or conditions that arise.

This brief statement of the purposes and objectives of this bill is sufficient to indicate that much good has already been accomplished by reason of former appropriations and can be accomplished by reason of further expenditures in our effort to build up and sustain strong allies to be helpful in maintaining peace and security throughout the world. However, the question is continually arising whether it is necessary to expend such vast sums and if so, then we should utilize the funds contained in the balances remaining unexpended. These funds as I have already stated amount to $8,717,100,000.

We must not lose sight of the fact that it is the expenditure of these large sums each year that is preventing the balancing of the budget and keeping our rate of taxation at a high level. It is my opinion that a careful survey should be made of these unexpended and unobligated balances to the end that they be utilized rather than appropriating each year additional sums. If a method such as this should be adopted it would enable us to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and at the same time carry on the programs deemed necessary to strengthen our security. It can be readily seen that to follow this course would relieve our people of the burden they are now carrying and would not eliminate or even curtail our help to nations which we may find necessary to extend for a time longer.

Furthermore, as a result of what I have observed in visiting many of the countries where we are carrying on his form of relief, I am of the opinion that much of it could be eliminated or curtailed without doing any real damage to the purpose and objective of the several programs we are now carrying on.

In this connection it is most gratifying to note that the Appropriations Committee has already recommended a considerable reduction. I am of the opinion it could and should be larger than it is. While I am willing for a while longer to support the program, yet I shall support the efforts that will be made to further reduce the amount.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a need for a program of foreign aid and cooperation. I believe it is essential in strengthening the free world in the fight against communism and totalitarianism. I believe it is a good investment in world peace, and in our Nation's own welfare and security.

I was very much interested in remarks by opponents of this bill pertaining to aid for needy people of the United States, for the children, for the aged, the unemployed and their families.

I share their concern about this but I cannot understand what it has to do with the legislation before us today. There are other ways to serve this worthy objective.

Many pieces of legislation has been proposed in this Congress to give our own people, and particularly those with the lowest incomes and the most needy, a better share of the good things of life which this Nation has in abundance. I speak of minimum wage legislation, social security, adequate school construction, aid to the handicapped, unemployment insurance and the like.

We can help our own people by enacting legislation for increased tax exemption to aid low income groups, and the implication of a program which would provide job opportunities for all who are anxious and willing to work.

What puzzles me about the arguments made today for our own people, is that for the most part, they have been made by Members whose record in the House is one of opposition to these programs I have mentioned, programs which would give to our own people a better share of our Nation's abundance and great wealth.

Even with our foreign-aid program, the Nation has tremendous surpluses of food and of all kinds of civilian goods which offer good living to our people. Yet with these great surpluses and the Nation's ever-increasing productive might, many of our citizens such as farmers, part-time and unemployed industrial workers, and others are faced with lower living standards.

Certainly, many of our own folks deserve a better break than they are getting. But there is no evidence that we can help them by destroying this important program as the opponents of this bill would like to do.

If we follow the thinking and philosophy of those who oppose this bill, and who also oppose liberal domestic policies, the chances are that unemployment and distress in this country would grow along with the pile of surplus food and everything else.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the same thought and consideration for our own people be given when we vote to improve minimum wage, social security, housing, and other legislation designed to do something for our own people.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have sat through all of the debate on this foreign-aid appropriation bill, H. R. 7224, which implements the authorization bill, S. 2090.

The record made here today by the statements of those who support this legislation will add confusion to a program that is in a chaotic state. Under the circumstances, it is difficult for me to understand how the Members of this House can vote for passage of this bill. I shall vote against it even though there are some provisions that I could support.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detract, in any way, from the fine work which the Appropriations Committee has done in cutting the request by more than $625 million. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, for his diligence and determination in attempting to write a reasonable bill in the face of administrative conduct which clearly has confused not only the Appropriations Subcommittee but also members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who have listened to this debate. However, in view of the fact that there is on hand unexpended funds as of July 1 of almost $10 billions, excluding the amount authorized in this bill, it is my firm conviction that it is absolutely unnecessary to appropriate one penny in addition to the amount now on hand.

Mr. Chairman, again I call your attention to the fact that this administration and the previous one have, at no time in any fiscal year since 1952, been able to expend in excess of $5 billion, except for fiscal 1953 when $5,700,000,000 was expended. With the large sum on hand as of July 1, the mutual-security program or foreign aid, as we speak of it, had sufficient funds on hand to operate for at least 2 full fiscal years without adversely affecting the program in any way.

The carryover as of June 30, according to official reports, was $8,717,100,000. The amount on hand in counterpart funds in countries abroad was $973 million. If the bill before us is passed, it will carry an authorization of $2,701,275,000; or a total for fiscal 1956 of $12,391,375,000. Just how proponents of this legislation can justify their position before the people of this country, in view of the tremendous amount on hand, is a deep, dark mystery to me. I have heard none justify their positions today nor last week when we considered the authorization bill.

There is another matter that should have the attention of the Congress and that is the manner in which the executive department plays fast and loose in its attitude and conduct toward the Congress. The sleight-of-hand performance and the juggling of amounts by the Department of Defense in the final hours of the 1955 fiscal year is indefensible; in fact, it is an insult to every Member of the Congress of the United States. Someone should be made to account to the proper committee of this House for that unconscionable conduct.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? On June 28, according to the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, FOA officials found that they had $932 million of unobligated and unreserved funds. Just what "unreserved" means, nobody seems to know; at least it is a new term used to confuse and deceive Members of the Congress.

Under the Mutual Security Act, the Defense Department may obligate only 25 percent of the total appropriations during the last 60 days of the fiscal year. The Department was in a dilemma, for it had on hand $932 million. What should they do? They hastily appeared before the Appropriations Committee and made the boast that they had saved some extra money and then requested that they be permitted to obligate $312 million of that amount and promised that the $420 million should not be "reserved" or obligated. This offer was made because they were aware that the authorizing legislation provided a carryover of only $200 million. It seems obvious to me that if they could get the $312 million, they were willing to give up the $420 million. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] expressed it as his opinion that the Department had a ruling from someone to the effect that "reserved" need not be construed as obligated. Upon receipt of that ruling, according to the chairman of the subcommittee, there was a rush to "reserve" several hundred million dollars during the final hours of the last day of the 1955 fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, attention must be called to the fact that when such action occurred, the Department obligated in excess of 42 percent of the entire fiscal year's appropriation in the last 60 days of the fiscal year. It was obvious that the Department was determined to obligate every penny, notwithstanding the legal limitation which I have mentioned.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this is reprehensible conduct and this Congress should deal with it. What actually happened was that they claimed all of the amount unobligated because of the ruling that a "reserve" is not an obligation. Again, as I have said, the proposition was made that—you give us $312 million, the legislation gives us $200 million, and then we will be happy to release $420 million.

This Congress, through the Appropriations Committee of the House, notwithstanding its honest effort to reduce the amount of the request in the bill before us, has a responsibility that it cannot avoid. Its hands are not clean in this transaction, for it has ignored the limitations of the law by permitting the Department to commit in excess of the amount allowed in the last 60 days of the last fiscal year.

My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], has pointed out that there was testimony to the effect that $75 million was to be obligated for the so-called infrastructure program in the last 60 days. This amounts to 73 percent of last year's appropriation, which is well over the 50 percent of the carryover plus the appropriation, which on its face shows a violation of that 25 percent provision. According to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] the committee took no cognizance of that admitted violation of the 25 percent provision in the markup of the bill. Why not? Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, this House should not be too happy about what has transpired on this floor today.

The need to scrutinize and evaluate this entire program is more urgent today than ever before and I, for one, hope that both the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, and the House Appropriations Committee will consider in the near future the problems that confront House committees in dealing with the executive department, under circumstances that have confronted us in the present session.

Mr. Chairman, when the authorization bill, S. 2090, was before this House, I offered an amendment to reduce the President's Special Fund for Asian Economic Development by $100 million. The amendment was defeated. I point out, however, that the Appropriations Committee has cut that same fund by the amount contained in my own amendment, and hence I feel justly proud that this committee has confirmed my efforts, in the bill that is before us.

I commend the Appropriations Committee on the action that it took on this item.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HAND. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 123, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—251

Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Broyhill
Burleson
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chelf
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Clark
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dodd
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
George
Gordon
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Heselton
Hillings
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Huddleston
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jenkins
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Knutson
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Md.
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Westland
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—123

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Ashmore
Bailey
Barden
Bass, Tenn.
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Burdick
Carlyle
Cederberg
Church
Clevenger
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Dempsey
Dies
Dondero
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Fisher
Fjare
Flynt
Gavin
Gentry
Grant
Gray
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Hand
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hull
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, N. C.
Kilgore
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Long
Lovre
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mason
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Moulder
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Phillips
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Saylor
Scherer
Scrivner
Shuford
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Talle
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Van Pelt
Weaver
Wharton
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Winstead
Withrow

NOT VOTING—60

Anfuso
Barrett
Blatnik
Buchanan
Buckley
Burnside
Bush
Chase
Chatham
Chenoweth
Christopher
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Eberharter
Evins
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Hébert
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Jackson
James
Johnson, Calif.
Kearney
Kelly, N. Y.
Kirwan
Klein
McCulloch
McDowell
McGregor
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Morrison
Mumma
Osmers
Perkins
Polk
Powell
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Rogers, Colo.
Sadlak
St. George
Sheehan
Short
Taylor
Udall
Utt
Widnall
Wilson, Calif.
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Chase against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Morrison with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Burnside with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. James.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the mutual-security appropriation bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, MILLER of Nebraska, and SAYLOR.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF SAME TRACTS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND ACCESS ROADS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1464) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, quite soon now, the Congress will present the American people with a program to build highways financed to fit the needs of our great and growing country.

The question is, will the program be financed to fit the purse of all, or will it continue to penalize the American car owner, bus operator and trucker with arbitrary and unreasonable automotive levies as he is being penalized on the highways of America today?

I hope that when the highway bill is framed for floor action by the Committee on Public Works that it reflects an equal solicitude for the purse of all.

The bill will pass in the House with a handsome victory and the program will succeed with fabulous results if framed to call a halt in the foreseeable future to the mounting cost of motoring in the United States.

For the past 24 years, from 1930 to 1954, the American car owner, the bus operator and the trucker have paid ever-increasing taxes on fuel and lubricating oils. They are charged with tolls on bridges and tunnels that help pay for projects not connected with their travel, not to mention the tremendous cost to them in man-hours paid to keep cars, buses and trucks serviced and repaired throughout the United States with the purchase of spare parts this requires.

In various parts of the country, the American car owner is being victimized by these unjust levies. He is being used to finance projects not connected with his travel. The American car owner "is the goose that has been laying the golden egg." His impact on the American economy is staggering. The satisfaction of his needs puts to work tremendous numbers of people in the automotive, truck and bus manufacturing industries.

The figures below tell a fascinating story of the contribution made by the motorist to our economy.

In table I, you can actually see America growing on wheels and still growing. It is a revelation. I would like you to read it; it indicates the motor fuel and lubricating oil consumption and Federal tax collections from 1930 to 1954.

Listed also are the States and the amounts of money each collected from automobiles, buses and trucks on the imposition of a State motor fuel tax. You will note in the first table the taxes that were collected by the Federal Government. In the second table, the taxes collected by each State. Again, you see the millions of dollars collected by States from their tax on gasoline.

TABLE I

Motor fuel and lubricating oil: Consumption and Federal tax collections, 1930–54

Year [1]	Motor fuel consumption	Lubricating oil, indicated consumption [2]	Federal gasoline and diesel fuel tax collections [3]	Federal lubricating oil tax collections [3]
1930	15,777,707,000	906,738,000	0	0
1931	16,711,699,000	836,808,000	0	0
1932	15,516,717,000	697,788,000	0	0
1933	15,482,744,000	720,384,000	$124,929,000	$16,233,000
1934	16,760,701,000	776,328,000	202,575,000	25,255,000
1935	17,854,479,000	825,762,000	161,532,000	27,800,000
1936	19,799,621,000	937,566,000	177,340,000	27,103,000
1937	21,374,697,000	979,566,000	196,533,000	31,463,000
1938	21,637,311,000	891,786,000	203,648,000	31,565,000
1939	22,916,486,000	995,946,000	207,019,000	30,497,000
1940	24,404,334,000	1,036,980,000	226,187,000	31,233,000
1941	26,720,118,000	1,270,710,000	343,021,000	38,221,000
1942	22,692,497,000	1,220,394,000	369,587,000	46,432,000
1943	18,871,422,000	1,321,278,000	288,786,000	43,318,000
1944	19,523,552,000	1,359,246,000	271,217,000	52,473,000
1945	22,303,755,000	1,484,028,000	405,563,000	92,865,000
1946	29,201,465,000	1,465,422,000	405,695,000	74,602,000
1947	32,035,886,000	1,506,624,000	433,676,000	82,015,000
1948	34,706,959,000	1,511,286,000	478,638,000	80,887,000
1949	36,835,254,000	1,390,242,000	503,647,000	81,760,000
1950	40,279,607,000	1,631,826,000	526,732,000	77,610,000
1951	42,950,729,000	1,776,264,000	569,048,000	97,238,000
1952	45,525,904,000	1,602,930,000	720,312,000	95,286,000
1953	47,889,793,000	1,700,874,000	905,770,000	73,321,000
1954	[4] 49,300,000,000	1,614,648,000	854,666,000	68,441,000

[1] The consumption data are on a calendar-year basis; the Federal tax collections are on a fiscal-year basis.

[2] These data include lubricating oils used for both industrial and automatic purposes.

[3] There were diesel fuel tax collections in only fiscal years 1952–54.

[4] Estimated.

TABLE II

State motor fuel tax collections, fiscal years 1950–54

State	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Alabama	$29,881,000	$33,207,000	$36,929,000	$40,046,000	$42,837,000
Arizona	10,156,000	11,633,000	13,545,000	15,083,000	15,538,000
Arkansas	22,899,000	24,850,000	26,559,000	37,663,000	29,399,000
California	137,826,000	150,230,000	160,301,000	184,637,000	230,508,000
Colorado	20,559,000	22,485,000	24,350,000	25,690,000	27,048,000
Connecticut	18,682,000	20,354,000	21,466,000	22,857,000	24,362,000
Delaware	4,201,000	4,722,000	5,032,000	5,445,000	5,756,000
Florida	51,205,000	57,388,000	63,938,000	69,566,000	74,673,000
Georgia	47,376,000	53,903,000	51,639,000	54,253,000	57,332,000
Idaho	10,168,000	10,962,000	11,292,000	11,737,000	12,173,000
Illinois	56,339,000	61,602,000	82,435,000	97,217,000	116,288,000
Indiana	40,040,000	43,968,000	46,840,000	50,054,000	53,389,000
Iowa	27,325,000	29,787,000	31,620,000	31,449,000	41,004,000
Kansas	26,122,000	26,952,000	29,250,000	29,932,000	31,410,000

Table II—Continued

State motor fuel tax collections fiscal years 1950–54—Continued

State	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Kentucky	35, 152, 000	39, 568, 000	41, 453, 000	44, 192, 000	46, 206, 000
Louisiana	42, 788, 000	45, 931, 000	50, 215, 000	44, 278, 000	45, 278, 000
Maine	12, 589, 000	13, 326, 000	14, 114, 000	14, 945, 000	15, 515, 000
Maryland	23, 117, 000	25, 734, 000	28, 135, 000	30, 739, 000	38, 085, 000
Massachusetts	27, 900, 000	28, 079, 000	37, 231, 000	46, 463, 000	53, 743, 000
Michigan	46, 871, 000	51, 478, 000	78, 951, 000	82, 625, 000	88, 913, 000
Minnesota	34, 193, 000	36, 834, 000	38, 556, 000	39, 954, 000	42, 649, 000
Mississippi	23, 361, 000	29, 256, 000	32, 450, 000	33, 574, 000	35, 281, 000
Missouri	19, 800, 000	21, 897, 000	22, 872, 000	34, 106, 000	37, 921, 000
Montana	9, 847, 000	10, 742, 000	10, 999, 000	12, 337, 000	13, 326, 000
Nebraska	23, 439, 000	23, 064, 000	22, 723, 000	23, 903, 000	28, 295, 000
Nevada	3, 618, 000	4, 210, 000	4, 861, 000	5, 934, 000	6, 388, 000
New Hampshire	4, 983, 000	5, 375, 000	6, 768, 000	7, 118, 000	7 606, 000
New Jersey	32, 672, 000	36, 853, 000	39, 584, 000	41, 129, 000	44, 357, 000
New Mexico	13, 345, 000	15, 912, 000	14, 708, 000	16, 033, 000	16, 779, 000
New York	90, 095, 000	97, 175, 000	102, 494, 000	108, 328, 000	110, 740, 000
North Carolina	52, 836, 000	64, 575, 000	69, 648, 000	73, 821, 000	75, 853, 000
North Dakota	4, 776, 000	6, 510, 000	7, 454, 000	7, 348, 000	7, 561, 000
Ohio	76, 197, 000	82, 382, 000	87, 024, 000	91, 370, 000	117, 971, 000
Oklahoma	36, 393, 000	39, 741, 000	42, 514, 000	44, 813, 000	46, 560, 000
Oregon	25, 454, 000	28, 726, 000	29, 373, 000	30, 540, 000	30, 631, 000
Pennsylvania	100, 399, 000	111, 871, 000	116, 308, 000	121, 465, 000	132, 836, 000
Rhode Island	6, 224, 000	6, 536, 000	6, 889, 000	7, 364, 000	7, 988, 000
South Carolina	25, 248, 000	32, 068, 000	36, 178, 000	38, 426, 000	39, 495, 000
South Dakota	6, 588, 000	7, 838, 000	9, 516, 000	10, 267, 000	10, 661, 000
Tennessee	41, 685, 000	45, 782, 000	49, 600, 000	52, 876, 000	56, 072, 000
Texas	76, 432, 000	87, 279, 000	95, 684, 000	104, 734, 000	109, 839, 000
Utah	7, 696, 000	8, 486, 000	10, 859, 000	12, 192, 000	12, 703, 000
Vermont	4, 652, 000	5, 093, 000	5, 101, 000	5, 347, 000	5, 601, 000
Virginia	42, 728, 000	46, 978, 000	49, 101, 000	57, 170, 000	56, 724, 000
Washington	37, 333, 000	41, 472, 000	43, 954, 000	46, 271, 000	47, 966, 000
West Virginia	16, 878, 000	18, 451, 000	19, 006, 000	19, 512, 000	20, 460, 000
Wisconsin	31, 455, 000	33, 857, 000	35, 323, 000	36, 652, 000	38, 544, 000
Wyoming	4, 951, 000	5, 038, 000	5, 445, 000	7, 142, 000	7, 833, 000
Total	1, 544, 474, 000	1, 710, 160, 000	1, 870, 297, 000	2, 018, 599, 000	2, 218, 097, 000

In 1954 there were 9,578,561 privately owned trucks and buses registered in the United States. A preliminary estimate of the total privately and publicly owned trucks and buses is set at 10,042,000. Most of these truck and bus operators are engaged in interstate commerce. They travel on highways and byways that go over our toll roads, they cross our toll bridges, and they go through our toll tunnels. They get their registration licenses in each State.

If you will look at the following figures, you will see the number of automobiles manufactured in 1930, 1940, and 1950 through 1954, and also the increased number of tires manufactured each year. Now we get an idea of the impact of the American car owners, not only on the automobile industry, but on the tire industry as well.

Table III

Number of automobiles and automobile tires produced during 1930, 1940, 1950–54

Year	Automobiles [1]	Automobile tires
1930	2, 787, 456	46, 130, 148
1940	3, 717, 385	50, 965, 429
1950	6, 665, 863	78, 598, 174
1951	5, 338, 436	65, 545, 941
1952	4, 320, 794	74, 341, 140
1953	6, 116, 948	81, 454, 605
1954	5, 558, 897	[2] 76, 805, 822

[1] Production based on factory sales.

[2] Preliminary estimate.

I would like to reemphasize and caution the membership that we cannot continue to expect the American car owner, the American trucker, and the American bus operator to carry this ever-increasing load. We have reached the danger point.

My district is part of Hudson County, N. J., where the density of traffic is probably the greatest in the Nation. Our families see the numbers of trucks and automobiles going from New York to Philadelphia and back. In addition, we have had the plague of unfair and unreasonable tolls charged by autonomous bodies. We have had these autonomous bodies take our municipal tax lands. The land then becomes tax free and lost to the municipality as a tax ratable. We have had traffic jam after traffic jam in our area. Land values have depreciated tremendously. We know something about cars, trucks, and buses, and have had them with us since they first started to roll on the highways. We can speak from experience. We want to make a constructive contribution. We are not concerned primarily in this with bondholders. We are concerned about car owners, truck owners, and bus operators. They help our economy. They provide jobs and payrolls.

The most important provision relating to the highway bill is the manner in which it will be financed. As an individual, I hope that the American car owner, trucker, and bus operator will not again suffer increased and burdensome taxes to defray the cost of this entire program.

COULD YOU LIVE ON 90 CENTS AN HOUR?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, where is this Nation going to find a market for all of its products and services when we keep millions of our fellow Americans in economic serfdom?

The Fair Labor Standards Act, intended to keep a floor under wages, and to help maintain national purchasing power, is a masterpiece of doubletalk. It is grossly unfair to many workers, and its standards are subhuman.

This is a Federal law, with a high-sounding title that conceals its callous disregard for the cost of existence, and its cynical exemptions in behalf of wage starving employers.

The present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour is a shocking travesty on economic justice.

Thirty dollars a week before taxes is no incentive for any store clerk to be a good citizen.

But what of the millions who are paid less, because their employers are conveniently excused from compliance with the law?

For them the minimum-wage law operates as a suffocating ceiling instead of a supporting floor.

If the American people were polled on the question as to what constitutes a basic living wage, I believe that the overwhelming decision would be for a $1.25 per hour minimum.

Fifty dollars a week is under average for industrial workers today. And it has to be stretched tight to support a wife and one child at today's prices.

By this yardstick, an increase from 75 cents to 90 cents per hour, as recommended by the administration, is entirely inadequate.

The House Labor Committee has done better by recommending a $1 minimum.

With reservations, and because the increase to $1 appears to be the only legislation on this issue that has a chance of passing at this session, I shall vote for it in order that no minimum of less than $1 shall disgrace a law that should try to measure up to fair labor standards.

Half a day's pay for a full day's work is not only a fraud perpetrated upon the workers—it is an affront to the American conscience.

We are proud of our rising standard of living, achieved by the cooperation of capital and labor. That pride suffers, however, when we observe the unorganized, low-wage groups that are being cruelly exploited.

This destructive conduct on the part of a few unscrupulous employers, no matter how they may try to rationalize it, constitutes a threat to legitimate business, organized labor, and to the economic justice inherent in collective bargaining.

In most cases, those who are employed at or below the miserly minimum wage are at the mercy of those who stubbornly cling to the illusion that any wage, no matter how small, is still some form of charity.

These helpless workers have only one alternative.

They must appeal to government to enact and enforce laws that will guarantee to each and every worker a fair return for his productive labor.

No government can remain indifferent to "poverty wage levels" that cripple the individual, stagnate communities, and become a drag upon the progress of the Nation.

A $1 minimum would affect only 1¼ million workers, comprising but 5.7 percent of covered employees, and at an annual increase in payroll costs of $343 million.

Does this seem unreasonable, compared with the billions we give away to raise the living standards of European countries?

Or must we be forced to accept the policy, against our standards of moral and material values, that an underprivileged class of workers is not only justified but desirable?

In my book no employee should suffer because of a slothful, inefficient, or avaricious employer.

This prosperous Nation cannot tolerate such a contradiction.

The cost of living has risen from January 1950 by some 14 percent, which bears most heavily upon the lowest-income group.

The last increase in the legal minimum wage, increasing it to 75 cents per hour, took place in 1949, and that increase itself was a compromise, failing to reach realistic minimum standards.

In the meantime, since 1950, the gross national product has gone up 44 percent. In terms of disposable income, there was a rise of 39 percent.

Workers employed at or below the subminimum wage did not share in any of this increased productivity.

In fact, they have been forced into the hole deeper.

By every economic yardstick, a breadwinner supporting a family of four must be paid at least $1.25 per hour for 2,000 hours of work per year, in order to maintain minimum standards of health and well-being for himself and his dependents.

This minimum should be fixed by law, applicable to all areas and industries in the Nation—except for the handicapped, learners, and apprentices for which special regulations are provided in the act—in order to prevent falling markets and cutthroat competition.

Those employers who cry in anguish that they will be driven out of business by any increase in the minimum wage have never proved their point. There is no foundation in fact for the claim that low-wage industries operate on narrow profit margins.

The strength of our Nation is based on the fact that more and more of our people are sharing—and to an increasing extent—in the fruits of our production.

The minimum wage is an effort to ensure that no workers are excluded from this general progress.

I regret that increases in the legal minimum always lag behind the real minimum that is necessary to maintain a decent standard of living.

One dollar and twenty-five cents per hour would be the fair and honest answer.

One dollar per hour is but a half measure.

Better than 90 cents, but still far short of the goal.

As long as this is all that we can manage to get out of the opposition, we shall support the bill which increases the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour.

At least, it is a step in the right direction.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 4046. An act to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor;

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez;

S. 244. An act for the relief of Anna C. Giese;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura;

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders;

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; and

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1003) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Kilgore, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Welker, and Mr. Butler to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2907) entitled "An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co., disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Kilgore, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Welker, and Mr. Butler to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4249) entitled "An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Kilgore, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Welker, and Mr. Butler to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5078) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Kilgore, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Welker, and Mr. Butler to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on the Interior may be permitted to sit during general debate in the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate during the sessions of the House for the balance of the week.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is during general debate?

The SPEAKER. Only when general debate is in progress.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday, July 18, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. ASHLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 60 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Sieminski] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks on the highway program placed in the Record this morning, I should like to emphasize that parallel with the growth of our gross national product over the years is the growth in vehicle miles traveled on the roads of America. The growth of both go hand in glove. Travel on the highways of America is now estimated to come to about a half trillion miles a year. The percentage of vehicle miles to gross national product over the years will be found to be rather consistent.

On the basis of the growth of the gross national product and the advance in vehicle miles traveled in America, we can better equate highway development with sound financing. Fiscal and construction programs planned and approved today must fit the needs of 1975, when over 200 million people will travel our highways.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Cannon and to include an editorial.

Mr. Thornberry and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Walter and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. Holtzman and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Jones of Missouri and to include an editorial.

Mr. Abernethy and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Engle and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Deane and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. Fascell in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Crumpacker in four instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. Wigglesworth the remarks he expects to make in Committee today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross and to include certain remarks made by the Honorable Burton E. Sweet.

Mr. Hoeven and to include an editorial.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. Arends) and to include an editorial.

Mr. Ashley (at the request of Mr. McCormack) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCormack and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Huddleston and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Westland (at the request of Mr. Martin) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cretella (at the request of Mr. Martin) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Frelinghuysen (at the request of Mr. Martin) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. Martin) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Brownson (at the request of Mr. Martin) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Quigley and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. Ashley in two instances.

Mr. Donohue in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Wolverton in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bentley and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Thomson of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schwengel and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bosch in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. Burdick and to include an editorial.

Mr. Boland (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dingell (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Multer (at the request of Mr. Albert) in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holtzman (at the request of Mr. Albert) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Albert) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Becker.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. McDonough.

Mrs. Kee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Messrs. Hébert, Rivers, Miller of California, Short, and Hess (at the request of Mr. Vinson) on account of official business of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Sadlak (at the request of Mr. Seely-Brown), for July 11 and 12, on account of illness in family.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have permission to meet during general debate in the House on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday afternoons of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 787. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1210. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 7, 1955:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322); and

H. R. 3636. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, Island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

On July 9, 1955:

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

970. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 1, 1906, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

971. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 4, 1925"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

972. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

973. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of May 31, 1955, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

974. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 7, 1955, the following bills were reported on July 8, 1955:

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7224. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3383. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 11, 1955]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1088). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 304. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1878. An act to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich., with amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7157. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6066. A bill authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 7214. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 5891. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1096). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. S. 1464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads (Rept. No. 1097). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7201. A bill relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 824. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 7, 1955, the following bill was introduced on July 8, 1955:

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 7224. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred July 11, 1955]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 7225. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 7226. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States, or its agents, during the period January 1, 1939, to April 10, 1948, and to provide for payment of amounts so determined to such producers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 7227. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil-defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7228. A bill to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7229. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to apply for temporary injunctions, restraining mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7230. A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 7231. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7232. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 7233. A bill to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 7234. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7235. A bill relating to the furnishing of accommodations at Kennewick, Wash., and Pasco, Wash., for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, Southern Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7236. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7237. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7238. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to promote the maintenance of the American fishing fleet under competitive conditions and in the interest of sustained fish food supplies in case of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7239. A bill to make certain changes in the administration of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7240. A bill to permit certain persons to take noncompetitive examinations for positions in the competitive civil service comparable to those which they held as employees of a State; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available on a voluntary basis, group hospital, surgical, medical, and other personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, through the facilities of prepayment group plans, group practice prepayment plans, Federal employee organizations, and insurance companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7242. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7243. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 7244. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 7245. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 7246. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age thereunder, to provide additional benefits for certain disabled individuals, to repeal the "work clause," and to provide an exemption from employment and self-employment taxes for individuals who have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 7248. A bill to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 7249. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to increase the penalty for transmitting false distress signals by radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7250. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, for developing a vaccine to prevent paralytic poliomyelitis, and to honor him by awarding him a special medal for his achievement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7251. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, for developing a vaccine to prevent paralytic poliomyelitis, and to honor him by awarding him a special medal for his achievement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 7252. A bill to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stock of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7253. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 7254. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7255. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel-post) mail matter at the post office at Newark, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7256. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7257. A bill to increase the annual compensation of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 7258. A bill to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to declare Sunday, July 17, 1955, a day of prayer for the success of the Four Power Meeting of Heads of Governments opening at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 18, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship, *Monterey*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to establish, subject to certain conditions, the fares to be charged by the Capital Transit Co. for a period not to exceed 120 days; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to establish, subject to certain conditions, the fares to be charged by the Capital Transit Co. for a period not to exceed 120 days; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution to designate the period from September 17 through September 23 as Constitution Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. Res. 305. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 304, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 306. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 262; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, extending to Patrick B. McGinnis and the officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. commendation for and encouragement in their efforts to develop the services of the railroad for the betterment of this area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of Act No. 47, passed by the 1955 Legislature of Alabama, entitled "Alabama Civil Defense Act of 1955"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7259. A bill for the relief of Miss Emily Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7260. A bill for the relief of R. M. Clark, an individual doing business as Lenoir City-Alcoa Bus Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 7261. A bill for the relief of Genevieve Fruit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 7262. A bill for the relief of Rosa Birger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7263. A bill to award Dr. Jonas E. Salk a gratuity of $10,000 per annum in recognition of his outstanding achievement to humanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Abdullah A. Khambaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7265. A bill to award Dr. Jonas E. Salk a gratuity of $10,000 per annum in recognition of his outstanding achievement to humanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 7266. A bill for the relief of Ryoko Nakayama and her minor child, Kaiichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 7267. A bill for the relief of Guillermina Peralta Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7268. A bill for the relief of Billy Shao-Ru Hwang (Wong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 7269. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia DeHaro Pera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7270. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7271. A bill for the relief of Rajka Markovic and Krunoslav Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7272. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7273. A bill for the relief of Takako Burba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7274. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Rimorin Patacsil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Natividad Castro de Prada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 7276. A bill for the relief of Dino Tassinari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7277. A bill for the relief of Clement Zammit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

348. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of AMVETS, Department of New Jersey, assembled at a State executive meeting, petitioning Mr. H. V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and all the Congressmen of New Jersey, including both United States Senators from New Jersey, to immediately take necessary measures to appropriate sufficient money to place into operation an additional 200 beds at the East Orange Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

349. Also, resolution of the Catholic War Veterans, Department of New Jersey, assembled at a State executive meeting on Wednesday, June 29, 1955, in Newark, N. J., petitioning Mr. H. V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and all the Congressmen of New Jersey, including both United States Senators of New Jersey to immediately take necessary measures to appropriate sufficient money to place into operation an additional 200 beds at the East Orange Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

350. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of 255 members of the National Federation of Grandmother Clubs of America urging full consideration and support for House Joint Resolution 205, designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmother's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

351. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Russell H. Bradshaw, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to stating a grievance relative to certain treatment received by his children in Maryland schools, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years after it was prepared, the Congress and the public have at long last obtained copies of the Wenzell report dealing with the plans of the administration for the future of the TVA.

That report was for many months kept as secret by the administration as if it contained the formula for making the hydrogen bomb. The very existence of the report was kept secret. The name of the author of the report was shrouded in secrecy.

At the time the Dixon-Yates controversy arose, the White House, under pressure, instructed the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission to prepare chronologies which would list all papers and meetings of the two agencies bearing on the origin of the Dixon-Yates contract. Nowhere in those chronologies was Mr. Adolphe Wenzell mentioned. Some of the meetings which he attended were mentioned, but Mr. Wenzell was not listed as having attended them. Nowhere in the Bureau of the Budget chronology was the Wenzell report so much as mentioned.

It required, Mr. Speaker, a chance mention, an accidental mention, of the name "Wenzell" in a memorandum to open the way for the ultimate disclosure of Mr. Wenzell's identity, the nature of the work he was doing for the Bureau of the Budget, and the existence of the report in which we have now discovered lay the origins of the Dixon-Yates contract.

All during the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the Dixon-Yates contract, the activities of Mr. Wenzell and the interests of the First Boston Corp., of which he was vice president were kept secret. When his name was subsequently brought into the open and Budget Director Hughes was questioned about his activities, Mr. Hughes replied that Mr. Wenzell had been employed by the Budget Bureau for advice on the accounting and financing system of the TVA. He denied that he had anything to do with policy decisions in regard to the Dixon-Yates matter. I am afraid that Mr. Hughes misled the Congress and the public.

Mr. Wenzell, as we now know, was brought into the Bureau of the Budget within a few months after the present administration took office. He was brought in by then Budget Director Dodge. We do not know exactly what Budget Director Dodge's instructions to Mr. Wenzell were, but we know what he did.

This vice president of the Nation's greatest utility financial house prepared a report on the TVA. He made four alternative proposals for either limiting the TVA and preventing its future growth, or which called for turning all of its assets which could be made profitable over to other private utilities.

One of those proposals was for the construction of privately owned wholesale electric plants whose production would be fed into the TVA system. That is exactly what was supposed to take place under the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. Wenzell, the New York banker, laid out the policy subsequently adopted in the Dixon-Yates plan. He attended the meeting at the Atomic Energy Commission which put this plan into motion. He attended the secret meeting at the Budget Bureau which put the administration's stamp of approval on this plan. Yet, Budget Director Hughes says that he was giving advice on some accounting systems and had nothing to do with any policy decisions on Dixon-Yates.

Mr. Wenzell has testified that in preparing his report he did not contact anyone in the Tennessee Valley Authority. He asked the TVA for no information. He asked the TVA for no opinion. He asked the opinion of no one in the TVA area who was familiar with the work of that organization. He did not ask the opinion of any people of the area.

Mr. Wenzell, the New York banker, also testified that the proposal he made which later came to fruition in the Dixon-Yates contract, was not his favorite proposal among the four he made. His favorite proposal was one under which TVA would turn over to another corporation all of its power dams, all of its steam plants, all of its transmission lines. Then that corporation would sell its securities to the public, presumably with some New York banking house making a large fee for doing the selling. The TVA would be left with flood control and navigation and nothing more.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who have sought to permit the TVA to construct the Fulton steam plant have been stymied. For there in the Bureau of the Budget lay this master plan for dismantling the TVA. And it lay there unknown to the TVA, unknown to the Congress, and unknown to the people of the United States.

The TVA has been a success which has been copied around the world. The idea behind it is the hope of millions of people in other nations. But the policy of the Bureau of the Budget as developed by Adolphe Wenzell proposed to undo its great work and turn back the clock in the TVA area to a period of high power costs and limited power.

It is no wonder that the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the President wished to have this report kept secret. They did not desire to have their true intentions toward TVA reach the light of day.

Now we know what Dixon-Yates really was. It was the first step in dismantling the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is no wonder that the administration, now that its true purposes are revealed for what they are, is ready to abandon Dixon-Yates. But this abandonment does not mean that they will not try again with another of the alternatives which Mr. Adolphe Wenzell proposed. The people of the Tennessee Valley area must be endlessly alert to protect the future of the TVA.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us, and countless thousands of persons throughout the United States, are greatly disturbed at the illness of our dear friend, Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, the majority leader of the Senate. Throughout the country there is widespread regret at his condition and widespread hopes and prayers for a speedy recovery, and this is evidenced in the editorial comment of the press all over the country.

In my extension of remarks, I include two editorials—one which appeared in the Boston Post on July 5, 1955, entitled "Senator Johnson's Illness," and another which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on July 5, 1955, entitled "Casualty to Duty."

The editorials follow:

[From the Boston Post of July 5, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The sudden illness of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson will be universally regretted. He was stricken with a heart attack on the holiday weekend.

The Democratic floor leader has made a remarkable record during the present congressional session. Under his cool leadership, the Senate has acted effectively on a great deal of legislation with a minimum of partisan friction or obstruction. Last week, the Senator had engaged in a sharp exchange of views with the President about this achievement.

Senator Johnson called the attention of anyone who cared to listen to the fact that the Democratic majority in the Senate had not obstructed the President's program, but had given it constructive attention. When the President quipped that there are still some bills which need urgent action, Mr. Johnson cooly reminded him that the Members of the Senate have "no intention of taking orders like a bunch of second lieutenants."

He is one of our few high officeholders with the capacity of serving the Nation and his party, too.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of July 5, 1955]

CASUALTY TO DUTY

Senator Lyndon Johnson's collapse is another reminder of the heavy burdens borne by leadership of the Congress in this mid-20th century. The toll taken by physical exhaustion in the 83d Congress is still a lively recollection.

To be sure, the present session is moving down the final lap toward adjournment, possibly by July 30; but the fact that the Congress is today far ahead of its predecessors in legislative performance is in great measure due directly to the efforts of the stricken Democratic Senate leader. And so is the high level of its performance.

Senator Johnson's work schedule averaged a 12-hour day. His guidance of his party's policy toward the administration was perhaps the chief factor in the era of relative good feeling in present-day Washington. The unity of his party, the progress of Congress, and the national welfare owe much to him. His illness will not change Democratic Party policy, but it may cause trouble for the administration in a Senate now divided 48–47.

Poland Given Away at Yalta: Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1955, the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind., began a series of articles pertaining to an interview with Senator Homer E. Capehart, senior Senator from Indiana, on the subject of the sellout of Poland at Yalta and other international conferences. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the first of this series of very timely and interesting articles:

POLAND GIVEN AWAY AT YALTA: CAPEHART

(By Francis K. Czyewski)

Poland was not sold at Yalta—it was given away, in the belief of Senator Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana.

Interviewed concerning the recent publication of the full Yalta treaty documents by the State Department, Senator Capehart emphasized that Poland's so-called sellout was even worse.

"I couldn't call it a sellout because when you sell something you get something in return. Poland was given away."

Joseph Stalin's position with regard to Poland was "definitely known by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and others high in our Government before the Yalta Conference was ever held," the Senator said, and "nothing was done to help the gallant ally in World War II.

"To say the least, Mr. Stalin was quite frank in his position concerning Poland both before and during the Yalta Conference, according to the Yalta papers recently released," he said.

WORST BLOW FROM STALIN

What Mr. Capehart considers was the worse blow to the ally who was first struck by Adolf Hitler's blitzkreig on September 1, 1939, was that Stalin "was not opposed at all as to how and why the Polish soldiers were to die at the hands of Russian soldiers."

According to Senator Capehart, Stalin's position was "only meekly opposed on the Polish boundary issue and only half-heartedly opposed on the Government of Poland issue, but nobody opposed what fate was to meet Polish soldiers at the hands of the Russians."

Fifty thousand Polish army men including some 11,000 Polish commissioned officers, with generals and top-ranking military leaders were executed and their bodies found in the Katyn forest in eastern Poland during the war. The Poles accused the Russians. At the pressure of Polish-American organizations the matter finally drew the attention of the Congress. A House committee investigation was held 3 years ago.

Concerning this investigation of the death of the 50,000 Polish army men, Senator Capehart said that "much ballyhoo was attached to the investigation of the question who killed the Polish army officers—Germany or Russia?"

"That investigation, which proved not nearly what the Yalta papers prove—and not quite the same answer—was conducted during the 82d Congress, which was not under the control of my party," he said.

Senator Capehart recalled that March 19, 1948, he introduced a resolution requesting an exact explanation of the agreements and charged violations based not only on the Yalta Conference, but also agreements and violations based on the many other conferences held by the world powers during and after hostilities in Europe.

"What happened to your resolution?" Senator Capehart was asked.

"The resolution was sent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but no committee action was taken on it," he said.

But, he said, a reply from the State Department was filed with the Senate on June 2, 1948, by the late Senator Vandenberg, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In this reply, 10 violations were cited, but only 3 were charged against agreements reached at Yalta. The others were based on agreements reached at Potsdam, Moscow and other meeting places.

"What violations did the State Department reveal?" the Senator was quizzed.

"One of the three agreements at Yalta cited in the reply as having been violated was the agreement that free and unfettered elections be held as soon as possible in Poland. It is interesting to note in the explanations of violations cited that, in addition to charging Russian influence in the elections, the United States Government itself feared that the election would not be free," he answered.

This is how Senator Capehart quoted the State Department's explanation:

"On January 28, the Department of State issued a release to the press stating that reports received from our Embassy in Poland immediately prior to and subsequent to the elections, based upon the observations of American officials, confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free."

MEANINGLESS AGREEMENT

"What did that reply indicate, Senator?"

"The Yalta papers prove this Government had reason to believe the election would not be free, but there is no indication that this Government feared such and by no means is there any indication that this Government expressed that fear. More important, the Yalta papers prove that Mr. Stalin's position on all points was clearly expressed by him not only at the opening of the conference but in December of 1944, more than a month before the conference," Senator Capehart answered.

Senator Capehart charges that the United States representatives at Yalta proceeded to enter into what obviously was a meaningless agreement with Russia on the boundaries, election procedures and the welfare of the Polish people.

"What makes you think, Senator, that this was the case?"

"Because the agreeement with Stalin was made despite the previous knowledge of Mr. Stalin's expressed opinion as to what he felt would be the future for our ally, Poland."

The questioning of the partitioning of Poland by Russia at Yalta, how the Polish emigre government in London was betrayed and how Poland's allies helped Russia eliminate opposition to communism in Poland will be answered in the next interview with Senator CAPEHART.

FDR Failed To Keep His Pledge To Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the second of the series of articles from the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., which are based on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana, on the effect of the Yalta and other international conferences on Poland:

FDR FAILED TO KEEP HIS PLEDGE TO POLAND

(By Francis K. Czyzewski)

President Roosevelt had pledged the emigrant Polish Government in London to help Poland regain its prewar boundary with Russia, but helped Stalin take almost a half of Poland at the Yalta Conference, the recently published Yalta papers reveal, according to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART.

Instead of keeping his pact with the Polish allies in London, Roosevelt is quoted as saying that "most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face," at the early sessions of the fateful Yalta Conference in December 1944, at which Poland's fifth partition in modern times was accomplished to give Stalin what he wanted, Senator CAPEHART pointed out.

(Poland was partitioned three times by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1772, 1793, and 1795. The fourth partition was by Stalin and Hitler in September of 1939.—Editor's note.)

"What did Roosevelt refer to in comparing the Poles to the Chinese, Senator?" he was asked.

"In the Yalta papers indicating the action of the Conference on February 6, 1945, the following quotation is attributed to Roosevelt," CAPEHART answered. "Here is the quotation":

"I should like to bring up Poland. I come from a great distance and therefore have the advantage of a more distant point of view of the problem. There are six or seven million Poles in the United States. As I said in Tehran, in general, I am in favor of the Curzon line. Most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face.'"

ON EASTERN BOUNDARIES

(The quotations and the story have to deal with Poland's eastern boundaries which were set at Tehran and then at Yalta. It should be mentioned here that the American Poles just before the general election in November of 1944 were asked by their national leaders to vote for Roosevelt, because he had promised the Polish-American Congress to fight for an independent Poland in its former boundaries as represented by the Polish emigrant Government in Great Britain.)

"The rest of the story is now history; black history for the United States." Senator CAPEHART charged as he referred to another partitioning of Poland by Russia with this Government's consent and permission by the American Government to have the Reds in Poland eliminate opposition by a puppet regime. Poland had lost almost a half of its territory in the east to Russia as a result of this action.

Senator CAPEHART, in revealing the plot, said that "during the period prior to the Yalta Conference this Government and Great Britain had been recognizing the emigrant Polish Government in London headed by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

DIFFER ON LIMIT

"What did the Polish emigre government ask with regard to the eastern boundary of Poland, Senator?" he was asked.

"Mikolajczyk, at the time," CAPEHART said, "had urged the United States and Great Britain to press for an eastern Polish boundary that would retain in Polish territory the city of Lwow."

"And what did Stalin want?"

"Stalin, who had been plainly favorable to the Lublin Polish Government rather than the London emigrant government," he answered, "favored the Curzon line for an eastern boundary."

(The Curzon line was an arbitrary line devised by the British Lord Curzon as Polish-Russian frontier after World War I. It was acceptable neither to Poland nor Russia. the city of Lwow, ceded to Russia at Yalta, it must be pointed out, was never a part of Russian territory, even during the three partitions of Poland in the late 18th century Lwow was in Austrian Poland.—Editor's note.)

"Did President Roosevelt promise Mikolajczyk what his government wanted?"

"The Yalta papers reveal that Mikolajczyk believed President Roosevelt had pledged his support to the emigrant government position on the boundary."

"But why Poland was robbed of its territory in the last?"

"At a conference in Moscow in October, 1944, Molotov declared in the presence of Mikolajczyk, American Ambassador Averell Harriman, and other that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin had agreed at Teheran to establish the Curzon line as the eastern boundary. As we all know," Senator CAPEHART added, "it was the Curzon line which was agreed to at Yalta."

"WHY NO FIGHT"

"But why didn't President Roosevelt fight for Poland?"

"It is interesting to note in the Yalta papers how vigorously our President and Yalta delegates fought for the rights of Poland, our ally," the Senator answered. He said that after the Teheran conference, Roosevelt wrote to Mikolajczyk as follows: "In so far as the United States guaranty of any specific frontiers is concerned I am sure you will understand that this Government, in accordance with its traditional policy, cannot give a guaranty for any specific frontiers."

"What happened at Teheran, then?"

"This statement by Roosevelt was written after the Teheran conference at which Molotov said agreement had been reached by the three powers on the Curzon line boundary and after Mikolajczyk contended Roosevelt promised to fight against the Curzon line boundary.

"Do the Yalta papers reveal anything clearly in this respect?"

"The Yalta papers quote Roosevelt rather clearly on the boundary question and leave no doubts as to whether he told Mikolajczyk the truth of whether Molotov did," Senator CAPEHART answered.

ROOSEVELT QUOTED

"What did Roosevelt say in Yalta?"

"In the Yalta papers indicating the action of the conference on February 6, 1945, the following quotation is attributed to Roosevelt: 'I should like to bring up Poland. I come from a great distance and therefore have the advantage of a more distant point of view of the problem.'

"Was Roosevelt definitely for the Curzon line?"

"Yes, the statement made by Roosevelt was: 'As I said in Tehran, in general, I am in favor of the Curzon line.' In addition, Senator CAPEHART revealed, Roosevelt also expressed himself like this: 'Most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face.'

"That was the extent of Roosevelt's fight for the Mikolajczyk boundary cause at Yalta—and just about the extent of the fight for any of the causes of the emigrant Government of Poland which we had been recognizing throughout the fighting," was the opinion of Senator CAPEHART.

In the third of the series of interviews, Senator CAPEHART will tell, in the light of the Yalta treaty exposé, how Poland got the "double double-cross" and how Stalin was permitted to set up the kind of government he wanted in Poland without protest from Poland's allies.

Double Double-Cross to Poland at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the third of the series of articles which appeared in the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana, concerning the effect on Poland of the Yalta and other international conferences:

DOUBLE DOUBLE-CROSS TO POLAND AT YALTA

(By Francis K. Czyzewski)

Poland at Yalta got what is commonly known by us as double double-cross, as far as free elections or government concerned. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, said in his third interview explaining the recent expose of the secret Yalta agreements made a little more than 10 years ago.

The papers, he said, now shed light on the subject why Poland today is ruled by a puppet government controlled by Moscow, and how the American Government helped liquidate Poles opposed to communism.

"Just in what manner?" the Senator was asked.

"Again the Yalta papers reveal that Roosevelt and our Yalta delegation knew far in advance of the conference that Stalin had no intention of doing anything else but establishing a Polish Government favorable to Russia," he replied. "That, apparently, was his conception of freedom of Poland."

But, before going further, Senator CAPEHART explained that late in 1944, before the Yalta conference, the United States and Great Britain were recognizing the emigrant Polish Government in London headed by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

What do the Yalta papers reveal about this?

MESSAGE REVEALED

"On October 22, 1944, the Yalta papers reveal a message from Churchill to Roosevelt in which Churchill reported on a meeting he had attended in Moscow for the purpose of discussing the Polish question, particularly the formation of a government of Poland. Attending that meeting were Mikolajczyk and Boleslaw Bierut. Bierut was at the time President of the Provisional National Council of the Lublin Polish Government which was Moscow-sponsored. Mr. Churchill wrote as follows to Mr. Roosevelt: "On our last day at Moscow Mikolajczyk saw Bierut who admitted his difficulties. Fifty of his men had been shot in the last month. Many Poles took to the woods rather than join his forces."

What connection does this have with Yalta?

"This comment by Churchill," explained Senator CAPEHART, "will lead to further serious revelations by the Yalta papers. Meanwhile, here I want to complete the story of the double double-cross in the formation of the Polish Government.

"Churchill wrote," continued the Senator, "he (Mikolajczyk) explained his plan but Stalin made it clear that the Lublin Poles must have the majority. You will note that Stalin made it clear. Well, he later made even more clear what he had in mind."

What happened in the meantime?

WINANT RELAYS WORD

On November 25, 1944, the then United States Ambassador to Great Brtain, John G. Winant, sent a message to our Secretary of State in which he said he had talked with Mikolajczyk, who informed him: "The Lublin committee was already largely Communist and those elements which were not Communist were being rapidly eliminated." It was in this same message Winant informed Roosevelt that Mikolajczyk had resigned as Premier of the emigrant Polish Government in London.

It was at this time, Senator CAPEHART said, that Roosevelt became concerned about the turn of events and sent a message to Stalin. This message, according to the Senator, while stating that "the United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, independent and democratic Poland, disclosed again the weakness of the American representations to Stalin."

"Did Roosevelt get a reply from Stalin?"

"Yes, on December 27, 1944, the answer was sent by Stalin which gave the full and complete feeling that Stalin had determined a program for Poland, and the Yalta Conference, as far as the Polish question was concerned, would be a farce."

"What did Stalin's message say?"

TERRORISM CHARGED

"It charged the Polish Government in London with instigation of terrorists to 'lead a criminal fight against Soviet troops which are liberating Poland' and asked for support of the Polish National Committee (Beirut's group), suggesting 'an immediate exchange of representatives with the Polish National Committee, so that after a certain time it would be recognized as the lawful government of Poland.'"

"What did our Yalta delegation do about this?"

"Let us look further into the Yalta papers for these answers," replied Senator CAPEHART. "First, let us look at the full text of the Yalta agreements as released to the press on February 12, 1945. Under the chapter of Poland we find at the very beginning this claim: 'As a result of our discussions we have agreed on the conditions in which a new Polish Provisional Government of national unity may be formed in such a manner as to command recognition by the three major powers.'"

"Was anything like that done?"

"No, they did nothing of the sort," replied CAPEHART. "They established a Commission to determine conditions of establishing such a government."

QUOTES STALIN

"And where was this Commission to meet, Senator?"

"In Moscow. And am I unfair in my inference here that such a meeting in Moscow would be under Red influence?"

In this connection, Senator CAPEHART quotes Stalin from the Yalta papers as follows, "We had the opportunity in Moscow to create a Polish Government with Poles. Both London and Lublin groups met in Moscow and certain points of agreement were reached." Stalin, Senator CAPEHART pointed out "was referring to the government Russia had already recognized and which he praised in his December 27 message to Roosevelt. It is also the same government Winant cautioned Roosevelt as being communistic and which was eliminating the non-Communist elements."

"What finally developed?"

"According to what Stalin remarked at Yalta, Mikolajczyk returned to London and was kicked out of the government. All these people were against the agreement and hostile to the idea. They called the Lublin government bandits and traitors. Naturally, the Lublin government paid the same coin to the London government. It is difficult to bring them together."

"What else did Stalin have to say?"

COMPARED TO DE GAULLE

"I am prepared to call the Warsaw Poles here, or better to see them in Moscow. But frankly, the Warsaw government has as great a democratic basis in Poland as DeGaulle has in France," Stalin was quoted as saying at Yalta.

"And so they met in Moscow," Senator CAPEHART emphasized.

"I ask how in Heaven's name," the Senator exclaimed, "could our leaders return from Yalta and tell the American people a just and fair agreement had been reached on the future of Poland?"

"How in Heaven's name could any sane and sensible person believe that such an agreement on the establishment of a Polish Government would be recognized in the face of the frankness of Stalin that he would stand only for his type of government in Poland?" continued Senator CAPEHART.

"And then our State Department in 1948 said to the United States Senate in answer to my resolution that reports from Poland 'confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free.' When were those fears expressed? Not at Yalta."

In the next and the last of his interviews, Senator CAPEHART will tell how Stalin himself in the Yalta talks revealed by implication how 50,000 Polish Army men were executed in the Katyn Forest.

Yalta Exposé Points to Polish Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the fourth and last of the series of articles run by the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana. In his final interview, the Senator points to the evidence contained in the Yalta papers on the massacre of 50,000 Polish Army men in the Katyn Forest:

YALTA EXPOSÉ POINTS TO POLISH MASSACRE

(By Francis K. Czyewski)

The recent Yalta conference exposé contains strong evidence as to the identity of the murderers of the 50,000 Polish army men in the forest of Katyn in eastern Poland during World War II, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, reveals in his final review of the Yalta papers.

"I already mentioned at the beginning of my series of interviews that a long investigation was conducted by a House subcommittee on that matter," he said.

"What do the Yalta papers reveal in this matter?" CAPEHART was asked.

"It probably would be a valuable addition to the House subcommittee's report to quote Mr. Stalin's remarks at Yalta, now revealed for the first time by the Yalta papers."

"In just what way, Senator?"

"Mr. Stalin said in that message: 'We cannot reconcile with such a situation when terrorists instigated by Polish emigrants kill in Poland soldiers and officers of the Red Army, lead a criminal fight against Soviet troops which are liberating Poland, and directly aid our enemies, whose allies they in fact are.' Yet this was but a mild reference," Senator CAPEHART explained. "It was a two-edged sword for his message because it was designed to make his position on government formation stronger and at the same time provide the alibi for whatever might happen to emigrant government followers."

NON-REDS ELIMINATED

"You recall, too, what Mr. Winant said, that the 'non-Communists were being eliminated.' I said earlier that Mr. Stalin made his position on Polish issues quite clear. I said he made his position clear on the fate of Polish army men. Let me quote to you again from Mr. Stalin's opening remarks at Yalta on this historic crime:

"I quote:

"'Now as a military man I must say what I demand of a country liberated by the Red Army. First, there should be peace and quiet in the wake of the army. The men of the Red Army are indifferent as to what kind of government there is in Poland, but they do want one that will maintain order behind the lines. The Lublin-Warsaw government fulfills this role not badly. There are agents of the London government connected with the so-called underground. They are called resistance forces. We have had nothing good from them, but much evil. So far their agents have killed 212 Russian military men. They have attacked supply bases for arms. If they attack the Red Army any more they will be shot. When I compare the agents of both governments I find that the Lublin ones are useful and the others the contrary. The military must have peace and quiet. The military will support such a government, and I cannot do otherwise."

NOTE OF SURRENDER

"What followed this statement of Stalin against the so-called Polish underground?"

"There follows this quote in the Yalta papers a note of solemn surrender to Mr. Stalin's position," Senator CAPEHART replied.

"In what manner was this surrender made?"

"That note says that as Mr. Stalin completed his statement Mr. Roosevelt called attention to the fact that it was then a quarter till 8 and that the meeting should be adjourned."

"What was wrong with this?"

"You can search the Yalta papers from that point to the conclusion of the conference and find not a single reference by a member of the United States delegation to Mr. Stalin's warning that Polish Army men, or any other persons, favorable to the London emigrant government would be shot. I bow my head in shame for those who represented this great country of ours in such a manner," Senator CAPEHART, exclaimed adding, "we have always felt that any representatives of the United States would at all times fight for what is right."

And Senator CAPEHART also added, "Our boys died in great numbers in the European theater of World War II for what they believed to be a great cause. We liberated a few countries, too, including, in my judgment, Mr. Stalin's own country, Russia."

"My thoughts return to the message by President Truman which prompted my introduction of the resolution March 19, 1948, seeking to bring before Congress the agreements which had been reached in the many secret meetings in Yalta, Teheran, and elsewhere," the Senator continued.

"What did Truman say to the Congress in that message?"

"Mr. Truman said to the Congress March 17, 1948, in that speech: 'You know of the sincere and patient attempts of the democratic nations to find a secure basis for peace through negotiation and agreement.' "

"Was the statement insincere?"

"How wrong he was. Congress knew nothing at that time of the agreements," said Senator Capehart. "Congress knows only little more today—but enough more to realize that sincerity did not always prevail in those conferences."

"What do we know now for sure, Senator?"

CITES ROOSEVELT DECEPTION

"We know now that Mr. Roosevelt deceived Mr. Mikolajczyk and London emigrant government of Poland. We know now that Mr. Roosevelt and all the members of the United States delegation to Yalta knew long in advance of the Yalta Conference that 'Uncle Joe' Stalin intended to run Poland his way. We know now that every possible Russian influence prevailed in the Polish issue long before the meaningless agreement of Yalta."

"And what of the Katyn Forest murders?"

"Yes, we know now the murderer of the Katyn Forest."

"What did your resolution in 1948 ask, Senator?

"Thirty-two Senators, headed by myself, wanted the American people to get a full and frank disclosure of the facts behind the changes in American policy abroad. The authors of it were interested in but one thing, and that is to ascertain what agreements, entered into between this country and Russia, have been violated, and what agreements were entered into between this Nation and Russia at Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, Casablanca, and other places. The resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations."

ASKS AIRING OF DOCUMENTS

"What should be done now that the Yalta papers have been published, Senator?"

"Every word of the secret conferences and agreements reached at those conferences should be laid before the Congress and the people of the United States," Sen Capehart replied.

"We have learned from the Yalta papers that misrepresentations to the Congress and the people have been made possible through the policy of hiding in secrecy decisions of such vast importance to our future well-being," he continued.

"Should other secret conferences also be brought to light Senator?"

"I commend the present administration for its decision to make the Yalta papers available to the people and to the Congress. The same action should be taken on the papers of Teheran, Potsdam, Moscow, and Casablanca. I hope the administration will follow its own good example and take such steps at the earliest opportunity," concluded Senator Capehart.

Aid to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is very unfortunate that the Members of this House voted to cut in half the request of the administration for a $200 million special fund for Asian economic development. This is the sort of program which I feel holds out more promise of settling the present world tensions than any other. I have said before that we must find an imaginative way of meeting the economic and technological needs of Asia in order to combat the rise of communism in that area. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to restore the cut in the Asian fund, and that this House will support them at a later date. In matters which affect our international security we cannot afford to be miserly.

Address of Hon. George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the Program Youth Wants To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the text of the remarks made by the Honorable George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the television program Youth Wants To Know on May 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Announcer. Youth Wants To Know, the unrehearsed, spontaneous questions of today's young people, and here is your moderator, Stephen McCormick.

Mr. McCormick. Hello, I am Stephen McCormick, welcoming you to another session of Youth Wants To Know, founded and produced by Theodore Granik. Our guest today is the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, a key adviser in the President's Cabinet. Secretary Humphrey's impressive experience well fits his responsibility as director of the Nation's multibillion-dollar program.

Mr. Secretary, it is very pleasant indeed to have you back on Youth Wants To Know.

Secretary Humphrey. It is very nice indeed to have the opportunity to be back here.

Mr. McCormick. The youngsters participating in the program under the auspices of the American Legion have many questions for you as you might well imagine.

Question. Are you in favor of the income-tax cuts as proposed by the Democrats?

Secretary Humphrey. No, Roberta, I was opposed to that, and the reason I was opposed to it was because I thought that it was offered in a way and at a time that was entirely inappropriate. I don't think we can have another tax cut until we know where the money is coming from to pay it.

In other words, we must save money, save expenditures, so that we have money saved from expenditures to use to pay for the tax cut before there should be another one.

Question. What are the chances of a tax cut next year?

Secretary Humphrey. John, that just depends on how much we are able to save in expenditures. As you know, this administration has been trying ever since we came here to reduce expenditures. We have reduced them very considerably, since we came, we are trying to continue to reduce expenditures, and when we can reduce expenditures sufficiently, then I will certainly be very much in favor of another tax cut.

Question. Do you think that the fact that next year is an election year will in any way influence whether there will be a tax cut or not?

Secretary Humphrey. It will not make a bit of difference as far as I am concerned unless we can save money. If we can save the money I am very much in favor of a tax cut just as soon as we can do it.

Question. Are you satisfied so far with the Democratic Congress' support of the administration's policy and program?

Secretary Humphrey. Well, John, in many ways they have been very helpful. In some cases we have had some pretty difficult battles. I think you are a page up there and you know. You have seen some of them going on. You know there have been some difficulties with some of the bills but by and large there are always different points of view and that is what makes America, John, it is different points of view, different people harmonizing their points of view. That is the way we get the best results. So I think, taking it by and large, we are getting along pretty well.

Question. Has the Government collected more or less in taxes this year than in fiscal year 1954?

Secretary Humphrey. We are collecting less than we collected the year before because taxes were reduced, but we are collecting more than the difference between the cut in taxes and the amount that we previously collected. The reason for that is because, as business improves, as individual earnings improve, we collect more taxes. Fortunately, there are more people today having more money to spend than there ever have been in the history of the United States and, of course, as the people have more money, we collect more taxes.

Mr. McCormick. Has moving the deadline up to April 15 from March 15 made a great deal of difference, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Humphrey. No; I don't think it made any. I think it was a convenience to some of the people in paying their taxes to have a little more time, but so far as the amount is concerned, it didn't make any difference.

Question. Are we to assume from your last answer that you believe there is no decrease in the purchasing power of America?

Secretary Humphrey. This has been known for the last 2½ years. The dollar will buy just as much today as it would 2½ years ago. It is a remarkable thing, that the economy has been so stable for so long a time. The cost of living really hasn't changed at all in 2½ years.

Question. I was wondering whether you would think the United States dollar would ever get back to where it was, say, 20 years ago?

Secretary Humphrey. Well "ever" is a long time. When you say a thing is never going to happen you go a long way out on a limb, but I have no expectation of it returning—what that means is, you see, that the dollar will buy more—it means there will be a very severe decline in all prices and I am not at all sure that it would be a good thing if it did. I think if we can stabilize the dollar as it has been stabilized for 2½ years—which means that the cost of living doesn't rise—I think that is the ideal way to have it because, you see, if you can keep the cost of living from rising, as we have for 2½ years, now, and at the same time, people can produce more and earn more, as they are doing, then you have going on just what is happening in America today. You have people earning more money than they ever did before, even though they pay us taxes. They are having more money to spend than they ever had before, and that is the way the general scale of living of the people rises.

Now, if increases in wages or increases in earnings are accompanied by an increase in prices, it does very little good, but if prices can remain level and you can then have some increases in earnings, why then the people are better off than they ever were before and that is just the way it is now. That is what is going on every day now. People are better off than they have ever been.

Question. Did you know that Senator Byrd of Virginia stated that the multibillion-dollar roads program offered by you was the most irresponsible method of financing that has been offered in his 22 years as a Senator? Will you comment on this, please?

Secretary Humphrey. Yes, I will be glad to. Senator Byrd is a very dear friend of mine and he is a great American. He is an American that I respect and I respect his judgment, but we can't always think alike. As I was saying a minute ago, there are differences of opinion and the way you get to the truth of matters is by some differences of opinion and working them out and then the American people decide how it is best to do it.

Now, I feel that the road program as proposed, the Eisenhower road program is a suitable program and that it can very properly be adopted, and he disagrees with that.

The reason I feel that, Billy, is this, just to take a minute more on it: I feel that the way we propose to finance the roads is by borrowing money that will be paid by the use of the roads, as measured in gasoline taxes.

Now, I think everybody will agree that with the automobiles we have, with the crowds and the traffic and all that, everybody will agree we ought to have more roads. I don't think there is any question about that. The only question is how fast we ought to have them and how should we pay for them. And if we have to pay all cash for the roads, we cannot have them as rapidly, we can't build them as fast and have the use of them as rapidly as we can if we pay part cash and borrow part and I think it is very desirable that we borrow part, so as to get the roads sooner.

You see there is a great difference between spending more than you earn, just for fun or for pleasure or amusement or for living. But if you want to buy a tool that will help you earn more money, so that your earnings go up, it is perfectly proper to borrow to get that tool to increase your earnings. Now, that is what we are doing with the roads. If we borrow for the roads, we are borrowing to get a tool that will improve all America, that will help the earnings of America, and then that loan is paid for by the use of the road, as measured in the gasoline tax.

Mr. McCormick. Mr. Secretary, I am sure the complexities in the financing of this road program are somewhat beyond the average American but they want to know when we will get the roads. Do you feel we will wind up with some sort of a program at least that will within a few years give us new roads?

Secretary Humphrey. Oh, yes, I do. I think more roads in this country are absolutely essential. I think we are going to get them and I think it is just a matter of harmonizing views on how it will be developed, and how rapidly we will pay.

You see, the great discussion is largely between paying all cash and getting the roads more slowly, or paying part cash and getting the roads more rapidly and that is a matter of balance that is not a—it doesn't go right to the root of the matter, it doesn't go to whether we are going to have more roads, it goes to just how we will get them and how rapidly we will get them.

Question. Mr. Secretary, how could you support the President's multibillion-dollar road bill when you have a reputation of seeking to balance the budget?

Secretary Humphrey. I think as I said just a minute ago to you there is a lot of difference between just general spending and reduction of general expenditures, or waste in Government, and in buying and earning assets, buying a tool with which to work. It is just like a carpenter. Here is a carpenter. If he borrows money, just because he is living beyond his means, that is a bad thing. But if that carpenter wants a new box of tools to help him earn more money, it is perfectly proper for him to borrow some money to buy that new box of tools to increase his earnings and then use those earnings to pay off that debt that he got for the tools.

Now, these roads, more roads in America are of the nature of more tools for America to live with, to use, and it is a matter of safety and expansion of employment. I think it is very proper to buy that tool and then measure the earnings, the gasoline tax that is paid for the use of it, and use that money to pay back the debt that is incurred in getting it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, don't you think we are planning to spend entirely too much money on highways and not enough on schools?

Secretary Humphrey. No, I don't. You see, it is quite a different thing. The responsibilities are quite different. The responsibilities for schools are very largely in the local communities and that is where they ought to be. I don't think you can balance the two at all, properly. I think we need them both. We need good schools. We also need new roads and the respective responsibilities ought to furnish them.

Question. Do you think the administration can balance the budget in 1956?

Secretary Humphrey. I don't know, Richard. We are going to try. We are not too far out of balance in our estimates and if business conditions continue good, if earnings continue good, if the people still are making lots of money as they are at the present time, and businesses are doing well, and plenty of people have jobs, I think there is an outside chance that we might be able to do it by cutting expenditures sufficiently to accomplish it.

Question. When the Government went $2½ million in debt this year trying to balance the budget, where do you expect to economize for 1956?

Secretary Humphrey. All along the line, Richard. I think there should be economies made all along the line.

I am sure there are many ways we can render excellent service, just as good service and better service through all the departments of Government to the people than we are now rendering and still save in waste and extravagance and get more money for our dollar—get more performance for our dollar.

Question. In the 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. If he seeks reelection, do you think it will hurt him if he doesn't balance the budget?

Secretary Humphrey. Of course you always want to do what you say you are going to do, as nearly as you can. He said he would try to balance the budget. I don't think there is anybody in America who doesn't believe he is trying his best to balance the budget. I think most everybody will agree to that. We still have a chance to balance it, we are still attempting and trying to balance it. It is a matter of first importance with us. I said first importance. I want to take that back. First importance is a matter of safety. It is a matter of safety in this country. Unless and until we are sure we are spending what is required for the safety of this country, to keep this country for you young people who are going to grow up in it, to keep it safe, to keep it the right kind of a country, so that you will have as good a country to live in as we older people have had. To keep this country secure is the No. 1 objective of this administration, but coupled right along with that is the desire to balance the budget, to keep the economy as safe as we keep the country from outside sources, and that is what we are trying to do, and I hope we will do it. I hope we will do both.

Question. If President Eisenhower declines the Republican nomination for President in 1956, who do you think will be nominated?

Secretary Humphrey. I haven't the remotest idea. I am not skilled in politics and I just don't know.

Question. Mr. Secretary, if President Eisenhower refuses, will you accept?

Secretary Humphrey. I will not.

Question. There has been a great deal of talk lately, sir, to the effect that Secretary Hobby is going to resign and there have also been rumors that an Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Folsom, will replace her. Would you care to comment on this, sir?

Secretary Humphrey. I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment on that. That is a rumor and it involves people other than myself. I will be delighted to answer questions about myself or about the Treasury, but I don't think it is appropriate for me to comment on matters affecting other people.

Question. With the 600,000-car backlog, what would be the effect of an auto workers' strike on the national economy?

Secretary Humphrey. Well, a strike is always a bad thing for everybody concerned. It is too bad when differences can't be reconciled and strikes become necessary. Occasionally, one side or the other thinks the strike is necessary, sometimes both sides. But usually, it is accompanied by losses in the whole economy and losses by everybody involved, that are not desirable. I would hope very much that there would not have to be a strike anywhere in this country. That is perhaps too much to hope for continuously, but I would hope they would be just as few as possible.

Question: I am a young man and I want to make a million dollars and you said when you came back from South America, that that is where you would go to make it. How would you do that?

Mr. McCormick. We are all interested in that answer, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary Humphrey. That is a kind of a tough one.

What I meant by that—and you don't have to go to South America to do well, either, although South America is an extremely interesting place. What I meant when I said that—I was quoted in that—I don't know that I ever did say exactly that, but I was quoted as saying that. I mean that there are great opportunities in South America in many of the countries in the development of their natural resources. South America, the opportunities for development are the same sort of developments that we have had in this country over the past 50 years or more, and there is lots of opportunity for the developments of natural resources and the building up of the countries.

Now in this country, we are just filled with opportunity, too. You young people just keep this in mind: You hear people say that there is less opportunity all the time. That is just baloney. There is more opportunity in America, today, than there ever has been in its history. There are more people, there are more new things, there are more new ways of getting things, there are more chances to make and to sell things that the people want, there is more opportunity every day for you young people to get ahead and do well in this country, more so than there ever has been before in all our history put together.

Mr. McCormick. Mr. Secretary, before taking the next question, it is time to announce the winner of this week's 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia, and the winner this week is William Robertson, 221 South Washington Street, Rockville, Md. The Station of the Week, WRC in Washington, D. C. For details of the contest, listen to the announcement at the end of the program.

Now let's hear the winning question. Will you give it, please?

Question. Secretary Humphrey, how can we reconcile the fact that Britain recently rejected the opportunity to lower their tax rate for fear of jeopardizing their financial aid from this country? Aren't we in effect now paying for that portion of their taxes?

Secretary Humphrey. Now does that question say that Britain failed to lower her tax rate?

Question. It says she rejected.

Secretary Humphrey. Rejected an opportunity to lower the tax rate?

Question. Yes.

Secretary Humphrey. You know, that is not correct. The question proceeds on a wrong premise. Britain just did lower her tax rate. Taxes in Great Britain were lowered only a few weeks ago. Maybe it is 2 or 3 months, now, but it is a relatively short time ago. So that I think the question starts from a wrong premise. To pass that by for the moment, I don't think Britain's raising or lowering her taxes has much to do with what we do in connection with assistance to Great Britain. As a matter of fact, our aid, strictly aid, to Great Britain has been very low for some months past. It has been very greatly reduced. Conditions in Great Britain are very good, they are doing very well, and they haven't required American aid for some time. The war damage that we sought to build up has been very largely repaired so that American aid in Great Britain is a very low and declining item.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said a few moments ago that American business was in fine shape. Yet every day we hear about mergers. Now something is wrong. What is the matter with American business?

Secretary Humphrey. I don't see why you say something is wrong. The fact is that there are many more small businesses today in this country than there ever were in its history. We have more new businesses, more new small businesses starting this year than have ever started in any year. So that the idea that there is nothing but big business in America is wrong. The idea that mergers are something wrong, or reprehensible, is entirely wrong. There are many, many mergers that are very much to the benefit of the people. They are very much to the benefit of not only the employees in the concern because it levels out their work—let's take a concern that has a seasonal product. That means that it has high employment in one season of the year and low in another. Here is another concern that makes another product that has another season, that works through another season. Now, how much better it is for those two things to get together, to give high season employment in one branch of the business at one time and high season employment in another time. That is very beneficial to their employees.

Another business makes a certain article where the sales would vary from time to time, in different times of the year. They can supplement that by something else that is made, and round out their program to give more constant employment, more steady employment and better earnings for the stockholders.

There are many businesses that supplement each other where mergers are very desirable.

Question. I realize that there are many small businesses but there are also those businesses that have to merge because if they don't they are going to go straight out of business. Take for instance the automobile industry. Last summer they merged and they are getting ready to merge again.

The question is this: If the mergers are not for financial reasons—you say they are for the benefit of the employees. Why does business say it is for financial reasons?

Secretary Humphrey. For the benefit of employees, for the benefit of stockholders and for customers.

Let's just take the automobiles that you are talking about. If you can merger several models into a single concern so that you get the interchange of parts and interchange of panels and one thing or another, you make a cheaper and a better automobile.

Now, if you can make a cheaper and a better automobile it is much to the benefit not only of the people who are working to produce it but of the people who want to buy it.

Question. Your first budget cut $5 billion out of the Air Force and made reassurances that we would have more defense money with no sacrifice in fighting strength.

Why didn't we cut $10 billion out and have twice as much defense?

Secretary Humphrey. You have to proceed with caution, you have to proceed slowly to be sure that you are getting more defense for less money, that your money is buying more of the things that you want, and that you are cutting out waste and not cutting out the heart of what you are trying to do. I hope the time will come when we can eliminate another $5 billion out of our Government expenditures and still give better Government and more security for that less money. I think it is possible, and I think it can be done by more efficient management, by better arrangement all along, and by getting more for our money as we spend it.

Mr. McCormick. Do you feel the Hoover Commission recommendation by and large will be able to be put into effect and that you will save money there?

Secretary Humphrey. I can't comment on them by and large, because I haven't studied them. I am sure that there are some that I have seen that are very excellent suggestions. I think perhaps there are others that will take a great deal of study and that may not be thoroughly practical. I am, however, absolutely sure of this, and that is that they merit the greatest consideration and the most careful study by every single department affected.

Mr. McCormick. I notice the question has been raised that perhaps the recommendations of the Hoover Commission might be nullified by the pressure groups they affect. At least, that was comment made by several people, Mr. Wilford May in the Financial and Commercial Chronicle, made a comment along that line.

Secretary Humphrey. That is one of the things that is very hard to do, reduce expenditures. You have tried it at home and you know it is pretty tough. Every time you undertake to cut down on expenditures, the people who are affected have trouble, and people who are used to something or other, hate to let it go. It may be that is better for the overall picture to have them let go but nevertheless it is pretty tough to do it.

Question. Do you think that the administration will find it necessary to request Congress to lower the national debt limit?

Secretary Humphrey. Not to lower it, to raise it.

Mr. McCormick. It would be rather pleasant to lower it, wouldn't it?

Secretary Humphrey. I wish you were right, but it will be necessary that the debt limit again be raised this year.

You see what was done last year was the debt limit was temporarily raised to take care of this year. You will remember they raised it to take care of the peak, and then we were to even it out. Now, we are going to be back, as we said we could, on June 30, but then we are going to run right into another peak next fall and next winter and that peak also is going to have to be provided for.

Mr. McCormick. I wish we had more time for questions but we must end today's discussion. Thank you very much, Secretary Humphrey for helping provide the answers to Youth Wants To Know.

"Debunking" the High Tax Cost to Other States of Western Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a great many statements have appeared in the Record in regard to the cost of reclamation projects, and particularly the cost per State of the upper Colorado storage project. These statements present fantastic tax figures per State, and are not in accord with the facts.

I have asked Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, to give me a correct statement of the tax costs which I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record.

I call attention, particularly, to his statement that the portion of general tax funds for each State for construction of the upper Colorado project is infinitesimal. It would amount to something like $18 million a year, The critics of the upper basin fail to point out that a large portion of the funds for the upper Colorado storage project will come out of the reclamation fund, which are not general tax funds. This will be over 73 percent of the total amount when construction on the project proceeds to the year 1965, as shown by table 1.

In addition, other States making contributions through taxes to reclamation projects receive a large proportion of the expenditures for labor and material. I am attaching table No. 2 which gives the breakdown on the expenditures for labor and material on the Colorado River storage project. The plain fact is that the Eastern States do rather well. Furthermore, the general taxpayer is getting the benefit of these wealth producing projects and history has shown that many of the reclamation project areas now contribute more in Federal taxes each year than the entire Federal investment in those projects.

Commissioner Dexheimer's letter, together with the two exhibits referred to, are attached for the information of the Members of the House:

United States
Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Reclamation,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1955.

Hon. Clair Engle,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Engle: The following information is furnished in response to your letter of July 6, 1955.

Recent articles in the Congressional Record and in the public press contain erroneous and misleading data on proposals for authorizing additional reclamation projects in the Western States, such as the upper Colorado storage, the Fryingpan-Arkansas, and the Trinity projects. Allegations are made that the cost of these projects would be proportionately assessed against the States of the Union with a corresponding increase in each State's tax burden. For the upper Colorado storage project, for example, it is alleged that the project will cost $4 billion and will cost the State of Massachusetts $127,600,000, Oklahoma $44,800,000, Ohio $236,000,000, and New York $493,600,000 in added taxes—to name a few. These statements are not in accord with the facts.

The upper Colorado River storage project, under consideration by the Congress for authorization, has a total estimated cost of $760 million as reported by the House committee or $1,093 million as passed by the Senate. The impression is being created that this cost, or the inflated estimated cost cited above, will require increased tax revenues from each State in proportion to its Federal taxes. The allegations made reveal that the financing of reclamation projects is deliberately misrepresented or is not understood.

Construction of complex, multiple-purpose reclamation projects must be spread over a period of years. The annual fund requirement is therefore much less than indicated by total cost data standing alone. Analyses made by the Bureau of Reclamation show that for the 10-year period from 1956 through 1965 maximum appropriations for all its activities of $240 million will allow for construction of all projects under way, on the new projects not yet authorized, and would finance the cost of investigations of future projects, operation and maintenance of completed facilities, and general administrative expenses.

The money that goes into building reclamation projects is made available by annual congressional appropriations from two sources: general funds of the Treasury and the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund was established by Congress in 1902. It receives a part of the receipts from public land sales and oil royalties out of the public land States (for fiscal year 1955, $34,500,000) and from revenues from reclamation projects. Revenues from reclamation projects include those from water sales, repayment of construction and operation and maintenance costs by irrigation farmers and revenues from the sale of hydrolectric power. These revenues were $58,500,000 in fiscal year 1955. These funds are paid into the United States Treasury as received and require appropriation by Congress before they can be spent.

The reclamation fund has carried a steadily increasing portion of the reclamation work. It will finance 53.3 percent of the fiscal year 1956 program. By the end of the decade in 1965 it will reach 73.2 percent according to Bureau estimates. The attached table (table 1) shows total annual appropriations and the portion from the reclamation fund. The estimated needs through 1965 include funds for the upper Colorado River storage project and all other projects the Bureau has recommended, or expects to recommend, to the Congress for authorization. About $100 million a year during this period is needed from the general fund of the Treasury. This money is largely reimbursable, and all power and municipal water costs will be paid back with interest.

Using the same tax distribution basis as our critics, the portion of general tax for each State for loan of construction funds for the upper Colorado River storage project is infinitesimal. For example, the $1 billion loan spread over 25 years is $40 million per year. An average of 55 percent will come from the reclamation fund and not from tax revenue. Therefore, the annual loan from the general fund of the Treasury is $18 million. The share of the States mentioned above is: Massachusetts, $575,000; Oklahoma, $202,000; Ohio, $1,060,000; and New York, $2,220,000. Eighty-one percent of the $18 million and other construction costs will be spent outside the upper Colorado River Basin and will provide employment and more business in those areas.

In addition, new taxable wealth is created by these projects. Many of the reclamation project areas now contribute more in Federal income taxes each year than the entire Federal investment.

Table 2 shows distribution of construction expenditures by States for the initial units of the Colorado River storage project, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

TABLE 1.—*Analysis of appropriations*

HISTORICAL

Fiscal year	Total appropriations	Portion from reclamation fund	Percent of total
1950	$366,963,357	$44,771,257	12.20
1951	277,727,668	47,322,094	17.04
1952	240,923,610	51,582,435	21.41
1953	214,191,956	73,182,415	34.17
1954	147,454,998	74,995,244	50.86
1955	165,660,500	83,706,919	50.53

ESTIMATED

Fiscal year	Total appropriations	Portion from reclamation fund	Percent of total
1956	$184,308,500	$98,240,450	53.30
1957	211,000,000	107,500,000	51.00
1958	220,000,000	115,500,000	52.50
1959	225,000,000	123,500,000	55.00
1960	235,000,000	129,500,000	55.00
1961	240,000,000	132,500,000	55.20
1962	240,000,000	138,500,000	57.70
1963	240,000,000	153,500,000	64.00
1964	240,000,000	166,500,000	69.40
1965	240,000,000	175,500,000	73.20

TABLE 2.—*Distribution by States of expenditures for labor and materials—Initial units of Colorado River storage project*

State	Dollars (in thousands)	Man-years
Alabama	7,025	1,405
Arizona	37,036	7,407
Arkansas	2,145	429
California	125,248	25,050
Colorado	47,981	9,596
Connecticut	15,181	3,036
Delaware	1,429	286
District of Columbia	774	155
Florida	2,797	559
Georgia	8,157	1,631
Idaho	5,963	1,193
Illinois	53,463	10,693
Indiana	23,815	4,763
Iowa	5,357	1,071
Kansas	10,270	2,054
Kentucky	5,953	1,191
Louisiana	5,536	1,107
Maine	3,452	690
Maryland	9,108	1,822
Massachusetts	26,970	5,394
Michigan	41,556	8,311
Minnesota	8,157	1,631
Mississippi	2,382	476
Missouri	12,980	2,596
Montana	4,275	855
Nebraska	6,547	1,309
Nevada	4,667	933
New Hampshire	2,441	488
New Jersey	33,400	6,680
New Mexico	17,006	3,401
New York	77,398	15,480
North Carolina	13,158	2,632
North Dakota	1,403	281
Ohio	50,844	10,169
Oklahoma	7,809	1,562
Oregon	9,847	1,970
Pennsylvania	55,549	11,110
Rhode Island	5,240	1,048
South Carolina	6,370	1,274
South Dakota	2,056	411
Tennessee	7,681	1,536
Texas	34,575	6,915
Utah	61,716	12,343
Vermont	1,191	238
Virginia	8,395	1,679
Washington	14,631	2,926
West Virginia	5,299	1,060
Wisconsin	18,100	3,620
Wyoming	10,719	2,144
Total	923,052	184,610

Record of Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from remarks I made at the Republican Party Workshop Meeting for the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania, in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN AT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WORKSHOP MEETING FOR THE EASTERN COUNTIES OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN THE BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 25, 1955

In the 1956 campaign we can go before the American people proud of our Republicanism because we have a Republican administration at Washington without favoritism, without corruption, without extravagance and without Socialistic regimentation.

We have a Republican administration that is sound, trustworthy and economical serving no special interests, but working to advance the welfare of all the people.

We have an administration that believes in the Constitution of the United States and respects its limitations on the power of the central government.

We have an administration that supports the American system of free enterprise which means unlimited opportunity, progress and prosperity.

We can go before the people with a record that is outstanding—a record of achievement that reflects the basic philosophy of the Republican Party and the principles to which the Republican Party is dedicated.

Let me review briefly what has been accomplished in the 2½ years since the American people ended the scandalous years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and placed Dwight Eisenhower at the head of our national government.

Taxes have been reduced.

When the Eisenhower administration came into power taxes were at a war time level. The Republican 83d Congress reduced taxes by $7,400,000,000 the biggest tax reduction ever made in a single year.

Government spending has been brought under control. The first step taken by the Eisenhower administration was to cut the Truman budget by $10 billion and actual spending was reduced by $6½ billion dollars.

The swollen army of more than 2½ million Federal employees was cut by nearly 300,000.

We no longer have the shocking disclosures of corruption in high Government places. The Bureau of Internal Revenue is no longer a happy hunting ground for income tax fixers. In 1953 alone there were 60 convictions of persons involved in tax evasions and bribery.

There are no red herrings in the Republican administration. Between January 1953 and June 1954, 2,400 security risks were removed from the Government; 41 Communist leaders have been convicted and another 35 have been indicted. Several hundred alien subversives have been deported.

Let us look into the unemployment situation.

A year ago the Democrats were screaming their heads off. They were making all kinds of gloomy predictions. They said our economy was ready to collapse.

But they were wrong. Right now more people are gainfully employed than ever before. In May of this year there was a gain of more than a million jobs over the preceding month and a million and a half over the same month last year.

Inflation has been checked and prices have been stabilized. The decline in the purchasing power of the dollar has been stopped.

Government is being removed from competition with private industry. Twenty-four Government-owned synthetic rubber plants have been sold to private industry.

The Inland Waterways Corp., which operated on the Mississippi River at a loss of $15 million, has been sold.

The Defense Department is giving up many activities which compete with private business such as coffee roasting, ice cream making, logging and saw mill operations and rope manufacturing.

We are no longer exposed to socialistic experimentation which would concentrate all authority in an all-powerful central Government. The socialistic advocates of a planned economy have gone into hiding, but they are ready to spring into action again with their dizzy schemes and false promises if they ever get another chance.

The Republican administration expanded social-security benefits and extended coverage to 10 million more people, the first major increase since 1935.

Under Republican prosperity construction records are being broken with more money being spent to build homes, churches, and schools than ever before. In April construction expenditures ran at the unprecedented annual rate of $41½ billion compared with the previous record set last year of $37 billion.

Under Republican Government the personal income of the American people set an alltime high last month and continues to rise. On an annual rate basis gross personal income of all citizens was computed by the Department of Commerce in April at $295½ billion, a $1 billion increase over March and $11 billion more than the rate for April a year ago.

These are all grand and glorious achievements, but the crowning glory of all is that we are at peace.

Going back to the beginning of this century in our history the Republican Party has never been in power at the start of any war.

Look over the whole Democratic record and you will find they have never been able to sustain prosperity without reckless and wasteful Government spending and without industrial production to be destroyed in battle.

For the first time in many years we have a sound, constructive, expanding economy based on peace instead of a false prosperity based on the death and destruction of war.

Athletes Know the Value of It—Why Not the U. N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 5, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 23 that stated in effect "that the President is hereby requested to instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to take such steps as may be necessary to have each day's session of the United Nations opened with prayer."

In introducing this resolution, I was then, and am now, firmly convinced that the United Nations sessions should be opened with prayer asking for divine guidance and help in the deliberations of that organization to bring about peace in the world. The desire for peace is the greatest desire of all people, and surely it seems only right that we, a Nation believing in a supreme being, should continue to use every means possible at our command to bring about the use of prayer in the United Nations.

I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Mike Lee, written in the Long Island Press of Sunday, July 3, 1955, with the heading "Religion Big Factor in Sports." This column details the many, many instances of our greatest athletes calling upon Almighty God to give them strength and courage and also expressing their thanks to Almighty God for his divine assistance.

I am hoping before this session adjourns that Congress will see fit to pass this resolution thereby reaffirming our faith and our belief that the United Nations can use all the divine assistance that would come through the use of prayer.

The Nation's School-Lunch Milk Program: A Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by myself on the subject of the Nation's school-lunch milk program, together with a news release from the National Dairy Council concerning the consumption of milk by the Nation's school youngsters.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S SCHOOL LUNCH MILK PROGRAM: A VITAL NATIONAL ASSET—VENDING MACHINES ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY

One of the most welcome statistical estimates I have seen is the news coming from the National Dairy Council to the effect that during the coming 1955–56 school year, around 3 billion half pints of milk may be consumed by the Nation's school youngsters.

I feel that the school-lunch program and in particular the milk phase of that program is absolutely essential to the future health of this country.

Some short-sighted critics have occasionally questioned the advisability of the program. But their rare and isolated comments have deservedly been drowned out in the chorus of approval from all over America—approval for helping to build up sturdy young bodies for the Nation's youngsters.

It is absurd to allow milk to remain in Federal cold storage plants, when it should be distributed now to those who can best utilize it.

YOUNGSTERS SHOULD GET IN MILK-DRINKING HABIT

I may say also that it is absurd to have youngsters grow up with the habit of drinking nonnutritious beverages and eating nonnutritious, often teeth-decaying products, when instead, they should be getting into the habit of consuming nature's most important, most healthful food—to build up teeth and bone.

So, youngsters need to be encouraged to get into the milk-drinking habit and to keep that habit.

ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY—THROUGH MILK VENDORS

And, too, there ought to be vending machines readily available to the Nation's youngsters, and for that matter, to the rest of our population, where wholesome dairy products are dispensed economically and efficiently.

Indeed the development of dairy vending machines (of which there are now more than 16,000 on location) particularly ones holding several types of dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream—offers one of the most promising channels for increased dairy consumption.

TEAMSTERS STUDYING LOWERING DISTRIBUTION COSTS

It is my purpose to be in continued contact with the National Automatic Merchandising Association, with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and other sources, private and public, toward the end of encouraging this automatic vending trend.

The Teamsters are, I may say, very commendably studying with United States industry the very significant problem of how to lower milk distribution costs. The Economics of Distribution Foundation, an organization for research along this line, will in the words of Teamster President Dave Beck, make a "fundamental contribution to the strengthening of the American economy and the public welfare. * * *"

WISCONSIN FIRST IN AMERICA ON SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Meanwhile, in the Nation's schools, the special school milk program, directly making available half-pints of milk, should be given every possible support.

The State of Wisconsin has led the way under this program. If all the other 47 States did as well under this program as Wisconsin has by its youngsters, then America would be infinitely further along in better health for our children and infinitely further along in ending the so-called dairy surplus problem once and for all.

PRESS RELEASE BY NATIONAL DAIRY COUNCIL

About 3 billion half pints of milk will be consumed by grade- and high-school students at school during the 1955–56 semesters, it is predicted by Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council.

Hult's announcement is based on three considerations:

1. Modifications, recently announced by USDA, which simplify procedures for schools participating in the federally sponsored $50 million special school milk program could mean this program will move 1 billion half pints of milk during the coming school year.

2. Further expansion of the national school-lunch program which in itself last year served an estimated 1,725,000,000 half pints of milk in schools. Volume could reach 2 billion during next school year.

3. Continuing expansion of National Dairy Council and affiliated Dairy Council unit activities which further the objectives of both school programs and offer teaching aids to

educators for use in teaching good eating habits to all grades.

As a member of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's National School Lunch Advisory Committee, Hult is familiar with details of the recently announced changes in the special school milk program for the school year ahead.

Major points in the modification, he said, are: (1) complicated book work by cooperating schools has been eliminated from Federal requirements, (2) a more equitable system of reimbursement has been announced, and (3) provisions will be established to insure that as a result of Federal payments, the price of milk will be lowered to children in participating schools.

Hult explained that under the 1954–55 school year system, schools which had well established national school-lunch programs were not, in the opinion of educators, offered enough incentive to serve additional half pints of milk under the new special milk program.

The new system should correct this, in Hult's opinion, by extending to State educational agencies the power to set a 4-cent maximum rate of reimbursement per additional half pint of milk served in schools already serving type A and B school lunches prescribed under the national school-lunch program, and 3 cents per half pint for all other schools.

This could also offer incentive to schools not under the national school-lunch program to take steps to acquire food service facilities to participate in that program.

Hult explained that the special school milk program was designed by Congress not simply as a stop-gap measure during a time of surplus purchases, but rather as a supplement to the national school-lunch program, and as another means of encouraging schools to recognize the importance of serving healthful meals to students. Healthier students make better pupils, Hult said.

Dairy councils located in 81 major markets in 35 States from coast to coast assist schools in launching and conducting school-lunch and special school-milk programs.

Last year 11 million school children in 55,000 schools participated in the national school-lunch program. The $50 million special school-milk program, launched late last fall by act of Congress, offered special reimbursement to these schools for additional milk served above their previous averages and to schools which had never served milk before. During the 1954–55 school year, about 47,000 schools enrolled under the special program and provided an estimated additional 400 million half pints of milk. Hult's estimate of a billion half pints of milk for the next school year amounts to an expansion of that service by 250 percent.

"The United States Congress, the Department of Agriculture, educators, parent groups, and the dairy industry all deserve commendation for promoting child health and solving the many problems of expanding milk service in schools," Hult said. "The school-lunch and special school-milk programs are important demonstrations of many community groups cooperating for a common good which they believe worthwhile."

What can dairy industrymen do about school lunch and special school milk programs where there is not a dairy council? Hult suggests the following:

1. Bring the matter up with the local milk dealers' association.

2. Initiate contacts with the superintendent of schools. He will discuss the matter from a policy standpoint as well as follow-through, or refer you to the school-lunch administrator.

3. Aim at having the new special school-milk program added to the schools which already have regular school-lunch programs.

4. Aim also at setting up arrangement for the special school-milk program in schools which have not participated previously in a school-lunch program.

There will be difficulties to be ironed out and it will take time. Whether a school has proper facilities for refrigeration may be an item. If not, they may need milk deliveries convenient to the school schedule, but not necesarily ideal from the standpoint of the milk dealer. However, procedures can and are being evolved which are satisfactory to all in many areas.

Happy Birthday to the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes entitled "Happy Birthday to the Marines."

The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The fabulous Marines—they even have two birthdays.

It was on July 11, 1798—just 157 years ago—that the United States Marine Corps was established by act of Congress. But nearly 23 years before then—on November 10, 1775, the official birthday—the Continental Congress by resolution had created the Continental Marines, forerunner of the present corps.

Whatever their name, whatever birthday they celebrate, wherever they stand in the hierarchy of unification, they have always packed a powerful punch. They look sharp and they are sharp. And they certainly cut an impressive swath on the capital scene.

There is something about the colorful sight of the Marine Band playing near the front door of the White House at state occasions that adds particular excitement to the already tingling sensation of entering that gorgeous mansion.

There is something about the surge of flowing power in the lines of the heroic Marine Memorial—the massive representation in bronze of Associated Press Photographer Joe Rosenthal's picture of the flag raising on Iwo Jima in World War II—that adds a throat-catching solemnity to the Washington horizon.

There is something about the leathery faces of the "old pros" in the Marines, and about the fresh-faced youngsters new to the corps that impresses each of us as we meet these men around town in Washington.

There is something about the marines, indeed—something fine and strong and dedicated to the Nation's service.

Of course, all of the boys in all of the services—and the smart looking girls in uniform, too—have our honor and respect and love. To me, serving on the House Committee on Veteran's Affairs, the problems and the needs and the future aspirations of all service people are real and personal things which I have come to know intimately by reason of the legislation which comes before my committee.

So it is with no disparagement of the other services that I say that Congress has a particularly warm spot for the marines. And, typically, Congress shows that affection with periodic votes of confidence that the Marine Corps, I am sure, finds most gratifying.

The most recent instance of that came on the last day of June when Congress—11 days early—celebrated the 157th anniversary of the formal establishment of the United States Marine Corps by voting the corps more money (a whole lot more—46 milllion more) than the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff had requested. This extra amount will maintain the corps at its present level of 3 combat divisions and 3 combat air wings, together with training and supporting forces for a total of 215,000 men, retaining 22,000 marines the budget had not provided for.

Much as Congress respects President Eisenhower's military knowledge, it refused to accept his projected cut of 22,000 in Marine Corps strength. In this, General Eisenhower is being treated no differently from other Presidents. President Truman, in fact, once protested the marines were superpropagandists; and the Navy privately fumed and implied the same thing when Congress insisted on giving the Commandant of the Marines coequal rank on the Joint Chiefs of Staff on any issues involving the Marine Corps.

But it is not any unusual skill at lobbying which gets the marines such special treatment from Congress unless you would call "lobbying" the work the marines have performed over many years on steaming jungles and bloody beaches and frozen mountains—on every front, in every war, in all of our Nation's history, where, as the Marine Memorial inscription recalls, "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

Happy unofficial birthday, Marines.

Federal-State Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal-State Relations," which appeared in the July 8, 1955, issue of the Washington Evening Star, and a newsletter of mine dated July 5, 1955, on the subject of "An Antidote to Centralization of Government."

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1955]

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Indicative of the general tenor of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is the group's announced belief that the "fundamental objective of our system of government should be to keep centralization to a minimum and State-local responsibility to a maximum." Taking note of widespread concern over increased centralization of governmental authority in recent years, the Commission has sought to point a way for arresting the trend and strengthening government at the State, county, and municipal levels. Its report is a well-balanced document, representing views of a majority of the 25-man bipartisan Commission, headed by Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago clothing manufacturer.

The Commission found that too much Federal aid to the States and local communities is apt to weaken local responsibility and initiative. This deterioration makes it difficult to effect a proper separation of Federal and local powers, for some of the States and cities are unable to assume what the Commission regards as their rightful obligations to the citizens. The Commission stressed that the main burden of strengthening local government rests on the States and local communities. But the Federal Government can help by taking care not to encroach on State domain and responsibilities.

Of special interest to the Washington metropolitan area was the Commission's comments on tax losses resulting from Federal expansion and on interjurisdictional problems in large metropolitan areas. With regard to the Federal impact on local tax-producing sources, the report urged adoption of a broad national policy to assure payments in lieu of taxes on Government real estate. Said the Commission: "Present tax immunities of Federal properties have weakened many local governments. * * * Equity as between Federal and local taxpayers requires the National Government to make appropriate payments. These should be based largely on the property-tax system, which is the main source of local revenue." Interjurisdictional planning of the type that has been undertaken here was advocated for all growing urban centers.

The Commission's inch-thick report covers a multitude of issues arising from intergovernmental relationships. It will be read with profit by administrators and legislators at all levels of government.

AN ANTIDOTE TO CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, July 5, 1955.—One of the most meaningful reports of contemporary times was released last week when the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concluded a comprehensive survey of "the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions to the end that these relations may be clearly defined, and the functions concerned may be allotted to their proper jurisdictions." It was my privilege, by appointment of the Vice President, to serve on this Commission.

The Commission has thus illuminated the variable scope of kinship between Federal, State, and local governments which has evolved in our country. In so doing the inherent dangers of intemperate reliance on the Federal Government have been brought into lucid and graphic perspective, and a series of plausible recommendations for the division of responsibilities in many fields of public endeavor have been advanced.

In what might be regarded by some as an understatement, the Commission has observed that "People in the United States, as elsewhere, have looked more and more to Government for assistance in solving their social and economic problems. The National Government has sometimes responded more readily than have the State and local governments." While the Commission, quite correctly, has not indulged in partisanship, this comment nonetheless capably characterizes the climate of public opinion in which the New Deal and Fair Deal became potent and fashionable.

As with the Hoover Commission recently, the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations have likewise been the target for citicism by the still-lingering disciples, dupes, and derelicts of the New-Fair Deal. Fortunately for the stability and sanity of our Nation, however, there are even now many, many millions of persons, Republicans and Democrats alike, who fervently believe in the durable Jeffersonian doctrine of a strong State government rather than a centralized Federal Government.

In this essential campaign to rejuvenate the traditional Federal-State precept, these fundamental guides, as offered by the Commission, should govern: "We have * * * as citizens a responsibility to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government" and "A realistic program of decentralization * * * depends too on the readiness and ability of the States and their subdivisions to assume their full share of the total task of government."

The Third Anniversary of Eisenhower's Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning a statement was presented to President Eisenhower citing the outstanding accomplishments of his administration, and urging him to run for a second term. As many of us know, today marks the third anniversary of his nomination to the Presidency.

This statement was signed by 54 Republican Members of the House representing all those first elected in the 83d or 84th Congresses. They come from 25 different States, representing 294 electoral votes. Without doubt, virtually all Republicans presently serving in the Congress—and millions of Americans throughout the Nation—subscribe to these views.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement which was presented to the President, together with the names of those who signed:

UNANIMOUS STATEMENT BY 54 REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, ELECTED IN OR SINCE 1952, ISSUED ON THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S NOMINATION BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, JULY 11, 1955

The undersigned, Republican Members of the House of Representatives, wish to take this occasion—the third anniversary of Dwight D. Eisenhower's nomination to the Presidency—to call attention to the outstanding accomplishments of his administration, and urge that he seek a second term of office.

All of us were elected to office at the time of, or after, the election of President Eisenhower in November 1952. We are confident that our views reflect the sentiment of virtually all Republican Members of Congress.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected President in 1952 by an overwhelming majority of the American people because they believed him to be uniquely qualified to lead our country in a time of crisis. Under his leadership the Republican Party has brought peace and prosperity to the United States, and hope and confidence to our people.

These are tremendous accomplishments, but the job President Eisenhower agreed to undertake is not yet finished. To solidify our gains and complete our program, we Republican Members of Congress believe President Eisenhower should remain in office for a second term.

In the atomic age, when one faulty decision could prove disastrous, it is vital that our Nation be led by a man with great experience in the international field and one who possesses patience, firmness, understanding, and courage.

Under President Eisenhower's great leadership America's defenses have been strenthened and the cause of world peace has been advanced.

At home, the Republican Party under President Eisenhower has advanced a program which has brought America unprecedented economic stability and prosperity. American workers have more jobs, at better pay, than at any time in our history.

Because of this exceptional progress, and the promise which continuation of his leadership holds for our people and the free world, we most earnestly hope that President Eisenhower will seek reelection. We are confident that upon consideration of all the factors he will not refuse his country's call.

ALGER, Texas; AVERY, Kansas; BALDWIN, California; BASS, New Hampshire; BAUMHART, Ohio; BECKER, New York; BENTLEY, Michigan; BOLTON, O., Ohio; BOSCH, New York; BROYHILL, Virginia; CEDERBERG, Michigan; CHASE, Nebraska; COON, Oregon; CRAMER, Florida; CRETELLA, Connecticut; CURTIS, Massachusetts; DEROUNIAN, New York; DIXON, Utah; DORN, New York; FINO, New York; FJARE, Montana; FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey; GUBSER, California; HENDERSON, Ohio; HIESTAND, California; HOLT, California; HOSMER, California; HYDE, Maryland; JOHANSEN, Michigan; JONAS, North Carolina; KNOX, Michigan; KRUEGER, North Dakota; LAIRD, Wisconsin; LIPSCOMB, California; MAILLIARD, California; MINSHALL, Ohio; PELLY, Washington; PILLION, New York; POFF, Virginia; RAY, New York; RHODES, Arizona; ROBSION, Kentucky; SCHERER, Ohio; SCHWENGEL, Iowa; SILER, Kentucky; TEAGUE, California; THOMSON, Wyoming; UTT, California; WAINWRIGHT, New York, WEAVER, Nebraska; WESTLAND, Washington; WILSON, California; YOUNG, Nevada; YOUNGER, California.

Relief for Schoolteachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I made on Senate bill 1505 before the District of Columbia Committee earlier this year when that bill was before the committee for consideration. I wish very frankly to state my reasons for asking its insertion in the RECORD. A group of persons very much interested in the principles which I supported on that occasion and in the objectives of my bill would like to have the statement I made in committee more widely distributed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON S. 1505

I have a speech to make on the Senate floor, and I would like to take about 5 minutes to testify in behalf of my bill, and discuss it on the floor of the Senate.

I have only a few points I want to make in support of S. 1505.

Let me make very clear, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, that the objectives of S. 1093 find no opposition from me.

I try, however, to be a legislative realist, and you develop on this job somewhat of a legislative intuition or hunch, and I would like to have the next few weeks prove me wrong on this hunch.

It is my judgment that you are not going to get S. 1093 through this session of Congress, because when you come in with a bill as complex as S. 1093, and it goes into the whole question of classification, you do not do that the first time you step up to bat, and we have an emergency problem in regard to the teacher situation in the District of Columbia, in my judgment.

That is why I introduced S. 1505, and there is nothing about S. 1505 that cannot go along with the longtime objective of S. 1093.

But we need some immediate relief for these teachers. I testify, gentlemen, in several capacities; not only as a Member of the Senate, but as a past president of a parent-teachers group, and as one who taught for 21 years, and I want to call attention to what I think is a very great teacher problem in the United States.

We need not only in the District of Columbia but we need in other parts of the country some stopgap action, in order to stop the present loss of teacher personnel and in order to provide a greater inducement for able people to come into the teaching profession.

The morale of the teachers is not high—and why should it be—because we are not paying, in my judgment, the salaries that ought to be paid.

I think the salary situation in the District of Columbia has become so notorious that the first stopgap action we ought to take immediately is to simply say, "Listen, we are going to give you the preparation for your next year's pay check, a blanket $600 increase; not that we think that is enough, not that we think, that is the final answer, but we are going to give that to you immediately, and then we are going to continue to consider other needs of improvement in the educational system in the District so that we can make it a model setup or somewhere near a model setup for the Nation."

I think, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, that you are just confronted with that emergency situation in the District.

Furthermore, let me say that in my bill it closes somewhat the gap between the salaries of the administrative officers and teachers, and I think that needs to be done. I do not think we need the teachers to say that, and the administrators will not say that and, of course, the whole trend is the other way.

Yet the educational job is not being done by the administrators primarily; it is being done by the man and the woman in the classroom. They are the ones who are performing the fundamental educational service for the parents of America.

I think it is a mistake to let this disparity between so-called administrator salaries and teacher salaries continue to widen.

I was an administrator in an institution of higher learning, but I took the position in the operation of the college of which I was dean that that should not be this disparity between the teachers and the administrative officers.

I think it is a mistake that is being made in the American educational system. I do not think that administrators need a great bracket of difference between their salaries and teachers in order to maintain their prestige, and I do not think the service they render is worth at least as great a difference as we are paying them.

I think the money ought to go in greater amounts to the teachers who are the ones that are really giving our boys and girls the education they need.

I want to stress, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, the importance of spending money on teachers' salaries. To use an argument with an analogy, I want to stress it as a sound expenditure of defense dollars.

We do not think anything about paying $200 million for a Forrestal carrier. We do not think anything about paying $1 million for a jet bomber. We do not think anything about paying a good many millions of dollars by way of military aid to some ally. I am for those expenditures; I have voted for them. I have never, and never will as long as the world situation is what it is, vote to cut expenditures in the national defense. I think we ought to be spending more, not less, if we are going to protect our country.

What I want to emphasize is that we also need to keep our eyes on some other ideals, and that is we are going to keep ahead of Russia only to the extent that we keep ahead of her in brainpower; and you cannot put a dollar value on a nuclear physicist.

You cannot put a dollar value on a biochemist. You cannot put a dollar value on any trained mind in any discipline. But the fact is we are wasting brainpower in this country.

We, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, are denying right today in America thousands of American boys and girls a college education. There are thousands of American boys and girls—this has been going on for some years past—who are not getting a college education because we are not qualifying them for a college education. We are not giving them the training in grade schools and high schools that make it possible in many parts of this country to meet the capacity tests for college training.

That is an inexcusable waste of American brainpower. The cause of it, the chief cause of it, is that we are not giving the support to the schools and to the teachers to which they are entitled in order to train this brainpower.

When you, in various parts of the country, have boys and girls in grade schools going a short half day in school, in many high schools in this country, going a short half day to high school, and with all of your supplementary techniques of homework, and so on, the fact is they are getting discouraged as far as pursuing a higher education is concerned, and I do not know how many nuclear physicists we are losing.

I do not know how many biochemists we are losing; but we are losing a great number of trained minds, and we need them.

I think it is a parsimonious policy on the part of our country to fail to recognize that when you spend dollars for teachers' salaries, you are spending defense dollars.

I think those dollars will probably develop as much for the defense of our country as a *Forrestal* carrier will.

But, you see, the difficulty is to get the people to understand that. When you talk the way I am talking now, you are talking in the abstract; you are talking in terms of idealism, and many people do not see that the only practicalities we have, after all, are putting those ideals to work.

It seems to me the only answer to my bill on the negative side deserving of attention is the answer to the question, is there a need in the District of Columbia today for an increase in the salaries of our teachers in order to hold those that we have got, in order to induce those that we need.

If anybody can argue there is not, then they ought to vote against my bill. But if they admit my major premise then let us start with this as a stopgap.

We simply say just as an inducement, as an employment inducement, as a good employer relationship, "We offer you $600 for this next year, and we do not want you to feel that we are stopping with that. But we are going to hand out this $600 as a bonus inducement to get you to stay on the payroll or to come in, if we are trying to get you under contract," and we need that in this District.

We can go on, and you will find me in your corner when you come to wanting to get bills through for other improvements in the educational system of the District of Columbia.

I did not serve for 2 years out here at the Alice Deal High School as president of that parent-teacher group, not to learn something about the situation in our District schools.

It is not good; and this Congress has not anything particularly to be proud about in regard to the District of Columbia school system at the present time, and it is not the fault of the administrators. It is the fault of Congress.

We are the school board really, and simply suggest as a school-board member that we start out here with a $600 bonus, so-called, and then we move on to the next problem.

I close, Mr. Chairman, because I have got to go in and fight for another matter on the floor of the Senate, I close with a plea on my lips that we recognize the relationship between the defense of our country and the development of brainpower. You do not develop this brainpower unless you have got the teachers, and teachers with high morale, teachers well trained, teachers that can really see a future, and dedicating themselves to this very great public service.

I think it is about time that, as parent and as Congressmen, we stop letting our teachers down.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of Braddock's Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to take the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues that an important event in American history passed with little or no notice last Saturday. I refer to the defeat of the British general, Braddock, near Fort Duquesne, on July 9, 1755. To me this is an important turning point in our history and in the history of free men everywhere. This defeat gave the colonists confidence to rise up and throw off the shackles of colonialism. They saw that the British regulars could be defeated. They saw evidences of strong leadership among their own people when Colonel Washington was called to take over in an emergency. These factors played a role in the development of the spirit of the colonists which was to manifest itself later in the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War. I think it is an event worthy of annual recognition, and so that all of us can be apprised of the significance of that day, I want to make the following remarks a part of the RECORD.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BRADDOCK'S DEFEAT

Saturday, July 9, 1955, marked the 200th occurrence of the anniversary of a disaster. As we learned in our history books as children, it was on July 9, 1755, that the troops under Gen. Edward Braddock were defeated and routed by the French and Indians in the Battle of the Wilderness, near Fort Duquesne.

Braddock, a courageous general and a skilled strategist in the traditional European style, fell a victim to the unaccustomed hazards of Indian warfare, and to his own stubborn conceit. He had refused to take, or even to listen to, the advice of his subordinate officers, both British and Colonial, and the advice of such astute civilian critics as Benjamin Franklin.

Franklin himself, in his autobiography, has left us an account of his conversation with Braddock shortly before the beginning of the expedition which well illustrates that Biblical proverb:

> Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall.

Franklin had warned the general of the dangers he was about to encounter in these words:

> To be sure, sir, if you arrive well before Duquesne with these fine troops, so well provided with artillery, that place, not yet completely fortified, and, as we hear, with no very strong garrison, can probably make but a short resistance. The only danger I apprehend of obstruction to your march is from ambuscades of Indians, who, by constant practice, are dexterous in laying and executing them; and the slender line, near four miles long, which your army must make, may expose it to be attacked by surprise in its flanks, and to be cut like a thread into several pieces, which, from their distance, cannot come up in time to support each other.

"He smiled at my ignorance," Franklin remarks, "and replied: 'These savages may, indeed, be a formidable enemy to your raw American militia, but upon the King's regular and disciplined troops, sir, it is impossible they should make any impression.' "

The attack, when it came, did not take the form envisioned by Ben Franklin, but it is evident that such a "cutting of the thread" of the line of British regulars would have been possible almost anywhere along the route. Overconfidence had prevented Braddock from keeping sufficient scouting parties out along his flanks, from using to full advantage the Indians and frontiersmen available to him for this service, and from interpreting correctly the signs of the presence of many Indians that should have caused him to take extra precautions as the army drew near Fort Duquesne. To quote from Franklin's dramatic account of the attack:

> The enemy, however, did not take the advantage of his army which I apprehended its long line of march exposed it to, but let it advance without interruption till within 9 miles of the place, and then, when more in a body (for it had just passed a river where the front had halted till all had come over), and in a more open part of the woods than any it had passed, attacked its advance guard by a heavy fire from behind trees and bushes, which was the first intelligence the general had of an enemy's being near him. This guard being disordered, the general hurried the troops up to their assistance, which was done in great confusion, through wagons, baggage, and cattle, and presently the fire came upon their flank. The officers, being on horseback, were more easily distinguished, picked out as marks, and fell very fast; and the soldiers were crowded together in a huddle, having or hearing no orders, and standing to be shot at till two-thirds of them were killed; and then, being seized with a panic, the whole fled with precipitation.

After further description of the defeat, including the wounding of Braddock himself, the wounding or killing of numerous officers and men, and the panic flight of one contingent of the army after another, Franklin concludes:

> This whole transaction gave us Americans the first suspicion that our exalted ideas of the prowess of British regulars had not been well founded.

Thus was laid one of the seeds that later grew in the Revolutionary War. Braddock's defeat showed not only that British regulars could be thoroughly trounced by an army no more than equal to them in numbers, but also that the military methods familiar to the colonial troops in their Indian warfare were superior, in this terrain, to the traditional British methods. For this reason, we celebrate Braddock's defeat, even though our own troops were involved in it, as a forerunner of the American Revolution.

Another reason why we, as Americans, rejoice at this defeat, is that on this occasion the colonial militia showed to advantage in comparison with veteran British troops, their leaders in many cases acting with conspicuous gallantry as well as cool efficiency to retrieve whatever of men and supplies could be salvaged from this disaster. Outstanding among the colonial militia officers was the young Virginia colonel, George Washington, who, acting as aide to General Braddock, and, upon his receiving his mortal wound, as aide to Colonel Dunbar, contributed enormously to the restoring of order and the retreat without further loss from the field of battle. Washington, despite the fact that he was just recovering from a long and wasting siege of fever, so that he could barely sit his horse, earned on this day the gratitude of the British regulars and the admiration of his colonial countrymen.

The part George Washington played is well illustrated by Douglas Southall Freeman's description of one of the crises of the battle:

> Braddock at last realized that the hill must be wrested from the savages and that the two 6-pounders must be recaptured before they were turned against the bleeding British crowded in the road. He sent George off to find officers and to tell them to organize one party of 150 to charge up the hill and another party of like size to recover the cannon. In delivering these orders, George managed to stay in his saddle despite his weakness. During the action he had two horses shot under him, but he found another and skillfully made his way through the woods. His tall figure was a mark for hidden riflemen. One of them sent a bullet through his hat, another, a third, and still another slit his uniform with hot lead. He was conspicuous, in the generous words of the wounded Orme, for "the greatest courage and resolution," and, happily, thus far was unscathed.

It was Washington who, with Robert Stewart's assistance, got the wounded General Braddock safely across the river under fire and in danger from the crowding of terrorized fugitives. Washington then, as the only officer who both knew the country and was qualified to speak for General Braddock, had to ride back through the forest to carry to Colonel Dunbar the news of the defeat, and of Braddock's wound, and to give orders for the preservation of what remained of the army. So far back was Dunbar with his supply wagons and his inadequate number of horses that Washington was not able to reach his position until 10 the morning of July 10. After the rest which his exhausted body could no longer forego, Washington took an active part in assisting the reunion of the retreating Braddock and Dunbar and in carrying out the further orders of Braddock for the destruction of supplies and the organization of the continued retreat. When Braddock died of his wound on the evening of July 13, George Washington was entrusted with the duty of burying him. After directing the general's burial with all the military honors that circumstances permitted, Washington then had the wagons and the men on foot all pass over the grave so that its place could not be discovered by the enemy and Braddock's body mutilated and desecrated by the Indians. This device was successful, and Braddock's body was not found until in 1824 some men repairing a road discovered a skeleton which, from insignia of rank found with it, was taken to be that of General Braddock.

Washington's words about Braddock, written in 1786, seem a fair appraisal of his character from a man in the best position to judge:

> Thus died a man whose good and bad qualities were intimately blended. He was brave even to a fault and in regular service would have done honor to his profession. His attachments were warm, his enmities were strong, and having no disguise, both appeared in full force. He was generous and disinterested, but plain and blunt in his manner even to rudeness.

And thus rose, into the full light of early fame and honor in this country, a man whose full height of character can hardly be measured even yet, the brave and efficient young soldier who was to earn the title, "the Father of his Country."

A Bill to Relieve Burden on Federal District Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill which, if passed, will do much to relieve the burden of case work with which our Federal district courts are now confronted. This bill contains two provisions which will put the requirements on a more realistic basis for presenting a case in a Federal district court.

AMOUNT SET IN 1911

In order for a plaintiff to bring a civil action in a Federal district court at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the amount in controversy must be at least $3,000. This so-called jurisdictional amount was raised to $3,000 in 1911 in order to clear from Federal dockets many thousands of minor cases involving lesser amounts. I think it is clear, in terms of the value of today's dollar that this $3,000 figure has lost the meaning which it had nearly 45 years ago. By raising the sum in controversy to $10,000, an important step will be taken to modernize the Federal court procedure and to make it possible for these tribunals to focus attention on the more pressing cases. Not long ago Congress recognized the tremendous workload on the Federal courts and passed legislation providing for additional Federal judgeships. It seems to me that this provision in my bill would be another healthy step in the same direction.

WOULD CHANGE CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

The second provision in my bill provides, for purposes of obtaining jurisdiction in Federal courts, that a corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State where it has its principal place of business, as well as a citizen of the State in which it has been incorporated. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, a corporation is deemed to be a citizen only of the State in which it has been incorporated. It thus becomes possible for a corporation which is sued in the courts of the State in which it is located to get the action removed to a Federal district court in the State in which it has been incorporated. Very often, of course, this step is purely a dilatory tactic having the purpose of achieving some sort of favorable settlement. One can imagine how much chance a private individual has in such a situation when faced with a battery of top legal brains and the necessity of engaging in a suit perhaps thousands of miles from the place where the cause of action has arisen.

I do not believe that it is either fair or proper for a corporation to avoid trial in the State in which is operates its business by employing a legal device which is not available to the individual citizen.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is based on the necessity for relief of congested Federal dockets, especially in our larger metropolitan communities, and to reduce the number of cases which come into Federal district courts on the fictional premise that a diversity of citizenship exists.

I very much hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will support the provisions of this bill which seek to bring our American judicial system into line with the growing needs of our Nation.

The Wenzell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times contained a very interesting editorial on the Wenzell report, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including, herewith, a copy of that editorial, which should be read by each and every Member of the House:

THE WENZELL REPORT

From Washington on Saturday came the overdue news of where the Federal Government seems to have got its new Tennessee Valley Authority policy. It got it, presumably, from a report drawn up for the Budget Bureau in 1953 by Adolphe M. Wenzell, an investment banker, who had been called in as consultant.

Mr. Wenzell's opinion, at the time the report was made, was, in effect, that the Government should get out of the power business in the Tennessee Valley, turning that business over, by degrees, to private enterprise. The Government, under this plan, would remain in the flood control and navigation businesses, which are not directly remunerative. The Nation would thus be preserved from socialism of either the creeping or the galloping kind.

Mr. Wenzell is entitled to his opinions, past and present. TVA had had to resort increasingly to steam in order to firm up its waterpower. A private corporation would do the same. Honest men may and do differ as to where public power should stop. Congress might well debate the issue. It might even choose to modify the policy under which TVA has developed and by means of which a wave of prosperity has flowed down a long-neglected river channel.

But Mr. Wenzell, however pure his integrity, was associated with parties interested in expanding private power, for private profit. The Budget Bureau is an executive, not a legislative, agency. Finally, this whole enterprise of hamstringing TVA was undertaken in a left-handed, side-winding way which indicated a desire to avoid, not promote, full and informed discussion.

The Wenzell 1953 report, now available, sheds some light on the thinking that produced the Dixon-Yates power plan. But a little more light is needed.

In addition, I would like to include in my remarks a copy of the letter I have today addressed to the editor of the New York Times, setting forth certain specific questions raised in connection with the handling of the situation.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1955.

EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I read with much interest your excellent editorial on "The Wenzell Report," in this morning's New York Times.

I feel that a great deal more light is needed in this very important matter.

1. Was Mr. Wenzell's report the basis for President Eisenhower's statement that TVA is "creeping socialism," in spite of the support he voiced for TVA during his crusade?
2. Did the President know of this report in 1953, and if he did not, is he not chargeable with knowledge of it?
3. Was Mr. Eisenhower aware of the fact that Mr. Wenzell was associated with the First Boston Corp., a company necessarily and completely dedicated to private enterprise and big business?
4. Could Mr. Wenzell properly reflect the interests of the First Boston Corp., and the people of the country at the same time?
5. Were the statements that the Dixon-Yates contract would help TVA just so many platitudes for public sale and consumption?
6. Should not our Chief Executive have been more circumspect in ordering this private power contract in view of the Wenzell report, the circumstances surrounding same, and the rejection of the contract by a majority of the Atomic Energy Commission?

As an individual Member of Congress, I am deeply disturbed by all of these questions which as yet remain unanswered. In the midst of a great hue and cry, of much thunder and lightning of the need to get Government out of business, I have come to the conclusion that the sooner we get business out of Government the better off we will be.

I have seen no real benefits to the people in the continuation in public office of officials of General Motors, Quaker Oats, or even the First Boston Corp.

Sincerely yours,
LESTER HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

Should Social Security Coverage Be Extended?—Physicians, Dentists, and Lawyers Speak on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has been studying possible revision of the Social Security Act. The question of extending the coverage of the act has been considered in these deliberations.

In order to aid the committee, and the full House, in these debates, I conducted a poll among the physicians, lawyers, and dentists who reside or practice in the Fourth District of Wisconsin. It was my intent to ascertain to what extent do the members of these professions favor the inclusion of their groups in the Social Security Insurance System.

The results of this survey are very interesting and enlightening. Before I proceed to discuss them, however, I want to say a few words about the very fine cooperation which I received in this undertaking from the professional people in Milwaukee.

Sixty-three percent of the dentists contacted during the survey replied promptly to the questionnaire, and the returns from lawyers and physicians were 56 and 50 percent in that order.

This is a remarkable record as polls go, and it speaks highly of our people's deep and active interest in legislative issues. It also makes the results of the survey very meaningful and reliable as an indication of the thinking of the members of the three professions in my district.

My questionnaire contained the following three questions:

Should social-security coverage be extended to the members of your profession?

Should the members of your profession be polled to determine whether your group should be included in the Social Security System before the coverage is so extended?

If two-third of your membership vote for social-security coverage, should their decision be binding on the entire group?

Of the 215 dentists who sent in their views, 177—82 percent—favored social-security coverage, 29—14 percent—opposed it, and 9—4 percent—had no comment.

Further, 149—69 percent—dentists felt that the members of their profession ought to be polled before the coverage is extended to the group; 45—21 percent—were against the referendum principle; and 21—10 percent—were noncommittal.

Among the 1,078 lawyers polled, replies were received from 602. Of these, 480—80 percent—were for social security coverage, 96—16 percent—were against it, and 26—4 percent—indicated no preference.

Three hundred and eighteen—53 percent—lawyers favored the referendum, 218—36 percent—opposed it, and 66—11 percent—were noncommittal.

Three hundred and fifty-seven—59 percent—attorneys want the decision of the referendum to be binding on the entire profession, 168—28 percent—disagree with this approach, and 77—13 percent—have no opinion on this question.

Percentagewise, the physicians sent in least replies to the questionnaires. Nevertheless, 233—65 percent—physicians who replied favored coverage, while 107—30 percent—opposed it, and 20—5 percent—gave no indication of their feelings.

More physicians favored a referendum than an outright inclusion in the Social Security System; 265—73 percent—replies from this group contained a yes answer to the second question; 60—17 percent—physicians said no, and 35—10 percent—said nothing.

Finally, 213—59 percent—physicians felt that the referendum should be binding on the entire profession, while 112—31 percent—were of the opposing opinion; 35—10 percent—had no comment to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the results of the survey which I have just described will receive careful and close scrutiny. I want to commend them urgently to the attention of the membership of this body.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the States of the Colorado River Basin are beset with a problem of great magnitude and this problem is water. This region is fighting desperately for the right to develop and use the only remaining source of water available to them—the share of the Colorado River which belongs to the people of these States by law and by right. Without this water, our States simply cannot continue to grow and develop.

A part of the water of this same Colorado River has been apportioned to California. A large share of it goes to southern California where the rapidly growing industrial, agricultural and municipal economy very largely depends on it. This is as it should be and no one has any quarrel with their legitimate use of this water. We definitely want southern California to have what is rightfully hers. But we are disturbed, Mr. Speaker, and deeply disturbed by the use—or perhaps more perfect terminology would be, lack of use—to which southern California is putting a great deal of this vital water.

In southern California's Imperial Valley, down in the hot desert country below sea level, lies the Salton Sea. The Salton Sea is a dead sea, a salt lake with no outlet to the ocean. Into that mournful body of dead and waste water is pouring each year approximately 1¾ million acre-feet of good Colorado River water. That is more than two-thirds the total amount of Colorado River water now being used in the four upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The Salton Sea was dry at the beginning of this century, until the Colorado River flooded out of its course in 1905 and poured into this desert waste hole. Its level dropped steadily from the time the flood was brought under control, in 1907, until 1936 when the completion of Hoover Dam made vast quantities of Colorado River water available for irrigating Imperial Valley—and the waste waters from this operation poured into the Salton Sea.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous evaporation rate in that hot, below-sea-level climate would normally drop the level of the Salton Sea about 8 feet a year. But so much Colorado River water has been allowed to waste into it that the lake level has risen 12½ feet since 1936, and 5 feet since 1950. Since 1950 about 1¾ million acre-feet a year have run to waste in the Salton Sea.

We sympathize with southern California's water problems, Mr. Speaker, but other States have water problems too. This country cannot afford to waste millions of acre-feet of precious water.

We want to develop the water of the Colorado River for beneficial, life-giving use—through construction of the Colorado River storage project, and later through projects to divert water into Arizona and Nevada. I suggest that southern California put her own share of Colorado River water to beneficial use instead of trying to deny other States the use of their lawful quota of the waters of the Colorado River.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, since the fateful day when our beloved friend and colleague, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was stricken with a heart ailment and taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital, many editorials have been written about this great leader and statesman.

Of the hundreds of articles I have read, none touched me so deeply as that written by a mutual friend of ours, Mr. Tom S. Whitehead, publisher of the Brenham Banner-Press, of Brenham, Tex., in his column, the Spectator. Mr. Whitehead's tribute to and concern for Senator JOHNSON is so simply and beautifully expressed that I believe every Member of Congress would want to read it.

I therefore, under unanimous consent, include the article by Mr. Whitehead in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SPECTATOR—PRAYERS FOR LYNDON—THE PACE THAT KILLS—TRIBUTE TO HIS FRIENDS—HIS GREATEST FIGHT

Many Brenham and Washington County friends of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON are responding to the appeal of his colleague, Senator PRICE DANIEL, and are praying for recovery of the senior Senator of Texas. He lies critically ill in a naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., after a heart attack suffered last Saturday. He is definitely unable to resume his duties as majority leader in the United States Senate until next January. The future course of his political career hinges upon how complete a recovery he is able to gain.

Those of us who have known LYNDON JOHNSON for the last 18 or 20 years are shocked at his sudden collapse but not too surprised. A man cannot keep up the driving pace he has maintained during those years without suffering consequences. We first became acquainted with JOHNSON in 1937 when, upon the death of Congressman J. P. Buchanan, he resigned his position as NYA Administrator for Texas to enter the scramble for his seat in a special election. We observed the whirlwind tactics of the young political aspirant then. He lost no time in announcing for the job as a 100-percent supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He would get up at the crack of dawn, campaign all day and as far into the night as feasible, and then come by the Austin American office, where we worked, to check up on the news and the progress of the campaign. We recall one time when he started at the Congress Avenue bridge and made his way door to door all the way up to the capitol, shaking hands with every storekeeper and every clerk and helper he could find. As a matter of fact his ability to shake hands and get away with good grace was one of JOHNSON's political strong points. It enabled him to see hundreds if not thousands of voters in a day whereas a less able campaigner would get stuck with long-winded conversationalists and could count a day's contacts only in the scores.

That first campaign for Congress was a dilly. There were 8 or 9 candidates for the office, many of them already well known. On the other hand, JOHNSON was not too well known to the voters and he had to become acquainted with them within the 30-day campaign. He did such a good job, however, that a week before the election we made a tour of the district, asking people whom they thought would win, and found the weight of public opinion favored JOHNSON. We predicted his election over the field. Although he finished the campaign in the hospital, having to undergo an appendix operation, he won handily and started his meteoric rise in the political world.

Although JOHNSON is only 46, tall, dark, and handsome, he has been plagued with ailments at crucial points in his career. We recall one campaign for reelection to Congress when JOHNSON was laid low with gallstones. His faithful wife, Ladybird, took the stump in his behalf and made a very favorable impression on the voters. He was, of course, reelected. He has had recurrent trouble from the stones, but a checkup at

Mayo Clinic early this year revealed he was in good physical condition.

However, JOHNSON's enthusiasm for his job and his desire to do all he can for his constituents have led him to overtax his physical makeup. Dutch Hohn can testify to that. We recall when Dutch was Washington County agent. He invited Lyndon down to tour the county and explain the newly enacted cotton allotment program. The two made a community-by-community tour of the entire county, speaking to groups wherever they could be found. The day was hot as blazes, but that didn't slow up the Congressman. He even stopped on the roadside to help a woman repair a flat tire. By nightfall, Dutch was pooped, but Lyndon was still going strong. Of course, since JOHNSON has become United States Senator, his duties have greatly increased. His responsibilities have been tremendous, but he has discharged them well, even at the possible cost of his own life.

Senator JOHNSON has always been wise in the choice of his aids and fortunate in the number and devotion of his friends. Many of them have worked incessantly in his behalf, paced by the Senator himself. We recently wrote about this in our column, commenting on the possibility of his being the next Democratic nominee for President. Only last week we received a letter from the Senator in which he said: "I appreciate what you said about me in your column on June 20 and I appreciate even more what you said about my friends. It is certainly true that my greatest strength is in my friends. I am the most fortunate man in the world in this respect."

But now, LYNDON JOHNSON has reached a point where he is beyond the help of his friends, anxious as they are to do whatever they can. They can only offer their prayers and hope for the best. It is up to Lyndon himself, the skill of the doctors, and providence. But knowing Lyndon as we do—his joy of living, his desire to keep on helping his country and his friends, his determined will—we predict he will win this greatest fight of his life and return once more to the position of power and greatness to which his ability, his efforts, and destiny have brought him. At least, that is our sincere hope.

Poland and the Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter recently received from the Polish American Congress, Inc., Division of Michigan, and my reply thereto. It expresses my views in regard to the proposals President Eisenhower should make concerning the nations behind the Iron Curtain at the forthcoming conference at Geneva.

The letters follow:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
DIVISION OF MICHIGAN,
Detroit, Mich., July 1, 1955.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: On Tuesday, July 12, 1955, representatives of organizations composed of Americans of Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Slovakian extraction will convene at the Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit at 7:30 p. m.

To our knowledge, this is the first time that these nationality groups will meet jointly in the cause of freedom and liberation of the countries of their forefathers presently enslaved by communism.

A resolution will be adopted, to be transmitted to President Eisenhower, requesting that he champion the cause of freedom of all nations behind the Iron Curtain at the conference of the Big Four in Geneva, and hasten the day of liberation of the peoples who today are subjugated and living under a tyrannical communistic regime.

We respectfully request the honor of your presence at this historical meeting and permission to introduce you to the groups assembled. You will not be required to speak.

Very truly yours,
INVITATIONS COMMITTEE,
MICHAEL G. BIDA,
ANTON BENESZ,
MITCHELL S. JACHIMSKI,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1955.

Mr. MITCHELL S. JACHIMSKI,
Chairman, Invitations Committee,
Polish American Congress, Inc.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. JACHIMSKI: Pressing and important official business makes it impossible for me to be present on the occasion of the meeting on July 12 at the Veterans' Memorial Building, but, however, it must be generally known that I stand in the forefront among those who demand restoration of full sovereignty to all of the nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Russia should be made to pay not only actual but punitive indemnities in cash, machinery, raw materials, and the restoration of every foot of terrain which she has treacherously taken from her defenseless neighbors. Poland's obliterated boundary with Rumania should be fully restored for the reestablishment of the friendly intercourse between these two nations. Poland's eastern boundaries should not only be restored to prewar status, but your conference should also go on record for securing forever the Oder-Neisse western boundary of a reconstituted Poland with absolute guaranties for Poland's retention of the mineral-rich Silesian territory, the Sudetenland, and such other mutilations of Czechoslovakian territory should be restored and guaranteed inviolate by the Big Four and NATO. I repeat, the perpetrators of World War II, both Germany and Russia, should be compelled to rebuild, restore, and replace all destruction and plunder.

Germany and Austria, two enemy countries, ironically, are recognized as free and sovereign, except for the part known as East Germany, which is dominated by the Russians. Relations between our former enemies and ourselves have been established from the highest level to the diplomatic and consular functions, all to the great advantage of our former enemies and to the detriment of our allies, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and others.

Your conference should boldly and formally demand that if and when the satellite nations are freed they should, as a matter of common honesty, decency, and fair dealing, be entitled to the same assistance dollar for dollar which we, particularly the United States, have granted to Germany, who, as the perpetrator of the greatest crime in history, now seems destined to be the greatest beneficiary.

These views apply with equal force and favor to Ukrainia, where in 1 year, for liberty's sake, more than 6 million people, mostly farmers and producers, were murdered by the Russian Communists or were systematically starved to death by and for communism. But this mass-murder plan failed. It was without effect, except to harden the determination among the patriotic, liberty-loving Ukrainian people to become democratic, free, and independent. There are more than 40 million souls in the Ukraine who yearn for liberation and are ready to lay down their lives in proof of their determination. Their differences with their neighbors are relatively small by comparison to liberty and can be reconciled for the main objectives and the good of all.

Russia and communism are decidedly weakened instead of being strengthened by the Iron Curtain shroud placed around their smoldering, resentful satellites. Russia's treachery and consistent betrayal of her Slavic neighbors for 1,000 years make her the undying and everlasting enemy of her neighbors and the foe of Slavdom, Christianity and democracy forever. Add to this the godless Marxian socialism we know as communism, which Russia has foisted upon her Christian God-fearing neighbors, and she must find a means of insulating herself against the Western World, that is exclusive of Germany, with whom she will always find a way to deal and collaborate or more properly stated conspire to prepare another blood bath for civilization. Russia will always try to retain enough pawns like a subjugated Poland, Czechoslovakia, or other countries, with the ignorant approval of the West, to save herself for future and more heinous crimes. "Defense in depth" for Russia was abandoned at Stalingrad on the long breathless marathon run toward Vladivostok and the far-off Pacific where more Russian soldiers died because of loss of breath and exhaustion than were ever killed by German gunfire. In fact, the Germans lost contact with the Russian rear until they reached Stalingrad, where American beans, butter, and bread, along with buckshot, barbed wire, and baled hell piled mountain high, stalled the onslaught of the Hun juggernaut. The Russian armies were saved from extermination by exhaustion over the wastes of Siberia or ultimate drowning in the far-off Pacific Ocean by American food and war materiel which reached them in time, but they were not helped by the theory of "defense in depth."

Now the Russian Communist plan is to seal off a tier of subjugated satellite states by insulation with another tier of so-called neutral states, as she succeeded in doing recently under the Austrian Treaty, to make permanent and secure the communism which is not as yet the dominant factor in the world of today or even in the Eastern Hemisphere. The plan of insulation, added to the Iron Curtain move to which the Western World pays little or no heed, might well be the death knell of Christianity, democracy, and civilization.

These subjects must be fully covered in your conference action, for I believe the views expressed in this communication are of vital importance, and should concern the conference in its deliberations and final decision. The administration and President Eisenhower should be forthright, fearless, and fair in determining a policy and future course which for a certainty will lead to the liberation of 100 million or more enslaved Europeans, most of whom are your brethren and mine of Slavic antecedents.

Your conference should finally and fully go on record for a positive and unequivocal stand initiated and sponsored by President Eisenhower at the Geneva Conference to build a strong tier of nations beginning with Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania, and possibly Austria, as a tier of insulation between the two arch conspirators, Germany and

Russia, and thus preserve peace and prosperity as long as such a central European barricade can be kept friendly and active.

I am attaching a copy of my speech delivered on the floor of the House on May 3, 1944, Polish Constitution Day. I respectfully call your attention to my views therein relating to the western boundary of Poland and to Germany's responsibility, but this has now been expanded to include the Russians for their bloody depredations.

If President Eisenhower is anxious about the safety, security, and future of the countries behind the Iron Curtain the suggested proposals are the least he can do.

With best wishes for a fruitful conference, I subscribe myself,

Cordially and sincerely yours.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the adoption of the document known as the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, an instrument which ranks as a historic document along with the Magna Carta and the American Constitution, as a bill designed to safeguard the interests, the happiness, and the freedom of its people. A great deal has already been said of the intent and the far-reaching effect of the Polish Constitution, so I shall not go into further treatment of this subject.

I might state in passing on to the subject matter of my discourse, that I am happy in the thought that the inauguration by me of the Polish Constitution Day program of the House of Representatives has become an accepted and an annual event with an ever-growing interest among the Members. The popularity of the program, intended to bring to the mind of America the glory and the greatness of Poland, is established by the ever-increasing number of speakers on these occasions.

The subject of Poland and her welfare as it may bear upon the future peace of the world is something in which we Americans are deeply interested. The errors of the reestablishment of Poland after the last war must not be repeated again. Poland must not only be reestablished and revitalized but she must be made strong and independent with a democratic government which will assure to her all the rights and privileges which we in America hold as God-given and inalienable. For Poland to be independent rather than dependent, for Poland to be made strong rather than weak, for Poland to be made democratic rather than despotic or bureaucratic, she must of necessity have the right to choose her own government in a free and a democratic way. She must be permitted not only to retain every inch of her 1939 territory, but she must likewise acquire additional liberated and traditionally Polish territory which has been taken from her by a treacherous and a persistent foe over the centuries.

Poland's boundary should be extended to the west at the expense of the aggressor Germans. Her western boundary should begin at the eastern bank of the Oder River and should run due south from and including the port of Stettin to a point which touches the old Czechoslovakian border. On the western side of the river there should be provided a demilitarized zone for a depth of 50 miles paralleling the Polish and Czechoslovakian littoral and policed at Germany's expense by a Polish-Czechoslovakian Army for a period of at least two generations. All of East Prussia, historically Polish and peopled by a great number of Poles, should promptly revert to a reconstituted Poland. Over and above that, the aggressor Germans should be compelled to pay an indemnity sufficient to restore all of the destruction within this unfortunate country. The aggressors should be obliged to pay in addition a punitive indemnity which would permit the Poles to reestablish themselves at or about the level which they might have enjoyed were it not for these periodic and unwarranted incursions by a plunderbund bent on rapine, destruction, plunder, and enslavement of a people whose history antedates in that part of Europe the history of their traditional enemies.

Germany must be made to restore and return all that she has destroyed and stolen even if it takes a hundred years of compulsory labor of her blustering and bloated militarists. If needs be, this element within Germany should be chained to a wheelbarrow and made to return not only the stolen gold, art treasures, and literary works, but also the sacred wares pilfered from the altars and the bells stolen from the churches and shrines of her neighbors. The fiendish and almost inconceivable thievery by the Germans of the fertile topsoil of the subjugated countries should make an endless and a timeless parade of wheelbarrows radiating in all directions from Germany as it is being returned to the nations which were so despoiled.

The concessions to be made to Poland in the west should not depend upon the pleasure of the Soviet Government. Poland is entitled to proper recompense without consulting her eastern ally. She expects no more and she is entitled to no less than the moral and the wholehearted support of Russia in this matter. As to the eastern boundary, the 1939 Polish boundary should be maintained inviolate. It should have been sacred and inviolate. The boundary was protected not only by pre-1939 treaties but also by a post-1939 agreement. It is moreover sustained by history as just and proper. It is Polish historically and to a great extent ethnographically. The greatest single element all through this disputed territory is Polish in language, religion, and custom. There are relatively few Russians to be found in this section. It is incomprehensible to me, as it is to millions of Americans, that Russia would insist upon what she acquired by a direct violation of her pledged word. After administering to Poland what America should remember as the original and the all-important stab in the back—for it was following the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement that Germany attacked Poland and was shortly thereafter similarly treated by her Russian neighbor—to think that today Russia finds fault with the Polish Government in exile when, as a matter of fact, that government ought to object to the unfriendly government at Moscow. Russia seems to have a distorted concept about who is the aggrieved party.

Russia is today treating Poland as an enemy, not as an ally. Russia, in fact, shows a disposition to be more temperate with her outright enemies who attacked her. Certainly Poland, attacked by Russia after a Russian agreement with Germany, and which it must forever be borne in mind precipitated the bloodbath for the whole world, cannot now be expected to cede territory to her aggressor neighbor to the east. If there are to be any concessions, and as yet I do not believe that Poland has demanded any, the Soviet Government should be prepared to yield territory and substantial indemnities. The so-called liberation of Poland by the Russian armies is a mockery. Poland would not have needed Russian liberation if it were not for Russian betrayal of not only Poland but all of the Slavic countries. If the demands of the Soviet Government, unjustified and sinful as they are, are forced upon her traduced neighbor, the Polish people will be impoverished to the point of total dependency.

The Poles are a proud and an intelligent people. They do not ask charity. They will not eat humble pie. They naturally will resent such proffers from a country which they cannot trust. Poland will die; she will be obliterated from the face of the earth if needs be, but she will not surrender principle and we in America can understand her attitude. She will live or die as a freeman, not as a slave or a satellite. The addition of the disputed Polish provinces mean everything to Poland and her future. The great bulk of her wealth and of natural resources, such as timber, minerals, and oil, lie to the east. She cannot subsist without them for to her they are indispensable, they mean strength and vitality, freedom and permanence. In area it approximates 50 percent of her 1939 terrain. To Russia, on the other hand, the acquisition of the territory means in depth or in area but a mere fraction of what Russia already possesses, as in this war it was proven that the additional terrain does not mean additional safety for the Soviet. Russia will derive far more benefit economically and from the standpoint of safety by aiding in the reestablishment of a stronger, self-sufficient, and independent Poland than she would by a land grab and the acquisition at the expense of Poland of the natural resources in the disputed area.

If America and Great Britain, and their allies, permit Poland's further despoilment, it will mean for a certainty another war at some time in the future. The Poles will not be subjugated, they will not be enslaved, and Poland some day will live once again. That Poland is the key to the future peace and security of all Europe was proven in this war. Had Poland been sustained and supported, had she been given proper aid within boundaries that were extended to include millions of additional Poles, and had East Prussia been ceded to the newly created Polish Republic, the story might have been entirely different. Even so, the world will forever remember, and we in America will always appreciate and recognize the fact that Poland was the first to challenge the foe, that she laid down her life to save civilization, Christianity, and perhaps all mankind from German enslavement. This she has done, as history records, on more than one occasion. Concededly she is the bulwark of Christianity and in Europe the keystone in the arch of peace. Poland desires to live in peace and harmony with her neighbors. That includes Russia, her Slavic sister, who has betrayed her into the hands of her enemies, but she cannot do so at the price of servile submission and permanent subjection.

Poland knows only too well that the terms and the conditions offered by Russia mean positive and absolute conversion to Godless Communist despotism. Freedom, independence, and Christianity—these she cannot forsake and these she will not give up even if she must once again become a martyr to the cause for which she fought so valiantly. More than once before she was bruised, battered, and beaten, and her boundaries were rubbed out by a combination of her enemies who could not dominate her, who were jealous of her progress, and she has, like the good Lord whom the people of Poland have served so well and faithfully, risen from her grave and taken her place among the nations of the world.

The proof of Poland's vitality and faithfulness to an ideal, even while she is enslaved and in chains, can be proved in a thousand and one instances in her sorrows and suffering, but practically and particularly in the fact that to date she has not weakened, has not faltered or produced a single Quisling. Similarly, she has repudiated the pro-Russian expatriate, Warda Wasielewskaya; the doubtful and subservient Soviet sympathizers, Prof. Oscar Lange and the Reverend Stanislaws Orlemanski, who soiled his sacerdotal robes of priesthood to kowtow to Stalin, and the others who betrayed the Polish people and the Roman Catholic Church into the hands of their enemies.

The unbroken authority of the Polish Government in exile will withstand the sinister and unwarranted challenge of the Communist regime at Moscow. The recognized

Government of Poland, functioning on English soil, deserves the wholehearted support of the entire civilized world. It is not antagonistic to any other government. It can only be, and positively is pro-Polish and that is precisely what is wrong with the officials in the eyes of Stalin and Molotov. Russia's desire is to implant within the borders of Poland a pro-Soviet Communist government subservient to the views and wishes of Moscow, but the average intelligent Pole, wherever he might be found, would prefer martyrdom and death of his country to the sacrifice of an ideal, of a sacred principle.

America, and I trust the world, will understand the noble aspirations of the Poles and, at the proper time, will sustain them. The best evidence of the caliber and character of Poland and her valiant sons and daughters is to be found in the glorious pages of her past history, and more especially, in the brilliant defense of her terrain which was a true symbol of her defense of all that we in this country, in our hearts, hold near and dear, and for which millions of our young men and women have undertaken to bare their breasts to the fire of the same common enemy.

Poland was always an ally of the United States of America. In this role she has never permitted a break. Russia is an ally of the United States today only because she has fallen out with her erstwhile German ally, who with violent treachery turned upon her as the Soviet Government turned upon an unsuspecting and innocent Poland. Were it not for the German attack upon Russia, the Communists here and abroad would still be shouting that this is an imperialist war. Our American people are too intelligent and the world is too well civilized to accept Russian propaganda.

Sugar Act Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, much misleading information has been put out concerning the proposal to extend and revise the Sugar Act of 1948 this year. Because I think it is of great importance, not only to our domestic sugar producing areas, but to the country as a whole, that this should be done, I would like to address myself primarily to some of the arguments which have been used against the proposal. Last week I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and filed a statement on this same subject. In the remarks to appear herewith, I will follow that statement almost verbatim.

I appear in support of H. R. 5406, having introduced an identical bill, H. R. 5443. Of course, the State which it is my privilege to represent has vested interest in this legislation. We are not one of the largest producing States in the Nation, but the sugar-beet industry is very important to our economy. Sugar beets represented 20 percent of the cash income crop in Wyoming in 1954, according to Department of Agriculture figures. It is not only important to us as farming commodity, but affects practically every other segment of our economy, including labor and business, which is practically all small business in Wyoming. Just to give you some idea of this, the farmer received approximately $6½ million for his crop. Payrolls of the sugar factories in 1954 represented $2 million. Freight payments by truck and railroad amounted to $1½ million. Two and one-half million were accounted for by sugar-refinery purchases of coal and various other industrial supplies. This totals $12½ million, but is really only a fraction of what could be developed, and if we were to arrive at the true realistic total, we would have to take into account the equipment purchased by the farmer and the food and other items purchased by farmers and factory workers, and those indirectly concerned. This will give you some idea of the importance of this to our economy.

I am not here, however, to make an appeal for special consideration for my State, nor any other State. I think this is good sound legislation, for the best interest of the country as a whole, and when I say the country as a whole, I mean of the farmers, businessmen, laborers, and the consumers.

Although the statement has apparently been criticised, I still think the question before this committee and the Congress can be simply boiled down to the proposition of, is the American farmer to be allowed to share in the growth and progress of America. No matter how one attempts to sidestep the issue, that is what must be decided.

I have attended a good portion of the hearings and have had a representative present at almost all others. We have attempted to secure copies of those statements made available to us. Speaking of facts, I think that most of the pertinent facts are in the record, and have been presented very fairly and ably by representatives of the growers and the domestic industry. I see nothing to be accomplished by reviewing these facts. I am confident that if they are weighed on the basis of fairness and historical evidence, and what is best for the overall American citizen, then this legislation is certain to be passed by the committee and by the Congress.

As we have followed these hearings, however, we have noted that some questions have come up which seem to be left more or less hanging in the air. It is my opinion that the time allotted to me could best be used in touching briefly on some of these points which more frequently appeared.

In the first place, there seems to be some effort made to tie this program to the issue of high rigid versus flexible price supports. I think it is obvious on the surface, that the situation pertaining to the principal basic commodities and the situation that pertains to sugar in the United States are not comparable for the simple reason that in the case of most of the basics, we have a surplus raised in the United States over what is consumed in the United States; whereas in the case of sugar, we are dealing with a commodity where our domestic production is approximately one-half of our consumption. I voted in favor of flexible price supports. Before doing so, I tried to give honest consideration to the other proposals. My vote was based on what I believe to be in the best interest of the American farmer and the American economy in general. I am confident that others, who voted otherwise, to a large measure, voted because of similar convictions. I certainly respect the opinions of those who disagree with me, and only time will tell which of us is correct. Certainly this committee should and will consider this legislation on its merits, and on the basis of what is best for the American farmer, the American economy, and the overall American otherwise, without permitting the legislation to be prejudiced by side issues.

Let me state that my constituents and myself are extremely interested in a selfish way in the basic crop which is a matter of greatest concern. Of course, I refer to wheat. Reference has been made to the living-room approach in connection with the restrictions on imports by quotas. If the approach with regard to sugar is a living room, then certainly our policy as to wheat, in which my constituents are also directly interested, and most of the other basic commodities, is that of a closed-door policy. With certain limited exceptions, we permit no importations, and this is as it should be, for we are raising presently in the United States, more of these commodities than we can consume.

Considerable comment has been made about the awful subsidy attached to this program. This, in my humble opinion, is not a subsidy in the sense that the word is commonly used in America today, but is a production payment made to the American producer in lieu of tariff. I think all of us must agree that the American producer cannot pay high wages or other high costs of production, nor can we in America continue to advance our standard of living, and still compete with foreign producers, whether we produce sugar, automobiles, bicycles, textiles, cotton, wool, livestock, toys, oil, coal, or almost any other commodity that you can think of. The Sugar Act took us from high tariffs to the quota procedure, with payments to growers, primarily to benefit Cuba. The whole sugar problem is a tariff problem and not a price support problem. Just as a further example, some members of this committee and myself have common interests in the livestock industry. We take great pride that our livestock producers have refused to seek price supports. On the other hand, if we were to suddenly throw open the Mexican border and drop all barriers to importation of Argentine beef, it would be but a short time before domestic industry was completely demoralized. I can continue to draw similar parallels with other commodities. The facts showed that the sugar program has not operated to the detriment of the consumer, but rather to his benefit.

In connection with the problem as to basic commodities, may I also point out that this revision of the Sugar Act will help to solve some of the problems pertaining to acreage cuts on the basic commodities. I know of instances in my own State where the reason that some of our veterans, who have been on projects for long enough to have acquired a sugar history since World War II, but have not, is caused mainly because they could grow certain basic commodities, at a guaranteed price, with less investment and less work. By permitting them to grow sugar beets now, we will ease the pain as far as the acreage restrictions are concerned on wheat; not only on them, but on other wheat growers.

It has been inferred that we cannot ease off on acreage controls every time we feel a pinch, or we will have a chaotic farm program. This might be true generally, but we certainly can increase the acreage allotments on sugar when we have a crop which we do not domestically produce in surplus, and when we can do so without taking it away from anyone else, as I will subsequently point out. I should also like to mention that during my short service in Congress, I have had occasion to vote for acreage increases for the small tobacco producer, rice producer, cotton farmer, and, I believe, peanut farmer, even though these are crops in which there is a domestic surplus. Certainly it is not fair to infer that there is no compassion in our souls for others while we ask special privileges, when all we are asking is for a share in the growth of America for our sugar producer and are willing to give and pay higher domestic prices in order to maintain our American standard of living, et cetera, with regard to the entire domestic consumption of other commodities.

I was somewhat amazed by the sweeping statements made on the part of some domestic industries, who apparently felt that they were best serving their own interests by suggesting that everything should be given to the foreign interests. In connection with this, I should like to compliment and thank the representatives of foreign interests other than Cuba for the very fair and fine statements which they have made. I certainly hope that they shall be given favorable consideration for a greater share in the foreign quota. As concerns domestic interests, who made statements to the opposite effect, I would again like to point out that they cannot, over the long haul, compete with lower labor and other production costs in foreign countries any better than can the American sugar producers. Within the last week, I have received a letter from one of my constituents wanting to know why he could not buy truck tractors from Canada without paying a 10 percent duty. I could very well use a new car. I might very well be driving an Italian Fiat, or a German Volkswagen, or a British Austin, if we were to remove the 10 percent duty. I am not suggesting that this be done, because I believe in preserving the American standard of living and protecting the American worker and businessman, but I might suggest that the same consideration be given our sugar farmers, laborers, and businessmen. I have some figures available, if anyone is interested, on what the small population in Wyoming alone buys in some of these commodities. Certainly if our economy is strong, the ability of the domestic market to purchase must be preserved. It is rather interesting to note that one of the companies whose representative appeared before this committee minimizing the importance of the domestic producer only very recently contacted me in an entirely different vein. The State which I represent was thinking of going into a machine accounting system. The Wyoming representative of this company approached me with the request that I speak to the Governor about giving his company an opportunity to be considered. At that time, I was led to believe that this was a very important piece of business to the company generally. May I remind this company that a good portion of the taxes that must be raised to pay for these machines, when and if they are bought, must come from Wyoming sugar beet producers and others directly and indirectly connected with the industry. The main argument seems to be centered around the obligation we have to Cuba. I think that it is established beyond contradiction that we have no legal obligation, which this bill seeks to controvert. Cuba will be left with her full quota before World War II, plus virtually all the increased consumption up to the present date, plus whatever share of the historic 45 percent foreign production that is eventually allotted to her by this committee and this Congress. The argument that we are cutting down on her is simply without basis or fact. We cannot be charged with disrupting her economy, for we do not propose to buy less from her, but continually more. The records of previous hearings and committee reports have been quoted for this record, and certainly established that Cuba had a right to expect that the domestic producers would reenter the market for their historic share as soon as they had recovered from the various effects of wartime dislocations. Cuba entered the market during wartime and supplied us over and beyond her historic quotas. Naturally we were gratified at this. On the other hand, they have been repaid well, and to say that they are entitled to more consideration is to completely overlook the primary fact that we fought and financed a war that benefited Cuba just as well as the rest of the world. I remember a Puerto Rican regiment in North Africa, and a Brazilian division in Italy, but to the best of my knowledge, no Cuban blood was spilled on foreign soil. I think we cannot disregard the interest of the American farmer, and particularly the debt that we owe to the veteran who took one of our reclamation farms in Wyoming and other Western States, and is now denied any sugar beet production under the present law.

Yes, Cuba was well repaid for contributing to our war effort by producing sugar—at a profit—while we fought a war—at a loss. Cuba has had all our increase in domestic consumption since the beginning of World War II, added to their basic quota at that time. The Cuban import quota increased from roughly 1,900,000 tons in 1940 to 2,668,000 tons in 1955. Under our bills we would take 188,000 tons out of the 200,000 estimated increase in consumption this year, and share the balance. Therefore, Cuba's quota for 1955 might well be as high as 2,673,000 tons. The argument that we would be taking something away from Cuba this year does not stand up in this light.

As far as I am concerned, the argument fails that we even have a moral obligation to Cuba in connection with this. If this Government, and this Congress, has a moral obligation to anyone, it is to these veterans, who are suddenly denied a right to produce. They have obligated themselves to pay for the expensive machinery now used on a sugar-beet farm. Unless we do something about this law and do it now, we are saying to them, "We made available to you a small 160-acre farm. We encouraged you to sign the repayment contract to pay back the cost of irrigation. We stood by while you invested in this machinery and gave a boost to the American factory worker. Now we are no longer interested in you. You cannot grow a cash crop. For all we care you can lose your machinery. You can lose your farm, and your family can go begging."

If there is any moral obligation involved in this legislation, in my humble opinion, it is to these veterans.

Let us look at the moral obligation statements from yet another angle. Throughout these hearings it has been pointed up that the reason for the 1948 Sugar Act amendments was to give the American farmer a chance to build back his production curtailed by the war, and to allow Cuba to scale down her production gradually to gear it to a postwar economy over a period of 5 years rather than take an abrupt drop in quota. There lies a moral obligation on the part of Cuba. Cuba has not lived up to the spirit of the agreement, nor made any recognizable attempt to live up to it. She has each year increased her acreage, and each year increased her production. Cuba, then, is in the peculiar position of charging the wronged party with a moral obligation that cannot exist in the light of her refusal to comply with the spirit of the agreement made possible by the generosity and understanding of the domestic producers and the Philippine producers.

I have one more salient point. I have always tried, throughout my legislative experience, to decide issues on the basis of principle. The principle involved here is that the American citizen, whether he be a farmer, laborer, a shipowner, or a lawyer, is certainly entitled to benefit from his own enterprise and his own initiative—he is certainly entitled to a share in the growth of America. This is the principle involved in the 50-50 provision of S. 2090 adopted on the floor of the House last week, to give the American shipowner a chance to take a half share of the shipping of American products abroad. When my Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation wired me to oppose this proposal, I immediately contacted them by telephone to tell them that I considered the principle involved—exactly the same principle we are fighting for in attempting to get the sugar bill passed—the right of the American to participate in the growth of America.

I supported the 50-50 provision for American shipowners and sailors. It was adopted by an overwhelming division vote. I think the House will follow the same principle as applied to our sugar industry if allowed an opportunity.

I urge that H. R. 5406 be given prompt and favorable consideration in the interests of the American farmer, the American economy, and the overall general American interest, both with regard to domestic and foreign relations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, July 11, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come in the assurance not of our feeble hold of Thee, but of Thy mighty grasp of us. We thank Thee for the sweet refreshment of sleep, restoring the frayed edges of care, and for the beckoning glory and the fresh vigor of the new day. Whatever the toiling hours of this day upon which we have entered may bring, O Thou great companion of our souls, keep our hearts with Thee as in quiet confidence we face the vexing social problems which our fallible judgments, without a wisdom greater than our own, are unable to solve.

In spite of all the organized ill will of this sadly sundered earth, send us forth, we pray Thee, as heralds of good will determined to cross all the barriers of race and creed, so that we may make our contribution to the glad day when justice and understanding shall engirdle this worn and weary earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 7, 1955:

S. 391. An act to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

On July 8, 1955:

S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

On July 11, 1955:

S. 107. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court, and the salary of the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1725. An act to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 216)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message and accompanying report, see House proceedings for today.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations or mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEREXPENDITURE OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overexpenditure of an appropriation within the Federal Housing Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition, from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., signed by Joseph F. Barr, national commander, relating to legislative riders to specific bills before the Congress, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

HIGHWAY LEGISLATION—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the city council of St. Paul, Minn., on July 7, 1955, urging the Congress to take action on highway legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is the conviction of this governmental body that the proposed accelerated Federal highway program will be of general benefit to the citizenry of this community and State, as well as to the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas it is essential that steps be taken to improve our obsolete streets and roads to expedite the flow of commerce, to assure safer transportation, and to provide adequate arteries for vehicular movement if needed for the defense of our country; and

Whereas the modernization of our highways is of national importance and urgent need: Be it therefore

Resolved, That for these reasons this city council of the city of St. Paul, Minn., does advocate that this session of the Congress of the United States take action to assure increased Federal funds for highway purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Wolodymyr Krysko (Rept. No. 768);

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond (Rept. No. 769);

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin; (Rept. No. 770);

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas; (Rept. No. 771);

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek; (Rept. No. 772);

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Sumie Legasse (Rept. No. 773);

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland (Rept. No. 774);

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Domenico Bompiani (Rept. No. 775);

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Gerassimo Troianos (Rept. No. 776);

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko (Rept. No. 777);

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball (Rept. No. 778);

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos (Rept. No. 779);

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose (Rept. No. 780);

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma (Rept. No. 781);

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Maria Anna Coone (Rept. No. 782);

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton (Rept. No. 783);

S. 1540. A bill for the relief of Edith Kahler; (Rept. No. 784);

H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of Marianne Anita Zelinka (Rept. No. 785);

H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Savarese (Rept. No. 786);

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo M. Gomez (Capaz); (Rept. No. 787);

H. R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts (Rept. No. 788);

H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Craig Newell (Rept. No. 789);

H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Dicran Simon (Rept. No. 790);

H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of Salvacion Carbon (Rept. No. 791);

H. R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Gualberto Estralla Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro (Rept. No. 792);

H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino (Rept. No. 793);

H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Kim Dong Su (Rept. No. 794);

H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Barbara Knape (Rept. No. 795);

H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Elena Gigliotti (Rept. No. 796);

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Margarete Gartner (Rept. No. 797);

H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Eufemia Bencich (Rept. No. 798);

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Samson (Rept. No. 799);

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Bengt Wikstam (Rept. No. 800);

H. R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Florentino Munoz (Rept. No. 801);

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D. (Rept. No. 802);

H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski (Rept. No. 803);

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Mihai Indig (Rept. No. 804);

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin (Rept. No. 805);

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Frank Scriver (Rept. No. 806);

H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir (Rept. No. 807);

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald (Rept. No. 808);

H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy (Rept. No. 809);

H. R. 3560. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 810);

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta) (Rept. No. 811); and

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg (Rept. No. 812).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst (Rept. No. 813);

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz (Rept. No. 814);

S. 602. A bill for the relief of Gordon Thompson Brown (Rept. No. 815);

S. 1368. A bill for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac (Rept. No. 816);

S. 1541. A bill for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel (Rept. No. 817);

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr. (Rept. No. 818); and

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe (Rept. No. 819).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Luigi Cardone and his two minor children, Vita Cardone and Diomedio Cardone (Rept. No. 820);

H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis (Rept. No. 822); and

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 821).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H. R. 4585. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations (Rept. No. 826).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 827).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 1619. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (Rept. No. 828);

H. R. 6419. A bill to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended (Rept. No. 829); and

H. R. 6832. A bill to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability (Rept. No. 830).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H. R. 1617. A bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (Rept. No. 832).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 7066. A bill to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 831).

CITATION OF JOSEPH STAROBIN FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original resolution certifying the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law, and I submit a report (No. 823) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 129) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Starobin to answer questions before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF HARRY SACHER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution certifying the report of the Committe on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law, and I submit a report (No. 824) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 130) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harry Sacher to answer questions before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee, and I submit a report (No. 825) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 131) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harvey M. Matusow may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 128) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Ladislaus J. Zbranek, and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2494. A bill for the relief of William J. Ryan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2495. A bill for the relief of Anna Abbene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2496. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2497. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $50 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2498. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument; and

S. 2499. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Indian Post Office, located in the Lolo National Forest, Idaho, as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2500. A bill for the relief of William K. W. Chan, also known as William Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEDUCTION, FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES, OF CERTAIN POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of permitting the deduction from income taxes of an amount not to exceed $50 each year made to candidates for elective Federal offices.

The bill parallels a measure offered previously by the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS], and our able colleague from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

I believe that the bill is necessary for the purpose of encouraging a broadening of the base of mass participation by American citizens in the financing of political campaigns.

I send to the desk a brief statement, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2497) to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $50 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

My colleagues are familiar with an exceedingly significant address which was delivered before the annual dinner of the School of Business of the University of Chicago on June 1 by the esteemed publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Philip L. Graham.

In this address, which was received with wide and earnest attention and admiration on Capitol Hill and among thinking people throughout this Nation, Mr. Graham commented on ways and means of securing deeper interest and participation by average Americans in political campaigns.

The art of government is necessarily tied up with the art of politics. Clean politics makes for clean government, and vice versa.

Included in Mr. Graham's remarks were a number of exceedingly telling observations on problems of modern politics and attitudes toward politics and politicians.

Without attempting to review all of the important phases which Mr. Graham brought up, I should like to make reference to one particular group of his observations concerning political contributions.

Mr. Graham noted that following the 1954 congressional elections, the Gallup poll asked people whether they had made a political contribution. The poll showed that only 1 family out of 20 had made any political contribution. This would mean that only around 2 out of every 100 citizens had dug down into his own pocket in order to finance a campaign which, with other campaigns, affected that citizen, directly and indirectly, his life, his health, his income, whether he would live in peace or perhaps perish in war, live happily in prosperity or perhaps miserably in depression.

Yet, in face of this relative indifference and nonparticipation, the ironic fact is that the costs of conducting a political campaign are skyrocketing. The whole vista of television and of other modern channels of political campaigning makes it more essential than ever before that candidates running for public office are in a position to defray the necessary expenses.

If that does not happen—if a candidate cannot, by legitimate means, encourage many public-spirited citizens to help undertake the necessary expenses of campaigning, he is faced with a problem of possible overdependence on a few more well-to-do sources; or, he may have to exhaust his personal finances. But the latter alternative may mean, in turn, that only the wealthy—with many wealthy friends—may be able to enter into a campaign in the first place. The average man of modest means attempting with his family and friends to finance his own campaign in a modern congressional or Senate race, might find himself or themselves seriously in debt if the candidate tried to use the television medium even fairly adequately, particularly if the upper limits of campaign expenditures are raised.

And yet it is essential that those upper limits—which are now exceedingly low and unrealistic—be raised, and that candidates of modest means who are dedicated to the public service and who are qualified to make the race should receive encouragement to do so.

For the good of the good candidate, therefore; for the good of the country, there should be a broadened base for political financing.

As Mr. Graham remarked, "Good citizenship requires political contributions by each individual to the party or candidates of his choice.

"Good citizenship requires this, just as much as it requires contributions to one's church, one's community fund, the Red Cross or other causes."

Toward this end, increased public service advertising, educating our people on the importance of sound political contributions is, I believe, all to the good.

On June 23, the Senators from Kentucky and Missouri offered a bill to permit the tax deduction of $100 each year for political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal office. I believe that the sum of $50 would be somewhat more appropriate, particularly as a beginning toward this objective. And so I have offered the bill today.

I introduce this bill, irrespective of any partisan or, certainly, of any personal consideration—irrespective of any particular election race in the past, present, or future.

I believe that the American people will rise to this challenge and opportunity. This will occur particularly if it is pointed out to them that, if the average American, with an average income, does not help carry the financial load of modern politics, then he is risking the type of alternative to which I have earlier referred—candidates' possible overdependence on a few well-to-do sources, or a difficult attempt by the candidate and a few friends at entirely personal financing; or, as another isolated possibility, in rare instances, possible recourse to undesirable sources of dubious background and intentions which do have money relatively readily available.

This bill, or the Clements-Hennings bill, is only part of the necessary picture of reform of primary and election practices to bring them up to date with modern reality. A great mass of our political statutes dealing with financing and other phases are hopelessly obsolete, and often make necessary undesirable subterfuges. I am hoping that before the end of this Congress, necessary nonpartisan reforms will be made. This bill today certainly involves one such reform.

OREN E. CLEVELAND—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary Senate bill 841, a private bill, for the relief of Oren E. Cleveland. This bill is identical to S. 2449 of the 83d Congress, from the consideration of which the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged and the bill was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

At a recent meeting of the committee, Senate bill 841, of this Congress, was considered and the committee directed that the chairman request that the committee be discharged from further consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 841, for the relief of Oren E. Cleveland, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF APPENDIX TO REPORT OF NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION (S. DOC. NO. 60)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks the National Planning Association issued a statement in the nature of "A Program for the Nonmilitary Defense of the United States," prepared by its special committee on nonmilitary defense planning, as well as a study on "The Tasks of Nonmilitary Defense and the Present Status of Planning" written by its consultant, Dr. William H. Stead. I commend this NPA special committee report to the attention of the Senate. It is one of the most valuable contributions to this vial area of our national security.

An appendix to this report on "The Present Status of Nonmilitary Defense Planning in Certain Federal Agencies" and including "Illustrations of the Present Status of Industrial Nonmilitary Defense Planning" was not included in the published report of the National Planning Association. In view of the importance of this appendix to our congressional tasks in connection with the civil-defense problem, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, preceded by the comments I have just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 20, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

Ronald N. Davies, of North Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of North Dakota, vice Charles J. Vogel, elevated.

George S. Register, of North Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of North Dakota, to fill a new position.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 5½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, next week a "conference at the summit" convenes in Geneva. Every American citizen prays that it may succeed in opening vistas of greater opportunity for a peaceful world. The United States of America will be represented by its President and by its Secretary of State. President Eisenhower is respected and admired by men and women all over the world as one who wants peace, and who, as a leader of the freedom-loving countries of the world, is determined that peace can and will be secured without loss to the dignity and prestige of the individual. In Secretary Dulles, the President has an aide who is well-versed by experience in world problems and in the ways of diplomatic conferences. In these two men—the President and the Secretary of State—supported, as they are, by a well-prepared staff, we can have confidence that our hopes for more security and a peaceful world will be advanced.

Today we live in what is still a world of great tension. In Europe the NATO forces are maintained at war strength, and across Europe are faced by Russian troops equally prepared. In Korea, troops daily man the bunkers near the 38th parallel. Across the Formosa Strait, sentries keep watch. In Indochina, there is guerrilla warfare. Yet no one really wants to fight.

The Geneva conference, therefore, has great responsibilities to those who want peace. Yet we can take hope from the accomplishments since World War II—even in the face of the terribly costly loss of life in Korea. The United Nations is now 10 years old. While it has not accomplished all that was hoped for it, it has not failed or faded out of existence, as so many prophesied. It has created throughout the world a force of public opinion for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It has acted as a fairly successful mediator in the Israel-Egypt troubles. It has shown, principally through our leadership and participation, that it will use armed resistance where boundaries and agreements are disregarded, as in Korea. More recently, the gathering of the leaders of so many nations in San Francisco showed conclusively that the peoples comprising the United Nations believe in its accomplishments and its potentialities for talking it out rather than shooting it out.

But the United Nations is not organized for making peace. That is done by treaties. Under our leadership, we have worked out agreements which lead to a more peaceful world—agreements for mutual assistance, agreements to end many, Italy, and Japan have been nego- wars. The treaties with Austria, Ger- tiated. Italy and Yugoslavia are no longer fighting over Trieste. We have agreements for mutual assistance with free China, among the nations comprising the SEATO organization, and we are helping the free people in Indochina to end the fighting there. Greece, Turkey, and Pakistan are bulwarks of resistance to enslavement. Mutual understanding with Spain is a reality. Israel is a free state. We have confidence that all these accomplishments will lead to greater world peace, and will lessen the chances that an aggressor will start another armed conflict.

With this background of accomplishment and with a solid record for peaceful endeavor, President Eisenhower goes to Geneva, not to get temporary advantages through yielding to promises which may not be kept, not to help some by putting others within the Iron Curtain, not to break promises that we and our friends have made, but to talk of ways and of methods which will, based on fact, lead to greater peace in the world; of ways and means of putting the atom to peaceful advancement and thus to exercise the leadership that is ours with firmness, with justice, with patience, and, above all, with faith in the future. The atoms-for-peace proposal, first made by President Eisenhower before the General Assembly in December of 1953, has gained surprising momentum. The response from other lands and among our own people has been most encouraging. It is clear that every possible effort should be made to implement this program in the interests of peace and the security of this Nation. Our respected President has our confidence in his ability and in his broad experience in dealing with men of all nationalities and beliefs, and we join with him in our prayers that the Geneva conference will lead to better understanding among nations, and thus to greater opportunities for a more peaceful world. With that behind us, we know that we in the United States of America will continue to go forward in the future as we have in the past.

The statement of President Eisenhower before the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1953 was, in part, as follows:

> My country wants to be constructive, not destructive. It wants agreements, not wars, among nations. It wants itself to live in freedom, and in the confidence that the people of every other nation enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life.

Mr. President, it seems to me that ours must be a hopeful realism, as we look forward with the President to Geneva. We must not expect overnight results. We must not expect decisions which will solve in a moment the countless problems the free world faces. We can, however, look confidently toward the making, on the part of the President and his aides, of every possible effort to achieve a more secure and a more peaceful world.

As one who has faith, optimism, confidence, and just such hopeful realism, I look for successful results for the free world from the parley at the summit, in Geneva.

COMMUNISTS ARE PEOPLE—IV

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 4 minutes and 27 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I commend to my fellow Senators an article in Life magazine for July 11. The title of the article is "What It Is Like To Deal With Russia in Its New Mood," and it will be found on page 108 of that issue. Walter Kindermann, its author, was interpreter of the Austrian mission which negotiated the peace treaty between the Soviet and Austrian Governments.

To quote briefly from the magazine:

> The Austrians found the new Soviet approach unexpectedly straightforward and businesslike—but one vital thing had not changed at all—whatever Russia really wanted, Russia got. * * * Kindermann's diary tells how the Russians behaved, both in bargaining and banqueting. Kindermann was born of an Austrian-Belgian family in Russia and lived in that country until 1945. Because of this his impressions of things Russian—including Russian politicians—are apt to be sympathetic and even sentimental. But his record of the give-and-take of the conference reveals just what it is like to sit down opposite the Soviet Union in 1955.

In the above quotation it seems to me that the significant sentence is "Whatever Russia really wanted, Russia got." In the diary itself it seems to me that the significant thing is that these Russians have something more than the bald, uncritical appetite for power which motivated Stalin. Without doubt they subscribe to the Communist doctrines. They believe that there is inevitable conflict between communism and the Western World. They believe that communism ultimately will dominate the world. But meanwhile they are human beings, not unsusceptible to material comforts and rich living, and are willing to face the facts of life in their endeavor to maintain their position.

All this means that they may possibly be reached through their immediate self-interest. They can the more easily retain their power, their position, and their perquisites if the people over whom they rule, and particularly the new middle class of officials and technicians, find their standard of living to be rising gradually. This happy situation can be brought about by directing the resources of Russia and the labor of Russians to improving their own well-being instead of wasting it on vast arms, armament and armies.

The long-range self-interest of the Soviet rulers lies in the same direction. They are going to find out eventually that the Communist doctrine in which they have been trained is false. What they call capitalism is not going to collapse. As the years go by, it will become yearly more clear that Western institutions bring a better living to the people than communism will ever be able to produce.

The ultimate recognition of this fact will be necessary if these men are to retain their power. Those who do not recognize it will lose their power to those who do.

Universal, complete, controlled disarmament serves the present interest of these Soviet rulers and furnishes a bridge toward a new and more intelligent concept of the facts of life in the world in which they live.

CANCELLATION OF DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's decision to cancel the Dixon-Yates power contract is an intelligent recognition of changed circumstances in the Memphis area. The effort of the political opposition to interpret this action as anything else is nothing but precampaign oratory.

There was a well-defined, early-established need for additional electric power arising from expanded needs in the Memphis community. The atomic energy development resulted in an additional need.

To meet these needs our Government entered into the Dixon-Yates contract. By pledging the construction of their own municipal powerplant the people of Memphis have removed this need and President Eisenhower has acted expeditiously to terminate an unnecessary expenditure.

I join in recognizing the wisdom of this decision. It is difficult to understand how any fair-minded observer can regard this step as anything more than a further demonstration of the President's constructive and objective approach to all the problems he is called upon to solve.

I read the morning newspapers and got sore eyes from looking for comments by those who share the view I have just expressed. I believe the overwhelming majority of the people share that view. I believe that only one Senator among the 13 or 14 whose statements were quoted stated affirmatively the position of the people on this question.

Under the circumstances, I want it to be known that Congress itself, by the action it took in connection with the TVA plant at Fulton, Tenn., turned down that proposal as a public project.

Inasmuch as there was need for power in that area, there was occasion for the President to ask private companies to submit their bids, which they did. The President acted in good faith, and he is continuing to act in good faith, following the proposal of the city of Memphis, by taking a new look at this project and taking a new position with respect to it.

FOREIGN AID BY INDIVIDUALS AND PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, while Congress votes billions of dollars for foreign aid, I feel there are times when we forget to give proper recognition to the many individuals and organizations that raise substantial sums of money for the same purpose.

One of the outstanding agencies in Kansas, through which our citizens have contributed $1,424,410 during the past 8 years to needy persons in foreign countries, is the Christian Rural Overseas Program.

The record year for contributions through the Christian Rural Overseas Program in Kansas was 1947, when almost every county in the State sent at least one carload of wheat to Europe to alleviate hunger and suffering. The total contribution that year was $402,287. These funds are contributed through county organizations in 80 of the 105 counties which have organized CROP campaigns.

Many individuals and church organizations carry on this work as one of their major charitable programs.

Congress has made available surplus food commodities which have been purchased and shipped through the Church World Services. Surplus goods valued at more than $10 million, or more than 39 million pounds of surplus food, were distributed through this program at a cost of $461,489, or a ratio of about $23 worth of food for every $1 donated.

Commodities shipped through this organization included dried milk, butter, cheese, and cottonseed oil.

During 1955 the Church World Services expects to distribute about 142 million pounds of surplus foods. About half of the cost, estimated at $1 million, will come from CROP with the other half being donated by other denominational sources.

The statewide goal for 1955 in Kansas has been set at $175,000. Last year, 1954, Kansas contributed $231,798.

These programs and other programs through which organizations and individual citizens contribute generously to relieve human suffering are a worthy Christian service.

AUTOMOBILE RACETRACKS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think the time has come to forbid automobile racing and similar carnages in the United States. I doubt if there is as much bloodshed in Spanish bull rings as today is occurring on automobile racetracks in this country. Now, even women racing drivers are getting killed in fiery and dreadful wrecks.

In my State, last week, a bicycle stunt artist, who leaped his bicycle over a number of automobiles, died hideously before a large crowd when he failed to clear the cars. I imagine there may have been many small children in the crowd who saw him perish. Yet, we talk unctuously about the horror of the bull rings in other lands.

Mr. President, I have heard a lot of talk lately about censorship of so-called comic books in an effort to stamp out juvenile crime and sadism, and yet, at the same time, we allow children to visit racetracks where men and women are constantly in peril of being maimed and killed. If automobile racing is necessary to perfect motor vehicles, as proponents of racing ridiculously claim, then I suppose we next will hear that we must run stallions off cliffs to improve horseflesh.

I believe the time has come for the United States to be a civilized Nation and to stop carnage on racetracks. The deaths on our highways are sad and tragic, but at least they are not purposely staged for profit and for the delight of thousands of screeching spectators.

REGULATING URANIUM PENNY STOCK

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn over the weekend of the decision of the Securities and Exchange Commission to tighten its regulations which apply to uranium penny stock.

While there are certainly many honest businessmen promoting sale of such stock, there are always some promoters who will take every advantage of small investors who sometimes seem altogether too eager to buy. A low selling price on the stock, coupled with the attractive but remote possibility of a very high and quick profit, has enabled these promoters to take many thousands of dollars from the pockets of the small investor.

During the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's study of the stock market last March and April, I questioned Ralph Demmler, then chairman of the SEC, about these uranium stock issues. At that time Mr. Demmler said they were giving the Commission a great deal of concern, but that a part of the trouble was the lack of careful study by the investor of the offering prospectus.

That, of course, is something which will be difficult to correct. But the Government can and should force fly-by-night promoters to provide more complete information. This, along with other new restraints on these issues, should go a long way toward protecting the public from those who would exploit for personal profit the speculative craze in uranium issues. The Commission is to be congratulated for the action which it has taken in this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief section of the stock market hearings, in which I questioned Mr. Demmler on this subject, as well as an article on the SEC announcement from the New York Times of July 10, 1955, be printed in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Chairman. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Senator Payne. Mr. Demmler, I wonder if I could ask whether you believe that the requirements for disclosure of pertinent information should be extended to issues not now covered under the law. I am referring, of course, to those issues of uranium stocks and so forth that are under the $300,000 amount.

Mr. Demmler. Well, I would say that the basic disclosure requirements are, under the present act, applicable to issues even under $300,000, because as a condition to the exemption which the Commission by rule has granted to issues under $300,000, the issuer is required to furnish to the investor and to file with the Commission an offering circular, and while the offering circular is not as full as the prospectus which is furnished to the investor in case of a registered issue, the offering circulars which our regional offices process call attention to what might be called the extremely speculative character of the type of issues you mention, just as a prospectus would require if the issue were not exempt.

So that I would think that it would not be in the public interest, that it is not necessary in the public interest, either to reduce the exemptive amount or to eliminate the exemption, or to eliminate the exemption with respect to any particular type of security because if, taking uranium for example, you were to eliminate the exemption, it would still be possible to prepare a registration statement in respect of a uranium issue and the information as to the speculative character of the enterprise would be little different in the registration statement from what it already is in the offering circular.

Senator Payne. Have those issues given the Commission any concern at all?

Mr. Demmler. Yes, sir; lots.

Senator Payne. Would you care to give us just a brief outline of the concern it has given, and whether or not you do have any suggestions as to whether the public might be better advised as to the nature of that type of stock?

Mr. Demmler. As to advising the public as to the nature of the type of stock, the offering circular itself does do that. If the member of the public will take the opportunity to read these offering circulars, which are simple documents, relatively speaking, he will know what he is getting into. The offering circulars indicate not only the uncertainty of that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, but they indicate a number of other things, such as the state of the exploratory operation, if it is an exploratory operation; they indicate the existence of options to promoters, and that sort of thing.

And under those circumstances, it would appear that the disclosure philosophy of the act is fully applicable to these uranium issues. The difficulty is that people do not read what is furnished to them.

Senator Payne. The fact that they sell at a very low price and they hope it might result in something higher is another encouragement, is it not?

Mr. Demmler. Well, I think that is probably correct.

Now, you did ask me some of the problems that faced us and what we are doing. Now, I have indicated a few of the problems by indicating the type of material that we require to be put into an offering circular or a registration statement. We have been doing some other things, too.

We have been trying to follow up the actual outcome of some of the offerings of uranium shares and other types of exempt offerings where it looks as if there had not been or was not going to be a really successful offering. One of the things that happens is that an offering will be partly sold and enough money will not be realized in the offering to do much more than pay the expenses, and enough will not be realized to get the people out into the hills to work the claims.

We have been trying to determine the success of these offerings by questionnaire methods. We have, as I have indicated, imposed administrative requirements that speculative features and hazards to the investor involved in such offerings be prominently disclosed in prospectuses and offering circulars. We have suspended the exemption for a number of offerings where material facts were not disclosed or the Commission's requirements were otherwise violated. We have made some field investigations.

We have opened a branch office in Salt Lake City as a branch of our Denver office, and we have added personnel to our Denver office. We are working those people out there shamelessly hard. Our regional administrator out there has had a heart attack and may be compelled to retire.

We are doing the very best we can on the subject, but the infirmities in the process are probably just the limitations on the efficacy of the administrative process generally. We have a disclosure statute, and if people do not pay any attention to the disclosure, they run the risk of suffering loss.

[From the New York Times of July 10, 1955]

SEC Plans Curb on Uranium Stock—Agency Seeks To Bar Shady Promoters Without Hurting Legitimate Businessmen

Washington, July 9.—The Government is planning to curb uranium penny stock deals.

Within a week or so, officials indicated today, the Securities and Exchange Commission will announce a tightening of its small issues regulation. The SEC wants to punish racketeering promoters without hampering the legitimate ones too much.

But the SEC, whose best efforts cannot protect persons who ask to get stung, says that asking a few commonsense questions is still the best protection against the pushers and fast-talkers who are riding high on the West's uranium rush.

Nevertheless, proposed new rules for domestic shares are in the works and, at SEC's request, the State Department is opening negotiations with Canada in an effort to restore restraints on the promotion of oil, metal, and uranium stocks across the border.

The international talks may take quite a while. Relations were strained in 1953 when an agreement clamping controls on mail and phone selling of cheap issues from Ontario broke down.

INQUIRY BY SENATE GROUP

Meanwhile, a Senate banking subcommittee headed by Senator Herbert W. Lehman, Democrat, of New York, plans to go ahead with a summer investigation. New York has tightened its own securities statutes, and Utah has gained a reputation for being tough on intrastate stock promotions.

There also is a movement, sparked by Representative John B. Bennett, Republican, of Michigan, to repeal by act of Congress the SEC's small-issues rule—regulation A—which some consider the chief loophole for fraud.

The SEC requires promoters to disclose fully the financial facts of their enterprises in registering stock-issuance proposals.

For issues under $300,000, standard in the penny-uranium field, registration is not required. But under regulation A a small promoter is obliged to set forth certain essential facts in his stock prospectus, furnish a prospectus to everyone who is solicited by mail, and furnish a copy to the SEC.

The repeal move may not get far, because it would penalize—along with the racketeers—the vastly larger number of small but legitimate concerns in every industry which regulation A was designed to help.

But the proposal is evidence of the growing concern felt in Congress and the administration over a market so disorderly that stock certificates, in some Western towns, have been given away by grocery stores like soap coupons.

The SEC has expanded its staff at Denver, where most of the hundred of new mining and exploration issues are filed, and opened an office in Salt Lake City to have "A policeman on the beat"—the beat being the Colorado Plateau where the continentwide uranium hunt is concentrated.

The SEC has no way of knowing whether a given claim is packed with the precious hot rocks or whether it is what one official calls a "grazing ground for moose." Even if the agency knew, it could not prevent the issue of worthless stock.

The SEC's function is to give buyers a fair idea of what they are getting, whether it be a blue-chip certainty or a piece of rank speculation.

An adept pitchman, however, can get his customer half-hooked by telephone. And some customers, unfamiliar with financial terms and forms, frequently do not read or understand the fine print when it reaches them.

After months of quiet investigation and thousands of questionnaires, the SEC found that a common trick among stock salesmen, who set themselves up as mining companies, is to pocket a large part of the proceeds. They do this by paying big salaries to officers, lawyers' fees, and trick underwriters' commissions. They leave little or nothing for exploration, development, and production.

The company, all too often, goes out of business after mining nothing but the sucker list.

SENATOR EARLE C. CLEMENTS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in January of this year I had the privilege of first meeting a man for whom I have come to develop great respect, admiration and affection. He is Earle C. Clements, the senior Senator from Kentucky, who has become the acting majority leader of the United States Senate.

In the Washington Sunday Star for July 10, 1955, appeared a friendly and informative sketch of Senator Clements by Joseph F. McCaffrey of that newspaper's staff. I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the body of the Record, and I call particular attention to Senator Clements' hope that more young people of ideals will participate in American politics and government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Earle Clements Is Well Qualified to Fill Lyndon Johnson's Shoes

(By Joseph F. McCaffrey)

For a man who has shunned publicity all his life Kentucky's Earle Clements finds himself in an embarrassing spot as the ninth-inning replacement for the stricken Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson.

Although Senator Clements has served 32 consecutive years in public life, he still refers to himself as being "not very good copy." He professes not to think anything he says or does is worth recording. As a result, his office scrapbook is slim.

This self-effacing quality has cost the Kentuckian a certain amount of fame. A Kentucky friend says:

"If a good man would only keep track of his work in the Senate and get notices out to the papers, Earle would be one of the most famous men in the Senate."

But Senator Clements has never found modesty a political handicap. Historians say only 90 men have served in the House, the Senate, and as State Governor. Earle Clements is one of the 90.

"I think he's solved the riddle of politics," one Republican Senator said recently. "Most of us stand in front of the curtains so we can take the bows. Earle stands in the back of the curtain so he never gets the blame."

JOHNSON'S BACKSTAGE

Most observers credit him with as much responsibility for the smoothness of the Senate's operations in the 84th Congress as Senator Johnson, who was in front of the curtain.

For a relative junior, Senator Clements has had a rather spectacular Senate career. A year after joining that body in 1951, he was chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. A year and a half later, at the 1952 Democratic national convention, he worked behind the scenes to heal the North-South split.

Says Minnesota's Hubert Humphrey of Mr. Clements' Chicago role:

"I knew who Earle Clements was, of course, before the convention started. But after it was over I knew why he had come so far. There is a man who has more horse sense than any man I have met in politics."

Mr. Clements is—as a Kentuckian would say—"right proud" of the Democratic 84th Congress.

"I don't believe that to be successful there must always be cannons booming and rockets firing. Just because there is no deep, emotional conflict doesn't mean this session hasn't been productive."

HARD WORKER

Senator Clements works hard at whatever job confronts him, and has little use for emotional debates. When the time for action comes, he has the reputation of acting fast and hard—some say ruthlessly.

As Governor of Kentucky he cleaned up the State park system in iron-fisted fashion. He improved State roads by the rather unpopular means of adding 2 cents to the gas tax. In a Dixie-oriented State he opened hospitals in Louisville in 1948 to postgraduate study by Negro doctors and nurses; in 1950 he allowed State-controlled schools to admit Negroes on action by the board of trustees.

Most importantly, he balanced the Kentucky budget, and says he'd like to see the same thing happen here.

ATTRIBUTES FOR JOB

Senator Clements brings with him in his move up from Democratic whip to acting majority leader many of the same attributes that made Senator Johnson so effective: Organizational ability, a built-in card index file in his mind and a burning desire to get things done as quickly, yet as neatly as possible.

To Mr. Clements' organizational ability goes credit for the health of the Kentucky Democratic Party today. He took over its leadership in the midforties after the Republicans had elected their first governor in more than 20 years. Not only did he heal deep splits but also headed the ticket which swept the State back to Democratic control.

Recently, while on a trip back home to Morganfield the Senator took a visitor on a tour of Union County.

"Darndest thing I ever saw," said the visitor when he returned to Washington. "The Senator was county judge back in the days of WPA and all during the tour of the county he named every road and culvert that was put in with Federal money. Why, he even gave me the dates and the costs as well as the rights-of-way involved."

All of these things contribute to Senator Clements' feeling so much at home in politics. During the final year of his term of governor in 1951 he was made attractive business offers ranging in salary from $35,000 to $50,000 a year. He turned them down to continue in politics.

Politics, after all, comes as natural to a Kentuckian as a love for bluegrass and fine horses. The Senator's father had been active in local politics, so it was natural that after coming back from World War I as an infantry captain, the younger Clements should run for sheriff of Union County.

After that came county clerk, county judge, a seat in the Kentucky State Senate, where he eventually served as majority leader, the House of Representatives, then Governor, and, finally, the Senate.

At 58, Senator Clements is young enough to be a vigorous and effective Senate leader, yet old enough so—under present conditions—he probably will not be the object of a presidential boom. His advice to the young, therefore, can be taken as coming from a man at the pinnacle of both his power and his ambition.

"I'd say," says Earle Clements, "that young men interested in public life should realize that good government is the best politics. It's been my observation that the electorate, when convinced of one's good performance, will stand by him whenever he goes before them again."

UNOBLIGATED AND UNRESERVED MUTUAL DEFENSE FUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement on unobligated and unreserved funds of the Foreign Operations Administration, which is now known as the International Cooperation Administration, and a letter which I received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, W. J. McNeil, dated July 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

As I indicated in my statement of July 7, I asked Secretary of Defense Wilson for a report on conflicting statements with respect to the size of the unobligated and unreserved funds which would lapse into the Treasury as the result of my amendment to the Mutual Security Act. I have now received, in reply, a letter from W. J. McNeil of the Comptroller's Office in the Department of Defense. That letter is attached. It must speak for itself. Put in its best light, however, it seems to me that it indicates that the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget finally got around to taking action in the last week of June which should have been taken during the previous 10 months.

I hope that one effect of my amendment will be to encourage the Appropriations Committees to reduce the amounts available for military assistance so that our budget need not be strained simply because Defense Department estimates of the amounts they can obligate in a fiscal year are too optimistic. The Defense Department should not receive funds in excess of those which it can obligate within 1 year by orderly procedures and careful planning.

The activities of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget during this June in connection with mutual defense funds illustrate two patterns of executive branch financial operations that deserve careful scrutiny. First is the pattern of last-minute obligation of funds to avoid their return to the Treasury Department.

This pattern is illustrated by:

1. The fact that this year, as last year, the heaviest obligations took place during the month of June—the last month of the fiscal year. Indeed, the attached letter from Mr. McNeil shows that the final 24-hour obligations totaled $614 million instead of the $575 million as I had earlier indicated.

2. Last year the June military assistance obligations were $652 million and the May obligations $488 million. Thus, $1.2 billion of $2.5 billion available for obligation during fiscal year 1954 were obligated in the last 2 months of the year. In other words, last year nearly one-half of the funds available were obligated in the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

The second pattern that needs careful scrutiny is that of making estimates that turn out to be unreliable. The attached letter from Mr. McNeil, for example, indicates in its last paragraph one estimate that was more than 100 percent in error. My statement of July 7 described the variety of estimates submitted to congressional committees during the past 2 months in connection with the carryover funds.

I might add one more illustration of an unreliable estimate. In July of last year, the Department of Defense estimated that its unexpended balance as of this June would be $5.5 billion. Earlier this spring, it revised its estimates to indicate that the unexpended figure would be $6.7 billion—an error in estimates of over $1 billion.

I hope that next year we can count on receiving more reliable estimates from the Department of Defense and that it will be able to avoid operations which lead it into the dangerous practice of last minute obligations of funds.

I should also like to request the Senate Appropriations Committee to investigate the whole question of carryover funds which, according to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], are in excess of $100 billion.

What the Congress needs is a competent staff of qualified accountants to go into the whole question of obligated, unobligated, and reserved funds and to submit around the first of the next calendar year a detailed understandable report and recommendations.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1955.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Secretary Wilson has asked me to reply to your letter of June 30 regarding the estimated unobligated and unreserved balance of mutual defense assistance program funds as of June 30, 1955. On May 10, Mr. H. Struve Hensel, then Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and testified that he had a program and a plan for its funding for fiscal year 1955 which when implemented would leave only $100 million of unobligated funds by the close of the fiscal year.

At the time he made the statement to your committee it was anticipated that full knowledge of the effect of the certification of obligations under section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1955 as of June 30, 1954, would be known by no later than May 31, 1955, in accordance with the Department of Defense Directive No. 7220.6, "Prerequisites for Reporting and Recording of Obligations." In order for Mr. Hensel's prediction to come true it was necessary to have a complete certification in order to obtain allocation and apportionment of substantial blocks of funds from the Bureau of the Budget. It was Mr. Hensel's belief that once the certifications had been made that the ensuing 30 days would be ample to carry out his plans for obligating and reserving funds.

The certifications under section 1311 were not complete on the May 31 due date. When the certifications had not been received by June 13, Mr. Hensel felt that it was necessary to indicate to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, which was then hearing testimony on the current mutual security legislation, that the failure to receive these certifications were endangering his plan of obligation and reservation of funds before the close of the fiscal year, as he had previously outlined to your committee. As the fiscal year was running out and it appeared that original plans could not be carried out, Mr. Hensel estimated to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Foreign Operations, Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives, that his unobligated and unreserved balance probably would total $620 million.

Certification of obligation was finally received on June 21, thus making possible the completion of the original plan for obligation and reservation of funds. Because the necessary details of these operations had been worked out prior to June 21, the decision was made to make a determined effort to complete the original planned actions before the end of the fiscal year, thus complying with the original plan. The last series of actions was the request for apportionment which was sent to the Bureau of the Budget on June 24. The Bureau of the Budget apportionment was received on June 30 and the common item orders which had long been prepared were issued and funds reserved in the amount of $614 million to complete the plan.

When the fiscal year closed the original plan outlined to the committee had been completed and when the full detailed reports are received the unobligated and unreserved balance should be well within the $100 million estimated for your committee on May 10.

I believe you will appreciate Mr. Hensel's increasing apprehension regarding his estimates when repeated delays encountered in receiving certifications under section 1311 were apparently precluding the accomplishment of his plan for the obligation or reservation of funds before the close of the fiscal year.

You have noted Congressman RICHARD's comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, page 9389. You are quite correct in your statement that the obligating procedures were changed during the last Congress and that the changed procedures were known to the Department of Defense at the time Mr. Hensel testified on May 10. The difficulty, however, arose from the fact that the process of certifying obligations has been a slower process than was anticipated by Mr. Hensel and others in the Department of Defense.

Early in the fiscal year the Department of Defense estimated that the certification made pursuant to section 1311 would result in a loss of $500 million of prior year funds. When the certifications were completed the loss actually amounted to $227 million and, as a result, the $1.4 billion in new obligational authority originally requested for fiscal year 1956 was reduced to $1.125 billion by a communication from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated July 1, 1955, to offset the savings.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. MCNEILL.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to state that this letter was not received by me in time to incorporate it in the RECORD on last Thursday, when I made my speech on the allocation by the Defense Department of $575 million on June 30 of this year. I received it the next day, and I now desire that it become a part of the RECORD. I also wish to state to the Senate that I was in error on Thursday when I stated that $575 million was obligated and reserved on the last day of the last fiscal year. The sum was $614 million, and the total during the month of June was $1 billion.

REVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point four editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Worcester Telegram, the Boston Herald, and the Springfield Republican.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 12, 1955]

IMMIGRATION POLICY

It is difficult to see any purpose to be served by Senator KENNEDY's proposed new commission on immigration and naturalization policy except the purpose of procrastination. Immigration is not a novel subject to Congress or the country. It was studied exhaustively by the House and Senate Judiciary Committees prior to adoption of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. It was reexamined, reappraised, and reconsidered by the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization which submitted an admirably thorough and thoughtful report on January 1, 1953. Both major political parties called for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act in their 1952 platforms; and both major presidential candidates promised to seek revision if elected to office. All of the leading Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish organizations interested in immigration have spoken out repeatedly and fervently for revision. The one thing the country has not had in connection with immigration during the past 3 years is action. Nothing has been done, in spite of all the hearings and all the investigations and all the reports, to remedy the cruel and xenophobic restrictions of existing law.

The President has done nothing to promote immigration reform, so far as we can ascertain, since he sent his 10-point letter of recommendation to Senator Watkins in 1953. We do not believe that the appropriate answer to his recommendations lies in the creation of another commission. It lies in a vote on the reform measures that have been kept locked up in judiciary subcommittees. About 10 bills have been introduced in the Senate since passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, while as many as 50 have been introduced in the House. A House judiciary subcommittee has hearings on these proposals planned for the immediate future. There is still time for them to be held and for a vote to be taken during this session of Congress. Senator Kennedy's proposed commission could produce nothing but delay.

In a disparaging reference to the President's Commission which studied the problem in 1952, Senator Kennedy observed that the "appointment of the Commission and its report were considered by some to be partisan in nature." No doubt this was true among those who disliked the Commission's findings; it might be equally true of any new commission. The 1952 Commission was, nevertheless, as thoroughly nonpartisan and expert a body as could be assembled. Deliberating under the chairmanship of former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman and taking testimony from a great variety of witnesses, it came to clear conclusions which experience under the McCarran-Walter Act has served only to reinforce. What is needed today for the achievement of an intelligent and humane immigration policy is not more information but more energy and resolution. The time for decision and action is long overdue.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of July 4, 1955]

Immigration Policy

Senator John F. Kennedy has the right approach to the question of improving the Nation's immigration policy. He would not try to patch up the Refugee Relief Act, which was supposed to let in 214,000 carefully chosen immigrants over a 3-year period. This Refugee Relief Act is a patch-up job itself, and a far from satisfactory one. Senator Kennedy would go right to the real source of trouble—the McCarran-Walter Act adopted in 1952 over President Truman's veto.

The Massachusetts Senator suggests appointment of a nonpolitical commission of experts to review our experience with immigration since enactment of the McCarran statute. On the basis of their recommendations, the permanent laws relating to immigration might be modified by Congress.

For many decades the influence of politics has been too heavy in this field of legislation. Politics gave us a bad immigration law 30 years ago. Politics prevented correction of its serious deficiencies for decades.

When it was finally possible to rewrite the statute, political circumstances put the project into the hands of committees headed by legislators whose distrust of immigration and immigrants was almost fanatical.

The late Senator McCarran, a son of immigrant parents himself, seemed to see an ideal immigration policy in a program that let in nobody at all. Representative Walter, who teamed up with McCarran to draft our present law, has more recently cropped up in the news as the chief critic of Edward J. Corsi. Mr. Corsi was permitted by Secretary of State Dulles to become a political casualty as administrator of the Refugee Relief Act.

The McCarran-Walter Act was debated and adopted at a time when politics exercised a particularly vicious influence. In 1952, with a presidential election coming up and charges of foreign-inspired subversion filling the air, many Members of Congress considered it politically expedient to accept without question an immigration policy that slammed the door shut and made second-class citizens of our naturalized citizens.

This McCarran-Walter law is a national disgrace. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 falls short of correcting the bad features and is only temporary, anyway.

Senator Kennedy is to be commended for asking a complete new study of immigration. We ought to get to work before the present arrangement results in more injustice. American relations with the people of the rest of the free world have suffered enough already.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of July 1, 1955]

A Straight Look at Immigration

There can be little doubt that the sprawling McCarran-Walter Immigration Act needs wholesale revision, or at least substantial amending. President Truman did his best to halt its passage when he was in office. Presidential candidates of both major parties criticized it during the 1952 campaign. Representatives of all faiths, labor and industry have gone on record against it. There are, at the present time, 10 bills in the House and 50 in the Senate aimed at modifying its provisions.

And even some of the act's most vociferous supporters favor some changes. Of course their changes may not be precisely the same as those advocated by the act's opponents. But the fact remains that good or bad, realistic or illusory, kind or cruel, there is a big demand from all sides for improvement.

Senator Kennedy has introduced a bill into the Senate which would create a legal commission on immigration modeled after the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization. It would be composed of 12 members, 6 drawn from private life, 4 from Congress, and 2 from the executive branch of the Government. The President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House would make the appointments. It would be required to study our present immigration laws and report to the President by next April 10 on changes it may recommend.

There has already been one Commission study of the act. It was 31 pages long; it was clear and forthright; it recommended that the Immigration Act should be completely rewritten—and it has been all but forgotten.

But the study was made at a time when all was politics and its effect was lost in a fiery cloud of partisan attacks and counterattacks. Of course this study will be published at a time when the politicians will be clearing their throats if not already mounting their stumps. But it should be a calmer time, nevertheless, and, therefore, this report, if it is actually made, should be greeted with more respect than the last.

Senator Kennedy can be counted as a sturdy opponent of the basic philosophy behind the McCarran-Walter Act. Yet he is adamant that the commission he proposes should be a bipartisan, blue-ribbon group, and that the study should be dignified and out of politics. He is obviously sincere in desiring a wholly objective investigation.

We hope Mr. Kennedy's proposal will meet with congressional approval. Congress and the people need an expert interpretation of this vast and complicated set of laws. In the meantime, however, we hope that those who back constructive, humanizing amendments to the act, like the Ives-Saltonstall-Case bill, will not give up the fight.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of July 10, 1955]

A Commission on Immigration

Senator John F. Kennedy was criticized by some very partisan fellow Democrats, during last fall's campaign, for having been, so they charged, too friendly and cooperative in his relations with that wicked Republican Senator Saltonstall. It will now be interesting to see whether Senator Kennedy, whose recent return to his Senate seat has been so widely hailed, draws similar criticism for his proposal that the revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be taken out of partisan politics by referring it to a bipartisan commission.

Although the McCarran-Walter Act bears the names of two Democrats—the late Senator McCarran, of Nevada, and the present Representative Walter of Pennsylvania—the fact is that Senator Kennedy's proposal would very definitely take the Eisenhower administration "off the hook" and therefore ought to be welcomed by it. As recently pointed out in these columns, with quotations from his 1952 campaign speeches, President Eisenhower then committed himself to a revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. But, since entering the White House nearly 2½ years ago, he has made no direct or positive move to that effect, although in April 1953 he wrote to Senator Watkins, of Utah, chairman of a Senate committee, specifying 10 criticisms that had been made of the McCarran-Walter Act and its racially discriminatory quotas.

There has been criticism of Eisenhower within his own party for this failure to follow up his 1952 speeches. But reference to such a commission as Senator Kennedy proposes would at least temporarily remove the issue from the political arena. If it should bring wise recommendations followed by congressional action, that would not be bad—except for the delay.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, these editorials discuss the joint resolution which I recently introduced, S. J. Res. 84, to establish a bipartisan commission to review our immigration and naturalization policy. The Washington Post and Times Herald in its editorial this morning criticizes the commission proposal, because it believes it would delay action on amending the McCarran-Walter Act.

If the choice lay between action on those amendments of which I am cosponsor and the establishment of a commission, I would agree with the Washington Post and Times Herald criticism. However, it is obvious that Congress will not so act this session. Inasmuch as the choice apparently lies between no action at all and the establishment of a high-level commission whose study could be undertaken in the intervening months before the Senate reconvenes next year, it seems to me the results of such a study would make it much more likely that the Congress would act in the coming session.

I do not believe it is any disparagement of the Perlman Commission's study of the McCarran-Walter Act to point out that that study was made during the summer and fall of 1952, during a political campaign, and at a time when the McCarran-Walter Act had not yet gone into effect. A high level study at the present time, by a commission composed of Members of the House and

Senate as well as representatives of the administration and the public, which could study the administration of the act without bias and submit its recommendations to Congress early next year, would, I believe, be a great step forward in bringing about the major amendments of the McCarran-Walter Act which are found to be necessary.

A CHALLENGE TO THE WEEKLY PRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wednesday, June 22, issue of the Huntington-Times and Suffolk Bulletin of Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.

The editorial is entitled "Bribing the Weekly Press," and indicates that an amazing and flagrant attempt has been made to buy up weekly editorial columns for the professed aim of "working for the ideals of the Republican Party."

Albert Rufhel, President of the Suffolk Consolidated Press, publishing the Huntington-Times and eight other weekly newspapers in New York, was quite indignant at this crude and unprincipled approach.

In view of this charge, it is fair to ask whether or not the "ideals of the Republican Party" include outright purchase of the American press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIBING THE WEEKLY PRESS

Here's a shocker.

After holding a letter, properly addressed and with handwritten signature, for several days in the hope that the editor's tired eyes were not playing tricks, it was finally decided to bring it to the attention of readers.

In substance the letter's author wants to buy the editorial column of a Suffolk Consolidated Press newspaper, of which this newspaper is one, and suggests possible compensation up to $50,000 a year, stating that that sum of money has been paid to a "cooperating" newspaper not identified.

And for what reason is the editorial column sought? "* * * to cooperate with us in working for the ideals of the Republican Party."

Not only was the letter a shocker, but the request was amazing for its unadulterated gall. It was shockingly insulting to the newspaper profession as a whole and, we hope, to the Republican Party.

If the request is not a hair-brained publicity stunt by a dabbler in public relations, it demands investigating by either the national or State Republican organization, or both.

Complete data will be made available to a properly accredited representative of the party.

The letter cannot be permitted to go unchallenged for any number of reasons. Here is one paragraph:

"We are public relations consultants for many individuals over the entire country who believe in and cooperate with us in working for the ideals of the Republican Party."

If this type of cooperation includes attempts at outright purchase of the press to aid the party and is condoned, popular revulsion must be expected quickly because Republican newspapers and the Republican Party will always be suspect.

MINNESOTA AS A VACATIONLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Tribune. It is entitled "Why Not Some Minnesota Boasts?" The article was written by Mr. Rolf Felstad, a Minneapolis Tribune staff writer.

In the article Mr. Felstad quotes Governor Freeman, of Minnesota, who invites the people of the United States to visit the greatest vacationland in America, namely, the State of Minnesota.

In view of the fact that the present session of Congress may soon terminate, and in view of the further fact that we have been experiencing rather inclement weather in Washington—or perhaps I should say the customary weather for July—which weather, of course, will become much worse in August, I should like to extend a most cordial invitation to all tired souls to refresh themselves in the wonderful tourist land of central and northern Minnesota. There are plenty of recreational facilities there to take good care of one and all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS BEATS US ON ONE POINT: WHY NOT SOME MINNESOTA BOASTS?

(By Rolf Felstad)

The trouble with Minnesotans, if anything, Governor Freeman said Friday, is that they've been a little too modest about Minnesota.

There ought to be some point about halfway between Minnesota modesty and Texas boasting, he declared.

"Perhaps we don't want to brag as much as the Texans," he said in a talk recorded for broadcast over the weekend. "But we ought, each of us, to speak out with real pride about the blessings and the benefits of our great State."

The Governor called Minnesota a land of 25,000 lakes—if you count the small ones.

"Whoever counted the lakes stopped at 10,000," he said, "just because he got tired of counting, and not because he ran out of lakes."

The fishing is fine, said Freeman. There are more fish than ever and more fishermen—a million last year to give the State more licensed fishermen than any other.

Besides being full of fish, Freeman went on, Minnesota is full of resorts—more than 4,000.

Breathtaking things to see include the Hiawatha Valley Highway, which rivals the Rhine Valley in Germany and the Palisades of the Hudson; the North Shore Drive; Pipestone, where the Indians made peace pipes; the Iron Range—the Paul Bunyan country; and many others.

A lot of mail inquiries to his office "are a reminder," Freeman added, "of the growing number of people from all over the Nation who are learning that Minnesota is the ideal summer vacationland."

Most tourists here, he said, come from Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri, with quite a few from other Midwestern States and from the east and west coasts. And, oh yes, Texas.

The Governor urged Minnesotans to be gracious hosts. After all, he pointed out, fishermen spent a total of $2,185,000 in Minnesota last year, including $546,000 from out-of-State anglers.

Freeman said he is going to take a dose of his own prescription in a week or two. He, Mrs. Freeman, and their two children, Connie and Mike, plan a week at a Minnesota lake.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly would not wish to keep anyone from going to the great State of Minnesota. However, I should like to inform one and all that the distance from Washington is only half so far to the great State of South Carolina, with its Myrtle Beach, and other fine beaches. Anyone who does not like beaches, can go to the northern part of the State and refresh himself in the mountain breezes, where he can sleep well at night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the great population of our country, we are perfectly willing to have a rather substantial number of people go to South Carolina. However, I extend a special invitation to my good friend from South Carolina to come to Minnesota. We would very much like to have him there.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have established almost a custom of inviting tired Democrats to come to Wisconsin, to be refreshed in that wonderful State, with its 9,000 lakes—Minnesota has 10,000—and to enjoy some of the wonderful Wisconsin cheese, and the muskellunge and other fish, including the brook trout. Above everything else, they would meet in Wisconsin people who stem from all the northern countries of Europe. They are industrious, hospitable, and eager to entertain visitors. Of course, across the river from us is Minnesota, with its good people.

As I listened to the flowery words of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I could not refrain from speaking for Wisconsin, with its fine recreational facilities, its great production of milk—16 billion pounds of milk a year—its factories, and its most wonderful cheese of all kinds. In Wisconsin those who have been more or less debilitated by the weather in Washington could enjoy the finest kind of nourishment and complete relaxation and comfort.

As I have said, it has become almost a custom for me to extend such an invitation, and I am glad to see that my colleague from Minnesota has caught on and is following the same good doctrine of looking after those who are in need of a worthwhile vacation and rest and of the inspiration such a vacation affords.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I have the floor, I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I cannot sit here and listen to the self-delegated representatives of the chambers of commerce of their respective States speak of their beauties and great attractions, without rising to say that I appreciate the invitation from my distinguished colleague from Minnesota and his comments relative to that State, and I also appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. But, Mr. President, only a few nights ago I slept in Maine under two blankets, and thousands of people were headed there to secure relief from the heat and humidity which affect less favored areas of the Nation. If it is not inappropriate for me to say so, my distinguished colleague from Minnesota has accepted an invitation which I extended to him and his good wife to visit Maine this summer, to view its 2,500 miles of coastline darting in and around harbors and coves, to see some of its myriads of lakes, rivers, hills, and mountains, the beautiful coastal area which Maine offers, and to enjoy some of Maine's lobsters which are known everywhere for their outstanding and delectable quality.

I wish to say that I shall hope to reciprocate and accept the kind invitation which the Senator from Minnesota has offered, and shall pay a visit to his State sometime in the near future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be a delight and joy to the Humphrey family to travel through Maine as we wander back to God's great, wonderful recreational area in the State of Minnesota. I extend, again, a cordial invitation to visit that State.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

OPERATIONS OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently, I had the privilege of receiving a communication from Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State, which communication contained a great deal of information concerning some of the difficulties of the Passport Office and some of the plans now being made to expedite the service in that office. I bring this to the attention of the Senate because I am confident that every Member of the Senate has had some problems in terms of passport and visa requests, and I should like to have them see this communication. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from the Director of the Passport Office and my reply thereto printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 9, 1955.

Frances G. Knight,
Director, Passport Office
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Knight: It was with a great deal of interest that I read your letter of July 1 in connection with the operations of the Passport Office. My office staff has on many occasions spoken to me of some of the problems encountered, particularly during the seasons of heavy travel abroad, and has indicated awareness of the difficulties.

We have had some complaints, true—I have only today referred one to you that I felt merited your personal attention—but on the whole we have had relatively few that we were not able to assuage. The Passport Office has long been understaffed for the volume of work and the kind of service expected of it. Despite the many handicaps, we have experienced fine cooperation and a great deal of assistance from your staff with the many problems that come up in connection with passports.

The plans that you have outlined in your letter, and that were described somewhat more fully in a recent New York Times article, should be of great interest to every Member of Congress. Funds should be made available to modernize the physical plant and to hire adequate personnel to make more efficient and expeditious the Department's functions. A realistic and comprehensive approach toward a solution to the problem, such as you have outlined, ought surely to meet with the hearty approval of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Hubert H. Humphrey.

July 1, 1955.

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Humphrey: This letter is by way of explanation, but not an excuse, for the delays I know your office has experienced in getting the passport office on the telephone in the past 2 months. I sincerely regret any inconvenience which you or your staff have encountered in this respect.

I understand how very annoying it must be to wait for hours, and sometimes days, to obtain a free line to this office in order to make a simple inquiry or check on a constituent's passport application.

You will be interested to know that a spot check on a few selected telephone lines to the passport office totaled over 13,000 calls within a period of 5 days. We averaged 250 calls per day per girl assigned to handle inquiries. According to the chief telephone operator of the Department of State, during the same 5-day period, there were a minimum of 22 calls awaiting service on each line into the passport office from 9 a. m. through 5 p. m. I tried to alleviate this heavy telephone traffic by adding four lines into my own office, but the volume has been so great that the addition did not result in a noticeable improvement.

The passport office staff has been working long hours 6 days a week. We issued or renewed 434,644 passports in 1954. We estimate that we will issue or renew a minimum of 480,000 in fiscal 1955. In May 1954 we processed 56,776 passports as compared to 71,055 in May 1955. This increased workload has been carried on with inadequate personnel, equipment, and space.

On Saturday, June 4, the passport mail room dispatched 4,140 passports. On the following Saturday, by virtue of volunteer overtime workers, we wrote 3,100, checked 4,000, and dispatched 3,500 passports. These figures are all-time highs, and I quote them merely to give you an idea of the volume of work we are turning out.

There have been complaints of slowness and inaccessibility from citizens in various parts of the country from which you may have had some reverberations. I am trying to correct these inadequacies by recommending that the passport office be moved to larger and modern quarters, and that eventually we have our own passport building designed to house our particular type of operation. I am also suggesting that I be permitted to purchase modern machinery and up-to-date office equipment, and streamline passport processing to meet the requirements of the coming jet age. I realize that in the past a citizen who planned an overseas trip months in advance, and took a leisurely 7-to-10-day voyage by boat, was willing to wait 3 to 4 weeks for the processing of his passport application. Today, with Europe an overnight hop by plane, and tomorrow when the jets will bring any part of the world within a few daylight hours of our embarkation ports, citizens want and should get speedy service from the passport office. If I succeed in my program of modernizing our operation, I am sure your office will not have the difficulties it encountered this year, and we will be better equipped to serve you and your constituents.

Please explain this to your office staff, all of whom have been most cooperative, understanding, and considerate. I do apologize for any delay or inconvenience to you or your staff during the past 2 months.

Sincerely,
Frances G. Knight,
Director, Passport Office.

VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER U NU, OF BURMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week we were honored in this Nation to have as our guest the Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu. He spoke to the Senate and commented briefly and pointedly on the similarities between recent Burmese history and our own history of the late 18th century.

The Prime Minister of Burma is not the first distinguished foreign visitor we have had in Washington this year. Perhaps the headlines were not quite so big for U Nu as they have been for some of our other visitors. Representatives of big nations with great power tend to command more attention than representatives of small nations—and Burma is small. It is only some 260,000 square miles in area, has a population of less than 20 million, and lies in an area not known for its accessibility to American tourists—or to Members of Congress.

But Burma is a big and important country if one thinks of its morally strategic position. Burma has only been independent since January 4, 1948. She confronts Communist China to the north, India and Pakistan to the west, and Indochina and Thailand to the east. In this pivotal position of importance, the things Burma does and the attitudes its leaders take are extremely important—probably more important than actions this Nation took during its political infancy.

We in the United States can look back at our own history with pride. We fought the Barbary pirates shortly after we achieved independence and we came to blows with the British in the War of 1812. But, as a general rule, we were isolated from the rest of the world when it came to having close and influential political neighbors.

That is not true of Burma. That nation is caught between the Communist and the non-Communist world. Some would describe Burma as a neutralist nation. I know there are Americans who demand that countries like Burma be with us or against us. They have not understood the attitude in Burma which several years ago asked us to stop our technical-assistance program to that country.

Mr. President, I think that the Burmese Prime Minister showed us this past week that a nation does not have to be big to be important; it does not have to have tanks and guns in profusion to advance the principles of democratic government. Burma is one of those countries of the Far East which rests on a broad democratic base, and U Nu, with his sound, good-humored advice, proved that last week.

During the war, the Thakin Party, of which U Nu was a member, helped to organize the resistance movement. By 1945 the Burmese defense army was working openly with the Allies. Shortly after achieving independence, the Burmese Government was seriously threatened by the Communists. Much of the rich Irrawaddy Valley was held by rebel forces and Rangoon itself was threatened.

During this critical period from 1949 through 1951 there was a strong feeling among Government circles in Washington that Burma must be written off. But that view failed to take into account the quality of the Burmese leadership. It failed, in the words of one author, "to distinguish between the Socialist slogans, which had helped the present government to emerge, and its firm determination to fight against Communist insurrection."

The Burmese Government gradually drove the rebels into retreat and today there is a strong, independent Burma which understands and knows how to handle the Communists and their techniques.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that U Nu during his visit here taught this Nation some lessons we might well take to heart. He taught us that the strength of this Nation lies not in its guns but in the fact that the United States serves as a beacon for freedom-loving peoples the world over.

Last Thursday U Nu remarked:

> I dare say that the leaders of our independence movement were as familiar with the Constitution of the United States as you yourselves. * * * That great document * * * has served throughout all the intervening time as a beacon to fighters for freedom everywhere. And it shines as brightly today as ever.

This statement deserves repeating, as it holds the key to the critical search for freedom that is going on in much of the Asiatic world.

We have grown strong in 175 years. The Prime Minister has reminded us that our strength, however, depends on our ideals and our freedom, not on our guns. It is this spirit of freedom that will help pivotal nations like Burma to survive. It is the success of nations like Burma in adapting concepts of freedom to the realities of Asia that will serve as a beacon to peoples throughout Asia.

The second lesson, Mr. President, we have learned from U Nu is the lesson of equality. Man, regardless of the color of his skin and regardless of the size or power of the nation from whence he comes, deserves always to be treated with full equality. The Burmese Prime Minister taught us this lesson, and he taught it well.

There are many leaders and potential leaders in Asia who can do what U Nu has done for his country and for the cause of freedom. If they can lead their own people with the firmness, understanding, and good humor U Nu has shown, the older democratic nations, including the United States, will have much to learn from them.

In 1789 it could have been said that the future of individual freedom rested with the United States. The experiment that was carried on here provided a new basis for popular government in which man ruled the state instead of the state ruling man. In 1955 the future of individual freedom rests largely in the hands of such nations as Burma, in which concepts of individual freedom are being tried and tested in a new environment. We must do what we can to help these nations in a material way. But more important than material help is the understanding they seek and which they should have.

EFFORT ON THE PART OF CHICAGO TO DIVERT WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year for some time now, the Congress has been confronted with the unhappy spectacle of an attempt to "railroad" through unsound legislation which has been appropriately identified as the "Chicago water steal"—namely, a unilateral effort on the part of Chicago to divert water from Lake Michigan in utter violation of solemn agreements between the United States and Canada, and in utter contrast to the judgment, interests, and opinion of other lake States, including my own.

Without reflecting in any way upon any individual colleague overzealously seeking this objective, I may say that, unfortunately, the effort toward it has been marked time after time by its partisans ill-considered, "speedup," and "slip-through" tactics which do not do justice to the traditions of the Senate and House of Representatives.

I respect, of course, the judgment of impartial colleagues on both sides of the hill, particularly that of members of the Senate Public Works Committee now reviewing this bill under the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. And I earnestly hope that the views expressed to the Senate committee on the part of the administration, objecting to this bill will be given earnest heed.

I have opposed the Chicago water steal in the past. I oppose it today.

I oppose it in the interests of the United States. I oppose it in the international interest of good neighborliness between the United States and Canada. I oppose it in the interests of the several lake States which would be harmed by it.

In the past, I have on many occasions presented detailed arguments against the bill.

Now, however, merely by way of reporting its current status so as to alert my colleagues to the dangers of it, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a news article from the Milwaukee Journal of July 8 be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER STEAL VETO HINTED IN A LETTER—BUDGET BUREAU SAYS LAKE BILL DOES NOT JIBE WITH PROGRAM OF PRESIDENT

A strong hint that President Eisenhower would veto legislation passed by Congress to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago was contained in dispatches Friday from Washington, D. C.

The hint came in a letter to the Senate Public Works Committee from the Federal Budget Bureau. The committee is considering a bill identical to the one passed Tuesday by the House, authorizing Chicago to withdraw 2,500 cubic feet a second from the lake for a 3-year test period instead of the current 1,500 cubic feet.

The Budget Bureau's letter informed the Senate committee that the increased diversion "would not be in accord with the program of the President," according to the Associated Press.

WRITES TO CHAVEZ

The Budget Bureau is part of the Executive Office of the President and as such it expresses White House sentiment on legislation. The Bureau's views were made known by Donald B. Belcher, assistant director, in a letter to CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the committee.

Belcher's letter recalled that Mr. Eisenhower last year said that reasonable opportunity should be given the International Joint Commission, composed of United States and Canadian representatives, and the Army engineers to complete studies of current lake levels before any law is enacted that might affect the Great Lakes. The President vetoed a similar bill last year after Congress had passed it.

"However," Belcher's letter related, "it is understood that the results of these studies will not be available before next year."

CITY OFFICIALS DELIGHTED

The State Department also expressed its disapproval of the legislation in a letter to the Senate group from Thruston B. Morton, an Assistant Secretary of State. Referring to the same surveys, Morton wrote:

"Dependent on the outcome of these studies and how the interests of the United States and Canada would appear to be affected, it will then have to be considered whether discussion of the proposal (increased diversion at Chicago) with the Canadian Government is in the overall interest of the United States."

Representative O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, who sponsored the House bill, previously had said he believed changes made in the measure from last year met the President's objections. The principal change was a rewording of the preamble to emphasize the experimental nature of the proposed diversion increase.

CITY OFFICIALS PLEASED

City officials were delighted with the Budget Bureau and State Department letters.

Mayor Zeidler said that the President and the State Department are "consistent in their views."

"I am inclined to agree with them, because the waters of Lake Michigan-Lake Huron basin are the waters of both the States and Canada," Zeidler said. "Chicago is endeavoring to divert water on a unilateral basis without considering the other States and Canada."

Harry G. Slater, first assistant city attorney, said that the news was "heartening."

ELECTION OF DELEGATES FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the committee report on H. R. 191, the bill under consideration, is on the desk of each Senator. It is a unanimous report by the committee.

The bill has been drafted in complete cooperation with the representatives of the two major political parties in the District of Columbia. It provides a procedure for the election of delegates to the national conventions of the two major parties.

The bill provides also for the submission, upon the recommendation of the controlling committees of the two major parties in the District of Columbia, of initiative matters affecting party affairs. The bill provides, further, for a procedure for placing upon the ballot the names of possible presidential candidates in the preferential primary, in case such candidates have no objection to their names being placed on the ballot.

I do not think anything more needs to be said in support of the bill, in view of the long and tedious work which the committee has devoted to it. I submit the bill on the basis of the committee report.

It will be recalled that yesterday certain typographical corrections were made in the print of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following officials of political parties in the District of Columbia shall be elected as provided in this act:

(1) National committeemen and national committeewomen;

(2) Delegates to conventions of political parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States;

(3) Alternates to the officials referred to in clauses (1) and (2) above, where permitted by political party rules; and

(4) Such members and officials of local committees of political parties as may be designated by the duly authorized local committees of such parties for election at large in the District of Columbia.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "qualified elector" means a citizen of the United States (A) who does not claim voting residence or right to vote in any State or Territory, and who has resided in the District continuously since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election, or, if such period has not begun, resides in the District; (B) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, 21 years old; (C) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned; and (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) The term "Board" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia provided for by section.

(4) The term "absentee resident" means a duly registered qualified elector—

(A) who is absent from the District and who—

(i) is a member of any branch of the armed services of the United States and any of their respective components;

(ii) is a member of the merchant marine of the United States;

(iii) is serving with the American Red Cross or the United Service Organizations or is a member of a religious or welfare organization, and is attached to or serving with the Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States; or

(iv) is a spouse or dependent of a person qualifying under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) above; or

(B) who, by reason of physical disability, as certified by a physician pursuant to section 10 hereof, is unable to vote in person at the appropriate polling place; regardless of whether or not such person is physically absent from the District.

CREATION OF BOARD OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be composed of 3 members appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The first terms of offices on the Board shall expire, as designated by the Commissioners, 1 at the close of December 31 of each of the first 3 years which begin after the date of enactment of this act. Subsequent terms of each such office shall be 3 years beginning January 1 following the expiration of the preceding term of such office. Any person appointed to fill a vacant office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such office. Until his successor is appointed and has qualified, a member may continue to serve even though the term of the office to which he was appointed has expired.

QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall be a member of the Board unless he qualifies as an elector and resides in the District. No person may be appointed to the Board unless he has resided in the District continuously since the beginning of the 3-year period ending on the day he is appointed. Members of the Board shall hold no other paid office or employment in the District government and shall hold no active office, position or employment in the Federal Government. Not more than two members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation of $25 per day while performing duties under this act. Except as provided in subsection (a) no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Board because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source. The right to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the Board, or as an employee of the Board.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall—

(1) maintain a permanent registry, keeping it accurate and current;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(4) divide the District into appropriate voting precincts, each of which shall contain at least 350 registered persons;

(5) operate polling places;

(6) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(7) perform such other duties as are imposed upon it by this act.

(b) The Board, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 7, 8, and 10. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(c) The Board may prescribe such regulations as it considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) The Board may employ necessary personnel, at such rates of compensation as may be fixed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without reference to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

BOARD TO BE INDEPENDENT AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of its duties, the Board shall not be subject to the direction of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(b) The District government shall furnish to the Board, upon request of the Board, such space and facilities as are available in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable the Board properly to perform its functions. Subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, privately owned space, facilities and equipment may be rented for the registration, polling, and other functions of the Board.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) No person shall vote in any election in the District unless he is a qualified elector and, except as provided in subsection (e), is registered in the District.

(b) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he is a qualified elector;

(2) he has resided in the District continuously since the beginning of the 9-month period ending on the day he offers to register; and

(3) he executes a registration affidavit by signature or mark (unless prevented by physical disability) on the form prescribed by the Board pursuant to subsection (c), showing his political affiliation, and that he meets each of the requirements specified in section 2 (2) for a qualified elector as well as the requirement of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(c) In administering the provisions of subsection (b) (3), the Board shall prepare and use a registration affidavit form in which each request for information is readily understandable and can be satisfied by a concise answer or mark. The Board may request additional information required to determine whether the registrant meets the requirements imposed by or referred to in subsection (b).

(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the 15-day period ending on the first Tuesday in May of each presidential election year, and except as provided by the Board in the case of a special election. While the registry is open, any person may apply for registration or change his registration.

(e) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board, but not later than 3 days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within 5 days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied, the appellant may, within 3 days after such denial, appeal to the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged," as provided in section 9 (d).

NOMINATIONS: CONTENTS OF BALLOTS

SEC. 8. (a) Candidates for office participating in an election held pursuant to this Act shall be the persons registered under section 7 who have been nominated for such office by a petition—

(1) prepared and presented to the Board in accordance with rules prescribed by the Board, but not later than 30 days before the date of the election; and

(2) signed by not less than 100 voters, registered under section 7, and of the same political party as the nominee.

(b) No person shall hold elected office pursuant to this act unless he has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia continuously since the beginning of the 3-year period ending on the date of the next election, and is a qualified elector registered under section 7.

(c) The Board shall arrange the ballot of each political party so as to enable the voters of such party—

(1) to vote for the candidates duly qualified and nominated for election by such party under this act;

(2) to answer in the affirmative or negative such questions relating to the conduct of the affairs of such party as the duly authorized local committee of such party may file with the Board in writing: *Provided, however,* That the questions shall be so filed not later than 30 days before the date of the election; and

(3) to state their preferences, as candidates for President and Vice President, from among those persons (A) whose names have been certified to the Board in writing by the local committee of the applicable political party and (B) who have filed with such committee and the Board in writing their consent to the use of their names for such purposes: *Provided, however,* That the documents required by this clause shall be filed with the Board not later than 30 days before the date of the election.

METHOD OF VOTING

SEC. 9. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) the ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(c) Each qualified candidate may have a watcher at each polling place, provided the watcher presents proper credentials signed by the candidate. No one shall interfere with the opportunity of a watcher to observe the conduct of the election at that polling place and the counting of votes. Watchers may challenge prospective voters who are believed to be unqualified to vote.

(d) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any such challenge or acting on his own initiative with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged." Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (e).

(e) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board within 3 days after election day. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the appeal is denied, the appellant may within 3 days of such denial appeal to the municipal court of the District of Columbia. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(f) If the official in charge of the polling place is satisfied that a qualified elector is unable to record his vote by marking the ballot or operating the voting machine, two officials of the polling place shall on the request of the voter enter the voting booth and vote as directed. The officials shall tell no one how the voter voted. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(g) No person shall vote more than once in any election nor in any election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be a member.

(h) Copies of the regulations of the Board with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

ABSENTEE VOTING

SEC. 10. (a) Any absentee resident shall be given the right and opportunity to vote in any election, and in the manner hereinafter provided.

(b) An absentee resident referred to in section 2 (4) (A) hereof who has reason to believe that because of his status as such he will be unable to vote in person may make application to the Board requesting an absentee ballot. An absentee resident shall be entitled to be sent an absentee ballot only if the application therefor is received by the Board at least 30 days before the date of an election.

(c) Any disabled absentee resident referred to in section 2 (4) (B) hereof may, either directly or through an agent, apply in writing to the Board, not less than 10 days before any election, stating—

(1) the name of his or her agent; and

(2) the disabled voter's name, postoffice address, and residence, and the political party with which such disabled voter affiliates. The voter shall accompany such application with a certificate, from a duly licensed and practicing physician, certifying that such elector is (A) compos mentis, (B) not afflicted with any contagious disease or under quarantine, and (C) in such a state of health that it would be dangerous and unwise for the voter to attempt to vote in person at the designated polling place.

(d) The Board shall furnish upon receipt of application from an absentee resident the proper ballot, two envelopes, and a voter's certificate. One envelope shall be marked as the "return envelope" and shall be sufficiently larger than the "ballot envelope" to conveniently enclose the "ballot envelope." The "return envelope" shall be addressed to insure prompt delivery to the Board, and the postage shall be prepaid.

The "voter's certificate" shall be substantially in the following form:

"VOTER'S CERTIFICATE

"The undersigned hereby certifies that he is a qualified elector in the District of Columbia; that the ballot enclosed in the 'ballot envelope' was exhibited by me to the attesting witness named below; that at the time I so exhibited the same to said attesting witness there were no cross marks opposite the names of any candidate or questions to be voted on; that thereafter I marked the same in the presence of said attesting witness, but in such a way that neither he nor any other person could see or learn for what candidates or questions thereon I voted; that thereupon in his presence I folded said ballot and without showing the same to any person, enclosed the same in the 'ballot envelope' and sealed it.

"Dated at ______________ this _____ day of ____________, 19___.

"____________________
"Voter's signature.

"CERTIFICATE OF ATTESTING WITNESS

"I hereby certify that I have read the foregoing certificate and know the contents thereof and that the same is true.

"Dated at ______________ this _____ day of ____________, 19___.

"____________________
"Attesting Witness."

Printed on the back of the "voter's certificate" shall be directions to voters in substantially the following form:

"DIRECTIONS TO VOTERS

"(1) Examine the ballot before marking. When once marked, do not erase, as an erasure will invalidate the ballot. Mark the ballot with either pencil or ink by placing an X in the block after each candidate for whom you wish to vote and in the appropriate block after each question, for or against which you wish to vote. Do not sign your name or put on the ballot any mark except the X mark or marks. Fold the ballot the same as it was folded before opening.

"(2) The ballot must be marked and sealed in the 'ballot envelope' in the presence of an attesting witness as provided hereinbelow, but in such a manner as to prevent such witness or any other person from knowing or learning how you have voted as to any candidate or question.

"(3) After marking and enclosing ballot in the 'Ballot Envelope' you and the attesting witness must each sign your respective names to 'Voter's Certificate' and 'Certificate of Attesting Witness.'

"(4) Do not put 'Voter's Certificate' in 'Ballot Envelope' but enclose same in 'Return Envelope.'

"(5) Enclose 'Ballot Envelope' and 'Voter's Certificate' in 'Return Envelope,' seal the latter, then deposit same in the Post Office in presence of, or by the attesting witness.

"(6) The ballot may be marked and mailed at any time after you receive it; it must, however, be mailed before 12 midnight of the day of election. If not postmarked by that time it will not be counted.

"(7) Any United States postmaster, assistant postmaster, postal supervisor, clerk in charge of a contract postal station, or any officer having authority to administer an oath or take an acknowledgment may be an attesting witness."

(e) The Board shall cause to be printed an adequate number of absentee ballots, envelopes, and voter's certificates, and shall make them available to the absentee residents as provided herein. The words "Absentee Ballot" shall be printed in large letters at the top of each ballot. The Board shall make provision for the deposit and counting of such ballots.

(f) Any qualified elector who anticipates that he will be absent from the District on the day of an election held pursuant to this act, but who is present after the ballots for such election are available, may appear in person before the Board prior to the day of such election and may certify under oath before a duly authorized official of the Board that he will be absent from the District on such election day. Upon the completion of such a certificate the elector may obtain his ballot and vote it without removing it from the premises of the Board.

ELECTIONS

SEC. 11. (a) The elections of the officials referred to in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first section and of officials designated pursuant to clause (4) of such section shall be held on the first Tuesday in May of each presidential election year. Any such election shall be conducted by the Board in conformity with the provisions of this act. Polls shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridian to 8 o'clock postmeridian on election days.

(b) Candidates receiving the highest number of votes in said election shall be declared the winners.

(c) In the case of a tie, the candidates receiving the tie vote shall cast lots before the Board, at 12 o'clock noon on a date to be set by the Board, but not sooner than 10 days following the primary, and the one to whom the lot shall fall shall be declared the winner. If any candidate or candidates, receiving a tie vote, fail to appear before 12 o'clock noon on said day, the Board shall cast lots for him or them. For the purpose of casting lots any candidate may appear in person, or by proxy appointed in writing.

(d) In the event that any official elected pursuant to this act dies during his or her term of office leaving no person elected pursuant to this act to serve the remainder of the unexpired term of office, the successor or successors to serve the remainder of such term shall be chosen pursuant to the rules of the duly authorized local committee.

RECOUNTS AND CONTESTS

SEC. 12. (a) If, within 7 days after the Board certifies the results of an election, any qualified candidate at such election petitions the Board to have the votes cast at such election recounted in one or more voting precincts, the Board shall order such recount. In each such case, the petitioner shall deposit a fee of $20 for each precinct petitioned to be recounted. If the cost of the recount is less than $20 per precinct, the difference shall be refunded. If the result of the election is changed as a result of the recount, the entire amount deposited by the petitioner shall be refunded. Such recounts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed by the Board by regulation.

(b) Within 7 days after the Board certifies the results of an election, any person who voted in the election may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review such election. In response to such a petition, the court may set aside the results so certified and declare the true results of the election, or void the election in whole or in part. To determine the true results of an election the court may order a recount or take other appropriate action, whether or not a recount has been conducted or requested pursuant to subsection (a). The court shall void an election only for fraud, mistake, the making of expenditures by a candidate in violation of this act, or other defect, serious enough to vitiate the election as a fair expression of the will of the registered qualified electors voting therein. If the court voids an election it may order a special election, which shall be conducted in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for regular elections), and at such time, as the Board shall prescribe. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

INTERFERENCE WITH REGISTRATION OR VOTING

SEC. 13. No one shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law.

EXPENDITURES

SEC. 14. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the funds of the District of Columbia, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Subject to the penalties provided in this act. a candidate for national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(c) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign covered by this act.

(d) No person shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 in connection with any campaign for election of any national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate.

(e) Every candidate and independent committee or party committee shall, within 10 days after the election, file with the Board of Elections an itemized statement, subscribed and sworn to, by the candidate or committee treasurer, as the case may be, setting forth all moneys received and expended in connection with said election, the names of persons from whom received and to whom paid, and the purpose for which it was expended. Such statement shall set forth any unpaid debts and obligations incurred by the candidate or independent committee or party committee with regard to such election, and specify the balance, if any, of such election funds remaining in his or their hands.

PENALTIES

SEC. 15. Any person who shall register, or attempt to register, under the provisions of this act and make any false representations as to his place of residence or his voting privilege in any other part of the United States, or be guilty of bribery or intimidation of any voter at the elections herein provided for, or, being registered, shall vote or attempt to vote more than once in any election so held, or shall purloin or secrete any of the votes cast in such elections, or attempt to vote in an election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be affiliated, or, if employed in the counting of votes in such elections, make a false report in regard thereto, and every candidate, person, or official of any political committee who shall make any expenditure or contribution in violation of this act, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both. The provisions of this section shall be supplemental to and not in derogation of any penalties under other laws of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 676, Senate bill 1835.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1835) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1835) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

> That (a) the last sentence of section 3 (c) (2) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 988), is hereby repealed.
>
> (b) Section 7 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

And in lieu thereof to insert:

> That (a) section 7 (b) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 993), is amended to read as follows:

On page 3, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; after line 7, to strike out:

> (c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have been paid wages for employment of not less than $130 in 1 quarter in his base period, must have been paid wages for employment in not less than 2 quarters in such period, and his total wages earned in such period must equal at least 1½ times the amount of his wages for the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

> "(c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have (1) been paid wages for employment of not less than $130 in one quarter in his base period, (2) been paid wages for employment in not less than two quarters in such period, and (3) earned during such period wages the total amount of which is equal to at least 1½ times the amount of his wages for the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest. Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3), any otherwise qualified individual the total amount of whose wages during such period is less than the amount required to have been earned during such period under such clause may qualify for benefits if the difference between the amount so required to have been earned and the total amount of his wages during such period does not exceed $70, but the amount of his weekly benefit, as computed under section 7 (b), shall be reduced by $1 if such difference does not exceed $35 or by $2 if such difference is more than $35."

On page 4, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; on page 5, line 20, after the numeral "1", to strike out "1955" and insert "1955, and the benefit rights of any individual having a benefit year current on or after the effective date shall be redetermined and benefits for calendar weeks ending subsequent to the effective date shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this act: *Provided*, That no claimant shall have his benefits reduced or denied by redetermination resulting from the application of this provision. All initial and continued claims for benefits for weeks occurring within a benefit year which commences on or after the effective date shall be computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this act."

Mr. **KNOWLAND**. Mr. President, I wonder whether we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act by, first, increasing the maximum weekly benefit amount; second, changing the duration period for all eligible claimants to a uniform maximum period of 26 weeks; and, third, changing the disqualification provisions to a straight 6-week disqualification, with no cancellation of benefits.

Under existing law, the maximum weekly benefit is $30, or less than two-fifths of the average weekly wage in the District, which is estimated to be between $80 and $85 a week. The bill makes the maximum weekly benefit amount a specified percentage—67 percent—of the average wage of all workers covered by the law, or approximately 50 percent of weekly earnings, whichever is lower, rather than a fixed dollar amount. This will eliminate continued future demands on Congress to change the maximum weekly benefit amount in order that it may keep pace with rising and/or declining wages.

The bill provides that all claimants who are eligible for benefits will be able to draw no more than 26 weeks of benefits if they remain unemployed for that long a period; however, the worker would, of course, be required to be able to work, to be available for work, and to accept suitable work when offered to him.

The bill provides that the period of disqualification for voluntary quitting of work, discharge of misconduct, or refusal of suitable work shall be 6 weeks. Under the present law the disqualification is from 4 to 9 weeks, depending on the judgment of the interviewer with whom the claim is filed; and the future benefit rights are reduced by the number of weeks for which the claimant is disqualified.

Mr. President, I should like to add that the bill has the unanimous support of the subcommittee, and that it passed the full committee with no dissenting vote, except in the case of one Senator who stated that he reserved the right to object, later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question now is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, in line 16, strike out the word "computed", and insert in lieu thereof: "computed: *Provided,* That such weekly benefits, if not a multiple of one dollar, shall be computed to the next higher multiple of one dollar."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I offer another amendment, as follows: On page 4, in line 11, after the word "amount", strike out the colon, and the following: "*Provided,* That such total amount of benefits, if not a multiple of one dollar, shall be computed to the next higher multiple of one dollar."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1835) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 7 (b) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 993), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The weekly benefit amount of any individual qualified therefor under section 7 (c) shall be an amount equal to the lesser of the following: (1) one twenty-third of the amount of his earnings for the quarter in his base period in which his earnings were the highest, or (2) 67 per cent of the average weekly earnings of all individuals performing service which constitutes employment (as defined in section 1 (b)) and of all individuals performing service which, if such service were not performed in the employ of the United States or of any wholly owned instrumentality thereof, would constitute employment (as defined in section 1 (b)) for the latest year for which such average weekly earnings have been computed: *Provided,* That such weekly benefits, if not a multiple of $1, shall be computed to the next higher multiple of $1. Such average weekly earnings shall be computed annually on the basis of reports of earnings and employment by all employers and by the United States, and shall be arrived at by dividing the total earnings paid to all individuals referred to in clause (2) of this subsection during the last completed calendar year for which reports have been received by a quantity equal to 4⅓ times the total monthly employment of such individuals for such period. For the purposes of this subsection the term 'earnings' shall have the same meaning as that assigned to such term in section 1 (d). All departments, agencies, and wholly owned instrumentalities of the United States shall submit reports to the Board containing such information as may be necessary to make the determination required by this subsection."

(b) Section 7 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have (1) been paid wages for employment of not less than $130 in 1 quarter in his base period, (2) been paid wages for employment in not less than 2 quarters in such period, and (3) earned during such period wages the total amount of which is equal to at least 1½ times the amount of his wages for the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest. Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3), any otherwise qualified individual the total amount of whose wages during such period is less than the amount required to have been earned during such period under such clause may qualify for benefits if the difference between the amount so required to have been earned and the total amount of his wages during such period does not exceed $70, but the amount of his weekly benefit, as computed under section 7 (b), shall be reduced by $1 if such difference does not exceed $35 or by $2 if such difference is more than $35."

(c) Section 7 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any otherwise eligible individual shall be entitled during any benefit year to a total amount of benefits equal to 26 times his weekly benefit amount: *Provided,* That such total amount of benefits, if not a multiple of $1, shall be computed to the next higher multiple of $1."

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of such act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) An individual who has left his most recent work voluntarily without good cause, as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such leaving occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week.

"(b) An individual who has been discharged for misconduct occurring in the course of his most recent work proved to the satisfactiton of the Board shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such discharge occurred and for the 6 weeks of consecutive unemployment immediately following such week.

"(c) If an individual otherwise eligible for benefits fails, without good cause as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, either to apply for new work found by the Board to be suitable when notified by any employment office, or to accept any suitable work when offered to him by any employment office, his union hiring hall, or any employer direct, he shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such failure occurred and with respect to the 6 consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week. In determining whether or not work is suitable within the meaning of this subsection the Board shall consider (1) the physical fitness and prior training, experience, and earnings of the individual, (2) the distance of the place of work from the individual's place of residence, and (3) the risk involved as to health, safety, or morals."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall be effective on and after July 1, 1955, and the benefit rights of any individual having a benefit year current on or after the effective date shall be redetermined and benefits for calendar weeks ending subsequent to the effective date shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this act: *Provided,* That no claimant shall have his benefits reduced or denied by redetermination resulting from the application of this provision. All initial and continued claims for benefits for weeks occurring within a benefit year which commences on or after the effective date shall be computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this act.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. **CLEMENTS**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. **CLEMENTS**. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the information of the Senate, that this measure will not be considered on tomorrow; it is very likely that it will be considered further by the Senate on Thursday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I also wish to state, for the information of the Senate, that the public works appropriation bill conference report probably will be acted on by the House of Representatives this afternoon. If that happens, and if the report is disposed of in the House of Representatives this afternoon, and comes to the Senate before the opening of the session tomorrow, that conference report will be the first order of business when the Senate convenes, tomorrow.

I wish to state, further, that it is the intention of the acting majority leader to arrange to have a calendar call on Monday, when the calendar call probably will not begin before 2 p. m.

I should also like to state for the information of the Senate that no other measures will be taken up tomorrow, unless they be of a noncontroversial nature, regarding which the minority leader and the acting majority leader can agree sometime tomorrow.

I also desire to announce for the information of the Senate that on tomorrow the Senate is likely to consider the conference report on House bill 6295, relating to travel allowances, if the House of Representatives acts on the conference report today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am very glad to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Does the acting majority leader have any idea when the military Reserve bill will be before the Senate?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say to my good friend from Michigan that I have no information which would permit me to set a date certain. I assure him that the acting majority leader is very desirous of bringing the measure to the floor at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. POTTER. Do I correctly understand the acting majority leader to say that on Monday there will be a call of the calendar,

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Will there be any record votes, or will any controversial matters be brought up at that time?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I cannot say at this time that no controversial matters will be taken up on Monday, but certainly by Thursday we ought to know whether any controversial matters will be taken up on Monday.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator.

DEATH OF HON. GUY MASON, FORMER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the people of Washington were grieved to learn of the passing of Guy Mason, who served for about 10 years as a Commissioner of the District of Columbia. During the 80th Congress it was my good fortune to become acquainted with Commissioner Mason, when I was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the District of Columbia budget. He was a very devoted public official, who rendered outstanding service to this community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point 2 editorials, 1 from the Washington Post and Times Herald and 1 from the Washington Evening Star, paying tribute to the late Commissioner.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

Guy Mason

Despite the handicaps under which he worked as a District Commissioner for 10 years, Guy Mason will be remembered as one of the most respected as well as one of the most colorful of our local public servants. He stepped into the commissionership in 1941 without any previous experience in public life, although he had a varied career in the Army, in newspaper work, and in the law. Assuming supervision over the difficult fields of health and welfare in wartime when the demands for service were rapidly expanding and appropriations often lagged, he had as difficult a role as any city father has faced since the days of Governor Shepherd. He played it with resoluteness, courage, and a rugged devotion to the public good even though some of his decisions were highly controversial.

Mr. Mason's bluntness sometimes spelled trouble. It was not unusual for him to voice his first reactions, as in his threat at one time to fire Dr. George C. Ruhland, then District Health Officer, before he had investigated all the facts. But after an explosion he was quick to make amends. Even those who were subjects of his biting remarks respected his integrity and his sincere devotion to the District.

It is well to remember that in the decade while Guy Mason was Commissioner the District budget expanded from $49 million to $121 million. The city grew at an uncomfortable rate and Mr. Mason grew with it. Despite his poor health during the later years of his service, he labored diligently to keep municipal services abreast of the ever-increasing demands. With his death at the age of 74, his name will be recorded in the annals of the Nation's Capital with affection as well as respect.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

Guy Mason

Guy Mason took office as a District Commissioner a few months before Pearl Harbor, and the full decade of his service was marked by rapid and profound changes in the character of Washington that made his term a rugged one. He brought to his job an intimate knowledge of the city and its people, and there have been few commissioners who applied themselves with more obvious relish for the duties and responsibilities of his position. He knew and candidly admitted his weaknesses as an administrator, but they were very human and understandable weaknesses, never the result of cowardice or indecision, but reflecting streaks of impulsiveness, short temper and sometimes stubbornness that commanded more affection than censure from those who came to know him. No one ever questioned his rugged honesty, reflected in his own willingness to admit error without harboring grudges against those who may have pointed it out. He left office with more friends than when he took over, and with nothing to be ashamed of and no regrets. He was not well in the final months of his administration, and in the hearts of his friends there is the satisfaction of knowing that despite the nature and length of his illness, he lived his full span of years with a rich enjoyment that found him ready to accept their peaceful end.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT EXPEDITION OF MERIWETHER LEWIS AND WILLIAM CLARK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many great events have played a part in the development of the American West, but none half so eventful or significant as the expedition across the continent led by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

This trek marked the first time that Americans ever spanned North America. It resulted in the exploration of the vast Louisiana Purchase and of the unknown wilderness which lay beyond. It helped to bring under American sovereignty what we now know as the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nevada, and Missouri.

The year 1955 heralds the 150th anniversary of the most memorable exploration in the history of the United States—indeed, the Lewis and Clark Expedition explored the very heartland of the United States, the citadel of our country.

In 1805 these two Army officers, with their followers, arrived at the mouth of the Columbia River. On that lonely seacoast, they flew the flag of 15 stripes and 15 stars. In the name of Thomas Jefferson, our illustrious third President, they claimed the prodigious area between St. Louis and the Pacific Ocean.

STILL NEAR TO LEWIS AND CLARK

I never realized how close we were to Lewis and Clark in time and space until my wife and I rode over the most perilous segment of their trail—in the Montana-Idaho solitudes, where the valiant explorers nearly starved to death. Far below us, in a prison of granite and lava rock, growled the icy Lochsa Fork of the Clearwater River, which drains the Bitterroot Mountain Range westward.

At Indian Post Office, highest point on the overgrown path, we walked through a meadow of bear grass, with its white pom-pom puffs, and saw three cairns of stones. They were about 6 feet high apiece. From one cairn protruded the bare trunk of a lodgepole pine. In my knapsack was a two-volume edition of the Lewis and Clark Journals. Hastily, I thumbed through one of the books. The hair on the back of my neck stiffened and gooseflesh ruffled my spine, as I suddenly knew that these conical mounds dated all the way from those original westbound Americans.

No iron cage or armed sentry protected the relics. They stood there on the windswept ridge, as they were in the time of Lewis and Clark—crude posts that guided the primitive Nez Perce Indians through the tangled labyrinth of the Bitterroots.

The Lolo Trail of Lewis and Clark is still that wild and remote. This segment of their route has yet to succumb to civilization, so the historic old cairns need no guards. Indeed, the very name "Lolo" has about it an air of the untrammeled freedom which symbolizes the wide open spaces of the West. The expedition's French-Canadian voyagers, whose perilous job it was to run hurtling rivers in clumsy log canoes, spoke of Lewis as "Le Louis." To the Nez Perce, grappling with the white man's perplexing tongue, this became in time the lilting "Lolo." When westerners now think of hardships and drama in the wilderness, the name "Lolo" invariably comes to mind. After Gen. William T. Sherman had read the early reports of pioneering cavalry troops, he concluded:

> The Lolo Trail must be the most terrible trail for man and beast on the Continent of North America.

LOLO TRAIL SYMBOLIZES THE EXPLORERS

My wife and I feel a kinship and affinity with Lewis and Clark, Mr. President, because we have been over the entire route of these brave explorers in preparation for the writing that I have done about the expedition. I imagine we are among the comparative handful of people who have traveled the whole Lolo Trail, where it threads the high divide above the Lochsa River. Each time that we make a pilgrimage into the Lochsa solitudes, we become more convinced of the heroism and resourcefulness of these greatest of American frontiersmen. Whenever we read again the pages of the Lewis and Clark Journals, we understand what Theodore Roosevelt was talking about when he said of the Lewis and Clark Expedition:

> It was all that an exploration ever should be.

Can any other deed in our Nation's annals match the feat of these men, who trekked 8,000 miles through a trackless realm inhabited by thousands of savages who never before had glimpsed people of white skin, and yet did not lose a single life to an act of violence?

This, in truth, was America's unparalleled outdoor adventure.

BILLS SEEK TO CREATE NATIONAL MONUMENTS

Mr. President, to perpetuate memory of the greatest of all American explorations, I am introducing today two bills which seek to establish as permanent national monuments a pair of historic spots on the Lewis and Clark trail. One bill would provide for the creation of a national monument at the original site of old Fort Clatsop, where Lewis and Clark erected the first habitation ever built by Americans on our Pacific coast. This spot, near the mouth of the vast Columbia River, happily is now owned by the Oregon Historical Society, and I am assured by Thomas Vaughn, the society's director, of warm support for this move.

Incidentally, Mr. President, a number of outstanding civic groups now are cooperating with the Oregon Historical Society to recreate old Fort Clatsop as part of the 150th Lewis and Clark celebrations this summer. The groups include the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, the Lions Club, the Finnish Brotherhood, the Colonial Dames of Oregon, the Oregon State Sesquicentennial Committee and the Crown-Zellerbach Lumber Corp.

My second bill on this occasion of the anniversary of the Lewis and Clark Expedition seeks to establish a national monument at the meadow where are located the three rock cairns which I earlier mentioned. This remote meadow is in the Lolo National Forest of Idaho, on the high divide between the Lochsa and Clearwater Rivers. It contains the last surviving relics—in an original condition—of the first westbound Americans. Its designation as a national historic shrine would be highly appropriate. Let me say at this point that I believe the meadow known as Indian Post Office should be preserved in its present wild state and not exploited commercially.

I am introducing these bills for the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] as well as for myself. I send them to the desk for their appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DWORSHAK), were received, read twice by their title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

> S. 2498. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument; and
>
> S. 2499. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Indian Post Office, located in the Lolo National Forest, Idaho, as a national monument.

AT ST. LOUIS, THE MARVELOUS PILGRIMAGE BEGAN

Mr. NEUBERGER. From St. Louis, at the edge of American civilization, Sgt. John Ordway, of the United States Army, wrote to his father and mother in New Hampshire:

> Honored parents, I am now on an expedition to the westward with Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clark, who are appointed by President Jefferson to go through the interior of North America. We are to ascend the Missouri River and then go by land to the great western ocean.

A courier went through the camp collecting such messages from men who were not sure they ever would be heard from again. Then, late on the rainy afternoon of May 14, 1804, the 29 members of the party embarked in 2 long, trim rowboats and a 55-foot bargelike bateau. They were voyaging into the unknown.

At St. Louis geography ended and myth began. The Indians whispered of the Shining or Rocky Mountains which scraped the sky. Was this merely one of their legends? Jefferson, when Minister to France, had heard mariners who sailed with Captain Cook on his Pacific voyages describe evergreen forests as boundless as the oceans and peaks high as the Alps, to be seen on America's western shore. Were their tales true? Jefferson's lively imagination had been fired and thenceforward he dreamed of sending brave men to "explore the great wilderness beyond the Mississippi and form a line of communication from sea to sea."

THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNED THE TREK

As soon as his envoys had bought from Napoleon, for an eventual total of $27,267,622, the more than a million square miles of territory that France claimed on the sundown side of the Mississippi, Jefferson asked Congress for $2,500 to finance its exploration. "And let us search out even that which lies beyond," he urged. Some Members of Congress feared this was an extravagance.

To lead the expedition the President selected his private secretary, 29-year-old Meriwether Lewis, believing that this young captain in the Army had a determination which nothing could conquer. Such a man was needed; there might be more than dangers of the wilderness to face and the temptations to turn back would be many. A race for empire was in prospect, for the British were talking of sending men to hoist the Union Jack at the mouth of the Columbia.

Jefferson suggested that Lewis select an alternative commander and Lewis named his best friend, William Clark, a 34-year-old artillery lieutenant.

They were in strong contrast. Lewis' thin countenance, with defiant jaw and slate-gray eyes, had an eaglelike intensity. He was taciturn, almost gloomy. Clark, redheaded, red-faced, was never stern or silent. His cheerful chatter often had revived the spirits of troops weary on the march. He liked to dodge officers' mess to eat with the men; he hailed colonels and corporals alike by their first names. He got along with Indians better than anyone else in the Army, possibly because he treated them as equals.

Clark went from post to post on the frontier, asking picked men if they wanted to plant their country's flag on the western ocean. Lewis arranged for supplies, which included presents for the Indians—mirrors, red cloth, needles, beads, calico shirts.

WAGES OF THE PARTY WERE ARMY PAY

Men picked for the journey were enlisted in the Army at $10 a month for privates, $15 for the three sergeants, $80 each for Lewis and Clark, and as a bonus they were promised parcels of land. Whether any of them would survive to enjoy these rewards was considered doubtful. Their eventual destination was so indefinite that Thomas Jefferson gave them papers bespeaking the good offices of "our consuls in Batavia, in Java, and at the Cape of Good Hope."

As they rowed up the sluggish Missouri River, under the flag with 15 stars, the party was a cross-section of the expanding Nation. Alongside Kentuckians chosen for their woodcraft were hunters from Virginia, farmers from Vermont, carpenters from Pennsylvania. There were Irishmen, Scots, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen. Near Lieutenant Clark in the first boat crouched his brawny Negro servant, York.

The explorers had not gone far before they realized that the map the President had supplied was useless; it did not even indicate the correct direction of the river. All they could do was to follow the Missouri to its source. From there, dead reckoning might take them to the sea. For the first few months it was an idyllic journey—comfortable camps at night, days uneventful save for sightseeing. By firelight the two leaders worked painstakingly on their journals, for the President and Congress wanted complete reports on plants, trees, beasts, birds, and Indians. One evening Lewis wrote:

> In addition to the common deer, which were in great abundance, we saw goats, elk, buffalo, antelope, the black-tailed deer, and the large wolves.

They counted 52 herds of bison in 1 day.

Three months out of St. Louis, the adventurers had voyaged 850 miles and were not far from what is now Sioux City, Iowa. The going got harder. The clumsy bateau repeatedly lurched aground on sandbars. One man collapsed from sunstroke. Sgt. Charles Floyd died of colic in the choking heat of an August afternoon. They buried him on a high bluff, the first American soldier to die west of the Mississippi. The boats went on, the men silent, Lewis wrapped in thought. A man dead, many sick, the real perils just begun. Medical authorities today think Floyd probably was the victim of a ruptured appendix.

That night, instead of appointing a new sergeant, Lewis told the men themselves to elect a successor to Floyd. Amid much oratory three soldiers were nominated. Grizzled Patrick Gass, of Irish descent, was chosen. Next morning the party took to the boats with renewed zeal; Lewis had turned the men's minds from brooding over the loss of their companion.

Misadventures multiplied. Nineteen-year-old George Shannon, on scout duty, got lost and almost starved. A riverbank crumbled and nearly destroyed the precious supplies. Lewis, habitually scouting ahead, had several narrow escapes from stampeding buffalo.

SACAJAWEA JOINS THE GREAT PILGRIMAGE

Most of the Indians they met were friendly, grunting with pleasure over trinkets and delighted with strong spirits dealt out in judicious doses. Whenever possible, chiefs of nearby tribes were summoned to pow-wows under a sailcloth canopy, the flag flying, and told about the Great White Father in Washington to whom they now owed loyalty. Council Bluffs takes its name from one of these pow-wows.

Gradually the huge pile of presents dwindled, and word of the remarkable white men spread over the prairie. To one mighty chief the generous Clark gave his army uniform. Several times Sioux warriors threatened an attack in an effort to get all the wonderful gifts, but were backed down by a rattling of cutlasses and by a reminder that the mysterious Great White Father could exterminate them all.

A lazy halfbreed, Toussaint Charbonneau, interpreted. The party had picked him up along the route. With him was his 19-year-old Indian wife, Sacajawea, slender in figure, with long braids and dark eyes. Six years before, she had been stolen from the mountain-dwelling Shoshones by marauding braves, and Charbonneau had won her in a gambling bout. A woman on the expedition? Lewis and Clark hesitated, but they desperately needed Charbonneau. Besides, Sacajawea's tribe was said to dwell beyond the high ranges. Maybe this Indian girl would know the way.

Meadows and prairies gave way to rolling hills, the hills stiffened into plateaus. But the horizons still were land. Where did it end? Where was the western ocean?

Every day the party found landmarks new to white men. Where a river or promontory had a definite Indian name, Lewis left it that way in the journals. Other places were called after members of the expedition irrespective of rank.

SNARED BY WINTER ON DAKOTA'S PRAIRIE

The first heavy snows fell in November, trapping the party near the site of Bismarck, N. Dak. In the half year they had made 1,600 miles, all up the Missouri. A few traders had been thus far but no white man had ever gone farther. They built a stockade, calling it Fort Mandan for the friendly Mandan Indians, and here during the long dreary winter a baby boy was born to Sacajawea.

On April 7, 1805, the last ice having drifted down the river, Fort Mandan was left behind. So was the bateau, too big for the narrowing Missouri and no longer needed for the dwindling supplies. Six canoes made of buffalo hides and willow branches took its place.

The country grew wilder, the landscape less hospitable. Mosquitoes and gnats were a curse. Buffalo were scarce and, without buffalo hide for patching, clothes and moccasins began to shred.

But the ragged frontiersmen now were unlocking the secrets of the continent. They came upon huge, ferocious, grizzly bears that it took half a dozen musket balls to kill. They spent weeks of backbreaking toil portaging goods and boats past thundering cataracts which they called the Great Falls of the Missouri. And on May 26, 1805, a Sunday, Lewis, who had been scouting ahead as usual, came back to camp excited. He had sighted majestic mountains. This was an American's first glimpse of the Rockies.

Independence Day, 1805, was celebrated at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, 2,500 miles and 14 months from St. Louis. Wistfully, they drank the last of their brandy. Other supplies, too, were running low. Lewis wrote in his journals:

> We all believe that we are about to enter upon the most perilous part of our voyage.

Only the Indian girl, her baby strapped to her back, had the vaguest notion where they were. From out of the memories of her childhood Sacajawea recognized a creek at which her people had collected clay for painting their war parties. When the dwindling Missouri abruptly forked into three branches her memory again helped. She sent them up the swiftest fork, which they named "Jefferson River."

The stream twisted through a labyrinth of volcanic walls at which it clawed with white-capped talons. Sometimes the boats upset and their loads were swept downstream. The men waded through the glacier-fed water, pulling their leaky craft on long ropes, for they could not walk on the steep banks. "The men by being constantly wet are becoming more feeble," Captain Lewis noted. Sharp stones cut to pieces what remained of the moccasins and drops of blood flecked the stream. They had journeyed as close to the crest of the continent as water would take them.

Wherever they looked the skyline was a jagged row of pinnacles, mountains piled on mountains, such peaks as Americans never had seen before. Each ridge surmounted brought a glimpse of a ridge higher still. Eventually they reached the region where now Montana joins Idaho, where the Rockies and the Bitterroot Mountains run parallel in a vast maze. Lewis sent scouts scattering to find some way across. They came back baffled, four of them nursing injuries from severe falls.

TO FIND A ROUTE OVER THE RANGES

By now Lewis realized that he must find the Shoshones or give up the expedition. His fatigued men could not drag themselves over those summits, let alone carry burdens; they must have horses. Rations were low and they could never survive a Rocky Mountain winter. Soon the snows would start and it would be too late even to go back. They had not seen an Indian for 4 months though Sacajawea insisted that she twice had seen the smoke signals of her people.

Lewis chose three rugged men and pushed on ahead. Every morning when they broke camp they left beads and mirrors as tokens of friendliness to any Indians who might stumble onto the dead fires. At last, ragged and exhausted, they crawled to the top of a high ridge and looked down the Pacific slope of the Rockies. Here, on the Continental Divide, they unfurled the flag. They had 2 pounds of flour left.

As Chief Cameahwait and 60 mounted Shoshone braves jogged over the crest of Lemhi Pass late in the afternoon of August 13, 1805, they saw tottering toward them a tall, ragged stranger with pale skin. In his right hand he carried a cloth of red, white, and blue. Half a hundred paces to the rear were three other strangers with long black sticks.

"Tabba bone—white man—" the hollowed-eyed stranger said.

"Ah hi e—I am much pleased"—the young chief replied gravely. There on the roof of the continent the feathered savage and the Virginia gentleman embraced and slapped each other on the back.

Game had been scarce that year, and the Shoshones were hungry, yet they shared with the white men. The captain's pulse quickened when the chief offered him roast salmon. Salmon came from the sea, from distant salt water.

Lewis bartered ornaments, coats, blankets, and knives for 38 horses, which were sent back to bring up the main party. A dramatic incident marked the reunion of the two parties. Sacajawea, meeting Cameahwait, greeted him with affectionate cries. They were brother and sister. Nevertheless, when the party went on, Sacajawea chose to stick with her husband and with Lewis and Clark, rather than return to her own people.

HUNGER ON THE PERILOUS LOLO TRAIL

A withered old Shoshone, whom Clark christened "Toby," volunteered to act as guide. He was not much help. They wandered in the Bitterroot Range like men in a rockbound fortress, while snow began to plug the passes. Provisions ran out. They had to kill some of the horses, which were starving, too, with ground bare of fodder. One day there was only a brace of pheasants for 32 mouths to eat. They scraped the bed of Hungry Creek for crawfish; they grubbed for roots. One wretched night they ate a timber wolf Lewis shot. Bratton was in desperate plight, and Lewis gave him his mount and struggled ahead on foot. A horse loaded with winter coats and Lewis' precious writing desk slipped, screamed in terror, and vanished over a precipice.

Finally they reached open country, at the end of the grim Lolo Trail. They looked like skeletons, and now even the inexorable driver, Lewis, collapsed. While he lay beside the Clearwater River, too weak even to sit up, the others trimmed pine logs and burned out the cores to shape rude canoes. The work was hard for exhausted men and it went slowly. This was near the present site of Orofino, Idaho.

In the canoes they floated down the Clearwater and into the Snake at the spot where Lewiston, Idaho, stands. They paddled down the Snake and, about the middle of October, came to a mighty river which surged out of the north and bent westward. This was the Columbia, the Great River Oregon, which for two generations adventurous souls had dreamed of exploring.

For 3 weeks more they stroked the bulky canoes between mountains and grassy meadows and fir forests. Snowy peaks loomed overhead like white castles. One quiet night a soldier heard a far-off roar. Soon long swells rolled up the river from downstream. Gulls flew overhead. The water was full of salmon. There was a tang of salt in the air.

Fog cloaked the Columbia on the morning of November 7, 1805, but around noon it cleared and in the distance a wide expanse of tossing breakers was visible. For a moment the men looked out to sea in silence. Then they cheered. In his watersoaked diary Clark scrawled:

> Ocean in view. Oh the joy. We are in view of the ocean, that great Pacific Ocean which we have been so long anxious to see.

For the first time Americans had spanned the continent they would one day settle from coast to coast. On that lonely shore, the flag flapping at his back, Captain Lewis thanked the soldiers in behalf of President Jefferson. They had reached their goal ahead of any nation with rival ambitions, covering 4,100 adventurous miles in a year and a half. Just 150 years later, one could board a plane at St. Louis after daybreak and be in Portland before dark.

CLARK CARVES A MESSAGE IN FIR

Near present-day Astoria, Oreg., the expedition built a stockade, Fort Clatsop, which sheltered them during the second winter, and in the bark of a tall fir that overlooked the sea Lieutenant Clark carved this terse record:

> Wm. Clark, December 3d, 1805, by land from the U. States in 1804 & 5.

Hoping that, even if they were lost on the way home, their success would be known, Lewis prepared a statement which they all signed, attesting that the party had reached the Pacific overland from St. Louis. The document was posted at the fort and copies were sent to Indian villages along the shore. No sign or trace of white men was visible, but perhaps a landing party from some frigate anchoring off that coast would come across them.

Late in March of 1806 the expedition began the long trek homeward. It required only a third of the time consumed in traveling west, for now they had landmarks. Again Sacajawea was helpful, riding at the head of the column with Lewis, her thin arm occasionally pointing the way.

> She has equal fortitude and resolution with any member of the party—

Lewis wrote. They arrived in St. Louis on September 23, 1806, 6 months to the day after abandoning Fort Clatsop.

The Nation had given them up for dead. They had been gone 2 years and 4 months. Cheering crowds escorted them through St. Louis, President Jefferson wrote his congratulations and triumphantly informed Congress of the expedition's success. They had traveled 8,000 miles through wilderness, had reached their objective and returned, had lost only one man—he to illness. People were amazed by the information brought back: fierce bears which weighed 1,000 pounds, mountain ranges three times as lofty as the Alleghenies, buffalo herds measured by horizons, wild sheep with horns shaped like cornucopias, goats that leaped from crag to crag. The New York Gazette predicted that the region would probably never be traveled again, but President Jefferson visioned "a great, free, and independent empire on the Columbia River."

Curiosity about the Far West increased. Men and women started looking with pride and hope toward the vast area across the Mississippi. The bulky journals of Lewis and Clark, supplemented with notes kept by two of the sergeants, were read in hundreds of homes. For the first time people had an accurate idea of what lay past the western frontier of the Nation.

A FEAT WITHOUT PARALLEL IN AMERICA

The Lewis and Clark Expedition still stands as the most important ever undertaken by the United States, clinching our title not only to the vast Louisiana Territory but later to the lands of the Oregon country as well.

Lewis was appointed Governor of Louisiana, and Clark was named Indian Agent for the region and promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Lewis, always a lonely man, was unhappy in political office. In the autumn of 1809, on his way to Washington, D. C., to answer criticism of his administrative methods, he stopped for a night at an inn near Nashville, Tenn. Shortly after midnight a pistol shot waked the household, and the tavern keeper found the 35-year-old explorer on the floor with a gaping wound in his side. He died at dawn. Jefferson, stunned with grief, always believed the captain had committed suicide. Tennessee folk maintained that he had been murdered. The mystery has never been satisfactorily solved.

Not far from where Lewis died a granite shaft stands, graven with the words of the President who sent him westward:

> His courage was undaunted. His firmness and perseverance yielded to nothing but impossibility.

Trees overhang the grave, and on stormy nights the wind roars through them like breakers crashing on the Pacific's distant shore.

This, in essence, Mr. President, is the stirring tale of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. Only men of remarkable valor and intelligence could have accomplished so notable a feat. Meriwether Lewis's name belongs with those of the great explorers of all time—Columbus, Magellan, Balboa, Scott, Mackenzie.

Lewis brooded that he was a failure and this, perhaps, goaded him to immortal success. On his 31st birthday, the captain confided to his Journals as follows:

> This day I completed my thirty-first year, and conceived that I had in all human probability now existed about half the period which I am to remain in this sublunary world. I reflected that I had as yet done but little, very little, to further the happiness of the human race, or to advance the information of the succeeding generation. I viewed with regret the many hours I have spent in indolence, and now sorely feel the want of that information which those hours would have given me had they been judiciously expended. But since they are past and cannot be recalled, I dash from me the gloomy thought, and resolved in future, to redouble my exertions and at least endeavour to promote those two primary objects of human existence, by giving them the aid of that portion of talents which nature and fortune have bestowed on me; or in future, to live for mankind, as I have heretofore lived for myself.

Nor can we pay honor to the Lewis and Clark Expedition, Mr. President, without marveling at the foresight and vision of the man who conceived it. This man, of course, was Thomas Jefferson.

Even while still our envoy to France, Virginia's first citizen had talked with seafarers about a route to the west coast of America. If by sea, why not by land—in spite of the possibly greater hazards?

ONLY $2,500 FINANCED THE ADVENTURE

Jefferson knew that the United States could not survive and prosper as a small Nation cramped along the Atlantic seaboard. He was aware of the measureless resources which undoubtedly lay westward. He dreamed of adding this vast area to his country, of a Nation stretching from one ocean to the other.

Yet in Jefferson's time, as in our own, there were people of the narrow view, men who felt that all mankind's progress had ended. They ridiculed Jefferson's consummation of the Louisiana Purchase. They said the money had been wasted. They referred to his act as "unconstitutional." No denunciation of the President was too trivial. Why was he frittering away $2,500 to send some Army men out into unknown, unmapped, and uncrossed territory?

But Jefferson had the long view of history, and he held to it. Lewis and Clark went west—with the far-reaching and majestic results which we now appreciate.

Jefferson's knowledge and understanding shine through his intimate connection with preparations for the expedition. He counseled Lewis to be patient and peaceful in his dealings with the Indians. In fact, after Lewis' death, the tribute to him from Jefferson particularly dwelt upon the great knowledge which the captain had "of the Indian character, customs, and principles."

Jefferson was so preoccupied with the details of the trek westward that he even sent Lewis to his friend, Dr. Benjamin Rush, for instructions in first aid, medicine, and such crude surgery as a layman could perform. The tiny $2,500 granted by Congress for the party did not permit the luxury of a bona fide surgeon on the journey.

And thus Lewis and Clark made their pilgrimage into the West, and thus they at last returned. Our debt to them and their followers is great. Our admiration for the foresight of Jefferson recognizes no limits.

That is why, Mr. President, on the occasion of this 150th anniversary year of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, I have taken the time of the Senate to relate some of the events and background of this most marvelous of all explorations in the history of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the letter of instructions which President Jefferson gave to Capt. Meriwether Lewis; a brief excerpt from President Jefferson's memoir of Meriwether Lewis, after Lewis' untimely death; an excerpt from chapter 9 of the book The Lewis and Clark Expedition, written by me; an article entitled "Reenacting a Great Exploration," written by Joe Miller and published in the New York Sunday Times of May 10, 1955; and an article entitled "Oregon Hails Lewis and Clark" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1855.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER OF JUNE 20, 1803, FROM PRESIDENT JEFFERSON TO CAPTAIN LEWIS

MERIWETHER LEWIS, Esq.,
Captain of the 1st Regiment of Infantry of the United States of America:

Your situation as Secretary of the President of the United States has made you acquainted with the objects of my confidential message of January 18, 1803, to the legislature; you have seen the act they passed, which, though expressed in general terms, was meant to sanction those objects, and you are appointed to carry them into execution.

Instruments for ascertaining, by celestial observations, the geography of the country through which you will pass have been already provided. Light articles for barter and presents among the Indians, arms for your attendants, say for them 10 to 12 men, boats, tents, and other traveling apparatus, with ammunition, medicine, surgical instruments and provisions, you will have prepared with such aids as the Secretary of War can yield in his departments; and from him also you will receive authority to engage among our troops, by voluntary agreement, the number of attendants above mentioned, over whom you, as their commanding officer, are invested with all the powers the laws give in such a case.

As your movements while within the limits of the United States will be better directed by occasional communications, adapted to circumstances as they arise, they will not be noticed here. What follows will respect your proceedings after your departure from the United States.

Your mission has been communicated to the Ministers here from France, Spain, and Great Britain, and through them to their Governments; and such assurances given them as to its objects, as we trust will satisfy them. The country of Louisiana having been ceded by Spain to France, the passport you have from the Minister of France, the representative of the present sovereign of that country, will be a protection with all its subjects; and that from the Minister of England will entitle you to the friendly aid of any traders of that allegiance with whom you may happen to meet.

The object of your mission is to explore the Missouri River, and such principal streams of it, as, by its course and communication with the waters of the Pacific Ocean, whether the Columbia, Oregon, Colorado, or any other river, may offer the most direct and practicable water communication across the continent for the purposes of commerce.

Beginning at the mouth of the Missouri, you will take observations of latitude and longitude at all remarkable points on the river, and especially at the mouths of rivers, at rapids, at islands, and other places and objects distinguished by such natural marks and characters of a durable kind as that they may with certainty be recognized hereafter. The courses of the river between these points of observation may be supplied by the compass, the logline and by time, corrected by the observations themselves. The variations of the compass, too, in different places, should be noticed.

The interesting points of the portage between the heads of the Missouri, and of the water offering the best communication with the Pacific Ocean, should also be fixed by observation, and the course of that water to the ocean, in the same manner as that of the Missouri.

Your observations are to be taken with great pains and accuracy, to be entered distinctly and intelligibly for others as well as yourself, to comprehend all the elements necessary, with the aid of the usual tables, to fix the latitude and longitude of the places at which they were taken, and are to be rendered to the War Office, for the purpose of having the calculations made concurrently by proper persons within the United States. Several copies of these, as well as of your other notes, should be made at leisure times, and put into the care of the most trustworthy of your attendants, to guard, by multiplying them, against the accidental losses to which they will be exposed. A further guard would be that one of these copies be on the paper of the birch, as less liable to injury from damp than common paper.

The commerce which may be carried on with the people inhabiting the line you will pursue, renders a knowledge of those people important. You will, therefore, endeavor to make yourself acquainted, as far as a diligent pursuit of your journey shall admit, with the names of the nations and their numbers; the extent of the possessions; their relations with other tribes or nations; their language, traditions, monuments; their ordinary occupations in agriculture, fishing, hunting, war, arts, and the implements for these; their food, clothing and domestic accommodations; the diseases prevalent among them, and the remedies they use; moral and physical circumstances which distinguish them from the tribes we know; peculiarities in their laws, customs, and dispositions, and articles of commerce they may need or furnish; and to what extent; and, considering the interest which every nation has in extending and strengthening the authority of reason and justice among the people around them, it will be useful to acquire what knowledge you can of the state of morality, religion, and information among them, as it may better enable those who may endeavor to civilize and instruct them to adopt their measures to the existing notions, and practices of those on whom they are to operate.

Other objects worthy of notice will be, the soil and face of the country, its growth and vegetable productions, especially those not of the United States, the animals of the country generally, and especially those not known in the United States; the remains and accounts of any which may be deemed rare or extinct; the mineral productions of every kind, but particularly metals, limestone, pitcoal, and saltpeter; salines and mineral waters, noting the temperature of the last, and such circumstances as may indicate their character; volcanic appearances; climate, as characterized by the thermometer, by the proportion of rainy, cloudy, and clear days, by lightning, hail, snow, ice, by the access and recess of frost, by the winds prevailing at different seasons, the dates at which particular plants put forth or lose their flower or leaf, times of appearance of particular birds, reptiles, or insects.

Although your route will be along the channel of the Missouri, yet you will endeavor to inform yourself, by inquiry, of the character and extent of the country watered by its branches, and especially on its southern side. The North River, or Rio Bravo, which runs into the Gulf of Mexico, and the North River, or Rio Colorado, which runs into the Gulf of California, are understood to be the principal streams heading opposite to the waters of the Missouri, and running southwardly. Whether the dividing grounds between the Missouri and them are mountains or flatlands, what are their distances from the Missouri, the character of the intermediate country, and the people inhabiting it, are worthy of particular inquiry. The northern waters of the Missouri are less to be inquired after, because they have been ascertained to a considerable degree, and are still in a course of ascertainment by English traders and travelers. But if you can learn anything certain of the most northern source of the Mississippi, and of its position relatively to the Lake of the Woods, it will be interesting to us. Some account, too, of the path of the Canadian traders from the Mississippi, at the mouth of the Ouisconsing to where it strikes the Missouri, and of the soil and rivers in its course, is desirable.

In all your intercourse with the natives, treat them in the most friendly and conciliatory manner which their own conduct will admit; allay all jealousies as to the object of your journey, satisfy them of its innocence; make them acquainted with the position, extent, character, peaceable, and commercial dispositions of the United States, of our wish to be neighborly, friendly, and useful to them, and of our dispositions to a commercial intercourse with them; confer with them on the points most convenient as mutual emporiums, and the articles of most desirable interchange for them and us. If a few of their influential chiefs within practicable distance, wish to visit us, arrange such a visit with them, and furnish them with authority to call on our officers, on their entering the United States, to have them conveyed to this place at the public expense. If any of them should wish to have some of their young people brought up with us, and taught such arts as may be useful to them, we will receive, instruct, and take care of them. Such a mission, whether of influential chiefs or of young people, would give some security to your own party. Carry with you some matter of the kine pox; inform those of them with whom you may be, of its efficacy as a preservative from the small pox; and instruct and encourage them in the use of it. This may be especially done wherever you winter.

As it is impossible for us to foresee in what manner you will be received by those people, whether with hospitality or hostility, so is it impossible to prescribe the exact degree of perseverance with which you are to pursue your journey. We value too much the lives of citizens to offer them to probable destruction. Your numbers will be sufficient to secure you against the unauthorized opposition of individuals or of small parties; but if a superior force, authorized or not authorized by a nation, should be arrayed against your further passage, and inflexibly determined to arrest it, you must decline its farther pursuit, and return. In the loss of yourselves, we should lose also the information you will have acquired. By returning safely with that, you may enable us to renew the essay with better calculated means. To your own discretion, therefore, must be left the degree of danger you may risk, and the point at which you should decline, only saying we wish you to err on the side of your safety, and to bring us back your party safe, even if it be with less information.

Should you reach the Pacific Ocean, inform yourself of the circumstances which may decide whether the furs of those parts may not be collected as advantageously at the head of the Missouri (convenient as is supposed to the waters of the Colorado and Oregon or Columbia), as at Nootka Sound, or any other point of that coast; and that trade be consequently conducted through the Missouri and United States more beneficially than by the circumnavigation now practiced.

As far up the Missouri as the white settlements extend, an intercourse will probably be found to exist between them and the Spanish posts of St. Louis opposite Cahokia, or St. Genevieve opposite Kaskaskia. From still further up the river, the traders may furnish a conveyance for letters. Beyond that, you may perhaps be able to engage Indians to bring letters for the Government to Cahokia or Kaskaskia, on promising that they shall there receive such special compensation as you shall have stipulated with them. Avail yourself of these means to communicate to us, at seasonable intervals, a copy of your journal, notes, and observations, or every kind, putting into cypher whatever might do injury if betrayed.

On your arrival on that coast, endeavor to learn if there be any post within your reach frequented by the sea vessels of any nation, and to send two of your trusty people back by sea, in such way as shall appear practicable, with a copy of your notes; and should you be of opinion that the return of your party by the way they went will be imminently dangerous, then ship the whole, and return by sea, by the way either of Cape Horn or the Cape of Good Hope, as you shall be able. As you will be without money, clothes, or provisions, you must endeavor to use the credit of the United States to obtain them, for which purpose open letters of credit shall be furnished you, authorizing you to draw on the Executive of the United States, or any of its officers, in any part of the world, on which drafts can be disposed of, and to apply with our recommendations to the consuls, agents, merchants, or citizens of any nation with which we have intercourse, assuring them in our name, that any aids they may furnish you, shall be honorably repaid, and on demand. Our consuls, Thomas Hewes at Batavia in Java, William Buchanan in the Isles of France and Bourbon, and John Elmslie at the Cape of Good Hope, will be able to supply your necessities by drafts on us.

Should you find it safe to return by the way you go after sending two of your party round by sea, or with your whole party, if no conveyance by sea can be found, do so; making such observations on your return, as may serve to supply, correct, or confirm those made on your outward journey.

On reentering the United States and reaching a place of safety, discharge any of your attendants who may desire and deserve it, procuring for them immediate payment of all arrears of pay and clothing which may have incurred since their departure, and assure them that they shall be recommended to the liberality of the legislature for the grant of a soldier's portion of land each, as proposed in my message to Congress; and repair yourself with your papers to the seat of government.

To provide in the accident of your death, against anarchy, dispersion and the consequent danger of your party, and total failure of the enterprise, you are hereby authorized, by any instrument signed and written in your own hand, to name the person among them who shall succeed to the command on your decease, and by like instruments to change the nomination from time to time as further experience of the characters accompanying you shall point out superior fitness; and all the powers and authorities given to yourself are, in the event of your death, transferred to, and vested in the successor so named, with further power to him, and his successors in like manner, to name each his successor, who, on the death of his predecessor, shall be invested with all the powers and authorities given to yourself.

Given under my hand at the city of Washington, this 20th day of June 1803.

THOMAS JEFFERSON,
President of the United States of America.

EXCERPT FROM PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON'S MEMOIR OF MERIWETHER LEWIS

I had now had opportunities of knowing him intimately. Of courage undaunted; possessing a firmness and perseverance of purpose which nothing but impossibilities could divert from its direction; careful as a father of those committed to his charge, yet steady in the maintenance of order and discipline; intimate with the Indian character, customs, and principles; habituated to the hunting life; guarded, by exact observation of the vegetables and animals of his own country, against losing time in the description of objects already possessed; honest, disinterested, liberal, of sound understanding, and a fidelity to truth so scrupulous that whatever he should report would be as certain as if seen by ourselves—with all these qualifications, as if selected and implanted by nature in one body for this express purpose, I could have no hesitation in confiding the enterprise to him.

EXCERPT FROM CHAPTER 9 OF THE BOOK, THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

One morning Captain Lewis rolled out of his blankets first, as usual. It was a cold dawn and he hurried to get his jacket where he had rolled it. But the river had soaked the garment during the night. The captain was puzzled. Rivers did not rise in November. Suddenly a thought hit him. Tidewater! Had the tide caused this spurt in the level of the river?

Lewis said nothing about this, not even to Clark. He did not want to arouse hopes that might be dashed later. But he was more alert than ever now. The increasing fogs had new meaning for him. Fogs often came from off the ocean. Several times he thought he saw gulls beating their white wings above the distant fir trees.

On the horizon the explorers could spy extinct volcanoes. These mountains were mantled with glaciers and snowfields. With some help from Ordway in spelling, Clark noted in his diary that the peaks were "in the form of a sugarloaf." The wayfarers were looking at the summits now known as Rainier, Hood, and St. Helens. These mountains loomed along the skyline when the men camped on a desolate island near the present site of Portland, Oreg. Charred snags told of a bygone forest fire, which probably had been set by lightning.

A few mornings later, Lewis shook Ordway in the dawn. "Ordway," the captain whispered, "you've fought with artillery. Put your ear to the ground. Do you hear cannon?"

Ordway lay with his face against the damp earth. "Too steady for artillery, Captain," he said with muffled voice.

The two men looked at each other steadily. The same thought came to both of them at once. The ocean.

Lewis put a finger to his lips in caution. "Not a word to the others," he said. "A false alarm would be very bad. The men are wondering now how long this journey must be."

Ordway nodded in agreement.

Soon it would be 2 years that the party had been gone from civilization. There had been many emergencies and much suffering. These hardships were not yet over. Yet always the goal was kept foremost in mind. That goal was the ocean which broke on the western rim of North America, on the shore where the flag of the United States had never flown.

Some of the men were beginning to fear that there was no such ocean. A few even had hinted that the party should turn back. What if they traveled so far that they ran out of enough ammunition and trade goods to make possible a safe return through Indian country?

Fog in heavy shrouds cloaked the river a week after they had passed the island with the burned trees. From the fifth canoe, the first boat was barely visible. It was a raw day. The tang of salt was in the air. Several of the men had quickly spat out water dipped from the river.

"Salt," they exclaimed.

All at last realized that the destination was near.

Around noon the fog lifted slightly and framed the river. The explorers seemed to be paddling through a long corridor. Now and then a salmon broke the surface of the water with wet and arching back. The men put down the paddles and let the boats bob gently on the waves.

From the capes and headlands, the fog continued to clear. It rose like a curtain on some great stage. Streaks of sunlight shone through the mist. The men shaded their eyes and peered steadily westward.

And there it was, breaking in white-capped glory beyond the bar—the western ocean, the blue Pacific. The surf heaved in frothy crests. Spray was tossed by the wind. Back of the breakers, the water rolled in rippling swells.

In the notebook dated November 7, 1805, Clark scrawled: "Ocean in view. Oh, the joy. We are in view of the ocean, that great Pacific Ocean we have been so long anxious to see."

The captain with red hair and merry face had never been so excited before.

For the first time in history, Americans had crossed the continent which they one day would inhabit from coast to coast.

[From the New York Times of May 8, 1955]

Reenacting a Great Exploration—13 Western States Rejoice in the Journey of Lewis and Clark

(By Joe Miller)

Seattle.—One hundred and fifty years ago the Pacific Northwest was claimed for the United States by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. In 1805 President Thomas Jefferson's Corps of Discovery struggled through a narrow defile called the Lolo trail in the Bitterroot Mountains of Montana and northern Idaho. From there the exhausted 32-man expedition—along with the Indian heroine, Sacajawea—made its way to the Pacific.

During 1955 the four Northwestern States that comprise the so-called Lewis and Clark country are planning to hold a rich variety of pageants and celebrations to note the sesquicentennial anniversary.

"Practically every community along the expedition's route is going to have a Lewis and Clark event of some type," says Oregon's Governor, Paul L. Patterson, who, along with other governors in the Northwest, has proclaimed 1955 Lewis and Clark Year.

To coordinate the many individual community events into a coherent pattern, Oregon's, Washington's, Idaho's, and Montana's Governors have appointed a Joint Lewis and Clark Year Committee. It is headed by Chapin D. Foster, director of the Washington State Historical Society.

SCOUTS' TOUR

To dramatize the original journey, a group of Northwest Explorer Boy Scouts has planned to retrace part of the Lewis and Clark route this summer. The Scouts will start at Great Falls, Mont., pack down the Lolo trail into Idaho and then navigate the Clearwater, Snake, and Columbia Rivers in dugout canoes to Astoria in Oregon. More than 1,000 Scouts will make the trip in small parties.

Among the many annual celebrations in Washington which will have a Lewis and Clark theme this year will be the water follies at Pasco, July 19–24, and the southeastern Washington fair at Walla Walla, September 2–5. The observance of the Gen. Isaac Stevens Indian Treaty Centennial at Walla Walla, June 11–12, also will be based in part on a Lewis-Clark theme. In Idaho, Orofino's Lumberjack Days, September 16–18, will also recall the historic event.

DOWNRIVER

Other communities downriver on the Columbia are making similar plans to honor the two explorers. The Stockaders Jamboree at Vancouver, Wash., August 10–13 will be centered entirely on Lewis and Clark. The featured speaker will be Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

The climax in the long series of Lewis and Clark celebrations will take place at Astoria, Oreg., the spot where the two Army captains first saw the Pacific Ocean. Six miles south of Astoria, Fort Clatsop, the rude frontier encampment where the Corps of Discovery spent the winter of 1805–6 before returning East, is being restored. The fort, being rebuilt under direction of the Oregon Historical Society, will be a near-perfect replica of the original settlement, and dedication of this new 6-acre historical monument will take place on August 20–21, almost 150 years after the Corps of Discovery heard a great roaring of waves and William Clark almost incoherently scribbled in his journal, "Ocean in view! O! the joy!" There will be a pageant by Astoria townspeople and a military ceremony by Oregon National Guard units. Secretary McKay, a native Oregonian, will dedicate the fort.

At nearby Seaside, an Oregon beach resort center, another Lewis and Clark celebration is being planned for late August. Its exact date has not been set.

Other Oregon plans for the Sesquicentennial are being held in abeyance until the State legislature acts on a request for $25,000 to finance other projected activities. One of these is a planned statewide tour by drama students of Lewis and Clark College, Portland, with a pageant honoring the explorers.

Further to celebrate the sesquicentennial, an indirect descendant of Meriwether Lewis will journey over the expedition's route, starting from Washington, D. C. He is a 17-year-old Tacoma high-school senior, also named Meriwether Lewis. His parents plan to take him to Washington, call on President Eisenhower, and then set forth to cover the expedition's entire itinerary from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean.

OTHER CELEBRATIONS

So widespread is Northwest interest in the commemoration that many communities which were not in the line of the explorers' westward advance plan to honor the two men anyway. For example, the week-long Spokane Lilac Festival that opens next Sunday will pay an acknowledgement to the two explorers.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1955]

Oregon Hails Lewis and Clark

(By Dolores B. Jeffords)

This is a gala year in Oregon—the Sesquicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition's arrival in the Beaver State. The expedition entered Oregon in the fall of 1805, but much of the commemorative program was planned for the summer season, so that out-of-State vacationers might also enjoy the observances.

Astoria will be the center of some of the main events, for it is the city nearest the site of Fort Clatsop, built by the expedition for its winter quarters.

The site has long been preserved, marked with a memorial tablet, but this year a reproduction of the log fort built by the explorers is being erected, in readiness for the celebration to be held there August 21–28. A pageant representing the arrival of the expedition's boats on the Lewis and Clark River, adjacent to the fort, will be one of the highlights of this celebration, which will mark the climax of the sesquicentennial.

ANNUAL EVENTS INCLUDED

Two annual events fit in with this special observance. One is the Astoria Regatta, which is scheduled for August 18–21; the other is the Astoria Salmon Derby scheduled for August 27–September 5.

This will keep Astoria in the spotlight for 18 consecutive days, with Seaside, a delightful resourt on the Pacific, sharing the honors, for Seaside is the site of the salt cairn built by the Lewis and Clark Expedition. Here they salvaged salt from the ocean, the supply brought with them from Missouri having been exhausted. An iron fence surrounds the old cairn, which is near the beach, in what is now the center of the resort.

But Seaside has an earlier spotlight of its own, being the scene of the "Miss Oregon" finals and pageant, when the fairest of Oregon's fair will be selected for the Miss America contest. Seaside is one of Oregon's pioneer vacation spots, dating back over 75 years. With great Tillamook Headland jutting out into the Pacific to form a dramatic backdrop for wide, beautiful beaches, it is one of the most popular of the State's ocean resorts.

DRAMA SERIES PREPARED

One of the commemorative features of the year will be a series of plays based upon the expedition, which will be presented through the summer by drama students of Lewis and Clark College, in communities along the Columbia River, the expedition's avenue of travel.

Rainier is planning a celebration to emphasize the fact that it is the oldest town on the Columbia River. The event is to coincide with the actual date when Lewis and Clark reached that point, some time in November.

A new State park with picnicking facilities, located at the site of Fort Stevens, near Astoria, is ready for use this summer, as well as one at Bandon and another at Ochoco Lake. There are new highways, new recreational facilities, and added accommodations for tourists. Also new, opened in April, is Prehistoric Gardens, featuring authentic reproductions of the giant saurians of the past. This startling exhibit is directly on the Coast Highway, U. S. 101, 12½ miles south of Port Orford. Its only connection with the sesquicentennial celebration is perhaps the discovery by Lewis and Clark, of the bones of some of these monsters, on their westward journey.

Nothing, of course, can superimpose upon the Oregon of today the wilderness of 150 years ago, when the Columbia was a wild, untrammeled stream with a few Indian villages on its banks. But the plays of the drama students, the pageants and commemorations, will recreate the figures of the intrepid explorers, their perils and hardships, and the many dramatic episodes of their journey through the uncharted wilds.

A deeper appreciation of the pioneer trailbreakers will be fostered—and a deeper appreciation, as well, of the beautiful cities and highways, and the mighty flood-control projects, which now mark the course of Lewis and Clark along the Columbia River.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the standing committees of the Senate be permitted to file reports with the Secretary during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 12 (legislative day of July 11), 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Reuben Buck Robertson, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to the provisions of Private Law 95, 84th Congress, approved June 22, 1955, the following officer for permanent appointment on the retired list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

To be commissioned rear admiral (lower half)

Paul A. Smith

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 12 (legislative day of July 11), 1955:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955.

Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 30, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose divine love and grace can satisfy our mortal needs and our immortal longings, may we now come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Thou art high and holy but always willing to identify Thyself with the lowly and the sinful and to help us achieve a spirit that is akin to Thy spirit.

Grant that it may be our highest vocation to bring to fulfillment and fruition those capacities for strength and nobility of character with which we have been endowed.

May we daily realize how sacred and wonderful it is that we may yield ourselves to one who can fulfill that which has been ordained for us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 28, 1955:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of Luigi Cianci;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Hussein Kamel Moustafa;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman;

H. R. 1086. An act for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum;

H. R. 1108. An act for the relief of Rose Mazur;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Casey;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sally Rice;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; and

H. R. 6410. An act to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto.

On June 29, 1955:

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 1660. An act for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski;

H. R. 1664. An act for the relief of Charles Chan;

H. R. 2126. An act to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 6499. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela.

On June 30, 1955:

H. R. 2973. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education;

H. R. 3005. An act to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals and by extending the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5240. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5560. An act relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6367. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6871. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1956;

H. R. 6992. An act to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit;

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, providing for increased pay costs for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1955:

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 2529. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; and

H. R. 5923. An act to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

On July 4, 1955:

H. R. 103. An act to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies.

On July 5, 1955:

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose; and

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1955:

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Freida Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikbu;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.;

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On July 11, 1955:

H. R. 619. An act to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust";

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3271. An act for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer; and

H. R. 6795. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 122. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens; and

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos;

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period of emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; and

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Shima Shinohara;

S. 188. An act for the relief of Paul Ichikawa;

S. 438. An act for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Edward and Lily Elsie White;

S. 607. An act for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski;

S. 619. An act for the relief of Kerson Huang;

S. 642. An act for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura;

S. 649. An act for the relief of Zelda Baumzveiger;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 678. An act for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad;

S. 689. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

S. 1056. An act for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their child, Mario Mazartzian;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp;

S. 1238. An act for the relief of Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte;

S. 1249. An act for the relief of Nouritza Terzian;

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Joseph G. Ferrara;

S. 1758. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans;

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture proposing an expansion of the tobacco production, utilization, and marketing research program, with primary emphasis on basic research; and

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1250. An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at

Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5559) entitled "An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE JOHN GREGG UTTERBACK

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of one who served honorably and well my Third District of Maine in the 73d Congress.

On the last day of his 83d year, Hon. John Gregg Utterback, of Bangor, Maine, departed this life while still appearing to enjoy the physical and mental vigor which distinguished him throughout his career as a businessman and leading Democrat of his time.

Born in Franklin, Johnson County, Ind., July 12, 1872, he brought to our time the best of what is sometimes slightingly referred to as "horse and buggy days." During the last half century the name of Utterback has become well and favorably known in Maine, where your late colleague engaged in the retail sale of carriages and, as progress overtook our State, in the sale of automobiles and fine leathergoods. Enjoying the confidence and esteem of his fellow citizens, and having a strong sense of civic duty, Mr. Utterback served his city, State, and district in those positions of responsibility where satisfaction must be in service well done rather than the financial return. A Democrat, he was councilman, alderman and mayor of the city of Bangor, usually a Republican stronghold, and was chosen as delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1932, the year he was elected Representative to Congress from Maine's Third District, remaining here for one term only. Appointed United States marshal in 1935, he resigned in 1944, and with his sons engaged in extensive business enterprises in his home community.

A handsome man of pleasing personality and gracious mien, the late John G. Utterback will be sorely missed by a large circle of friends in every station of life. It was not my fortune to know him well, but that he gave to his family, his party, and his country the best of his recognized abilities and devotion is well known to all of us.

Friendly sympathy is extended to his widow and children with deepest sincerity this day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of my good friend, John Utterback. While he served in this body for but one term, he made a marked impression upon his colleagues of that particular Congress. He was a remarkable gentleman, a strong personality. He was a very sincere and devoted representative of the interests of his people. He served the people of his district and the people of the State of Maine with sincerity, with character, with ability, and in a most effective manner, obtaining unusual results during the 2 years he served in this body.

I join with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] in extending to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn this morning of the death of John Utterback, of Bangor, Maine, who represented the Third Maine District in this body in the 73d Congress.

Mr. Utterback was born in Indiana in 1872, came to settle in Bangor in 1905, entered business there, served on the city council, and was mayor of the city in 1914 and 1915.

After his service in the House of Representatives, he was named United States marshal for the State of Maine and served in that office from 1935 through 1944. It was in his capacity as marshal that I had occasion to see Mr. Utterback most frequently.

He was a modest man who served diligently in every post that he ever held. He was much esteemed in Maine and his death will be widely mourned. I extend my sympathy to his bereaved family.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' TRAVEL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6295) to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1088)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

And agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166; 5 U. S. C. 837) is amended by striking out '4 cents' and '7 cents' and inserting '6 cents' and '10 cents', respectively, in lieu thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MATTHEW M. NEELY,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Reduces the maximum per diem allowance from $13 per day as proposed by the House to $12 per day as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Authorizes an increase in the mileage rate for privately owned motorcycles from the present 4 cents to 6 cents and for privately owned automobiles or airplanes from the present 7 cents to 10 cents, when engaged on official business, as proposed by the Senate. No increases in the maximum mileage rates were proposed by the House.

There was considerable discussion among the conferees on whether a per diem rate of $12 or $13 was fair and equitable. The House managers pointed out that the information presented to it in hearings and reports from the Bureau of the Budget and various agencies indicated that the higher figure would be warranted. The Senate managers noted, however, that the military had already been given an increased per diem rate for travel expenses to $12 and it would be preferable to have a uniform rate as between civilians and the military. The House managers believed that with the actual expense proviso in the bill any serious problems of inequity could be cured.

Although the House had received no information to show the need for an increase in the mileage rate for privately owned automobiles and motorcycles, the Senate felt such an increase was necessary.

The House, therefore, receded in these two particulars.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JULY 31, 1947, AND THE MINING LAWS TO PROVIDE FOR MULTIPLE USE OF THE SURFACE OF THE SAME TRACTS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1096)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after the words "United States", insert the words "subsequent to the location of the claim"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

Amendment No. 1: Insertion, after the words "but not limited to," where the first occur in the first full sentence of section 1, of the words "common varieties of the following:". Agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, this amendment results in language in section 1 conforming to the initial clause of section 3 of the bill, which in turn is complementary to the definition of "common varieties" contained in the last full sentence of section 3.

Amendment No. 2: Addition, in the first sentence of section 1 of the bill, following the words "is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including", of the words ", but not limited to, the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, and". Agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, this amendment refers to the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, and makes clear the intent to leave the provisions of this act unaffected by the terms of the bill.

Amendment No. 3: Deletion, following the word "municipalities" in the second full sentence of section 1, of the words "or any person,". Agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, this amendment deletes a clause contained in the Materials Disposal Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 681), in the belief that authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make available, without charge, materials and resources subject to the act, should not include such discretionary power in the case of individuals. Authority in this respect affecting governmental subdivisions, nonprofit associations, or corporations, etc., is unaffected by the amendment.

Amendment No. 4: Deletion, after the words "Department of Agriculture" where they last appear in section 1 of the bill, of the proviso: ": *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national parks, monuments, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interests of national defense." Originally inserted in the bill by House committee amendment, this proviso was intended to insure that amendments to the Materials Act of 1947 contained in section 1 of the bill would not be construed as opening lands administered for the purposes specified to Materials Act entry. In concurring in the Senate amendment deleting the proviso, the House managers are in agreement that the fourth full sentence of section 1 of the bill clearly accomplishes the purpose intended by the proviso, and that the language deleted might have been subject to a construction vesting, in the executive branch, authority with respect to these areas presently reserved to the Congress.

Amendment No. 5: Addition, following the proviso in subsection (b) of section 4 of the bill, of a further proviso as follows: ": *Provided further,* That if at any time the locator requires more timber for his mining operations than is available to him from the claim after disposition of timber therefrom by the United States, he shall be entitled, free of charge, to be supplied with timber for such requirements from the nearest timber administered by the disposing agency which is ready for harvesting under the rules and regulations of that agency and which is substantially equivalent in kind and quantity to the timber estimated by the disposing agency to have been disposed of from the claim: "The managers on the part of the House agreed to this Senate amendment, with an amendment inserting, after the word "United States", the words "subsequent to the location of the claim,". The amendment, as amended and agreed to by the conference committee, would require the Federal agency disposing, after location, of timber on a claim, to supply timber to the claimant in the amount the Federal agency has removed if the claimant needs such timber in his mining operation.

Amendment No. 6: Occurs in subsection (b) of section 4, in the form of an additional proviso, to be inserted after the proviso adopted by agreement to amendment 5, as follows: "*Provided further,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the ninety-eighth meridian relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, use, and distribution of ground or surface waters within any unpatented mining claim." Agreed to by the House managers, this amendment makes clear an intent to leave unaffected the operation of State water laws in the reclamation West governing the ownership, control, appropriation, use, and distribution of ground or surface waters.

Amendment No. 7: Insertion, preceding the word "limitation" where it first occurs following the words "United States" in section 7, of the word "reservation".

Amendment No. 8: Insertion, after the word "limitation" where it first occurs following the words "United States" in section 7, of a comma.

Amendment No. 9: Insertion, preceding the word "limitation" where it last occurs following the words "United States" in the House version of section 7, of the word "reservation".

Amendment No. 10: Insertion, after the word "limitation" where it last occurs following the words "United States" in the House version of section 7, of a comma.

Amendment No. 11: Following the word "patent", where it last occurs in the House version of section 7, striking the period and adding the following: ", or to limit or restrict any use of the lands covered by any patented or unpatented mining claim by the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licensees which is otherwise authorized by law." The House managers agreed to these several clarifying and perfecting amendments (amendments Nos. 7 through 11) to underscore the legislative intent to leave unaffected the scope and operation of certain existing statutes which limit or restrict mining activities upon lands owned by the United States. Examples include: the act of April 8, 1942 (62 Stat. 162), which opened the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws, but which limited—with respect to timber on such lands—the rights of persons making entry on those lands; the act of August 12, 1953 (Public Law 250, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 559), and the act of August 13, 1954 (Public Law 585, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; 68 Stat. 708), both of which operate, within the terms thereof, to create authority for, and to establish procedure whereby, there is reserved to the United States all Leasing Act minerals. Further, the latter two acts operate to reserve to the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licensees, within the limits specifically set out, the right to entry upon and removal from mining locations (prior to, and after patent) of Leasing Act minerals; and the right to use mining locations, or restricted mineral patent lands falling within the scope of the acts is similarly reserved to the United States, its lessees, etc., for access to adjacent lands for mineral leasing activities.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Dixon-Yates contract which was born in secrecy and nurtured in darkness is dead. What it will cost the taxpayers to bury it we do not yet know. It is likely to be considerable.

We would have thought that the administration in its confession of error could have made it with some modicum of grace. That was not the case. In ending the Dixon-Yates contract the administration has sought to impose on the city of Memphis a stipulation which continues to demonstrate its malignancy toward the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The administration, we learn, is demanding that if the city of Memphis is willing to construct its own electric powerplant, as it has demonstrated it is, that plant must be cut entirely out of the TVA system.

The administration is trying to enforce a rule whereby Memphis and its powerplant is to be cut bodily away from TVA.

This is a strange thing. It is an absolute reversal of the plan for the Dixon-Yates plant which was to produce power to be fed directly into the TVA system.

To demand that a wall be constructed and maintained between TVA and the new Memphis plant will weaken both. And that is precisely what the administration wants. As the price of abandoning the ill-starred Dixon-Yates plant the administration demands that Memphis now build a wall around itself. It demands that no matter what the future needs of itself or the TVA or other communities in the TVA area, that the Memphis plant shall not be connected with the power lines of the TVA. No matter what emergency might arise power could not flow from one system to the other.

This demand goes against commonsense. It goes against common practice. It is born out of common malice.

It is common practice not only in the TVA area but throughout the United States for power systems to be interconnected to form a grid. In the TVA area the transmission system is connected directly with a number of privately owned transmission systems. This enables the unimpeded transfer of power from one system to another. This is the normal and efficient means of meeting emergencies in the demand for power. It is such an interconnection between the new plant of the city of Memphis and the TVA system which President Eisenhower seeks to forbid.

The administration was defeated in its effort to superimpose the Dixon-Yates plan on TVA. It became afraid of the political consequences of defying the people of the TVA area and those people the country over who have taken pride in its work. It became afraid of the political consequences of the revelations which are now taking place as to the genesis of the Dixon-Yates contract. It sensed the growing public outrage with the revelations of the secret finagling by New York bankers and officers of the Budget Bureau and the Atomic Energy Commission. Yet it could not bring an end to Dixon-Yates without one more effort to damage the TVA and the city of Memphis.

The condition demanded by President Eisenhower that the power system of Memphis be walled off TVA cannot and must not be allowed. If the present administration insists on such a condition, it will bring upon itself the same condemnation which it suffered from its attempt to foist the Dixon-Yates contract on the people of this Nation. We will not stand for it.

DEMOCRATS' TWO-FACED FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days President Eisenhower leaves for the top level, Big Four Conference. He goes with the full support of Congress. He goes with the overwhelming well wishes of the American people. They are united behind him in his coming efforts for peace as perhaps never before.

The coming conference, to all decent, honest men, is above party politics. They know for the good of America, it has to be.

There is apparently one lone dissenter.

There is one man who apparently believes that this is the moment to cross the seas, land in Europe, and undermine with doubt the unity and solidity of our allies on which so much depends.

This man is the laughingly called Honest Ave Harriman.

Let me quote what he recently said in London:

> The American people are disillusioned with President Eisenhower's policies.

That is an untrue statement, as every Member of this body knows.

This is as much as saying that in his journey to Geneva, the President goes unsupported by the American people.

This is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. This is pure politics at its worst.

Could this statement have been made in sheer stupidity? Harriman is supposed to have at least average intelligence. He is supposed to be an experienced diplomat. He was one of the master caller-of-the-shots at the now infamous Yalta Conference.

I guess Harriman has started his campaign for the Presidential nomination in 1956. With calculation and deliberateness, he apparently is trying to undermine Dwight D. Eisenhower, at the cost of world peace, if necessary, in order to gain his own selfish, political ambition.

And how about the lofty support the Democrats claim they give our President in his foreign policy? Once before, the former Democratic national chairman, Steven Mitchell, torpedoed our effectiveness at a conference by saying it would be a failure, even before our Secretary of State had left the United States. Now there are no less than two foreign policies for the Democratic Party. Is it not time that they agreed on one?

ECONOMIC SITUATION IN 1954

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers carry the disclosure that complete records of the Commerce Department show the 1954 recession to have been only half as severe as previously reported.

Members of this body have heard—from the moaners and groaners—much of this "recession." Some of the doomers even warned that the recession—that almost was not—actually heralded a coming depression so severe as to endanger the Nation's economy.

To most of us, yesterday's Commerce Department announcement came as a confirmation of our faith in the American way. A careful look at more complete records has cut in half the previous production loss estimates for the year of 1954 and proved that the transition from a war economy to a peacetime economy was accomplished with a minimum of economic disruption.

The Commerce Department report said the Nation's total production of goods and services hit a record annual rate of about $375 billion in the first quarter of this year and continued to climb substantially in the second quarter to an estimated new record level of about $380 billion.

The upward revision of the 1954 production record resulted in a new estimate for the last quarter of 1954 of $367 billion compared with the old estimate of $362 billion.

Embarrassing as it may be to political enemies of the administration, it is nonetheless heartening to most of the American people to find that a nation at peace can also reach new heights of prosperity, and the outlook ahead is even brighter.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the first page of today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

BUSINESS PEAK FOUND HIGHER THAN EXPECTED—NEW STUDY ALSO SHOWS 1954 RECESSION WAS MILDER THAN REPORTED

(By Frank O'Brien)

The Commerce Department said yesterday the 1954 recession was only half as severe as it previously reported, and recovery this year is carrying the economy to peaks higher than previously suspected.

The Department said the Nation's total production of goods and services hit a record annual rate of about $375.25 billion in the first quarter of this year, and in the second quarter continued to climb substantially.

This would indicate a further increase of something like $4 billion in the annual rate of production during April, May, and June, to a new record level of nearly $380 billion.

The new gross national product report was based on more complete information than was available when the Commerce Department's previous report was published in May.

It was further influenced by an analysis issued late this spring by the Internal Revenue Service, on corporate and personal income during 1952. This gave the Commerce Department new benchmarks against which to measure and assess its 1954 information.

> The outstanding results of the revision were:
>
> Total economic activity fell off by approximately $4 billion, from a level of $364.5 billions in the boom year of 1953 to $360.5 billions in the recession year of 1954, a production loss of just over 1 percent.
>
> This cut in half the previous production loss estimate during the recession.
>
> The upward revision of the 1954 production record resulted in a new estimate that in the last quarter of 1954, when production was reviving, the economy was producing goods and services at an annual rate of $367.1 billion, compared with the old estimate of $362 billions.

STATE GOVERNMENTS AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, all too often the jeremiads of modern prophets are forgotten in the unpredicted sunshine of the present. I think it is important to refer now and again to the predictions of business recession and vast unemployment made by the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party when they were intent on scaring up enough votes to defeat the Republican congressional candidates. It is important because enough people were frightened by these false prophecies so that many Republican candidates were defeated. It is important that the people be kept mindful that these prophets are not to be completely trusted.

And so on July 8, 1954, we had on the floor of the House for debate H. R. 9709, a bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program. The statements and predictions of certain Democratic leaders who were definitely not supporting President Eisenhower's program in this matter, as they have not supported it in so many other matters, is well worth reading. The debate begins on page 10062 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Aside from the gloom and doom predicted, which was not forthcoming, these prophets were accusing the administration of—let me quote Congressman DINGELL:

> The administration has completely sidestepped its responsibility * * * in that it has expressed its concern about insufficient insurance payments both as to size and duration, but has recommended to the States that they take action to correct the deficiencies. "Buckpassing" in typical Army style comes naturally in this administration (p. 10067).

Congressman FORAND said—page 10068:

> They have become very successful in playing both ends against the middle—

Referring to the opponents of adequate unemployment insurance—

> and take full advantage of the situation which the present administration has got itself into by insisting that improvements in payments and their duration should be made at the State levels.

The issue, of course, was whether this administration was to change the basic Federal-State relationship in the unemployment insurance program. The administration took the position that the State authority should not be diminished on the theory that in the long run under the setup the program would be better administered and would better take care of the unemployed. Contrary to the impression that the doom prophets tried to create that the issue was who was most sympathetic to the unemployed and who wanted to do the most for them, the real issue was which program, the Federal-State or the new proposal of Federal dominated program would help the unemployed the most.

Now it was predicted that the States would not assume their responsibilities in this field. The Federal Government had to do it or it would not be done. We have heard these arguments time and time again on all subjects by those who seek to create an even more centralized Federal Government here in Washington, by those who in truth have no real faith in the people. I say in truth they have no real faith in the people because they seek to move their Government farther and farther away from them so that they have less and less control over it. Government of the people, by the people and for the people is not in their plans. Rather it is government of the planners, by the planners, located in Washington, D. C., for the people in the far flung provinces—not States any longer.

Well here is the record:

As of June 20, 1955, in a roundup of State legislation by the Department of Labor the report is:

> Unemployment Insurance: Maximum weekly benefits have been increased in 23 States, Alaska, and Hawaii. Ten States, Alaska and Hawaii raised their basic maximum weekly benefit above $30, and seven others increased theirs to $30. Ten now have a maximum weekly benefit amount of over $30 and 19 States have a $30 maximum.

Furthermore, here we are in the last weeks of this session of the 84th Congress which the Democrats control partly as a result of their scare campaign and what do we find on the record on labor legislation? First, all of the oratory about the Republican bill extending unemployment compensation has gone with the wind. There has been no legislation even proposed, that I have heard of, to bring about all the things said to be so necessary in floor and campaign speeches.

Even the measures that President Eisenhower proposed be passed by this Democrat Congress affecting the welfare of labor are still not enacted and obviously it is not even the intent of the leaders of the Congress to get many of them passed. Possibly we will get the increase in minimum wage, but what about the revision of the 8-hour laws proposed by the President in his state of the Union message? Or the grant-in-aid occupational safety program which the President furthered in his budget message by including $2 million to the States in furthering industrial safety? Or the proposed legislation for safety of Federal employees? The increased benefits suggested under the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Act? The proposed revision of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act? The Workman's Compensation for Puerto Rico? An last, but by no means least, the proposed amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act. That slave-labor act under which the unions have so prospered that today most of the new and elaborate buildings going up in our fair Capital city are those of the self-same labor unions. Their leaders claimed, and I guess still do claim, their unions were going to be destroyed by the act. Have they apologized to the peopel and their union members for this gross error?

I think it is time for the American workingman and the famous little man of political oratory to look around to see who in truth has been his friend and who in truth has been giving him lip service.

There is no recession; there is no war; there is no shackling of the American workingman. Quite the contrary, there is the greatest prosperity in history; there is peace and the laboring man has reached new heights—more power to him. I dare suggest that the only shackling the American workingman now needs to worry about is from certain labor bosses whose interest no longer seems to be that of promoting the interests of the laboring man, but rather a hunger for personal political power.

There are three kinds of men in the labor movement today. The good labor leader whose interest is the welfare of his membership, and I am satisfied that this applies to the majority of labor leaders. 2. The racketeer who has moved into the labor field just as he moved from bootlegging, narcotics, white slavery, gambling and other illegal fields into certain legitimate businesses. 3. The politician who under the guise of being a labor leader has tried to take over the labor movement to further his political ends. It is this third kind of labor leader who is the most dangerous to the welfare of labor, because after all the gangsters become obvious and we have laws to deal with them.

Against the labor politician we have no laws, nor should we ever have any laws. He is an honest, conscientious citizen, but his political ideas may be in error. It is important that the people always examine the political ideas of a politician, and to do so it is important that they learn to recognize who is indeed a politician. Today, the smart politician has found out that his most effective way of operating is to appear not to be a politician. So we have newspaper editors and columnists, radio commentators, business and labor leaders among many other guises who are truly politicians and nothing else. By calling those who are in the open as politicians "politicians," they win many a political argument. The public does not appraise them and their views with the same critical eye they have learned to appraise their elected officials.

This discussion of labor politicians is important because the New Deal wing of the Democrat Party is controlled and directed by many of these posing politicians. It is important for the union membership and the working man in general to recognize them in their proper light to see how far their interest in the working man and in the little man goes. To see if it is beyond oratory and the ballot box.

REAR ADM. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House I wish to say I have today introduced a bill to authorize President Eisenhower to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy, in recognition of his outstanding service to our Nation in connection with the use of atomic power for marine propulsion, and in particular in the submarine U. S. S. *Nautilus*.

Recently Admiral Rickover was called to testify before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in connection with the authorization for two nuclear-powered merchant vessels. At that time I looked into his record and came to the conclusion that recognition for his outstanding service to the Nation was very much in order at this time. I find that the admiral has received many honors and decorations. The action suggested by this legislation, however, would be recognition for the first time from the Government as a whole.

I hope the appropriate committee will look into the merit of this proposal.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised and no little amused to note in the headlines that 54 Members of the minority party had sent a petition to the White House asking the President to run for another term. I was especially surprised when it turned out that the Congressional Quarterly had checked the record and found that those 54 had an overall average of less support for the President's program than the entire majority side. I was not so much surprised at the names I saw as I was at some of the prominent names that were not on the petition. I was wondering if there was any significance in that.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. The significance of that was that they were not asked. This petition was signed just by the younger Members.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am glad to have that information. Mr. Speaker, a portion of the newspaper article follows:

> FIFTY-FOUR HOUSE REPUBLICANS CALL ON IKE TO RUN IN 1956
>
> (By Edward T. Folliard)
>
> Fifty-four House Republicans, who have boundless admiration for President Eisenhower as a vote-getter but trail House Democrats in backing his program joined in an "Ike-in-'56" boom yesterday.
>
> The 54, all of whom have come to Capitol Hill in the last 2½ years, signed an appeal to the Chief Executive to run for a second term. It was taken to the White House and delivered to him by three of their number.
>
> General Eisenhower chuckled as he read the appeal, but he said nothing one way or the other about his political plans for next year.
>
> Later in the day the Congressional Quarterly, a nonpartisan research organization, began looking up the voting records of the 54 Eisenhower enthusiasts.
>
> It found that, while the 54 had a slightly better average record of supporting Eisenhower measures than all House Republicans, they nevertheless fell short of the Democrats' record of administration support.
>
> Here is the score compiled by the Congressional Quarterly on the basis of 29 rollcalls in the House through June 26:
>
> Fifty-four Republicans' support of Eisenhower measures—67 percent.
>
> Overall Democratic support of Eisenhower measures in House—69 percent.
>
> The CQ figures showed a wide—at times violent—disparity in the voting records of the 54 House Republicans who joined in praising General Eisenhower and urging him to lead their party in next year's election.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7278, Rept. No. 1116) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time; and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds of the personal privilege.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 8th of July there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "Petty Reprisals." In this editorial, referring to me, it was said:

> He seems to have no scruples about using the power which seniority has brought him as a member of the Judiciary Committee to attempt personal reprisals against those whom he dislikes.

Further in the editorial, the last sentence:

> A man with so little capacity for governing himself seems scarcely fit for the governing of his countrymen.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated grounds for a question of personal privilege. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, what the Washington newspapers write about me is of little consequence to me. What the editorial writers think of me is of no importance whatsoever. No matter what it is, I assure you that the feeling is mutual.

However, what you think of me is of more importance to me than anything else in this world. For nearly a quarter of a century I have been a Member of this body. I have never walked into this room without a feeling of great pride because I have been honored by being one of the 435 men and women who write the laws for the greatest Republic on the face of the earth. During that period of time I have never knowingly or otherwise done anything that justifies the kind of attacks that have been made upon me by the Washington newspapers, for very obvious reasons, ever since I became chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I am quite certain that any man who occupies that position can expect the same sort of treatment. I am going to take this editorial of July 8 and demonstrate to you to what extent this man, Alan Barth, who wrote it, went in order to attempt to discredit me. He started by stating:

> The latest case in point involves Chief Judge William Denman, of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which upheld a district court decision displeasing to the Congressman; in sentencing an alien convicted of smuggling, the district court judge recommended against deportation.

That is not the fact at all. This matter was never presented to Judge Denman. This fine old gentleman went out of his way to attack me because I expressed displeasure and apprehension over the fact that a United States district judge would recommend that an alien racketeer be not deported.

Why was I apprehensive? A man by the name of George K. Jue was convicted of smuggling Chinamen into the United States. Crime has been that man's business for 15 years. He has made thousands and thousands of dollars by bringing Chinese illegally into the United States.

When the provision was written in our very liberal immigration and nationality code giving the judges some discretionary powers in matters of deportation, it was with the idea of preventing economic hardship to the wife and children of American citizens, and to give a little break, if you please, to the alien who made a mistake.

Does this case come within that category? This man was not the casual offender; as I said, crime was his business.

Would economic hardship result from his deportation? Oh, no; his wife and children live in China.

So when I said that this judge leaned over backwards in order to misinterpret the law so as to prevent the executive branch of the Government from carrying out the very clearly expressed intent of Congress, I meant it.

When Judge Denman said that I was guilty of criminal libel for making this statement, he made a gratuitous statement that is not borne out by the facts. As a matter of fact, last week I went to California personally and conducted a hearing with the Committee on Un-American Activities. There I made, outside of the protection I had from being a Member of this body, the same statement.

Let us go a little further in this editorial. The editor stated particularly:

> Mr. WALTER was reported to have told the Immigration Subcommittee, which he heads, that the district judge—

This is a direct quote—

> ought to be deported.

Even this editorial writer ought to know that we do not deport American citizens.

He goes further and says:

> In retaliation against Judge Denman, who is 81 years old, he introduced the bill requiring that any chief judge shall relinquish the chief judgeship upon reaching the age of 70.

That bill was in the course of preparation for months; and as a matter of fact—and this is further evidence of the difficulty experienced by the editorial writer in making a legitimate charge against me—here is the bill, H. R. 7161, which provides that when a judge reaches the age of 75—not 70—he shall not continue in his duties as chief justice. That bill was introduced at the request of many judges who because of advanced years wanted to be relieved of the arduous tasks that devolve upon the chief justice, while remaining on the bench.

Barth goes on further and says that my bill is too blatant to deserve serious discussion. We will talk about that at the appropriate time.

He also says:

> More recently he—

Meaning me—

> recklessly accused Edward Corsi of association in Communist-dominated and Communist-front groups because Mr. Corsi had been critical of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

That is not the fact at all. Last February, at the hearing before the Judiciary Committee, our distinguished chairman made the public statement that Mr. Corsi was going to "ease Scott McLeod out" of his position. I expressed great concern because the record shows that Mr. Corsi was an active member of the Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, an organization which has only one function, and that is to attempt to prevent deportation of aliens who have been charged with subversive activities. I just felt that a man who has been connected with that kind of an organization was not the proper person to pass on the qualifications of the people that we were opening our doors to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the letter I wrote to the Secretary of State concerning the qualifications or the lack of them of this man whose sole asset has been, during his life, that he was not born in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MARCH 14, 1955.

PERSONAL—STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During your recent absence from Washington I have publicly questioned the fitness of Mr. Edward J. Corsi to remain your advisor on immigration, refugee, and international migration.

I have done so for two reasons:

1. Mr. Corsi's association with highly objectionable groups and organizations, branded as subversive by the Attorney General, and his neglect to resign from such organizations after their true nature has become a matter of common knowledge, proves conclusively that Mr. Corsi—to say the least and to be very merciful—is a person of inferior judgment;

2. Mr. Corsi should not be entrusted with the administration of laws for which he has expressed contumacious disdain and contempt.

As you well know, entries of immigrants under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, are subject to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (sec. 15 of Public Law 203, 83d Cong.). In that connection, Mr. Corsi's testimony of October 1, 1952, before a Commission appointed by President Truman, is pertinent. Mr. Corsi, testifying not as a private citizen, but as the then Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York, has referred to a Federal statute (which he is now charged to administer) in the following words:

"(The Immigration and Nationality Act) * * * based on archaic concepts cannot be patched up * * * it must be junked entirely * * *."

"The world is in too precarious a state for this Nation to indulge itself in the luxury of conduct based on the same type of pathological mentality that brought the German people to destruction."

"To base national policy on a type of reasoning which, if displayed by an individual would place him in jeopardy of commitment to an asylum, etc."

Subsequent to his statement before the President's Commission, Mr. Corsi has published under the auspices of the B'nai Brith, in 1953, a propaganda pamphlet under the title "Paths to the New World: American Immigration—Yesterday, Today." A perusal of pages 27 to 44 of that pamphlet provides ample evidence that Mr. Corsi has not only neglected to acquaint himself with the existing law, but also appears to be addicted to avoiding telling the truth where a lie would better serve his propaganda purposes.

Mr. Secretary, I do not feel entitled to take much of your precious time during these crucial days. However, I feel that it is my duty to draw your personal attention to the fact that Mr. Corsi's job specification has been written so as to circumvent the necessity of submitting to the United States Senate an obviously obnoxious name. I am quite certain that if for nothing else but for having called American legislators, in effect, Nazis and candidates for an insane asylum, Mr. Corsi would have never been confirmed by the Senate should the nature of his appointment and his duties call for the Senate's advice and consent.

It has been reported to me that Mr. Corsi's clearance has not yet been obtained from the investigative agencies. I am, of course, unable to predict the outcome of the investigation as to his loyalty to this country but the results of the investigation notwithstanding, I am convinced that to continue Mr. Corsi's services in your department and to entrust him with the administration of a law which he has pledged himself to destroy, to use his own words to junk, is not compatible with American ideas of good government and does not serve the interests of this country. I trust that you as the head of the agency which employs him will readily see that the only proper thing to do is to dispense forthwith with the services of a man of very poor judgment, rather loose treatment of the truth and a scornful toward the law. Such a man should never be permitted to continue in a position of responsibility in the Federal Government.

I am at your disposal should you desire to discuss this matter with me personally and I sincerely hope that you will be able to place it on your highly overburdened schedule.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Now then, we get around to this next charge:

> Thomas G. Finucane, chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals, and a highly respected public servant, was held unfit to hold his job because Mr. Finucane, too, had criticized the McCarran-Walter Act.

That is not the truth at all. A notorious racketeer in the State of Ohio was under deportation order. An application was made to set his deportation aside. Under those proceedings it must be found affirmatively that the alien is a person of good moral character. Despite the fact that there was a police record a mile long, despite the fact that this man was a notorious gambler and racketeer who had never done an honest day's work in his life, this same Mr. Finucane found he was a man of good moral character and directed that his deportation be suspended.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said that Finucane is unfit. That is the understatement of this whole year.

Now, who is this man Barth who has been writing this editorial?

He has consistently ridiculed and vilified all efforts to eliminate Communist, subversive, and espionage activities in the United States; he has consistently advocated policies of benefit only to the Soviet Union and the international program of Communist aggression.

The Communist campaign of treason that culminated in the conviction of Alger Hiss and the Rosenbergs has been dismissed by Barth as "a story that simply could not be told with a straight face." Let me quote from an article by Barth in the Guild Reporter, official organ of the once Communist-dominated American Newspaper Guild, dealing with the anti-Communist investigations of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

> "It is now definitely established," says an interim report of the committee, "that

> during the late war and since then there have been numerous espionage rings at work in our executive agencies which have worked with and through the American Communist Party and its agents to relay to Russia information vital to our national defense and security."
>
> On what does this impression rest? It rests principally on the testimony of three renegade Communists the gist of whose stories had long been known to many newspapermen and had been left untouched as either libelous or scuttle butt or both.

Recently corroborated by Winston Burdett.

> One of the three witnesses, Elizabeth T. Bentley, testified that as an agent for the Soviet Government she had dealt with two (not numerous) Communist espionage rings, and that the members had furnished her with information which she had passed on to other Russian agents in New York.
>
> The second committee witness, Whittaker Chambers, did not testify about espionage activities at all, but merely charged that a number of former Government employees were part of what he termed a "Communist apparatus." The third, Louis Budenz, repeated some gossip he said he had heard at Communist Party headquarters implicated by Miss Bentley and Mr. Chambers.
>
> "In allowing Chambers to testify," asserts Barth, "the committee is guilty of something very much like subornation of perjury."

I am not going to go further, except to point out to you that this man has consistently criticized the State Department when it has properly acted in withholding passports for Communists. He has consistently criticized the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I would like to call your attention to what he said about the Mundt-Nixon bill. This is a direct quote:

> This is somewhat as though Congress were to say it will not outlaw the Catholic or Jewish religions but will merely require all Catholics and Jews to wear armbands or noserings or to have their ears cut off.

Now, I ask you, my colleagues, not to take seriously the attacks that this man has made, because I argue that anybody who is capable of making the statements that I have just read to you is not motivated by the desire to tell the truth.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. I do not know of a Member of this House who is more respected than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. I agree with everything he has said, and I am glad that he is chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I am glad that he had the intelligence and the character to write the McCarran-Walter Act. I think the gentleman has done a great job for the country.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 216)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the second semiannual report of the President on the activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as required by that law.

This report contains the details of the programs carried out under the act through June 30, 1955, including the volume and dollar value of commodities agreed on as well as of those already shipped, together with the planned uses of the foreign currencies generated by sales.

With experience under the act now running to some 10 months, a study is being initiated to analyze the whole problem of disposal of our agricultural surpluses. It will be the intent of this study to try to appraise objectively what the potentialities are for disposals of such surpluses within the framework of the legislative and executive policies that are applicable to legislation such as Public Law 480.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 12, 1955.*

SECOND TERM FOR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the gentleman from Ohio referred to the fact that some 54 Members on the Republican side of this House submitted a petition to the President suggesting that he become a candidate again. These Members, I believe, were all first and second termers, and I am sure that their views are echoed by the other Republican Members on this side of the House. Criticism is voiced, however, by the gentleman from Ohio, who says that his record and the record of his colleagues is better than that of the Republicans. In that case, I would suggest to him that the petition is still open, and the gentleman from Ohio and the other Members on the Democratic side of the aisle are now invited to join in the petition urging President Eisenhower to become a candidate again for a second term.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that our friends in the Republican Party misinterpret the purpose of pointing out the better record of Democrats in support of what some people call the Eisenhower program. Of course, you find Democrats implementing the messages and supporting suggested legislation that come here from the White House because they are echoing the Democratic program. To the extent that the President recommends our program, we are glad to support it, even when mislabeled the Eisenhower program. We are indeed happy to see more and more Republicans embracing Democratic philosophy and programs, albeit under the guise of following the President.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 113]

Abbitt
Anfuso
Arends
Blatnik
Boykin
Buchanan
Chenoweth
Christopher
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Eberharter
Evins
Fernandez
Fine
Fulton
George
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Hébert
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hosmer
Jensen
Johnson, Calif
Kearney
King, Calif
Knutson
McConnell
McDowell
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
Norrell
O'Neill
Osmers
Perkins
Polk
Powell
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Rogers, Colo.
Sadlak
Schwengel
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Sieminski
Smith, Va.
Taylor
Wilson, Calif.
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 5046.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1085)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6766) "making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 16, 19, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$401,173,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,030,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,962,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 31.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
FRED MARSHALL,
JOHN J. RILEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
DON MAGNUSON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
LISTER HILL,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
WARREN MAGNUSON,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROBERT S. KERR,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 6766), making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $575,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $618,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Allows transfer of $481,400,000 from prior appropriations as proposed by the House instead of $582,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $27,053,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $26,214,000 as proposed by the House. Of the funds appropriated, $204,000 is allocated for investigation of future projects, $250,000 for navigation operations, $166,000 for flood control operations, $2,200,000 for fertilizer and munitions development, $400,000 for resources development, and $75,000 for government relations and economics staff. The conferees are in agreement to the statement in the Senate report concerning production of diammonium phosphate fertilizer. The conferees are in agreement with the language in the Senate report pertaining to transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Company.

Amendment No. 5: Provides not to exceed $1,000,000 for resources development activities of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $600,000 from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $684,000 as proposed by the House.

Continuing Fund, SPA

The conferees are in agreement that if not already included in existing contracts provisions are to be inserted to require that power and energy be delivered to the load centers of all generating and transmission contracting systems, if practical, at the basic Southwestern Power Administration rate. The managers on the part of the House are in agreement that the statement in the Senate report with respect to settling accounts on a net balance basis includes operation and maintenance costs on G & T co-op facilities.

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

The conferees are in agreement that funds available in this appropriation item shall be available for the Upper Olympic Peninsula Service and the Olympia-Aberdeen No. 2 line.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $6,600,000 instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendment No. 8: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Provides that $4,421,812 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,987,253 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are in agreement that of the funds appropriated for general investigations, $150,000 shall be available for advance planning on the Rogue River project, Talent Division, and $85,000 for the Palisades reregulating dam and associated facilities.

Construction and Rehabilitation

The conferees are in agreement that the funds appropriated by this item shall be allocated in the following manner:

Project or unit	Budget estimate	Conference allocation
Arizona:		
Gila project, Arizona	$3, 500, 000	$3, 500, 000
Yuma project, auxiliary division, Arizona	408, 000	408, 000
Palo Verde project, Arizona-California	1, 985, 000	1, 985, 000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	1, 390, 000	1, 390, 000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	200, 000	200, 000
Boulder City municipal office, Nevada	50, 000	50, 000
California:		
Central Valley project, California	14, 000, 000	15, 000, 000
Santa Maria project, California	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000
Salano project, California	13, 000, 000	13, 000, 000
Colorado: Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	2, 100, 000	2, 100, 000
Idaho:		
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	520, 000	520, 000
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	2, 200, 000	2, 200, 000
Palisades project, Idaho	9, 000, 000	9, 000, 000
Montana: Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota	325, 000	325, 000
New Mexico:		
Carlsbad project, New Mexico	$1, 171, 000	$900, 000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	7, 200, 000	6, 256, 000
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	40, 000	40, 000
Oregon: Deschutes project, north unit, Oregon	274, 000	274, 000
Utah:		
Provo River project, Utah	------------	300, 000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10, 895, 000	10, 895, 000
Washington:		
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division, Washington	631, 000	631, 000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	75, 000	475, 000
Wyoming:		
Eden project, Wyoming	800, 000	800, 000
Kendrick project, Wyoming	750, 000	750, 000
Riverton project, Wyoming	300, 000	300, 000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	300, 000	300, 000

Project or unit	Budget estimate	Conference allocation
Miscellaneous:		
Drainage and minor construction	$348,000	$348,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	2,125,000	2,125,000
Missouri River: Missouri River Basin project:		
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	6,784,000	6,784,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,500,000	1,500,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	[1] 8,120,000	8,120,000
Hanover-Bluff unit, Wyoming	[2] 1,540,000	1,540,000
Hardin unit (Yellowtail Dam), Montana		4,000,000
Heart Butte unit, North Dakota	200,000	95,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	3,000,000	3,000,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	1,400,000	1,400,000
Lower Marias unit, Montana	[3] 3,675,000	3,675,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming		900,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	490,000	490,000
Missouri River: Missouri RiverBasin project—Con.		
Sargent unit, Nebraska	$3,300,000	$3,300,000
Transmission division	16,480,000	16,665,000
Webster unit, Kansas	3,500,000	3,500,000
Drainage and minor construction	500,000	535,000
Investigations	[4] 2,915,000	2,915,000
Other departmental agencies	2,550,000	2,550,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	55,954,000	60,969,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation program	146,041,000	151,541,000
Less available funds from prior years		−5,500,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation (new funds)	146,041,000	146,041,000

[1] Increased by $2,120,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[2] Increased by $290,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[3] Reduced by $2,825,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[4] Increased by $415,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

The managers on the part of the House are in agreement that funds previously appropriated for the Mecca-Blythe Highway crossing on the Coachella project shall be used for essential features of the reclamation construction program rather than for construction of the bridge.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $24,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $23,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Provides that $20,223,638 of the appropriated funds shall be derived from the reclamation funds as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,912,000 as proposed by the House.

General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $3,600,000 instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency Fund

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Rivers and harbors and flood control

General Investigations

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $5,940,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,190,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that of the funds appropriated herein $10,000 is allocated for Pigeon Creek, Ind.; $20,000 for Lorain Harbor, Ohio; $25,000 for Merced River, Calif.; and $30,000 for Monroe Reservoir, Ind.

Amendment No. 16: Provides $1,000,000 for study authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $401,173,000 instead of $369,894,800 as proposed by the House and $411,273,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds appropriated herein are to be allocated as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alaska:				
Gold Creek		$35,000		$35,000
Metlakatla Harbor			$383,000	
Petersburg Harbor			274,000	
Wrangell Harbor			220,000	
Alabama:				
Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers:				
Jackson lock and dam		70,000		70,000
Warrior lock and dam	$4,100,000		4,100,000	
Coosa River		15,000		15,000
Fort Gaines lock and dam			1,800,000	
Mobile Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Arizona:				
Painted Rock Reservoir		90,000	600,000	
Arkansas:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (bank stabilization and channel rectification)	3,000,000		3,500,000	
Beaver Reservoir				25,000
Calion		40,000		40,000
Dardanelle lock and dam			450,000	
Greers Ferry Reservoir		30,000		180,000
Ouachita River and tributaries				50,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	450,000		525,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)				
California:				
American River Levee		90,000		90,000
Black Butte Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel		50,000		50,000
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	785,000		785,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm and Lytle Creeks			1,250,000	
Riverside		50,000		
Folsom Dam	2,650,000		2,650,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	14,000,000		14,000,000	
Playa Del Rey Inlet and Harbor			25,000	
Port Hueneme Harbor		70,000		70,000
Redondo Beach Harbor			450,000	
Richmond Harbor			500,000	
Russian River Reservoir			500,000	
Sacramento River	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Sacramento River, 30-foot ship channel			500,000	
San Antonio Reservoir	530,000		530,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	700,000		700,000	
San Joaquin River and tributaries			250,000	
San Lorenzo Creek				25,000
Success Reservoir		110,000		110,000
Terminus Reservoir				50,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	933,000		933,000	
Colorado:				
Chatfield Reservoir		10,000		10,000
Connecticut:				
Hammonasset Beach	167,000		167,000	
Hartford (Folly Brook section)	263,000		263,000	
Housatonic River	750,000		375,000	
Sherwood Island State Park			159,000	

State and project	Budget estimate		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Delaware:				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea:				
Mantua Creek anchorage	$1,000,000	-----	$1,000,000	-----
Inland Waterway between Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay	-----	-----	147,000	-----
Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (35-foot channel)	-----	$210,000	-----	$210,000
Mispillion River	-----	-----	275,000	-----
District of Columbia:				
Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland	2,750,000	-----	2,750,000	-----
Florida:				
Apalachicola Bay channel, St. George's Sound	-----	-----	300,000	-----
Apalachicola River channel improvement	-----	-----	500,000	-----
Central and Southern Florida	6,300,000	-----	6,300,000	-----
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia	920,000	-----	920,000	-----
St. Augustine Harbor	-----	-----	163,000	-----
Tampa Harbor	977,000	-----	977,000	-----
Georgia:				
Buford Dam	11,830,000	-----	11,830,000	-----
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	-----	-----	3,000,000	-----
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia. (See Florida.)				
Hawaii:				
Nawiliwili Harbor	-----	-----	500,000	-----
Idaho:				
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington:				
Grande Ronde River, Oreg. (See Oregon.)				
Malheur River, Oreg. (See Oregon.)				
Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, Idaho	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
Prineville, Oreg. (See Oregon.)				
Randle, Wash. (See Washington.)				
Lucky Peak Reservoir	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
Illinois:				
Alton	-----	50,000	-----	50,000
Beardstown	800,000	-----	800,000	-----
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.	-----	-----	60,000	-----
Carlyle Reservoir	-----	75,000	-----	75,000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
Degognia and Fountain Bluff Levee and Drainage District	420,000	-----	420,000	-----
East St. Louis and vicinity	1,285,000	-----	1,285,000	-----
Grand Tower Drainage and Levee District	250,000	-----	250,000	-----
Illinois Waterway:				
Calumet-Sag Channel	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa), Ill., Iowa, and Mo. (rectification of damages)	70,000	-----	70,000	-----
Preston Drainage and Levee District	260,000	-----	260,000	-----
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie duPont Drainage and Levee District	485,000	-----	485,000	-----
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	700,000	-----	700,000	-----
Indiana:				
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
Indiana Harbor (widening at Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.)	45,000	-----	45,000	-----
Mansfield Reservoir	-----	-----	-----	90,000
Mason J. Niblack levee	-----	60,000	-----	60,000
Ohio River locks and dams:				
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	-----	125,000	1,250,000	-----
Vincennes	584,000	-----	584,000	-----
Iowa:				
Coralville Reservoir	4,500,000	-----	4,500,000	-----
Little Sioux River	-----	150,000	500,000	-----
Lock No. 19 at Keokuk	3,200,000	-----	3,200,000	-----
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	700,000	-----	700,000	-----
Missouri River:				
Kansas City to Omaha	3,300,000	-----	3,650,000	-----
Omaha to Sioux City	5,800,000	-----	5,800,000	-----
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Nebraska.)				
Muscatine	-----	70,000	-----	70,000
Sabula	-----	30,000	-----	30,000
Upper Iowa River	-----	-----	-----	68,000
Kansas:				
Abilene	-----	30,000	-----	30,000
Manhattan	-----	-----	-----	15,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Ottawa	-----	30,000	-----	30,000
Pomona Reservoir	-----	45,000	-----	45,000
Salina	-----	65,000	-----	65,000
Strawn Reservoir	-----	25,000	-----	25,000
Topeka	-----	60,000	-----	60,000
Toronto Reservoir	2,800,000	-----	2,800,000	-----
Tuttle Creek Reservoir	-----	-----	7,500,000	-----
Wichita and Valley Center	2,200,000	-----	2,200,000	-----
Kentucky:				
Barbourville	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
Buckhorn Reservoir	-----	70,000	-----	70,000
Catlettsburg	-----	50,000	300,000	-----
Green River:				
Locks and dam 1 and 2	4,400,000	-----	4,400,000	-----
Channel	2,275,000	-----	2,275,000	-----
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
Jackson	246,000	-----	246,000	-----
Louisville	475,000	-----	475,000	-----
Lock and dam 41	-----	-----	-----	150,000
Lower Cumberland lock and dam, Kentucky and Tennessee	-----	200,000	-----	200,000
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)				
Maysville	1,540,000	-----	1,540,000	-----
Pineville	816,000	-----	816,000	-----
Rough River Reservoir and channels	-----	-----	500,000	-----
Louisiana:				
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans District):				
Algiers cutoff	1,263,000	-----	1,263,000	-----
Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	1,260,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
Overton-Red River Waterway	-----	-----	-----	175,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
Maine:				
Beals Harbor	-----	-----	200,000	-----
Portland Harbor (House Island anchorage)	820,000	-----	575,000	-----
Wood Island Harbor and Pool at Biddeford	-----	-----	153,000	-----
Maryland:				
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md. (See District of Columbia.)				
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	1,400,000	-----	1,400,000	-----

State and project	Budget estimate		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Massachusetts:				
Adams	$1,900,000		$1,900,000	
Buffumville Reservoir		$55,000		$55,000
Mystic River (35-foot project)	500,000		500,000	
North Adams	750,000		750,000	
Town River			250,000	
Winthrop Beach	210,000		210,000	
Michigan:				
Battle Creek		60,000		60,000
Black River Harbor			110,000	
Crooked and Indian Rivers			241,000	
Port Austin Harbor			433,000	
St. Marys River (lift bridge and removal at Bridge Island)	338,000		338,000	
Minnesota:				
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis	215,000		215,000	
Knife River Harbor			258,000	
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	650,000		650,000	
St. Anthony Falls extension	1,285,000		1,285,000	
Missouri:				
Bear Creek Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Canton		50,000		50,000
Cape Girardeau (Reach No. 2 only)	750,000		750,000	
Carthage	367,000		367,000	
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff	314,000		314,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	500,000		500,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Mo. and Ark	11,000,000		11,000,000	
Montana:				
Billings		40,000		40,000
Havre	600,000		600,000	
Libby Reservoir		15,000		15,000
Nebraska:				
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak	13,950,000		13,950,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	600,000		600,000	
Norfolk		25,000		25,000
Nevada:				
Pine Canyon Reservoir		65,000		65,000
New Hampshire:				
Hampton Beach	140,000		140,000	
Otter Brook Reservoir		160,000		160,000
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H	400,000		400,000	
New Jersey:				
Atlantic City	906,000		906,000	
Cold Spring Inlet	60,000		60,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See Delaware.)				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton (40- and 35-foot channels), N. J. and Pa	6,000,000	100,000		100,000
New York and New Jersey channels	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Ocean City	67,000		67,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
New Mexico:				
Albuquerque		60,000		60,000
Artesia		25,000		25,000
Chamita Reservoir (Abiquiu)		75,000	425,000	75,000
Los Esteros-Alamogordo Reservoirs				50,000
Rio Grande Floodway	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Two Rivers Reservoir		50,000		50,000
New York:				
Buffalo Harbor (north entrance, Buffalo River and Buffalo ship canal)	1,200,000		2,000,000	
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal				100,000
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.)				
Oswego Harbor		36,000		36,000
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wellsville	350,000		350,000	
North Carolina:				
Manteo Bay (6-foot channel to Wanchese)			47,000	
Rollinson Channel Breakwater			175,000	
Wilmington Harbor			557,000	
North Dakota:				
Garrison Reservoir	20,000,000		20,100,000	
Lower Heart River		60,000		60,000
Marmarth				23,000
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)				
Ohio:				
Ashtabula Harbor (east outer harbor)		46,000	250,000	46,000
Cleveland Harbor (bridge replacements and channel improvements)	85,300,000		5,300,000	
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)				
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000		7,000,000	
Oklahoma:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
Enid		25,000		25,000
Eufaula Reservoir			450,000	
Keystone Reservoir				150,000
Markham Ferry Reservoir	6,300,000		6,300,000	
Oklahoma City Floodway	2,260,000		2,260,000	
Oologah Reservoir			1,000,000	
Oregon:				
Amazon Creek		22,000		22,000
Columbia River at mouth, Oregon and Washington			750,000	
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington:				
Grande Rhonde River, Oreg		55,000		55,000
Malheur River, Oreg		6,000		6,000
Prineville, Oreg		4,000		4,000
Coos Bay			200,000	36,000
Cougar Reservoir		100,000	500,000	
Green Peter Reservoir				100,000
Hills Creek Reservoir		10,000	300,000	10,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington		500,000		550,000
Johnson Creek		35,000		35,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	200,000		200,000	
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works (Multnomah Drainage District, Oregon)		35,000		35,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	11,000,000		11,000,000	
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash	63,500,000		63,500,000	
Tillamook Bay and Bar			200,000	
Willamette River, bank protection	300,000		300,000	

State and project	Budget estimate		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa.		$100,000		$100,000
Bradford	$500,000		$500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See Delaware.)				
Johnsonburg	396,000		396,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir		40,000		40,000
Monongahela River, dam 8		50,000		50,000
Presque Isle Peninsula	600,000		600,000	
Reynoldsville		37,000		37,000
Swoyersville-Forty Fort	400,000		400,000	
Williamsport	278,000		278,000	
Rhode Island:				
Woonsocket		100,000		100,000
South Carolina:				
Charleston Harbor	200,000		200,000	
Port Royal Sound to Beaufort			500,000	
South Dakota:				
Fort Randall Reservoir	7,860,000		5,860,000	
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
McCook Lake			150,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
Oahe Reservoir	25,000,000		25,000,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota).				
Sioux Falls			400,000	
Tennessee:				
Cheatham lock and dam	6,360,000		6,360,000	
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	700,000		700,000	
Old Hickory lock and dam	5,475,000		5,475,000	
Texas:				
Buffalo Bayou		100,000		100,000
Canyon Reservoir		60,000	340,000	60,000
Corpus Christi Bridge	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Dallas Floodway	2,690,000		2,690,000	
Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir	2,450,000		2,450,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Galveston district):				
Guadalupe River channel to Victoria		5,000		5,000
Houston ship channel:				
36-foot project	500,000		750,000	
McGee Bend Dam			1,500,000	
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)				
Navarro Mills Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	600,000		600,000	
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)				
San Antonio		100,000		100,000
Texarkana Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
Waco Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Utah:				
Salt Lake City		5,000		5,000
Vermont:				
Wrightsville Reservoir (modification)		40,000		40,000
Virginia:				
Deep Creek			150,000	
Norfolk Harbor: Craney Island disposal area	700,000		700,000	
Norfolk & Portsmouth Belt Line R. R. bridge	800,000		800,000	
Virginia Beach	235,000		235,000	
Winter Harbor			150,000	
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam	18,000,000		18,000,000	
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington:				
Randle Wash		3,000		3,000
Colfax		40,000		40,000
Eagle Gorge Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River:				
Dredge extension 30-foot channel, new turning basin			421,800	
Point Chehalis	120,000		120,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam			1,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Shilshole Bay		50,000		50,000
Tacoma Harbor			646,200	
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)				
West Virginia:				
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
Hildebrand lock and dam			1,000,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Summersville Reservoir		75,000		75,000
Sutton Reservoir			1,300,000	
Wisconsin:				
Cornucopia Harbor			230,000	
Sheboygan Harbor			218,000	
Wyoming:				
Greybull	300,000		300,000	
Jackson Hole, Snake River		55,000		55,000
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	600,000		700,000	
Snagging and clearing	300,000		400,000	171,000
Projects deferred for restudy		171,000		171,000
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		4,500,000	
Lower Columbia River fish-sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	1,400,000		900,000	
Total, construction, general	362,675,000	5,000,000	395,431,000	5,742,000

The conferees are in agreement that land acquisition at the Gavin's Point Reservoir shall be in conformance with the new real estate policy.

Amendment No. 18: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 21: Allocates not to exceed $4,500,000 for small authorized projects as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $83,030,000 instead of $82,500,000 as proposed by the House and $83,560,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Expenses

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $9,300,000 instead of $9,200,000 as proposed by the House and $9,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $51,962,500 instead of $50,885,000 as proposed by the House and $53,040,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 30: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
FRED MARSHALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOHN J. RILEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
DON MAGNUSON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is in agreement between the House and Senate and there is complete accord in the report on the part of the managers of both the House and Senate who signed it. The only amendments to be submitted to the House are technical amendments which were brought back in disagreement under the rules.

The conference report allowance is $1,365,613,500. The House allowed $1,372,122,800. The Senate allowance was $1,377,571,000. The budget allowance was $1,801,465,000.

The pending report is $11,957,500 less than the Senate recommendation, $6,509,300 more than the House recommendation, and $435,851,500 under the budget estimate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], and myself refused to sign the conference report because we felt that it started an enormous number of projects which would be a menace to the country for years and years to come.

The complete bill, including the number of starts adopted by the House and adopted by the Senate and approved in conference, results in over $2 billion of new starts. If you figure that those new starts will call for at least 20 percent of the total amount of the new starts, you can figure that this bill, from the standpoint of rivers and harbors, flood control, and that sort of thing, will increase at least $400 million every year from now on. Now, with the situation that we are in in this country and the money we have to borrow to meet expenses and our commitments, it seems to me that we should be more careful about approaching our responsibilities and that we should not approve this conference report. The effect of voting down the conference report would be that the conferees would have to get together again, and I would hope that they would be more aware of the situation of the Treasury and the taxpayers than has been the case so far.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say to the gentleman that I hope, as he does, that this conference report will be voted down and that it will be resubmitted to the conferees so that we can give better consideration to those measures which are in the interest of national defense and to the elimination of some measures which are not so important or so urgent to the national economy at this time.

The action of the conferees in striking out the $6 million appropriation for the dredging of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton to provide a 40-foot channel is a reckless and unwarranted blow at an area whose continued industrial development contributes as much to national defense and to a healthy national economy as any area of similar size of the United States.

The Congress seems to have endless funds for parasites, peanuts, and picayune projects. To deny funds for revenue-producing, job-making proposals such as the Delaware channel is completely shortsighted and discriminatory.

Increased corporate and individual income taxes paid by reason of the expanded industrial development along the shores of the Delaware represent a major source of additional revenue to be derived from the 40-foot channel project. Increased activity in the area—1945–1960—will result in capital expenditures of over $4 billion—two-fifths of which is north of Philadelphia.

Opponents of the deeper channel for the upper Delaware on June 16, 1955, made numerous charges, none of which can be substantiated by the actual facts. Here are the answers:

Opponents stated that for 20 or 30 years the Delaware River had a depth of 25 feet in its upper reach and that nobody used it.

Correction: The Engineers' Syllabus on the Delaware River, on page 26, table 4, states that 7 million short tons were shipped between Allegheny Avenue and Trenton, N. J., in 1950. This tonnage was being utilized by industry already in existence on the river, who were forced to use shallow-draft vessels. Since the governing depths of a river channel limit the size of ships, naturally the carriers would have to be of proportionate size to be able to safely navigate the river. Realities of the situation allowed them no choice but to use shallow-draft vessels.

Opponents inferred that because traffic on the upper reach of the river was not heavy in the past, it would not be substantial in the future.

Correction: This inference completely ignores the vast industrial complex rapidly swinging into being in the Delaware Valley and the $4 billion capital expenditure program underway by industry there. In fact, credit should be given to the United States Steel Corp. that this expansion was set in motion largely as a result of this corporation locating its Fairless plant in the big bend of the river off Newbold Island, in Bucks County.

Two highly reputable surveys of potential traffic on the upper reach of the river also disprove this inference. One is the official economic feasibility study prepared by the Army engineers. The board of engineers for rivers and harbors determined the benefit-cost ratio of the Delaware River 40-foot channel project as approximately 2 to 1, which is an extremely high benefit-cost ratio for a navigation project. A private engineering consulting firm of high repute, namely, Knappen-Tippets-Abbett-McCarthy, surveyed the potential of the upper reach of the river to Trenton. This organization in its Report on Port of Trenton, December 1952, forecast potential tonnage moving to the port of Trenton alone at 2.5 million tons per year in 1960, 2.7 million tons in 1967, and 3 million tons by 1977, which increases are due principally in traffic potential to deep-draft vessels.

Opponents stated there will be only one user of the upper reach of the river, United States Steel Corp.

Correction: Surveys made indicate that the Victor Chemical Co., Philadelphia Coke Co., Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., and Northern Metal Co., in addition to the United States Steel Corp., will utilize a 40-foot channel. These companies are already in operation on this stretch of the river. In addition to these companies, the National Gypsum Co. is to locate on the Delaware shortly and import 400,000 tons of cargo annually in deep-draft vessels, and the American Can Co. will locate here and have a definite need for a deep channel. Obviously, other companies will utilize a deep channel when it becomes a reality.

Opponents stated that on the St. Lawrence River the United States Government is paying only $100 million to complete a seaway 105 miles long.

Correction: The navigation phase of the seaway project, with adjustments for current cost levels, will approach $300 million, $100 million of which will be borne by the United States Government. The power phase of the project is estimated to be approximately three times the total cost of the navigation phase. What has been omitted from the record is significant. This is the fact that the $100 million is in reality just the beginning of the total potential cost of the main canal itself. Engineers estimate that another $109 million will have to be spent by the Federal Government for channel improvements on the upper Great Lakes to make ports there capable of handling the deeper draft vessels and increased tonnage. Furthermore, this $109-million figure is a conservative one. One United States Army engineer estimates that at least $500 million may be invested in the next 10 years for harbor and channel improvement in the area served by the seaway. The proportion of this cost that will ultimately be borne by the Federal Government is a matter of surmise at this time.

Opponents implied that 66 seaports on the Great Lakes will be benefited by the $100 million improvement by the United States Government.

Correction: Actually, only a very small part of the improvement of the 66 seaports is included in the $100 million figure. Most of them would have to be made at a cost over and above the $100 million figure, as outlined in the previous statement.

Opponents stated that there are 59 million tons now awaiting shipment on the St. Lawrence River.

Correction: Estimates of commerce on the seaway range from 36 million tons for the first year of operation to 44.5, 45.7, to 57 million tons annually. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Corps of Engineers in charge of civil works, said—October 19, 1954—to a convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers in New York, that "prospective commerce on the St. Lawrence above Montreal—over the 114-mile reach of the river to be improved by the seaway project—has been variously estimated at 45.5 million tons annually after a reasonable development."

Opponents said that according to the statements made by the very active chamber of commerce—Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia—the Delaware River port is the greatest port in the United States today.

Correction: The Delaware River port is the No. 1 port in import tonnage, recently exceeding the port of New York. The Delaware River port is also the fastest-growing port in the Nation. It is not at all unlikely that it will become the No. 1 port in the Nation.

Opponent said:

> There is a 40-foot channel all the way to Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Correction: The statement infers that the city of Philadelphia is presently served by a 40-foot channel. Actually, the 40-foot channel extends up the Delaware River to the naval base, which is located at the southern tip of the city of Philadelphia. Only 1.7 miles of the city's waterfront are served by the 40-foot channel of progressively lesser depth and wholly inadequate to meet present, to say nothing of future, demands; 9.2 miles of the city's waterfront have a channel of 28 feet or less.

Opponent stated that the National Steel Co. recently constructed a large mill on the 40-foot channel.

Correction: The National Steel Co. some time ago took an option on a large number of acres in New Jersey near Paulsboro, but it has not constructed any plant there, nor has it announced when it would build such a plant.

Opponent said that the United States Steel Corp. paid every nickel for the dredging of the Orinoco River in Venezuela.

Correction: The actual fact of the matter is that the steel corporation did pay the initial cost to get the project under way, with the stipulation, however, that the Venezuelan Government would reimburse the corporation over the life of the project for its entire cost.

Opponents stated that the United States Steel Corp. received a $450 million writeoff on its Fairless plant at Morrisville.

Correction: The total cost of the Fairless plant of the United States Steel Corp. is $450 million, which would indicate they received a 100 percent fast writeoff of the plant. This statement is obviously false because under no circumstances does the Office of Defense Mobilization allow a 100-percent writeoff.

Opponent stated one of the United States Steel subsidiaries is building four steel boats, ore boats, in Japan with cheap labor.

Correction: United States Steel Corp. is not, nor are any of its subsidiaries building any type of bulk ore cargo vessels in a foreign country. The corporation uses a contract carrier for its shipments.

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N. J., of February 9, 1955]

UNANIMITY ON DELAWARE

Last week in Washington, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware launched an all-out legislative battle to obtain the money to deepen the Delaware. Reporting on the moves made, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., said in his column in the Trentonian Monday morning that the "unanimity among the representatives of three States is almost unprecedented."

This is cheering news for those who are interested in the Delaware as an avenue of sea-borne commerce, as well as for those who believe that the city of Trenton can become the "port of Trenton."

THOMPSON is spearheading the legislative machinery. He has introduced a bill calling for an immediate appropriation of $25 million to get the project started. With Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, he forms a bipartisan committee to represent the New Jersey congressional delegation in coordinating action with Pennsylvania's delegation.

The unanimity of which Thompson speaks should put tremendous weight behind the tri-State drive for a deeper Delaware. And it should be noted that both Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, and Governor Leader, of Pennsylvania, are playing leading roles. They were in Washington last Thursday and helped no little in forming the coalition. Although Governor Boggs, of Delaware, was not present, he sent assurance of his support and that of Delaware's congressional delegation.

Certainly we cannot say that our elected representatives are not doing their utmost to obtain an appropriation of sufficient funds to get the project underway. But they have to overcome a rather formidable hurdle, President Eisenhower's recommendation that a portion of the overall cost be borne by private interests.

Lurking in the background is some administrative thinking along the lines of making the Delaware a toll waterway. Neither device seems to possess merit.

The fact of the matter is that the Delaware, as a channel to the sea, would pay for itself many times over in years to come.

But more important is that it would open up the great Delaware Valley as a new industrial empire.

What that could mean to Trenton can be gleaned from the story of what has happened and what is still happening in Houston, Tex., as told in the Trentonian yesterday by Edmund Goodrich, editor and publisher. Houston, 50 miles from the sea, became a great port because a bayou was converted into a ship channel. And the Federal Government paid the entire bill.

As we stated above, our elected officials are carrying the ball. But they can't get it over the goal line unless they are assured of the united support of their constituents. Those of us who have the future welfare of Trenton and the Delaware Valley at heart, should lose no time in advising our members of Congress that we are backing their play.

The overall expenditure of $91 million seems like a staggering sum. It really isn't. It's a good, sound investment in the future of this great segment of our country. The preliminary appropriation of $25 million should be voted by Congress without delay.

Mr. TABER. I just hope when this conference report comes up that the House will refuse to agree with it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Are we to understand that the amount in the conference report is approximately $2 billion more than was recommended by the committee in the first place?

Mr. TABER. No, but there are $2 billion of new starts in the bill as it passed the House and the Senate and the committee of conference; that is, there might not be a million dollars appropriated for something that would cost $50 million to complete. That means that next year and in the next 5 years—and they generally insist on getting the money within 5 years—there would have to be a large sum of money added to what has been provided this year; at least, you would not divide that $2 billion of new starts by more than 5, and that would make $400 million additional in each of the next 5 years to come.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Am I correct in understanding that the amount contained in the conference report is substantially below the amount that the Eisenhower administration requested?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it in excess of the budget estimates?

Mr. TABER. The amount allowed for rivers and harbors and flood control is above the amount that the administration requested by a little over $30 million. The amount allowed for the Atomic Energy Commission, however, is below the amount requested by the Eisenhower administration. So that the overall picture probably is this——

Mr. ROONEY. That is exactly what I wish the gentleman would advise the House. Is not the overall picture one in which the amount contained in the conference report is less than the overall amount requested by the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. But the amount for rivers and harbors and flood control and the amount for new projects are way above what was submitted in the budget.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact, which he well knows, that the bill that follows, the supplemental bill, picks up the money for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. TABER. I suppose that would be so, and that is because, as I understand it, we cannot trifle too much with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is there a single amount in this bill that was not recommended by the budget?

Mr. TABER. Quite a considerable amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman does not have a figure on that? I understand it is a considerable amount.

Mr. TABER. I have not that figure. On the other hand, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said, the overall picture, because of the large cut that was made by the Senate for the Atomic Energy Commission, is as he described it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I, too, am interested in balancing the budget. Yesterday we voted $2.7 billion for 1 year for foreign aid. Is it not a fact that that makes $11 billion available for this slush fund type of spending for foreign aid?

Mr. TABER. It makes $11 billion available to spend. On the other hand, the bill itself was $649 million below the budget request.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. In connection with reclamation and flood control, am I not correct that from 1842 to 1952 July, which was the last date for which I could get figures, we have spent a total of only $11 billion on these programs in this country through that historical period?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. That might be. Of course, we have to realize that reclamation projects are necessary in order to have farm relief. We would not need farm relief if we did not have reclamation projects. As a result of those projects, we have opened up large areas of land for cultivation which have caused serious trouble in the agricultural field.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. Reverting to the discussion which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had with the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], with respect to the effect of this conference report on the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, I should like to point out to the gentleman a fact which he knows, but for the information of the House, that this conference report carries a reduction of about $144 million for the Atomic Energy Commission below the request of the Commission. In view of the fact that 90 percent of the budget of the Atomic Energy Commission is in procurement of raw materials and producing weapons, this reduction is a very, very serious matter. I am heartened by the gentleman's reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that this deficit will be corrected in the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. The bill was reported today.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] asked about the exact figures of the additions. I think they should be in the RECORD, and they are as follows: For construction, $395,431,000 additional; for planning, $5,742,000 additional. Then in connection with the reclamation projects there was appropriated $146,141,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in 5 minutes I can make the situation clear in regard to the Garrison Dam. That has been an issue here for several years. I will try to do that in a short time. When the bill authorizing the building of Garrison Dam was before this House, we offered an amendment that any water pool that became necessary in that dam should be limited to 17 million acre-feet. That was put in the bill. Seventeen million acre-feet is approximately 1,830 feet above sea level. That was the original authorization, and it has not been changed. It distinctly said in that amendment that the pool should not interfere with the beneficial consumptive use of water west of the ninety-eighth meridian. We are in that area at Williston.

When we passed the bill, we knew that a higher water level would interfere with our irrigation projects and with the city of Williston. The engineers knew that. They know that today. To get around that idea of not interfering with our beneficial uses of water, they have proposed the creation of dikes around those irrigation projects and the city of Williston.

I had always hoped that Congress would not pass any appropriation for dikes until they found out whether these dikes would protect the people, and there has been no hearing on that at all. For several years this House has refused any appropriation for dikes, and you did it this year. But when the bill got over to the Senate, they put a double-barreled proposition in there. They want $100,000, which this bill gives them, to start the program of building dikes. If you start, you know what will be the end of it. They have a proposition here to irrigate a great area of land 150 miles from that dam, and they want a high level so they can bring that water over and irrigate. Ninety percent of the farmers over there do not want it.

They came here before this committee and testified. One of them found out that of 65 farmers contacted only 1 wanted water. But this Congress is going to force them to take the water. If you start in with this $100,000, it does not mean much, but if they get their foot in the screen door, they will come back for more.

Here is the development. These irrigation projects cost about $2 million. In order to put dikes around those projects costing $2 million, it costs $13 million; $13 million to build dikes to protect $2 million worth of effort of this Government before.

The most sensible amendment that has been made by the Senate is a provision that the owners of land in that area by December 15 of this year can vote on the question of whether they want to surrender their land and get out of there altogether or whether they do not. That provision provides that if two-thirds of them want to sell out, then the trouble on dams and the protection of the irrigation projects will be eliminated because there is no one there to care—who would care? I will say to you I have been accused of having a personal interest in this matter. I will tell you I do have some land which will be flooded, but I have no personal interest in it because they have offered me more for the land than it is worth. I could pull out tomorrow, but I was protecting my neighbors, these men who earn a living on the river bottom. I would be the last fellow on earth to sell out no matter how much money I could get, if it was going to visit dire results on my neighbors. I like neighbors, and I can get 100 percent of their votes in the district where I have my place—and you cannot do much better than that. Maybe Mr. KRUEGER can down in his district, but 100 percent is the best that I can do.

Now here is what these landowners say, and I want to make this a part of my remarks. They know just as well as I know that a dike built upon quicksand will not hold. We have tried that for 50 years and it will not work. They do not want any dikes. They prefer, if you are going through with this high-level proposition, to sell out to the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. I was supposed to have 2 minutes more from somebody here.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman has already had 5 minutes and that is all I can give him.

Mr. BURDICK. I was promised 2 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Well, you had five.

Mr. BURDICK. I have not said anything yet, and I would like to finish.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is your fault.

Mr. BURDICK. If the gentleman will give me half a minute, I will be able to conclude.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one-half minute.

Mr. BURDICK. Here is what I am going to tell you. Do not get excited about this. There is no hurry about it because they will not have the 1,830-foot level filled 5 years from now. It will take 5 years to fill what they already have. In the meantime, you can find out what dikes will do and what protection they will give. I do not know how to manage this thing to get a vote on cutting out this $100,000 which is the first step in the creation of a debt of $500 million. But I presume the best way is to vote down the conference report. I am not asking for more money—I am asking for less.

You can see what a curiosity this amendment which was put in by the Senate really is. The Senate proposes letting the landowners vote on the question of selling on or before December 15 of this year, but at the same time and not waiting for that vote, they propose with this $100,000 to start the dikes. Why start the dikes if the landowners are going to sell out? Why obligate the Government for $13 million for dikes, when after the vote it might appear that no dikes are necessary?

The landowners do not want dikes and this telegram I have made a part of these remarks makes it clear that they have no confidence in dikes. They are right, and no one who is familiar with the quicksands of the Missouri River has the least confidence that any dike can prevent the water from a level higher than the fields from getting in and destroying the fields.

Just take it easy and await the result of the vote and the dike system will be greatly simplified. Congress can then hold a hearing on this precise question of dikes around Williston and determine for itself the feasibility of this system of protection. Congress can also determine whether it wants to enter upon a program of maintaining a high level in order to build a $500 million irrigation project where the farmers do not want water. This initial appropriation of $100,000 may be the entering wedge of a very costly enterprise at the taxpayers' expense. Surely Congress should sometime put some restraint on the Army engineers in developing projects that are not needed and are not wanted.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *July 11, 1955.*

USHER L. BURDICK,
Member of Congress, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: The landowners in the east valley of the Bufford-Trenton Irrigation District unanimously agree that they do not desire to live behind dikes and therefore urge adoption of the amendment to public works bill 1956 as it pertains to Garrison Dam in North Dakota and particularly that portion of the amendment as it affects the east bottom of the Bufford-Trenton Irrigation District.

EAST VALLEY LANDOWNERS ASSOCIATION,
M. W. ANDERSON,
MARVIN BRAATEN,
F. T. MARTIN,
JAMES F. MARTIN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has again expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, I admire my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota, who always can present his case very ably. However, there are some things he did not mention and I want to bring a few facts before the House.

First. The House approved the budget estimate for fiscal year 1956 of $20 million on June 16, 1955, without any restrictive or qualifying language regarding its use or expenditure in either the report or the bill.

Second. The Senate, on July 5, 1955, approved an increase therein in the amount of $100,000, the Appropriations Committee stating in its report, Senate Report 700, page 29, that such additional allocation coupled with available funds "will permit a start on these protective works."

Third. The Senate committee report further states:

> Garrison Dam has been constructed to operate at a maximum normal pool elevation of 1,850 feet. For many years there has been local objection to the operation at that elevation. On several occasions the Congress has included restrictive language in the appropriation bills and reports in order to give the opponents ample opportunity to secure review of the project by the legislative committees. More recently the committee has stated that the reservoir should be operated at a maximum normal operating elevation of 1,850 feet. Closure has been made and the reservoir is filling. It is necessary, therefore, that work be initiated on the protective works in the vicinity of Williston. The committee has, therefore, increased the allocation for the Garrison Dam by $100,000.

Fourth. With the expenditure of the budget estimate for the current year the project will be 90 percent complete. The most economical construction schedule and the orderly programing of the remainder of the project require the early initiation of work on the necessary protective works in connection with the project.

Fifth. The authorizing legislation, Flood Control Act of 1944, provided that final storage capacity of the reservoir should be jointly agreed upon by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Such agreement was reached on June 1, 1953, and the storage capacity of the reservoir was fixed at 23 million acre-feet and the maximum normal operating pool elevation was set at 1,850 feet mean sea level.

Sixth. Lowering the maximum operating pool elevation to 1,840 feet would mean a loss of 59,000 kilowatts in capacity and 151 million kilowatt-hours of energy at the Garrison powerplant. The loss of downstream plants, primarily at Oahe and Fort Randall, would be 48,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Such reduction in capacity would adversely affect REA's and other preference customers who have applied for all the potential power at the Garrison as well as other basin hydro plants.

Seventh. Reducing the operating elevation from 1,850 to 1,840 feet would reduce the reserve storage capacity by 3,600,000 acre-feet, decrease the power revenue by $600,000 annually, and increase the pumping cost to irrigators in the Garrison division by $159,000 per year. Such reserve storage would be enough to irrigate 900,000 acres of land for 2 years.

Eighth. The operating level of the Garrison Dam in North Dakota affects not only the State but is part of a whole system of control for the Missouri River Basin, needed for floodwater regulation and power all down the river. The testimony of the chairman of the Missouri Basin States Committee, Governor Brunsdale, of North Dakota; of Governor Foss, of South Dakota; and Governor Anderson, of Nebraska, pointed the importance of a 1,850-foot level at Garrison. Wilbur Jones, board chairman of the Missouri Valley Association, says that reducing the storage capacity of the Garrison Reservoir would affect every downstream city from Williston to New Orleans and the water supply, sanitation, and navigation, particularly in periods of long drought. REA and other users have much at stake. Charles A. Robinson, staff engineer for the National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, cites the loss of 151 million kilowatt-hours annually from Garrison and 48,000 kilowatt-hours at Fort Randall, if the Garrison operating level is 1,840 feet. The Upper Midwest Power Forum, representing 90 electric cooperatives, with 250,000 members in Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and the 2 Dakotas, have gone on resolution for the high level. The North Dakota Rural Electric Association, which represents all but one of our State cooperatives, favors the high dam and its full power potential. The board of county commissioners of 41 of the States, 53 counties, passed resolutions for the 1,850-foot elevation; 53 city councils, 67 city and service organizations, and letters from 1,000 individuals petitioned for the high level for the reservoir. These governing bodies, organizations, and individuals represent 536,605 of the State's 619,363 population—over 86 percent. The North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, a State instrumentality governing water use, is for the high pool level.

Ninth. The Senate-approved increase of $100,000 to the regular budget estimate approved by the House for the Garrison project should be retained.

The conference committee agreed to this increase.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House presents a situation that is disappointing and discouraging to all who are interested in the development of the Delaware River Valley.

The House conferees by their refusal to agree to the Senate amendment providing $6 million for the deepening of the Delaware River channel between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., have destroyed the hopes and ambitions of the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, their municipalities, civic organizations, and the manufacturing, industrial, and commercial concerns that now utilize the waters of the Delaware and have shut the door in the face of those new activities that had planned to locate on the shores of the Delaware. This action by the House conferees has destroyed the possibility of providing thousands of new jobs to the unemployed in the Philadelphia and adjacent areas of the Delaware River Valley. They have ignored the fact that Philadelphia and the surrounding area is a distressed labor district.

The reasons advanced by the two leading opponents of the appropriation when the original bill was before the House were not substantial nor entitled to serious consideration. In fact, some of the reasons advanced as actual facts do not even exist. It was plain from the arguments then made that the whole reason for opposing the deepening of the channel was a personal one, namely, industries in their respective districts, the Youngstown Sheet Metal & Tube Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Works were fearful of the competition that might develop. No matter what else was said, this was the controlling reason that blocked the appropriations through the efforts of certain individuals in a position to influence legislative appropriations.

This was about as small a consideration as I have at any time observed in my long service in this House. If this type of influence had been the controlling factor throughout our entire history as a Nation there would have been no progress such as we as a Nation have experienced. Picayune considerations such as this would have kept us a small nation. It is fortunate that this type of consideration has not controlled our legislation in the past, and I am certain it will not prevail in the future in this matter. The decision of the conferees was wrong. An appropriation for the purpose was justified. It should have been granted. The failure to grant it was an injustice and should be corrected.

There were many statements made by the opponents at the time the original bill was before the House that cannot be sustained by the actual facts. For instance, it was said one of the United States Steel subsidiaries, an alleged beneficiary of the deepened channel, is building four steel boats, ore boats, in Japan, with cheap labor. The truth is that the United States Steel Corp. is not, nor are any of its subsidiaries, building any type of bulk or cargo vessels in a foreign country. The corporation uses contract carriers for its shipments.

Second, it was stated that for 20 or 30 years the Delaware River had a depth of 25 feet in its upper reach and that nobody used it. The truth is, as the Engineers' Syllabus on the Delaware River—on page 26, table 4—states, 7 million short tons were shipped between Allegheny Avenue and Trenton, N. J., in 1950. This tonnage was being utilized by industries already in existence on the river, which were forced to use shallow-draft vessels. Since the governing depths of a river channel limit the size of ships, naturally, the carriers would have to be of a proportionate size to be able to safely navigate the river. Realities of the situation allowed them no choice but to use shallow-draft vessels.

Third, it was inferred that because traffic on the upper reach of the river was not heavy in the past it would not be substantial in the future. This inference completely ignores the vast industrial complex rapidly swinging into being in the Delaware Valley and the $4 billion capital expenditure program underway by industry there. In fact, credit should be given to the United States Steel Corp. that this expansion was set in motion largely as a result of this corporation locating its Fairless plant in the big bend of the river off Newbold Island, in Bucks County. Two highly reputable surveys of potential traffic on the upper reach of the river also disprove the inference. One is the official economic feasibility study prepared by the Army engineers. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors determined the benefit-cost ratio of the Delaware River 40-foot channel project as approximately 2 to 1, which is an extremely high benefit-cost ratio for a navigation project. A private engineering consulting firm of high repute, namely, Knappen-Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy, surveys the potential of the upper reach of the river to Trenton. This organization in its report on the port of Trenton, December 1952, forecast potential tonnage moving to the port of Trenton alone at 2.5 million tons per year in 1960; 2.7 million tons in 1967; and 3 million tons by 1977, which increases are due principally in traffic potential to deep-draft vessels.

Fourth, it was said there will be only one user of the upper reach of the river—the United States Steel Corp. The truth is that surveys made indicate the Victor Chemical Co., Philadelphia Coke Co., Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., and Northern Metal Co., in addition to the United States Steel Corp., will utilize a 40-foot channel. These companies are already in operation on this stretch of the river. In addition to these companies, the National Gypsum Co. is to locate on the Delaware shortly and import 400,000 tons of cargo annually in deep-draft vessels. Also the American Can Co. will locate here and have a definite need for a deep channel. Obviously, other companies will utilize a deep channel when it becomes a reality, and many more similar instances could be given.

Fifth, it was said that the port of Philadelphia is not the great port it is alleged to be. The fact is that the Delaware River port is the No. 1 port in import tonnage, recently exceeding the port of New York. The Delaware River port is also the fastest growing port in the Nation. It is not at all unlikely it will become the No. 1 port in the Nation.

Sixth, it was said by one of the opponents that there is a 40-foot channel all the way to the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The statement infers that the city of Philadelphia is presently served by a 40-foot channel. Actually, the 40-foot channel extends up the Delaware River to the naval base, which is located at the southern tip of the city of Philadelphia. Only 1.7 miles of the city's waterfront are served by the 40-foot channel. The remaining miles of the waterfront are served by a channel of progressively lesser depth and wholly inadequate to meet present, to say nothing of future, demands. Nine and two-tenths miles of the city's waterfront have a channel of 28 feet or less.

Seventh, it was said that the United States Steel Corp. paid every nickel for the dredging of the Orinoco River in Venezuela. The actual fact of the matter is that the steel corporation did pay the initial cost to get the project under way, with the stipulation, however, that the Venezuelan Government would reimburse the corporation over the life of the project, for its entire cost.

The conferees have totally ignored the importance of the proposed project and the beneficial results that would follow its adoption. I have emphasized the following considerations in committee hearings and on the floor of the House on previous occasions. I feel justified in doing so again. They are entitled to repetition to emphasize what it means not only to the Delaware Valley but to the whole United States to have the project of deepening the Delaware River channel carried on to fulfillment.

We must not overlook the controlling factors that I again reiterate:

First. The deepening of the upper Delaware River channel has been found economically justified by the business, industrial, maritime, State, and municipal interests of the entire Delaware River area. It has the enthusiastic and aggressive support of each of these.

Second. There is no area in the entire Nation that gives promise of greater expansion than the area within the Delaware River Valley. Industrial, commercial, and maritime interests have made, and are now making, large investments amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars to promote economic expansion of the entire district served by the Delaware River. The importance of this contribution to our national wealth and our national security cannot be disputed.

Third. The Delaware River is the main artery of commerce, foreign and domestic, that serves an industrial and farming area not exceeded by any other river in the entire Nation. At the present time its insufficiency of depth is a great handicap in fulfilling its complete usefulness. The traffic on the Delaware River is seriously hampered by this condition and if it is not speedily corrected the injury wrought upon the commerce of the entire area will be incalculable. Furthermore, we must not overlook the further fact that the Delaware Valley lies in the heart of an area in which there is taking place a rapid industrial and commercial expansion that will require service of oceangoing vessels of a draft in excess of 35 feet.

Fourth. The resultant financial gain to the United States Treasury is a further justification for an adequate appropriation to deepen the Delaware River channel. The following figures show that it is just ordinary good business for the Federal Government to invest in the Delaware River:

(a) Customs receipts alone bring $52 million a year into the United States Treasury. Since 1836, the Federal Government has spent a little over $100 million on our Delaware River channel—but since 1900 it has collected almost $1.5 billion in customs revenue—or a return of $14 for every $1 invested.

(b) Every day the Delaware River carries 700,000 barrels of crude oil to feed our great petroleum refineries. With an adequate channel the large modern tanker can deliver crude oil at least 60 cents per ton cheaper than the smaller tanker which our Government built during World War II. The Navy's Military Sea Transport Service is now asking Congress to authorize the building of 20 such large modern tankers because of their defense value. The yearly saving in transportation costs of $20 million for just this one item of our Delaware commerce will mean a Federal tax revenue of $10 million.

(c) The Delaware River will handle for the steel industry an estimated 15 million tons of imported iron ores. If we calculate conservatively that the large ore carrier will bring this ore to our docks for 50 cents per ton less than the cost of using smaller ships, the benefit to the Federal Treasury will be almost $4 million in additional taxes.

(d) Prosperity in our three-State Delaware Valley area depends upon an adequate Delaware River channel. With such a channel, we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal revenue from business and individual taxes. In the last fiscal year Pennsylvania and New Jersey alone contributed over $7 billion in Internal Revenue collections of all kinds—better than 10 percent of all tax revenues.

Another fact that is entitled to the most serious consideration relates to the vast sums of Federal revenue collected each year in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. When the amounts collected are compared to the amounts returned by way of grants-in-aid to these States and local governments together with Federal-aid payments direct to individuals within the States other than loans, the result is astonishing and leaves no doubt of the right of the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to receive the small sum, comparatively speaking, that will be necessary to effect this entire project. However, at the present time the amount requested by the budget with the approval of the President is only $6 million. Compare this small sum with the moneys Internal Revenue collected from these three States and the small amount returned to them as benefits. In the fiscal year 1954 it was as follows:

State	Internal revenue collection 1954	Grants-in-aid and payments to individuals	Percent of collection
Delaware	$905, 492, 783	$7, 140, 158	0. 79
New Jersey	2, 069, 575, 232	65, 116, 871	3. 14
Pennsylvania	5, 351, 690, 024	182, 431, 518	3. 43

In conclusion, I regret the time available prevents my setting forth many other considerations that should be controlling and that would justify the appropriation but in no event should a matter of this importance to three of our States that would affect the whole Delaware Valley and its continued progress be decided upon on the basis that a competitor, or competitors, in the same line of business as United States Steel objects.

The issue and the welfare of the people of these three States that would be benefited by this project should be the fundamental consideration. If such were so considered it would mean that this conference report would be set aside with respect to this particular project.

The gentleman from the Fourth New Jersey District [Mr. Thompson] is well aware of the benefits that could and would come to his congressional district by the approval of this project.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and to say that notwithstanding the erroneous charge that this would benefit just one industry, 50,000 jobs in the next 10 years depend upon this thing and there would evolve up to 12 new industries, making available on the New Jersey side of the river, alone, thousands of new jobs.

I would like to point out to the membership the splendid cooperation we have received from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wolverton] as dean of our delegation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Members from both sides of the aisle from the three States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I assume from what the gentleman has said that he is against the conference report and in favor of its resubmission for further consideration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Durham].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the 5 minutes in view of the statements that have been made by the members of the Appropriation Committee on the minority side. I just want to call to the attention of the House the serious cut that existed prior to the action this morning by the committee, I am informed, in the supplemental appropriation bill. The cut has been substantially restored.

We would have been cut something like $144 million, as has been pointed out here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cole], minority member of the committee, which would have seriously handicapped the operations of this organization for the coming fiscal year, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I understand from the minority side that has been substantially replaced, is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I recall, the matter had not proper authorization when it came in the regular bill. I would have to send down for my records on the supplemental bill, but I am quite sure it is in the supplemental bill.

Mr. DURHAM. I would also like to ask the chairman of the committee on the majority side, can he give us some substantial encouragement as to what action will be taken as to how to replace this serious cut in the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman, in the supplemental bill, there is $138,577,000 in new money and $101 million in obligated balances, which I think represents the amount the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. DURHAM. I might state for the information of the House that in giving consideration to the transfers from the plant and equipment appropriation, and after giving consideration to the availability of unobligated prior years funds, the amount of obligating authority available to the Commission is as follows:

The request of the President was for $1,525,251,000. The House allowance when it left here was for $1,423,847,000. The Senate allowance was $1,481,847,000.

Now, when it went to conference, this is what happened: The conference report shows that the conference finally agreed on $1,380,847,000. Thus it can be seen that the conference report provides an amount which is $43 million less than the amount which would have been available from the House report and $101 million less than was available from the Senate. So we wind up with a deficit of $144 million in requested funds. This would seriously affect the operation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That was for plant and equipment?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is $138,577,000 in the supplemental.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I should like to join with the gentleman in bringing out as he has done the deficiency of this conference report in respect to the atomic energy program and to express my pleasure in finding that the Appropriations Committee is going to correct this neglect in the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it clear that in addition to the $138,577,000 approved by the full Committee on Appropriations of the House this morning, there is also an unobligated balance of $101 million available?

Mr. DURHAM. No. I think the gentleman will find that $101 million in the conference report was in disagreement, and according to the statement by the conferees they exacted from the Commission that there were no further funds available unobligated at the present time. I may be incorrect in that statement.

Action of the House and Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill for 1956, which is before the House for adoption at this time, affects in an important way the financing of the Atomic Energy Commission's operations. The effect of the recommendations of the conference report is to reduce by more than $100 million the operating funds of the AEC for the fiscal year 1956.

It is not my purpose to criticize the detailed and effective work of the members of the Appropriation Committees of both Houses and the conferees. I do feel, however, a responsibility to point out to the Members of the House certain facts.

We on the joint committee have an obligation to keep ourselves thoroughly informed of the Commission's activities. Because of this we sometimes have a greater appreciation for the importance of the AEC's program together with a more detailed knowledge of how such programs are successfully brought to fruition.

It is for this reason that I rise to relate some of the history of the events of this past fiscal year which have resulted in an apparent overestimate on the part of AEC of its needs for money to carry out its program. Apparently these remaining fiscal year 1955 funds have caused the Appropriation Committees to feel that a reduction in fiscal year 1956 funds could be made. I am sure my friends on the appropriating committees comprehend the reason why the AEC did not spend as much operating money this past year as they originally estimated, and I would like to explain at this time to the House in general terms these reasons.

The Commission launched its fiscal year 1955 program to achieve a given end in weapons development. To achieve this goal it felt that it was wise and necessary to explore parallel methods to accomplish the goal. Not being sure which method would prove successful, research was carried along on several different avenues. Before the year was out, however, definitive tests proved one avenue to be successful much sooner than it could have been reasonably expected at the outset of the program. When this proof became available, the Commission could and did abandon its parallel development program which resulted in the apparent savings in expenditures of its fiscal 1955 appropriations.

Because of the above, it does not necessarily follow that the same good fortune and expeditious solution of complex experimental problems will take place this current fiscal year. Therefore, it seems to me, that the Congress is placing an unwarranted limitation on the Commission's vital work for the defense of this country to say nothing of the highly necessary development of peacetime uses of atomic energy.

I should like to say at this time that I am informed that the reduction in funds set forth in the conference report before us will have these serious effects on the AEC's fiscal 1956 program:

(a) A serious curtailment in the program for the purchase of uranium ore which is already under contract;

(b) Abandoning the highly important plans to expand the activities of the weapons research and development programs;

(c) A definite reduction in the production of special nuclear material; and

(d) Eliminaiton to all intents and purposes of any further participation of the AEC in the civilian power reactor development program.

I, therefore, strongly urge that the House reject the conference report now before it and return it for further consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to state that this was a unanimous report is to state only a small portion of the whole truth. It was unanimous among those who signed the conference report, but there were four of us, as you will note, whose names do not appear thereon. I am one of those who refused to sign this conference report, and I am sure that not many of you will be surprised by that refusal. In fact, the chairman of our committee asked me when this conference report was first brought here if I wanted some time to cuss it out, and I told him yes, I did want some time for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed this bill in its final form as it left the House, because I considered it a bad bill at that time. If it was bad then, I do not know the proper language to describe the measure after it had been defiled and deformed by the additions that were made in the other body. At the time this bill was before us earlier I told the House that included in the commitments that we were making was a program that would require 25 years to complete at the current rate of appropriations if we made no new commitments whatsoever. Yet, what has happened? When the bill got to the Senate, they added another 50 or 60 separate projects in addition to a larger number that they earmarked within an appropriation of $4.5 million, projects many of which I had never heard of before, and I have been working on this particular appropriation for the last 5 years. In truth, they scraped the bottom of the barrel of the authorized projects in adding them on the other side.

Oh, you say, "What is another few million dollars here and there in this appropriation?" I am not concerned so much about $1 million or $2 million or $3 million added to an appropriation of this nature, but I am greatly concerned with the commitments that have been made, with the foot-in-the-door technique that is represented by these additional millions here and there.

Take, for instance, the Ice Harbor project in the Northwest that this committee has been guarding very closely for a number of years because we were afraid of the commitments involved. All you will find in this bill is one measly million dollars, but the foot is in the door. There is no use completing the $142 million Ice Harbor project unless you are going to commit yourself to the other three on the Snake River. So, that one little million dollars involved in this bill means the commitment of about $400 million for the taxpayers of this country.

Oh, no, the million dollars is not so important, but it is what we have committed ourselves to in connection with this bill that is so important. For instance, when this bill left the committee, we had added commitments totaling $381 million in nonbudgeted civil works projects, to the amount that had been originally recommended in commitments by the Bureau of the Budget. On the floor of the House we added another quarter of a billion dollars in terms of commitments. It went to the Senate. They added another $1,474,136,200 in terms of commitments. The conference report includes over $1.8 billion of commitments not included in the budget estimates. So, take the Bureau of the Budget commitments and add $1.8 billion to it, and you get a picture of what has happened in this conference report.

I would like to review the history of this appropriation for a few years, if I may. Some of us who have worked on water resources for the past 5 years can recall that we have had to work under rather stringent rules, and the House, in its responsibility, has gone along with it. In the 1951 and 1952 years we were involved in the Korean war. In 1953 we had a review of this thing to know where we might be going in the future. Last year, for the first time, we began to talk in terms of new commitments, of broadening the base of the civil-functions program as the peacetime situation would permit. Last year you will recall there were a number of new starts, mainly urgent flood-control and navigation projects that had a large measure of local contribution.

This year the Bureau of the Budget recommended new starts involving commitments of half a billion dollars, in an orderly fashion of expanding the program. I, indeed, can sympathize with those members of the majority of the committee who have the responsibility of carrying this bill. It must be a bitter pill for some of them who have worked on this for the last 5 years to have to swallow an irresponsible measure of this kind when they can recall that their recommendations were tossed in the ashcan on the floor of the House and thereafter it went to the Senate and they multiplied that error three times.

This as it stands today certainly has no resemblance to the composite judgment of the members of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations. Oh, if this expansion of the program were based on any study of our water-resources program. I wish you would read the pious language in the report of the other body about the study that is needed of the expansion of the water-resources program. It is good language. The only trouble is they have not paid any attention to it over in the other body. These projects were added not as a result of any study by the Corps, by the Bureau of Reclamation, by the Bureau of the Budget, or anyone else. The bare truth is, and I hesitate to state it on the floor, the bare truth is that the way these projects for the most part were put in in the other body was by way of a telephone call, letter, or talk from some Senator or administrative assistant to some Senator. Those are the facts, whether they will admit it in the other body or not.

I think it is about time that we took stock of what has become an unbearable situation. As I said, I did not agree with this bill as it left the floor, but it was a whole lot better bill than what is in this conference report. Some of you who might be concerned at taking effective action to undo some of those irresponsible things that were done in the other body need not be concerned because everything that was put in here in the House was accepted in the other body. So those matters would not be in conference if you gave us another crack at this bill. What we would attempt to do, and I believe we can do a much better job than has been done, would be to undo some of the irresponsible things that were done in the other body and put into this conference report.

I hope when the motion for the adoption of this conference report is made, it will be voted down, and I shall ask for a record vote on that motion. It is time that we put some effort at responsibility back into this measure which, as it stands today, is a piece of irresponsible work mainly as the result of the architecture in the other body.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. With reference to the statement that has been made that this is a unanimous report, is it not a fact that only two members of the managers on the minority side of the House signed the report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct. I think if this House will vote this conference report down it will greatly strengthen the hands of the House conferees.

I am familiar with some of the pressures that existed, some of the reasons why we had to concede on almost everything. The normal procedure was for the House conferees to recede and concur. In fact, as we left the conference room on the other side to walk back to the House wing of the Capitol, one of my colleagues asked the question whether it would be in order to strike out the words "free and full conference," as they appear in this conference report. I am sure we can do a better job.

I hope the motion for the adoption of this conference report will be voted down.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this bill it was claimed one particular industry would greatly benefit by the deepening of the Delaware River Channel and I would like to state most emphatically here and now that I favor no one industry and harbored no such thoughts during the many conferences and hearings that were held on this measure. I repeat again, I favor no one individual industry, but am greatly concerned over the welfare of the 8,600 varied industries located along the banks of the Delaware.

The Members of Congress representing the city of Philadelphia have been accused of knocking out the $6 million for the deepening of the Delaware River Channel when, in effect, we have been working both day and night in an effort to obtain approval of an adequate appropriation to start the work. We all realize the necessity for the improvement of the channel because the results will be highly beneficial not only to Philadelphia, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am for economy and I try in every way to vote appropriately on the various appropriation bills to insure our national economy. My colleagues and I believe that the benefits our Nation would derive from the deepening of the channel would, to a great degree, assure our economic stability.

It is a well-known fact that the Delaware River Channel is obsolete and presents a constant hazard to the shipping companies using the Philadelphia port. The channel, as it stands today, has been responsible for 120 accidents involving 169 vessels with a total damage of $13,445,845. Fifty-seven of the 120 accidents were reported as groundings and I do not know what more definite proof is needed to show that the improvement of the channel is necessary. Please remember, we are dealing with cold, hard facts and not figures. More important is the fact we are toying with human lives. During the past 4 years 28 seamen have lost their lives—not on the high seas, but on the Delaware River Channel. Certainly if we can save human life by deepening the channel it is worth every dollar expended by our Government.

The Democrats have been accused of killing this $6-million item. This certainly is not true because we have done everything humanly possible to retain the $6 million in the bill. Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful and that is why I am very much opposed to this conference report. It is my sincere hope that the report will be voted down and returned to conference so the $6 million can be restored.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if this bill is voted down and it goes back to conference for restudy and reconsideration, will he vote in favor of putting the $6 million back into the bill for the deepening of the channel?

Mr. TABER. For my own part, I cannot make any commitment as to what I will do when we go back into conference. I will go into a free and open conference, as the rules prescribe. I will have no commitment of any description except to do my best for the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHUDOFF. It is a shame the gentleman does not have more time to set forth the arguments for the Delaware River Channel. I think the committee of conference made a very serious mistake and very definitely set us back in the Delaware River Valley economically for future development. I for one will be pleased to vote to return this conference report to the committee of conference, to have the conferees really go into this matter with an open mind and put that $6 million back.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I stated to the Members of this body about a month ago, the deepening of the channel in the Delaware River is a matter of great concern to me and to my people in Philadelphia, as well as all of the Delaware Valley. The action of the conferees in disapproving the item for $6 million in the public works appropriation bill has a tragic bearing on the improvement of the Delaware Valley.

During the past 50 years the development of the Delaware River has cost the Government $105 million; yet for each of these dollars the Government has received $14.25 in return. And there is every reason to believe that this return will be greatly increased in the coming years because of the value of this project to the Nation.

The Delaware River Valley is of strategic importance to the future security and national defense. The diversified industrial power of the river basin is a keystone in the Nation's arsenal. Much of this industrial capacity is equipped for military production. This area includes such vital facilities as the Philadelphia Naval Base, shipyards, the Frankford Arsenal and other industries. Other important installations are definitely planned which will further increase the value of the area to the Armed Forces. The natural advantages and enhanced security which the Delaware River Valley enjoys, however, are totally wasted unless joined to it is a major program of channel deepening undertaken as an urgent project in the national defense.

With the approval of funds for the deeping of the channel in the Delaware River the employment problem would certainly be greatly alleviated by the creation of new jobs; business would be so greatly buttressed that people from other parts of the United States would be drawn to the Delaware River Valley to make their livelihoods; and the impetus to the shipping industry and to allied industries—trucking, railroads, and so forth—would be increased by attractions of a port accessible to the sea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the restoration of the $6 million item in this bill for work on a 40-foot channel in the Delaware River.

Mr. BARRETT. Would the gentleman vote against the conference report on the basis that we might get this item restored if it goes back to the committee?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I would vote against it, yes.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERSISTENT BUT WHOLLY ERRONEOUS IDEA OF DELAWARE RIVER PROJECT

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make only a few comments on the conference bill on public works appropriations. It is obvious that the Delaware River project has been murdered for this moment by reason of the conviction of so many Members that this in some way is intended to be some kind of Federal handout or subsidy to the United States Steel Corp.

I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Philadelphia congressional delegation and our colleagues from New Jersey and the Member from Delaware and the others who have joined with us and helped us on this would not be fighting such a continuous and unremitting battle as we have fought in connection with this matter if it was only a case of helping United States Steel.

On the other hand, it is interesting to note how fearful some Members here are that United States Steel might benefit from a project which also benefits—which benefits to an infinitely greater degree—thousands of other firms, and millions of American citizens, and thus the whole American economy.

I do not believe we must punish one of the great industrial centers of the world—not just of the United States but of the world—for fear a single firm might also benefit. We have never objected to widening channels in other sections of the country where industry competes with us.

Nevertheless, in the atmosphere which has been engendered here, and which the Budget Bureau helped to create with its original shortsighted and altogether fantastic position on this project, probably nothing any of us could say right now would change the situation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for myself, and I am sure my fellow Philadelphians all agree, we will never cease our efforts to get this project into construction because it is a worthwhile, necessary, useful, meritorious one. It is too bad there has to be some further delay. But I intend to do everything I can to make sure that that delay is a short one, and that right will prevail, and that this unfair campaign which has been waged so successfully this time against the Delaware improvement is finally overcome by a recognition by the Congress of the true facts.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here in defense of the House conferees and the conference report. They eliminated the $6 million which was put in by the other body for the Delaware River. Dwight Eisenhower, the President of the United States, said today, and it is in the press, that he is ordering the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract. Now the Dixon-Yates contract is not 1, 2, 3 with this one. He said last week that he was going to ask for a review of that contract and that he was misinformed on the Dixon-Yates contract. There is no chance of his being misinformed on this contract, if they ever got one, because from the rostrum of this House of Representatives last January in his state of the Union address, he said he was for partnership in Government with business and industry. One thing he mentioned was the Delaware River project, saying that they would have to put in enough money to meet their part. They first asked for $25 million in the subcommittee and that was turned down. It came to a vote on the floor of the Congress and they lost by a vote of 107 to 77. That was for $18 million. It went over to the other body and they put in the $6 million, after the President of the United States sent up word to put in the $6 million, holding up that great lawmaking body until 8 o'clock in the evening. They do not deny that over there. It was 8 o'clock that evening, before they could mark up the bill. The President of the United States also said he was opposed to legislation where they put a sneak rider on it. He said that after a rider was put on a bill here a few weeks ago, and they had to shelve the bill for 6 weeks. He said it was a menace to this Nation. He said that kind of legislation was a menace to the country. So it went over to the other body last year where they put a rider on this bill on which they never had 1 day of hearings in the House. It came back here 2 days before the adjournment of Congress. Now, if I were you I would not ask to send this back to conference because, I again repeat as I did before, that the Dixon-Yates contract is not 1, 2, 3 with this one.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. When the gentleman refers to this other contract—to what is he referring?

Mr. KIRWAN. To the contract which would be let by the Army engineers when they let the contract to somebody to dig that canal 40 feet. You had one up there for 30 years of 25 feet and nobody used it. It refilled itself up to 8 feet. These 8,400 industries you are talking about never used that channel. Not one of them used it in 30 years. Nobody used the 25-foot canal. All of a sudden you are going to use the 40-foot canal. The Army engineers said that the only one, that is, the only industry that was going to benefit 100 percent was United States Steel.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Does not the gentleman agree that there are 8,400 different industries along the banks of the Delaware River?

Mr. KIRWAN. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true, as I mentioned here on the floor, that every piece of legislation that is enacted on this floor involves someone getting greater benefit than someone else?

Mr. KIRWAN. Somebody may, but the Army engineers said that the only one in this case was United States Steel.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. KIRWAN. No, the record contains what the Army engineers said. It is in the record here.

Mr. SCOTT. I just wanted the gentleman to know that that statement is not correct.

Mr. KIRWAN. The Army engineers testified before the committee which I happen to be on. On the 35-foot channel, perhaps, some would benefit 85 percent, but on the 40-foot channel there is only one company that would get 100 percent benefit out of it.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the gentleman forgotten the United States Gypsum Co., and the Kopper's Coke Co. and some other companies?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today asking the Members of Congress not to vote to recommit this. If the only thing they are hollering about is the Delaware River canal, let them take it next year to the House committee and hold proper hearings on it. Let them do as the President suggested. Let them go through all of that and, if the House works its will and we want them to dredge the Delaware River, then that is fine. Then let it go over to the other body. But, do not let it go over there calling for a 35-foot channel. Local interests were supposed to pay $18 million which they were satisfied to pay, and then over in the other body they tacked a rider on it making it a 40-foot channel and the local people did not have to pay any money. Do not vote to recommit a bill for something like that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, first I would have it understood that I am not opposed to all the items in this proposed legislation. Most of them, in my opinion, should be supported. I feel constrained, however, to vote against the report on the ground that so many items in the measure were not approved—in fact, not even considered—by the Bureau of the Budget.

I hope that by sending the bill back to the committee some of the items contained in this legislation, and not approved by the Bureau of the Budget, may be eliminated.

We are advised by the Appropriations Committee that expenditures amounting to $400 million are included in this bill for the purpose of starting projects located in various places across the country. These items which have been discussed on the floor today do not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The thing that makes the situation a little more serious is the fact that spending the additional $400 million not approved by the Budget Bureau will mean a total and final expenditure of more than $2 billion when such projects are completed.

It seems to me that since the Appropriations Committee of the House has been rather liberal in supporting legislation approved by the Bureau of the Budget, we should not include additional appropriations for big projects that have not really been examined nor approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Voting the conference report down does not kill the bill, but it will give the conference committee another chance to look the situation over with a view of trimming out at least some of the items not supported by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. If we delay this matter until tomorrow, it may be rather an embarrassing situation for the White House and others.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe that under all the circumstances I must insist on the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with the promise made to the House, that further consideration of this conference report be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I think that here and now we should clear up two apparent basic misconceptions that exist concerning the reclamation program.

In the first place, some people would lead us to believe that the reclamation program is an expensive program to the taxpayers that threatens to bankrupt the United States. The facts are that from the beginning of the reclamation program under Theodore Roosevelt, to June 30, 1952, which is the last year for which I have complete figures, the total expenditures on reclamation by the Federal Government in the 17 Western States has been less than $2,159,000,000. Of this amount $1,924,000,000 is reimbursable to the Federal Government. In other words, only $235 million is not repaid to the Treasury principally because of nonreimbursable benefits such as flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. The total amount expended on reclamation through the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, will be, as per best estimates, $2¾ billion, of which all but about $250 million is reimbursable. Compare this with the foreign-aid program to which the House added $2,700,000,000 yesterday to provide total unexpended balances of over $11 billion.

The second misconception which some people would leave with us is that our reclamation program accounts for our agricultural surpluses. That simply is not the fact. Surplus products which apparently concern us are the basic commodities of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco and peanuts. From personal observation, I do not believe that there are any of these commodities moving into Government surplus from the reclamation projects of my State. The amount of surplus commodities from reclamation projects would be negligible, in my opinion, except in one instance. In certain areas of California and Arizona, cotton is grown on reclamation projects and undoubtedly some of this moves into Government surplus. In my State and surrounding area, the fact is that the reclamation projects are used to raise nonsurplus crops, and crops to stabilize our livestock economy. In the past year, the Federal Government spent over $650,000 in my State alone to alleviate serious drought conditions. This did not remove the effect of the drought, it merely minimized it by assisting in providing winter feed for carrying over breeding herds. Economically speaking, this could be said to be money down the drain. With reclamation projects under an adequate water storage program we can solve the problem much better. In addition to that, the additional income tax from these reclamation projects is income to the Federal Government instead of output. As a matter of fact, a study of representative reclamation projects recently showed that the Federal Government very quickly recovers in a matter of a few years the entire cost of the project from additional income taxes alone.

Our whole domestic public works program is here put under attack as being irresponsible spending. As the gentleman from Minnesota has so aptly stated, I cannot see how some people can have this great concern over this public works program and its effect upon the Treasury, and, at the same time, have supported the appropriation made yesterday for foreign aid. It is my understanding that since 1947 for foreign aid, under one name or another, we have appropriated over $50 billion. None of this will be reimbursed. According to the figures furnished to me by the Interior Committee of the House, as of June 30, 1952, our total expenditures by the Corps of Engineers—flood control, rivers and harbors, and so forth—the Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, and Tennessee Valley Administration, amount to less than $11 billion. As I have already stated, a substantial portion of this, particularly as concerns reclamation, is reimbursable. For the information of the House, the figures for this by States, and by purpose are as follows:

Federal expenditures, by States, on water conservation and control projects (1848 to June 30, 1952) with estimated repayable and nonreimbursable amounts

	Expenditures to June 30, 1952 [1]	Repayable [2]	Nonrepayable
Alabama	$366, 385, 923	$181, 108, 238	$185, 277, 685
Arizona	239, 438, 747	234, 341, 141	5, 097, 606
Arkansas	422, 465, 047	4, 281, 647	418, 183, 400
California	853, 687, 914	395, 036, 859	458, 651, 055
Colorado	195, 289, 985	144, 338, 144	50, 951, 841
Connecticut	35, 442, 100	----------	35, 442, 100
Delaware	50, 296, 900	----------	50, 296, 900
District of Columbia	8, 910, 583	47, 283	8, 863, 300
Florida	160, 675, 000	----------	160, 675, 000
Georgia	146, 715, 138	9, 006, 003	137, 709, 135
Idaho	119, 285, 823	81, 120, 272	38, 165, 551
Illinois	338, 992, 500	----------	338, 992, 500
Indiana	77, 896, 500	----------	77, 896, 500
Iowa	122, 280, 500	----------	122, 280, 500
Kansas	99, 386, 570	10, 156, 176	89, 230, 394
Kentucky	421, 659, 114	119, 544, 678	302, 114, 436
Louisiana	593, 870, 200	----------	593, 870, 200
Maine	13, 818, 000	----------	13, 818, 000
Maryland	58, 880, 000	----------	58, 880, 000
Massachusetts	105, 545, 300	----------	105, 545, 300
Michigan	186, 214, 000	----------	186, 214, 000
Minnesota	55, 007, 700	----------	55, 007, 700
Mississippi	290, 598, 563	15, 877, 217	274, 721, 346
Missouri	360, 735, 723	3, 192, 723	357, 543, 000
Montana	301, 276, 320	136, 729, 663	614, 546, 657
Nebraska	169, 109, 566	51, 986, 753	117, 122, 813
Nevada	101, 195, 758	100, 640, 338	555, 420
New Hampshire	14, 422, 300	----------	14, 422, 300
New Jersey	127, 409, 900	----------	127, 409, 900
New Mexico	61, 046, 512	34, 314. 901	26. 731, 611
New York	296, 384, 400	----------	296, 384, 400
North Carolina	153, 860, 240	52, 993, 014	100, 867, 226
North Dakota	160, 568, 620	21, 913, 800	138, 654, 820
Ohio	225, 965, 100	----------	225, 965, 100
Oklahoma	165, 851, 410	15. 157, 880	150. 693, 530
Oregon	473, 019, 080	111, 919, 337	361, 099, 743
Pennsylvania	323, 865, 900	----------	323, 865, 900
Rhode Island	15, 236, 200	----------	15, 236, 200
South Carolina	71, 908. 600	51, 100	71, 857, 500
South Dakota	144, 058. 885	29, 507, 485	114, 551, 400
Tennessee	897, 901, 837	544, 041, 860	353, 859, 977
Texas	386, 093, 521	8, 938, 199	377, 155, 322
Utah	46, 452, 266	44, 055, 659	2, 396, 607
Vermont	14, 082, 200	----------	14, 082, 200
Virginia	140, 762, 337	1, 704, 829	139, 057, 508
Washington	893, 140, 391	639, 702, 451	253, 437. 940
West Virginia	177, 616, 900	----------	177, 616, 900
Wisconsin	114, 045, 300	----------	114, 045, 300
Wyoming	136, 972, 070	123, 745, 847	13, 226, 223
Total	10, 935, 723, 443	3, 115, 453, 497	7, 820, 269, 946

[1] Represents expenditures by Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, and Tennessee Valley Administration.

[2] Includes Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, and Tennessee Power Administration. Corps of Engineers data not available.

Breakdown of total expenditures and total repayable

	Expenditures	Repayable
Corps of Engineers	$7, 245, 017, 000	----------
Bureau of Reclamation	2, 158, 185, 988	$1, 923, 985, 655
Southeastern Power Administration	51, 100	51, 100
Southwestern Power Administration	20, 162, 924	20, 162, 924
Bonneville Power Administration	246, 977, 979	246, 977, 979
TVA	1, 265, 328, 452	924, 275, 839

HOUSE MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO ATTEND NATO PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 109, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference in Paris in July 1955, on the part of the House Messrs. HAYS of Ohio, SMITH of Mississippi, ANFUSO, JOHNSON of California, CRUMPACKER, and BECKER.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and to myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate of the bill H. R. 5168.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by the pending resolution is H. R. 5168, to provide for the retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under the provisions of the Farm Credit Administration, to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, at the hearing held by the Rules Committee it was revealed that in the early consideration of the bill by the Committee on Agriculture there was some opposition to certain sections. The Committee on Rules was told that the bill as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture in almost all respects meets the objections raised to it.

The resolution (H. Res. 298) was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. I believe the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for the retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under the provisions of the Farm Credit Administration, to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration the bill H. R. 5168, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us does part of the job of reorganizing the Farm Credit Administration. I will understand it if Members feel that we come in here and ask for reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration each and every year. This is not quite the case, but you cannot be blamed for that feeling. Therefore, I think it might be well to go back and give a little history of the Farm Credit Administration.

The Farm Credit Administration grows out of the several farm credit institutions that have been established by the Congress over a period of years. The oldest of these is the land bank system established in 1916. Then we had established at later dates the cooperative credit system, then we had the production credit system. Each of those were at one time separate institutions. They were finally consolidated and for a long period of time were under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

The borrowers of those various agencies gradually began to feel they wanted to be considered an independent agency. A little over a year ago the Congress gave them an independent agency under the control of a board appointed by the President, representing 12 regions. That board in turn elects what is known as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. The Governor is the administrative officer of the system.

In the system we find the real estate or the long-time credit system which is made of the land banks, of which there are 12, 1 in each region. They were originally established with Government capital. These land banks in turn are owned by the national farm loan associations which are scattered all over the country. You do not find 1 in every county but on an average you will find that there is more than 1 in each congressional district. They are farmer cooperatives. They own the land banks. The land banks are now wholly owned by the national farm loan associations. The Government has been repaid. The national farm loan associations in turn are wholly owned by their borrowers. So that the real-estate credit is wholly farmer owned as of today. There is no Government capital in the land bank system.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. In my opinion the gentleman from Texas is the best informed Member of the House in the field of agricultural credit. I want to commend him for the clarity of his remarks. I hope he will give a full discussion of all problems related to this bill. This would be helpful to the Members of the House and to the public generally.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. I think it is clear that the land bank system is farmer owned, there is not any Government capital involved, although originally in 1916 the Government put up all of the capital. But that has all been retired. The borrowers now own the land bank system.

Probably next in order of organization was the production credit system, although there was a cooperative credit system established even prior to that time, but as we know it now, the production credit system is the next in order of time.

The production credit system involves that system which provides credit for a relatively short time, or for what we might call and it is called in the case of the banks, intermediate credit. That is not simply a 30- or 60-day credit, but a credit that involves the making of a crop or possibly the maturing and selling of a herd of cattle. It involves credit for stocking a ranch, for buying equipment for farms, for handling the ordinary necessary capital to operate a farm or ranch. It does not involve credit for the purchase of the real estate. This production credit is handled through a more complex system, and as I have seen it, a system which never was quite as satisfactory as the system of the land banks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. While the gentleman is discussing the Federal land bank situation, a practice of the Federal land bank down in my area over the period of the last 20 years has been to withhold half of the minerals and reselling the land that has been foreclosed and has come into possession of the land bank through foreclosure. The net result of that has been that thousands upon thousands of landowners in the State of Mississippi have been deprived of half of the minerals in the land that they purchased from the Federal land bank. It has created quite a bit of dissension and unrest among the farmers down in my area, most of whom lost their land to the Federal land bank back in the days of the depression. They feel—and I think rightly so—that it was never the purpose of the original act which permitted the setting up of the Federal land banks to permit their indulging in mineral speculation. Further, it has been reported to me that the Federal land bank in New Orleans has made what you might call excessive profits during the last several years following the discovery and development of several oil fields in Mississippi and Louisiana. Can the gentleman enlighten us as to the amount of dividends paid by the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans in particular over the past 8 or 10 years? It is my understanding that last year they paid almost 25 percent dividends.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, I cannot enlighten the gentleman as to the specific amount of dividends paid by the New Orleans bank. Whatever these dividends have been, they have gone to the farmers who have borrowed or who are now borrowing from the bank. I can comment upon the policy that he refers to, however, because it has been a policy to which I have taken exception time and time again, and which, to my mind, is an extremely shortsighted policy. Of course, the bank at Houston has been involved in exactly the same transactions as the bank at New Orleans, and it probably has gone a great deal further than any bank in the United States, because it covers more land with known mineral deposits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am delighted to hear my friend say that, and I am glad that he realizes what the situation is. I hope that the Committee on Agriculture, or the appropriate committee, whichever committee it might be, may see fit to make a study of the operation of the Federal land banks all over the country, particularly with respect to their mineral dealings and mineral holdings, with a view toward making some determination as to what their future policy should be in regard to mineral speculation and withholding of these minerals from the landowners.

Mr. POAGE. Since the question has been raised, I want to take a moment to discuss it, although it may detract from my efforts to explain the structure of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I make one more remark?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The situation in my area in particular has reached the point where it appears to be developing almost into racket proportions. We are very much disturbed about it. I do hope that the Committee on Agriculture will have an opportunity to look into this matter thoroughly with a view to correcting whatever bad situation may be prevailing.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend from Mississippi that this has been a matter of great concern to me personally, and has been a matter of considerable concern to the Committee on Agriculture. But we are faced with a very practical problem. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will realize the difficulty of dealing directly with this situation. The land banks are engaged in a competitive business, as they should be. Private lenders provide a large portion of the farm credit of the United States, as we want them to, and we hope they continue to provide a substantial portion of the credit. As long as the private lending agencies have it within their power to make these reservations, the land-bank system has felt that they in turn should have the same power. I cannot speak for the entire system, but I have discussed this problem with the officers of the Houston bank, which covers Texas and a large portion of the mineral area. They recognize the problem fully. They recognize the evil of the practice of reserving these mineral rights.

They have done this much: They have gone to Austin and have urged the Legislature of Texas to pass legislation prohibiting the reservation of these mineral rights in perpetuity by anyone, whether it be the land bank, an insurance company, or anyone else. To my mind, that is the correct approach. That is the approach that should be used all over the country. It is a matter over which each and every State has complete jurisdiction. The States have the right to pass their own laws in regard to the ownership of real estate.

Personally, I have long been convinced that there is a grievous evil in allowing the separation of the mineral estates and to retain those estates separated over a long period of time without any development of the mineral estate.

I recognize that in passing such legislation there should be opportunities to develop the mineral estate separate from the surface estate where development dictates that. But for mere speculative purposes—and that is what the gentleman is referring to I am sure—it does work a hardship and, in my opinion, it is going to become worse if this practice is continued. Withn the next 100 years the farmers and the ranchmen all over America are going to find themselves with absolutely no interest in mineral development.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I do want to get back, let me say, before I yield to my friend from Tennessee, to explaining this bill. I am going to suggest that I shall gladly yield for any question relating to this bill, but I do not want to get too far away from the bill. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to comment for the benefit of the Committee, and also for the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that in subcommittee we did discuss this very subject of mineral rights and the division of surface and mineral rights. The gentleman from Texas who is now speaking did express his deep concern over that matter, and his position was made known to the representatives of the land banks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is concerned, as I am personally equally concerned, with this situation. I recognize that there is a wrong which should be corrected in some manner. I do hope the gentleman may use his talents and ability and efforts and influence in the Committee on Agriculture to see to it that the Federal land banks all over the United States are investigated so far as their profits are concerned and so far as the mineral holdings and mineral dealings are concerned, particularly with respect to whether or not they are improperly withholding minerals from the people in violation of the original intent of the law.

Mr. POAGE. May I again suggest to my friend from Mississippi that this is, as I conceive it, primarily a proposition for each and every State to determine for itself although I realize that if the States fail to act that this Congress may have to act. I would suggest that the State of Mississippi should make a decision promptly before it reaches the unhappy situation that my State has reached and that Oklahoma has reached and that certain others have reached, because it is much easier to get State legislation before these mineral rights have ripened than it is at a later date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is absolutely correct, except that I think we should remember that the Federal land bank is an agency which is a child or a subordinate of a Federal agency and is set up by Federal law. I believe it should be attacked not only by State law but also the Federal Government, which is the father of this agency, should certainly give consideration to the policies it is going to follow.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Since the gentleman is going to get back on the subject and the details of the bill before us, am I correct in assuming generally that what this bill does is for practical purposes of operation and otherwise to give the production credit associations autonomy other than the usual obligations which they assume for inspection, and so forth?

Mr. POAGE. No; I fear the gentleman is wrong. That is not what the bill undertakes to do. This bill is intended primarily to get Government capital out of the system.

Mr. BURLESON. I am inquiring if it does not give them a greater autonomy than they have now.

Mr. POAGE. I think it gives to the local production credit associations some greater assurance that they will be able to operate according to their own desires than they do today. It does rewrite some of the requirements in regard to the selection of directors, but this bill does very little for the production credit associations, as such.

I had just started the discussion of the production credit feature of the farm credit system when my attention was directed to the land banks and minerals estates.

The production credit associations are the local organizations that make loans to farmers who need production loans. In some areas the local borrowers own all of the stock of the production credit associations. That is true in the Texas area. The borrowers in the Texas area own all of the stock of the local PCA's. In some areas the Government still owns some of the stock of these local associations. In no area do the farmers own the stock of the refinancing institutions or the discount institutions. Nor do they own the stock of the supervising agency.

As I started to explain, this production credit is a more complicated situation than with the land banks, because the PCA's discount their paper with what are known as the intermediate credit banks, which are wholly Government-owned institutions. The intermediate credit banks discount not only the paper of the PCA's but also the paper of certain other privately owned local institutions. In our area we call these the old financial institutions. They are generally livestock loan institutions, but they, too, discount paper with the intermediate credit banks.

Then there is an institution in each area known as the Production Credit Corporation, which is the supervisory agency. It supervises the activities of the local PCA's, and examine their accounts.

There was a great deal of discussion in the committee as to whether the production credit corporations and the intermediate credit banks could not be consolidated into one institution. Some feel that they should be consolidated in one institution, some feel apparently like maintaining the two separate institutions. There was such wide diversity of opinion before our committee that we finally felt there was no practical way of providing legislation, for which we might hope to have general support at this session, if the bill should provide for the retirement of the Government capital from those two institutions, or from either one of them until the different groups had had further time for discussion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We did assure those persons interested in the subject that we would continue to study the matter in the months ahead and would further consider it early in the next session.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We requested the Farm Credit Administration to give us another report at the beginning of the next session and another recommendation as to how we might handle this problem, and I am sure each member of the Agriculture Committee intends to give further study to it. We all recognize that we should pay off this Government capital. If the PCA's won't get together I am sure the committee will feel that it must take action anyway.

For the reasons I have mentioned, there is very little done to the PCA's in this bill because we took out of this bill, as it was originally introduced, the proviso for the purchase of stock in the production credit corporations by the local production credit associations. We expect to deal with this next year.

A third great field of farm credit is the cooperative credit. We have what is known as a bank for cooperatives in each of the farm credit regions. That bank for cooperatives lends money to such cooperatives as farmers' elevators, creameries, oil mills; to cooperatives gins and that type of cooperative enterprise which borrow their money in a large part from banks for cooperatives. There is some farmer money in the capital structure of this bank. The major portion of the capital still is Government owned in these banks for cooperatives. This bill provides a means, and one of the most important things in the bill, is the specific provision made here whereby the Government capital will be retired from the banks for cooperatives. For it will be substituted the capital placed there by the farmers themselves or the cooperatives that do business with them. That is achieved by issuing several different kinds of stock and requiring that any earnings be invested in stock and requiring that money be placed in proportion to the needs into the system by the borrowing agencies.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Could the gentleman from Texas tell me whether these big cooperative enterprises here in the metropolitan area can take advantage of the facilities of this bank for cooperatives?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. AVERY. Is that reserved strictly for agricultural purposes?

Mr. POAGE. It is strictly for agricultural agencies. These banks are a part of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have received a number of inquiries from production credit associations expressing objection to the bill. I note that in the bill the committee has stricken out language. Does the striking out of that language remove the objections of the production credit associations?

Mr. POAGE. So far as we know it removes the objections of the production credit associations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. As I explained a while ago, some of the production credit associations felt and still feel that there should be a consolidation of the intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations. The production credit corporations are the administrative and supervisory agencies and the banks are the rediscount agencies. Many people feel that one agency could serve every good purpose of the two. On the other hand, some production credit associations feel that it is desirable to maintain the two separate agencies. There was a vast difference of opinion on this point. Some of the production credit associations felt that they could assume the obligation of rapidly acquiring the stock of the supervisory agencies and they could take it up in 5 or 10 years. Other production credit associations said it was an utter impossibility. That depends largely upon the local situation of your production credit associations. It happens that in my part of the country all of the production credit associations are farmer owned. There is no Government money in them. In those areas where there is still considerable Government in the local associations there is an understandable reluctance to assume the purchase of even one agency.

Mr. MARSHALL. This bill, as I understand the gentleman from Texas, does not make any decision in that matter; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir. It puts the decision off until next year.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is just referred back for further study?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman has answered the question I had in mind and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. POAGE. So far as we know there are no production credit associations now opposed to this bill. A great many feel we should take action, and we hope by next year it will be possible to take action that will provide a way of eliminating the Government capital in these production credit agencies. But this bill does not eliminate the Government capital in the production credit agencies. It does provide the elimination of Government capital in the cooperative credit agencies. The Government capital is already eliminated in the mortgage credit field. So with the passage of this bill, we will have gone two-thirds of the road—two-thirds of the way toward eliminating Government capital in this farm credit. By and large the great hope of the authors of this bill is to try to eliminate Government capital and to make this farm credit truly cooperative, farmer-owned, rather than a Government enterprise.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. With the passage of this bill will these banks, being cooperatives themselves, qualify as a cooperative?

Mr. POAGE. They are cooperatives, yes. They will be cooperatives themselves, because they will be entirely owned by their members.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Will they enjoy any special tax benefits on the moneys they earn?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know of any benefit that they will enjoy that they do not enjoy today. The bill does not in any way change any of the tax laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before you today in response, basically, to legislation enacted in the Farm Credit Act of 1953. May I quote from that, because that act says:

> To encourage and facilitate increased borrower participation in the management, control, and ultimate ownership under the permanent system of agricultural credit made available through institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

First, may I commend the Farm Credit Board for the diligent manner in which they have sought out recommendations which came to our committee to discharge the responsibility placed on them under the Farm Credit Act of 1953.

I also want to commend our chairman and the committee for the hearings held on this legislation and for the opportunity for various units of the farm-credit system to appear before the committee and express very freely their constructive suggestions for amending this bill. I think it was a very excellent opportunity for those who opposed provisions of the bill to express themselves freely, and that the committee responded to those who were opposed to provisions of the bill by removing from the original bill certain sections in order that there might be given ample time by all interested parties to work out the constructive manner in which this end should be accomplished.

I think it should also be made a matter of record that the farm organizations, particularly the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which represents in their organization approximately 4,000 farm cooperative organizations, are strongly favoring this legislation. Their interest, of course, is particularly in that area dealing with a provision by which the bank for cooperatives can be owned by borrower organizations.

The American Farm Bureau is also on record favoring this legislation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has explained certain phases of the farm-credit system. I want to take just a few moments to touch upon 1 or 2 points in the bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] mentioned the fact that the objective of this bill, in relation to that part of it dealing with the banks for cooperatives, is to provide the legislative framework by which, over a period of time, organizations using the facility of the district bank and the central bank could acquire full ownership and retire the Government capital which now rests in the capital structure unit of this farm-credit system.

The details of the legislation accomplishing this objective, I think, is perhaps a bit technical, but let me say that in my opinion, and I think that of my colleagues on the committee, this legislation provides not only the vehicle by which the Government capital may be retired over a reasonable length of time, but it also provides a vehicle by which the ownership and management of this system will rest in the member cooperatives that participate in its use.

As the gentleman from Texas mentioned, there are a very few provisions in this bill which would touch upon the production credit associations. Those provisions are, roughly, sort of housekeeping provisions to assist in some technical arrangement in relation to reserve and surplus accounts and guaranty funds. In that provision of the bill, however, that deals with the Federal land bank, there is one portion to which I would like to address myself for a few moments because I think it does establish a fundamental change from procedure in use since the land banks were established. I believe the record should show at least the opinion of one member of the committee, an expression of opinion as to what the provision means. I refer to section 303 of the bill which is referred to in the report accompanying this legislation on page 19. It refers particularly to appraisals by land bank designees.

It has been an inherent part of the land bank system to which we are referring at this time that an appraisal shall be made by land bank appraisers, who are public officials appointed by the Appraisal Subdivision of the Farm Credit Administration as we know it today. These appraisers have been responsible solely to the appraisal subdivision for the standards by which they appraise property and the accountability of the appraiser in relation to the performance of his duty. That has been the custom down through the years; and it has been the responsibility of the appraisal subdivision to maintain and set, and to review and reestablish currently as time might require, the levels of value to which appraisals shall be made and upon which loans must be made. They have, you might say, held in trust that responsibility to the bondholders, who invest in the consolidated bonds of the system.

After all of these years of experience it has been recommended to the committee, and is a part of this legislation, that we move away a bit from this procedure and provide that experienced people, like secretary-treasurers of national farm loan associations who meet the qualifications do this appraisal work. This law provides that within 1 year after a loan has been made on an appraisal of a land fund designee an appraisal shall be made by a land bank appraiser.

And the point that I think should be a matter of record in order that there may be no misunderstanding is that when the appraisal is made by what is indicated here as a land bank designee and the loan closed, that the appraisal made by a land bank appraiser within the following 12 months shall not in any way affect the loan made by the National Farm Loan Association and accepted by the land bank of that district. It will not change the status of the loan and the relationship of the National Farm Loan Association to the banks and their endorsed liability will not change by virtue of the reappraisal. This appraisal by the land bank appraiser will come into effect only to determine whether or not the land bank designee in appraising the property has conformed with the usual standards. And it will also, of course, reflect the portion of that loan, if there happens to be any difference in ideas relative to value, that could be offered as collateral to any consolidated bond issues of the system. There is no change in the statute that provides that a land bank loan shall be made not in excess of 65 percent of the normal agricultural value of the property upon which the loan is to be made. It should be understood the appraisal subdivision has full responsibility and control in establishing levels of value to be used in appraisal work by the respective land bank districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, there are provisions in this bill for increasing the maximum loan; there are also provisions in this bill in relation to some technical matters dealing with the relationship of the volume of loans to the capital structure of the National Farm Loan Association. There are also some provisions in relation to the Federal Farm Credit Board and also the directors of the district board. These are technical matters to effect a better administration and better timing in relation to election.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5168 is an excellent piece of legislation and I sincerely hope the House will pass it by an overwhelming vote.

I am particularly grateful to the members of the committee for deleting from the original legislation which was suggested to us that part of the legislation which would require the production credit associations to purchase the stock of the production credit corporations at this time. As the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] so ably stated, these production credit associations are the very heart of the farm credit system in many of the areas of our country.

There are four of these production credit associations in the Eighth District of Florida that I have the honor to represent. These associations felt that they should not be required to purchase the stock of the production credit corporations at this time because they were fearful of the expense involved and they were somewhat concerned about the details of supervision. After studying the bill and listening to testimony I think perhaps there might be some merit in making the production credit corporation a part of the intermediate credit bank. However, I think the committee was wise in delaying that particular aspect of the bill until we had further time to study it. I want to thank the committee for the farmers of my district for doing that because I think no harm can be done if we delay for another year and study this matter in the meantime.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a bill that meets with the unanimous approval of all the members of the Committee on Agriculture and a great majority of the

others who testified in behalf of the legislation and, as I previously stated, I sincerely hope this bill will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farm Credit Act of 1955."

TITLE I—BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

SEC. 101. Section 42 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 42. (a) Classes of stock; ownership; voting rights; dividends; and retirement of stock: Except as provided in section 111 of the Farm Credit Act of 1955, each regional bank for cooperatives shall have the following classes of stock, all of which shall have a par value of $100 per share:

"(1) Class A stock shall be issued to and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States, and stock of such banks held by the Governor on the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 shall be exchanged, share for share, for class A stock of the respective banks. Class A stock shall be nonvoting and no dividends shall be paid thereon. At the end of each fiscal year, each of such banks, subject to the provisions of sections 33 and 40, shall determine the amount of class A stock that shall be retired at par by that bank. The minimum amount of class A stock that shall be retired shall be the equivalent in dollar value of the amount of class C stock issued for that year, except that class C stock issued by a regional bank on account of class C stock issued to it by the central bank, class C stock issued by a regional bank in exchange for class B stock the proceeds of which were used to retire an equivalent amount of class A stock, and class C stock issued by a regional bank in exchange for capital stock of the bank outstanding on the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955, shall not be included in such bank's calculation. Any amount of class A stock retired in excess of such minimum amount in one year may be used to reduce to that extent the amount of such stock required to be retired in any subsequent year. Funds from the retirement of class A stock shall be paid into the revolving fund authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, and shall continue to be available for the purchase of class A stock in the banks in accordance with sections 33 and 40.

"(2) Class B stock may be issued in series and amounts approved by the Farm Credit Administration, and may be sold or transferred to any person subject to the approval of the issuing bank. Such stock shall be issued only at par and shall be nonvoting. Any bank may pay dividends of not to exceed 4 percent per annum on class B stock if declared by the board of directors and approved by the Farm Credit Administration and if the surplus account of the bank, after payment of such dividends, will not be less than 25 percent of the sum of all its outstanding capital stock. Dividends on class B stock shall not be cumulative, but no bank shall distribute in any year any of its net savings as patronage refunds as provided in section 36 (a) unless for that year a dividend of at least 2 percent is declared and paid upon outstanding class B stock of the bank. Each series of class B stock shall be issued only with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration and shall carry on the face of each certificate a statement of the maximum dividend which may be declared and paid thereon and of the minimum dividend which shall be declared and paid thereon before the bank may distribute any of its net savings as patronage refunds: *Provided,* That such maximum and minimum dividends may be the same amount. After all class A stock has been retired, class B stock may be called for retirement at par with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration and shall be called in such manner that the oldest outstanding stock at any given time will be retired first. Any holder of class B stock whose stock has been called for retirement may elect, with the approval of the issuing bank, to leave his stock in the bank subject to its being included in the next call for retirement.

"(3) Class C stock, except as approved by the Farm Credit Administration and consented to by the issuing bank, may be issued only to banks for cooperatives and farmers' cooperative associations as defined in section 15 (a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended. Such stock may be issued in fractional shares, shall be issued at its fair book value not exceeding par, as determined by the bank, and no dividends shall be paid on it. Each holder of one or more shares of class C stock which is eligible to borrow from a bank for cooperatives shall be entitled to one vote only: *Provided,* That any such holder which within the period of 2 years next preceding a date, fixed by the Farm Credit Administration, prior to commencement of the voting has not been a borrower from a bank of which it holds class C stock shall not be entitled to vote. From time to time each bank for cooperatives shall obtain information concerning its class C stockholders to determine whether they continue to be eligible to borrow from the bank and to vote. Any class C stockholder found by the bank to be ineligible to borrow shall not be entitled to vote until its eligibility is reestablished to the satisfaction of the bank. Whenever in section 5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, and section 4 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, provision is made for a nomination or election by cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of any bank for cooperatives the term 'cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund' or the equivalent of that term, shall mean such cooperatives which are eligible to vote. Each borrower from a bank for cooperatives shall be required to own at the time the loan is made at least one share of class C stock. The purchase price of such stock may be retained out of the loan. In addition, each borrower as defined by the Farm Credit Administration for purposes of this sentence, shall be required to invest quarterly in class C stock an amount equal to not less than 10 nor more than 25 percent, as prescribed by the board of directors of the bank with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, of the amount of interest payable by it to the bank during the calendar quarter. Payments for such stock shall be made quarterly or when the regular interest payments of the borrower are payable, but the stock shall be issued to the borrower as of the end of each fiscal year in the amount of the payments for stock made by it during the year. Each regional bank shall purchase at least one share of class C stock of the central bank. In addition, the regional bank shall be required to invest quarterly in class C stock of the central bank an amount equal to not less than 10 nor more than 25 percent, as prescribed by the board of directors of the central bank with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, of the amount of interest payable by the regional bank to the central bank during the calendar quarter by reason of any interest purchased by the central bank in a loan made by the regional bank. Payments for such stock shall be made to the central bank and the stock shall be issued to the regional bank in the same manner, insofar as practicable, as is provided in this section for payments for and issuance of stock on account of loans by the regional bank in which the central bank does not purchase any interest. Subject to rules prescribed by the board of directors of the lending bank with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration a borrower may convert class B stock into class C stock for the purpose of making the investment in class C stock required by this paragraph. After retirement of all class A stock, class C stock also may be retired at par by calling the oldest outstanding class C stock, but class C stock that was issued for a fiscal year period shall not be called for retirement until all class B stock that was issued during or prior to that fiscal year has been called for retirement.

"(b) Guaranty fund subscriptions in lieu of stock: If a cooperative association is not authorized under the laws of the State in which it is organized to take stock in the bank, the bank shall, in lieu thereof, require the association to pay into or have on deposit in a guaranty fund of the bank, or the bank may retain out of the amount of the loan and credit to the guaranty fund, a sum equal to the amount of class C stock which the association would otherwise be required by subsection (a) (3) of this section to own at the time the loan is made and to purchase thereafter. Any such association may make additional payments into the guaranty fund from time to time in lieu of the purchase of class B stock, and shall receive credits to such fund in lieu of patronage refunds payable in class C stock. Each reference in this act to capital stock or class B or class C stock shall include also the guaranty fund equivalents of such stock, and, to the extent permitted under the laws of a State in which a cooperative association is organized, a holder of guaranty fund equivalents of either class B or class C stock shall have the same rights and status as a holder of class B or class C stock, respectively. The rights and obligations of the bank as respects such guaranty fund equivalents shall be identical to its rights and obligations as respects class B or class C stock, respectively.

"(c) Lien on stock: Except as hereinafter provided in the case of an association which is a direct borrower from the central bank, each bank for cooperatives shall have a first lien on all stock in the bank owned by each cooperative association as additional collateral for any indebtedness of such association to the bank. In the case of an association which is a direct borrower from the central bank, the central bank shall have a first lien on any amount of class C stock which the borrowing association owns in any regional bank on account of direct loans of such association from the central bank; and the regional bank shall have a lien on such stock junior only to the lien of the central bank. In any case where the debt of a borrower is in default, the bank may, in accordance with regulations of the Farm Credit Administration, retire and cancel all or a part of the stock of the defaulting borrower at the fair book value thereof, not exceeding par, in total or partial liquidation of the debt, as the case may be, and, to the extent required, corresponding shares held by a regional bank in the central bank shall be retired.

"(d) Calculation of proportionate interests in banks: For the purpose of determining pursuant to section 5 (d) (2) (C) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, the amount of the capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund of a regional bank for cooperatives held by cooperatives the term 'capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund held by cooperatives' or the equivalent of that term shall also mean all outstanding class B and class C stock and the guaranty fund equivalents thereof."

SEC. 102. Section 35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Application of regional bank stock provisions to central bank: All provisions of law with respect to class A, class B, and class C stock in the regional banks for cooperatives shall apply to the Central Bank for Cooperatives, except as they may be inconsistent with the provisions of this section. Each borrower from the central bank shall be required to own at the time the loan is made at least 1 share of class C stock in such regional bank as the Farm Credit Administration shall designate and shall be required to invest quarterly in class C stock in such regional bank or banks as the Farm Credit Administration shall designate an amount equal to not less than 10 nor more than 25 percent, as prescribed by the board of directors of the central bank with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, of the amount of interest payable by such borrower to the central bank during the calendar quarter. Payments for such stock shall be made quarterly or when the regular interest payments of such borrower are payable, but the stock shall be issued to the borrower as of the end of each fiscal year in the amount of the payments for stock made by it during such year. The regional bank whose stock is so issued to such borrower shall purchase a corresponding amount of class C stock in the central bank."

SEC. 103. Section 36 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 36. (a) Application of savings: Each bank for cooperatives, at the end of each fiscal year, shall determine the amount of its net savings after paying or providing for all operating expenses (including reasonable valuation reserves and losses in excess of any such applicable reserves) and shall apply such savings as follows: (1) To the restoration of the amount of the impairment, if any, of capital stock, as determined by its board of directors; (2) 25 percent of any remaining savings shall be used to create and maintain a surplus account; (3) if said bank shall have outstanding capital stock held by the United States during the whole or any part of the fiscal year, it shall next pay to the United States as a franchise tax, a sum equal to 25 percent of its net savings then remaining, not exceeding, however, a rate of return on such Government capital calculated at a rate equal to the computed average annual rate of interest on all public issues of public debt obligations of the United States issued during the fiscal year ending next before such tax is due, as certified to the Farm Credit Administration by Secretary of the Treasury; (4) reasonable contingency reserves may be established; (5) dividends on class B stock may be declared as provided in section 42 (a) (2); and (6) any remaining net savings shall be distributed as patronage refunds as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That any patronage refunds received by a regional bank from the central bank shall be excluded from net savings of the regional bank for the purpose of computing such franchise tax. Amounts applied as provided in (2) and (4) above after the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 shall be allocated on a patronage basis approved by the Farm Credit Administration. At the end of any fiscal year, any portion of the reserve established under (4) above which is no longer deemed necessary shall be transferred to the surplus account and, if the surplus account of any such bank for cooperatives exceeds 25 percent of the sum of all its outstanding capital stock, the bank may distribute in the same manner as a patronage refund any part or all of such excess which has been allocated. In making such distributions, the oldest outstanding allocation shall be distributed first. Wherever used in this act, the words 'surplus account' as applied to any bank for cooperatives shall mean any surpluses and contingency reserves shown on the books of the banks as of the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 and any amounts applied as provided in (2) above after the effective date of said title I. Said surplus account shall be divided to show the amounts thereof subject to allocation as provided in this section and may be further subdivided as prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration. In the event of a net loss in any fiscal year after providing for all operating expenses (including reasonable valuation reserves and losses in excess of any such applicable reserves), such loss shall be absorbed by: first, charges to allocated contingency reserves; second, charges to allocated surplus; third, charges to other contingency reserves and surplus pro-rata in accordance with the second sentence of subsection (c) of this section, fourth, the impairment of class C stock; and fifth, the impairment of all other stock.

"(b) Patronage refunds: The patronage refunds of each regional bank for cooperatives shall be paid in class C stock to borrowers, as defined by the Farm Credit Administration for the purposes of this subsection, during the fiscal year for which the refunds are declared. Patronage refunds of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall be paid in class C stock to the regional banks for cooperatives upon the basis of interests held by the central bank in loans made by the regional banks and upon direct loans made by the central bank to cooperative associations; and any part of such refunds derived from such direct loans of the central bank shall be paid in class C stock issued to the regional bank or banks which issued to the borrower the stock incident to the loans, or to a regional bank or banks designated by the Farm Credit Administration, and such bank or banks shall issue a like amount of class C stock to the borrowers. All patronage refunds shall be paid in the proportion that the amount of interest earned on the loans of each borrower bears to the total interest earned on the loans of all borrowers during the fiscal year.

"(c) Application of assets on liquidation or dissolution: In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives, after the payment or retirement, as the case may be, first, of all liabilities; second, of all capital stock issued before the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 held by cooperative associations at par, all class A stock at par, and all class B stock at par; and third, of all class C stock at par; any surpluses and contingency reserves then remaining shall be distributed as provided in this subsection. If necessary in absorbing losses, allocated contingency reserves and allocated surpluses shall be exhausted first in accordance with rules prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration and other contingency reserves and surpluses shall be used pro rata. Any surpluses and contingency reserves which were on hand as of the effective date of said title I, shall be apportioned on the basis of stock ownership in the bank on such date and that part of such surpluses and reserves so apportioned to stock owned by the United States, shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and that part of such surpluses and reserves so apportioned to stock owned by all others shall be paid to the holders of outstanding stock issued before the effective date of said title I and class C stock pro rata: *Provided*, That if the central bank is liquidated or dissolved before the regional banks, that part of such surpluses and reserves so apportioned to stock owned by the United States shall be distributed to the regional banks on the basis of stock held by them in the central bank, and the amount so distributed shall be added to the corresponding surplus and reserve of each regional bank subject to payment into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts upon liquidation or dissolution of such regional bank. Any allocated surpluses and allocated contingency reserves then remaining shall be distributed as allocated on the books of the bank."

SEC. 104. Section 31 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 31. Board of Directors of Central Bank. The Central Bank for Cooperatives shall have seven directors. Of this number four shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board, and three shall be elected by the regional banks for cooperatives and cooperative associations: *Provided*, That the terms of office of directors established prior to the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 shall continue through the 31st day of December next following the effective date of said title I and shall expire at the end of that day. Three of the directors appointed by the Farm Credit Administration shall be appointed for terms of 1 year, 2 years, and 3 years, respectively, as designated at the time of appointment and the fourth appointed director shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and thereafter each appointed director shall be appointed for a term of 3 years. Any appointed director may be removed at pleasure at any time by the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration shall prescribe rules and regulations for the nominations and elections required by this section. Sufficiently in advance of the 1st day of January next following the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955, and at any time subsequent to the enactment thereof, the Farm Credit Administration shall take all action necessary in order to permit the elections hereby provided and shall group the several farm credit districts into 3 areas, each of which shall be comprised of 4 contiguous farm credit districts, and a director shall be elected from nominees from each of such areas by regional banks for cooperatives of the area and cooperative associations of the area eligible to vote. The 3 elected directors shall be elected for terms of 1 year, 2 years, and 3 years, respectively, as shall be designated by the Farm Credit Administration and thereafter elected directors shall be elected for terms of 3 years: *Provided*, That whenever, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, the sum of the capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund of the central bank held by persons other than the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States and surplus and reserve accounts of said bank shall equal or exceed 66⅔ percent of the total capital stock, subscriptions to the guaranty fund and surplus and reserve accounts of said bank as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of any appointed director, except the fourth appointed director, whose term next expires, the successor to such director shall be elected and nominees for a term of 3 years by regional banks for cooperatives of the area and cooperative associations of the area eligible to vote on a basis of areas comprised of 2 contiguous farm credit districts as designated by the Farm Credit Administration. Appointed directors except the fourth appointed director shall continue to be replaced by elected directors in accordance with the foregoing provisions until the total number of elected directors shall be 6, elected 1 from each of 6 such areas comprised of 2 contiguous farm credit districts. Whenever, as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, the sum of the capital stock and subscriptions to the guaranty fund of the central bank held by persons other than the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States and surplus and reserve accounts of said bank shall not equal or exceed 66⅔ percent of the total capital stock, subscriptions to the guaranty fund and surplus and reserve accounts of the banks as of the date 3 months before the expiration of the term of office of any elected director whose term next expires, the successor to such elected director shall, if the number of elected directors then exceeds 3, be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration by and with the advice and consent of the Federal Farm Credit Board for a term of 3 years. In any such case where only 1 additional appointed director is needed in order to increase the total number of appointed directors to 4, and the terms of office of more than 1 elected director next expire, the Farm Credit Administration shall designate the 1 of such next expiring terms of office which shall be replaced by the additional appointed director. Any vacancy in the Board whether filled by appointment or by election shall be filled for the unexpired term in the same manner in which the vacant office was filled. Each regional bank for cooperatives, each cooperative association which is a direct borrower from the central bank, each holder of 1 or more shares of class C stock in a regional bank for cooperatives which is eligible to vote under section 42 (a) (3), and each holder of 1 or more shares of stock in the central bank or any regional bank for cooperatives issued before the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 which is eligible to vote shall be eligible to vote for directors of the central bank and each such holder shall be entitled to 1 vote only without regard to the number of shares held in any 1 or more of said banks, and the vote of any such holder of stock in more than 1 bank shall be cast only with respect to elections in the area in which is located the main office of such holder. Elected directors shall have been, for at least 2 years, residents of the area for which they are elected. No person shall be eligible for nomination, election, or appointment as a director if such person has within 1 year next preceding the commencement of the term being a salaried officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or of any corporation operating under its supervision. Any person who is a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board or a district farm credit board when appointed or elected as director shall resign as a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board or the district board before assuming his duties as director of the central bank. No person who becomes such director shall be eligible to continue to serve if he becomes a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board or any district farm credit board or an officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or an officer or employee of any corporation operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 105. Section 32 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 32. Powers of Board of Directors of Central Bank: The Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members. The powers of the Board of Directors shall be such powers as may be prescribed in the charter and bylaws with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided*, That said Board without limitation of powers conferred by section 60 shall have power, subject to approval of the Farm Credit Administration, to appoint and fix the compensation of the chief executive officer and such other officers and employees, experts, and consultants as may be necessary for the efficient conduct of the bank's business: *Provided further*, That the chief executive officer of the bank shall not be an officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 106. Section 38 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end of said section the following new sentence: "After the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 any amendment in the terms of the charter issued to any bank for cooperatives and any regulation issued under authority of this section or otherwise affecting lending operations of any such bank shall be consistent with the principle that the central bank shall make loans only in cases where it is not practicable for the loan to be made by a regional bank."

SEC. 107. Section 41 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or of any bank for cooperatives designated to act as custodian of collateral securing loans made by any such bank to any cooperative association eligible to borrow therefrom may, in accordance with regulations of the Farm Credit Administration, act at the same time as custodian of collateral securing loans made by any other lenders to any cooperative association eligible to borrow from any such bank."

SEC. 108. (a) Section 33 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by striking the words "Chairman of the Board" in the last sentence of said section and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Board of Directors."

(b) Section 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking the words "Chairman of its Board of Directors" in the first paragraph of said section and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 109. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Loans to cooperative associations made by any bank for cooperatives shall bear such rates of interest as the board of directors of the bank from time to time determine with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, but in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 percent per annum on the unpaid principal of a loan."

SEC. 110. (a) Section 65 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by striking the word "regional" in the first sentence of said section.

(b) Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(c) The second sentence of section 7 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 is hereby repealed.

(d) Section 6 of the act approved January 23, 1932 (47 Stat. 14), is amended by adding immediately following the comma after the word "Act" where it first appears the following: "the Farm Credit Act of 1933."

SEC. 111. This title shall be applicable to loans made before its effective date from the date on which they may be changed by agreement to conform hereto, otherwise, except as provided in this title, such loans shall be treated as though this title had not been enacted. Any cooperative association owning capital stock or guaranty fund credits in any bank for cooperatives issued before the effective date of this title which is eligible to vote shall, as long as such eligibility continues, be entitled to vote to the same extent as a holder of class C stock which is eligible to vote; any cooperative association owning such stock or guaranty fund credits shall be entitled to have such stock or credits retired as though this title had not been enacted; and any such association may with the consent of the bank have such stock or credits, if it is found eligible to own class B or class C stock, converted in whole or in part into Class B or class C stock or equivalent guaranty fund credits: *Provided*, That any bank for cooperatives with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration may retire at any time capital stock or guaranty fund credits issued before the effective date of this title held by any cooperative association and may hold the proceeds of such retired stock or guaranty fund credits as security for any indebtedness of the association to the bank.

SEC. 112. This title shall take effect on the first day of the month next following 120 days after its enactment.

TITLE II—PRODUCTION CREDIT SYSTEM

SEC. 201. Section 4 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Classes of stock; amount; par value; ownership; dividends; preference upon liquidation: Each production credit corporation shall have the following classes of stock, all of which shall have a par value of $100 per share:

"(1) Class A stock shall be issued to and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States in exchange share for share for stock of the respective production credit corporations held by the Governor on the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955. Class A stock shall be nonvoting and no dividends shall be paid thereon. At the end of each fiscal year, each of such corporations shall determine the amount of class A stock that it shall retire, which shall not be less than 10 percent of the amount of stock of the corporation held by the Governor on behalf of the United States on the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955: *Provided*, That any amount retired in excess of such 10 percent in 1 year may be used to reduce to that extent the amount of stock required to be retired in any subsequent year. Funds from the retirement of class A stock shall be paid into the revolving fund authorized by section 5 and shall continue to be available for the purchase of class C stock in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection.

"(2) Class B stock may be issued only to production credit associations. Such stock shall be issued at par and no dividends shall be paid on it. Each holder of class B stock shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock held by it. Each production credit corporation shall from time to time determine the amount of its class B stock which shall be subscribed to and purchased by the production credit association of the district. The minimum amount of such stock subscribed to and purchased by such associations shall not be less than an amount computed as the sum of the following: As to each association, 3 percent of the amount of its stock held by persons other than the corporation or $5,000, whichever is the greater. The subscriptions to such stock by the associations shall be allocated by the corporation upon an equitable basis and the amounts of subscriptions and purchases of such stock by the associations may be adjusted annually: *Provided*, That such stock of a corporation outstanding shall not be less than such minimum. The stock ownership requirements of this subsection shall also apply to any association organized after the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955. In case of liquidation or dissolution of any association, the stock of the corporation owned by such association shall be canceled and the association paid the par value of such stock.

"(3) Class C stock may be issued in amounts approved by the Farm Credit Administration. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration may purchase class C stock of any production credit corporation from time to time in such amounts as he determines are required to meet the credit needs of the district served by such corporation. Payments for stock purchased by the Governor shall be made out of the revolving fund authorized by section 5 and such stock shall be held by him on behalf of the United States. Class C stock shall be issued only at par and shall be nonvoting. When declared by its board of directors and approved by the Farm Credit Administration, any such corporation may pay dividends on Class C stock at a rate not exceeding the average annual rate of interest on all public issues of public debt obligations of the United States issued during the fiscal year next before any such dividend is so declared, as certified to the Farm Credit Administration by the Secretary of the Treasury. Dividends on class C stock shall not be cumulative. After all class A stock has been retired, class C stock may be called for retirement at par in amounts approved by the Farm Credit Administration.

"(4) In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any production credit corporation, after the payment or retirement, as the case may be, first, of all liabilities; second, of all class A stock at par and all class C stock at par; any sums remaining shall be paid pro rata to the holders of outstanding class B stock.

"(b) Payment of expenses of production credit corporations by production credit associations: Beginning on the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 expenses of each production credit corporation shall be allocated in such manner and amounts as shall be determined by the board of directors of the corporation and shall be paid by the production credit associations of the district: *Provided*, That such allocations shall be made annually and shall be progressively increased in such manner that no later than the 10th year after the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 all expenses of the corporation not covered by income of the corporation shall be paid by such associations.

"(c) Postponement of stock retirement and payment of expenses under special circumstances: Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(1) the board of directors of a production credit corporation may, because of adverse conditions in the district, reduce the amount of class A stock to be retired during any year to the extent the board determines necessary in order to meet the credit needs of the district: *Provided*, That all class A stock of the corporation shall be retired on or before the end of the 10th year after the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955; and

"(2) the board of directors of a production credit corporation may, because of adverse conditions in the district, defer in whole or in part the amounts which otherwise would be paid by the production credit associations under subsection (b) of this section in any year to the extent the board determines necessary in order to enable the associations to provide adequate credit service to farmers at reasonable costs: *Provided*, That after the 13th year following the effective date of title II of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 all expenses of the corporation not covered by income of the corporation shall be paid by such associations.

"(d) Any action by the board of directors of any production credit corporation under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 202. Section 21 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by striking out of the fifth sentence the words "all stock shall share in dividend distributions without preference" and substituting therefor the words "Dividends may be paid on class A and class B stock without preference or on class A stock alone, as the board of directors of the association may determine."

SEC. 203. Section 22 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Each production credit association shall, at the end of each fiscal year, apply the amount of its earnings in excess of operating expenses (including provision for reasonable valuation reserves) during such fiscal year, first, to the restoration of the impairment, if any, of capital; and, second, to the establishment and maintenance of a surplus account, the minimum amount of which shall be prescribed by the production credit corporation.

"(b) A production credit association may pay dividends of not to exceed 7 percent per annum when such payments are approved by the production credit corporation of the district and are consistent with policies established under regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 204. The amounts in the guaranty fund reserve and the reserve account for bad and doubtful debts of each production credit association shall, as of the effective date of this title, be transferred to the surplus account of such association established pursuant to the provisions of section 22 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 as amended by section 203 of this title.

SEC. 205. Section 23 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. Each production credit association shall, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the production credit corporation of the district with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, invest its funds and make loans to farmers for general agricultural purposes. Such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions, at such rates of interest, and with such security as may be prescribed by the corporation. No borrower shall be indebted to the association at any one time in an amount in excess of 15 percent of the capital and surplus of the association unless the loan has the prior approval of the corporation, or in excess of 35 percent of the capital and surplus of the association unless the loan also has the prior approval of the Farm Credit Administration. Borrowers shall be required to own, at the time the loan is made, class B stock of the association in an amount equal in fair book value (not to exceed par), as determined by the association, to $5 per $100 or fraction thereof of the amount of the loan. Such stock shall not be canceled or retired upon payment of the loan but may be transferred or exchanged as provided in section 21 of this act."

SEC. 206. The last sentence of section 63 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The exemption provided herein shall not apply with respect to any production credit association or its property or income after the class A stock held in it by the production credit corporation has been retired, or with respect to the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or any production credit corporation or bank for cooperatives, or its property or income after the stock held in it by the United States has been retired."

SEC. 207. (a) The Government Corporation Control Act is amended by deleting from section 101 the following: "production credit corporations;"; by inserting "production credit corporations, (4)" in section 201 immediately following "(3)"; and by changing "(4)" to "(5)".

(b) Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (d) (2) of said section and adding in lieu thereof the following: ", or to any production credit corporation organized pursuant to the Farm Credit Act of 1933.".

(c) No appropriation act shall apply to a production credit corporation on and after the effective date of this title.

SEC. 208. This title shall become effective the first day of the fiscal year next commencing after its enactment.

TITLE III—FEDERAL LAND BANK SYSTEM

SEC. 301. Sections 3, 7, and 8 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, are amended—

(a) by changing next to the last paragraph of section 3 to read as follows: "The Farm Credit Administration shall prescribe a form for the statement of condition of national farm loan associations and land banks under its supervision, which shall be filled out by each such association or bank and transmitted to said administration as required by it.";

(b) by changing the fifth sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 7 to read as follows: "He shall make a report to the Farm Credit Administration as required by it upon forms to be provided for that purpose."; and

(c) by deleting the last sentence of section 8.

SEC. 302. The last paragraph of section 5 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 303. Section 10 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act to the contrary, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, the investigation and the written report or reports on the value of the security offered for a Federal land bank loan, which otherwise are required by this section to be made by land bank appraisers appointed under the authority of section 3 of this act, may be made, in accordance with appraisal standards prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration, by any person (including a person who is secretary-treasurer of a national farm loan association) designated so to do by the Federal land bank of the district; a Federal land bank is authorized to make a loan, if otherwise authorized, on the basis of such an investigation and report by a person so designated; and a loan so made shall be eligible as collateral for farm loan bonds under section 19 of this act, if otherwise qualified thereunder: *Provided*, That, within 1 year, the land bank shall obtain a written report on the security for the loan by a land bank appraiser appointed under section 3 of this act, in terms and form prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration, and such a loan shall be eligible as collateral for farm loan bonds thereafter only if such report by a land bank appraiser establishes that the security meets the standards prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration for a land bank loan, and in no event shall any such loan thereafter be carried as such collateral for bonds at more than 65 percent of the normal value of the security as determined by such land bank appraiser. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this paragraph, all provisions of this act relating to loans made through national farm loan associations shall, insofar as applicable, apply with respect to loans made on such investigations and written reports by such designated persons."

SEC. 304. Section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) by changing paragraph "Fourth" to read as follows: "Such loans may be made for general agricultural purposes and other requirements of the owner of the land mortgaged, under rules and regulations of the Farm Credit Administration.";

(b) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence of paragraph "Fifth" and adding the following: "; and, consistent with community standards, the appraisal may also reflect home advantages, and the availability to a typical operator of the property of earnings from other dependable sources to supplement the normal earning power of the farm.";

(c) by striking out "the raising of livestock" wherever it appears in next to the last sentence of paragraph "Sixth" and substituting therefor "farming operations" and by striking out of such sentence "Land Bank Commissioner" and substituting therefor "Farm Credit Administration"; and

(d) by striking out "$100,000" from paragraph "Seventh" and substituting therefor "$200,000" and by striking out of such sentence "but loans to any one borrower shall not exceed $25,000 unless approved by the Land Bank Commissioner.

SEC. 305. Paragraph "Nineteenth" of section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Such a deferment may be permitted for other purposes for a period not exceeding 5 years under regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration."

SEC. 306. (a) That part of section 23 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, which precedes the last paragraph, is amended to read as follows: "Every Federal land bank shall semiannually carry to reserve account a sum not less than 50 percent of its net earnings until said reserve account shall show a credit balance equal to the outstanding capital stock of said land bank. After said reserve is equal to the outstanding capital stock 10 percent of the net earnings shall be added thereto semiannually until said reserve account shall show a credit balance equal to 150 percent of the outstanding capital stock of said land bank, and any land bank having a credit balance in said reserve account in excess of 150 percent of its outstanding capital stock may withdraw such excess from said reserve account with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration. Whenever said reserve shall have been impaired it shall be fully restored before any dividends are paid.

"After deducting the 50 percent or the 10 percent hereinbefore directed to be deducted for credit to reserve account, any Federal land bank may declare a dividend or dividends to shareholders of the whole or any part of the balance of its net earnings, but only with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration.

"The reserves of land banks shall be invested in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration."

(b) The second sentence of section 24 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "until said reserve account shall show a credit balance equal to 50 percent of the outstanding capital stock of said association, and any association having a credit balance in said reserve account in excess of 50 percent of its outstanding capital stock may withdraw such excess from said reserve account with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration.".

(c) The amendments made by (a) and (b) of this section shall become effective on the next January 1, or July 1, whichever first succeeds enactment hereof.

SEC. 307. Section 601 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 is amended by inserting after "Federal land banks,", the second time it appears therein, "national farm loan associations,"; by striking out "joint-stock land banks," wherever it appears therein; and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting ", except that the amounts apportioned to national farm loan associations shall be assessed against and collected from the Federal land bank of the district which may in turn collect such amounts from the associations in a manner approved by the Farm Credit Administration.".

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Section 5 (d) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended—

(a) by substituting "six months" for "three months" wherever it occurs in paragraph (2) thereof; and

(b) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) As directed by the Farm Credit Administration, the election of a director under section 5 (d) (2) by any group may be begun any time within 6 months before the expiration of the term of office to which the director is to succeed, subject to the required determination being made as of the date 6 months before the expiration of such term of office that a director so elected by such group is to serve in lieu of a district director (or third district director)."

SEC. 402. Section 4 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 is amended—

(a) by inserting in the first proviso in subsection (a) "all persons so tied shall be considered designated as nominees" in lieu of "the procedure prescribed therein shall be followed again until the tie is broken";

(b) by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence of subsection (b) ", except that one full term of 6 years shall be considered to include an additional 4 months if the particular term is one which was legally extended for an additional 4 months"; and

(c) by adding the following additional sentence at the end of subsection (c): "All terms of office which otherwise would expire on November 30 of any year following enactment of this sentence are extended 4 months to expire on the following March 31 so that the term of office of all successors to the terms so extended shall begin with the first day of April."

SEC. 403. (1) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(b) The right to alter, amendment, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. POAGE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 10, line 14, after "SEC. 103", insert "(a)."

Page 12, line 9, strike out "offective" and insert "effective."

Page 12, beginning on line 20, strike out "pro rata in accordance with the second sentence of subsection (c) of this section."

Page 13, beginning on line 19, strike out the remainder of page 13, all of page 14, and through line 2 on page 15, and insert:

"(c) Application of Assets on Liquidation or Dissolution: In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives, after the payment or retirement, as the case may be, first, of all liabilities; second, of all capital stock issued before the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 held by cooperative associations at par, all class A stock at par, and all class B stock at par; and third, of all class C stock at par; any surpluses and contingency reserves existing on the effective date of said title I, shall be paid to the holders of outstanding capital stock issued before the effective date of said title I, class A stock and class C stock pro rata, and any remaining surplus and contingency reserves shall be distributed to those entities to which they are allocated on the books of the bank. If it should become necessary to use any surplus or contingency reserves to pay any liabilities or to retire any capital stock, allocated contingency reserves and surplus shall be exhausted first in accordance with rules prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration."

"(b) For purposes of applying the amendment in subsection (a) of this section, that part of the fiscal year 1956 preceding the effective date of title I of this Act and that part of such year following said effective date shall be deemed to be separate fiscal years."

Page 16, line 23, strike out "three" and insert "six."

Page 17, line 19, strike out "three" and insert "six."

Page 23, beginning on line 14, strike out all of section 201, through page 28, line 8, and renumber following sections to conform.

Page 30, beginning on line 20, strike out all of sections 207 and 208, through page 31, line 8.

Page 34, line 10, strike out "therefore" and insert "therefor."

Page 34, line 13, strike out the period at the end of subsection (d) and insert "and substituting 'but loans to any one borrower shall not exceed $100,000 unless approved by the Farm Credit Administration',".

Page 35, line 10, strike out "capitol" and insert "capital."

Page 37, line 2, after "SEC. 401." strike out through and including the colon on line 8, and insert:

"(a) Section 5 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the sixth sentence thereof to read as follows:

"'After the date of enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1955, no person shall be eligible for election or appointment to membership on said Board if such person has within one year next preceding the commencement of the term been a salaried officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration, or a salaried officer or employee of any corporation operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.'

"(b) Section 5 (d) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by substituting 'six months' for 'three months' wherever it occurs in paragraph (2) thereof; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows":

Page 38, line 9, strike out "this sentence" and insert "the Farm Credit Act of 1955."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 298, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDS THREEFOLD TO FOURFOLD EXPANSION OF AGENCY'S WORK

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years—from 1939 to 1953—there was a steady growth in the amount of funds appropriated each year for the Food and Drug Administration, now a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Appropriations reached an all-time high of about $5,600,000 in the last two budgets submitted by President Truman. The new administration, however, apparently was not too sure of the value of the work of this agency, for in the 1954 fiscal year the amount for the Food and Drug Administration was reduced by $400,000, or nearly 8 percent. The following year, that is for the fiscal year which just ended, the Food and Drug Administration was reduced an additional $100,000.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, warned last year and the year before that we were providing insufficient funds for so vital a program of government—and one which affects the health of every man, woman, and child in the United States. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, however, suggested that instead of appropriating more money for the Food and Drug Administration, we appropriate nearly $90,000 for studies within the Department, of which nearly $50,000 would be for a study of the Food and Drug Administration—to assess objectively the various programs and policies of the Food and Drug Administration and to determine whether the agency was properly and fairly regulating business as well as protecting the consumer, or whether it was engaging in unnecessary interference with business.

At the time of action last year on the supplemental appropriation bill which contained these funds for a study of the Food and Drug Administration, I had serious misgivings about the proposal for this reason: It was perfectly obvious to all of us in the Congress who have taken an interest in the Food and Drug Administration and in its work that this agency was being starved for lack of funds in doing its work to protect the consumers; it was obvious, I thought, that any objective study would merely confirm this view; therefore, if we were going to appropriate additional funds in connection with food and drug activities, it would be much more effective to provide funds which could be used to hire additional inspectors and enforcement personnel rather than to tell us what we already knew.

COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE OF ALL GROUPS

I still feel, Mr. Speaker, that we did not need a committee of distinguished Americans to tell us that the Food and Drug Administration has not been getting sufficient funds to do its job properly. But since such a committee was appointed to make a study, I think that not only the Congress but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should immediately take steps to carry out the recommendations of the committee.

This committee was headed by Mr. G. Cullen Thomas, vice president of General Mills. Its members included the following:

Mr. Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the board, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Miss Catherine Dennis, president, American Home Economics Association; Dr. Harry Dowling, professor of medicine, University of Illinois; Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn, president, the Food Law Institute, Inc.; Mr. Robert A. Hardt, vice president, Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.; Dr. Leonard A. Maynard, director, School of Nutrition, Cornell University; Mr. Lee W. Minton, president, Glass Bottle Blowers Union, American Federation of Labor; Mrs. Grace D. Nicholas, executive director, General Federation of Womens Clubs; Dr. Charles Franklin Poe, dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Colorado; Mr. Herbert N. Riley, vice president, H. J. Heinz Co.; Mr. Walter F. Silbersack, president, American Home Products Co.; Judge Patrick T. Stone, United States district judge, United States District Court, Wisconsin; and Mr. H. Gregory Thomas, president, Chanel, Inc.:

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that a number of the members of this committee are officials of industries regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, and that the committee itself includes representatives of business generally, and labor, and consumer groups, medicine and pharmacy, and the Federal bench.

RESOURCES WOEFULLY INADEQUATE

After working on the assignment given them at their initial meeting February 3 by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration reports that the resources of the Food and Drug Administration "are woefully inadequate to discharge its present responsibilities."

It adds:

> The Food and Drug Administration now has insufficient funds, staff, and facilities to meet its essential responsibility of protecting the public health. This serious deficiency should be corrected by increased appropriations; by the addition of needed personnel, including the employment of key senior members and the upgrading of key staff positions; and by the addition of needed modern equipment and other operating facilities.
>
> The required expansion in personnel and facilities is between a three and fourfold one, within 5 years to 10 years; such expansion should be progressively authorized by increased appropriations, as fast as it can be absorbed from an efficient organizational standpoint. The increased appropriation each year should be based on an evaluation of the record of the FDA in the past year, and its need in the next year; and a small ad hoc citizens advisory committee may well be appointed by the Secretary each year, to aid in this evaluation.
>
> In the first year, a budget increase of from 10 to 20 percent over that for 1956 will be needed to initiate the 5- to 10-year expanded program on a constructive basis.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of a really excellent, thoroughgoing comprehensive 91-page report with many pages of additional information in the appendix which was submitted on June 30 by Chairman Thomas on behalf of the Citizens' Committee to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FDA REGULATES $60 BILLION INDUSTRIES

Step by step, the committee went through the various programs of the agency, and in nearly every single instance found the Food and Drug Administration trying to do its best—often under the most frightful conditions of insufficient funds and personnel and facilities—to protect the people of this country from adulterated or misbranded drugs and devices, adulterated and misbranded foods or cosmetics—from dangerous products and also from fraudulent practices. It found that the Food and Drug Administration was doing very little to protect the consumer from being cheated by misbranded cosmetics or short weight or deceptive containers because it just did not have the funds for that kind of work. It found that the Food and Drug Administration cannot begin to cover the 100,000 establishments within its jurisdiction handling food, drugs, and cosmetics and subject to inspection and regulation—a $60 billion-a-year responsibility.

It found that almost half of the highly potent drugs available today, and whose purity must be protected by the Food and Drug Administration, were unknown 15 years ago; that the output of frozen foods has more than tripled in the last 7 years. It found that Congress over the years has been giving the Food and Drug Administration more responsibilities in more fields, but that we are not providing equivalent funds—in fact, in terms of purchasing power of the dollar, the Food and Drug Administration is little better off this year than it was in 1938 before its funds began to increase. Consequently there has been a 15-percent reduction in personnel in the last few years.

SULLIVAN BILL ADDS $1,096,800 FOR FDA

Mr. Speaker, to me this means one thing: We must immediately take steps to put this vital agency of Government on an efficient and effective basis of operation. The committee recommends a threefold or fourfold increase in its funds within the next 5 or 10 years—that would mean a budget of from $15 to $20 million a year, rather than a little more than $5 million. But as all of us familiar with this problem know, there is the problem of absorbing chemists and inspectors and other trained people into such a highly technical type of work; you cannot expand overnight. You have to train people for the work. The committee, therefore, recommends an immediate 10 to 20 percent increase in funds for the first year of such an expanded program.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for an additional appropriation for the current fiscal year for the Food and Drug Administration of $1,096,800, an amount just 20 percent of the 1956 fiscal year appropriation, so that the Food and Drug Administration can begin immediately to take the necessary steps to expand its work and its personnel along the lines suggested by the Citizens Advisory Committee. Although the Citizens Committee reported to Mrs. Hobby on June 30 recommending a substantial expansion in the funds of the Food and Drug Administration so that it could begin hiring additional personnel, I have not as yet heard that any request has been sent to the Congress by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for a supplemental appropriation.

The Advisory Committee, Mr. Speaker, made clear all through its report that this expansion in the funds and personnel of the Food and Drug Administration was urgent. It made clear that legitimate, responsible business, including the major food, drug and cosmetics firms in this country, endorsed the work of the Food and Drug Administration and value the protection of this agency both to the consumer and to legitimate business.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us not fool around for another year on this matter, as was done last year. I hope the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare will agree to act on these recommendations of her Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, and that she will initiate the steps necessary to have the President send to Congress a formal request for a supplemental appropriation. But whether this is done or not, I think we in the Congress should act promptly. I urge the Appropriations Committee to consider my bill as soon as possible so that, before this session of Congress adjourns, we can put through a supplemental appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration to initiate and that is all we would be doing, to initiate—on an efficient organizational basis as recommended by the Advisory Committee the first steps toward an eventual threefold or fourfold expansion in the work and facilities and personnel of the Food and Drug Administration.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 7287

A bill making additional appropriations for functions of the Food and Drug Administration for the year ending June 30, 1956, to initiate a program of expansion and improvement of services to help safeguard the health of the American people.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to make possible on an efficient organizational basis an immediate start on a fourfold expansion of the personnel and facilities of the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare within a period of 5 to 10 years, as recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a report to the Secretary dated June 30, 1955, an additional sum of $1,096,800 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to be used by that agency in employing additional inspectors, chemists, and other scientific experts for a substantially enlarged educational and informational program, and otherwise to begin to put into effect the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, thus assisting the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate steps necessary to overcome the present serious deficiency because of lack of funds in its ability to meet its essential responsibility of protecting the public health.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members H. R. 4667, which I introduced on March 7 and on which hearings were recently held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill would authorize a 5-year program of grants to accredited medical and dental schools to be used for the construction of needed facilities for the training of doctors and dentists. H. R. 4667 would authorize a total of $300 million for construction grants for the 5-year period—$250 million for medical schools, and $50 million for schools of dentistry. This bill is very similar to the bill sponsored earlier by my colleague [Mr. PRIEST], H. R. 4743, except that that bill dealt exclusively with the construction needs of medical schools. H. R. 4667 would include dental schools on the same basis as medical schools—but would authorize a separate appropriation for dental school needs.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of strengthening our medical and dental schools today if we are to meet health needs of tomorrow. Even with the new schools now fairly definitely in prospect, physician-population ratios are slowly losing ground. It has been recently reported by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee of ODM that the 1960 ratio can be expected to be about 133 physicians per 100,000 population, as compared to 137 in 1950.

We must also remember that there are a number of factors which will work together to increase the effective demand for physician services. First, there are two very important factors which will tend to increase private purchasing power with respect to medical and hospital services: Economists foresee a rise of personal consumption expenditures of about 55 percent in the next decade or so. And there has been a steady continuing growth in voluntary health insurance coverage.

Second, along with our economic expansion, and the increases in insurance protection, which will increase purchasing power for medical and hospital services, we will have a growing need for such services, not only because there will be more people but because the proportion of older people in our population is growing.

Third, along with additional purchasing power, and an increasing need for medical and hospital services, we are steadily improving the number and distribution of all kinds of hospital and medical care facilities. Services will therefore become increasingly accessible to people who need them.

The progressively increasing demand for dental care, coupled with our rapid population growth, likewise makes it imperative that the supply of dentists be accelerated. Dr. Rusk's forecast for the dental profession is that the predicted increase will not be sufficient to maintain dentist-population ratios at the current level:

> Present forecasts are for an increase in population of 9 percent by 1960 but an increase in the supply of dentists of only about 5 percent.

From these schools also come our medical and dental research workers.

In the next decade, when the baby boom of the war years begins to be reflected in an increased number of college graduates, we can also expect much greater pressures on admissions to medical and dental schools. If opportunities for college graduates to enter medical and dental schools are to be offered in the future at anything like the existing ratio the numbers of freshman places available will have to be substantially increased.

The schools need help to accomplish these tasks. In the current years, 1954–55, there are 82 medical schools in operation. They have enrolled about 7,500 freshmen. A poll of medical schools by the Association of American Medical Colleges, indicates that these proposed construction grants would permit the construction of buildings which would make possible increased enrollment in these schools up to 8,378—and the 3 medical schools now in final planning stages would be able to enroll 271 freshmen—bringing total freshman enrollment up to some 8,649.

A recent survey of the present and future financial needs of the schools of dentistry made by the Council of Dental Education of the American Dental Association indicates that 314 additional applicants could be enrolled if the dental schools could meet minimum needs for construction of new buildings, for expansion and remodeling of existing facilities, for new equipment, and for replacing and repairing present equipment. Four new dental schools are scheduled to open within the next few years and the establishment of some three others is under serious consideration.

Research facilities and the rehabilitation or replacement of present structures are needed in many instances in order to maintain the quality of present instruction. It is believed that the availability of Federal grants as a source of assistance for the financing of needed instructional plant will call out the necessary matching funds.

The grant program outlined in H. R. 4667 has the approval and support of the medical schools. It is endorsed by the committee on financing medical education of the executive council of the American Association of American Medical

Colleges and it has been approved in principle by the American Medical Association. The American Dental Association specifically recommended inclusion of the dental schools within the program and approved the authorization of a separate grant program for that purpose.

I should like to give you a brief summary of the major features of the bill. It would authorize a one-time grant program, over a 5-year period. Its purpose is not continuing support of medical and dental education but to help meet urgent requirements for the physical plant necessary to carry forward medical and dental science and education. The bill contains specific safeguards against any attempt at interference with or control over the schools.

It would make available $50 million a year—for each of the 5 years—for medical-school-construction grants, and $10 million each year for dental-school instruction. No one school could receive more than $3 million in total grants for the 5-year period. The grant would normally not exceed 50 percent of the construction costs. It could go as high as 66⅔ percent of costs in the case of new schools and would be fixed at 66⅔ percent for existing schools planning at least a 5-percent increase in freshman enrollment. In addition, each school would be permitted a grant of $25,000 for preparation of plans.

While the main emphasis in the bill is placed on construction needs, there is one provision which recognizes the problems of maintenance. At the option of the school it would be possible to set aside up to 20 percent of a grant for new construction which could be allocated to the school's permanent endowment and would be available for the cost of maintenance of the new facility.

The bill has been carefully framed to give ample protection against any possibility that the quality of instruction might be sacrificed to the need for making possible continued increases in enrollment. There is an incentive feature—in the higher share of construction costs which could be met by the Federal grant in the case of schools planning increases—to encourage schools to expand as rapidly as they safely can. But no grant can be made unless an existing school has been accredited by a recognized body approved by the Surgeon General for the purpose after he has obtained the advice of the Federal Council on Medical and Dental Educational Facilities. In the case of a new school, grants would be made only upon recommendation of the national accrediting agencies. Furthermore, regulations as to payments to medical and dental schools could be made only after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council.

Under the bill, the Federal Council on Medical and Dental Educational Facilities would be composed of 6 members appointed from among leading medical, dental, or scientific authorities who are skilled in the sciences related to health, and 6 members selected from the general public. The Surgeon General would serve as chairman ex officio.

I am confident that the passage of H. R. 4667 would provide much-needed assistance to the schools in procuring the physical plant which they must have if they are to continue to turn out increasing numbers of well-qualified physicians and dentists and if they are to go forward in essential medical and dental research and the training of research workers.

MANHATTAN'S WEST SIDE

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times is currently printing a series of articles concerning various sections of New York City. These stories are in the best tradition of the Times, and I recommend them as both excellent reading and accurate accounts of events and conditions in the various sections of our great city. I was particularly interested in the report on Manhattan's West Side written by Russell Porter. Of the total West Side population of 816,900, more than 357,000 live in the 20th Congressional District, which I represent. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert most of that article in the RECORD. I have made a few changes in it to narrow the scope to the central area between 22d Street and 110th Street, which I represent. I believe that I can say this is our district. The analysis, written almost entirely by Mr. Porter, of the Times, points out the need for more public housing and improved social-security legislation. I respectfully call your attention to Mr. Porter's statement that "35 percent" of the people in the West Side of Manhattan "occupy the lower income level, many of those living in slums bred of 19th century tenements and old brownstone fronts converted into overcrowded, unsanitary rooming houses."

The story begins:

There have been many changes on the west side of Manhattan in the last 25 years, but, to paraphrase an old saying, the more it changes the more it remains the West Side.

That is, the major change today is a population shift, just as it has usually been since the Manhattan Indians lived along the east bank of the Hudson River in the northern part of the island.

First the Dutch displaced the Indians. Next, the British ousted the Dutch. Then came successive waves of immigration, including Irish, German, Italian, Greek, and Jewish settlers. Now Negroes have spilled over from Harlem and Puerto Ricans have found the West Side a good place to live in.

The total population of my West Side district, from 22d Street North to 110th Street, is 357,003. Puerto Ricans in the entire West Side area from 14th Street to Fort Tryon, not counted seperately 25 years ago, are now estimated by the city planning commission to number 104,800.

IN THE ECONOMIC STRATA

As to income, 10 percent of the total population is rated upper-bracket. These West Siders are concentrated mostly north of 54th Street and along Central Park West and Riverside Drive, mainly in the Seventies.

Due to some careful Republican gerrymandering in Albany, the Central Park West blocks from Columbus Circle to 72d Street are divorced from the rest of the West Side, and are included in the 17th Congressional District, long known as the Silk Stocking District.

Fifty-five percent have middle-class incomes. Their chief habitat is still for the most part Washington Heights, on the upper West Side. Hell's Kitchen, near 42d Street west of 10th Avenue, also has become largely a middle-class neighborhood, belying the name it had in the days of the Hudson Dusters, Owney Madden, and prohibition.

Thirty-five percent occupy the lower income level, many of those living in slums bred of 19th-century tenements and old brownstone fronts converted into overcrowded, unsanitary roominghouses.

A characteristic of West Side life is the mixture of races and nationalities in rundown neighborhoods with antiquated housing, in close proximity to modern houses and apartments with all the comforts and conveniences. These contrasts of squalor living next door to luxury have created some friction, resentment, and fear.

Typical of much, though not all, of the West Side is a picture of living conditions in the Chelsea area between 14th and 30th Streets drawn recently by New York University's Center for Human Relations Studies.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Its report, published last April, found that overcrowding in inadequate housing had been a Chelsea problem for a long time but had been intensified by the Puerto Rican newcomers. Some of these are exploited by landlords.

Residents want homes large enough for decent family living at moderate rentals. They are concerned about juvenile delinquency and youthful gang wars. They worry about children forced to play in the streets in danger from speeding cars, cabs, trucks, and buses.

Many are afraid on the streets because of reports of muggings and the molesting of women and children.

A BETTER PROSPECTIVE

However, the West Side is not exclusively marked by violence, crime, and sin, or by contrasting riches and poverty, as some appear to believe. It is also known for its old established home neighborhoods, some with backyard trees and gardens; for its churches, parks, and playgrounds; for its theaters, opera houses, concert halls, music, dramatic and other schools, and for its colleges and universities, museums, and other cultural institutions.

All the changes in the last 25 years have not been those of deterioration. There have been major improvements, too.

For example: the George Washington Bridge, now to have a second deck increasing its capacity by 75 percent; the Lincoln Tunnel, for which a third tube is being constructed to raise its capacity by 50 percent; the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, the Riverside Church, the Port Authority Bus Terminal, some new office buildings, and the Yale Transport Corp.'s new modern trucking terminal.

Also opened in the last quarter century have been the Sixth and Eighth Avenue subways, and the West Side Highway connecting with the Henry Hudson Parkway. The Sixth and Ninth Avenue elevated structures have been removed, letting more light and quiet fall upon West Siders. Death Avenue has been eliminated with its grade crossings where many fatal railroad accidents occurred.

New piers have been built and old ones modernized. The long criticized shapeup of longshoremen has been abolished. Labor peace has settled at least temporarily upon the waterfront that is so important to the West Side's economic life, linking New York with the seven seas.

A West Side airlines terminal is under construction and is to open soon at 42d Street and 10th Avenue. Industry has expanded near the railroad tracks along the Hudson. One-way traffic has been ordained for main avenues and streets. A vast television center has grown up in the sixties.

In the last few years 4 new public-housing projects have been completed with a total of 4,541 occupied apartments. They are the Elliott, Amsterdam, Dyckman, and Marble Hill developments. Three other such developments are under construction or have been planned with a total of 5,214 apartments—the Manhattanville, General Grant, and Frederick Douglass projects.

As for private housing, 49 buildings with 3,522 apartments have been put up since 1947, including 26 on Washington Heights.

Four new public schools and two new junior high schools have been built on the West Side in recent years, including one at 77th Street and Columbus Avenue.

CIVIC PRIDE IN ACTION

West Siders are proud of the West Side—as I am. We consider ourselves the real New Yorkers and identify ourselves with the West Side as Brooklynites identify themselves with the Dodgers. Over the generations West Siders have acquired a tradition of civic cooperation and social consciousness.

These qualities are coming into play now. Civic organizations are cooperating with the city authorities to clean up bad spots, improve housing conditions, and make the streets safer. They are pushing rezoning plans to make the whole area more attractive to business and industry. We have begun to rebuild the West Side.

The two-block coliseum development at Columbus Circle, to open next spring, will give the West Side a modern exhibition hall for conventions and expositions, a 20-story office building, a public parking garage, and 2 new apartment houses.

North of the coliseum, the rundown 30-acre Lincoln Square section is to be redeveloped with a slum-clearance project to include a downtown campus for Fordham University and new apartment houses. It is hoped the project will eventually attract a new Metropolitan Opera House, a new Carnegie Hall, a fashion center, and an engineering center.

The New York Times recently announced the purchase of nearby property between 62d and 65th Streets, along the New York Central railroad tracks, for future use.

Tentative plans have been announced to rebuild Pennsylvania Station and over it to erect a skyscraper to be known as the Palace of Progress. It is to house a permanent world-trade center and a wholesaling center for buyers.

Other plans are being drafted, also, for new housing and slum-clearance projects, for better traffic control and parking facilities, for modernized docks and for midtown expressways.

Thus, the West Side is on the move again. It has snapped out of its lethargy. It has had enough of deterioration. It wants to rejoin the march of progress.

The West Side says it assimilated the Dutch and the English and the Irish and the Germans and the Italians and the Jews and all the others, and it can assimilate the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans, too. Aren't we Americans all?

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it is clearly recognized here today that the primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy under our Constitution is with the President. It is he who is going to Geneva, not us. I do not intend that a word that is said here today should restrict the freedom with which he may act at Geneva.

At the same time, what is said and done by the President at Geneva cannot be effective unless it finds support in depth here in Congress. Are there not some self-evident truths which we in Congress recognize, and which, thus recognized, can strengthen the President's hand at Geneva? I can think of at least three.

First, we in Congress trust the President to make a bargain, if a bargain is to be made, that brings this country and the world closer to peace. The President's going to Geneva is not a sign of weakness or appeasement, but a constructive opportunity to move away from the possibility of an atomic war which would destroy civilization. We of the Democratic opposition are not going to undermine his efforts toward peace, now or later, by calling him an appeaser.

Secondly, if the West will go to Geneva armed with a constructive proposal, some good is bound to come of it. Unless we go there thus armed, the intiative is likely to fall to Russia. Then it will be we, instead of the Russians, who are in the position of turning down proposals. Of course, for tactical purposes, we may wish to leave such a proposal in our briefcases until after the Russians have been heard from. What is important is that, before the conference is over, the West in fact present a constructive proposal.

It would be a mistake to anticipate from Geneva a definite agreement sorting out the outstanding problems and settling them once and for all. But it would be equally a mistake to consider Geneva a failure unless such an agreement is produced. If the West will present at Geneva a constructive proposal and Russia disdains such a proposal, the NATO countries can then go forward with grim preparations—preparations which include ever-increasing NATO strength and the rearmament of Germany—with morale high, confident that only Russian intransigence prevents a settlement. But what is needed, let me repeat, is that the West not let Geneva go by, as it let Potsdam go by 10 years before, without offering a constructive proposal for settlement.

Finally, any proposal must recognize that in order to get something we must give something. The essence of a constructive proposal is that its acceptance would serve our national interest and bring us closer to peace. Certainly Congress should not attempt to tell the Executive what to propose at Geneva. But surely it will strengthen the President's hand at Geneva if he knows that there are areas of negotiation in which he can look for the support of the American people.

We know some of the things that we want to get if we can: a start toward disarmament, whether by census, verification, inspection, or actual reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments; the unification in freedom of Germany; the withdrawal of Russian armies back to her historic borders so as to permit free elections in the new enslaved states; the demilitarization of these states; the free interchange of peoples and ideas, East and West; the fostering of the principle of European federation, particularly as a method of solving the Polish-German territorial dispute over the Oder-Neisse frontier, and for insuring the protection of human rights in central and eastern Europe.

To get some or all of these things, what are we prepared to give? Surely not an end to the NATO alliance, nor a withdrawal of American military power from Europe, nor consent to the isolation of Germany in an armed neutrality. But is it not to our national advantage to be prepared to give, in agreement with our NATO allies, including Germany, a reciprocal pledge of disarmament? An agreement to impose some limits to the rearmament of Germany, within this larger context of general disarmament? An agreement not to station NATO troops east of a certain line?

Undoubtedly, there are other possible concessions that could be made. In each case the governing question is whether what we get is worth what we give.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want first to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for stating the purpose motivating this discussion. Many of us want to express our opinions on certain aspects of the foreign policy at this time because of its importance. We think this is one of the crossroads of history. The President is going to Geneva to deal with the Russian giant. We wish him well. His is a most difficult task and we seek to help him. We want only at this time to place before the Congress sincerely some of our thoughts in connection with possible matters which we consider to be the most important.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Dickens established the background for his great novel, the Tale of Two Cities, with these phrases:

> It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us, we had nothing before us; we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way.

Would not one have believed, Mr. Speaker, that these words were descriptive of the period in which we live rather than the time of the French Revolution? Were his thoughts directed to this present age, Dickens might have added that it was a most simple time, it was a most perplexing time; it was a time of potential peace, it was a time of potential war. It was a time when there was a vision of mankind moving toward the loftiest age in the history of civilization through peaceful uses of the atom; it was a time when the shadow of a mushroom-shaped cloud hung heavy over the prospect of extinction of the civilization which man had laboriously wrought for centuries.

The memory of that cloud is important, Mr. Speaker, because this year marks the 10th anniversary of man's use against his fellowman of the destructive capacity of atomic energy—of the opening scene of what has become the new life and death drama of our age.

With the termination of World War II there began an all too brief period marked by the fervent hope that we were on the verge of witnessing the achievement of a lasting foundation for world peace. We looked to the organization of the United Nations as a body in which all the peoples of the earth would be represented, a body which would be dedicated to the encouragement of individual freedom for all peoples and the elimination of war as a means of settling disputes. We envisioned a world ruled by the orderly processes of law in which disputes between nations would be subject to settlement in the same manner as disputes between individuals.

Today such goals are much more distant. The fraternal spirit which marked the opening session of the United Nations has been all but shattered in a mounting accumulation of controversies with the Soviet Union, its Eastern European satellites, and Communist China. The beneficence and sympathetic understanding which we believe to be high among our fundamental national traits, and which led us to seek to relieve the economic plight of nations torn by war—and which caused us to try to help underdeveloped countries attempt to eliminate poverty, eradicate disease, and achieve the fullest use of their resources, at a cost of billions of dollars to our taxpayers, now seems to have been forgotten by much of the world and we are puzzled and saddened, witness many of the comments which were heard in the House a few days ago when the mutual security bill was being debated.

On the other hand, remembered all too well is our policy of national security, which has emphasized primary reliance upon armaments and military bases capable of being used to ward off, if that is possible, the threat of aggression from our inner citadels—and also capable of being used for delivery of the bomb. The warm glow of good will which first greeted our Nation's generosity and friendship has become more and more diffused by the spectre of massive retaliation. Paraphrasing Wordsworth's famous line: "The bomb is too much with us, late and soon."

The world does not relish the thought of atomic war. While we believe in and declare our peaceful intent, while we desire and preach that men shall live in harmony with one another, that swords shall be beaten into plowshares and men practice war no more, unfortunately too much of the world seems to believe that the United States is the Nation most to be feared in dealing with this latest instrument of devastation. Much of the world knows no other use of the bomb than for killing. The shroud of secrecy which originally was woven to protect the atom's use for military purposes has not been lifted sufficiently to disclose the swiftness with which the atom is being adopted to peaceful uses.

Perhaps the most tragic casualty of this attitude of belligerency is the magnificient message delivered by President Eisenhower to the United Nations Assembly on December 8, 1953, which was one of the truly great utterances of our time. The President spoke of universal peace and human justice, of the fearful engines of atomic might and the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb. He protested the hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic colossi are doomed malevolently to eye other indefinitely across a trembling world.

> My country—

He declared—

> wants to be constructive, not destructive. It wants agreements, not wars. * * * It wants * * * to live in freedom * * * in the confidence that the people of every nation enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life.

The President concluded by saying:

> The United States knows that if the fearful trend of an atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon for the dignity of all mankind. The United States pledges to devote its entire heart and mind to find a way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

Never was a more loftier, more significant sentiment expressed. It electrified the member nations of the United Nations as few messages had ever done before. It stunned and set back the Soviet Union. The President seemed to have opened the way for a new and effective foreign policy. But, unfortunately, tangled in reassessments, agonizing reappraisals, the New Look, massive retaliation, and buffeted by a studied delaying policy by the Soviets who recognize well the potency of the President's proposal, our State Department failed to grasp the initiative opened by the President's ringing challenge. The vision of hope it brought soon faded.

In its place in April, the world hung breathlessly upon our decision whether war would break out in the Formosan straits with Red China. The State Department's impulsive and rash reaction rejecting the offer of Chou En-lai at the Bandung conference gave substance to the Communist propaganda that the United States wants no peace. The art of diplomacy requires temperate consideration and cool analysis. It should not have been necessary to reverse our hasty decision within a few days after that statement, as was done, and to accept the Chinese offer. Of course, we should have taken the necessary time to review the consequences of such a highly important matter in the first instance, rather than to use such an occasion to express our hostility. Let us hope the Department of State will profit by the experience.

And now, Mr. Speaker, "the two atomic colossi," to use the President's own words, move into position across a conference table at Geneva, the champions of their respective ways of life; the United States for democracy, with all of its implications; the U. S. S. R. for totalitarianism, with all of its implications. The world watches and prays. Hanging in the balance are the hopes and aspirations not only of the Western World but the Asians, hundreds of millions of people who, in the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, "Covet a right to shape their own free destiny, who seek friendly guidance, understanding and support; not imperious direction; who want the dignity of equality, not the shame of subjugation; who strive for an opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of the normal nationalist urge for political freedom."

In 1954, Secretary of State Dulles said:

> Our national purpose is not merely to survive in a world fraught with a falling danger. We want to end this era of danger. The way to end the peril itself is to demonstrate that freedom produces not merely guns, but spiritual, intellectual, and material righteousness that all men want.

With this statement we all agree. To my mind it expresses what I hope will be the note for the Geneva Conference. It will furnish the basis for a dynamic, affirmative policy, a policy which will accentuate the positive, and which will let the world know what we are for, rather than what we are against. We know and they know that we are against the things for which communism seeks its conquests, but have we made clear the things for which we stand? The ideals that underlie America's aspirations? The ideals that go to make up our way of life?

There is no doubt but that we have to keep our weapons primed and our powder dry for the gravity of the Soviet threat is still present. I know that the President's actions at Geneva will not dissipate the strength we have built up with such difficulty. We must make clear that we stand for the things of the spirit, the fine spiritual values which we hold dear. We must not insist on placing too much value on sheer military might, for if we do, we will be continuing to fall into the Communist trap of identifying the United States as a nation which looks to military rather than peaceful pursuits as a basis for the settlement of international disputes.

Mr. Speaker, the Geneva Conference offers the possibility to the United States to fulfill the promise implicit in the President's statement to the United Nations Assembly. We can offer to the peoples of the world new hope and new life through tangible evidence of the fact that atomic energy can be a force for good, rather than evil, consecrated to the life of man rather than to his destruction. What more concrete expression can be furnish to the people of the world of our desire for peace than to make available the miracle of the atom, fashioned in peace and designed to help the power-starved nations overcome the deficiencies which a lack of electricity brings. As Commissioner Thomas Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission stated:

> We know from experience that only with great difficulty can men in severe economic want be made to think of matters other than their own hunger. Our first imperative task then is to use the atom to assist in the elimination of want where it exists and to forestall want where it threatens. It is clear to me that not only can we do this by developing nuclear power but that in so doing we can simultaneously enrich ourselves and the world both materially and spiritually.

The dynamics of peace require as much of us as those of war. Now, with that best instrumentality, with such unbelievable possibilities of good, why should we not share it for the benefit of mankind? The instrument of the peaceful atom opens promise of bringing freedom to nations and individuals, for freedom can be sustained only by economic survival and opportunity for growth. We can show the world that our way of life means freedom and prosperity with dignity for the individual in a manner far superior to that professed by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson envisioned that one day the United States would be a great nation, and it is well that we heed his advice. He said:

> Not in our day, but at no distant one, we may shake a rod over the heads of all, which may make the stoutest of them tremble. But I hope our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us that the less we use our power the greater it will be.

Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague from Illinois for his graciousness in yielding to me at this time in order that I might join him and my other colleagues in trying today to participate in what I think is one of the finest traditions of our country, a truly bipartisan effort in order that we may show to the world a united front behind our President and in order that he may be sure that we think always of our country first.

Not since the international conferences during World War II and the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 have the attention and prayers of the peoples of every part of the world focused upon a meeting of the heads of state as they will at the forthcoming summit conference in Geneva next week. I want to emphasize that the vast majority of those who will be watching and praying for the success of this conference hold the hope that this will not be just the first of a series of meetings of the great world powers, but will be the basis for the implementation of the United Nations Organization where the representatives of all people have a chance to be heard and to have their problems sympathetically considered.

Two of the problems which I hope the summit leaders will consider are: First, the admission of other countries, such as Italy, Ireland, Austria, Finland, Japan, Portugal, The Republic of Korea, Cambodia, Ceylon, Libya, Laos, and Nepal, to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does the gentleman consider also the inclusion of Spain to the United Nations?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I may answer that question.

Mr. YATES. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am frank to say that as far as each individual case is concerned we must be sure that the nations will live up to the basic standards that are established.

I prefer not to go into any controversial issue, but merely to mention those about which I think there can be no question of any kind. If the gentleman feels that there is a reservation about Spain, that, of course, is something for him to express.

Mr. TUMULTY. I could not stand for the exclusion of Spain with Russia included.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be very happy myself to include Spain. I think the gentleman interrupted before I had finished my complete list.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Foreign Affairs Committee today considered a resolution asking that we do everything possible to support the nations the gentleman mentioned in their desire to be admitted to the United Nations.

The question of Spain did come up and we determined through checking with the State Department that Spain has not applied for membership in the United Nations at this time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much, and I would like to join with him in the thoughts expressed in the concurrent resolution. I think the number is 186.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I think at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] I will yield further, but temporarily I think the gentleman from California should be permitted to finish his statement.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to make a brief comment on this particular matter.

Mr. YATES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut for that purpose.

Mr. MORANO. The Foreign Affairs Committee also raised the question of whether or not Western Germany should be included in the resolution. We discussed that this morning. That country, too, would be included in our resolution if they had applied for entrance into the United Nations.

Mr. VORYS. I think it should be made clear—I do not think there is any secret about it—that Mr. WILLIAMS' resolution was unanimously approved by the committee for action by the House this morning, but it was confined in its text to these 14 countries that had already applied for membership in the U. N. and had shown themselves to be fully qualified but had been kept out by the Russian veto.

Mr. MORANO. And that Germany and Spain both had failed to apply for entrance into the United Nations, which is the reason they were not included in the resolution.

Mr. YATES. I hope the gentleman will be permitted now to finish his statement, then I shall yield for questions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that that was part of the reason Spain was not listed in my own list of the nations to which I refer.

I wish to join with my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. HARRISON WILLIAMS, in the thoughts he expressed in Concurrent Resolution 186, where he states that large segments of the world's population are still not affiliated with the United Nations and this policy of exclusion is hindering the attainment of international peace and is weakening the foundations of the United Nations, and that the people of the nations to which I have just referred have earned a seat on the world's councils. I join my colleague in his hope that the United States will use its influence through its membership in the United Nations, and more particularly, will seize the opportunity presented by the summit conference to allow these free nations to achieve a position of full membership in the U. N.

Secondly, this body on the 30th day of June of this year passed without a dissenting vote an amendment to the Mutual Security Act. That amendment states "It is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations." I voted for this resolution, and I believe in it.

I hope and pray that the summit conference will give the President the opportunity to explain to the Russian representative and to the rest of the world that our opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations organization is not a blind prejudicial opposition against the people of that country, who make up 23 percent of the world's population. Quite the opposite. Almost since the inception of this country, we have counted China as one of our closest friends. We fought for the open-door policy for China; we backed her against Japan at the Paris Peace Conference at the end of World War I; when, in 1932 Japan invaded Manchuria, we were the first country to announce a policy of nonrecognition, the so-called Stimson doctrine; China was one of our great allies during the Second World War, and if it was not for our insistence, would not have become a member of the U. N. Security Council.

Let it be made clear to the world that we are not undertaking to tell the Chinese people what form of government they should have. We insist upon their inherent right to be a member of the U. N. the minute that they have a government that will respect the rights of the peoples of other nations, fulfill their international agreements, forswear aggression and protect the rights of citizens of other countries within their borders. But our opposition is firm and strong against any government which continues to be the equivalent of an international brigand. The truth should ring around the world, for men of good faith everywhere will recognize the truth. But its true meaning must be made clear to the whole world and the effect of the deceitful propaganda twists used by the Red China Government and Pravda in Moscow must be fumigated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of this country and the people of the world who are placing such hope in the forthcoming conference are entitled to know the results of this conference. Therefore, within the limitations which must accompany all international negotiations, I hope that the President will report to the people of our country and to the people of the whole world not only upon the agreements reached but upon the disagreements which remain, in order that we may concentrate on efforts to achieve a solution to those remaining points of danger. May God speed the President on his way and guard and guide him to a safe return.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Members who are presenting a point of view to the House this afternooon have been conferring thoughtfully and wisely and that they wish to be constructive and to help the President as he prepares for the Geneva conference. I appreciate the opportunity to make these comments, because, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am grateful for this interest on the part of the Members who lead this discussion. I trust that my reference to the fact that those who are participating are of the majority party will not be misunderstood. I have been a long-time believer in bipartisanship, and sometimes we tend to obstruct bipartisanship by these very references. But, the President of the United States should be heartened by the things said today in this discussion, this indication of our concern, that we might help him, that we might give evidence of unanimity, that we are eager to show in the present situation that we want him to speak for all of us.

On the whole, the bipartisan idea has worked pretty well. There have been times in the interest of the Nation when it has been interrupted, when we needed to pose honest differences. On such occasions the people have had a choice between congressional candidates with opposing views and in national elections some differences in platforms. Sometimes we have had bipartisanship on the wrong basis. I remember in 1920, for example, after our strong Democratic position was so eloquently stated by our candidate for President, Mr. Cox, of Ohio, that the people had a clear choice. It was not bipartisanship. The Democrats lost that election on the platform of international cooperation. In 1924, when we had an opportunity to follow that same philosophy, Newton D. Baker pleaded with our party delegates in the Madison Square Garden convention to stand by that position. It was abandoned, and so we had both parties in 1924 yielding to what was obviously the mood of the country. We retreated from world responsibilities. That was bipartisanship on the wrong basis. My party failed, from my point of view, in that situation. On the whole, however, at least in recent years, I think it is fair to say that bipartisanship has worked. I remember in the 80th Congress, while there were sharp differences between us on domestic policy, the Republican Party, inaugurating much of the Marshall plan and supporting many of the Democratic administration's proposals, gave a good example of cooperation.

I hope the gentleman will pardon these brief historical references. What I am trying to say is that as I interpret his remarks, this is all in the spirit of true bipartisanship, in an effort to strengthen the hand of our President as he goes on this significant mission, a mission which we hope will be fraught with success.

I am grateful to the group for presenting these views even though there may come into the debate expressions with which I shall differ. It is an effort to advance the maturing process of developing a foreign policy which both parties can embrace. The gentleman from Illinois is contributing to our country's spirit of good will and our essential unity.

I am eager to know if I have properly interpreted the attitude of those who are bringing these splendid thoughts to our attention. What the gentleman has said about the use of atomic power, for example, has been thrilling and I am happy that he has emphasized the place that our policy on the use of atomic power has in world leadership. And since I must not transgress further upon his time, if I have any contribution to make, it is only as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to thank him and my other colleagues for a timely utterance.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], who is one of the most constructive members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who always makes a contribution when he rises to speak in this Chamber, for his participation in today's discussion. He has correctly interpreted the motives of the group who have taken time today to express our views on certain aspects of foreign policy.

We have no recriminations, we make no partisan criticisms of the foreign policy of the administration. We have disagreed in degree with what has happened in the past, which is our right, and I think that the administration would want to have constructive criticism from us.

The invitations to participate today were distributed to the entire House membership, inviting Members of both parties to come to the floor and to share it with us in a constructive endeavor to place before the President the thinking we have on these fundamental issues in order that he may know what we are thinking and perhaps be guided by them in his deliberations at Geneva.

All of us wish him well. On his actions on his decisions, as we stated in our letter to the House, may depend the saving of our civilization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The subject of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations has come up here again this afternoon. I am opposed to Communist China being admitted to the United Nations. But the thing that has always puzzled me is, What is the difference between the brand of Chinese communism and the brand of Russian communism insofar as the United Nations is concerned?

Mr. YATES. I see the distinguished authority on China, Dr. JUDD, on his feet, anxious to answer your question, and I yield to him to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Is he also an authority on Russian communism? That is what I want to know.

Mr. YATES. Suppose we let the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] answer and then the gentleman from Iowa can make up his own mind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are two major differences between the two situations. One is that the Soviet Union is already a member of the U. N. and you cannot do anything about it. You cannot expel her because she can use the veto against her expulsion. But you do not need to make the same mistake a second time. The fact that the Soviet Union is in and nothing can be done about that fact under the Charter, does not mean that we should go ahead with our eyes wide open and admit a second Communist power, that has no discoverable unlikeness to the first in its devotion to world conquest.

The other basic difference is this: At the time the Soviet Union was admitted, or rather, when she was one of the founders of the United Nations, she was pretending to be democratic. She was pretending to be law-abiding. She was pretending to be peace-loving. She was pretending to be willing to fulfill her obligations as a law-abiding member of society.

In the case of China, however, there is not even the pretense. She has brazenly revealed her lawless character, before admission, not after it. Before she has even been considered for admission, she has openly violated the principles of the charter and ordinary decent obligations under the laws of civilized nations.

Two years ago at Panmunjom she solemnly promised to return all prisoners of war. She still has not done so. She promised she would not build up air forces north of the 38th parallel; she has built up a powerful air force there. Only a year ago next week she made a commitment at Geneva, and Chou En-lai was her spokesman, that there would be no building up of the Vietminh, the Communist forces in north Viet-Nam. We recently had testimony that their strength is now a little more than twice that of a year ago, and every bit of that assistance came from Communist China.

It would evidence a genius for self-deception on our part to admit to the

U. N. as a peace-loving government an outfit which insists on acting in such lawlessness, openly violating her commitments. I subscribe to what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said, regarding our opposition to admission of Red China. It is not due to arbitrary or stubborn prejudice against China, much less against the Chinese people. It is due to the behavior of the Chinese Communist regime. It excludes itself by its own conduct. If it would reverse its behavior and demonstrate by deeds, not words, that it has become a law-abiding member of civilized society, it would be admitted, in my opinion. It is up to it.

The language of the section we passed unanimously last week, and I had something to do with the drafting of it, very carefully said the Chinese Communist-regime has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill its international responsibilities and obligations as a member of civilized society and, therefore, has not qualified and is not eligible to be admitted and should not be permitted to join.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may reply to the gentleman?

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman permit me first to yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON]? I would be glad to yield to the gentleman later toward the expiration of the time.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be a participant in this positive discussion of international policy. I am particularly concerned that we avoid some of the vacillating swings that have characterized our country's international policy during the past few years. There is a longing for true world brotherhood and permanent peace in the world. Representatives of free nations who attended the Bangdung Conference expressed this repeatedly. These leaders are earnestly working, perhaps sometimes feebly, to end starvation, exploitation, feudalism, dictatorships, discrimination, bad land tenure systems, and all other injustices and threats to world peace. The point I want to make is this, we now have an opportunity, as we have never had in the history of the world, to contribute to the solution of the evils enumerated. Our international policy should stem from our sincere interest in bringing security from hunger and nakedness, of good will and a spirit of international friendship, to the people of the free and democratic nations.

There are many nations of the world still subject to wild ups and downs in the world raw materials market and monetary exchanges. There is no denying that we have not as yet found the solution to these problems. If the big powers would propose and effectuate solution of these problems, it would propel conditions of peace and security.

First, I am very much concerned over a statement made by a distinguished Senator from Iowa on July 7, the essence of which revolves around a do-nothing policy which he has very interestingly labeled "free enterprise." There is a question whether the Senator from Iowa is thinking of the individuals and their families in their search for opportunity necessary to better living standards, or whether he is thinking of international private cartels which monopolize international trade. Under the Senator's proposal only the farmers and other raw material producers of the world enjoy the fruits of free enterprise and competition.

Congressman METCALF, Senators MURRAY, HUMPHREY, and 21 other Senators have introduced in this Congress international food and raw materials reserve bills. I support the legislation which has been introduced. This legislation is consistent with proposals of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers. IFAP proposed at the Nairobi, Kenya meeting in 1954, that the matter of a world food reserve should be kept under active consideration. The committee recommends that the Secretariat of the IFAP prepare a study indicating the nature of the machinery needed to implement the plan, and correct obstacles that have stood in the way of the attainment of this objective by giving all possible suggestions as to how such obstacles might be overcome.

It seems evident that this international organization of individual country farm organizations is cognizant of the need to develop an international agency which would be charged with the responsibility to prevent extreme fluctuations in prices of agricultural commodities and other raw materials in international markets; to encourage expanding production to meet the world's pressing need for increased supplies of food, fiber, and other raw materials; to absorb temporary market surpluses; and through use of national currencies involved, make self-liquidating loans through appropriate international lending agencies for economic development. This should include the purchase, for food and fiber of merchandise importing countries, and include raw materials needed in food and merchandising exporting countries.

These individual country farm organizations fully recognize, as do the supporters of an international food and raw materials reserve in this Congress, that farm family living standards in all the nations, including our own, are dependent upon expanded international trade and farm commodities and other raw materials. Parenthetically, it should be stated that the world price of other commodities such as tin, rubber, and iron fluctuate wildly from month to month. The stabilization of farm commodities as well as these nonfarm commodities, would greatly improve living standards generally.

United States generally has become increasingly dependent upon foreign sources for low cost essential industrial raw materials. It is ordinary commonsense for each of the various nations to expend its greatest efforts in producing those sorts of goods they can produce at greatest efficiency, and the domestic surplus of which they can exchange for those commodities produced more efficiently in surplus in other nations.

This international food and raw materials reserve proposal, coupled with the recently enacted Reciprocal Trade Agreement, International Commodity Agreement such as the International Wheat Agreement, can encourage investment, stabilize markets, encourage increased production, make a beginning toward elimination of famine, near starvation, and nakedness. The international food and raw material reserve would serve to bolster international economic situations just as our price-support legislation has bolstered our domestic economy.

Second, I hope this proposal will be considered at the meeting of the large nations to stabilize better living standards among all people.

Slowing down the rate of expansion in raw material industries not only reduced the supply of such materials to meet human needs, but it also holds down the purchasing power of persons and firms on the raw materials sector which in turn cuts down on sales, scale of operation, and consequently of income and purchasing power of the industrial and service segments of the economy. Consequently, the entire economy idles along at a lower rate of production and expansion than needs to be the case. In the more highly industrialized nations, the symptoms are seen in chronically depressed industries like farming and coal mining in the United States. Among the lesser industrialized nations, a drop in raw material prices can bring an entire nation dangerously close to bankruptcy and can directly cause a widespread drop in personal income and standards of living of the entire population.

I feel that such action is required not only to provide desirable protection and cushioned readjustment for domestic producers in the several nations including our own but also to provide and to encourage a better basis for insuring an ample supply of raw materials for the economic growth of nations of the free world.

The industry of advanced nations is chewing up basic resources at a tremendous and rising rate. For example, the United States which has 7 percent of the world's population and 30 percent of the world's natural resources, accounts for 70 percent of the world's manufactured goods. The United States is using up its resource base at a very rapid rate and very much faster than the rest of the world. To be secure in our rising living standards and to retain the resource base for an expanding economy, we must assure ourselves a stabilized source of supply of the raw materials for our manufacturing industry. The same situation is true in other industrious nations such as United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. The thought-provoking details for different commodities were thoroughly considered in the Paley report of several years ago.

Highly industrialized nations could depend entirely upon private industrial concerns to make long-term contracts with raw material producers in other lands. And, this should be done. But, it can only be successfully and securely accomplished under the protection and encouragement by governments and international economic accords.

These latter conceivably could be done exclusively through bilateral arrangements between the United States and foreign nations; one nation at a time, one commodity at a time. However, no supplier, private enterprise, or State, wants to become dependent exclusively on one buyer; nor does an importing nation or industrialist want to become dependent exclusively on one buyer; nor does an importing nation or industrialist want to become dependent upon only one seller.

Through the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, exporting nations can obtain assured long-term stabilized markets and importing nations can obtain an assured long-term ample supply at stabilized prices of imports on terms that will not injure domestic producers who must sell their commodities in competition with imports.

The international food and raw materials reserve would operate in coordination with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Many of the national restrictions we now have that hold down greater international exchange of commodities, is the desire of nations to preserve their monetary position in different currencies particularly dollars and pounds sterling. The international food and raw materials reserve would completely eliminate this problem by operating in terms of all currencies on the basis of internationally agreed upon official exchange rates.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a pamphlet, American Abundance and World Need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

A Statement on American Abundance and World Need by 88 American Religious Leaders

God has blessed the United States of America with abundance. A vast endowment of natural resources, brilliant achievements in science and technology, a free society, and a dynamic economy have united to bring us to heights of material productivity never before known to mankind. Both our natural resources and our human skills of hand and brain are the gifts of God. We are His creatures and stewards in His vineyard.

The abundance which is ours and the potential productivity within our grasp are at once blessings to be enjoyed and a trust to be administered in the name of God and in the service of mankind.

It is contrary to the will of God that islands of prosperity should persist amid oceans of poverty, hunger, and distress. Bread for myself is a material concern; bread for my brother is a spiritual concern.

In a moral universe, the continued prosperity of one nation can only be justified by its faithful and courageous efforts to make comparable abundance available to all nations.

These basic ethical considerations point toward certain goals which should be firm guides to national policies and programs. In the domestic sphere, the appropriate goals are an expanding peacetime economy and equitable distribution of the national product. These goals are fundamental because as a Nation we cannot share what we do not possess.

In the international sphere, America's goal should be greatly expanded sharing of our material abundance, our technical skills, and the dynamic spirit of a free society. This goal must be pursued in a genuine spirit of international friendship and good will. Although our efforts should always be dedicated to the advancement of free institutions and opposed to any form of totalitarianism, we must avoid making our participation contingent upon political conformity or subservience on the part of other nations.

We pledge ourselves, and we call upon our national leaders, both in the social sciences and in the practical realms of business, labor, agriculture, and politics, to work together for the following specific policies and programs:

1. National economic policies designed to achieve and maintain full employment with full and efficient production both in industry and agriculture. With growing population, increasing labor force, and mounting productivity this means not a level, but an annually rising gross national product.

2. Industrial wage and agricultural price policies which will produce a just and equitable distribution of consumer purchasing power throughout the economy.

3. Food and nutrition programs which will assure adequate and healthful diets for all Americans and for as many as can be reached and served abroad.

4. Expanded programs of technical assistance in the fundamental work of world economic and social development.

5. International trade and monetary policies designed to facilitate and expand the international flow of goods and services. Appropriate public aid should be provided to agricultural and industrial enterprises facing adjustments as trade barriers are progressively removed.

6. Foreign economic aid programs geared to meet situations of emergency and long-time human need. For this purpose both the offices of government and of the voluntary and religious agencies should be used.

In order to minimize suspicions of nationalistic or imperialistic motivation on the part of the United States, to reduce international tension, and to promote world peace, we believe the following three principles should be observed in all programs of foreign trade, aid, and technical assistance:

(a) Complete separation of United States economic and technical aid from programs of military aid.

(b) Full utilization of private and nongovernmental agencies in trade, aid, and technical assistance programs.

(c) Maximum utilization of the United Nations and the specialized agencies associated with it.

In the last analysis, American policies and programs are determined by the will of the people. This is the glory of our free and democratic society. Therefore, our ultimate appeal is to the people of America. We call upon all Americans of moral idealism and righteous conviction to join us and their neighbors in an all-out crusade to employ the God-given abundance of America in an expanded program of world development, human progress, and international peace.

"And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; but they shall sit, every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid." (Micah 4: 3–4.)

This statement is endorsed and supported by the following persons:

From the Catholic community: Most Rev. William T. Mulloy, D. D., bishop of Covington, Ky.; Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D. D., archbishop of Kansas City, Mo.; Most Rev. John P. Treacy, D. D., bishop of La Crosse, Wis.; Most Rev. Albert R. Zuroweste, D. D., bishop of Belleville, Ill.; Rev. A. J. Adams, S. J., St. Marys, Kans.; Very Rev. Urban Baer, Eastman, Wis.; The Reverend Paul J. Brinker, Mayslick, Ky.; The Reverend Francis A. Candon, Fairfield, Vt.; The Reverend Michael P. Dineen, Des Moines, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. F. Frommherz, Ottoville, Ohio; The Reverend J. B. Gremillion, Shreveport, La.; Very Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. George J. Hildner, V. F., Villa Ridge, Mo.; Mr. Emerson Hynes, Collegeville, Minn.; The Reverend Joseph Hylden, Edgeley, N. Dak.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti, Des Moines, Iowa; The Reverend Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., New York, N. Y.; The Reverend Frederick McGuire, C. M., Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. G. Murray, Roslindale, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C.; The Reverend Edward W. O'Rourke, Champaign, Ill.; Miss Betsy Phelan, Kansas City, Mo.; Miss Pauline Reynolds, Fargo, N. Dak.; Dr. Paul Sacco, Davenport, Iowa; Mr. Martin Salm, Chilton, Wis.; Dr. Elmer L. Sauer, Champaign, Ill.; The Reverend Wilfred J. Schuster, Brodhead, Wis.; The Reverend Alexander O. Sigur, Lafayette, La.; Dr. Paul C. Taff, Ames, Iowa; Mr. Edward C. Trainer, West Trenton, N. J.; The Reverend James L. Vizzard, S. J., Santa Clara, Calif.; The Reverend J. A. Wagner, West Point, Iowa; The Reverend Irvin R. Will, Sigel, Ill.

From the Jewish community: Mr. Maxwell Abbell, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Samuel Belkin, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Rochester, N. Y.; Saul Bernstein; Rabbi Morris Dembowitz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, New York, N. Y.; Judge Solomon Elsner, Hartford, Conn.; Irving M. Engel; Moses Feuerstein; Mr. Julian Freeman, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rabbi Israel Goldstein, New York, N. Y.; Mr. I. Cyrus Gordon, Rockville Centre, N. Y.; Adolph Held, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Morris Iushewitz, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Irving Kane, Cleveland, Ohio; Rabbi Israel Klavan; Rabbi Eugene Lipman, 838 Fifth Ave., New York 21, N. Y.; Hon. Abraham Multer, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Charles Rosengarten, Waterbury, Conn.; Dr. Norman Salit, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi Bernard Segal, New York, N. Y.; Bernard H. Trager, Bridgeport, Conn.

From the Protestant community: Dr. John C. Bennett, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Boston, Mass.; The Reverend Clifford Earle, Philadelphia, Pa.; The Reverend Shirley E. Greene, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Luther A. Gotwald, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Ernest A. Gross, New York, N. Y.; The Reverend Cameron P. Hall, New York, N. Y.; Mr. M. Glenn Harding, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. Paul Hutchinson, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Benson Y. Landis, New York, N. Y.; Bishop William C. Martin, Dallas, Tex.; The Reverend L. B. Moseley, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dr. Reuben E. Nelson, New York, N. Y.; Bishop D. Ward Nichols, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. C. Arild Olsen, 297 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Washington, D. C.; The Reverend Albert J. Penner, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Clarence Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.; The Very Reverend James A. Pike, New York, N. Y.; The Reverend Clyde Rogers, Columbus, Ohio; The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Washington, D. C.; The Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ralph Sockman, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Harry B. Taylor, Cleveland, Ohio; The Reverend Norris L. Tibbetts, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, New York, N. Y.; Dr. James E. Wagner, Philadelphia, Pa.; Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I was delighted to hear the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON] mention the international food and raw materials reserve, which I introduced as House Resolution 197. It is cosponsored by a distinguished group of Senators, chiefly sponsored by the Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY. I am the author of the resolution in this body. I know of nothing that would do more to provide for the proper disposition of our own surpluses and provide these raw materials, and at the same time create a better national understanding than the adoption of such a proposal as has been so well described by the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON].

At the same time, the adoption of such a reserve would make all large nations partners for progress and abundance. If they would become partners in attempting to get world abundance and proper distribution of raw materials, of course we are partners in avoiding the horrors of war.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the meeting between the various heads of state at Geneva next week is to attempt to bring about a lessening of world tension and thus contribute to the development of world peace. Now we all are well aware of the simple fact that economic discontent has long been a breeder of tension and war. Therefore, it seems to me to be worthwhile to discuss briefly the steps and policies that can and should be taken by the United States in this vital area. As has already been pointed out, it is not our intention to tie the President's hands at Geneva. Rather, I simply want to indicate the general outlines of economic policy which seem to me to fit in with the historic and necessary position of the United States in this realm.

Democratic foreign policy has long shown a clear understanding of the necessity for a prosperous and economically healthy world situation if the peace of the world is to be maintained. I would like to reiterate our continued support of any policy which tends to accomplish these results. Beginning in the 1930's, the American Government, under the brilliant leadership of Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt, instituted a program of reciprocal-trade agreements which has done much to build healthy and stable economies throughout the world. This type of agreement has also been greatly beneficial to the United States itself, both in aiding our own industries in foreign markets and in building friendship for the United States.

In the early days of this session, the Congress spent many hours considering how best to implement the reciprocal-trade program. A bill was finally passed which has many merits, not the least of which is that it continues a program of this type. In my opinion, the bill as passed leaves much to be desired, but it at least maintains the program. Under the law as it now exists considerable discretionary power has been given to the President. I believe it is the duty of Congress to encourage the President, whenever he can properly do so, to lower the trade carriers that now exist. I also think the President should make it clear that he will do so when he meets with the other leaders at Geneva.

The United States today is one of the world's great market areas. All the trading nations of the world are anxious to enter this market and actually they must do so if they are not to destroy their own economies. Whenever we lower the tariff on a specified material or product, we are building friendship for the United States. We are also easing the economic tensions of the world and helping American industry too. Many of my colleagues, I am sure, remember too well the disastrous trade wars that did so much to bring on the depression of the 1930's and contributed in no small degree to the coming of the Second World War. We have learned much from that costly lesson. I hope the President will make it clear at Geneva that we have learned the lesson permanently and do not intend to reverse our position at some time in the future.

Reciprocal trade, however, is only one aspect of the economic foreign policy of the United States. Such a program would be of little assistance to many of the so-called underdeveloped nations of the world. Here again, it has been a traditional program of the Democratic Party to give aid to these nations. We have pursued such a program because we know that only in this way can these nations achieve the economic stability they need and because any instability in these areas can only lead to tensions and warlike acts. Under the leadership of President Truman, the Congress adopted the point 4 program and this development has now been under way for several years. Even those who are opposed to such projects will admit, I think, that our implementation of the point 4 program has done much to win the friendship of the recipients of the grants. Today we in the United States tend to regard communism as the one threat to world peace. Yet, if the menace of communism were to be eliminated tomorrow, we would still face many of the same problems we are confronted with today. One of the major areas of conflict and tension lies in just these underdeveloped nations that we have attempted to aid under the point 4 program and through the facilities of the United Nations. These countries are only now emerging from long years of domination by colonial powers. They want and deserve to have equal status with other nations. The statements of the leaders of these nations at the Bandung Conference this spring indicated their distaste for both colonialism and communism. Yet, because they are so far behind the nations of the Western World industrially, they feel overpowered and dominated still. This feeling is a fertile ground for future trouble and conflict. By implementation of the point 4 program and by giving our continued support to similar programs within the United Nations we have it within our power to do much to alleviate this possible source of conflict. It seems to me that the President might do well to use the forum of the Geneva Conference to indicate clearly that we recognize the problems facing these less fortunate nations and that we intend to do all we can to aid them without the economic strings that go with the colonialism or imperialism they fear.

Until the advent of the Second World War, the United States was able to pursue a "go it alone" policy with a fair degree of success. Today we have been thrust into the role of world leadership by the cataclysmic events of that war. It is a position for which we had little training and it came upon us with startling rapidity. We now have responsibilities throughout the world to which we have not fully adjusted. Nevertheless, it seems to me that we have done a remarkable job of meeting the necessities of the situation. Perhaps no other area has tested our capacity for leadership so fully as foreign economic policy. Here our success has been apparent to the whole world. Our great industrial capacity has enabled us to pursue a series of measures which have markedly reduced tensions throughout the world and have saved many nations from literal bankruptcy. By pursuing such objectives, we have averted the outbreak of atomic or hydrogen warfare and built up a situation in which direct negotiation between the heads of state is not only possible but brings with it the hope of establishing some sort of more permanent peace.

Next week President Eisenhower and his staff will be engaged in negotiations on which much depends. It is my hope in making this speech this afternoon to indicate support in the Congress for the principles of our economic foreign policy which have been productive of so much success in the past. They are principles which I feel would do much to bring about peace in the world. They are principles which I hope all the Members of this House can and will support. They are principles which the Democratic Party and its representatives have always supported. They are principles which I believe can be productive of much good at the Geneva Conference. Whatever the outcome of this meeting at the summit, if the President indicates his clear support of such programs and principles at this time, the result will be in our favor, for it will be a clear indication of our desire for a peaceful and stable world in which all nations will be respected and treated as equals. Finally may I say that, whatever the final result at Geneva, we in the House of Representatives and the people of the Nation wish the President well and hope that he will be able to achieve some measure of the peace we all so ardently desire. All of us will pray that the President's mission will be safe and successful.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the short period of time remaining, I want to thank the Members who have participated up to the present time in this discussion of foreign policy. I know that all of them will join with me in wishing the President Godspeed on his very important mission.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] who has just expressed himself. I think it is a very fine and a very important contribution at this time to the whole discussion.

Mr. YATES. I join with the gentleman in his commendation.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEANE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the discussion this afternoon demonstrates clearly the amazing pace at which history has been moving. It was only 10 short years ago that the leaders of the allied nations of World War II met to lay the groundwork for peace based upon continued cooperation among themselves. For the first time since the historic meeting at Potsdam, leaders of these same nations are now assembling at Geneva in an effort to reduce tensions which have developed between them—tensions which threaten the destruction of civilized society.

During this 10-year period of the so-called cold war, the political and economic systems of the free world have been engaged in a death struggle with those of the Communist camp. The first phase of this struggle, during which the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons, was marked by the emergence of the United States as the postwar leader of the nations of the free world. In 1950, our atomic monopoly ended with the first explosion of a Soviet atom bomb, and we since have engaged in a race to reestablish a balance of armaments between the Soviet bloc and the free world.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are now entering into a new phase of what has come to be known as the cold war, a phase in which the threat of thermonuclear destruction will give way more and more to the power of new ideas.

On the eve of the Geneva Conference, when the hopes of the world ride so high, I think we must face realistically the fact that, so far as we know, the objective of Soviet policy remains the same—world domination. What history has taught us all too clearly is that Communist strength trickles in where resistance is weak, halts where resistance is firm, but never remains completely dormant.

It is because the free and the Communist worlds continue to be unalterably opposed on the ideological level that we must look at the forthcoming Geneva Conference realistically and with a readiness to reorient our own thinking.

When I say that we must look at the Geneva Conference realistically, Mr. Speaker, I mean simply that the major opposing powers are in no position nor are they disposed to make the concessions necessary to settle the basic issues between the East and the West. What we can hope for, it seems to me, is that ways will be found to relax the more severe and dangerous tensions which have kept the world in the shadow of nuclear warfare.

And when I say that we must be ready to reorient our own thinking, I mean that—with the apparent stalemate in armaments—war, and the threat of war, will become less and less an instrument of national policy.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant results in recent months, to my mind, was the Soviet arms-reduction proposal of May 10. This plan recognizes that there is no longer any really reliable system of inspection or control, a fact which top officials of our Defense Department, State Department and the National Security Council all agree upon. The Soviet Government accepts in principle the standstill agreement proposed by Canada, France, Britain, and the United States as a first stage in disarmament, and also the idea that the freeze be based upon actual expenditures during 1954 rather than appropriations.

Strange indeed, when we think back to the opposition of the Soviet Union to the Baruch plan, is the fact that now the Soviet Government concedes that production of nuclear weapons may continue until disarmament is well advanced. Another major reversal of policy is found in the Soviet readiness to give up its superiority in conventional armed forces. Previously, the Kremlin stood fast on a one-third reduction of armed forces by all states. But now it accepts the principle of equality in conventional forces between the Communist nations and the allied—at levels which the allies can maintain.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Some weeks ago I introduced a resolution which, in effect, followed a resolution introduced by 42 Senators in the other body, which made the determination of the intent of a country the amount of its resources that it devoted each year to its armed program. Is it the gentleman's idea to follow that, or is the gentleman following merely a limitation of armament itself?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am sorry; I think the gentleman misunderstood me. What I was discussing here was the Soviet arms reduction program. I was trying to point out some of the changes in their policy which emerged with their recent proposal as contrasted with their policy over the last 10 years.

Mr. SPRINGER. It has been true, I believe, both under Mr. Truman and under Mr. Eisenhower, that they both voluntarily made proposals on disarmament to Russia; that is, they were willing to limit our arms providing that Russia was willing to limit their arms under the same agreement and was willing to have a system of inspection which was adequate and full under the supervision of the United Nations. Does the gentleman feel that we should weigh any such proposal as has been made in the past?

Mr. ASHLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I think we should weigh most carefully the proposal for disarmament advanced by the Soviet Union on May 10, because, in many respects, it is parallel to the plan which I believe on March 8 of this year was proposed by Canada, the United States, France, and Great Britain.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Soviet proposal, so far as I recall it—the gentleman may have more information than I do—did not propose a system of inspection, international inspection, did it?

Mr. ASHLEY. I think that it is fair to say that the Soviet proposal recognized the futility, at the present time and under present conditions, of the kind of control and inspection which the Baruch plan set forth 7 years ago. We have come too far and, I believe, as I say, that we recognize that fact, as the Soviets apparently do, that that kind of control is futile at this time. I believe I can say with accuracy that the kind of control that is now being very definitely considered both in this country and abroad is control based upon check points; that is, the industrial facilities, airports, transportation and communication facilities throughout the world, rather than an endeavor to check the production of each particular kind of weapon.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman this last question, if I may. Does the gentleman know of any proposal since the end of World War II by Russia, under which they have been willing voluntarily to submit to any international inspection for the control of armaments?

Mr. ASHLEY. Their most recent proposal that I speak of is the only one I know of.

Mr. SPRINGER. However, it does not propose to submit them voluntarily to inspection under international controls?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes, it does, as a matter of fact, to the limited extent that I speak of.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is something I do not know about. The gentleman says this was submitted by Russia when?

Mr. ASHLEY. On May 10.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman this last question? Is there any escape clause under that?

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, yes, there is an escape clause that they talk about, that all bets are off in terms of self defense.

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes; the gentleman is quite right about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would describe what he feels would be an effective inspection and control system?

Mr. SPRINGER. My idea is this. I cannot say to the gentleman at this moment what the inspection should be, but I do say this, that the President's proposal and I think Mr. Truman's went along the same line—there is nothing partisan in this, may I say—that as controls could be worked out under the supervision of the United Nations, they should apply to every country; and whatever they work out and we voluntarily agree to, that should be the system of inspection which would be used.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. With primary responsibility in the United Nations to work out the program?

Mr. SPRINGER. To submit it to us and by us to accept it and once we accepted it, every nation would be controlled by it. I believe honestly that we can work out a system of controls, of international inspection, which would work, if it is done in that manner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I say I am in complete accord with the gentleman on that?

Mr. ASHLEY. I believe I was saying at the point at which I yielded that the Kremlin formerly had stood fast on a one-third reduction of armed forces by all states but now it accepts the principle of equality in conventional forces between the Communist nations and the allied at levels which the Allies can maintain.

It is also interesting that as a first step toward the prohibition of nuclear warfare, the Soviet proposal suggests that all nations possessing nuclear weapons discontinue the testing of these weapons. Previously, of course, they had resisted all such proposals, insisting instead on an immediate and total prohibition of nuclear weapons at the outset. The Soviet proposal now accepts in principle the four-power stand that nuclear weapons will not be used except in defense against aggression.

Particularly significant, Mr. Speaker, is the second stage of the Soviet proposal which calls for a halt in the production of nuclear weapons in 1957, at which time all signatory nations would reduce their armed forces by a remaining 50 percent.

I cite this proposal in some detail, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that it lends substance to the urgent need for the free world to reorient its thinking with respect to its international policy. If this need is not already established, consider for a moment the tremendous implication of the section of the Soviet proposal which reads:

> The states shall undertake to promote broad international cooperation in the peaceful use of atomic energy. They shall strive to devote part of the savings resulting from disarmament to the broad utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes—

Particularly in helping economically underdeveloped areas.

Unless I am mistaken about the significance of this proposal, which will be but one of many offered at the Geneva Conference, it seems to me that we must start planning now, in the clearest possible detail and with the fullest publicity, the reconversion for peaceful purposes of some sections of our economy hitherto engaged in defense production. It seems to me that we should develop now a program in which the United States, jointly with other industrial nations, should assure, for at least a decade, the availability of the greater flow of capital into underdeveloped countries. This flow of capital would be composed of private investment and loans as well as public grants, of approximately equal amounts. It is an economic fact of life that all countries which are now developed produce 90 percent or more of their development capital within their own economies and also that without outside capital, development of countries which are now underdeveloped is impossible.

Banks now making international loans, both here and abroad, should be prepared to increase their rate of lending to underdeveloped nations as rapidly as suitable projects can be set up. The Export-Import Bank has already access to about $2 billion in unloaned funds, and the World Bank can raise about the same amount through sale of bonds guaranteed by the United States.

To help stimulate private investment abroad, Congress should approve the proposed International Finance Corporation as an affiliate of the International Bank with power to make loans or nonvoting investments for private enterprises abroad. Congress should also enact the tax incentives proposed by the present administration for foreign investors.

As the flow of capital into underdeveloped countries increases, technical assistance services should be enlarged, possibly as much as 50 percent of the estimated $200 million which is now available from all sources. If such a program to stimulate free world growth is to be successful, steps must also be taken to protect foreign suppliers against fluctuations and international commodity markets and to stabilize and gradually lower our tariffs on foreign goods. Also there must be continued efforts to arrive at a means of noncompetitive disposal in foreign countries in our Government-held food surpluses and, finally, we must undertake a practical means for developing and making available atomic reactors for power generation suitable for use in underdeveloped countries.

The concerted thinking of our Government, financial, business, and labor leaders is essential to the implementation as broad and as necessarily vague as the one I suggest, and I think that the establishment of a commission of financial, business, labor, and Government leaders for this purpose should be given first priority by the President.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that the meeting in Geneva may well herald a significant and critically important shift in the conduct of world affairs, and my belief that, in the battle of new ideas which is now developing, we must continue the world leadership which is expected of us and which we have provided in the past.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I commend the gentleman for his very thoughtful and well-presented address and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for his very constructive presentation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the discussion today and mention briefly one aspect of the general problem we are discussing. I think one of the really significant things that has taken place in the Congress since we convened last January has been the growth of what we call bipartisanship in foreign affairs. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that this is one of the really significant developments that has occurred. It is a quiet thing. There is nothing dramatic about it, and yet it has occurred. I do not think we can any longer afford the disharmony and lack of bipartisanship that we have had in the recent past. I think the state of the world is such that in foreign-policy matters we have to stick as closely together as we can. Let me suggest a couple of things that to me dramatize the return to bipartisanship. I think the role that has been played by Senator WALTER GEORGE on the Senate side has been a massive one in this whole business. I sometimes think myself that Senator GEORGE in recent months has played a role at least as large as that which the late Senator Vandenberg played so magnificently in past years. Certainly, with regard to the Geneva Conference, I sometimes wonder if it would actually have been arranged if it were not for the forthright speaking that Senator GEORGE did back in February, March, and early April. He was out ahead of the President and was preparing public opinion. I think a great deal of credit should go to him. I think, too, of the day last winter when our beloved speaker strode down to the well of the House and saved the foreign-trade bill. There again was an act, I feel, of high bipartisanship. On the other hand, I thought that it was in that same generous spirit that Secretary Dulles at Vienna, when the Austrian Treaty was signed a few weeks ago, sent telegrams to his predecessor, Mr. Acheson, and to former President Truman and gave them a measure of the credit for what had occurred there. I thought that that indicated a feeling for the continuity which exists in foreign policy. I, for one, want to applaud these acts. I think these are the sort of generous gestures that get us back on the high road we need to stay on. I note that many of my freshman colleagues are here today. In the recent computation made of votes on foreign-policy support of the administration, the Congressional Quarterly listed me as a 100-percent supporter. As a Democrat this does not embarrass me in the least. In fact, I take some pride in it. A compilation made on 10 foreign-policy rollcalls since the Congress convened shows that the Republicans in this body supported the administration 42 percent of the time; the Democratic support was listed as 69 percent and among the new Democrats the support was 77 percent.

I think this evidence refutes the feeling that we might be considered a disruptive force in this Congress.

It may occur as an outgrowth of the Geneva Conference that the President and the Secretary of State may have to lead off in new directions. They may have to do some things that might appear to be unpopular. We should be slow to criticize. We should be ready to be persuaded and to support them if they are right.

In my own mind, it may be that the most valuable thing that President Truman did—more important even than leading out on the Marshall plan—was his decisiveness in the Korean police action that literally saved the United Nations. It was one of the most unpopular things that he did. Yet it may be that historians will say this was the finest contribution he made to world peace. If the President and the Secretary of State must now make compromises and do things that appear to be unpopular, we should be slow to criticize them and be ready to support them if it is apparent they are right.

I hope we can continue that spirit of bipartisanship that has been growing in this House and in the country.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman for his impartial and well-chosen words.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I would like to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. I feel that he made a very commendable statement—a statement that should be of vital concern to every Member of the House today—the importance of our bipartisan foreign program.

I do feel that headway is being made along that line. I certainly would like to say publicly that I appreciate very much this fine expression by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and I feel exactly as he does with reference to these matters, and particularly with reference to the necessity of a bipartisan approach. It is my hope and my prayer that the President may come away from Geneva with good things for all of us because, as Americans, we are all vitally concerned, irrespective of our party affiliations.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this debate has been very constructive. There are many things that have been said with which I disagree and many with which I agree. I think that illustrates two things: One is that the problems of peace and the problems of negotiating for peace, the problems of the loosening up of the ice blockade that has been the cold war, are among the most acute and complex problems of any people at any time to face.

The disagreements I feel and the agreements I feel are representative, I am sure, of a number of people in the United States. I am sure it is almost impossible to expect that on details the people of the United States or the Congress of the United States would agree on everything. I think the real significance of this discussion today is that while we realize the infinite complexity of the problems which confront our President as he goes to this meeting in which so much of our hopes lie, the infinite complexity and disagreements that will inevitably result regardless of the decisions that are taken, I think this discussion demonstrates that overriding the difficulties and disagreements, whatever controversy may arise, there is an overwhelming support in the United States today for negotiation of an honorable peace, for an imaginative, forwardlooking, strengthened foreign policy. I think perhaps what we need keep in mind most is that what we need in times of difficulty, facing problems as complex as they are, is an understanding of the difficulties that confront the men who must make decisions and who must carry the ball for all the American people. In a word we need now and will need in the future a completely nonpartisan tolerance that in past days of our history sometimes has been lacking.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman and the others who have spoken before him on a constructive contribution to their country's welfare.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. Gladly.

Mr. JUDD. There is one thing more that I think ought to be said on this question of bipartisanship in foreign policy; sometimes a great many completely well-meaning people give the impression that bipartisanship in itself is necessarily a great virtue. I do not think that necessarily follows.

As someone here has said, I think it was the gentleman from Arizona, we must support the President—if he is right. But we should not support any President if we think he is not right. There are greater issues at stake than bipartisanship; there is the survival of our country, there is the survival of a free world.

In the 80th Congress I was in the minority when President Truman was in charge of our foreign policy. I was proud of the fact that the Republican 80th Congress cooperated wholeheartedly. It passed the Marshall plan legislation, the program that set up the student-exchange plan, the Voice of America, the Greece-Turkey aid bill. The basic foundation planks of our foreign policy in the whole postwar period were worked out by a Democratic administration and a Republican Congress. We were bipartisan not just to be bipartisan but because we were convinced that the policies were right.

Later, there was not that same bipartisanship with respect to policies in the Far East. It was because there was a vast difference of opinion as to the rightness of the administration's policies there. In the case of Europe, it adopted a policy of assisting the countries there to keep the Communists out of their governments. In Asia it adopted a policy of aiding the largest and most important country, China, only if it would take the Communists into the government.

Some of us in the minority were fearful of that policy and that it would lead to disaster. Events have justified that fear. There was not bipartisanship on that issue and should not have been.

Then we supported President Truman when he went into Korea. I made a statement here at noon on the 27th day of June 1950, before the administration had declared its position. I said that the United States must either take a strong stand in Korea or prepare to retire to the Western Hemisphere, because if we let Korea go, then Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and southeast Asia and Europe would go down like a row of dominoes.

To the eternal credit of Mr. Truman, he took that difficult decision and called our country and the world to stand against such aggression. I think the mistake that was made, an almost fatal mistake, was not that we went in, but that somewhere along the line some of our allies or the neutrals persuaded our leaders not to press on to the victory that was within our grasp. It was the turning back that led to failure. There was not for a time bipartisanship in policies relating to that part of the world.

Mr. UDALL. Would the gentleman agree with me that when we are talking about bipartisanship we are talking about national unity to accomplish a purpose of great national importance?

Mr. JUDD. That is right, national unity.

Mr. UDALL. That was uppermost in my mind.

Mr. JUDD. I think that is a better term at this stage. It means we have got to go along and play ball loyally when the majority decides against us, although the views of the minority may prove right in the end. But the minority need not surrender its views. For example, in recent months, some have decried criticisms of some Yalta decisions, saying it is hindsight, and, therefore, unjustified criticism. But is that the case? You on that side of the aisle are in the minority as far as foreign policy is concerned, because the administration now in charge of our foreign policy is Republican. If you get up before a conference and say you are against certain things in the President's program or position, and warn that they will fail or be injurious to our country, you will be accused of being negative or defeatists, or pessimists.

If during the conference you believe in good conscience that a certain course will be wrong or disastrous, and warn against it, you will be charged with rocking the boat or being an obstructionist.

Then after it is over and the course you warned against has proved wrong, if you point that out or say "I told you so", you are criticized just as vigorously for talking with hindsight, or with being partisan and saying it for political purposes. Sometimes I wonder just when is one who disagrees supposed to warn?

So the minority should express its dissents and criticize policies it believes are wrong—before, during, and after—but national unity requires that when a decision has been taken by the proper authorities, we must go along with it, hoping it will prove right and seeking to make it succeed. That is the way to work in the country's interest.

I appreciate the gentleman's generosity with his time.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman agree that Dixon-Yates was a case where the minority was right and the President was wrong?

Mr. JUDD. No, I do not agree with that. The contract was canceled because the situation changed. If you had got the people out in Memphis to go ahead and build their own plant in the first place, there never would have been a Dixon-Yates contract. I am glad you got Memphis to do the right thing, which enabled elimination of the contract you were objecting to. I am happy now that everybody is happy.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think the gentleman from Illinois pointed out well that the situations are different.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. ASHLEY was permitted to proceed for another 10 minutes.)

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the global shift of Communist policy with its tactics to muffle the drums of war, and rely on nonmilitary and political, economic, and propaganda measures, to win the struggle of competition coexistence with the forces of freedom, requires a reexamination of foreign policy.

Since my advent into the Congress it appears that the world has moved into a period of intensified nonmilitary competition between the Communist and the free-world nations.

From the floor of this House on March 16, 1955, I made the well-supported and generally accepted observation that total victory was a myth—in fact, Einstein and other world famous scientists have gone so far as to say that "a war with H-bombs might possibly put an end to the human race." We are in an era in which exists a tournament or a battle for men's minds. The decisiveness of the victories of the free nations over people's minds was delineated and demonstrated at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia a couple of months ago. The courage and conviction of the people challenging the Communist claims of being apostles of peace and anticolonialism seem to have dampened the enthusiasm and ambition of Red China in their attempt to corral the uncommitted peoples of the Orient into their camp.

The sudden agreement of the Soviet Union to an Austrian treaty which came in the wake of their drive to forestall West German membership in NATO has proved that Soviet policy has shifted. The amazing buildup of anti-Communist military power achieved through United States leadership seems finally to have persuaded the tacticians of aggressive marxism that their bellicosity was heading them into a military showdown.

Perhaps they realize that the disastrous consequences of a global war fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs would result in total destruction of civilization. Perhaps they realize that neither side could win such a war in the traditional meaning of the word "win." It could so happen that one side would be totally exterminated and that the other side would be only partially exterminated. But could anyone call such a situation a victory? And even if some might call such a situation a victory, we must remember that perhaps no one would be left to celebrate it.

It must be further remembered that war cannot make peace. War has been tersely and adequately described as man's inhumanity to man. War can only destroy, and the extent of the possible destruction in another global war is beyond comprehension. We know that bombs exist today which are 2,500 times as powerful as the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima.

In the light of these developments, one of the most significant, and at the same time, most dangerous problems which confronts the Geneva Conference is the subject of disarmament. It is necessary that the Congress, the administration, and the American people understand the subject and its significance. For disarmament has a special appeal to the peoples of a democratic, peace-loving Nation such as ours, and we must be wary, even while we seek this goal which in the light of today's history appears so necessary. But let us seek for this goal pointed out by Pope Benedict XV in August 1917 when he said that "the first and fundamental point should be that the moral force of right should replace the material force of arms" in his discussion of disarmament. If only we could by some means know that the Russians would accept the moral force of right in the place of the material force of arms then we could safely proceed with the subject of disarmament.

At the present time the East and the West are locked in a desperate struggle which may continue for years, if not generations. We have temporarily achieved what we might call a stalemate or a balance of power. The nuclear arsenal of the United States, coupled with the American Air Force, still the greatest in the world, are the major weapons of the West. The Soviet bloc, on the other hand, leads in conventional land armaments. Each is trying to overtake the other's power supremacy.

The West is attempting, through the rearmament of Germany, the strengthening of NATO and our allies in the Pacific, to achieve equality in conventional land armaments with the Soviet Union and its allies. As yet we are far from that goal. The Russian bloc is trying to neutralize our nuclear supremacy. Russia's new aircraft developments, her progress in thermonuclear weapons, and her large submarine fleet—with potential nuclear deliverability capability—all are steps in that direction. We cannot know, but I fear that she may be perilously near the goal of equalization.

Of course the West will not use its advantage, and the Soviet bloc do not dare to use theirs. But should they destroy our nuclear lead, and continue to lead in conventional land armaments, they might well yield to temptation. This possibility cannot be tolerated. Therefore we must make certain that in the absence of a real and effective disarmament procedure, we shall not be dissuaded from the advocacy of German rearmament. We must continue our nuclear developments, and we must take all other necessary steps to maintain the superiority which at the moment is ours. Disarmament, therefore, must be cautiously but seriously considered.

Universal disarmament is the paramount need of this day and age. The mutual fears of the world are such that there cannot possibly be real peace until there has been universal disarmament, right down to the level of lightly armed and strictly limited forces for internal order only, with continuous and effective international inspection and control.

We will have to discard a great deal of our outworn political ideas and prejudices before we will be willing to do those things that are essential to complete an enforceable world disarmament, even if Russia and the other major powers were willing. There are many difficulties. Many would object to what could be called the sacrificing of our sovereignty to the extent of permitting international inspection teams to examine our military establishments as we would want to examine Russia's. The national interest must be reevaluated in the light of modern warfare. Even more important is the role of the United States as the leader of the Western civilization in setting the moral tone.

There are some who say that the very idea of universal disarmament under international inspection and control, desirable as it might be, is so utopian and so impossible of realization as not to be worthy of serious discussion. All that can be said to such persons is: "What is the alternative?"

No disarmament plan can be accepted unless we can be certain that it will do the job. What sort of disarmament plan can furnish such a guarantee? How can we know that the Communists will accept the moral force of right?

I am not prepared, nor do I feel capable of, advancing a proposal which will solve this occult problem which has confronted us for the past 10 years. However, we can at least detect and point out the shortcomings of some of the approaches that have been advocated in the past.

The first step would probably have to be an agreement on the extent of inspection of atomic production and weapons. Then the question raises itself as to whether or not any system of inspection can be a really dependable safeguard, for we know that a quantity of plutonium enough to fill a cigarbox would suffice to produce weapons which could give indisputable world domination to any great power which had the only developed supply of it.

From 1946 until very recently, the United States was committed to the so-called Baruch plan, or some modification thereof. The Baruch plan, while quite complicated, really consisted of two principal elements: the establishment of a system of effective international inspection and control of atomic materials and capabilities, and, once that has been effected, the gradual reduction of atomic weapons. The Russians have countered, also until very recently, with an upside-down version of the Baruch plan. First they say we should limit, reduce, and destroy all of our atomic weapons. And after that was done we should then seek a system of inspection and control. The U. S. S. R. has been saying, "Ban the bomb; trust us Russians." Obviously, this approach was never seriously considered by the West, and the resulting impasse has delayed our attempts to foster a disarmament plan. Now it appears that both sides have yielded to a certain extent. We have come to realize that an effective system of international inspection and control is, frankly, a most difficult if not impossible task. Russia has come to realize that it is folly to speak to us of the destruction of atomic arsenals, unless some assurance is given that such a course of action would not be unilateral on our part. They know that we will never accept their verbal guarantees, and so they have indicated a willingness to seek a middle ground.

What sort of disarmament plan might do the job? Again I cannot offer a detailed blueprint. But I can assert that certain essential elements must be included within any such plan. First of all, a disarmament system to be effective must be realistic. It must deal with the international situation as it actually exists. It must recognize that the Soviet Union will cooperate and fulfill its pledges only as it is convinced that this is to her best interests. Since it is impossible to do away completely with nuclear information, it will be impossible to effectively abolish nuclear weapons. Therefore a disarmament plan, while it may well include an abolition of the use of such weapons, certainly cannot include the abolition of the weapons themselves. Secondly, any disarmament plan must be enforceable, which means there must be an enforcing agency. Since the plan would have to be worldwide, the enforcing agency can only be the United Nations. But the United Nations today is not capable of policing such a plan. Therefore disarmament must necessarily include a strengthening of the United Nations organization. Because the U. N. needs strengthening, disarmament cannot be achieved immediately. Our people will have to expect that even if negotiations go well, the search for disarmament will cover many years. Patience certainly will be needed.

I would like to emphasize my belief that we must not be unyielding; we must be prepared to accept and understand the fears which motivate all nations. We must realize that international relations involve give and take by all participants. We certainly are not prepared to yield on every point, but at the same time we cannot expect the Soviet Union to yield on every point. I am convinced that an effective plan can eventually be produced, provided we have the will and the desire, and provided that the Russians are willing to substitute the moral force of right for the material force of arms, and provided as well that we understand the complexities of the problem and the necessity for patience and a willingness to negotiate.

It seems to me that the collective cognitive faculties of the brains of 20th century statesmen can conjure up, hit upon a plan for the elimination of armaments. I do not believe and will not believe that the scientists have a monopoly on that rare item.

THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Big Four Conference at Geneva will not begin for nearly a week, but already speculations about it have reached a crescendo. The fact that these meetings are of paramount importance is recognized everywhere, and the discussions that have been held here this afternoon are ample evidence to support that point.

Until today there has been very little mention of one of the elements that I think should have been mentioned and certainly has been this afternoon. I am referring, of course, to the bipartisanship of the highest order that has been demonstrated in this Congress. I think it was fitting that the first mention of bipartisanship was made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays], for I know of no one in the Congress that enjoys greater bipartisan esteem and affection than he. I am sure that my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], who have followed this discussion this afternoon so closely, will certainly agree with that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am happy to confirm that impression. May I say for the record that back in the 78th and 79th Congresses, when the gentleman from Arkansas and I were freshmen here in the same role as some of the gentlemen now occupy who have been giving such excellent statements this afternoon, we wrestled for at least 4 years trying to get consideration of a resolution that we drafted, the two of us, to establish bipartisanship in foreign policy. We were not able to obtain a hearing when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was a member of his party, nor were we able to when the chairman was a member of my party. But we still are wrestling with the same problem and still are, to the best of our ability, trying to get agreement on policies that are right and therefore will command the respect of the overwhelming majority of our people both in and out of the Congress, and we believe the respect of the people around the world.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota would not agree with me that much good was accomplished—I think that was implied in his statement—aside from the fact that this effort of ours never was recognized formally by action of the Congress. Still, in adding to the atmosphere of good will and providing some direction in our political councils we did get results. The gentleman shares my feeling that those efforts were worthwhile.

Mr. JUDD. I certainly do. I think few if any of the things I have been able to do in the 13 years I have been here have given me as much personal satisfaction and perhaps have had as much benefit, outside if not in the Halls of Congress, as the efforts the gentleman from Arkansas and I made. We even made one trip throughout the country trying to develop public opinion on this issue.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and his other colleagues for this partisan plan this afternoon to organize and state bipartisan support for a President of the opposite party. I think the notice we all received was an interesting document and I hope it is to be inserted in the proceedings that have gone on here today because it was a splendid statement of the support, although all of the signers were of one party. I think this is an almost unique celebration that we are having here today. While I have not been able to hear every word of all of the speeches and have not agreed with every word of all of the speeches, yet certainly the messages which we hope will go from here to the summit are in a splendid spirit typical of our great country and typical of a fine bipartisan approach.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure I speak for all the gentleman who have spoken this afternoon in thanking the gentleman from Ohio for those thoughts.

This is, of course, a phenomenon that all Americans can consider themselves fortunate to witness: true bipartisanship before a series of meetings that may prove to be crucial. But I suggest that this is far more than simply a matter for self-congratulation, that this is a state of affairs that demands preservation. We should cherish bipartisanship, cherish it and warm it and help it grow. It is to the end of preserving this high level that I raise this question: Are these bipartisan approaches to continue? Are we facing a new future that asks for new approaches to bipartisanship in foreign policy?

CHANGE IN THE INTERNATIONAL ATMOSPHERE

As to the latter point, I think it must be demonstrably true that we are entering a new era at Geneva. Already, we have had whiffs of new Soviet air. It was no surprise to hear the President state:

> We are going there honestly to present our case in a conciliatory, in a friendly attitude.

But how amazing it was to hear almost the echo of these words from none other than Krushchev:

> If you talk to us honestly and sincerely, as equal to equal, something will come of it.

Now what of these words from the once snarling bear? They link up with recent Soviet actions to cast the Communist world in a new role. As the New York Times commented on Sunday:

> On both sides there were indications that a change in the international atmosphere had been taken for granted.

I do not think we should be too hasty to assume that the lilacs are in bloom in Siberia and amity is everywhere. Let us not expect too much—but let us take account of the new atmosphere as it will affect our own actions. For even if the Soviet intentions are no different now than they were last year, or in 1950, or in 1948, let us recognize that the sounds of Soviet sweetness may be at least as threatening as the clank of Red armor. It portends an era of verbal war that may be fought primarily on psychological grounds.

MEETING THE NEW CHALLENGE

And if in this new era we are to fight psychologically, it should certainly follow that we need a psychology of the new warfare, one that takes account of the very real dangers inherent in psychological, economic, and political battles on the internationaly scene. That we can win new peoples to the free world—whether the cold war should continue as it has been in the past or take on this new aspect—may be beyond question. But I am concerned that the psychological, economic, and political battles of tomorrow may divide us more than the threats of yesterday. I am concerned, then, with bipartisanship, and with preserving it in foreign affairs. We can hardly fight a psychological war internationally if we are at each other's throats at home. Yet as surely as I stand here, there is far more danger of political division in this new era of the cold war than there ever has been before. I am, of course, not the first to point out that war, or even the threat of war, unites a nation. Party ties are forgotten when the battlefront is in flames, but in an era of psychological warfare—and particularly if we do not recognize that we are in a psychological war—the shifting ground of a Soviet offensive may send us off balance and divide us.

What can we do to fight this new war effectively and present a united front? What steps can we take to insure that the most intelligent and experienced men in both parties work effectively in this new atmosphere?

It is my opinion that the new Soviet peace offensive, with all its implications of winning new converts to communism under a cloak of good will, cannot be satisfactorily countered with only the diplomatic weapons used during the earliest phases of the cold war. The international new look asks for a formal bipartisanship, a bipartisanship that will command the attention of both parties and utilize both parties.

For beyond the boundaries of the United States, our policies should be neither Democratic nor Republican, but American.

FOREIGN POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

I have suggested the creation of a Foreign Policy Advisory Council to the President for two compelling reasons. The first: A bipartisan council would make available to the President the best advice of those who have dealt with Soviet actions from the beginning of the cold war. The second reason may be considered as only symbolic, but I think it nonetheless important: A bipartisan council to advise on foreign policy matters would serve as a symbol of unity not only abroad, but most important, at home.

The council I have proposed might be made up of distinguished individuals from the very highest levels, those who have in the past served with distinction in the Congress and in the executive branches.

I know this idea is not new and I know that others have suggested similar councils. Perhaps this is the first one that specifies that the membership be drawn from people with experience in our international policies.

Can it be argued that those who have years of experience in dealing with the Soviet Union would be of no value in meeting this new challenge? The wise counsel of those who have learned through experience to understand the vagaries of the Communist world can hardly be denied.

One of the most important considerations in government at every level is continuity of experience. In the ordinary operation of the Federal establishment there is a real need at all times for the counsel and competence of those who know the mechanics of government at firsthand. How much more extraordinary is the demand for the participation of those who have devoted their energies and intellects to international matters. Many of them are career servants in government in the best sense, sensitive to the needs of diplomatic approaches to crucial problems.

Not only would a Foreign Policy Advisory Council assure us of a continuing veteran approach to matters of international import, it would serve as a strong deterrent to the unfortunate recriminations that sometimes follow meetings at the summit.

Twenty-twenty hindsight is no help, yet there is a great deal of it. If we can help insure bipartisanship in foreign policy through this means, that simple fact will help to unite our major political parties in the field where unity is a positive necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest this Advisory Council not lightly, and if the Democrats are successful next year in assuming the Presidency, as of course I hope the Democratic Party will be, I will suggest then also, that the best people of this administration be brought into the counsels of the new administration.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on suggesting such a Foreign Affairs Advisory Council, and would like to point out that in the last session of Congress I introduced a bill, H. R. 6900, which would set up a Foreign Affairs Advisory Board. My idea in proposing such a board was to insure continuity of our foreign policy, and also to bring to bear nonpartisanship in the conduct of our foreign policy. I feel that your proposal and mine have great similarity, and I hope that in the not too distant future some action will be taken to guarantee that our foreign policy will be nonpartisan and that it will be continuing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman very much.

I was very much interested in his description of nonpartisan. I think it was the late Senator Vandenberg who first used that expression.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON].

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker I wish to compliment the gentlemen on the very fine presentation he has made. Like many others here, I would like to associate myself with those remarks. I should like on my own account to say a few words in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in praying that the imminent conference at the summit which will be participated in by the Big Four may serve to encourage the recent seeming trend toward a reduction in the cold-war tensions. Our goal is peace. To achieve it, we shall and we must strive with all the strength and energy which we in the past have used to build America to make it great.

The historic worldwide disregard for the Biblical commandment, Thou Shalt Not Kill, has brought us now to the point where if once again we take up the arms of war, we shall surely kill ourselves. And yet our President must go to Geneva fortified and backed by strength. There can be no relaxation of our preparedness. It has undoubtedly been our relentless struggle to maintain a sound military posture which has finally brought this first glimmer of hope in the cold war. To relent now, would be to make those years of sacrifice count for naught. Make no mistake, the cold war has been costly, and we have sacrificed much in the waging of it. Our schools and children have suffered as a result. Economic and technical asistance here at home and abroad have taken second place to military preparedness.

The proof of this is the new Soviet approach. They have failed to frighten us by bluster and calculated military gambits. They were stopped in Korea because President Truman had the courage and foresight to see that failure to respond to the invasion of South Korea would mean the eventual fall of one friendly nation after another into the Soviet orbit. He saw also that it would spell the end of the United Nations. We won a round on points, but the struggle is far from over. This is one of those old-time, no-holds-barred affairs and we are now entering another round.

Among the mail which I received yesterday were appeals from natives of two captive countries now dominated by Russia. The Committee for Hungarian Liberation wrote calling attention to a provision of the Hungarian Treaty of Paris which provides for the withdrawal of the Russians from Hungary within 90 days after the evacuation of Soviet troops from Austria. Here it would seem exists a sterling opportunity for Russia to give evidence of its sincerity at the

Geneva Conference in the light of the recent Austrian Treaty. I also received a copy of the plea for Polish freedom which was sent to the President.

The liberation of enslaved peoples must continue to be a basic objective of American policy.

In yesterday's mail, we received the next to last report to Congress of the operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. This report emphasized the new sphere of attention in the cold war and reverts to the course which was staked out by General Marshall and President Truman. In this report, we read of the recent developments in Soviet-bloc foreign economic activities, especially in underdeveloped countries. The report graphically describes the Soviet attempts at economic penetration so we see that where the way to military expansion is barred, Communist Russia switches to conquests through economics. The goal is the same. The targets are the same—conquest and enslavement of the world, starting with the most susceptible areas.

The Marshall and Truman plans outlined our defense in this field. We have recently approved a new foreign-aid program. As I said when the bill was before us, its primary emphasis was on defense support, and I felt that the development assistance and economic and technical aid portions were not large enough. These should be increased and our efforts directed toward the new arena in which the world struggle is now patently being waged. Please do not misunderstand. I do not mean that we can in any way reduce our military preparedness. The Russians will maneuver to strike in whichever field they think there is the most chance of success. They are shifting to the economic field now and we must move with them. In fact, I urge that we move ahead of them and beat them at their own game.

The underdeveloped areas of the world are ripe for subversion and subtle economic pressure. Japan needs markets for her goods. Britain, France, and Germany likewise. As do Israel and Egypt. The Arab States, Asian countries, and the South American Republics need to import and export many goods. The smaller countries need aid in building up their lands. They need technical advisors on modern methods of farming and construction. They need schools, books, and most of the commodities which we have come to regard as necessities. To them these commodities are luxuries, enjoyed only by the very rich. Unless we help them to help themselves, we will lose this next round, and if we do, the loss is just as efficacious as if an army of Soviet troops had marched into these underdeveloped areas of the world.

We may view this in a sense of enlightened self-interest for if these depressed and possibly envious countries cannot support an adequate standard of living, they will be unable to buy the goods we produce and which we must sell for our own well-being. This country is not self-sufficient. We must import many essential supplies. We must export much to sustain our industry and continue a high level of employment. In short, we need friendly free nations throughout the world with which we can trade. If we fail to help these countries now, the Russians will see to it that they drop into the Communist field of influence and become lost to us as friends and economic partners forever.

At Geneva we must be prepared to deal with the Soviets in language they understand. We must be strong militarily and we must be strong economically. We can expect a concerted effort by the Communists to expand their program of conquest by economic subversion. I believe that that will be the base strategy of their participation in the conference at the summit.

We can win this phase of the cold war in a walk if we try. We are world champions in the economic field. We have the know-how, the ability, and the wherewithal, which the Russians cannot acquire in a hundred years regardless of what the Pravda propaganda machine might say. The important thing is that we must understand what the Russians are trying to do. We must at all times keep our attention fixed upon their motivation notwithstanding sweet talk, lessening of tension, or even a few good deeds. We must be willing to be fair, but not fooled. We must be kindly, but not kidded. We are justified in having faith in ourselves, albeit our trust must repose with the Almighty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. I find a great deal which I am in complete agreement with in his statement.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon has served a useful purpose. We are fighting at this moment for the preservation of our civilization. My memory this afternoon, while I was listening to the discussion here, went back to an evening in the Tropics in my boyhood. The tropical sun was going down in a brilliant glow of beauty, and then suddenly there was the blackness of night. My father said to me: "Barratt, that is the way our civilization will go. That is the way of life. That is the working of the cycle. As seasons and men and nations follow in cycles so do civilizations. Our civilization will go as all others have gone. And then man again will work his tedious long climb from the cave back to another civilization."

I was astounded that such words could come from my father and I said, "Father, this is different. We have books, we have education, we have understanding, we have culture, we have gentleness, we are different." He said, "Yes, Barratt, in many civilizations that have preceded ours they had all those things. Then something happened and another civilization was wiped out."

As the years have gone on that which came to me in my boyhood as a shock I have accepted in the meaning of the one infallible guide of recorded history that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. When man in his vanity over his accomplishments overreaches himself for power and advantage another civilization falls.

Mr. Speaker, at this period we live in a civilization the highest of which we have any record. It may be that we live in the sunset period of that civilization, which as the tropical sun in its setting surrounds the skies with glorious beauty and then the fall of the blackness of the night. Here is the challenge that my colleagues here today are accepting, the challenge that this generation shall not fail where all other generations have failed and that this civilization shall not go the way of all others.

It is now within the power of man to destroy himself. If ever there was occasion for avoidance of passions and search for understanding in honor it exists now.

In our Committee on Banking and Currency within the last few days I was surprised to learn, for I had not known it before, that the Department of Defense of our own country is spending a billion dollars each and every year in research, in research to find greater instrumentalities of destruction. We were informed, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] made inquiry of the witness on the stand, that the expectation was that this will continue for a period of years, without any end that the witness could anticipate—a billion dollars a year being spent in research alone to find deadlier instruments of destruction. If we are doing that and, of course, Russia is doing the same, we have a cold war which amounts to the deadliest race of armaments that the world has ever known. As I read my history, I can find no race of armaments that ultimately did not end in war. We go back to the days of the Roman Senate when they were crying for the destruction of Carthage, saying that the two systems of government could not live side by side, and it ended in a war of annihilation.

I go back to my own young manhood when Germany and England and France were in wars of armaments, and here in the United States we wondered why they could be spending all of their resources in building up arms and not know that that kind of a race could only end in destruction and disaster. And we wondered here in the United States. At that time I was a young man publishing a magazine, and I remember putting an article into this magazine depicting the amount of money that France and England and Germany were putting into this race of armaments in contrast with what we were doing with our money in building up the institutions of happiness and contentment and service.

Well, it has got to end; that is, it has got to end either as men and women are on their knees in every American home praying it will end in peace, in a permanent peace, or it has got to end the other way.

There is hope in this conference; there is hope; it is a hope that better may be realized because our President cannot fail to go to the Conference heartened and strengthened by what my colleagues on this floor this afternoon have said. He goes there to accept the challenge, to serve not only his own country but all the world by making it possible for a peace of understanding. And, as someone said here this afternoon, it might be that something he would do might seem at the moment to be politically unpopular, but he must elect to take that chance, and if he does the right thing, even though temporarily unpopular, it will be accepted.

Oh, I think, my colleagues, you have rendered a great service to our country this afternoon. As I have listened with rapt attention your talks seemed all so constructive, so well prepared. You examined into all of the crevices of this problem, and you presented your conclusions.

I should not have talked so long, because there is nothing that I can contribute except just my word of deep appreciation of the services you have rendered, and tonight I know and tomorrow night, because the newspapers will report what you have done this afternoon, and for all the nights between now and the convening of this Conference and during the period of its deliberation, in every American home, men, women, and children will be praying to the God of creation to guide the President of the United States and his fellow conferees at Geneva to the path of peace.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know all of my colleagues join me when I say we are thankful when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] brings his warmth of personality, his love of humanity, and his depth of understanding to this House.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Geneva Conference on July 18, I hope and pray that the President of the United States as Chief of State will use his important position to establish a future conference agenda which may result in a conscientious program of world disarmament and a reestablishment of the independent governments not only of Germany but of the other central European countries now behind the Iron Curtain.

It is my sincere hope that the conference at the summit will not be chilled by the rarefied atmosphere, but that on the other hand it may develop into a warm climate for free and open discussion of world problems which certainly transcends any provincial problems.

For the success of this summit conference, it is essential that all parties conscientiously participate in an exploratory effort to find areas of agreement rather than to use the conference as a "sounding board" for the purpose of influencing opinion at home or abroad. It cannot be reasonably expected that the conference will bring about a panacea or that it will bring about a prompt restoration of order. The maximum hope is that it will establish an agenda for future discussions.

It is indeed regrettable that the price for a conference at the summit is a bypassing of the United Nations organization although it cannot be disregarded that the progressive work of the United Nations was undoubtedly the basis for the Geneva Conference. The United Nations organization must be expected to carry on its contemplated functions in providing the media for international discussions.

This Conference in its first or in its continued sessions must of necessity assign to the United Nations the responsibility of reforming liquidated boundaries and institutions. In this way, it is possible for the world to be reconstructed for a permanent peaceful stability. This conference must put into motion the machinery which can guarantee the future of Germany and the central European countries as independent entities. The success of this conference will depend entirely upon the ability of the participating members to confine their discussions to the possibility of perspective action rather than grub about in the pitfalls, the disunity, the disharmony, the frustrations of silent, moody, international bitterness.

In this mission to Geneva, it is unlikely for us to expect any documented or recorded free or unrestrained conversation between the participating parties. The lessons of Yalta are still fresh. There can be no secrets at the summit for long.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I should like to take this moment to congratulate my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on his contribution and to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] for his beautiful words, and all of the others who have taken part, and particularly to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], from the other side of the aisle, for their kind acceptance of this small effort and for their gracious words.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], I submit the letter of yesterday inviting participation in this afternoon's debate:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1955.

Dear Colleague: Special orders have been obtained for Tuesday afternoon, July 12, in order to explore some aspects of our foreign policy involved in the forthcoming Geneva Conference on July 18. We believe that the President's participation in the Conference is not a sign of weakness or appeasement, but a constructive opportunity to move away from the possibility of an atomic war which would destroy civilization.

It is hoped that such a discussion will strengthen the President's hand at Geneva by developing the support of the American people and their understanding of the issues involved in the meeting at the summit. This is vitally necessary, whether the Conference be a success or a failure.

The discussion respects the primary constitutional responsibility of the President in foreign policy, and will seek in no way to impose any restrictions on his activity. It can serve, however, to assure him that there are lines of action open to him which we in Congress consider important and are prepared to support.

We believe that the Geneva Conference, far from being foredoomed to failure, can succeed if this country and the West will come to it prepared with proposals that will lead toward peace if Russia agrees to them, and will reinforce the moral position of the West if Russia disdains them.

We invite you to be present at Tuesday's discussion and to express your views.

James M. Quigley; Frank Thompson, Jr.; Harris B. McDowell, Jr.; Henry S. Reuss; Stewart Udall; Richard E. Lankford; Eugene J. McCarthy; Frank M. Clark; B. F. Sisk; Thomas Ludlow Ashley; Torbert H. Macdonald; Charles A. Boyle; James Roosevelt; George M. Rhodes; Sidney R. Yates; Victor L. Anfuso; Edith Green; Lee Metcalf; Charles A. Vanik; Lester Holtzman; Barratt O'Hara; Don Hayworth; Coya Knutson; H. A. Williams, Jr.; Richard Bolling; Wayne L. Hays; Irwin D. Davidson; Pat Jennings.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the President leaves for Geneva and the Big Four Conference. The importance of such a meeting cannot be overemphasized—not only because of the good that can come from it but also the adverse effects it might have on the free world. I join with the overwhelming majority of the people of our country in assuring President Eisenhower that the American people have full confidence in his ability to represent their desires at this meeting. Not since the end of World War II have the hopes and aspirations of our people been so encouraged that peaceful solutions may be found during the discussions at Geneva. Sitting down at the conference table with the emissaries of Communist Russia is in itself a challenge to the resourcefulness, the intelligence and the astuteness of our representatives. Experience in dealing with the Russians in the past should forearm our leaders as they go to this meeting. President Eisenhower will be able to use to advantage the knowledge gained from past experiences in dealing with representatives of Russia and the satellite countries.

There are many problems confronting the Conference. There is undoubtedly no easy solution to any of these problems. I am satisfied that the American people realize this is a fact and that in spite of their high hopes for success at the Conference, they nevertheless do not expect that a miracle will take place overnight.

One of the main problems we hope will be discussed is the question of an independent Germany in the free world. On the one hand Russia has proposed that Germany be neutralized, and on the other hand the nations of the West, along with the West Germans themselves, feel that Germany must take its place in any collective security arrangements as an independent nation.

Another point of discussion, if the feelings of Secretary of State Dulles have been accurately reported, is the question of Soviet domination of Eastern European satellites, a situation vigorously denied by the Soviet. They claim that there is no such problem and have already accused Dulles of trying to becloud the issues and thus weaken the effectiveness of the conference. Consequently, there is little possibility of this problem ever getting on the agenda. The success or failure of this meeting depends greatly on the ability of all involved to give a little, take a little, and make a supreme effort to secure peace in Europe and the free world. Their task is great but their goal is greater.

I am deeply concerned about the bypassing of the United Nations in the holding of this conference. If such action on the part of Russia has the ultimate objective of so weakening the powers of the United Nations, then there is great danger to all of the free nations. I cannot help but recall the fate of the League of Nations and realize in that instance that it was our own withholding of support to that organization which eventually caused its final collapse. There are still isolationists of the same ilk today in this country and there is no question in my mind that Russia would like nothing better than to see the United Nations destroyed. I sincerely trust that these forces, though having different objectives, may not use the continuance of the principle of direct negotiations by the big powers to circumvent the United Nations and thus to again precipitate a return to the secret treaties which plagued the world following the collapse of the League of Nations and which later proved to be of no force in maintaining peace in the world.

The smaller nations now members of the United Nations represent many millions of people who have the same aims and desires for peace as do those of the larger nations. They must have ample opportunity to exercise their rights of sovereignty as now provided within the framework of the United Nations. And so, it is the hope of the American people that no action will be taken at Geneva which will weaken or even tend to weaken the structure of the United Nations. Rather, it is to be hoped that understandings can be reached, not only to admit those nations which are not now members of this organization, but to so strengthen the very structure of the United Nations that it may be a greater force than ever before to bring about understanding and a legal method to achieve lasting peace throughout the world.

The American people have sacrificed much in terms of their wealth and peace of mind in order to strengthen the defenses of our own country and the other nations of the free world in the past decade. We have built defensive outposts throughout the world. We are maintaining armed forces in large areas of the world manned with American troops and American armament. We have every reason to believe that as we go to this conference we do so from a position of strength. From our experience in the past in dealing with the leaders of Russia we know that they are tough bargainers and that they cannot be bluffed into agreement. It is hoped that at this conference there will be a minimum of propaganda and a maximum of action. That following the conference the American people will be told in plain language where we stand. There is no answer to lack of information and no limit to the ability of our people to give their wholehearted and intelligent support to the leaders of their Government if they understand the problems which confront the country.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the constructive proposals which have been advanced here today by this group of Members. Without partisanship or recrimination, these distinguished colleagues have sought to point out areas of discussion which might prove fruitful in the forthcoming foreign policy sessions in Geneva.

Like all good Americans, we are deeply interested in the outcome of this meeting of the heads of state of East and West and its implications on the peace of the world. We want to strengthen the position of the President at this historic meeting in any way we can. That is the purpose of this discussion. We hope that the President will become informed on the specific suggestions made here today, grassroots expressions of the people's elected Representatives on the eve of this most important and far-reaching international meeting at the summit. No commentary on the pending international conference would be complete without some appraisal of the policies which have produced our present position of strength as a Nation. This, in my statement, I propose to do.

Thomas Wolfe, that great American novelist, is fond of comparing time to a river. Time flows from minute to year to decade, and in its flow is fed by a thousand different streams of thought and action. So, too, flows a nation's foreign policy, and in the 10 years since the war ours has been fed by a host of principles and positions, of policies and proposals. We have, as a Nation, predicated our actions upon the following set of general operational concepts:

First. Containment of Soviet expansionism.

Second. Counterpressure whenever faced with Communist pressure.

Third. Creation of a force adequate for such containment and counterpressure, as well as for any negotiation to relieve, by diplomatic means, threats of an expansionist type.

Fourth. Negotiation for the removal of such threats.

Fifth. Unification of Western Europe.

Sixth. Collective security.

Seventh. Establishment and strengthening of institutions of international cooperation.

Eighth. Control of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, and eventual disarmament.

Ninth. Reduction of cultural and trade barriers.

Tenth. Economic development of undderdeveloped countries.

Eleventh. Support of freedom and independence.

In Western Europe, acting under this rubric, the United States policy since the war has been fundamentally important in that area's recovery of political, economic, and military strength. The Marshall plan, under which the organization for European Cooperation and the European Payments Union continue to operate successfully, will live in the chronicle of man as one of the most notable achievements in the history of interstate relations. More than any other single factor, it was responsible for dissipating the power of indigenous Communist elements in the Western European area.

Fundamental also have been policies and programs directed toward European economic, political, and military unification. The Council of Europe, the Coal and Steel Community, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—central themes in American policy—have, with our sympathy and help, provided Western Europe with a degree of harmony and security few would have considered possible a short while ago.

West Germany, prostrate in defeat, has been defended with all the ingenuity, good will, and resourcefulness at the command of a victor state. Besides economic and political assistance of dimensions we are as yet unable to appreciate, the United States has promoted the establishment of a free and sovereign West German Republic, the defense of the free city of Berlin, and the inclusion of German forces in a European Army. Following the failure of the European Defense Community proposal of the French, we were instrumental in securing the restoration of sovereignty, and the incorporation of Germany in NATO.

The impending conference, Mr. Speaker, testifies to the success of these accomplishments.

In the Near and Middle East, United States policy since the war has enhanced peace and security. Soviet expansion was checked in Iran, where Russian troops were compelled to withdraw from Azerbaijan before the hard kernel of a "people's republic" could be created. Soviet threats to the Turkish Straits, as well as Communist aggression in Greece, were met by the Truman Doctrine, a decision which marked the firm intent of our country that Communist conquest would be resisted by cooperative efforts within the free world community.

In Latin America since the war, the United States has maintained and strengthened the good neighbor program of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1949, seeking to extend that concept, we joined out Latin American friends in the creation of the Organization of American States, a body under which internal progress and external good will are made a matter of collective concern.

In Asia, where the forces of our time meet in combat, long and terrible for the minds and lives of men, the United States since the war has played a highly important role in the defense of freedom and the promotion of peace and prosperity. India, Indonesia, and the Philippines know that we have been their full, however much their critical, ally in their quest for independence. Japan feels, beneath its resentments, the benefits of our efforts to reestablish a peaceful nation, and to establish a democratic one. Korea, a people oppressed by the very nature of their geographical position, have frequently known the stamp of a tyrant's boot, lives today half free because Americans, in their concern that freedom shall not perish from any portion of the earth, were willing to give their lives in searing battle.

In China, where a greater tragedy was chosen, unknowingly, in preference to a lesser, more immediate one, the United States tried desperately to throw itself into the breach and still defends today the remnants of its battered ally. In the whole of Asia, particularly that part known as Southeast Asia, American policy has sought to forge the bonds of good will, economic development, and collective defense which that region needs for its survival and growth. Particularly notable have been the technical assistance programs operated both under general foreign aid authorizations and the point 4 program.

These are some of the accomplishments of our postwar foreign policy on a regional basis. On the basis of broader relationship and objectives we have successfully executed a cluster of other programs and policies. Recognizing the psychological roots of the cold war, we have fashioned instruments of political propaganda—the Voice of America and related functions—for sustaining free men behind the Iron Curtain and reinforcing the ties between nations of the free world. We have shaped a large mutual defense assistance program, by which arms and economic aid flow to our allies for use in our collective defense efforts. Sensing the need for better cultural contacts we have sought to relax Soviet restrictions, while at the same time conducting, through the Fulbright program and the leader exchange program, a novel experiment of our own in international understanding.

Within the world at large, the United States has also striven since the war for the establishment and strengthening of institutions of international cooperation. We led in the formation, and now lead in the operation, of that great internations body, the United Nations. Our own brilliant former Secretary of State, who has played such a critical and sensitive role in the development of national power, gave to the United Nations one of its most important weapons in this divided world—the Acheson or "Uniting for Peace" resolution. It was the same Secretary Acheson who supervised, in the spring of 1951, the successful American move to secure United Nations condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor in the Korean war. Aggression was not to be met with arms alone, nor with talk, no matter how stern. Our Government, under the leadership of President Truman and Secretary Acheson, was determined that armed violence should be met with all of the measures at the disposal of free men, including expressions of collective conscience.

Within the United Nations the United States has also led in the development of especialized agencies for treating particular problems in the life of man.

Related to the U. N. are organizations in the economic field—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—which we hope will soon be incorporated into the Organization for Trade Cooperation; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and the International Monetary Fund. All of these agencies have received the strong and consistent support of the United States. All, in turn have contributed to the security of the free world, and to the position of national strength with which we enter the Geneva Conference.

Finally, the United States, while seeking to establish and maintain armed might adequate to deter aggression and to spur diplomatic discussion, has sought to devise ways of alleviating the tension and the burden of modern weapons development. While the decision of President Truman to produce the hydrogen bomb stands as an example of our determination to remain free, the Baruch plan is a landmark in man's efforts to control the forces which could bring his self-destruction. That the two should have developed within the same framework of thought and action is proof of the goal toward which all I have mentioned is directed—the goal of peace, for all the world; the goal of a better, fuller, freer life for all men.

This is neither a Democratic nor a Republican goal—it is a goal of all our people, of whatever party who in its pursuit work together for the common good. All the more important at the present time, therefore, is a proper appreciation of the contribution of one of our great parties—our own Democratic Party—to the present strength with which Republican leadership approaches the Geneva meeting. In my remarks I have attempted to touch on the salient features of postwar foreign policy as conceived and administered by the Democratic Party. Let me, in closing, offer a few of the important conclusions such a review suggests.

First, the present position of strength from which the United States will negotiate at Geneva results directly from the full array of Democratic foreign policy programs in the postwar period.

Second, that although the present administration has criticized certain of these programs and policies, it has continued most of them with little or no change.

Third, that whenever the present administration has sought to transform or innovate Democratic policy, it has met with serious obstacles, and been forced to return to the mainstream of Democratic policy. One need only recall campaign oratory on the liberation of the satellites to appreciate the extent to which the Republican administration has followed closely the pattern of its predecessor in accepting the realities of power in that area of the world. Psychological warfare, which was to be used as a major weapon in such a liberation, is now applied in the more moderate fashion of the pre-1952 era. Massive retaliation, which frightened our friends without frightening our enemies, has been partly discarded in favor of the original Democratic concept of containment and localized warfare. Agonizing reappraisal, a hollow phrase, without reappraisal and with a good deal of agony attached to its repelling tone, has been abandoned, we may trust. In its place is an older, more sensible policy—cooperation with one's allies, and sympathy with their problems.

Fourth and last, that recent successes in the foreign policy field have been the consummation of Democratic achievements—in-being. The termination of the Korean war was not a matter of the personal influence of the President, nor of American negotiators who signed the final agreement—it was the end result of a long series of steps begun as early as 1950, and it would have happened no matter which party had been in power in 1953.

The Southeast Asia Treaty, which is significant development in collective security, cannot be credited to the skill of a Republican Secretary of State. Rather, it was the product of policies initiated before 1953, by Secretary Acheson under the direction of President Truman. The Austrian Peace Treaty, was, as Mr. Dulles graciously admitted in telegrams from Vienna to Dean Acheson and George Marshall, the culmination of years of effort under a Democratic administration. The restoration of West German sovereignty, and admission of the West German Republic into NATO, stemmed from the policies and programs of the Democratic Party. Interesting, for example, is the fact that the first recommendation for German participation in NATO was made in September 1949, by Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

In the last analysis, the coming Big Four Conference itself is a result of policies and programs pursued since the war by Democratic administrations. The aim of our great party has been the creation of positions of strength on the basis of which diplomacy could seek its natural ends. We now have that strength. May the ends it now seeks to serve, and the diplomacy it supports and sustains, be equal to the transcendant task of achieving peace—with honor—in our time.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize briefly what seems to me to be one of the most dramatic and timely proposals which this Government could advance. I speak of the need for prompt and humanitarian implementation of the much-heralded atoms-for-peace program.

We remember the favorable reaction around the world, particularly in the underdeveloped areas, to President Eisenhower's dramatic speech on December 8, 1953, before the United Nations, in which he outlined the atoms-for-peace program. Here was a bold, new program of translating through an international agency the fantastic powers of the atom to the peaceful benefiting of all mankind. It challenged the imagination of hundreds of millions of people who live in fear of nuclear warfare and gave hope of a brighter day of a world at peace where the atom will serve and not destroy civilization.

The President held out hope for the use of atomic energy in the fields of agriculture, medicine, and in the production of electrical energy for the power-starved, unindustrialized countries where ignorance, poverty, and disease flourish, and where the false promises of communism have the greatest appeal.

The forthcoming summit conference provides a timely and ready-made forum for this Nation to assume the world leadership in sharing the benefits of peaceful application of atomic energy for the good of humanity. Just 3 weeks following the opening of the summit meeting in Geneva, the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy will convene in that same city of Geneva, Switzerland. We can set the stage for this historic atomic-energy conference by positive action to implement our atoms-for-peace program at the summit conference.

That this action would be tactically sound can be seen from the fact that Soviets have continuously been on the defensive, insofar as the international peacetime uses of atomic energy are concerned, since the President's December 1953 U. N. speech. Their position was one of confusion and uncertainty in the U. N. Political and Security Committee and the General Assembly meetings last November and December, when the atoms-for-peace plan was debated and approved.

It is significant that just 10 years ago this week the first atomic explosion in the history of the world took place on the New Mexico desert. Events have moved swiftly in the past decade. New and even more horrible weapons of destruction have been developed and stockpiled. Terms like "fallout," "radioactivity," "H-bomb," "thermonuclear," have become household scare words. Soviet Russia was only a few years back in obtaining the secrets of the atom and has also stockpiled the weapons of nuclear disaster.

These are the harsh facts of life which have set the stage for the atoms for peace program.

Recently the administration has placed much emphasis on the need for an atomic-powered merchant ship to dramatize the peacetime potential of atomic energy to the peoples of the world. This proposal has been questioned by many Members of Congress, not because of the feasibility of the project, but rather because it is not symbolic of the type of atomic energy which is necessary to meet the real needs of the peoples of the world. What the world needs today is electric power, cheap power which can be produced by atomic reactors.

Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a speech last month made this pertinent observation:

> Today in many parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere the lack of power is holding back economic and social developments. As one high placed observer recently said of Europe, "Next to peace, electric power is the primary interest of many governments. Unless something is done about it, the lights will grow dim over much of Europe."

Mr. Dean went on to point out that "the United States has many times in the past 2 years promised assistance in this field but we are not delivering on our promises." He stated:

> Our Government is still not quite willing to give the information necessary to friendly foreign countries to build modern power reactors, and we are not yet even willing to permit an American industrial concern to sell a power reactor to a foreign country—at least to countries which don't have them. This is not the fault of Congress, for Congress last year amended the Atomic Power Act and set up simple procedures to accomplish the result. What then is holding us back? I very much fear that we are still operating on the theory that someday the Russians will be able to build a reactor, make plutonium, and fabricate a bomb.

Mr. Speaker, this head-in-the-sand attitude of the present Atomic Energy Commission in failing to face up to the fact that Russia does have advanced technical atomic know-how is hindering our country in the vigorous implementation of the "atoms for peace" program which can be of such tremendous advantage to us in this new stage of the cold war.

As Mr. Dean had commented:

> We are today building in this country two reactors optimized so as to produce power * * * But both bear the secret label. The design of neither is available to other countries nor for that matter to American industry except under security conditions. Today, foreign countries may have, as for years they have had, all the information they wish on the uses of radioactive isotopes. They may have the design of a research reactor and the unclassified literature and know-how necessary to build and operate a research reactor. But let's face it—what they want is atomic power, and American industry would like to supply the reactors to produce it.
>
> We are simply not implementing the President's "atoms for peace" proposal. I submit that if we do not soon change our policy and take the secrecy wraps completely off these power reactors, our pretention that we are spreading blessings will have a very hollow ring.

What this boils down to is summed up in this one sentence in Mr. Dean's speech:

> The most significant and most dramatic item which America has to sell to the underdeveloped areas of the world is its latest knowledge on power reactors.

Mr. Speaker, the secrecy phobia of the Atomic Energy Commission with regard to commercial power reactors is inconsistent with "atoms for peace" program and, indeed, seriously jeopardizes its success.

An article in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald dramatically emphasizes this shortsighted attitude of the Atomic Energy Commission. According to the Associated Press story, a Japanese scientist saw and described fantastic atomic research equipment far advanced over any similar device now in our possession. The scientist also reported seeing "the world's first atomic-energy electric generation plant, located southwest of Moscow," utilizing steam to produce 5,000 kilowatts of electric power.

There is every indication that the President realizes the tremendous potential of the atoms for peace program. Just last month in a commencement address at Pennsylvania State University, he outlined steps to make available to free nations research reactors and nuclear matter to operate them. He also alluded to a plan for making available to friendly nations, under certain security considerations, technical information dealing with the construction of power reactors. Agreements have been entered into with other countries to permit them to purchase nuclear research reactors from us. But for this program to be successful, we must reevaluate our emphasis on security as the prime consideration of action in this field.

Mr. Gordon Dean, the Nation's leading authority on this subject who can speak out publicly, describes the atomic-energy security problem in these terms:

> The notion that we can share atomic blessing with one and all and at the same time place the secrecy label upon them does violence to all concepts of security. Not security, but the appearance of security is all that will be achieved. This much is quite clear to me. But the point I really wish to leave with you is that in the field of peacetime uses there is no need and no room for secret labels.

This is the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission speaking.

Dean proposed the following plan to implement power reactor exchange that—

> The Atomic Energy Commission declassify with one bold stroke all power reactor technology, face up to the fact that the Russians long ago perfected the bomb, face up to the fact that without such action we will make enemies out of three-quarters of the Western World whose security systems don't match ours, face up to the fact that what we are talking about here is nothing more than a new source of heat for power and that the world wants what comes from cheap power.

It is in this way that America can again take world leadership in the atomic-energy field. As Mr. Dean has pointed out:

> American industrial concerns will be freed to compete in the world markets. They will be able to sell power reactors to mining countries in the far north, the high Andes, and the jungles of Africa. They will be able to install large central station powerplants in countries which now desperately need them. They will be able to supply the power to convert salt water to fresh, irrigate the deserts, and alter the entire face of the globe. They will be able to make good friends and good will for America.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of program which I believe is needed and the challenge of United States foreign policy as the time draws near for the summit conference. I respectfully suggest that the President and his State Department advisers seriously consider this dynamic and positive approach to free the atom and put it to use in the solution of economic deficiencies of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States share with the people on both sides of the Iron Curtain the hope that lasting peace will come to the world. We share with the people of all lands the desire to live in freedom and as neighbors to enjoy the blessings of a bountiful world at peace.

Thinking people everywhere know the dangers that would come with another world conflict. Some of our greatest scientists have expressed doubt that civilization could survive nuclear war.

Free men everywhere are concerned because in many parts of the world there is no freedom. We all abhor oppression, tyranny, and the lack of human decency and dignity that is prevalent in totalitarian nations. War is not the answer because war breeds more evils and more tyranny. If atomic war comes it means the imposition of totalitarianism in every land. It means the end of all of the freedoms which make life worth while.

Leaders of all nations rightfully fear that there is little chance of victory in such a conflict. They realize that we must learn to live together in peace or perish together.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the summit conference affords a great opportunity for the United States. If the Soviet Union cannot be influenced by our good intentions, our efforts will have an effective influence on the other nations of the free world and on many good people in Iron Curtain countries.

We can take hope and comfort, too, in knowing that the spark of human freedom never burns out. However low it may burn, it will again burst into a flame.

So, I say, the hope of the people of satellite nations to be free, depends much on the wisdom that we show in constructive efforts on our part. And the peace of the world and mankinds' survival also depends on the wisdom we show in meeting the challenge that confronts us.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Just one last word: In view of the general remarks and the specific suggestions the gentleman from New Jersey made, may I say I attended the bipartisan meeting at the White House this morning. At the end there was bipartisan agreement that the White House should make the sole summary of the meeting and discussion. Nevertheless, as the gentleman knows, that meeting was sort of a bipartisan advisory congressional council meeting, and I believe it will be helpful to the President and to our country in the proceedings at the summit and afterwards. I feel this afternoon's session here is a significant informal sequel to this morning's meeting.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I say to the gentleman that I know the President had the benefit of a great deal of wisdom in the bipartisan meeting this morning.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I add my voice to those voices that have spoken in approval of the speeches and statements that have been made here this afternoon. It seems to me that by action here today the House of Representatives has certainly strengthened the hand of the President in whatever he may be called upon to do or in the face of whatever difficult problems he may have to deal with in the Geneva conference.

As far as I can recall within recent history I know of no similar action by the Congress anticipatory of the President, any President's going to an international conference. The action taken here today and the words spoken here today, it seems to me, should leave the President as free and strong as it is possible for us, the House of Representatives, to leave him.

We have had an expression here of willingness to give honest and full support to whatever decisions he may make, or at least to restrain ourselves from irresponsible criticism. We have not had Members of the House taking the floor, each Member taking some possible position as to the decisions that may be made so that no matter what might come out of the conference there would be someone, possibly some one Democrat, who could say, "I was right." We Democrats could then rally around him, saying, "This Democrat was right, and of course the President is necessarily wrong." Rather, the statement has been one of intent to give support, an almost positive pledge of support to refrain from irresponsible criticism and to give our support to the program and recommendations if such program and recommendations are developed, as best we can.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman very much. I think all of us who are new here are honored to have a man of the experience and wisdom of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] join in the colloquy this afternoon.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I have no desire to prolong this already lengthy but very inspiring discussion, but I would like to take the opportunity to express my general agreement with most of everything that has been said here and to say that as a freshman Member of this House I have gotten more encouragement and more inspiration out of what has happened here than out of any other experience that has been mine since I arrived in Washington last January.

I think what we have witnessed here has been a proper part of the "I want to advise Ike" week. It is fitting and proper that the Members of this House should get into the spirit of the week, because you cannot pick up your daily paper or turn on your radio without noting that editors and columnists and commentators are extending advice to the President as to what he should or should not do when he finally arrives in Geneva. Of course, the editors, and the columnists have written and the commentators and, I suppose, the Congressmen, too, speak even though they are fully conscious that Mr. Eisenhower may be whisked off to Geneva without having the opportunity to be made aware of what has been written and what has been said let alone have the opportunity to fully digest and profit and benefit from the almost unlimited, although sometimes conflicting advice, which has been offered to him.

In my opinion, there has been both too much wishful thinking and much too much gloom about the Geneva Conference. People, I am afraid, have been expecting too much, and yet, on the other hand, many others tend to expect too little. We have been disappointed often at the results, or the lack of results, of previous international conferences, and, I suppose, that tends to explain in great part, the spirit of national gloom or lack of optimism as we approach Geneva. I hope and pray that Geneva is a success. But if success is not possible, it is most important that Geneva should prove not to be a failure.

One of the many bits of advice to Ike that has come to my attention appeared in the Nation magazine of July 9. In its lead editorial entitled "Geneva and the Ike We Like," it made some very interesting points, and I would, if I could, Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, ask unanimous consent to insert this lead editorial, together with the supplement attached thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEANE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENEVA AND THE IKE WE LIKE—FROM GUILDHALL TO GENEVA

In the wake of the United Nations commemorative sessions the refound "spirit of San Francisco" has given fresh impetus to popular hopes and aspirations for the success of the coming Big Four Conference in Geneva. Prior to the San Francisco meeting administration spokesmen had looked, acted, and spoken as though the crime of the year were to raise the slightest favorable expectation in relation to Geneva. But since San Francisco and the significant rejection by the Senate of Senator McCARTHY's proposal to scuttle the Geneva conference, the commentators have been deluging the President with unsolicited advice as to the attitudes he should or should not adopt when he sets off to meet the other three "at the summit."

Since nearly every organ of opinion has been heard, the feeling prevailed around the Nation office that we, too, might tender some unsolicited advice. No conference of the postwar period is of greater moment, we suspect, than the one that will take place in Geneva. The time for negotiation has clearly arrived; on this there is nearly universal agreement. Not even Senator KNOWLAND rejects this assumption. Never during the postwar period have general conditions been more favorable for the success of a conference at the summit. Some of the power vacuums have been filled; stalemates have been ended in situations that at earlier conferences could not be resolved; the right wing of the Republican Party has been brought to heel and significant changes have taken place in the relationships and attitudes of the principal governments.

What is important is not so much that the Geneva Conference should succeed as that it should not be permitted to fail; that it should lead, logically and naturally, to a series of conferences and negotiations which will produce agreements across which, as bridges, the peoples of the world can escape from the narrow islands of fear to broad plains of understanding and accommodation.

The attitude of President Eisenhower is likely to be one of the key factors which will determine what happens at Geneva. So it is to the President, not to Mr. Dulles, that we address ourselves. Low's delightful cartoon of Mr. Dulles' trainers urging him to show more flexibility as he steps on the tennis court to meet Mr. Molotov accurately reflects the general feeling that the American Secretary of State is determined to be unyielding despite a marked relaxation in the domestic political temper. For our part we would feel more confident of the outcome if Senator GEORGE, not Mr. Dulles, were to be the principal American negotiator.

But we do have confidence in the President's will to peace. We did not support the President in 1952; we are not likely to support him in 1956; and we have been consistently critical of his domestic program and, on many counts, of his administration's handling of foreign affairs. But on one point we are grateful to the President, namely, for his timely personal interventions in behalf of peace and for the general moderation which he has shown in every crisis of sufficient gravity to come to his direct attention. Although the full records are not available, it seems clear that it was the President's intervention which prevented an air strike by American carrier-based planes during the siege of Dien Bien Phu. It was at the President's personal direction that American carriers were ordered to withdraw from positions dangerously close to the China coast during last summer's flare-up, when a British passenger plane was shot down and American planes in turn shot down two Chinese MIGs. It was the President, again, who from his Denver summer headquarters, decided against more active intervention last September when the Formosa crisis began to acquire a new and critical urgency; and, more recently, in the excitement over Quemoy and Matsu, it was the President who within 9 days brought about a change of mood in Washington properly described by the BBC correspondent as one of the most remarkable of its kind in the turbulent postwar period.

On April 17 it looked as though active intervention in Formosa was very near; 9 days later the President was calmly chatting with reporters about a sixth sense which told him that there would be no war and expressing confidence that his old war companion, Marshal Zhukov, was devoted to good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Doubtless pressure of American public opinion had a great deal to do with this change of mood; but as consistent political critics of the President we must say that his conciliatory attitude—note an exception for the unfortunate statements which preceded the joint resolution on Formosa—was an important factor.

We have confidence, therefore, on the basis of his past performance that the President will carry to Geneva the general attitudes and outlook necessary to insure the success of the conference.

But there are other reasons for our belief in the President's will to peace. If there is one element that stands out impressively in Bela Kornitzer's drab-dull account of the brothers Eisenhower (the Great American Heritage), it is the importance of the River Brethren tradition in the Eisenhower family. This religious tradition was without doubt the most powerful single influence upon the President and his brothers in their formative years. According to Earl Eisenhower, the word "hate" was never mentioned in the family. "Of course," he says, "we were taught to hate evil. But you never hated people. You might get angry with them; you might think they were wrong; you might pity them; but you never hated them." It is this tradition, in conjunction with related personality traits, that doubtless accounts for the fact that the President has always been the least military of professional soldiers. It is this tradition which made his peace speech, delivered before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953, one of his few memorable utterances.

But it was in his Guildhall speech, delivered July 12, 1945, on the occasion of the presentation to him of the freedom of the city of London, that the President gave clearest expression not merely to his deeply felt will to peace but to the basic friendliness and goodwill which he exudes with a consistency that tends occasionally to be monotonous. Our advice to him, therefore, as he prepares for the Geneva Conference, is to reread his Guildhall speech, the greatest of his career. It is the spirit of this speech which we should like to see reflected at the Geneva Conference. Here is the Ike we like; his detestation of war and violence, his humility, his genuine sense of social democracy, his liking for people—all kinds of people—and his faith in the universality of human nature. The bonds between Abilene, Kans., and London, England, are closer and more natural than those between Abilene and Moscow—but these, too, exist. As the President said then, when two peoples face the tragedy of war to defend the same values, they become truly related—"sisters under the skin"—in the deepest sense, whether they like the idea or not and despite the fact that neither cares to acknowledge the relationship. * * * If he will act at Geneva in the spirit of Guildhall, he will succeed in drawing the farms and plains of the Soviet Union a little nearer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas. It is with this in mind that we herewith reprint the historic Guildhall speech.

Guildhall Address

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

(This speech was delivered by the then General Eisenhower almost exactly a decade ago—on July 12, 1945—upon the occasion of the presentation to him of the freedom of the city of London.)

Humility must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned by the blood of his followers and the sacrifices of his friends.

Conceivably a commander may have been professionally superior. He may have given everything of his heart and mind to meet the spiritual and physical needs of his comrades. He may have written a chapter that will glow forever in the pages of military history.

Still, even such a man—if he existed—would sadly face the fact that his honors cannot hide in his memories the crosses marking the resting places of the dead. They cannot soothe the anguish of the widow or the orphan.

A commander can receive satisfaction from the tributes of his friends only by humbly acknowledging that no matter how unworthy he may be, his position is the symbol of great human forces that have labored arduously and successfully for a righteous cause. Unless he feels this symbolism and the rightness of what he has tried to do, he is disregarding the courage, fortitude, and devotion of the vast multitudes he has been honored to command. If all allied men and women that have served with me in this war can only know that it is they whom this august assemblage is really honoring today, then indeed I will be content.

The feeling of humility cannot erase of course my great pride in being tendered the freedom of London. I am not a native of this land. I come from the very heart of America. In the superficial aspects by which we ordinarily recognize family relationships, the town where I was born and the one where I was reared are far separated from this great city. Abilene, Kans., and Denison, Tex., would together equal in size possibly one five-hundredth of great London.

By your standards those towns are young, without aged traditions that carry the roots of London back into the uncertainties of unrecorded history. To those people I am proud to belong.

But I find myself today 5,000 miles from that countryside, the honored guest of a city whose name stands for grandeur and size throughout the world. Hardly would it seem possible for the London council to have gone further afield to find a man to honor with its priceless gift of token citizenship.

Yet kinship among nations is not determined in such measurements as proximity of size and age. Rather we should turn to those inner things—call them what you will—those intangibles that are the real treasures free men possess.

To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before the law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit, subject only to provisions that he tresspass not upon similar rights of others—a Londoner will fight. So will a citizen of Abilene. When we consider these things, then the valley of the Thames draws closer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas.

To my mind it is clear that when two peoples will face the tragedy of war to defend the same spiritual values, the same treasured rights, then in the deepest sense those two are truly related. So even as I proclaim my undying Americanism, I am bold enough and exceedingly proud to claim the basis of kinship to you of London.

What man who has followed the history of this war could fail to experience an inspiration from the example of this city? When the British Empire stood alone but unconquered, almost naked but unafraid to defy the Hitler hordes, it was against this devoted city that the first terroristic blows were struck. Five years and eight months of war, blitzes big and little, flying V-bombs—all of them you took in your stride. You worked, and from your efforts you would not be deterred. You carried on, and uttered no cry for mercy, no wail of defeat. The Battle of Britain will take its place as another of your deathless traditions. And your faith and endurance have finally been rewarded.

You had been more than 2 years in war when Americans in numbers began swarming into your country. Most were mentally unprepared for the realities of war—especially as waged by the Nazis. Others believed that the tales of British sacrifice had been exaggerated. Still others failed to recognize the difficulties of the task ahead.

All such doubts, questions, and complacencies could not endure a single casual tour through your scarred streets. With awe our men gazed upon the empty spaces where once had stood buildings erected by the toil of peaceful folk. Our eyes rounded as we saw your women serving quietly and efficiently in almost every kind of war effort, even with flak batteries. We became accustomed to the warning sirens which seemed to compel from the native Londoner not even a single hurried step. Gradually we drew closer together until we became true partners in war.

In London my associates and I planned two great expeditions—that to invade the Mediterranean and that to cross the Channel. London's hospitality to the Americans, its good-humored acceptance of the added inconvenience we brought, its example of fortitude and quiet confidence in the final outcome—all these helped to make the Supreme Headquarters at the two Allied expeditions the smooth-working organizations they became.

They were directed by chosen representatives of two proud and independent peoples, each noted for its initiative and for its satisfaction with its own customs, manners, and methods. Many feared that those representatives could never combine together in an efficient fashion to solve the complex problems presented by modern war.

I hope you believe we proved the doubters wrong. And, moreover, I hold that we proved this point not only for war—we proved it can always be done by our two peoples, provided only that both show the same goodwill, the same forebearance, the same objective attitude that the British and Americans so amply demonstrated in the nearly 3 years of bitter campaigning.

No man alone could have brought about this result. Had I possessed the military skill of a Marlborough, the wisdom of Solomon, the understanding of Lincoln, I still would have been helpless without the loyalty, vision, and generosity of thousands upon thousands of British and Americans.

> Moreover, behind us always were our great national war leaders and their civil and military staffs that supported and encouraged us through every trial, every test. The whole was one great team. I know that on this special occasion 3 million American men and women who served in the Allied Expeditionary Force would want me to pay a tribute of admiration, respect, and affection to their British comrades.
>
> My most cherished hope is that after Japan joins the Nazis in utter defeat, neither my country nor yours need ever again summon its sons and daughters from their peaceful pursuits to face the tragedies of battle. But—a fact important for both of us to remember—neither London nor Abilene, sisters under the skin, will sell her birthright for physical safety, her liberty for mere existence.
>
> No petty differences in the world of trade, traditions, or national pride should ever blind us to our identities in priceless values. If we keep our eyes on this guidepost, then no difficulties along our path of mutual cooperation can ever be insurmountable. Moreover, when this truth has permeated to the remotest hamlet and the hearts of all people, then indeed may we beat our swords into plowshares and all nations can enjoy the fruitfulness of the earth.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I do this for three reasons. I would like to bring this particular editorial and its particular line of thinking to the attention of the membership of the House—first, because I agree with the editorial; second, because I disagree with the editorial; and, thirdly, because this happens to be July 12.

Now I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey for the sake of his sanity and for fear of mine will have to yield me sufficient time to explain those three obscure and contradictory statements. As to the last reason first: This is July 12, 1955 and this happens to be the 10th anniversary of a day a decade ago when the city of London extended the freedom of the city to the then General of the Army, Dwight D. Eisenhower. On that particular day General Eisenhower was made an honorary citizen of the city of London, and on that occasion he made a speech which many considered to be by far the best public utterance he has ever given. It has become known as the Guild Hall address. It was that Guild Hall address that the editors of Nation magazine saw fit to reprint in the July 9 issue because they liked the Ike that delivered that speech. They hope that the same Ike will go to Geneva. And the particular thing that Mr. Eisenhower states in his talk 10 years ago today that this editors liked was that he had discovered, as a result of his wartime experience, that Abilene and London really were not very far apart. The editorial concludes with the wishful thought of the editors of this particular magazine that the same Eisenhower will go to Geneva, and that there he will discover that Abilene and Moscow really are not very far apart.

Well, while I too like the Guild Hall Ike, I am afraid that I cannot share that blind optimism about Geneva that the editor expresses. In the first place, it will not be General Eisenhower of 10 years ago who goes to Geneva this weekend. It will be President Eisenhower, a somewhat older and, I believe, a somewhat wiser man. I hope that when he goes to Geneva he will be very conscious of the fact that Abilene and London are still not far apart, but I hope that he will not forget that as President he learned rather painfully that sometimes Abilene and Appleton can be quite a distance apart. Further, in fact, than a man can travel.

So I would say that I believe the editor of this particular writing is in error when he expressed the thought that all you need for success at Geneva is an Eisenhower of deep democratic faith, an Eisenhower dedicated to peace. Yes, we need that, but that in itself is not enough. It takes more; it takes much more. Whether, when you attempt to measure the distance from Abilene to Moscow, it turns out to be as close as London or as far as Appleton will depend only in part on Mr. Eisenhower's attitude, and will depend a great deal more on the attitude of those on the other side of the table.

It is my hope and my prayer that we will expect not too much, yet we will expect not too little, and that as a result of the expressions that have been put forth here today and the spirit which prompts them we can look forward to a time when this Nation, as a United Nation, can move progressively forward in the field of international relations, and that we as a people, as a united people, will finally realize in our lifetime our oft-expressed hope for peace. That is our wish, our hope, and our desire. We pray we will not be chasing a will-o'-the wisp at Geneva as we have too often done in the past.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the President will not forget at the summit, and I am confident he will not forget, how far Abilene and Moscow are apart—until such time as Moscow gives incontrovertible evidence that it is accepting the general principles on which the kind of society at Abilene was based. All we have today is the same old wolf, except that its sheep's clothing has been given a fresh shampoo. There must be a cleansing inside as well as externally before the free world can fully enter into agreements with the Kremlin.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY], that is what he had in mind.

Mr. QUIGLEY. That is certainly my hope and my prayer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to again express my appreciation for the many statements that have been made this afternoon. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and all the others who have spoken, on the fine attitude they have displayed. I want to join with them in the hope and prayer that President Eisenhower, as he goes to Geneva, will courageously represent our dedication to peace, the dedication of our great Nation to peace and abundance and happiness for all men throughout all the earth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I want to thank the gentleman who has served so long and so constructively in the field of international relations and international good will.

Mr. Speaker, I know this discussion has been very helpful to me as a Member of Congress. The discussions we have had this afternoon I hope will be helpful to the people of this country as opinions shape and form and ideas are expressed.

I would like to state my conclusions briefly.

First, there is no real alternative to peace. I am sure we all agree to that. But it seems to me that the glimmer of hope for peace is growing every day. As a free Nation, interested in maintaining peace, one of our contributions to keep this glimmer alive appears to me to be that we must remain strong. I do not believe we have to do so much bragging about our strength. If we are strong, our enemies will know it.

As has been so well stated by so many this afternoon, we must recognize that the cold war is not fought on the military level alone and that today, possibly the levels of the economic and the political and diplomatic are more important than the military—certainly they are at least equally important. Here we must have firm programs, designed to provide United States assistance to the free world in developing economic strength, political stability, personal hope and moral courage.

In the shifting scene which we presently face, we must have patience, firmness of purpose and, above all, tactical flexibility. The steps which restrict flexibility on the part of the United States are detrimental to the interests of peace and freedom. Under our system of Government and our Constitution, the President is the leader of foreign policy, and he must be given the opportunity to lead.

This does not mean that we cannot criticize him. I think it is significant this afternoon that none of the speakers told the President that he must do this or he must not do that.

And finally, a bipartisan foreign policy in formulation and executive becomes even more important in the future than it has been in the past. I believe the creation of a bipartisan foreign policy advisory council consisting of the most experienced and highly regarded men in the field, would help assure bipartisanship and at the same time would constitute an invaluable contribution to our foreign policy development and execution.

TIDELAND MINERALS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, no real good can come from the strong-arm action of the Secretary of the Interior in attempting to force through the sale, to prevent ownership, of certain tidelands in serious dispute. He has advertised for sale some of the minerals under some 283,000 acres of land off the Louisiana coast, title to which is claimed by the State of Louisiana. He is going ahead, with the help of the Attorney General, regardless of the claims of Louisiana.

I am told that under our law the United States cannot be sued for an injunction without its consent. The United States has not given its consent to the State of Louisiana in this case. Under these circumstances, a State government hardly can be said to have adequate redress in our courts.

Buyers must be bewildered by this action—a State and a Nation claiming the same property and each trying to sell the same property at the same time. The property cannot be expected to bring even a fraction of its full value, and the taxpayers are the ones who are going to be the real losers.

Mr. Speaker, the courts should be allowed to settle title to this property before the Secretary of the Interior attempts to exploit it. Our National Government should set an example of fair play, and it should withhold all further action in respect to exploiting seriously contested lands until the courts have had a chance to act. In the interest of good sportsmanship, fair dealing, and of getting the maximum price for this valuable property, the Secretary of the Interior should desist in his efforts to sell until title has been fully settled, one way or the other.

WHY SENATOR MORSE BECAME A DEMOCRAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Johnson] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oregon bears many resemblances to my own State of Wisconsin. Many outstanding citizens of Oregon were born, reared, and educated in Wisconsin, and moved west into Oregon in response to the pioneering urge that is so characteristic of our people. One of the most outstanding of these is the present senior Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Wayne Morse.

Senator Morse is a product of our Wisconsin stock, our University of Wisconsin, and in a political sense, of the Progressive movement which was led so courageously and creatively by Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and his followers for over half a century. Senator Morse ranks today as one of the Nation's foremost exponents of progressivism in the tradition of "Fighting Bob" La Follette.

Senator Morse's recent experiences in the field of politics parallel developments which took place somewhat earlier in his native State of Wisconsin. He has found in Oregon, as we progressive-minded people found out in Wisconsin almost 10 years ago, that there is no hope for progressive principles of government within the Republican Party. For most of its history, the Progressive political movement carried out its battles within the ranks of the Republican Party. It was able to win impressive gains for the people's interests within the Republican Party. Unhappily, this is no longer true, either in Wisconsin or in Oregon.

Just as Progressives in Wisconsin were forced by their conscience to leave the Republican Party, Senator Morse has been forced by his conscience to resign from the Republican Party, and to take his stand with the forward-looking, clean, progressive Democratic Party of Oregon. This is exactly the course that took place in Wisconsin over the past 20 years. First, we Progressives operated as a third party. But in 1946, following the defeat of the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., it became clear that neither as a third party nor within the Republican Party was there any realistic hope for progressive principles. Senator La Follette's defeat was the signal for a tremendous movement of progressive-minded and independent Wisconsin voters into the Wisconsin Democratic Party. The addition of many thousands, literally hundreds of thousands of Progressives, into the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, has made that party the spokesman of the farmer, the small-business man, the workingman, the citizen who is interested in good, clean government for the public interest, and all who want government to serve the interest of all the people instead of the narrow special interests of a privileged few.

Mr. Speaker, recently Senator Morse delivered a splendid address to his fellow citizens in Oregon dealing with his reasons for resigning from the Republican Party and taking his stand with the Democrats. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record at this point the address by the Honorable Wayne Morse, senior Senator of Oregon, to the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee rally at Portland, Oreg., on February 17, 1955. Senator Morse's remarks follow:

The Ideals of Representative Government

(Speech of Senator Wayne Morse)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Oregonians, it is always good to be home. My trip back home this time has been for the purpose of carrying out a very solemn obligation which I feel I owe to all the people of Oregon. I wish to thank the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee and the officials of the Democratic Party in Oregon for their invitation to use this forum tonight for a statewide discussion of some major political principles which support a political decision I now wish to announce. Today I registered at the Lane County Courthouse as a member of the Democratic Party.

THE PRINCIPAL OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Ever since I have been in politics I have tried to keep faith with the abiding principle of representative government which has motivated my actions in the Senate of the United States. It is the principle enunciated by Edmund Burke in 1774; namely, that the primary obligation which an elected representative of a free people owes to his constituents is to keep faith with his gift from providence—his conscience. It was this sound liberal principle of political philosophy which framed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

As every student of American political science knows, our political rights as a free and self-governing people were forged into being in the furnaces of hot political debate. They were hammered out into organic law on the anvil of courageous independence of judgment exercised by constitutional fathers who were dedicated to the spiritual tenet that responsible men owe it to their fellow men to keep faith with the dictates of their conscience. Students of the great constitutional debates which produced our organic charter of freedom know that this principle of representative government was the generating force which reconciled many differences of opinion among the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. From this principle emerged our constitutional system of representative government. Students of biography know that most of our constitutional fathers believed that as delegate-representatives of the colonists they owed the duty to follow the dictates of their conscience after thoughtful study of competing constitutional proposals.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF AN ELECTED OFFICIAL

Probably no man in his time epitomized this principle of representative government more than Thomas Jefferson. However, the historic writings of most of our other constitutional fathers, such as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, John Dickinson, Robert Morris, and James Madison all show that they did not believe that the elected representatives of free people served as hired men of political parties and political machines, but held their offices as the servants of a free people. They shared Burke's political philosophy when he said:

"It ought to the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure: no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable."

I respectfully say to the people of the State of Oregon tonight that this sound principle of representative government is also the warp and the woof of the political faith of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and every other great liberal statesman, past and present, who has represented the American people throughout our history, either in an executive or legislative position.

THE FUNCTION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

Let us not forget that when our representative government came into being and for a considerable time thereafter, American politics were not organized on a political party basis. When political parties came into being they were not created for the purpose of dictating to the people's elected representatives what their votes should be on controversial issues. It was never considered at the beginning of our two-party system that party officials should turn the American political stage into a puppet show. Rather, it recognized the need for party organization if effective political campaigns were to be waged against ugly forces which were seeking advantages at the expense of the public interest. Political parties came into being because it was recognized by the people themselves that the voters needed party organizations in order to strengthen the hand and support the views of elected leaders. Political parties were organized in order to help administer and conduct effective campaigns against great economic combines that were organized in our country to take selfish economic advantage of the mass of our people. There is no question about the fact that the organization of political parties was in response to a people's movement, and not a political boss movement.

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

As is to be expected in all human institutions, human frailties must be guarded against. Thus the history of political parties is a history of glorious ups and shameful downs. The total record of the two-party system has been a great record, because political assets have completely overbalanced political liabilities. When a political party housecleaning has been needed from time to time, the people have finally taken care of the dirt under the political rug.

Since about 1900 there has been a growing tendency of reactionary economic forces in our country to try to control political parties with party machines. It was against this evil that Teddy Roosevelt fought. There have been repeated attempts to propagandize the American people with the notion that some way, somehow, an elected official becomes the property of his political party.

To the contrary, when a man is elected to a political office he becomes the representative of all the people of his constituency, including those who voted against him, as well as those who voted for him. He takes the oath of office, as I did in 1945 and 1951, to uphold the Constitution of the United States—to uphold it in accordance with what a study of the merits of any given issue convinces him is right—not to "uphold" it in accordance with the interpretation and dictates of party bosses.

Reactionary propagandists have tried again and again during the last half century to convince the American people that so-called "party regularity" is synonymous with "party responsibility." This is a great fallacy. The highest order of party responsibility is to be found in the exercise of intellectual honesty by an elected official. Whenever an elected official compromises his intellectual honesty, he ceases to be politically responsible. Whenever he compromises what he knows to be a political principle in connection with any controversial issue, he becomes untrue to the political ideals of a sound two-party system in America.

Let me say at this point to the young people of Oregon—I would have you always remember that the only practicality you will ever experience in your lifetime is but the practicality of an ideal put to work. Whenever anyone tells you that to be practical in politics you have to compromise your principles at least a little bit, let me tell you that such political sophistry is dangerous political subversion. To the voters of Oregon, I would emphasize tonight that when one tries to convince you that doing the so-called expedient is sometimes necessary in politics, he is only trying to get you to swallow political corruption in the form of a sugar-coated pill. That has been true so many times in hours of crisis throughout our history, it is of the utmost importance that we hold firm to the sound principle of not compromising our political ideals.

TRUE PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

I have tried to apply these principles to my work in the Senate of the United States. In the face of abuse and much criticism I have insisted upon serving the people of Oregon in the Senate as a freeman—free to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as I find them. This was the primary pledge I made to the people of Oregon in my candidacies for the Senate, both in 1944 and 1950—a pledge which I made in both the primary campaigns, as well as the general election campaigns. No Republican Party officials ever had the right to expect me to place so-called party policy above what I considered to be the best interests of my State and my country. I promised the voters of Oregon in both campaigns that I never would place partisanship above what I considered to be a matter of political principle. No Republican Party officials, State or National, ever had the right to assume that in the name of party regularity I would sacrifice my responsibility to the people of Oregon by voting a party line whenever I thought a so-called party policy was not in the public interest.

I have always held to the view that a political party should be big enough to welcome a divergence of opinion on specific issues. A political party should always be big enough to welcome minority views in respect to any party policy unless the dead hand of political reaction is to toll the death knell of the party. Such a tolling occurred once in our history, when reaction killed the Whig Party and the great Lincoln Republican Party arose as a third party movement from its ashes.

Throughout our history differences over great political issues determined the party labels which individual voters wore. It is a mistake for my critics to assume that I do not believe that political parties should stand for and take sides on the political issues of the day. I most certainly think that they should. One of the functions of any political party is to serve as an institute of political education. One of the primary obligations of a political party is to stand for a legislative program which it believes will best promote the general welfare. There certainly would be no incentive for party work if the activities of a political party were to be limited solely to administrative preparation for party conventions and elections. The legislative program and political principles of a party should be so specific that voters of like mind can join forces with enthusiasm under its banners.

However, whenever a political party in the name of party regularity demands that a representative elected under its label vote for legislation which he is convinced is neither in the best interests of his party nor of his country, then that representative has the clear duty of voting for what he believes is in the best interests of all the people of the State and of the Nation irrespective of party affiliation. One of the greatest evils in American politics today is the growing practice on the part of too many politicians to let party officials and economic pressure groups tell them how to vote. That I have not done, and will not do under any party label. A Senator may vote on some occasions with a majority of his party colleagues and on other occasions with a minority of his party colleagues. It does not follow that when he votes with a minority he is guilty of any party disloyalty, but, to the contrary, he may seek only to stand for what he thinks is best for the public and to attempt to make a record that will lay a foundation for future action which will change the minority into a majority.

PRINCIPLE ABOVE PARTY

However, when an elected official in due course of political events finds himself consistently in a very small minority within his party, and finds himself unalterably opposed to major shifts in party policy which have developed during his term of office, then he comes face to face with the ethical obligation of following the sound advice of Woodrow Wilson when he said:

"I would not for a moment be understood as seeking to lend any color of justification to that most humiliating and degrading precept, 'Party, right or wrong.' This is the maxim of knaves or of fools."

In the same vein Woodrow Wilson said:

"Is it the party, then, to which men of thought owe and pay allegiance? No. It is to the principles, of which party is the embodiment. The man, therefore, who adheres to any party after it has ceased to avow the principles which to him are dear and in his eyes are vital; the man who follows the leadings of a party which seems to him to be going wrong, is acting a lie, and has lost either his wit or his virtue."

I found myself confronted with that ethical problem in 1952 and acted accordingly by resigning from the Republican Party. I have no regrets.

THE LIBERAL RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

During the 2 years in which I have been an Independent I have stated repeatedly that my future course of action would be dictated by what I believed would best advance the cause of liberalism in American politics.

In the 1954 campaign the Democratic Party of Oregon and its candidates presented their program honestly and forthrightly. They demonstrated that the Democratic Party is the party of liberalism. Their program is in the best interests of the independent farmers, small-business men, working people, white-collar and civil-service workers—indeed, the overwhelming majority of the people of Oregon.

Likewise the economic program of the Democratic Party since the great depression has been in the best interests of the legitimate rights of big business as well. The Democratic Party has never been opposed to the predominant corporate structure of American business. It has only been opposed to the excesses and abuses of big business corporate practices which have attempted to thwart and exploit the economic welfare of our people. Thus the Democratic Party has a record of opposition to monopolistic control of industrial production by powerful financial combines. Under the Democratic administrations since the great depression, many pieces of legislation have been passed which have protected the American consumers from exploitation by selfish economic interests, and at the same time have strengthened the competitive rights and advanced the economic opportunities of business, big and small.

It is not true that the Democratic Party is against business. To the contrary, its record is in stanch defense of enlightened capitalism manifested in private enterprise.

In fairness, let me say that there are millions of Republican and independent voters across our land, along with Democratic voters, who are ardent supporters of the major pieces of legislation dealing with economic problems which have been passed since 1932. The fact that most of this legislation has not been repealed is due largely to the bipartisan support it has received in and out of the Congress. In our own State of Oregon, there are large numbers of Republican and independent voters, as well as Democratic, who never hesitate to rise above party considerations when it comes to supporting individual candidates and specific legislative proposals. My own election to the Senate attests to that fact, and it is but one of many examples in the political history of our State. In fact, the voting of the people of Oregon for many years is a convincing demonstration of a political phenomenon that most professional politicians seem to overlook—namely, that the average voter takes pride in the fact that first of all he is Mr. or Mrs. Independent Voter.

The average American today is more devoted to political independence of judgment than to political partisanship. And in the interests of good government we should not want it any other way.

In the last campaign I supported and campaigned for the candidates of the Oregon Democratic Party because of our common belief in the necessity of a bipartisan program of international cooperation with the free nations, and a domestic program for constant expansion of economic opportunities and strengthening of the competitive private enterprise system.

It is my considered judgment that I can best contribute to such a program by working within the Democratic Party. That party, particularly in Oregon, has advocated policies, especially in the important area of comprehensive resource development, upon which the economic future of the Pacific Northwest depends. On these issues, the leadership of the Republican Party in Oregon has worked against the best interests of the people of Oregon, as exemplified by participation and acquiescence in the attempted scuttling of the Hells Canyon Dam project.

THE UNSUCESSFUL FIGHT FOR LIBERALISM WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

While I was a member of the Republican Party I attempted, with the help and support of many Republicans in Oregon, to advance the cause of liberalism. Their unstinting and devoted efforts will always be remembered and appreciated. A number of these liberal Republicans have reached the conclusion that liberalism is stifled and thwarted by the Old Guard leadership of the Republican Party in Oregon. I came to this conclusion reluctantly but irrevocably in 1952.

For 8 years I received little help or encouragement from Republicans in the Senate in my efforts to further liberal legislation. During this period I did my utmost to cooperate with the Republican Party in the hope of advancing and strengthening the forces of liberalism within it. For example, in 1946 I was a member of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee and worked actively for the election of candidates whose subsequent records did not support their reputations as liberals. In the 1948 campaign I made twice as many speeches on behalf of the Republican presidential candidate as any other Republican Senator.

It is well known that Republican Party leaders in May 1952 arranged to have me excluded from all Republican national convention committees, despite the fact that the Republican voters in the presidential primary had given me the second highest number of votes of the delegates elected. The then Republican national chairman, acting behind the scenes, participated in this move. At the Salem, Oreg., meeting of the convention delegation I was openly attacked by Republican leaders because I was supposedly too liberal. It is clear that I was too liberal for the reactionary politicians who control the Republican Party in Oregon.

Nonetheless, I attended the Republican National Convention and did everything I could to promote the candidacy of General Eisenhower, in the hope and belief that he would advocate progressive programs and rescue the Republican Party from its isolationist drift.

The convention platform was a grave disappointment to me and thousands of other liberal Republicans. It was disheartening to see the victorious Eisenhower forces embrace steamroller tactics to push through the nomination of Senator NIXON. At that time I was working with others to advance the candidacy of Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, for the vice presidential nomination. We were told General Eisenhower wanted no nominee in competition to NIXON.

During the 1952 campaign, General Eisenhower's campaign tactics were increasingly disappointing. His Morningside Heights agreement with Senator Taft, in which Taft's program was embraced, made it clear that the Republican candidate's slogan was "anything to win."

Meanwhile, Adlai Stevenson was doing what he pledged to do: talk sense to the American people. As a matter of conscience I felt there was no alternative but to campaign for Governor Stevenson. This I could not do and remain in the Republican Party. Therefore, I resigned.

In the last 2 years there has been repeated evidence that reactionary economic forces have taken over the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party leadership on most domestic issues, and particularly in the field of natural resources.

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD IN CONGRESS

On the other hand, the Democrats in Congress proved themselves responsible on foreign affairs and liberal on most of the key issues of domestic policy. It was with Democratic votes that the Bricker amendment was defeated. It was the fighting band of Democratic liberals who carried on the fight against the tidelands giveaway and for the Hill oil-for-education amendment. It was essentially the same group of Democrats who fought against the giveaway atomic energy bill, authorization of the Dixon-Yates contract, and fought for improving provisions to the atomic energy bill on patents, public generation of power from atomic materials, and the preference clause in the marketing of such power. This group has worked for public power development and rural electrification throughout the country and especially in the Pacific Northwest. All but one of the cosponsors of my Hells Canyon bill in the last Congress were Democrats.

This is only a partial catalog of the measures on which this band of liberals has distinguished itself and, more importantly, provided leadership and made significant gains for the people of the country and of Oregon. Other vital stands include the reciprocal-trade program, unemployment insurance improvement, extension of social security—in which this group led the way—public housing, adequate loan facilities for small business, and firm supports for agriculture. It is this Democratic band that has fought the policies of scarcity that have characterized the Republican administration from early 1953 when the Treasury embarked on the tight-money program.

It is this group with which I have worked and which has worked with me on matters of special importance to Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. The Democrats in the Senate have made few votes party issues. But when they have, as in the case of the recommittal of the unfair, antilabor amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and in support of increasing the personal income tax exemptions, their stand has been sound and in the best interests of the country.

LIBERAL PROGRAM OF OREGON DEMOCRATIC PARTY

We see it on issue after issue in our State. For example, in this session of the State legislature, in the house, 29 out of 31 Democrats supported a memorial calling for the building of John Day Dam as a Federal project. In the senate the Democrats were unanimous in opposition to the Republican Party's phony partnership scheme.

On many other occasions in the months ahead, I shall speak throughout the State in opposition to the Republican Party's attempt to sell the birthright of the people of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest in our natural resources for a bowl of private utility monopoly pottage. Here is an issue between the parties which I am convinced will cause thousands and thousands of Republican and independent voters in our State to join forces with us in opposition to the sellout of the people's best interests in our natural resources by both the State and the National Republican administrations.

There has developed a clear-cut and clean-cut cleavage between the Democratic leadership and Republican leadership in the State of Oregon, not only in the field of natural resources, but also on issues involving taxes, aid to education, labor, agriculture, old-age benefits, public health, and for that matter, almost every legislative issue which draws the political line of difference between protecting the general welfare on the one hand and yielding to economic and political reaction on the other.

There are those Republican leaders who try to fool the voters with the political slogan that they are liberal in human relations but conservative in economic policies. However, more and more voters are seeing through such political mumbo-jumbo. They know from personal experience, much of it sad and costly to them, that human rights and happiness cannot be separated from the economic welfare of the people. When people stop to analyze the political slogan traps of this Republican administration, both State and National, they know that the strength of our private enterprise system is dependent upon a broad and deep mass-purchasing power of all of our people. They know that the keystone of our constitutional system is that clause in the Constitution which dedicates our system of self-government to the promotion of the general welfare. They know that when the general welfare of the people is promoted by our Government through legislation which stimulates greater job opportunities for our workers and wider markets for our farmers, American business generally, including General Motors, is best served thereby.

CAN BEST SERVE PEOPLE OF OREGON WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

It is because I have become convinced that I can make my best contribution to a legislative program that will best serve the people of Oregon, and the Nation, under the banner of the Democratic Party that I now announce my intention to run for reelection to the Senate in 1956 as a Democrat.

As I made clear to Democratic leaders in Oregon months ago when I was first invited by many leading Democrats to join the Democratic Party, I felt I had no moral right to come into the Democratic Party unless such an action met with the pleasure of State and local leaders of the party, as well as the clear sentiment of the rank and file membership of the party. Thus for many months past, I have attended a good many meetings of Democratic groups throughout the entire State where I was urged to come into the party. Likewise, an overwhelming majority of the Democratic leaders of the State have invited the decision which I have announced tonight. I want the leaders of the Democratic Party of Oregon, and the many members of the party with whom I have talked or corresponded, to know that I deeply appreciate the cordial, enthusiastic welcome which they have extended to me.

One of the reasons why I am pleased and proud to join the Democratic Party is that I look forward with enthusiasm to working with the liberal leadership of the Democratic Party in Oregon. We worked together in close harmony throughout the 1954 historic campaign which resulted in sending to the Congress of the United States two fine liberal Democrats from Oregon—Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER. The splendid record which they are making in the Congress has already focused favorable attention on Oregon. DICK NEUBERGER has received the best committee assignments of any freshman Senator that I can recall during my 10 years in the Senate. Already, with his brilliance, he has pitched into the battle for the protection of our natural resources. EDITH GREEN has been appointed to the powerful House Committees on Education and Labor and Interior and Insular Affairs.

She has been elected president of the 84th Congressional Club which is made up of Democratic Party newcomers to the House. Her background of experience in education has attracted the attention of the Democratic Party leaders of the House, and undoubtedly she will exercise great influence.

I wish to express a special word of appreciation to your national committeewoman, Mrs. Lillian Burton, and your national committeeman, Monroe Sweetland. These two Democratic Party leaders have devoted years of hard work to the building up of a program of Jeffersonian Democracy in Oregon.

Ever since he has been in the legislature, Monroe Sweetland has fought courageously to put into legislative practice the liberal principles which he has always urged within the party.

To the Democratic Party's very able State chairman, Howard Morgan, who led the party to victory in 1954, I want to say publicly what I have said to him privately. He has demonstrated to me time and time again that he places political principle above personal interest. He believes—as Woodrow Wilson put it—that a political party is the embodiment of a set of principles. Oregon Democracy is greatly indebted to his leadership.

In accordance with my pledges to the people of Oregon in the campaigns of 1944 and 1950, and in keeping with the principles of representative government, reiterated in this speech tonight, I shall be proud to place my candidacy for reelection to the United States Senate on the Democratic ticket in 1956 in the hands of all the voters of Oregon. I shall campaign on my record, confident that when my fellow Oregonians come to evaluate it, both in retrospect and in perspective, they will endorse it.

I shall always be deeply appreciative of the high honor which the people of Oregon have bestowed upon me, and of the opportunity for public service which they have made available to me. It is my continued pledge to my fellow Oregonians that they can always count upon me to fight for what I think is right in accordance with the facts as they come before me in the Senate.

Only by dedicating myself to that pledge can my service in the Senate keep faith with the people of Oregon and the ideals of representative government.

Tonight I issue an enlistment call. I issue a call for enlistment in a great campaign fight for 1956. I ask Republicans and Independents and Democrats alike to join it, because in that great campaign of 1956 we are going to draw the line between a progressive campaign conducted by the Democratic Party with the support of Independents and Republicans by the thousands against the reactionary Republican machine that has for too long controlled politics in this State. I want to say to the people of Oregon tonight that I think they are going to select their Senator, and they are not going to have him selected for them by any purge movement that arises in the East, even though it comes out of the White House itself, because we are proud of the fact that in Oregon we, the people, run our own politics and no political machine runs it for us. I shall give you a campaign in 1956 if you want to join under the Democratic banner for a clean, hard-hitting fight that will protect the best interests of the people against the monopolistic combine that has taken over the Republican Party in the State of Oregon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fjare.

Mrs. St. George and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDonough in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Multer and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Brownson and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dawson of Utah.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Shima Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 188. An act for the relief of Paul Ichikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 438. An act for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 603. An act for the relief of Edward and Lily Elsie White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 607. An act for the relief of Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 619. An act for the relief of Kerson Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 642. An act for the relief of Shigeko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 649. An act for the relief of Zelda Baumzveiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 678. An act for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 689. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1056. An act for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their child, Mario Mazartzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1238. An act for the relief of Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1249. An act for the relief of Nouritza Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1416. An act for the relief of Joseph G. Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1758. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture proposing an expansion of the tobacco production, utilization, and marketing research program, with primary emphasis on basic research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

975. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of May 1955, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

976. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

977. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits," for the fiscal year 1956, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

978. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a copy of a report to the President with respect to an overexpenditure of an allotment of funds within the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to section 3769, Revised Statutes, and of Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1; to the Committee on Appropriations.

979. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

980. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 217); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7278. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 741. An act to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1041. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5856. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6243. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7125. A bill to extend to June 30, 1956, the free mailing privileges granted by the act of July 12, 1950, to members of the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6274. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4672. A bill to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2150. A bill to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4106. A bill to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7194. A bill to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2149. A bill to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7028. A bill to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 483. A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2559. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TUMULTY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6590. A bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6621. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the Vice President-elect and to authorize Secret Service protection for the Vice President-elect; with amendments (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. A report pursuant to House Resolution 91 pertaining to a special study mission to Central America on international organizations and movements; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1599. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; with amendments (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 186. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations; with amendments (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1550. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Nurith Spier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Antonio Andrea Chitato; without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Anna Wiesneth; with amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1183. A bill for the relief of Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 350. An act for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tomasella; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Marino and Giselda Proni; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Ivo and Elia Monari; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Madiros Kebabjian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Joan Frances Feeley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Osamu Ikeda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3956. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Edeltraudt Margot Hackelberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6036. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florentine Kintzel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Capano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Calderon de Villarreal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Francisca Alemany; with amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Luisa Guidi Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6794. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry, United States Army, retired, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines; with amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 92. An act for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 135. An act for the relief of the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1033. An act for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co., without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc., without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Dezso Szilagyi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor); with amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez-Gomez); with amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6002. A bill for the relief of Helena Rapp; with amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6532. A bill for the relief of John William Scholtes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; with amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 7278. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7279. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 7280. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purpose of pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7281. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers, including part-time farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7282. A bill relating to the allowance of the credits for dividends received, for dividends paid, and for a Western Hemisphere trade corporation in computing the alternative tax of a corporation with respect to its capital gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7283. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers, including part-time farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 7284. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7285. A bill to amend section 608 of the National Housing Act to prevent the charging of excessive rents, resulting from unduly high estimates of costs, in the case of property covered by a mortgage insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7286. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that compensation paid thereunder shall be based on wage rates currently in effect; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7287. A bill making additional appropriations for functions of the Food and Drug Administration for the year ending June 30, 1956, to initiate a program of expansion and improvement of services to help safeguard the health of the American people; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 7288. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to exempt intrastate water carriers from the provisions of that act which relate to minimum wages and maximum hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 7289. A bill to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7290. A bill to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 7291. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 7292. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution to improve the relations of the United States with Western Germany and Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting legislative action quieting title to certain small islands among the Florida Keys; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7293. A bill for the relief of Joseph T. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7294. A bill for the relief of Nellie Mary Trent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosalia Dato Mateo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 7296. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7297. A bill for the relief of Laing Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7298. A bill for the relief of Enrique Zaragosa-Bermejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7299. A bill to authorize the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sea Water Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Members of Congress to sponsor legislation to provide for construction of demonstration plants to produce fresh water from sea water of a quality suitable for industrial, agricultural, and consumer use, I was especially pleased to support H. R. 2126 which passed both the House and Senate during the present session of Congress—Public Law 111—authorizing $6 million for research over a period extending to 1963.

I introduced my first bill, H. R. 6031, to provide for research to process sea water for general use in the 81st Congress on March 29, 1948. The purpose of this legislation was to strengthen national security and the common defense as well as to increase the national water resources by authorizing the construction of demonstration plans to carry on the necessary research to develop methods of converting sea water into fresh water at a cost that would justify its use as a substitute for other water sources.

No action was taken by the Congress on my original bill, and I reintroduced this legislation in the 82d Congress—H. R. 859.

In spite of my vigorous efforts to get action on this legislation because of its vital importance to the United States, and especially to southern California where we are dependent upon our water supply for survival, no action was taken until 1952 when the Saline Water Act of 1952 which I supported was finally passed authorizing an initial appropriation of $2 million for research to be carried on over a 5-year period.

As in my original legislation introduced 4 years previously, the act of 1952 provided for a research program with the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting sea water and other saline water to fresh water of a quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, and municipal uses.

This program is of vital importance to the Nation because as a result of our expanding industry, growing population, and expanding agricultural production, we have experienced a demand for larger and larger quantities of fresh water which has placed a severe drain on our existing water resources, especially in the arid and semiarid regions of our Nation.

The sources of water on which we normally rely are gradually being exhausted and, through use and reuse, the supply derived from these sources is being contaminated. There is, therefore, an urgent need for finding and developing every possible additional fresh water source.

We have known for some time that fresh water could be produced from sea water and processes were developed which have been used in certain instances to assure adequate water supply for naval vessels and other military installations where a fresh water supply was not available.

However, the process has been too expensive for extensive use, and a practical economical process must be developed before the conversion of sea water can be used as a regular source of water supply.

To date the results from the initial experiment and research under the Saline Water Act have been encouraging. At the beginning of the Government's program in 1952 the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was estimated at about $400 to $500 an acre-foot. The initial cost goals for the program were set at $125 per acre-foot for municipal water and $40 per acre-foot for irrigation water on the basis that these amounts represented about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use.

Although considerable work remains to be done before these initial goals are fully realized, they are being approached now, and it is believed they can be reached and lowered if the research is continued as it will be under the amendment to the Saline Water Act already passed by this Congress.

It is also interesting to note that today research in this field is also in progress in other countries, and as a result of foreign research there is a strong indication that with the development of plants to convert sea water to fresh water at a reasonable cost, methods may also be perfected to produce power from the sea as well.

The University of California, in this connection, has been closely observing an experiment of French scientists on the Ivory Coast of French West Africa, and have already announced that the university calculations resulting from their own research pretty much coincide with the new French theory thereby indicating that obtaining both power and fresh water from the sea is a definite possibility.

Los Angeles County and all of southern California can use converted sea water as soon as it can be processed economically into fresh water to augment our existing water supply. In this area we realize that we must maintain a constant adequate water supply or face the ever-present danger of a major disaster in the event of a prolonged drought or any other serious threat to the sources of our water supply.

We must increase the available supply to meet the constantly mounting demands of our increasing population, now over 5 million in Los Angeles County alone, as well as the needs of our expanding industry and growing agricultural production.

As a result of the research carried out under the Saline Water Act, we may find the partial solution to the problem of dwindling water resources in many parts of the country. The research will be continued under present provisions to 1963, and we should reach our goal in the development of economical processes to convert sea water and other saline water to fresh water thus opening up the inexhaustible supply of the sea itself to southern California and all other areas in our Nation which can utilize water from the sea.

The Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by Senator KNOWLAND before the Foundation To Defeat Communism at their recent meeting in Washington are timely and of deep import and interest.

We must not forget that the Communist menace is still abroad in the world and in our own land, even though the Russians are cooing and purring to make us forget its existence.

We must be on guard and we must also remember the American prisoners still held illegally in Communist China.

Senator KNOWLAND's address follows:

> Two and one-half billion people who populate the earth today ponder the future fate of mankind. Although boundary lines presently divide these people in two opposing camps, the great majority are unified in their hopes and prayers for an honorable and enduring peace.
>
> Today, for the first time in recorded history, a total conflict in peacetime has evolved with its theater of operations worldwide in scope. The headquarters of this conspiracy against mankind is located in Moscow and its chief instrument is international communism.
>
> Over 30 years ago, Lenin expounded the eternal philosophy of communism's irreconcilability with our free system and no Communist has deviated from that platform to the present date. "It is inconceivable," Lenin said, "that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."
>
> In 1952 Stalin wrote, "It is possible that in a definite conjecture of circumstances, the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then, it will no longer be the present peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism." In any analysis, the words that promise our future must be evaluated by past performances and deeds.
>
> From the beginning of the revolution in Russia in 1917, international communism has been able to spread over the lives of 40 percent of the earth's inhabitants. Most of these gains have occurred in the 15-year period since the start of World War II.

Perhaps it might clarify the problems of the present to recall these events of the past when the Communists, by invasion or subversion, took over once-proud countries and peoples. The casualties read as follows:

In 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

In 1939 and 1949, Poland; in 1945, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania, and North Korea. In 1947, Hungary; in 1948, Czechoslovakia; in 1949, China; in 1954, North Vietnam. Present threats exist today against Formosa and South Vietnam.

I am convinced that there will never be a real and lasting relief of world tensions until the last vestige of slavery has been eliminated from the earth. As long as there exists suppression in Russia or in China or North Vietnam or in Poland, Hungary, or Rumania, there will be no real peace in England, in France, or in the United States.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they still hold 11 American airmen who have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

The Chinese Communists have released four American jet fliers that had been held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice. All Americans will, of course, rejoice with the families of these men that they have been returned to their loved ones and their country.

However, we must not lose sight of the other Americans who are still held. The fact that only four have been released may well indicate that the Chinese Communists are going to use the balance in negotiating Formosa and Far Eastern area problems with us.

This would be the role of an extortionist nation and not of a civilized one. The Chinese Communists should be told that we will not permit them to use our men in such a fashion. Both the United States and the United Nations should make it clear that before any discussions are entered into relative to tensions in the Pacific all Americans, military and civilians, who are being illegally held should be freed.

For the entire life of our Republic, Amercans have been indoctrinated with the belief that every citizen owes an obligation to his flag and to his country which included service in the Armed Forces when required. The Government must not lose sight of the fact that by the same token the Nation has an obligation to the men in uniform who serve it.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

The meetings have recently been concluded between the Soviet and the Yugoslav representatives.

Despite all efforts to sugar-coat the results, it has been a substantial setback for the free nations of the world.

It is a demonstration that Communist birds of a feather still flock together.

Communist Yugoslavia under Tito, after having received substantial economic aid and military equipment from the United States, has now moved into an even more neutralist position than it has taken for the last year. Tito has fully subscribed to the Soviet line that Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations despite the fact that it committed aggression against that organization, that it should have Formosa despite the fact that it would mean enslavement of 9½ million free Chinese; and, that the atomic weapon should be barred though he and the Soviet representatives know, as does the Western world, that without the superiority in this weapon in the hands of the West it would have been possible for Communist manpower with their standard weapons to have overwhelmed all of Europe long before now.

We might as well be frank about it and not deceive ourselves. Communist Yugoslavia under Tito is engaged in playing both ends against the middle. This is not an admirable characteristic in private life any more than it is among nations. It's time that Yugoslavia's Tito and others of a like mind understand this fact.

Certainly we have no desire to use our resources to impinge upon the sovereignty of any nation.

However, I doubt very much whether we do have the resources to assist the nations that are alert to the dangers of communism and are prepared to do the utmost to help themselves and their neighbors in resisting overt aggression and at the same time to aid and assist those nations which, by their diplomatic and other efforts, are attempting to break down the system of collective security without which we would not be able to preserve the free world.

Yesterday, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Molotov, addressed the United Nations ceremonies in San Francisco and stated that the United Nations has no greater purpose than to secure peace, friendship, and cooperation among the peoples. Mr. Molotov then went on to describe the Soviet Union's conditions of communism's program for "peaceful coexistence." This included admission of Red China into the United Nations, the return of Formosa, Quemoy, and Matsu to Peiping, the dismantling of this country's overseas bases; withdrawal of all United States forces back to this country, and the elimination of all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and its satellites.

At the same time that Mr. Molotov's program for peaceful coexistence was unveiled for the United Nations, a joint declaration was being signed by Mr. Nehru and the Soviet Premier Bulganin in Moscow. This declaration also called for the admission of Red China into the United Nations and the giving up of Formosa and surrounding territories to Red China.

It is strange to me that Mr. Nehru, a self-styled neutralist, generally takes a position in support of the Soviet Union's objectives and against the interest of the free world.

It is inconceivable to me how Nehru and his so-called Ambassador of Peace, Mr. Mennon, can support a tyrannical force like Red China that has been condemned by the United Nations, itself as an aggressor, and as Mr. Nehru knows, Red China to this date continues to flaunt the will and edicts of the United Nations.

The President of the United States is about to embark on some highly important conferences. Although these top-level conferences are designed to be purely exploratory in nature, in my judgment, there is nothing to foreclose our representatives in such conferences to raise any or all problems and issues of existing tensions. I do not believe the President of the United States, who is a great American, will forget Mr. Molotov's statement in February of 1955—the same Mr. Molotov who called for the Soviet type peaceful coexistence yesterday in the United Nations—who said:

"It is quite natural that in connection with the changes that have taken place in the world situation the corelation of forces between social systems, especially during the past 10 years, has definitely changed to the advantage of socialism."

This is the same Mr. Molotov who in 1947 wrote:

"We live in an era in which all roads lead to communism."

When the Austrian State Treaty was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I questioned the Secretary of State whether the Soviet Union would be asked to live up to its agreement to withdraw its forces from Hungary and Rumania. In my judgment, since this country was a signatory to the treaty with those countries, we have a moral obligation to insist on Soviet compliance with those conditions.

The Mutual Security Appropriation Bill for 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, once again the people of this United States are being asked to buy friends and friendship. Perhaps that is a bit brutal, but if we are to be realistic, that is just what we are doing if we approve the mutual security appropriation bill for 1956.

Certainly we should be realistic; in fact, this appropriation bill might well be termed a question of realities versus dreams. While we all like to have pleasant dreams, although that might be a major task during this humid, hot weather with which we are plagued, nevertheless these dreams must be kept out of the Halls of Congress, or they may turn out to be nightmares.

I, personally, like to face reality. It is a reality that the avowed aim of the Communist world is to bankrupt the United States through wild spending. This was stated very clearly by Lenin in an interview with the New York Telegram in 1924 when he said:

> Some day the Soviet Union will compel the United States to spend itself to destruction.

It is a dream that we can continue to pour billion after billions of dollars overseas without seriously weakening the economic structure of this Nation and thereby the free world.

It is a reality no friend who was bought and paid for ever equaled a friend who was that for friendship's sake and because of mutual trust and agreement. I very definitely would not depend on loyalty that can be easily bought and sold. The "Go home, you dirty Yank" signs show the results of this friendship.

It is a dream that foreign-aid billions will buy a strong free world in which all is peace and light. Yet this dream persists despite the fact that much of our foreign aid has resulted in nations which are weaker, more dependent, and more anti-Western than before.

It is a reality that much foreign aid has been eaten up, as former Ambassador Chester Bowles had said, by "Cadillacs and French perfume, champagne, and evening gowns."

It is a dream that this money is giving people needed "bulldozers, fertilizer, electric motors and penicillin," to quote Mr. Bowles again.

It is a reality that the Foreign Operations Administration, now the International Cooperation Administration, has $8.7 billion dollars in unexpended but authorized funds. Therefore, this new appropriation would give more than $12 billion dollars for spending.

It is a dream that this authorization is the major defense against communism. We need to be strong economically, militarily and spirtually—"We" that is, not some other nation which cannot be counted on when needed. Not some nation that sells its friendship and loyalty. I believe in technical assistance for nations on whom we can count, but $12 billion in foreign-aid spending is going too far.

There are many more realities and dreams in this bubble of foreign-aid spending. And this bubble must be burst. Let the authorization be used up and then include foreign aid as a regular part of our annual budget, letting all funds be accounted for each time a new appropriation is made.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to awake from this dream of spending our way to glory and face the realities of a world divided into two camps—one dedicated to slavery and the other to freedom.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the project is not self-liquidating, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at 2½ percent, on $1 billion of original investment for the smaller project proposed is $25 million per year; for the larger $1.6 billion development proposed is $40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or, if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than $1 billion for the smaller development and $4 billion for the larger development by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation, since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

Admiral Radford, in Take-It-or-Leave-It Stand, Prefers No New Legislation to House Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, as the House passed the Reserve bill without a rollcall vote, I expressed my disappointment at this procedure, which, in my considered opinion, might well be deemed irresponsible by the young men whose lives and liberties will be directly affected. I also expressed an apprehension—voicing a feeling quite prevalent on the floor last week—that the House was willing to settle on almost any provisions in order to pass a number, a title, and an enacting clause to serve as a vehicle for a UMT bill to be drafted on the other side of the Capitol and submitted to the House only for approval of a conference report in the closing days of this session.

This morning I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article by John W. Finney, of the United Press. This piece quotes Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as joining with Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps officials who stated they would rather have no new Reserve legislation than the bill approved by the House. "I feel the same way," Admiral Radford is quoted as saying. "Unless we get a workable bill in its entirety, we would be better off to utilize the present law," he continued.

In other words, unless the Pentagon is given full authority to dictate to the Congress a UMT bill and unless the Congress agrees to rubber-stamp the measure exactly as the empire builders in the armed services want it, they will, at long last, utilize the present law. I say it is about time they did just that; about time to stop the sabotage of the voluntary Reserve system which has always worked well in the past; and time to utilize existing legislation which the military admits by implication it has not done in the past.

Let them reexamine the whole problem realistically asking: "For what exact purpose do we require new, younger defense manpower? What combat or logistic function will they perform? How many do we really need? Should they be in uniform or could they better be civilian technicians? If they should be in uniform, what training course will best prepare them to assume their functional role in their defense mission? Who can best give each phase of that training, the military or civilian educators? Where? What effect will the taking of this manpower have on other branches of the armed services, on the training and supply of professional and technical personnel and, in time of emergency, on our labor force?"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the United Press article as carried in this morning's Post and Times Herald in the RECORD at this point. I shall read as much of it as time permits. I trust that any conflicts or inconsistencies between the statements in this article and the statements of the leadership and of proponents of UMT on the floor of the House will be forgiven by a charitable membership:

RADFORD BACKS IKE ON RESERVES

(By John W. Finney)

Adm. Arthur W. Radford told Congress yesterday the Defense Department would rather do without a new Reserve program than accept major changes in the one President Eisenhower proposed.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff took a strong take-it-or-leave-it stand in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee about the need for compulsory Reserve training.

He and other top defense officials opposed a move by Committee Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, to replace the compulsory features of the administration's program with a voluntary, bonus-incentive approach.

They likewise branded as unacceptable a bill passed by the House which included compulsory training but eliminated Mr. Eisenhower's proposals for National Guard participation and overhauled some other provisions.

The testimony closed out 3 days of public hearings on Reserve proposals. RUSSELL said the committee will meet Wednesday to start drafting a bill.

Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps officials all said they would rather have no new Reserve legislation than the bill approved by the House.

WOULD BE BETTER OFF

Asked for his views, Radford said "I feel the same way." He said that unless "we get a workable bill in its entirety, we would be better off to utilize the present law."

His remarks were sharply criticized by RUSSELL, who said Radford was saying in effect that "you don't think the Pentagon is capable of making a mistake."

In another highlight of the hearing, Gen. Maxwell B. Taylor warned that the Army will need more men than Mr. Eisenhower's cutback program authorizes if it undertakes the training of reservists.

The new Army Chief of Staff said adoption of the administration's Reserve program would put an extra load on the Army but so far "no provision has been made" for increasing its strength.

ALL-OUT FIGHT

Making an all-out, but apparently uphill, fight to win approval of the original Reserve plan, the Defense Department sent its highest brass before the Senate committee. Their testimony included these points:

Radford said that if the plan is not approved "we will have to make a complete review and reorientation of all our defense planning."

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson said in a statement compulsory training is the only way to insure fully qualified men will be available. But he said it will only be used when valid defense requirements are not met by voluntary means.

Assistant Defense Secretary Carter L. Burgess said the volunteer approach has not succeeded in the past. He said the compulsory feature would spur Reserve training in the way that the draft spurs enlistments.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, retiring president of the Reserve Officers Association, said the compulsory feature is the heart of the bill.

Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, Chairman of the National Security Training Commission and general manager of the New York Times, said "it is foolish to delude ourselves" that voluntary methods would build the Ready Reserves to the 2,900,000-man level contemplated by mid-1959.

Mr. Speaker, the voices of veterans and servicemen are beginning to be heard. While I cannot completely agree with the writer of the letter to the editor carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 8, 1955, especially in his view that the Powell amendment is extraneous, I believe his analysis of the Reserve compromise is thought-provoking, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESERVE COMPROMISE

It would be serious indeed if the national Reserve plan—to be pushed through the Senate this week—should pass without some examination of the uncritical assumption that it is, in fact, likely to make a contribution to our national security which will outweigh the burden it will lay on the men compelled to serve in it.

At its present stage, the plan calls for 48 weekly meetings and 2 weeks of summer training a year. It thus makes demands upon all but 2 weeks of an individual's year, and this makes it perhaps the military's deepest penetration yet into the body of individual liberties in this country. I do not see how one can escape the conclusion that the traditional freedoms to move, to travel, to vacation away from one's home if one's personal situation should make that necessary or possible, will be seriously invaded.

As one now in service I recognize the need for a Reserve, will give my time to it, and will not complain that others of my generation stand to escape military obligation altogether. But those of us who have given 2 years of our lives to the military already deserve something better, I think, than for the succeeding 4 years to be nothing but a series of 6-day passes from our local units of the military Reserve.

It seems to me that an acceptable compromise between the requirements of security and the rights of the individual could be struck by reducing the number of weeks of required training from 50 to 36 or 30. None with a realistic knowledge of the caliber of military training can argue that this would seriously lower the effectiveness of the program. The change would, I suspect, work to eliminate a great deal of the evasion which, otherwise, would inevitably accompany the program.

The Powell and Bow amendments are extraneous, of course. But there are compelling reasons for the country to think seriously about the implications of the military Reserve plan. I hope we have not yet lived so long in a defense society that we cannot see that the issue of personal liberty is quite intimately involved here, and that it needs to be defended more passionately than it has been defended so far in the editorial columns of the Nation's leading newspapers.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

Mr. Speaker, compulsory military service is a deliberate confiscation of both individual liberty and leisure time. The obligation is on the Pentagon to explain the actual need, the real purpose, and the exact scope of the measure they propose. With 2,400,000 Reserves in existence today, why must we train 100,000 to 400,000 more every year to reach a total of 2,950,000 men by 1959? What is sacred about the figure of 2,950,000? How was it arrived at; what are these men needed for, and how are they to be trained to make them more effective than the 2,400,000 reservists on the rolls today? And, if today's reservists are so ineffective as the military claim, why have not some general officers been reclassified for this training failure?

How effectively do the Pentagon proposals result in the equitable sharing of Reserve obligations? Is it true, as Walter Millis, editor of the Forrestal Diaries, states, "the basic purpose is not to draft men in order to create a needed Reserve, but to create a Reserve in order to draft men"?

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in the dry country of the West, the most important piece of equipment of the desert traveler is his canteen. It contains the meager water supply which may mean the difference between life and death.

In a larger sense, the Colorado River system is the canteen—the only source of water—for large portions of seven Western States.

Southern California has drunk deeply from that canteen, and the effects of that life-giving water are everywhere to be seen. In the 1930–40 decade, as Hoover Dam made large quantities of Colorado River water available to the lower basin of the river, this area increased its population by 21.2 percent, a rate of growth double that of the 11 Western States and triple that of the Nation as a whole.

In the 1940–50 decade, as the lower basin put more and more Colorado River water to use, its population increase was a tremendous 52.9 percent, compared to 22.8 percent for other Western States and 14.5 percent for the Nation.

Now that the thirsty upper-basin States are reaching for the canteen, southern California is protesting and trying in every way to keep the vital water from us. And if we are not permitted to use our share of the water—by developing it through the Colorado River storage project—our upper-basin States will be unable to grow and develop.

Why does southern California begrudge a neighbor a sip from their joint canteen—especially when the neighbor has furnished more than 90 percent of the water to fill it?

Does southern California want all the water?

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision. On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, appeared before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and described the Copyright Act of 1909 as archaic. At that time they requested the creation of a number of new positions in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress to undertake a 3-year study looking toward the revision of the domestic law. The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives included a recommendation of $20,000 for the initiation of studies relating to the revision of the copyright laws in its report on H. R. 7117 in House Report No. 1036. By a voice vote the House on July 1 passed H. R. 7117, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1956, without amendment. This bill, containing an appropriation of $20,000 for the special study of the copyright laws, is now under consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee is Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

I include as part of my remarks excerpts from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909.

VII. THE NEW BEGINNING, 1932

In the early days of the 72d Congress 3 S. 176 by Mr. Hébert, S. 3985 by Mr. Dill, and H. R. 139 by Mr. Vestal, were introduced. No action, however was ever taken on any of these bills. Representative William I. Sirovich, the new chairman of the House Committee on Patents, struck out in a new direction by calling for hearings on the subject of a general revision of the copyright law without considering any particular bill. These hearings were held on February 1, 2, 3, 12, 15, 23, 24, 26, 29, of 1932, and March 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14 of the year 1932. The committee invited all the various groups and interest concerned with copyright to appear and state their views. The objective seems to have been to attempt to get a definite statement from each with respect to what should be in a major revision.

No attempt has been made, while covering the hearings held in preceding Congresses, to indicate the specific arguments offered in support of or in opposition to the bills with which those hearings dealt. In order, however, to present a true picture of the complications, and difficulties with which congressional committees were faced in attempting a major revision of the copyright law, some of the arguments and contentions advocated during this hearing by the various special interests are set out below.[1]

Mr. Richard C. DeWolf, Acting Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, commented on some of the legal aspects of the subject. Briefly summarized, he stated:

"First, as to the nature of the right itself. It was pointed out in hearings before the Senate committee that there are two schools of though in relation to the nature of copyright. One holding that it is a natural right of the author, the other holding that it is a purely statutory right granted so to speak on the balance of convenience between the author and the public." [2]

During the course of his testimony Mr. DeWolf was questioned as to his opinion with respect to certain controversial matters. He pointed out "that it is a highly controversial matter and we feel in the Copyright Office that we should remain neutral in regard to these controversies."

Mr. Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights, then commented upon the present situation and the contents of some of the bills that had been introduced in recent years. In the course of his remarks he stated:

"It seems futile to hope for the enactment of a general revision bill during this session, but it may be possible to pass a brief bill for this one purpose with no proposals for copyright amendment except such as are required to bring our copyright law into accord with the articles of convention." [3]

He was speaking with respect to our entry into the International Copyright Union. Mr. Karl Fenning, professor of patent laws, then testified with respect to the 2-cent royalty on the production of phonograph records, stating that it was unconstitutional, and, in addition, opposed the destruction of copyright material at the Library of Congress.[4]

During the course of the testimony of the succeeding witnesses, the chairman of the committee requested that they state whether they were in favor of 3 or 4 points which he put thusly:

"First, copyright of the author's product of his mind in his own name. Second, the privilege to him to assign that copyright to whomever he wishes provided it is registered in a copyright office. Third, the right to license to any individual that the author may wish his copyrighted product, either in whole or in part, provided that it is registered in the copyright office in Washington, which will be an emancipation of the authors of America." [5]

The following witnesses endorsed these principles: Mr. Joseph B. Bickerton, Jr., Authors' League; Mrs. Inez Haynes Irwin, president, Authors' League; Edward Childs Carpenter, president, Dramatists' Guild; Chester Crowell, Authors' League; Miss Fannie Hurst; Will Irwin; Silas Bent; Miss Thyra Samter Winslow; Lodewidk Broom; Arthur Guiterman; Sigmund Romberg (he was also in favor of removing the 2-cent price fixing clause) (he was opposed to automatic copyright however); Rupert Hughes (opposed to automatic copyright); William Hamilton Osborne, council, Authors' League; John Schulman, Songwriters' Protective Association; Miss Margaret Widdemer; Mrs. Mateel Howe Farnham; M. Koenigsberg; Lyman Beecher Stowe; Joseph Wharton Lippincott, the Book Publishers' Association; W. T. Bisell, the National Association of Publishers; William O. Tufts, Rand McNally & Co., map publishers; Mrs. Verma P. Taylor, the American Pen Women; Miss Mary Meek Atkinson, District of Columbia Chapter, the American Pen Women; Wallace McClure, State Department.

In addition to endorsing the three principles enunciated by the chairman of the committee, Mr. William O. Tufts, listed above, points out in a written brief that with respect to publishers who were in fact employers of authors something additional was needed. He stated:

"There are three important points to be kept in mind by your committee while framing copyright legislation. These are briefly as follows: (1) The right of protection and the copyright title must in many cases rest with the publishing firm as technically the authors of maps, atlases, or reference books in question, (2) there should be no difference in the protection granted to maps and atlases as distinguished from books and periodicals. The maps and atlases are literary property in the same sense as printed books and magazines, (3) any change in the present copyright act should not be framed so as to invalidate the protection now resting in the common law during the process of production and before publication has taken place." [6]

The testimony of Frederick G. Melcher, Book Publishers Association, reflected the consistent advocacy of entering into the Bern Convention by the Register of Copyrights, and the consistent opposition on the part of the printers and book publishers.[7]

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, State Department, in the course of his testimony with respect to the protection of the producers of literary artistic work in other countries stated:

"The Department of State believes that we can do that best by becoming a party to what is known as the Bern Convention for the protection of literary and artistic works, as several times revised since its original inauguration at Bern in 1886. Now we have the latest revision before us, that of Rome, made in 1928." [8]

He stated further:

"At the last session of Congress, copyright bills were before Congress, and one passed the House of Representatives. The Department of State thereupon sent to the President and he to the Senate where it was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, asking advice and consent of the Senate that the President might adhere to the treaty on the part of the United States the copyright convention as revised at Berlin in 1908 together with a protocol of 1914. The revision of Rome had not come into force at that time. Now the revision of Rome is in operation and consequently if the contemplated bill should pass the House of Representatives we feel certain that the Department of State would recommend that the President send the Rome Convention to the Senate for the same purpose in order that the Senate might take up a new treaty and the new bill at the same time. I do not think there was ever any direct offer to the United States of conditional membership." [9]

The Bar Association of the City of New York, committee on copyright, stated its views on the subject of a general revision of the copyright law in part as follows:

"First, the association believes that such a general revision is necessary at this time in order to adapt a copyright law into the many changes which have taken place in modes of communications of intellectual and artistic creations since the act of 1909. Second, the association favored the adherence of the United States to the convention creating an international union for the protection of literary and artistic works. * * * Third, as a necessary corollary to the foregoing, the association favors the principle of so-called automatic copyright, that is to say of securing to authors from the creation of their works full statutory copyright protection without compliance with any formalities or conditions. * * * Four, the association favors a change in the copyright term from the present 28 years with a renewal for a like period, and it believes that the provision for a term measured by the life of the author plus a fixed number of years, after his death, is the most workable. We are not wedded to any particular number of years and there is ground for reasonable objection to so long a period as 50 years [after the death of the author] * * * Fifth, the association of the bar and this committee favor the principle of divisible copyright." [10]

A minority of the committee, although signing the report, submitted their views in a memorandum attached thereto. They opposed two features, that of extending the time of protection to 50 years after the death of the author, and the loss of common law copyright protection but a substitution of automatic copyright.

H. H. B. Meyer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington. D. C.[11] Dr. Meyer stated that he was appearing as a private individual and also as spokesman for the American Council of Learned Societies. He advocated that the present copyright law (1909) be not changed with respect to the importation of single copies of books by scholars for their own use and not for sale.

John G. Paine, the Music Publishers' Protective Association,[12] endorsed the three points made by the chairman of the committee with respect to the authors; however he stated that before completely and fully endorsing it he wanted to see the language. He also testified as to the general similarity of interest between the Music Publishers' Protective Association and the American Society of Authors, Composers, and Publishers, pointing out that in some cases individuals were members of the board of both organizations. He felt, however, that copyright should be assigned as a whole and stated that he had never been in favor of the divisibility of copyright.

Carl L. Cannon, book-buying committee, American Library Association, testifying with respect to the importation provisions of the present law, stated:

"The American Library Association desires to see, in any legislation that may be enacted, the present right of American libraries to import any book duty free, in other words to retain the same provision, the same clause as in effect at present." [13]

Harry Shaw, president, National Association of Broadcasters, appeared before the committee to oppose the passage of the Vestal copyright bill, H. R. 12549, and any other copyright legislation which in the judgment of the organizations' copyright committee was inimical to the best interest of broadcasting stations.[14]

---

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings, General Revision of the Copyright Law, 72d Cong., 1st sess.

[2] Hearings, op. cit., p. 9.

[3] Hearings, op. cit., p. 28.

[4] Hearings, op. cit., p. 29, et. seq.

[5] Hearings, op. cit., p. 41.

[6] Hearings, op. cit., p. 109.

[7] Hearings, op. cit., p. 111.

[8] Hearings, op. cit., p. 125.

[9] Hearings, op. cit., p. 128.

[10] Hearings, op. cit., p. 137–138.

[11] Hearings, op. cit., p. 141.

[12] Hearings, op. cit., p. 144.

[13] Hearings, op. cit., p. 155.

[14] Hearings, op. cit., p. 161.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include an excerpt from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the Copyright Law of 1909:

Louis G. Caldwell, National Broadcasters Association, endorsed in behalf of the association the three points made by the chairman of the committee. He pointed out that a majority of the broadcast time of radio stations concerns musical compositions rather than literary works. He reviewed briefly the interpretation placed by courts upon the present copyright act with respect thereto as follows:

"The courts have so far held (1) that a broadcaster who broadcasts a copyrighted musical composition performed in his studio is engaged in a public performance for profit of that composition and is liable for infringement, if he is not authorized by the copyright owner; (2) that a broadcaster who broadcasts copyrighted musical compositions performed elsewhere than in his studio, that is, by a hotel orchestra connected with the station by remote control, is likewise engaged in a public performance for profit of that composition, and is liable if neither he nor the person actually performing the composition, that is, the hotel proprietor, is authorized by the copyright owner; (3) that a hotel proprietor who operates a receiving set and loudspeaker for the entertainment of hotel guests is likewise engaged in the public performance for profit of that same musical composition and is liable for infringement if neither he nor the broadcaster is authorized by the copyright owner. The questions which are not yet settled are the following:

"1. Is the hotel proprietor in the case last mentioned liable if he does not have a license, but the broadcasting station to which the receiving set is tuned does have a license?

"2. Is the broadcaster liable for a program which he receives by remote control from a hotel dining room or a dance hall where the broadcaster does not have a license but the hotel or dancehall proprietor does have a license?" [15]

In the light of this Mr. Caldwell stated:

"The sort of case I had described leads us to advocate the principle which we have come to call the single-performance principle. We urge that the man who has no control over what music is played and who cannot possibly protect himself against infringement no matter what precautions he takes and no matter how many license fees he paid should not be held liable under sound copyright legislation." [16]

Mr. Caldwell pointed out the various problems with which radio stations both rich and poor were confronted in trying to avoid infringing copyright with respect to music. Even if the technical problems within the radio station itself were solved, the broadcasting station is not protected:

"The American society does not control all of the American music by any means and only controls a portion of foreign music. There is another organization in this country known as Associated Music Publishers, Inc., which claims to control some 600,000 foreign titles, about 10 percent of which are registered in the United States and have copyright protection. A large number of stations have felt it necessary to take out a license from this organization which has made a demand upon virtually all of them. There is still a third organization which during the past 18 months has appeared on the scene, Elkin-Vogel Co. of Philadelphia, which claims to have the grand performing rights of French music. So far as foreign music is concerned, the license of the American society gives protection or is supposed to give protection on music controlled by similar organizations in Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungary, and Sweden." [17]

After a brief interruption, Mr. Caldwell continued:

"This, however, does not cover all the music in all these countries; for example, three important publishing houses do not belong to the English society: Stainer & Bell, Novello & Co., and Gould & Co. The very important music of Germany and Austria is in an unsettled state. A few German and Austrian publishers are represented by this second organization, the Associated Music Publishers. There is still another organization known as the Society of European State Authors and Composers, which controls music which is not covered by the license of the American society, including the Society of Spanish Authors and Composers, the Society of German Stage Authors and Miscellaneous Publishers. You will note that the Italian music is not included in the list I have mentioned. You can readily see what would happen if all foreign music were given automatic copyright protection in this country and the number of new organizations broadcasters might have to deal with." [18]

Later he stated:

"This leads directly into a question upon which we can be somewhat more specific in our position. From what I have already said, you will readily see the importance to the broadcaster of being able to ascertain what musical compositions are protected by copyright and what are in the public domain. This is why we have so vigorously urged that when copyrighted works are published they must be accompanied by a printed notice to copyright, and also that they must be registered in a central office of such as is now done under the present copyright act. The term of copyright protection must also be a definite term of years so that the broadcaster or other user can tell when the work passes into the public domain and is free for use by anyone." [19]

Still later on, he stated:

"The floodgates are completely open with automatic copyright in the sense which it is enforced in Europe, together with a copyright term consisting of the life of the author plus 50 years, so that no one can tell when the term ends there will hardly be any public domain, and there will in reality be almost perpetual copyright." [20]

Mr. Caldwell concluded:

"The points in which the broadcasters are interested may be summarized as follows: (1) A trustworthy and practical means by which copyrighted works can be distinguished from works that are in the public domain. In the present state of our knowledge we believe that copyright notice, registration, and definite term of copyright protection are all necessary for this purpose. But we shall maintain ourselves open-minded and receptive to any substitute which might adequately accomplish the same purpose; (2) protection against penalties, particularly for innocent infringement. This means (a) that the minimum damage clause should either be made to correspond with the actual damages suffered or be eliminated. Penalties as distinguished from damages should be payable to the United States Government not to private parties, (b) that the single performance principle should be recognized so that only the person orginating the performance will be liable and no person who does not have control over what music will be played can be held; (3) protection against abuses of power on the part of combinations of copyright owners; (4) if the author's so-called moral right is to be recognized, protection against the exercise of it against the usual incidents of broadcasting; (5) that ordinary commercial phonograph records shall not be given copyright protection as such; (6) protection of broadcast programs from piracy." [21]

Erwin M. Treusch, the Automatic Music Industries, presented the views of the manufacturers of coin-operated machines:

"It is our purpose in discussing the freedom of bargaining that a person whose genius has made possible the production of a musical work, shall have a right to say how much he shall receive for any particular use of that work provided he treats it as a union; in other words that he may be permitted to separately bargain either for the entire right, or for the rights as they apply to sheet music, or as they apply to phonograph records, or as they apply to piano rolls but having done that once he is not permitted to follow it down through the course of use and collect multiple royalties." [22]

Mr. Treusch further explained:

"If admission is charged to the place where the reproduction or rendition occurred, then, obviously the purpose of the business is being served by the use of that record and royalty further should be paid, but that right should not accrue unless it is a direct part of the business and unless a profit accrues directly which is the result of the admission or the cover charges which the chairman has pointed out. It is in other words, Mr. Chairman, the desire of this association to avoid a multiplicity of royalties. That is stating the proposition in a comparatively few words." [23]

HOMER E. CAPEHART, vice president, the Automatic Music Industries, pointed out the crux of the argument:

"There are two ways it can be done. One is that he can get a royalty on every record. That is the 1909 law, that he is only entitled to a royalty on those records. Now he comes along he not only wants a royalty on those records but he likewise wants another royalty or fee when those records are played in the field." [24]

Mr. CAPEHART pointed out that the music industries have no quarrel with the second fee where admission is charged to the place of business and they feel that he is entitled then to an additional royalty.

Willis D. Nance, the Mills Novelty Co., and the Seeburg Piano Corp.,[25] indicated that they also favored one royalty and one royalty at the source. They were completely opposed to a multiplicity of royalties particularly where such multiplicity of royalties comes from owners of candy kitchens, drug stores, and small town merchants.

Louis Swarts, chairman, copyright committee, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, stated that the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America had not as yet taken official action as to what their attitude would be and that he was therefore speaking generally for Paramount-Publix Corp., Metro-Goldwyn-

---

[15] Hearings, op. cit., p. 174.

[16] Hearings, op. cit., p. 175.

[17] Hearings, op. cit., p. 186.

[18] Hearings, op. cit., p. 187.

[19] Hearings, op. cit., p. 191.

[20] Hearings, op. cit., p. 191.

[21] Hearings, op. cit., p. 196.

[22] Hearings, op. cit., p. 200.

[23] Hearings, op. cit., p. 201.

[24] Hearings, op. cit., p. 209.

[25] Hearings, op. cit., p. 213.

Mayer, Universal Pictures, RKO Pictures, Fox and Fox Films. During the course of his testimony Mr. Swarts pointed out:

"The United States, because of its copyright laws which granted copyrights to foreigners on certain conditions and formalities, enjoyed a very large public domain; that is, there were many, many works free in this country which were protected not only in the country of origin but frequently throughout the convention at Berne. To deprive this country of that public domain and those engaged in the utilization of copyrighted material, seemed to be out of the minds of most people and Members of Congress whom I have contacted in the past, and so it seems that the direct approach to the copyright through the convention of Rome is not possible at this time." [26]

The chairman of the committee then stated the three points upon which many previous witnesses had agreed, adding a fourth and a fifth:

"That where an author assigns a license of any particular part of his copyrighted material to 2 or 3 people at the same time and for the same thing, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment, fine, or both; and a fifth, that where one is copyrighted and licenses in whole or in part to any particular individual and receives money therefrom and in the end it proves that this material has been plagiarized or is not his own, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to imprisonment, fine, or both.[27]

The chairman then requested Mr. Swarts to state whether his principal favored these five points. Mr. Swarts replied:

"In part, yes, sir. Of course, we reserve our opinion with reference to what you have said until we see how it will be accomplished." [28]

Mr. Swarts then advocated the principle that a licensee or assignee should have the right to sue in his own name, and further stated that he felt that some provision should be made for the protection of an innocent infringer.

Gabriel L. Hess, general attorney, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America,[29] stated that they were also interested in preserving the so-called penalty provisions in the existing copyright act. Mr. Hess pointed out several abuses which these penalties were designed to prevent, "holding over and bicycling." Holding over, is where an exhibitor purchases a show to show in his theater for 2 days and holds it over for 3. Bicycling, is where an exhibitor purchases a show or picture to be exhibited at a particular theater and then exhibits it at a different theater. He pointed out that the market of the distributors of motion pictures is limited to the playing time of the theaters. In other words they charge a greater fee for exhibiting a motion picture for 3 days rather than 2, and for exhibiting the film in a larger theater rather than a smaller.

Gene Buck, president, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, endorsed the 5 principles enunciated by the chairman.[30] During the course of the testimony of the succeeding witness the chairman of the committee referred back to Mr. Buck and questioned him with respect to the Society's attitude with regard to the 2-cent fee put upon mechanical records requesting whether they took the position that the law should be changed. Mr. Buck replied that that particular 2-cent clause was the most iniquitous piece of legislation ever passed in Washington.[31]

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include a section of a major study prepared for me by the Library of Congress of the many attempts to modernize the Copyright Law of 1909:

The hearings on the morning of February 29, 1932, had been designed to afford the theatrical producers an opportunity to present their views. The chairman announced:

"Apparently the theatrical interests, so far as I can see, are shot to pieces. The Shuberts are in the hands of receivers, they are practically bankrupt. Al Woods is another, Hammerstein is bankrupt. I predicted 4 or 5 years ago at the meeting of the Committee on Patents, if conditions continued as they have these legitimate interests would be bankrupt. Since we have no representative of that great organization, I am going to call on Mr. Solberg, the former register of copyrights, to say whatever he may, regarding the subject of copyright." [32]

Mr. Solberg then gave extensive testimony to the effect that he was in favor of a copyright for life and 50 years after the death of the author. He also testified that he was in favor of automatic copyright and of entering the convention of Berne. Louis G. Caldwell, former counsel, Radio Commission, Washington, D. C., when asked by the chairman as to which he preferred, automatic copyright or registration and recordation, he stated that he was in favor of registration.

"The broadcasters are interested in having sufficient registration and copyright notice so that they will be able to tell what material is protected by copyright and what material is in the public domain. So far as automatic copyright goes broadcasters have no quarrel with it if the requirements of notice and registration are preserved." [33]

Stephen L. Newman, representing the Association of Picture Publishers, the American Art Bureau, the Association of Artists and Art Dealers, the American Federation of Art in Washington, the American Homes Bureau,[34] appeared before the committee and made a special plea for a separate fine arts section such as that contained in the British copyright law, and in the copyright law of every member of the Berne convention. He pointed out the abuses to which artists and their works are subjected, especially in the field of imitation and near imitation. The British act concludes that near imitation is copyright infringement.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, and William B. Warner, president of McCall Co., chairman of the copyright committee, National Publishers Association (magazines and periodicals),[35] appeared in behalf of their organization. They were in favor of the five points made by the committee. They made a special plea, however, in behalf of provisions protecting the innocent infringer against injunction because of the terrific investment a magazine has in a particular issue covering many, many pieces of advertising and other material, whereas the innocent infringement may be a small item. An injunction would prevent the issuance of the particular edition, involving the publishers in terrific financial losses, although the infringement may be in matter submitted to the magazine in advertising over which they have no control.

Sidney E. Samuelson, president, Allied Theater Owners of New Jersey,[36] testified respecting the campaign of terror and abuse to which theater owners had been subjected by certain organizations which constituted themselves middlemen and who stand between the producers and the creators, on the one side, and the public, on the other. He offered written letters, photostats of checks, and other things. George P. Aarons, Motion Picture Theater Owners of Eastern Pennsylvania, Southern New Jersey, and Delaware, testified, in part:

"My objection to the copyright law in that it does not apply to the holdover situation is this: we have 10 decisions on that subject in the lower courts; 8 of which have established that the holding over is a violation of the copyright law, and I hold that it is a violation of contract." [37]

Later, the following interchange took place between Mr. Aarons and the chairman:

"The CHAIRMAN. To summarize the views of those here today who have spoken, you are in favor of giving to every author and composer the right which he is given by article I, sections 8, 9 of the Constitution, which gives him the exclusive right for a number of years to his work. We can not deprive the author of that. You have no sympathy as I gathered with the deliberate and willful infringer who goes out and steals?

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. But what you want is some legislation that will protect the innocent man who through a high pressure salesman or inadvertently, becomes a victim of a misunderstanding, and who, because of the limited amount of damages that can be claimed under the statute which may be claimed, is put at the mercy of this group; whereas he might nightly have taken in $250 at his theater? Is that correct?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that right?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Suppose in writing the new copyright law which I intend to frame and submit to our committee I insert a provision wherein an infringement has been done in an innocent way, there shall be no collection of infringement damages. But where you get proof of willful infringement or where there is a question of doubt or a matter of opinion, it must go to the court where the minimum damage shall be from $50 to $5,000 depending upon the discretion of the court. Would that, in your opinion, be just?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes. That would be more just than the present law. I am in favor of the Federal court having jurisdiction of the violations of the Federal copyright law. But I think that the new law which is to be written should differentiate clearly just what is a violation of Federal copyright law in the holding-over of pictures; so that in holding-over you will not have that question to be determined by the Federal court, as it would be determined before hand.

"The CHAIRMAN. But how about the man who takes his motion picture and plays it in different theaters?

"Mr. AARONS. He should be taken into court; the State court or the Federal court. We have no sympathy with that man and do not care what you do with him." [38]

Alfred T. Reid, chairman, the legislative committee, American Artists' Professional

---

[26] Hearings, op. cit., p. 242.

[27] Hearings, op. cit., p. 243.

[28] Hearings, op. cit., p. 244.

[29] Hearings, op. cit., p. 246 et seq.

[30] Hearings, op. cit., pp. 298–299.

[31] Hearings, op. cit., p. 307.

[32] Hearings op. cit. p. 321.

[33] Hearings op. cit., p. 335.

[34] Hearings, op. cit., p. 340.

[35] Hearings, op. cit., p. 344 et seq.

[36] Hearings, op. cit., p. 393 et seq.

[37] Hearings, op. cit., p. 405 et seq.

[38] Hearings, op. cit., p. 407.

League,[39] entered a plea for a special provision protecting the artistic works of artists. With respect to the points enumerated by the chairman to the other witnesses, Mr. Reid was in agreement.

C. E. Chambers, the Artists' Guild (free-lance artists),[40] discussed the pirating of pictures, cartoons, etc., produced by artists, and requested special protection in the copyright bill.

M. L. Raney, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and personal book buyers generally,[41] attacked the manufacturing provisions of the statute and desired liberalization with respect to the importation of single copies for use and not for sale.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights,[42] again testified in support of the statements of Mr. Raney. He stated that "when it comes to proposed legislation, however, we find that the restrictions of the existing law have been increased [in relation to importation], and it is there where the strongest protest, in our opinion, should be made."

Dr. W. G. Leland, director, American Council of Learned Societies, testified as follows:

"The point I wish to speak about is the last one brought up by Mr. Raney and the one Mr. Solberg spoke of, namely, the threatened limitation of the right of the individual to purchase authorized editions for his own use. Under the present copyright law, with which we are satisfied so far as that provision is concerned, scholars are allowed to purchase such books as they may need for their own use and to bring them in subject to the payment of duty. This provision under the new law would seriously limit that privilege which we have at present.[43]

Dr. Charles R. Mann, director of American Council of Education,[44] also testified in support of Mr. Raney's and Mr. Solberg's statements.

Harry H. Hershfield, journalist, as representing drama critics, testified with respect to destructive dramatic criticism:

"I think the biggest danger to the legitimate drama and amusement in general is not the destructive criticism as we know destructive criticism; but the critic boosting a show is in my opinion more dangerous than the deliberate destructive criticism. Well, there may be cases of desire to favor some individual fan who might be a producer or author. Even a city like New York can stand no more than 10 hits at one time; the rest must go by the board, and if these shows are what are called built up by continual praise which often happens, the effect on the public is destructive in this way if the show did not merit that praise. They naturally go to the shows that they have read most about and that have been praised most. They are often very much disappointed and they have been disgusted with the general idea of show business." [45]

Hatcher Hughes, professor of dramatic art, Columbia University, stated:

"And I agree with the sanity of Mr. Hershfield's statements to this extent that the condition of criticism is such that it would be extremely difficult for me to conceive of the thing being done in the way that I should like to have it done under present conditions.

"Dramatic critics on the daily papers in New York—I do not know so much about the conditions outside of New York—they have to be first journalist, that is they must report the play the next morning for their paper because I have talked with editors about just that point. The editor thinks that however bad it may be for dramatic criticism it is good newspaper journalism—good journalism to have that report the next morning for the public to read." [46]

Saul Rogers, general counsel, Fox Film Corp., stated:

"The position I take with reference to dramatic criticism is this. Dramatic criticism after all should be an analytical expression on the part of the reviewer of the achievements of the artist who I may call the dramatist, who has written the play and the artist who has interpreted this play. It may be commendatory, it may be adverse, I am not opposed to adverse criticism if it is honest adverse criticism." [47]

Robert Bruce Coleman, Jr., dramatic critic, Daily Mirror:

"I have made a few notes, for instance my idea of criticism is that criticism should analyze. It should get at the facts. I think that today criticism has a social as well as an artistic aspect and by that I mean that it should criticize a play from the standpoint of art, at the same time it must be a report to the public, to the reader of a paper." [48]

Later the chairman quesioned him stating:

"All right. We go to the second question, which is, should there be any limitation imposed by law upon the exercise of this function of criticism?

"Mr. Coleman. No. Most certainly not."[48]

The hearings concluded on March 14, 1932. Thereafter, Congressman Sirovich introduced H. R. 10976, 10364, and 10740, providing for a general revision of the copyright law.[49] On March 21 the committee began hearings on H. R. 10976. Once again the various interests took sides as follows:

Those in favor of the bill were:

Will Irwin, chairman, copyright committee, Authors' League.

Mrs. Manteel.

Harold Farnham, Authors' League.

William Hamilton Osborne, council, Authors' League.

William B. Warner, president, National Publishers Association.

Robert C. Coulson, counsel, National Publishers Association.

Frederick G. Melcher, National Association of Book Publishers.

Albert T. Reid, American Artist Professional League, the Artist Guild, the Society of Illustrators.

George W. Harris, Harris & Ewing, Washington, D. C.

Frank A. K. Boland, the American Hotel Association.

Those either opposing the bill outright or certain features of it or proposing amendments were:

Milton Danziger, International Association of Fairs and Expositions.

R. S. Ould, patent attorney.

William O. Tufts, Rand McNally Co.

John H. McCracken, American Council on Education.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights.

Karl Fenning, professor of patent law, Georgetown University.

Gabriel L. Hess, motion picture producer and distributor of America.

Samuel Spring, counsel, Metro Goldwyn and Paramount Pictures Corp.

George E. MacClean, former professor, the University of Minnesota, former chancellor, University of Nebraska, former president, University of the State of Iowa.

Abram F. Myers, general counsel, Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors.

Arthur E. Garmaize, Columbia Phonograph Co.

Henry A. Bellows, National Association of Broadcasters.

Henry Grattan Doyle, George Washington University.

Nathan Burkan, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Music Publishers.

Louis E. Swarts, attorney, Paramount Corp.

Julian Brylawski, Motion Picture Theater Owners of America, District of Columbia Theater Owners.

---

[39] Hearings, op. cit., p. 412.

[40] Hearings, op. cit., p. 418.

[41] Hearings, op. cit., p. 461.

[42] Hearings, op. cit., p. 488.

[43] Hearings, op. cit., p. 488.

[44] Hearings, op. cit., p. 500.

[45] Hearings, op. cit., p. 506.

[46] Hearings, op. cit., p. 510.

[47] Hearings, op. cit., p. 524.

[48] Hearings, op. cit., p. 536.

[49] U. S. Congress. House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 10976, pp. 1–32.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, great interest has been expressed in a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress of the many attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. A portion of that study is included here:

The hearings on H. R. 10976 were concluded on March 25, 1932, and thereafter the House Committee on Patents reported the bill on April 5, 1932 (H. Rept. 1008, 72d Cong., 1st sess.), but no further action was taken upon it. After several changes Congressman Sirovich reintroduced the bill as H. R. 11948. Hearings were again called on May 12, 1932, on the revised bill. At the beginning of the hearings Congressman Sirovich stated:

"I would like to make the following statement. For almost 3 months the Committee on Patents and Copyrights has held hearings for the purpose of perfecting a copyright bill. At these hearings we gave permission to every industry, to every enterprise that would be affected through the principle of copyright; every organization that I thought was interested in the copyright legislation was invited to appear before the committee and give its views.

"A bill was then written upon which hearings were held, at which every interest that appeared, before the bill was written, was invited to appear before the committee. So far as the chairman of this committee knows, everybody was permitted to give their opinion about the bill, either for or against it. We then had a hearing on the bill in the executive session; the bill was reported out. It was reported out unanimously, with a permission given to Mr. Lanham and Mr. McLeod to make any amendments or any revisions that they may wish, or any changes, on the floor of the House, and we went before the Rules Committee and tried to get a rule to bring the bill up.

"Last week we were told that there were 2 or 3 interests who claimed that they had had no hearing on this bill. One is the map people, the other is the exhibitors, and the other was the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. In order that this bill that the committee reported should not lose its position a new bill was introduced in which two modifications to meet objections raised by the map people and exhibitors were made in the bill. Otherwise the bill is absolutely identical with the bill H. R. 10976 as it was." [50]

The hearing then proceeded. Those in favor were William O. Tufts and Abraham F. Myers, while those opposed to the bill or some of its features were: Gabriel L. Hess, national distributors of motion pictures; Samuel Spring, motion picture producers and distributors; Natan Burkan, counsel, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Ray T. Ernst; A. Julian Brylawski.

At the conclusion of the hearings on H. R. 11948, the committee reported the bill to the House (House Rept. No. 1361, 72d Cong., 1st sess.) and a special order was applied for (H. Res. 229). In the floor debate on the order Congressman Sirovich described his efforts to bring harmony and obtain a general agreement:

"When the Committee on Patents was organized at the first session of the 72d Congress, 19 members being present, it was unanimously decided to hold hearings on the subject of copyright legislation. Every industry interested in copyright was invited to be present.

"This novel method was used in inaugurating and continuing the hearings of the Committee on Patents. These hearings, starting in January 1932, were in the beginning held with no formal bill before the committee. I had extended invitations to all persons, associations, companies, concerns, and counsel interested in and affected by copyright to come before the committee and express their ideas and convictions as to what might be done to improve the copyright law of 1909 in view of the great changes brought about since then in all lines of communication, presentation, and publishing.

"In doing this it was my intention to get a cross section of opinion from those most competent to give it of what should be incorporated in the proposed bill, so that all those entitled to it should have fair and equal representation and be given ample time to present their views. Authors, dramatists, composers, publishers of periodicals, magazines, books, maps, and charts; motion-picture authors, scenarists, directors, and producers: radio organizations: phonograph, music-roll, and record makers, their counsel or organization representatives were urged to appear before the Committee on Patents and state their views. No one was denied hearing or full opportunity to present his or her views on the rights of authors and others to copyright.

"After a series of hearings had been held and the statements of those present and those communicating had been considered, a bill was drawn up and introduced in the House of Representatives in order to have a definite document corrected to the moment before the committee. This and other bills were amended and introduced until the final bill, H. R. 12094, was laid before an executive meeting of the committee, favorably reported out to the House, a rule obtained, and the bill given a place on the calendar." [51]

On the other side Congressman Lanham gave a different picture of the situation:

"Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, most of the Members of the House are familiar with the fact that for many years I have been very much interested in copyright legislation, and working in an effort to get upon our statute books some proper provisions to supersede the very archaic and obsolete law of 1909, under which we are now operating.

"Today, with this copyright measure pending, many pleasant memories of this service come to me, but they are tinged also with sadness. In my judgment, no man in this country has done or will do as much to make desirable copyright legislation possible as our late and lamented friend, Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana. [Applause.] For 8 years he labored faithfully, diligently, and efficiently in an effort to reconcile and harmonize the divergent interests affected by copyright legislation. At first these various interests were at one another's throats, but through the patience and persistence of our former colleague he so oiled the troubled waters that in the last session of Congress he was able to bring before this body and to pass a copyright bill. It passed the House of Representatives with only one amendment and that is a tribute to his skill and to his industry and to his intelligence.

"Through those years it was my pleasure in a very modest way to cooperate with Mr. Vestal, and I value that association with him. It is out of the depth of that experience that I am enabled to make this statement and pay this tribute.

"As is generally known, last year the Vestal bill failed of passage in another body largely by reason of certain filibustering tactics, which prevented many measures from being considered. When we came back for this session, Mr. Vestal, who had labored so long and so faithfully with the committee in the forming of his bill and in preparing the way to make a consideration of copyright matters feasible, introduced on the 8th day of last December H. R. 139. This bill, in the main, is the bill which the House passed last year. That bill, introduced by this man who had given so many years of study to the measure and who had made it possible to consider copyright legislation in this body, was never considered for 1 minute by the Committee on Patents.

"Now, what is the situation this year? I am familiar with the terms of the Vestal bill. I worked on it for 8 years. In collaboration with Mr. Vestal during the last session, I explained its various provisions when it was before the House. I know something about it. Casting aside this bill that was the result of these years of labor and study, we have had introduced this year several copyright bills.

"I wish to be entirely fair to the chairman of the committee; and if I make any statement which is inaccurate, I should like to be corrected. Three copyright bills were introduced by the chairman of the committee. One was introduced on the 10th of March, one on the 22d of March, and one on the 30th of March 1932. He has introduced two or three bills since then, but they have been more or less modifications or amendments of the three bills cited.

"What about the hearings on this measure? Hearings began early in February, but they were quite general in their nature. The chairman had an idea, very much the English idea, and perhaps it is a good one, of conducting a school for the benefit of the committee and having men interested in various features of copyright legislation appear and give their views without reference to any particular bill, for no bill had then been introduced except the Vestal bill, and it was not considered or made the basis of hearings.

"After the bill of March 30 was introduced—and it was upon this bill that a rule was originally asked—we had, I think, 2 days of hearings. I attended them. I did not attend the school during February, because I had had 8 years of study on this subject, was very busy with many official matters, and wanted to reserve my strength for the time when we should actually have a bill before us. All the hearings, which were held prior to the application for a rule, were held prior to the introduction of the bill on which the rule was asked. The Committee on Rules suggested that the Committee on Patents should hold further hearings and give those who desired an opportunity to be heard, and such a hearing was held on May 12.

"The bill this year is different in many particulars from the one we had before us last year. This bill was not drawn by the Committee on Patents, and I think I may say, and I hope members of the committee will correct me if I am wrong, that the committee did not share in drafting the provisions of this bill. I had heard the rumor that the bill had been drawn by a young lawyer in New York in the office of some attorneys who are of counsel for certain concerns which would be affected by copyright legislation. If it is a good bill, I take no exception to that, if, indeed, that be true. It happened that on May 12, the last day on which hearings were held, this young gentleman was present and rose to interpolate some statement in the testimony of a witness before the committee. That was a rainy day, the House was not in session, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Goodwin], and I were the only committee members present. We devoted the entire day to the hearing. I incorporate an extract from this hearing of May 12, pages 115 and 116:

" 'The CHAIRMAN. Read the bill. The sky is the limit. Mr. Jaffe, where willful infringement takes place after registration, the sky is the limit?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. After registration.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. What interest do you represent, Mr. Jaffe?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. I am associated with the counsel for the National Publishers' Association.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. May I ask him this question?

" 'The CHAIRMAN. Any question you want.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. I have understood that this bill, not those features we are discussing, was drawn by you. Is that correct?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. No. I sat in with a number of other people with various interests, with a number of other attorneys who took part in drafting the provisions.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. Was it drawn by attorneys in New York?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. No.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. Who did draw this bill?

" 'The CHAIRMAN. I drew the bill. I took the bill that was given to me by Mr. Dill, redrafted his bill, took his bill, and I did not like every word of it, and I rewrote it and redrafted it and called in various representatives of different organizations that were responsible to help along with the particular interest that they represented.'

"It seems clear from this excerpt that the Committee on Patents has had little or nothing to do with the preparation of this measure.

"Now, gentlemen, reflect upon the situation. After the committee had worked for 8 years in drafting a bill which the committee understood, this year we have had 3 different bills introduced in rapid succession, prior to the subsequent ones which have been amendatory of certain provisions, and these bills have had the careful consideration, it seems, of various persons but not of your Committee on Patents.

"I want a copyright measure that will protect everybody that is entitled to protection." [52]

At the conclusion of the debate the bill was recommitted to the committee.[53] Congressman Sirovich made one further effort toward a major copyright revision by the introduction on June 2, 1932, of one more bill, H. R. 12425. However, no action was taken on the bill. This concluded efforts at a major revision of the copyright law in the 72d Congress. The new beginning had failed.

---

[50] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 11948, p. 1.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, p. 11062.

[52] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, pp. 11065–11066.

[53] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, p. 11072.

Our Antitrust Laws Must Be Strengthened, Not Weakened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my statement before the Celler Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on July 13, 1955, in opposition to H. R. 6875:

I want to thank you for your kindness in according me the opportunity to express my views this morning in opposition to H. R. 6875. This bill, as you know, would change the mandatory requirement of treble damages in private antitrust suits and leave the imposition of more than actual damages in such actions to the discretion of the judges. At the same time, however, it would continue the compulsory treble-damage provision where the violation, in the words of the bill, "shall have been willful."

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted, it seems clear that it will weaken substantially the deterrent effect which treble-damage actions presently occupy in our antitrust framework. The specter of treble damages for antitrust violations has been an ever constant warning to potential antitrust violators, particularly in recent years when substantial awards have been made in such private actions. As the able representative from the Department of Justice noted in his well documented statement, defense counsel have openly recognized this fact. Jerrold G. Van Cise, a prominent practicing lawyer epitomized his legal experience under the antitrust laws in the following language:

"We find that the threat of treble-damage suits, even more than the possibility of Government action, deters businessmen from carrying out the proposed acts or practices. It is our estimate that for every act or practice which results in an actual treble damage there are hundreds of others which were once considered for action by businessmen and were rejected by them because of the fear of treble-damage claims" (p. 7, statement of Bicks).

This deterrent effect of treble damages has long been acknowledged by responsible officials in charge of enforcing the antitrust laws. As the former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Morison, related to this very subcommittee:

"We have, for the first time since the history of the enactment of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act, begun to see the development of private litigation under the triple-damage statute, which is of substantial help. It already is a deterrent, I point out, in the case of the movie industry—there it is a substantial deterrent. It is a substantial deterrent in whatever area the Government has decrees, and the effectiveness of this is for the first time being felt. We begin to feel that we have some companion element of assistance in this which we never had before" (hearings on H. R. 3408, 82d Cong., p. 15).

If treble damages are presently an effective deterrent to antitrust violations, it stands to reason that modifying the mandatory exaction of triple damages will substantially weaken the salutary effects of this provision of the law. It seems to me that since the private antitrust suit has achieved some success in recent years as an adjunct to the efforts of the Department of Justice to enforce the antitrust laws, there should be set forth by the proponents of H. R. 6875 some overwhelming public interest involved which militates against permitting the private action to succeed in its avowed purpose; that is, penalizing violators of the antitrust laws.

It is difficult for me to understand the position of the Department of Justice in advocating enactment of this bill. The representative of the Department adopts the position, rather naively I must confess, that, and I quote:

"The bill could not, as some urge, impair the deterrent effect of private suits. Expressly barred from the benefit of any discretion is the conscious malefactor. This provision, I note, was added to the original Walter bill at the request of this Department. And the unwitting violator seeking to act in conformity with the law is in any event unaffected by the threat of treble damages" (Bicks, p. 11).

This is the same reasoning advanced by the Attorney General's committee, which also advocated this legislative change. The Brownell committee said:

"Moreover, may we urge that making triple recovery discretionary will not impair the deterrent effort of private suits. For the conscious malefactor cannot expect the benefit of such discretion, and the unwitting violator, seeking to act in conformity with the law, is naturally unaffected by the threat of triple damages" (report, p. 378).

In view of the testimony your subcommittee heard concerning the composition of the Brownell committee, its solicitude over unwitting violators, Mr. Chairman, is understandable. But the learned members of the Antitrust Subcommittee surely realize that many so-called unwitting violators will seek to improve their knowledge or to secure legal advice so they can conform to the law, only if they continue to be faced with the discouraging prospect of treble damages for each transgression. On the other hand, the tendency to be unwitting, Mr. Chairman, I submit, will increase if through ignorance one can escape the peril of the threefold penalty.

I think the history of antitrust litigation, certainly in the last 10 years, shows that the persons who were most often hailed into court are the big corporations, who through the years have made a practice of employing the very best legal talent available.

I think the history of the Department of Justice shows that many of their best men are repeatedly recruited from that Department into the legal departments of all of these big corporations and they do it because the corporations want to get the best advice they can.

None of them can claim ignorance of the law. None of them can claim ignorance of the various interpretations of the law as placed upon it by our courts.

Their knowledge on that score is always up to the minute.

They are constantly watching the progress of legislation in this Congress.

I am not being critical of them for seeking the best advice and watching so closely the progress of legislation and the trend of the court opinions.

I think they are wise in doing that. But it points up the fact that there are and will be very few if any unwitting or unlawful violators.

So the cry that you need this bill as now before you in order to protect the unwitting or the unwillful, I think, cannot stand up under analysis.

The deterrent effect of the present law will be further diminished, Mr. Chairman, because without the incentive of treble damages, plaintiffs will be unable to commence private actions or to see protracted litigation to its conclusion. Violations of the law undetected by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission will thereby go unpunished.

The Attorney General's committee, which, it seems to me, showed an undue concern for antitrust defendants, said the change from mandatory to discretionary damages would not reduce incentive for private suits. They state, and I quote from page 379 of their report:

"Nor will incentive to private suit be curtailed. The inducement of mandatory trebled damages is no longer necessary to encourage suits by injured persons. The development of both the procedural and substantive law, largely favorable to the plaintiff, plus the award of attorney fees, affords sufficient incentive to private antitrust actions."

I disagree with the conclusions of the committee. As the statistics show, plaintiffs have been notably unsuccessful in private treble-damage actions. Can they be more successful if they have the additional burden of proving willfulness before recovery of treble damages is to be allowed? The proposed legislation will only add to the burdens already encumbering the private suitor. It can only further discourage the institution of civil proceedings.

Apparently, the Attorney General likewise disagrees with this conclusion of his committee. If I understand the position of the Antitrust Division's representative correctly, it is that a reduction of the mandatory treble-damage provision is necessary in order to encourage private enforcement of the antitrust laws. As the Attorney General's representative stated to this subcommittee on June 29:

"Allowing some courts discretion to assess double or treble damages where violations are not willful may mean more verdicts for private plaintiffs."

We thus have this anomalous situation, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney General's committee recommends discretionary damages on the grounds that the inducement of mandatory trebled damages is no longer necessary to encourage suits by injured persons. At the same time, the Attorney General himself advocates discretionary damages principally on the grounds that plaintiffs will thereby win more often and that by upping the total number of plaintiff verdicts, and thus strengthening the promise of attorney fees, the bill may in fact increase incentive to sue.

The proponents of this legislation should be able to make up their minds as to whether this bill will or will not increase the incentive for private persons to bring antitrust actions under section 4 of the Clayton Act. Certainly, that is one question this subcommittee must answer before it passes upon this legislation.

I frankly confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am unable to explain the complete reversal of the Department of Justice in this important matter from the position it maintained in previous administrations. You read at the last hearing, Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Mr. Graham Morison, who stanchly supported the treble-damage section of the statute as an important auxiliary to the enforcement activities of the Department of Justice. As you well know, Mr. Morison was in charge of the Antitrust Division, when he stated:

"Now, presumably, if you did away with the triple-damage suit entirely, and you still wanted substantial enforcement in order to have economic freedom, you would have to quadruple the size of the Antitrust Division."

The administration's desire to cut down on Government expenditures is utterly at variance with the recommendation for this legislation, if it intends not to increase or decrease, but merely to maintain existing antitrust enforcement standards. To enact this bill must necessarily add measurably to the number of Government employees in the Department of Justice.

If they are just going to proceed on the same level on which they are proceeding, but without the aid of the treble-damage threat, they would have to at least keep their personnel at the same number that they have had in prior administrations instead of cutting back as they are doing.

We are all in favor of cutting down on personnel where you can save some money for the Government but the appropriation should not attempt to be saved if it means less enforcement of our antitrust laws.

To seek to determine, however, whether enactment of this bill will be an incentive to the institution of litigation is begging the question. The existing statute and any amendment of the statute should not be predicated upon incentives to sue. The purpose of the existing law is, and any amendment thereto should be, to deter prospective violators from violating the statute.

Mr. Rodino. I might point out, Congressman, that I agree with you wholeheartedly; it appears, however, there has been a change in position in some of those who previously felt this law was a deterrent as was indicated by a letter of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in 1953, who now, however, does not take any position in the matter and as a matter of fact, it is my understanding from a reading of their positions that there are four different positions on the Federal Trade Commission.

But nonetheless they clearly stated in 1953 in a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable Chauncey Reed, that the Commission believes that the present mandatory triple-damage provision to the Clayton Act is a deterrent to violations of the antitrust laws.

There was no question then of an incentive to litigation. That position has been indicated all along up until this time.

Mr. Multer. I am glad to hear that.

I hope that that will be the conclusion of this subcommittee and the full committee.

As a lawyer of many years experience, and with a deep seated interest in the true administration of justice, with which principle I am sure this entire committee agrees, I do not want any of our courts cluttered up with lawsuits because there is an incentive held out to lawyers of having the court award them fees if they succeed in the litigation. That will be the only incentive remaining if the proposed bill is enacted. The very threat of the punishment of being required to pay triple damages and attorneys' fees will keep cases out of the courts because most prospective violators will behave. Too many of our sitting judges are out of sympathy with these antitrust suits as is evidenced by the small number of recoveries in triple-damage suits. The non-jury cases invariably turn, not upon a question of law but upon a determination of a question of fact by the sitting judge. Questions of fact are determined by judges, as this committee well knows, by the judge's opinion based on his own background and philosophy. As the trier of the fact he has the right to disregard overwhelming evidence, and findings of fact are rarely, if ever, reviewed by the appellate courts.

Under Federal jurisdiction they have the right to, but they rarely do.

To require a finding of fact of willfulness in these cases would in most instances be tantamount to barring the remedy. Vesting discretion in the court as to which defendant should or should not pay double or treble damages will invite years of litigation as to when and how the court may exercise its discretion. Will the judge or the jury make the determination of willfulness? On what will the court base the exercise of its discretion; the size of the violator's business, or the type of business or maybe the color of his vehicles? Or the color of the necktie he may be wearing the day he testifies?

Mr. McCulloch. I would like to interrupt there to inquire of our colleague if there be any doubt in his mind whether or not a jury would determine the question of willfulness under proper instruction from the court under the Walter bill?

Mr. Multer. Sir, is your question whether or not the——

Mr. McCulloch. Is there any doubt in your mind that the jury would determine the question of willfulness?

Mr. Multer. Under the way the proposed statute reads?

Mr. McCulloch. Under the Walter bill.

Mr. Multer. There is considerable doubt. I think lawyers will agree that the way this bill reads now, there will be years of litigation before you finally settle the question as to whether or not this is a question of law or a question of fact, or a mixed question of fact and law and if so, is it within the province of the court alone or is it within the province of the jury to determine the fact and then the court impose the penalty.

Mr. McCulloch. Then it is your studied judgment that there is grave doubt about how that provision would be construed?

Mr. Multer. Oh, yes.

I think that you will find there is considerable agreement among the legal profession on that subject. If the judgment of the committee should be to report a bill which is intended to provide that treble damages should be recovered only where there is a willful violation, then I urge as strongly as I can I am opposed to the bill in the present form or even if you clear that up I don't think there should be any discretion vested in the court and I don't think it should be dependent upon whether it is willful or not. But if the judgment of the full committee is that that is the way the law should be changed, I urge as strongly as I can that you clarify this and indicate precisely whom you want to determine this question; shall it be a question of fact, then say so in your bill. Specify whether the violation was willful or not should be a question of fact to be determined by the jury where there is a jury. And specify further whether the court is to be bound by that. You should say precisely what you intend. Advisory opinions on questions of fact by juries to the court may be disregarded by the court.

When it comes to the sentence in a criminal case, the jury has nothing to do with it and the jury is charged by a judge who wants to be very careful—"Don't you consider what the penalty may be. This is for the court to determine. You are just going to determine the guilt or innocence of this defendant and then the court will take into consideration all the surrounding facts and circumstances and background of the defendant and sentence him accordingly. You are not to consider whether there is a penalty or not." If the jury is to pass on this question of willfulness as a question of fact do you want the court to be bound by it? If the court is to be bound by it you should say so. On the other hand if it is for purely advisory purposes, you should say so. I predict if those matters are not clear in the bill as you bring it out, those questions will result in years of litigation on that very question.

It is true that the lawbooks are full of decisions by the courts determining the meaning of willfulness and they vary from State to State and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Even if we assume we have settled on the Federal court level what is willful and what is not willful, you still run into the other questions. Who will determine the question, court or jury, and shall the court be bound by the jury's verdict on that question?

Mr. Rodino. The question propounded by the distinguished member of this committee seems to be one that arises in the minds of many of us, and I think the gentleman has wisely indicated that the language of the bill might be spelled out in such detail that it will not be left to a question whether or not willfulness may be within the province of the judge or the jury or both, since it is a mixed question; that seems to have been the thread that permeates throughout these hearings, that a presentation, whether it will not give rise to further litigation and never resolve this question.

Mr. Multer. That brings up another question which has been raised in the testimony before this subcommittee. I have read most of it. That is the question of whether or not there are so few recoveries in treble-damage suits because the jury or the court is unwilling to grant the full damages, and I think in some instances this committee has been told that a plaintiff going into court has no choice; he either sues for treble damages or he does not.

Let me suggest that that is not so. Any plaintiff going into court who thinks he does not want to penalize a defendant to the extent of the treble damages does not have to ask for the treble damages. He can ask for simple damages. He can't get the treble damages unless he asks for them in his complaint.

But he can waive them if he wants to. So that has not been one of the difficulties in getting the judgments in favor of plaintiffs who should be so compensated. Compensated may be the wrong word, because the initial amount of damage he sustained is supposed to be compensation and when they triple that, that is supposed to be by way of punishment of the defendant.

I think you will find in very few cases is there a defendant who has not been willful to the extent that we mean to interpret the word "willful." As I have already pointed out, these defendants know precisely where they are going and what they are doing. In most instances, whatever the charge is it is a violation of the law as a result of long premeditated and deliberate thinking and action on their part.

I don't mean to say that they have deliberately intended to go in and violate that law, but their course of action was dictated by the way they thought they could evade the law.

Why put a premium on a violator's guessing right as to whether the trial judge will be tough or easy.

Let the statute stay as it is and he knows his penalty in advance of commission of the wrong.

This switch in the Department of Justice, Mr. Chairman, disturbs me. It disturbs me for the following reasons:

The first suggestion to this subcommittee that the treble-damage provision should be modified and made discretionary was made by Kenneth C. Royall (hearings on H. R. 3408, 82d Cong. p. 46). Mr. Royall was at that time and now is a partner in the law firm of Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey. This firm now represents and has represented 20th Century-Fox Film Corp. as a defendant in more than 144 private treble-damage actions under the antitrust laws. At least two other partners in the firm, Mr. Koegel and Mr. Caskey, represented defendant, 20th Century-Fox, in the Government antitrust suit against the movie industry. Mr. Royall appeared before this subcommittee on behalf of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the official position of the Department of Justice has been communicated in both the 83d and 84th Congresses not by the Attorney General or even by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, but by the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers. Mr. William P. Rogers, Mr. Chairman, was a partner in the law firm of Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey before he became Deputy Attorney General.

In view of this disturbing association, I feel this subcommittee should probe deeply into such questions as: Were any investigations made by the Antitrust Division which would warrant a shift in Department policy such as enunciated by Mr. Rogers to the 83d Congress? Has the staff of the Antitrust Division recommended such a shift in Department policy? What was the basis for Mr. Rogers' recommendation in the 83d and 84th Congresses? Have we here an instance of an attempt to weight the scales of justice in favor of special groups? Why did not Mr. Rogers disqualify himself from any consideration of this matter? Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a most serious situation indeed.

I want the committee to understand that I am making no blanket condemnation of the Atttorney General's staff or attack upon the integrity of the various gentlemen who participated in the recommendations resulting in the making of the Attorney General's report. But I bring to bear upon this matter my own vast experience in connection with the legislative process, including my many years of activity on bar association legislative committees.

Persons participating in such work necessarily bring to bear upon their recommendations their own personal experiences and, consciously or unconsciously, that of their clients. While I would not have excluded from this committee some representatives of the viewpoint of the antitrust violators, I would have made certain that they would not have had the extensive representation evidenced by the makeup of this committee. But what is more important, I would have made certain that there were at least an equal number of representatives of the viewpoint of those injured by the violators, and of those who could show the difficulty injured parties have had in getting redress from the courts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I can answer any questions that you may desire to put to me, I will try to do so.

Mr. RODINO. Any questions?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. No questions.

Mr. RODINO. No; I would merely like to state to the gentleman that he always comes here with a wealth of information and the experience he has both as an attorney in this field and as a Member of Congress and one who is expert in the field of banking and business, and enlightens us a good deal in these matters as indicated here. His apprehension regarding this certainly will give us much pause, and I assure the gentleman that his statement will receive our earnest consideration. I am particularly interested in the latter part of your statement where you refer to Mr. Rogers, and I certainly think this is cause for thought on the part of our committee.

There is no doubt in our minds and that no reasonable man could conclude otherwise than that persons who have formulated certain opinions and who have had some interest undoubtedly should feel it proper to disqualify themselves. Of course, there always is a question which I suppose must be resolved by the individual. We know that many people can separate themselves and do a proper job, yet nonetheless it does give rise to speculation and concern.

Mr. MULTER. I think in fairness to the public officials involved I think we ought to recall that some of our judges whom we expected would be very biased because of their particular type of activity at the bar before becoming judges nevertheless became some of our most outstanding and fairest jurists, and I think the same can be said of many of our public officials.

I don't want to be understood as condemning any of our public officials, because I think we have difficulty enough recruiting good and able and honorable men into the Government. I do think they should be overly careful not to raise any suspicions because of their prior connections when they come before the Congress to testify.

Mr. RODINO. I think the gentleman has well stated it. Thank you very much, Congressman MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you for the privilege of being here.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 1955

Dr. Bertram W. Korn, senior rabbi, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

I thank Thee, my maker and my master, that Thou hast permitted me, the grandson of humble immigrants, who came to these shores in search of the freedom and opportunity which were denied to them in their native lands, I thank Thee that Thou hast permitted me to sing Thy praise in this great legislative forum of the most blessed land in human history.

I thank Thee, lord of all souls, that my daughter and the child yet in the womb of my wife will be privileged to grow in an atmosphere of law and order and tranquillity unrivaled in the annals of the human race.

Not for myself alone do I voice these phrases of gratitude, but for scores of millions of my fellow citizens to whom equal rights are guaranteed: the opportunity to speak freely to Thee, in home and sanctuary alike, in the accents of our preference; the opportunity to reside and work and enjoy the fruit of our labor in accordance with our own desires; the opportunity to think and speak out in accordance with our best judgment; the opportunity to rear our children free from the fear of autocrat, bureaucrat, or armed might.

The prayer of all our citizens, O Lord, is that Thou mayest endow these men of destiny, the delegates of their peers, with the insight, the intelligence, and the integrity to guard zealously the rights and the opportunities which are the possession of all. And may they receive Thy special blessing, in their homes and in their hearts, in their family life and in their professional careers, as a token of Thy beneficence to this dear land.

Yivorechecho Adonoi veyishmerecho—may the Lord bless thee and keep thee.

Yoair Adonoi ponov elecho v'chuneko—may the Lord cause His countenance to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee.

Yiso Adonoi ponov elecho v'yosaym l'cho sholom—may the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee and grant thee peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 12, 1955, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of July 12, 1955,

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 4225. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark. (Rept. No. 835);

H. R. 4946. A bill to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act (Rept. No. 834);

H. R. 5792. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments (Rept. No. 836); and

H. R. 6796. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used (Rept. No. 833).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 12, 1955, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Najibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. deSzethofer and Blanche Hrdinova deSzethofer;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife, Stefania Janicki;

S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand;

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 802. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces;

S. 804. An act to amend section 201 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1290. An act to amend the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1571. An act to authorize voluntary extension of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year;

S. 1633. An act relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska;

S. 1993. An act authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol; and

S. 2135. An act to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for the retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Reorganization, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], of the Committee on Government Operations, be given permission to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], of the Committee on the Judiciary, be given permission to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session or the afternoon recess of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Henry Vance Raab to be postmaster at Horsham, Pa., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Michael D. Buscemi, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr. (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment as lieutenant general, United States Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President;

Rear Adm. Maurice E. Curts, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation by the President;

Barton LeR. Smith (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy;

Thomas E. Froehlke, and sundry other Reserve officers, to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy;

Milton T. Shoffeitt, warrant officer, United States Navy, to be appointed a temporary chief warrant officer in the Navy;

William E. Ball, Jr., and Donald G. Mason (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps; and

Carl G. W. Axberg, and sundry other enlisted aviation pilots for temporary appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Paul A. Smith, for permanent appointment on the retired list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the rank of rear admiral (lower half).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

M. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVERAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, regarding the apportionment of the appropriation "Readjustment Benefits, Veterans' Administration," for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the

Secretary of the Navy to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON VENTURA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Ventura project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORITY FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ADJUST RATES ON AIR PARCEL-POST SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS HOSPITALS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Mankato, Minnesota Chapter No. 10 of the Disabled Veterans at their regular meeting on June 14, 1955, expressing their strong opposition to the closing of 19 veterans' hospitals, including the hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Minot and Fargo, N. Dak., and Lincoln and Grand Island, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the membership of Mankato Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, that a task force of the Hoover Committee has recommended the closing of 19 United States Veterans hospitals, among them the hospitals at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Minot and Fargo, in North Dakota, Lincoln and Grand Island in the State of Nebraska; and

Whereas using the Royal C. Johnson Hospital at Sioux Falls as a criterion as of March 3, 1955, there was a waiting list of veterans of 168, plus 7 per day for 15 days assigned but had not been reported in, as well as an operating cost for $1.70 per day per patient less than other hospitals in this area; and

Whereas the local hospitals are already overcrowded to the point where they cannot take care of any additional patients if the above-mentioned hospitals should be closed, even after planned additions are put in use, which is especially true of the Minneapolis and Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital, who would be called upon to care for the veterans in the areas served by the hospitals above-mentioned should they be closed as suggested by the Hoover Committee; and

Whereas the patient load at the Sioux Falls Hospital has increased by over 100 patients during the last year and will continue to increase as the veterans grow older and their ailments become more and more chronic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Mankato Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., located at Mankato, Minn., in regular meeting assembled this 14th day of June 1955, do unalterably oppose the closing of any of the above-mentioned veterans hospitals for reasons cited herein.

Approved and adopted unanimously.

WILLARD L. MOTT,
Chapter Commander.
CHAS. T. BLAKE,
Chapter Adjutant-Treasurer.

RESOLUTIONS OF JAMES VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., EDGELEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of five resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the James Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., on June 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—GARRISON DAM

Whereas large sums of taxpayers' money have been expended in the construction of the high-level dam at Garrison; and

Whereas protective dikes will be built to protect an area in question near Williston; and

Whereas the Government has offered to buy all of the land that might have been in danger of flooding near Williston and lease it back to the previous owners; and

Whereas the operation of Garrison Dam at even the 1,850-foot level will not supply future power demands in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the James Valley Electric Cooperative go on record favoring the operation of Garrison Dam at the 1,850-foot level.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—INTEREST RATES

Whereas the rate of interest that an REA cooperative must pay is an important factor in its cost of operation and in establishing the rate that it must charge for the electricity sold by the cooperative: Be it

Resolved, That the membership of the James Valley Electric Cooperative go on record favoring a continuation of the present 2-percent interest rate on all loans made to REA cooperatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—HELLS CANYON

Whereas the full use of Hells Canyon must include abundant cheap power, full agricultural development, flood control, and other multipurpose benefits in order to serve all the people of the area, attract industry, and provide jobs through an expanded economy; and

Whereas the proposed private projects at Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley on the Snake River below Hells Canyon site would be contrary to the best and most comprehensive method of development and would result in higher-cost power to the region and threaten future reclamation in the upper Snake Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the James Valley Electric Cooperative go on record as opposing the construction of private projects and urge the construction of a high Federal multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon and call on other organizations to cooperate toward the maximum use and development of our natural resources.

RESOLUTION NO. 4—DIXON-YATES

Whereas we the members of the James Valley Electric Cooperative believe that it is our constitutional right to own and operate our electric power and electric distribution cooperatives, furnishing electricity at minimum cost to its members, which was achieved after many years of struggle; and

Whereas our National Government has built with taxpayers' money a huge Tennessee Valley Authority project generating large amounts of energy; and

Whereas our National Government has entered into a contract with a private utility, Dixon-Yates, for the building of additional power facilities in the Tennessee Valley, largely for the use of Government atomic plants; and

Whereas we believe that the construction and operation of such additional facilities should be built and operated by TVA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of James Valley Electric Cooperative go on record protesting the construction by Dixon-Yates of the above power facilities and recommend that this and future power needs be built by TVA.

RESOLUTION NO. 5—HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization has recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be abolished and that in its place a Rural Electrification Corporation be set up; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission has recommended that this proposed Rural Electrification Corporation be run by a board appointed by the President, thereby removing it from the close supervision that Congress has over the present REA; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission recommends that the co-ops, through the Rural Electrification Corporation, borrow money needed for future growth from private financial institutions resulting in interest rates on future loans from 2 to 3 times as high as at present; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission recommends giving these private moneylenders a first mortgage status and downgrading the outstanding REA obligations to a second mortgage status; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission recommendations if enacted into law would increase interest rates, increase our cost of power, restrict our future expansion, weaken our competitive position, strangle the cooperative electrification program and put co-ops at the mercy of private financial institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of James Valley Electric Cooperative, assembled in annual members meeting this 8th day of June 1955, go on record as absolutely opposed to the Hoover Commission recommendations which would establish a Rural Electrification Corporation serving the private power utilities and the investment bankers. The REA co-ops through loans from the Federal Government have immeasurably improved the farmers' standard of living. The successful REA co-op built through hard work and a helpful Rural Electrification Administration is not a venture that we now propose to turn over for guaranteed profits to those interests who in the past have been unwilling to help electrify rural America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senators William Langer, Milton R. Young, Allan J. Ellender, George D. Aiken, John L. McClellan, and Joseph R. McCarthy, Congressmen Usher L. Burdick, Otto Krueger, Harold D. Cooley, Clifford Hope, William L. Dawson, and Clare E. Hoffman.

RESOLUTIONS OF McKENZIE COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the McKenzie County Farmers Union, at its annual convention, held at Watford City, N. Dak., on June 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions Adopted by the Accredited Delegates of the McKenzie County Farmers Union Representing 916 Paid-Up Members at Its Annual Convention Held at Watford City, N. Dak., June 18, 1955

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas the reduction of the 90 percent base of parity to a flexible base as low as 82½ percent, and the drastic cut in acreage allotment will reduce the income of the family type farmer to such an extent that they cannot possibly pay running expenses, and support the family on the farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to take immediate action to fix a base of 100 acres of wheat to be exempt from any allotment—this to apply to all farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That allotment over the 100-acre base be on a graduate base cut, increasing as the total acreage increases.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas there is a constant propaganda carried on by those who wish to exploit our national resources for private profits to creat distrust in the ability of our Government to handle its business; and

Whereas their assumed fear of Government monopoly and creeping socialism is used only to divert the attention of the real danger—that of control of our Government by powerful corporations; and

Whereas in a democracy the people are the government, and we could certainly not very well enslave and exploit ourselves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we resent any such propaganda or a democratic government is of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose duty it is to provide for the general welfare of the people; and be it further

Resolved, That we recognize that, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that we can only lose democracy in America if we fail to avail ovurselves of our rights and duties by not keeping ourselves informed on State and national issues and by not going to the polls on election day, and casting an intelligent vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas there is again before Congress bills asking for universal military training (Senate bill 2, the Legion draft, UMT, and H. R. 5297, the UMT Reserve bill) a system that destroyed every nation that has spent its substance in building and maintaining huge armies; and

Whereas if such bills become a law we will definitely become a military nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we declare that we are definitely opposed to compulsory military training in time of peace.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas the continuous cold war raging in the world today can never bring world peace but only create more hatred between nations; and

Whereas unless some means can be found to end the cold war it will eventually result in a third world war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government to take immediate steps, through diplomatic channels, to work out a plan for coexistence with nations whose ideologies and views differ from ours.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas we in the Farmers Union recognize that organized labor has proved to be our good friends and supporters; and

Whereas except by joining our forces can either of us hope to get just laws passed by Congress for our protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we pledge our support to the American laborers in their struggle to maintain a wage scale sufficiently high to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas the present administration is favoring private utilities in preference to federally owned and operated hydroelectric plants and transmission lines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we oppose this line of action because the REA Co-ops must have a source of cheap power, and the preference clause must be continued in order for the REA Co-ops to be able to operate and pay off their loan to the Federal Government.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas Congress has seen fit to remove a definite base from any farm products and passed in its place a flexible scale of support, thereby establishing an uncertain market; and

Whereas this has caused the market on grain, livestock, and dairy products to drop far below parity; and

Whereas agriculture is, and always has been, in America the basic industry whereupon all prosperity depends: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to repeal the sliding scale and reinstate the 90 percent of parity, and to constantly work for 100 percent of parity.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas it appears that Congress may pass a new farm plan, known as the Two-Price System; and

Whereas this system would guarantee the farmer 100 percent of parity on that portion of his crop that would be used for home consumption, and the balance would have to be sold on the world export market; and

Whereas this export market would be much below parity and would result in lowering the average price of wheat and other commodities to a price equal or lower than the sliding scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that if Congress should pass this two-price plan that the following provisions be included, as follows: "That the first $5,000 sale of farm products be granted a price equal to 100 percent of parity, the next $10,000 sale of farm products be guaranteed 90 percent of parity, and all over $15,000 be sold on the world market."

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas at the American National Cattlemen's meeting recently held at Williston, N. Dak., a resolution in support of Benson's sliding scale was passed, while at the same time the members recognizing the danger of a drop in the livestock market, decided to carry on an aggressive campaign to induce the public to eat more beef; and

Whereas this plan might increase the consumption of beef to some extent but would decrease the consumption of other meats, such as pork, mutton, and poultry, which have already dropped to a dangerously low point; and

Whereas it is an established fact that the only factor that decides the consumption of meat products, and also all the other branches of our economics is the purchasing power of the consumer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the convention, That we declare that the only way the purchasing power of the people can be raised is by establishing a parity price of 100 percent for the family-type farmer, and full employment for labor at not less than $1 per hour; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to take immediate steps to put this plan into effect and thus avoid an economic depression while there yet is time.

Roy Johnson,
Ernest Sondrol,
Howard Bell,
Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the American Legion, Department of Texas, at Conroe, Tex., on June 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on Status of Forces Treaty Under NATO

Whereas an agreement commonly known as the status of forces treaty was signed by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on June 19, 1951; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty places American military personnel under the criminal jurisdiction of the North Atlantic Treaty nation in which such American military personnel are physically present; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty deprives American military personnel of the right to trial by either an American military court or an American civil court; and

Whereas the vast majority of the members of the American military forces did not choose of their own free will to enter the military services nor to be assigned to duty on foreign soil, yet are being denied the protection guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the second division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the use of American military personnel in nations in which they are subject to the provisions of the status of forces treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the adjutant be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

Resolution Regarding UNESCO

Whereas a special committee of the National American Legion, of which Mr. Ray Murphy is chairman, at a meeting of the national executive committee, May 4, 5, and 6, 1955, in Indianapolis, has again beclouded the position of the American Legion on UNESCO by again submitting a report supposedly clearing UNESCO of sponsoring world government, being atheistic, being communistic in basic concept, and infiltrating schools; and

Whereas UNESCO's advocacy of world government, now deliberately clothed in the terminology, "education for international understanding" in order to avoid arousing popular opposition (as revealed in the minutes of UNESCO), is clearly outlined by the following statements made by members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, to wit:

1. Former Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, addressing the first meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO in September 1946, said:

"We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty."

2. William G. Carr, member of United States National Commission for UNESCO and Executive Secretary of NEA, addressing a group of educators at the UNESCO Teachers' Seminar on August 1, 1947, said:

"It seems to me that we should, with all loyalty to the United Nations, teach that the world organization should be revised to take on some of the aspects of a system of world government and world law. Unwillingness to face this issue is perilous—if the United Nations is to be transformed into a limited world government, the psychological foundations for the wider loyalties that are necessary must be laid, in part, in the schools. I urge you, therefore, not only to teach about the United Nations as it is today, but also—to teach the attitudes which will ultimately result in the creation of World Government."

3. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother and a well known advocate of world government, speaking in the Wichita, Kans., Arcadia Auditorium in 1949, said:

"One can truly understand UNESCO only if one views it in its historical context and viewed in this way it reveals itself as one more step in our halting, painful, but I think very real progress toward a genuine world government"; and

Whereas UNESCO's advocacy of atheism is clearly outlined by the following statement made by Dr. Julian Huxley, First Director General of UNESCO, a member of the Planning Commission for UNESCO, and an avowed atheist in his book, UNESCO—Its Purpose and Its Philosophy, to-wit:

"From acceptance of certain principles or philosophies, UNESCO is obviously debarred. Thus, while fully recognizing the contribution made to thought by many of their thinkers, it cannot base its outlook on one of the competing theologies of the world as against the others, whether Islam, Roman Catholicism, Protestant Christianity, Buddhism, Unitarianism, Judaism, or Hinduism. * * * Accordingly, its outlook must, it seems, be based on some form of humanism. Further, that humanism must clearly be world humanism. * * *" (Note: Humanism rejects any belief in a supernatural God; belief is that man is God); and

Whereas the communistic nature of UNESCO is clearly indicated by the fact that UNESCO is the primary propagandizing group for adoption of the infamous Covenant on Human Rights, support of the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights being adopted as a major UNESCO goal at UNESCO's third general conference at Beirut in 1948. (Note: After more than 400 meetings, the Human Rights Commission of the U. N. refused to approve a provision in the covenant guaranteeing the basic American right to private ownership of property); and

Whereas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 6, page 8099 (in discussion of appropriations), appears a statement by Senator Pat McCarran, as follows:

"The subcommittee heard a great deal of testimony relative to a very clear propaganda campaign to sell the people of this country, and particularly the school children, on the doctrine of one world government and world citizenship. The subcommittee held 3 hearings on this matter, 1 hearing in which the witnesses making the charge were heard, 1 hearing in which officials of the State Department were heard in rebuttal, and 1 hearing in which both sides were present.

"It seems that there is a group in UNESCO, a United Nations organization, as well as some thinking in the Department of State, of the belief that our objective should be to set up 1 world government and have only 1 kind of citizenship—world citizenship.

"The committee had presented to it documentary proof of this insidious campaign. They feel that international cooperation is one thing, but that for us to stand idly by and appropriate funds to be used to destroy this country as a political entity is quite another"; and

Whereas the objective of UNESCO is to infiltrate schools is clearly stated in the State Department publication 3931 entitled "The UNESCO Story," which says on page 26, "If you think UNESCO and its objectives of international understanding aim only at adults, you may be interested in the following reports—and you might compare them with activities in your own schools." (See attached documentation); and

Whereas the Murphy report is contrary to the official position of the American Legion on UNESCO, and without official status, but is nevertheless being circulated by propagandists as representing the official position of the American Legion on UNESCO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the second division convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas:

1. That the second division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, does hereby reaffirm its concurrence with resolution No. 33 opposing the teachings of UNESCO, which resolution was adopted by the National Executive Committee in Indianapolis on April 29 and 30 and May 1, 1953, and with resolution No. 322, reaffirming the resolving clauses of resolution No. 33, adopted by the national convention in Washington on August 30-September 2, 1954;

2. That the Second Division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, does hereby petition the national commander to take all actions necessary to clarify to the American Legion as well as to the general public, the status of the special committee's report on UNESCO, and to prevent the release of future reports of committees of the National American Legion prior to acceptance of their findings and action on their status by the national executive committee or the national convention; and

3. That, immediately after adoption of this resolution by the Second Division convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas, the proper American Legion officials of the Second Division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, forward certified copies of said resolution to the following:

(a) President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the White House, Washington, D. C.

(b) National commander, American Legion.

(c) State commander, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(d) All division commanders, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(e) All district commanders, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(f) All post commanders, Second Division, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(g) Members of the national executive committee, American Legion.

SOURCE OF REFERENCES

William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State—address to first meeting of United States National Commission of UNESCO—"United States National Commission for UNESCO, report on the first meeting, September 1946" (United States-United Nations Information Series 14), page 25.

William G. Carr, the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, volume 31, No. 150 (December 1947), pages 13–14.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, from "Story of the Bricker Amendment" by Frank E. Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, page 21.

Julian, Huxley, UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy, page 4; published by Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C.

Humanist reference—"What Can We Believe," Harold R. Rafton, president, Humanist Fellowship of Boston, Inc., and long-time member of the board of directors of the American Humanist Association. The Humanist No. 3, 1953.

Senator Pat McCarran in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 6, page 8099.

United States Department of State publication 3931, "The UNESCO Story," International organization and conference series IV, United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization 12.

Subtitle of the book is, "A Resource and Action Booklet for Organizations and Communities." That should be enough: If UNESCO is not operating in America and has no program, why an action booklet? But let's look inside. We'll try page 26. Under caption "UNESCO in the Schools," we read:

"If you think UNESCO and its objectives of international understanding aim only at adults, you may be interested in the following reports, and you might compare them with activities in your own schools."

Then follows nearly three pages of reports of UNESCO activities in schools and State councils. At the bottom of the third page is a picture of 3 young people and 1 older person, with this description: "George V. Allen, as Assistant Secretary of State, receives 3 winners of a UNESCO essay contest in 50 high schools in northern New Jersey. The contest was a feature of a UNESCO day rally sponsored by 3,500 students and teachers from Newark and 31 surrounding communities." So, UNESCO has no program and is not in the schools, Mr. Murphy says.

Organizing a UNESCO Council is another official document. Its Department of State number is 4646. It also is Series IV and its UNESCO number is 18. It is written by a Kansas "educator" to explain how that State attained a leading position in UNESCO organization and to urge others to "go and do likewise." For point 3 the author develops the declaration, "A UNESCO council must not lose sight of the fact that education is the most difficult and most necessary form of action."

A Junior High School Looks at UNESCO is another State Department publication of Series IV; it is UNESCO 15. The subtitle reads: "The story of a unit of schoolwork on UNESCO developed at Alice Deal Junior High School, Washington, D. C.

Under the caption "What is UNESCO trying to do?" the booklet named above contains the following paragraph:

"Could they (the students) evaluate UNESCO and its aims? They decided they couldn't answer that until they got into the project. The first thing was to find out what material already existed on UNESCO. They set to work to learn all they could, and the instructor taught UNESCO as though it were a regular course." (So, in a 2-year investigation a legion committee can find no UNESCO in the schools. One might wonder where they looked.)

RESOLUTION REGARDING BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas every member of the American Legion has pledged himself to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America"; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America is in the process of being destroyed through the medium of treaty law, as evidenced in part by the following precedent setting United States Supreme Court decisions, to wit:

1. *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) simply pronounces the doctrine that if the Federal Government does not have power under the Constitution to legislate with respect to a particular subject, it can acquire that power by first making a treaty on the matter, in spite of the 10th amendment reserving to the States and to the people powers not delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government;

2. *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203) simply holds that an executive agreement, not even ratified by any of the Senators, has the force and effect of a formal treaty that had been ratified by the Senate and such executive agreement overrides the provisions of the fifth amendment prohibiting the taking of private property for public purposes without just compensation and without due process of law; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements are continuously being negotiated by the President and the Secretary of State and innumerable treaties, covenants, and international compacts of all kinds have been drafted and are being drafted by numerous agencies of the United Nations, many of which expressly deal with, regulate, and control domestic matters, the control of which is reserved to the States and the people by the 10th amendment; and

Whereas the Bricker amendment affords adequate protection against the insidious encroachment of dictatorial treaty law upon the Constitution of the United States, said amendment having been thoroughly reviewed and approved by the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, the American Bar Association, and numerous lay organizations (including the American Legion), and found to be in accordance with the intent of the Constitution of the United States of America as promulgated by our Founding Fathers; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America pledged himself under oath to "faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States"; and

Whereas in the constitutional process of amending the Constitution the President of the United States has absolutely no function to perform; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America, as head of the executive branch of the Federal Government, has actively and continuously opposed the submission of the Bricker amendment to the people for ratification and in so doing has directly interfered with the powers vested in the legislative branch of the Government—and the people to amend the Constitution when experience has proved a need for such amendment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the second division convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas:

1. That the second division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention here assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States of America to discontinue his opposition to submission of the Bricker amendment to the people for ratification, and to confine his activities to the Office of President as outlined in the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with his oath of office.

2. That, immediately after adoption of this resolution by the second division convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas, the second division adjutant be instructed to forward certified copies of said resolution to:

(a) President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the White House, Washington, D. C.

(b) National commander, American Legion.

(c) State commander, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(d) All division commanders, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(e) All district commanders(American Legion, Department of Texas.

(f) All post commanders, second division, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(g) Members of the national executive committee, American Legion.

Resolution on the President's Atoms-for-Peace Plan Proposed by Americanism Committee, Eighth District

Whereas American superiority in the development and production of atomic energy is a paramount requirement for the future military security of the United States of America; and

Whereas the President of the United States recently submitted what he calls an atoms-for-peace plan to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the President's atoms-for-peace plan, the basic idea of which he presented at the United Nations meeting on December 8, 1953, at the original instigation of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, would create an international atomic laboratory—financed in large part by the United States—in which all nations of the world, including Soviet Russia, would be allowed to participate; and

Whereas it is impossible to confine the results of an international atomic-energy laboratory to purely peaceful uses of fissionable material by the nations participating therein; and

Whereas said atoms-for-peace plan—if adopted—would accordingly endanger the security and freedom of the citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in convention assembled, does hereby oppose the adoption by the Congress of the President's atoms-for-peace plan; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the adjutant be instructed to forward copies hereof to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Philadelphia, Pa., resolutions which had been adopted by that great organization of American women, at their most recent convention in May, 1955, in Philadelphia. These resolutions cover a broad gamut of American interests, and they evidence the deep civic responsibility of this splendid organization.

I present the resolutions, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Federation of Women's Clubs Resolutions Adopted in Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., May 23–27, 1955.

1. USE OF RADIO AND TELEVISION IN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs have always held as a major objective the furtherance of activities which lead to a fuller exercise of the rights and duties of American citizenship; and

Whereas the first-hand experience with the proceedings of American Government as shown on television and heard on radio, acts as a stimulant for greater participation in the affairs of Government and results in a better informed citizenry; and

Whereas many proceedings of Government are traditionally open to the public, which has an inherent right to attend the same, limited only by the size of the place in which the proceeding is held; and

Whereas radio and television are capable of removing physical limitations so that the American people have access to these proceedings: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, approves the fuller use of radio and television in serving the public interest by broadcasting actual open public proceedings as they occur.

(Presented by Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, chairman, Radio and Television Division, Communications Department.)

2. COMIC BOOKS

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs believes that there is a growing concern about the harmful effects of objectionable comic books upon the minds and morals of the youth of our communities, and has initiated a campaign to rid the newsstands of comic books based on horror, crime and sex themes, a campaign which has met with gratifying success; and

Whereas the code adopted by the Comic Magazine Association of America, Inc., will be effective only if strong public opinion which demands maximum improvement in the contents of comic books is continuously expressed: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, determines to continue the vigorous campaign to remove from newsstands crime, horror, and sex comic books, and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs recommends that a positive program be undertaken in communities to encourage the reading of wholesome and worthwhile literature that youth may learn discrimination in the choice of reading material, thereby promoting a healthful, moral and spiritual growth; and further

Resolved, That clubwomen be asked to cooperate with other groups in seeking local, State and Federal laws to prevent the sale and distribution of obscene literature including objectionable comic books; and to see that such laws provide for fines and punishment for violators; and to assume the responsibility for arousing a public opinion which will insist upon strict enforcement of such laws when passed.

(Presented by Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman, community affairs department.)

3. CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF DELINQUENCY

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is deeply interested in the welfare of youth, in causes of behavior problems, in the early detection of trends toward delinquency, in the prevention of actual delinquency, in addition to provision of facilities for treatment and detention of delinquents, and believes that added emphasis should be placed upon prevention: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, advocates a positive approach to the problems of youth through the establishment of local communitywide committees devoted to the creation of conditions in the home, the school, the church, and the community which are conducive to the development of sound, wholesome youth and urges member clubs to assume the initiative in the creation of such committees where none exist and to offer enthusiastic cooperation to such committees in communities where they have been established.

(Presented by Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman, community affairs department; Mrs. Gilbert F. Loebs, chairman, home department.)

4. JUVENILE COURTS AND DETENTION FACILITIES

Whereas all States now provide the machinery whereby youth who come within the purview of the law may be heard in juvenile courts, and

Whereas adequate detention and probation services are necessary for successful functioning of juvenile courts and are not provided in a measure commensurate with the need and thousands of children each year are held in jails in contravention of the law and to the physical, mental, moral detriment of these children: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, urges the State federations and their member clubs (1) to use every available means to increase efficient use of the juvenile courts; (2) to urge provision by State and local governments of detention facilities which are safe, well equipped, and dedicated to the best interests of the children; to provide trained and skillful probation officers in order that youthful offenders may be rehabilitated as rapidly as possible.

(Presented by Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman, community affairs department; Mrs.

Gilbert F. Loebs, chairman, home department.)

5. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas our country's waters are vital to its very existence; to its economic and social progress; to its national safety, and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic, agricultural, fishing, wildlife, recreational uses and industrial productive capacity are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers, and lakes, and

Whereas the responsibility for water pollution control is primarily State and local, a majority of the Nation's rivers are interstate streams or tributaries thereof: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, urges that local, State, and Federal agencies cooperate to accomplish adequate pollution abatement; that pollution control be developed as an integral part of comprehensive river-basin programs; that the Pollution Control Act of Congress, June 30, 1948, as amended, be extended and implemented; and that stronger regulatory laws be enacted to improve water pollution control with the broadest possible benefits to the public; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, the Army, the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare; and to the governors of the States.

Presented by Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Department; Mrs. E. R. Starkweather, chairman, Water and Soil Division.

6. AIR-POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas air pollution is becoming an increasing concern in many communities; and

Whereas knowledge of the causes and results of air pollution is limited: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, urges:

1. That programs of research be furthered in governmental agencies and nongovernmental institutions to ascertain what the air pollutants are and what is their effect on the health and economic welfare of the people in the area affected;

2. That, as soon as possible, Government, industries, communities, and individuals take action based on the research findings in order to bring about solutions of the problems arising from air pollution.

Presented by Mrs. Harold V. Milligan, chairman, Division of Health, Community Affairs Department.

7. CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

Whereas land and water that can be devoted to the conservation of wildlife in forests, field, or stream is becoming increasingly important and increasingly limited; and

Whereas the proper methods of land and water management must be practiced to create a favorable environment and habitat for wildlife, which is consistent with other purposes to which the land and water must be devoted: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, urges the consideration of and provision for adequate wildlife habitat in any program of development of our natural resources, consistent with all purposes to which land and water must be devoted, to the end that wildlife and wildlife habitat shall not needlessly suffer from resource management in our expanding Nation.

Presented by Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Department.

8. COURSES IN FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY

Whereas the proportion of families broken through recourse to the divorce courts is significantly large; and

Whereas whatever the causes, the emotional impact of divorce upon both adults and children is of lasting importance; and

Whereas many marriages which might have developed successfully, have ended unhappily because of inability to deal constructively with problems of adjustment: Therefore

Resolved, That in order to protect the family as a unit the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges and recommends that all clubs urge in the local communities that teaching of family living and responsibility be integrated into the curriculum of the schools as a unit toward graduation; and further

Resolved, That club members encourage churches of all denominations to give courses on successful family living to couples previous to marriage ceremonies, and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges basic courses in family life education be included in the curricula of teacher-training institutions in order to prepare teachers to present information on the solution of family problems.

(Presented by Mrs. Gilbert F. Loebs, chairman, home department; Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, chairman, education department.)

9. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER INTERESTS

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs recognizes the fact that the well being of the home and family are dependent upon consumer education and skills in buying wisely and using effectively consumer goods and services; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has long been seeking a solution to the problem of the consuming public; and

Whereas the interests of business and of labor are protected and advanced by a Department headed by a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and the consuming public whose welfare is equally important to a sound economy, is not so represented and protected: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, recommends the establishment of a United States department dedicated to the education of consumers, good management by the consumers, and protection of the interests of the consuming public, which is headed by a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President of the United States; and further

Resolved, That such Government agencies as the Bureau of Standards, the Food and Drug Administration, Education and Inspection Services of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, and Information Bureau, and other such bureaus, agencies, and boards as can render services be contributing agencies to the proposed Department of Consumer Interests.

(Presented by Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Mrs. A. N. Satterlee, chairman, consumer division, home department.)

10. SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES

Whereas it is the high mission of the United States to be a witness to the worth of freedom and democracy and to remain the patient friend of peoples who are determined to exercise a free choice as to the government under which they shall live; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward self-government which are truly expressive of the desires of a people which has demonstrated its capability to establish and protect free institutions: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, declares its belief in the inherent right of people to self-determination and supports application of that principle under the auspices of the United Nations.

(Presented by Mrs. Norbert Klein, chairman, international affairs department.)

11. ROADS AND ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the demands of rapidly growing traffic necessitate vast road-building programs; and

Whereas the problem of highway safety and conservation in roadside development are a constant concern to motorists and to communities bordering the highways: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs and its member clubs continue in the effort to preserve the natural beauties of the landscape and to keep the roadsides free of litter and disfiguring structures; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, records its support of strict control of roadside development through zoning regulations, and well-designed planting for both safety and beauty; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges its member clubs to support legislation providing proper development of highway programs, using the scientific skills of highway engineers, landscape architects, and planning boards.

(Presented by Mrs. J. Howard Hodge, chairman, Safety Division, Public Affairs Department.)

12. FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Whereas we are living in a time when the progress of human freedom is suffering alarming reverses and the future depends on the vision, courage, faith, and devotion of those who believe that freedom must underlie any satisfying personal life, political order, or productive economy; and

Whereas our country and the documents guaranteeing our freedoms are sources of inspiration to people in many lands, giving them strength and guidance in their aspiring efforts toward freedom because they are based on the doctrine of freedom of equal men limited only by transgression of the freedom of others: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs (1) declares its belief that in an era when fundamental human rights are being subjected to both overt and insidious attack it is in a rekindled and vibrant faith in and the practice of the principles of freedom that the hope of the future lies; (2) reiterates support, and strongly urges all Americans to reiterate their devotion to those ideals which have made this country a sanctuary of freedom: namely, those freedoms set forth in the constitutionally supported Bill of Rights and such inherent rights as respect for the dignity of the individual, the right of men to work in jobs of their own choice, and that freedom of thought, discussion, and belief which only the knowledge of the truth insures.

(Presented by Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.)

13. STATEMENT OF SYSTEM OF FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS AND FEDERAL AID AND ASSISTANCE

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is deeply concerned with the serious economic, educational, and social problems facing our people and is equally concerned with some problems created by the system of Federal development, aid, and assistance which has been established as a part of the solution adopted for economic, educational, and social difficulties: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1955, declares its conviction that:

A. Federal development of projects:

(1) In general, the Federal Government should not be in business, particularly in competition with private enterprise, and should retire from those businesses already established as quickly as is possible without jeopardizing the public interest and without

entailing unjustified sacrifice of public property and investments.

(2) It must be recognized that conditions exist, and could continue to exist, which may necessitate Federal expenditures and that there are desirable projects which private enterprise cannot develop effectively nor economically.

(3) Federal development should include, and aid should be extended to those projects only whose beneficial results are widely distributed among the people.

B. Federal aid and assistance:

(1) In making allocations of Federal aid, the formula used should take into account: (a) Established need; (b) demonstrated effort to reach a solution with private or State and local resources; (c) ability of area in question to pay (per capita wealth); (d) the number of people affected.

(2) After a project has been approved, allocation made, and funds provided, administration and control of projects using Federal aid and having local and State application should be by local and State officials; and Federal controls should be confined to financial accounting and compliance with the terms of the contract.

(3) In order to increase local and State self-sufficiency and decrease need for supplementary Federal aid, taxing power in certain suitable fields should be left to, or returned to, the several States.

(Presented by the policy committee. Approved by the executive committee.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3193. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters (Rept. No. 837).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill (Rept. No. 838).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7000. A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 840).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1746. A bill continuing the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962 (Rept. No. 849).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1745. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran (Rept. No. 851).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 878. A bill to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character; without amendment (Rept. No. 841).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 3123. A bill to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn. (Rept. No. 842).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 4367. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 843).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 535. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried (Rept. No. 844); and

S. 2198. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 845).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1906. A bill to authorize the pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque, in New Mexico, to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 846).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 1801. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 847); and

H. R. 1802. A bill to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes (Rept. No. 848).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 852).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2403. A bill to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 850).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism; with an amendment (Rept. No. 855).

S. Res. 127. Resolution favoring restoration of sovereign rights of self-government to enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia; without amendment (Rept. No. 854).

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2280) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 853) thereon.

I may say that the bill not only provides better compensation against industrial accidents to longshoremen and harbor workers but also for workers in the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that in the next printing of this bill the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bender], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] may be added as additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the additional cosponsors will be added to the bill, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Murray, Mr. Ives, Mr. Neely, Mr. Purtell, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Bender, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Allott, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. McNamara):

S. 2501. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2502. A bill establishing certain offices within the Department of Defense and defining the functions thereof, and creating a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2503. A bill to improve legal services in the executive branch of the Government by establishing certain offices within the Department of Justice and defining the functions thereof, creating a legal career service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2504. A bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Wiley when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Goldwater):

S. 2505. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Taeko Miyazaki;

S. 2507. A bill for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung); and

S. 2508. A bill for the relief of Elisiva Kaufman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2509. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor Numbered 980 at Institute, W. Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2510. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1954; and

S. 2511. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2512. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2513. A bill to authorize the sale of Welles Village war housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the housing authority of the town of Glastonbury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2514. A bill to declare the portion of the waterway at West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north eighty-five degrees, fifty-four minutes, forty-three and five-tenths seconds east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers harbor line system are north four thousand six hundred sixteen and seventy-six hundredths and west nine thousand four hundred fifty and eighty hundredths, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2515. A bill to provide more stringent penalties for violations of laws concerning pornography and related matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2516. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2517. A bill to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska; and

S. 2518. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 2519. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2520. A bill for the relief of Joseph Marchetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2521. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the maximum permissible Federal financial participation in the plan for aid to dependent children of the Virgin Islands and to permit payments under such plan to relatives with whom dependent children are living; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 2522. A bill to authorize appropriations for the conversion and operation of a merchant vessel and for the construction and installation of an atomic energy propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKENLOOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CLEMENTS):

S. 2523. A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2524. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2525. A bill for the relief of Margit Schimkowitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hans Knoblich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference 15 more bills at the request of the Hoover Commission. I have not had an opportunity to study all these bills in detail, so it is entirely possible that I, myself, may object to some parts of them. However, I think the Hoover Commission has made such an outstanding contribution to efficiency and economy in Government that any bills it recommends should be considered very seriously.

I know it will be impossible at this session to have these bills considered and acted upon, in view of the lateness of their introduction; but I hope that hearings will be held on them during the recess or adjournment of the Congress and, that early next year, action may be taken on the 54 Hoover Commission bills which I have recently introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated.

S. 2527. A bill establishing certain offices within the Department of Defense and defining the functions thereof, and creating a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2528. A bill relating to the fixing of interest rates or other charges with respect to loans by the Farmers' Home Administration;

S. 2529. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the production credit corporations, and for other purposes;

S. 2530. A bill to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes; and

S. 2531. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2532. A bill relating to the fixing of interest rates, fees, or charges with respect to loans made, insured, or guaranteed by agencies of the United States;

S. 2533. A bill to require that the rate of interest payable by agencies of the Government on loans and advances from the Treasury shall be not less than the going rate of interest paid by the Treasury on its obligations of comparable maturities;

S. 2534. A bill to make the Small Business Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, and for other purposes;

S. 2535. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

S. 2536. A bill to require the banks for cooperatives to exchange their holdings of United States securities for a non-interest-bearing credit in the Treasury; and

S. 2537. A bill to require the exchange of interest-bearing obligations of the United States held by certain agencies of the United States for non-interest-bearing Treasury certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2538. A bill to establish a Defense Supply and Service Administration as a department in the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2539. A bill to liberalize the conflict of interest provisions of section 434 of title 18 of the United States Code in the case of Presidential appointees;

S. 2540. A bill to improve legal services in the executive branch of the Government by establishing certain offices within the Department of Justice and defining the functions thereof, creating a legal career service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2541. A bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 2542. A bill for the relief of A. T. Bennett Haines and Dagny Adele Haines (nee Ahrman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2543. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to implement the recommendations of that Commission While I have not had time to examine the bills, I am happy to introduce them at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2502. A bill establishing certain offices within the Department of Defense and defining the functions thereof, and creating a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2503. A bill to improve legal services in the executive branch of the Government by establishing certain offices within the Department of Justice and defining the functions thereof, creating a legal career service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2504. A bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an administrative code, and for other purposes.

MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES IN MEMORY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, recently the parents of a young man who was killed on a jet-training mission brought to my attention a sad personal problem of theirs involving the denial of permission to erect a memorial marker for their son within Fort Snelling National Cemetery.

In checking into the question, I find that Public Law 675 of the 83d Congress, to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action, apparently is not broad enough in its present form to provide memorial markers for the number of servicemen killed on active duty whose remains could not be recovered. Specifically, Public Law 675 only provides markers for those servicemen designated as "missing in action." I am informed that this term is used in reporting casualty status resulting directly from hostile action and has, therefore, very limited application. Casualties remain in the missing-in-action status only until information is available as to the exact circumstances surrounding the serviceman's disappearance. Thereafter, he is classified as killed in action, died of wounds in action, captured, or interned.

It will be seen, therefore, that Public Law 675 has only limited application and does not grant the right to a marker in memoriam to a deceased serviceman where there is positive evidence of his death although his remains were not recoverable.

In view of the restrictive nature of the existing law, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Law 675, 83d Congress, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of those members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while on active duty and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF LAWS CONCERNING PORNOGRAPHY AND RELATED MATTERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on half of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide more stringent penalties for violations of laws concerning pornography and related matters. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the amendments proposed by this bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2515) to provide more stringent penalties for violation of laws concerning pornography and related matters, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

ANALYSIS

Sections 1461, 1462, and 1463 of title 18, United States Code, presently provide for a penalty of a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

These amendments propose to make the penalties more stringent under each of these sections. The amendments provide in each instance that "upon conviction" the penalty shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both. Upon subsequent conviction for any offense under these sections, the penalty shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not less than 3 years nor more than 10 years.

It is further proposed to amend section 872 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1901 (31 Stat. 1332, sec. 22–2001 D. C. Code), to increase the penalty for dealing in indecent publications which presently provides that the offender shall be fined not less than $50 nor more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both." This amendment proposes to increase the penalty as follows: "Upon conviction thereof, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year, or both, and shall upon any subsequent conviction of any offense under this section, be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 and imprisoned for 1 year."

AUTHORITY TO HOLD AND DETAIN MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2516) to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO HOLD AND DETAIN MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS IN CERTAIN CASES

This bill empowers the Postmaster General, whenever he finds that it is necessary under the Act of August 16, 1950 (39 USC 259a), to order mail adressed to any person held and detained by the postmaster at the office of delivery pending determination by him whether any of the orders authorized by such act be issued with respect to the mail. The order for holding and detention of such mail shall expire within 10 days after issuance unless the Postmaster General files, prior to the expiration of said period, a petition in the United States District Court for the district in which such person resides or has his principal place of business, or an order extending the time to hold or detain such mail.

The person to whom the mail is addressed shall be notified by the clerk of the court of the petition and shall appear and show cause within 5 days why such order shall not issue. The court shall order that mail be further detained where it determines that continued withholding and detention is not unreasonable and is for the protection of the public. Where no such finding is made, the court shall order the petition dismissed and the mail released.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PROVIDE FOR SALE OF PORT NEWARK ARMY BASE TO CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. CASE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 730, 74th Congress, as amended, under which the Secretary of War sold the property known as the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, subject to the right of the United States to retake the property in the event of war or a national emergency declared by the Congress.

The Army base premises are now in such physical condition that major rehabilitation work must be accomplished in the immediate future if the premises are to continue as a marine terminal in good operating condition. If this bill is enacted the work can be accomplished without cost to the Government and without impairment of the Government's right of retaking. At the same time completion of this necessary work in the near future will provide an assurance of continued employment to approximately 1,500 workmen. Thus, there will be constantly available to the Government, in the event of war or a national emergency declared by the Congress, an efficient marine terminal in good operating condition manned by a skilled labor force.

The Port Newark Army Base is 136 acres, more or less, of land located on the north side of the Ship Channel at Port Newark in the city of Newark, New Jersey, with a frontage along the deep water ship channel of approximately 4,000 feet. Prior to August 16, 1917, this property was owned by the city of Newark. On that date the city agreed to sell the premises to the United States for military use and on April 10, 1919, they were conveyed to the United States.

The Quartermaster Corps occupied the area, and constructed the buildings now on the premises. These buildings, which were completed in 1918, were of typical emergency construction for war time use and were considered as temporary structures.

Between 1911 and 1936 the city expended in excess of $25 million in developing its Port Newark Marine Terminal, including the Army base and other areas adjacent to the ship channel. Among other things, Newark spent more than $1 million to dredge the channel from its then existing depth of 20 feet to a depth of 30 feet to permit the passage of deep draft vessels.

From 1918 until 1936 the Army base area remained in Government ownership and was for various periods in possession of lessees of the Government. In 1935 appraisals established a value for the land and all improvements thereon of between $2,300,000 and $2,600,000. The city offered to purchase the premises for $1 million but this proposal was not accepted. Thereafter, in 1936, the 74th Congress enacted Public Law 730 under which the United States was authorized to sell the premises to the city for $2 million payable in installments, subject to the right in the United States to retake the property in the event of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress to exist upon payment by the Government to the city, as liquidated damages, of the sum of 3 percent per year on the amount of purchase price paid by the city prior to the taking. An appropriate contract was executed and the city commenced the required payments.

In 1942 the Government exercised its right to take the premises. Government occupancy of the area was terminated on July 1, 1947. During the period 1942–47 the Government paid to the city an annual rental of $18,000.

In March 1948, the Port of New York Authority leased the Port Newark marine terminal, including the Army base property, from the city of Newark. In 1951 the Air Force determined that occupancy of the Army base area by it was necessary for the prosecution of the several military programs then under way. Consequently, the Air Force negotiated with the port authority for the rental of these premises as well as other premises in Newark under the jurisdiction and control of the port authority and a mutually satisfactory lease was executed. On May 31, 1955, notice of termination of the Air Force lease as of August 31, 1955, was delivered to the port authority. Since the port authority-city lease, the port authority has paid the purchase price installments. The last installment is due and payable on or before August 1 of this year, at which time the Government is obligated to give the city a deed for the premises.

The temporary, wartime emergency structures erected by the United States in 1918 are now almost 38 years old. The anticipated life of such structures is normally regarded as 20 to 25 years. During the period from 1917 to 1936 no major rehabilitation was undertaken by the Government or by its tenants. The work done by Newark between 1936–42 was maintenance and repair only. From 1942 to 1947 Government occupants performed only routine maintenance. During the recent Air Force occupation of the premises a similar situation prevailed.

All buildings, structures, and utilities are now in poor condition. One thousand and five hundred feet of the wharf must be rebuilt if it is to be used at all. The electric wiring, water mains, sprinkler system, and heating systems, must be replaced. Practically all of the building platforms and all of the street areas must be rebuilt. It is anticipated that about $5 million must be invested in the premises immediately, and about $5 million more by 1960 if commercial tenants are to occupy the site, and thus provide sufficient revenues to permit the preservation, continued maintenance and rehabilitation of the area so as to insure its continued availability as a marine terminal in good operating condition.

It is to the mutual benefit of the Government and the city and its tenant, the Port of New York Authority, that Public Law 730 be amended. The location of these port facilities in close proximity to Newark Airport and to major highways and land transportation make them of prime importance to the military services in time of war. Thus from the Government standpoint it is important that they be maintained in good operating condition. A substantial investment is now necessary to rehabilitate these facilities. The city's tenant, the Port of New York Authority, is ready to make that investment but as a self-supporting public agency without taxing powers, it may not expend its funds, unless a reasonable return thereon is possible. The necessary investment here cannot be made on any reasonable economic basis in the face of existing retaking right created by Public Law 730, which limits possible return to $60,000. This bill will eliminate that obstacle. It proposes amendments to the provisions of the underlying act relating to the annual payment to be made by the Government in the event of any retaking after August 1, 1955. These amendments reflect the views of and have been approved by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Properties and Installations. They secure to the Government the full present value of its right of retaking. In addition, they will require the Government to pay increased annual rentals upon retaking only if a minimum additional sum of $3 million has been invested in the premises by persons other than the United States. The exact amount of the increased payments is in all cases restricted to a percentage of the fair rental value of the premises on the date of retaking. The amendments are acceptable to the representatives of the city.

The city of Newark, which will become the owner of the premises upon payment of the last installment of the purchase price on August 1 of this year, has expressed its vital interest in this matter in the form of a resolution adopted by the municipal council of the city on March 16, 1955, in which the council declared that the best interests of the city necessitate amendment of Public Law 730 so as to provide a sound economic basis upon which the necessary expenditures for the preservation and development of this property can be undertaken.

His Excellency, Governor Meyner of New Jersey, has been advised of this problem and is most anxious, in view of the importance of the Port Newark area to the commercial life and strength of the city of Newark and the State of New Jersey, that Public Law 730 be amended as promptly as possible in order that this segment of the marine terminal may be preserved.

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I firmly believe that this bill will benefit the United States and will at the same time safeguard the interests of the city of Newark and the State of New Jersey. The imminent termination of the Air Force occupancy of the Army base area makes immediate action on this bill a matter of the greatest urgency. So valuable a National and State asset must not be permitted to deteriorate beyond repair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2519) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ATOMIC POWERPLANT FOR INSTALLATION IN A MERCHANT VESSEL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the building and equipping of an atomic power facility for installation in a vessel. The bill is in line with the President's request, and is somewhat different from the amendment which was offered to another bill a few weeks ago. I hope the bill will meet the objections of some of the objectors to the atomic ship proposal of a few weeks ago, and I hope it will receive immediate consideration by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presume the Senator knows that in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce there are now pending 3 or 4 bills relating to the development of an atomic powered merchant vessel.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assume the Senator's bill does not refer to that subject.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It refers to the authorization of the construction of an atomic powerplant to be installed in a vessel in conjunction with the Maritime Administration, and arrangements of that kind. It does not provide for the building of a ship. It authorizes the acquisition of a ship. I do not believe there will be any difficulty in that connection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason I asked my questions of the Senator from Iowa was that I am about to introduce a bill which is the net result of some conferences held among Senators who have introduced other bills on the same subject.

It seems appropriate at this time, in view of what the Senator from Iowa has suggested, that I should make a brief statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The bill I am introducing directs itself more squarely to the construction of an atomic power plant, to be installed in a merchant ship. The bill does not provide for the building of a merchant ship, but for the acquisition of a proper hull in which the power plant can be installed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill we are proposing would provide for the construction of a prototype merchant ship powered by nuclear energy. The two proposals would not be incompatible. However, in contrast to what the President has asked for, the bill would provide for a practical merchant ship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Iowa will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2522) to authorize appropriations for the conversion and operation of a merchant vessel and for the construction and installation of an atomic energy propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF AN ATOMIC-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the acting majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to inaugurate the construction of an atomic powered merchant ship designed to fit the needs of modern times.

It is my purpose to bring the measure before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the earliest opportunity, because other bills pending before the committee involve the same subject. Should it be approved after due consideration—and I call this matter particularly to the attention of the Senator from Iowa—I shall request that it be referred also to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for further study.

This is obviously a problem that falls within the jurisdiction of both committees. Each should have the fullest opportunity to consider the measure carefully and make whatever improvements are necessary.

Personally, I consider this a matter of the highest priority. We are stepping into the atomic age at a rapid pace and we must be prepared to meet the problems as they arise, not only the problems of war but the problems of peace.

I share the President's interest in the necessity for converting the atom into a peaceful instrument. That is the hope of all America. But I disagree—as do my colleagues on this side of the aisle—with the method he has proposed.

It has never appeared to me to be wise to take an atomic reactor developed for a ship of war and build a merchant-type hull around it and call it a ship of peace. The experts I have consulted tell me that it would not be efficient, and we do not have such an inexhaustible reservoir of skill and materials that we can afford to be wasteful.

These were also the views of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when he led the successful fight against the Presidential proposal.

The legislation I am proposing would not represent a mere gesture. It would direct the appropriate agencies to go to work at once on an atomic ship designed from stem to stern to serve the needs of international commerce and, therefore, the needs of a world that want to live at peace.

It would propose a real solution to a real problem.

Mr. President, the times are ripe for taking this step. The knowledge we have gained in the vast new field of atomic energy has accumulated rapidly in recent years.

It is time to tap that accumulation to serve the ends of peace, but we should tap it wisely without waste motion and with full knowledge of what we are doing.

It has always been recognized that transportation is one of the most vital problems of our society. As the world has become more crowded, it has become increasingly essential that we learn the most rapid and the most efficient methods of moving goods from regions of abundance to regions of scarcity.

We have taken long strides in harnessing the atom to the demands of warfare. But every step has been taken with reluctance because we are a nation of people who want to live at peace, who hope and pray with every fiber of our being that the terrible weapons we have created will never be used.

There is another side to the coin, however. The atom can become the servant of humanity rather than its destroyer. It can become a beneficent goddess rather than an avenging angel.

There is no partisanship on my part in sponsoring this bill. It is my hope that all of us—regardless of our affiliations—can come together, resolve our disagreements, and proceed with this project which can be our pledge to the world of our peaceful intentions.

To my mind, this is planning for peace, for a world that can exist without war and without bloodshed. I commend this measure to my colleagues in the hope that it will be received in the spirit in which it is offered and that it will emerge representing the will of a united Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2523) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at port, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CLEMENTS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS OR LAWFULLY RESIDENT ALIENS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Address delivered by Senator JACKSON before the annual fellowship dinner of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the State of Washington, at Olympia, Wash., on Tuesday, June 21, 1955.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by him on July 12, 1955, at the 56th Annual Congress of the National Retail Hardware Association, at Buffalo, N. Y.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address by Hon. Harry S. Truman, before the General Assembly, during 10th anniversary celebration of the United Nations at San Francisco, Calif.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Transcript of television broadcast on "Person to Person," May 27, 1955, with reference to the Truman family, which appears in the RECORD.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of 94 persons for appointment, promotion, and designation in the Foreign Service of the United States. I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days in accordance with the committee rule. The list appears elsewhere in the RECORD of today.

ILLNESS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record several very fine editorials commenting upon the illness of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson]. These editorials are from the Baltimore Evening Sun, the Boston Herald, the Nashville Tennessean, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Atlanta Constitution, the San Angelo Standard-Times, the Daily Oklahoman, the Atlanta Journal, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Louisville Times, the Detroit News, the Toledo Blade, the Providence Journal, the Marshall News-Messenger, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, the Buffalo Evening News, the Chicago American, the Oregonian, and the Journal Every-Evening of Wilmington, Del.

Mr. President, I am very proud to submit this request because Senator Johnson possesses the highest qualities of leadership in the greatest deliberative body in the world.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of July 5, 1955]

A Leader's Illness

The skilled parliamentary leader is worth his weight in gold to his party and in many cases also to his country. Senator Lyndon B. Johnson has clearly established himself as such a leader.

He is in a class with that other Texan, former Vice President Jack Garner, in this regard—a shrewd judge of what Senate Democrats ought to do and a skilled worker in winning his colleagues to the chosen line. His adept performance stands out in sharp contrast with that of his opposite number in the Republican Party, Mr. Knowland, who is too busy trumpeting some of his own pet ideas to have much time for doing the sort of thing which has won Senator Johnson such acclaim.

Under Mr. Johnson and Speaker Rayburn, Democrats in the Senate and the House have already made a substantial record in this Congress. As President Eisenhower has said, they could do much more than they have done to push along the administration's legislative program, but they have avoided the kind of die-hard obstructionism which the GOP so often offered to Mr. Eisenhower's predecessor.

Senate Democrats will miss the man who has done so much toward making a good party record, and all will wish that the illness which has taken him from his post for the remainder of the session yields promptly to rest and medical treatment.

[From the Boston Herald of July 9, 1955]

Pacesetter

When the President had his little tiff with Democratic Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson last week, the issue was how much remained to be done this session, not how much had been done.

Mr. Eisenhower was more than willing to concede that the record of accomplishment was good, and, if he had been pressed, he would certainly have added that a large share of the credit belonged to his friend, the Senator from Texas.

Senator Johnson will make no further contributions to this year's legislative record. Struck down by a heart attack over the weekend, he had a narrow escape from death, and it will be many months at best before he can resume his post of majority leader. But he should be helped in his recovery by the genuine expressions of esteem which have been pouring in from Republicans and Democrats alike, including that certain party leader with whom he was exchanging good-natured barbs only a few days ago.

Lyndon Johnson has proved himself a good politician and a good public servant. It is a rare combination but in our society it is the most effective there is. As majority leader, Johnson has been much more than a loyal opposition to the President. He has taken active direction of many administration measures, particularly in the foreign field, which he considered important to the Nation and has pushed them without regard to politics. He has proved himself a good partisan by knowing when to rise above partisanship.

America needs men of his stamp. The whole Nation is rooting for him and wishing him a speedy recovery so that he may be back at his post in January.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of July 9, 1955]

Democrats Feel the Loss of L. Johnson

(By Jay G. Hayden)

Washington.—The sudden severe illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson (Democrat, Texas), majority floor leader of the Senate, in what may be the last month of this year's Congress, is comparable in political consequence with the death of Senator Taft, Republican, Ohio, near the end of the 1953 session.

Johnson, 46, suffered a heart attack on Saturday which, while by no means pointing to permanent incapacity, seems likely to greatly lessen his participation in politics for the remainder of this year and during the preliminaries of the 1956 presidential election.

As with Taft's removal from the Senate, 2 months before the end of the 1953 session, Johnson's absence probably will not affect legislative results this year. Most of the important measures either have been passed, irretrievably defeated, or are so near to a final vote as to make a change in Democratic leadership relatively inconsequential.

Senator Clements, Kentucky, who will take over as acting Democratic floor leader, at least for the remainder of this session, is in almost all policy respects an authentic reflection of Johnson.

POTENTIAL POWER

But in the overall Democratic outlook there probably is no single individual with more power in shaping events, assuming he quickly recovers, than Johnson. Among the younger leaders of the Democratic party, he easily has risen faster and with more promise of greater services to come than any other.

Even as Johnson was stricken on Saturday afternoon, a Sunday New York Times "Week in Review" was going to press with an article headed: "Democratic Congress Is Going 'Lyndon's Way.'"

Johnson, this piece declared, is "father of the concept that he calls responsible opposition."

"Almost no one here, in either party, questions that Mr. Johnson's skill as a leader is unmatched in recent memory, as is his influence on a heretofore temperamental group of Senators running all the way from profoundly standpat Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, to the volatile New-Fair Dealer Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota."

The measurement of Johnson's managerial performance is the degree to which he has quieted partisan contention with effect of pushing through many of President Eisenhower's legislative recommendations.

WAITING MEASURES

After Johnson last week boasted of Democratic accomplishments in that line, President Eisenhower countered with a statement that, while praising performance of the Congress so far, listed a large number of measures still to be acted on.

Even so the President no doubt was wholly sincere when he expressed deep regret concerning Johnson's illness and hope that he quickly will recover.

It is with respect to the approaching presidential race, however, that Johnson's illness casts the biggest shadow. He is today immeasurably the most powerful elected politician from the South. Particularly, northern Democrats have been looking to Johnson, more than any other, as their main hope of mollifying the Dixiecrat revolt which carried 4 Southern States into the Republican electoral column in each of the last 2 presidential elections, 1948 and 1952.

Johnson's special importance with the latter regard is that he hails from Texas and is the one officeholder rated as strong enough to seriously challenge control by the State Democratic machine, headed by Gov. Allan Shivers, which carried Texas for Mr. Eisenhower.

CONSIDERED LOYALIST

A candidate for reelection himself in 1952, Johnson mostly kept out of the bitter intra-Democratic row in his home State, but he did mildly assert support of the Democratic ticket of Stevenson and Sparkman and he continues to be rated a member of the southern loyalist faction.

It is with a view to the southern Democratic situation in 1956, that leftwing Democratic Senators from the North and West mostly have played along with Johnson, even though they have felt that he was too tender and deferential toward President Eisenhower.

Democratic city bosses in the North have courted Johnson with an offer of vice presidential nomination and in a few cases even have suggested that by 1960 or 1964 he should be a powerful presidential aspirant.

Certainly, if Johnson should be even partially incapacitated during the prepresidential convention fight in Texas next spring, Shivers' chance of retaining complete control of the Democratic Party in the State will be greatly increased.

As to the Senate, resignation by Johnson of his leadership before opening of next year's session almost certainly would provoke a knockdown fight between the right and left wings within the Democratic majority.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of July 6, 1955]

Senator Johnson's Health Upsets Democrats' Plans

Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas is seriously ill of a heart attack in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md.

The Texan has been first of all an American. Secondly, he has served the Democratic Party wisely and well. He and Georgia's two Senators, Walter George and Richard B. Russell, generally are credited with having enabled President Eisenhower to defeat Senator Joe McCarthy's efforts to smash the administration's bipartisan foreign policy. They also have kept the party on a level keel and prevented it from straying off into strange pastures.

His illness makes it most unlikely the Texan will be able to make half of the most-talked-of Democratic presidential ticket for 1956, Adlai Stevenson and Lyndon Johnson. In fact, the Senator is considered second only to Stevenson in popular appeal.

The Nation needs him and the Democratic Party needs him. We join with his thousands of friends in earnest wishes for complete recovery.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times of July 5, 1955]

Even Taking It Easier, Johnson Influence Large

While the illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson is considered by many a grave blow to hopes for northern-southern Democratic Party harmony, there is no reason to write the Senator off. A heart attack can be a temporary thing if the person so afflicted has the will to live and to resort to the disciplines of life that are demanded.

A heart malady is a grave thing, frequently brought on by long hours of hard labor, taking the problems of office to bed with one, and ignoring the routines of physical checkups at intervals of a year or more.

Senator JOHNSON has been much in the public eye because he was getting more done as the majority party leader in the Senate than any other leader in recent years. He could be compared only to the best ever to hold that job. He was mentioned as a presidential or vice presidential candidate because of the excellent job he has been doing. This talk may, in itself, have stimulated more activity on the part of the tall Texan than his heart would bear.

At any rate the fate of Senator JOHNSON rests more with himself than any other person. If he takes this as a warning and operates within the limits of his physical capacity, he can undoubtedly recover his health to render vast service to his country and his party.

[From the Daily Oklahoman of July 5, 1955]

A LOSS TO THE COUNTRY

If Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S unexpected heart affliction proves more than temporarily incapacitating the country as well as the Senate has suffered a grievous loss.

For, regardless of his recent and rather acrid political exchange with the President, it must appear that the Senate has accomplished far more under Senator JOHNSON'S adroit leadership than it might have accomplished under a majority leader more partisan-minded.

Perhaps the most convincing tribute to the Texan's consummate skill as a parliamentarian was the extreme divergence of political views represented by those who offered condolences.

The majority leader's illness was mourned alike by Democrats and Republicans, including the President with whom JOHNSON recently had been jousting concerning the progress of the administration's legislative program.

But even more noticeable was the great range of political opinion within the Senator's own party that united on the occasion of his illness to express grief and shock.

Certainly not every majority leader could command the respect and support of such southern conservatives as RUSSELL and BYRD on one hand and such northern extremists as HUMPHREY on the other.

In steering legislation through the Senate, Senator JOHNSON has managed to anticipate the points at which partisan controversy might occur and to minimize conflict by limiting the opportunities for it.

How remarkably he has succeeded is indicated by the divergent sources of his "get well" greetings in his present illness.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 5, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

Everyone will regret the serious heart illness that has taken Senator LYNDON JOHNSON out of the post of majority leader for the rest of the session. One of the ablest members in either branch, the 46-year-old Texan is largely responsible for the dispatch with which the 84th Congress has been doing its work. Indeed it is his hard work that has undermined his health. The Eisenhower administration is almost as much indebted to him as is the Democratic side.

When the 84th Congress met 6 months ago, Senator JOHNSON, thanks to the political revolution in Oregon, moved up from the minority post to majority leader. From the outset he and his fellow Texan, SPEAKER RAYBURN in the House, have demonstrated the inaccuracy of the President's 1954 campaign prediction that a Democratic Congress would produce a "cold war" with the White House.

On international issues the Democrats, under Senator JOHNSON'S leadership, have given the President far better support than he ever got from his own party when the McCarthys, Jenners, Brickers, Bridgeses, and other Old Guard men were able to throw their weight around as committee chairmen. In the early months of the present session the Democrats were the President's strong backers when Minority Leader KNOWLAND was going off on his own repeatedly.

This also is at least partially true in the domestic field. Under the JOHNSON leadership the Democrats have advanced and enlarged some White House domestic proposals that were allowed to languish during Republican rule of Congress. Postal pay, Government pay, housing, minimum wage—these are only four of the domestic bills that might be cited.

Senator JOHNSON has looked out for Texas and Texas interests and at times these come into conflict with national interest as on offshore oil and natural gas price regulation. But it is not fair to blame him for every shortcoming among the Democrats as some progressives in politics find it easy to do. Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, sets his record clear in his timely article, Making a Scapegoat of LYNDON JOHNSON, in the current New Republic.

Senate Democrats have been harder hit by illness in this session than the Republicans. Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, missed much of the forepart of the session and Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Foreign Relations chairman, has been away from Capitol Hill for more than a month. Fortunately neither side has sustained a loss such as that of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, who died just 2 years ago this month, after having occupied the leadership post for a similar gruelling 6 months.

[From the Atlanta Journal of July 5, 1955]

GOOD WISHES TO SENATOR JOHNSON

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON will be missed in the Senate. The hardworking majority leader, who suffered a mild heart attack over the weekend, was a victim of his own energy. He will not be able to return to the Senate before next year.

JOHNSON'S leadership was most effective. He succeeded in a difficult assignment, directing Democratic forces in the Senate under a Republican President.

In this respect, JOHNSON followed a policy of constructive opposition to the Eisenhower legislative program. He supported a considerable part of this program and rallied his Democratic colleagues behind it. On and off the Senate floor, he was a deft manipulator who got results with a minimum of fanfare.

JOHNSON'S absence from the political scene will hurt the cause of the Democrats. The Texas Senator was accepted as a standard-bearer by all wings of the party, including the several factions in his home State. He was adept at healing differences in the party and bringing unity to it.

JOHNSON'S successor, Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, probably will continue the policy of constructive opposition to the Eisenhower program. It is hoped that the Democratic spirit of cooperation, fostered by JOHNSON, will prevail through the remainder of the session.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 6, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S JOB

The illness of Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON focuses public attention on an important but often unappreciated Washington job. Although the Senate majority leader is frequently mentioned in the news, he carries on his work in a manner that is not easy to observe. Office conferences, telephone conversations, signals on the Senate floor do not make headlines. And yet these are the devices by which legislation is pushed along.

Senator JOHNSON, making few speeches and seldom holding the Senate in night sessions, has not been a spectacular leader. But during his months of leadership of the upper chamber of the 84th Congress, he has rolled up a solid record of accomplishment. He has reunited the members of the Democratic Party. He has faithfully followed what he has referred to as the role of responsible opposition—guiding much of the Republican administration's program through the Senate. On June 30 only 19 bills which had been reported by committees remained to be acted on by the Senate; on the same date in 1953, the last year when the Senate was under a new leader, there were 135 bills to be acted on.

As this is written, the Senate majority leader—though still in serious condition—is reported to be making satisfactory progress in recovering from the heart ailment which struck him late Saturday. We hope this is an indication that the Senate will again be able to make use of the services of a man who has shown that he knows so well how to make the legislative process work.

[From the Louisville Times of July 5, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON, SKILLFUL LEGISLATOR

LYNDON JOHNSON was first elected to the Senate as recently as 1948. He won the Democratic nomination in Texas that year by only 87 votes out of a total of 988,295 cast. His critics at the time tauntingly referred to him as Landslide LYNDON. But his rise in the councils of the Senate was almost as sensationally rapid as the margin of his first election to that body had been narrow.

When the present Congress convened last winter, Senator JOHNSON, beginning just his second term, was majority leader in the upper House, the youngest man ever to hold that office. The Senate is not his first legislative experience. He had served for 10 years before 1948 in the House. Nevertheless, his advance has been extraordinary, and in the majority leadership he has revealed authentic genius in parliamentary maneuver and persuasion.

The political professionals in all factions of both parties have been captivated by the competence of his performance, and the people of the country have begun to join in the admiration he has won from the experts in Washington. Thus the news of his sudden illness at the weekend was a shock to the Nation; the prayer for his speedy recovery is general. His being put out of action for the present is a sharp reminder that the Senate, his party, and the country could not afford to lose him.

For the remainder of the session, Mr. JOHNSON'S place will be taken by his chief lieutenant, EARLE CLEMENTS, of Kentucky. Mr. CLEMENTS is himself a legislative technician of uncommon skill. This became apparent to Kentuckians when he served as majority leader of the State senate in 1944. In the national Senate he has lived up to the reputation he made in those days as an astute practitioner of the parliamentary arts. Naturally LYNDON JOHNSON was attracted to him.

[From the Detroit News of July 6, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

Majority Leader JOHNSON'S sudden heart attack is not so much a threat to orderly accomplishment of present Senate business as it is a shadow on the future.

He is generally conceded to have given his Democratic followers the best Senate leadership they have enjoyed in a quarter century. For 2½ years he has unified them behind a policy of "reasonable opposition" which has benefited both his party and the Nation's business.

Senator Johnson is a refreshing departure from the traditional mint-julep Senator from south of the Mason-Dixon line. It is to be hoped that an ailing heart will not limit so promising a career or interfere with the equilibrium he has brought to the world's greatest deliberative body.

[From the Toledo Blade of July 6, 1955]

HARMONIZER

Stricken with a moderately severe heart attack at the age of 46, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas will have to give up active Senate leadership for the balance of this congressional session. Democrats and administration alike have cause to hope his illness will be of a temporary nature.

Senator Johnson has done much to help unify the Democratic Party and to restore the dignity of the Senate. A stanch New Deal supporter during the early Roosevelt administration, he has gradually moved over to a position roughly midway between the liberal and conservative branches of his party. By maintaining close ties with Georgia's influential Senators Walter George and Richard Russell, while helping northern Senators obtain choice committee assignments, campaigning for them in the 1954 elections, and cooperating with them on many legislative proposals, he has helped bring the party to a measure of unity few would have thought possible during the latter years of the Truman administration.

Impatient with windbaggery and with battles for lost causes, one of the Senator's favorite words is "constructive." And apparently he means it, with due regard for the political interests of his party. Where the Democrats could not accept the Eisenhower program as submitted, he has tried to work out alternative ways of moving toward the same ends. Because of his settled views about the need for preparedness, moreover, he has been able to cooperate with Mr. Eisenhower on nearly all national defense measures.

Senator Johnson has been described as "one of the hardest workers on Capitol Hill," as one who "drives himself at a punishing pace," and as "a man in a hurry." He will have to slow down from here on. But if he makes a satisfactory recovery, his harmonizing talents can continue to serve the Nation well.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of July 6, 1955]

LET'S HOPE SENATOR JOHNSON WILL BE BACK SOON

The immediate regret is that it should have happened to such a thoroughly nice guy as Senator Lyndon Johnson; and the hope is that he will successfully pull through a bad heart seizure and return to his career (with bright promise for a man only 46) of usefulness and reputation.

If the country is now traveling on a course of pleasant waters approximating an era of good feeling, a very considerable share of the credit belongs to Senator Johnson. He is a practicing professional politician, in the highest meaning of that term, in the sense that it was applied to the late Senator Taft. His sensitivity to the currents of public feeling advised him that under present circumstances it would be political folly for the Democrats to butt antagonistic heads against the wall of favorable popular sentiment that supports President Eisenhower. The cooperation of the Democratic Party with the Eisenhower administration, as engineered by Senator Johnson, has smoothed the way for much of the President's program.

It was the brains, the will, and the measured judgment of Senator Johnson that were responsible for this situation. This is not to say that the majority leader had turned Republican or lost the spirit of fight, though certain Democrats lamented his amiable cooperation. In his reckoning, it was the best kind of politics, and it placed the Democrats in a strong position when the bombardment really began. The question that arises is whether, with Senator Johnson inactivated, succeeding leadership will take the party on another course.

[From the Marshall News-Messenger of July 6, 1955]

JOHNSON CAN MAKE MOST OF ADVERSITY

From all parts of the Nation, sympathy has found its way to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson on the occasion of the heart attack suffered by Senator Johnson.

Mrs. Johnson, the former Miss Lady Bird Taylor, of Karnack, asked that his friends pray for the Senator's recovery. This they already had done from the moment they heard of his suffering the attack.

Perhaps none in Washington had driven himself to the extent the Senator had moved this year in Washington reconciling differences among party factions, leading a Democratic majority along bipartisan lines with a Republican President, and steering legislation through the Senate.

None moved with such rapidity. None worked more tirelessly. None sought to heal political wounds. None took his work more seriously.

Too, none was more prominently in the spotlight. No less a publication than the U. S. News & World Report only a week before had said the Senator could be on the next Democratic national ticket if he wanted the place. A boomlet had started for him to lead the ticket.

In the meantime, the Senator's friends quietly were working but waiting until 1960, feeling confident that by then the gentleman from Texas would be without opposition by the time of the convention and that his being named standard bearer would be but a formality.

Then came the heart attack; but, with it, hospital attendants reported, the Senator was smiling. None doubts the Senator's courage. None doubts his strong, vital physical makeup.

His friends say he will come through; that the heart attack merely will slow his physical efforts; that with the foundation he has built, future physical efforts will yield to mental direction of party affairs.

Lyndon Johnson has a way of making the most of any adversity. He becomes stronger with such experiences.

The prayers that he may recover are being offered for a man who is headed with his former Harrison County wife to a residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue—the White House.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 7, 1955]

A SPEEDY RECOVERY

The country, which has observed with approval Senator Lyndon B. Johnson's deft management of his Senate majority along a generally constructive path, will wish him a speedy recovery.

President Eisenhower, in spite of his recent exchange of partisan umbrage, will miss Senator Johnson's expeditious maneuvering of legislation toward a vote during the remainder of this session.

What this second indisposition in one session will do to Mr. Johnson's prospects for vice presidential nomination is anyone's guess. His admirers have been inflating a considerable boom for him as a running mate for Adlai Stevenson next year. His health may now become a subject for consideration.

The fact is, of course, that, under his deceptively calm and amiable manner, Senator Johnson has been working at a killing pace. The taming of the majority, which includes many spirited statesmen, was by no means as easy as it looked.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, July 5, 1955]

THE ONLY ONE, BUT—

Senator Lyndon Johnson's incapacity, whether he is considered as Senator or majority leader, is bad for the Senate, no matter what anyone says. He is too good a man to be lost at any time. It is true, however, that his loss to the Democratic Party, at this stage of the 1955 session, does not compare with the loss to the Republican Party in 1953, only a few weeks earlier, of Majority Leader Taft. Nor is it yet apparent that his role in the Senate as a sort of loyal oppositionist leader concentrating more on getting sensible things done than on political pyrotechnics and "Eisenhower-baiting" will be duplicated by Senator Clements. The latter, as assistant leader, rises almost automatically to the vacant post.

This doubt was expressed, in an indirect way, by Senator Humphrey, who asserted that Senator Johnson is the "one man able to hold the Democratic forces together in the Senate and move the program along with ease and relative speed." At the same time, he promised Senator Clements "our wholehearted cooperation." The irony is that it is the New Dealers, represented by these gentlemen, who have really had to be held somewhat in check to prevent the session's becoming a pop-off political rally along the theme that "Ike isn't doing enough" (to spend money, spread socialism, commit exaggerations on the domestic front). At the same time they and southern Democrats, unlike some Republicans, have done yeoman's work for the President's foreign policies.

Republican Senator Ives is another who says, "The Senate just can't spare Lyndon Johnson—a really heartfelt tribute, especially when you consider that Senator Johnson never hesitated to take his "lambasting" gloves off whenever Republicans intimated that the Senate, and the Presidential program, not to mention the GOP, could very well spare the whole Democratic membership.

The aim has been for congressional adjournment by the end of July, predicated on winding up the important national measures. It's also possible for Congress to adjourn by the end of July, having done nothing but talk. It's to early to deplore. A hope for the best and for the best in Senator Clements is decidedly in order.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of July 5, 1955]

SENATE WILL MISS HIM

The serious illness of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, is a loss not only to his party in Congress but to the Senate, and the Nation. Serving in what is undoubtedly the most exacting role on Capitol Hill, he has shown a parliamentary brilliance and a talent both for composing intraparty differences and for expediting the business of the Senate that has rarely been matched in recent years.

In the last Congress, he was nominally the minority leader, but his minority became in fact a bare majority after the death of Senator Taft. Since the start of the present Congress last January, he has been majority leader in name as well as fact and has performed the assignment under the most difficult circumstances possible. As the leader of the majority in opposition to a popular

President, he has not only had to choose when to cooperate and when to oppose the administration, but in charting his strategy he has had to carry with him a party normally more divided than united.

That he has succeeded in a way to win praise from every faction in both parties is a measure of the Senate's loss for the rest of this year's session, and also a measure of the Democratic Party's concern lest he be unable to resume his service during the crucial election-year session next winter. We join his colleagues of both parties in wishing him a swift recovery.

[From the Chicago American of July 6, 1955]

JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON strikes at a most inopportune moment. In the 84th Congress, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, has been a leader of Republicans as well as his own party.

His support of President Eisenhower has been more effective than that of any Republican. His opposite number on the Republican side, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, has often been opposed to the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration, but Democrat JOHNSON has been a tower of strength to the President.

LYNDON JOHNSON, in recent months, has often been mentioned as the probable Democratic candidate for Vice President. Democrats, concerned over the defection of Texas in 1952, have regarded JOHNSON as a gift from heaven, a Texan with an exceptionally good record in Congress.

It was believed that his nomination was inevitable, particularly if Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, were nominated for the Presidency.

The toll that congressional work takes out of those who really tend to business is greater than the people realize.

It can only be hoped that the present illness of Senator JOHNSON of Texas, will not be the end of a brilliant and useful career.

[From the Oregonian of July 4, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The serious heart attack which has put Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, out of action for the remainder of the session, at least, is bad luck for the Nation as well as to him and his family. As majority leader of the Senate, the 46-year-old Texan has distinguished himself as an astute and conscientious composer of differences not only between a Democratic Congress and a Republican executive but among factions of Democrats.

Things have gone so smoothly in Congress under his guidance that a strong movement was developing, particularly in the South, to bring his name before the national convention next year as a nominee for President. This movement will end. The party and the voters would not risk nominating and electing a President with a bad heart. Good health is a top consideration for that grueling post of world responsibility.

In his 18 years of service in House and Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON has won the confidence of his colleagues in both parties. His national stature has increased as he demonstrated temperate and conservative leadership in healing the 1952 breach between Democrat liberals of the North and West and the conservative Democrats of a no longer solid South. His support of President Eisenhower on vital foreign issues, and some domestic programs, and his relations with Vice President NIXON added to his reputation. The Oregonian wishes him a speedy recovery and longer service.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal Every Evening of July 5, 1955]

MAY HIS RECOVERY BE SPEEDY

The heart attack which felled Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, over the Fourth of July weekend and threatens to keep him out of action for an indefinite period is a heavy blow not only to the Democratic Party but to the Nation as a whole. As majority floor leader, Senator JOHNSON has displayed not only remarkable qualities of leadership but a high sense of responsibility for the welfare of the country. Against the advice of the more violently partisan members of his own party, he has hewed consistently to the line that sound statesmanship is the best kind of politics and that the Democrats stand to gain more by cooperating with President Eisenhower, where his policies are acceptable to them, than by opposing and frustrating him at every turn.

As a result of this leadership Mr. Eisenhower has had remarkable success in getting his legislation through a Congress, particularly in the field of foreign affairs, even though the Democrats have a majority in both Houses. Despite the differences between the two and their fairly frequent clashes, Senator JOHNSON, in his role as leader of a "constructive opposition," has been one of the President's most effective aides. If one of the Texan's major motives has been political—to strengthen the Democratic position for the presidential campaign ahead—there is no doubt that the country has benefited from his type of leadership.

His political opponents as well as his friends join today in hoping that Senator JOHNSON recovers speedily. Fortunately, his work for the current session is largely done. But it will be a serious loss to his party and to his country if he is not able to resume his active leadership again when Congress reconvenes next year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceeding of July 12, 1955, p. 10300, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill is now in the same form as that in which a similar Senate bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House. Later the House passed House bill 6295 and sent it to the Senate. The Senate amended it so as to correspond with the bill which had already passed the Senate, and sent it back to the House. There was a conference. The conferees have agreed upon the bill as it passed the Senate, so I do not think there will be any question about approving the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand, the bill involves an increase in per diem and travel allowance for Government employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. The increase in the subsistence allowance is from $9 to $12. The figure in the House bill was $13.

Mr. CURTIS. And the Senate version prevailed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. The Senate allowance for mileage also prevailed.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the figure for the mileage allowance?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The mileage allowances were increased from 4 cents and 6 cents to 7 cents and 10 cents, respectively, to correspond with increases in salaries.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, this bill takes care of travel allowances for Government employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What about committee employees? Does it take care of them?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This bill does not take care of them, but I understand that the Appropriations Committee will deal with that subject. It usually maintains such allowances at the same level as those in the law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Allowances for committee employees are handled through the Legislative Appropriation Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, the bill does not take care of committee staff members who may have to travel on committee business.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does not, I hope the Senator, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, will see that this subject is properly handled in the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I have advised my friend from Wisconsin what the acting majority leader's plans are. I am sure that he will share his plans with me.

We have no legislative business to consider today, unless the conference report on the public works appropriation bill is acted upon by the House. It is the plan of the acting majority leader to move a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

It is my understanding that a yea-and-nay vote will be taken in the House this afternoon when the conference report on the public works appropriation bill is presented, and that when the necessary formalities are concluded the conference report can be submitted to the Senate and acted upon this afternoon. It is a very important measure. Many Senators expected that it would be acted upon either yesterday or today.

With that explanation to my friend from Wisconsin, I thought perhaps he might advise me what his plans may be. We shall be glad to make every reasonable effort to accommodate the Senator from Wisconsin.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have no plans for speaking today. My plans will depend largely upon what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee does with respect to the two resolutions which are pending before it.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] so apparently the meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has been concluded.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement which I made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOE McCARTHY BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 126, JULY 13, 1955

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for hearing me today. Let me say, first of all, that I am happy the subject of the Communist-enslaved peoples is again before this committee. I think that most of us believed, and we certainly hoped, the subject would get another airing after the unfortunate impression that seems to have spread through the world in the wake of the defeat of Senate Resolution 116.

The question now before the committee is how far, in its opinion, the Senate ought to go in expressing its views about liberation. The committee has before it two resolutions which suggest different approaches to the problem. I trust the committee will permit me to comment on both of them, since they deal with the same problem.

I shall not speak against adopting the Knowland-Clements-George-Wiley resolution: No one can do that and hang onto his virtue. I do think, however, that there is a serious defect in the Knowland resolution, which the committee ought to correct. I believe, further, that the committee should recommend steps for implementing the Knowland resolution, which, I suggest, are the measures called for by my resolution.

The Knowland-Clements-George-Wiley resolution has, as I see it, one glaring omission. As if by oversight, there is no mention of communism, or of the Soviet Union, or of the Iron Curtain, or of any other word that specifies what the resolution is presumably talking about. The omission, of course, was not an oversight; and I urge the committee to do some hard thinking about the reasons for the omission.

I am sure that if Senator KNOWLAND had had his way, the resolution would read quite differently. Perhaps the same is true of the other sponsors. I do not attribute the wording to them. This is an administration resolution, and the reason for the language is very clear: The administration wants to avoid giving offense to the Soviet Union. The administration is, to be sure, indignant over the fate of the captive peoples, but not so indignant as to risk identifying the tyrants by name.

Now, I ask the committee to consider from two points of view the administration's unwillingness to allude to communism. First, from the point of view of whether the Senate still functions as an independent body: Three weeks ago the Senate was told by the administration that we should not recommend that this country secure the Soviet Union's commitment to discuss the satellites, prior to Geneva. That word was passed down directly to this committee. The Senate acquiesced. Then the Senate was advised that it should not even express its hope that the President would bring up the satellite question at Geneva. Although the President and the Secretary of State were in complete sympathy with the humanitarian objective of my resolution concerning the satellites, the administration said we would be tying the President's hands if we said we hoped he would pursue those objectives. Again, the Senate knuckled under.

Then, we asked—and I refer the committee to the transcript of its hearings on June 21 at the point when I was questioning the Under Secretary of State—we asked if the Senate might not, please, be permitted to express its sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of the satellite resolution. "No," said the administration. "You had better not do that, either." Dutifully, the Senate did not do that, either.

Still, the Senate did have a mind of its own; some Senators were apparently determined to go on record favoring the freedom of the satellite peoples. The administration said, "All right—if you insist. But you must be very careful of the form of words you use. You can have the word 'imperialism,' and also 'despondent.' If you want to work in 'tyranny' that will be all right, too. But we cannot give you 'Communist' or 'Soviet Union'; and you must not mention Geneva and, above all, you must not do anything more provocative than hope for the freedom of the enslaved peoples."

Now I submit that this is no caricature of the administration's relations with the Senate on this question. I urge this committee to give very serious thought to how long the Senate should jump through every hoop the administration puts in front of us. Moreover, I suggest this last instance is pretty clearly a case wherein the Kremlin itself makes the marginal decision. The Senate, let us assume, wants to call a spade a spade and condemn Communist tyranny. The administration, let us hope anyway, would also like for the Senate to do this, but fears that plain language would bring forth an unfavorable reaction from Moscow. The Soviet Union is thus, in effect, given a veto over how the United States Senate expresses itself on the question of the satellite countries.

Now it is clear why a resolution of the KNOWLAND type is not intolerable to the Communists. Words like "imperialism" and "despotism" are not necessarily equatable with "communism"; and in the Communist vernacular, such language can be taken as a condemnation of British imperialism in the Near East, of French "despotism" in Indochina—or, if you please, a condemnation of certain American policies as they are seen in Communist eyes. Such language, in other words, means different things to different people and thus, in real effect, means nothing.

Now, consider this language from the second point of view—that of how it will be received by the freedom-loving people of the world. Generalities like "imperialism" and "despotism" have been selected by the administration because it thought they would be palatable to the Soviet Union. But by the same token these words are hollow and meaningless in the eyes of the people on whom they are supposed to have a propaganda effect. Just to the extent the language of the resolution is tolerable to the Communists, just to that extent it will be useless as a propaganda weapon. Surely none of us is so naive as to believe that the free peoples of the world will fail to catch the significance of the omission of any mention of communism or of the Soviet Union.

Therefore, I suggest that the committee report favorably on the KNOWLAND-CLEMENTS-GEORGE-WILEY resolution, but with the following amendments: In the first clause of the preamble, substitute the word "Soviet" for the word "totalitarian"; in the second clause of the preamble, substitute the words "the Soviet" for the words "an aggressive"; and in the resolving clause, substitute the words "Soviet despotism" for the words "alien despotism."

I would prefer the word "Communist" to "Soviet"; but this would bring Yugoslavia into the purview of the resolution which, I take it, was not the intention of the resolution's sponsors.

The members of the committee may feel these amendments are unnecessary. I expect to hear the objection that: "Everyone knows we are talking about the Soviet tyranny in the Communist slave states." My answer is, first: if everyone knows this, then surely there is no harm in saying it; and second, that the only reason for not saying it is that it is desired the resolution be ambiguous.

Now let me turn to the resolution I have submitted. As I have said, I see no harm in adopting the Knowland resolution properly amended—provided we do not let the matter drop at that. I said on the Senate floor 2 days ago that "We will make no real progress toward the goal of liberation, nor will we succeed in convincing either the slaves of the tyrants that we mean business, if we content ourselves * * * with pious statements, dripping with humanitarian concern for oppressed peoples, but containing not the slightest hint of concrete measures for unhorsing the tyrants. * * * We invite (the world) to conclude * * * that the American Government's concern for oppressed peoples is a cheap politician's concern about how Americans of Eastern European descent will vote in the next election."

We must, in other words, take positive steps toward the liberation of the captive peoples. I think it goes without saying that we cannot move 1 inch forward so long as we recognize the Soviet puppet governments as the official representatives of the captive peoples. Indeed, every day we do so, we take an additional step backward; for we give just that much additional strength, stability, and dignity to the Communist regimes. It is utterly contradictory for us to talk, as the Knowland resolution does, about hoping that the enslaved peoples shall again enjoy the right of self-determination—while we give official recognition to the very men who are preventing that right of self-determination from being exercised.

I assume the members of the committee do not need to be reminded that these several Communist gangs were handpicked for the job by the Soviet Union—that the "governments" they now dominate were forcibly imposed against the will of the Eastern European peoples. But if we are to consider the question of recognition, I think we have clearly in mind the backgrounds of the puppet regimes. So let me trace briefly the Communist takeovers in each of these countries. This picture is set forth in great detail in the several reports of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, published this year. I shall, in some instances, use the Select Committee's language verbatim.

Let us turn first to Poland. When the Nazis drove the Red Army out of Poland in 1941, the Polish Communist Party was split into two segments. One, called the Polish Workers Party, remained in Poland as an underground resistance group, working under direct control of the Kremlin. Its assignment was to set up Communist cells in the loyal underground, to denounce uncooperative elements of the loyal underground to the Gestapo, and lay the groundwork for postwar control of the government. The second segment migrated to Russia with the Red Army and was set up in Moscow as a planning and propaganda unit.

In July of 1944, after the Red Army had reconquered the eastern half of Poland, the Moscow and the underground units of the party, together with the Red Army, established the Polish Committee of National Liberation. The committee was given "legal and provisional executive authority in all liberated territory." Leaders of the committee were all members of the Moscow section of the Polish Communist Party. The committee proclaimed itself the provisional Governent of Poland on December 31, 1944, and then proceeded to cede eastern Poland to the Soviet Union.

This was the government which Roosevelt and Churchill, at Yalta, agreed should form the basis of a new Polish government. The new coalition government was supposed to include non-Communist Poles "from Poland and abroad"; but by June of 1945 most of the leading non-Communists in Poland were dead, in jail, or deported. Out of 24 cabinet posts in the "coalition government," 21 were given to Communists. The Communists were, of course, in complete control. "Free" elections were then called for.

The Communists had control of the administration and the electoral machinery for the election of 1947. They were free to cancel or alter the voting list of the Polish Peasants Party, headed by Mikolajczyk, the leader of the former London government-in-exile. The secret police freely liquidated the opposition. The voting was often by open ballot; it was everywhere conducted under the watchful eye of the Red Army, in polling places manned by Communists. The votes were counted by Communist-controlled election boards.

The rigged elections took place, and the Communists won by a ratio of 15–1. When the new government was formed in February 1947, it did not include a single non-Communist. By May 1949 all anti-Communist leaders were dead, deported, in jail, or had fled the country. Poland was now a helpless Soviet puppet.

The Czechoslovakian Communist Party operated similarly to the Polish Party during the war. In Czechoslovakia, as in Poland, the Soviet Union maintained both a Communist underground in Czechoslovakia and an informal puppet group in Moscow, headed by Klement Gottwald. When the Red Army invaded eastern Czechoslovakia in 1944, a Soviet-inspired liberation movement took control of Slovakia. In 1945, President Benes flew from London to Moscow to set up a coalition government with the Communists.

Let us turn now to Hungary. Communism, as a political movement in Hungary, had been almost nonexistent since the days of the short-lived Bela Kun Communist government of 1919. The Communist leaders selected for Hungary had spent the 26 years preceding the takeover in Moscow under Communist tutelage or in Hungarian prisons as offenders against the peace and security of the state. They returned to Hungary with the Red army, armed with instructions to capture the state.

In January 1945, the Communists launched an intensive but careful campaign for the subjugation of the state. A Communist was appointed to head the Hungarian trade-union movement and promptly usurped all power. Next, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the control of the police were given to a pro-Communist member of the Peasants Party. While a member of the Smallholders Party became Minister of Defense, the organization, distribution, and command of the army actually rested with the Red army.

All undemocratic elements were screened in the public service, the professions, and private industry. An economic strangehold obtained by the removal of Hungarian machinery forced economic cooperation and the establishment of joint Soviet-Hungarian companies.

Feeling safe in their methods and confident of their power the Communists agreed to the popular demand for elections. Surprisingly, however, the Smallholders Party won the national election. It was a brief moment of triumph for the forces of freedom. But the Russians systematically sabotaged the Smallholders government. The party in power was forced to oust deputies to prevent acts of Red terror and preserve what little remained of the Hungarian economy. Under pressure by the forced coalition government, made necessary by Marshal Voroshilov's rulings and the constant threats and sabotage by the Soviet Union, the Smallholders Party was forced into an untenable position.

A general conspiracy charge was leveled at the non-Communist deputies and wholesale investigations were made by the Communist police. Confessions, forged or obtained under torture, began to appear and more and more deputies to disappear. Finally the leaders of the Smallholders Party were arrested and tortured into admitting a conspiracy against the people. Ferenc Nagy, the Premier, left the country in May 1947. Finally the 1949 election had only one single party list of candidates. Following the "elections" Hungary passed behind the Iron Curtain as the Hungarian Peoples Democracy.

In Rumania there were only 750 Communist Party members out of a population of 16 million people, when the Russians entered Rumania on August 23, 1944.

The initial phase was one of military invasion and occupation during which the legal government, intellectuals, and other high government officials were deported or executed. But because the Soviet Union could produce no native Communist capable of holding the premiership, close coalition with Rumanian parties was required.

A coalition cabinet was formed under the leadership of a Rumanian general, Sanatescu. The Communists assumed the Ministry of Justice, Public Works, and Communications and subsequently the Ministry of Interior. All leftwing parties were merged into a National Democratic Front. By virtue of their cabinet posts the Communists had an iron grasp on all railways, food supplies, medicines, and communications.

Communist pressure and manipulation then forced a redistribution of the usable land which effectively destroyed Rumanian food production. It is estimated that between $1 billion and $2 billion worth of goods were removed from Rumania by the Soviet Union. This included food, cattle, farm equipment, machinery, etc. With the Rumanian economy smashed the Communists were ready for the next step.

The stage was ready for a fraudulent election. One witness testified that in the village where she lived 100 percent of the people voted against the pro-Communist government coalition, yet the official reports indicated a 90-percent majority for that element. Opposition leaders charged that duplicate ballot boxes had been prepared to be substituted for the legal ballot boxes. Red army soldiers were allowed to vote and trusted pro-Communist elements were permitted to vote 6 or 7 times.

The "free election" of November 1946 gave 3,389,414 votes to the pro-Communist coalition. The way now appeared clear for an open Communist government. But this did not take place. The reason for the Communist delay in taking over became apparent in 1947 when, as a result of Communist looting, the economy of Rumania completely collapsed and grave famines occurred. This was no time for the Communists to make an open declaration of power. But at the height of the famine after securely placing the blame on the Liberal Party and Peasant Party, the Communists arrested the remaining non-Communist leaders and openly took power—the alleged saviors of the Rumanian people. King Michael was forced to abdicate. The 1948 Communist-controlled "elections" for the constituent assembly gave a 90-percent majority to the Communist-led government. The aggression against and takeover of Rumania was now complete.

Of all the acts of Communist aggression since World War II, that taken against Bulgaria was the most ruthless and bloody for it was in Bulgaria that the prewar Communist movement was most bitterly opposed. Consequently, when the Soviet troops entered, the Bulgarian Communists, disregarding any basis of popular support, attempted to repeat the pattern of the Bolshevik revolution by violent means. Following an initial period of violence and terror there was a somewhat less violent but nonetheless determined campaign of political coercion. An effort was made to concentrate all power in the hands of a Communist government with non-Communist representatives but only for the purpose of lending an air of coalition and legality to the government.

The subsequent formation of the fatherland front government under the control of Communist, Peasant, and Social Democrat Parties led by Tsola Dragoicheva, one of communism's most ruthless female personalities, differs little from comparable coalitions in other victim states. The ministries of interior, justice, and police organizations were held by the Communists.

Open resistance was broken by the arrest and trial of 11,000 men and women of whom at least 3,000 were sentenced to death during Dragoicheva's regime as secretary of the fatherland front. Political opposition was killed off, imprisoned, or forced to flee, and even opposition within the Communist group was ruthlessly suppressed in favor of the Russian point of view. Finally, in 1948, there was no further opposition of significance and the Communists were undisputed masters.

In Albania, native, Moscow-directed Communists seized the capital city of Tirana from the Nazis in 1944.

A reign of terror was conducted during the remainder of 1944, 1945 and 1946, during which time from 10,000 to 15,000 persons were imprisoned and at least 3,000 executed while the Communists strengthened their hold on the country.

A typical "free election" was held on December 2, 1945, in which the Hoxha government won 82 out of 82 seats. Shortly thereafter, the Hoxha faction denounced King Zog and the government-in-exile, and declared Albania a peoples democracy. The Iron Curtain had fallen on Albania.

I shall not take the committee's time to trace the Communist takeovers in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—not because they are unimportant, or any less ruthless than any others, but because these countries are not pertinent to this resolution. The United States has not recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, and we continue to recognize their governments-in-exile. Latvia and Lithuania have legations here in Washington; the Estonian legation is in New York.

All of the other puppet regimes, with the exception of Albania, are recognized by the United States. We sent a number of missions to Albania after the war with a view toward recognizing the Communist government. We offered to do so if the Communists would hold free elections, and if they would honor the international commitments of the Albanian Government prior to 1939. These conditions were not met, so we still have not recognized Albania. But neither is there a free Albanian government-in-exile. My resolution recommends that we favor the establishment of such a government.

With regard to Bulgaria, the United States recently withdrew its diplomatic representatives from Sofia, and the Bulgarian Government called its representatives home from Washington. But I am informed by the Department of State that this suspension of diplomatic relations does not imply withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from the Communist government. That remains to be done.

Now, one of my points in urging withdrawal of recognition is this: The very reasons that have convinced the United States not to recognize Red China are also applied to the eastern puppet regimes. As in the case of Red China, the Communist governments in Eastern Europe were forcibly imposed against the will of the people, and with the military assistance of a foreign power. Why should we refuse to recognize one aggression, and agree to recognize others?

My resolution also calls for the Senate to go on record as favoring, in principle, the establishment of governments-in-exile representing the enslaved peoples. It is not enough merely to withdraw recognition from the tyrants; we must give the captive peoples a standard around which they may rally—a government of their own that is both a symbol of their aspirations to freedom, and a practical instrument for bringing those aspirations to fruition.

In the Second World War we followed this principle with great success when we recognized the governments-in-exile of Norway, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

Such governments-in-exile would be of tremendous aid in the free world's fight against communism. They will be able to direct and organize resistance movements on the continent. They will be able to wage a more effective propaganda war on the satellite countries. They will be able to take care of refugees and put them to work in the liberation movement. Most important of all, they can organize and train, under military leaders of their own nationality, fighting battalions—possibly, if the flow of refugees is great enough, whole armies—for eventual service in the liberation of their homelands.

The United States should, as I say, extend diplomatic recognition to the governments-in-exile; but we should also give them financial and technical assistance. The emigres will have few funds of their own; so we should furnish quarters for them, and the equipment they need to carry on the fight. We must include these governments in our foreign-aid programs, along with the other free governments of the world.

I do not overlook the possibility that once the United States and the other free nations have approved, in principle, the establishment of such governments, more than one emigree group from a single nation will come forward, asking recognition. The members of the committee should not overlook this possibility either—but neither should they be discouraged by it. The allied powers faced precisely the same problem during the Second World War, the most conspicuous example being the question of which French faction to recognize. We had to decide between General De Gaulle and General Giraud: We made the choice, and in the end there existed a large measure of cooperation between the groups.

The difficulties here are not insurmountable if we adhere to three principles: (1) Encouraging and fostering cooperation among the rival groups; (2) if the divisions persist, recognizing that group that in the judgment of our intelligence agencies and the Department of State is most representative of the free, democratic elements in the particular captive nation; and (3) insisting upon the provisional or interim status of the government we recognize—insisting, that is, that the country's permanent government will be selected by free elections when the country is liberated.

We must, at the same time, be careful that the exiled governments do not become, either in appearance or in fact, the puppets of the United States. After we have withdrawn recognition from the Communist regimes; and after we have indicated our support, in principle, of the establishment of free governments in exile, the initiative must be taken by the emigree groups. Thereafter, the actions of the United States should be confined to diplomatic recognition of the group (assuming there are more than one) that is most representative of the free peoples, and to giving the government so recognized financial and technical assistance. And, I repeat, we must make it crystal clear that our recognition is "provisional"—that the men who will one day take the reigns of government in the captive nations are not necessarily those of whom the United States approves—but men who will be selected by the peoples themselves in free elections.

One often hears the argument that it is futile to hope that the captive peoples will ever be able to throw off their chains. If left to their own resources, this is undoubtedly true. But the committee should not forget the East German uprising of 1953—and how abysmally inadequate the West was to that challenge. If the free governments in exile should, within the next year or two, become going concerns, and if they should organize armies recruited from escaped patriots, is it too much to hope that the next "Berlin uprising" will be given enough outside military support to grow into successful revolution?

If the Senate is serious about seeking the liberation of the Communist-enslaved peoples, it must take these first basic steps—recommend that the United States withdraw recognition from puppet regimes and announce that we favor the establishment of free anti-Communist governments-in-exile.

I want to make this final point to the committee: That it is not only important for the Senate to go on record favoring these steps but that it will be catastrophic if it does not. Consider, if you will, what the world will think if the Senate adopts the Knowland-Clements-George-Wiley resolution and at the same time rejects the McCarthy resolution. In one and the same breath we will tell the world that we "hope" for freedom of the captive peoples but that we are against taking the steps that are absolutely necessary to turn this hope into a reality. I assure the members of this committee that the significance of these two votes will not be lost on the freedom-loving peoples of this world. They will understand that our intentions go as far as our words, and that they stop right there.

I earnestly urge the committee to report favorably on both of the resolutions before it, although I believe the Knowland resolution should be amended as I have suggested. Thus we may strike a resounding blow against the worldwide Communist tyranny.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS, ETC.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations and any other standing committee of the Senate be authorized to file reports on bills, or any other matters, during any recess or adjournment of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in line with the explanation by me a short time ago, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 31 to the bill, and concurred therein.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for that purpose, and will withhold it for other Senators, some of whom have speeches to make.

Mr. BENDER. I have no speech. I merely wish to make a comment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for the insertion of material in the RECORD; but if there is to be comment, I will not yield.

Mr. BENDER. I should like to insert in the Record the observation that the situation in which the Senate is waiting on the House for action is like that of the man biting the dog.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CAPT. AUDIE MURPHY

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, before his illness, had arranged to introduce to the Senate a distinguished Texan, who is in the gallery today. It now becomes my honor and privilege to do so. This distinguished young Texan who is in the Senate gallery today is Capt. Audie Murphy. Born the son of a sharecropper on a cotton farm near Kingston, Tex., he is the most decorated hero of World War II. At the age of 17, Audie Murphy enlisted in the Infantry as a private and now holds the rank of captain in the 36th Division, Texas National Guard. Presently he is in the motion-picture industry and has starred in several excellent pictures. His latest, To Hell and Back, recounts his experiences during the war, and will soon be released.

Audie Murphy holds the highest medal awarded to any serviceman during time of war, the Congressional Medal of Honor. In all, he has 24 decorations, including the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with Oak Leak Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the ETO campaign ribbon with seven battle stars; a Presidential Unit Citation ribbon, the Combat Infantrymen's Badge, the French Legion of Honor, Chevalier; the Croix de Guerre with two Palms; the Fourragere, and a Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Mr. President, I ask Audie Murphy to stand in the gallery so that the Senate may give him a proper greeting.

[Capt. Audie Murphy rose from the seat in the gallery and was greeted by applause, Senators rising.]

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 12, 1955, p. 10307, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Martin] has asked that I yield to him in order that he may make a statement in reference to one of the projects which was deleted from the bill. I understand that the Senator has some other work to do, and, therefore, I gladly yield at this point.

UPPER DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL PROJECT

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the kindness of the senior Senator from Louisiana in yielding to me at this time, as I am engaged in work on a conference committee this afternoon.

Mr. President, since the conference report now before the Senate was made public I have received many communications expressing regret and disappointment that the Senate amendment providing an appropriation of $6 million to initiate work on the upper Delaware River channel project had been rejected by the conferees.

I do not mind saying that I too keenly regret this action, which was a great disappointment to me.

To my mind, no river and harbor navigation project which has come before Congress in many years has greater potential value to the economic progress and the defense of our country.

It was so recognized in reports by the Corps of Engineers. It had the complete endorsement of every level of government having responsibility for navigation improvements.

To these endorsements was added, as recently as June 29, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget over the signature of the Director of the Budget and the concurrence of the President of the United States. In his letter of June 29 to the President for transmittal to Congress, the Director of the Budget referred to the importance of the Delaware River channel not only to the continued economic development of the area but also to the Nation as a whole.

The Director of the Budget took the position it would not be fair to delay further the initiation of this project pending the solution of the problems involved in the determination of local benefits and the assessment of local contributions.

Mr. President, the proposal that local interests be required to contribute toward the cost of navigation improvements on our rivers and harbors is contrary to the historic policy of the United States.

It is contrary to the traditional American concept that the improvement of navigable streams for the promotion of commerce is a function of the Federal Government. It is contrary to the constitutional provision under which the Federal Government has assumed full responsibility for developing and maintaining our major waterways for commerce and navigation.

The Senate Public Work Committee of the 83d Congress recognized this principle in its report which accompanied the bill authorizing a 40-foot channel in the upper Delaware River.

Referring to the suggestion of the Budget Bureau that a contribution by local interests be required the committee stated:

> The adoption of this recommendation would be inconsistent with the national policy followed for many years on navigation projects over the entire country.

It may be argued, Mr. President, that the time has come to abandon that historic policy. It may be considered fair and equitable that the direct beneficiaries of river and harbor improvements should be required to pay a share of the costs of such improvements. If we in the Congress should come to a decision that such a change was in the national interest, and was just and proper, I would not stand in opposition. But I would insist, with all the vigor at my command that "no preference shall be given." I quote the language of article 6, section 9 of the Constitution of the United States:

> No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another.

In other words I would take the position that any contribution from private sources for river and harbor improvements should be required only pursuant to general laws, applicable to each and every project in every State, under uniform regulations.

It becomes apparent, therefore, that in the case of the Delaware River channel improvement there is involved a national policy to which we should adhere until such time as Congress decides that it should be changed.

I contend, Mr. President, that, from the the economic and national defense standpoints, the Delaware River 40-foot channel project is too important to be used as a guinea pig by those who would reverse a policy which has served our Nation so well for so many years.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that Federal taxes collected in Pennsylvania have paid a large part of the cost of navigation improvements and other public-works projects in every other State of the Union. At the same time Pennsylvania has received only a thin trickle of Federal funds for public works within its borders.

Since 1946 Pennsylvania taxpayers have poured almost $40 billion into the Treasury of the United States. In the same period there has been allotted to Pennsylvania less than $110 million in Federal funds for river and harbor improvements and flood-control projects and approximately $200 million for Federal-aid highways.

Much of the opposition to the deepening of the Delaware River grows out of the misconception that one industry, the United States Steel Corp., will be the sole beneficiary. The truth is that a number of industries, now in operation on the upper reach of the Delaware River, will utilize a 40-foot channel when it becomes a reality. Among these industries are the Victor Chemical Co., the Philadelphia Coke Co., the Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., and the Northern Metal Co., all of which have need of a deep channel for low-cost water transportation of raw materials in large volume.

In addition to these companies the National Gypsum Co. of Buffalo, N. Y., has written to me under date of June 24, 1955, outlining their plans for a multimillion-dollar plant to be located on the Delaware River north of Philadelphia.

The company's letter, signed by L. R. Sanderson, president, states, in part, as follows:

> MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: With the tremendous home building program that is currently with us and because of the expected increase in home building, we have launched on a $75-million program to build additional gypsum mills to alleviate the shortage in gypsum products, which is extremely acute.
>
> A study of the locations for this expansion indicated that the Delaware River Valley represents one of the fastest growing areas on the Atlantic Seaboard. Thus, we selected a site on the Delaware River just north of Philadelphia, adjacent to Burlington. This gypsum installation will be a multi-million-dollar plant employing approximately 500 people; will use some 350,000 tons of crude gypsum annually, which will be supplied by our quarry near Halifax, Nova Scotia.
>
> Three new ships are currently being built to take care of our rock transportation to our various Seaboard plants, including the new one we are building on the Delaware River. These ships are 15,000 tons capacity and require a 30-foot draft. We plan to use fuel oil, as undoubtedly others in this area will do likewise, and there will be a tremendous advantage in a deeper channel for large ocean-going tankers to supply this fuel in this area.
>
> We selected this site feeling that the Government must, of necessity, recognize the many advantages of a deeper channel in the Delaware River for the tremendous benefit of the public at large by industries locating in this strategic zone.

Let me explain that ships drawing 30 feet while at rest in salt water require at least a 40-foot channel for safe navigation in fresh water.

Mr. President, over the past 50 years development of the Delaware River has cost the Federal Government $105 million. Of that sum the United States Treasury has received a return of $14.25 for each dollar invested.

The improvement of the upper Delaware is another capital investment that will pay rich dividends in increased customs receipts and higher income-tax payments.

It will add to the tax revenues of many States, counties, and municipalities.

It will create new employment and new payrolls by attracting new industries which will benefit from low-cost water transportation.

The transportation needs of the United States have become so great that it is necessary to take full advantage of every possible waterway. The prosperity of many industries depends upon the movement of raw materials in large volume at low cost. Our rivers have become so much more important because we do not have the rail capacity or the highway capacity to transport the enormous amount of petroleum, ore, coal, and other bulk commodities required by our expanding industry. Our rivers and other natural waterways provide the most economical roadway for the movement of such goods.

The importance of the Delaware River as an international waterway, essential to the expansion of commerce and industry, needs no lengthy discussion. It is second only to New York in total waterborne commerce. It is the leading port in the United States in the handling of import tonnage.

Its paramount importance to the defense of our Nation was amply demonstrated in two World Wars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Bureau of the Budget letter of June 29 to which I have referred and also the letter of transmittal from the President of the United States to the President of the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the report of the Chief of Army Engineers on the Delaware River project.

There being no objection, the letters and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense—Civil Functions as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

"Construction, General

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general,' $6 million, to remain available until expended."

The budget document for fiscal year 1956 included an item under the heading "Proposed for later transmission" for the initiation of the dredging of the authorized 40-foot channel in the Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., contingent upon reaching agreement with local interests on adequate cost sharing in some form.

This project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 and is presently estimated by the Corps of Engineers to cost $95,100,000. The amount of $6 million is necessary to initiate dredging and rock removal in the section of the channel between Pennypacker Creek, Pa., and Delanco, N. J., and to initiate action toward replacement of the Delair bridge.

Substantial benefits are derived by individual users of our waterways. The demand from many sections of the country for water resources projects, involving large sums of money, focuses attention on the need for developing suitable arrangements to enable the beneficiaries to meet their fair share of the cost and to ease the burden on the general taxpayers of the Nation which results whenever an inordinate financial burden involved in such projects is imposed on the Federal Government. These arrangements should be consistent with an equitable general policy for sharing the cost of essential water resources projects. We have been faced with the problem of developing a method which would be equitable with respect to the Delaware River project and yet would not discriminate against this project in relation to other water resources projects. However, considerable time and effort will be required to develop a consistent overall policy and to work out arrangements for its application to individual projects.

Under the circumstances, and since no satisfactory proposal for bringing about an equitable sharing of the cost of the Delaware as a separate project has been found, it would seem fair not to further delay initiation of this project. We have in mind the importance of the Delaware River channel, not only to the continued economic development of the area but also to the Nation as a whole. Furthermore, local interests in the Delaware port area have made substantial investments in related harbor and terminal facilities to which an improved waterway is essential.

Initiation of work on the Delaware River does not change the basic objective of developing a satisfactory means for obtaining local contributions toward the cost of water development projects in line with the partnership policy of this administration, which would apply to the Delaware as well as other projects.

"FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS

"For payment of contributions by the United States for flood storage in the Markham Ferry project, as authorized by the act of July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), $6,300,000, to remain available until expended."

The 1956 budget message states that provision will be made for cooperation in authorized partnership projects such as the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma. This project, under the terms of the authorization contained in Public Law 476, approved July 6, 1954, will be constructed for hydroelectric power production and flood control in accordance with the terms of the Federal Power Act, by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma. The project will involve a total cost of about $25 million, of which not to exceed $6,500,000 is authorized to be contributed by the United States for flood control storage in the reservoir. This authorized Federal payment will be reduced by an amount for certain lands to be conveyed to the Grand River Dam Authority by the United States, presently estimated at $200,000.

On June 22, 1955, the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Grand River Dam Authority to construct the Markham Ferry project (FPC project No. 2183). The full amount of $6,300,000 is required to be appropriated at this time in order to enable the Authority to sell revenue bonds to finance its part of the cost of construction. The appropriated funds will be administered by the Chief of Engineers, and transferred periodically to the Authority in amounts commensurate with the construction work completed by the Authority.

In view of the above considerations, I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense—civil functions.

The details of these proposed appropriations, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN PHILADELPHIA, PA., AND TRENTON, N. J., AND PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA—REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., November 18, 1953.

Subject: Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., and Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.

To: The Secretary of the Army.

1. I submit herewith for transmission to Congress the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted April 13, 1950, requesting the Board to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., contained in House Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 11, 73d Congress, 1st session, and other reports, with a view to determining whether any modification of the existing project is advisable at the present time, particularly with a view to providing increased depths in the channel and turning basins, or provision of additional turning basins; and in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted May 21, 1951, requesting the Board to review the reports on Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and the sea, submitted in Senate Document No. 159, 75th Congress, 3d session, and subsequent reports, with a view to determining whether any modification of the existing project is advisable at this time. It is also in review of the reports of the district and division engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., and of Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

2. Improvement of navigation facilities on the Delaware River by the United States has, over the years, been one of the primary factors in the industrial and economic growth of the region, and has provided, as the progress of the Nation required, a modern port for the service of commerce and trade with all parts of the world. The present impetus of the national defense program, the accelerated demands of defense and civilian needs, and the strategic location of the Trenton-Philadelphia-Camden area with respect to sources of materials and labor and the markets for processed goods, together with the definite possibility of increasing the national wealth in this highly industrialized area, now combine to require further modernization of the waterway. Private enterprise has already invested its resources in an unprecedented industrial expansion in the region to the benefit of the defense program and the future normal peacetime economy. Improved navigation on the Delaware River to permit use of larger and more efficient vessels is a necessity that follows from judicious planning and foresight. It will add some 60 miles of deepwater harbor capabilities which will in itself be a large increase in the size of the low-cost transportation area in this great and rapidly expanding commercial district. The benefits are such as to warrant the construction of the project.

3. After full consideration of the reports secured from the district and division engineers, the Board recommends:

(1) That the existing project, Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea, be modified to provide for deepening the channel from the Philadelphia Naval Base to Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, a distance of 8.5 miles, to 42 feet in rock and 40 feet in other material, with a width of 500 feet through Horseshoe Bend and 400 feet through Philadelphia Harbor to Allegheny Avenue, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable; at an estimated cost to the United States of $4,490,000 for construction and no increase in the annual cost of maintenance;

(2) That the existing project, Delaware River from Philadelphia, Pa., to Trenton, N. J., be modified to provide for enlarging the existing channel from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge at Delair, N. J., a distance of 1.5 miles, to a depth of 42 feet in rock and 40 feet in other material and a width of 400 feet, including relocation of the channel at the railroad bridge and suitable reconstruction of the bridge; for enlarging the existing channel from the railroad bridge at Delair to the upstream end of Newbold Island, a distance of 22 miles, to a depth of 42 feet in rock and 40 feet in other material, and a width of 400 feet in the straight reaches with suitable widening at bends; for deepening the existing channel from the upstream end of Newbold Island to the Trenton Marine Terminal, including the turning basin, a distance of 5.5 miles, to 35 feet and widening the turning basin to 800 feet; for constructing such bank-protection works as may be necessary; and for eliminating the authorized anchorage near the mouth of Biles Creek, Pa.; generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer as modified herein and with such other modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable; at an estimated cost to the United States of $86,899,000 for construction and $759,600 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; provided that local interests agree to: (a) Furnish, free of cost to the United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project and for subsequent maintenance when and as required; and (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; and

(3) That the foregoing modifications be made subject to the further provision that the United States Steel Co. agree to provide at its expense suitable terminal and transfer facilities at its Fairless plant, including a turning basin if and when required.

4. I concur with the River and Harbor Board that a 40-foot channel from Philadelphia to Newbold Island and a 35-foot channel thence upstream to Trenton is economically justified. A 40-foot channel is the most suitable development of the waterway, in view of the industrial growth now taking place and planned in the Delaware Valley, and such a channel would unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region which represents an important segment of the national economy. However, all evidence indicates that the use of depths greater than 35 feet now or in the foreseeable future will be confined to a single company, and, in accordance with established policy, the greater depth required by this single company warrants a substantial cash contribution to the incremental cost of the greater depth. I believe, therefore, that the incremental depth from 35 feet to 40 feet should be provided by the Federal Government subject to the condition that the United States Steel Co., or other local interests, contribute one-half of the cost of the incremental depth, this half being presently estimated at about $18 million.

5. Since preparation of the Board's report, additional information has become available concerning the prospective use of a channel limited to a 35-foot depth. I have, accordingly, reexamined the economic justification of a project of this depth, and I find that a preponderance of the total prospective commerce, including iron ore, would undoubtedly move on such a channel. The proposed large ore carriers can be expected to use a 35-foot channel even if partial unloading should be required at Philadelphia, although with somewhat less savings than for full-load operation. All other commerce can be expected to move in types of ships now in use and requiring channel depths up to 35 feet. It is estimated that a channel 35 feet deep in earth and 37 feet deep in rock from Philadelphia to Trenton would cost $55 million for construction and would have average annual charges of $2,807,000, of which $600,000 would be for maintenance. The estimated average annual benefits from such a channel would be $4,888,000 and the ratio of benefits to costs would be 1.74. Accordingly it appears that improvement either to a 35-foot depth or to a 40-foot depth downstream from Newbold Island and to a 35-foot depth between Newbold Island and Trenton is amply justified economically.

6. After due consideration of the reports of the district and division engineers and of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, I recommend that the existing projects for the Delaware River be modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Board, but subject to the condition that responsible local interests shall, prior to initiation of construction of the recommended improvement, give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will contribute in cash to the United States one-half of the actual additional cost of construction of the recommended improvement of the 40-foot channel in excess of the cost of a 35-foot channel. I further recommend that if this local contribution is not forthcoming when Federal funds are available for initiation of construction, the authorization for increased deepening of that portion of the project between Philadelphia and Newbold Island shall be limited to depths of 37 feet in rock and 35 feet in other material.

S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I express my sincere appreciation to the chairman and members of the committee, and to all others who have worked hard to retain this project in the bill. I shall not ask that the report be sent back to conference, but I hope that during the adjournment of Congress, Senators will give the project very serious consideration, because it is urgently needed to help build up the economic strength and the defense of our country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, that the chief bone of contention which was advanced by the Members of the House was that the House Public Works Committee had had no hearings on the proposal to dredge the channel 5 feet deeper than was required for general navigation, as provided for in the authorization bill.

The Senator will remember that the House held hearings on the authorization of the project and agreed to authorize a 35-foot channel. But when the bill came to the Senate, provision was made for a channel 5 feet deeper. This was done without giving the House an opportunity, as I was informed, to hold hearings on the matter. That was the chief bone of contention.

It is my considered judgment that if the Senator from Pennsylvania will take steps to have the matter of the additional depth adjusted by the House, I believe he would not experience any difficulty at all with the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the comments of the senior Senator from Louisiana. This is a matter of education; that is why I have asked the indulgence of the Senate this afternoon. I hope the Members of the House will secure a full appreciation of what is needed. The upper part of the Delaware River, as the Senators know, is fresh water.

If there were some method by which the river and harbor projects might become self-liquidating, and the method could be used uniformly throughout the United States, I would not be in opposition.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Speaking for myself and in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], we wish to identify ourselves fully with the very excellent statement which has just been made by our colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. As the Senator from Pennsylvania is aware, we have been working with him and with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] in trying to have approved a project which will bring about the development of the Upper Delaware River. It is in the interest of my State, as well as of Pennsylvania, that this project be carefully studied and pursued, as rapidly as possible, to the end that the development of this most important channel may be accomplished.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the senior Senator from New Jersey for his excellent statement.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, there is a strong temptation for anyone interested in the Delaware River Valley of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, to vote against the conference report. However, because of the overall importance of the bill, I expect to vote for the conference report. I wish to point out that the action taken was not in accordance with the needs of the area which I have the honor in part to represent.

The House failed to include any funds to begin the Delaware River project. The Senate took the other and wiser view. Unfortunately, in conference the House view prevailed.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report. I am sorry I cannot agree with the eulogies and encomiums which have been showered upon the head of my distinguished colleague from Louisiana in this connection.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should give me credit at least for trying to retain the project in the bill.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The only thing that could have made the Senator try harder would have been if he had happened to come from our area. Then I am sure he would have won.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read the record, he will find that there was a great deal of opposition to this project from New Jersey. Many witnesses from New Jersey appeared against it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the reason why this project was turned down by the House was that in the closing days of the last session of Congress the item was included in the authorization without the House having been given an opportunity to hold hearings on the subject of the 40-foot channel. The House objected to it. If the project had remained one calling for a depth of 35 feet, I have no reason to doubt that the House would have agreed to the $6 million appropriation.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear at the conclusion of the remarks of my senior colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement submitted by Mr. CASE of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

There is a strong temptation for anyone interested in the Delaware River Valley area of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey to vote against this conference report on the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1956.

The temptation is there, but better judgment prevails in view of the overall importance of the bill as a whole, hence I will vote for the conference report.

Nevertheless, I will not now stand silent, lest this silence be taken as a lack of concern for the project to which I have just referred.

The House failed to include any funds to begin an already authorized project to dredge a 40-foot channel in the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton. The administration sought local cash contributions for the last 5 feet of that 40-foot depth. This contribution was not forthcoming. Thus the House upheld, in a sense, the administration's position.

However, this position changed. Just before the Senate Appropriations Committee reported out this bill, the President and Budget Director Hughes recommended an additional amount of $6 million to initiate the Delaware River project. The Budget Director made it clear that the administration was still seeking ways to promote an equitable general policy for sharing the cost of the essential water-resources projects. At the same time, Mr. Hughes stated that in the search for a consistent overall policy the Delaware River project should not be discriminated against or delayed any further because of its basic importance not only to the Delaware Port area but also to the Nation as a whole.

The call was clear. The Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate acted accordingly. A $6 million appropriation was voted. But opposition interests in the House prevailed in conference, although the Senate position was clearly the more solid one, inasmuch as the House had new information on which to act. The will of the Senate conferees should have prevailed.

I will vote for this bill, which is now no longer a very good bill, but I certainly intend to explore with my colleagues from the Delaware River Valley area the possibilities of future action to obtain the needed appropriation.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUFF. I wish to express my chagrin, which I am certain is felt by all the people of Pennsylvania, that the Delaware River project has been deleted from the conference report. I know of no other improvement, anywhere in the United States, which would yield such spectacular taxes to the Government as would the improvement of the upper Delaware River. Customs receipts alone bring $52 million a year into the United States Treasury. Since 1939 the Federal Government has spent a little more than $100 million on the improvement of the Delaware River Channel. But since 1900 the Federal Government has collected $1,500,000,000 in customs receipts alone.

The State of Pennsylvania already has made a magnificent contribution to the port of Philadelphia. As is known by everyone who is familiar with the Delaware River, and also with the Schuylkill, which enters into the Delaware, the channel of the Delaware River was constantly being filled with silt from the coal mines of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania in the last 9 years, in order to make a great contribution to the port, has spent $29 million of its own funds to eliminate from the river the silt which found its way into the harbor. Without such removal, the harbor could not properly have been maintained for the benefit of vessels of the draught of those which operated between the port of Philadelphia and Delaware Bay.

Furthermore one of the greatest industrial areas of America is located between Philadelphia and the bay. Roughly speaking, 6,000 different enterprises are located between Philadelphia and Delaware Bay.

The only reason why the area between Philadelphia and Trenton is not similarly developed with immense industry is the lack of a channel of suitable depth throughout that area. The fund which has been eliminated from the conference report would have begun the work in the nature of a study to determine costs and to plan to make that tremendous area available for this type of industrial expansion.

In addition, the people of Pennsylvania have contributed to the development of the port of Philadelphia by constructing in Pennsylvania the first trans-state 4-lane highway at an expense of $220 million.

That in effect gave to the port of Philadelphia access to a four-lane highway, now being joined with the highway across Ohio, and with another to go to the Great Lakes. Anyone who knows of the movement of traffic which took place during World War II certainly realizes that the railroads alone were unable to take care of the vast amount of freight which was necessary to send overseas in a hurry.

So that we have already made a contribution of $29 million to the Delaware and the Schuylkill and $220 million to the trans-State highway, both of which were projected, in considerable part, on account of the necessities of the great Port of Philadelphia.

I am positive, as is everyone else who knows the Delaware valley area, that the immense income which has already originated in that part of Pennsylvania, and which has paid income taxes from the existing development, would be more than doubled by this improvement in the upper river area.

Therefore I am hopeful that in the next session of Congress this tremendously important project will receive the attention it deserves, because there is not a single investment this country could make which would result in such an immense and immediate return in the way of taxes, as would the improvement of the upper Delaware Valley.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to give assurance to my good friend from Pennsylvania that this project will again receive the consideration of the Committee on Appropriations next year. Unless matters change, I shall still be Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, and I give him that assurance.

Mr. DUFF. I thank the Senator. I also wish to express appreciation for the way in which the bill was handled before the subcommittee.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me for an observation.

I wish to join with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in expressing the hope that the Delaware River project will receive the careful consideration of the Members of the Congress between now and the next session. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee has expressed what is in our hearts when he says Congress at the next session will give this project a second look.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues on the conference committee for the very careful consideration which they have given all the projects throughout the country. I would be less than human if I did not mention those in my own State. I am sorry it was necessary for the conference to eliminate one project in Kentucky, that on the Barren River. The word "Barren" as applied to that river is a misnomer, because it is a stream which runs through a very fertile and productive section of our State. But in the very nature of things I suppose one cannot expect everything at one time. That is the only one of the Kentucky projects put into the bill by the Senate which was eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, and only planning money was involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. So that at the next session I hope we shall get favorable consideration of that item in both Houses. I shall look forward to it. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues for the very careful consideration they gave, particularly to the projects in my State, which have been greatly delayed and are sorely needed by the people of that area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to the fact that there was a little project in my State which I had to give up. Being chairman, I thought I could retain it, but because of the pressure, I had to give in.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the chairman had to give up one project in his State, no one can criticize us for having to give up one in our State.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a moment, so that I may complete the statement I started?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senattor from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for what the committee did and what Congress is about to do in the case of the Ohio River for the people of Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. I am sure the people of that area will rise and call blessed the names of CLEMENTS, BARKLEY, BRICKER, and the two Senators from Indiana, CAPEHART and JENNER, and particularly that of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for what they have done for the Markland Dam.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana and also the conferees for what they did in providing for the Hartwell Dam. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will recall that the late Senator Maybank and I fought hard to keep the Hartwell Dam project in a previous bill, and held the Congress in session for several days before the question was decided. The bill was sent to conference 3 or 4 times in an effort to keep the Hartwell Dam project in the bill. Naturally, I am pleased to know the funds are contained in the bill now before the Senate. The House has already voted for the funds, and the Senate is about ready to vote, and will vote for funds for the Hartwell Dam today. That project is very much needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may seem somewhat ungrateful at this time, when congratulations are being passed around the Chamber, and when very eloquent statements have been made by Senators with regard to the deepening of the Delaware River Channel, if I inject a somewhat negative note.

It seems as though a buildup is being started for the Delaware River project for the next session of Congress. In view of the speeches, and the very sincere speeches, which have been made, I think it is well that the Senate keep the facts in mind. The original authorization was for a total expenditure of $91 million for deepening the Delaware River. Of that amount, $55 million was for the original project to deepen the channel to a depth of 35 feet, and $36 million was the amount needed to deepen the channel by an additional 5 feet, or from 35 to 40 feet from Philadelphia to Trenton. I understand costs have increased since the estimates were made. There is only one practical purpose for which the channel is to be deepened from Philadelphia to Trenton, and that is to allow ore boats from South America to go up to the United States Steel plant on the Delaware. This is a proposal to spent $36 million primarily and directly for the benefit of the United States Steel Corp.

I know that view has been challenged, but I should like to read what Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stevens, had to say on this subject in a letter dated March 19, 1955, contained in House Document No. 358, 83d Congress, 2d session, which is the report of the Army engineers on the project. This is what he said:

> I have carefully considered the report of the Chief of Engineers and the attached papers, as well as statements that have been presented by major civic and development associations concerning the desirability of providing the full 40-foot channel, and the matter of local cash participation. I do not believe that any evidence now available indicates that prospective general commerce on the river, other than iron-ore receipts, will require more than a 35-foot depth. It appears true that additional economic benefits will accrue directly to the United States Steel Corp. from a 40-foot channel, and there seems every reason for the beneficiary to participate in the project.

In addition to the comments of Mr. Stevens, Mr. Rowland Hughes, who was then Deputy Director of the Budget, had this to say in a letter under date of February 25, 1954, contained in the same document:

> The Chief of Engineers states that all evidence indicates that the use of depths greater than 35 feet now or in the foreseeable future will be confined to the United States Steel Corp. Since sizable additional economic benefits would accrue directly to this corporation by provision of the recommended 40-foot depth, we believe that no exception should be made to the long-established principle and practice in such cases of requiring local participation in the cost, and that the amount of cash contribution proposed by the Chief of Engineers in this case is reasonable.

Thus, far from setting a precedent, Mr. Hughes states that it would be an exception to long-established principle if the company directly benefited did not share in the cost of the project.

Furthermore, the Chief of Engineers proposed that one-half of the added cost for the 40-foot channel, or $18 million, should be met either by the company which was benefited or by the local interests.

Mr. President, the United States Steel Corp. is able to bear this cost. I have before me the financial statements of the United States Steel Corp., and they show that in 1954, its net income, after taxes and expenses, amounted to $195,417,611; that in 1953, its corresponding net income amounted to $222,087,840; and that this year—1955—its profit will be even greater. So we are not dealing with a poor, impecunious corporation. Instead, we are dealing with the second largest corporation in the United States, one which has abundant resources and which will be able to pay for the benefits which will accrue directly to it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this project is designed for the purpose of bringing ore from South America to the Fairless mill, at Trenton. I understand from the statement of Congressman KIRWAN in the House debate of June 16 that the channel is to be deepened to 40 feet because the company is now having built, in Japanese shipyards, 3 vessels which need a 40-foot channel. According to him, also, they will fly under foreign flag.

I should like to point out that we in the Middle West probably will be obtaining a large part of the iron ore we use in the future from Labrador. When that ore comes from Labrador, over the new St. Lawrence Canal, which we in Congress have authorized, it will pay tolls; and I believe that tolls should be paid on the iron ore, and that the mills which will benefit, and the commerce and industries on the Great Lakes which will benefit, should pay the cost, with interest, of the capital improvement which is made.

In this instance, one of our requests is that the same principle, by which we are willing to abide, insofar as the steel industry of the Midwest is concerned, be applied to the steel industry of the Atlantic coast.

Mr. KIRWAN also compared the cost on the Delaware with the cost on the St. Lawrence. There we are paying only a little over $100 million to complete a seaway 27 feet deep and 105 miles long. There are 66 seaports on the Great Lakes which it will serve. There are 50 million tons of goods expected to be shipped through there annually. It is estimated that the Delaware waterway from Philadelphia to Trenton will carry only 14,800,000 tons, 13 million of it to the United States Steel plant. But the cost will be almost as much as that we intend to spend on the St. Lawrence.

One or two other things need to be considered. It is said that to require the local units to pay a part of the cost of river and harbor improvements will amount to a totally new principle. I should like to refer to the testimony given on May 13, 1954, by Colonel Milne, of the Corps of Engineers; and I read from page 42 of that hearing:

> Colonel MILNE. There have been a number of examples, Mr. Chairman, where the Corps of Engineers has recommended a local cash contribution, and such contribution has been approved by the Congress and has been made by those interests.

Colonel Milne then went ahead to give some specific examples. I wish to quote what he had to say on that subject:

> Some specific examples that come to my mind:
>
> In the New England area, in Town River, Mass., where we found that provision of a certain depth produced both local and general benefits, but there was a great deal of local benefit involved, project modification by the 1937 River and Harbor Act provided that the local people pay 30 percent of the cost of the project, which they did.
>
> Very recently we have recomended to the Congress further improvement of Town River, where we also found a substantial amount of local benefits, and we recommended that a 25 percent contribution be made in that particular case.
>
> In the case of Houston Ship Channel, when it was originally dredged to 30 feet, we recommended that local interests pay one-half of the cost, which amounted to $1 million, and they did that.
>
> In the Stockton Deepwater Channel, in California, we also recommended that local interests pay one-half of the cost, which they did.

So there already exist sufficient precedents.

One very encouraging remark was made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, that if the industries of the Delaware River and the State governments adjoining the Delaware River were prevented from having the entire cost of deepening the channel met by the Federal Government, he would advocate the principle of sharing the costs of all such river and harbor improvements in the country. Mr. President, I hope that may be done. In the case of my own State, we have a project which is very dear to the hearts of many persons—the so-called Cal-Sag Canal.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is included in the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so understand. I wish to say that I have been perfectly willing and ready to have this principle applied to projects in my own State of Illinois, and on the stump last fall I advocated it, that is to have half the cost met by the industries and communities which will be directly benefited. So I was willing to take for my own locality, the medicine, which I recommend be applied in the case of the Delaware River.

I think the only way we shall protect ourselves against demands for continuous appropriations for river and harbor projects is through some built-in deterrent, such as the sharing of costs. I know that in past year I have made myself obnoxious by trying to delete provisions for specific projects. I know that the task is more than any one person can carry out successfully. The obstacles are too great, the amount of knowledge which ane one person may have is not adequate, and the pressures upon one to support such improvements in his own State are so great that, thereby, he feels compelled to support improvements of a similar nature in all other States. Therefore, the purpose is defeated.

Under these circumstances, a Senator may well feel that, after many years, despite all the efforts he has made, he has had but little success and has very little prospect of future success. The pressures to support such projects are almost too great for flesh and blood to resist. To resist them is like shouting in the face of a hurricane. Yet there is the feeling that such local logrolling results in the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars—not that the projects are not worthy, but that they are not sufficiently worthy to justify the costs, in many instances; and that the money could be used for better purposes.

So I think we should apply the principle which was endorsed by the Secretary of the Army, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President himself, until, on June 29, they gave in to the pressures and recommended $6 million to begin the Delaware project. We should provide for a sharing of costs, under a flexible arrangement, so that the poorer communities would pay one-third of the cost, and the richer communities or richer companies would pay or would meet two-thirds of the cost, with the result that the general average would be one-half of the cost. Unless we have some such built-in deterrent, I believe that inevitably the river and harbor bill will sweep over us each year, and a great deal of money will be wasted.

It may be that our good friends who are interested in the Delaware River, and whom we like personally very much, may have fulfilled their mission, if in being sacrificed for the sake of this principle, they succeed in universalizing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the situation growing out of the canalization of the Ohio River.

Before I came to the Congress, the Congress had committed itself to the canalization of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo, with a year-around channel of 9 feet, so there could be year-around navigation on that river.

Twenty-five years ago that project on the Ohio River was completed, and the people in the valley have been celebrating the 25th anniversary of its completion. But the locks and dams, built under that program, have become obsolete. Perhaps Senators will be surprised to know that 2½ times as much commerce goes up and down the Ohio River as goes through the Panama Canal. The old locks and dams have become obsolete, and it is now necessary, because of new methods of transportation, to supplant them with larger and higher dams, and to replace 3 or 4 dams now in operation. I am very glad that this process has been begun with regard to the Markland Dam, between Cincinnati and Louisville, that provision is made for it in the bill now before the Senate, and that we may look forward, as the program progresses in years to come, to the completion of a series of locks and dams in the Ohio River which will facilitate the most modern methods of transportation.

As a representative of the State of Kentucky, which borders the Ohio River between West Virginia and Missouri, I thank the committee for giving this important and vital project in the Middle West its favorable consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that by reason of the construction of the Markland Lock and Dam four other locks and dams are eliminated.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. At the present time those locks are so small that any sizable tow must be broken in two, and sometimes in three.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. This project would eliminate such necessity, and would save a great deal of time and money for the shipping industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. And facilitate the transportation of commerce by water in the great Midwest Channel.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Iowa wish to address the Senate at this time?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I desire to speak on title I at the appropriate time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me state for the RECORD that the conference agreement provides an appropriation of $1,365,613,500, which is $11,957,500 below the amount approved by the Senate, and $6,509,300 below the amount approved by the House.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of the bill, showing how the money is to be distributed among the various titles. Title I embraces independent offices, and includes the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Title II covers the Department of the Interior. Title III covers Civil Functions, Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1956—Bill summary

	Budget estimate, 1956	House allowance, 1956	Senate bill	Conference
TITLE I. INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Atomic Energy Commission: Operating expenses	[1] $1,045,000,000	$618,000,000	[1] $575,000,000	[1] $575,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	27,550,000	26,214,000	27,053,000	27,053,000
Total, title I, independent offices	1,072,550,000	644,214,000	602,053,000	602,053,000
TITLE II. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Office of the Secretary:				
Southeastern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance	1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Operation and maintenance	1,134,000	684,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Continuing fund		(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)
Bonneville Power Administration:				
Construction	[2] 15,353,000	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
Operation and maintenance	6,650,000	6,500,000	6,650,000	6,600,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	22,003,000	21,100,000	21,250,000	21,200,000
Bureau of Reclamation:				
General investigations	5,175,000	5,104,000	5,104,000	5,104,000
Construction and rehabilitation	[3] 146,041,000	146,041,000	146,041,000	146,041,000
Operation and maintenance	24,000,000	23,500,000	24,750,000	24,750,000
General administrative expenses	3,700,000	3,500,000	3,700,000	3,600,000
Emergency fund	700,000	600,000	500,000	500,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	179,616,000	178,745,000	180,095,000	179,995,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	203,913,000	201,689,000	203,755,000	203,605,000
TITLE III. CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Quartermaster Corps: Cemeterial expenses	[4] 6,027,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Corps of Engineers:				
General investigations	[5] 3,905,000	5,190,000	5,940,000	5,940,000
Construction	[6] 367,675,000	369,894,800	411,273,000	401,173,000
Operation and maintenance	83,560,000	82,500,000	83,560,000	83,030,000
General expenses	9,400,000	9,200,000	9,400,000	9,300,000
Mississippi River and tributaries	50,885,000	50,885,000	53,040,000	51,962,500
Niagara remedial work	3,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
United States section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	518,975,000	520,219,800	565,763,000	553,955,500
Total, title III, Department of the Army, civil functions	525,002,000	526,219,800	571,763,000	559,955,500
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	1,801,465,000	1,372,122,800	1,377,571,000	1,365,613,500

[1] See the following:

	Revised budget estimate	House allowance	Senate recommendation	Conferees recommendation
Appropriation	$1,045,000,000	$618,000,000	$575,000,000	$575,000,000
Transfer from "Plant and equipment"	220,804,000	481,400,000	582,400,000	481,400,000
Unobligated balance	259,447,000	259,447,000	324,447,000	324,447,000
Total, funds available	1,525,251,000	1,358,847,000	1,481,847,000	1,380,847,000

[2] Reflects reduction of $1,103,000 submitted in H. Doc. 156.

[3] Includes $3,700,000 submitted in H. Doc. 161.

[4] Includes $447,000 in H. Doc. 126, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

[5] Includes $220,000 in H. Doc. 156 for Rocky Reach survey.

[6] Includes decrease of $800,000 in H. Doc. 126, and increase of $12,300,000 in S. Doc. No. 59.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that, as will be recalled, the bill as passed by the Senate provided $1,481,847,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, in contrast to the sum of $1,358,847,000 provided by the House. In conference the conferees agreed to $1,380,847,000, which is twenty-two-million-odd dollars more than the House provided.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have been sitting here since 20 minutes past 2. I left a very important meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which was called for this afternoon. The joint committee is discussing a subject about which we have heard a great deal in the past; namely, the Dixon-Yates contract. Most of the other members of the joint committee are present at the meeting. The committee is holding an open hearing, and I should like very much to return to it if I can. So, if the Senator from Louisiana will indulge me, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to do so. I will say to my good friend from Iowa that I myself would like to return to the Appropriations Committee, which is holding important meetings on a bill involving appropriations of more than $3 billion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at the outset let me say that I am not suffering from any illusions or delusions. I doubt whether the conference report could be sent back to conference.

Nevertheless, because of the item of appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in title I, under the heading "Independent Offices," the bill should be sent back to conference for appropriate action.

I do not say this in caustic criticism of the conferees, but before I conclude I think I can demonstrate that although the conferees acted in good faith, there was confusion in the figures, and in effect, the conference report would completely scuttle the development of the Atomic Energy Commission, if it were allowed to stand. As I say, the conferees acted in good faith, but unwittingly. I shall try to explain my statement, and demonstrate how such a result would come about.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on an occasion 3 years ago this month it was necessary for me, with the aid of a number of other Senators who supported me at that time on the floor of the Senate, to speak all night on the floor of the Senate. The conference report was sent back to the conferees three different times until we got the appropriate and proper amount of money to provide for the continuation of this program. If it had not been for that action, we would have been far behind in our so-called atomic energy leadership today.

Today we face a similar situation in connection with the pending appropriation, if it is allowed to stand. Again let me say that I do not criticize members of the committee. They have acted in good faith. They believed that they were providing what was adequate for this program, but I think I can show that, in fact, they did not do so.

For this program the President requested $1,525,251,000. The total House allowances, including a transfer from "Plant and equipment" and the use of unobligated balance, were $1,358,847,000, which is $166,404,000 less than the administration requested.

In addition to the $1,358,847,000 which the House appropriated, there was available approximately $65 million which the Commission dug up from somewhere and which was authorized to be used. This made the total deficit $101 million under what the administration requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the amount which was eliminated. The Senate increased the amount to be transferred from the "Plant and equipment" item by $101 million.

Let me say to my good friend from Iowa that at the moment the House of Representatives is considering a supplemental bill, in which funds for plant and equipment are being provided.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sum of $101 million has been deducted from that amount for the reason that it was transferred in this bill. When the other bill comes before the Senate, I am sure the Senator will have ample opportunity to show that this amount is necessary in order to provide for operating expenses. I am confident the Senator will have such an opportunity within the next week.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand; and that statement was made on the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday by members of the Appropriations Committee who were acting in good faith. They thought that the gap had been provided for. The fact is that analysis yesterday afternoon and this morning of the language in that bill shows that it does not help the situation one iota, so far as production and development are concerned. That is the important thing. That was the mistake which was made, in good faith, by the other body yesterday, and by the Appropriations Committee of the other body. That is the catastrophe which faces the Atomic Energy Commission today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the supplemental appropriation bill was reported to the House yesterday, and I understand the House will consider it tomorrow. If the House in its wisdom does not see fit to add the amount to which the Senator has adverted, certainly when the bill comes to the Senate—and it will be before the Senate after the House has acted on it tomorrow—there will be no reason why the Senate cannot add the amount to the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is not the slightest doubt that the Senator from Alabama would be one of the first to appropriate in the bill all the money the Atomic Energy Commission needs to keep the program going. I am not criticizing the conference report so far as other items are concerned; and certainly no one is trying to destroy the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. However, I should like to give the Senate this thought. The language in the appropriation bill must be changed from the present wording of the bill as reported to the House.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing to prevent the Senate from changing the language, or adding the amount of money the Senate believes should be added to the bill. If the House does not see fit to change the language and add additional funds, that does not bind the Senate. The Senate can change the language. It can include any funds it sees fit to add.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand. However, my reason for speaking today is that up to now there has been a misapprehension as to what the appropriation would do. I wish to call this to the attention of the Senate as strongly as I can. If the language stands as it is in the conference report, I submit, as the result of a very careful and sincere and objective analysis of the whole program, that the production of fissionable material will be decreased very definitely during the coming year, and the program for the expansion of the production of weapons will be curtailed. Subcommittee after subcommittee—in fact, it looks as though every committee of Congress is trying to get into the act—is trying to increase and strengthen our production of weapons.

I solemnly warn the Senate today that if the language now found in the conference report shall be retained the production of weapons will be curtailed, not expanded. The civilian power reactor program will be sacrificed. The Commission will be put in such a position that it will be doubtful if it can meet the commitment to pay for uranium and other raw materials which have already been contracted for.

I shall not labor the point today. I shall not move to send the report back to conference. There are many other elements in the bill, and I do not believe it is possible to have it sent back to conference and there is no use making a futile gesture.

However, I am calling attention to the fact that the bill comes from the conference not with $43 million less than the Senate figure, which was higher than the House figure, but with $43 million less than the lower figure of the House. That is what the net result is.

Mr. HILL. The bill comes from conference with $22 million more than the House figure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the Senator from Alabama forgets the $65 million.

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That figure must be taken into consideration. Twenty-three million dollars subtracted from $65 million leaves $43 million less than the House figure.

Mr. HILL. The conference figure is $22 million higher than the House figure. I may as well be frank and say to my friend from Iowa that the conference did not act without first discussing the matter with the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who were present in the conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, I do not doubt the word of the Senator. I do not criticize anyone. However, what I have stated is the result. I do not care whether all the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were present. My analysis shows that the appropriation, as the result of conference committee action, is $43 million less than would have been available to the Commission under the House figure. The conference failed to permit the use of the $65 million. After eliminating the $65 million, the conference increased the appropriation by $23 million. Therefore, if we deduct $23 million from $65 million, the deficiency is below even the low House figure.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe language can be used in the supplemental bill which will correct the situation, and which will virtually reestablish the Senate figure and the authorization provisions as they passed the Senate. Those are, I believe, the bare minimum figures, and they are below even the bare minimum the Commission can possibly get along with to carry out the program for the production of weapons, reactors, and the other things that have been coming along.

The matter resolves itself largely into a rearrangement of language. The necessary provision could be inserted at the appropriate place in the supplemental bill, and I have a notation as to where the language should be placed. Something like the following should be inserted:

> *Provided further*, That, in addition to the transfers otherwise authorized by law, $101 million of unexpended balances available under this head shall be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission."

I am not the author of that language. I have been advised by what I believe to be competent authority, within the Commission and on the joint committee, that that language would take care of the situation and permit the provision to stand virtually as the Senate left it in the bill as it passed the Senate. Also, the language must increase the appropriation from $138 million to $239 million-plus.

Mr. HILL. What the Senate did was to allow the Atomic Energy Commission to use the $65 million of unobligated balances. Then the Senate also transferred $101 million from the "Plant and equipment" appropriation to the operating fund.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senate did that. Up to that point I believe the Commission could, by careful management, almost live within what the Senate provided.

Mr. HILL. The Senate did it. It transferred to operating expenses the $101 million, which the Atomic Energy Commission advised the Senate committee it did not now contemplate using for plant and equipment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. When the bill went to conference, the $101 million was lost; and it was lost because it was then and there brought to the attention of the conference committee that the supplemental bill would be before the Senate shortly, and that the supplemental bill would deal not only with the question of plant and equipment but with the whole subject.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I interrupt the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The inadequacy of the appropriation does not vitally touch plant and equipment. What it affects is the production and operation end.

Mr. HILL. My good friend from Iowa realizes, of course, that the Senate and the Congress have the power not only to deal with plant and equipment, but also with operating expenses. The thought in conference was that when the supplemental bill comes before Congress we will go into the whole matter, and if anything else is needed by the Atomic Energy Commission, we will provide whatever may be needed.

I notice that my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is nodding his head in agreement with my statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot quite agree with my friend from Alabama. I was disturbed about the matter because what we did in the Senate was to take the proposed allowance of $618 million of new money and cut it back to $575 million, because between the time the House acted and the time the Senate acted the Atomic Energy Commission found an additional $101 million in capital account, and $65 million in operating account. So we included those two figures and cut the new appropriation back from $618 million to $575 million, which would make a net cut in the estimate of $43,400,000.

When the bill went to conference the House conferees said, "We will leave the Senate figure for operations where it now is, and cut $101 million from the transfer"—which meant, instead of a cut of $43 million, a net cut of $166 million, which is approximately $22 million below the amount the House provided.

It is my understanding that in the supplemental bill, what the House wishes to do is to use the $101 million in the capital account. But what worried me at the time of the conference—and I think the chairman will remember that I was questioning whether there was sufficient money in the operating account—was the point which I have just stated.

If the Senator from Alabama agrees with me that there should be some money in the supplemental budget for operating account, as well as approximately $300 million for capital account, and we can include in the $300 million the $101 million left over, then there will be sufficient money. But I was not clear about it in the conference, and that is why I am now on my feet, to stress the importance of realizing that there should be more money provided for the operating account.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it was agreed, and I believe my good friend from California made the suggestion, that the supplemental bill was coming up, and that if there was any deficiency in the operating funds we could provide them by a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the ranking minority member of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, and also as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, permit me to say that I think the Appropriations Committee was very mindful at the time the action was taken, and is today, of the importance of the Atomic Energy Commission and of carrying on both the defense phases and the peacetime phases of atomic power. The managers on the part of the House, however, felt, as I understood their position, that there had not been as full and clear an explanation when the matter was before the House as they felt they were entitled to have. They all indicated, as I interpreted their position, that they would have no objection to the Commission coming before the appropriate committee of the House or of the Senate on a supplemental bill and making their justifications, and they felt that the House would deal with it in a constructive way. I do not believe any of us can say precisely the amount of the funds they will agree to. I think it depends on how strong a case the Atomic Energy Commission make either before the House committee or the Senate committee. But I am sure if they come well fortified with the facts, they will not find Congress negligent in providing adequate funds for carrying on this important work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree thoroughly with my friend from California.

Mr. HILL. I agree thoroughly with the statements made by the distinguished minority leader. He has stated the facts.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The only thing I can say is that I regret that we have to follow this double road. It seems to me it could have been taken care of in conference. The bill comes from the conference committee with approximately $40 million less than the House figure, instead of a sum which is somewhere near the Senate figure.

I have before me a study of this question made by the comptroller of the Commission, which clearly shows there is a deficiency of approximately $40 million, even below the House figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must take issue with my good friend from Iowa. As I pointed out previously, the House allowance was $1,358,847,000. In the conference report the amount is $1,380,847,000. I am speaking of what the House actually did and what the conference committee did.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The conference committee took out that amount and put it into unobligated funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. The figures I quoted are the total amounts available for operating expenses, the House figure as well as the Senate figure and the conference figure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully disagree. What the Senate did was to reduce the amount from $618 million to $575 million. That was accepted in conference, and the transfer money, which we had increased by $101 million over the House figure, was eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the assumption that it would be put back in the supplemental bill when it was considered by the House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It left the operating account at a figure which was $43 million less than the amount provided by the House. So that the net result was $166 million less than the estimate. The Senate figure was $43 million less than the estimate, and the House figure was $144 million less than the estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the total amount which was provided by the House was for the operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, that is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that the entire amount the conference agreed upon is for operating expenses?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will look at the figures which I have just made available he will see that the House provided for operating expenses out of new money, plus transfers, and unobligated balances $1,358,847,000 and the conference raised that figure to $1,380,847,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully disagree with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are the figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I disagree with it, because the original——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the tables with the figures here. The Senator is entitled to look at them. I am sure there was no mistake in addition. The conference recommendation aggregates $1,380,847,000, which is approximately $22 million above what the House provided.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have before me a study which was made by the Controller of the Atomic Energy Commission. These are the important paragraphs:

> Thus, after giving consideration to transfers from the Plant and Equipment appropriation and after giving consideration to the availability of unobligated prior year funds, the amounts of obligating authority available to the Commission are as follows:
>
> Requests of the President, $1,525,251,000.
>
> House allowance, $1,423,847,000——

Mr. ELLENDER. The House allowance was $1,358,847,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is necessary to have $65 million. The Senate allowance was $1,481,847,000. The conference report provides $1,380,847,000.

I am still reading from the report of the controller of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows:

> Thus it can be seen the conference report provides an amount which is $43 million less than the amount which would have been available from the House report and $101 million less than was available by the Senate action.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply cannot follow that at all. As I have indicated, and as the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has admitted, the amount provided in the House bill was for operating expenses. It consisted of the following: New money, $618 million; transfer from plant and equipment, $481,400,000; unobligated balances, $259,447,000.

What the Senate did was to decrease the cash amount, but to increase the amount for transfer from Plant and Equipment and unobligated balances.

The entire amount provided in the conference report is higher than the amount allowed by the House; and both the amount provided by the House and the amount allowed by the conference were for operating expenses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of the budgetary expenditures contained in the President's budget for the Atomic Energy Commission, 95 percent of the expenditures are composed of the cost of source materials and the cost of special nuclear materials, weapons, reactors, research and development, and unpaid obligations. That is where 95 percent of the Commission's money goes.

The reduction of roughly 10 percent will hit 95 percent of the most vital operations of the Commission. As I said a moment ago, it will be bound to decrease the production of fissionable material, and will be bound to decrease the expansion of atomic weapons in the laboratories. Also, it will be bound to sacrifice, to a substantial degree, the civilian reactor power program; and there will be caused a definite lag in the raw-material delivery program because of the probable impossibility to pay existing commitments for which the Commission has obligated itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to belabor the question; I simply want to restate that the amount provided for in the conference report is greater than the amount provided in the House bill, and all of it is for operating expenses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I disagree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the Senator's privilege. We have the figures before us.

Mr. HILL. The conference allowance was $22 million more than the allowance by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly; that is what I have pointed out on 2 or 3 occasions. The amount provided by the House was for operating expenses, and the amount provided in the conference report is for operating expenses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot refrain from pointing out the $65 million was dropped, and the $22 million was added. Thus there is a difference between the $22 million and the $65 million, which makes a deficiency of $43 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator from Iowa will read the Record tomorrow, because he will find all the figures in it.

Mr. HILL. The $65 million of unobligated balances which the Senate included was not dropped. It is in the bill. But in conference, the $101 million, which was for transfer from "Plant and equipment" was dropped.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have before me the report from the Atomic Energy Commission, signed by Mr. Burrows, the controller, which the senior Senator from Iowa has placed in the Record. I think the situation is now clear to me. The controller in his statement omits the $65 million of transfer which was found between the time the bill passed the House and the time it passed the Senate. So actually the amount which was appropriated in the conference report is approximately $22 million more than was appropriated by the House, but aproximately $101 million under the amount provided by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would account for the difference. What we have in mind is the $101 million in capital account, which should be included in the $300 million which the Atomic Energy Commission needs, and have asked for. What we hope the Commission will do is to ask for more money in a deficiency appropriation, if they need it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is needed for operating expenses, $101 million can be added to the supplemental appropriation bill when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his indulgence. I hope the discussion will cause a serious examination to be made to determine what the real situation is. I have one view; other Senators may have a different view. I merely wanted to show that language has not been properly used to make this amount available. I do not believe a supplemental bill containing the language found in the bill as it has been introduced in the House will do the job, although I am certain, from the language of the bill, that it was the desire to do the job. I hope the matter will be given serious consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. If my good friend from Iowa will restudy the figures, I think he will agree with the statement made by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] that the amount provided in the conference report is $22 million more than the amount provided by the House.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am thoroughly convinced from an examination of the figures that it is $43 million less than the low House figure; but that matter can be thrashed out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority, the conferees agreed to the Senate amount, and approved the language in the Senate report pertaining to transmission connections with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., and the language in the Senate report pertaining to production of diammonium phosphate fertilizer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question in regard to that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] inquired of Mr. Vogel about the items regarding additions to the steam plants which had been in the bill when it was before the committee. I think I placed in the record a telegram in answer, stating that it would amount to $144,500,000. That sum is not carried in the appropriation bill, is it?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from Louisiana state whether it will be necessary to appropriate those funds at any time for the construction of additional steam plants?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I understand that the Tennessee Valley Authority has the right to use the funds out of its own receipts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Where do those funds come from?

Mr. ELLENDER. From net operating revenues.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator from Louisiana enlighten me as to why it is necessary——

Mr. ELLENDER. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], who held the hearings on this subject, can probably furnish more details than I can.

Mr. HILL. The Tennessee Valley Authority has the power, under the basic act creating the Authority, to use those funds. The funds come in as revenue from the sale of power, or as any other proceeds the Authority might have, and the Authority may use those funds and proceeds for any additional units which may be needed in its plants.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell me why the statement was in the bill originally approving of the use of those funds for enlargement?

Mr. HILL. Throughout the years, each year the Tennessee Valley Authority has come before the committees of the House and Senate and has stated to the committees exactly what its needs and problems are, what it suggests, and what it proposes to do to meet the different needs and problems.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the action of the committee in striking that approval, can the Senator from Alabama tell me whether the TVA will proceed with the construction of those enlargements?

Mr. HILL. I cannot speak for the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. All I can say is that in the basic act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Board of the Authority has the right and the authority to use its proceeds to install additional units in the plants.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am certain the Board of the TVA would be very much interested in the views of the senior Senator from Alabama, in view of his own interest in the matter.

Would the Senator mind expressing his view as to whether he thinks the TVA should proceed to use that money, in the face of the disapproval of its use by the committee of conference?

Mr. HILL. The Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the past has exercised the authority provided in the law to use the proceeds of the Tennessee Valley Authority to install additional units in existing plants. It has done that in the past. I think it will do it in the future. I think it should do it; and Congress, in enacting the basic act, had in mind that the proceeds should be so used.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has 1 of 2 ways in which it can install units. One is by coming to Congress and getting an appropriation, which means getting funds out of the Treasury of the United States. The other way is by husbanding and wisely using its revenues from sale of power—its proceeds—so as to enhance the Government's property by installing additional units. The Tennessee Valley Authority belongs to the Government and its property is the property of the Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator feels the TVA should and will ignore the action of the committee in striking the approval of those funds?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state that question again?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think the TVA will ignore the action of the committee?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say what the TVA Board will do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator recommend that it do so?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say what the TVA Board will do, and I cannot undertake to speak for the TVA Board, but I will say I think Congress was wise when it provided that additional units could be paid for out of proceeds and revenues from the sale of power. The practice of installing additional units from proceeds is a wise course. I would expect and hope the Tennessee Valley Authority will follow that wise course. I would strongly urge the course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there any limit of which the Senator knows as to how much TVA can spend? What is the limit?

Mr. HILL. The limit is that it cannot use any funds except proceeds or unobligated balances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it can use all of the proceeds?

Mr. HILL. It may use the proceeds subject to the provisions of the statute, which requires the Tennessee Valley Authority to amortize the cost of its projects. Subject to such provisions, the Tennessee Valley Authority can use its proceeds just as can any other business, to install additional units, or to enlarge its investment. I think that the provision for use of such funds which Congress wrote into the TVA act was wise. TVA has followed that course. I would certainly expect the TVA to follow that wise course and would approve its action in doing so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why should the amount of $27 million not be paid out of the proceeds?

Mr. HILL. Those moneys would go toward financing flood control, navigation, development of fertilizer, and matters of that kind, and not to power operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The TVA actually returns to the Federal Government the amortization only of the cost of its power facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. No; TVA returns to the Treasury all the costs of the power facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the power loan?

Mr. HILL. Yes. All the cost of the power facilities. It is not a loan because the Government owns the facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell us what percentage of the total investment TVA has actually returned to the Treasury in the 20 years or so TVA has been in being?

Mr. HILL. TVA has been returning to the Federal Treasury some 4 percent on the investment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I right in concluding that in 20 years TVA has returned 80 percent of the total investment?

Mr. HILL. I could not say that, because the total investment has been made through the years. It was not made at any one time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. About $1½ billion has been invested, has it not?

Mr. HILL. Not that much up to date. It has been about $750 million, up to the last fiscal year in power facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator speaking only about the power operations?

Mr. HILL. I am referring only to power operations; I would say the fertilizer operations pay for themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The total amount the Federal Government has invested in TVA is nearly $1½ billion, is it not?

Mr. HILL. An investment of $1½ billion is contemplated, but it has not been made up to the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much money has been put into the TVA?

Mr. HILL. As I recall the testimony, at the end of fiscal year 1954 it was about $750 million, which would be charged up to the power operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not mean power alone; I said I referred to the total investment for everything. How much money has been put into TVA by the Federal Government? It is nearly $1½ billion, is it not?

Mr. HILL. I do not wish in any way not to answer the Senator's question, but I am not quite sure what the total is as of today, and I do not want to commit myself to a figure without knowing what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator have his assistant supply that figure?

Mr. HILL. Yes. I will be delighted to supply it myself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And will the Senator also supply the figure as to how much has been returned to the Federal Government in cash?

Mr. HILL. Very well. I may say that, so far as amortization requirements are concerned, the TVA is ahead of the requirements in meeting the amortization payments. They have anticipated them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be interesting to have the figure.

Mr. HILL. I shall be happy to supply the figure for the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very much surprised that the Senator, who is the greatest authority on the TVA, is unable to supply the figures.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to supply the Senator with the figures for today's RECORD.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, the power investment is $968,365,181. The total investment for navigation, flood control, power, chemical plants, and other assets, is $1,313,192,000.

The repayment of the investment in the power program through 1956 will amount to $210,131,519.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In view of the action of the President in canceling the contract which was designed to supply power, has that action established the policy that from now on any expansion by the TVA will be taken care of by the communities in the TVA area?

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that would follow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would that be a logical conclusion from the action?

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So we can look forward to having no further appropriations for additions to the TVA?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether or not there is any reference in the basic legislation which authorizes TVA to build steam units in general or authorizes the supplying or manufacture of electric power by the building or operation of steam units in general.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not consulted the law in quite some time so as to be able to answer whether it was intended that the Tennessee Valley Authority should utilize funds obtained from operating income to build the plants.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. When the question of the new Johnsonville steam plant to be built by the TVA was raised on the floor, a point of order was raised with regard to an authorization for the building of the steam plant. At that time the late Senator Vandenberg was the President pro tempore, and he presided over the Senate and ruled on the question. In ruling on the question he ruled that steam plants were authorized for construction under the basic act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that I may address a question to the distinguished Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama to state, if he knows, whether there is in the basic TVA legislation any reference, in general, to steam units or steam plants for the manufacture of electricity.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Florida I do not have a copy of the basic act before me at this time, but, as I say, this very question was raised on the floor of the Senate during the 80th Congress, when the late Senator from Michigan, Senator Vandenberg, was the President pro tempore. When he was the presiding officer he held very specifically and very directly that steam plants were authorized by the basic act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida was here at that time and he voted for the legislation to provide for the construction of the Johnsonville steam plant, but the Senator from Florida from a reading of the whole of the debate at the time of the passage of the basic authorization bill has found no reference to steam plants in general and certainly no intimation that power was being given to TVA to construct an unlimited number of unidentified steam plants.

As I recall, the objective in authorizing the New Johnsonville steam plant and in providing funds for its construction was to allow the firming up of the hydroelectric power in the TVA. I should like to say for the RECORD that it has never been in the remotest recesses of my mind that any legislation in this field ever authorized the use of the proceeds—either the net proceeds or the gross proceeds—of a total investment of the United States Government of approximately $1,900,000,000 for expansion of power-producing facilities in whatever direction the TVA authorities might wish to go, without specific additional authorization from the Congress; and I would never permit to go unchallenged any statement on the floor of the Senate which would indicate that Senators are seriously contending that the TVA is a runaway team, going downhill, with all the authority it needs to spend all the revenues from its immense Federal investments for the unlimited increase of its empire.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to say——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that I may complete my statement, please.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Furthermore, referring to my motion, the other day, to eliminate the paragraph which had been prepared in the subcommittee print of the report—I refer to the paragraph which, if adopted, would have given specific committee approval for the construction of 6 additional steam units in 3 existing steam plants—I felt that after the full Appropriations Committee had rather conclusively voted against a continuation of that expansion policy, and had voted for elimination of that paragraph, the committee had made it wholly clear to the administrators who are in charge of the TVA that the committee was disapproving the course of action under which the TVA could of its own motion continue to invest, as a revolving fund for investment, the proceeds of the sale of power produced either by the hydroelectric plants or by the steam plants of the TVA, or both, instead of approving that course, as would have been indicated if that paragraph in the prepared report had been approved by the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that the New Johnsonville steam plant was not constructed primarily to firm up hydroelectric power. Instead, it was constructed primarily to generate power from steam. It was not merely a matter of firming up some hydroelectric power. And Congress so voted. That matter was threshed out on this floor, and there was quite a debate on it. Congress voted the funds for the New Johnsonville steam plant, knowing that the plant was being built, not merely to firm up hydroelectric power, but to generate power in and of itself, without regard to any hydroelectric power for the TVA.

As I have said, the basic act gives the TVA authority to install additional units from its operating proceeds or revenue. The TVA has done so from time to time in the past. It has been a wise policy. I, for one, expect the TVA to follow that wise policy, and to use its proceeds in just the way that any other business would use its proceeds, namely, to strengthen and fortify and enhance its equipment, plants, and properties for the operation of its business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to deal now with title II.

The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment on the Southwestern Power Administration, and agreed that the language in the Senate report with respect to settling accounts on a net balance basis includes operation and maintenance costs on generation and transmission co-op facilities.

With respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, the conferees agreed that the funds available in this appropriation shall be available for the upper Olympic Peninsular Service and the Olympia-Aberdeen No. 2 line. On operation and maintenance, the conferees agreed on $6,600,000, instead of $6,500,000, as passed the House, and $6,650,000, as passed the Senate.

General investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation: This item is substantially as passed by the Senate; the conferees agreed that $150,000 shall be available for advance planning on the Rogue River project, Talent division; and $85,000 for the Palisades reregulating dam and associate facilities.

Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation: The conferees agreed on the allocation proposed by the Senate, except no funds were allowed for the Rogue River project, Talent division.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a tabulation showing the breakdown of the construction and rehabilitation item.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Project or unit	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Arizona:				
Gila project, Arizona	$3,500,000	$3,500,000	$3,500,000	$3,500,000
Yuma project, auxiliary division, Arizona	408,000	408,000	408,000	408,000
Palo Verde project, Arizona-California	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	1,390,000	1,390,000	1,390,000	1,390,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Boulder City municipal office, Nevada	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
California:				
Central Valley project, California	14,000,000	14,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Santa Maria project, California	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Solano project, California	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Colorado: Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Idaho:				
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	520,000	520,000	520,000	520,000
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Palisades project, Idaho	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Montana:				
Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
New Mexico:				
Carlsbad project, New Mexico	1,171,000	1,171,000	900,000	900,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	7,200,000	7,200,000	6,256,000	6,256,000
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Oregon:				
Deschutes project, north unit, Oregon	274,000	274,000	274,000	274,000
Utah:				
Provo River project, Utah	----------	----------	300,000	300,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10,895,000	10,895,000	10,895,000	10,895,000
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division, Washington	631,000	631,000	631,000	631,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	75,000	75,000	475,000	475,000

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation—Continued

Project or unit	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Wyoming:				
Eden project, Wyoming	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000
Kendrick project, Wyoming	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Riverton project, Wyoming	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Miscellaneous:				
Drainage and minor construction	348,000	348,000	348,000	348,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,125,000
Missouri River:				
Missouri River Basin project:				
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	6,784,000	6,784,000	6,784,000	6,784,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	[1] 8,120,000	6,000,000	8,120,000	8,120,000
Hanover-Bluff unit, Wyoming	[2] 1,540,000	1,250,000	1,540,000	1,540,000
Hardin unit (Yellowtail Dam), Montana			4,000,000	4,000,000
Heart Butte unit, North Dakota	200,000	200,000	95,000	95,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Lower Marias unit, Montana	[3] 3,675,000	6,500,000	3,675,000	3,675,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming			900,000	900,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	490,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
Sargent unit, Nebraska	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
Transmission division	16,480,000	16,480,000	16,665,000	16,665,000
Webster unit, Kansas	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Drainage and minor construction	500,000	500,000	535,000	535,000
Investigations	[4] 2,915,000	2,500,000	2,915,000	2,915,000
Other departmental agencies	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	55,954,000	55,954,000	60,969,000	60,969,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation program	146,041,000	146,041,000	152,041,000	151,541,000
Less available funds from prior years			−6,000,000	5,500,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation (new funds)	146,041,000	146,041,000	146,041,000	146,041,000

[1] Increased by $2,120,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[2] Increased by $290,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[3] Reduced by $2,825,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

[4] Increased by $415,000 in accordance with letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated Apr. 20, 1955.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on page 6 of the conference report, the following paragraph is found:

> The managers on the part of the House are in agreement that funds previously appropriated for the Mecca-Blythe Highway crossing on the Coachella project shall be used for essential features of the reclamation construction program, rather than for construction of the bridge.

The conferees on the part of the Senate do not concur in this statement.

The position of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is found on pages 9 and 10 of Senate Report No. 700. The statement reads as follows:

> With reference to the funds previously appropriated for the Coachella division of the All-American canal, the committee directs that funds programed for the construction of a highway crossing for the Mecca-Blythe Highway across the Coachella Canal be reserved to assure the fulfillment of the Government's obligations under the existing contract with the State of California Department of Public Works. However, the Committee again urges the Bureau to negotiate with the California State Department of Public Works in an effort to agree upon a modification of the plans to provide a structure to meet the traffic needs at a lower cost.

This statement is the position of the Senate conferees on this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a short history of the Mecca-Blythe Highway Bridge.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MECCA-BLYTHE HIGHWAY BRIDGE, CROSSING OVER DETENTION DIKE AND DISPERSION CHANNEL ADJACENT TO COACHELLA CANAL

COACHELLA DIVISION—ALL-AMERICAN CANAL SYSTEM

Status of negotiations with California Highway Department

On March 7, 1946, the United States entered into a contract with the State of California, department of public works, for construction of a temporary oil-surfaced road across the detention dike and dispersion channel above the Coachella main canal on State Highway 195, known as the Mecca-Blythe Road. Article 8 (c) of the aforesaid contract provides that in the event the highway were not abandoned by the State of California within 5 years, the United States is obligated to construct a permanent bridge 660 feet in length, as provided on a drawing attached to the contract.

The highway was not abandoned during the 5 years provided in article 8 (c) of the 1946 contract, but in contemplation of the likelihood thereof, the time specified for the possible abandonment of the highway was extended for 2 subsequent 1-year periods ending March 7, 1953. The State in the contract reserved (unless it abandoned the highway or the United States constructs the bridge within the time prescribed, which time, as is indicated, expired on March 7, 1953) the absolute right to terminate the right granted by the contract to the United States to cross the State's highway with the Coachella Canal.

At the request of the board of supervisors, Riverside County, Coachella Valley County Water District, and other local interests who considered construction of a permanent bridge as provided in the contract of March 7, 1946, to be an unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds, the Bureau of Reclamation and the department of highways, State of California, agreed to defer determination as to the means by which the contract of March 7, 1946, would be fulfilled until the California State Legislature had an opportunity to pass on a proposal to abandon the Mecca-Blythe Road from the State highway system.

Effort has been made on several occasions to abandon the highway. Since this is a bonded road it cannot be vacated without the approval of the voters and action by the State legislature. We were advised that on January 28, 1947, in the California Legislature senate bill 626 was introduced to amend section 364 of the Streets and Highways Code so that this section of road would cease to be a State highway. The bill was not opposed by the California Division of Highways. It did, however, meet with opposition and was never voted out of the committee on transportation to which it was referred. It is also our understanding that bills with the objective of abandoning the Mecca-Blythe Highway from the State highway system were again introduced in 1953 but the legislature adjourned without taking any action thereon. Since there is considerable local public opinion in favor of maintaining the road it cannot be predicted that legislation to abandon the road will be successful in the foreseeable future.

When it became evident that the roadway would not be abandoned and the California Division of Highways declined to further extend the contract period for State abandonment, the Bureau of Reclamation submitted an estimate of $260,000 for construction of the bridge and funds in this amount were provided in the Interior Department appropriation for fiscal year 1953. However, in an effort to reach agreement with the State on a crossing that would meet the State's requirements without being unduly expensive, negotiations were undertaken with the division of highways.

The conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1955 provided that:

"With reference to the funds provided for the All-American Canal project, the committee has been advised that the Bureau of Reclamation and the division of highways of the State of California are presently negotiating in an effort to agree on a less expensive structure for the Mecca-Blythe highway crossing on the Coachella division. The conferees believe it would be in the best interests of the State and Federal Governments that a more economical alternative be worked out by mutual agreement and that such plan or plans be submitted to the two Appropriations Committees for their approval before any of the construction funds available for this purpose are expended."

In accordance with this report the Bureau again reexamined the design criteria for the crossing in an effort to find an acceptable plan which would be satisfactory to the State and which it could offer to the two Appropriations Committees for their approval.

The Bureau developed a plan for the crossing which, in its opinion, was the most economical plan which the Bureau could support and which would not impair the full effectiveness of the existing flood protective works. This plan included, among other items, a bridge of 145-foot length in lieu of the 660-foot length of bridge contemplated in the contract of March 7, 1946, between the State of California and the United States. This lesser plan was submitted to the State for consideration and was found unacceptable by the State. The State, in turn, proposes a bridge of 215-foot length as the minimum acceptable.

Pending reduction of the plans to final form, the cost of construction of the 215-foot length bridge and the necessary roadway modifications cannot be made absolute. From preliminary computations based on preliminary plans which have been used for discussion with the State, it appears that the 215-foot length bridge, which the State has advised would be its minimum requirement, can be built and the necessary roadway modifications and protective features provided for a total cost of approximately $170,000. This compares with the estimated cost of the 660-foot length of bridge of $260,000 which estimate, having been named some 3 years ago, would require indexing upward to provide for increased labor and material costs since that time.

Completion of features of the flood-protective works, which has been deferred pending solution of the highway-crossing problem, will involve a cost of approximately $80,000 or a total expenditure of approximately $250,000. With this expenditure, construction work on the Coachella system can be completed, the terms of the March 7, 1946, contract discharged to the satisfaction of the State of California, and the flood-protective works will remain unimpaired as to effectiveness. Sufficient funds from previous appropriations are available for this work and no new appropriations are required (unless the Congress accepts the views of the House Appropriation Committee referred to below). If the two appropriations committees approve, the Bureau of Reclamation will proceed with negotiations to develop final approved plans for the most economical structure satisfactory to the State and the Bureau of Reclamation, and upon final completion of those plans, issue construction specifications for construction of the bridge and completion of the floodways. It should be possible to bring this work to near conclusion in fiscal year 1956 if timely agreement is reached.

The House Committee on Appropriations in its report on the Public Works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956 stated:

"That none of the funds, previously appropriated for construction of a highway crossing for the Mecca-Blythe highway across the Coachella Canal be obligated for this purpose, but that such funds be applied to essential features of the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation."

If the provision were to be accepted by both Houses in the form of a committee statement rather as an item actually adopted in the appropriation act, question may exist as to whether in such case there would actually be a rescission of previously appropriated funds.

Moreover, the contract itself reserves to the State, in the event of a failure of appropriations, all of its rights with respect to the highway or the highway right-of-way. In other words, the State has not by the contract (unless the United States builds an appropriate bridge) waived its constitutional right to just compensation for the taking of its property.

Were the United States not to carry out its contractual obligation, the situation would then come down to this. Unless the State abandons the highway, it has a constitutional right to just compensation for the taking of its property. The contract was entered into to provide facilities to replace those taken by the United States. That is to say, by the contract the United States would provide facilities rather than pay monetary compensation. Failure of the Government to provide such facilities, or termination by the State of the right-of-way for failure to construct the facilities within the prescribed time, would not eliminate the States' right to just compensation, which right would then be for determination in the appropriate court.

In the event funds for the Mecca-Blythe highway crossing are actually rescinded by the Congress, it would be necessary to go through the usual budgetary and appropriation procedures to again provide funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to perform this work. However, the State might, in such event, elect to terminate the right-of-way granted to the United States and to proceed against the United States for just compensation in the appropriate court.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on Operation and Maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation, the conferees agreed to the Senate amendments.

General administrative expenses: On this item the conferees agreed on half of the Senate increase.

With respect to the Emergency Fund, the conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I desire to compliment the Senator from Louisiana and the other conferees on the way in which they have handled the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration and continuing fund. I think they did a very fine service for that agency, and I am very happy to congratulate them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In his remarks, Mr. President, the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has referred to the Talent project, in the State which I have the honor in part to represent here. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues for including in the Senate version of the bill $500,000 for the Talent project. As he stated earlier in his remarks, the amount for the Talent project was cut back to the House item, namely, $154,000. In my opinion, the Talent project eventually will be recognized by both Houses of Congress and will be more amply provided for, as the Senate has begun to amply provide for it.

If there is any fault to be found because of the fact that the Talent project is not receiving ample funds this year, it is my opinion that the fault lies with the administration, which in its original budget which was presented to the Congress did not include construction funds for the Talent project.

I wish the RECORD to show that I, as one of the two Senators from Oregon—and I am sure that, in this respect, although I am not authorized to speak for him, my distinguished senior colleague agrees with me—am deeply appreciative of the leadership the Senator from Louisiana showed in obtaining an increase in the amount originally authorized by the House of Representatives. It is regrettable that the increase voted by the Senate did not hold in the conference committee, but we understand how such things occur.

Again I say that the original fault was that the administration in its budget did not include the construction funds, and I realize that such a situation makes it much more difficult to obtain them in the conference committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator is aware, we were faced with quite a few projects in the bill which were unbudgeted. The conferees tried to retain all those that the Senate inserted, but, of course, we had to yield in some instances. As I pointed out to my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] a while ago, there were three little projects in Louisiana, and I yielded with respect to one. Kentucky was another instance, and this is a third. However, all in all, frankly, I think the conferees got much more than I anticipated when we entered the conference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I realize, for example, that the item for deepening the Columbia River Channel to 48 feet was not included in the budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Construction funds for the Ice Harbor project were not included in the budget. Construction funds for the Cougar project were not included in the budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. We had to make a choice. We did the best we could. We could not get them all.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Construction funds for the Hill's Creek project were not included in the administration budget. That makes all the more remarkable the achievement of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do not give me all the credit.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Credit is due the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues on the conference committee for retaining in the conference report these items so important to the Pacific Northwest, because they were not included in the administration's original budget.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague. On behalf of the people of Oregon, I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana and all the other conferees for doing justice and equity to our projects. I have talked with most of the conferees on the part of the Senate with regard to the Talent project. I am satisfied that on the showing we shall make upon the completion of the planning this year we shall obtain a substantial amount for construction in the next appropriation bill.

As the Senator has pointed out, when we enter into conferences of this kind we cannot expect that everything that is requested will be granted. I think the conference committee has been exceedingly fair and just to us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out to my good friend from Oregon that this afternoon we discussed at length the $101 million amount which was stricken from the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations. That was one of the amendments with respect to which we yielded.

The second was with respect to the hurricane amendment. In that instance the amount was reduced from $1 million to $500,000. The conferees agreed on the House figure.

Another project which we had to strike from the bill was the Bruces Eddy project. The reason we had to yield to the House was that the project was not authorized. We sought to authorize its planning by language in the bill, but the House conferees vociferously objected, and, of course, we could not retain it.

The other project with respect to which we had to yield was the Soo Line railroad bridge. In order to get the bridge built we had to put it under the Truman-Hobbs Act. The item was more or less legislative. We had to conform to the demand of the House conferees and agree to strike it out.

Otherwise, everything else was left in, except two planning projects, one in Kentucky to which the House conferees objected, the Barren River Reservoir No. 2, and a small project in Louisiana, involving an amount of $37,000. They were the only fatalities in the planning provisions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before the conference report is acted upon by the Senate, I should feel somewhat derelict in my duty if I did not express my own appreciation and the appreciation of the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of the Pacific Northwest generally, by congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Lousiana for helping us in connection with what we think are deserving projects. I myself was a member of the conference committee. The Senator from Louisiana and all other members of the Senate conferees were very cooperative in connection with projects which we think will not only reflect wise judgment, but will redound to the benefit of the economy of the entire Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in addition to the Delaware River project and the Pomme de Terre project in Missouri, there was another, the Keystone project in Oklahoma, for which the Senate provided $450,000 for planning and construction. The House objected on the basis that there may not have been sufficient or adequate planning, so the conferees decided, that instead of allowing $450,000 for planning and construction, they would reduce the amount to $150,000, for planning only. However, all the other items were retained.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. On behalf of the people of Oklahoma, I wish to express deep appreciation for the tremendous job which the senior Senator from Louisiana and his fellow conferees did in keeping as nearly intact as they did the program as passed by the Senate. While we regret the loss of some $300,000 in connection with the Keystone project, we know that certain concessions had to be made. Because of the original consideration by the committee, and the zeal of the conferees, Oklahoma, and the people of the great drought-stricken Middle West area, have the very best water resources program they have ever had in their history. We are grateful to the Senator and the other conferees for their help.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee was very much impressed with the showing made in connection with the construction of certain dams in Oklahoma. As I remember, there was under consideration one dam which, if erected, would provide water for 162 or 163 localities within an area of 50 square miles. For that reason, it was rather easy to retain such projects in the bill, because they were worthy projects. They had been under consideration year after year, and we thought they should be built.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should also like to express the appreciation of the entire State to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who was a member of the committee, and who was also one of the conferees. He did a fine piece of work in cooperation with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. He was of great assistance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma with regard to the various projects which have been mentioned. They are a part and parcel of the development of the Arkansas. Those projects must be constructed, along with the Dardanelle lock and dam and other projects in which we are more immediately interested. We recognize the importance of the projects in Oklahoma, and are very glad to see them retained in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleagues in heaping encomiums on the chairman of this particular subcommittee and his colleagues, as well as upon the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

We in Montana are greatly pleased by the way we have been treated in connection with the pending bill, especially with respect to the action of the Committee on Appropriations in providing appropriations for the first time, 11 years after the authorization, for the Yellowtail Dam on the Crow Reservation in Montana. The people of Montana are delighted to know that there is now a fine prospect of the construction of this project getting underway. We are deeply appreciative of the kindness extended to the people of Montana in that respect, and, of course, in other respects also.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. We have been working on the Yellowtail Dam project for a great many years. It should have been built long ago. However, we are pleased indeed with the fine cooperation we received in connection with this bill, and I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his effective work and constructive efforts.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator very much.

TITLE III

Mr. President, the House conferees agreed to the Senate amount for General Investigations and the Senate conferees agreed to the House amount for the hurricane study.

Construction General, Corps of Engineers. The conferees agreed on $401,173,000 instead of $411,273,000, as passed Senate, and $369,894,800 as passed the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation showing the breakdown of the construction and planning items as passed by the House, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corps of Engineers: Construction, general, fiscal year 1956

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1956		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alaska:								
Gold Creek		$35,000		$35,000		$35,000		$35,000
Metlakatla Harbor					$383,000		$383,000	
Petersburg Harbor					274,000		274,000	
Seward Harbor of Refuge			(1)		(1)			
Wrangell Harbor					220,000		220,000	

[1] Included under item for small authorized projects.

Corps of Engineers: Construction, general, fiscal year 1956—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1956		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Alabama:								
Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers:								
Jackson lock and dam		$70,000		$70,000		$70,000		$70,000
Warrior lock and dam	$4,100,000		$4,100,000		$4,100,000		$4,100,000	
Coosa River		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
Fort Gaines lock and dam			1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
Mobile Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000.		1,000,000	
Arizona:								
Painted Rock Reservoir		90,000		90,000	600,000		600,000	
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir						100,000		
Arkansas:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (bank stabilization and channel rectification)	3,000,000		3,000,000		4,000,000		3,500,000	
Beaver Reservoir				25,000		25,000		25,000
Calion		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Dardanelle lock and dam			450,000		450,000		450,000	
DeGray Reservoir		(70,000)		(70,000)		(70,000)		(70,000)
Greers Ferry Reservoir		30,000		30,000		180,000		180,000
Ouachita River and tributaries						100,000		50,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	450,000		450,000		600,000		525,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								
California:								
American River Levee		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
Black Butte Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	785,000		785,000		785,000		785,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm and Lytle Creeks			1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000	
Riverside		50,000						
Folsom Dam	2,650,000		2,650,000		2,650,000		2,650,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
Playa Del Rey Inlet and Harbor			25,000		25,000		25,000	
Port Hueneme Harbor		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
Redondo Beach Harbor			450,000		450,000		450,000	
Richmond Harbor					1,000,000		500,000	
Russian River Reservoir					1,000,000		500,000	
Sacramento River	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Sacramento River, 30-foot ship channel			500,000		500,000		500,000	
San Antonio Reservoir	530,000		530,000		530,000		530,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
San Joaquin River and tributaries					500,000		250,000	
San Lorenzo Creek				25,000		25,000		25,000
Success Reservoir		110,000		110,000		100,000		110,000
Terminus Reservoir						50,000		50,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	933,000		933,000		933,000		933,000	
Colorado: Chatfield Reservoir		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
Connecticut:								
Burial Hill Beach					(1)			
Compo Beach					(1)			
Gulf Beach					(1)			
Hammonasset Beach	167,000		167,000		167,000		167,000	
Hartford (Folly Brook section)	263,000		263,000		263,000		263,000	
Housatonic River	750,000		375,000		375,000		375,000	
Middle Beach					(1)			
Patchogue River					(1)			
Prospect Beach					(1)			
Sasco Hill Beach					(1)			
Seaside Park					(1)			
Sherwood Island State Park					159,000		159,000	
Southport Beach					(1)			
Stonington Harbor					(1)			
Westcott Cove					(1)			
Westport Harbor					(1)			
Woodmont Shore					(1)			
Delaware:								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea: Mantua Creek anchorage	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay					147,000		147,000	
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (35-foot channel)		210,000		210,000		210,000		210,000
Mispillion River					275,000		275,000	
Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del					(1)			
District of Columbia: Anacostia River, District of Columbia and Maryland	2,750,000		2,750,000		2,750,000		2,750,000	
Florida:								
Apalachicola Bay channel, St. George's Sound			200,000		300,000		300,000	
Apalachicola River channel improvement			418,000		500,000		500,000	
Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay					(1)			
Central and southern Florida	6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia	920,000		920,000		920,000		920,000	
St. Augustine Harbor							163,000	
Tampa Harbor	977,000		977,000		977,000		977,000	
Georgia:								
Buford Dam	11,830,000		11,830,000		11,830,000		11,830,000	
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C					3,000,000		3,000,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia. (See Florida.)								
Hawaii: Nawiliwili Harbor					500,000		500,000	
Idaho:								
Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir						100,000		
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington:								
Grande Ronde River, Oreg. (See Oregon.)								
Malheur River, Oreg. (See Oregon.)								
Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, Idaho	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Prineville, Oreg. (See Oregon.)								
Randle, Wash. (See Washington.)								
Lucky Peak Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	

---

[1] Included under item for small authorized projects.

Corps of Engineers: Construction, general, fiscal year 1956—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate or fiscal year 1956		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Illinois:								
Alton	--------	$50, 000	--------	$50, 000	--------	$50, 000	--------	$50, 000
Beardstown	$800, 000	--------	$800, 000	--------	$800, 000	--------	$800, 000	--------
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.	--------	--------	--------	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------
Carlyle Reservoir	--------	75, 000	--------	75, 000	--------	75, 000	--------	75, 000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------
Degognia and Fountain Bluff Levee and Drainage District	420, 000	--------	420, 000	--------	420, 000	--------	420, 000	--------
East St. Louis and vicinity	1, 285, 000	--------	1, 285, 000	--------	1, 285, 000	--------	1, 285, 000	--------
Grand Tower Drainage and Levee District	250, 000	--------	250, 000	--------	250, 000	--------	250, 000	--------
Illinois Waterway: Calumet-Sag Channel	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------
Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa), Ill., Iowa, and Mo. (rectification of damages)	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------
Preston Drainage and Levee District	260, 000	--------	260, 000	--------	260, 000	--------	260, 000	--------
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie duPont Drainage and Levee District	485, 000	--------	485, 000	--------	485, 000	--------	485, 000	--------
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------
Indiana:								
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
Indiana Harbor (widening at Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.)	45, 000	--------	45, 000	--------	45, 000	--------	45, 000	--------
Mansfield Reservoir	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	90, 000	--------	90, 000
Mason J. Niblack levee	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000
Ohio River locks and dams: Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	--------	125, 000	--------	125, 000	1, 250, 000	--------	1, 250, 000	--------
Vincennes	584, 000	--------	584, 000	--------	584, 000	--------	584, 000	--------
Iowa:								
Coralville Reservoir	4, 500, 000	--------	4, 500, 000	--------	4, 500, 000	--------	4, 500, 000	--------
Little Sioux River	--------	150, 000	--------	150, 000	500, 000	--------	500, 000	--------
Lock No. 19 at Keokuk	3, 200, 000	--------	3, 200, 000	--------	3, 200, 000	--------	3, 200, 000	--------
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------	700, 000	--------
Missouri River:								
Kansas City to Omaha	3, 300, 000	--------	3, 300, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------	3, 650, 000	--------
Omaha to Sioux City	5, 800, 000	--------	5, 800, 000	--------	5, 800, 000	--------	5, 800, 000	--------
Missouri River, Kanslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Nebraska.)								
Muscatine	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000
Sabula	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000
Upper Iowa River	--------	--------	--------	68, 000	--------	68, 000	--------	68, 000
Kansas:								
Abilene	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000
Manhattan	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	15, 000	--------	15, 000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Ottawa	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000	--------	30, 000
Pomona Reservoir	--------	45, 000	--------	45, 000	--------	45, 000	--------	45, 000
Salina	--------	65, 000	--------	65, 000	--------	65, 000	--------	65, 000
Strawn Reservoir	--------	25, 000	--------	25, 000	--------	25, 000	--------	25, 000
Topeka	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000
Toronto Reservoir	2, 800, 000	--------	2, 800, 000	--------	2, 800, 000	--------	2, 800, 000	--------
Tuttle Creek Reservoir	--------	--------	7, 500, 000	--------	7, 500, 000	--------	7, 500, 000	--------
Wichita and Valley Center	2, 200, 000	--------	2, 200, 000	--------	2, 200, 000	--------	2, 200, 000	--------
Kentucky:								
Barbourville	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------	600, 000	--------
Buckhorn Reservoir	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000	--------	70, 000
Catlettsburg	--------	50, 000	--------	50, 000	300, 000	--------	300, 000	--------
Green River:								
Locks and dam 1 and 2	4, 400, 000	--------	4, 400, 000	--------	4, 400, 000	--------	4, 400, 000	--------
Channel	2, 275, 000	--------	2, 275, 000	--------	2, 275, 000	--------	2, 275, 000	--------
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------	4, 000, 000	--------
Jackson	246, 000	--------	246, 000	--------	246, 000	--------	246, 000	--------
Louisville	475, 000	--------	475, 000	--------	475, 000	--------	475, 000	--------
Lock and dam 41	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	150, 000	--------	150, 000
Lower Cumberland lock and dam, Kentucky and Tennessee	--------	200, 000	--------	200, 000	--------	200, 000	--------	200, 000
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
Maysville	1, 540, 000	--------	1, 540, 000	--------	1, 540, 000	--------	1, 540, 000	--------
No. 2 Barren Reservoir	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	100, 000	--------	--------
Pineville	816, 000	--------	816, 000	--------	816, 000	--------	816, 000	--------
Rough River Reservoir and channels	--------	--------	--------	--------	500, 000	--------	500, 000	--------
Louisiana:								
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans District):								
Algiers cutoff	1, 263, 000	--------	1, 263, 000	--------	1, 263, 000	--------	1, 263, 000	--------
Plaquemine Morgan City alternate route	1, 260, 000	--------	1, 260, 000	--------	1, 500, 000	--------	1, 500, 000	--------
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (deferred for restudy)	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	(37, 000)	--------	--------
Overton-Red River Waterway	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	350, 000	--------	175, 000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)								
Maine:								
Beals Harbor	--------	--------	--------	--------	200, 000	--------	200, 000	--------
Hendricks Harbor	--------	--------	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	--------
Lubec Channel	--------	--------	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	--------
Portland Harbor (House Island anchorage)	820, 000	--------	575, 000	--------	575, 000	--------	575, 000	--------
Wood Island Harbor and Pool at Biddeford	--------	--------	--------	--------	153, 000	--------	153, 000	--------
Maryland:								
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md. (See District of Columbia.)								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	1, 400, 000	--------	1, 400, 000	--------	1, 400, 000	--------	1, 400, 000	--------
Massachusetts:								
Adams	1, 900, 000	--------	1, 900, 000	--------	1, 900, 000	--------	1, 900, 000	--------
Buffumville Reservoir	--------	55, 000	--------	55, 000	--------	55, 000	--------	55, 000
Mystic River (35-foot project)	500, 000	--------	500, 000	--------	500, 000	--------	500, 000	--------
North Adams	750, 000	--------	750, 000	--------	750, 000	--------	750, 000	--------
Town River	--------	--------	--------	--------	250, 000	--------	250, 000	--------
Winthrop Beach	210, 000	--------	210, 000	--------	210, 000	--------	210, 000	--------
Michigan:								
Battle Creek	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000	--------	60, 000
Black River Harbor	--------	--------	--------	--------	110, 000	--------	110, 000	--------
Crooked and Indian Rivers	--------	--------	--------	--------	241, 000	--------	241, 000	--------
Port Austin Harbor	--------	--------	--------	--------	433, 000	--------	433, 000	--------
St. Marys River (lift bridge and removal at Bridge Island)	338, 000	--------	338, 000	--------	338, 000	--------	338, 000	--------

---

[1] Included under item for small authorized projects.

Corps of Engineers: Construction, general, fiscal year 1956—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1956		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Minnesota:								
Crooked Slough at Winona	----------	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	----------	----------
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis	$215,000	----------	$215,000	----------	$215,000	----------	$215,000	----------
Knife River Harbor	----------	----------	----------	----------	258,000	----------	258,000	----------
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	650,000	----------	650,000	----------	650,000	----------	650,000	----------
St. Anthony Falls extension	1,285,000	----------	1,285,000	----------	1,285,000	----------	1,285,000	----------
Missouri:								
Bear Creek Reservoir	----------	$50,000	----------	$50,000	----------	$50,000	----------	$50,000
Canton	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000
Cape Girardeau (Reach No. 2 only)	750,000	----------	750,000	----------	750,000	----------	750,000	----------
Carthage	367,000	----------	367,000	----------	367,000	----------	367,000	----------
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff	314,000	----------	314,000	----------	314,000	----------	314,000	----------
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	----------	500,000	----------	----------	----------
Table Rock Reservoir, Mo. and Ark	11,000,000	----------	11,000,000	----------	11,000,000	----------	11,000,000	----------
Montana:								
Billings	----------	40,000	----------	40,000	----------	40,000	----------	40,000
Havre	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
Libby Reservoir	----------	15,000	----------	15,000	----------	15,000	----------	15,000
Nebraska:								
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak	13,950,000	----------	13,950,000	----------	13,950,000	----------	13,950,000	----------
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
Norfolk	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000
Nevada: Pine Canyon Reservoir	----------	65,000	----------	65,000	----------	65,000	----------	65,000
New Hampshire:								
Hampton Beach	140,000	----------	140,000	----------	140,000	----------	140,000	----------
Otter Brook Reservoir	----------	160,000	----------	160,000	----------	160,000	----------	160,000
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------
New Jersey:								
Atlantic City	906,000	----------	906,000	----------	906,000	----------	906,000	----------
Cold Spring Inlet	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See Delaware.)								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton (40- and 35-foot channels), N. J. and Pa	6,000,000	100,000	----------	100,000	6,000,000	100,000	----------	100,000
New York and New Jersey channels	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------
Ocean City	67,000	----------	67,000	----------	67,000	----------	67,000	----------
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)								
New Mexico:								
Albuquerque	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000
Artesia	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000
Chamita Reservoir (Abiquiu)	----------	75,000	----------	75,000	425,000	75,000	425,000	75,000
Los Esteros-Alamogordo Reservoirs	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	50,000	----------	50,000
Rio Grande Floodway	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------
Two Rivers Reservoir	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000
New York:								
Buffalo Harbor (north entrance, Buffalo River and Buffalo ship canal)	1,200,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	200,000	----------
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
New York and New Jersey channels. (See New Jersey.)								
Oswego Harbor	----------	36,000	----------	36,000	----------	36,000	----------	36,000
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
Wellsville	350,000	----------	350,000	----------	350,000	----------	350,000	----------
North Carolina:								
Manteo Bay (6-foot channel to Wanchese)	----------	----------	----------	----------	47,000	----------	47,000	----------
Pasquotank River	----------	----------	----------	----------	(1)	----------	----------	----------
Rollinson Channel Breakwater	----------	----------	175,000	----------	175,000	----------	175,000	----------
Wilmington Harbor	----------	----------	----------	----------	557,000	----------	557,000	----------
North Dakota:								
Garrison Reservoir	20,000,000	----------	20,000,000	----------	20,100,000	----------	20,100,000	----------
Lower Heart River	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000
Marmarth	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	23,000	----------	23,000
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Ohio:								
Ashtabula Harbor (east outer harbor)	----------	46,000	250,000	46,000	250,000	46,000	250,000	46,000
Cleveland Harbor (bridge replacements and channel improvements)	5,300,000	----------	5,300,000	----------	5,300,000	----------	5,300,000	----------
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
Enid	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000	----------	25,000
Eufaula Reservoir	----------	----------	450,000	----------	450,000	----------	450,000	----------
Keystone Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	----------	450,000	----------	----------	150,000
Markham Ferry Reservoir	6,300,000	----------	----------	----------	6,300,000	----------	6,300,000	----------
Oklahoma City Floodway	2,260,000	----------	2,260,000	----------	2,260,000	----------	2,260,000	----------
Oologah Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
Oregon:								
Amazon Creek	----------	22,000	----------	22,000	----------	22,000	----------	22,000
Columbia River at mouth, Oregon and Washington	----------	----------	----------	----------	750,000	----------	750,000	----------
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington:								
Grande Rhonde River, Oreg	----------	55,000	----------	55,000	----------	55,000	----------	55,000
Malheur River, Oreg	----------	6,000	----------	6,000	----------	6,000	----------	6,000
Prineville, Oreg	----------	4,000	----------	4,000	----------	4,000	----------	4,000
Coos Bay	----------	----------	----------	----------	200,000	36,000	200,000	36,000
Cougar Reservoir	----------	100,000	----------	100,000	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
Green Peter Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	200,000	----------	100,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	----------	10,000	----------	10,000	300,000	10,000	300,000	10,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	600,000	----------	550,000
Johnson Creek	----------	35,000	----------	35,000	----------	35,000	----------	35,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------

[1] Included under item for small authorized projects.

Corps of Engineers: Construction, general, fiscal year 1956—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1956		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington—Continued								
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works (Multnomah Drainage District, Oreg.)		$35,000		$35,000		$35,000		$35,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	$11,000,000		$11,000,000		$11,000,000		$11,000,000	
The Dalles Dam, Oregon and Washington	63,500,000		63,500,000		63,500,000		63,500,000	
Tillamook Bay and Bar					200,000		200,000	
Willamette River, bank protection	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Pennsylvania:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Bradford	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See Delaware.)								
Johnsonburg	396,000		396,000		396,000		396,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Monongahela River, dam 8		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Presque Isle Peninsula	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Reynoldsville		37,000		37,000		37,000		37,000
Swoyersville-Forty Fort	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Williamsport	278,000		278,000		278,000		278,000	
Rhode Island: Woonsocket		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
South Carolina:								
Charleston Harbor	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Port Royal Sound to Beaufort			250,000		500,000		500,000	
South Dakota:								
Fort Randall Reservoir	7,860,000		5,860,000		5,860,000		5,860,000	
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
McCook Lake					150,000		150,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
Oahe Reservoir	25,000,000		25,000,000		25,000,000		25,000,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Sioux Falls					400,000		400,000	
Tennessee:								
Cheatham lock and dam	6,360,000		6,360,000		6,360,000		6,360,000	
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
Old Hickory lock and dam	5,475,000		5,475,000		5,475,000		5,475,000	
Texas:								
Buffalo Bayou		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Canyon Reservoir		60,000		60,000	340,000	60,000	340,000	60,000
Corpus Christi Bridge	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Dallas Floodway	2,690,000		2,690,000		2,690,000		2,690,000	
Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir	2,450,000		2,450,000		2,450,000		2,450,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Galveston district):								
Guadalupe River channel to Victoria		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000
Houston ship channel:								
36-foot project	500,000		500,000		1,000,000		750,000	
McGee Bend Dam			1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)								
Navarro Mills Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (*See* Arkansas.)								
San Antonio		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Texarkana Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
Waco Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Utah: Salt Lake City		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000
Vermont: Wrightsville Reservoir (modification)		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Virginia:								
Deep Creek					150,000		150,000	
Norfolk Harbor: Craney Island disposal area	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
Norfolk & Portsmouth Belt Line RR. bridge	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Virginia Beach	235,000		235,000		235,000		235,000	
Winter Harbor					150,000		150,000	
Washington:								
Chief Joseph Dam	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
Columbia River local protection, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington: Randle, Wash		3,000		3,000		3,000		3,000
Colfax		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Eagle Gorge Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River:								
Dredge extension 30-foot channel, new turning basin			421,800		421,800		421,800	
Point Chehalis	120,000		120,000		120,000		120,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam					1,000,000		1,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Shilshole Bay		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Tacoma Harbor					646,200		646,200	
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
West Virginia:								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
Hildebrand lock and dam					1,000,000		1,000,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Summersville Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Sutton Reservoir			1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Wisconsin:								
Cornucopia Harbor					230,000		230,000	
Sheboygan Harbor					218,000		218,000	
Wyoming:								
Greybull	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Jackson Hole, Snake River		55,000		55,000		55,000		55,000
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	600,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
Emergency bank protection								
Snagging and clearing	300,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		171,000		171,000		208,000		171,000
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		4,000,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
Total	361,275,000	5,000,000	366,294,800	5,068,000			394,531,000	5,742,000
Lower Columbia River fish-sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	1,400,000		1,400,000		900,000		900,000	
Program total, construction, general	362,675,000	5,000,000	367,694,800	5,068,000	404,969,000	6,304,000	395,431,000	5,742,000
Savings on completed projects to be applied to approved program			−2,800,000	−68,000				
Grand total, construction, general			364,894,800	5,000,000	404,969,000	6,304,000	395,431,000	5,742,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Operation and Maintenance: The conferees agreed on $83,030,000 instead of $83,560,000 as passed the Senate and $82,500,000 as passed the House.

General Expense: On General Expense the conferees recommend $9,300,000 in lieu of $9,400,000 as passed the Senate and $9,200,000 as passed the House.

Mississippi River and Tributaries: The conferees recommend $51,962,500 for Mississippi River and Tributaries which is an even split between the amount for this item as passed the House and as passed the Senate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the committee for its splendid work on the bill, particularly in retaining in the bill the item for the Yellowtail project in Montana, and the Owl Creek project in Wyoming. I am very much interested in the Yellowtail project, because I hope it will provide some power for my State which needs it very badly at the moment. I have been associated for a number of years with both distinguished Senators from Montana in working for the Yellowtail project.

Of course, I am very much interested in the Owl Creek project, for which the bill carries an item of $900,000 to commence construction of that project.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana was instrumental in writing into the bill the item for the Owl Creek project. The people of that area are very appreciative of his effective work.

An appropriation was made for that project a number of years ago, but, because of some difficulty with respect to the 160-acre limitation provision, the money was used elsewhere. Inasmuch as we have been able to secure the enactment of legislation which corrects the situation with respect to the limitation on privately owned land in the area, it is now possible to go ahead with the Owl Creek project with the unanimous support of all the people of that area.

Therefore, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his fine work, and also to thank the other members of the committee for the efforts they put forth to get the bill through in such good shape.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very grateful to my good friend from Wyoming. I wish to say also that we provided funds for Ice Harbor. There are 2 or 3 projects in the Snake River Basin which, in my judgment, should be considered as early as possible. Among those is Bruces Eddy. My good friend from Idaho succeeded in placing in the bill a provision which would have had the effect of authorizing the planning of that project, but the House would not agree to that provision. It is my hope that the Committees on Public Works of both Houses will consider this worthy project when they take up the next public works bill, and that they will include the project in an authorization bill so that money at least for planning can be provided at an early date.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to bring to the Senator's attention a request for approximately $240,000 to construct a transmission line from the Yellowtail Dam site in Montana to Lovell, Wyo. About 2 years ago the Bureau of Reclamation erected the poles and crossarms, and bought the wire. All that is needed at the present time is about $240,000 to string the wires, so that power can be transmitted from Montana into our State, where it is needed very badly. If a supplemental appropriation bill is taken up later I hope the amount can be included in that bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to give assurance to my good friend from Wyoming that that matter is being considered. An effort will be made to include an appropriation for that purpose in the bill which is now before the House.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REPORT ON CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE MAILING OF PUBLICATIONS OF CHURCHES AND CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 833, H. R. 4585.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4585) to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, H. R. 4585 amends the act of August 24, 1912, to permit churches and church organizations to mail their publications under second-class rates—the rates now applicable—without the necessity of maintaining subscription lists separate from their membership lists.

Enactment of H. R. 4585 would have no effect on postal revenues but would remove a hardship currently imposed on churches and church organizations. This would place churches and church organizations in the same status with respect to rate requirements as institutions of learning, trade unions, benevolent societies, and other similar organizations now provided for in the act of August 24, 1912, as amended.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who desires to address the Senate, has been very generous with his colleagues this afternoon. He has permitted discussion of the conference report on the public works appropriation bill to continue without interruption. Certainly I would not wish to make any statement with respect to the pending bill until after the Senator from Vermont has had an opportunity to address the Senate.

PROBLEMS BUT NO CRISIS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the graciousness of the acting majority leader. This is not the first time that similar sentiments have been expressed and acted upon on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. President, the newspapers recently have been trying to work up a difference of opinion between the President and Secretary Dulles. The Secretary is supposed to believe that Soviet affairs are in such a critical condition that they feel a top conference to be necessary, and that they would be negotiating from weakness. In opposition, the President is reported as not appearing to think that we can count on so favorable an approach to the agenda of the conference.

As I see it the rulers of the Soviet are not being driven to negotiation by a collapse of their policies, foreign or domestic. Rather, perhaps, they are getting a truer picture of the facts of life and are intelligently adjusting themselves to it. Growing realization of difficulties rather than sudden crisis explains whatever "new mood" they may seem to display.

It is true that the Soviet endeavor to split Western Germany from the Allies has failed. Yet it is also true that the rearming of Germany is running into trouble with the Germans themselves, many millions of whom abhor the military system which led their nation to defeat in two world wars, and who distrust the formation once more of a national army, with all the chances and mischances of a new general staff on the old lines.

It is true that the people of the satellite countries are sullen and noncooperative, but the revolt in East Germany was quickly put down, and any future uprising can be controlled with similar ruthlessness.

It is true that the scale of living among their own people is low, that promises of improvement are indefinitely deferred and that no great or immediate improvement is in sight. Yet the Russian people have always lived under tyranny and have always suffered as a result. There is no expectation that they will revolt. Should they do so their endeavor would end in failure.

Except perhaps in agriculture, there is no crisis. The Soviet Government is not being driven by dire necessity to a new willingness to negotiate. In my judgment that new willingness arises from a correspondingly new willingness to face facts.

This reminds me of a story. The town of Concord, Mass., was the home of a group of philosophers who called themselves transcendentalists. Among them was one lady philosopher, Margaret Fuller by name, who one day announced "I accept the universe." Emerson reported this announcement in a letter to Carlyle. He replied, "By gad, she'd better." Maybe our Soviet friends are "accepting the universe."

Communism has gone as far as it can on its present road. It leads to nowhere. There is nothing in sight except more of the same. This situation is not one which intelligent, ambitious men would rejoice to accept. They are looking for further achievement, but they are not in critical present trouble.

We will therefore make a serious mistake if we negotiate under the delusion that a crisis of some sort has driven the Soviet leadership to Geneva. Instead, practical self-interest has led them there. Practical self-interest will guide their negotiations there. They can successfully be met only by a corresponding intelligence on our part.

It would be most unintelligent to assume that they are dealing from weakness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Jersey has likewise been a fine cooperator in the chamber this afternoon, and I certainly would not wish to go forward with the pending business until after he has had an opportunity to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

RESIGNATION OF MRS. OVETA CULP HOBBY AS SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few moments concerning the bad news which we received this afternoon of the resignation of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby because of the severe illness of her husband.

Mr. President, it was with deep regret that we learned officially this morning of the resignation of Mrs. Hobby as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am sure that despite the burdens of her high office she is leaving the magnificent team the President has assembled with great reluctance.

I know that all of us can well appreciate her devotion to her distinguished husband, Governor Hobby, whose illness necessitates her leaving the Cabinet post which she has filled so ably. As Mrs. Hobby returns to Texas, our prayers and best wishes for the speedy recovery of the Governor go with her.

The record Mrs. Hobby is leaving behind as the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is one of striking and enduring accomplishment. Her imagination, dedication, and persistence have revitalized the many and varied programs under her direction and molded them into sound patterns for the years to come.

Among the most important, certainly, was the establishment of the Department and its organization. For the first time in the Nation's history, the important programs of health, of education, and of welfare, which are the Department's responsibilities, have representation in the President's Cabinet. For the first time in our history the needs and the aspirations of the American people for a better life for their children and a reasonable security with the advancing years have important recognition in the highest council of the executive branch of the Government. Mrs. Hobby, originally serving as Federal Security Administrator, played a major role in developing the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1, which established the Department. And in those important first months she transformed the abstract conception of a Department of Government into an inspired, vibrant, living organization.

Secretary Hobby set out on a thoroughgoing review of her Department's many and various programs to see whether they were, in fact, truly responsive to the desires of the American people as expressed through the Congress. Were they accomplishing the purposes for which they were set up? Were they suited to the conditions of modern life? Did they represent inordinate interference by the Federal Government within the States?

In order to carry out this review, Secretary Hobby enlisted the aid of task forces made up of consultants from within Government and from outside Government—men and women equipped to bring to the problems a fresh and objective view of the programs.

SOCIAL SECURITY

On the recommendation of Secretary Hobby and by action of the Congress, social security has been greatly expanded and strengthened. In 1955, 10 million more Americans, and their families, became eligible for coverage; retired workers, widows, and dependent children gained improved benefits. As a result the social structure of the Nation gained in stability and strength.

HEALTH

In the highly important field of health, Secretary Hobby recommended to the President, who forwarded to the Congress, a needed expansion of the Federal-State-local hospital building program. In 1955, the added construction provided for in this legislation will see the building of badly needed chronic-disease hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and medical rehabilitation centers. This new construction—for which the Congress authorized $182 million over the next 3 years in addition to the regular annual authorization of $150 million—will provide more beds at lower cost to the Nation and to the States and local communities who share in the plan.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The vocational rehabilitation program has been radically revised and improved under Mrs. Hobby's direction. As a result many thousands of our disabled who would otherwise have remained unrehabilitated will be restored to happier, more useful, and more productive lives.

Other proposals in the field of health concerning which the Congress has not taken action, such as the plan for reinsurance of hospitalization and medical-care plans, a program for practical and professional nurse training and expanded grants for mental health—all of which are included in an omnibus health bill submitted by the Department—attest to the concern of Secretary Hobby for the health needs of our people.

EDUCATION

To aid the States and local communities in developing action programs to meet school needs, the Secretary recommended and President Eisenhower requested Federal funds to aid in financing a series of State conferences on education which will culminate this fall in the White House Conference on Education.

While it is expected that this conference will lay the foundation for a long-range solution of our educational needs, President Eisenhower, early in this session, recommended to the Congress that it adopt a program for emergency aid to school construction developed by the Department under Mrs. Hobby. This program, if enacted and fully utilized, would, over the next 3 years, make possible the joining of local State and Federal resources amounting to $7 billion, which would result in approximately 200,000 new classrooms to house nearly 6 million children.

FOOD AND DRUGS

Within the past 10 days a task group which Secretary Hobby assigned to study and make recommendations for improved administration of Food and Drug activities has made a report which will be invaluable to the Department and to Congress in insuring better protection of the health of the American consumer.

THE POLIO PROBLEM

Mr. President, under adverse and very trying conditions, Mrs. Hobby, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and especially the Public Health

Service have assumed their difficult responsibilities growing out of the dramatic discovery of the Salk vaccine for poliomyelitis.

Refusing to be precipitated into a hasty program of Federal regimentation, Mrs. Hobby and her advisers, with the full cooperation of the doctors, vaccine manufacturers, and distributors, worked out a program of voluntary distribution which promises maximum effectiveness and retains our basic American principle of non-Federal control of the doctor-patient relationship.

I am especially happy to note that only yesterday the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare voted unanimously to report a bill to assist the States in providing an opportunity for all children to receive the benefits of the Salk vaccine. This bill, by conforming to existing public-health grants, follows the consistent position of the Secretary that there is no reason to upset the established public-health practices in taking care of the Salk vaccine problem.

MRS. HOBBY'S CAREER

Mrs. Hobby's distinguished service as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has capped an outstanding career of public service.

Her early interest in the legislative process was, as many Senators know, gained from going to Austin at the age of 14 with her father when he served in the House of Representatives of the State of Texas. Later she codified the banking laws for the Texas banking commission and served on the staff of the judiciary committee of the State legislature. Before she could vote, Mrs. Hobby had been appointed parliamentarian of the Texas Legislature, in which position her knowledge of parliamentary procedure soon became such that she wrote a textbook on the subject.

Mrs. Hobby was never out of public life after her early association with the Texas Legislature. As a staff member and later an executive of a great newspaper, she was always close to governmental affairs. She served for a time also as secretary of the Texas League of Women Voters and was later its president. Mrs. Hobby is thus among the many women whose membership in this thriving organization contributed so greatly to a sounder basis for widespread participation in our civic and political affairs.

Mrs. Hobby first came to national attention in 1942, when she was appointed Director of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. The following year she became a full colonel, heading the Women's Army Corps, her leadership having been in large part responsible for shortening the name of the corps and increasing greatly the range of its responsibilities.

After the war, and after receiving the Distinguished Service Medal of our Government and the Military Merit Medal of the Government of the Philippines, Mrs. Hobby returned to Houston, her family, and her husband's newspaper. She did not wholly return to private life, however.

She served as a consultant to the first Hoover Commission and as a director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. She became also a member of the Advisory Committee on Women in the Services for the Department of Defense; a member of the National Advisory Council of the American Cancer Society; a member of the board of directors of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; and a member of the board of governors of the American National Red Cross.

Mr. President, I desire to close these remarks with a personal word. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as chairman of that committee during the first 2 years of President Eisenhower's administration, I have had the great privilege of working with Mrs. Hobby in the development of some of these important welfare problems.

I have been deeply impressed not only with Mrs. Hobby's wonderful ability and clarity of expression in presenting the matters with which she has been concerned, but also and especially with the great human interest she has put into the work of the Department. Mrs. Hobby believes in people, she loves people, and she is thinking in terms of the welfare of all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, it is the greatest regret to me that we have lost this great public servant, and Mrs. Smith and I join with Mrs. Hobby's many well wishers as she returns to her native State of Texas.

I am deeply gratified with the news that the President is appointing Mr. Marion B. Folsom, Under Secretary of the Treasury, to assume this new Cabinet post. We all wish for Mr. Folsom the greatest measure of success as he undertakes his new duties, and, of course, we offer to him our full and wholehearted cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mrs. Hobby's letter of resignation, sent to the President today, and the reply by the President accepting Mrs. Hobby's resignation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Personal reasons of a high order compel me to take leave of my post as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Only such reasons could persuade me to leave your administration or the responsibilities of the Department, and if agreeable, I would like to make August 1 the effective date of my resignation.

The period of 30 months which I have spent in Government in your administration has been a richly rewarding experience, for public service provides the greatest compensation of all—the satisfaction of working for the betterment of mankind. I am grateful to have had such an opportunity and have deep regrets in relinquishing it now, no matter how compelling are my reasons for doing so.

The privilege has been all the more rewarding to me because I have had the unique opportunity of being associated with a man whose life has been devoted to his country, and whose principles of individual liberty and human freedom are the highest expression of what we in the United States cherish for our Nation and for people everywhere.

Your concern for the health, education, and welfare of the American people has been an inspiration to all of us who have had the privilege of serving under your dedicated leadership.

Wherever I am, I shall hope to further the ideals and principles to which you have given meaning and emphasis.

May God bless you and give you courage and strength as you continue to serve us.

Faithfully yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

DEAR OVETA: This is one of the hardest letters I have ever had to write.

For months, since you first discussed them with me, I have recognized that personal obligations and responsibilities might make your resignation as Secretary an inescapable decision. I now have no alternative than to accept it, effective August 1. But I and all who know you as a dedicated, inspired American leader will miss your voice and counsel in Government.

Twice, in little more than a decade, you have earned the thanks and respect of your fellow citizens. Few—men or women—have brought to heavy tasks and critical challenges such great spirit, integrity, and vision or such readiness to spend energy and high talent in the country's service.

Under your command in the Second World War, the Women's Army Corps opened a new field of service for American women. From the very outset of its organization, they demonstrated their value and capacity in the most trying circumstances. More than a hundred thousand women, led by you, proved themselves—in their devotion to duty and in their contribution to victory—worthy comrades of our fighting men.

In this administration, as the first Secretary of the newly created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, you organized into an integrated program many units and agencies of Government. Great qualities of leadership were essential. You brought them to your mission along with a perseverance, a wise patience, a deep understanding of the personal problems of our people, and a dedication that difficulties could not shake. You made the heart in Government a visible fact and an effective influence.

We are still too close to the beginning of the new Department to see fully and in a wide perspective all that you have accomplished. But I know that history will hail you in this field, too, as a courageous pioneer in the service of your country.

In official Washington, many thousands as well as I will miss you. On the personal side, none will miss you more than Mrs. Eisenhower and myself. But all of us know that wherever you go, whatever you do, every talent you have will be at work for the good of America.

With affectionate regard to you and Governor Hobby,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind and appropriate words of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] concerning the resignation of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I hasten to add my expression of regret because of the resignation and especially because of the reason therefor. I refer to the illness of her husband, the distinguished former Governor of Texas and publisher of the Houston Post, the Honorable W. P. Hobby.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Mrs. Hobby for the service she has rendered both in war and in peace. Even those who have engaged in criticism during recent months will be among the first to recognize and acknowledge that her patriotic devotion and service to the country has had few equals in the history of our Nation.

Mrs. Hobby will be missed by the administration, and as she returns home to Texas I extend on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson], our sincere good wishes and our hope that Governor Hobby will improve far beyond present expectations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Daniel] with respect to Mrs. Hobby.

It is always a sad occasion when any public servant leaves office. I think it is particularly sad in this instance, because personal reasons pertaining to her family have caused Mrs. Hobby to leave office at a time when I feel certain she herself desired to continue the good work she has been doing.

On this occasion I wish to pay tribute to her, because during the past few months I have had the opportunity, through my membership upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to work with Mrs. Hobby and to see, as it has been put so often, the "stuff" of which she is made.

I realize that there has been a great hue and cry about various portions of the polio vaccine program. Yet I must say in tribute to Mrs. Hobby that, despite the hue and cry and all the emotionalism which was bound to be associated with it, and in which each of us parents must share, Secretary Hobby was able to keep her head and to keep foremost before her that which was always most important, that which many persons still do not recognize, namely, the safety of the American children.

I am sure hundreds of thousands of other parents would, if they were here today, join me in thanks for the part she played in assuring the American public that, first of all, this was a safe program, and one which you, Mr. President, I, and all parents could advise their children to participate in, and could advise their friends to participate in. Her statement that there was no reason to upset the established public health practices in taking care of the Salk vaccine program is a succinct, simple, and plain statement of fact.

Therefore, with my colleagues, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Mrs. Hobby upon this occasion, and to thank her with, I am sure, hundreds of thousands of other parents for her fine devotion to her task, which did not permit her to be stampeded into a maelstrom of emotionalism, but which kept before her mind and before the American people the fundamental duty which she assumed when she took her oath as Secretary. We all owe her thanks upon this occasion, and I am happy to pay my thanks and render my tribute to her.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it was with regret that I learned today that Mrs. Hobby has found it necessary, because of the ill health of her husband, to resign as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mrs. Hobby has rendered commendable service as Secretary of this vast and most important Department of our Government. There are many phases of its administrative responsibility such as the health, welfare, and education of our people and the regulatory responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee who served on the subcommittee with the specific responsibility for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's appropriation, I was impressed with her administrative understanding and knowledge of this Department.

It is regrettable that Mrs. Hobby must retire as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will be a great loss. Mrs. Hobby, as the first Secretary of this Department, has organized it well and has laid an excellent foundation for others to build on. Her administrative ability has won her recognition throughout her long public career, first in the military service and then as first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am very sorry Mrs. Hobby has resigned her position as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The unfortunate political controversy which arose in connection with the Salk vaccine program has obscured the excellent work which Mrs. Hobby has done for the country. By reorganizing her Department, she contributed materially to the improvement of its efficiency and to the expansion of its work.

I hope she will remain actively interested in public service, and I know the Nation wishes her well.

I never knew a more conscientious public servant than Mrs. Hobby. I am a Republican, and she is a Democrat, but I say she has done excellent work. She has been criticized in connection with the Salk vaccine program for things for which she was not responsible. She did her work well and rendered valuable service.

On the floor of the Senate some Senators tried to attack her for the part she played in that matter, but she can stand up against any of them so far as her performance and fine quality of service are concerned.

SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE MAILING OF PUBLICATIONS OF CHURCHES AND CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4585) to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF BONDS COVERING EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 834, H. R. 4778.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 14 of title 6 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 14. Purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government

"The heads of the departments and independent establishments of the Government (including the government of the District of Columbia) shall, and the appropriate officials of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government may, obtain blanket, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds covering civilian officers and employees, and military personnel thereof, required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. Each bond shall be of the most economical type available for the number and type of personnel required to be bonded. The bond premium may cover a period not exceeding 2 years, and shall be paid from any funds available for the payment of administrative expenses at the time such premium becomes payable. If, in the opinion of the head of the department, or independent establishment concerned, the premium cost for any bond procured under this section covering officers or employees in the executive branch of the Government will exceed a rate of $250 per annum, procurement shall be made through the Administrator of General Services when so required by him pursuant to section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252)."

Sec. 2. The analysis of title 6 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 1 of such title, is amended by striking out the item "14. Rate of premium on bond; premiums not to be paid by United States.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"14. Purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government."

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect 60 days following the date of its enactment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, H. R. 4778, as amended, authorizes the heads of departments and agencies of the Government to purchase bonds for officers and employees out of appropriated funds.

At the hearings held by the committee in its consideration of this measure, it was testified that it would be cheaper for all concerned, and in the best interest of the Government, for bonds to be purchased on a blanket basis by the Government instead of individually for each employee. The Post Office Department representatives testified that administrative costs of keeping records of over 1 million individual bonds is in excess of what it would cost the department to purchase and pay for a blanket bond for all its employees.

Enactment of the pending bill is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Comptroller General, and the bill was reported unanimously by the committee. I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government."

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 128

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 839, Senate Resolution 128, authorizing additional funds to the Committee on Foreign Relations, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT FOLLOWING TODAY'S SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President and the President protempore be authorized, during the adjournment following today's session, to sign enrolled bill H. R. 6766, the public works appropriation bill for 1956, or any other duly enrolled bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order authorizing the signing of H. R. 6766, the Public Works appropriation bill, and other bills, be rescinded, and that the present Presiding Officer [Mr. BIBLE] be authorized to sign such bills as Acting President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., DURING CAPITAL TRANSIT CO. STRIKE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, sometimes there is a tendency to criticize the Police Department of this or any other city. Perhaps sometimes the police departments deserve criticism, although I believe that many times they do not deserve the criticism they receive.

This afternoon, Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues and to the public in general that, in my opinion, the Washington Police Department as a whole has rendered unusually outstanding service in connection with the handling of traffic during the streetcar and bus strike.

I know that all of us use our automobiles morning and evening. Perhaps a great many of us get to our offices earlier than the rush-hour time. Certainly most of us do not leave until after the rush is over. But on the many occasions when we have been caught in the rush of traffic in the morning and evening during the difficult situation occasioned by the strike, we have found that the Washington police, at great sacrifice to themselves, by working overtime, on hot streets, and with an irritated public, have manifested outstanding courtesy and efficiency in handling traffic.

I merely wish to pay tribute to their zeal and devotion to public duty, and the administrative way in which the problem has been handled up to this point.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Iowa in what he has said about the Police Department of the District of Columbia. I served on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for 8 years. I know how handicapped the police department is at the present time in regard to funds and the ability to employ the number of officers needed to maintain public order in the District of Columbia. The police have certainly rendered wonderful service. That is understood more particularly when we realize they have done so with the small force the department has at the present time.

CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL RESERVES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 838, H. R. 7066.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7066) to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal reserves through measures of flood control and anthracite mine damage, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending measure, H. R. 7066. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide not to exceed $8½ million, on a 50–50 matching fund basis, to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in support of a program to check and reduce the flooding of the Nation's principal reserve of anthracite coal.

Relevant data submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have demonstrated that the increasing burden of disposing of encroaching waters is adversely affecting the economy of the anthracite coal industry to an extent that endangers the national security of the Nation.

In 1944, it was necessary to pump 14 tons of water for every ton of anthracite coal produced. In 1954, that ratio had increased to 56 tons of water pumped for every 1 ton of coal mined.

As a result, mine after mine has closed and hundreds of miners have been thrown out of employment, with resultant distress area declarations by the appropriate governmental agencies.

The committee agrees with the declaration of the Department of the Interior, in the favorable report of that Department on the proposed legislation that "it seems prudent national policy to assist in preserving this basic natural resource of the Nation which is concentrated in this area."

I further call attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

Mr. President, the appropriation which would be authorized by the bill is small, when compared with the value of the vast natural resources it will help to save. I urge its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7066) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 835, House bill 1619.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1619) to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, any person in the active service having insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan, the term of which expires while the person is in the active service after April 25, 1951, may replace such insurance at any time within the 120-day period after separation from service during which he is covered by indemnity protection. However, if the insurance expires after separation from service, even though within the 120-day period of indemnity coverage, it may not be replaced. Section 1 of this bill would amend section 5 of the Indemnity Act to correct what appears to have been an oversight in the basic law.

The bill as approved by the committee would assure that those cases in which the 5-year term period expired during the 120-day period after discharge and such period has now elapsed, would have 120 days within which to replace their term insurance, if application is made within 120 days after enactment of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1619) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEFINITION OF "STEPCHILD" AND "STEPPARENT" RELATING TO SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 836, House bill 6419.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6419) to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended, which provides for the payment of a maximum amount of free indemnity of $92.90 monthly for a period of 10 years to certain survivors.

The bill would require that the stepchild be a member of the insured's household, unless designated as beneficiary by the insured.

It would also require that a stepparent, unless designated as the beneficiary, show that he stood in loco parentis to the insured prior to the latter's attainment of 21 years of age and for a period of not less than 1 year prior to his entry into active service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6419) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEE IN TOTAL-DISABILITY SUITS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 837, House bill 6832.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6832) to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this bill amends section 500 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, to provide that in any suit brought by an insured during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability, the court as a part of its judgment or decree shall determine and allow a reasonable fee to be paid by the insured to his attorney.

The present law bars the payment of any fee in excess of 10 percent of the amount recovered and provides that this amount shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the payments to be made under the judgment or decree at a rate not exceeding one-tenth of each such payment until paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6832) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 840, House bill 1617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1617) to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 2, line 18, after the word "clause", to insert a comma and "except that premiums shall not be automatically waived with respect to any policy where the amount of the dividend earned would exceed the amount of the premium waived:"."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, many individuals who had national service life insurance were either prisoners of war, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or otherwise in such a condition as to prevent their making application in writing for the waiver of this insurance premium. This bill is to correct the situation described above by providing that any insured, as provided in the Missing Persons Act, who has been in the status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged at any time after April 25, 1951, and before April 26, 1952, shall be entitled to the waiver of premiums on term insurance and that portion of the permanent insurance premium which represents pure insurance risk. Application for this waiver must be made within 120 days after date of enactment of this clause or the date of his return to military jurisdiction, whichever is the later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 842, House bill 4946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4946) to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provides for unemployment compensation to the veterans of the Korean conflict under the State system but in no case in an amount less than $26 a week or to continue longer than 26 weeks. There is no terminal date, however, for this legislation other than the one established by the President's proclamation of last January, ending eligibility for certain benefits for Korean veterans, which provides that there shall be no unemployment compensation paid after January 31, 1960. Legislation of this general type was requested in the President's budget message of January 17, 1955.

The bill as reported by the committee provides that no unemployment compensation shall be paid for any week commencing more than 3 years after the effective date of the amendment made by the bill or 3 years after the effective date of the discharge or release of the person eligible for such a benefit, whichever is the later date. Provision is also made, in line with the President's proclamation, that no unemployment compensation shall be paid under this title for any period after January 31, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4946) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR APPLYING FOR MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 844, House bill 5792.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H. R. 5792), to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to extend, for an additional 2-year period, the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments by Korean-war veterans. Many veterans of the Korean conflict were discharged before the date of enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—July 16, 1952—and thus did not receive their payments at the time of their release from the service.

The purpose of this bill is to provide an opportunity for these Korean conflict veterans to apply for this benefit on or before July 16, 1956. In effect, it is a 2-year extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5792) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 218)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allott in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill was displaced by a motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 700, Senate bill 2391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators at this time to the fact that even though Senate bill 2391 has been made the unfinished business, it is not the intention of the acting majority leader to bring the bill up for consideration tomorrow. It is our hope that it will be brought up for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

I wish to announce at this time the program for tomorrow.

It is the intention of the acting majority leader to call up first tomorrow Senate Resolution 127, which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Knowland], who was joined by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. George]; the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley]; and the acting majority leader.

Following that, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to bring up House Concurrent Resolution 149, which passed the House on a yea-and-nay vote by a unanimous vote. I do not recall the exact vote. It was 360 or 370, or perhaps 380. However, the vote was unanimous.

Should these two measures be disposed of tomorrow, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to bring up House bill 7000, the military reserve bill reported by the Armed Services Committee today. Although there may be some differences with respect to certain sections of the bill, the bill was reported unanimously from the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. Hill, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2501. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis; without amendment (Rept. No. 839).

TRADE WITH IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to two statements in the periodical press for the week of June 27 which, if they are accurate, indicate extraordinarily contradictory action on the part of two departments within the administration so far as trade with Iron Curtain countries is concerned.

The first clipping is taken from Time magazine of June 27, 1955. It points out that the Willys-Overland Export Corp., which, apparently by subterfuge, had shipped 100 jeeps from this country to Rumania, first had its export privileges suspended for 2 months and then was put on probation by the Commerce Department.

The second clipping is from Business Week of June 25. It describes the commercial negotiations which may be underway between the United States and Soviet Russia. One paragraph states:

> Last week the Commerce Department granted a license for the shipment of 500 Chevrolets to Bulgaria—something that wouldn't have happened a year or two ago.

I am at a loss to understand how it is illegal for the Willys-Overland Co. to ship 100 jeeps to Rumania, behind the Iron Curtain, and how it can be perfectly legal for General Motors to ship 500 Chevrolets to Bulgaria. Bulgaria and Rumania are on an identical footing, in that they are both Iron Curtain countries, and both of them, presumably, would have been granted legitimate self-government by the provisions of the Yalta agreement if those provisions had not been disregarded by Soviet Russia.

There may be an explanation for this inconsistency. It is possible that since the shipment of Willys-Overland jeeps was made earlier, the sale may have fallen under an earlier interpretation. However, it is extraordinary that in the same week one company is penalized for shipping 100 jeeps to Rumania, behind the Iron Curtain, and another company, General Motors—which is in a rather intimate relationship with the administration—is given permission to ship 500 automobiles to Bulgaria, also behind the Iron Curtain.

I ask unanimous consent to have the clippings printed in the Record at this point in my remarks, and I request that the appropriate committee of the Senate investigate the matter; and that the Department of Commerce be invited to make a reply to the query which I have raised.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Time magazine of June 27, 1955]

Foreign Trade

THE CASE OF THE 100 JEEPS

In the 7 years since Washington put a ban on the sale of war-useful materials to Iron Curtain countries, there has been many an attempt to evade the embargo, chiefly by foreign firms. Last week Washington revealed the first case involving a major United States firm—the Commerce Department had caught

Willys-Overland Export Corp. in a deal that landed 100 of its jeeps behind the Iron Curtain.

It began 2 years ago when the trading firm of Les Fils de Basile Obegi, of Syria, placed an order with a New York export house for 100 four-wheel-drive jeeps (which cannot legally be exported to Iron Curtain countries). The jeeps' purported destination was Beirut, where a merchant named Jean Maghamez supposedly wanted them for local farmers. Willys-Overland Export Corp., of Toledo, cabled its Syrian dealer, Levant Motors, to investigate the $150,000 order. Levant Motors discovered that Consignee Maghamez was just a front man, and replied that it suspected Les Fils de Basile Obegi was planning to reexport the jeeps to Rumania. The auto firm, however, said nothing to the Commerce Department.

On October 30, 1953, the jeeps arrived in Beirut and less than a week later they were aboard an Italian freighter bound for Constanta, Rumania. One of the widespread army of Commerce Department informers spotted the 100 crates being transshipped and informed the United States Embassy, which wired Washington.

Last week the Bureau of Foreign Commerce suspended Willys-Overland Export Corp. from export privileges for 2 months, then commuted the sentence to probation for 6 months.

[From Business Week of June 25, 1955]

INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK

Ask Washington officials if the United States will put trade on the bargaining table at Geneva and they will give you a flat no. They say that President Eisenhower has no intention of using this particular leverage on Premier Bulganin.

Still, it's a safe bet that at some stage of the East-West talks the question of trade will be a bargaining counter. And that means Soviet bloc trade with the United States, as well as with Western Europe and Japan.

There are these straws in the wind:

Britain's Eden apparently intends to put his emphasis on world trade when he makes his opening statement at Geneva. (Eisenhower reportedly will stress Germany and France's Faure disarmament.)

Eisenhower's Council on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Joseph M. Dodge, is taking a careful look at East-West trade. It is examining the whole question of strategic controls, including the embargo on trade with Red China.

Last week the Commerce Department granted a license for the shipment of 500 Chevrolets to Bulgaria—something that wouldn't have happened a year or two ago.

Big American companies, especially those with long experience in world trade, think they feel a changing wind. They expect to see trade channels gradually opened through the Iron Curtain as political differences are settled.

No doubt the Communists will ask to have Western trade controls pretty completely dismantled.

That won't happen, of course. The United States will keep some kind of control regulations as long as the Communists remain a real military threat.

But you can expect the controls to be whittled away. The process started last August, when the Europeans got us to agree to cut the embargo list down by half. And it will go a lot further in the next year.

That still will leave two big hurdles in the way of East-West trade: (1) the shortage of exportable goods in the Soviet bloc; and (2) the difficulty of doing business with Communist state-trading systems.

One thing might produce a sensational break in the whole East-West trade picture—a disastrous harvest in Russia and eastern Europe.

That could force Moscow to come to the United States and Canada for grain. In that case, the whole process of achieving an East-West settlement would move faster than today's most optimistic estimate (p. 32).

THE CAPITAL TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make a report about the Capital Transit strike emergency which confronts the District of Columbia.

Yesterday the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], conducted a hearing on the matter. One of our principal witnesses was the chairman of the board of directors of Capital Transit Co., Mr. Louis E. Wolfson. I believe the Senate will be interested in having the RECORD disclose what the essence of Mr. Wolfson's position in the matter is, as brought out by his testimony.

First, let me point out that Mr. Wolfson took exactly the same position which the president of his company, Mr. Broadwater, has taken before the committee, which is adamant opposition to voluntary arbitration of the dispute.

The RECORD should show that the union, from the very beginning, has been willing to submit the dispute over wages and hours and conditions of employment to voluntary arbitration. The record is clear that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has urged arbitration upon the company. Likewise, it is clear that the District Commissioners have urged arbitration, and that the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, which is considering the matter has urged the parties to accept voluntary arbitration.

Therefore it should be perfectly clear that the responsibility for failure to follow the well-recognized peaceful procedure of voluntary arbitration for the settlement of the dispute rests squarely upon the shoulders of the officials of the Capital Transit Co.

The subcommittee thought it was very important that it have Mr. Wolfson appear before it, to determine his position on the strike. We felt that until the chairman of the board of directors himself had advised us of his position we could not be certain that we had exhausted all possibilities in seeking to obtain the acceptance of voluntary arbitration for the settlement of the dispute.

The record shows we had great difficulty over a period of days in locating Mr. Wolfson. Because so much has appeared in the press about the matter, and because some misunderstanding exists as to the position taken by the subcommittee, it is only fair to the Senate that the subcommittee make clear this afternoon the procedure it followed with regard to having Mr. Wolfson appear before it.

The members of the subcommittee are the agents of the Senate, and we stand ready and willing at all times to have our actions judged by the Senate.

On July 1, which was the first day of the strike, the subcommittee directed its general counsel, Mr. William Gulledge, to communicate by telephone with Mr. Broadwater, the president of the Capital Transit Co., to determine if Mr. Broadwater could advise us where we could reach Mr. Wolfson. Mr. Broadwater told Mr. Gulledge—and there is no denial of this statement by Mr. Broadwater—that he did not know where Mr. Wolfson could be reached.

Mr. Gulledge made it very clear to Mr. Broadwater that he would like to have Mr. Broadwater communicate with Mr. Wolfson and advise Mr. Wolfson that his presence was desired before the subcommittee for the taking of testimony on the strike on the following Thursday at 10:30 a. m.

Mr. Broadwater made it very clear that he could not give any assurance that he could reach Mr. Wolfson.

Under the circumstances, and in keeping with what we considered to be the committee's very clear public duty, the subcommittee unanimously voted to have a subpena issued which would seek to bring Mr. Wolfson before the subcommittee on Thursday at 10:30 a. m.

However, it developed that the United States marshals in Los Angeles could not locate Mr. Wolfson. As days went by, it became perfectly clear that his presence could not be obtained for the hearing on Thursday. Then the subcommittee unanimously voted to have a so-called produce forthwith subpena issued, and that was issued.

Then for a few more days what might be described as a game of hide and seek proceeded. Mr. Wolfson was finally located at the Beverly-Wilshire Hotel in Beverly Hills, Calif., and the subpena was served. That subpena brought him before the subcommittee yesterday.

I make that very brief statement with the assurance to the Senate that at no time during that period of days could we obtain from the president of Capital Transit Co. any assurance that Mr. Wolfson could be located and could be produced for a hearing before our subcommittee on a voluntary basis. Therefore the subpena, of course, was clearly mandatory.

I do not think that there can be any argument that it was the duty of the committee, as an agent of the Senate, to obtain the views and the opinions of the chairman of the board of directors in regard to the strike.

He was before us yesterday afternoon, and testified for a period of several hours. The record he made speaks for itself.

I wish to make a few comments on the record, because it seems to me that his own testimony now directs the course of action which the Senate must necessarily follow in order to restore transportation to the District of Columbia. It is testimony which, in my judgment, made him the best witness I could offer in support of my bill which seeks to cancel the franchise now held by the Capital Transit Co., because, in my opinion, his testimony makes it perfectly clear that there is no hope of the government of the District of Columbia ever carrying on successful relationships with this company in the future. In my judgment, the company is going to be the cause of continuing conflict with the District Government, because it is obvious from Mr. Wolfson's testimony that he is motivated by one objective, namely, to take out from this company every dollar of profit he can, and the interest of public service, the interest of the workers, and the interest of the riders are obviously secondary to him. I am perfectly willing to submit his own testimony in proof of that allegation in the case he sought to make for himself yesterday.

He not only testified in opposition to the use of voluntary arbitration for the settlement of this dispute, but the second major point I would make in summarizing his testimony is that he admitted, as did the president of his company, in testimony the other day, that he is satisfied that the workers are entitled to a wage increase.

Neither Mr. Wolfson nor Mr. Broadwater made any statement as to how much the wage increase should be, in their opinion, but both admitted under examination that the workers are entitled to some increase. I would have the Senate keep that in mind, because I think the chances are now probably 9 to 1 that before the present session adjourns we will have to pass some legislation in regard to this transportation crisis in the District of Columbia. As we come to pass such legislation, I think we need to be on guard against adopting any measure which will have the effect of breaking the union or breaking the strike. Certainly, we should not permit Mr. Wolfson and his Capital Transit Co. associates to maneuver the Congress into such a position that it will be functioning as a strikebreaking body, because we have the admission that the workers are entitled to increases in wages.

Mr. Wolfson and Mr. Broadwater did not make any statements which would justify anyone reaching a conclusion as to whether they think the workers are entitled to any benefits over and above a wage increase, although their testimony is clear that they do recognize that the demands of the workers are proper subjects for negotiation, provided certain financial benefits which the company is insisting upon are granted to the company in the first instance.

Mr. President, the third point in summarizing the testimony is that Wolfson takes the position that he, as chairman of the board of directors, is not in a position to intervene in the matter, or to exercise any jurisdiction in the matter, or even to sit down and talk to the officials of the union concerning the strike. Yet, Mr. President, he draws $24,000 a year for expense money, $2,000 a month, for performing whatever duties the chairman of the board of directors may have. It happens to be a very important operative fact in the whole situation, so far as trying to work out a settlement is concerned, that the officials of the union consider him to be really the key to the solution of the deadlock. Yet the chairman of the board of directors takes the position that the matter is entirely in the hands of the president of the company and that he himself cannot exercise any jurisdiction whatsoever.

I think that is a commentary—and I shall say no more about it other than to point out that it is a commentary—on the attitude of these two men. It gives a rather clear indication of the adamancy of the chairman of the board and the president of the company that they will do nothing to settle the dispute until they have been given a bag of money with which to pay any additional costs resulting from a settlement of the strike.

That leads me to the fourth point, Mr. President. The testimony of Mr. Wolfson yesterday makes it perfectly clear that it is his position and it is the position of the president of the company and of the board of directors—and he testified that he agreed with it—that nothing shall be granted the workers in this case until legislation by the Congress or a decision by the Public Utilities Commission shall supply the company with whatever additional revenue will be needed in order to cover the cost of any settlement of the dispute.

I wish to say, Mr. President, and I speak advisedly, solemnly, and sadly when I say it—because it makes me sad when any industrialist, any leader of business, lets down the great mass of American industrialists and businessmen—that speaking as a liberal on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I am satisfied that more than 90 percent of American investors and businessmen do not hold the 1845 labor philosophy which Mr. Wolfson demonstrated yesterday before the committee and which the president of his company had previously demonstrated in his testimony.

The position that these men are taking is really a position of threatening to hold this community, the government of the District of Columbia, and Congress in a situation of economic collapse, so far as mass transportation is concerned, until we meet their demand for an economic shakedown, which they are insisting that the community pay them. I do not think the citizens of this community, the government of the District of Columbia, or Congress will ever yield to that kind of economic threatening and bludgeoning.

I think it is shocking for the Capital Transit Co. to take the position that it will offer nothing by way of what is admitted to be deserved wage increases to its employees until, first, it has been handed a bag of money by the Government in order to pay the increased labor costs.

This leads me to my next point in the summary of Mr. Wolfson's position, and it is a very surprising position; namely, that the Capital Transit Co. is under no moral obligation, is under no economic obligation, is under no obligation as a beneficiary of a franchise which the Government has given to it, and which makes it possible for the company to operate in the District of Columbia without competition, to use a single cent of its reserves to meet this kind of emergency.

In my judgment, when a company takes that position, it takes a position which is not held by American business generally. It is not held by public utilities generally. Those who operate public utilities across the land recognize that one cannot, in advance of a settlement of a labor dispute, for example, which becomes an economic emergency in the life of an industry, obtain money by way of rate increases, fare increases, tax exemptions, or what not, which would make it possible to pay additional labor costs. What is necessary to be shown, first, is the need for additional revenue.

But Mr. Wolfson takes the position that not a dollar of the reserves of his company shall be used to pay, for a temporary period, the increased costs of labor until judicial bodies, set up under regulatory law, can judicially review the record to be presented at a hearing, in determining the question as to whether or not the company is entitled to higher fares; as to whether or not the company should receive some financial benefits by way of tax-exemption legislation or other legislation which will provide the company with some kind of financial subsidy.

I could hardly believe my ears when I listened to this much-touted financier take such a position before the committee. He made it very clear that he considered that his primary obligation was to make certain that the stockholders got their dividends, and that he would not use any reserves which might otherwise be made available for dividends in order to meet increased labor costs. Of course, it was pointed out to him—he seemed to overlook the fact—that the reserves were built up by the riders on his lines, and were produced as the result of the work of the laborers who operate his lines.

I would be the first to recognize, as I have stated throughout the hearings, that the stockholders are entitled to a fair return on their investment, consistent, of course, with efficient management. Yet, as I listened to the testimony of Mr. Wolfson, I did not see how it was possible to avoid the conclusion that what he is insisting upon is not a fair return on the basis of the investment of the stockholders, consistent with efficient management, but that he is insisting upon a guaranteed return. That simply is not recognized in public-utility law.

A public utility operating under a franchise has protection from competition, but the franchise also affords the public the protection of regulation by the Public Utilities Commission. It does not guarantee to the company any return. What the law provides is that the company shall receive a fair return on its investment, consistent, of course, with efficient management.

In other words—and the cases are legion—no public utility commission can hand down a rate decision which will grant the stockholders a return on their investment, if the record shows that the company is guilty of gross mismanagement, waste, and inefficiency. The commission must take into account what the income and the revenue of the company in all probability would be if certain inefficient practices were discontinued by the company, and the rate is fixed upon the basis of such considerations as these.

But in this instance we have the chairman of the board of directors, and the company president, as well, who testified on an other day, preceding the chairman of the board, taking the position that they ought to be guaranteed a return which will pay for the additional labor costs, and that no money should be used out of the company's reserves.

This causes me to reintroduce a bill which was introduced last year and which passed the Senate, as a result of the Payne committee investigation of the Capital Transit Co. In the last Congress the bill was known as S. 1403. It passed the Senate, but failed to pass the House.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. How long are we going to put up with the streetcar strike in Washington? We are bandying words around and engaging in a lot of conversation. Why not submit the matter to a mediation board or to some other board? We want to ride the streetcars. I need a ride on the streetcars every day.

All I hear is conversation. I hear Mr. Wolfson being attacked; I hear my distinguished friend from Oregon being attacked.

After all, we want service. We cannot get service. We have not had streetcar or bus service for 12 or 13 days. I think the conversation should be stopped, and the matter taken into court.

While I am not a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have been in Washington a long time, and I have never seen a city so tied up as is Washington.

I think there should be less name-calling and less talking. The sooner the matter is taken into court or before some agency or board, the quicker we will get somewhere. The business of Mr. Smith calling Mr. Jones a bad name, and Mr. Jones calling Mr. Smith a bad name, gets us nowhere.

I have seen other strikes settled easily; but in the Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia, everyone talks, talks, and talks.

I would love to ride home tonight in a streetcar, instead of having to walk. Of course, walking is good for me, and I happen to need a little walking, because it is the only exercise I can get. But I do not like to walk at this hour of the day; I want to walk when I like to walk.

Mr. MORSE. I may say most respectfully to my friend from Ohio, that I am sorry he has displayed such a lack of information and gross ignorance in regard to what the Committee on the District of Columbia has been doing. Rather than to make the comments he has just made on the floor of the Senate——

Mr. BENDER. I do not care what the Senator from Oregon says about me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not yield. I cannot imagine any view with which I am less concerned than the view of the Senator from Ohio on this or any other subject. But I may say most respectfully, for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio, that the committee has been trying to accomplish exactly what he has just spoken about. We have been urging mediation; we have been urging arbitration. We have called the parties before us in a process of mediation, trying to get them to reach an agreement.

We have now concluded that the stage of legislation has been reached, and that, as Members of Congress, we have a duty to offer proposed legislation to the end that the streetcars and buses may resume their operations, so that the Senator from Ohio can again ride on them.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I will not yield. In view of the nature of the Senator's previous remarks, I will not extend to him the courtesy of yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. We are trying to get for the Senator from Ohio and everyone else in the District of Columbia some transportation, but we have reached the point that, in order to do it, we must have legislation. We are offering some proposed legislation today.

Mr. BENDER. All we have had is conversation.

Mr. MORSE. We hope we shall get the support of the Senator from Ohio for such legislation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to call the Senator to order, unless he insists, but if he continues to persist as he has, he will be called to order. I decline to yield to him.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am being respectful. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the interruption, I was discussing a bill which I am introducing, which I think is one of the steps which must be taken in order to restore transportation to the District of Columbia. It is identical to the bill which the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] introduced last year, which passed the Senate, but did not get action in the House. The bill was known as S. 1403, to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia. All we need to do to present an argument to support the bill and speed its passage through the Senate of the United States is to quote for the RECORD that part of the Payne committee report of last year which begins on page 39, and I read it as follows:

> For the 9 years from 1941 to 1949, Capital Transit paid $3,720,000 in cash dividends, out of $13,242,000 net earnings. For the 3 years from 1950 to 1952, cash dividends paid amounted to $5,424,000 while net earnings were only $3,546,000. For the 9 months ended September 30, 1953, dividends paid amounted to $1,152,000, while net earnings were but $669,000.

Mr. President, these figures give a pretty good indication of the reserves which are available for the settlement of this strike on a temporary basis. So far as providing funds for an equitable wage increase is concerned, until such time as the Public Utilities Commission can render a decision in this case. The Payne committee went on to say in its report of last year:

> The present policy of paying dividends in excess of earnings could not be pursued unless the company had the cash with which to pay dividends. The source of this cash has been discussed in connection with the comments on rate base and working capital. It arises largely from liquidation of road and equipment, through depreciation recoveries in excess of amounts reinvested in property. There is a definite long-range relationship between dividend payments and amounts reinvested in property: when the former is high, the latter is low, and vice versa. When earnings are being reinvested in property, they obviously are not available for payment of dividends. However, as the investment in property is liquidated, cash for dividends becomes available. This latter has been the situation with Capital Transit for the past several years. From 1950 to 1952, approximately $6.9 million of property was converted into cash by way of depreciation charges recovered through revenues, while only $2.7 million was expended for new property. But the dividends that have been paid throughout the existence of Capital Transit Co. have all been paid from earnings of either current or prior years. There is no question of the company's paying dividends out of original paid-in capital.
>
> The real question which arises out of the present dividend policy is whether management is depleting the resources of the company to the point where its ability to render service may be impaired either now or in the foreseeable future; whether at some time in the future the management will have stripped everything of value from the company and will then not be able to produce the necessary capital to provide adequate equipment to serve its patrons.
>
> This is just cause for future concern, although at the end of 1952, the company's financial structure was quite sound. It had $4.6 million working capital and a debt of only $5.7 million. Its equipment was in good condition. Although its depreciation reserve was inadequate according to PUC computations, and the cost to replace equipment at 1953 prices was more than would be recovered through depreciation of the existing equipment, the company was, at the end of 1952, certainly not at a dangerous point financially. To a great extent, new equipment could be financed through borrowed capital, if necessary, without impairing the ability of the company to render service.
>
> Although there was no impairment of capital in this specific instance, all things, considered, it would be prudent to give the Public Utilities Commission the authority to regulate the dividend policies of the utility companies. The power to prescribe accounting procedure and to require adequate depreciation reserves is not enough to protect the public interest against irresponsible management. The Commission should be empowered to enforce its judgment with respect to dividend policies, taking into consideration long-range planning for extension and improvement of service and probable capital requirements in the light of increased costs, neither of which is a matter of historical accounting.
>
> For the 4 full years of Wolfson control (1950 through 1953), cash dividends amounted to $29 per share, based on the 240,000 shares of stock outstanding before the 4-for-1 split. This is an average annual dividend rate of $7.25, or a return of 36¼ percent each year on the $20 per share cost to the Wolfson group. It is an average annual dividend rate of over 10 percent on the highest market value that the stock ever reached during those 4 years. It is an

> average annual dividend rate of over 9 percent on the present par value of the stock. The subcommittee notes that the dividend rate paid by the Wolfson group is in excess of the maximum rate of return sanctioned by the Public Utilities Commission to be earned on invested capital.
>
> By this dividend action, the Wolfson management has effectively dissipated a substantial part of the surplus built up by the company during the years prior to Wolfson control, without regard for the fact that this surplus emanated from the pockets of the transit riders. Mr. Wolfson stated before this subcommittee that, that "We didn't go into this company to distribute this cash surplus." (Transcript, p. 311.)
>
> Mr. Wolfson himself asked at this same hearing, "What are you going to do with stockholders who paid $132 for the stock?" We think that this has little bearing on the problem. First, such stockholders constitute a small minority of the investors in Capital Transit, and, second, their loss was sustained many years ago. The subcommittee cannot advocate or even condone a procedure whereby the transit riders are forced to subsidize those individuals who make a poor investment.
>
> The subcommittee can view the recent dividend policy of Capital Transit Co. under the Wolfson management only as a course of action wholly inconsiderate of the public interest, wholly inconsistent with the philosophy of fair and reasonable return to the owners of a regulated utility, and wholly inconsistent with the stated intentions of representatives of the Wolfson group before the ICC.
>
> The subcommittee, therefore, deem imperative the early passage of S. 1403, to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia, which bill is patterned after similar provisions of the Illinois Code.

This is one step I think we will have to take in order to solve the transit problem in this city. We will need to do again in the Senate what we did last year, and hope that the House will accept and adopt the measure which the Senate passes. We need to pass the bill recommended by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the present speaker, for a dividend control law in the District of Columbia that will empower the Public Utilities Commission to prevent the depletion of reserves in the manner in which the Capital Transit Company has depleted its reserves.

Mr. President, I say that because it is a part of the answer to Mr. Wolfson's position of yesterday, which was that no reserve money should ever be used in order to meet the costs of an emergency created by a labor strike. Obviously such a law will not put the streetcars and buses back into operation, but it will help the fiscal situation in the District of Columbia when it comes to the handling of similar problems in the future, because if this company should continue to operate the Capital Transit Company—and I shall have something to say about other legislative proposals which would deny the company that privilege—then on the basis of the record I have just read, I believe it important that the Public Utilities Commission have authority to place some check upon the depletion of reserves, as the Capital Transit Company has depleted its reserves since it took over the company in 1949.

What else do we feel must be done, Mr. President? It is perfectly clear that the company is entitled to some protection and some help in regard to the matter of exemption from the gross-receipts tax. I felt that way during the hearings in connection with the Payne investigation. I said so then, and I said so yesterday afternoon at the hearing. At a very early date, I think the Congress should conduct hearings and should enact legislation which will give whatever relief the facts presented at the hearings will show is justified, by way of exemption from the gross-receipts tax. We have already, as a part of another bill—one which the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. BIBLE], as I recall, brought to the floor of the Senate, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia—voted for some relief in connection with the school-bus-fare problem. At the present time that measure is in conference. It offers some relief to the company, from the standpoint of increasing its revenue through the fares it receives for the transportation of schoolchildren.

Mr. President, I say now, as I have said before, that it is neither fair nor right to ask the Capital Transit Co. to subsidize the parents of the children who live in the District of Columbia, by giving them so-called school tickets at a price of 3 cents each. If a subsidy is to be paid, I believe it happens to be a matter which the Congress should pay for, out of a proper appropriation, rather than to ask the company to subsidize the parents.

The legislative proposal before the Senate seeks to solve the problem by authorizing the Public Utilities Commission to increase the school fare. I think it is a temporary remedy; I do not believe that bill as written is fair to the Capital Transit Co. I believe the Capital Transit Co. should be allowed to collect an adequate fare for the transportation of schoolchildren; or, even better, I believe we should try to do in this case what is done for schoolchildren within a stone's throw of the District line, by means of the so-called schoolbus program, through which schoolchildren are taken to rural consolidated schools at the expense of the taxpayers. But certainly we have no right, in my judgment, to expect a private business to subsidize what I believe to be a public responsibility; and I have consistently taken the position that the Capital Transit Co. is entitled to some relief on this score.

However, now we come to the question of an increase in fare. What the Capital Transit Co. says about that is that it should not settle this labor dispute until it has been guaranteed an increase in fares by a decision of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. President, what do the facts show? They show that the company's petition for a hearing was filed on June 6. So, at best, the matter has been pending before the Public Utilities Commission only since June 6. Certainly the Congress should not expect the Public Utilities Commission to order an increase in fares until evidence and a record supporting such an increase in fares have been submitted or made before the Commission. Mr. President, on that score I can speak for the other two members of our subcommittee because we are unanimous on this point; and the subcommittee takes the position that the company has no right to expect the Public Utilities Commission to order an increase in fares until a record of evidence supporting such an increase in fares has been made before the Commission. If we are to be put in the position that the strike must continue until such time as such a hearing is completed, I say the company is taking unfair advantage of the residents of the District of Columbia.

The president of the Public Utilities Commission appeared the other day before the committee; and, in answer to questions, he testified that the Commission has authority to proceed, and is willing to proceed on the basis of that authority, to grant a temporary order relative to fares, as made necessary by any increase in labor costs, if—and I emphasize the word "if"—the record made would support the issuance of such a temporary order. But, Mr. President, in this case we are dealing with a company which seems to think that the Public Utilities Commission should issue such an order without a hearing.

Of course, as was pointed out yesterday, and was pointed out again this morning in an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, that would clearly be a violation of the judicial trust reposed in the members of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOLFSON SLAMS THE DOOR

Louis E. Wolfson's testimony before the Senate District Subcommittee yesterday dramatically undercut the Capital Transit Co.'s previous offer of a wage increase of 10 cents an hour to its striking employees—if somebody would supply the funds. To be sure, this offer was not much of a concession in the first place. The only significance it had was that it put the company into the position of acknowledging in part the justice of the union's demand for higher pay. This raised a glimmer of hope that Mr. Wolfson might negotiate with the union on this basis, but that hope was dashed completely by his statement before the Senate Subcommittee that he would make no offer until new revenue for Capital Transit is in sight.

It may be that Mr. Wolfson was trying to intimidate Congress and the Public Utilities Commission and thus force acceptance of the scheme he had approved at the suggestion of Congressmen McMILLAN and BROYHILL. But if this is his game, it is doomed to failure. The idea that Capital Transit can force the hand either of the PUC or of Congress in this kind of situation is utterly fantastic. The pity is that Congressmen McMILLAN and BROYHILL did not foresee the embarrassing predicament in which their proposal would trap them.

The McMillan-Broyhill scheme was hopeless from the beginning because they undertook to assume the responsibilities of the PUC. The Commission could not ratify the

Congressmen's political bargain with Capital Transit without abandoning the standards of ratemaking set up by law. It is not the function of the Commission to make bargains it has to determine rates on the basis of what is fair to the community and the company in the light of all existing circumstances. Its members would be subject to impeachment if they yielded when Congressmen point a gun at their heads.

The outlook is no better if reliance is placed on the bill Messrs. McMILLAN and BROYHILL introduced to carry out their scheme. The effect of this measure would be to shift the ratemaking function to Congress. It is difficult to think of anything that would be more distasteful to Congress as a whole or more unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of the District, the transit company and its workers.

The quizzing of Mr. Wolfson by the Senate subcommittee appears, however, to have had one useful result. It has removed all doubt as to the transit company's attitude. Mr. Wolfson has now said in effect that the strike will last until the company gets what it wants. Our conclusion that it is Mr. Wolfson's strike is thus confirmed and sharpened. Congress is now on notice that public transportation in the Nation's Capital will not operate again until public authority is asserted. This leaves no alternative to the enactment of a law authorizing the District Commissioners to seize and operate the Capital Transit properties, and the sooner this bill gets to rolling through the legislative mill the better it will be for everyone concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely agree with the thesis of the editorial, which is to the effect that a public utilities commission which would issue an order of the kind the officials of the Capital Transit Co. are asking for, would be subject to impeachment. In fact, yesterday afternoon we put the counsel of the Public Utilities Commission on the witness stand; and he expressed views to the effect that the Public Utilities Commission would have no legal right to issue such an order, because it would be subject to reversal on a taxpayers' suit, duly filed.

Therefore, Mr. President, if this company is going to act in good faith with the District of Columbia and with the Congress, I believe it important that the company be willing to negotiate or arbitrate or mediate a settlement on wages and working conditions; and until the Public Utilities Commission can render a judicial determination as to whether the company is entitled to an increase in fares, the increased labor cost should be paid out of reserves.

Mr. President, that leads me to comment on the kind of legislation we may have to consider in order to get the streetcars and buses back into operation, because if the company will not arbitrate and will not mediate, and if it refuses to bargain collectively over specific amounts for wage increases, then it follows that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia must take some course of action to restore transportation.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. On several occasions, I have listened to them testify regarding this matter. They have worked hard in mediation negotiations, in trying to get the parties together. They have cooperated with the Mediation and Conciliation Service, which has held a series of mediation conferences with the parties. But the Commissioners report to us that they have run up against a complete roadblock on the part of the company, which refuses to grant any wage increase until it has been paid additional revenue which will pay the additional cost resulting from such a wage increase.

That raises the question of whether increased fares can be justified. I do not know. Again, I point out that is a matter for judicial determination. Certainly it is not a matter for congressional determination.

Today, there is pending a proposal that Congress pass legislation providing that for a period of 120 days there shall be a 10-cent wage increase. The result of such legislation would be that Congress would, in effect, determine the rate structure for transit operations in the District of Columbia. I agree with the Washington Post and Times Herald editorial of this morning. I do not think the Congress will tarry very long in the consideration of a proposal which represents such an interference with the judicial process. In my judgment, the matter of ratemaking must be confined to the judicial processes which go along with the jurisdiction of a regulatory body.

I consider it to be very important that this transportation system be operated by private enterprise, but I do not believe that a particular company ought to be allowed to get by with an adamant attitude which holds up transportation in this District until the Congress hands over a bagful of money to pay additional labor costs. Therefore our committee yesterday asked the District Commissioners if they were at work on proposed legislation which would recommend a course of action for the Congress to follow in restoring transportation. I am advised today that the District Commissioners are about to complete their recommendation for such proposed legislation.

I have presented this summary of the situation up to this hour because I think the Senate is entitled to know what transpired at a hearing before one of its committees, and that the Senate is entitled to be put on notice that it is about to receive from the District Commissioners recommendations for proposed legislation for the operation of mass transportation in this District for an emergency period, until the strike can be settled.

Speaking, now, for the benefit of the acting majority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS], I strongly urge tonight that, if and when the proposed legislation is recommended by the District Commissioners, it be given first consideration by the Senate, because I think it will be fair legislation. We may need to modify it in some respects, but I am satisfied that we have three dedicated public servants who have been spending long hours, as those of us on the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee have been spending long hours, for the past several days in an effort to work out a fair and equitable solution of this problem by way of mediation, negotiation, or arbitration.

If the proposed legislation arrives tomorrow, I sincerely hope that the acting majority leader will change his tentative plans, as he announced them to some of us today, not to hold a session on Friday, and that we can take up the proposed legislation on Friday and pass it forthwith.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

The bill (S. 2555) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia, referred to by Mr. MORSE, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, whenever the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia finds that the capital of any public utility, subject to its jurisdiction, has become impaired or may become impaired, or that the ability of such public utility to render reasonable and adequate service is likely to be impaired by the payment of a dividend, the Commission shall have power after due notice and hearing to order said public utility to cease and desist the declaration and payment of any dividend upon its stock, and no such public utility shall pay any dividend upon its said stock until the Commission finds that such impairment shall have been made good.

SEC. 2. No public utility shall declare or pay any dividend upon its stock unless—

(a) its earnings and earned surplus are sufficient to declare and pay such dividend after provision is made for reasonable and proper reserves; and

(b) the dividend proposed to be paid upon common stock can reasonably be declared and paid without impairment of the ability of the public utility to perform its duty to render reasonable and adequate service at reasonable rates.

SEC. 3. If any dividend prohibited by section 2 hereof is proposed to be declared and paid, the public utly shall give the Commission at least thirty days' notice in writing of its intention to so declare and pay such dividend and the Commission shall authorize the payment only if it finds that the public interest requires such action: *Provided, however,* That the Commission may grant such authority upon such conditions as it may deem necessary to safeguard the public interest.

SEC. 4. The public utilities subject to the provisions of this Act shall furnish to the Commission such information as it may require to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. If any public utility subject to the provisions of this Act, or any agent or officer thereof, shall violate any provision of this Act, or shall do anything herein prohibited, or shall fail or refuse to perform any duty enjoined upon it, or shall fail, neglect, or refuse to obey any lawful requirement or order made by the Commission, or any judgment or decree made by any court, upon application of the Commission, it shall forfeit and pay to the District of Columbia for every such violation, failure, or refusal, the sum of $1,000. In construing and enforcing the provisions of this section the act, omission, or failure of any agent, officer, or other person acting for, or employed by, any public utility, acting within the scope of his employment and instructions, shall in every case be deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such public utility. Every day during which any public utility or any agent or officer thereof shall fail knowingly or willfully to observe and comply with any order or direction of the Commission, or to perform any duty enjoined by this Act, shall constitute a separate and distinct violation of such order or direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the remarks of my colleague on the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], not only with respect to what he had to say about the present situation, but also with respect to what he proposes for the future. I am sure that after the meeting which the subcommittee will have tomorrow morning with the full committee, we shall obtain full clearance with the District Committee, and shall be able to bring to the floor of the Senate the proposed legislation to which the Senator from Oregon has referred. I join him in hoping that the Senate will act promptly to bring about some relief in this emergency situation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I care very little about what the Senator from Oregon says in his appraisal of me or of what I say. So far as I am concerned, the rebuke from the Senator from Oregon is a caress. I have no desire to enter into any controversy with him. I know how facile he is, how ready he is, and how argumentative he is.

I invite the attention of Senators to his biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory. As Senators know, we write these sketches ourselves. Everything which appears in this volume under the heading of biography is written by ourselves.

Among other things, the distinguished Senator from Oregon says that he was a professor of argumentation at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Minnesota. That is very commendable. I believe in argumentation. I think it is desirable on occasion. But, Mr. President, there is in progress in the Capital of the Nation a streetcar strike. The strike has been in progress for 12 days. There is no time for argumentation. We have had too much argumentation.

I remember that the day before the strike was called, my distinguished colleague from Oregon had very voluminous statements to make. He made some very outspoken comments, and he suggested that certain things be done. I remember that there was a great deal of huffing and puffing, and the house was blown down; but at the present time no streetcars or buses are in operation in the District of Columbia. That has been the situation for 12 days. We are talking about further conferences and further meetings. Certainly some way can be found legally to have this private system taken over.

I am not a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I do not know what the Senator will finally come up with, but I say that this is a bad affair. Last night I had to take a cab home. Two old ladies, who would have had heart attacks if they had not taken a cab, paid the cab driver 30 cents, plus a 20-cent tip, or 50 cents, in order to ride for a few blocks. Why? Because there is too much argumentation.

I hold no brief for Mr. Wolfson. I do not know him at all, except that I know that he believes in argumentation, too—but wholesale.

So far as the editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald is concerned, I think it is wonderful. I have no quarrel with it. Let me read one comment from the editorial:

> Our conclusion that it is Mr. Wolfson's strike is thus confirmed and sharpened.

The editorial writer believes, however, that one good thing has come from the committee. He points to one good result:

> The quizzing of Mr. Wolfson by the Senate subcommittee appears, however, to have had one useful result.

But no streetcars are operating. It is wonderful for professors of argumentation to get together, and for Mr. Wolfson, who is an expert in argumentation, to come before the committee and engage in all this argument. But there are no results. They huff and puff, but nothing results from all the argumentation.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon would not yield to me. He even suggested that he might have me censured for asking questions. I asked a question which seemed reasonable to me. Certainly he ought to reply in kind. I have always treated him with respect, and I like to be treated the same way.

When I entered the Chamber, I saw present a number of Senate employees who had sat here for long hours and listened. But all we get is argumentation, without any settlement of the strike.

On this floor I hear so much argument that sometimes I do not know whether I am on foot or on horseback. Two or three of our colleagues spend all their time in argumentation. It is wonderful. It is in order. I believe in free discussion; but when there is a streetcar strike in the city of Washington, and the people are inconvenienced for 12 or 13 days, there is no sense to all this talk. Certainly the public interest should be served, and we should take over this streetcar company and argue about it later. I say there is a way to do it. It has been done in other cities. It has been done in my home city of Cleveland.

I am not a novice in public life. I have been in public life for many years. I have been elected to public office by the citizens of Ohio for 25 years. I know how these things are settled. I am a businessman. I believe in argumentation, but I also believe that there is a time when argumentation is out of order. Washington is experiencing the hottest weather it has had for a long time. All we hear is argumentation. We get no service. This is the Nation's Capital, and certainly we ought to have some results looking to a solution of the difficult situation which affects the city, instead of all this talk. All we hear is talk.

I am not a lawyer, but I have hired lawyers many times in connection with my business. I have also hired professors of argumentation. I have even paid them a fee of $1,500 to hear them talk.

Frankly, argumentation is out of the question so far as the present strike is concerned. The Senator from Oregon can refuse to answer my questions, and he can refuse to permit me to question him.

General Motors meets with Walter Ruether, and they settle a strike in 1 or 2 days. The Ford Motor Co. meets with its union, and they settle a strike in 1 or 2 days. The steel companies meet with their unions, and they settle their strikes.

All we have in the District of Columbia is inconvenience and argumentation, and nothing comes of it except more argumentation.

I subscribe to all the editorial comments which have been made. I read the comments of certain Senators and Representatives even before the strike occurred. They made violent statements about the people involved. I believe those who are working for the transit company deserve an increase in pay. On the other hand I believe certain rights exist on both sides, and those rights should be respected.

I certainly feel very strongly that this is no time for us merely to talk and spend hours and hours in discussion in order to get our names in the newspapers.

I have no particular interest in the District of Columbia beyond wanting the Nation's Capital properly served and in having its citizens and visitors served, not like cattle, but like human beings.

A strike like this is the most devastating thing that could happen to the people of a city like Washington, where poor people must get to their work and employees of the Government must get to their various offices. A great many people work for the Government and others work for stores. All of us are being inconvenienced by the strike. I say the strike can be settled and can be handled properly if we stop arguing and actually get down to brass tacks.

If our committee will get busy, we can have the matter adjusted and settled.

As I said before, I have been rebuked by experts. Sometimes, when someone, a ready speaker, from whom words flow easily, tries to administer a rebuke, we remain supine; we take it from him; we are afraid to stand up and exert ourselves.

Mr. President, I was elected to represent in part the great State of Ohio. I was elected by 9 million people. Of course I was elected by a very small majority, but I was elected. I am not here to take anything from any individual on the floor of the Senate, or anywhere else in Washington, without expressing my own opinions and convictions.

The people of Washington cannot get home by reading newspapers or reading about an argument on the floor of the Senate. That does not make the cars and buses run. Neither does a great deal of argumentation on the floor of the House of Representatives make the cars and buses run. Neither does an editorial writer.

I am interested in having the cars and buses run. I know they can run, and should run, and will run, if we do something about it. The Congress is the city council of the city of Washington. We have the authority to take action. If, instead of arguing about this matter, an appropriate bill is submitted to Congress, I am sure every Member of the House and of the Senate will vote to get the cars operating. Then we can continue the argument.

Mr. President, that is what we need. I believe if the committee will come forward with a bill, supported by both Republicans and Democrats, we will get somewhere and be able to have a ride home on the cars and buses, instead of walking miles and miles, or paying exorbitant rates for transportation, and being inconvenienced, as we have been for the past 2 weeks.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to receive without suffering deductions from their social-security benefits.

Generally speaking, under existing law, a retired individual over 65 years of age drawing social-security benefits may not earn more than $1,200 annually without suffering the loss of 1 month's benefits for each $80 earned in excess of $1,200. This limitation on earnings applies only to wages and salaries and does not apply to any amount of income which an individual may receive from life insurance and annuities, company pension plans, pension trusts, interest on bonds and savings, dividends received from securities, rents, and other monetary benefits derived from the use of capital investment. Thus a retired individual drawing social-security benefits may receive any amount of income from these latter sources without suffering any reductions in his benefits. On the other hand, an individual not so fortunately situated and who is solely dependent on his social-security benefits as a major source of his retirement income is often forced to seek outside employment to supplement such income in order to maintain a decent standard of living, but is penalized in the event his earnings from such outside employment exceed $1,200 annually It is abundantly clear that the limitation-on-earnings test imposes an inequitable and undue hardship upon this class of our elderly citizens and can only be alleviated by the Congress taking immediate corrective action to bring the social-security law in line with present-day needs.

My proposed amendment is designed to liberalize the so-called retirement or limitation of earnings test. Simply stated it would increase from $1,200 to $1,500 annually the amount of earnings individuals would be permitted to receive without suffering any deductions from their social-security benefits. This $300 increase in annual earnings is small indeed, but yet will help immeasurably to alleviate the hardships imposed upon many of our retired citizens caused by the increased costs of living, while at the same time making it possible to utilize their talents and skills in the interests of our Nation's welfare. The cost of the proposed increase under my bill is nominal. The increase in the present social security tax rate would amount to only fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent. This would be divided equally between employer and employee. It, too, is small, indeed, in comparison to the inestimable value of the investment made in America's future.

I am not unaware that the limitation-of-earnings test is predicated upon a justifiable basis for it is clear that if a worker has substantial earnings he cannot be considered to be retired. It is also clear, however, in taking into consideration today's living costs, that not by the wildest stretch of the imagination could the annual yearly sum of $1,500 be considered substantial. I am also aware of the fact that the elimination of the limitation-of-earnings test would be expensive to the social-security fund, and would in effect provide benefits to everyone upon attaining the age of 65 years, even though they continued on a full-employment basis. It is essential therefore that a limitation-of-earnings test take into consideration the present high cost of living and provide for an adequate allowance to those individuals who through necessity find it necessary to supplement their social-security benefits with outside earnings in order to maintain a decent and respectable standard of living.

For in spite of the improvements we have made in the benefit structure of the social-security system, it is still true that the average benefit in my own State of Florida in December 1954, was just $59.44 per month, or $713.28 per year. For the entire country, the average was slightly lower—or $59.14 per month, which comes to $709.68 per year. I do not need to add that this represents a bare subsistence income. But I remind you that it is less than half of the budget for a modest level of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in a study of 34 cities which set a minimum figure of $1,602 per year.

It seems only fair and just to me, to allow those persons who can find a job to supplement their income up to an amount which will provide them with a reasonable degree of comfort, and enable them to remain as active members of the community. For I know that an inadequate retirement income for far too many of our senior citizens means that they must not only live on a bare substance amount, but that they must also withdraw from many of the activities in which they formerly engaged simply because they do not have any money left for such activities.

To my mind, one of the remarkable aspects of our times is that our older citizens are demonstrating the fact that versatility and creative ability do not cease with retirement. Because it is a striking example of this fact, I would like to describe briefly a project recently launched in my own State by a retired citizen. Down in Holly Hill, Fla., Paul M. Bryant is demonstrating the importance of part-time jobs for older people who want a few hours work each week to supplement their incomes received from pensions or social security benefits. He has set up a small factory with a working force composed entirely of retired or disabled workers. Discarding the production line idea, they are engaged in building early American furniture, using the hand craftsmanship methods that were in vogue a century or more ago. The emphasis is on skill rather than production schedule, and previous experience in woodworking is not necessary to get a job. One of the employees was formerly a women's garment maker in New York, another was a concrete construction contractor, another was disabled because of the loss of sight in one eye. Bryant insists that Florida is rich in possibilities for such small industries to give work to retired men and women who can still produce on a leisure-time basis.

Because I believe every encouragement should be offered to those enterprising men and women past 65 who can find a means of supplementing their income, I therefore propose a revision of the retirement test, which would allow earnings up to $1,500 per year—instead of the $1,200 which is used in existing law. With this ceiling, people who have substantial earnings would, of course, still not merit benefits, but those people who are able to increase their retirement income through a part-time or newly created spare-time job would not be penalized for their activities.

It is high time that we as a Nation change our attitude and approach toward our older citizens if we are to make maximum use of manpower in our continually expanding economy as well as in the interests of our own national defense. It is common knowledge that through advances made in medical science the useful life span of each of us has been considerably lengthened. In fact today it has reached the point where the age of 65 is no longer considered old. We should make maximum use of this source of inestimable wealth.

In the United States today there are over 13½ million of our citizens 65 years of age and over. Approximately 300,000 of this number reside in my own State of Florida. A large number of these citizens are still physically fit, and continue to have the desire, capacity and ability to make substantial contributions through the use of their experience and skills toward the welfare of this Nation. We have not, however, through various circumstances permitted them to do so. Many of them living in my State would like to supplement their social-security benefits in order to meet the high cost of living, but are unable to do so except on a limited basis. There are some 360,000 elderly workers throughout the Nation who have paid social-security taxes, in most cases for many years, and who are now over 65 and receiving no benefits simply because of the fact that they are presently earning annually more than the prescribed limit of $1,200 a year.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the present picture is that the law gives elderly people a grim choice between compulsory idleness and a heavy monetary forfeit. This idea runs counter to the best current thought of the medical profession about health and happiness in old age. Dr. Edward L. Bortz, former president of the American Medical Association, an outstanding expert on problems of the aged, recently stated that—

> There are numerous examples to prove that retirement is a curse rather than a blessing. * * * An all-absorbing motive is a

necessary asset to good health and an interesting old age. * * * If older folks are permitted to court debility and signs of decay, disaster and premature senility will surely follow.

Drs. Murray B. Ferderber and Gerard P. Hammill, who were in charge of hospitals in Pennsylvania with many aging patients that showed all signs of senile decay, pointed out that when these patients were offered a program of activity the results were astonishing. These and similar experiments afford ample evidence that our retired citizens need purposeful activity, and opportunity for recognition, throughout the life span. It is bad psychologically to place an undue burden on this vast reservoir of creative energy and talent by fomenting premature retirement on a below-standard living cost.

By raising the limitation on earnings test under our present social-security law to $1,500 we compliment the creative ability of our citizens in their golden years, and we say to them, you need not accept a jolting lowered standard of living, your services are vitally essential to the Nation's welfare. If we take this realistic approach we take a step forward to building a greater and stronger America.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this bill is referred will see fit to take prompt and favorable action on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2543) to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with reference to the need for legislation which will help the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] to ride home on the first possible occasion, and in keeping with the report which was so roundly castigated by my friend from Ohio, I move that, in accordance with the previous order, the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 13, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister of the United States of America:

John M. Allison, of Nebraska.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.
Lester D. Mallory, of Washington.
Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon.
Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.

Thomas K. Wright, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Douglas Jenkins, Jr., of South Carolina, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert G. Barnes, of Pennsylvania.
Harry N. Howard, of Virginia.
Ernest A. Lister, of Maryland.
Howard P. Mace, of Ohio.
Rufus Burr Smith, of Montana.
Harold C. Vedeler, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph J. Wolf, of Maryland.

Anthony Clinton Swezey, of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 4 to class 3.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Louis Bohmrich, of Wisconsin.
William H. Byrd, of the District of Columbia.
James J. Byrnes, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Samuel De Palma, of Maryland.
Millan L. Egert, of Maryland.
Robert A. Fearey, of the District of Columbia.
J. Bruce Hamilton, of Massachusetts.
David Handler, of New York.
Austin P. Maley, of Pennsylvania.
Charles P. Nolan, of Massachusetts.
Richard W. Tims, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Arthur S. Abbott, of Illinois.
Robert S. Black, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Marie W. Cannon, of the District of Columbia.
Paul B. Carr, of California.
Philip F. Cherp, of Minnesota.
Kennedy M. Crockett, of Texas.
William Giloane, of Maryland.
Robert S. Hoard, of California.
Richard F. Kitterman, of Maryland.
Miss Frances H. Lafferty, of Delaware.
Henry J. Lilienfield, of Maryland.
Mrs. Ruth E. McKee, of Virginia.
John H. Morris, of Arizona.
Elmer C. Pitman, of Indiana.
Miss Françoise G. Queneau, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert Spielman, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

S. Cole Blasier, of Michigan.
Edward L. Killham, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph A. Booher, of New York.
Ramon M. Gibson, of Missouri.
Theron S. Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Andrew I. Killgore, of Alabama.
Raymond W. Laugel, of Ohio.
Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.
William A. Mitchell, of Maine.
Anthony F. O'Boyle, of Pennsylvania.
Leon Pukach, of Maryland.
Robert B. Williams, of Kentucky.
Carlos M. Yordan, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James H. Bahti, of Michigan.
Martin A. Dale, of New Jersey.
Stockwell Everts, of New York.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Richard L. Gross, of New York.
Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
Charles W. Henebry, of California.
Charles S. Kennedy, Jr., of California.
Samuel Lee, of the Territory of Hawaii.
John M. McIntyre, of Illinois.
John J. Mullin, of California.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
Kenneth M. Rabin, of Massachusetts.
John Reed, of California.
Warren E. Slater, of New York.
John Sylvester, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Fentress Gardner, of Florida.
Francis J. Hejno, of Illinois.
John R. Higgins, of New York.
John A. Noon, of Maryland.
Henry T. Robertson, of Connecticut.
Larry W. Roeder, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Jacob D. Esterline, of Pennsylvania.
Louis P. Napoli, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Leslie S. Brady, of Ohio.
W. Bradley Connors, of Pennsylvania.
Walpole Davis, of Virginia.
Joseph S. Evans, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Thomas E. Flanagan, of Massachusetts.
Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.
Nedville E. Nordness, of Virginia.
John E. Pickering, of Illinois.
Allan L. Swim, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Charles M. English, of Minnesota.
Justin Sloane, of Virginia.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Harry Lee Walker, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years, vice Aubrey B. Fennell, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Clare Partridge, O12630, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward John McGaw, O12631, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., O12782, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Donal Harkins, O17625, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Mark McClure, O14935, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Howard Harper, O15083, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank McAdams Albrecht, O15131, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Emil Lenzner, O15810, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Emerson Charles Itschner, O15516, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. David Henry Tulley, O16075, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Nutter, O16095, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles George Holle, O12612, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Carroll Heiney Deitrick, O14796, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Douglas Valentine Johnson, O15072, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen, O15143, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Binns, O15207, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Vinson Bromley, Jr., O15239, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Peter Conover Hains 3d, O15657, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Emil Lenzner, O15810, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Harold Willard Glattly, O16967, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. John Frederick Bohlender, O17814, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. John Ruxton Wood, O17821, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Paul Dunn Berrigan, O16741, United States Army.

Col. Henry Joseph Hoeffer, O16765, United States Army.

Col. Gerald Francis Lillard, O16770, United States Army.

Col. Parmer Wiley Edwards, O16775, United States Army.

Col. Charles Pennoyer Bixel, O16808, United States Army.

Col. Louis Howard Foote, O17010, United States Army.

Col. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, United States Army.

Col. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, United States Army.

Col. William Ross Currie, O17115, United States Army.

Col. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17308, United States Army.

Col. John Ogden Kilgore, O29008, United States Army.

Col. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, United States Army.

Col. James Percy Hannigan, O17531, United States Army.

Col. Philip Henry Draper, Jr., O17543, United States Army.

Col. Harold George Hayes, O17554, United States Army.

Col. John David Francis Phillips, O17584, United States Army.

Col. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619, United States Army.

Col. Robert Little Cook, O17675, United States Army.

Col. Lester Skene Bork, O17685, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775, United States Army.

Col. Lloyd Roosevelt Moses, O29362, United States Army.

Col. Frederick Theodore Voorhees, O29374, United States Army.

Col. Lou George VanWagoner, O41668, United States Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grades indicated in the line and staff corps of the Navy as appropriate, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Lloyd E. Sellman

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Norman F. Daly

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Lindsay C. Getzen

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

"H" "L" Sumner, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Rodger F. Hill.

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

John P. Charles

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Johnanna Reid
Grace O. Fisk

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification as provided by law:

LINE

Mary D. Chapman
Leona K. Cloutier
Carol M. Comstock
Beatrice E. Dalier
Anne L. Ducey
Elizabeth S. Harrison
Dorothy T. Yarnall

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Mary F. Keener
Elizabeth Reeves

SUPPLY CORPS

Mary J. Aplin
Elizabeth J. Stover

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Malcolm L. Barringer
Tedford J. Cann
Aldo J. DaRodda
Jack L. Finney
Ernest Fischbein
Lionel R. Harsh
Edward F. Havel
Harlie B. Helms, Jr.
John S. Kelly
Robert Lewis
Marjorie H. Mogge
John MacGregor
Roy E. McCoy
William J. Ogle
Harry Ohan
Mark E. Perrault
Robert F. Reynolds, Jr.
Harvey P. Rodgers
Jason J. Smith
Walter G. Squires, Jr.
Eugene K. Walling
Tommy H. Warren, Jr.
Philip W. Wehrman
John R. Weimerskirch
Marvin M. Weissman

SUPPLY CORPS

Frank J. Jerich
Hugo M. Luoto, Jr.
Augustine G. Saukas

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John W. Woodring

NURSE CORPS

Emily E. Guillotte

Lt. (jg.) John T. Janus, DC, USNR, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Reserve of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. (jg.) Paul D. Olson, USN, for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named officers of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

Edward J. Stump
Donald A. Wiederecht
Robert W. Shaw
Robert J. Huston
William R. Haycraft
Jack M. Chourre
Edward E. Coates
Roger F. Reedy

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grades indicated:

COMMANDER, LINE

Thomas J. Moriarty

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Robert F. Hart
Simeon G. Higgins
William A. Smith
Horace D. Sharon
Emmett Barlie

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Justin D. Denman
Claude D. Masters
Oran W. V. Young
Robert W. Epps
Jack J. Jones
Charles M. Gassett

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Arthur C. White
Luther Lefler
John G. Gilyard
Donald E. Stanley
Arnold N. Singer
Alfonz Zimm
Joseph C. Mayer
Otis G. Pennington
Andrew G. Szymanski
Charles E. Kaessinger
James W. Sands
Edwin E. Lindbeck
Herbert I. Byron
Albea D. Hight
Russell B. Ramsey
Robert M. Ottensmeyer
Lawrence A. Chappell
George F. Gobble
George M. Bates
Waring B. Haselton, Jr.
Frank J. Zwolinski
Leslie E. Concannon
Minor T. Rice
Robert L. Kirkhorn
Stanley S. Ricker
Alvin P. St. John
William B. Crytser
Joseph Caglione, Jr.
John R. Fitzpatrick
Roy L. Bergeron
Edwin C. Vestal, Jr.
Robert V. Werner
Thomas B. Mangus
Forrest T. Bruce
Donald E. Wallace
Elmer C. Everett
Martin D. Archer
Ellis G. Kelly
Donald A. Cruse
Frank W. Hughes, Jr.
George T. Chapman, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Cassell O. Crain
Edwards M. Morris
Joseph A. Mayo, Jr.
Gerald E. Roberts
Earl G. Slemons, Jr.
Charles W. Smith
Carl N. Beatty
Loveman F. Rolen
Walton M. Morrison
Anthony W. Rudzinski
Ferdinand D. Peloquin
Hugh H. Chandler

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Albert C. Gillespie
George E. Sherman
James I. Huffman

The following-named commissioned warrant officers, W-3, for permanent promotion to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Wilson S.
Alexander, Murray C., Jr.
Alfred, Harold D.
Allen, Robert C.
Allison, Howard G.
Alvord, Henry C.
Amick, Lester E., Jr.
Amundsen, Melvin S.
Anderson, Alonzo G.
Anderson, Harry K.
Anderson, Ralph H.
Angleton, Joseph M.
Arnold, Patrick H.
Bain, Thomas L.
Bair, Edward S.
Baker, Alma H.
Baker, Jeriod I.
Baker, Lewis G.
Baker, Russel B.
Ball, Gilbert R.
Ballard, Elmer L.
Banks, Guy L.
Banks, Milton W.
Barnhart, William L.
Barnstead, Robert E.
Barron, Charles R.
Bartels, Leroy E.
Bartholomew, Albert A.
Bartlett, Edwin C.
Bayliss, Thomas I.
Beall, Thomas H.
Bean, Joshua S., Jr.
Beason, Darrell E.
Beaty, Chancy B.
Beauchamp, Arthur J.
Beck, George W., Jr.
Beck, James D.
Becknell, John W.
Bednarck, Stephen J.
Beland, John
Bengtson, Gorden W.
Berry, Lamar S.
Besco, Steve
Bevans, Thomas W.
Biangardi, Queady
Bickerstaff, William L., Jr.
Bidwell, Robert F.
Bieri, Reuben V.
Biernat, Wladyslaw S.
Bilbo, Charles A.
Biszmaier, Harry I.
Blasco, Vincent G.
Blevins, Edwin K.
Blick, Johnnie Y.
Bliss, "T" Jay
Bloom, Lyman C.
Bodes, Henry M.
Boller, Joseph P.
Bonham, John W., Jr.
Borowski, Arthur A.
Bostwick, James L.
Bowman, Marvin K.
Boyd, Charles A.
Boyd, Claude Jr.
Boynton, Mack M.
Bradley, Charles J.
Bradley, John R.
Brandenburg, Charles W.
Bratkovic, Frank A.
Brehm, Raymond
Brewer, Sam H., Jr.
Brice, Robert C.
Briehler, John F.
Brooks, Cecil T.
Brothers, George
Brown, Chester F.
Brown, Eduardo P.
Brown, Harold C.
Brown, Robert S.
Browne, Peniston E.
Brzostek, Bernard F.
Brunner, Harold R.
Brunson, Leighton J.
Brunson, Robert E.
Bryant, James E.
Buccini, Albert
Buckbee, William D.
Bugg, James E.
Burchfield, Kenly N.
Burgener, Bernard L.
Burgess, Carlton E.
Burk, John
Burns, James F.
Burns, Robert
Burnside, Leland N.
Burris, John P.
Byers, Elmer G., Jr.
Cade, Howell A.
Calhoun, Carl P.
Callies, Leo B.
Camp, Jack E.
Campbell, Colin
Campbell, Hugh L.
Campbell, Leslie E.
Campbell, William H.
Card, Robert V.
Carmichael, Kenneth E.
Carpenter, Emmett W.
Carruth, Edward N.
Carter, Allen E.
Carter, Clyde L.
Carter, Lyle E.
Carter, Robert J.
Carter, Wilbur W.
Cash, Eugene
Casterline, Robert E.
Catanzarito, Joseph
Causey, Phines
Cearley, Arvin
Cely, Frederick W.
Chambers, Milton W.
Chappelle, Charles M.
Chapter, Andrew J.
Charleton, James R.
Chatelain, Gurley P.
Cherok, Nicholas
Chetwynd, Charles B.
Chilcutt, Booth
Chinn, Donald T.
Christensen, Charles H.
Christian, Charles W.
Claytor, Samuel T.
Clunie, John E.
Coder, Jay L.
Coe, James R.
Cofield, Perry C.
Coleman, Lawrence W.
Collins, Ralph M.
Comer, Paul R.
Connell, Raymond K.
Conners, Francis F.
Conway, James P.
Cornetta, Martin V.
Cotter, Joseph J.
Coughlin, Leo R.
Cox, Harold L.
Cozad, Richard C. J.
Craig, Byron D.
Craig, Thomas E.
Crain, Hugh B.
Cramer, Marion E.
Creech, Roy F.
Creech, William D.
Crisman, James L.
Crosnoe, Robert E.
Cross, Lloyd G.
Crownover, Edgar P.
Crutchfield, Edgar J. O.
Culbreth, Dossie O.
Culp, James D.
Cupp, Joseph H.
Dalton, Lionel B.
Dalton, Pierze H.
Danenhower, James H.
Dangelo, Anthony S.
Daniels, Earnest W.
Daras, Steven
Darnell, Jesse R.
Davenport, Aaron M.
Davis, Charles H.
Davis, George W.
Dawson, Floyd W.
Dawson, William S.
Deadwyler, Robert E.
Deans, Shelton
Debri, Thomas H.
Decious, Warren D.
Deen, Harvard F.
Deremicio, Dominic
Descoteaux, Joseph A. R.
Dewitt, Fred
Dewitt, John S.
Dexter, Lloyd D.
Dickson, Jack E.
Dixon, Ray V.
Dobbs, Lewis
Doering, Wallace S.
Dominguez, Edward
Donley, Parks
Doyle, Clement C.
Dreiling, Elmer E.
Dreman, Wesley C.
Driskill, Leigh E.
Drown, Loraine E.
Dubois, Philip C.
Duckworth, Edward W.
Duke, Clinton H.
Dunham, Roy E.
Dunlop, Kenneth
Dunn, William A.
Dunning, Gordon
Durham, Earl R.
Dutch, George B.
Dyer, James M.
Eads, Lyle W.
Earhart, Hugh L., Jr.
Early, Juston H.
Eaton, Arthur H. M.
Edington, Benjamin F., Jr.
Edmonds, John W. C.
Edwards, James J.
Ehlers, Ervine B.
Eirich, Norman C.
Ellis, William A., Jr.
Emerson, Ralph W.
Enwright, Thomas L.
Erwin, Haskell A.
Evans, Glenn E.
Evans, Jacob T.
Falcone, Ralph E.
Farley, Floyd E.
Feiser, Milo C.
Ferree, Benjamin F., Jr.
Fish, Norris L.
Flournoy, Milton C.
Flynn, Francis H.
Fooshe, Thomas R., Jr.
Ford, Donald G.
Forgette, Arthur J.
Foster, William L.
Fowler, Ralph E.
Fowler, Thomas G.
Fowlkes, Hubert A.
Fox, Chester C.
Fox, George L.
Fox, Lyle B.
Fox, Roy W.
Fraise, George J.
Franks, Bryan W.
Frano, Joseph J.
Freeman, Herbert E.
Funke, Harold J.
Gallagher, Bernard F.
Gallagher, Matthew F.
Gambill, Maurice A.
Garbrous, Joseph V.
Garrett, George P.
Gasparovic, Paul J.
Gaumer, Chester T.
Geer, Norman L.
Geringer, Walter H.
Gibb, Donald W.
Gibbons, William J., Jr.
Giles, Russell H.
Gill, Fred S.
Gillenwater, Thurston M.
Ginther, Roy L.
Glezen, Glenn F.
Gooden, Donald R.
Goodrich, John
Grafe, Edward E.
Graham, Ogden C.
Grant, John E., Jr.
Grantham, Joseph A., Jr.
Gray, Albert E.
Gray, Terry L.
Green, William R.
Gresowski, Karl C.
Griesbach, Gustave F.
Griffin, James H., Jr.
Grozier, Gaylord L.
Guertin, Frederick F.
Guilbault, Elie A.
Gulbranson, George W.
Gundrum, James O.
Gunkel, Frederick H.
Habecker, Ralph H.
Haines, Lawrence I.
Haines, Orval G.
Hall, Edward J.
Hall, Fred M.
Hall, "G" Stanley
Hall, Henry L.
Hall, Paul H.
Halverson, Richard L.
Hamilton, David D.
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hammond, James C.
Hansen, Eugene E.
Hantsche, Edgar M.
Harley, Douglas M.
Harper, John G.
Harr, Jonas W.
Harriman, Harold L.
Harvey, Newell L.
Hazzard, Lois H.
Hawkins, Victor N.
Hawthorne, Staley P.
Hayes, Henri L.
Heath, Arvel
Heath, Philip E.
Herman, Charles F.
Herold, Charles C.
Herrick, Stewart V.
Herring, Charles C.
Hess, Harold C.
Hewson, John F.
Hickey, Earl F.
Hicks, George D.
Higginbotham, John T.
Hill, Harold C.
Hill, "J" "D"
Hiller, William C.
Hilliard, Ralph E.
Hilsenberg, Hubert E.
Hinton, "J" "P"
Hnatek, John Jr.
Hober, Wilbur L.
Holland, Donald V.
Holmes, Carl
Hopkins, Paul W.
Horn, Carl G.
Horn, Glenn J.
Horn, Leslie E.
Horne, Daniel F.
Horoschak, Metro
Hough, Fred R., Jr.
Hudson, Ray G.
Huffman, Chester A.
Huggett, Wayne T.
Hughson, Robert M.
Hurley, Ellis L.
Husband, Joseph E.
Irby, Frederick G.
Ishie, Everett E.
Israel, Alfred C.
Jackman, Carl S.
Jackson, Donald C.
Jacobson, Robert G.
Jaeger, Richard G.
James, William R.
Jennings, Gerald W.
Jessup, Charles R.
Johnson, Edward L.
Johnson, Frank C.
Johnson, Roy S.
Johnson, Thurman G.
Johnson, William R.
Joslin, Harold E.
Kadow, Eugene V.
Kane, Neal H.
Kasworm, Martin A.
Kean, Donald T.
Kelly, William E.
Kemp, Robert E.
Kenney, Edward J.
Kent, Charles J., Jr.
Kenton, Roy M.
Keogh, John D.
Kerns, Clifford D.
Kerr, Stuart W.
Kerr, Thomas E.
Kidder, Clinton R.
Kilcoyne, Francis J.
Kindt, Gilbert O.
Kitzinger, Bernard R.
Kline, Robert L.
Klombies, Carl B.
Kloss, Henry
Knight, Ernest C.
Knight, Fred S.
Korn, Ralph E.
Koski, George W., Jr.
Kotsmith, Chester M.
Kraft, John D.
Kreckel, John P.
Krenn, Martin J.
Krobatsch, Howard E.
Kroger, Raymond M.
Larson, Theodore R.
Larue, Richard M.
Lasky, Edward
Law, Paul C.
Lawson, Harvey W.
Layman, Harold E.
Ledbetter, Bud A.
Lee, Charlie W.
Lee, Cletus A.
Lee, John W.
Lefevre, Bryon D.
Leffingwell, George D.
Leightley, Albert L.
Lesher, William A.
Levin, William W.
Lewis, Heber S.
Lewis, James H., Jr.
Lewis, Morton L.
Liedtke, Fred
Lightle, Herbert N.
Little, Hermon T.
Loader, Harold W.
Loflin, Eugene P.
Lollar, Samuel R.
Lowell, William J.
Lucas, Frank J.
Luckenbach, Lovine B.
Maconaghie, Dysart O.
MacPherson, Walter R.
Maier, Charles W.
Malone, Roy B.
Malone, William C.
Mancuso, Vincent J.
Mann, Howard E.
Manning, Fletcher A.
Marcozzi, Phillip
Marcus, Samuel C.
Margolies, Lyonel V.
Marks, Thomas W.
Marshall, Louis S.
Martin, Orvis A.
Martin, Sidney J.
Mathews, John R.
Maurel, Andre A.
Maxwell, Riley F.
May, John F.
McAfee, Arthur R.
McAllister, Damon O.
McCann, Edward F.
McCluskey, Paul M.
McCord, Eyrie L.
McDaniel, James E.
McDonald, James C., Jr.
McGahee, Esli M.
McGill, Myron G.
McIntire, Llewelly H.
McKinney, Herman R
McLain, Martin E.
McLane, Albert R.
McLellen, Jack E.
McNaught, Joseph R.
McTigue, James T.
McVay, Harley V.
Meek, Charles B.
Meek, Vern
Miechurski, Thomas A.
Mikus, Donald G.
Milano, Daniel D.
Miller, George P.
Miller, Joe R.
Miller, William A., Jr.
Minkler, William A.
Momberg, Vernon B.
Montgomery, Cedric A.
Montgomery, Wilfred L.
Moore, George W., 396353
Moore, George W., 204709
Moore, Hugh
Moore, James K.
Moore, Lee R.
Moore, William R.
Morgan, Chauncey J.
Morgan, William M.
Morrison, Basil T.
Mudd, Robert P.
Mudgett, Leon P.
Muenich, Gustav J.
Murphy, Joseph M.
Murray, Hoseia J.
Murray, Walter F.
Myers, William A.
Napolitano, Tony
Nelson, Charles F.
Newton, Richard E., Jr.
Nicholson, Hiram A.
Noel, Walley H.
Nolde, Robert R.
Norconk, John T.
Oleson, Willard F.
Oliver, Edmond H.
Olson, Engwall A., Jr.
Olson, Gilbert W.
Olson, Joseph C.
Orr, Stanley C.
Outlaw, Jessie B.
Owens, Elmer L., Jr.
Paddock, Robert H.
Page, Irving M., Jr.
Page, John M.
Palmer, Richard B.
Parris, Paul O.
Patrick, George L.
Patterson, William B.
Patton, Robert C.
Peirano, James H.
Pendrey, Warren K.
Penrose, Robert A.
Peoples, Robert L.
Perkins, Leonard J.
Perry, William B.
Peterson, Gordon I.
Petranek, Jerry J.
Petrusky, Martin, Jr.
Phalan, Robert A., Jr.
Phelan, Robert P.
Phillips, Orville H.
Phillips, Pearly L.

Pierce, Everett E.
Pierson, Percy A.
Pizzuto, Patrick C.
Plunkett, Roy D.
Poole, Ray I.
Poole, Stuart G.
Posey, Eugene V.
Post, Walter E., Jr.
Potter, Earl L.
Preble, Casmer E.
Price, Raymond F.
Proctor, Charles R.
Pullum, Alvin C.
Pyron, Josie T.
Quinn, Rayburn M.
Radcliffe, Carl E.
Radford, John L.
Ragsdale, Carl M.
Railsback, Robert A.
Rasimas, Alfonso E.
Rauber, Carl A.
Redeye, Fredrick A.
Reeves, Edward R.
Reifel, Conrad H.
Rentz, James F.
Replogle, William C.
Reynolds, Russell F.
Rhinehart, Edwin A.
Rhodes, Clarence G.
Rhodes, Joseph C.
Rice, Charlie A., Jr.
Rice, Leslie B.
Rice, Thomas G.
Richardson, Herald E.
Richardson, Galen W.
Rickey, Paul E.
Riggs, Virgil
Riise, Morris M.
Rinard, Ellis B.
Ritchie, David C.
Roach, John E.
Robinson, Joseph W.
Roe, Theron J.
Rogers, Lloyd E.
Roller, Donald T.
Rooksberry, Marion C.
Roop, David A.
Rosekrans, Leslie A.
Rothermell, Carroll W.
Rothlisberger, Marche
Rountree, Jack
Rowley, Richard G.
Rundall, Paul S.
Russell, Holland A.
Ryn, Eugene G.
Sagen, Alvin O.
Sarris, Frank J.
Sarsfield, John J.
Salmon, Douglas A.
Sanford, Kenneth L.
Santille, Augustine
Satterthwaite, Guilford W.
Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Scallorn, Cecil D.
Scheffler, Raymond R.
Schmitz, Harold A.
Seago, James T.
Sears, Alfred R. J., Jr.
Secondo, Anthony P.
Secovitch, Tony
Sharp, Ralph H.
Shaw, Franklin B.
Shelton, Frank C.
Shirley, Jack M.
Shiveley, John P.
Short, Alvin L.
Shull, William L.
Singer, Bernard
Sinyei, Louis
Skapin, Jack J.
Skranski, John
Smith, Courtenay A.
Smith, Lauren J.
Smith, Maurice R.
Smith, Maurice L.
Smith, Richard E.
Smith, Robert B.
Snook, Norman A.
Socha, Edward J.
Sorey, Jay H.
Sommers, Harold E.
Sontag, Frank B.
Spadone, Leighton
Sparks, Robert H.
Sparrell, Herbert F.
Spiewak, Chester J.
Squares, Irvine G.
Stafford, Edgar
Stankiewicz, Joseph F.
Statchen, Henry J.
Steele, Arthur W.
Steele, James H.
Steger, Gordon E.
Stempski, Henry J.
Stephens, Leonard D.
Stewart, John S.
Stone, Horace E.
Stone, Robert S.
Stout, Doin E.
Stowell, Edward J.
Striplin, William E.
Stroud, Densil C.
Stuart, Harold H.
Stuart, "L" "V"
Suarez, Cecil
Sulewski, Frank
Sullivan, James T.
Sullivan, John T., Jr.
Sumrell, Guy H., Jr.
Sutherland, Will R.
Sylvester, Clyde W.
Symons, Earl K.
Szikney, Alphonse J.
Tait, George L.
Taylor, Grover W.
Taylor, Kenneth D.
Taylor, Robert W.
Terry, Charles F.
Theiss, Charles L.
Thomas, Alfred J.
Thomas, James C.
Thomas, Martin K.
Thompson, Dale J.
Thompson, Edward F.
Thornton, Albert H.
Thorsell, George E.
Timm, Richard C.
Timmons, Harry S.
Tinsley, Dennis P.
Tobin, Thomas J.
Tomlinson, Ray L.
Tomlinson, Leslie L.
Tracy, Frank L.
Tracy, John E.
Trapp, Robert I.
Tremblay, Philip A.
Troup, Howard H.
Troyner, Joseph
Tucker, Edward C.
Tufts, Charles E.
Tuggle, Francis J.
Turansky, Louis
Turner, Berry F.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Roger M.
Turney, Robert F.
Twibell, Murrel D.
Twiss, Ernest B.
Valencia, Walter S.
Van Kirk, William C.
Van Limburgh, Robert C.
Van Vleet, Carroll
Verburg, Edwin D.
Vermillion, Burke S.
Vernon, Lee H.
Vickroy, Robert K.
Vlasnik, Donald J.
Vollmer, Wayne F.
Vroman, Earl E.
Ward, Dalton C.
Walker, John B.
Wallace, James E.
Walton, Billie M.
Wannemacher, Charles R.
Watkins, James C.
Watts, Lowell A.
Weaver, Wallace S.
Webb, Max R.
Weinstein, Sidney
Wellons, William I., Jr.
Wells, Max
Wenger, James E.
Weston, Hector R.
Whalen, Bruce R.
Whalen, Roy K.
Whalen, William F. C.
Whaley, Elton M.
Wheat, Clyde E., Jr.
Wheeler, Leon F.
Wheeler, Robert I.
Wheelock, Arnold M.
Wheelus, Clee O.
Whelchel, James S.
White, Lloyd R.
Whitt, Malgum E.
Wigner, Frank A.
Wilcox, Marion E.
Williams, Edward B.
Williams, Wilmot L.
Willis, Gerald J.
Willis, Paul K.
Wilson, Louis A.
Wilson, Robert E.
Wilson, Vernon
Wilson, Victor E.
Winey, Roy C.
Wiseman, Harold A.
Wolfe, Troy E.
Wolslegel, Edward S.
Wood, Arthur H.
Woodard, Hugh E.
Woods, Morris W.
Woods, Samuel A.
Woodside, Dwight R.
Woodworth, Milton R.
Wortley, Edmund L.
Wreath, Clarence F.
Yarbrough, Paschal R.
Yetka, Joseph L.
Young, William A.
Zavodny, Roland J.
Zok, Leo J.

The following-named commissioned warrant officers, W–2, for permanent promotion to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, W–3, in the Navy, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Kilmer, Francis C.
Edlin, Robert A.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

George Grady Duke, Russellville, Ala., in place of E. P. Thompson, transferred.

ARIZONA

Betty E. Fox, Bullhead City, Ariz., in place of L. N. Clayton, removed.

Alice L. Maxwell, Chinle, Ariz., in place of E. D. Guillet, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Luther D. Kerr, Williford, Ark., in place of A. C. Willbanks, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

J. B. Long, Clarksburg, Calif., in place of I. B. Lawlor, resigned.

COLORADO

Rudolph G. Verzuh, Crested Butte, Colo., in place of R. G. Verzuh, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Henry L. von Dwingelo, Rowayton, Conn., in place of D. H. Short, removed.

Edward J. Speer, Southport, Conn., in place of H. B. MacQuarrie, resigned.

FLORIDA

Warren A. Ray, Opa-Locka, Fla., in place of W. S. Griffiths, resigned.

GEORGIA

Burl F. Sanders, Atlanta, Ga., in place of L. F. Livingston, retired.

Dick B. Bell, Jr., Colquitt, Ga., in place of M. W. Miller, resigned.

Marion R. Sams, Newborn, Ga., in place of Mellie Pitts, retired.

ILLINOIS

Theron C. Tavenner, Freeport, Ill., in place of J. C. McKinstra, deceased.

Robert G. Wheeler, Mill Shoals, Ill., in place of C. L. Quindry, transferred.

Joseph Knuth, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of D. L. Besander, resigned.

John R. Simpson, Park Ridge, Ill., in place of M. E. Sullivan, retired.

Milo L. Pearson, Pleasant Hill., Ill., in place of Hallie Weir, retired.

Paul J. Michael, Somonauk, Ill., in place of E. P. Devine, retired.

INDIANA

William E. Shirley, Bedford, Ind., in place of A. C. Clark, retired.

Lola M. Dixon, Dayton, Ind., in place of Earl Funk, retired.

Sid Charais, Gary, Ind., in place of James Neugebauer, removed.

Leonard J. Rosenbaum, Wanatah, Ind., in place of B. L. King, resigned.

IOWA

Delbert C. Kamman, Imogene, Iowa, in place of C. B. Saner, resigned.

Anna M. Bramer, Monmouth, Iowa, in place of Gerald Gilmore, transferred.

Esther C. Long, Sharpsburg, Iowa, in place of R. A. Rutledge, transferred.

KANSAS

Ardythe A. Goodrow, Morland, Kans., in place of A. H. Smith, retired.

Homer N. Vaughan, Scott City, Kans., in place of M. I. Lawrence, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Milburn L. Ireland, Sonora, Ky., in place of T. B. Terry, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Eli Speyrer, Washington, La., in place of Arthur Deshotels, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert L. Deschamps, Eastham, Mass., in place of R. W. Pearson, removed.

Olive D. Cadwell, East Princeton, Mass., in place of A. C. Sawyer, resigned.

Clarence M. Waite, Greenbush, Mass., in place of P. C. LeMoine, resigned.

Raymond H. Allen, North Grafton, Mass., in place of James Connaughton, retired.

MICHIGAN

Earl M. Halsey, Almont, Mich., in place of C. B. Dabney, deceased.

Jeanette J. Reider, Big Bay, Mich., in place of W. R. Shortridge, resigned.

Oscar K. Ziegler, Carsonville, Mich., in place of John Kennedy, transferred.

Francis William Nienstedt, Caseville, Mich., in place of J. W. Quinn, removed.

DeRossa A. Essex, Essexville, Mich., in place of J. C. White, resigned.

John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.

Elizabeth M. Smith, Lennon, Mich., in place of M. E. McMichael, retired.

Russell J. Strazzulla, Newport, Mich., in place of T. V. Manor, transferred.

Leslie H. Dean, Sr., Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L. Stockwell, retired.

Benedict A. Hunsanger, Ruth, Mich., in place of M. A. Zinger, retired.

MINNESOTA

Arthur C. Reetz, Dakota, Minn., in place of E. L. Brown, transferred.

Irving C. Elmquist, Hopkins, Minn., in place of A. F. Ess, removed.

Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.

Faith V. Erickson, Silver Bay, Minn. Office established May 1, 1954.

Chauncey B. Erwin, Winona, Minn., in place of L. L. Bronk, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Ruby Q. Burney, Arcola, Miss., in place of R. R. Williams, retired.

MISSOURI

Raymond G. Baum, Arnold, Mo. Office established August 1, 1945.

Arnold C. Miles, Vanduser, Mo., in place of A. G. Layton, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Edward J. Dolista, Farwell, Nebr., in place of Edward Borzych, retired.

Russel J. Dow, Indianola, Nebr., in place of B. D. A. Quigley, removed.

Donald C. Mumm, Yutan, Nebr., in place of Otto Dau, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Frank C. Fertig, Atlantic City, N. J., in place of T. C. Stewart, retired.

Mary Musselman, Blawenburg, N. J., in place of G. J. Holbig, resigned.

George W. Schuyler, Clinton, N. J., in place of Nelson Pickel, deceased.

Charles Mertz, Millington, N. J., in place of C. S. E. Cullen, retired.

NEW YORK

Howard E. Guinnip, Angelica, N. Y., in place of F. K. Jude, retired.

Robert H. Schaffer, New York, N. Y., in place of Albert Goldman, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edward Leroy Hobby, Apex, N. C., in place of T. B. Miller, retired.

Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N. C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Delbert D. Metz, Flasher, N. Dak., in place of C. C. Shearer, retired.

OHIO

Othal Paul Ballinger, East Liberty, Ohio, in place of L. R. Noble, retired.

Elizabeth K. Woodall, Glendale, Ohio, in place of T. G. Smith, retired.

Ila J. Tabbert, Graytown, Ohio, in place of A. M. Dick, retired.

James S. Fenner, Laura, Ohio, in place of Josiah Eikenberry, resigned.

James J. Copham, McDonald, Ohio, in place of L. V. Wick, resigned.

Raymond L. Lucht, Mantua, Ohio, in place of L. C. Goodell, retired.

Harry E. Bricker, Negley, Ohio, in place of V. M. Murphy, deceased.

Clark Wickensimer, Washington Court House, Ohio, in place of W. E. Passmore, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Kenneth A. Fahrny, Atoka, Okla., in place of D. H. Rounsaville, transferred.

Ernest H. Armstrong, Baker, Okla., in place of R. W. Sellers, deceased.

William E. Logan, Seminole, Okla., in place of C. W. Johnston, retired.

OREGON

Vida G. McLean, Weston, Oreg., in place of T. K. Reiss, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Vincent G. Jankauskas, Elmhurst, Pa., in place of A. S. Van Campen, retired.

Harold W. Richards, Jim Thorpe, Pa., in place of G. W. Smith, retired.

John Willard Seyler, Luthersburg, Pa., in place of Carl Seyler, retired.

Charles S. Glisan, Markleysburg, Pa., in place of A. T. Seese, retired.

Bernard J. Harding, Scranton, Pa., in place of J. F. Conrad, retired.

Charles H. Grier, Swarthmore, Pa., in place of W. C. Snyder, transferred.

Morna M. Huffman, Whitney, Pa., in place of R. W. Haas, transferred.

Edward B. Maguire, Wynnewood, Pa., in place of E. R. Eakins, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Carmen T. Alvarez Fuentes, Guaynabo, P. R., in place of Pedro Alvarez, deceased.

Rafael Rexach-Rexach, Rio Grande, P. R., in place of P. R. de Rexach, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sherman S. Seward, Agar, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Evans, retired.

Raymond A. Lutz, Glenham, S. Dak., in place of George Lehnert, retired.

Luther M. Miller, Pierre, S. Dak., in place of R. Y. Bagby, removed.

TENNESSEE

Ross C. Hopkins, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of C. M. Seal, resigned.

TEXAS

Donald J. Laughlin, Groves, Tex., in place of G. P. Stegall, resigned.

Charles C. Fair, Odessa, Tex., in place of W. T. Henderson, retired.

UTAH

Merlin S. Collins, Bonanza, Utah, in place of H. M. Phillips, Jr., resigned.

Charles Norman Baxter, Milford, Utah, in place of Rudolph Nielson, retired.

VIRGINIA

Eugene C. Beagle, Charlottesville, Va., in place of E. L. Johnson, retired.

Joseph Richard Campbell, Marion, Va., in place of F. R. Johnston, transferred.

Josephine B. Masi, Millwood, Va., in place of R. C. Lloyd, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bland K. Hesse, Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. J. Duncan, retired

Loren A. Hoffman, Grafton, W. Va., in place of H. F. Courtney, deceased.

Rebecca L. Ziler, Great Cacapon, W. Va., in place of G. R. Avey, retired.

Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.

WISCONSIN

Howard F. McKeen, Bear Creek, Wis., in place of F. W. Flanagan, retired.

Riley D. Robinson, Mauston, Wis., in place of J. J. Steiner, retired.

Harvey DiVall, Montfort, Wis., in place of M. I. Kennedy, resigned.

Felix F. Neider, Wabeno, Wis., in place of M. E. Lang, resigned.

WYOMING

Virginia C. Bennion, Cokeville, Wyo., in place of V. L. Green, retired.

Ruth Newbrough, Pavillion, Wyo., in place of E. G. Kirschbaum, retired.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 13, 1955:

POSTMASTER

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry Vance Raab to be postmaster at Horsham in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13, 1955:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for permanent promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service in the grade indicated:

To be medical directors

Ladislaus J. Zbranek
John B. Hozier
E. Ross Jenny
Thomas R. Dawber
Theodore F. Hilbish
Raymond F. Kaiser
James V. Lowry
Michael L. Furcolow
Robert T. Hewitt
Aaron W. Christenson
Francis T. Zinn
Weldon A. Williamson
Karl Habel
Murray A. Diamond
Robert D. Wright
Harald M. Graning

To be dental director

Gordon G. Braendle

To be dental surgeon

Frank W. Nelson

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John C. Greene
Warren E. Maley
James R. Lambrecht

To be sanitary engineer director

Hugh R. McCall

To be senior sanitary engineer

Lawrence B. Hall

To be sanitary engineer

Jack H. Fooks

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Ralph K. Longaker
David H. Howells
Robert L. Harris, Jr.
Eugene T. Jensen
Frederick A. Flohrschutz, Jr.
Harold W. Wolf
Edward R. Williams
Francis M. Crompton

To be senior pharmacists

Robarts L. Proper
Arnold H. Dodge

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Carl H. Brown
George J. Gruber

To be scientist director

Martin D. Young

To be senior assistant scientist

Earl S. Schaefer

To be senior sanitarians

Ralph L. Perkins, Jr.
Evelyn Rahm

To be sanitarian

George R. Hayes

To be senior nurse officers

Harriet G. Dexheimer
Clarice M. Russell
Josephine I. O'Connor
Anna M. Matter
Genevieve S. Jones
Lola M. Hanson

To be nurse officers

Marie D. Grant
Vivian L. Gibson
Mildred K. McDermott
Helen L. Roberts
Mary N. Bouser
C. Vistula Lancaster

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Florence A. Canada

To be assistant nurse officer

Frances R. Donoghue

To be dietitian

Annette L. Buza

FOR CORRECTION

(This name is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in spelling in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on January 10, 1955, and confirmed by the Senate on January 27, 1955:)

Marie F. Hanzel to be nurse officer.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James R. Moncus, Birmingham.
Walter Howard Schad, Brewton.
Warren G. Findley, Calera.
William R. Pope, Danville.
James E. Lambert, Darlington.
William S. Griffin, Dutton.
William Lee Howell, Fairfax.
Daniel R. Tyner, Florala.
Dorothy B. Andrews, Fulton.
Flora T. Mauldin, Killen.
Cyrus Kitchens, Oneonta.
Tommy H. Bellomy, Scottsboro.
Hunter L. Stokes, Sulligent.
Austin E. Gray, Trafford.

ARKANSAS

Emma Hurst, Hartman.

CALIFORNIA

Robert F. Smith, Big Bear Lake.
Alda D. Thornton, Lake Arrowhead.
Roberta K. Paranick, Lee Vining.
Richard E. Bolton, Monrovia.
Charles C. Herrick, Oakland.
Beth Rinden, Waterman.

COLORADO

William G. Tucker, Kremmling.
Cleo F. Talcott, Weldona.

CONNECTICUT

Fred H. Grimshaw, Windsor.

FLORIDA

Ellen B. Turberville, Century.
James M. Solano, Elkton.
Arthur O. Jefferis, Eustis.
Elbert L. Brown, Oxford.
Andrew Bartlett O'Hara, Rockledge.
Richard L. Schweizer, Winter Park.

GEORGIA

Rae N. Neville, College Park.

ILLINOIS

James S. Rutter, Addison.
Neal E. Muma, Brownstown.
Annabelle C. Lorenz, Carbon Cliff.
Ray D. Robison, Ferris.
Roy J. Bowen, La Harpe.

Ralph C. Jacob, Mendota.
Virgil H. Ruff, Modesto.
Theodore W. Whitehouse, Mount Olive.
J. S. Marsh, Saunemin.
William E. McElroy, Springfield.

INDIANA

Byron V. Hoover, Carlisle.
Ralph E. Watson, Tipton.
Gene M. Wilson, Versailles.
Roger J. Rhodes, Walton.

IOWA

Leland M. Gardner, Cambridge.
Richard E. Staples, McGregor.
Ervin F. Plueger, Scotch Grove.
Hoyt E. Carrier, Vinton.
Odette B. Kastler, Woolstock.

KENTUCKY

Roy Burl Phillips, Grahn.

LOUISIANA

Melvin J. Hester, Basile.
Henry P. Ponstein, Chalmette.
James F. Roberts, Downsville.
Thomas N. Sofford, Morgan City.
Mastin A. Robison, Oil City.
Robert Mitchell, Jr., Ringgold.

MASSACHUSETTS

Candido A. Torcoletti, Southboro.

MINNESOTA

Clarence J. Verthein, Hokah.

MISSISSIPPI

Luther P. Robertson, Merrigold.

MISSOURI

John H. Scott, Bunceton.
Norman F. Kline, Ellisville.
John H. Jones, Ethel.
Carl W. McKinney, Houston.
Margaret H. Mackie, Mexico.
Eldon R. Woods, Orrick.

MONTANA

Eugene Wallace Wade, Cooke.

NEBRASKA

Otto J. Guretzky, West Point.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George W. Conway, Concord.
Raymond H. Chase, Dover.

NEW JERSEY

Louis T. Wigdortz, Asbury Park.
Geoffrey A. Parmee, Ringwood.
Paul G. Peterson, Rumson.
Clarke L. Newman, Titusville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Junius Paul Cheek, Chapel Hill.
Cecil B. Vuncannon, Ellerbe.
Ben F. McGregor, Shannon.
Neil D. Shively, Spray.

OHIO

Donald Rupert Kyle, Dorset.
Robert H. Benton, Holland.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Stanley, Alma.
Margaret Marie Duel, Carmen.
Loetta Jo Conditt, Countyline.
Phil H. Underwood, Custer.
Warren C. DeMoss, El Reno.
Ivan A. Southwick, Garber.
Gerald L. Ridle, Gracemont.
Charles E. Doolin, Jennings.
Harvey Bowen, Jr., Meeker.
John N. Wheatley, Yukon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ruth C. McCrabb, Delta.
Thomas M. Benner, Ford City.
George D. Henrie, Mifflinville.
Howard F. Rabold, Newmanstown.
Sharon L. McHenry, Parker.
Herrwood E. Hobbs, Pottsville.
Walter L. Alexander, Sharpsville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Marie Logue, Oelrichs.

TENNESSEE

Filbert G. McIllwain, Holladay.
Clyde M. Guffey, Johnson City.
Robert H. Eddings, Westmoreland.

TEXAS

Johnnie E. Brown, Alba.
William B. Hudson, Dallas.
Mattie K. Elmore, Shepherd.
Charles E. Paxton, Sweetwater.

VERMONT

Donald C. Shedd, Wallingford.

VIRGINIA

Leo W. Arthur, Hurt.

WASHINGTON

George J. Morry, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

Paul F. Sheets, Clarksburg.
Don Shields, Jr., Coal Mountain.
Walter L. Boggess, Gassaway.
Walter M. Ferrell, Kenova.
Richard U. Duerr, New Martinsville.
Ralph C. May, St. Albans.
Raymond Stanley, Sylvester.

WISCONSIN

Herbert C. Lee, Dallas.
Anthony Janoch, Herbster.
Arthur F. Hammes, Jefferson.
Alvin A. Kaziak, Woodruff.

WYOMING

Fred G. Dudley, Laramie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, may Thy divine spirit daily dwell within us abundantly and triumphantly, transforming our inner self into a sanctuary of light, of joy, and peace.

Help us to surrender ourselves to Thy will and guiding spirit, and fill our hearts with that love which makes us loyal, and that faith which makes us courageous and unafraid.

Show us how we may hasten the coming of that blessed day of friendship and fraternity, and of peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1835. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes."

THE HONORABLE OVETA CULP HOBBY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby is a distinct loss to the Eisenhower administration. Energetic, capable, and possessing much commonsense, she ably filled a position that is always full of controversy.

As war chief of the WACs and as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby made notable contributions to the public service.

Her resignation was undoubtedly caused by the serious illness of her husband, making it necessary for her to return to her personal affairs.

In returning to her Texas home, she leaves behind a host of friends, who realize the excellent service she has rendered to the country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think that Mrs. Hobby is a very capable and fine lady. She and her husband have been friends of mine over the years. Their paper, including the editorial page, has been very kind to me. Frankly I think she has had a very rough ride. She is not a doctor, not a scientist, and she has had to take the advice of someone else on things like vaccine.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say a few words about the fine service my fellow townswoman, Mrs. Hobby, has rendered the Nation. I have known the Secretary and her family for many, many years. She has one of the most capable minds I have ever known. Her counsel and her good judgment will certainly be missed by the President and Cabinet. She brought with her good, common, horsesense, and certainly a lot of human understanding to the administration.

I know we all will miss her here. Her husband is very ill. At one time he was one of our great Governors of the State of Texas.

I hope that when she gets with him again his health will improve and that she and the Governor will live many, many long, happy, and useful years.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby deserves high praise for her service to this country, both in war and in peace.

The excellence of her record as Commander of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps earned Mrs. Hobby the Distinguished Service Medal.

The job she has done as first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reflects her fine administrative talent and her solid understanding of the problems of that office.

My own close working acquaintance with Mrs. Hobby since 1953 has been a privilege for me. I have found her always pleasant, conscientious, and accommodating.

Her sympathy for the well-being of the people with which the Department is concerned has been coupled with an excellent sense of balance and judgment with respect to Federal responsibilities.

To her credit, Mrs. Hobby has maintained a sound perspective, consistently refusing to be stampeded into unsound, ill-considered actions sometimes proposed for the Department.

She has shown admirable courage and forbearance in the face of difficulties and undeserved criticism.

The contributions she has made to good government will be remembered for years to come.

The expansion of our social security, vocational rehabilitation, hospital and medical facilities, and educational programs are among noteworthy achievements of the Department under Mrs. Hobby's leadership.

It may safely be said, moreover, that under Mrs. Hobby's guidance the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has gained stature as a full-fledged member of the executive branch family. It is a Department dedicated, as was its first Secretary, to humanitarian principles.

We all want to make this country the best posible place on earth in which to live.

Mrs. Hobby can return to her home and her family, after many years of service to this cause, with full assurance that she has helped all of us materially along the road to that goal.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have known Mrs. Hobby through the years feel that in her leaving her position as the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we are losing someone who has rendered valiant service to her country. On the other hand, the splendid work she has done, the good commonsense she has made part and parcel of this new Department, will keep her with us, for those who follow her carry forward on the foundations she has laid.

I had the privilege of working with her during the years when she established the Women's Corps. I found her then, as now, in all things fair, objective, and possessed of great good sense. We, who are women, feel that she had held the standard of our service to our country high. We are reluctant to have her go, yet we know, perhaps even better than the men of the country, that a woman's first love is her home. It is as it should be that her husband is her first responsibility. So we wish for her every possible good thing as we express our regret at her leaving and thank her from grateful hearts for the intelligent, loyal, stimulating service she has rendered the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret to learn that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby has found it necessary to resign as our Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will be a distinct loss to the administration and to the country.

Knowing her deep love for her husband and children, all of us sympathetically understand why she finds it impossible to continue in the Cabinet. The demands upon her time and energy are almost beyond imagination, and she served unselfishly at great sacrifice to her fine family. She had a choice to make and we cannot but admire her for the decision, motivated by love of her home.

Mrs. Hobby has the distinction of being the second woman to be in the United States Cabinet, and she served with distinction. It is hardly necessary to recite here all that she has accomplished in her period of service for improving our health programs, our social security system and for the advancement of education.

She is a woman of many talents and many accomplishments. She served for several years as parliamentarian in the Texas House of Representatives. She was a newspaper editor and publisher. She was an executive director of a radio-television station. But probably she is best known to the country for her outstanding service in World War II as Director of the Women's Army Corps, for which our Government awarded her the Distinguished Service Medal and the Philippine Government conferred on her the Military Merit Medal.

Truly, Mrs. Hobby is an exceptional woman. I am proud to have had the opportunity to know her personally and to work closely with her in connection with the Eisenhower administration's program. She will be greatly missed but never forgotten. She has made a place in our country's history that can never be erased but which will become with time more widely recognized than even today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the service of Mrs. Hobby.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mrs. Hobby as the Secretary of the Department of Health and Education is a great loss to the Nation. I had the pleasure and the privilege of serving on the Intergovernmental Relations Commission with Mrs. Hobby. As a member of that Commission I learned to know and appreciate the work, the ability, and the leadership of Mrs. Hobby. She is one of the greatest and most gracious ladies I have ever met or have ever been associated with. Mrs. Hobby, in my opinion, reflects great credit and honor upon the women of America through the service she has rendered as a member of the President's Cabinet, and her management of the Department of Health and Education.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Mrs. Hobby resigned today as head of that Department of Government second only to the State Department in so far as the burden of the office is concerned.

As Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, she appeared many times before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the occasion of her last appearance before the committee, she flew to Washington from the bedside of her husband. Always she was a courteous, gracious, and well-informed witness who defended whatever position she took with firmness, but at the same time with friendliness.

As she retires from public office, I wish to join with her many friends in Texas and across the country to wish her well, and to express the hope that the condition of her husband's health may greatly and speedily improve.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with those of my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, who has tendered her resignation to the President as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is with regret that I learn that she has found it necessary to retire from public service.

Her fellow Texans everywhere have a high regard for this gracious, charming, and highly capable lady. Long before she agreed to serve her country in the Cabinet of this Nation, Mrs. Hobby was rendering great public service. In our State, she has made an outstanding contribution to its development and to that of her community. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] referred a moment ago to her leadership in making the Women's Auxiliary Corps such an effective arm of our country's defense in time of war.

Much as she has done in many fields of public service, I desire particularly today to express my thanks to her for what she has done for Gallaudet College, the only senior college for the deaf in the world. Gallaudet College has not always received the consideration to which it is entitled. At the beginning of Mrs. Hobby's service in the President's

Cabinet, she took a personal interest in the college and because of that interest, Gallaudet College has received the recognition and assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which it has needed.

As a result of her interest, a find building program for Gallaudet College has been initiated. When this program has been completed I know that Gallaudet College will be able to provide better college training for more worthy deaf young men and women of this Nation.

I speak for many grateful people throughout this Nation when I express appreciation to her for what she has done for Gallaudet College. And just as she has made a contribution in this very important part of her administration, so has Mrs. Hobby done great work throughout the whole of her Department.

Her husband, Gov. William Pettus Hobby, is also a great Texan. I count it a privilege to know both of them and to feel that they are my friends. Governor Hobby is a wise, kindly, and honorable gentleman. To both Governor and Mrs. Hobby go our best wishes for good health and happiness.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely glad to pay tribute to Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby for the great work that she has done all through the years, not only since she came to Washington with the War Department and did fine work there but when she was in Texas as a parliamentarian of the Texas Legislature. She was writer and then editor and manager of a great newspaper. Step by step Mrs. Hobby has progressed. Her work as the head of the WACs was outstanding during World War II. It was pioneer work. Many persons did not want to have women work with the Army, but it proved to be a tremendous success. We all admire her for the work she did then. We have admired her for her courage and ability in administering her duties as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one of the very most difficult jobs in the entire country.

She has shown great courage and loyalty in her gentle way; she has been a great fighter for any cause she considered right throughout her career. She succeeded in being a great public official.

I am very fond of Oveta Hobby and of her devoted husband, former Governor Hobby. His pride in her knows no bounds. I wish them many years of happiness and a well-earned rest.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, while I join my colleagues in expressing regret at the loss of the services of Mrs. Hobby, a very capable woman who has served ably in the President's Cabinet, I should also like to call attention of the House to the fact that Mrs. Hobby's successor, Mr. Marion Folsom, is a very able man. I have known Mr. Folsom for a great many years. I had the privilege of working with him for some 3 years when he so ably served as director of the staff of the Postwar Policy Committee of which I had the honor to be chairman. Whatever success that committee achieved—and we do think it conducted a very successful study of postwar conditions and did a splendid job—it was largely the result of the able leadership of the staff by Mr. Marion Folsom.

He is eminently qualified for this job. He has contributed perhaps more than any other man in the United States to the statutes now on the books with reference to social security. His ability has long been recognized in Government as well as business circles. He has served his country well under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower and I am sure he will continue to serve his country well in his new capacity.

Born and reared in Georgia, this truly great American moved to New York as an employee of the Eastman Kodak Corp. His ability was soon recognized; and for the past 12 or 15 years he has served with credit as the treasurer of that great organization.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on his selection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to learn that Oveta Culp Hobby has resigned as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Her service as Secretary of this important department of Government has been highly efficient, able, and distinguished.

Secretary Hobby came to the office she has so ably filled with an educational background and a wide experience that admirably equipped her to fulfill the duties of the office. Not only did she possess the qualifications that made it possible for her to render such outstanding service, but, in addition, she had a deep and sincere regard for the human elements that are so necessary in one who would be highly successful in performing the duties that are so closely alined with the lives of our people.

During the time I was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it was my privilege to be closely associated with Mrs. Hobby in the work of her Department because many of its activities, particularly concerning matters of health, came within the jurisdiction of our committee. In all these matters I found Mrs. Hobby had a deep and sincere desire to extend and expand service to our people that would tend to promote their welfare. An examination of her views expressed in public addresses, testimony before our committee and the many other means by which they found appropriate expression, leave no doubt that in the field of health activities of a government character she had a complete understanding of the good that could and should be done without trespassing upon the American system of health care. She was forward looking and progressive in all of her recommendations. It is, in my opinion, unfortunate after having demonstrated her grasp and understanding of the many problems that arise, and, with the desire to solve them in a way that would prove beneficial to our people, that she has found it necessary to resign from her position before she accomplished the full program she had envisaged.

Again, may I express my deep regret that necessity has caused her to retire from Government service. She is the type of public servant that will be missed, yes, greatly missed. May long life and continued success be her portion in the years ahead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted.

PUT MORE SECURITY INTO SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, how anyone can oppose the development of the old-age and survivors insurance program is beyond understanding.

It is based on taxes paid for this purpose by employers and employees.

It is self-supporting, like an automatic savings plan, building up a trust fund to support people during old age, sound, conservative, and eminently respectable, in contrast with some of the sorry financial adventures of government.

Even the most cautious of legislators can have no complaint.

Social security is now 18 years old, time to have reached its majority, but we have not permitted it to grow up.

Some people are still excluded from coverage, and the benefits resemble a juvenile allowance, rather than retirement pay for the aged who have completed a lifetime of work.

There is no doubt in my mind that the legislation which gave birth to social security will be recognized as one of the outstanding accomplishments of the Congress during the whole of the 20th century.

While our hearts respond to its humanitarian appeal, our judgment is impressed by its economic advantages.

By distributing income and maintaining purchasing power, social security will become one of the strongest supports of our national economy, providing income for the aged who seldom had it before, and thus spreading the market for goods and services.

I said "will become," because the present law is far from adequate: Like an unfinished house, an austerity meal, or a suit that fits like a straitjacket.

Recognizing these shortcomings, the Committee on Ways and Means has recommended that we get on with the job. By continuing benefit payments to disabled children who are 18 years of age and older; by providing disability payments for insured workers at the age of 50; by extending coverage to certain professional men and women, and to Tennessee Valley Authority, home-loan bank, gum naval store employees; by reducing the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years; and by revising the contribution schedule to maintain the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors' insurance program.

Ability to pay keeps step with liberalized coverage.

The one lack is an upward revision of benefit payments.

While older, retired people consume less than younger, active workers, they must still pay the same price for the necessities of life.

This Congress has established a justified pattern for increasing the salaries of Government officials and Government employees, as well as for members of the Armed Forces.

To be consistent and fair, we should provide increased benefits for those entitled to social security payments.

The present maximum of $108.50 per month for a retired worker is not enough. Many get much, much less.

This week we are legislating a long overdue increase in the minimum wage.

This is predicated upon the minimum income needed by a worker to survive.

But what about the older workers who have retired by choice or by necessity because technological improvements and other considerations have determined that there is no room for them in the labor market?

On the average, the benefits they receive from social security, are less than half of the minimum wage that we consider necessary to keep body and soul together.

We are pleased that the eligible age for women shall be reduced from 65 to 62, thus narrowing the gap during which some women must depend on charity before they become entitled to old-age insurance.

We would like to see the eligibility age for retirement reduced to 62 for men as well, because, under our economic system, it is very difficult for an unemployed person, 60 years of age or over, to get any kind of a job.

The present bill represents a timid advance, and we shall support it only because it represents some improvement, reserving the right to press for full coverage, increased benefits, and a further reduction in the eligibility age for retirement at the next session of Congress.

We shall not be satisfied until social security becomes more substantial than it is at the present time.

LIQUIDATION OF DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that conferences would begin soon between the Atomic Energy Commission and representatives of Dixon-Yates as to the amount which the Government will be expected to pay for the liquidation of the Dixon-Yates contract.

There is a considerable question as to whether anything at all is due the Dixon-Yates organization. These people went into this matter knowing that there was determined opposition to the contract on the part of many Members of the Congress. They went into it knowing that the people of the Tennessee Valley were unalterably opposed to it. They were aware from its inception that they were engaged in a hazardous matter and in entering into it anyway, they took the chance that the public would eventually enforce the abandonment of the Dixon-Yates contract.

Furthermore, the financing which was arranged by the First of Boston Corp. has not been finalized. The bonds have not been issued. The loans have not been made. The financial end of the deal has not been approved by the SEC and since the matter has now become moot, I doubt if such approval will ever be given.

What has been lost, if anything, is a small part of the small amount of risk capital involved. And risk capital is precisely what its name implies, subject to risk which Dixon and Yates well knew they were taking in entering into that contract.

No one would wish the Federal Government to act meanly about this matter. It is true that the executive branch is as culpable as Messrs. Dixon and Yates in attempting to foist this contract on the people of the Tennessee Valley. I would suggest that the Dixon-Yates combine be reimbursed, therefore, for the exact amount of out-of-pocket expenses they have incurred in the small amount of site clearance they have done in preparation for construction. They should be given not a penny above that amount and not a penny for any damages they now may claim.

REPUBLICAN POSTAL SERVICE SLOWER THAN PONY EXPRESS

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the 1952 Republican platform carried the following statement:

> DELIVERY OF MAIL
>
> We pledge a more efficient and frequent mail delivery service.

During the campaign many people were led to believe that this statement meant a return to two mail deliveries a day. That was not the case, however, because Republicans later pointed to the language which reads:

> More efficient and frequent service.

I would like to report on how the Republican administration has been doing in the Post Office Department.

I hold in my hand an envelope, mailed from the Capitol on July 1, 1955, to 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., under a special-delivery and a 3-cent stamp. It took 6 days for that letter to be delivered. Formerly, under the Democratic administration, special-delivery mail was handled during the same day it was mailed.

Feeling that perhaps this was an unusual occurrence, I sent another envelope to the same address on July 8. Here it is. This letter was sent from the Capitol special delivery and it took the Post Office Department 4 days to get it down to Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican crusade in the Post Office Department has placed us back on schedules slower than the old Pony Express. Using horses, the Pony Express, in 1860, was able to make it from Missouri to California in 7 days. Ninety-five years later, without horses, it takes Mr. Summerfield anywhere from 4 to 6 days to deliver a special-delivery letter approximately 20 blocks in the city of Washington. I am not sure that the day of the horse is past after all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today and tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tomorrow, Thursday, to file a report on the bill H. R. 7225, the social-security amendments of 1955, and that the same length of time be allowed for the filing of any minority or separate views on the bill; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD today and include a summary and pertinent material and information on the bill H. R. 7225, the social-security amendments of 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be received throughout the country with regret and with the hope that it does not mean a permanent end to her public service. In the period since her appointment to the President's Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby has rendered distinguished service in a highly complex, difficult post. She deserves and will have the gratitude of all those who recognize a job well done.

At the same time the country is fortunate in having, as a nominee to replace her, the wise and able Under Secretary of the Treasury, Marion B. Folsom. It is doubtful if there is anyone in the country who is better qualified to fill the position of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare than Mr. Folsom. In the past decades he has rendered many services to the Federal Government, including outstanding services to the Department which he is now nominated to head. Mr. Speaker, I applaud his designation by the President to this important post and take this means of extending my best wishes to Mr. Folsom for a successful tenure as head of this Department and member of the President's Cabinet. I am sure the people of Rochester and western New York join me in these good wishes.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimons consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I have read editorials in the New York Times, the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat taking the House of Representatives to task for appropriating $2.657 billion on a $3.285 billion authorization for the extension of the foreign-aid program.

Each one of these editorials completely disregards the basic issues involved. The issues involved are the case the executive department presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in justification of the request for authorization of an extension of the program and the case the executive department presented to the House Appropriations Committee in justification of the request for funds to carry out the extension granted.

The Congress and its committees have a constitutional job to perform as the representatives of the people. That job consists of studying in detail any requests by the Executive for additional authority and additional moneys. The Congress should not be swayed by mere general statements of fine intentions and noble purposes. It has the duty to go behind the words and get into the details. If the executive department fails to supply the details to the Congress or, indeed, misinforms the Congress, or the Congress fails to obtain the details which alone can make meaning of the stated noble intentions, there has been a dereliction of duty.

I wonder if the authors of these particular editorials took the trouble to read the testimony of the executive department officials in the hearings conducted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee or the testimony of the executive department officials in the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee. I wonder if the authors of these particular editorials read the 2 committees' reports or read the debate in the House on the 2 bills.

To me it is obvious that none of these basic documents have been read. Only through reading these documents can it be determined whether or not the executive department has been derelict in its duty to properly inform the Congress on the programs and moneys it sought and to present an adequate justification for the additional powers and moneys requested.

If, indeed, the executive department has failed to properly present a case, far from criticizing the Congress for doing its duty, those who seek to mold public opinion should be praising the Congress and calling the executive department to task.

Actually, in my judgment, the Congress deserves great censure, but not along the lines of these editorials. The Congress deserves censure for not adequately doing its duty in requiring the executive department to get its program planning in such order that it could be intelligently presented. The Congress should have sent the executive officials back to do their homework, even though it meant keeping the Congress in session several months longer in order to pass an intelligent foreign-aid program.

I happen to be strongly for the stated objectives of our foreign policy, and have been ever since I have been in the Congress. I believe I could make as eloquent a plea for these objectives as any person in the House, and yet for 5 years I have been unable to even vote for or against the objectives of the program because there were no connecting links between the oratory and the specific authorities and moneys requested. A blank check and a blind trust in the executive department cannot be regarded as a connecting link.

I suggest to the authors of these editorials and the rest of those in the field of molding public opinion who have been penning similar themes, that the surest way to undermine an independent and responsible legislative branch of Government is to continue on their course. The power of the executive branch of Government, coupled with the control of the public relations media, is such that a Congress can be made into a subservient creature of the executive branch of the Government all too readily. Certainly the Congress can vote blank checks and blank authorities to the executive department—but I submit no Congress is needed if that is all that is to be done.

The issue involved in the consideration of the recent Foreign Aid Authorization Act and appropriation bill is not whether the Congress of the United States Government, or the people are for the stated objectives of our foreign policy. I think there is no doubt that they are overwhelmingly for these objectives. The issue is whether we are going to set up detailed programs to attain these results. If there is no real planning, if there is no real fiscal responsibilities set up in detailed programs, then I suggest it is time the people know about it. Otherwise we live in a fool's paradise and a dangerous one at that. Oratory and dollar bills are meaningless by themselves. They cannot defeat an enemy from without and they aid the enemy from within which in my judgment is presently our greatest danger.

These are disturbing thoughts to me because the matter not only goes to fiscal affairs, it goes to the very lives of our people. At the same time the Congress is being abused for not turning over blank checks to the Executive, it is being abused for not giving blanket authority to the executive department over the youth of the country. I suggest these same three editors and others who seem to think as they do read the testimony of the executive officials before the House Armed Services Committee in justification of the Reserve program requested. Read the committee report and the debate on the floor of the House. Here again in my judgment the executive department failed to present a case. The officials in charge of our armed services from their testimony in the hearings obviously have never tried to make the present Reserve program work because they were in complete default in explaining in any detail why the program was not working. Now, indeed, is it the desire for the Congress to fall into line the executive prescribes in generalities under such a set of circumstances?

I made speeches on both of these subjects which may be found on page 9664, June 30, 1955, and page 6497, May 17, 1955, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the debate on these measures. I am sorry the press found insufficient material in those speeches to report to the public. Certainly they found ample material to present the opposite viewpoints advanced by the executive department of the Government.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with other colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the outstanding and distinguished service rendered by Mrs. Hobby. I also want to take advantage of the oppotunity to pay brief, but very sincere, tribute to her distinguished successor, Hon. Marion B. Folsom. It has been my privilege to know Mr. Folsom very pleasantly for some 20 years, and to have worked with him very closely. I feel that a more capable, better qualified, and more efficient person could not have been found anywhere in the country to be appointed to this important position of Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 75, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission the following member on the part of the House: Mr. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the benefit of the Members so that they can be alerted that if the Committee on Rules reports out a rule tomorrow on the minimum-wage bill—that bill will come up on Friday.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the adoption of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconisn. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 92, not voting, 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—316

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chelf
Christopher
Church
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fine
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Gordon
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen
Haley
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kearns
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Scherer
Schwengel
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—92

Adair
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andresen, August H.
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Becker
Bentley
Betts
Bosch
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Burdick
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Clevenger
Corbett
Coudert
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Dondero
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Gentry
Granahan
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Hoffman, Mich.
James
Jonas
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
McConnell
McCulloch
McGregor
Martin
Mason
Morgan
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Phillips
Poff
Quigley
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Pa.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Tuck
Utt
Vorys
Wharton
Widnall
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Withrow
Wolverton

NOT VOTING—26

Avery
Buchanan
Chenoweth
Cole
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Eberharter
Evins
Fernandez
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Hébert
Hess
Jensen
Kearney
Keating
Miller, Calif.
Moulder
Mumma
O'Neill
Pfost
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Wilson, Ind.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Keating.
Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Avery.

Mr. WITHROW, Mr. OSMERS, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SCHERER, Mr. REECE of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CHURCH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14, page 18, line 17, insert:

"SEC. 206. The Secretary hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Director, Division of Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 22, line 10, insert the following: "*: Provided further,* That not to exceed $210,000 of funds appropriated herein may be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for relocation of those permanent resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled within the project area on May 17, 1950, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary therefor on the condition that the Secretary of the Interior transfer to the control of the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Dalles Dam project, Oregon, an irregular-shaped parcel of land containing in the aggregate approximately five and five-tenths acres located in lot 1 of section 17 and in lots 1 and 2 of section 20, township 2 north, range 15 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, being a portion of the land previously transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the act approved February 9, 1929 (45 Stat. 1158). Title to the lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior for the above stated purpose shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian for whose benefit it is acquired; any such trust may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior by conveyance of a fee simple title to the Indian or his heirs or devisees, without application therefor, when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the Indian or his heirs or devisees are capable of managing their own affairs. In carrying out such relocations the Secretary of the Interior may enter into a contract or contracts with any State or political subdivision thereof."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 24, line 1, insert the following: "*: Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, not to exceed $2,050,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and not to exceed $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein: *Provided, however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the landowners, on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount provided for such land acquisition."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 24: Page 24, line 13, insert the following: "*: Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, not to exceed $1,750,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project: *Provided, however,* That the substitution of land acquisition for protection shall not be made unless two-thirds of the landowners on or before December 31, 1955, have offered to sell their property on agreeable terms, and which are within the proportion of the total amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided further,* That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District the construction charge obligation as set forth in a proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, assignable to such remaining lands shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 25, line 17, insert the following "*: Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the port of Tacoma for such work as they may have done within the limits of the Federal portion of the Tacoma Harbor project, over and above the work required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the authorized modification adopted in the 1954 River and Harbor Act: *Provided further,* That such payment shall not exceed the sum of $373,216."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 26, line 7, insert the following: "*: Provided further,* That funds herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River, shall be available to cooperate with the State of South Dakota in restoring a reasonable water level to a portion of McCook Lake, Union County, S. Dak., which water level has been impaired and surrounding residential properties damaged by the reduced flow of the Missouri River due to the construction of the Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dam projects: *Provided,* That the cost to the United States shall not exceed $150,000: *Provided further,* That the State or local agencies shall contribute an equal amount to the cost of the restoration works which restoration shall be accomplished by agreement between the Game, Fish, and Parks Commission of the State of South Dakota and the Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 29, line 21, insert the following:

"The Chief of Engineers hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place the position of Chief of the Programs Branch, Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in the grade GS-17 established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while the House is in session this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1097)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
HENRY DWORSHAK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1464) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment removed from S. 1464 a 5-year limitation upon the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads. The Senate conferees, in receding from their disagreement to the removal of this restriction, concurred in the opinion of the House conferees that the Department of the Interior should be given authority comparable to that which the Department of Agriculture has had for some time in the management of national forest lands.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 304 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

(1) The transportation and distribution of mail, including—

(A) The transportation of regular mail by air;

(B) the discontinuance of post offices and rural routes; and

(C) the utilization of common carriers and other facilities for the transportation of mail;

(2) Actions taken and procedures followed with respect to the classification and appointment of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service;

(3) General administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(4) Fiscal administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(5) The mailability of articles and printed matter generally, including among other things, the mailing of unsolicited articles with requests for payments or contributions;

(6) The application and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including—

(A) the operation and effect of Executive Order No. 10577, dated November 22, 1954, and effective January 23, 1955, relating to the establishment of a new appointment system for the competitive civil service;

(B) the operation and effect of the provisions of the Federal Employees' Uniform Allowance Act, as amended, the provisions relating to premium compensation contained in the Federal Employees' Pay Act Amendments of 1954, and other provisions of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.);

(C) methods of, and limitations on, (i) job classification, (ii) appointments, (iii) assignment of positions to schedules A, B, and C, (iv) distribution of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, and (v) separation of employees; and

(D) the desirability and effect of the limitations imposed by law on the performance of personal services within the Federal Government and the extent to which such limitations have caused the Federal Government to enter into contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of administrative and management services;

(7) The operations of the United States Civil Service Commission;

(8) Administrative actions and procedures pursuant to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(9) Practices and procedures of the United States Civil Service Commission and the departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government relating to the examination of applicants for civil positions in or under the Federal Government;

(10) Actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigation and study, conducted by the committee under authority of House Resolution 32, 83d Congress, with respect to dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(11) Dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of positions, number of positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate; and

(12) The organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce: *Provided,* That no such investigation or study by the committee shall duplicate any investigation or study which is being conducted by any other standing committee of the House of Representatives.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make investigations of certain matters enumerated in the resolution itself. So far as I know there is no objection to the resolution. It was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Rules. There are no two Members of the House for whom the committee has greater respect than the chairman and the ranking minority member of this committee, and for that matter of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We feel certain that these proposed investigations will be carried on in a reasonable, thorough, and patient manner, which will reflect credit upon this House and the country as well.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has so ably explained this resolution, it is the usual type of resolution granting power to a legislative committee to conduct investigations of matters coming within its jurisdiction. This resolution was requested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and by the ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. It is our understanding it was the unanimous request of the entire membership of the committee and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It would simply give power of subpena and the right to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of records in connection with any investigations within the committee's jurisdiction, which might be carried on within the borders of the continental United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEN'S AND VETERANS' SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 295) providing for the consideration of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. Amendments offered by direction of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 7089 under a closed rule, waiving all points of order with 2 hours of general debate. No amendments shall be in order to the bill, except amendments offered by direction of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits, and those amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Select Committee on Survivor Benefits was created by a resolution passed by the House, which permitted this committee not only to investigate this very complicated and difficult problem which involves the jurisdiction of a number of committees, but also provided the right to that committee to present legislation.

When the select committee appeared before the Committee on Rules it pointed out the complexity of the provisions of this bill. The merits were not discussed before the Committee on Rules. That will be done in detail during the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill which you have before you is the result of a great deal of work by the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. I would be the last one to appear before you and state that in many respects the bill is not a tremendous improvement over the laws in effect at this time. However, there is one provision of this bill which I think is distinctly undemocratic, unrealistic, and distinctly un-American. It is something which strikes at the very heart of a principle of this country which has rejected class distinction among Americans, who have given their lives in the defense of our country. We are a peaceful people and require our citizens to go into the armed services only when our national security is in jeopardy. At that time every able-bodied, red-blooded American is called upon to render his or her service where it will be of the greatest service to his country, and if he or she is killed those who survive them are entitled as a matter of equity and justice to be treated equally by our Government. Every time there has been a war this same subject has come up and it has been the uniform policy of this country to reject the contention of the present bill. This inequitable treatment of the widows of deceased servicemen provision in the bill is the finest example of what the Pentagon brass has been able to do for themselves. This provision to which I call your attention, and which I label class legislation, undemocratic, unrealistic, and distinctly un-American is that the survivor of one who gave his life in the defense of his country shall be paid $112 plus 12 percent of his pay, based upon his rank and length of service. It varies from $122 a month to $242 a month. The widow of a private who has been killed in service, who has just enlisted or been drafted and loses his life, will get $122 a month. The widow of a general, killed by the same shell, will get $242 a month. To me it is class legislation contrary to the concepts of our American system of equality. It is completely undemocratic, unrealistic, and un-American because we do not have an army of paid mercenaries in this country. The statistics that have been furnished to me by the Library of Congress are that in World War I, World War II, and Korea, 1 death out of 26 that occurred were from the ranks of the so-called Regular, or career members, of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Twenty-five of these deaths are from the ranks of civilians who had enlisted or been drafted and made the supreme sacrifice to defend their country.

The best example I can give to you to bring it home—and I think this could apply to every Congressman—is the case of a man who makes $125 a week. Take a lineman for the telephone company. If he works 40 hours a week he makes about $125. That is the same as the base pay of a colonel. Let us assume each is married and that each makes basically the same weekly wage. The draftee or enlistee is sent with an Army colonel to the frontlines and the same shell kills both of them. The widow of the man who is making $125 a week as a civilian will, under the bill, receive $122 a month, yet the wife of the colonel, whose base pay is $125 a week, who was killed by the same shell, will receive $208 a month. To me that is absolutely unconscionable, undemocratic, and un-American.

I have gone into the records of the debate which occurred on a similar bill in the House of Representatives in 1917. I have the record before me. The distinguished Speaker of the House was then the leader managing that bill to see to it that that principle which is now being fostered by the Pentagon was defeated.

There was another gentleman from Texas, Mr. Eugene Black, who stated:

> How can you afford to discriminate between these equally deserving men, whether officers or men, when they are soldiers in the field; to discriminate between their families at home, to discriminate between them when they come home maimed and bleeding from service in their country's cause and when they fall upon the battlefield, to discriminate between their widows and orphans.

Mr. Black concentrated his attack primarily upon the differentiated pension for widows and dependents. He proposed the amendment which was finally accepted by the House, the vote being 139 to 3. In justifying his position with reference to uniform pensions, he said, in part:

> I have no quarrel to make as to the pay which our officers and enlisted men are receiving. No, not a bit of it, but are we going to pursue this distinction of pay beyond the borders of the grave? That, gentlemen, is the question that now squarely confronts you. I thought that surely if there was any country in the world where the burning words of John J. Ingalls were applicable, it was in this great Republic of ours:
>
> "In the democracy of the grave all men at last are equal. There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave. At that fatal threshold the philosopher ceases to be wise and the song of the poet is silent. There Dives relinquishes his riches and Lazarus his rags. The poor man is as rich as the richest and the rich man as poor as the poorest. There the politician forsakes his honors, the proud man his dignity, the invalid needs no physician, and the weary are at rest."
>
> And yet in this land of the free and the home of the brave it remains for this committee to bring before us a bill that would preserve the distinction of rank and station beyond the borders of the grave. And this is being offered as a war measure in a war that the President of the United States says is being waged to make the world safe for democracy. The idea of such a proposition in the bill is incomprehensible to me.

It was also agreed on the floor of the House in 1917 that the country would not approve the bestowal of unequal favor on officers and their widows beyond the pay received for their active duty.

First I would like to say that this will come to us under a closed rule. This is a technical matter, I am sure, but it is not so technical that the Members of this Congress are not able to deal with it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If the rule is adopted will it be impossible to offer an amendment to strike out the provision to which the gentleman objects?

Mr. SAYLOR. If the closed rule is adopted the only amendments permissible are amendments by the committee; and the rule is so tight that even they may not be amended. If this closed rule is adopted there will be but one motion to recommit. This is the situation all Members of the House are faced with.

I admit, as I said in the first instance, there are many good provisions in this bill, but I certainly think this one issue is of sufficient importance that we should not have a closed rule.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will also point out to the House where the committee took $3,000 away from each general's wife. If the gentleman is familiar with the bill he knows this provision is not what the Pentagon asked for.

Mr. SAYLOR. It may not be what the Pentagon asked for; and it is true that they gave up about $3,000 in death benefits; the committee increased the amount which is payable to those in the lower grades and decreased it to those in the higher grades. In that respect I have no quarrel with the bill.

But I say this one provision which I have referred to is definitely un-American and violates a principle which every prior Congress has refused to adopt.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BATES. Does the gentleman not realize that the American Legion supports this bill? And does the gentleman contend that the American Legion would support a bill which was un-American?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have spoken to a number of the leaders of the American Legion. They have said that officially they are on record for it, but privately they asked me to do everything I could to oppose it because they do not agree with this principle.

I might also state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that representatives of the VFW, DAV, and AMVETS have also conferred with me and asked me to oppose this provision of the bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the 5 minutes at this time. I will call attention to just one thing, that is, to the necessity for a closed rule.

The committee very carefully went into the interrelationship of the various benefits that are provided and that must be considered simultaneously in this bill. An amendment to one phase of this bill, if adopted, would completely throw the whole thing out of kilter. The bill should be voted either up or down.

If anyone objects to a specific provision, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated, there is opportunity by way of the recommital motion to offer an amendment. I may say that if an attempt is made to amend this bill in its general provisions, the whole thing, in my opinion, would have to be discarded.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RADWAN. Would it not be possible to bring in a rule permitting just one amendment?

Mr. HARDY. One amendment is permitted under this rule.

Mr. RADWAN. As I understand it, under this rule an amendment to put the widow of a private and the widow of a colonel on equal terms is not possible.

Mr. HARDY. It would be under a motion to recommit.

Mr. RADWAN. But it would not be possible to offer it as an amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Only in a motion to recommit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said it would be possible in a motion to recommit. Which comes first, a straight motion to recommit or a motion to recommit with instructions?

Mr. HARDY. There is no straight motion to recommit and no arrangements have been made for a motion to recommit to be offered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But which comes first of those two?

Mr. HARDY. I think that will depend upon the person who is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who would be recognized?

Mr. HARDY. I have no idea.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of reluctance that I present the views I am about to present here. I want to congratulate the committee on the fine job it has done. I think the committee proposal has many good features and corrects many existing inequities. The committee has done a splendid job, but I think it quit or was required to report before it was much more than halfway through. In fact, that was virtually the admission of their staff member who explained this to the Veterans' Committee yesterday, of which I am a member.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out the two reasons why I oppose the closed rule. As a matter of fact, I oppose any rule and, unless someone else does so, I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill for further study. I know that certain members of the committee have a long record of being interested in economy in government and are not in favor of selling our children down the drain or putting the country into bankruptcy. Due to certain reasons I will point out, that is exactly what this bill will do.

In the first place, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, this bill treats all military casualties in identically the same manner. I cannot buy the proposition that we owe the same obligation to the widow and children of one killed in Korea that we owe to the man who is killed driving his automobile from his home to the Pentagon. I might be killed driving from my home down here to the Capitol. He should be treated like me. It is putting two entirely different things together.

Secondly, we have no idea of the cost of this bill. The bill has a gratuity payment for 6 months with certain limitations. We can compute that. There is the second feature of direct payments that we can compute. But the third and the joker is that no one can tell us the cost when we put the entire military program under social security.

I recently had a little experience in converting a State teachers' retirement plan and a retirement plan for State employees to social security. Let me tell you about that. We were taking 3 percent from the teachers' salary and 3 percent from the school district, a total of 6 percent. We had a selected risk group.

We had that matter studied by an actuary and we found out in our State that the plan which paid lesser benefits with higher contributions than social security was financially and actuarially unsound. We would have had to appropriate between eight and sixteen million dollars in order to make it financially sound over the years.

What did we do? We let the Federal Government take that over under social security. The Government collected only 2 percent from each, a total of 4 percent, yet the Government hiked the payout.

Mr. Speaker, is this plan actuarially and financially sound?

I asked a staff member yesterday, "Have you decided whether it is financially and actuarially sound? Can you tell me what the cost is that the taxpayer is going to have to pay in making up the deficit under social security?" They have not studied that part of the program. He had no idea of the answer to that. Until we know that answer, can we afford to take this big military setup that we have got and put them under this system? Now, this affects every man that serves in the Army, careermen, and everybody else, whose pay we just raised 12.5 percent. Now, we do not know how much more we are giving them or what the cost to the taxpayers is. I think it may very well end up with something that will cost a billion dollars a year. Nobody knows.

One other point. I want to tell you what we are asking the taxpayers to do here, something they cannot do for themselves. This is something I know about. A young taxpayer at 30 years of age with prior service who has retained his GI insurance may by supplementing it with private insurance at a cost of over $700 to himself a year—$700, mind you—provide for his wife a death gratuity of $7,735. He can provide for his wife and his kids $186.90 for a period of 12 years. For the next 3 years, until the youngest boy reaches 18, they will get $181. At that time the kids can have $1,930 apiece to get a college education as best they can, and in addition to that the wife can have $39 a month for the rest of her life. Compare that to the benefits in this bill and try to arrive at the real cost of this bill, if you please.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEAN. I could not understand exactly what the gentleman was driving at with reference to social security. Why is it going to be any more unsound to take the military into social security than to have other people under social security? Is it on account of the great number of deaths in wartime?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Not at all. Let me answer it this way: I have to compromise with myself once in awhile, too. When it comes to taking doctors under social security, doctors as taxpayers are contributing to the unsound social-security system as taxpayers. They will have to pay taxes. But when you are creating a new program like this that goes beyond our social security with your two payments—you went even beyond social security—social security is limited to payments to the wife, and widow, and two children, and this bill gives $25 additional a month for each child over two. In addition it supplements social security by giving the surviving widow an additional payment for life which varies from $122 per month for the widow of a private to $242 per month for the widow of a general.

I can see putting the military under social security but when we do, we must know the cost to the taxpayer before we know how much more we can give the career military men out of the taxpayers' pocket.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard thus far, I believe the rule before us is an unfair one. I think it is most unfair to have a closed rule on a bill as important as this. If there is some unfinished business, as was pointed out by the last gentleman, if we vote down the rule, perhaps that could be taken into consideration when a new rule would be reported. But, I certainly think it is most unfair to provide a repugnant social system for the widows in this particular bill.

And I want now to ask the chairman of the select committee, or anyone, for that matter, to answer this question: What justification is there for paying the widow of a general $242 as against the widow of a private $122?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is there any place in the whole American system where survivors' benefits are not tied to a man's attainment? Why should not the gentleman have much better survivors' benefits than survivors of people who work in his office?

Mr. RADWAN. That does not answer my question. The gentleman is asking me a question. I am asking the question, Is there any justification for such discrimination in this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is no discrimination.

Mr. RADWAN. But is there any justification for making such a disparaging difference here?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is there any place in our whole system where survivor benefits are not tied to the attainment of a man?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I should like to answer that question.

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The folks in our offices come in voluntarily. The private in the service is taken in. He does not go in voluntarily. He is drafted. He has no choice about it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Members of Congress come in voluntarily, too. And we Members of Congress have a better retirement system for ourselves than have the people who work in our offices.

Mr. RADWAN. In view of the fact that there just is not any answer to the point that I have raised, I believe this rule should be voted down, because it does not permit a legitimate amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, surely this rule is not going to be voted down. We will surely be permitted to discuss the merits of this bill. We are bringing you here one of the most complicated questions that could possibly confront the Congress, so much so that there is no committee of the Congress which has jurisdiction over all of the subjects involved. Therefore, a select committee was appointed consisting of members of the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, all of which committees have jurisdiction over a portion of the questions involved in this subject.

There is a situation existing as to survivors of the military service that is in urgent need of revision. We have great inequities involved. This bill is an attempt to overcome those inequities.

As to whether or not there is any rank in death, surely you are going to permit us to reach the point of discussing what we propose to do to eliminate the inequities which exist now. But even if it be said that this imports into the survivors' benefits of the military service the question of a different compensation by rank, it is not for the first time. That is in the existing system, ever since 1941, when social-security benefits were made available to members of the armed services.

Most of us are not familiar with the fact, unless it has been called to our attention in connection with a particular case, that the military are right at this moment covered under social security on a noncontributory basis. Every person in the military service since 1941 has been given credit in social security of $160 a month. That applied to draftees, emergency soldiers, regulars, generals, privates, and everyone else. So that ever since 1941 that situation has existed.

We have here what I believe to be a very reasonable readjustment of a patchwork that has existed over a period of years. It has grown up through the days starting when the military were stationed on the frontier. We have brought you here a bill that I think deserves your consideration. I believe you are going to adopt the rule and permit us to get the bill considered.

As to the question of costs, we would like to show you the work that has been done on it, the reports which have been made to us by the Comptroller General, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by the actuaries of the various services, and by the Social Security Administration. Our staff is composed of men who are well qualified in these fields, and we have secured the services through authorization by the Committee on House Administration of an actuarial firm that has been able to give us the information we needed, irrespective of what the departments might have given us. This is a matter that has been worked on for a year. In good grace I can say that no committee has ever done a harder job, because I have been a member of this select committee only during the present Congress. I was not a member of it prior to January of this year. In the early period of that time members of the committee cleared away the underbrush and did a tremendous amount of work, so that in this Congress we have been able to get down to the heart of the matter and work it out. It is necessary in things of this kind not to have the bill open for amendment. I do not like closed rules, but everything handled by the Veterans' Administration is affected by this bill and every type of social-security payment is affected by this bill. It is one of those things that in rare instances have to be considered under a closed rule. You have to take it all or reject it all, so that when it comes back we have something that is actuarially sound. So I hope if the rule is adopted we will be able to present to you the result of a year's real hard, solid effort.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am very happy to have the distinguished gentleman from Texas call the attention of the Congress to the fact that this subject was so involved that only a new committee set up by Congress should be able to handle it. It should be brought to the attention of the House that there are only five Members of the House on that committee, and then there is the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], who was on that committee during the 83d Congress but was not reappointed this year.

The adoption of this closed rule would amount to saying to the Members of this Congress that these six Members of the present Congress had the combined knowledge of this august body on this subject, and——

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. SAYLOR. And know all there is to know about survivors' benefits, and do not need to have the other 429 Members of Congress express their views on this subject. I entirely disagree with that philosophy.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further. I disagree with the gentleman's philosophy and there is no pretension here that the six members of the committee contend that they are the only ones who can pass on this subject. As a matter of fact, no one knows better than we do, how incapable we are of passing on this subject because we understand the questions involved. It is probably the biggest thing that has ever been brought to the Congress. What we are asking for is an opportunity as a committee of five, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] who served last year but is not on the committee this year, may have an opportunity to bring you what we have learned after very extensive hearings and present it all to you. Then the 435 Members of the House—and not the 5 or 6 who compose the committee—by a majority vote can either take it or leave it. It means no more to us on the committee whether you take it than it does to every single Member here. It affects the people of the United States far more than it affects any member of this committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago this House in its wisdom, because of the fact that we all had been plagued and troubled by the problems which had arisen out of the veterans' retirement benefits for those in the military forces, saw fit to establish or create by its own resolution and by the vote of the majority of this House, a special committee representing various committees, which might have jurisdiction over this type of legislation or some phase of it, to study the whole problem and to bring in legislation which might correct the present situation and which might establish a workable, fair, and reasonable retirement system. In my opinion, those men who were named to serve on this special committee are among the ablest Members of the Congress, Mr. Speaker. They are men who have had long years of experience in connection with affairs of this type and with legislation of this type. Most of them, if not all of those who served on this committee, were veterans themselves, and men who certainly have at heart the interest of the veterans of this Nation. That special committee after a year or more of careful study prepared and brought out a bill which this rule would make in order for the consideration of the House. The committee and its membership appeared before the Committee on Rules and expressed the unanimous opinion that it would be absolutely necessary to consider this bill under a closed rule because it was so complicated and it cut across so many jurisdictional and other lines that to have an open rule whereby some amendment might be hastily adopted would result in wrecking the whole program. The Committee on Rules, as I believe I am correct in stating, unanimously, and the only time that I know of that the Committee on Rules has unanimously agreed, reported out a closed rule. So, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that if we are to have any legislation on this subject, it is necessary and certainly advisable to adopt this rule. I favor the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 376, nays 24, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—376

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chatham
Chelf
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Diggs
Dixon
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hiestand
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Mason
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—24

Adair
Ashley
Bailey
Burdick
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Dodd
Evins
Hays, Ohio
Hoffman, Mich.
Macdonald
Magnuson
Murray, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Quigley
Radwan
Sadlak
Saylor
Scott
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Tumulty
Wier

NOT VOTING—34

Blatnik
Boggs
Buchanan
Buckley
Chenoweth
Cole
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Eberharter
Fernandez
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Halleck
Hayworth
Hébert
Hess
Hillings
Hinshaw
Jensen
Kearney
Keogh
Lesinski
McDowell
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
O'Neill
Powell
Rabaut
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Short
Simpson, Pa.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Short.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hess.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Halleck.
Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. ADDONIZIO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. SEELY-BROWN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolutions 264, 265, 268, and 272, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 28, 1955, be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Preliminary hearings by an ad hoc subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee developed that these resolutions are similar in purpose to H. R. 6730, a measure sponsored by the administration which was introduced June 8, 1955, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during the rollcall on the public works appropriation conference report today. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

SERVICEMEN'S AND VETERANS' SURVIVOR BENEFITS BILL

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7089, with Mr. DOYLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a booklet which contains some charts and some other information pertinent to this bill. Sufficient copies of this booklet are available for each Member of the House to have a copy, and I ask those of you who do not already have copies to have a page bring you one in order that you may follow the charts and the other information contained herein.

For those of you who have copies, I call attention first to the fact that just inside the cover is printed a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the President urging early action on this measure. Following that is a letter from the Director of the Budget, then a letter from the Secretary of Defense, then certain excerpts of testimony given by representatives of the American Legion, and then a letter from the American Legion, which I should like to read. The letter is addressed to me and is dated July 1:

> This is to advise you that the American Legion supports the enactment of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of veterans and servicemen. While this is primarily a peacetime measure designed to improve the status of those in the uniformed services, we are aware that it has many important provisions to improve benefits to survivors of those who are, or were, eligible for membership in our organization as wartime veterans.
>
> H. R. 7089 is an important step in the reconstruction of veterans' benefits and services. There is a special appeal to us in that the bill will provide increased grants to approximately 300,000 widows; that the financial status of some 85,000 orphans of veterans will be improved; that many of the 285,000 dependent parents on the rolls will receive larger awards; that the contract insurance rights of more than 6 million veteran policyholders and one-half million insurance beneficiaries in death cases are maintained over and above the increased compensation awards; that no one now receiving survivor awards need surrender a penny; and, that those survivors now on the rolls have the option of electing to receive the new awards after January 1, 1956.
>
> The bill is important also in that, while placing the peacetime Armed Forces personnel under old-age and survivors insurance as contributory members, it preserves the principle of having the Veterans' Administration as the agency handling and administering veterans' benefits and services.
>
> You will appreciate that experience in administering such a complex and far-reaching measure may reveal defects not apparent today. In the past we have always presented to the Congress our ideas regarding the demonstrated use, for amendatory legislation. Our support for H. R. 7089 does not change that policy.

Mr. Chairman, on June 24, 1953, I delivered before the House the longest speech which I have made in my 9 years as a Member of this body.

The subject of my remarks on that occasion was Survivor Benefits for Members of the Armed Forces.

I first became intimately interested in the subject of survivor benefits in 1950 when, as chairman of a subcommittee of a House Committee on Expenditures, I was directed by the chairman of that committee to investigate a report of the Comptroller General dealing with the cost to the Federal Government of the national service life insurance program.

Since this time I have maintained a sustained interest in the subject of survivor benefits for I saw the need for certain remedial legislation in this field.

In 1953, when I addressed the Congress, I stressed the fact that there were 5 existing survivor-benefit programs with the jurisdiction of these 5 programs divided among 4 standing committees of the House.

At that time I called attention to hardships, inequities, and extravagances which had resulted from piecemeal legislation and lack of coordination of the various benefit programs. In my speech of 1953 I urged prompt correction of these conditions and I introduced a resolution proposing to confer jurisdiction and responsibility on a select committee.

Since 1950 and even since 1953 the gross inequity existing between payments made to survivors of certain reservists and regulars has become more acute and more apparent. Today certain reservists are entitled to payments under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. The legislative history of this program indicates that it was not the intent of the Congress that reservists be covered under this survivor program in the manner which exists today.

Today reservists who die in line of duty during peacetime are eligible to receive double the survivor benefits provided regulars of equal rank and who may have died in the same military accident.

Let me mention briefly the several programs which are currently in effect.

In 1950 Congress granted retroactively to all members who served in the Armed Forces from September 16, 1940, a gratuitous social security wage credit of $160 per month. This temporary stopgap legislation is in existence today and has been renewed annually. Within the past 2 years the value of social-security coverage to Armed Forces personnel has become increasingly apparent, but at the same time the cost to the Federal Government and the long-term implication of providing gratuitously a benefit which traditionally requires a tax contribution accents a problem of increasing magnitude.

I do not think that the Congress could continue without review to provide FECA payments for certain reservists, or continue indefinitely gratuitous social-security wage credits to all Armed Forces personnel.

Because of these 2 situations, plus the fact that there were certain other areas which deserve the consideration of the Congress, I, on June 30, 1953, introduced a resolution recommending the creation of a 7-man select committee to make a study of survivor benefits with the end objective being the coordination of benefits which would provide equitable treatment for all Armed Forces personnel and simplify the existing hodgepodge of survivor-benefit legislation. My resolution was not acted upon.

After having acquainted my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] with the existent situation, he, on May 17, 1954, offered a resolution which would establish a five-man select committee on survivor benefits. The resolution was agreed to by the House on August 4, 1954.

The committee was established and the gentleman from Massachusetts served as its first chairman. It was my pleasure to serve with him on this committee and the other members comprising the committee were Mr. KEAN, of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. KEARNEY, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts the committee, from September through December, worked diligently in an effort to ascertain and evaluate the facts on existing survivor benefits programs.

During this period extensive exploratory hearings were held in which all Government agencies, veterans groups, and others were asked to come before the committee and give their views on existing survivor benefits and what changes could be made to provide a more equitable survivor benefit program.

With the close of the second session of the 83d Congress the select committee expired.

In making its report to the House the committee reported that after having studied and carefully evaluated the facts which were then available to us, the committee urged that a select committee of the House on survivor benefits be established by the 84th Congress.

The committee report further stated:

> Based on information and data now available to the committee, we feel that it would be premature to make any specific recommendations to the Congress at this time.

With the convening of the 84th Congress I introduced a resolution that a select committee on survivor benefits be established in the 84th Congress.

On January 31, 1955, my resolution, House Resolution 35, was adopted. I was privileged to be named chairman of the reestablished select committee on survivor benefits, and I was further privileged by the appointment to that committee of Mr. BATES, chairman of the predecessor committee; Mr. KILDAY; Mr. TEAGUE; and Mr. KEAN. No chairman could ask for a finer working group.

In introducing House Resolution 35 I realized that the work of any select committee in this field could only be effectively done if the select committee were empowered to report legislation.

All chairmen of the standing committee having jurisdiction over certain benefit programs concurred with this view. Therefore, we under the provisions of House Resolution 35, were directed to report to the House, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations not later than January 15, 1956.

I am pleased that due to the cooperation of the entire membership of the committee, the Government agencies, the veterans organizations, and others, that we have been successful in completing our assignment considerably prior to the deadline date.

I do not contend that the bill reported is perfect, but the committee believes that it is fair and reasonable and treats effectively with the variety of problems posed by the confused and overlapping existing laws.

H. R. 7089 is an extremely complex piece of legislation and I shall avoid any attempt to over-simplify what is being proposed.

There are several provisions of the committee's bill which offer new concepts in the field of veterans legislation. There is no doubt that the primary objective of the committee, that of greater equity, has been achieved. We have tried, however, to be sure that legislative changes proposed do not affect basic concepts of existing laws as they affect civilians.

The bill does not represent an economy measure. As a matter of fact, in certain respects, on a temporary basis the cost to the Federal Government will be slightly in excess of current costs.

The 5 major survivor benefit programs which exist today have been reduced to 3.

In reality what we have done is combine 2 existing VA benefits—the gratuitous indemnity and death compensation—into 1 program.

It is true that the committee has recommended the redistribution of the $10,000 gratuitous indemnity, sometimes incorrectly referred to as free insurance. In essence, we have not terminated the gratuitous indemnity, but rather assimilated the payments under this program into compensation payments made by the Veterans Administration.

It is interesting to note that the proposed combination dependency and indemnity compensation will have a greater actuarial value than existing VA compensation plus the gratuitous indemnity.

I will not labor this point for I would like to have my colleague [Mr. TEAGUE] explain in detail what has been done in this regard.

The committee has recommended that all Armed Forces personnel be placed under social security on a contributory basis.

Under this recommendation, the serviceman as an employee would pay the 2-percent social-security tax on his base pay, and the Federal Government as an employer would pay a like 2-percent tax. The present gratuitous social-security wage credit of $160 per month would be terminated.

My colleague from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] will explain in detail this provision of the committee's bill.

The committee has made certain other changes in the 6 months' death gratuity and has recommended the termination of Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits for certain reservists. The 6 months' death gratuity shall equal 6 months basic pay, plus special and incentive pays with a minimum of $800 and a maximum of $3,000. This differs from present law where the death gratuity range from a low of $468 to a high of $7,656. Another change consists of paying the death gratuity to survivors when the former serviceman dies of a service-connected disease or injury within 120 days after separation from the service.

All of the payments provided under the committee's bill are compensation payments, and inasmuch as the indemnity compensation has been included in these payments the committee's bill appropriately refers to these payments as dependency and indemnity compensation.

We have not studied the field of pensions.

Those who will benefit under this bill and those on the compensation rolls today who will have the right of election under this bill are the compensation cases only and not pension cases.

To illustrate the scope of the legislation under consideration, I would like to say that there are approximately 465,000 cases on the various death compensation rolls today.

In peacetime years approximately 11,500 new cases are added annually, while death, remarriage, and other circumstances tend to reduce the rolls by an indeterminate number.

The estimated budgetary cost of providing existing survivor benefits is in excess of $600 million per annum.

If the legislation recommended by our committee becomes law, perhaps more than a quarter of a million individuals now on the rolls will become entitled to increased survivor benefits.

The committee in its deliberations did not feel that its jurisdiction permitted a study of non-service-connected pensions.

I think at this point that I should perhaps pause for a moment to bring to the attention of the House the definite distinction which exists between the terms "compensation" and "pensions." Compensation is paid only in cases where the death occurred on active duty or as a direct result of a service-connected disease or injury. Pensions are paid in the cases of non-service-connected deaths but by virtue of prior service affiliation.

It may seem odd to some of you that we are able to raise the benefits to survivors as significantly as we have in this bill and at the same time develop ultimate savings to the Government. The answer to this seemingly anomalous situation rises from the use of social security on a full contributory basis. The servicemen themselves will contribute toward their own survivorship benefits and this will have the effect of further increasing total benefits.

Before yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], there are a few general remarks which I would like to make with regard to the committee's activities.

In my 9 years on the Hill and my prior business career, I have never encountered any problem which was more complex and less susceptible to a simple solution than the subject which has been under consideration by the select committee for the past 9 months.

At times I think we all had reservations as to what could possibly be accomplished by this select committee that would be generally acceptable to all concerned. It has been only in the past 90 days, after months of diligent research, practically continuous public and executive hearings, and the most diligent staff work that the clouds of doubt were dissipated and the light of possible solutions shone forth.

I do not want to labor the point, but as chairman of the committee, I think it is incumbent upon me to acknowledge publicly the sincere devotion that my colleagues, a great many individuals in the Government agencies, the veterans organizations, and others have demonstrated during the past 9 months. It was out of a genuine desire to create equity, to simplify where simplification was possible, and to achieve overall a better survivor-benefit program for the members of the Armed Forces and former members of the Armed Forces than that which exists today.

My colleague [Mr. BATES] in his opening remarks will set forth some of the practical problems which the committee faced in its deliberations. I hope that in our discussions we will clear up many of the questions which arise in your minds. It will be the purpose of the committee to explain this bill fully and completely and I believe that when this has been done there will be virtually unanimous support.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Did I understand the gentleman to say then that this bill concerns the question of pensions not at all?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. And the committee has not gone into that area?

Mr. HARDY. The committee has gone into compensation but not into the area of pensions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What does this bill do to the free insurance program that is in effect now for servicemen?

Mr. HARDY. I referred to that a moment ago. It will be fully discussed a little later by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. What it does in effect is combine the indemnity payments under the gratuitous indemnity program. It combines those with the compensation payments under the Veterans' Administration. Instead of the two, veterans' compensation and the gratuitious indemnity program, you have a combined payment of the two.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, since coming to Congress, in 1939, I have supported veterans' legislation, but in regard to H. R. 7089 I must confess that I am greatly disturbed.

In my opinion, if this bill becomes a law it is a definite step in revolutionizing the entire field of veterans' benefits as now administered by the Veterans' Administration.

I want it strictly understood that I am not being critical of the select committee which drafted the legislation. There is no doubt of the sincerity of its members. I compliment them for liberalizing benefits for survivors of members of the Regular Establishment and certain survivors of veterans of America's wars.

Mr. Chairman, to be more specific, the provision of H. R. 7089 which extends coverage of the Social Security Act to all members of our Armed Forces is the basis of my concern.

This extension of social-security coverage could be the opening wedge in the eventual abolishment of the Veterans' Administration and its related services, including hospitalization and medical care.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that what I have said about the extension of social-security coverage to our Armed Forces as being an opening wedge in abolishing the Veterans' Administration is not meant to be critical of the select committee.

As I have said before, I do not question the sincerity of its members. I feel, however, that I would be remiss in my obligation as a legislator and active in veterans' circles if I failed to express my conscientious opinion.

Mr. Chairman, by projecting my thinking into the future in the event this bill becomes a law, I can visualize veterans of future wars or their survivors being referred to social-security field offices for a solution to their problems regarding veterans' benefits.

In addition, I can see the veterans of America's future wars being referred to public-health hospitals and clinics for needed medical attention.

Mr. Chairman, there are groups in this country who for years have been advocating that the veteran and his dependents be placed under the social-security program and that the Veterans' Administration be abolished and its hospitals turned over to the Public Health Service.

What does this mean? It means that the level of benefits being paid to the veteran of today and tomorrow, as well as to his survivors, will be limited and lowered to meet the social-security benefits, which do not begin to compare with current benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration, not to mention what will happen to the many Veterans' Administration hospitals spread across the Nation today.

In a few words, the special treatment accorded America's veterans and their dependents since the days of George Washington will eventually be eliminated, and, thus, service to one's country in time of war will not be considered above and beyond the duties of ordinary citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill with marked reluctance because it has some redeeming features.

I predict, however, that if this bill becomes law veterans' organizations supporting this legislation may regret their action and ask eventually for repeal of those sections which I feel are inequitable to veterans and their dependents.

It is my hope that during Senate consideration of this legislation the threat to veterans' benefits as contained in H. R. 7089 will be fully recognized.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe I am accurately stating that when these hearings started at least a majority, and I believe every member of the select committee, was against placing the military under contributory social security. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows that today every member of the armed services is under social security.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As time went on and we tried every way to work out a bill that excluded social security, it became more and more apparent that that was impossible. Eventually we reluctantly came to social security. At first I shared the gentleman's views that social security may later take over all benefits of the Veterans' Administration. And, I asked over and over again, Where is social security going? How far is it going? And, finally, toward the end of the hearings, when the head of social security was on the stand, he practically admitted that social security would like to take over veterans' benefits. But, it appears that we came out with participation by the Veterans' Administration stronger under this bill than they were.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for the reluctance he shares with me as far as this bill is concerned. Maybe I will not be here, but I predict again that the veterans' organizations will see the day when they will come back to Congress for the purpose of requesting repeal of certain provisions of this bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the original chairman of this committee, I believe I would be somewhat remiss if I did not take the time to express my appreciation for the splendid cooperation which I have received from the members of this select committee. The idea was originally brought to my attention by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], who had done a considerable amount of work on this subject back in 1952, and it was as a consequence of an article which I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in June 1953 that my thoughts were stimulated and eventually I put in my resolution.

Mr. Chairman, some comment was made about the select committee, and I want to say a word about that. I do not know how we could have possibly gathered together a more informed group than the gentlemen who comprised the committee: The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] the distinguished hero of World War II, the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a man who perhaps knows as much about veterans' affairs as any man in Washington; and with him the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who I think is generally recognized as the greatest authority in the Congress on personnel matters in the Armed Forces; and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] who is an authority on social security. In addition, during the last Congress we had the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a former national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I want to also express my congratulations to the Government agencies, because never in my time have I really appreciated to the degree I did on this occasion the tremendous capacity and the ability of those who work in the Government service. It certainly renewed my faith in Government employees. They worked day and night and many week ends. And, to the veterans' organizations who appeared before us on three separate occasions and who were always available for consultation I also express my gratitude, as well as to the counsel of our committee, the modest gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Stephen Carnes. His native ability and his dogged determination in a large measure reflects the bill which is here before us today.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some comment made as to who originated and who wrote this bill. Let me say quite frankly that this is the product of many minds. It was not written, as has been suggested here, by the Department of Defense. It was not written by the Social Security Administration. It was not written by the General Accounting Office. It was not written by the Director of the Budget. It was not written by the veterans' organization. Indeed, it was not even written by the committee itself. However, throughout this entire bill will be found threads which were woven by all of these various groups. It was, in fact, a cooperative effort where pride of authorship or adherence to archaic principles had no room. Hundreds of suggestions were received, all of them seriously entertained and fashioned into a bill after 12 months of concentrated study, after 57 meetings of our committee, after over 200 meetings between our staff and members of the Government agencies and the veterans' organizations. No one can say with any justification whatsoever that this bill has been hastily conceived.

There were those times, Mr. Chairman, when it appeared that our efforts might be in vain because of the complexity of the subject matter and the diversity of views. I know when I was chairman and while Mr. HARDY was chairman, we asked all witnesses to divest themselves of preconceived or parochial ideas and to approach the problem with an open mind so that we could meet and fulfill our responsibility. I must say that they all responded splendidly to the task that was assigned to them.

Mr. Chairman, in what manner and how much should a grateful Government pay to the dependents of those who lost their lives in the service of our country? There is, of course, no monetary payment that can ease the anguish caused by death. The least we can do, however, is to see to it that the economic hardships caused by these deaths are removed.

During the last 8 months, this select committee, comprised of five Members of the House, gave this matter the most searching study ever conducted on this problem. Why was this study necessary and an overhauling of the entire program warranted? At the present time, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government maintains five separate and distinct benefit programs for the survivors of our deceased military personnel. These programs, starting in 1862, have evolved through the years and are the results of so-called piecemeal legislation. A representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, testifying before our committee, stated:

> The present program, as we see it, has grown like Topsy.

In addition, anybody who was familiar with the present laws on this subject realized it was a complete hodgepodge. When a man dies today in the Armed Forces, his survivors are advised to file for benefits with five different Government agencies. If such survivor is qualified for an award, he or she will receive checks from each of these agencies each month. That is the kind of a situation we have today.

Very few people on active duty today can explain in any sort of detail what the present programs provide or how much their dependents would get in the event of the serviceman's death. A spokesman for the Department of Defense, appearing before our committee, said:

> If you would go over to the Pentagon and interview 50 officers, including those of high rank, I doubt very much if even 10 of them could give you any idea as to the benefits that their dependents might get.

Today thousands of survivors of Armed Forces personnel are receiving aggregate monthly benefits which amount to more than the total base pay and allowances of the deceased while he was alive and on active duty. By the same token, however, there are other survivors who are today receiving survivor benefits which are insufficient to meet even the basic minimum needs. The discrimination and complexities of these problems clearly indicate an objective reappraisal of the existing survivor program is warranted.

There are 4 standing committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over these 5 existing benefit programs. However, inasmuch as an objective simultaneous appraisal of all these programs was necessary, it was our judgment, and the Congress so voted, to establish the select committee, as a consequence of my Resolution 549, which I introduced over a year ago. The committee, when it first met, was aware of many of the problems, but it hardly realized that it would take over 500 hours of meetings to resolve the problem finally. At the present time there are over 465,000 cases on the various death compensation rolls, and to those are added approximately 7,000 more each year.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has already outlined the inequities of the present program. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] will explain the first portion of the bill, that having to do with the 6 months' death gratuity. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] will explain the second portion of the bill, that having to do with social security.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is somebody going to explain to us the precise costs that will be involved in this bill?

Mr. BATES. Yes. That will be explained. In the meantime the gentleman might note the remarks pertaining to it in the report.

Mr. ADAIR. But somebody from the floor will address himself to that point?

Mr. BATES. That matter will be discussed. I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is going to discuss the matter of cost.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, maybe it would be well to dispose of that point right now.

Mr. BATES. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. HARDY. The cost of the first year's operation of the bill will be between $14 and $20 million more than the present program is costing. The savings that will be generated by the provisions of the bill as time goes on indicates that in about 5 years after the effective date of the bill we will be back to a point where the cost will be about the same as under the present program. From then on there will be a gradual buildup of savings until at the end of 18 years it is estimated the annual savings will be $83 million.

Mr. ADAIR. When the gentleman says the cost in the first year will be $14 to $20 million beyond the present cost, does he take into account the contribution which will be made out of Army funds to social security and out of the funds of the individuals which will be made into social security?

Mr. HARDY. We have taken into account contributions which would be made by the Army but not by the individual.

Mr. ADAIR. So that the cost of the program to all concerned would be $14 to $20 million the first year plus the 2 percent contributed by the individual?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman have any figures as to what that 2 percent might amount to?

Mr. HARDY. Based on the present strength that 2 percent will amount to a little over $100 million a year.

Mr. BATES. One hundred and fourteen million dollars.

Mr. ADAIR. So in effect the total cost to the Government and to the individuals additionally the first year the program would be in operation would be $114 million plus $14 to $20 million?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. So that the total overall cost to all concerned would be $130 to $140 million a year?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct, except for one thing. We have to take into account the obligation which is accumulating under social security provided on a gratuitous basis. That is accumulating at the rate I believe of $130 million a year. So you see we have a combination of factors there which over a period of time is going to make the total cost less.

Mr. ADAIR. The obligation to which the gentleman refers is an obligation against the social security trust fund, is it not?

Mr. HARDY. It is an obligation on the taxpayers to reimburse the social-security trust fund. We have an obligation there which amounts now to $590 million for previous payments from the social-security trust fund.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman tell us that that is a direct obligation upon the Government to repay?

Mr. HARDY. That is a moral and perhaps a legal obligation upon the Government to reimburse the social-security fund. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] will discuss that more fully a little later.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman from New Jersey is going to go into that point, I will not pursue it further at this time.

Mr. HARDY. I feel sure that he will.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the debate shows that there are some Members who suggest that the committee was not quite certain of its figures. But let me reassure the House that we not only had actuaries from many Government agencies who evaluated these figures, but we also had a private agency come in and on an actuarial basis to work with the committee and examine the figures for us.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee met last fall there was unanimous and ready approval by all of the witnesses to eliminate the Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits which go to reservists. Even the Reserve Officers Association agreed with that principle. In addition, there was no controversy regarding that portion of the program relative to the 5 months' death gratuity, and the program which is currently in the bill is in general conformity with that which all of the witnesses, the committees included, agreed on a year ago. However, in other aspects of the bill, feelings were originally considerably divided. There were those who believed that the income to survivors should be a reflection of the earning capacity of individuals in civilian life before they came into the Armed Forces. There were others who believed that since men were brought into the services, and in many cases by force, that all survivors should get the same entitlements. Yet, there were others who contended that if we are going to get into the Military Establishment the finest leaders we can find to lead our young men in battle, then there should be some consideration given to the rank of the individual.

Mr. Chairman, all of these arguments have considerable validity and yet they are in contravention with one another. The committee was also aware of the weaknesses of each argument. For instance, to predicate payments on past income before entering the service would help those who were fortunate, perhaps, because of family connections to secure high earnings. Likewise, it would penalize the young man who had graduated from college and attempted to start a new business and plowed back most of the earnings into that business and retained only an amount sufficient to make ends meet. Nevertheless, the committee gave weight to prior earnings through social security when credits are carried forward from civilian life into the military service. Because 90 percent of people in civilian life today have social security, in that many cases it will be brought over. However, the most potent argument, in my judgment, for adopting social security is that it has that unique feature of applicability to civilian and military life. For instance, a young man who had social security on the outside would continue it while he is in the service, and then continue it when once again he went into civilian life. Unless we take some action in this regard, then it means that the social security credits which people are establishing in civilian life will be lost or seriously diluted. In fact, that is the reason today, under the present law, all men in the Armed Forces have social security free wage credits. All we are doing is to continue that kind of program.

Mr. Chairman, the committee did not believe because of the fact that many young men were brought into the service, that rank alone should be the determining factor in establishing payments. Neither did it believe that the benefits equal to the salary of the lower ranks was sufficient to give to the family adequate benefits because men in the lower ranks on active duty today receive additional payments through the "Q" allotments.

The committee decided, therefore, that the survivors of all military personnel regardless of rank would receive $112 veterans' compensation in addition to social security, but in addition to this in order to attract able men into the Armed Forces to lead our sons into battle, the committee added another factor of 12 percent of the base pay for each individual. While this ignores 88 percent of the base pay, it does provide some difference.

The committee could not agree, and some did suggest that all payments be predicated upon rank alone, but on the other hand the committee did not feel that we should adopt the policy of paying to all survivors the same amounts. We felt it is just as logical, if we are going to pay everybody the same after death, then we should have everybody on active duty either, all privates or all generals, and pay them all the same. I have heard of no one who advocates such a policy as that.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, we tried to reconcile these three philosophies, and I do believe that incorporated in this bill are sufficient elements on each of those plans to justify the views of all.

Mr. Chairman, during the last few days I have been approached by several Members of the House with questions regarding this bill. I think they are of such general information that if I could read those questions and give you the answers it perhaps might remove some of the questions which may exist in your minds.

I think the question that was asked most was this: Is there anyone on the present roll today who will lose benefits as a result of this bill? The answer is "No." The survivors who are on the rolls today can elect to continue the same benefits which they are receiving or they can elect to go under the provisions of this bill. No survivors today on the rolls will lose money as a consequence of the enactment of this legislation.

Another question was: Under the old bill, 10 to 15 forms were required out of a total of 27 applicable forms to be filed for the different survivor benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

How many forms will be required to be filed by survivors under the present bill?

The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that only one single form, under the provisions of this bill, will be required to be filed. It can go to either Social Security or to the Veterans' Administration, and once having gone to either one of those agencies, everything thereafter is automatic.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hold in my hand a case of a Marine flier who went down recently off of Korea. These are the forms that went to his widow who lives at Dallas, Tex.

Mr. BATES. Another question that has been asked by Members is this: Is there anyone opposed to this bill? I would say that certainly there is no active opposition to this bill by any organization. I think most of the Members of the Congress know that, because if there was active opposition, every one of you would have had telegrams or letters in your office, and none of you has received any.

Oh, there is some difference in the philosophy; some want a little more of this or a little less of that, but as I explained just a moment ago, I believe the committee has reconciled the various viewpoints.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am going to give you 5 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. But I wanted to ask a question.

Mr. BATES. You have had some time and I am going to give you 5 minutes more. Let me complete my statement.

Many Members are expecting to get time, and I simply will not have it to give to them if I use it all myself. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has already had 5 minutes and he is going to get 5 more. I will still be around when the gentleman's turn comes if he wants to ask me questions.

Mr. Chairman, there was only one expression of opposition to this bill, and that came from the railroads a week ago. I am pleased to advise the House that a committee amendment will be offered which removes all the objections of the railroad organizations.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, was this: Under the existing laws survivors whose deceased had less than 6 quarters coverage under social security received no benefits. In other words the dependents of a man with 18 months service do collect benefits, while those with only 17 months do not. What happens in that situation under this bill?

This bill provides automatic coverage for all servicemen upon entering the service. Furthermore it gives retroactive entitlement to payment to 3,700 cases which was denied them as a result of present law.

Does this bill affect compensation payments for disabled veterans or pensions for non-service-connected cases?

This does not affect those categories at all. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] expressed a fear that this bill is an opening wedge. Let me assure the Members of this House that that thought never occurred to the members of this committee, and I am certain that under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], under whose jurisdiction bills of that nature would come, there is no reason to fear such a move.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure the gentleman will testify to the fact that I asked over and over whether social security was in any way attempting to take over the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BATES. Yes; the gentleman is on his toes all the time, and I am sure he is going to watch that very important question.

Another question that was asked was: Why are we terminating the $10,000 free insurance?

The answer to that question is we are not terminating the benefits; we are merely transferring these benefits to another program and distributing these benefits not only over the 10-year period which they collect today under the insurance program, but we are distributing them over the entire lifetime of the recipient. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will cover that point further.

Another question: Who is covered by this bill?

The answer is: All persons on active duty or active duty for training in the uniformed services. It will include, for instance, week-end warriors who might be killed performing flights.

Why was a closed rule requested? I think, Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee wanted an open rule if that were feasible, but anyone who understands the practical complications of an open rule either on this type of bill or on a tax bill can see quite clearly that there is no room in a measure of this nature for an open rule. We had actuaries study the problem. We would have no idea of the cost of an amendment; we could not possibly evaluate them because the subject is so complicated.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, this is a good bill. Your committee has labored hard and diligently now for a year. We have held 57 meetings ourselves, 200 by the staff of the committee.

The bill increases the benefits to widows in the number of 300,000. Three hundred thousand widows will benefit as a consequence of this legislation.

Sixty-five thousand orphans will benefit as a consequence of this legislation.

Two hundred and eighty-five thousand dependents, parents, will benefit as a consequence of this legislation.

No one on the rolls today will lose a cent as a consequence of this legislation; in most cases they will gain. Still the bill will cost somewhat less than present law.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill will have and should have the support of this House and of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, now that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has yielded 5 minutes to me, I would like to have him answer a question, since I could not get him to yield to me when he had the floor.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I appreciate the generous offer of the gentleman from Virginia, because I would like to have this question answered. In view of the statement that the gentleman from Massachusetts has just made that this bill only covers servicemen, may I ask, Why the title "To provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes"? If this is only to provide for survivors of men on active service, for servicemen, why does the word "veterans" appear in the title?

Mr. BATES. This bill does not affect veterans themselves whatsoever, whether they are service connected or whether they are nonservice connected. This bill does have to do with those benefits which accrue to the survivors of people who incur disability on active duty, who die on active duty, or die as a consequence of service-connected injuries.

Mr. SAYLOR. But does not have anything to do with veterans' benefits as such?

Mr. BATES. It does not. It has merely to do with survivors' benefits.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it should be obvious to the Members of Congress that the very title of the bill is misleading. I was intrigued, and I think the Members of the House should be intrigued, at the arguments that have been advanced as to why we should have a closed rule. The members of the committee would have you understand that this bill is so complicated that no Members of the House, except 5 or 6 who are members of the committee, are able to understand it and to offer any amendments in connection with it; yet when this bill passes from the House of Representatives and goes over to the Senate, all 96 Senators will be allowed to get up and speak and to ask all of the questions they want to or to offer any amendments that they see fit to offer.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will not.

Mr. BATES. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman has taken the position that the Congress should not accept the study of the committee on which the committee has been working for over a year. He does seem to think we should accept the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have not said that at all. I merely said the House is entitled in free and open debate to have the views of every Member expressed and to permit the Members to come here and offer amendments. This is again typical of the gag rule which I have opposed since I have been a Member of Congress. I have opposed it under this administration, I opposed it under prior administrations.

Mr. BATES. May I say to the gentleman that if he really wanted to do some work, if he was anxious to perfect this bill, then why did not the gentleman even on one occasion come before our committee and express his views?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is a very interesting point, because this bill, as the gentleman stated, was not written until very recently. Nobody was able to get a copy of it. The fact of the matter is when I requested the testimony taken in the hearings held by the committee, it was impossible to get it in printed form. But I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee and his staff because they were every obliging. They gave me a copy of the transcript which was produced by the various reporters as they took the testimony and it comprised a pile of typewritten pages about a foot and a half thick. I took a great deal of time in reading it. The gentleman has indicated many, many times that there have been differences. The gentleman will realize since I talked to him the first time about this very provision that the committee has seen fit to change its philosophy. Before it was $100 plus 15 percent; now they are down to $100 plus 12 percent. I think I have indicated my interest to the gentleman who has asked the question and to other members of the committee as well as to members of the staff. It is no secret to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have had an interest in this and an interest in veterans' affairs for a long time before even he was appointed to this committee and I will continue to have that interest, in veterans' affairs so long as I am a Member of Congress.

Mr. BATES. I do not want to indicate that the gentleman has not been interested in this problem. He has been greatly interested. The only point I make is, if the gentleman had such great interest in the problem, why did he not give us four Members the benefit of his experience.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to reiterate the warning which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], perhaps the outstanding leader of veterans' organizations in the Halls of Congress.

There are some veterans' organizations which have said that they are in favor of this legislation, and while I am not able to see into the future any further than they, I can certainly see certain signposts which have been erected, and I predict that within 10 years the Veterans' Administration will be a thing of the past.

Now, if that is what the veterans' organizations desire, then their support of this bill is urged, but if the veterans' organizations really have the interest of the veterans at heart, if they really are interested in the men and women who served these United States, and they are interested in preserving for those veterans the rights which they have fought for for many years and finally achieved, then they should urge that certain provisions of this present bill be corrected.

I can tell you—and it is no secret—that this is not just the opening wedge; this is the very door through which the Veterans' Administration will pass into oblivion.

There are at work forces in this country that want to see the veterans' hospital program done away with. They will take great heart from the passage of this bill. They will see that what they have been striving for and been unsuccessful in accomplishing all these years can be done if you just get the right select committee to preside at the hearings. Now, I do not mean by that statement to pass any personal reflection upon any of the six members of this committee, because I do not think that was their motive, but the pattern has been set. A select committee will now be requested—oh, not in this Congress, that is true, but within the next 3 or 4 sessions of Congress you will find groups that want to destroy veterans' benefits, will get a resolution passed for a select committee to determine what will happen to the veterans' hospitals, to the other services, and entitlements of veterans, their widows, dependents, and orphans. Within 10 years I predict they will have control of all your veterans' hospitals. This is the death knell of benefits to American veterans which the veterans' organizations heretofore have fought for, and I predict that the veterans' organizations, some of whom violently oppose some of the provisions of this bill, will be in here pleading with the Members of Congress not to appoint another select committee to destroy the veterans' rights and privileges that have been won at so great a price.

Now, at the proper time, if I am successful, I will offer a motion to recommit with instructions which will eliminate the inequality which I commented upon when we were considering the rule. That is that the widows of all veterans or servicemen who die in the service shall receive the same compensation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman expresses great fear of the ultimate result of this proposed legislation; but will the gentleman concede that the basic purpose and objective of this proposed legislation is sound?

Mr. SAYLOR. Some of the provisions in this bill are those which I urged when I was a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House, but which we were then unsuccessful in getting passed into law.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will take a little time to tell us something about what his motion is going to be.

Mr. SAYLOR. My motion to recommit will be to strike out section 202 (a) of the bill which section provides, under the present terms, that the widows of veterans will receive $112 plus 12 percent of their basic pay. My amendment will provide that all widows will receive $140 per month, regardless of rank and regardless of how long the man was in the service. It is at that point that the

Parliamentarian has informed me my amendment should be offered.

There are some other sections of the bill with which I might disagree, but if that one provision is accepted I think the House will have done itself a great service, it will have done the veterans of this country a great service, and it will have done the survivors of veterans of this country a tremendous service.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the discussion concerning the disparity in benefits paid to widows, which has been discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I think it appropriate to call attention to the actuarial equivalent or insurance value of the benefits available to the widow of an E–1 as compared to the benefits available to the widow of an O-8, comparing the lowest with the highest rank within our military service. We have to make some assumptions. Let us take an E–1, the lowest rate of enlisted man. Let us assume he leaves a widow age 20. The actuarial equivalent or insurance value of the annuity which she would receive in terms of compensation, assuming she does not remarry, would be $43,310.

Assuming the case of an O–8, the highest rank with the highest pay in the whole Military Establishment, who leaves a widow at age 55—and she could not be much younger than that if the officer had attained the rank of a major general—at age 55, the actuarial equivalent of $242 a month which she would receive would be $52,591, so that there is a little over $9,000 difference between the two in insurance value. Offsetting this, it should be borne in mind, we have reduced the immediate payment of the 6-month death gratuity to this same general's widow by more than $4,000.

But let us make another comparison of benefits payable to these same two widows, assuming that neither remarries. In the case of the E–1 widow, she would receive an annuity of $122 per month for a life expectancy of 55.84 years, giving her an aggregate total benefit of $81,628.

The widow of the O–8 would receive $242 per month for a life expectancy of 24.78 years which would represent a total gross value of $71,961. Thus in arguing that there is a disparity in the annuities payable based on the rank of the deceased, it must be borne in mind that the insurance value to the widow of E–1 is approximately $5,000 less than the insurance value to the widow of O–8, and the gross value to the widow of E–1 is approximately $10,000 more than the gross value to the widow of O–8.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, other members of our select committee have just explained certain portions of this bill. What I want to address myself particularly to is its social-security provisions.

In 1946, at the close of World War II, it was called to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee that those who had been drafted into the service, and who had previously had social-security coverage, were losing many of their rights under the old-age and survivors insurance law, and in some cases even losing the entire protection for their wives and children, owing to their having been called into the service.

As a result of this, the Ways and Means Committee enacted into law a bill providing for a temporary $160 per month gratuitous-wage credit for all those who served in the Armed Forces after September 15, 1940, with the chief purpose of bridging the gap while they were in the Armed Forces.

This credit has been extended from time to time. But you will note that a termination date was always included. This gratuitous-wage credit was definitely a temporary expedient. Its latest expiration date was June 30 of this year, and the House has passed a bill extending it to the early part of next year.

There have been discussions for many years as to whether those entering the armed services—most of them being primarily civilians joining the Armed Forces for only a comparatively short time—should not be included under old-age and survivors insurance in the regular way, with 2 percent contributed by the soldier and 2 percent by the Government as his employer. Thus, there would be no interruption of his wage record and his survivors would have the protection provided by the law.

A committee appointed by President Truman to study the matter, in its report filed last year, recommended full social-security coverage for the military.

In the public hearings before our committee, nearly all witnesses favored social-security coverage for the military.

Many members of the committee were at first hesitant about this. But as we got further into the picture it seemed that coverage for the military under the regular OASI system fitted well into the picture.

It seemed likely that sooner or later a bill to provide coverage for the military would be enacted into law. It would have been folly for our committee to have devised a new survivor-benefit program excluding social security, only to have our entire program thrown out of kilter in a few years by such action.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also stated that they could not continue indefinitely to allow the trust fund to be milked by the $160 gratuitous wage credit provision.

So this bill provides full OASI coverage on a contributory basis for all soldiers, sailors, and marines with contributions and benefits calculated on their base pay.

The average base pay of an enlisted man is $127 a month. The average base pay of all in the military service is over $160 a month.

At first suggestions were made by representatives of the Armed Forces that in calculating a military man's earnings all benefits which he receives such as housing, clothing, medical care, and so forth, should be taken into account and that he be taxed and his benefits be based on an estimate of the cash value of these benefits. This the armed services calculated to be $200 a month.

However, members of the committee felt that those in the lower grades whose cash income was only about $100 a month or less would not understand why they should pay 4 percent of their actual pay toward their social-security benefits when all their friends in civilian life were only paying 2 percent and would protest violently.

Attention was also called to the fact that these soldiers only pay income taxes on their base pay and that if social-security taxes were based on some estimated, illusive, much higher figure it would become logical and probably inevitable that members of the armed services would be called to pay income taxes on this same estimated figure.

Members of the Armed Forces under this bill will pay approximately $114 million annually into the trust fund for their protection. The Government, as their employer, will pay a like amount.

Other problems faced us. The social-security law provides that total family benefits may not exceed 80 percent of a worker's average wage. It was evident that applying this provision would result in a package of too low benefits for the family of a soldier or sailor who should unfortunately die while still in the lower grade. There will not be many of such cases as few of the lower grades have children.

However, special increases in benefits from the VA for children of those whose average wage was less than $160 a month, $20 per month per child, has been included in the bill to remedy this situation.

Another problem. Under the social-security law a worker is not covered for survivors benefits until he is under the OASI system for at least 6 quarters—18 months. This provision is there to protect the system and make sure that an individual really belongs to the work force before he is covered.

But the case of the military is different. Most of them are inducted involuntarily into the Armed Forces. As our committee was considering widows' and children's benefits as a package, considering social-security benefits and VA benefits combined to provide the necessary compensation, it would have been awkward to try to provide that the survivors of a soldier who had not been in the service for six quarters should have more VA benefits than one who had been in that long.

And how about the worker who already had social-security credits from civilian life before he entered the service?

To meet this difficulty the committee has provided that the moment a man enters the military service he will be considered as insured for survivors' benefits. He will have this presumed insured status the day he enters the service.

This will result in an additional cost to the social-security system, and under the bill the Government will reimburse the trust fund for this additional expenditure.

This does not mean that if a man leaves the service after serving only a few months that he will continue to be insured. He will only receive credit for those months in which he was in the armed services. He can only carry over into civilian life the actual months which he serves. For instance, if he should be discharged after 6 months of service, all he would carry with him into civilian employment would be 2 quarters of coverage. This provision is peculiar to the military only and should not transcend to civilian employees.

Another point particularly applicable to the military is the question of the disability freeze.

You may remember that in the social-security bill passed last year—and I am particularly proud of this section as I was the one who suggested it—if a worker who has been in the system for 5 years becomes permanently and totally disabled, his wage record is frozen so that his benefits when he retires, or his survivor's benefits if he dies, will not be lessened as a result of his misfortune.

You will note I mentioned that a civilian is not entitled to this disability freeze until he has attained at least 5 years coverage under the act, but because of the extreme hazards of military service we felt it appropriate that any man who became permanently or totally disabled through a service-connected injury while in the Armed Forces, regardless of his period of coverage under social security, should be presumed to have had 5 years coverage under the Social Security Act so as to protect without further contribution his rights both as to survivorship and retirement under the Social Security Act.

This provision is also peculiar to the military only and should not transcend to the civilian employee.

This extension of contributory social-security coverage to members of the Armed Forces departs in these two significant respects from principles followed with respect to covered civilian employments.

First, men would acquire insured status as soon as they enter the Armed Forces and would not have to contribute for the minimum of 6 quarters before attaining such status.

Secondly, the 5 years' coverage required in the case of civilian employments before a person becomes eligible to take advantage of the disability freeze is waived in the case of the military, so as to make this protection immediately available to servicemen.

The cost of these special benefits will impose no burden or drain upon the OASI trust fund, inasmuch as the Government will reimburse the fund for payments arising from these provisions, over and above the amounts contributed by the Government at the normal employer tax rate.

I want to make it very clear that these provisions are designed to meet the special circumstances and needs of the Armed Forces, so as to achieve the objective of a uniformity of benefit rights for all persons who are exposed to the common risks, hazards, and compulsions peculiar to the military service. They are in no sense to be regarded as a precedent for similar action, or an indication that the committee believes that such changes in eligibility requirements would be desirable, with respect to civilian employment.

On the contrary, we believe that the requirement, as applied to civilian employment, of a minimum period of contributions to establish eligibility is essential to the preservation of the character and integrity of the program as a contributory insurance system, with benefits payable as a matter of earned right rather than as an unearned gratuity.

One point I wish to mention before I close: As I have said before, all men who served in the Armed Forces after September 15, 1940 were temporarily granted by the Federal Government $160 per month gratuitous OASI wage credits. To date the Congress has not reimbursed the trust fund for the money it had to spend for its having granted these gratuitous wage credits.

Thus, it might be said that all the other civilian workers and employers who were contributing their hard-earned dollars to the trust fund were having their equity which is there for their own protection reduced by the payment being made to the military.

Maybe there was some excuse for this during wartime as one of the sacrifices that we all have to make during such a period, but there certainly is no excuse for this in peacetime.

The Ways and Means Committee has recognized this obligation in the past. They recognized it again the other day by accepting an amendment to the temporary extension of the gratuitous wage credit to provide for reimbursement.

However, this was finally omitted from that bill as it was felt that the proper place to take care of this was in this bill. So that we have made provision for reimbursement to the trust fund of the actual out-of-pocket cost to the system of the gratuitous wage credit.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that this bill will be $590 million, of which $210 million has already been spent. The additional $380 million will be the additional cost as former members of the Armed Forces die and retire.

This bill provides that the trust fund be reimbursed $21 million a year over a 10-year period for the amount they have so far actually paid out.

In addition they will pay the estimated balance of $380 million as these costs incur from year to year. These payments will probably continue over a 30-year period.

No one is entirely satisfied with all of the provisions of this bill. There may be objections from Members interested in a particular group. But we have attempted to achieve a balance, and any important change in the package throws the whole system of benefits out of line. Thus, I joined in asking for a closed rule. It is even more important in this case than it is in a tax bill.

Though this bill is not perfect, it is certainly a tremendous improvement over the present jumble of laws for the survivors of the military and I urge its enactment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is the gentleman saying that if this bill is adopted there will hereafter be $114 million annually contributed out of the Army pay funds and a similar sum contributed by the individuals which will go into the Social Security fund?

Mr. KEAN. Under the present social-security tax structure.

Mr. ADAIR. Reference was made to an additional $21 million annually. From what source would that come?

Mr. KEAN. That will come from VA payments.

Mr. ADAIR. In other words, the Veterans' Administration hereafter for 10 years will be charged with the sum of $21 million a year to be paid into the social-security trust fund?

Mr. KEAN. No, no, no. That will not go into the Social Security fund. That $21 million they were talking about goes to the widows and survivors out of the VA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KEAN. That money will not go into the social-security fund; that money goes to the widows and other survivors out of the VA fund payments.

Mr. ADAIR. It comes directly out of funds, then, appropriated to the Veterans' Administration, and is paid to the person entitled to it.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to be sure I understand what fund the gentleman is inquiring about.

Mr. ADAIR. Reference was made to some $21 million per year for 10 years for annuity merely.

Mr. KEAN. I misunderstood the gentleman in the first instance.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentlemen are talking about different funds.

Mr. KEAN. What the gentleman is talking about is the money to reimburse the social-security trust fund for money spent.

Mr. ADAIR. Yes.

Mr. KEAN That money will have to be appropriated by the Congress to the trust fund and come from the general funds in the Treasury.

Mr. ADAIR. It will be the subject of a separate appropriation.

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. And does not come out of funds already appropriated to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. KEAN. No.

Mr. HARDY. Not at all; that will have to be a separate appropriation made for the social-security fund.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield for one further question, can it be said that this bill, then, has a dual function: It bolsters the social-security trust fund and tends to bring up to date and perhaps equalize and make more equitable the payment of survivors' benefits. Does it have those two functions?

Mr. KEAN. The first function, that of reimbursing the trust fund, is a minor one, although it is a moral obligation where the money has been taken out of that trust fund and no repayment has been made.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield to me on that, I think we would all agree that the bill does at least have those two functions; one is to make more equitable payments, and the other is to recognize the obligation of the taxpayer to the social-security fund because of expenditures which have already been made out of it.

Mr. ADAIR. Would this put $228 million in the social-security fund?

Mr. HARDY. It would have that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has additional requests for time. I yield the gentleman 10 more minutes that he may allot to his side.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I would like to address myself to the proposition that no organization has objected to this bill. There are a lot of statements in the front of this folder that would lead one to believe that organizations might have approved it. Let me draw a distinction between an organization approving and the hierarchy at the top approving. One organization was mentioned on the floor of the House a while ago, the American Legion. In the newspapers I read that the American Legion Forty and Eight organization that is supposed to be part of the Legion is about to part company with the Legion because of opposition to the hierarchy at the top purporting to set policy without approval or direction from the rank and file. When we say an organization approves, it should be approval from the rank and file in connection with such an important subject as this.

We are purporting to cover something of vast importance to a great number of citizens. Why should we not study this for the rest of the summer? Why should we not try to come up with better answers? Why should we not have the opportunity to go back home and talk with the rank and file about this and then form our opinions? We can act after being advised by the rank and file and permitting them to give full consideration in convention instead of after hearing only from the reported hierarchy that the newspapers report is threatening to tear the organization itself apart by some of the things it advocates.

Let me tell you that we represent the rank and file here, and let us not forget it in connection with this bill for 1 minute. But aside from that, I have some serious doubts about some of the provisions and philosophies of this bill, although I have a very high regard for this committee. I am certainly not prepared to argue with them when they have spent a year studying it, and I have only examined it for a period of 2 or 3 days. But I would just like to throw out a couple of questions.

This makes a package bill out of the civilian soldier who is called in against his will, and the Army career man who is serving during peacetime; they all get the same. Let us think for just a minute of a concrete example, that of the fellow who is jerked in under circumstances over which he has no control, and ends up getting killed as a second lieutenant. I know of such a case as that. Under this bill, the widow of that man killed would get $84.40 for her 2 children by the social-security payment being added to the $122 she would receive as a childless widow. On the other hand, if a lieutenant colonel was killed over there, his wife would have had $200 to raise her 2 children, in addition to $180 to take care of herself.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He does not want to put something that is incorrect in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. When the gentleman said the widow would receive $84, I do not know where he gets that.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Out of social security. The difference between what she would get if she had been alone, which would be $122, and then you add your social security, your step 3. For a second lieutenant, it would be $166. I used the wrong figure. I appreciate the correction.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I still think the gentleman is wrong in his figures.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. She gets the difference then between $206.40 and what a wife with 2 children gets at the top of your table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Page 9: $206.40, under the proposed plan for a private E–1, under a combination of social security and the direct payment. What she would get if she had no children would be $122. That is on the preceding page. So there is left $84.40 for the child to be raised with. Yet for a warrant officer 4th grade or anyone above the rank of captain, they get $200 to raise their children.

I do not think you can mix up these people, that is, the career serviceman in peacetime and the man who gets killed on the field of battle. They are all alike out there.

Let us get down to the career service. Make no mistake about it, this is a Pentagon bill, particularly that part of it involving career-service retirement. By this I mean a bill that primarily benefits and takes care of the career peacetime Army. I think we should take care of them within the limits of our ability, but I am not satisfied that we can go for this.

The statement has been made on the floor of the House that the actuaries can tell us the cost. I defy them to do that for the reason that those same actuaries, rather the staff members of the select committee, in the Veterans' Affairs Committee yesterday said that they had made no effort to determine how much the taxpayer was going to eventually have to put in to make the social security actuarially and financially sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is saying something that is not correct. We did not tell the gentleman that we had not tried to determine the cost because we did. We did tell the gentleman we did not go all the way back to the Ways and Means Committee to determine whether social security was proper for this country but we did not tell him we had not determined the cost.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The staff member did, and I will stand on the record. There was no effort made to determine how much the taxpayers' subsidy to social security would have to be in order to make it pay out. I will stand on the record on that.

Mr. HARDY. So we may understand, the statement was to the effect that the committee made no effort to determine whether or not the taxpayers are going to have to subsidize social security as an overall program.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. As an over-all program, that is correct.

Mr. HARDY. We will stand on that.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Just so we agree. In connection with that, I believe that we should put our Army under social security. I can go along with that. They are taxpayers. If this is going to encompass everyone, all right.

The next question that comes up is, having done that, how much further we should go in taking care of them. I think the answer to that question depends upon how much it will cost the taxpayers of the United States in taxes to put them under social security. We are saying here, in addition to social security we are going to give them—I hope somebody will correct me if I misinterpret this because I have only been with it for several days—from $122 per month for the widow of a private E–1 up to $242 per month for the widow of a general officer for life. That is for the widow for her life and in addition to social security. I do not know how much the total cost to the taxpayer will be. But I seriously question whether we can afford that sort of program. I don't think we should enact it until we know how much.

Let me give you another example. I checked on a young FBI man who is taking care of espionage here in Washington. That is pretty risky business in peacetime; maybe more so than a job out in the Pentagon. If anything happened to him, his wife and children would get from the Government $263 per month until the children are 18 years old, and then it would drop off to about $180 for the widow. That is a far cry from the $421 a month that we propose to give on a comparable pay scale in the Army. We better be fair about this whole thing and take a look at it and find out how much it is going to cost us. Sure, this generation can stand for it because it is our children who will be making up the deficit, but can we continue to add to the burdens of our children and their children and honestly say we are building a better world for them? Are we to spend them into bankruptcy by passing generous legislation for Army retirement without even asking the question—what is the total cost?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion on the rule that the reason a closed rule was asked for was because it was a complicated bill and because amendments might seriously complicate the situation on the House floor. Be that as it may, since the members of the select committee have the power to introduce an amendment but we do not, I then make a request upon the committee to permit the House to express its will on the one glaring imperfection in this bill, and I ask the committee collectively and individually to offer an amendment, which they have a right to do, to give the surviving widow, regardless of the rank of the soldier killed, the sum of $140 so that everybody will be treated equally.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to be sure I understand what the gentleman is proposing. The $140 figure is proposed as a lifetime consideration regardless of the age of the survivor?

Mr. RADWAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman, of course, realizes that the actuarial equivalent for the younger widow, for the lower-ranking individuals, would be a lot less than that of the higher rank.

Mr. RADWAN. I realize that, but I make that request based on this consideration. There has been some suggestion by a member of the committee in the discussion on the rule that usually survivors' benefits are measured by the attainment of the man. Well, when a man is killed in action, whether he be a private or a colonel or a general, he attains the pinnacle, because he has given his all for his country regardless of rank. Rank ceases upon death, and there should be no further differentiation between the widow of a colonel or a general or a private based on that ground.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Does the gentleman believe that everyone on active duty today should have the same rank and everybody get the same pay?

Mr. RADWAN. I do not believe that. I have always supported adequate pay scales for all members of our Armed Forces. My point is directed to surviving widows' benefits.

Mr. BATES. Certainly we should have as much consideration for our soldiers when they are alive as when they are dead.

Mr. RADWAN. I am concerned about the widow, whether she be the survivor of a private, a colonel, or a general. During their lifetime we are treating everybody in the officers' ranks on a fair basis, based on their ability to rise in the service, but upon death rank ceases, and it is for that reason that I make my request in all sincerity and in all good conscience to a committee that has done an otherwise fine job on this bill.

I shall support this bill with or without the correction I suggest, but it will be a much fairer bill if so corrected. Furthermore, the amendment I request will be supported overwhelmingly by the membership of this House.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill which is obviously the result of a great deal of study. I think the Members who have served on this select committee are to be commended upon the amount of work and study that they have done on this matter. I believe it is a bill which should be supported, and it is my intention to vote for it. However, that does not preclude mention of the fact that there are certain things, in my opinion, which are not altogether good in this bill, and which, accordingly ought to be brought to the attention of the House. Some of them have been heretofore mentioned and need only to be touched upon briefly.

In the first place, this matter is before us, as we are all completely aware, under a closed rule. That, I believe, is bad. If legislation is good, if it is valid, if it has sufficient merit so that it can stand up under the questions which may be brought against it on the floor, it could stand, it seems to me, the questioning which might come under an open rule. It might be taken to indicate a lack of confidence on the part of some as to the bill in all its parts if it has to be brought to us under this kind of a rule which does prevent the membership of the House from offering amendments as to this legislation. Amendments may be offered, but only by the select committee which brought it in. Therefore, I say to the House that I think it is a bad thing that this is before us under a closed rule. It does not give us an opportunity fully to try to improve this proposed legislation as many people think should be done.

Secondly, I believe that every person in this House should say to himself that here is quite definitely a possibility that we are moving in the direction—and I repeat I am only saying moving in the direction—of an absorption of Veterans' Administration functions by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or some other branch of the Government. The members of the select committee have made their position abundantly clear today, and I admire them for it. They have said many times that that is not their intent, they do not want it, they do not believe this bill is a step in that direction, but I say that it must be considered by us as a possible move that way when we do tie together so closely survivors' benefits with social security because it becomes, to use a phrase which has been used here today, "a package" of the two systems. I cannot see how we are doing other than moving in that direction in this bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I should like to say to the gentleman in regard to the fear that he has expressed, that I shall join with him in opposing any motion which would do away with benefits under the Veterans' Administration as they exist today.

Mr. ADAIR. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the gentleman and I am fully convinced that they express the sentiments of all on the committee, for which I am very glad.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield to me, I should like to express the same sentiment as just expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] on that point.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Thirdly, the matter of costs which have been glossed over too lightly here. A bill which in many respects increases benefits, certainly increases costs. It will increase costs to the Army pay fund, it will increase costs to the individuals involved. But we ought not to vote for this bill on the assumption that it does not increase costs.

We have been told today that initially it will directly increase the costs from $14 million to $20 million a year, although in the long run, it is hoped and believed, on the basis of studies, that the balance will be the other way and economies will be effected. That also ought to be in our minds.

Then we are further told that there will be each year, so long as the social security rates remain the same, the sum of $114 million paid from Army funds to the social security trust fund, and the same amount paid from individuals into the social security fund. So there is an aggregate of $228 millions which will go into the program.

It has been well said by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that it goes into the general social security trust fund, that is, the old age and survivors' insurance fund, and it should benefit that fund and probably does. But I ask today whether we are here with a bill to bolster that old age and survivors' insurance fund, or whether we are here with a bill which is designed to make equitable payments to survivors of Armed Forces personnel whose deaths are service connected.

I think on the whole this is a good bill. I intend to vote for it. But I think we ought to do it with our eyes wide open to the fact that it is by no means a perfect bill and contains some long-term aspect that will bear watching.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the question of cost has been raised, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD so that I may explain the cost aspects of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I wish to address myself to a review of the select committee's development of the cost aspects of this problem. First, let me emphasize that the committee's real objective was the attainment of a program which would be realistic, equitable, and based on principles so soundly conceived that it would endure not only during the comparatively simple years of peace, but under the stress of mobilization and war.

To achieve such a program, it is necessary, of course, to give serious consideration to the cost. No program could be soundly conceived if it generated a cost so excessive that future generations of Americans would revolt against it and insist on radical changes injurious to the dependents of those who had died in their country's service.

Let me repeat that the committee's objective was not economy but equity, and that the ultimate savings that this plan will generate, as compared to the present system, result from the removal of the inequities that exist in that system rather than from any reduction in benefits to the survivors of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and of our disabled veterans.

You will note that I have spoken of ultimate, not immediate savings. Let me explain briefly the difference between these two. As you know, survivorship programs are spread over long periods of time. For example, on June 30, 1954, there were still 151 widows of Civil War veterans drawing death compensation from the VA, although that conflict ended over 90 years ago. It is, therefore, perfectly reasonable to suppose that 90 years from now there will still be some widows on the rolls whose husbands' death resulted from the Korean conflict. I make this statement merely to emphasize the fact that these survivorship programs are long range in character, and that their ultimate cost cannot be estimated merely by multiplying the numbers on the rolls by the monthly benefits payable, the method commonly in use to obtain an annual appropriated cost. We cannot properly estimate the ultimate financial impact of this program by comparing the monthly benefits paid to the various classes of beneficiaries. The point I want to make is that the true cost of a program can be determined only by considering three basic factors: how much do you pay, to whom do you pay it, and for how long do you pay it? When these three factors are properly correlated, it is perfectly possible to have in a program the situation that exists in the proposed bill, a higher immediate cost coupled with ultimate savings.

Let us first examine the two major elements inherent in the program which best illustrate this contrast. The greatest single element of savings under the new program is the elimination of the FECA, which, as I pointed out to you in my previous discussion, has resulted in payments to the survivors of one single class of servicemen, that is to say, reservists who die as a result of peacetime injuries, amounts ranging to as much as 2½ times the amounts paid to the survivors of Regulars and National Guardsmen and reservists killed in wartime. In the table on page 20 of the report it is shown that the elimination of FECA will result in a reduction of the incurred liability of the Government as a result of the deaths of reservists in a single year of approximately $43 million. Of this $43 million, perhaps $3 million will be saved during the first full year of operation. However, in the second year $6 million will be saved, and the third year $9 million will be saved as the survivors of successive year groups become eligible for benefits. Eventually, in approximately 15 years, the total savings realized would equal the total of $43 million shown in the table. To substantiate this statement, one need only look at the budget for 1956, which, on page 870, shows that the payments by the Bureau of Employees Compensation to survivors of military personnel have increased from $9,500,000 in 1954 to $12.1 million in 1956. It should be clear, therefore, that the elimination of this provision of existing law will result in ultimate savings of $43 million.

Let us look now for a moment at the other side of the coin. On June 30, 1954, there were a total of 608,000 survivors of former service personnel receiving death compensation at the VA. As has been pointed out previously, this bill provides for generous increases to very many of these survivors. The VA has estimated that election of the new benefits provided in this bill by current survivors will result in the initial expenditure of $38 million during the first full year of the following enactment. However, in contrast to the annual savings resulting from the elimination of FECA, this immediate expenditure will eventually decrease as time takes its toll. For a period of the next 15 years, this amount will unquestionably fluctuate. Two rapidly diminishing categories within this group are parents and the children of the veterans of World War I. In contrast, the widows of the veterans of World War II will probably increase in number during the next 15 years. Widows of World War I veterans however have reached a condition of relative stability. It is safe to state that at the time the annual savings from the FECA reach their peak, approximately 15 years from now, annual expenditures for the increased compensation by the VA will have started to decline and therefore 15 years from now, the Government will be saving from these 2 facets of the bill, not less than $5 million a year, although the net immediate increase in cost resulting from these 2 provisions would be $35 million for the first year.

Another provision of the bill which will result in ultimate savings in exactly the same manner as FECA, is the transfer of the current indemnity to the single compensation payable under this act.

Now, I wish to emphasize the veterans' compensation to be paid under this act has been increased under existing law by an amount which, based on lifetime expectancy, is actuarially equivalent to a far greater sum than the $10,000 free indemnity. However, unlike the indemnity, this increased compensation is contingent upon the dependency of the beneficiary. That is to say, it terminates when the widow dies or remarries and is not payable to nondependent parents. The committee as a whole and I personally have no apologies to make for this provision. It has been the committee's desire and intent to increase the benefits to dependent survivors of our service people, but it has been its intent and purpose to confine these increased benefits to those who are truly dependent of the Government, those who have suffered financial loss and disaster as a result of the veteran's death. It is obvious that most of the young widows without children will remarry, and it is equally obvious that not all parents of servicemen are dependent or will become dependent upon the deceased serviceman or veteran. It is, therefore, estimated that the long range savings in this provision will amount at the end of 10 years to approximately $36 million a year. Here again the buildup will be gradual and this net savings will not have its full effect until 10 years after the effective date of the act.

Further minor savings will occur from the sliding scale of dependency established for parents and from the transfer of certain children's benefits to the social security. These might between them total a million dollars a year.

The last aspect of savings lies in the inauguration of contributory social security for the military service. This highly significant provision serves two purposes. It provides not only a large increase in the overall benefits to the service people but it also permits this level to be obtained without a corresponding increase in cost to the Government. This is due solely to the fact that social security is supported by contributions from both the employee, that is to say the serviceman, and the Government as employer. Under existing law, social-security rights which have been granted to service personnel are entirely an obligation of the United States Government. This obligation has been repeatedly acknowledged by the House through the appropriation of funds for this purpose. Unfortunately, the other body to date has not seen fit to recognize this obligation with the result that we are now faced with a due bill of the staggering amount of $590 million, consisting of $210 million of actual expenditures made by the social-security fund as a result of these provisions of the law and a liability of $380 million to be paid in the future for obligations incurred because of these same provisions.

Testimony before our committee indicates, moreover, an additional liability is now being incurred at the rate of not less than $120 million a year. Taking the figure of $120 million a year, and I wish to reemphasize that this is the minimum of several estimates given before the select committee by skilled professional actuaries, the contributory feature of this bill will result in a net savings to the Government of approximately $6 million annually.

Therefore, in summary, let us total the immediate savings and the immediate expenditures resulting from the new program and then let us glance ahead to the ultimate savings which will result to the Government in future years. In the first years of obligation we will save $3 million from FECA, 3.6 from the transfer of the indemnity, $1 million in minor savings and $6 million from the social security, a total of $13.6 million. In contrast, we will expend $38 million to survivors currently on veterans rolls who will receive increased benefits under the new system, or a net increase in the annual expenditure in the first year of $24.4 million. As I have said, however, the savings will overtake the expenditures sometime within the next 10 or 15 years and, eventually, when the beneficiaries on the veterans rolls consist only of those who have entered it subsequent to the enactment of the law, the full savings shown in table I of approximately $83 million annually will be effected.

Mr. Chairman, I yied 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield my 5 remaining minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in the 1 minute allotted to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts and the 4 by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], I can say very little, but I do want to give a warning about this measure. I feel very strongly that it is the beginning of the end of the Veterans' Administration, and that may be what the Congress wants, perhaps not this year or next year or the next, but at some later time. We talk about what we will do. No one knows whether any one of us will be here 2 months from now, 3 months from now, or a year from now or years from now. We are legislating for the future and what other Members of Congress may do we do not know and we cannot speak for them.

I have been in civilian hospitals a good deal recently, and I have looked into veterans' matters in their hospitals. I think this bill will speed the time when the veterans' hospitalization program will be placed under the Public Health Service. Trend is that way very strongly.

There are people who will lose money under this bill. I think there is no doubt of that. A careful study will show that, but there is not time to explain that in 5 minutes.

I am very glad that the widows are receiving more under this bill as a whole. Those who have worked with veterans' matters for years know how difficult it has been to secure even a pittance for the widows. Perhaps because no man has ever been a widow he does not realize exactly what it means. While this bill provides more compensation for some widows, there are glaring inequities, one of them being the fact that Spanish-American War widows are left out. But not to pass this bill might mean there would be no legislation for widows at this session of Congress.

The bill will have strength because it has representation from the various committees, the Committes on Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs.

I have received a good many protests from veterans regarding this legislation. Not very much is understood about it, I know. I think when they do understand it many more protests will be received. The Massachusetts American Legion passed various resolutions, and one of them was that they did not want the veterans' benefits to go under social security. There was a very strong resolution to that effect.

I have had a great many protests regarding the elimination of the insurance. The veterans have felt that that insurance was theirs, and they should decide to whom the insurance should be paid. If they wanted to pay it to a niece or a nephew or a cousin or an aunt or somebody else they could do it. But under this bill the insurance is taken away and the benefits will be paid to the people designated under the law. I find great objection to that. I wish we had a longer time to discuss it. I wish there were more Members here. When we take up foreign aid the Chamber is packed. When we take up benefits for our veterans, there are not very many on the floor, not that they are not interested, but they do not realize what the situation is. This bill comes to us under a closed rule. I understand that we cannot even move to strike out the last word. The bill was printed only a very short time ago. It is a very vital bill. I expect to vote for the bill, but I hope the other body will go into it and rectify many of the mistakes. I think over there they are very much interested in veterans' problems. They will have a longer time to study it and there will be a reaction, and insofar as the veterans' organizations are concerned, I know of their interest over all of the years in veterans' legislation. I know they were interested in building up one administration to take care of veterans' affairs. I believe individually they feel extremely sorry to have anything happen to the Veterans' Administration. I think they are placed in a very difficult position, also because they are anxious to have the widows taken care of. Many of you know of the situation over a year ago—how difficult it was to get any rule out of the Committee on Rules. That was one reason I felt so suspicious because the Rules Committee granted a rule to select committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. I am not accustomed to criticising committees. I think this committee has worked hard and has come before us with a bill that has much merit. The members of the committee are outstanding in ability and in knowledge of veteran problems. I doubt, however, that we have had sufficient time to read the bill and to study its provisions. I regret that the bill comes to the floor under a closed rule. It would have more quieting to our concern in guarding against inadvertencies if the rule had been open. I am speaking especially for the Spanish-American War group. My colleagues will appreciate my position as the last remaining veteran of that war of the 96 or 97 who have served in this body. Among our Spanish-American War veterans, there is some concern. We feel that the House could have quieted that concern if there had been an open rule, and it had been permissible to present an amendment that in substance would have recognized that in the Spanish-American War there were no records kept. Now, I know how difficult it is for younger veterans to appreciate conditions at that time. So that it may be made clear in the record, I have requested this time to ask one who knows, the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] to make comment on that phase.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would certainly agree with the gentleman that the records kept during the Spanish-American War and during World War I and World War II are altogether different. The records were very poor, when we find any record at all, so far as the Spanish-American War veterans are concerned.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. So that it would be impossible for a Spanish-American War veteran or his widow to prove that the veteran had service-connected injuries?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is so in practically every case.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I deeply appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I am sure it will carry weight when later there is occasion for consideration of the fact that Spanish war veterans stand on a different basis in that there is no way under the sun in the absence of records the veterans can meet the service-connected proof requirement. We have been concerned that this might work to the harm of the widows of this group, all aged and few in number and mostly subsisting on meager pensions. I am sure that my colleagues would not wish to harm these aged women. Under an open rule it would have been possible to provide against this by writing in the law that in the case of the widows of that war the deaths of the veteran husbands would have had the presumption of service connected. I am sorry we did not have an opportunity to introduce the amendment. I anticipate the amendment would have been accepted by the House. As such eventuality was made impossible by the closed rule, I do hope the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shortly will report out the bill for a small increase in the pensions of these aged widows and that the bill will pass.

I want to thank the gracious gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time to raise the voice of a Spanish war veteran for the widows of that war of more than half a century ago. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I do not have as much fear today about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare taking over the Veterans' Administration program or the Veterans' Administration hospitals as I had before we started writing this bill.

It has been said that this is a Pentagon bill. It is true that some mighty fine men in the Pentagon did a lot of work on this bill, but by no stretch of the imagination is it a Pentagon bill.

This committee had two of the finest staff members of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, the Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, from the Pentagon, all of our major veterans' organizations did a terrific amount of work on this problem. It was interesting to watch this group. When we started we thought it was easy. As time went on we found how difficult and complex it was.

As I said before, a majority of the members of the committee did not want to include contributory social security, but we finally came to the belief that we had to do this.

This bill has a great effect on any service-connected death of a man in the service or a man out of the service. As far as the $10,000 indemnity program is concerned, that has been eliminated, and a payment substituted in lieu of it that spreads over the lifetime of the widow. The committee made a much more liberal definition of a widow in this bill. Today a dependent parent making more than $105 a month can receive no compensation. A dependent parent receives $75 per month or where there are two parents, $40 each.

This bill tried to eliminate the abrupt cutoff of the fixed-income limitation by making a sliding scale whereby if a parent has a job and makes some income would still receive the same compensation.

Of course the point that has been most criticized and the point which I had greatest fears about was our tying the amount of compensation to attained pay of the man in the service. Compensation is an attempt to compensate a family for what they lost. If a colonel dies or if a sergeant dies, in most cases the colonel's wife would lose more financially than the sergeant's wife. In every phase of our life the survivor benefit is tied to what the man is paid. It seems to me we have done nothing wrong in this bill, and I do not share the fears of a lot of people.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Now that you have mentioned these various organizations and agencies that participated in the preparation of this bill, from your own experience and the very long period of time connected with legislation on veterans' affairs, where did this idea of this type of bill originate? Did it originate with the veterans' organizations or with the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, or in the Pentagon, or did it originate in your committee? What was the first you heard of it?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. From this staff group, after considerable hearings, it became evident there were approximately four basic beliefs. We printed up four committee prints, with one group supporting more of this and another group supporting more of that. We had hearings on those four bills. After very complete hearings on the four bills, this select committee went into the committee room and sat down and wrote this bill. We had the members of the legislative colunsel's office assist in the final wording of the bill. So, if this bill came from any place it came from this select committee.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. It would be correct to say that this was an evolutionary process, would it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It certainly was.

Mr. WIER. What I am getting at is, how active were the three major veterans' organizations, the DAV, the VFW, and the American Legion? How active were they in participating and urging the support of this bill? We get some very curious questions sometimes in response to letters regarding this bill and what it does to the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If you talk to Mr. Charles Stevens of the American Legion, he will tell you how many hours they put in on it. I am sure you would be satisfied they had a great deal to do with it. The same with Mr. Adin Downer of the VFW and Mr. Charlie Foster of the DAV and Mr. John Holden of AMVETS. The American Legion supported the bill in its entirety. The AMVETS and the VFW and DAV opposed the difference in compensation to the widow. I do not believe they disagreed with any other point in the bill. I think they made the point that if there should be a war we might want to go back to some kind of an insurance program. I think they made that point.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. On page 39 of the salient features which are put out by the Department of Defense appears a very interesting comparison of costs, especially in view of the action just taken by the House Ways and Means Committee. This indicates that there is $116 million which will be contributed to the social-security fund. That is on the basis of 2 percent. But I understand that this coming week, and maybe tomorrow or Friday according to the majority leader this morning, we will be called upon to vote on a bill which comes out of the House Committee on Ways and Means which will increase the social security from 2 percent beginning January 1, 1956, to 2½ percent; January, 1960, to 3 percent; 1965, 3½ percent; 1970, 4 percent; and in 1975 to 4½ percent. So that within the very near future the amount you have indicated here as costing only $116 million will be more than doubled. This bill therefore, as to expenditures, will prove a great deal more costly then the present setup.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment our fine staff director, Mr. Stephen Carnes, who did an outstanding job on this bill. I have never served on a committee that has worked harder. PORTER HARDY was an excellent chairman, and the members, PAUL KILDAY and BILL BATES, made a wonderful contribution from their knowledge of military affairs. We leaned heavily on BOB KEAN to guide us on social-security matters. The members worked hard at this job and I wish to compliment each one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing that called the attention of the people and the Congress in the first instance to a necessity for this revision was the survivors' benefits available to the survivors of Reserve personnel in the Korean war. Because that was technically a time of peace, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] stated, those survivors of Regulars and National Guard men killed in Korea might receive $87 a month, whereas for Reserves only it was many times that, and frequently more than the man made while alive and on active duty. With that realization, there then became apparent to all what had been known to those of us who have worked on military pay for a long period of time—that while we had made rather adequate provision for active-duty training and retired personnel, we had not taken care of their survivors.

From that beginning and through a well-prepared address by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], it was called to the attention of the Congress at the last session, and the select committee resulted. It is something that has needed the attention of Congress for a long period of time.

I do not agree with the gentlemen who fear what might happen with reference to veterans' programs being taken over by social security. If we were talking now about the attitude in 1938 and 1939 or 1940, I have no doubt in my mind but that in those days the people originally advocating social security hoped to see it be the all-inclusive program with respect to subjects of this kind. However, that time has gone, and I cannot share the apprehension of those who feel that this might in any way lead to the elimination of veterans' hospitals or veterans' benefits because since that time social security has been recognized pretty generally in the United States by labor organizations and by industry as constituting the floor, the beginning of a social program in the United States, and superimposed upon it nowadays in every collective-bargaining agreement you have had a company retirement system.

Effective in 1941, that same thing was imported into the military survivors' benefit system when the $160 wage credit was granted on a noncontributory basis. We now find ourselves in the position of having started that $160 wage credit and being unable to let go. There is no way that you can suddenly abolish that or permit it to expire and then have any uniform program in connection with the survivors' benefits.

My colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has expressed his reluctance at having social security on a permanent basis. The further you get into this subject the more you realize it is essential that something of that kind be done. So I do not share the fears of those who express themselves that this might result in the elimination of the veterans' program. It would take another act of Congress and surely not in the conceivable future will there be a time when it would be possible for such a program to be passed by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been worked on diligently and faithfully. I am really surprised to hear any statement made here today that this constitutes a Pentagon bill. This is the first time in my years of service that I have seen a bill written as this one was written. I have never seen a major proposal of this kind involving so many pay scales and such highly technical questions that did not begin with some type of a bill which came from a department which set forth the vehicle upon which that legislation was based. When this committee started to work it had no vehicle of any kind. The committee began studying the situation as it existed under these various laws. There was no committee that had done any work before. There were four committees, all of which could have handled part of it; none could have handled all of it.

After much testimony and with the assistance of people that we asked from the departments, not that the departments sent down here to tell us how they wanted the bill written, we prepared this bill. We asked the General Accounting Office, the Veterans' Administration, the Social Security System, and the Bureau of the Budget to send us specialists from their staffs who could go over this information we had and give us additional information we might need. By working together with this panel, the original basis of the legislation was formulated. This is the first time I have ever seen a bill started off in the committee with no legislative proposal before us. The information was gathered by the committee, the necessity was appreciated by the committee, and from the information that the committee developed we wrote the first bill. Other prints were written. I think there were four prints written before we got down to writing the final bill.

Now, this bill has been available for more than 2 weeks. Bills of this character are generally not available for 2 weeks in advance.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

The 6 months' death gratuity first became law in 1907.

This payment is calculated on 6 months' base pay plus special and incentive pays.

At the present time the minimum payment is $468 and the maximum payment available is $7,856.

This payment was originally designed as a relocation allowance to provide an immediate payment to widows living on or near the station with the serviceman immediately prior to death.

In order to achieve its original purpose this payment should be made immediately. In the past, payment has not been made immediately because certain detailed information was required by the disbursing officer before payment would be made. Where the survivor was not a widow, the 6 months' death gratuity was designed to provide a lump-sum payment to the next of kin to clear up all personal obligations of the deceased, and if such kin be dependent, to provide carryover funds until monthly compensation payments begin.

Traditionally the class of beneficiaries to whom this payment is made has been liberal, with distant relatives under certain conditions eligible for this payment.

The cost to the Federal Government of providing the 6 months' death gratuity based on present pay and present in-service military strength is approximately $8 million.

In 1954 there were 6,135 in-service deaths.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE 6 MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY UNDER H. R. 7089

The present 6 months' death gratuity would continue.

There would be a minimum payment of $800 and a maximum of $3,000. The class of beneficiaries would be slightly more restrictive than currently exists.

The bill provides that where the survivor is a widow or minor children living on or near a station or post with the serviceman at the time of his death, then the 6 months' death gratuity shall be paid immediately, immediately meaning the very day of death or within 24 hours. The commanding officer and disbursing officer are to waive certain restrictions which currently exist.

Unlike present law this payment is also made to survivors where the former serviceman dies of a service-connected disease or injury within 120 days after separation from the service.

The present 6 months' death gratuity will provide a higher level of benefits for most enlisted men and will result in those officers of rank of lieutenant colonel or above receiving less than they do today.

This program of the committee's bill is considered as a definite improvement over existing legislation and more equitable in its practical application.

The cost of providing the 6 months' death gratuity under the committee's bill will be slightly more expensive than existing law, the cost having been estimated at $8,600,000.

FECA BENEFITS

FECA benefits were first extended to Armed Forces reservists in 1914. This was done to provide certain disability benefits for reservists serving on active duty for short periods of time. When FECA benefits were first extended to the military, perhaps 95 percent of those on active duty were Regulars.

Prior to 1935 reservists were not entitled to VA compensation but were paid under FECA benefits which, except in the case of high-ranking officers were less than VA benefits.

In 1935 a persuasive argument was made before the Congress that reservists on active duty were being discriminated against. Therefore, an election privilege was granted. Reservists could elect between VA and FECA, choosing the higher benefit. This election meant that all but the high-ranking officers would choose VA compensation. In 1949 the FECA Act was amended and the disability and death benefits under this act were significantly increased.

At the time of these amendments no consideration was given by either House or Senate to the fact that certain reservists who died in line of duty during peacetime had the right of election between FECA and VA benefits.

Therefore, this right of election continued in existence.

Since 1949, 6,700 reservists who died in peacetime periods, and Korea was considered a peacetime period, have collected significantly higher survivor benefits than Regular enlisted men and officers were entitled to under VA compensation.

This has created an inequitable situation.

After review of the legislative history of this program the committee came to the conclusion that it was never the intent of the Congress that reservists be continued under FECA, especially after the FECA Act amendments of 1949.

There were no witnesses appearing before our committee who did not agree that allowing certain reservists to elect FECA benefits, while paying Regulars only lesser VA benefits, was a discriminatory situation which should be corrected, the answer being the termination of FECA.

The committee in its bill, recommends the termination of FECA benefits payable to reservists and in the future survivors of reservists and Regulars will be paid alike.

The Bureau of Employees' Compensation, of the Department of Labor, which administers this program, concurs with the committee that this benefit should be terminated.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman mentioned something about benefits a year ago. Most of the Members have been receiving a large number of letters from beneficiaries or widows or relatives regarding the meager allowance that is being allowed them during these times of high cost of living. They have been pleading for an increase in survivors' benefits. Would the gentleman say this bill meets that situation?

Mr. KILDAY. I would not say that this bill is adequate but it is a tremendous improvement.

Mr. WIER. In other words, if the Veterans' Affairs Committee had come in here today with a bill increasing survivors' benefits by 10 or 15 percent, would this bill serve that purpose?

Mr. KILDAY. Only a portion of it, and a very small portion of it, from $70 as to present payments to $122, which

I regard as being a rather substantial benefit, not adequate but much better than it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the pending bill at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the provisions of H. R. 7089, entitled Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act. It meets in an admirable manner and solves problems that have long existed and which have called for solution. After careful study and long consideration, the bill now before us is the result. I congratulate and commend the select committee for the fine work it has done.

The purpose of this bill is to establish a new and equitable survivors' benefits program for members and former members of the uniformed services. This objective has been accomplished in a most satisfactory way.

There is general satisfaction with its provisions. In fact, I have never known any legislation that has met with a greater degree of satisfaction and approval. The report of the committee that contains the views expressed by the several departments of Government, including the President, leaves no doubt that the administration is highly pleased with the bill and is anxious for its early adoption. In this connection, President Eisenhower has addressed a communication to the chairman of the committee, in which he informs the chairman:

> It is my hope that your bill will be favorably received both by the Congress and by the civilian groups directly interested, so that we can see it written into law at the earliest possible date.

The departments of Government that have direct contact with the subject have without exception given their approval to the bill. The Secretary of Defense expressed his views by saying:

> The Department of Defense strongly supports this legislation.

Further favorable viewpoints could be given if such were deemed necessary at this time.

Likewise, veterans organizations have expressed their favorable attitude toward the legislation. I will make reference at this time to the letter addressed by Seaborn P. Collins, national commander of the American Legion, to Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits, dated July 1, 1955, which is characteristic of the general attitude of the veterans and service organizations.

In part, he said:

> This is to advise you that the American Legion supports the enactment of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of veterans and servicemen. While this is primarily a peacetime measure designed to improve the status of those in the uniformed services, we are aware that it has many important provisions to improve benefits to survivors of those who are, or were, eligible for membership in our organization as wartime veterans.
>
> H. R. 7089 is an important step in the reconstruction of veterans benefits and services. There is a special appeal to us in that the bill will provide increased grants to approximately 300,000 widows; that the financial status of some 85,000 orphans of veterans will be improved; that many of the 285,000 dependent parents on the rolls will receive larger awards; that the contract insurance rights of more than six million veteran policy holders and one-half million insurance beneficiaries in death cases are maintained over and above the increased compensation awards; that no one now receiving survivor awards need surrender a penny; and, that those survivors now on the rolls have the option of electing to receive the new awards after January 1, 1956.
>
> The bill is important also in that, while placing the peacetime armed forces personnel under old-age and survivors insurance as contributory members, it preserves the principle of having the Veterans' Administration as the agency handling and administering veterans benefits and services.

In conclusion, may I say that it gives me very great pleasure to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans and I have great respect and admiration for the excellent job done by this select committee which has labored so diligently and laboriously with a difficult assignment. I do not, however, agree with the procedure under which it has been presented to us and for that reason voted against the closed rule. There is, Mr. Chairman, altogether, too much resort to the device of a closed or gag rule for important legislation on the floor of the House. The trend is increasing and thereby restricting and curtailing the activity and expression of opinions of each Member of this body. During this session there have been brought to the floor bills from many other committees than the Ways and Means Committee from which complicated and technical tax measures have been accorded no amendment rules because of their inherent intricacy and vastness of coverage. The device is becoming too convenient but simultaneously denying the fullest fulfillment of our responsibilities to our constituents. Here we restrict and in the other body there is no limitation. In this particular legislation only 5 Members, all able men, write the provisions and 430 of their colleagues marvel at their ingenuity and resourcefulness but are estopped, by the rule, from changing a word. After 2 hours debate, many questions arise and, by suggested amendments, a better and more comprehensive bill could be adopted today but the rule denies any change.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, on Monday suspension of the rules will be used to bring the social-security amendments to the floor. The measure cannot be altered in any way under this procedure; it is, take it or leave it, and I shall take it though I cannot submit for the consideration of the entire membership of the House my amendment offered in the committee of lowering the age of eligibility of benefits to age 60 for widows who would be required to seek employment at that age.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read. No amendments are in order to the bill except those amendments offered by direction of the Select Committee on Survivors' Benefits. Are there any such amendments?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer certain amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HARDY:

Page 32, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through line 8 on page 33, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) (A) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any service, performed by an individual as a member of a uniformed service, which is creditable under section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. The Railroad Retirement Board shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as provided in section 4 (p) (2) of that act, with respect to all such service which is so creditable.

"(B) In any case where benefits under this title are already payable on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income at the time such notification (with respect to such individual) is received by the Secretary, the Secretary shall."

Page 53, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through line 25, on page 57, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 411. (a) Section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(p) (1) Military service rendered by an individual after December 1955 shall be creditable under this section only if the number of such individual's years of service is 10 or more (including, in such years of service, military service which, but for this subsection, would be creditable under this section).

"'(2) In any case where an individual has completed 10 or more years of service and such years of service include any military service rendered after December 1955, the Board shall as promptly as is practicable (A) notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that such military service is creditable under this section and (B) specify the period or periods of the military service rendered after December 1955 which is so creditable.

"'(q) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section and section 2 (c) (2), military service rendered by an individual after December 1955 shall not be used in determining eligibility for, or computing the amount of, any annuity accruing under section 2 for any month if (1) any benefits are payable for that month under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income, (2) such military service was included in the computation of such benefits, and (3) the inclusion of such service in the computation of such benefits resulted (for that month) in benefits not otherwise payable or in an increase in the benefits otherwise payable.

"'(r) The Secretary concerned (as defined in section 102 (9) of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act) shall maintain such records, and furnish the Board upon its request with such information, regarding the months of any individual's military service and the remuneration paid therefor, as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out its duties under this section and sections 2 and 5.'

"(b) (1) The first sentence of section 4 (n) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended—

"(A) by striking out '(i)' and '(ii)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1)' and '(2)', respectively;

"(B) by striking out 'for military service after December 31, 1936' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for military service after December 31, 1936, and prior to January 1, 1956'; and

"(C) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and (3) an amount found by the Board to be equal to (A) the amount of the total additional excise and income taxes which would have been payable during the preceding fiscal year under chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the compensation, as defined in such chapter, of all individuals entitled (without regard to subsection (p) (1) of this section) to credit under this act for military service after December 1955 if each of such individuals, in addition to compensation actually paid, had been paid such compensation in the amount of $160 in each calendar month in which he was in such military service during such preceding fiscal year and such taxes were measured by all such compensation without limitation as to amount paid to any individual in any one calendar month, less (B) the amount of the taxes which were paid with respect to such military service under sections 3101 and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.'

"(2) Section 4 (n) of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In determining pursuant to section 5 (k) (2) for any fiscal year the total amount to be credited from the Railroad Retirement Account to the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, credit shall be given such account for the amount of the taxes described in clause (3) (B) of the first sentence of this subsection.'

"(c) Section 1 (q) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out 'as amended in 1954' and inserting in lieu thereof 'as amended in 1955.'"

Mr. HARDY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and printed in the RECORD at this point, after which I will explain the purpose of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to leave as nearly as possible in its present situation the $160 gratuitous credit which is provided to railroad retirement personnel. The language in the bill provides a slightly different method of reimbursing the railroad retirement account because of service in the military of people who are entitled to railroad retirement benefits. This amendment conforms to the wishes of the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, and others.

I quote a memorandum having to do further with the committee's intent:

It is important to clarify the intended effect of the committee amendment upon the status of the railroad retirement account and the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund under the so-called financial interchange provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. The committee amendment, in *continuing* the present $160 credit for military service under the Railroad Retirement Act in the case of certain railroad workers, provides that the railroad retirement account shall be reimbursed for such service in an amount equal to the taxes which would have been paid if it were actual railroad employment minus the amount of the taxes actually paid with respect to such service for social security purposes. At the rates which will be in effect on January 1, 1956, this reimbursement would be at the rate, with respect to military service performed by an individual in any month, of 12½ percent of $160 minus 4 percent of that individual's basic pay.

A simple example will serve to illustrate the effect of these provisions, and the manner in which the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the railroad retirement account will be provided with the funds needed for the payment of benefits based on military service performed after 1955. If a serviceman has basic pay of $100 for military service in January 1956, he would pay $2 in tax and the Government (as his employer) would pay another $2. This $4 would be received and held in the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund; the fund, having received the $4 directly, would not be entitled under the financial interchange provisions to any additional credit with respect to that service, but the receipt of the $4 would not have the effect of reducing the total of any other amounts to be credited to the fund under those provisions. At the same time, the railroad retirement account would be reimbursed with respect to that month's service in the amount of $20 (12½ percent of $160) minus $4 (the tax actually paid on such service), or $16. If the benefits which are based on such service are ultimately paid under title II of the Social Security Act, no adjustment would be required with respect to that service; the tax which was collected would simply be used to pay the benefits, without further transfer or credit. If, however, the benefits which are based on such service are ultimately paid under the Railroad Retirement Act, the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund would be charged by the railroad retirement account for the amount of the social security benefits which would be attributable to the service on which such taxes were so collected, counting as the individual's wages or compensation for such purpose only his basic pay of $100 (since only that amount would have been included if the benefits had been payable as social security benefits) even though the benefits actually payable with respect to such service would be based on a presumed compensation of $160.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another minor amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 20, line 10, strike out the words "dependency or indemnity" and insert "dependency and indemnity."

Page 21, line 5, strike out the comma following the word "pension."

Page 22, line 14, strike out "has" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOYLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 295, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 116]

Barden
Buchanan
Celler
Chenoweth
Cole
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dolliver, Ia.
Eberharter
Fernandez
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Hêbert
Hess
Jensen
Kearney
Keating
Krueger
McDowell
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Mumma
O'Neill
Powell
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Roosevelt
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Wis.
Taylor

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 404 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SERVICEMEN'S AND VETERANS' SURVIVOR BENEFITS

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming moves to recommit the bill H. R. 7089 to the Select Committee on Survivors' Benefits for further research and study.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 12, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate very much the honor of being given the opportunity of attending the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, in Paris, as a member of the congressional delegation.

In view of the fact that the conference is being held next week, when there are many matters scheduled to come before the House in which I am vitally interested, I find that it is impossible for me to go, and I would appreciate your naming another Member in my place.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 109, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference in Paris in July 1955 on the part of the House, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. UDALL, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PREPAREDNESS FOR ATOMIC ATTACK

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have referred to the urgent need for adequate preparation through appropriate civilian defense and by direct military action to organize the Nation against atomic attack.

We are informed by the experts that there is no real defense against atomic attack, that inevitably some of the attacking planes are bound to get through to critical targets and drop their atomic bombs on civilian populations in our great cities, our industries, and military installations. Naturally it is to be presumed that any such attack would be particularly directed by the enemy at critical industrial and military areas.

If this were to happen it is estimated by those who should know that great havoc would be wrought and great loss of life and widespread injury to persons and property would occur. This would be true also of any retaliatory attack which it might be necessary for our own armed forces to make against enemy territory.

The question posed for the Congress, therefore, is: how we can best minimize the brunt of such an attack, save lives, restore order, and speedily rehabilitate industry and economic activities. The first problem connected with this subject is a military one which relates to the setting up of defenses—extensive transcontinental, intercontinental, and oceanic radar screens and warning systems; secondly, plans in readiness for speedy interception and destruction of enemy bombers by our own modern, supersonic aircraft and our latest rapidly developing, effective, super missiles and rockets.

In view of most recent scientific advances in the field of electronic weapons and aircraft, we certainly are justified in believing that many of the attacking planes could be destroyed before they reach their targets, thereby diminishing the severity and devastating effects of any attack.

The second problem is one of dealing with the immediate effects of such an attack, of mobilizing speedy units to stamp out conflagrations, provide prompt medical aid and hospitalization, restore public-utility services, transportation, and industrial and business operations. Up to this time it has been assumed that this problem should be left to the civilian defense and local agencies organized on a statewide basis and coordinated with each other under the guidance of the national Civilian Defense program. I am not of the opinion that this program can be carried out without the active, substantial participation of the military and, in my judgment, the military would have to play a great part one way or another in achieving the hoped-for results of any sound effective relief and rehabilitation programs. Thus, as I see it, civilian defense as we now define it, is definitely a function in large measure for the military. It is essentially a military problem and should be dealt with on that basis without impairing, but by coordinating, existing civil-defense organizations.

The impact of atomic attack upon industry and the need for preparation against it has been thoughtfully presented in a recent article by Mr. Marshall K. Wood in the Harvard Business Review for May–June 1955 entitled "Industry Must Prepare for Atomic Attack."

Mr. Wood's first postulate is that "the danger is almost intolerable—but there is some hope, if Government and industry do a realistic job of cooperative planning." His analysis and conclusions are cogent and provocative. He states:

> This Nation faces a military threat unique in its history; an avowedly hostile nation, the Soviet Union with the present capability to attack and destroy our major centers of population and industry.

I do not agree that the Soviet can either fully attack or largely destroy our major centers of population and industry, even though I acknowledge that it may have the present capacity to do extensive devastating damage in many places. There is certainly some question concerning the present striking ability and effectiveness of Russian aircraft over such a long range, and there is also a question concerning the present availability in terms of quality and quantity to the Soviet of adequate A-H weapons. However, to insure that margin of safety which is necessary in the circumstances and to minimize the risk inherent in the military situation confronting us today, I think we should lay our plans on the basis of very considerable Soviet potentiality to mount destructive attacks on the American mainland, even though we may be well aware of current limitations of its air strength and striking power, the limitations of its A-H strength, and its weaknesses in industrial capacity and economic potential.

We should also recognize the fact that Soviet leaders themselves must be fully cognizant of the immediate, destructive, catastrophic attacks by air, by missiles and by rockets that would be made upon Russian industry and centers of population as a retaliatory measure against such ruthless aggression, if it should ever come. These are factors which we must carefully weigh in a military, as well as in a diplomatic and political, sense. We cannot afford to rely on the potential enemy's weaknesses alone, but it is well to recognize and properly evaluate them. And it is imperative that we, as a Nation, should be fully prepared for the worst.

As I have been stressing for many years now since the end of World War II the real dangers to this Nation and to human freedom lie in policies of appeasement, vacillation, and delay in diplomatically, politically, and economically coping with this great threat to our security and the security of the free world. If the summit talks can initiate a more rational, a more realistic, a more reasonable approach to these great problems in a genuine spirit of resolution to recognize the frightful dangers of an entire world drifting toward A–H war, it may well be possible to find some common area of agreement for establishing a preventive international political mechanism to vitiate the possibilities of atomic warfare by policies of disarmament and the regulated control of atomic and hydrogen substances, biological agents, and other devilish weapons which many nations have perfected along lines that could conceivably lead to the destruction of much of our civilization. It should be recognized too that this Nation and our allies have in being at the moment definite scientific and highly developed technological techniques for defending the Nation against aircraft, missiles, and rockets. Although I am not asserting for one moment that we should ignore the existence of the terrible potentiality of these weapons, yet it is clear that we have some means available to us of greatly minimizing their possible effects. Any policy which we pursue regarding military retaliation or civilian defense should not be predicated on hysteria or unreasoning fear or terror, but on the current reality of the great strength of our position and our vast potentiality as compared with the possible enemy.

Mr. Wood's article very appropriately points up the challenge to American industry implicit in this situation and the need for collaboration by businessmen and industrial leaders with the Federal Government in assuming major responsibility for better dispersal and relocation of industries essential to national survival and retaliation after atomic attack and sound planning to deal efficiently with problems of civilian and military needs in the event of destruction of any major metropolitan areas or essential industrial or military establishments.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Wood that management's role cannot be considered to be a passive one and that going along with Government leadership is not enough. Clearly, as Mr. Wood states in substance, problems and conditions will develop following an attack which, if they cannot be done only, can be done best, by industry.

Whether Mr. Wood's proposition that "a successful attack against our 50 largest metropolitan areas would devastate over 60 percent of total manufacturing production, and over 70 percent of production of the critical hard goods industry is unqualifiedly tenable in all circumstances, I would not venture to estimate, but as I have stated above we must minimize the risks involved by basing our plans upon the assumption of maximum estimated damage so that we may both in the short and the long run increase our capability to survive and fight after atomic attack."

It is obvious, as he states, that we must set up administrative machinery to make best possible use of human and material resources remaining after attack and seek geographical redistribution of our resources with emphasis on achieving such a balance of industry in dispersed areas as will most nearly correspond to our postattack requirements. There is no question but that these tasks are urgent and require immediate attention and effective implementation.

I am unable to accept the thesis that the Soviet has current power to destroy the United States in its entirety or largely, but I do think that the Soviet may be well on its way to the achievement of very great striking power within the foreseeable future, possibly within a few years. Moreover, it is impossible to speculate upon what course desperate Communist leadership might embark once it realizes that its aim for world conquest has been frustrated. Some signs point to the fact that that stage has now been reached and that may be the reason for the present softness of Soviet foreign policy toward conciliation and diplomatic or judicial settlement of pending problems. This Nation cannot afford to proceed on any assumption which would further jeopardize our security or leave us unprepared to cope on a grand scale with any attack.

Only a madman in charge of a great nation or any nation would be willing to take responsibility for launching an international A-H warfare. We have had madmen before in this world at a not too distant time in history and we should remember that fact.

A-H bomb destruction is rapidly growing as are the effects of subsequent fall-out once it is detonated. But the destructive radius of such weapons, if we can rely on scientific judgment, are also rapidly approaching equilibrium. In other words we are reaching the point where increasing the size of these bombs may be militarily impracticable, because the radius of destructive power does not increase in proportion to the bomb's size and there are limitations imposed in effective military use by greatly increased size of the weapon.

Mr. Wood has treated with some of the military aspects of the question rather extensively, and I am impressed with his suggestion that American business on its own take immediate steps to formulate plans. I understand that the Defense Department maintains considerable data regarding industrial mobilization and I am further exploring the matter with the Department of Defense to secure assurances, if possible, that that Agency has industrial reactivation plans in being which can be implemented in the event of emergency with minimum loss of time.

There are operational problems involved such as assessing the damage and the effects thereof upon a prospective war effort, transferring production and sources of military equipment into nonvulnerable areas where possible, harnessing small plants to take up part of the load, relocating military production where necessary, disbursing and redistributing industrial resources as required and directing rehabilitation and future growth to meet the urgencies of war need.

It is Mr. Wood's view, and I think it is substantiated by the facts in a very large measure, that present policy regarding industrial remobilization after attack is inadequate. Little action has been taken, to be sure, on President Truman's national industrial dispersion policy announced in 1951. It will be recalled that the plan met with considerable criticism and opposition in and out of the Congress, but many of its fundamental principles are worthy of our earnest consideration. Undoubtedly, the expansion goals of the Office of Defense Mobilization must, under our system, depend on incentives to secure most favorable results. Dispersion has met with understandable resistance and hesitancy, but it is for the national leadership to provide the blueprint, the direction, and guidance needed to formulate a program that can be rapidly implemented whenever the occasion arises.

Accelerated tax amortization, while helpful, is certainly not all-embracing, nor will it assure automatic redistribution and reactivation. That is something that will continue to depend upon wise governmental policies, and if the Government would but undertake to enlist the cooperation of industrial business leaders, these problems could be tackled with the vigor, knowledge, and broad vision that our present position requires.

Mr. Wood has most emphatically stimulated national thinking in the right direction, and it is to be hoped that his warnings and assessment of the needs will soon be heeded by responsible heads of the National Government and the Congress.

I will look forward to receiving the considered views of the Department of Defense regarding this vital question.

EXCELLENT FOOD WITH LOW CALORIC CONTENT NOW AVAILABLE TO EVERYONE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the ingenuity of the American is limitless. All of us know that some of our most delicious foods have a tendency to increase our weight because of their high caloric content.

Congressmen are blessed by having a rear admiral, retired, who looks after our health. His name is George W. Calver. By his insistence on annual checkups and his fatherly advice on health problems he has reduced the annual congressional death toll by 70 percent. One of the things that Dr. Calver watches particularly is our weight and also the amount of cloresterol—fat—in our blood. He warns us and nurses us like we were his children. When the report of our checkup shows that our blood tests do not disclose an excess of cloresterol he smiles broadly and looks as pleased as if the test was of his own blood. He beams with delight when our checkup discloses that the healthy weight for us has not been exceeded.

In my congressional district—11th of California—we have a lady who operates a large cannery in Stockton and one in Modesto, the two largest cities in the district. These plants can a tremendous amount of fruit and vegetables.

The name of this lady is Tillie Lewis and the name of each cannery is Flotill.

This lady has realized for some time that the delicious fruit which her canneries produce contains so much sugar and so many calories that to many people only a small portion of this canned fruit could be consumed, without jeopardy to their health.

So Tillie found a way to take the calories out of the canned fruits but in no way lessening their delicious, satisfying flavor and thus permitting people to eat all of the wonderful fruit that they desired, without endangering their waistline or adding pounds to their proper weight.

She followed the same procedure in other food products manufactured in her plants.

Many people love chocolate dressing with their ice cream. But it again has too many calories for some people. Tillie has found a way to give you this same delicious chocolate with many less calories and you could not—at least I could not—tell the difference. The taste was exactly the same and the nourishment and health-giving ingredients were the same.

How was all this done? In the first place Tillie Lewis worked hard at the problem and got advice and suggestions and help from many sources. She persisted until her theory of good, healthy, rich food with less calories was perfected. She got professional medical advice, and advice from dietitions.

Finally when her goal seemed to have been accomplished she received the approval of the American Medical Association that her Tasti Diet foods were in fact good for one's health and free from excessive calories which could be injurious to the health of the consumers.

IMPLEMENTING VARIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing 50 bills which have been suggested to implement various recommendations of the second Hoover Commission; and it is my understanding that further bills are currently in process of preparation.

As requested by a constituent, I have been happy to take this prompt action because of the continuous and signal interest of constituents of the 13th District of Illinois in the Hoover Commission itself and in its findings; and because, as a former member for 4 years of the Committee on Government Operations, I found no phase of its activity which held my own personal interest more keenly than the proposals and actions on legislative and executive reorganization.

Further, I have taken this action in order that the legislation may, even before the close of this session of Congress, not only be placed before the appropriate committees for study but particularly be brought to the attention of House Members. It may be true that there may be some opposition—and even in some instance I myself may possibly find reason for objection—but there is no doubt that the legislation merits our prompt and close consideration.

SECOND TERM FOR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] expressed surprise and amusement over a statement presented the day before to President Eisenhower by me and my colleagues, Mr. AVERY, of Kansas, and Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I might point out that July 11 marked the third anniversary of Mr. Eisenhower's nomination to the Presidency.

The statement cited the outstanding accomplishments of the Republican Party under President Eisenhower's leadership, and urged that he run for a second term of office. It was signed by all 54 Republican Members of the House first elected in the 83d or 84th Congresses.

The gentleman from Ohio justified his surprise by quoting, and inserting in the RECORD, an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald misquoting the facts on the amount of support given to the President's program by these 54 Members.

The facts have now been set straight by a retraction, appearing on page 1 of today's Washington Post and Times Herald. I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

> FIFTY-FOUR BACKERS OF IKE STRONGEST ON VOTES
>
> The 54 House Republicans who appealed to President Eisenhower Monday to stand for reelection turn out to be stronger supporters of his legislative program than the average Congressman, Republican or Democrat.
>
> The statement made in this newspaper yesterday that they fell behind the House Democratic record in backing White House measures was based on incorrect information from the research organization Congressional Quarterly.
>
> Corrected calculations from CQ yesterday showed the 54 "Ike-in-'56" Republicans supported the President in rollcalls 67 percent of the time; the score for all GOP Representatives was 62 and for all House Democrats 51.
>
> The 54 Republicans did, however, fall considerably short of the Democratic average in voting for the President's foreign policy program. They backed him on the average in only 56 percent of rollcalls on foreign policy measures, while the Democrats, on the same issues, supported him 69 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the correct facts show that we 54 Members of Congress who have asked the President to run for a second term have an over-all average of support for President Eisenhower's program which is better than the average of the entire majority side. I might point out that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has a record of only 28 percent support for the President's program. He has thus far opposed the President 59 percent of the time.

To correct any other possible misapprehension, I should like to point out that I personally circulated this statement. Only those Republicans who were first elected with, or since, the election of President Eisenhower were asked to sign. They did so with real enthusiasm. Without any doubt our senior Republican colleagues would have gladly signed had they been given the opportunity.

President Eisenhower has won the admiration and fine support of the members of his party. Millions of Americans, regardless of party, have equal confidence in his leadership and want him as our President for a second term. It is to be hoped that members of the majority party who now boast of their support of the President's program will also support our efforts to persuade him to seek a second term.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 12, 1955, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgillio Jackson); and

H. R. 3636. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain lands situate in the city and county of Honolulu, island of Oahu, to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Hawaiian Islands.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4585. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations; and

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6766), entitled "An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956 — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 218)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today approved H. R. 6042 making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I have done so because the funds which the bill makes available are urgently needed by the Department of Defense. Except for this imperative need, I would have withheld my approval of the bill, for I am advised by the Attorney General that one of its provisions, section 638, constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the province of the Executive.

Section 638 deals with the authority of the Department of Defense to rid itself of many of the manifold activities that it has been performing with its civilian personnel, and that can be adequately and economically performed by private industry without danger to the national security. That section states that funds appropriated in the bill cannot be used to enable the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority if, in the case of any activity of the Department proposed to be terminated, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives disapproves such proposed termination.

The Constitution of the United States divides the functions of the Government into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, and establishes the principle that they shall be kept separate. Neither may exercise functions belonging to the others. Section 638 violates this constitutional principle.

I believe it to be my duty to oppose such a violation. The Congress has the power and the right to grant or to deny an appropriation. But once an appropriation is made the appropriation must, under the Constitution, be administered by the executive branch of the Government alone, and the Congress has no right to confer upon its committees the power to veto Executive action or to prevent Executive action from becoming effective.

Since the organization of our Government, the President has felt bound to insist that Executive functions be maintained unimpaired by legislative encroachment, just as the legislative branch has felt bound to resist interference with its power by the Executive. To acquiesce in a provision that seeks to encroach upon the proper authority of the Executive establishes a dangerous precedent. I do not, by my approval of H. R. 6042, acquiesce in the provisions of section 638, and to the extent that this section seeks to give to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authority to veto or prevent Executive action, such section will be regarded as invalid by the executive branch of the Government in the administration of H. R. 6042, unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

One other rider added to the bill is most unfortunate. This rider—contained in section 630—virtually precludes the services from considering the purchase of foreignmade spun slik yarn for cartridge cloth.

This rider—attached to the bill without adequate opportunity for reasons against it to be presented—runs directly counter to the steps which have been taken by the administration in the field of Government procurement policy. No reason appears why foreignmade spun silk yarn, or indeed any other article or commodity of foreign origin, should be singled out for special exemption from the general provisions of the Buy American legislation. By making it virtually impossible for our friends abroad to sell us goods when such goods are materially less expensive to our taxpayers than those that can be procured domestically, such provisions could effect a deadly attrition of our whole international trade policy and bring about impairment of our relations with other nations.

It is my earnest hope that as soon as possible the Congress will repeal section 630 of the bill in its entirety.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 13, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that in his message the President has discussed section 638 of H. R. 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the coming year.

When this matter was before the House several days ago, many of us took the position that section 638 was a bad section and should not have been in the bill. In the first place it made it impossible for the executive department to get rid of certain business activities that it has been performing with civilian personnel in the Armed Forces establishment. I realize there are certain Members of the House who have these activities in their district and they do not want to see them closed, even though the Defense Department can get along without them or they could be better done by private industry.

My colleagues will recall that during the past few years the Committee on Government Operations has surveyed the Military Establishment and made recommendation after recommendation to get the Government out of the free enterprise field. On all of those occasions a majority of the membership has endorsed that kind of action. You will recall that 3 years ago we passed the bill to sell some 13 rubber plants which had been operated as a part of the Defense Establishment. Since then those plants have been operating by private capital and are now paying income and other taxes to the Federal Government and to State and local governments.

Recently, under considerable pressure from the Armed Services Committee of the House, the Defense Department started getting rid of a number of civilian activities that should be in the free enterprise field. This included some paint plants, coffee grinding establishments and at least one ropemaking factory. In addition on many of the military bases civilian activities, which had been undertaken with civilian employees, are now being transferred to the free enterprise field. We all realize that some of these activities grew up as the result of wartime activities and nothing could be done about them then. The important thing I am emphasizing now is that the trend is in the other direction, and all of that is good.

There were many of us who felt that section 638 would effectively tie the hands of the executive department to continue to economically perform the activities of the Defense Establishment. That section makes it necessary for the Secretary of Defense to come back and get the approval of the Appropriations Committee of the House or the Senate. I am sure that every Member of this House understands that there will be a considerable reluctance of members of that committee to allow termination of these activities in bases in their districts. In addition, this section makes it possible for other Members of the Congress to run to the Appropriations Committee for help any time that the Defense Department asks to terminate these civilian activities in their districts. All in all, it creates a very difficult situation for the Department of Defense to effectively perform its function. I think I can safely say that all the good work which the executive department has been doing along this line would be curtailed.

I am not in any way attempting to go into the legal question involved which the President has discussed at some length upon the advice of the Attorney General. That is a very technical legal point and I would certainly wish to examine the statutes and the decisions at greater length before trying to pass an opinion on that matter.

My only purpose at this time is to point out the fact that section 638 was bad legislation when it was passed and it is bad legislation today and never should have been put in the bill in the first place. It has a poor morale effect upon those administering the Defense Establishment and in my opinion section 638 should be repealed.

IMPROVED PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY STATUTE

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Legislature recently took a forward step in the art of democratic government. It enacted an improved presidential primary statute which pioneers in a number of respects. This statute may be the model for similar statutes in other States which share Florida's objective of giving the American people more voice in the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.

While the entire Florida Legislature deserves credit for enacting this measure, the work of three men has come to my attention in connection with this model statute. They are Paul T. David, of the Brookings Institute; Manning J. Dauer, head of the University of Florida Political Science Department; and William A. F. Stephenson, chairman of the Pinellas County, Fla., Democratic executive committee.

Mr. David was in charge of a research group of the Brookings Institute which, in connection with the 1952 elections, made the most complete study of American presidential nominating procedures of which I have any knowledge. The results of their research have been published in five volumes entitled "Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952," edited by Mr. David together with Malcolm Moos and Ralph M. Goldman. Dr. Dauer and Mr. Stephenson worked on the drafting of the bill, with the advice of Mr. David, based upon his research and experience recorded in this work.

These are the essential features of Florida's new presidential primary law:

First. The presidential primary would be a closed primary; voters would be allowed to vote only the ballot of the political party in which they are registered.

Second. The ballot would carry organized slates of delegates; no would-be delegate would be allowed to run for election as an individual, but only as a part of an organized slate that includes a full list of candidates for delegate-at-large, together with a full quota of district delegates in at least half of the congressional districts of the State.

Third. Delegates-at-large would be elected on the basis of the statewide vote; district delegates on the basis of the vote in their respective districts.

Fourth. In each congressional district, the ballot would carry only the portions of the slates to be voted on in that district: the candidates for delegate-at-large and for district delegate for that congressional district.

Fifth. Organized slates that prefer a particular individual for the presidential nomination would be allowed to indicate their preference on the ballot, in a position prominently associated with the box or circle in which the voter places his mark. The consent of the potential nominee would not be required for the inclusion of such expression of preference on the ballot.

Sixth. If two or more slates are filed in support of the same candidate, he would be given an opportunity to choose the one to appear on the ballot. If he declined the making of a choice, the first slate filed would be placed on the ballot.

Seventh. Delegates would not be required to execute any formal pledge of support for the candidate they favor, the moral commitment implied in association on the ballot being deemed sufficient if the candidate proves to be available.

Eighth. The ballot would carry organized slates running on a "no preference" basis where such slates are offered.

Ninth. If two or more "no preference" slates meet the filing requirements in the presidential primary of the same party, all would appear on the ballot.

Tenth. In each slate of delegates carried on the ballot, the individual to serve as delegation chairman would be clearly indicated and he would head the list of candidates for delegates-at-large.

For several years Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and I have cosponsored a bill to encourage States to hold presidential primary elections. Our identical bills on this subject which are now before Congress are S. 652 and H. R. 2532. Enactment by the States of improved presidential primary laws would help in the effort to give the American people greater voice in the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President. But the battle for more democratic nominating procedures will never be entirely won without Federal legislation along the lines of the bill which I am cosponsoring with Senator DOUGLAS or along the lines of similar legislation sponsored by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS. Without such Federal legislation, each candidate would continue to enter the primaries of only the States in which his chances of success would be best. State primaries would continue to be lacking in the unity and coordination which they would have under a system of State primaries where the States voluntarily accept the minimum coordination needed to give primaries the maximum meaning and effectiveness.

Until the bill which Senator DOUGLAS and I are sponsoring becomes law, or until some similar Federal law passes, improved primaries like the Florida primary can do much toward making our nominating procedures more democratic; and after the passage of Federal law, the previous or subsequent enactment of State laws along the lines of the Florida law can effectively form a part of a total legislative procedure for workable presidential primaries. There are minor inconsistencies between the new Florida primary law and S. 652 and H. R. 2532. These could easily be reconciled if these Federal bills were enacted. Until that happy day arrives, the purposes of these Federal bills can be well assisted by improving State primary laws. I hope the States now thinking of improving their nominating laws will consider the new Florida presidential primary law as a model for their legislation.

MEETING AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include essays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, these next few days may be fateful ones in the history of civilization.

As the President of the United States, flanked by highest diplomatic authorities, goes abroad to confer with statesmen of other powers, the prayers of peace-loving people everywhere attend him.

Much has been said and written in advance of the "meeting at the summit." Nothing I have encountered more fully accounts for all that is at stake than a series of editorials which comprise the remainder of my remarks.

Proudly I seek to direct the attention of this body to 10 essays dealing with the Big Four Conference now at hand. They were written by the editor of a Midwestern county seat town. I risk his friendship only by divulging that credit or byline which the author himself modestly withheld. The writings which surely deserve the reflection of us all were composed by Scott B. Chambers, editor of the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times. His father before him was an editorialist of note. Aside from his arduous duties as the directing head of an outstanding newspaper organization, the son, I dare suggest, is a worthy contender for even wider recognition in a State famous for its production of top-flight journalists.

So that the author's fine work may be faithfully recited, I am taking the liberty of quoting the captions as well as the complete text of his excellent presentation:

CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT HAS GREAT POTENTIAL, BUT DON'T EXPECT TOO MUCH TOO SOON FROM BIG FOUR MEETING

On July 18 the long-heralded talks at the summit will take place in Geneva, Switzerland, between the heads of state of the Big Four powers—Britain, France, Russia, and the United States.

As all of us watch from the sidelines, let us observe two precautions:

1. Don't underestimate the Big Four Conference.

2. Don't expect too much too soon.

The two statements sound contradictory, but they are not necessarily so.

We should not expect too much too soon because there is much at stake, and each side will bargain cautiously and reluctantly. It is a fault of us Americans that we get in too big a hurry, and this can prove costly.

This conference at the summit is a good deal like a modern aircraft carrier, which does not operate by itself but has numerous auxiliary vessels, a normal complement of supporting destroyers, supply ships, submarines, and other types as required.

In the same way the summit conference has been preceded by talks by foreign ministers, economic advisers, trade experts, military men, and atomic authorities, and will be followed by dozens of such meetings.

While there may be significant news from the conference itself indicating the direction affairs are taking, the real fruit of the conference may not mature for many months.

Don't expect too much too soon.

Don't underestimate the Big Four Conference.

It may very well prove to be the most important diplomatic conference in the history of the world. It could make of 1955 a date to plague school children's memories; a new companion for 1066, 1492 and 1776.

All of this may not come to pass, but the conference does have such a potential—and it can be good, or it can be bad.

It can set the course of world affairs and accelerate the pace of that course. If the conference establishes grounds for mutual confidence among the nations, it can lead rapidly to the beginning of an era in which the world's attentions are focused, not upon its conflicts, but upon its constructive and peaceful pursuits.

Or the same thing can happen in reverse.

In 1938 the nations went to Munich hopeful that a war could be averted, only to learn that Hitler's terms could not be met by peoples unwilling to give up their freedom. From that moment, the pace toward war was accelerated, and nations armed feverishly for the conflict that had become inevitable.

Can it happen at Geneva?

It certainly can.

There is reason to believe that it will not, but to make such an assumption would be to whistle in the dark.

As we wait and watch, we shall not be taken too badly by surprise if we observe the two precautions:

1. Don't underestimate the Big Four Conference.

2. Don't expect too much too soon.

IS NOW THE TIME TO NEGOTIATE?—YES; THERE ARE REASONS WHY WE MUST, AND OTHERS WHY WE SHOULD

On the eve of the Big Four Conference there are those who say, "This is not the time to negotiate."

They say we should wait until Germany has been rearmed and has divisions in the field; until SEATO, the Asian alliance, has the full-blown capacity of NATO to challenge aggression in the East in a decisive way; until we can corner the Soviet countries and make them say, "Uncle."

We offer 2 reasons why we are compelled to negotiate now, and 3 reasons why we should negotiate anyhow.

The West is compelled to negotiate: 1. Because the people demand it. This is specially true of the European populations, who with good reason might expect to bear the brunt of warfare, and who have already experienced it firsthand as we in the United States have not. 2. We must negotiate now because refusal to negotiate would put us in the light of wanting war. This especially would be true of the effect our refusal would have on the peoples of India and other Asian republics, the countries of the Middle East and Africa, whose good will and esteem is invaluable to us in this struggle.

There are reasons why we should negotiate now:

1. Why else have we built ourselves and our allies into a position of great strength, if not that we might negotiate a peace with honor? We have established the great alliance under NATO for the defense of the Atlantic and Europe. We have organized SEATO for the defense of Asia. We have fought a police action in Korea to uphold the hand of the United Nations against Soviet aggression. We maintain vast military establishments, and we have the world's greatest stockpile of atomic bombs and weapons. We have established a network of military bases throughout the world.

All to what end?

That we might wage war?

No. That we might negotiate an honorable peace.

2. How much pressure should be applied before we negotiate is a relative matter, but insistence on the ultimate in pressure brings us to the very brink of war, and it is altogether possible to skate too close to the edge.

It is when men are cornered that they shoot their way out. A nation so cornered as to be helpless in negotiations could well be expected to take a similar shortcut. It might well decide to gamble on its one great opportunity—to be the first to strike in an all-or-nothing atomic dice game world war III.

3. There is more than a bare possibility that Russia is ready for peace. The fact that it is not a sure thing still does not warrant cynicism. A few months ago any settlement of the Austrian situation appeared so remote as to be impossible, but today it is an accomplished fact.

IS IT LIKELY RUSSIA REALLY WANTS PEACE?—IF SO, IT MAY NOT BE THE KIND OF PEACE THAT WE HAVE IN MIND

Does Russia really want peace?

That's the big question mark that hangs over the Big Four Conference. President Eisenhower has said that the conference will be an opportunity to test Russian intentions.

Russia is partly responsible for the conference, so she must have some motive. Let's look at the possibilities:

1. The most pessimistic view is that Russia wants to get things settled in the West so that she will have a free hand to complete the conquest of Asia—to infiltrate and subjugate such lands as Burma, Indonesia, and Indochina, and ultimately, of course, Japan, the Philippines, and all the rest.

2. Her purpose could be to ease the economic problems at home. Food production is not good. Certainly China must be a drain on her resources.

It was a Russian idea that the Communists would wait until the West should be in the throes of the depression that they thought must result inevitably from its system of capitalism, and at that time walk in and take us over. What appears to have happened is exactly the reverse. The Western allies were never so prosperous; it is Russia that is having economic troubles.

3. Her purpose could be to prevent war from exploding in Germany. A divided Germany is a constant threat of war, and feeling in both zones is bitter against the Russians.

All of these things likely influence Russian thinking, but a fourth seems to be at the core of the issue:

4. Russia doesn't want to fight; has never thought of war as an instrument of policy; and has wished to use her military strength only to bluff and threaten those smaller and weaker than herself. Like the bully she is, when someone her own size (which now we are) shows up, she no longer wishes to play the game.

Many factors have turned the military tide against Russia, and here we mention but two:

1. The first is the nuclear bomb.

Russia's great defense factor has been its space. Both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated by the great space of Russia, which prevented their armies from penetrating to the heart and vitals of the country.

Now the atomic and hydrogen bombs—carried by supersonic planes—have simply erased that space. Russia's historic defense is gone.

2. The rearmament of Germany will be a body blow to Russia's one phase of military superiority, her ground troops. A rearmed Germany cannot give the West superiority in ground forces, but it can greatly reduce Russia's advantage.

If this line of thinking is correct, then Russia sees its opportunity in the military field running out, and is ready to sue for a military peace.

It isn't that Russia has had a change of heart, but a change of situations; not that she objects to the inhumanity of war, but to its extravagance. Why waste all that money, manpower, and machinery taking countries by war, when you can accomplish the same thing by infiltration, fomenting class and racial struggles, propaganda, psychological warfare, getting a slice of territory here, and a member of parliament or a cabinet minister there?

Does Russia want peace?

Very likely; that sort of a peace.

MILITARY POWER IS BIG FACTOR IN NEGOTIATIONS—A BROAD COMPARISON OF SOME STRATEGIC MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS

How do we stack up in a military way as compared with Russia? Have we reached that "position of strength" about which President Truman used to speak when he asked for military appropriations?

The answer to these questions does make a difference, for it is axiomatic that nations seldom win in diplomatic conferences what their military forces would be unable to win outside of them.

Let's examine the Russian position:

We have noted that the great space of Russia, which has been its historic defense, has been erased by the discovery of the nuclear bomb, and that German rearmament will greatly reduce the advantage in land forces which the Soviets hold over the West.

Russia also has transportation difficulties.

The location of her sealanes—on the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea, and the Pacific—is such that they are not useful in war. The route between the Baltic and the Black Seas leads all the way around Europe—through the English Channel and the Straits of Gibraltar—while the route between the Black Sea and Vladivostok is even longer.

On the other hand, the methods of land transport—roads, canals, and railways—are costly, and specially so because of Russia's great space. Moreover, it takes about a thousand trucks to carry the cargo of one good ship.

Except for airpower, Russia is in a relatively poor position. In this connection, it should be observed that she has no advanced bases, that her only route to the United States is over the Pole, and her sole threat to us is strategic air bombardment.

Allied plans for the defense of Europe are built around the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a military alliance of 15 nations with a unified command.

NATO is based in the United States, and its communications are good. This country and all of the other 14 countries have good harbors.

Our advanced military bases are many; they are widely dispersed, and some are almost on the Russian doorstep—in Turkey for example.

NATO has permanent offices in Paris, and a council there which directs its affairs. Operating under the council is a military committee, charged with strategic planning.

NATO has three strategic commands: The European Command, with headquarters in Paris; the Channel Command, with headquarters in England; and the Atlantic Command, with headquarters in Norfolk.

The European Command is divided into four areas: The area from the North Cape to Denmark, with headquarters at Oslo; the area from Denmark to the Alps, at Fontainebleau; the area including Italy, Greece, and Turkey, at Naples; and the Mediterranean area with its headquarters at Malta.

The land threat to Europe is via Germany.

Russia's 175 divisions constitute an immense force, even when it is considered that about half of them are from the satellite countries of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The troops from the satellites are practically slave troops with foreign masters from Moscow, and both their efficiency and their loyalty are questionable.

The allied countries have 15 divisions in Germany and about 27 in southern Europe, so it can be seen that the 12 new divisions from a rearmed Germany will be an important contribution to allied strength.

If Russia invaded Europe it would probably be required to concentrate its troops, which in turn would make them vulnerable to the bomb.

It seems reasonable to conclude that allied representatives at Geneva may well negotiate from strength. The position of strength which we have long sought for this purpose does, indeed, seem at hand.

CRUCIAL PROBLEM FOR CONFERENCE WILL BE GERMANY—RUSSIAN PROPOSAL FOR A NEUTRAL GERMANY NOT POPULAR HERE

When the heads of state of the four great powers sit down in Geneva, Switzerland, just 2 weeks from now they will consider several problems of tremendous scope and importance, but the most crucial, immediate problem before them will be Germany.

Strength makes Germany important. As the most populous and greatest steel-producing country of Western Europe, she is the nucleus of the strength of Europe.

Geographic location makes Germany important. If war were to come between the Soviet powers and the West, land forces of the opposing armies would meet as they crossed Germany. It is significant to note that Germany provides a depth in which Western defense could operate.

Division makes Germany important. There are really three Germanys—the German Federal Republic (West), a free, sovereign state; the German Democratic Republic (East), with a Moscow-dominated government; the Polish-occupied area east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers—and we might add Berlin, under joint administration, as a fourth. This division is a festered sore of magnitude in the world political situation. It could explode into world war III.

German unity is an issue both sides will be glad to get settled, although their ideas about settlement are somewhat different.

Russia, unable to get Germany for herself, now hopes to keep the West from having her, with the idea that some later opportunity may make a Communist revolution possible there. Russia's timetable for Germany runs like this: Divide, neutralize, subvert, and absorb.

The allies of the West want a free, united, self-reliant Germany. That means a Germany which is a sovereign state, without domination by anybody, free to arm, to make treaties and join alliances at will. They see in a strong, free Germany the bulwark of a strong, free Europe and the preservation of Western culture.

Both the Allies and Russia want free elections to be held in Germany. The West wants elections held throughout all Germany under the supervision of some international authority (possibly the United Nations) to elect representatives and establish the kind of government that the people of all Germany shall choose.

The Russians want to negotiate with the West and determine the kind of government Germany should have, then hold an election to name officials.

Russia thought that Austrian neutrality would set the pattern for Germany; that the Germans would be so anxious to be together again that they gladly would accept neutral status, but the Russian bait for Germany was too little and too late. The neutrality bait was not received well in Germany. Even the Social-Democratic press, the Socialist opposition to the Adenauer government, viewed the whole thing skeptically.

The Germans recall the treatment they got as prisoners of the Russians at the time of the invasion, and the people of East Germany are bitter and resentful against Russia for her occupation of that zone. Berlin, which is jointly administered, is said to be the most anti-Russian city of Germany, a fact which would be additionally significant if it were to become the capital of a reunited Germany.

Chancellor Adenauer has gone so far as to say that if Germany must choose between unity and membership in NATO, then it must be NATO. A hard, but wise choice, for if it has NATO it may some day achieve unity; but if it were to choose unity and forego NATO, it would not have the means to defend itself, and might soon lose not only its unity, but also its freedom.

Can Marriage of Expediency Become Partnership in Love?—Fears and Doubts Concerning Germany as Partner of West

There are fears and doubts concerning Germany as a partner, and these center around three propositions:

1. Bismarck's boast, "Germany will dominate any federation of which it is a member."

2. Germany has always played the East and the West against each other. Will she try this "swing" policy again?

3. Germany's alliance with the West is a shotgun wedding. Can this marriage of expediency become a partnership of love?

The boast that Germany would dominate any federation of which she is a member is perhaps the least serious of the three ideas. The remark was made three-quarters of a century ago by Bismarck of Bismarck's Germany, which was in a much stronger position than Mr. Adenauer's Germany. Domination of NATO's other 14 countries, including Great Britain and the United States, would be somewhat of an ambitious undertaking.

It might further be said that treaty provisions with Germany limit both the size and character of her military establishment, and that the organization of NATO does not easily lend itself to domination.

In the formative years of Germany, Prussia came under the occupation of Napoleon, and was able to force its liberation by means of a treaty with Russia made at Tauroggen.

Similar German-Russian treaties of friendship have followed from time to time and include the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922, the Berlin Treaty in 1926, and the Hitler-Stalin Treaty of 1939. The idea of all of them was to guarantee Russian neutrality, so that Germany could safely face the West.

Those who fear a replay of the swing policy point out that Germany has now gotten what she can from the West; what's to prevent her from bargaining with Russia and getting what she can from her?

There are two things that might reasonably be expected to stop her. The first is that Germany just isn't big enough to do it. It takes a great power to swing a swing policy. The second is that the Germans may remember that the swing policy hasn't always paid off.

The ink on the Treaty of Rapallo was scarcely dry when the Politburo ordered a Communist revolution in Saxony in 1923, attempting to overthrow the very government with which it had just concluded this friendship treaty.

In 1939 Hitler thought he was safe behind his pact with Stalin—safe to attack the West—but that, too, turned out to be another Russian doublecross.

Now Russia has just devoured a good part of Germany and would like another friendship treaty as a cover for further operations against that country.

The report is that there isn't much sale for the swing policy in Germany today.

What of the fear that the alliance of Germany is a marriage of expediency—one into which she is forced by circumstances—and for that reason won't last?

It is true that her participation as a member in the coal and steel community is expedient for Germany's economy; that her membership in the Western European Union strengthens her political position and that NATO is essential for her defense.

However, these seem, on the contrary, good reasons why the marriage will last. They offer good solid foundations for a nation in partnership.

Further, it can be said of practically all the alliances of history that they were the products of expediency. It is true of the unwritten alliance that the United States and France have had for two centuries. That alliance, based upon the expedient of our common fear of Great Britain, has survived the shotgun days—when we feared Britain—to become a partnership in love.

The world being what it is in this year of 1955, even the secondary nations like Germany can be made and unmade by the great powers.

What Are Chances for the German Republic's Future?—It Is Surrounded by an Entirely New Set of Facts

What are the chances that the German Federal Republic will succeed and endure although the Weimar Republic of Germany following World War I did not?

First, let us remind ourselves that each of these governments has been surrounded by a set of facts as different from the other as can be imagined.

The Weimar Republic never at any time had the good will of the majority of the German people. It lacked the support of large and influential groups. Civil government still was beholden to the military. Economic disaster made the German mark a joke, and moral collapse and psychological bewilderment followed.

The Weimar Republic was deserted, as well, by the allies, who dictated and sought to enforce terms of retribution in spite of Woodrow Wilson's plea for peace without victory. We joined European countries in the insistence upon payment of reparations, and stood by to watch the economic collapse that ensued.

With their national aspirations denied, their fortunes lost, and their self-respect gone, the German people had nothing more to lose. They were ready to try anything, and did—Hitler.

Today we have a new set of facts:

At the conclusion of World War II it became established American policy to create conditions in Germany which would permit democratic government to live.

Gen. Lucius Clay was in charge of the occupation, and under him were five administrators. One of the five was Dr. Herman Wells, president of Indiana University, who was in charge of German cultural affairs. This included schools, the press, churches, museums, concert halls and musical organizations, etc. More than any other person, he was charged with establishing a German cultural program that would be acceptable to the German people and at the same time lay the foundations for democracy in that country.

In 1948 we established a German currency reform, and there followed a program of Marshall plan aid to make Germany strong economically.

Germany is not the typical vanquished nation of history. Indeed, she has become a partner, first in the Coal and Steel Community, then the Western European Union, and now as a member of NATO.

Her sovereignty is restored; she is a nation among nations.

When the facts are so different, shall we be surprised to see the response of a people changed?

The government, which is representative in character and has a constitution with a bill of rights very much like our own, has the support and good will of the people as a whole. It has no Communists and no Nazis. The Social-Democratic Party is the opposition party, but its members are democratic, who also believe in a free press and free institutions.

The best indication that the German people will support the republic is that they are supporting those nongovernmental, free institutions which we know to be the bastions of all freedom—the press, the church, the school, and the family.

Another fact which we must recognize as a response of the nation is that it has produced men to lead it who approach greatness, of whom the best known to us, of course, is Chancellor Adenauer.

In some ways, the German Government is the most stable government of Europe.

The good will which has existed in Germany for the occupation forces is not without significance. Our own purpose has been made conspicuous by their contrast with the Soviet policies in the Eastern Zone, and the fruit they have borne is good.

Love's labor is not lost.

Will France Sue for Alienation of Affections?—Is New Importance of Germany Upsetting to Historic Friendship?

France has been the keystone of our European policy throughout United States history. Now circumstances are compelling France to share this historic position with Germany.

Will France sue for alienation of affections?

The friendship of the two countries has been in reality an unwritten alliance that began before the American Revolution, was promoted by such early statesmen as Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson, and continued through two world wars. It is a friendship 200 years old.

It has been a proverb of diplomacy that the route to London was via Paris. It has been Britain's policy for a long time to back the French position on the continent of Europe. So, whenever there was a European proposition to be discussed, the first thing London wanted to know was what Paris thought about it. In this sense, both Britain and the United States have made France the keystone of their European policies.

The new importance of Germany has altered this.

The diplomatic importance of France stemmed in part from the fact that the military front of the allies was on the Rhine, but today it is on the Oder.

The new position of Germany as a partner in our military alliance, its size, strength, and strategic geographical position, have dictated its new importance.

Moreover, in a time when events have moved rapidly, France has been involved in a series of convulsive cabinet changes. It has been hard to consult France when policies worked out with one administration might be vetoed by a new one next week. French leaders, among whom there are many great statesmen, have warned their country that such irresponsibility would hurt the leadership of France by compelling us to turn to Germany and other countries in the formulation of policies.

The whole colonialism issue has poured salt in the wound. France is a colonial power, and sees the colonies as one of its last holds on its status as a great power. Moreover, it has real trouble on hand in Indochina, Tunisia, and Algeria. In such difficulty France would at least like some sympathy, but it is precisely that which we feel unable to give. Our only participation in colonialism was as a colony. Further, we believe that the independence of colonies is inevitable, and that if we don't give them some encouragement, they will look to the Communist powers for it. We very earnestly want these colonies to remain part of the free world.

There is an ancient Viennese proverb that says, "The situation in Germany is serious but not hopeless; the situation in Austria is hopeless but not serious."

The situation with France is far from hopeless, and we hope that it may never even become serious.

Indeed, there is an altogether new and changed relationship between Germany and France, itself. They are partners in the Coal and Steel Community, in the Western European Union, and in NATO.

While France debated European unity for a long time, now that she has committed herself, she seems to regard unity as a primary tenet of French policy along with her Atlantic ties.

It is altogether possible that in a situation which combines the Atlantic ties with European unity, France may find greater security and prosperity than she has known.

Certainly any change in the French-United States relationship comes from force of circumstances and not from any change of heart. The fact that circumstances have put some rocks in the path of this friendship may mean what it means to any good friendship, that both parties will have to work at keeping the friendship in good repair.

It may be added that this is not only a friendship of governments, but a friendship of two great peoples, who have nothing but good will for each other in their hearts.

Centuries of History Are Telescoped Into a Single Decade—Events Reveal Some of Strangest Facts in World's History

On August 6, 1945, an atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, and the end of World War II was at hand.

Centuries of history have been telescoped into these past 10 years:

We witnessed the rapid and peaceful dismantling of a colonial system that was several centuries in building, and the appearance in Asia of 10 new republics—India, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, etc.

China passed through a Communist revolution.

India emerged as a new power.

A United Nations police action was fought in Korea.

Italy, Germany, and France, which were in ruins—some physically, and all economically, emotionally, and politically—have returned to the status of powers.

On June 25, 1948, the Berlin airlift began in answer to the Soviet blockade of that city, and we knew then that we were in a cold war.

At the beginning of this decade there were just two powers, the United States and Russia, but now there are others of importance, including Britain, France, Germany, China, Japan, India, and perhaps Italy.

Germany is a nation in transition, France is reorienting herself, Britain is riding out the decline of empire to find that emotional and spiritual ties do bind a great commonwealth of nations together, and the United States is becoming more accustomed to its mantle of world leadership.

The United Nations has just celebrated its 10th birthday, and seems well on the way to becoming a permanent institution that serves the nations and their peoples in many ways.

Important organizations to strengthen and defend the free world have come into being:

(NATO) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(WEU) Western European Union.

(CSC) Coal and Steel Community, sometimes called the Schuman Plan.

(SEATO) South East Asian Treaty Organization.

On February 8 of this year Mr. Molotov, addressing the Supreme Soviet of Russia, warned that Russia would not sit idly by and see Germany rearmed; that dire consequences would follow any such action.

The West ignored this threat; adopted WEU, provided for the rearmament of Germany, made her a sovereign power again, and a partner in NATO.

Russia's reaction was not what it promised. Instead it moved to negotiate a treaty for Austria, its leaders went to Belgrade for talks with Tito, Mr. Adenauer was invited to Moscow, China released some American airmen, and peace talks are to be held by the heads of state in Geneva in a few days.

That we have come to a position of strength and respect is not an accident, but the triumph of American policy, based upon two principles:

The first, collective security. This includes recognition of the fact that the economic welfare of all free nations is important to a free world, and it was achieved through such agencies as NATO, SEATO, and CSC.

The second, that America stands for humanity. Instead of demanding reparations from conquered countries, we have taxed ourselves and spent money on them—$3½ billion on Germany. Then, having helped them to their economic feet, we restored their sovereignty and self-respect, shook their hands as friends, and made them partners in our alliances for the free world.

This is certainly one of the strangest facts in history:

That Germany and Japan, who were so recently our enemies, have now become the keystones of our defense on their respective continents.

Yes, it is the natural fruit of our policy of good will toward their peoples and governments.

The Need To Prepare Emotions and Spirit for the Conference—It Is Important for Us as Well as Our Leaders

(This is the last in a series of editorials on Germany and the forthcoming Big Four Conference. Acknowledgment is made to the Indiana University conference on "Problems of American Foreign Policy," from which much of the material has been drawn.

(The nature of these university conferences has required that attendance be limited to about 100 persons, but the conferences have been of such high order that we have wished to share their substance with our readers.

(The Courier-Times is solely responsible, however, for the opinions expressed.—Editor.)

The White House midnight oil is burning these days in preparation for the Big Four talks in Geneva. We hope that before the big day comes off these men who are to represent us will take a moment in meditation and prayer to ask themselves:

"Are we emotionally and spiritually prepared for this experience?"

That is a question we ordinary folk ought to be asking ourselves, too. This is a democracy, you know. We make foreign policy, and if we are ill informed or ill prepared in any sense, we could make some far-reaching and pretty bad mistakes.

We shall need great patience.

Chancellor Adenauer has cautioned us: "With the West, time is important; the Russians are interested only in space. The West cannot have too much patience."

We shall need a spirit of compromise.

This does not mean being an easy mark.

It does mean that it is very unlikely that we can have peace without compromise, and the nature of a compromise is that both sides give up something.

If we ask, "What sacrifices can we safely make?" the answer is, "None." But the final question really is, "Can we afford not to make them?"

We shall need the spirit of the Lord.

We must enter these negotiations prayerfully, mindful that the God of Moses and of Jesus Christ is the Lord of history.

In the prologue to John's gospel is this amazing statement:

"The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it."

Although we wouldn't say it that way today, the symbolism of light for good and darkness for evil is not unusual.

The amazing thing about this scripture is that it proclaims the invincibility of goodness. It declares that goodness will survive and triumph in spite of any temporary setbacks.

Some of the setbacks didn't seem so temporary at the time. Things must have looked pretty dark to the early Christians. We've seen some bad days ourselves, when dictators bellowed and swaggered. The world isn't exactly a carefree sort of place today.

Evil is frequently noisy and always a bully, while there is a natural association of quiet humility with goodness. Not infrequently goodness is forced or scared into a retreat.

Yet in spite of all the evil that can come, goodness is going to come out on top. Goodness is invincible.

How? Why?

Because evil is a contrivance of men, but goodness is not the battle of man alone; it is God's fight too.

This positive, assertive scripture proclaims at once the supreme strength of God, and His glory as Lord of the creation.

Its very assurance puts a frightened world on notice that it can find its ultimate solution—its victory—in God, because His goodness is invincible.

"The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it."

EXTENDING PERIOD FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word 'two' from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting the word 'four' and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: 'After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection, but no such loan shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG FOUR MEETING AT GENEVA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of hours President Eisenhower and his top advisers will take off on a fateful mission—the Big Four meeting at Geneva which has been aptly termed the "meeting at the summit."

It is a summit meeting in many ways. Certainly it comes at a time when hopes for peace are soaring, and the President carries with him the very earnest wishes of all his countrymen for a successful meeting that will advance the cause of peace with freedom for all peoples. It is a summit meeting in the sense that the major powers will be sitting down around the conference table. The gathering is being held at the peak of a Soviet campaign allegedly purposed to unfreeze the cold war, and, vitally important, it is a summit of perils, for from it could come, unwittingly, decisions to seal the doom of the captive peoples of the Russian satellite states.

The American people welcome the assurance from the President, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to the summit conference at Geneva "honestly to present our case in a conciliatory, in a friendly attitude, and we don't intend to reject anything from mere prejudice or truculence or any other lesser motive of that kind." Equally, it is reassuring to hear from the President that he is going to Geneva armed with caution. This is well, for America has always gone to international conferences with good intentions, but only too often she has returned with scraps of paper, while totalitarian powers have walked away with large chunks of territory and dominion over millions of people.

In recent days, with the approach of the summit conference, an Alice In Wonderland atmosphere has been created with reference to international realities. All is sweetness and light. No word must be said that will upset the newly found amiability of the Russians. The record must not be invoked. Any honestly given impression of a month ago must be redone with glossy finish. A new world of polite international fictions has been created. A few words dropped at a cocktail party on the subject of national strength in a distant capital, and our national administrative apparatus is immediately convulsed to "interpret" the otherwise clearly expressed views of our Secretary of State.

Intelligent realism is the need of the day, Mr. Speaker. We are only going to plunge dangerously from the summit if we attempt to camouflage ugly realities with pink smoke screens.

For example, there may be satisfaction in top administration circles over the acceptance by our State Department of the Russian offer to meet half the costs of shooting down an American patrol bomber over international waters on June 23, but I doubt that the American people are happy over this solution. I know that the crew members who were injured and the seven who were badly burned will not rejoice over the settlement or count it to be enlightened national policy.

In the past, and there have been more than a few such instances, similar happenings have been properly regarded as serious international incidents. In the past, our Government has made stern representations to the nation involved. In the present instance, the Russians must have realized that they had a very poor case; in fact they must have thought that they were wholly at fault when they so quickly offered to pay half the expense. Whereas this admission and this offer should have served as the basis for the further vigorous prosecution of our case, the mere receipt of a "conciliatory note" by the State Department was the signal for us to rush in with a ready acceptance.

It is not too farfetched a notion to believe that this whole incident was by design rather than by accident, for it is an established policy of the Communists to try to cause the West to lose face prior to major international conferences.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that, despite the vast library of unhappy examples to the contrary, there appears to be a substantial number of our policymakers, and I judge by the policies we evolve, who still mistakenly believe that a submissive type of conciliation promotes reasonable responses from the Communists. The plain fact is that the Communists always and everywhere mistake reasonableness for weakness, they have only contempt for softness, and they ruthlessly exploit anything that looks like indecision and vacillation.

The Russian dictum on all of this is plain. The Marxian dogma and the policies of Lenin and Stalin are firmed to unremitting war on the democracies, not necessarily a war in the military sense, but a war of doctrinal tactics, of infiltration and subversion of economic piracy and the stimulation of moral chaos. For Lenin has said:

> We are living not merely in one state but in a system of states; and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long, long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end.

All of us pray for the success of our Chief Executive at Geneva. I am sure that every loyal American wants President Eisenhower to translate his very real, deep-seated feeling for genuine peace into an agreement of substance at Geneva. Mankind yearns for peace, Mr. Speaker. The horrors of modern war are devastating just to contemplate. God-fearing men realize that atomic warfare is the ticket to annihilation. The A-war man is extinct. Victory will be with the dead, for they will be delivered from the man-made inferno.

President Eisenhower, I am certain, has all this in mind as he prepares to wing his way to Geneva. There is no need to impress, by rhetorical flourishes, the ugliness and devastation of war on the man who commanded the Allied Forces to victory in World War II. We can well appreciate, too, his mental conflict when he ponders on the fact that a former ally of World War II, by its acts, has clearly proclaimed its dedication and commitment to a program of world mastery which aims at the ruin of democratic liberties and the free way of life.

As he sits down at the Geneva Conference table with the representatives of Khrushchev and company, President Eisenhower, determined in good will as he is, will find it difficult to escape the over-riding fact that the Russian delegates represent a system of dictatorship that depends for its existence on a tyranny that is wholly incompatible with human liberty and the dignity of man. So, we must realize the enormity and complexity of the problem that confronts him, and we should individually pray zealously, each in his own way, that the Father of all men will guide his steps.

Our one main theme at the Geneva Conference, Mr. Speaker, must be that nowhere is there any actual evidence that justifies the conclusion that the Russians have abandoned their dreams of world domination. Oh, yes, we have a chorus of timely manufactured sentiments of sweetness on their part, but actions belie the words. There is the recent plane-shooting incident that I spoke of earlier, there are the violations of the Korean war truce on the part of the Communists; there is the buildup opposite Formosa, although for the moment that is being soft-pedaled; and there is the impending campaign against Laos.

By any sane test of measurement, do the above-enumerated programs of aggression constitute a crusade for peace? On the contrary, they reveal the logical unfolding of the plans of the Kremlin, plans which cannot be changed by soft words, but only by demonstrations of strength, by the forceful articulation of firm purpose and strong resolve that the free world sincerely wants peace but will battle to the death any aggressor.

I realize that this is no time to be muddying the waters, that we need clear vision and fixity of purpose and, above all, that sense of calm which comes from our good national conscience. But I must confess to a sense of compulsion in this matter because I have in mind the results of another meeting at Geneva not so long ago. And, if I speak with a sense of some misgiving now, and also with exhortation for caution and adherence to sound moral principle in our forthcoming summit meetings, it is because the pitfalls I advised against at the last Geneva conference only too unhappily snared us.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, as will my colleagues, for the RECORD amply shows my pre-Geneva views, that, when we were going to sit down with the Chinese Communists I pointed out, and, I might add, with no degree of the prescient, for it was there to be seen that the Chinese Reds were merely using the Geneva meetings for a propaganda vehicle. Before those meetings, I urged that our State Department make it a condition precedent for attendance that the Mao jailers release from servile captivity not only our imprisoned American fliers and our other maltreated nationals but also the nationals of other nations who are being held unjustly in Red China. I am firm in the conviction, in view of what has happened in recent weeks, that if we had insisted upon this condition we would have been successful, for the Chinese Communist regime is ever so anxious to gain face. Time and again, I have pointed out that the reason the Chinese Communist government is so eager to gain admittance to the United Nations is that the matter of legitimacy in governmental succession is so vitally important in Chinese national life and culture.

As the date of the summit meetings is at hand, should it not be in order, inasmuch as the sessions are convoked for the purpose of attempting to achieve a just peace, that the Communist jailers in all countries be called upon to liberate their thousands of prisoners? What more salutary beginning could the summit conference have than the wholesale deliverance of political prisoners who are languishing in prisons behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains? Thousands of prisoners of World War II who fell into Communist hands are still unaccounted for. No one will contend, I am sure, against the claim that large numbers of political prisoners are being held by the Asiatic Communist countries. Certainly if the Communists want to validate their good intentions as the summit conferences begin, they can do so by turning their captives back to freedom. How else can they make good their claims to wanting peace and ridding the world of dangerous tensions? For one thing, they can abolish their slave labor camps, the existence of which has been abundantly proved over the last several decades. They can assent to free elections, under United Nations auspices, in the Soviet captive states, so that there can be a just determination of the people's choice. They can authorize and honor in the spirit, as well as in fact, freedom of worship, so that their systematic persecution of God will cease. They can establish freedom of education so that the breath of intellectual free air will permeate all of Russia. They can lift the barriers which now prevent free movements of peoples in and out of their vast domain.

If the Russians come to the conference table with a willingness to do these things, then the matter of armaments can be arranged so that reasonable and effective checks may be placed upon them. It is futile, however, to talk about curtailing and abolishing arms if first we do not make a conquest of the spirit of peace, for unless these other things which I have enumerated are accomplished, then any peace pact becomes a mockery.

It will serve no good purpose to enter into any trade pacts with the Russians if they first refuse to agree to the primary requirements of peaceful nations, for trade in that event would only be "arming the burglar to rob your house." You all know my views on the subject of increasing trade in so-called nonstrategic goods, Mr. Speaker. Time and again I have insisted that any item of commerce that bolsters the Soviet economy helps them to strengthen their tyrannical hold on their subject peoples; hence, every item, with the possible exception of bubble gum, must be considered strategic. Total economic strengths are what count in warfare today. Wars are but the extension of the civilian front. We know that well, and this might be a good time to put out the reminder that during World War II, America gave Russia more than 70 percent of the war materiel that enabled her to stay in the war against the Nazis.

Just as sure as I stand here today, among the first things that will come out of Geneva will be inspired reports that the way to relieve tensions and show good purpose will be to step up trade with Russia. You may count on that as a certainty. And we may as well reckon with the fact that numbers of people in our own Government are already straining at the leash waiting for the signal to relax the requirements and pour goods into Russia. Well, Mr. Speaker, permit me to remark that certainly if we are to ease tensions, one of the ways to do it would be to encourage trade with the Communist countries but, with this important proviso: After, not before, they have, by their actions, not by their promises, demonstrated that they are sincerely seeking to better world conditions and genuinely improve the prospects for peace.

As I come to the conclusion of my remarks, I cannot help but recall the words of wisdom and warning that Abraham Lincoln gave to this young Nation when its life was once before in peril:

> This Nation cannot continue to exist half slave and half free.

And so, too, Mr. Speaker, applying this rule in our own time, we can say that the world cannot continue to exist half slave and half free. To this, I would add the scriptural admonition:

> See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise; Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

God grant that our misgivings may be unfounded, that the miracle of Grace is working, that the anti-Gods have been put to rout, and that in this our day may be set the foundations for a truly lasting peace which will speed, rather than stay, the consummation of the vision of the prophet Amos when for all mankind everywhere, judgment will "run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

To the President and our friends of the free world who go to Geneva, I would but add this final warning. It is in the form of a prediction made 24 years ago in Moscow to the students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare by high-ranking Communist Dmitry Z. Manuilsky:

> War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.
>
> So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to express to the gentleman the appreciation of all of us who are listening to him for the courageous and forthright spirit with which he is addressing the House. I would like to add my testimony that, as a new member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he has brought to that circle not only the attribute of intelligence which is evidenced by the remarks he is making at this time, but also a great spiritual strength.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentlelady for her very encouraging remarks.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RICHARDS. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman on his well-thought-out statement. I congratulate him as a younger Member of the House, and also those younger Members who addressed the House yesterday on the problems of the coming so-called summit conference.

I think it is a fine thing that the younger Members of this House are expressing their viewpoints on this floor more and more on that very important subject. I am particularly glad that the gentleman has called to the attention of the House today, and in that way called to the attention of the President himself as he goes to Europe, that Mr. Stalin and Mr. Lenin both said, "We never deviate from the one great objective of communism, that is world revolution. We may zig and we may zag, we may compromise, but we will never lose view of that one purpose, and that is world domination, if necessary by force."

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his important contribution.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the able gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. As always it is informative and inspiring to hear our distinguished colleague from West Virginia address the House. I know of his work as my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee. His scholarship, his wisdom, his idealism, and his realism attracted my attention when we were both new Members in the 83d Congress.

This afternoon, once again he has hit the target at a time when so many among us and abroad in this land are missing it by a mile.

It is distressing to me to hear some of our colleagues talking about the need for us to make concessions to the Reds at Geneva. These misguided and misinformed people obviously do not know history, and they do not know the Communists and they do not know the facts of international life.

It is tragic that the American people should receive this kind of advice from these people at such a critical hour.

It is my considered judgment that the United States has been plagued for years by this type of thinking and oftentimes at high levels of government.

People who urge that disarmament be discussed at Geneva before the Communists get out of the captive nations and before our prisoners are released from captivity in the Communist world are not doing any service to America or the free world.

Disarmament is the last subject to be considered, and I suggest that those who talk disarmament so lightly would be well advised to study the subject further and to learn some of the lessons of recent history.

One nation was able to deceive a great many on this question of disarmament between the two world wars and I hope that the gentleman will discuss this question in his remarks if he has time.

Once again, may I say that the gentleman is making a great contribution to a better understanding of the situation which confronts us by the delivery of this address this afternoon, and I wish to associate myself with him and with his remarks.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my true friend, the congenial gentleman from Connecticut for his statement.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman knows I concur thoroughly in the sound warnings he is giving. But is it not true that our Government was not in the saddle at Geneva a year ago, and that it was only at the insistence at Berlin of certain of our allies that we agreed to go to that conference? We went in an effort to preserve as much unity as possible with those allies. Although they insisted upon dealing with the Chinese Communists, we maintained the position that we would not enter into any agreements with the Chinese Communists because, among many reasons, of their illegal holding of our prisoners to which the gentleman has referred; and although some influential persons in American journalistic and intellectual circles screamed that we were "going it alone" and breaking our close relations with our allies, we still stood our ground at Geneva and refused to be party to any agreement by which 11 or 12 million more people would be turned over to Communist enslavement. True, it was only a negative act, but it represented one of the few real victories for human freedom that the world has seen in this postwar period. Despite the efforts of our allies, our Government refused to depart from our fundamental position based on concern for human freedom and the rights of human beings, including our own prisoners of war so unjustly held.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to my distinguished floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think a very interesting thought in connection with that is, what was the result? What about the people of Vietnam? Where are they? What happened?

What the gentleman from Minnesota says, as a fact, is correct so far as I know, but then what deal was made in Indonesia or Indochina? We know what has happened, and, to the human beings who are there affected, the results of Geneva have been most unfruitful and saddeningly informing.

Mr. JUDD. I agree that the results were bad. But the United States, it seems to me, did the only thing it could do there. Certainly we were not going to war with our allies to prevent their signing the agreement, but we refused to be a party to it. I wish it had been possible for things to take a different course. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that has been my position all along. But the only way we could have prevented what our allies agreed to was by going to war. Obviously we were not willing to do that. But we could and did refuse to be a party to the iniquitous agreement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the situation in southern Vietnam now? We know what it is in north Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, throughout Thailand, and we are very much concerned.

What are we going to do if they hit the border of Thailand and those in control of the Thailand Government ask the United States to send troops in there? This request the Thailand Government probably would make and from their position undoubtedly would feel justified in making.

What about the plebiscite? What about the treaties they made with France in which Diem says the Vietnam Government did not agree?

These are all unfortunate and perplexing questions that arise out of Geneva. Some of us realize that Geneva was the goal of the Communists. The meeting in Berlin was only the shadow, the front, to bring about an avenue which would lead to Geneva where Red China would be there with its representatives and that would be construed as de facto recognition. I remember that after Berlin, I took the floor of the House and warned against Geneva, that the Communists were only using Berlin as the avenue and the means for Geneva and that there is where they would undertake to do their damage. We have to think in terms of results, in terms of human beings who are in Vietnam, we have to think of the importance of Vietnam and all southeast Asia to the free world and to the national interest of our country. What the gentleman says is correct. Whether history will say the action was correct is another thing.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will remember that the Secretary of State also warned that the results of the Berlin decision to hold the Geneva Conference were very likely to be disastrous. At Berlin he warned that once a date was set for the Geneva Conference, the 26th of April, 1954, as I recall it, it was almost certain that the Vietminh supported by the Chinese Communists would step up their military operations and make every possible effort to capture Dien Bien Phu so that they could go to the Conference at Geneva with victory in Indochina in their hands—as they did. But the French Government and the British Government, in considerable part, I think, to placate those at home calling for peace and to appease domestic political opposition, insisted on that conference. I myself warned against it, as did the gentleman from West Virginia. I regret the end results which we predicted and feared. The only value in going over the past is to learn from it, so that, as the gentleman from West Virginia has properly pointed out, we will not make the same sort of mistake again insofar as it is within our power to prevent it.

I am particularly grateful to the gentleman from West Virgiina for his forthright realism in pointing out that there is no indication that the Kremlin has abandoned a single one of its basic objectives. It does not want to end the struggle, but only to end the advantage we have gained, in order that it may win the struggle.

Some people say: Look at the concessions the Soviets are willing to make with regard to the satellites. But if you boil it down all their talk means only that they are offering to give up those of their policies in eastern Europe that are failing, if we will give up our policies which are succeeding. They are beginning to get results.

The Communists present a subtle temptation to many of our people, I admit. But we must resist it. One of the most encouraging things I see in the whole picture is the awareness of the nature of the Communist menace which the Members of Congress are demonstrating overwhelmingly. Probably those in the executive branch see it as clearly but cannot speak out as plainly as we do. But we go back to the people and we are responsible only to them. We know that the views expressed here yesterday and today are what most of our people are thinking. Unfortunately, so many of those who write columns seem to take a position opposite to that expressed in the Congress. I do not know for whom they think the are speaking. I am sure they dangerously mislead many, especially abroad. That is why the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia is so timely. I congratulate him and commend him for his stand today as on previous occasions. I am grateful for his combination of idealism and realism which holds open always the door of hope that the peace we desire may come to pass, but recognizes that until there is some real change in the hearts and minds of the men in the Kremlin it would be foolish for us to get our hopes too high.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the able gentleman from Minnesota for his statement. I have felt for a long, long time that our minds generally are in agreement upon this tremendously important subject, while we may not agree exactly as to the past. The past is prologue. I am certain we will agree that we must approach the forthcoming meeting with firmness.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure my friend from West Virginia will agree with me that above all there should be a repudiation of subversion, of the Cominform, of the Third International, of the international conspiracy to infiltrate and subvert the governments of other peoples, which is of vital importance. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman about free elections internationally supervised by the United Nations. It seems to me the disavowal of subversion is a matter of vital importance and of concern to all peoples and all nations.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman, and I concur with him in his very cogent expression.

Mr. Speaker, the historian tells us a story of Napoleon and his men, a story that might be appropriate to repeat here. We are told that during one of Napoleon's famed long marches, he came to a great desert. As his men started out across the desert they became exceedingly thirsty and they searched for water. But they could find no water. After 2 or 3 days had passed they discovered that they were lost in the great desert. The sun beat down upon them with its burning rays, and the men cried out in their thirst, but they could find no water. Here and there, in their frantic search for water, they came upon white, bleached bones of men who, like themselves, had searched in vain for precious, life-giving water. Finally, yonder in the distance, they saw a beautiful lake with its waters gleaming in the light of the tropical sun. They let out a great cry of relief and they ran toward the lake, but as they ran, the lake ran. As they went forward, the lake receded. It was no lake at all. It was a mirage in the desert.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TUMULTY. The gentleman has pointed out that instead of the United States making concessions at this conference, it is about time the Soviet Union should make concessions. The gentleman said in his speech that the United Nations should supervise elections in the countries which are now captive and under Soviet domination. May I point out that Red Poland is one of the United Nations. I assume the gentleman will agree with me that if the United Nations is to supervise free elections, Red Poland would be in no position to supervise such an election in that country.

Mr. BYRD. I would certainly take this position. We do not want the type of elections we have been accustomed to seeing demonstrated as the type of elections normally conducted by the Communists.

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, I hope the forthcoming meeting will not be a mirage in the desert. I approach it with hope, and it is a hope that our leaders will go there with a firmness of convictions and determined to demonstrate that firmness in dealing with the Communists. I pray that we will not go to this Conference as we have gone sometimes in the past, too eager to lick the boots of the Communists in order to reach an agreement, but that, with the past lessons clearly in our minds, we will approach this Conference realistically and, again I say, with extreme firmness, believing that our purpose is just and that our cause is right. With the help of God and with faith in ourselves, let us show the Communists that this is one conference in which we will achieve the victory.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in this way that we can hope to achieve the goal we seek at the forthcoming Conference. I, for one, am tired of our sitting down at the conference table with the Russians and coming out with a piece of paper, while the Russians come out with a chunk of territory.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is well-versed in the Holy Scriptures, from which came the best in our country and our culture. Does not the gentleman think perhaps one of the counsels we should keep in mind at this conference is this advice from the wisest man who ever lived, "Be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." Sometimes we act as if He had just said, "Be ye harmless as doves," and therefore think we must give away every position of strength to show our good will. But He also said, "Be ye wise as serpents." Why? In order that we can be as "harmless as doves." If we are not wise as serpents, we cannot intelligently find a solution which will be beneficial and not harmful to the people of the world.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot do anything other than agree.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that the President in going to this meeting—and we must realize that the President does so under great difficulty because he has never occupied the role of negotiator before—will understand that he is dealing with some pretty clever foxes in the diplomatic field. When you deal with Molotov and the other Communists, when you deal even with our friend from England, Prime Minister Eden, and our French friends, you must realize that they have had years and years of experience in the highest levels of diplomacy as negotiators, and they are clever foxes, and I use that term in a complimentary but most guarded way. I am confident that the President, who has never had negotiating experience in the high field of diplomacy, and those who accompany him, will keep that in mind.

CONSTITUTIONALITY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago I listened to an amazing message from the President on the bill H. R. 6042, the Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1956. In that message the Chief Executive challenged the constitutionality of a section of the bill, but in the same breath placed himself and the executive department above the constitution. I was completely astounded. I was shocked. Seldom have I heard such complete and utter disregard for the rights and privileges of Congress or of the constitutional processes of law.

To me, it is unbelievable that the Chief Executive of this great Nation would in this way seek to place himself above the law and to set aside a section of law that he or someone who speaks for him does not like. This is veto by paragraph, and veto by paragraph is not legal. This is usurpation of the powers of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had the idea that the Civil War settled the question of nullification in this country, but this is a nullification of an act of Congress.

Mr. SIKES. Of course it is. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that limitations on appropriations acts are not new.

There have been similar provisions in many acts of Congress. Some are in effect now and they present no serious difficulties in operation. The disposal of real estate and various other matters are reported to the Congress periodically by the departments administering such laws. They are safeguards whose use has been found wise. Section 638 was modeled on these provisions. Responsible officials in departments of Government affected by these limitations have told me they find no difficulty in operating under such restrictions. As a matter of fact I have questioned administrative officials in each of the military services and not one has told me that he foresaw any serious problem arising from the operation of section 638 in any case where the Government is in the right.

I would remind Mr. Eisenhower that this is not a military government. This is not a government under martial law. We live under a civil government, and all Americans under our Constitution are bound by the same laws.

ATLANTIC EXPLORATORY CONVENTION

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House of Representatives of 2 interesting statements which have just been made by 2 important European statesmen, both of whom have been leaders in the effort to achieve a united Europe. Many of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle support a resolution calling for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention. This resolution asks that a convention be called of citizen delegates from the seven democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to explore to what extent their peoples might further unite.

In connection with this resolution Mr. Paul Henri Spaak, Belgian Foreign Minister, has given out this statement:

> The Atlantic Union Exploratory Convention resolution proposed in the American Congress by Senators KEFAUVER and FLANDERS and other leading Americans seems to me a most praiseworthy effort to obtain at least a preliminary examination of the advantages and disadvantages of closer cooperation between the western democracies. I personally hope that such discussion will take place between citizens of the Atlantic nations very soon.

This view is shared also by Paul Van Zeeland, the former Belgian Premier, who has issued the following statement:

> Any step leading to the acceptance or the support by the United States of the creation of a truly well balanced and equitable Atlantic community would, in my opinion, be a great support and a strong inducement for those who are doing their best to create a European economic union.
>
> In fact, the fear of seeing a united Europe more or less separated from the United States and enclosed in a policy of economic autarchy is one of the considerations which kept several European leaders from supporting the idea of a European economy.
>
> To sum up, it would be a major step toward peace and prosperity throughout the world.

I am glad these important statements from two of Europe's most distinguished statesmen have been made. They are particularly interesting in that they follow so closely the statements made a few weeks ago by the father of the Schuman plan and the father of the Marshall plan. I recall that General Marshall, former Secretary of State and Defense, called the resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention a most prudent proposal worthy of our support.

Remembering the words of the President of the United States in San Francisco a short time ago, that every avenue to peace, no matter how small or novel it should appear to be, was worthy of exploration and that no stone should be left unturned in our search for an honorable peace, this resolution deserves the support of Americans everywhere.

EASTERN LOCARNO: SECOND CHANCE FOR PEACE?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the New York Times, an editorial raises this question: "Will a guaranteed eastern Locarno give Europe a long-range chance for peace?

In 1933 an eastern Locarno was rejected. It would have guaranteed the federated states of Central Europe—now Soviet satellites—from the Baltic to the Adriatic, prompt and direct armed assistance against an aggressor.

The question is, at Geneva, Will the Soviets and Western Europe guarantee and eastern Locarno?

During debate on the Mutual Security Act the other day, I referred to conditions that might make a guaranteed eastern Locarno desirable.

On page 8269 of the RECORD, following the splendid defense of the act by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], I said, in effect, "Let this House not think that if a power acts outside the law and commits aggression against them that the people of Yugoslavia, of Poland, and of Central Europe, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, as Christian as they are, will not fight with the wounds of the past opened up to spur them to independence."

I further said, in part, that "If the people of Yugoslavia seem not firmly committed to the East or to the West, perhaps they wait to see how East and West will behave."

The other day, I rose to say what I did, Mr. Speaker, because the tide of the debate seemed to run to recollections I had of the summer of 1933 when the topic of Eastern Locarno was most alive.

In July of that year, after a regatta in which I rowed, at Henley-on-Thames, I went to London, later to Paris.

In London, at the home of Sir Austen Chamberlain, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, if I recall, and up to then one of the best friends Germany ever had, from his secretary, Mr. Wilson, if I remember, I picked up a copy of a speech Sir Austen delivered on Germany in the House of Commons that spring. It was electric.

In Paris, in early September, at the Polish Embassy, I called on the Polish Ambassador, Alfred Chlapowski, whose autographed picture I still have. I wanted his views on the situation in Europe. I was gathering material for my senior thesis. I had rowed with the British at Henley; I had rowed with the Germans on the Alster; and from a launch on Wansee, saw Tom Sullivan put his magnificent Berlin Club crew through the paces. Those boys could row. I attended a few lectures on political science at the University of Warsaw, in Poland. En route home, I stopped at the Polish Embassy in Paris and asked the Ambassador, in effect, "What's up"?

I remember him even now. It was late afternoon, about 5:45. The knot of his tie had slipped to the bottom of his collar. He seemed tired. He looked at me and said slowly, in effect, if I recall, "The peace of Europe is lost, they will not guarantee an eastern Locarno."

The question is, in 1955, at Geneva, will East and West guarantee an eastern Locarno?

The editorial in today's New York Times follows:

THE KEY ISSUE IS GERMANY

> The crucial issue that will determine the outcome of the Geneva conference is the problem of Germany, which involves the unification of that country and the creation of an all-German government capable of joining in a final peace settlement. This issue is crucial because it is the key not only to the ultimate position of one of the largest and most vigorous nations in Europe but also to European unification, to the fate of the Soviet satellites, to European freedom and security, to disarmament and to world peace.
>
> This is why the Western powers, which share with Soviet Russia the final authority and responsibility in the matter, are determined to make Germany the main topic of discussion as an acid test of Soviet intentions. But it is no happy augury that the Soviets, despite their latest statement to the contrary, appear to be equally determined to sidestep the issue in the hope of making a separate deal with the Germans.
>
> In principle, both sides agree that 10 years after the war there is an urgent need for both German unification and a German, which means a European, peace settlement. But there is no agreement on either methods or ultimate objectives.
>
> The Western powers, with ardent support from Western Germany, insist on free and internationally supervised elections throughout Germany in order to create an all-German government with authority to commit the whole German people to whatever peace settlement is ultimately reached. The Western powers expect that this new government, which would replace the present West and East German regimes, would hold to the Western alliances in keeping with Chancellor Adenauer's dictum that Germany can no longer stand alone and must be either an ally of the West, or a puppet of the Soviets, and that this would promote a European unification which might ultimately attract the satellites. But the Western powers do run the risk that such a government might reject the alliances, as it would have a legal

right to do, in favor of a deal with the Soviets.

The Soviets also profess to favor German unification through free elections. But in their system the will of the people is expressed by the chieftains of a tiny Communist minority, and they propose that elections should be held under a "Provisional all-German Government" to be composed of elements from East and West Germany, analogous to the Lublin committee which "unified" Poland. What is more, as the price for such a "unification" they demand both Germany's neutralization and German "demilitarization" under four-power control, which would be expected to leave the East German "police army" intact. As a final bait they propose an all-European "security pact" under which the Western Powers would withdraw their troops from Germany, abrogate their alliances and dismantle their bases for a mere paper guaranty of Soviet nonaggression.

This plan has long since been rejected both by the Western Powers and by Western Germany. It would drive the United States out of Europe and mark the end of the Western European Union, of the North Atlantic Alliance, of European unification, and of European freedom. But to allay any genuine Soviet fears of German rearmament, and in any case to counteract Soviet propaganda on that score, the Western Powers are now working on a possible compromise based on the idea of an Eastern Locarno suggested by former Prime Minister Churchill and on proposals by Chancellor Adenauer and one of his coalition parties.

The precise form of this compromise, and the Soviet reaction to it, when and if it is revealed, remain to be disclosed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Davis of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hosmer in 11 instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Scudder to extend his remarks in the Congressional Record and to include two letters in reference to the appropriation bill passed today.

Mr. Doyle in two instances and to include appropriate material.

Mr. Dawson of Utah in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Frelinghuysen and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Granahan to include a letter and extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record and to include a splendid article written by Holmes Alexander about my dear friend, Senator Lyndon Johnson, which appeared in the Boston Herald recently, together with remarks of my own. Mr. Speaker, if it happens that this article has therefore been inserted in the Record, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the duplication, it may be printed in the Record with my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Celler.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Udall, for the week beginning July 18, 1955, on account of attendance at NATO's Parliamentary Conference in Paris, France.

Mr. Crumpacker, for the week beginning July 18, 1955, on account of attendance at NATO's Parliamentary Conference in Paris, France.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1835. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6766. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

982. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

983. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

984. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

985. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to 57 Stat. 380 and 59 Stat. 434 (Rept. No. 1160). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to 57 Stat. 380 and 59 Stat. 434 (Rept. No. 1161). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. S. 1577. An act to amend the acts granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate toll bridges across the Connecticut River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3120. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4391. A bill to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7097. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7186. A bill to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 72. An act to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 374. A bill to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 426. A bill to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 604. A bill to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1855. A bill to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 127. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO; with amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4718. A bill to authorize and direct the issuance of patent to Robert W. Retherford of Anchorage, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of income received from patent infringement suits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 7301. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va., to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7302. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 7303. A bill to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 7304. A bill to fix the effective date of sections 613, 172 (a), and 172 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7305. A bill to make certain changes in the administration of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7306. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall conduct an investigation and survey to determine the advisability of providing air-conditioning facilities in Government buildings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7307. A bill relating to burden of proof in certain proceedings before the Tax Court; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7308. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7309. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7310. A bill to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7311. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7312. A bill relating to the fixing of interest rates or other charges with respect to loans by the Farmers' Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7313. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the production credit corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7314. A bill to repeal section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7315. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7316. A bill to establish a Defense Supply and Service Administration as a department in the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7317. A bill relating to the transportation of personal motor vehicles for military or civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7318. A bill to establish general policies for mobilization purposes governing industrial properties of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7319. A bill to provide for a Commission on Naval Vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7320. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7321. A bill to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7322. A bill relating to the retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7323. A bill relating to the transfer of funds by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7324. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations issued pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7325. A bill to terminate title VII of the Housing Act of 1954 relating to urban planning and reserve of planned public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7326. A bill to terminate certain functions of the Public Housing Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7327. A bill relating to the equities required with respect to home mortgages purchased under section 305 of the Housing Act of 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7328. A bill prohibiting a member of the Home Loan Bank Board from being a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7329. A bill to provide for increasing the equities required for the insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7330. A bill to change the name of the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7331. A bill to change the name of the Public Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7332. A bill to terminate the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to educational institutions for housing construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7333. A bill extending the authority of the General Services Administration with respect to warehouses and other storage facilities operated by civilian agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7334. A bill to make the Alaska Railroad subject to the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7335. A bill to make the Small Business Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7336. A bill to add a new title relating to real property management to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7337. A bill relating to the traffic management functions of the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7338. A bill to provide for improving accounting methods in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7339. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus Government property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7340. A bill to provide for a survey of the production of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7341. A bill providing for a survey by the Comptroller General of the United States of the operation by the Department of Defense of commissary stores and post exchanges; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7342. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7343. A bill to make the Rural Electrification Administration subject to the Government Corporation Control Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7344. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7345. A bill to provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7346. A bill relating to hospital and medical care for American merchant seamen, for personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents, and for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7347. A bill to liberalize the conflict of interest provisions of section 434 of title 18 of the United States Code in the case of Presidential appointees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7348. A bill relating to the simplification of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7349. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7350. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7351. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration through the establishment of a Senior Civil Service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7352. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7353. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7354. A bill relating to reduction in personnel procedure and preference of veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7355. A bill relating to the construction of general hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, the hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7356. A bill to require the exchange of interest-bearing obligations of the United States held by certain agencies of the United States for non-interest-bearing Treasury certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7357. A bill relating to the fixing of interest rates, fees, or charges with respect to loans made, insured, or guaranteed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7358. A bill to require the banks for cooperatives to exchange their holdings of United States securities for non-interest-bearing credit in the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7359. A bill to require that the rate of interest payable by agencies of the Government on loans and advances from the Treasury shall be not less than the going rate of interest paid by the Treasury on its obligations of comparable maturities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 7360. A bill to authorize appropriations for the conversion and operation of a merchant vessel and for the construction and installation of an atomic propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7361. A bill to amend section 212 of the act approved June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7362. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7363. A bill to amend title 28, section 633 (b), United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7364. A bill relating to the application of the documentary stamp tax to transfers of certain installment obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7365. A bill authorizing the modification of the general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Missouri River Basin to include certain flood-control works in the Gering Valley, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7366. A bill to permit all civil officers and employees of the United States to take part in political activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 7367. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 7368. A bill to provide that an appropriate memorial marker shall be furnished for each member of the Armed Forces dying in service whose body cannot be recovered; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7369. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 7370. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to subject the submerged lands under the marginal seas to the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution reaffirming the rights of the people of the world to freedom of religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the manuscript entitled "The House of Representatives"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7371. A bill for the relief of Wong Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7372. A bill for the relief of Won Chen and Mrs. Rose Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 7373. A bill for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 7374. A bill for the relief of Abdo A. B. Abi Aoun Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 7375. A bill for the relief of John Franklin Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7376. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Dori Lengyel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Donald W. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 7378. A bill for relief under the national service life insurance contract of George A. Whitaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H. R. 6766, Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the conference committee report just concurred in regarding the public-works appropriation bill for fiscal 1956, I greatly appreciate the attitude of the committee in providing $500,000 in initial construction funds for the Coyote Valley Reservoir of the Russian River project in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif.

The people of the district, by a vote of 3 to 1, on May 10, 1955, bonded themselves to raise local participating funds. The moneys appropriated in the public-works bill for fiscal 1956, along with that raised by local interests, will make it possible for the Army Corps of Engineers to get started on construction this year.

I would like to insert with my remarks the following letters from the Office of Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., and from the district engineer, San Francisco, which attest to the worthiness of this project:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1955.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Western Section, Public Works Subcommitee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Representative SCUDDER has informed me of your suggestion that a letter be furnished you outlining the latest information on the Coyote Dam project. On June 6, Mr. SCUDDER conferred with Mr. D. R. Belcher, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and with Colonel Starbird of my staff. It was agreed in the conference that I would write to you giving the information needed by you.

The Coyote Dam project was outhorized by Public Law 516 of the 81st Congress. The authorization called for a reservoir of 122,000 acre-feet of which 52,000 acre-feet would be allocated to flood control and sedimentation, while 70,000 acre-feet would be allocated to conservation. The annual benefits were estimated in the project document as flood control $301,000, increased land use $40,000, improved recreation development $857,000, improved domestic and irrigation water supply $496,000 giving a grand total then of $1,694,000.

Fund allocations for planning of this project totaling $586,000 have been made during fiscal years 1953–55, inclusive. Some additional planning would be necessary prior to the start of the first construction contract. However, the planning has been brought to a status where construction could be initiated during the fiscal year in which first construction funds are available. Real-estate acquisition could be initiated within 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year and a construction contract could be awarded about April 1. It is planned that a major portion of the construction of the dam would be accomplished under one continuing contract. A total of $2 million could be expended in the fiscal year of which $1 million would be on real estate, $400,000 would be on relocations and $600,000 on the dam's construction.

The authorization for this project contains a provision that "prior to starting construction, local interests shall contribute the sum of $5,598,000 in cash in full repayment of the conservation benefits. * * *" At the time that budget recommendations for fiscal year 1956 were formulated local interests could give no assurance that they would be able to make the necessary advance payment. On May 10, 1955, however, after submission of the President's budget, a successful election was held and authority was granted thereby to the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to bond itself in the amount necessary for the advance contribution. County commissioners have informed the district engineer that bonding companies will accept the bonds and that the contribution can be advanced within 60 days after Federal approval is given to proceed with construction. The present estimated Federal cost of the project is $16,600,000.

Local interests, during preelection negotiations, agreed on a modified use for their conservation storage to increase municipal and irrigation usage and to compensate by a decrease of minimum flow for recreational areas. We are now reevaluating that proposed usage and it appears that the revised estimate of benefits will show flood control as approximately $400,000 annually and improved municipal water supply something over $500,000 annually. Other benefits for irrigation, land enhancement, and recreational usage will bring the total annual figure to approximately $1,800,000 annually. The annual charges will be approximately $850,000, giving a benefit-to-cost ratio approximating 2.2 to 1.

I trust that the above information will be satisfactory to your committee's needs. Should it not I hope you will call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WM. WHIPPLE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
(For E. C. Itschner, brigadier general, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works).

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT,
San Francisco, Calif., June 27, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCUDDER: I have your letter of June 24, 1955, requesting information on recent events pertinent to the Coyote Valley Reservoir, Russian River, Calif., which emphasizes the urgency of initiating immediate construction of this project. Following are some items I believe of importance in this category.

Since the passing of the bond issue on May 10, 1955, many of the local people have anticipated an expedited construction program by the Corps of Engineers, including the purchase of rights-of-way. Consequently, numerous inquiries have been received in this office from people residing in the reservoir area in regard to when they will be required to move. The discomfort and inconveniences of being held in a state of suspense have been emphasized by these people. Since it is now a foregone conclusion that their removal is only a matter of time, they are anxious to be resettled in order that their normal living conditions and plans might be restored.

Recently the State of California completed the preliminary plans for realinement of State Highway No. 20, which is now located in the reservoir area. The State is now ready to complete the final engineering as well as plans and specifications for this relocation. It would be advantageous and economical to have this new road completed as soon as possible in order to route auto traffic out of the construction area of the dam.

Prior to the bond issue the board of directors of the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District had a firm of municipal financing consultants prepare a financial and economic report on the control and use of Russian River water. As a result of this report and other pertinent data, it was decided to establish a special zone in the recreational area along the lower reaches of the river in order to make the tax burden more comparable to the benefits to be received. The additional tax in this zone was based on the amount of water required to maintain an adequate stream flow through this area. A careful study by the people directly concerned with this stream flow and additional tax resulted in the conclusion that 125 cubic feet per second would maintain adequate flow to support all recreational requirements.

The foregoing decision substantially changed the benefits analysis. A restudy of all benefits was directed by the Bureau of the Budget at the time the project was authorized in 1950. This restudy, including the effect of changing the requirement in the recreational area from 200 c. f. s. to 125 c. f. s., indicates that the following annual benefits may be expected to accrue from construction of the Coyote Valley project.

Type of benefit	Project document	Current estimate
Flood damage reduction	$301,000	$400,000
Higher land utilization due to flood control	40,000	40,000
Municipal water use	(1)	600,000
Agricultural water use	496,000	425,000
Stabilizing low flow through recreational areas	857,000	[2] 400,000
Total annual benefits	1,694,000	1,865,000
Total annual costs	$738,750	$850,700
Benefit/cost ratio	2.3/1	2.2/1

[1] Considered all agricultural uses.

[2] An estimate of a minimum figure for this benefit. Final figure will probably be larger.

I would like to point out that under current conditions it appears that flood control and water conservation benefits comprise the major part of the total and these benefits alone would yield a benefit-cost ratio of about 1.7 to 1. This is in contrast to the survey report in which the greater part of the benefits resulted from sustaining values in the recreational area.

Representatives from Mendocino County and the city of Ukiah have visited this office recently to obtain basic data relative to the project. They stated that Mendocino County is planning to hold a bond election in October to determine the extent and possibility of sharing in the local cost of the project. A zone of benefits will be delineated in order to direct the tax responsibilities of those who will receive the major benefits.

On May 25, 1955, the board of directors of Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District passed a resolution which agreed to provide and guaranteed the United States of America and the Corps of Engineers the required local cooperation including the contribution of $5,598,000 in cash, in whole or in part as required, for the reservoir construction cost prior to the initiation of said construction by the Corps of Engineers.

This office has advanced the detailed planning with over $600,000 of Federal funds already made available for that purpose to the point where construction could be started within a few months. We are prepared, therefore, to complete the planning work and subsequently initiate construction when funds are appropriated for those purposes, subject of course to fulfillment of the requirements of local cooperation, including the above-mentioned cash contribution of $5,598,000.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. GRAF,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River compact was signed in 1922 and later ratified by the Congress. Its purpose was to divide the waters of the Colorado River system between the upper basin States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico and the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

In paragraph III (a) of that compact it is stated:

> There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

From this language it is readily apparent that shares of water are apportioned to the upper basin and to the lower basin on exactly the same terms. The upper basin has precisely the same right to its water as has the lower basin to its share. And, conversely, the lower basin has every right which the upper basin can claim.

Now that the upper basin is proposing use of its share of water, through construction of the Colorado River storage project, some lower basin spokesmen are making some astounding statements.

They are saying that the upper basin States have no right to store their share of water—even though it is obvious they cannot develop and use the water without major storage facilities. If this ridiculous contention were true—which it is not—it should logically follow that the lower basin also would be prohibited from storing water. Does the lower basin believe that?

The answer is found in the tremendous structures of Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, Imperial Dam—all of them built to store water for the lower basin, particularly southern California.

The campaign against the upper Colorado River storage project has reached the nasty stage. Misinformation is being broadcast throughout the country at an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Opponents of the project blandly misstate the facts, inflate cost figures, and repeat the false statements that the development would add to our agricultural surpluses.

How much credence should Members of Congress give to these statements?

Arizona has tangled with the southern California lobby before. Outmanned and outfinanced it finally assented to a court test on water rights. Before consenting, assurances were given that the case would be expedited and it would not be used to delay development in the upper basin States. Were those assurances kept? Thanks to my colleague, Representative STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, we have an answer to that question. Here is his review of the promises and the subsequent violations of those promises:

1. Promises that upper basin development would not be delayed by litigation.

Colloquy between Representative FRANK A. BARRETT, and Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general of California, House hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935, May 1949, at page 738 thereof:

"Mr. SHAW. * * * it is recognized right now, and has been for many years, that the share of the waters of the Colorado River belonging to the upper basin is ample for its needs, and therefore we do not come to any question of conflict until you approach right close to the 7,500,000 acre-feet limit.

* * * * *

"Mr. BARRETT. As a practical matter, if we should get involved in your lawsuit, if you were successful in getting Congress to authorize a lawsuit, then, of course, the Congress would say, 'We cannot authorize any project at all in the entire basin until the lawsuit is settled'.

"Mr. SHAW. * * * This lawsuit (*Arizona* v. *California*) so far as the upper basin is concerned can only concern this last 800,000 acre-feet, or whatever it is that they want to add to the 7,500,000 acre-feet allotment by the device of this depletion theory.

"I do not think there is any reason to believe that Congress would hesitate to authorize projects or appropriate money for projects up to the 7,500,000 acre-feet."

VIOLATION OF THESE ASSURANCES

On July 15, 1954, counsel for California filed a motion to join the upper basin States as parties in the *Arizona* v. *California* litigation on the ground that the upper basin States are necessary parties in this lawsuit. This motion is still pending before the Supreme Court.

2. Promises that action would not be delayed by appointment of master.

Statement in memorandum by the attorney general of Nevada, the attorney general of California, and Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general of California, filed as part of the hearings on H. R. 1500 and 1501 in April 1952, at page 846 thereof:

"From the foregoing review of major issues, it is plain that the matters in controversy between Arizona and California are characteristically legal issues, being matters of interpretation of statutes and other documents. The ordinary factual elements, relating to quantities and time of flow and use, which characterize most water litigation are not to any substantial extent critical factors.

"It is true that some of the classic interstate water cases, such as *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46), *Wyoming* v. *Colorado* (259 U. S. 419), and *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming and Colorado* (325 U. S. 589), have required 10 years or more to reach adjudication. This has occurred because in each of these cases it was necessary for the Court to appoint a master to take voluminous testimony relative to factual issues. In the case at bar it is not considered that a master need be appointed, nor that factual testimony be taken. The issues which are significant as between California and Arizona can be adjudicated upon briefs and oral argument within a reasonable time, not to exceed 2 or 3 years."

VIOLATION OF THESE ASSURANCES

On April 5, 1954, California counsel demanded the appointment of a special master and subsequently the Supreme Court appointed a special master and referred the case to him.

3. Promises that litigation would be expedited.

Mr. Northcutt Ely, assistant attorney general, appearing for defendant, State of California, in testifying in hearings before subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolutions 225, 226, 236, and H. R. 4097 in May of 1948, as page 93 thereof said:

"We feel that the decision can be obtained within a reasonable time, within 1 or 2 years at the most; that the taking of protracted testimony will not be required and that the submission of this case to the Court will advance the cause of the development of the Colorado River. We see no advantage in delay."

VIOLATION OF THESE PROMISES

According to a United Press dispatch on March 7, 1955, Mr. Ely testified for the Ways and Means Committee of the California State Assembly and stated the Arizona-California lawsuits: "May take 6 to 8 years to resolve." At the time this statement was made the lawsuit had already consumed 2½ years.

4. Promise that facts would be stipulated to.

Excerpt from letter dated April 16, 1949, sent by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and placed in record of hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 by Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., May 12, 1949, at page 707 thereof:

"Since the major issues of the controversy are matters of law and not of fact, it is probable that within a comparatively short time the Court could hear legal arguments, without the necessity of taking extended evidence regarding facts, and adjudicate the rights of the affected States promptly. I believe the case could be presented to the Court on an agreed statement of facts. Each year that the settlement of the controversy is delayed means additional years of delay in the development of the areas affected by the use of Colorado River water."

Testimony of James H. Howard, general counsel, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, House hearings, April of 1951, at page 1244:

"I think pleadings would have to be filed and answers, probably cross-complaints, and the issues of law would be clearly framed. If there are any issues of fact so far as California is concerned, you would find a disposition to agree upon the facts to the extent that facts are necessary in the case. We would not run into any 20- or 30-year litigation, you can be assured of that. It might take 2 years * * *."

VIOLATION OF THESE PROMISES

To date, California counsel have bluntly refused to enter into any stipulations regarding the facts.

I would like to say emphatically at this point that I do not mean to imply the slightest criticism of Chief Justice Warren. He is a man whose word is unimpeachable; and if he were still Governor of California, I am certain the *Arizona* v. *California* lawsuit would already be history.

DRAW YOUR OWN CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing violated promises were perpetrated by the same group of southern California interests that are attacking the upper Colorado River storage project.

Before accepting as fact statements that originate from these sources, I urge Members of Congress to ask themselves why this project—of all reclamation projects—has been so attacked.

Does California want all the water?

Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Reports That Mayors of 259 Cities, Speaking for 31,600,000 Americans, Maintain Continued Firm Opposition to Harris Natural Gas Bill as Serious Blow to Consumers; Forwards Objective Analysis of Measure Showing How It Would Raise Gas Rates To Provide Windfall Profits to Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I heard with a great deal of interest today that the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, had stated that it was somewhat unlikely the Harris natural gas bill would pass in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a serious blow to the consumers of natural gas via the interstate pipelines if this bill or any bill resembling it were to pass in this session or in any session. It is a bill which, I maintain, goes to extreme lengths to benefit a small group of oil companies at the expense of the millions of natural-gas consumers, even to the length of repealing—you might say—a Supreme Court decision. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I will continue to fight against this proposal to end Federal jurisdiction over the prices of natural gas in the field, when shipped in the interstate pipelines.

PHILADELPHIA'S MAYOR CLARK HAS LED CONSUMER FIGHT

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the mayor of my city, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., has been instrumental in organizing an effective voice for the consumers of this country in expressing their opposition to this bill. He enlisted Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr., of New York, in a drive to organize scores of mayors of our major cities and of many smaller cities into a committee to oppose this natural gas price-increase bill. The latest count shows that 259 cities representing a total population of 31,600,000 in 21 States, and including 8 of the first 10 cities in population as well as many smaller ones, are enlisted in this drive against the bill.

Mayor Clark, Mayor Lawrence, and Mayor Wagner yesterday sent to many Members a letter expressing the continued opposition of their committee to the so-called compromise bill on natural gas. Apparently the mistaken impression has been given to some Members of Congress that the changes made in the original Harris bill had made the measure acceptable to Mayor Clark's committee of mayors. This is definitely not the case, as the letter points out.

In addition to the letters expressing this continued opposition, Mayor Clark enclosed an objective analysis of the Harris bill as amended, showing why the so-called consumer protective devices written into the bill would actually be ineffective in protecting the consumer. The producers, however, would be completely free of any effective control.

The mayor's letter, and the analysis are as follows:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 12, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A bill proposing radical changes in the Federal Power Commission's statutory authority to regulate natural gas producers was reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 28. The vote on this highly controversial measure was 16 to 15, narrowly secured after an initial tie vote which promised to keep the bill from being reported out at all.

As you know, a large number of mayors have joined together in a committee which gives expression to the fact that this bill, if passed in its present form, would operate to the severe detriment of natural gas consumers throughout the United States. As of the present time, this committee consists of the mayors of 259 cities, comprising a total population of 31,600,000 distributed throughout 21 States; and these cities include not only the Nation's largest municipalities (for instance, 8 out of the first 10), but also a wide range of smaller communities.

On behalf of this committee, we are writing you at this time, because Members of Congress are apparently being assured that H. R. 6645 (the amended Harris bill referred to above) is generally agreeable to the mayors of American cities in its present form. The chief purpose of this letter is to assure you that this is definitely not the case. The mayors' committee is strongly opposed to this bill and is convinced that its enactment would be a serious blow to the natural gas consumers in all of our cities and would be counter to the public interest.

We are attaching herewith an analysis of this bill which makes clear, we believe both accurately and fairly, the adverse effect which the bill (despite the claims of its supporters) will have on natural gas consumers. We hope that your busy schedule will permit you a few minutes in which to read this highly important digest.

With our basic responsibility for the protection of consumers in American municipalities, we feel we must oppose this legislation with all the strength at our command.

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Mayor of Pittsburgh,
ROBERT F. WAGNER, JR.,
Mayor of New York,
JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.,
Mayor of Philadelphia.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6645 (THE AMENDED HARRIS BILL)

	COMMENTS
Section 1: The first section of the bill amends the Natural Gas Act by including in interstate commerce, commerce between the United States and a foreign nation.	This provision is intended to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission wth respect to gas which is imported and exported from and to Mexico and Canada, clearly a reasonable extension of FPC authority.
Section 2 limits the "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce" and "sale in interstate commerce for resale" to transportation after the natural gas has been delivered into the transportation facilities of the interstate pipelines, beyond the field or fields where produced, and sales are considered to be in interstate commerce only after transportation has commenced.	This is the heart of the Harris bill, making as it does an arbitrary defintion of interstate commerce completely outside of the philosophy which has grown up around the term of "interstate commerce," and contrary to the spirit of the Natural Gas Act as originally written. By this arbitrary definition, this important aspect of the natural gas business; i. e., the initial sale to the pipeline, is excluded from the control of the Federal Government, and puts the producers beyond any effective regulation.
Section 3, including the so-called consumer protective provisions, sets up a "reasonable market price" standard against which the Commission is to judge the field price included by the pipeline when it comes before the Commission in a rate case.	
A. This section requires the Commission to make a finding with respect to the reasonableness of the price in new or renegotiated contracts, and allows the pipeline company to charge as operating expense only such part of the contract price which does not exceed the "reasonable market price." There is a similar provision which permits the Commission to apply the same standard against increases in field price based on escalation clauses, which a pipeline company wishes to pass on to consumers. Also, if a pipeline company wants to have an advanced determination made by the Commission, the Commission is empowered, on its own motion, to decide whether the field price is a "reasonable market price."	A. There are three primary difficulties with this section, plausibly worded as it is to give a semblance of consumer protection. The first of these difficulties relates to the use of the words "reasonable market price." There is no positive set of criteria established by the Harris bill which the Commission can use in arriving at such prices; nor is there any historical or legal background of use in making such determinations. Certainly, with respect to escalator clauses it would be very difficult for the Commission to prove that a new price, escalated up to the level of the most recent price contracts negotiated in the field, is not a "reasonable market price." Consequently, this provision would seem to give legislative sanction to the pernicious favored-nation clauses about which so much testimony was received.
B. Included in this section is a provision that after the Commission has made a finding, the pipeline company is required to pay to the supplier only the price found by the Commission to be a reasonable market price, and that the supplier is required to live up to the contract even though he may be dissatisfied with the price allowed.	B. The second difficulty with section 3 is that the provision attempting to hold suppliers to their contracts, even though the full price be not allowed by the Commission, is of doubtful constitutionality. Obviously, having once defined that such sales are not in interstate commerce, Congress cannot legislate with respect to the contracts under which the sales are made.
C. Finally, pipeline companies are permitted to charge the "reasonable market price" for gas which they themselves produce.	C. With respect to gas produced by pipelines themselves, to allow the pipeline the "reasonable market price" for gas produced by facilities which, in most instances, have already been paid for out of the rates charged for gas, is giving an unwarranted windfall profit to the owners of the pipelines. It also makes it economically beneficial to the pipelines that prices continue to rise in order that the gas which they own can be more fully priced as they sell it. Some change may be necessary in order to encourage pipelines to develop additional gas reserves; but the provision in the Harris bill provides an incentive far out of proportion to the advantages which could accrue out of more active exploration by the pipeline companies themselves.
Section 4 amends the certificate provisions of the Natural Gas Act by saying that when a pipeline comes before the Commission for authority to initiate or expand its service, FPC shall consider whether the field prices in purchase contracts for gas dedicated to this new or increased service are reasonable market prices.	This of itself is not a particularly pernicious provision and, indeed, some amendment of this sort could play a definite part in a strengthening of the Natural Gas Act. However, the meaningless words "reasonable market price" destroy what value the amendment could have.

GENERAL

The minority reports, specifically those on pages 60, 66, and 88 of the report of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this legislation, give the full background as to why this legislation should not be enacted and what its effect will be. Putting it in its simplest terms, the report, on page 73, has a table which indicates that if the effect of this legislation is to raise the field price of gas by 15 cents per thousand cubic feet, $800 million a year will be added to the consumers' gas bill. This is the increase between 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, the present average field price, and a figure of 25 cents per thousand cubic feet which has many times been quoted as being the target of the oil industry, as a "reasonable" evaluation of their product. It is entirely likely that, freed from regulation, the oil industry will achieve this objective and that consumers will be subjected to this additional annual cost. The increase in prices which has already taken place in the past few years, as a result of the pernicious escalation clauses in the gas-supply contracts, has already cost the customers over $200 million a year, with increases still coming thick and fast.

Facts Versus Fiction on Surplus Crops From the Colorado River Storage Project—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I began a reply to an attack on the upper Colorado River storage project by the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. As I noted yesterday, the crops which are grown in the four upper basin States are not raised in surplus to any appreciable extent, nor are they ever likely to be.

On the occasion of his attack on May 19, 1955, the gentleman from southern California also made this statement with respect to the project and surpluses:

> A few days ago, April 18, 1955, during debate in the Senate on the upper Colorado River project bill, S. 500, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, said to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois:
>
> "Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not the types that are in surplus supply?"
>
> There seems to be some difference of opinion between Senator WATKINS and the Bureau of Reclamation. (RECORD, May 19, 1955, p. 6682.)

From what the Census Bureau's figures show and from what the Department of Agriculture and the President's Water Resources Policy Commission have had to say about the nature of agriculture in these States, which I discussed in part I of my reply, it is quite evident that there is no difference of opinion between the distinguished senior Senator from Utah and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to agriculture in these States. But let me explain in greater detail.

The gentleman from southern California placed in the RECORD a list of some 34 possible participating projects, showing the types of crops which could be grown on lands supplied water by these projects, and then he proceeded to cite the dollar cost of the acquisition of these commodities by the CCC under the price-support program. His obvious implication was that all these commodities will be grown in great volume on each of the 34 participating projects and would end up in Government warehouses, placed there by the price-support program. Now let us examine this assumption and the facts surrounding each of these commodities he mentioned.

Certainly it is true that small grains will be grown on some of this land, and it is also true that small grains are eligible for price support. But the plain facts are, as the 1954 Agricultural Census for Emery County, Utah, indicates, that little grain is grown by farmers in that county where, as I mentioned yesterday, the participating project known as the Emery County project will be located. For example, out of 725 farms in Emery County, 223 do produce small grains, but these grains are not placed under price support but fed to livestock and poultry. In this respect, it should be noted that of the 725 farms and ranches in Emery County, 639 produce cattle and calves. Nearly 95 percent of the small grain purchased is fed to cattle and other livestock. By and large Utah is a deficit feed area.

Next, the gentleman from southern California went on to say with respect to sugar beets:

> This year we have seen the spectacle of farmers on Federal irrigation projects in the West coming to Washington to protest the acreage restriction. This has happened in a number of places, notably in the immense Columbia Basin project of Washington with regard to sugar beets. * * *
>
> What was the administration's answer to these farmers? It was: no more acreage. (RECORD, May 19, p. 6683.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the correct facts in this situation. The reasons why acreage cuts have had to be made under the Sugar Act are basically these:

First. Since 1934, the American domestic sugar requirements have been divided between our domestic growers of cane and beet sugar and foreign countries. The Sugar Act of 1948 limited American beet growers to 1,800,000 tons of sugar and domestic cane growers to 500,000 tons, based upon an estimated domestic sugar requirement of 8 million tons.

Since 1948, therefore, the amount of increased consumption occasioned by population growth and other factors has largely been supplied by Cuba. For example, in 1948 Cuba's basic quota was 26.7 percent of a 7,200,000-ton market. In 1954, it was 32.4 percent of an 8,200,000-ton domestic market. So although our consumptive needs and requirements have increased, domestic growers have not benefited from it.

Second. Since the prices of farm commodities have undergone a market decline, farmers have in increasing numbers wanted to plant and grow sugar beets. This is because in the light of lower prices for other crops the growing of sugar beets has become a more profitable alternative. However, as more farmers have turned to their production, it has meant smaller acreage allotments for those farmers who have had them in the past. This is why the representatives of sugar beet growers have wanted larger acreages.

Third. This situation can be remedied if the gentleman from southern California will help me see that H. R. 5404 is enacted into law, since this bill provides a formula by which the domestic growers can share in providing sugar for an increasing domestic sugar market. Now sugar beet and cane growers have received subsidy payments, Mr. Speaker, not because they produce too much sugar with resulting lower prices, but as a reward for relinquishing the large part of our domestic sugar requirements to friendly foreign nations whose economies primarily depend upon a single crop—sugar.

Fourth. Now the administration's answer to farmers who want to grow sugar beets is not as the gentleman from southern California has said: "No more acreage." On June 8, 1955, the Department of Agriculture in a press release announced that new sugar legislation should be enacted which would return the relationship between domestic and foreign producers to a percentage quota so that the domestic producers could share in the added volume produced by our population growth.

Fifth. The sugar beet industry in general is on the decline in this upper basin area. For example, in Emery County, Utah, where the participating project by that same name is to be constructed, the Agricultural Census of 1954 indicates that only 2 farms produced sugar beets. In 1949, there were only 7 farms which produced beets.

Next the gentleman from California noted that farmers in most of the upper basin area produced dairy products, and then he proceeded to cite the CCC's present holdings, and ended with the statement that "nobody knows what we are going to do with all the butter we have hoarded away—RECORD, May 19, page 6683. Yes, it is true dairy products are produced on intermountain farms but, this is important, only in relatively small quantities when compared with livestock. Looking at the Emery County, Utah, project area again, the 1954 agricultural census points out that whereas 639 of the 725 farms and ranches produced beef cattle, only 64 produced and sold whole milk, and 108, which includes those 64, sold cream.

Now let us digress a moment and set the record straight on another aspect of this matter. The dairy price support program of Secretary Benson is making effective progress not only in getting rid of our surpluses but also in bringing supply back into line with demand and at better prices to farmers. On June 15, 1955, Secretary Benson, in a talk to the American Seed Trade Association of Minneapolis, Minn., stated:

> The level of price support for dairy products was adjusted to 75 percent of parity. * * *
>
> Within 6 months, there was clear-cut evidence that the dairy industry was beginning to emerge from its serious trouble. Now, less than 15 months after the dairy price support level was adjusted, the evidence is overwhelming that the program is functioning effectively.

What is the evidence? In essence, Secretary Benson, on the same occasion, presented it as follows:

First. During the marketing year ending last March 31, consumption of butter increased 9 percent over the preceding 12 months. Consumption of American cheese was up 14 percent. Fluid milk consumption is also rising.

Second. An increasingly greater proportion of the total milk production is going into fluid consumption as a result of increases in per capita consumption and our population growth. This leaves milk for manufactured products and less surplus for the Government to purchase.

Third. From October 1953, through May 1954, almost 1 billion pounds of dairy products were purchased by CCC. During the corresponding 8-month period just ended, Government purchases dropped to 472 million pounds—less than half as much.

Fourth. At the same time, CCC has been moving into channels of consumption at home and abroad huge stocks of dairy products acquired under the old program. Concerted effort has pared these stocks by nearly 500 million pounds since last October.

The Secretary concluded by saying:

> Looking ahead, I believe the time is fast approaching when the Government will no longer be buying surplus dairy products.

In the light of these two facts, first, the success of the Administration's dairy program; and second, that dairy products are not produced in disproportionate amounts in the upper Colorado River Basin States ought to make it clear that the construction of the Colorado River storage project will not result in the production of the surplus basic agricultural commodities which comprise the "surplus problem" today.

Now the statement by the gentleman from southern California "that the administration is asking that the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to cough up this enormous amount of money to bring into production at an almost unbelievable cost these arid lands to grow more grasslands for cows to graze on and purchase more butter, cheese, and milk to add to the towering piles of surpluses"—Record, May 19, page 6683—is unwarranted. Yes; a great part of this land will be used to produce hay and forage crops for livestock as well as pasture. But this is primarily needed to feed beef animals.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is this important? An excellent answer not only with respect to this question, but why the development of the upper Colorado River project is so important to these four States was provided in 1950 by the President's Water Policy Resources Commission as follows:

> The several water resources programs in the Colorado River Basin should bring in some additional areas of new land besides providing more adequately for lands now suffering water shortages. This irrigation will greatly aid in stabilizing the range economy by providing wider opportunities for marketing livestock, by creating greater feeder possibilities, and by increasing the economic base so that the range need not be so badly abused. * * *
>
> To the extent that these programs can be spread into new areas and into the sparsely inhabited portions of the basin, even greater benefits will be provided by permitting close integration of livestock and feeding. (Ten Rivers in America's Future: No. 5 Colorado River, vol. 2, p. 81.)

Yes; every one of these participating projects, as the gentleman from southern California stated, "would produce hay and pasture," but as the President's Water Resources Policy Commission pointed out, this is not wasteful nor uneconomic agricultural production. Quite to the contrary, it represents making the best economic use of limited resources.

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has completed work on the preparation of the Social Security Act amendments of 1955, H. R. 7225. This legislation was ordered favorably reported with technical amendments by the committee yesterday afternoon. It is expected that the committee's report will be filed Thursday, July 14, 1955, and be available to the House membership Friday morning.

As a result of conferences that I have had with the House leadership, it is my expectation that this legislation will be called up for floor consideraiton early next week. So that the House membership can be informed on the improvements that this meritorious legislation would make in our social-security law, I will include a brief summary of H. R. 7225 at this point in the Record.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO THE OASI PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL-SECURITY LAWS AS PROPOSED IN H. R. 7225—DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Disability insurance benefits would be provided for covered workers who are aged 50, who have 1½ years of coverage in the 3-year period ending with disability plus 5 years of coverage in the 10-year period ending with such disability, and are fully insured.

It is estimated that in the first year disability insurance benefits would be payable to about 250,000 workers—at a cost of one-tenth of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to $200 million in benefits and that in 25 years 1 million workers would receive disability benefits—at a cost of four-tenths of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to about $850 million in benefits a year.

It is estimated that this provision would put into effect disability income protection amounting to $2,400,000,000 a month. Of this amount, $500 million would be immediate protection which would be available to workers now between the ages of 50 and 65, and the remaining $1,900,000,000 represents protection for younger workers in the form of monthly disability benefits beginning at age 50.

The procedures for determining and for defining disability would be those now contained in present law for purposes of determining a disability "freeze." This means, of course, that disability determinations would be made by State agencies.

It will be recalled that the Advisory Council appointed by the Senate in the 80th Congress recommended disability insurance payments by a vote of 15 to 2.

RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN BENEFICIARIES

The age of eligibility for all women beneficiaries—widows, wives, and women workers—would be lowered from 65 to 62. The Advisory Council to the Senate in the 80th Congress unanimously recommended that the eligibility age for women be lowered to 60 years.

It is estimated that in the first year benefits would be paid to almost 800,000 additional women—at a cost of one-fourth of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to about $400 million in benefits and that in about 25 years 1,800,000 additional women would be receiving benefits—at a cost of one-half percent of payroll—amounting to about $1,300,000,000.

Insured workers now have the equivalent of some $70 billion in life insurance protection for their widows, with the present qualifying age of 65. Reduction in the qualifying age for widows from 65 to 62 means the immediate addition of about $15 billion in survivors' protection for these insured workers.

DISABLED CHILDREN OVER AGE 18

Disabled children who are disabled before they are aged 18 would continue to receive benefits after age 18. In addition, disabled children who reached 18 in 1954 and 1955 would receive benefits provided they were disabled at the time they reached age 18.

It is estimated that eventually 5,000 children and their mothers will receive benefits totaling $2 to $3 million per year.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Coverage would be extended to lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, optometrists, Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal home loan bank employees, and gum naval store employees.

SHARECROPPERS

The bill enacts existing regulations so as to clarify present law whereby persons who undertake, under the ordinary crop-sharing arrangement, to produce a crop or livestock on land belonging to another for a proportionate share of the crop or livestock produced, or the proceeds thereof, would be considered to be independent contractors and covered as self-employed persons. Like all other self-employed persons, a sharecropper's net earnings from self-employment would have to amount to $400 a year either from his farming operations or in combination with earnings from other covered employment, before he would be subject to the self-employment tax and before he would receive credit for social security purposes.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill provides that at least 2 years before social-security taxes are scheduled to increase, an Advisory Council would be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to examine the financing of the system and make recommendations thereon.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The new benefits, coverage provisions, and a tax increase of one-half percent on both the employer and employee—a total of 1 percent—and three-fourths percent on self-employed persons would be effective January 1, 1956.

At present, social-security taxes are scheduled to increase in 1960, 1965, 1970, and 1975. The effect of the 1 percent total increase on January 1, 1956, is to increase each of the presently scheduled employer-employee increases by a total of 1 percent on these same dates and the self-employment tax by three-fourths percent. This means that the rates would be:

Years	Employee	Employer	Self-employed
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1956–59	2½	2½	3¾
1960–64	3	3	4½
1965–69	3½	3½	5¼
1970–74	4	4	6
1975 and thereafter	4½	4½	6¾

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of additional persons who will be benefited by the proposed revisions, their benefits (and cost*[1] *to the system), and additional cost as a percent of payroll—listed by proposed changes*

Calendar year	Proposed revisions: Reducing retirement age for women to age 62		
	Benefits	Number of beneficiaries	Cost in percent of payroll[2]
	Millions		
1956	$389	780,000	0.23
1957	455	840,000	.26
1958	519	890,000	.30
1959	584	950,000	.33
1960	650	1,000,000	.36
1970	1,006	1,340,000	.50
1980	1,292	1,770,000	.59
1990	1,399	1,950,000	.59
2000	1,362	1,880,000	.53
2020	1,840	2,560,000	.64
Level-premium[3]			.56

Calendar year	Proposed revision: Monthly disability benefits after age 50		
	Benefits	Number of beneficiaries	Cost in percent of payroll[2]
	Millions		
1956	$200	250,000	0.11
1957	278	350,000	.16
1958	355	440,000	.20
1959	433	530,000	.25
1960	511	620,000	.29
1970	742	890,000	.37
1980	859	1,020,000	.39
1990	888	1,050,000	.37
2000	1,012	1,180,000	.39
2020	1,044	1,210,000	.36
Level-premium[3]			.37

[1] Not shown here is the relatively small increase in cost for continuation of child's benefits beyond age 18 when disabled (about 2 to 3 million dollars a year, after the first few years of operation).

[2] Taking into account lower contribution rate for self-employed as compared with employer-employee rate.

[3] Based on 2.4 percent interest. Level-premium contribution rate for benefit payments after 1955 and into perpetuity, not taking into account (*a*) existing trust fund, and (*b*) administrative expenses. These level-premium rates assume that benefits and payrolls remain level after the year 2050.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated progress of old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, 2.4 percent interest—present law*

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions[1]	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Interest on fund	Fund at end of year
	Actual data				
1953[2]	$3,945	$3,006	$88	$414	$18,707
1953[3]	4,105	3,236	92	424	19,102
1954[2]	5,163	3,670	92	468	20,576
1954[3]	5,373	3,920	96	477	20,936
	Intermediate-cost estimate				
1960	$8,482	$7,540	$135	$616	$26,716
1970	13,598	11,931	172	931	40,473
1980	17,498	16,050	206	1,624	69,936
1990	18,744	19,565	238	2,080	88,239
2000	20,459	21,129	258	2,334	99,126

[1] Combined employer, employee, and self-employed contributions. The combined employer-employee rate is 4 percent for 1954–59, 5 percent for 1960–64, 6 percent for 1965–69, 7 percent for 1970–74, and 8 percent for 1975 and after. The self-employed pay ¾ of these rates.

[2] Excluding effect of railroad coverage under financial interchange provision.

[3] Including effect of railroad coverage under financial interchange provision (as is also the case for future estimates shown below). Preliminary; partially estimated.

NOTE.—The estimated figures in this table are based on high-employment assumptions.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated progress of trust fund under proposed revisions, intermediate-cost estimate, high-employment assumptions, 2.4 percent interest*

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Interest on fund	Balance in fund
1955[1]	$5,970	$5,434	$130	$508	$21,850
1956	8,198	6,446	135	544	24,011
1957	8,630	7,028	140	594	26,067
1958	8,702	7,594	146	637	27,667
1959	8,774	8,159	151	670	28,800
1960	10,278	8,725	156	708	30,906
1970	15,643	13,713	197	1,160	50,376
1980	19,744	18,247	235	1,948	83,709
1990	21,154	21,903	267	2,489	105,695
2000	23,092	23,561	287	2,892	123,050
2020	25,651	30,478	348	3,572	149,820

[1] Estimated operations under present law since bill is not effective as to benefit disbursements until 1956.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Indiana?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Indiana has more than 135,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But, it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able speech by our colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], recently delivered, concerning the condition of our national defense. I think it deserves the attention of all Members.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY M. JACKSON, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP DINNER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF MASONS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AT OLYMPIA, WASH., JUNE 21, 1955

In the past 3 months, Soviet foreign policy has made the most striking series of shifts since the beginning of the "cold" war in 1946. In no less than nine different cases, the iron fist of Stalin has been supplanted by the disarming diplomacy of Moscow and Peiping.

To underline this change, let us review these unexpected reversals of the Communist position.

In the Far East, Communist China has concurred in a de facto cease-fire in the Formosa region and indicated a willingness to discuss a settlement. Four American fliers held in Chinese prisons for more than 2 years have been released. Russia, having refused to sign the original treaty of peace with Japan, is now discussing a bilateral agreement. The Kremlin has begun a concerted campaign to win favor with Nehru—the leader of the neutralist bloc.

In Europe, an effort is being made to heal the breach with Tito, who not long ago was being denounced from Moscow as a heretic. Concessions to the West's position on the reduction of conventional armaments have been indicated. Chancellor Adenauer has been invited to discuss resuming diplomatic relations after Russia's initial refusal to recognize Bonn. And following 7 years of obstruction, the Soviet signature has been placed on the Austrian Treaty.

On top of these events must be added the Russian agreement to join a four-power conference at Geneva next month.

The American people would be less than human if they did not take heart at this turn of events.

As always, however, there is another side to the coin. I am frank to question whether the current optimism can be justified by the realities of the situation.

The simple fact is that with Stalin's death there has come to power in Russia a group that is subtle, clever, and flexible—as opposed to the bluntness, rigidity, sometimes stupidity of the Stalin regime. Where Stalin was obvious, Khrushchev is devious.

Most of Stalin's failures stemmed from the clarity of the threat he posed to the free world. Recall for a moment our reactions at home to Soviet moves in Iran, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, and Korea. It was these threats that pushed us into a program of alliances, a military buildup, and a determined attempt to shore up the defenses of the free world.

The Russians' "good neighbor" policy of recent weeks, by apparently diminishing this threat, has placed us in a difficult position. On the surface, we are faced with a new, disarming and conciliatory Communist approach. Behind this front the basic aims of communism remain unchanged.

It is a front because the Khrushchev regime is building the greatest military machine in Soviet history. As they talk peace, their preparations for war exceed our greatest estimates of their military capabilities. Never, in fact, has any country boasted of peaceful intentions with such a large portion of its economy dedicated to armaments.

Let me document this point with a brief look at recent history. Six years ago, in the spring of 1949, our conventional forces were vastly outnumbered by those of the Communist world. As a matter of fact, they still are. But, as against this, in 1949 our air-atomic power was incontestable. We possessed the B-36, then the world's only true long-range bomber. We had already flight tested the B-47, the world's first strategic jet bomber. And, above all—6 years ago—we had a monopoly of atomic weapons.

Intelligence reports told us then that our atomic monopoly would be long lived. Some responsible officials declared that 10 or 20 years might pass before the Soviets mastered the riddle of atomic energy. The matter of stockpiling nuclear weapons in large numbers was even more remote. As for delivery aircraft, we were informed that Soviet jet bombers were many years in the future. In short, most of us believed in the spring of 1949 that America's trump card—our industrial and scientific supremacy—would indefinitely cancel out Moscow's superiority in conventional forces.

Today we know, or should know, otherwise. Far from requiring decades to split the atom, the Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949—years before the expected date. Their first hydrogen explosion occurred in the summer of 1953—only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test.

Had we been realistic, we should have assumed that a nation capable of mastering atomic energy so quickly would also soon have air fleets with long-range jet bombers. Yet, even after the Soviet hydrogen test, confident officials soothingly declared that nuclear bombs were of no use unless they could be delivered against targets. As far as ability to deliver these bombs went, they said, our lead was clear and permanent.

Then came the Russians' air demonstration of May Day, 1954. This revealed the existence of Soviet jet bombers comparable to our own medium-range B-47 and our long-range B-52. The intelligence communities of the free world were shocked. The Russian planes had been flown well before the expected date. In certain important respects—in the size of their jet engines, for instance—they were more advanced than our own bombers.

Despite these facts, the soothing voices were heard again. They said the Soviet planes were doubtless hand-tooled prototypes. They predicted that years would elapse before these first models could be mass produced. The implication was clear that mass production was unique to the United States.

Six weeks ago we learned the truth. In their 1955 practice May Day displays, the Soviets flew both their medium- and long-range jet bombers in operational numbers. Furthermore, they flew large numbers of a new day fighter. Performancewise, this is a better plane than any we ourselves are now flying in other than limited flight tests. In addition, they flew operational numbers of all-weather interceptors which are superior to any plane we ourselves have in combat units today.

Again our defense planners were caught by surprise—just as they were surprised when thousands of MIG's flew in Korea at a time when the Soviets theoretically could not mass produce fighters.

The American people are now being told that, as of today, we are still superior to the Soviets in long-range airpower. Those who issue these statements, however, do not say how we stand in relation to the Soviets in fighter aircraft. Neither do they say how we will stand in strategic airpower a few years from now.

Speaking as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my own estimate of the present balance of airpower is this:

Long-range jet bombers. We are now in a neck-and-neck race with the Soviets. They may well be ahead of us.

Medium-range jet bombers. As of now, it is likely that we have more medium-range jet bombers than the Soviets possess. But they may well overtake and surpass us in a year or two.

Fighter aircraft. We are now vastly inferior to the Soviets in terms of numbers of high performance fighters. As a matter of fact they are thousands ahead of us. Qualitatively, the latest Soviet fighters are at least the equal of our best planes—and they may be better.

The intercontinental ballistic missile. The race for this absolute weapon is now nip and tuck. We should not be surprised if the Soviets get it first.

What a shocking distance the Russians have traveled in 6 years. In 1949 our airpower lead was incontestable. Today our only comfort lies in the fact that—in certain types of planes—we still appear to be ahead of the Russians. To put it bluntly, we find ourselves for the first time simply trying to keep up with Soviet progress in delivery vehicles—rather than being decisively ahead.

Nor is this all. All the evidence indicates that the Russians have been able to move from the design of prototype aircraft to mass-production models more quickly than we have. In other words, they now appear to be our superiors in the very techniques for which America has always been famous—quickly tooling up for mass production.

To cite an example. Our work on the B-52 bomber began in 1948. It was first tested in 1952. First production started in the spring of 1954. The comparable Soviet plane—the type 37—was apparently designed in 1950. It was tested in 1953 and produced in quantity in 1954. Although the United States had production facilities for a jet bomber that the Soviets lacked, they gained at least 2 years on us in this race.

The growth of Soviet technology is documented in a recent speech by Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. "Military needs dominate their research programs," he said. And he added: "We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do." As an ominous footnote, Mr. Dulles reported that the Russians would graduate 1.2 million in the sciences in the decade from 1950 to 1960 compared to only 900,000 in the United States.

The meaning of these facts for the future is clear. What is past is prologue. In 1949 we led decisively in the contest for air-atomic supremacy. Today, this same contest hangs in the balance. If the present trend continues, I put it to you as a fact that by 1960 the Soviets will be unquestionably ahead of us in airpower. When that day arrives—as it surely will if we do not change course—our historic trump card of technological supremacy will be nullified. To their present superiority in conventional forces our enemies will add superiority in advanced weapons system—with fateful consequences for the future of the world.

What are we going to do about this challenge?

Certain things seem clear. We are now engaged in a struggle for our national survival. In this struggle, our foes are working around the clock. We cannot hope to win this contest if we ourselves work 1 shift on a 5-day basis.

More specifically, I propose the following six-point program:

First, I propose that our production of jet bombers and fighters be placed on a crash basis at once—on a wartime footing.

Second, I propose that there be an expansion of our present aircraft industrial capacity. Existing aircraft plants should now operate around the clock, 7 days a week.

Third, I propose that we immediately convene a board of top industrial experts to determine why we are now slower than the Soviets in tooling up for the mass production of aircraft. We cannot prevent wars with models sketched on drawing boards.

Fourth, I propose that we immediately assign supreme and overriding importance in our defense effort to the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. This project must be tackled with the resources, the skills, the moneys, the urgency, and the priority given our wartime atomic effort. The question of war or peace may depend on our getting this ultimate weapon first.

Fifth, I propose that, as an absolute minimum, our ground forces be kept at their present level. Proposed cuts could be disastrous.

Sixth, I propose that we immediately undertake to expand our atomic weapons program.

The Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is now completing an extended 3-month series of secret hearings on the general subject of our atomic preparedness. During these meetings, we have heard from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the three services, from the Strategic Air Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, the Commander of NATO, and from ranking scientists.

These hearings have made it clear to me that our existing and planned atomic production facilities will be inadequate to meet the real needs of our Armed Forces for nuclear weapons. This is particularly the case with small weapons of relatively low destructive power which could be used for antiaircraft defense and against troops in the field. Accordingly it is my earnest hope that the members of the joint committee will soon see fit to recommend to the President a major step-up in our atomic weapons output.

Yet atomic weapons in themselves can furnish us with no military protection unless we can deliver them against enemy targets. In all sincerity, I regard the recently announced acceleration of 35 percent in our B-52 production schedules as completely inadequate. I believe these schedules must be revised drastically upward. It is my fervent hope that we will not need another Russian May Day demonstration to jolt us into stepping up our military programs along the lines I have suggested, which surely represents the minimum price of national survival.

Will larger military budgets be required to strengthen our Air Force and to expand our atomic production? Of course they will. But defense in this atomic age cannot be purchased in bargain basements. Any peacetime military budget is small, and bearable, when compared with the incalculable cost and horror of the atomic war which may well befall us if our preparations are so weak as to invite attack. Our military preparations cannot and must not be budget-limited. Instead, they must be based upon the needs of our Armed Forces and the requirements of our national survival.

Our top military leaders, testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have made it clear that we could not begin to mobilize our resources and step up arms production after an all-out atomic war had started. In such a war, our entire economy could be prostrated in a few days. This fact represents an historic change in our Nation's military position. In previous wars we have been spared direct attack. With the impetus of a Pearl Harbor, we have had a period of grace to mobilize and produce the goods of war. Today, however, our industries are only a few hours away from the fields of the long-range Russian air force. The period of grace is a thing of the past. As a result we must now build up our armed strength to wartime footing in time of peace.

Some of you may feel that what I have said tonight is too much in the realm of saber-rattling. I have made this speech for the purpose of letting people know the military steps which must be taken to prevent war. In our present peacetime situation, the only rallying force we can use to speed our production and defense buildup is the device of honest information conveyed to the American people by their elected and appointed officials. I believe that an American public fully informed of the clear and present danger to our security will support an effective defense program now with the same vigor they showed in our mobilization effort after Pearl Harbor.

I should add that this is not a partisan speech or a partisan issue. Both the present administration and its Democratic predecessor have underestimated the strength and potential of the Soviets. This national shortcoming can be remedied only through national support for a new and vigorous defense program.

In light of this critical Russian threat, what can we expect from the forthcoming four-power conference? I hope you will agree that the Soviet military buildup dwarfs in significance the recent shifts in Soviet foreign policy. The real issue at this conference, and in the months of discussions ahead, is whether or not the Russians are prepared to show good faith in their dealings with the free world. The American people will not put much stock in Russian signatures on agreements. But assurance that Russia was genuinely interested in living up to commitments would be warmly received.

What could we regard in days ahead then as a show of good faith from the Soviets—a genuine change of heart? Three things, I suggest, Russia must do to reestablish her credit with the free world.

First, she must lift the Iron Curtain to allow the free flow of people and ideas between Russia and the non-Communist nations.

Second, she must withdraw her troops from the satellite countries occupied at the end of World War II.

Third, she must stop the activities of the Cominform—the agency devoted to the spread of international communism.

Unless the Russian attitude on these questions is changed, we cannot assume that the basic aims of the Kremlin are directed toward a real solution to the cold war conflict. When the Kremlin moves to lift the Iron Curtain, free the satellites and abandon the Cominform, this will be the essential demonstration of good faith.

Until this time, we must remain hopeful but pessimistic as to Soviet intentions. And we must move promptly to meet the ominous challenge of the Russian military buildup.

Civil Rights Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith my testimony delivered today before House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 2, on civil rights bills:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you today and testify in behalf of my bills, H. R. 258, H. R. 259, H. R. 627 and H. R. 628. I hasten to assure you that I do not intend to belabor you with proof of obvious facts.

Let me state three propositions which establish the necessity of civil-rights legislation. First, today there is widespread violation of the civil rights—the human rights—of fellow American citizens. Second, it is clear to me, as it was to President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, that "the National Government of the United States must take the lead in safeguarding the civil rights of all Americans." Third, it is clear to me that Congress has been derelict in its duty to provide wise legislation to safeguard the civil rights of our citizens. I recognize that some will disagree with one or more of these basic propositions. But, as I said, I have no intention of reviewing the overwhelming and, to me, conclusive evidence in support of these propositions which has been presented to the Judiciary Committee on previous occasions. I can only respectfully disagree with any who as yet remain unconvinced of the soundness of these basic propositions.

As a member of the legislative branch of the Government, I am ashamed of congressional lethargy in the protection of civil rights. We have abdicated our responsibility completely. Furthermore, under the present administration the executive branch has shown no great zeal in this area. It has remained to the judiciary to carry the heavy load of this great national responsibility with any degree of honor. I am happy to applaud the courage and wisdom of our judges.

But it is most inappropriate that the Judiciary should be forced to carry this burden alone. It is very difficult for the courts to fashion a well coordinated overall policy for the effective protection of constitutionally guaranteed civil rights. The courts can only proceed by a piecemeal, case-by-case approach. It is regrettable the courts are forced to this difficult position by the failure of Congress to provide a coordinated legislative policy.

It is my belief that the bills which I have introduced would provide a more coordinated legislative civil rights policy and provide more effective protection of recognized civil rights. At the same time, analysis of these bills will disclose that they make no revolutionary innovations in the law. H. R. 627, identified as the Civil Rights Act of 1955, calls for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights and a Federal Commission on Civil rights in the executive branch of the Government to investigate and report annually on the status of civil rights protection in the United States. Sections 111 and 112, pages 7 and 8, of this bill provide for reorganization of the Department of Justice to make enforcement of civil rights legislation more effective. I consider this one of the most pressing current needs, i. e., the effective enforcement of recognized civil rights. H. R. 627 would provide an additional Assistant Attorney General to head a more potent Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice and authorize additional FBI personnel to effectively investigate alleged violations of civil rights.

Title II of this bill, starting on page 10, would close some loopholes in existing civil rights statutes. At present, title 18 U. S. C., section 241, punishes conspiracies to encroach on federally secured rights of citizens. But it does not punish such encroachment when done individually. On page 11, subsection (b) is added by my bill to punish such individual encroachment. Also, this statute at present does not protect the rights of aliens. My bill, on page 10, amends present law to include all inhabitants of the United States, thus including aliens, in its protection. This amendment would make section 241 consistent with section 242 on this score. At present, section 242 of title 18, United States Code, punishes officials who, under color of law, deprive persons of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by Federal law. The only proposed change in this section is to provide a more severe penalty when its violation results in killing or maiming the victim. This increased penalty provision is also proposed for section 241.

On page 13 of H. R. 627, a new section is added to these civil-rights statutes. The purpose of this new section is to clarify rather than make any great changes in existing law. But this clarification would make effective enforcement much easier. I am sure you gentlemen are aware of the case of *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91), in which a county sheriff, a policeman, and a special deputy beat to death a Negro youth. A jury found the officers guilty of violating present section 242. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction on the grounds, among others, that the instructions to the jury did not correctly state the requirement of willful encroachment on a federally secured right. In addition, the Court indicated that section 242 raised serious problems of vagueness and indefiniteness. The Court said it is not always clear what rights, privileges, and immunities are federally secured. The new section added on page 13 of H. R. 627 gives legislative specification of some rights which have already been judicially determined to be federally secured. These remedies, in part, solve the problem of vagueness and indefiniteness attending prosecution under sections 241 and 242. (See hearings, Committee on the Judiciary, 81st Cong., serial No. 18, p. 91.)

Section 204, on page 14, of the bill amends title 18 U. S. C. section 1583. This amendment makes clear that the holding as well as selling into involuntary servitude or slavery is punishable. The insertion of "other means of transportation" is simply to bring the statute up to date, supplementing the now-present word "vessel."

Beginning on page 14, H. R. 627 amends existing protections of the right to vote. Section 211 makes it clear that section 596 of title 18, United States Code, is intended to apply to general, special, or primary elections. The existing language is "any election." Section 211 would amend this to read "any general, special, or primary election." Section 212 makes a number of changes in phraseology in the present section 1971 of title 42, United States Code, to close certain loopholes now open for construction. The phrase "general, special, or primary election" supplants the words "any election by the people." The present statute speaks only of distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The words "previous condition of servitude" have been dropped as unnecessary, since the slaveholding days are far removed. In their place have been substituted the words "religion or national origin."

It is clear that the existing guaranty against distinctions in voting based on race or color is expressly authorized by the 15th amendment. (*U. S.* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214 (1874)); *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649 (1944))) and is validly applicable in all elections, whether Federal, State, or local (*Chapman* v. *King* (154 F. 2d 460 (1946))). In addition, the present statute has been sustained under the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment (*Nixon* v. *Herndon* (273 U. S. 536 (1927)); *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73 (1932))), which clause also is the source for the claim that distinctions in voting based on religion or national origin are arbitrary and unreasonable classifications both as they appear in State laws or in the administration of such laws. Thus H. R. 627 provides an up-to-date legislative clarification of the federally secured right to vote and specifies civil as well as criminal sanctions for the effective enforcement of this coordinated legislation.

Since the Supreme Court decided the case of *Henderson* v. *U. S.* (339 U. S. 816 (1950)), and *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483 (1953)), any kind of racial and similar segregation and discrimination in interstate transportation appears doomed. It seems only a matter of time until, case-by-case, all such discrimination is condemned. The duty of Congress to immediately clarify the law and provide civil rights protection is clear. That is the purport of the last part of H. R. 627.

H. R. 259 is a Federal antilynching law. At present, under (18 U. S. C., secs. 241, 242, and 371), it is possible to prosecute law enforcement officers and individuals who conspire with such officers to substitute mob violence for the lawful adjudication and punishment of crime in accordance with due process of law. However, in many cases there is no provable conspiracy with law enforcement officers making it impossible to prosecute members of the lynch mob. It is the purpose of this bill to provide full Federal protection for this despicable crime, a crime which by its very nature indicates the breakdown of republican government as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. There is no doubt of the constitutionality of this antilynching law as applied to State officials or those who conspire with State officials. I see no constitutional impediment to its application to private individuals who take the law in their own hands and, in effect, destroy republican government in a given part of the Nation. But I recognize that this latter is more debatable.

H. R. 628 makes clear that the attempt as well as the completed crime of subjecting another to peonage or involuntary servitude is to be punished.

In conclusion, it is clear that, with the exception of certain aspects of the antilynching law, every provision I have offered raises absolutely no legitimate constitutional questions. Furthermore, I think it is clear that there is nothing revolutionary about the legislative program I propose. It builds on existing civil rights foundations, closes loopholes in existing laws, clarifies uncertainties in existing law and provides adequate law enforcement officials for the effective protection of recognized civil rights. In my estimation, Congress has been derelict in its duty, on the one hand, to keep civil rights legislation abreast of the progress of our Nation and, on the other hand, to provide effective enforcement machinery for existing civil rights protections. I think the legislation I propose is a step in the right direction toward fulfillment of these duties and I respectfully urge its favorable consideration.

The Attorney General was invited to appear and testify on Thursday, July 14, on these bills, but he declined. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Civil Service Commission, were all invited to appear on that date, and all declined. The Department of Labor, General Services Administration were invited to appear but no response has been forthcoming from them. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was invited and will appear.

Any claim by these agencies that these 53 bills present an overwhelming and impossible task is pure deception. Most of these bills are identical copies. There are at the most 13 different bills, and, as far as substance is concerned, no more than 10 different proposals. Furthermore, most of these proposals were referred for these agencies' consideration last winter.

These are the agencies primarily concerned with civil rights. The Justice Department, for example, has said that it could take no action because existing laws were too weak. Yet when offered the opportunity to testify on these bills, it declines. How can existing laws which are weak be made stronger without the benefit of the testimony of the Justice Department? President Eisenhower has stated that civil-rights issues should be considered on their merits. If the executive branch ducks responsibility to testify, how can Congress adequately supply the needs of the Nation? Apparently the administration wants to have its cake and eat it too. The agencies decline to express themselves. Why? Apparently the administration does not want to alienate voters in certain sections of the country, the South, for example, who supported Eisenhower. The administration gives the impression that it supports these bills with pontifical declarations. It does not implement these declarations by deeds and actions. The administration dares not oppose these bills. It is afraid to come down to the Judiciary Committee and approve them. Such a pusillanimous attitude is most unworthy.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Kentucky?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Kentucky has more than 170,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am particularly pleased to include an article appearing in the Boston Herald on July 11, 1955, in relation to my distinguished friend, the outstanding majority leader of the United States Senate, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and written by Holmes Alexander, whose articles appeared in a number of other newspapers throughout the country.

The leadership of Senator JOHNSON as majority leader of the Senate has been outstanding, constructive in every respect, the leadership of constructive support, of constructive proposal, of constructive opposition, and of constructive criticism. The people of our country have witnessed the Democratic control of the 84th Congress operating and functioning both in the field of foreign and domestic affairs in the best interests of our country and our people. In that leadership Senator JOHNSON has played a most important part. I am proud of his friendship. I am particularly proud of his outstanding leadership.

The article follows:

JUNGLE LAW AMENDED—JOHNSON COULD HAVE HURT IKE, BUT CHOSE CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON of Texas likes it fine when reporters spell out his middle name—it belongs to his mother.

Lyndon's mother is one reason why Majority Leader JOHNSON can throw the arm of approval over worthy legislation, even when it bears, for him, the dubious label of Republican. How come as true a Texas Democrat as LYNDON JOHNSON can rise above partisanship?

DO WHAT'S RIGHT

"That's easy," the Senator told me earlier this summer when he sat characteristically with his gleaming shoes on a gleaming desk top and his head below the level of his chair back. "My momma always told me—'Lynnun, just you do what's right.' "

There's another family story which the tall, engaging Texan tells. Years ago when he was a boy, says Lyndon, he went to a party and came home with a black eye. Next morning his father came to the bedside and looked sternly down upon him.

"My daddy said," the Senator relates, " 'Sonny, there are lots of ways of getting yourself noticed. Some of the boys at that party got noticed because they were very handsome, some because they were witty and attractive; but it looks like you chose the very worst way. You got mixed up in a rumpus. Next time you want to be noticed, try some better way.' "

Between them, the two Johnson parents raised up a handsome, gregarious, successful, charming son who is, I would surmise, the best-liked political person in Washington. By doing what's right and gaining public notice strictly by tending to business, LYNDON JOHNSON got to be a national figure at the age of 46.

Unhappily, at the year's half-way mark, JOHNSON was hit with a heart attack, quite likely brought about by the energetic performance of his job as Senate majority leader. What this cruel stroke of fate will do to his rising career, or to the length of his life, had best be left to Heaven—where, for the record, many nonpartisan prayers will be found on file for Lyndon's recovery. Meanwhile, to borrow a phrase from Carlyle, the history of the 84th Congress can best be described as the elongated shadow of this great fellow LYNDON JOHNSON.

The name which his leadership goes by in Washington—"constructive opposition"—is a little pompous, but 'twill do.

HAD POWER, SKILL

JOHNSON had the power in his hands and the skill at his finger tips to make political life hardly worth living for the Eisenhower administration. Another political pro from Texas, House Speaker Jack Garner, did some unconsionable things to the ham-strung Hoover administration in 1931–32. The comparison is by no means exact, for Presidential popularity is not the same this year as in Mr. Hoover's last days of office. But there's no doubt that JOHNSON was tempted—and publicly urged by the "Social-Democrats"—to go all out to destroy the Eisenhower program, prestige, and image.

Instead, as the country has witnessed, the Democratic leader became the prime mover in the most "constructive" congressional session within memory. By the end of last month the Senate had passed 3 bills to every 2 bills passed at a similar period by the 83rd Congress. It was spending only 4 hours of debate to every 5 expended by the previous Senate with its lesser output. While bills-and-hours statistics are an imprecise way to measure congressional accomplishment, there's no doubt from observation that JOHNSON's leadership has been expeditious and impressive.

Such is our transitory life that nobody knows which day will be the last for any man or any nation, but good deeds are never wasted and never lost in the sum of history. It's a fair guess that LYNDON JOHNSON has already made the political community a little better for his presence. The old saying that the "opposition's business is to oppose" now stands amended by the one important adverb—"constructively."

It's a good amendment to the long-prevailing jungle-law of politics. Let Democrats and Republicans take notice and hereafter oppose constructively. Maybe some of us in the press coop, too, could learn from Lyndon's law.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Louisiana?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, Louisiana has more than 2,769,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

I Now Belong to the Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Ohio, Representative OLIVER BOLTON, has been absent for a number of weeks because of illness. He has now returned to his duties and all of us are, I am sure, pleased to know that he has fully recovered. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his weekly report from Washington dated July 14, 1955, in which he very ably discusses his thoughts and experiences during his recent illness:

I NOW BELONG TO THE CLUB

I now belong to a club with an increasing number of members. I am one of an estimated 1 million persons in the United States who has had a heart attack. In my case, the attack was mild. I experienced little of the sharp burning pain in my chest and arms which usually accompanies an attack; I felt no nausea, no buzzing in my head, no desperate gasping for breath.

Actually, it all started when I went to the doctor for a checkup on which I thought was an upset stomach. Becoming suspicious, after an electrocardiogram, he hustled me off to the hospital for more tests. His diagnosis: a damaged heart muscle brought on by overwork, tension, and fatigue. His prescription: complete rest for at least 6 weeks followed by partial rest and recuperation for several months more.

After the first few days in the hospital, with pills of one kind or another to keep me relaxed, treatment consisted mainly of rest. If you've been active all your life, if you've lived and experienced things intensely, you can understand how difficult it is to come to a complete stop suddenly. Virtually immobile, you lie on your back waiting for a muscle not much bigger than a good-sized fist to heal and to build new lines of blood supply for itself. You are allowed no visitors at first, except your immediate family and staff assistants.

Time drags slowly, but there are compensations. You get a chance to read some of the books you missed because of the long campaign last year and because of the press of congressional duties. You also get a chance to think, to mull over the problems of your own life as well as the life of the Nation and the world. You reexamine your philosophy, shore up some of your earlier convictions, discard others and—with the wider vision of one who has looked into the valley—you adopt broader ones.

Finally, after 6 weeks, the day arrives when the doctor says it's O. K. to go home to more rest, reading, and thinking. The weeks in the hospital have made you realize that life cannot be lived in a state of constant tension, but rather should be lived rationally and calmly, fully yet without overexertion, with interest in all things, with concern for some and worry for none.

With this philosophy, the doctors say I'll be as good as ever. They tell me that more than 80 percent of the persons with heart attacks resume their normal way of life after a reasonable period of rest. Personally, I am convinced I'll be better than ever—because out of my illness I believe I have developed a new sense of humility, a feeling about life which now contains for me a new freshness, a new meaning, a new wonder. Just waking up in the morning is a wonderful experience; walking in the sunshine is a new inspiration; each lick of work provides unusual satisfaction; and each visit with friends a warm new experience.

In short, I have learned, I hope, not only to live, but to extract a maximum out of life which I never believed possible before. I understand now what Father Jean Marie Latour meant in Willa Cather's novel, Death Comes to the Archbishop, when he said, "I shall not die of a cold, my son, I shall die of having lived."

I think the experience of the past few months has made me not only a better person, but a better Congressman.

AT THE SAME OLD STAND

It's wonderful to be back once more reporting to you from my desk at the Capitol. During my absence, I managed to maintain close contact with my office staff on pending legislation and on matters concerning the 11th Congressional District. I found the threads easy to pick up again.

Many of you were kind enough to write me a note or send me a card while I was ill. Each one was acknowledged, but the written word often fails to express adequately the deep appreciation I felt for your thoughts and your prayers. Let me say thanks again to everyone for your kindness and your friendship. It shall be my constant effort to merit them.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, water rights upon which the project depends for power revenues are now in litigation before the Supreme Court and may never become available.

The whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper Basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower Basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

> I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.
>
> Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agri-

> cultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.
>
> Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.
>
> In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (e) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

> ART. III. (e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the Lower Division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.
>
> ART. IV. (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River System may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years—the minimum required by article III (d) of the compact—they may keep everything else. Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California et al. Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Battlement Mesa irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Battlement Mesa project is a part of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

The Decadence of the United States Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received an article written by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn., dated July 1, 1955.

In this article Mr. Sensing calls attention to the action of the United States Supreme Court in deciding cases on psychological and sociological grounds rather than according to law and the Federal Constitution.

For approximately 6 years I have been pointing out in speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, and elsewhere, that the United States Supreme Court has been following a course of usurping legislative functions which the Court does not possess.

Whenever any one of the three separate and independent departments of our Government attempts to usurp the functions of another department, such attempted usurpation is a direct threat to the existence of our Government.

The public generally are becoming aware of the fact that the Supreme Court has for a number of years been overstepping its bounds, and that the nine men filling the positions of Justices of the Supreme Court have been palming off their own individual sociological views upon the people as being the law of the land. Such conduct is reprehensible in the extreme. It is a fraud upon the public. It is bound to have the effect of bringing about loss of respect for law and loss of respect for the Court.

The article by Mr. Sensing which I refer to is as follows:

> THE DECADENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
>
> Our Government is a government of checks and balances, with three main divisions—legislative, executive, and judicial.
>
> All three divisions have traditionally been held of equal rank. All three divisions should have the respect of the people.
>
> In order to have this respect, of course, it must be deserved. Tragically enough, it is now beginning to look to many people as if one of these branches, the judicial, no longer deserves this respect. That is, so far as the United States Supreme Court is concerned.
>
> This is tragic, because when the United States Supreme Court—traditionally held in highest esteem, and the court of last resort—loses the respect of the people, then our form of government has suffered a body blow.
>
> Yet two of our distinguished southern Senators in recent days have made speeches which tend to show that the members of the Supreme Court are not qualified to hold their present high positions and that at least one major ruling substantiates this charge.
>
> Speaking before the Harvard Law Club in New York City, Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, emphasized the decadence of the Supreme Court by pointing out that only 2 of the 9 members of the Court as it is now constituted ever served as an appellate judge on any Federal court inferior to the Supreme Court before he was elevated to his present office; that, moreover, few of them have devoted their major efforts to the actual practice of law. In other words, they do not have the judicial training and temperament necessary for Supreme Court judges.
>
> Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, pointed out that the Supreme Court's ruling on segregation was admittedly based on the opinions of psychological and sociological authorities rather than on legal precedents and the Constitution. He further pointed out in detail, naming them one by one, that most of these authorities had at one time or another been extremely active in Communist-front organizations, so cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee.
>
> If the members of the United States Supreme Court are not qualified to hold their jobs, as evidenced by the fact that their decisions are based on other than respectable judicial authority, then they should be removed from office—just as would be the case in the other two branches of Government.
>
> The implications to the future welfare of the Nation, as contained in the charges made in these two speeches, are even more serious than the problem of segregation itself.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Michigan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Michigan has more than 690,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, Before 56th Annual Congress of National Retail Hardware Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I had the privilege of talking before the 56th annual Congress of the National Retail Hardware Association at their meeting at Buffalo, N. Y. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I made at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

For several weeks, I have been looking forward with pleasure to being in Buffalo with you today.

There is always something stimulating about occasions when retailers meet to exchange ideas and to seek solutions to their business problems. When this is done in the relaxed atmosphere of an annual convention, we experience the perfect blending of business with pleasure.

It would be hard to find a more representative group of small-business men than the members of the National Retail Hardware Dealers Association. In every State of the Union, your stores occupy a central position in the pattern of our everyday life.

More than 40 percent of all hardware stores are located in towns of under 2,500 population. On the Main Streets of these small towns, these smaller stores ring up 28 percent of total hardware sales.

It is not a full statement, however, simply to say that hardware dealers are typical small and independent business enterprisers. To complete the thought, it is essential to add that in common with every segment of the American small-business community, hardware men today are plagued by much the same problems which bother most groups of small-business men who are trying, in the midst of prosperity for some, to conduct a retail business at a profit.

By way of illustration, since 1946 total annual hardware sales have increased by about 50 percent, or from $2 billion to almost $3 billion in 1954. Yet, the average yearly sales per store have declined by almost 10 percent in the same period.

At the same time, and covering the same years, your costs of doing business have climbed from 18 percent to 27.5 percent of sales. One direct result of this is that your average net profits, which stood at 9.9 percent in 1946, had declined to 1.9 percent last year, a dangerously low level.

Individually, however, and with the alert guidance of your association, you are taking steps to meet the challenges—or threats—to your profit position. Looming large among these challenges is the formidable competition from mass merchandisers, from mail-order houses, lumber yards, chain stores, discount houses, variety stores, and even food supermarkets.

It came to me as a surprise to learn that a recent survey of food supermarkets disclosed that almost one-third of the nonfood items carried were hardware supplies. Thirty-three percent of the surveyed supermarkets actually sold hammers.

In self defense, against this kind of competition, many of you in recent years have diversified and expanded your own merchandise lines by stocking housewares, power tools, sporting equipment, garden supplies, electrical appliances, and many other new lines.

Other modern merchandising techniques which are finding favor with hardware dealers are self-service systems and installment selling. With self-service you can pare your overhead and by extending credit you undoubtedly attract many customers who cannot always buy the larger items for cash.

Of course, in extending credit one must be guided by sound business principles. A close and somewhat anxious watch is being kept in Washington today on the level of consumer credit, which, as you know, is at an alltime high, being in excess of $30 billion.

As home buyers, we have obligated ourselves for another $79 billion in the form of mortgages.

On the other hand, personal income has also attained new heights, and the records show that those who buy on credit terms are making their payments fairly promptly.

Those who keep tabs on the Nation repayment rate say that it is currently taking between 11 and 12 percent of disposable income * * * a level which is not considered by some to be dangerous.

Rightly or wrongly, sky-limit credit with little or no down-payment and years in which to repay has become one of the characteristics of our present-day prosperity.

In commenting on this fact, a Washington economist said recently that: "Autos at 36 months means credit being extended clear out at the very margin of respectability."

There is clearly discernible a circus aspect that is creeping into the automobile credit picture today. In Florida, one General Motors dealer is presenting one share of common stock in General Motors to each car purchaser.

These Barnum & Bailey tactics are carried a step further by yet another Miami dealer who now offers a 6-day, all-expenses-paid trip to Paris to anyone buying an automobile.

I do not pretend to know who is kidding whom in a deal like that.

I expect to hear any day now that one of this dealer's competitors has topped the Paris package by throwing in a 2-day side trip to Rome.

I hope that this slight note of caution I am striking does not label me as being hopelessly old-fashioned. I realize that to be considered up-to-date in business circles these days, one must be an unquestioning optimist and exhibit at all times an almost evangelical faith that the present rate of business activity cannot possibly go in any direction but up.

Certainly, I am not blind to the fact that our economy is capable of even greater expansion.

Certainly, too, I believe that we can achieve an even higher standard of living, which is the proper goal of all economic effort.

But (and this is a rather large "but") this will not come about unless we base our future progress on the time-tested principles of a free competitive economy; unless the door of entry into business is kept open; and unless the benefits of any expansion of our production accrue to the many and not just to the already powerful few.

I should like some assurance that the small-business men of America are going to receive a fair share of this widely advertised prosperity.

In brief, I would feel more confident about the future if our millions of small and independent businesses in both the production and distribution of goods did not find themselves at the end of the banquet table scrambling for crumbs.

That may sound somewhat unfashionable in the light of many present-day utterances. Commonsense tells us, however, that any prosperity which does not fully include the small-business community in its benefits is out-of-balance and will cause trouble.

From the small business point of view, there are several factors that suggest an unbalanced picture.

For instance, our biggest corporations are making an increasingly higher rate of profit than our smaller producers. In fact, many small concerns are not making any profit these days.

Yet, overall manufacturing earnings for 1954 were the second highest on record. Manufacturing profits after taxes were 3.4 percent above the 1953 level and only 1.5 percent below the record of 1950.

In the fourth quarter of 1954, however, the smallest group of manufacturers (those with assets under $250,000), went into the red by 3.5 percent after taxes, while every other size group showed fourth-quarter increases over the same period in 1953. Corporations with assets of over $100 million showed a profit of 13.7 percent of stockholders' equity.

I am disturbed by this widening gap between the profit rate of our biggest and our smallest companies.

I am concerned also because the small business share of our national sales pie is getting smaller.

Small manufacturers' share of total sales has fallen off from 19 percent in 1947 to 14 percent in 1953.

Small business is getting less, not more, of Government defense contracts.

I have tried to indicate to you some of my reservations with the popularly held theory that whatever seems good for big business must of necessity also be good for small business.

I do not hold to the conviction embraced by many advocates of the status quo that the fate of small independent businesses is chained by any natural economic law to the fortunes of our biggest and wealthiest corporations. It does not always work that way.

The trouble with the trickle-down theory of business prosperity is that the faucet is apt to get clogged up.

It is true that 29 American companies each sold $1 billion worth of goods and services in 1954, ringing up a combined sales total of more than $67 billion worth of products. General Motors Corp. headed this blue-chip list with sales of $9,823 million.

Even so, I do not see how it can be possible for us to maintain a well-balanced and prosperous economy in the years ahead unless we can broaden the business base and develop a commercial climate in which it will be possible for well-managed small and independent companies also to make a decent rate of profit.

We are living in a time when it is not enough for a company to do just a little better than break even and provide a mere living for its owner. Small businesses must earn enough to be able to finance their growth and expansion. In many cases they must either expand or wither away.

With their larger competitors spending heavily and expanding at an unprecedented rate, if the smaller companies merely stand still, the profit parade will surely pass them by.

My comments so far have been perhaps but a general preface to a consideration of what is probably the most important economic question facing us today. That is simply this:

What effect is the concentration of economic power having on our industrial and commercial life?

And again: Is the current wave of mergers on the verge of pyramiding economic power to the point where its top-heavy weight may crush out of shape and recognition our traditional free enterprise system of doing business?

T. K. Quinn, former vice president of the General Electric Co., stated before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on February 1, this year, that there are: (a) 68 private billion dollar corporations in this country today, most of which have greater annual incomes than the total receipts of any one of the 48 States in the Union; that (b) as few as 200 industrial giants own outright the most important half of all American industry; and that (c) their control extends backward and forward to tens of thousands of suppliers and dealers who must either deal with them on their own terms or be eliminated.

The Small Business Administration has estimated that only 30 percent of the Nation's total manufacturing output is produced by small manufacturers. These constitute 94 percent of the total of manufacturing concerns. That leaves 6 percent of our largest producing corporations accounting for 70 percent of all manufactured products.

And still the wave of industrial mergers rolls on unchecked. Each day's newspaper carries the announcement of the intention of two more of our blue-chip companies to consolidate their forces into a single stronger unit.

I am convinced that only by means of a more rigid application of the antitrust laws can a stop be put to those mergers which clearly and illegally lessen competition and tend to create monopolies.

In this regard, I was keenly disappointed in the recent report of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws.

This 63-man committee handed to the Attorney General a document which, if adopted, would modernize nothing and would strengthen only the opportunities for conspiracy and unrestrained monopoly.

Shortly after the release of the Attorney General's report, I called for full committee hearings on it. Perhaps the most pointed criticism during the hearings came from one of the members of the Brownell committee, Dr. Louis B. Schwartz, professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania and an acknowledged authority on antitrust matters.

He said: "The net effect of the report * * * is to weaken rather than strengthen the antitrust laws. * * * It does this in three ways: (1) By proposing specific legislative changes tempering the vigor of the antitrust laws; (2) by suggesting or endorsing interpretations of existing law favorable to big business; and (3) by underwriting a 'rule of reason' approach to the administration of the antitrust laws.

"Among specific legislative proposals to soften the antitrust laws are the following: (1) To terminate the right to treble damages which the victim of an antitrust violation has under present law; (2) to require the victim to start suit within 4 years; (3) to repeal the power of the Federal Trade Commission to limit extraordinary quantity discounts for very large buyers; (4) to repeal criminal provisions relating to price discrimination; (5) to reduce penalties for violating orders of the Federal Trade Commission."

There was, in fact, little reason to be surprised at the report which this 63-man committee handed to the Department of Justice. The committee was loaded with corporation lawyers whose business background and whose lifelong experience made it difficult, if not impossible, for them to make unbiased recommendations regarding how to strengthen our antitrust laws and regulations.

As one critic termed their report: "It is a handbook for antitrust violators and a document which will be relied upon by those seeking excuses and permission to violate our laws."

I should be less than frank if I did not say at this point that I have long felt that the Federal Trade Commission has not been sufficiently active in enforcing legislation designed to maintain a climate favorable to small and independent businesses. This has been particularly true of the past 30 months.

For one thing, the Commission has consistently side-stepped the fair-trade problem. As recently as last February, the Federal Trade Commission washed its hands of fair-trade enforcement in denying the request of a group of retail jewelers to conduct an investigation of the fair-trade enforcement practices of certain manufacturers of jewelry, silverware, and appliances.

According to the complaint, these manufacturers discriminated against the fair-trading retailers by holding them to fixed prices while deliberately allowing discount stores to sell the same products at cut rates. The retailers charge in effect that the manufacturers were using long-established retail jewelry stores as a "showcase stimulus to the business of discount houses."

In denying the application for an investigation, the Commission advised the retailers that they "may resort to various avenues of self-help." Specifically, the Federal Trade Commission told the aggrieved fair-trading retailers that they could sue in State courts for injunctive relief against price-cutting competitors. Or, the Commission added, they "may themselves disregard the resale prices fixed by the manufacturers and compete on a price basis with the discount houses."

The suggestion of the Federal Trade Commission that the retailers sue for injunctive relief appeared questionable in view of the Commission's further observation that under the facts alleged there is no "legally enforceable obligation upon a retailer to continue to observe the manufacturers' fixed prices." A retailer who "as a matter of law" is not himself bound to practice fair trade is hardly in a position to demand that others do so.

Furthermore, the jewelers contend that to meet illegal price-cutting competition with illegal price-cutting was scarcely an appropriate remedy since a businessman should not be forced to adopt a practice he is under a moral obligation to avoid. The Federal Trade Commission countered this statement of principles with the doubletalk that "it cannot seriously be suggested that price competition is morally reprehensible."

Obviously, the Federal Trade Commission is not interested in the enforcement of the Fair Trade Act.

The Commission is also derelict in the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act which helps small-business men to buy fairly just as retail price maintenance helps them to sell fairly.

In 1936, Congress gave the Commission power to impose quantity discount limits. It was not until January of 1952 that the Commission decided to utilize this authority and promulgated a quantity limit ruling which fixed one carload as the maximum amount on which manufacturers could grant discounts on rubber tires and tubes. Here, then, was an action having a direct effect on our entire economy.

Naturally, the tire manufacturers applied for an injunction. The Government has pressed this vital case with so little vigor that it still has not been decided by the courts and at the present rate of progress, there is no telling when it will be decided.

I mention this merely as one of many instances in which the Federal Trade Commission is not moving aggressively to protect small business.

In the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission has a statutory broadsword to safeguard the basic principles of free competition. I think the Commission should use that broadsword against the larger restraints of trade and spend less time sticking needles in small-business men.

I do not think it is unfair or inaccurate to say that the vast powers which some Federal agencies hold over our economy today are not always exercised in behalf of small business. This is especially so of those agencies with regulatory powers and with quasi-judicial authority.

Does anyone believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board is working night and day to promote the interests of our smaller airlines and nonscheduled air transport companies?

If so, let them consider the case of North American Airlines, a flourishing nonscheduled airline which started in business after World War II. After years of persecution, the Civil Aeronautics Board on July 1, finally pronounced a death sentence on North American by cancelling its letters of registration, effective September 1.

I think that you will be interested in hearing what James Fischgerund, an officer of the company, had to say about this action. "The Civil Aeronautics Board has demonstrated," Mr. Fischgerund stated, "its inflexible hostility to low-cost, safe air transportation. The record of North American in pioneering aircoach and operating the lowest fares in the industry, has always bothered monopoly-minded members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and it is no surprise that they are resorting to technical regulations in an effort to strangle this popular type of service.

"Although we expected something like this, we were shocked by the Board's complete disregard of merit, judicial judgment, and orderly procedure in its frantic desire to 'get' North American. Obviously, we are the victims of a grudge for flying too many people, too regularly, too cheaply, and without any subsidy."

There is no safety issue involved. North American has a perfect safety record. Its chief mistake is that under the American system of free enterprise it has pioneered in mass transportation of passengers at low rates, and has built a strong competitor to the favored big airlines.

It is my belief that this airline would be well advised to take this decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board into court just as soon as it can get it there. I should like to see a judicial determination made of the issues involved in this matter. Only when the facts of this case have been scrutinized in the light of congressional intent can the propriety of the administrative action be accepted.

I have observed that very often the courts are more protective of the rights of small business than many Government agencies.

For example, there is a practice in the Post Office Department in mail fraud hearings whereby the trial attorney sometimes writes the decision of the hearing examiner. That is, the prosecutor also acts as judge and jury.

This is certainly one of the most insidious bureaucratic practices with which small-business men must contend. What prosecutor, given the opportunity to play the role of judge, would fail to agree with the case he himself had made, and automatically rule against the small-business despondent.

One more instance of the Post Office Department's disregard for elementary rights of small-business men was brought to light on May 13, 1954, by a ruling made in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

The Post Office Department had summoned a California businessman to come to Washington for a mail-fraud hearing. This man replied that he could not come to Washington because his wife was ill and, in addition, he did not have the money for the trip.

The Post Office Department refused to hold the hearing in California, which it could quite easily have done. The hearing was held in Washington without the businessman being present to answer the charge, and a fraud order was issued against him.

In declaring this order void and granting the businessman a permanent injunction against the Post Office Department, Judge Mathes stated:

"Had the Government moved judicially in a court of law, instead of administratively in an executive department, to put plaintiff out of business, it would be shocking in the extreme to learn of a summons by the court purporting to call upon him to leave his residence in California and cross the continent to Washington, D. C., with his witnesses and his attorney, or else default in the defense of his property right.

"It is equally shocking to learn that an administrative tribunal has so disregarded the necessity and convenience of a party defendant in an administrative proceeding."

The defects in procedures and the occasional abuses of power in the operation of a quasi-judicial hearing conducted by some agencies of the Government work to the grave disadvantage of small business.

Procedural reform as well as a reforming of the point of view of some Government personnel toward small-business men is overdue. In connection with this, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch issued a report in March of this year which called for some drastic changes in the present judicial functions of these agencies.

This report advocates establishment of an Administrative Court of the United States which, among other functions, would take over the jurisdiction in the trade regulation field now vested in the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, among other agencies.

In addition, the report urges that hearing examiners should be replaced by hearing commissioners who are completedy independent of the agencies whose cases they hear. Such hearing commissioners would be under the control of a central authority to be known as the Administrative Court of the United States.

There are many recommendations of the Hoover Commission with which I disagree.

I believe, though, that those dealing with this problem deserve consideration. Any step that would bring about greater objectivity and impartiality in the conduct of Government hearings is certainly worth careful thought.

Furthermore, there is no question in my mind but that beneficial results would be obtained if an investigation were to be made of the manner in which some Federal agencies handle complaints involving small businesses as contrasted with the way these agencies handle similar cases involving large corporations.

I have in mind specifically such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission; the Mail Fraud Division of the Post Office Department; and the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

I conceive the primary job of the Senate Small Business Committee of which it is my honor to be chairman, is to do whatever is possible to maintain that vitally essential balance of power between the larger and the smaller units of our economy.

The economic atmosphere must be made more conducive to the growth of small firms.

The rules of competitive fair play must be strengthened and enforced with vigor.

I should not like to see resale price maintenance scuttled until a workable substitute is found. I do not forsee any attempt during the present session of Congress to alter the present fair trade picture.

While we live in troubled times, I do not believe that anyone can destroy our free enterprise system by force. I am equally certain that if we are not everlastingly watchful, it can, in the slow course, of time, slip away from us.

The real bedrock foundation of our economic superiority is composed of some 4 million small-business enterprises. Every time a small business fails because of external reasons over which it could exert no control, such as unfair competitive tactics by its larger rivals, I feel that the foundation of our entire economic structure is to some degree undermined.

The title on the handsome brochure put out by your association expresses the thought perfectly: "Let's have competition—but clean."

The economic climate must be such as to encourage young men with ideas and initiative to continue to start new enterprises with the reasonable expectation that the rules of fair play will be enforced and that ability and hard work will bring their rewards.

Let it not be thought that I have any quarrel with big business as such. Bigness is not necessarily an evil in itself. It is only the uses to which bigness is sometimes put that draw my censure.

It has been well said that all power corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is why we must have reasonable checks on great concentrations of power whether they be in the political or economic field.

Our national history has shown that the average American small-business man is more than able to hold his own, given a fair chance.

Let us make certain that he has that chance, and thereby strengthen and maintain our system of free enterprise that has made us a free and great people.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Tomichi Creek irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Tomichi Creek project is a part of the multi-million-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been fighting the Colorado River storage project with every resource at her command. Why?

Southern California spokesmen would have us believe that they are altruistic—that they oppose the project only because they honestly believe it would be bad for the Nation. But let us look at a few hard facts.

Southern California interests have spent tremendous sums of money to fight against the Colorado River storage project. Official reports filed under the Lobbying Act—public documents which may be checked at any time to verify what I say—show that southern California interests have paid approximately a quarter of a million dollars to a single lobbyist, Mr. Northcutt Ely, who has directed the fight against our project. And this is only a fraction of the money which southern California has spent to oppose us.

You all see, every day, delivered to your desks, examples of the highly expensive propaganda against the Colorado River storage project, which is being paid for by southern California.

We all know that every interested group may spend money to fight for a good project, because of the long-term return which may result. A group may oppose a project on principle—but when a group spends big money to fight against a project, there is always an ulterior motive. The money would not be spent if a corresponding return—in good, hard cash—were not expected.

Why is southern California willing to spend tremendous amounts to oppose us? What return can she expect for the money she put out?

The answer is obvious. There is an ulterior motive, and southern California does expect a return.

If the Upper Colorado River Basin is not allowed to develop and use its own share of Colorado River water, that water will flow on down to southern California. This is a multi-billion-dollar resource, whose total future value is incalculable. With such a stake, the expenditure of a million dollars or so for propaganda becomes fully understandable.

The simple answer is that southern California has the water which belongs to her—but she apparently wants all the water.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Minnesota?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Minnesota has more than 874,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Address of Hon. Harry S. Truman at 10th Anniversary of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the 10th anniversary celebration of the United Nations at San Francisco, Calif. One of the most significant highlights of this historic occasion was the address of the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, to the General Assembly on Friday, June 24. President Truman was warmly and enthusiastically received by the delegates at the United Nations and the public. He was in truth the hero of the occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have the address of former President Truman printed in the Congressional Record. I commend its reading to every Member of the Congress. It represents not only a tribute to the United Nations but a constructive and challenging statement on foreign policy and America's role in the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Truman Takes Stock of U. N.

You have conferred a great honor upon me by inviting me to attend this celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, and I thank you very much.

This is a memorable occasion for me. It is almost exactly 10 years since I spoke, as President of the United States, to the concluding session of the conference which framed the United Nations Charter.

I see many familiar faces, veterans of that great conference, and I am sorry to note there are some faces missing.

Tonight I am a private citizen of the United States. And, like the great majority of the private citizens of my country and peoples of all the world, I have faith in the United Nations and hope for its future. In expressing that faith and that hope I feel that I am expressing what is in the minds and hearts of millions of my fellowmen all over the world.

TRAGIC DEATH OF F. D. R.

It was my fate to take over the presidency upon the tragic death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt was among the first to envision the United Nations as an instrument to keep the peace.

My first official act when I took office was to instruct Secretary of State Stettinius to proceed with the United Nations conference as planned. My conviction was so deep that we had to have a world organization that I felt no event, no matter how sad and unfortunate, should interfere with the drafting of the charter of the United Nations.

I felt that there was nothing I could do, which would be more fitting to the memory of President Roosevelt, than to go ahead with the conference.

The conference was held in this city as scheduled, and the difficult task of drafting the charter was completed. When I spoke at the concluding session, I was pleased that the charter had been worked out and agreed to.

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT

On that occasion, I pledged my support to the United Nations. I believe that I have kept that pledge, both as President and since I have retired from the White House.

Certainly, I have never failed to work for the United Nations, and tonight as a private citizen I pledge my support of it once again.

Since the charter was signed, many things have happened, and many vital decisions have been made. The United Nations has faced many crises and many difficult decisions. There have been times when some people thought, and hoped, that the United Nations might fail. At one point in this period, armed aggression in violation of the principles of the United Nations took place with the support and help of nations that had signed the charter.

That aggression was met as it had to be met. We had to fight to preserve the principles of the United Nations.

And the charter which we signed here at San Francisco in 1945, was given new life and new vigor by sacrifices of the many brave men of many nations who fought to uphold it in Korea.

The decision to fight for this great organization has cost us much blood and treasure, but it was the right decision.

The purpose of the United Nations intervention in Korea, and the objective of free nations in building up their military strength in support of the United Nations have been deliberately misrepresented in some quarters.

GOAL TO ATTAIN

When the charter was drafted 10 years ago, we had before our eyes the goal we wished to attain, the priceless goal of world peace based on law, justice, freedom, and human dignity.

But we did not foresee all the difficulties and the trials and the pain that it would cost to pursue this great objective. Today, we know more about the price of peace, more about what it costs, how great it is, and how much determination and effort is needed to fulfill the pledges of the charter, but we are even more firmly resolved that the charter must be maintained.

The reasons are very clear. When I placed the United Nations Charter before the Senate of the United States and asked that great legislative body to consent to its ratification, I told the Senators that they did not have a choice between this charter and something better. The choice was between this charter and no charter at all.

Today, for the whole world, the choice is not between the United Nations and something better. The choice is between the United Nations—between the principles of the United Nations—and international anarchy and violence which may lead to total destruction for all the nations of the world.

LIVING INSTITUTION

The United Nations today is a living institution. Like all living things, it follows a development of its own. Some of the things we put down on paper in the charter have not come to pass, some of the procedures originally planned have proved unworkable, but they have been replaced by new activities, new procedures, all within the spirit of the charter, that we did not foresee 10 years ago. This is the course of all written constitutions if they are to endure and meet the changing needs of the years.

One of the most significant developments of recent times is the growing power and prestige of the General Assembly. It is in the General Assembly more and more that world opinion is making itself felt.

The Security Council, which in the beginning we thought would be the controlling body, is yielding to the General Assembly as the place where the force of world opinion is brought to bear upon the solution of the really vital issues. This development has been highlighted by the passage of the uniting-for-peace resolution, a great landmark in the constitutional development of the United Nations.

GROWING PRESTIGE

I think the growing prestige of the General Assembly is a development of the greatest volume and importance. There is no veto in the General Assembly. And if collective action is necessary in defense of the charter, a call for action by the General Assembly can be even more effective than a command from the Security Council.

The effectiveness of a request addressed to sovereign states, jealous of their sovereign rights, depends not upon whether the request is legally a command or a recommendation. It depends upon the extent to which the request expresses the will and has the support of an alert and aroused world opinion and a world conscience.

The Security Council could never speak for world opinion with the same moral authority as the General Assembly. Certainly the General Assembly now speaks with an authority that the great powers on the Security Council cannot ignore.

And it may be a good thing, especially for the large nations, to let them know that the balance of mankind is not going to give up striving for peace and order just because the great powers cannot agree.

MEMBERSHIP ISSUE

This raises the whole question of enlarging the membership of the United Nations.

Since this is a living and growing institution which should reflect and provide the means for crystallizing world opinion, it cannot be held forever in the iron mold imposed by the great war of 1940–45. Other nations are rightfully seeking admission. One of the best evidences of a real relaxation of international tensions would be the speedy removal of the obstacles to the admission of those nations justly entitled to be members.

The growth of the United Nations in its first 10 years has been a hard one, beset with difficulties and disappointments, but as I look back over that 10 years I am convinced more than ever that our conference here in 1945 did much more than draft an international agreement among 50 nations. I believe our conference in 1945 set down on paper the only principles which will enable civilized human life to continue to survive on this globe. These principles are, first, that there is no substitute for peace, and that force and the threat of force have become intolerable as instruments for the settlement of differences in a world which force can easily destroy. The second principle is that the life of mankind is a united and common life, carrying with it a common responsibility for the welfare of all. No place is far enough away from any other place in this atomic age to escape the obligation to be a good neighbor.

Ten years ago in this city all the nations represented here agreed on the goal of world peace. They also agreed that to achieve peace would require determination and effort. On that occasion, I said:

"If we had had this charter a few years ago—and, above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

"It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our thinking and all actions be based on the realizations that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning, and, with our eye always on the final objective, let us march forward."

And the Soviet delegate, then Ambassador Gromyko, said:

"The peoples of the countries represented in this conference pursue a common objective—to prevent the repetition of a new war * * * under the charter, members of the international organization obligate themselves to achieve peaceful settlement of disputes. Let us hope this aim will be realized."

The same views were voiced by many others.

ALL JOIN IN HOPE

Ten years after we see the truth of these views. We feel the increasingly insistent pressure of the common opinion of mankind throughout the world against force and the threat of force in international affairs. This year, as in 1945, the world still hopes that within the framework of the charter we can make real progress toward peace.

We all join in this hope, but we all know we cannot achieve world peace simply through organizations and meetings. There is no magic in international procedures. We must deal with the underlying problems. Today, one of the gravest problems facing mankind is the need to reduce the burden of armaments.

I have been, and I still am, one of the most ardent advocates of disarmament. In 1950 and in 1951, I placed proposals before this organization for reducing armaments under effective international controls. At the same time, I made it clear that unless agreement could be reached on this issue, even those nations which most abhorred the use of force—and which were most determined not to use force in the settlement of their difficulties—would be compelled by circumstances to build up their own armed strength in order to resist attacks upon them or upon the ideals of the United Nations.

BURDENS HEAVIER

This question of armaments has clouded the international horizon for many years. It grows more and more serious. Every year science places new and more terrible weapons in our hands. Every year the financial burdens of defense grow heavier and heavier. Every year the consequences of sudden attack and the perils of inadequate defense become more deadly.

Today, the battles of World War II are almost as far behind us technologically as the battle of Napoleon or the techniques of Genghis Khan. The use of force in international affairs today raises the threat—the almost incomprehensible threat—of total destruction, not only of cities and nations, but of all human life.

I earnestly hope that the time has come when we may break the deadlock on international disarmament. Recent negotiations on the subject have been overshadowed by other affairs, but the fact is that the expressed views of the principal military powers of the world on the reduction and control of armaments have come much closer together. This is a hopeful sign, and I pray that it may be a forerunner of better things to come.

REAL DISARMAMENT

To make real progress in this work of disarmament, we should move forward as rapidly as we can—not only toward the progressive and balanced reduction of armaments under effective international controls, but beyond that, toward the proposition that no state, no nation, should be allowed to have sufficient arms to wage a successful war. Disarmament should become a steady process of creating conditions which make it more and more difficult for any nation to break the peace.

Effective disarmament should remove from the world not only the terror of atomic weapons and guided missiles, but also the threat of mass armies.

Effective disarmament means an open world with no secret armies, no secret weapons and no secret war planes. If we are to achieve effective international control of armaments, we have to have a world open to inspection.

This will be difficult. Some nations have become to accustomed to living in the dark that it is not going to be easy for them to learn to live in the light.

I believe that in time effective disarmament is possible.

TOP JOB FOR NATIONS

But I do not think that world peace can be achieved by disarmament alone. There must be a common determination on the part of all nations not to embroil the world in war. All nations must follow policies which will make possible the peaceful settlement of their differences.

For this reason, I welcome the signs in the world today that greater understanding and agreement may be reached among the great powers. I welcome the proposals for further conferences and negotiations. It may not be possible to make sudden or vast strides in these conferences, but agreement even in some things will be a gain. Agreement even in little things may be a foundation on which greater things can be built.

I am more convinced now than ever that the growth and development of the United Nations are essential for international peace and progress. The charter embodies the obligation of the members not to use force except in defense of the charter. This is both a legal and a moral obligation. It binds all the nations that signed and ratified the charter, even those which may be strong enough to violate it. It is a powerful, if intangible, restraint on all the nations. It is sustained by the mighty force of the moral judgment of mankind.

PRAISE TO FOUNDERS

If we can make that obligation good, if we can carry it out in practice, the way is open for an international community based on law and order. In such an international community, material and social progress will be within the grasp of every nation. The welfare of mankind will cause to be secondary to the grim question of national survival, and will become the primary concern of governments. In such an international community, the social and economic activities of the United Nations will reach their fullest development.

Second only to peace in the United Nations Charter is the emphasis it lays on improving the standards of living of mankind and safeguarding the fundamental freedoms and the dignity of men. This work must be carried on at the same time that we strive to eliminate war. Indeed, this humanitarian program strikes at one of the main causes of war. It is a tribute to the framers of the United Nations Charter that they gave this objective such great importance, and set up machinery for pursuing it effectively even before the framework of international peace was completed.

MUCH TO BE DONE

As I think back over the last 10 years, I am encouraged by what has been done in the economic and social field. But all our accomplishments to date are only a good beginning. There is much that remains to be done. Here is a challenge to the understanding, the generosity and the ingenuity of man.

We now take it as a matter of course that one nation should offer scientific instruction and technical advances to another, free, without expecting a return of any kind except the consequences of being part of the brotherhood of man. What a tremendous step forward this is in the realization of our common international responsibilities. Fifty years ago, a program of technical assistance, such as I proposed in the fourth point of my inaugural address in January 1949, would have been considered completely visionary. Nowadays, the only real question is—how big should such a program be? This revolutionary change in public opinion is the result, at least in part, of the economic and social portions of the United Nations Charter, and the general acceptance of their underlying philosophy.

I am glad to see that technical assistance and economic development are a growing part of the work of the United Nations. While all international good works need not be confined to the United Nations, there are many situations in which this organization is the best channel for such international activities. I hope all the member governments will support these activities of the United Nations wholeheartedly and generously.

CHOICES FOR WORLD

In this atomic age, no nation can live unto itself alone. There is no hope for any nation either in isolationism or in imperialism. The United Nations is the best hope of mankind for deliverance from mutual destruction. It is even more important in this respect than it was 10 years ago.

The United Nations is a beacon of hope to a world that has no choice but to live together or to die together.

The charter may not be perfect, but no charter can provide easy or automatic solutions for the complex and difficult problems of international life. The charter does give us the means—the opportunity—of meeting and resolving these problems by peaceful processes. In our impatient zeal for perfection, let us not lose faith in the charter and the means it provides for working together for our common salvation.

We have come a long way in the past 10 years. During this fateful period, two great forces have emerged to play an essential role in shaping the destiny of mankind. One of these is the United Nations, man's most ambitious attempt to keep the peace. The other is the development of nuclear science, which has unleashed physical power of a magnitude hitherto undreamed of—a magnitude great enough to make fundamental changes in man's way of life for better or for worse.

We in our generation are confronted with the magnificent challenge of reconciling these two great forces. We must use the one and harness the other so that we may combine them for the everlasting benefit of all mankind.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Mississippi?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, Mississippi has more than 1,272,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Opening Statement of Subcommittee Chairman Clyde Doyle at House Un-American Activities Committee Public Hearings, Los Angeles, Beginning June 27, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do I am pleased to submit to the attention of all my colleagues the text of my opening statement as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee at the recent Los Angeles hearings which commenced June 27, 1955, in the Federal Building at Los Angeles, and continued for 6 days.

I submit the following text of the opening statement because both before and since I returned to Washington from the hearings at Los Angeles, and also at San Diego, several Members of this great legislative body have asked me what sort of an opening statement was made by me on occasions when I was presiding as subcommittee chairman, or by other committee members presiding over committee hearings. Therefore, I am aware that there is somewhat unusual interest in this particular feature of our committee hearings.

In the first place may I state that by virtue of the Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, unanimously agreed to by this honorable body March 23, 1955, it provides as follows:

> SEC. 2. (i) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an open statement the subject of the investigation.

Therefore, the text which follows of my opening statement at the Los Angeles hearings is intended to comply with that requirement.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the obligations and requirements of House Resolution 151, I will state that at all times in the recent Los Angeles and San Diego hearings, there were not less than two committee members present. I mention this in view of subdivision (h) of section 2 of House Resolution 151, which provides as follows:

> (h) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which shall not be less than two.

The statement is as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. DOYLE, LOS ANGELES HEARINGS, JUNE 27, 1955

The subcommittee will please be in order. Let the record show that the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, establishing this committee, duly appointed Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, on my right, DONALD L. JACKSON, of California, and GORDON M. SCHERER, of Ohio, on my left, and myself, CLYDE DOYLE, of California, as a subcommittee, with myself as chairman, to conduct these hearings.

The full subcommittee is present. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, composed of nine members. Each member is also a member of one other major congressional committee. Since the workload of this committee is so constant and heavy, it has been found necessary to divide the committee into subcommittees when the work undertaken is away from Washington, D. C.

The Congress of the United States has imposed upon this committee by Public Law 601 the duty of making investigations of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and which attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

In the discharge of this duty in the current hearings, the committee proposes to make further inquiry regarding Communist Party activities emanating from this and other areas which may be calculated to advance the Communist conspiracy and extend its influence and power. Preliminary investigation has indicated Communist Party membership of certain individuals occupying administrative or policymaking positions in certain organizations. It is the purpose of the committee to inquire as to the possible existence of a Communist Party plan to place its members in such important positions the object sought to be obtained and the extent of such practices. It is also the purpose of the committee to inquire as to the extent, character, and objects of Communist Party activities in Los Angeles County during periods and at places not fully covered by testimony heretofore taken by this committee. The information obtained at this hearing should better enable Congress to legislate more ably and comprehensively on the subject of communism, or other subversive activities.

The committee has devoted much time in the past few years to the investigation of the subject of communism, and has endeavored to keep Congress well informed of the extent, character, and objects of the Communist conspiracy within this country as an aid to necessary remedial legislation. In the performance of this huge task, the committee, in its reports to Congress, has made 18 recommendations for new legislation or the strengthening of existing legislation, designed to aid in the fight against this Communist conspiracy. All but four of these recommendations by this committee have been enacted into law in one form or another.

The committee wants it understood that in the conduct of this hearing it is not interested in any dispute between management and labor or between one labor union and another labor union. Neither is it interested in the internal affairs of any labor union. It proposes, however, to investigate to the full limit of the ability and resources, Communist Party activities of any person as to whom reliable information indicates Communist Party affiliation and activity, whether that be in the field of labor or any other field, and regardless of who the person or group of persons may be. This is our bounden duty under Public Law 601.

It is the standing rule of this committee that in the event testimony or evidence is adduced in the course of committee hearings, disclosing Communist Party membership on the part of any individual, that individual, if he desires, shall be afforded an early opportunity to appear before this committee under oath for the purpose of denying or explaining any such testimony or evidence. This is part of the American way of doing right and justice. If this be such a person's desire, he should communicate promptly with a member of the committee staff.

I desire to make it clear that the fact that a lawyer appears before this committee as legal counsel for a witness should not be taken as any disparagement against that lawyer for so doing. The committee invites counsel to be present. However, for the benefit of counsel who have not hitherto appeared before this committee, may I state a positive limitation on the privileges that legal counsel has before this committee. The committee is not a court and it does not follow strictly the rules of court procedure. The presence of counsel is permitted and encouraged for the purpose of advising the witness as to his constitutional rights. Counsel is not permitted to make oral arguments, or to address the committee. We want the witness' testimony and not that of the lawyer and we have the right to expect an ethical member of the bar to confine his advice to his client to matters involving his constitutional rights and not to put words in the mouth of the witness.

I would remind those present in this hearing room that we are here at the direction of the Congress of the United States to discharge an important function of our Federal Government that has been assigned to us by Public Law 601. You are here by permission of the committee. I trust that you will conduct yourselves as guests of this committee. A disturbance of any kind or audible comment during the course of testimony whether favorable or unfavorable to any witness or the committee will not be tolerated. For infraction of this rule the offender will be immediately ejected from this room and may not be allowed to return. I trust it is necessary only to call this matter to your attention once and that it will not be necessary to have it repeated.

There will be no television, radio, or mechanical recording during the taking of testimony. The only photographs that will be permitted to be taken will be still shots and they must be taken either before or after a witness testifies.

The salient provisions of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, which established this committee as one of the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives, by which this committee in these hearings will be bound are as follows:

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.”

In this connection I will say that when witnesses are subpenaed to appear before this committee, they or their legal counsel are supplied with a copy of the rules which govern the proceedings of this committee.

The distinguished designated legal counsel of our committee, Mr. Frank Tavenner, of Washington, D. C., will proceed to interrogate the first witness and all witnesses, who will first take the usual oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth before they begin their testimony.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Texas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Texas has more than 3,928,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Person to Person, With Margaret Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently, millions of Americans had the opportunity to visit, by way of television, in a home which we, in Missouri, feel symbolizes all that is best in family life in America.

On this program, Miss Margaret Truman introduced her mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Harry S. Truman, at Independence, Mo.

The wholesomeness and the friendliness of the ensuing half-hour visit was truly typical of this wonderful family, for almost 8 years the first family of America.

Members of Congress and readers of the Congressional Record who missed the program, will be interested in reading the transcript. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of Person to Person for May 27, 1955, inserted in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CBS Television—Person to Person, With Margaret Truman

Miss Truman. Good evening; I'm Margaret Truman. The name of the program is Person to Person.

It's not possible for Edward R. Murrow to be here tonight. He is in London, following up the British election results. He asked me to help escort you through a home in Independence, Mo., that I know very well—I was born there. And our guests tonight will be two persons of whom I'm very fond—my mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman is a former President of the United States. He spent almost 20 years in Washington as Senator, Vice President, and President. He loves politics and people, particularly Democrats.

Since the Trumans left Washington I have been living in New York, but our family home is where it always has been, in Independence, Mo.

This is where we live. It's a rather rambling, Victorian-type house, built 89 years ago, shortly after Abraham Lincoln died. It has 12 rooms, and stands on the corner of North Delaware Street and Truman Road, about a half acre in all.

It's exactly 9½ miles from here to my father's present office in the Federal Reserve Bank Building in Kansas City. As he drives himself to work each morning down Truman Road—it will always be 15th Street to me—he passes Truman Car Wash, Truman Road Grill, Truman Pharmacy, Truman Palmistry, and Truman Road Hamburger Shop. And when he makes the 30-minute trip home each night he can still note Harry's Tavern, Harry's Cafe, and Harry's Used Furniture.

We love Missouri.

When my father was a Senator we used to spend about 6 months a year in Independence. Or mother did. Dad was frequently out speechmaking.

Later, when my father was at the White House, mother always came home for the summer.

Now, this has been the only home for my parents for the past 2 years and 3 months; that is, when Dad isn't out gallivanting around and talking to people.

We have never had cameras in the house before. But I hope they are working tonight.

Mr. Truman. It's all right with me.

Miss Truman. Dad, so many people ask, “How are your parents making out from their switch to Pennsylvania Avenue and Washington to North Delaware Street in Independence?”

Mr. Truman. Well, I think we are doing very well. I always liked the hometown better than any other place I know of. I didn't have anything particular against Washington, but I think that Independence is a much better city.

Miss Truman. He is likely prejudiced. Mother, please tell everyone why you went back to Missouri instead of staying in Washington.

Mrs. Truman. There was never any question about staying in Washington. Never any question of not coming home. Is that reason enough?

Miss Truman. That's reason enough. Mother, where is Vietta?

Mrs. Truman. Oh, she's in the kitchen.

Miss Truman. Vietta knew me before I knew her. I was 3 years old when she came to work with us. She raised me, too. Hi, Vi.

Vietta. Hi, Margaret.

Miss Truman. I must tell every one that Vietta stayed 8 years at the White House as sort of master of bread and rolls and when I had my first concert Dad insisted she go with me. Now she is the big wheel in the Independence kitchen.

Say, I haven't had a chance to talk to you since the big party at the house celebrating Dad's 71st birthday and groundbreaking for the new library. How many people were there?

Vietta. Between 200 and 250. I had plenty of help.

Miss Truman. I want to go back and talk to Mother and Dad. Mother, are we still getting a lot of sightseers and visitors?

Mrs. Truman. All the time. Every day. We had a funny experience the other night. Dad and I went over to see your cousin across the street and there were so many out here in front of the house we couldn't come home. We had to spend most of the evening on the front porch all by ourselves because our cousins weren't at home.

Miss Truman. What about the time someone picked your tulips?

Mrs. Truman. Oh, yes; some woman came in the backyard and started picking all my beautiful white tulips and one of the men on the place went down there and asked her just what she thought she was doing and she said she didn't think Mrs. Truman cared if she took some of her tulips. She took all she wanted.

Miss Truman. Dad, we know you're not the greatest believer in the accuracy of poll takers, but on your morning walk around town, do you ever take a poll of how people feel toward you?

Mr. Truman. Whenever I meet them I can tell very well that they are happy to see me. There are a great many of them who don't know me as well as those home folks do, that are somewhat awed by the fact that I once lived in the White House, but it doesn't bother me because that never occurs to me, and I can see how I'd feel if I were meeting a President and I still lived here in Independence as a private citizen.

Miss Truman. Everyone who stopped at the house in recent years knows we have a big iron fence around the property with a gate that opens only when we push a button in the house. Incidentally, Ed Murrow's television men tell me the gate needs an oiling.

Mrs. Truman. I am afraid he was telling the truth.

Miss Truman. Dad, why don't you explain why you have that fence out there?

Mr. Truman. Well, the fence had to be put up to keep the American propensities from collecting souvenirs and tearing the house down. I was told that when Herbert Hoover went to Washington as President, they took the door knobs off his house and almost tore the house down before they placed guards there to prevent it. The Secret Service decided that the fence would save our property from being destroyed. It is an old story that Americans like to collect souvenirs. When I was in the First World War it was said that the British fought for the control of the seas and the Americans fought for souvenirs, and they are still fighting for them.

Miss Truman. Mother, we were talking about tulips a minute ago. How does your garden grow?

Mrs. Truman. Oh, we have had some wonderful rains and the garden is all in bloom, especially Mrs. Lasree's Peace Roses. They're gorgeous.

Miss Truman. Dad, you used to tell reporters that the White House was a jail. Do you feel free now?

Mr. Truman. Well, substantially so; practically as free as I expect we ever will be. For some reason or other, I don't suppose we will ever be as free as we would have been if we hadn't lived in the White House.

Miss Truman. I think that sounds logical. Mother, do you miss Washington?

Mrs. Truman. Oh, yes; I miss Washington. I miss Washington a lot. I loved it there but I am completely happy at home.

Miss Truman. That's what I thought. Mother, would you and Dad show us to the living room, please?

Mrs. Truman. Yes; we'd love to.

Miss Truman. All right. This is our side porch. It leads on down to our dining room. We usually have our meals here. First off, let's show everyone the portrait of Dad that you like so much. As we know, Mother, that's yours, right?

Mrs. Truman. Strictly mine. No library, no museum ever gets it.

Miss Truman. Dad, while we are at it, let's show the painting of your daughter and get it over with.

Mr. Truman. Right over here.

(Portrait of Miss Truman.)

Miss Truman. Someone asked me recently, Daddy, "Did your father ever say that your house in Missouri creaks and groans like the White House?"

Mr. Truman. Yes; it did creak and groan just like the White House. It doesn't groan so much now.

Miss Truman. Remember the night, speaking of ghosts, that you heard a knock on your bedroom door in the White House?

Mr. Truman. Yes; I heard the knock and got up and answered it about 3 o'clock in the morning. There wasn't anybody there. I think it must have been Lincoln's ghost walking up and down the hall.

Miss Truman. Dad, I just won a small bet. Before Ed Murrow left he said that I couldn't steer you away from politics this long. I win but you'll get your chance. I have a lot of things that he wants me to ask you. Dad, do you have anything left up your political sleeve?

Mr. Truman. No; nothing in particular.

Miss Truman. I want Mother to answer this one. Have you made sure that Daddy takes things easy since he left Washington?

Mrs. Truman. That's a laugh—between the piles of mail and the many, many visitors, it's a little difficult.

Miss Truman. So many people want to know what you do to relax inasmuch as you don't fish, hunt, or play golf.

Mr. Truman. Well, my only relaxation is to work and I never have known anybody to be injured by too much hard work. It is the lack of it that kills people.

Miss Truman. Well, now I think I will ask you to show us the way to the music room.

(Laughter.)

Miss Truman. Dad, how is the book coming?

Mr. Truman. Coming along all right. I think we will meet the deadline on the 15th day of June, and the book will probably be published about the 15th of September, I hope.

Miss Truman. I know you once had the stories of your years in Washington up to 1 million words. How long is it now?

Mr. Truman. We have had to cut down to about 500,000. That is a very hard job but I think we are going to succeed in doing it.

Miss Truman. That still sounds like a lot of words. Mother, how is the proofreading going?

Mrs. Truman. It is still pretty strenuous.

Miss Truman. Everyone in the Truman family knows that when Mother gets to proofreading on anything Dad is working on, that means it is on the way to completion.

Back in the other room we saw the paintings, one of me and one of Dad. Dad, let's look at Mother's. I think that is awfully good.

Mr. Truman. That is a wonderful picture of your mother.

Miss Truman. That's my favorite. Let's see some non-Truman paintings. You two sit and I will introduce them.

Over Dad's shoulder is a present to Dad from Sir Winston Churchill painted by his own hand at Marakecsh. I brought this home from London when Sir Winston asked me to bring it to my father.

Now, over the piano is an original given to us by Grandma Moses.

Dad, now it's your turn to explain things, Could we have the history of the piano, please?

Mr. Truman. Well, this piano is the one that was purchased for you when you were a very little girl. You had your first lesson on it and it's been your piano ever since. It gets a right good workout when you're at home.

Miss Truman. I think I was 7 or 8. Do you remember the first thing you taught me on that piano?

Mr. Truman. Yes; I think it was a little waltz I taught you. I think I can still play it.

Miss Truman. Dad, when you did that television tour through the White House you showed everyone you could still play. Let's prove you still haven't lost your touch.

Mr. Truman. Let's try and see what happens. Then you can tell whether the piano is in tune or not. This is your waltz.

(Mr. Truman played the piano.)

Miss Truman. Isn't that Paderewski's Minuet?

Mr. Truman. Yes; that's part of it.

Miss Truman. I enjoyed that. If you want to go back to your chair, I have another question to ask.

Mr. Truman. Fire away.

Miss Truman. Just how much influence and help was Mother when you were in the White House?

Mr. Truman. She was a wonderful influence and help. A President is in a bad way if he doesn't have a First Lady that knows her job and is a full support to him. She's the greatest help a President can have. Mine was.

Mrs. Truman. Thank you.

Miss Truman. Dad, how is the new library coming?

Mr. Truman. It's coming along all right. They have the ground graded and they are digging the foundation now. They have the signal to finish in about a year and 2 months.

Miss Truman. That's good. Are you going to travel toward the den now and show us some of that?

Mr. Truman. Yes, I think so. I have a picture of the library out here I want to show you. Here it is.

Miss Truman. Have they made much progress since the ground-breaking 2 weeks ago?

Mrs. Truman. Oh, yes, a lot of progress. And he goes by most every morning on the way to the office to see just what they are doing.

Miss Truman. Are you going to go easy on the Truman Library builders?

Mr. Truman. I'm going to watch them put it up and I'll see that they do it right, just as I always did whenever I had anything in charge like that.

Miss Truman. Sidewalk superintendent. How much have you stored in Kansas City ready for the library?

Mr. Truman. There is an old big vault full of books, papers, and pictures and things of that kind that will go into the library when it's up. There is a tremendous collection of Bibles in the vault that will be very interesting when they are put out for the people to see.

Miss Truman. How much is it all going to cost and how much cash has the committee raised so far?

Mr. Truman. It is estimated that the library itself will cost $1,700,000, and we have collected $1,200,000. I think the rest of it is in sight. We will have the money all collected by the time that the library is ready to use.

Miss Truman. Good. I suppose some day the scholars will go through your personal papers and draw up a summary of your administration. What do you hope you will be remembered for?

Mr. Truman. I hope to be remembered as the people's President. I have always said that there are a great many important organizations with lots of money who maintain lobbyists in Washington. I'd say 15 million people in the United States are represented by the lobbyists in the city of Washington. The other 150 million have only 1 man who is elected at large to represent them—that is, the President of the United States. When he goes back on them they are in a bad way.

Miss Truman. What do you think has been the most important development in the country or world since you left Washington?

Mr. Truman. I think we are approaching a peace settlement and, I hope, the end of the cold war. The signing of the treaty is a step in that direction.

Miss Truman. A moment ago I saw the icon you received from Queen Helen of Rumania. Do you recall the circumstances surrounding that gift?

Mr. Truman. The Government of the United States, at my direction, sent 200,000 tons of wheat to the starving Moravians and the Queen of Rumania presented me with this icon, which came out of the mosque of St. Sophia—Constantinople it was then.

Miss Truman. You know a lot of people have said to me, your father sure loves a fight. True or false?

Mr. Truman. Well, I never held up a fight, but I never ran from one if it was necessary to meet things head on.

Miss Truman. Mommie, do you want to say a few words about politics specifically or in general?

Mrs. Truman. No; not in either category, thank you.

Miss Truman. Well, that's definite. Dad?

Mr. Truman. You know your mother never talks about such things.

Miss Truman. Ed wanted you to talk about the campaign in '48. He wanted to know what made you so sure you would win.

Mr. Truman. Well, I have been through a similar experience on 2 or 3 occasions and I had come to the conclusion that when the people know the facts and they know that you are telling the truth and stand for the things that are for their best interests they will vote for you and I was very well assured if I could see enough people and talk to enough people I could be elected and that is what I did and this is the way it came out.

Miss Truman. Well, tell me, what is the toughest decision you had to make?

Mr. Truman. To go into Korea to save the United Nations Republic of South Korea.

Miss Truman. Dad, what advice do you have for young people who want to go into politics.

Mr. Truman. Well, the best thing they can do is study history, particularly the history of their country, their city, their county and their State, to read all the history they possibly can and study about what makes men act and the biographies of the people who made history are much more important to a person who wants to go into politics and the fundamental thing is that a politician must be fundamentally honest, intellectually and otherwise. Unless he is he won't make it.

Miss Truman. Well, I have to go now so I guess I will have to say goodby.

Bananas on Pikes Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, New York has more than 100,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Ohio?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Ohio has more than 95,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou seeking shepherd of our souls who leadest us beside still waters and in green pastures: To Thee we bring our parched souls that they may be restored by the riches of Thy grace. Unto the hills of Thy strength and glory we lift the expectant eyes of our faith, for from Thee cometh our help. Even as with bending backs we toil in the valley we are grateful that the light of heaven falls upon our daily tasks and that in the beauty of common things we may partake of the holy sacrament of Thy presence.

In these days when searing hate has done so much to blacken the good earth, we thank Thee for men and women of good will, under all skies, the saving salt of a tortured world, upon whose integrity of character and upon whose understanding sympathy with other nations and races the hopes of tomorrow's world rest. Keep strong everywhere, we pray, all souls who try to maintain the uniting insights of human brotherhood. May we in this dear land of liberty be ministers of an abiding peace and true servants of the common good. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 13, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Mr. ANDERSON, of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Narcotics of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. ERVIN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of Elnore M. Shields to be postmaster at Grassrange, Mont., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Smith to be a commissioned rear admiral in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague for appointment to the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., for appointment to the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment in the Regular Army.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Regular Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, Department of State (S. Doc. No. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Department of State, in the amount of $2,500,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriations, Department of Labor (S. Doc. No. 63)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of Labor, in the amount of $1,350,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriations, Department of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $2,198,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, Independent Offices (S. Doc. No. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, and a proposed provision, for the fiscal year 1956, for the Independent Offices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, Office of Defense Mobilization (S. Doc. No. 65)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Office of Defense Mobilization, in the amount of $500,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, National Capital Planning Commission (S. Doc. No. 66)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the National Capital Planning Commission, in the amount of $57,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, Legislative Branch (S. Doc. No. 61)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Legislative branch, in the amount of $155,835, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Relief of Certain Members of Uniformed Services

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Audit Report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Preservation of Ford's Theater, Washington, D. C.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the most appropriate treatment necessary to preserve and interpret Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Code To Provide Compensatory Absence of Certain Coast Guard Military Personnel

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Smithsonian Institution

A letter from the acting secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Institution, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Appointments of Deputy Maritime Administrator

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under civil-service laws, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Yearly Estimate of Certain Expenses and Losses in Revenue by Post Office Department

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston of South Carolina and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide for construction of a new veterans hospital at Wood, Wis.

"Whereas the present Veterans Administration hospital and domiciliary facilities at Wood, Wis., includes 35 buildings built between 1867 and 1899, constituting more than one-half of the entire floor space; and

"Whereas these old buildings are obsolete, unsafe, and in constant need of repair and modernization; and

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill (H. R. 600) which would provide for (1) Construction of a new VA general hospital at Wood, (2) Conversion of present hospital buildings into domiciliary facilities, and (3) Abandonment of the antiquated and unsafe domiciliary buildings presently being used to house some of the 1,661 elder and disabled veterans living at Wood; and

"Whereas only 2 of 14 urgently needed improvement projects for the veterans facility at Wood have been programed for the fiscal year 1956 and 1957 by the Veterans Administration; and

"Whereas it appears that plans for improvement and major maintenance at Wood are delayed because of the possibility of the construction of a new replacement hospital; and

"Whereas the construction of a hospital as provided in bill H. R. 600 would obviate the need for piecemeal patching up of the antiquated buildings at Wood; and

"Whereas bill H. R. 600 has been referred to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which has asked the Veterans Administration to submit its recommendations on the bill: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring,* That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to act favorably on bill H. R. 600 in order to provide facilities which veterans urgently need and deserve; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Veterans Administration and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee are earnestly requested to recommend passage of bill H. R. 600; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress, to each Wisconsin Member thereof, to Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Harvey Higley, Veterans Administrator, and to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"W. R. KRAMLER,
"*President of the Senate.*
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*
"MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

A resolution adopted by the Department of Massachusetts AMVETS of World War II, favoring an investigation of boxing and the operations of the International Boxing Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress relative to the closing of the Gurnet Point Lifesaving Station

"Whereas the Coast Guard has for many years maintained a Coast Guard station at Gurnet Point in Plymouth; and

"Whereas many lives have been saved by the personnel stationed at this station; and

"Whereas the boating population is steadily increasing in this area; and

"Whereas this station was deactivated on May 29: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to take the necessary steps to cause the immediate reactivation of this important and necessary lifesaving medium; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States and all Members of Congress from this Commonwealth."

CHIROPRACTIC TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN PERSONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon Chiropractic Research Association, of Eugene, Oreg., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1768, to extend to persons entitled to receive medical care by or through the Veterans' Administration the right to elect to receive chiropractic treatment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON CHIROPRACTIC
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Eugene, Oreg., June 8, 1955.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The following resolution was passed on April 31, 1955:

"Whereas chiropractic care under the present administrative regulations is not being furnished by the Veterans' Administration;

"Whereas we feel that this deprives the veteran of an avenue of approach to his restoration of health in instances where chiropractic care is indicated; and

"Whereas this violates the veterans' freedom of choice in health methods: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Oregon Chiropractic Research Association duly assembled at McMinnville, Oreg., April 31, 1955, endorse, support, and urge passage of Senate bill 1768.

"Whereas a copy of this be spread upon the minutes and also be sent to our Senators and Representatives to enlist and urge their support."

Sincerely,

H. H. CAMERER, D. C.,
President.

CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four resolutions adopted by the Aluminum Workers International Union, local 165, East St. Louis, Ill.; lodge 1431 of the International Association of Machinists, of Corvallis, Oreg.; Crowfoot Grange 314, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lebanon, Oreg.; and the Willamette Democratic Society, of Willamette, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALUMINUM WORKERS
INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 165,
East St. Louis, Ill., July 8, 1955.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The high Hells Canyon Dam is necessary to complete one phase for the full development of the Columbia River program. The power to be so generated is vitally needed by the aluminum industry of the Northwest. Only through the additional power so generated can this industry continue to thrive and to meet foreign competition. Development and expansion of the existing industry is necessary in order to protect the jobs now held by aluminum workers and to create new ones. More firm power is a critical necessity upon which all this is based.

The Aluminum Workers International Union, local 165, of East St. Louis, Ill., goes on record as favoring the immediate authorization and construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WEBER,
President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS, LODGE NO. 1431,
Corvallis, Oreg.

Attention Mr. NEUBERGER:

This is to advise you that our lodge 1431, of Corvallis, Oreg., after discussing the Hells Canyon on the Snake River with deep concern are overwhelmingly in favor of supporting the Senate bill 1333 authorizing the construction of the high dam by the Federal Government. We would like you to support this bill.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST JOHNSON,
Recording Secretary.

CROWFOOT GRANGE NO. 314,
Lebanon, Oreg.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Whereas the Oregon State Grange and our subordinate grange, Crowfoot No. 314, have repeatedly announced their support of a Federal-built dam in Hells Canyon, and their opposition to the partnership plan; and

Whereas, our Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, have worked hard to carry out the known wishes of the grange in these matters, often in the face of hostile conquest; therefore be it

Resolved by Crowfoot Grange No. 314, Patrons of Husbandry, that we do appreciate and uphold our Senators, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, for their efforts in behalf of a Federal Hells Canyon Dam, and against the partnership plan, and that the Secretary of Crowfoot Grange be instructed to transmit this resolution to each of our Senators, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN.

HOWARD CROCKETT,
Master.
(Mrs.) RUBY MILES,
Secretary.

Whereas the Willamette Democratic Society is ever mindful of the Northwest needs for vast new hydroelectric power facilities for industrial expansion and development; and

Whereas the Willamette Democratic Society is informed that opponents of public power in an attempt to justify low dams by private power companies on the Snake River, which would ruin the Hells Canyon site with consequent loss of hydroelectric potential of the Northwest are now contending that projects across the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers would produce benefits equal to a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas this organization is solidly of the opinion that such substitute dams would irreparably damage the greatest salmon spawning grounds of the Columbia River system and the salmon fishing industry; and

Whereas this society is opposed to the granting by the Federal Power Commission to private power companies the right to construct low dams on the Snake River that would in any manner interfere with or render impracticable the construction of a high dam at Hell's Canyon, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Willamette Democratic Society goes on record as being in full accord with S. 1333 sponsored by 28 United States Senators in addition to our Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, authorizing the United States Bureau of Reclamation to build the high hydroelectric dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River as recommended in the 308 Report of the Army Engineers and similar legislation sponsored by our own Congresswoman, EDITH GREEN, in the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately mailed by the Secretary to each Oregon member of the United States Congress.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Willamette Democratic Society held this 28th day of June, 1955.

MIKE M. DECICCO,
President.

Attest:

EMERY V. INGHAM,
Secretary.

MAXIMUM WAGE SCALES AND WORKING CONDITIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of House bill 5734, providing maximum wage scales, maximum working conditions and maximum manning scales for seagoing personnel in the subsidized American-flag ships.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Democrat from North Carolina, has introduce H. R. 5734, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; and

Whereas this bill has for its purpose to establish maximum wage scales, maximum working conditions and maximum manning scales for seagoing personnel in the subsidized American-flag ships; and

Whereas this in effect will nullify the collective bargaining rights of American seamen and will eventually be extended to American shipyard workers who build and repair subsidized ships; and

Whereas we have been informed that this has been promoted by certain shipping companies for the purpose of taking away the fundamental right granted by the United States Government to all American workers to bargain collectively: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record condemning this proposed piece of legislation to enslave the American seamen and take away their collective bargaining rights and eventually put the American seamen back under the slave conditions that existed years ago before the seamen were recognized; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon all metal trades departments, all labor councils, all State federations of labor, and upon the American Federation of Labor and President Meany to give full and complete support in our fight to eliminate this vicious piece of legislation; and be it also

Resolved, That all agents of the Sailors Union of the Pacific be instructed to take this resolution to the various labor bodies of the A. F. of L. in their vicinity and also to notify the Congressmen in various States of the position of the Sailors Union of the Pacific; and be it finally

Resolved, That the sailors delegate be instructed to bring this to the SIU convention in Canada.

Respectfully,

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF
PORTLAND AND VICINITY,
GUST ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

INVESTIGATION OF PRIVATE UTILITY PRACTICES—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Washington Public Utility Districts' Association, relating to an investigation of private utility practices.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSOCIATION

INVESTIGATION OF PRIVATE UTILITY PRACTICES

Whereas a number of PUD's, municipalities, and cooperatives are being subjected to increasing attack from private electric systems of the EBASCo group; and

Whereas these attacks are being financed by the diversion of electric revenues from consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our recommendation that Congress conduct a searching investigation of private electric utility practices including the attacks upon consumer-owned electric systems.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr. (Rept. No. 858); and

S. 1584. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner (Rept. No. 859).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 4808. A bill to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 857).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 65. A bill to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska (Rept. No. 860); and

H. R. 6331. A bill authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights (Rept. No. 861).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 6059. A bill relating to revisions of the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946 (Rept. No. 862).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. Res. 121. Resolution to investigate the effect of imports of textiles from Japan upon the domestic textile industry (Rept. No. 863).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 2406. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (Rept. No. 864).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 2427. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency (Rept. No. 865).

By. Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2428. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 866).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 985. A bill to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 867).

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 3253. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations; with amendments (Rept. No. 871).

ARMY PERSONNEL ACTIONS RELATING TO IRVING PERESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 856)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I should like to read a statement with respect to the submission of the subcommittee report on Army Personnel Actions Relating to Irving Peress.

The statement of the distinguished Senator reads as follows:

I have filed today with the Senate, the report which the Senate Permanent Subcommittee has made to the Committee on Government Operations concerning the investigation of Army personnel actions relating to Maj. Irving Peress, who after invoking the fifth amendment before the subcommittee was honorably discharged from the Army.

As set forth in the conclusions of this detailed and documented report, Irving Peress' promotion, change of orders, and honorable discharge, were the result of a combination of factors: Individuals errors in judgment; lack of proper coordination; ineffective administration procedures; inconsistent application of investigating regulations; and excessive delays.

As shown in the report, the Army committed some 48 errors of more than minor importance. Although some of these errors have been corrected, the subcommittee feels that additional corrective action should be taken. To that end, it has made recommendations concerning Army Intelligence, the Inspector General's Office, and the Army Personnel Board, which will contribute to improved efficiency in those areas thereby permitting the Army to more properly carry out its responsibilities.

With the filing of this report, the investigation of the Peress matter by the subcommittee is concluded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with the Senator's statement, I should like to say that the accuracy of the detailed report of the committee is a credit and a tribute to the staff of the committee, especially the chief of staff, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy. He did a superb job on the report. It is impossible to read it without getting a fairly clear picture of complete incompetence and ineptness, and of the unnecessary redtape and delay involved to get rid of this fifth-amendment Communist.

Mr. Kennedy should be accorded a real vote of thanks of the Senate for the superb job he did.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his praise of the committee staff and its chief counsel. I know that he, as a member of the committee, will agree that not only is the staff, under the leadership of Mr. Kennedy, functioning well in this instance, but is functioning well on the other cases which have come before the committee.

I submit the report, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed, with illustrations, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT OF 1955—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 869), together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PROPOSED MENTAL HEALTH STUDY ACT OF 1955—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 256) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 870) thereon, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT BY UNITED NATIONS OF PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING AND RELEASING RADIOLOGICAL INFORMATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably an original resolution (S. Res. 134) relative to the United Nations establishing a procedure for collecting and releasing radiological information, and submitted a report (No. 868) thereon, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Whereas various nations are setting off an increasing number of nuclear explosions; and

Whereas the number of such explosions is more likely to increase than decrease in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas it has been established that the radioactivity released as a result of such explosions can have serious deleterious effects, from an immediate and long-range standpoint, on human beings and other living organisms; and

Whereas existing knowledge of the effects of such explosions on living organisms is very incomplete: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate endorses efforts of our chief delegate to the United Nations to take appropriate steps to work to establish within the United Nations procedures to receive, assemble, and report on radiological information collected by the various States with particular emphasis on radiation effects on human health and safety.

CITATION OF EUGENE C. JAMES FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably an original resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Eugene C. James may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law and I submit a report (No. 872) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Eugene C. James to answer a series of questions and to produce documents and records before the said committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, so the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Eugene C. James may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2544. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Albert M. Jones, United States Army, retired, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2545. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 2546. A bill for the relief of Ali Dawud Abu Ghannam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Bridges, and Mr. Cotton):

S. 2547. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2548. A bill to exempt shipments of livestock from the tax on transportation of property; and

S. 2549. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on household type equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Douglas):

S. 2550. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2551. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2552. A bill amending section 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, relating to the privilege of the members of the Commission on Atomic Energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2553. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mrs. Smith of Maine):

S. 2554. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit children adopted by United States citizens to be naturalized in certain cases without satisfying the residence and physical presence requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2555. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument in the city of Decatur, Ill., to the memory of, and in honor of, the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REEMPHASIZING TRADE DEVELOPMENT AS PRIMARY PURPOSE OF TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Holland, Mr. Scott, Mr. Young, Mr. Schoeppel, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Thye, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Clements) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2253) to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR STUDY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That section 2 of Senate Resolution 36 of the 84th Congress, agreed to February 4, 1955, extending the time for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations on technical assistance and related programs, is amended by striking out "$52,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$67,000" and by striking out "$24,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$39,000."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him before the Colgate University Seventh Annual Foreign Policy Conference on July 11, 1955.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statement prepared by him on the death of John Gregg Utterback, a former Representative from Maine.

By Mr. HILL:

Address on the subject Building the Nation's Health From the Ground Up, delivered by him before the Alabama Association of County Agricultural Agents, in Birmingham, Ala., on June 24, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, July 21, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Herbert P. Sorg, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS—RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL S. 633

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate action a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill S. 633, for the relief of certain alien sheepherders. The bill as it passed the Congress provided for the granting of permanent residence in the United States to seven alien sheepherders. Information has come to the committee, since the bill passed, that one of the alien sheepherders has returned to Spain, and further investigation is necessary in his case. We had not received that information before. It is therefore necessary that the bill be returned in order to strike out the name of Rufino Merino Jimenez, so that the necessary further investigation may be conducted. The amendment will not affect the bill in any other way.

Mr. President, unless the bill is returned and Jimenez's name is stricken, the President will have to veto the whole bill, and the cases of the six other persons mentioned in the bill are meritorious. The resolution is submitted to prevent delay in the relief of the other six alien sheepherders.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), submitted by Mr. KILGORE, was read, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; that if and when returned the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President of the Senate pro tempore in signing the said bill be, and the same is hereby, rescinded; and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike the name "Rufino Merino Jimenez".

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object to this request, but I believe that in the orderly procedure of the Senate, it would be helpful if such a matter were first discussed with the majority and the minority leaders, because it might involve a situation where we would at least feel some clearances were necessary with the ranking minority members of the particular committee having jurisdiction. I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that because the President is preparing to leave the country, there may be some necessity for prompt action. Otherwise, I would have been constrained to object until I could have had opportunity to do the clearing which is the normal procedure in the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to say to the Senator from California, the minority leader, that the resolution had to be presented very hastily, for the reason that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who introduced the bill, did not himself know that Jimenez had returned to Spain. The Immigration Service did not know it. The State Department did not know it. That fact was discovered only yesterday evening. We knew we would have to give that information to the President, and that he would veto the bill, because it would give to a nonresident alien certain rights in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the only purpose of the concurrent resolution is to get the bill back and strike out the one name?

Mr. KILGORE. The only purpose is to strike out that one name.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend from West Virginia that what the minority leader has said is what I would have said if I had heard the request made. When the Senator from West Virginia presented his request I was engaged in a private discussion of another matter. Should there be any need for a similar request hereafter, I hope that the Senator from West Virginia will advise us in advance. It takes only a few moments to get such matters cleared on each side of the aisle. Not only in the interest of orderly procedure, but in the interest of conservation of time, it is important because of the necessity to formulate the Senate's program, that we know in advance that this type of proposal is to be submitted.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I have made such a request but once, and it is made in an emergency because of the imminent departure of the President. This procedure is being followed rather than having the bill returned with the President's veto, and being faced with the necessity of again getting the bill through both Houses. I will say to the acting majority leader I shall always confer with both sides on such matters, as I have done previously, but the information that one of the beneficiaries of the bill had returned to Spain reached me only last night. This morning I drafted the resolution and submitted it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure the Senator from West Virginia that the procedure he is following is a little different from the normal procedure he follows in discussing matters with the acting majority leader and the minority leader, when the program for a particular day is being discussed. I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I submitted a concurrent resolution, which was agreed to, and which called for the return from the office of the President of the United States of Senate bill 633, for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, which bill had been passed. The bill was hastily drawn up, and there had not been time to make an adequate check.

It has now been discovered that the bill has not yet reached the office of the President. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the action taken by the Senate in adopting Senate concurrent resolution 48 be rescinded, and that the resolution be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I now submit the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), was read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, to make the following change, namely: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "Rufino Merino Jimenez" and the comma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—let me say that, as I understand, the submission of this resolution is based on the fact that the bill to which it relates has not reached the White House; and the intention is to strike from the bill the name of one person, who it has been found is no longer in the United States, but presumably has returned to his native country.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. At the time when the other resolution was submitted, we understood that the bill had reached the White House. But now we find that did not happen, and that we can straighten out the difficulty without disturbing the functioning at the White House. That is why I have had the Senate rescind its action in adopting the other resolution, and why I request that this resolution be considered at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection, but I respectfully suggest that if Members who have matters of this kind will bring them in advance to the attention of the majority and minority leaders, some difficulty and inconvenience may be avoided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) was considered and agreed to.

WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, because I wish to associate myself with the observations contained in the article, as though I were making a speech on the same subject, an article entitled "The Raid on Our Wildlife Refuges," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Raid on Our Wildlife Refuges

(With stockmen and oilmen avid to break in, Interior Department is studying which refuges to abandon; Secretary McKay could do it with a stroke of the pen; and 3 of 5 regional Fish and Wildlife directors favor forfeitures to States.)

ARTHUR H. CARHART, AUTHOR, WATER OR YOUR LIFE, IN SPORTS AFIELD

By merely signing a typewritten order, one man can wipe out great national wildlife refuges. In the same way, he may open the gate to oil drillers, stockmen, rocket shooters, or others who would overrun them. This appointed official can take such action without hearings, advance public notice or discussion. Who is the man with such life—and death—power over our Federal wildlife refuge system? He's Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, ex-governor.

At least 40 refuges appear to be in immediate jeopardy. The first solid step of what appears to be a plotted course is an official memorandum signed on March 31 last year by Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis and Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor. The memo established a five-man "survey team" to overhaul the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interior Department agency that supervises the Federal refuge system.

Where the antelope play

On June 2, last year, "after 6 weeks of intensive study and investigation," the team reported. There's no question of the integrity and good intentions of the men in that group. But the fuse that can blow the main demolition charge is this statement by the team: "There are certain existing refuges the continued maintenance of which under Federal control seems of doubtful value."

That gave Interior the springboard to make the next jump. Early this year, a directive went out to the regional directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service to "study" refuges, with a plain suggestion of abandoning any "of doubtful value."

That "survey team" may or may not have known that 3 of the 5 regional directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service already, either by act or statement, have shown positively their inclination to move out of large Federal wildlife refuges and let other interests take over.

The Sheldon Refuge in Nevada was one of the first areas to be dedicated to protecting vanishing wildlife.

Nearby Hart Mountain in southeastern Oregon was made into a refuge because many of the antelope move back and forth between it and the Sheldon, finding good kidding grounds and summer range. In 1919 some 200 antelopes were counted; now there are 6,000 to 7,000 head using the 2 refuges.

These 2 refugees are in region 1 of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Regional director is Leo J. Laythe. He said frankly he was inclined "to turn them over to the States for management."

If you know the pattern of western States' politics you realize how stockmen dominate the scene. After 20 years of range and wildlife management, the Sheldon and Hart Mountain areas look like a cow paradise to stockmen.

Last step to surrender

The forage has come back since overloading ended; your money and mine has built excellent watering places. It would be slick to have this area subject to local politics and pressures.

Men who know how State lands have been handled in the past figure that "turning the refuges over to the States for management" would just be one in a series of steps toward a surrender to grazing interests which even the best-intentioned department couldn't ward off.

In Nevada a driving campaign is on to get the Federals out of the Sheldon range. Are stockmen behind this?

I have indicated only a few of the refuges that are in jeopardy. They set the overall pattern of what appears to be a general movement to dismember our national game refuges.

There are whisperings that the National Bison Range in western Montana, the National Elk Refuge in Jackson Hole, Wyo., the Sullys Hill Refuge in North Dakota are likely to be classed as of doubtful value in the Federal wildlife lands.

In Oregon and northern California, there's a hell-roaring campaign to wipe out the last of that most vital key area in the Pacific coast flyway—the Klamath and Tule Lake Refuges.

A policy of sellout?

If this area is blotted out as a wildlife sanctuary, the center is knocked out of the whole Pacific flyway—no less.

On other refuges oil interests have tried to get in to drill. An order that would have allowed this reportedly got as far as the desk of Secretary of the Interior McKay.

This move became public knowledge. Protests were made. As this is written, the order is believed to be on that desk, perhaps cooling off and ready for action later.

There's enough evidence on this issue for sportsmen and conservationists over the Nation to demand that the Secretary of the Interior define his policy on our national wildlife refuges.

Is there or isn't there a sellout shaping up for wildlife?

THE RESIGNATION OF MRS. HOBBY AS SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an exchange of letters between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the President of the United States dealing with the resignation, effective August 1, of Mrs. Hobby, and the President's reply.

Mrs. Hobby has had a long and distinguished career, not only in newspaper publishing but also as head of the WAAC organization during the war and as the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mrs. Hobby's Letter to the President

Dear Mr. President: Personal reasons of a high order compel me to take leave of my post as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Only such reasons could persuade me to leave your administration or the responsibilities of the Department, and if agreeable, I would like to make August 1 the effective date of my resignation.

The period of 30 months which I have spent in Government in your administration has been a richly rewarding experience, for public service provides the greatest compensation of all—the satisfaction of working for the betterment of mankind. I am grateful to have had such an opportunity and have deep regrets in relinquishing it now, no matter how compelling are my reasons for doing so.

The privilege has been all the more rewarding to me because I have had the unique opportunity of being associated with a man whose life has been devoted to his country, and whose principles of individual liberty and human freedom are the highest expression of what we in the United States cherish for our Nation and for people everywhere.

Your concern for the health, education, and welfare of the American people has been an inspiration to all of us who have had the privilege of serving under your dedicated leadership.

Wherever I am, I shall hope to further the ideals and principles to which you have given meaning and emphasis.

May God bless you and give you courage and strength as you continue to serve us.

Faithfully yours,

Oveta Culp Hobby.

The President's Letter to Mrs. Hobby

Dear Oveta: This is one of the hardest letters I have ever had to write.

For months, since you first discussed them with me, I have recognized that personal obligations and responsibilities might make your resignation as Secretary an inescapable decision. I now have no alternative than to accept it, effective August 1. But I and all who know you as a dedicated, inspired American leader will miss your voice and counsel in Government.

Twice in little more than a decade you have earned the thanks and respect of your fellow citizens. Few—men or women—have brought to heavy tasks and critical challenges such great spirit, integrity, and vision or such readiness to spend energy and high talent in the country's service.

Under your command in the Second World War, the Women's Army Corps opened a new field of service for American women. From the very outset of its organization they demonstrated their value and capacity in the most trying circumstances. More than a hundred thousand women, led by you, proved themselves, in their devotion to duty and in their contribution to victory, worthy comrades of our fighting men.

In this administration, as the first Secretary of the newly created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, you organized into an integrated program many units and agencies of Government. Great qualities of leadership were essential. You brought them to your mission along with a perseverance, a wise patience, a deep understanding of the personal problems of our people, and a dedication that difficulties could not shake. You made the heart in Government a visible fact and an effective influence.

We are still too close to the beginnings of the new Department to see fully and in a wide perspective all that you have accomplished. But I know that history will hail you in this field, too, as a courageous pioneer in the service of your country.

In official Washington, many thousands as well as I will miss you. On the personal side, none will miss you more than Mrs. Eisenhower and myself. But all of us know that wherever you go, whatever you do, every talent you have will be at work for the good of America.

With affectionate regard to you and Governor Hobby,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

HOPE FOR THE SATELLITES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is not likely that the forthcoming conference in Geneva will concern itself specifically with the future of the enslaved satellites of the Soviet power, except for the case of Eastern Germany, whose future is inseparable from that of Western Germany. The future of the latter country will be very much under discussion.

The first thing to be sure of is that we do not, whether directly or by implication, accept the enforced slavery of the satellites as an accepted fact. It is a present fact, but its acceptance by us is not within our purpose and policy. It is indeed not a permanent fact. This modern slavery, like the older one which was done away with in our country, is uneconomical. It will be found, it is being found, that free men working freely contribute more to the well-being of neighbors as well as to their own well-being than the most skillfully managed body of slaves can ever do.

Over 2 years ago the President set forth these principles to the Association of Newspaper Editors:

> The way chosen by the United States was plainly marked by a few clear precepts which govern its conduct in world affairs.
>
> First. No people on earth can be held—as a people—to be an enemy, for all humanity shares the common hunger for peace and fellowship and justice.
>
> Second. No nation's security and well-being can be lastingly achieved in isolation, but only in effective cooperation with fellow-nations.
>
> Third. Any nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable.
>
> Fourth. Any nation's attempt to dictate to other nations their form of government is indefensible.
>
> Fifth. A nation's hope of lasting peace cannot be firmly based upon any race in armaments, but rather upon just relations and honest understanding with all other nations.

Those judgments are still valid, and will still hold, regardless of whatever turn the negotiations at Geneva may take.

Progress toward universal, complete, controlled disarmament does away with any strategic need for a ring of satellites about the Soviet center. If there is to be no invasion, there is needed no territory to absorb attack from the West. If there is to be no attack by the East, there is needed no springboard of satellites for launching that attack.

The progress of common sense in the Soviet mind will be in the direction of substituting free institutions of high productivity for a slave economy increasingly difficult to control and increasingly inefficient in practical results.

Meanwhile, whether at Geneva or elsewhere, when the Soviet rulers raise the question of "tensions," why not tell them the truth? There were no tensions until they began enslaving peoples, while at the same time Western nations were setting their peoples free.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RESTORATION OF SOVEREIGN RIGHTS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT TO ENSLAVED PEOPLES OF EUROPE AND ASIA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 862, Senate Resolution 127, favoring the restoration of sovereign rights of self-government to enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which, with the preamble, is as follows:

> Whereas millions of people in Europe and Asia are living in subjection to a totalitarian imperialism; and
>
> Whereas the domination of free peoples by an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own; and
>
> Whereas the people of the United States cherish a heritage and tradition of freedom and self-determination; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress give expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Senate proclaim the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on the request of agreeing to the pending resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I rise to urge approval by the Senate of Senate resolution 127.

Senate resolution 127 proclaims the hope of the Senate that those peoples in Europe and Asia who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall soon again enjoy the right to determine the form of government under which they shall live. This resolution, submitted by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Wisconson [Mr. WILEY], was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 12 and 13, and the committee, by a vote of 14 to 0, recommended that the Senate approve it. The resolution has the support of the Department of State.

The reasons for the committee action and the State Department letter supporting the resolution are set forth in the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the report which has been printed and is on the desk of every Senator be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 854) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration Senate Resolution 127, favoring restoration of sovereign rights of self-government to enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia, report the resolution favorably to the Senate and recommend that it do pass.
>
> COMMITTEE ACTION
>
> The committee had before it two related resolutions, both of which had been introduced on July 11, 1955—Senate Resolution 126, introduced by Senator MCCARTHY, and Senate Resolution 127, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND (together with Senators CLEMENTS, GEORGE, and WILEY).
>
> On July 13, Senator MCCARTHY appeared in executive session and urged adoption of Senate Resolution 126, which related to the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from certain Communist-dominated governments. The committee considered the resolution carefully and on July 13 voted, 13 to 0 to table it.
>
> On July 12 Senator KNOWLAND testified in executive session in support of Senate Resolution 127. The committee considered this also carefully and on July 13 voted 14 to 0 to report it favorably to the Senate.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION

"Whereas millions of people in Europe and Asia are living in subjection to a totalitarian imperialism; and

"Whereas the domination of free peoples by an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own; and

"Whereas the people of the United States cherish a heritage and tradition of freedom and self-determination; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress give expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Senate proclaim the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live; and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter."

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

It is the purpose of this resolution to reaffirm Senate support of one of the fundamental principles contained in the Atlantic Charter of 1941. That document proclaimed "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." This resolution expresses the sense of the Senate and does not call for any particular action on the part of the United States Government.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH SUPPORT

The Department of State supported favorable action on Senate Resolution 127 in the following letter from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton addressed to Senator George.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 12, 1955.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In response to your request for the comments of the Department of State on Senate Resolution 127 concerning the captive peoples in Europe and Asia, the text of which is enclosed, I take pleasure in advising that the substance of that resolution is consistent with the position which has frequently been set forth by the President and the Secretary of State and, accordingly, the Department perceives no objection thereto from the standpoint of foreign policy.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On numerous occasions in the past the Senate has gone on record with respect to the situation of peoples subjected to alien despotism against their will. This past action has been in recognition of the fact that the people of this Nation have long cherished a tradition and heritage of freedom. They deplore the existence of conditions in the world which have interfered, temporarily, with the right of peoples to determine for themselves the form of government under which they will live. The committee does not believe that the continued subjection of formerly independent peoples to the domination of alien despotism is conducive to world peace.

The President of the United States has sought to promote conditions in the world which will encourage the expectations of captive peoples that they will not be held in bondage forever. The committee supports the President in these endeavors and expresses the hope that these peoples may soon be able to choose the form of government under which they will live.

The committee believes the resolution is desirable, because it will remind captive peoples, as well as the peoples of free nations, that man's aspiration toward self-government, although thwarted from time to time by forces not subject to his immediate control, cannot be denied forever. It recommends favorable action on this resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it is particularly appropriate that the United States Senate should express its views at this time on this important subject. Our long heritage of freedom, our experience in developing self-government in this Nation, and our abiding interest in the expansion of the freedom of man throughout the world, lends weight to this expression.

It should not be necessary, Mr. President, for the Senate to give expression to the desire of peoples to control their own destiny. It would not be necessary were it not for the fact that large areas of the world have been subjected in recent years to the control of alien despotism. The peoples in those areas yearn for their freedom. Their continued oppression is one of the main sources of tension in the world. Not being free to govern themselves, these peoples—or I should rather say their despotic governments—are a constant threat to peace, and if peace is breached even in a small way, there is danger of a world conflagration.

It was at Sarajevo more than 40 years ago that we saw the desire of a people to be free give rise to the murder of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. That act expressed one of the underlying tensions that led to the holocaust of World War I.

As long as peoples who desire to be free are oppressed by despotism of foreign origin, they will seek freedom. The answer to these dangers, which will continue as long as men are dominated by foreign oppressors, is not more oppression, but more freedom.

The resolution now before us recognizes that fact. It reaffirms one of the fundamental declarations of the Atlantic Charter—"the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." It reaffirms the hope of the signers of the Atlantic Charter to see "sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. President, this resolution expresses the sense of the Senate. It does not call upon the President to take specific action. It does, however, express the fundamental sympathy of the American people for the oppressed peoples of this earth. The resolution should serve as a message to them that their freedom will always be a matter of the deepest concern to us, and that we cannot acquiesce to their continued subjugation.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will unanimously record its support of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate Resolution 127, which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, this resolution, I believe, is in conformity with the pledges of both the great national political parties, that we, the United States, would not lose interest in, but would continue to have a deep concern for the peoples behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, we would be equally concerned about any other form of tyranny which might arise in the world, be it Nazi or Fascist, which would destroy the independence and freedom of nations which theretofore had been independent and free. But, Mr. President, there is only one tyrannical totalitarian government loose in the world today, and that is the Soviet Union, which has violated its agreements and has subjugated once-free peoples. So far as the age of history through which we are now passing is concerned, that totalitarian government is the Soviet Union. No man knows what the future may hold in store, but should some other form of tyranny ever arise which would subjugate free neighboring countries, I take it that, true to their historical policy, the people of the United States and the Government of the United States would not fail to hold out the hope of ultimate freedom for peoples who would find themselves behind another iron curtain, as we now hold out hope to the people of Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and the satellite states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and other nations in Europe or Asia that have been subjected to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

I believe our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support, and what retards it we should oppose. I believe this resolution is in conformity with our policy ever since our own Declaration of Independence was proclaimed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the body of the RECORD the American Declaration of Independence which I think basically is the foundation of our foreign policy and is a document which should be constantly held up to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain so that they, who are temporarily enslaved, may never lose the hope that one day they may be free.

There being no objection, the Declaration of Independence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN CONGRESS
JULY 4, 1776

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE 13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fal themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections among us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every Stage of these Oppressions We have petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind. Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

WE, THEREFORE, the REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN GENERAL CONGRESS, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly PUBLISH and DECLARE, that these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which INDEPENDENT STATES may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

(The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members:)

JOHN HANCOCK.

New Hampshire: Josiah Bartlett, Wm. Whipple, Matthew Thornton.

Massachusetts Bay: Saml. Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry.

Rhode Island, etc.: Step. Hopkins, William Ellery.

Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Sam'el Huntington, Wm. Williams, Oliver Wolcott.

New York: Wm. Floyd, Phil. Livingston, Frans. Lewis, Lewis Morris.

New Jersey: Richd. Stockton, Jno. Witherspoon, Fras. Hopkinson, John Hart, Abra Clark.

Pennsylvania: Robt. Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benja. Franklin, John Morton, Geo. Clymer, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, James Wilson, Geo. Ross.

Delaware: Caesar Rodney, Geo. Read, Tho M'Kean.

Maryland: Samuel Chase, Wm. Paca, Thos. Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Th Jefferson, Benja. Harrison, Thos. Nelson, jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton.

North Carolina: Wm. Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn.

South Carolina: Edward Rutledge, Thos. Heyward, junr., Thomas Lynch, junr., Arthur Middleton.

Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, Geo. Walton.

Resolved, That copies of the Declaration be sent to the several assemblies, conventions, and committees or councils of safety, and to the several commanding officers of the Continental Troops: That it be PROCLAIMED in each of the UNITED STATES, and at the HEAD of the ARMY. [Jour. Cong., vol. 1, p. 396.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator for his success in doing what I was unable to do 3 weeks ago. I think the resolution undoubtedly will be adopted and should be adopted. It will no doubt undo much of the damage that was done by the rejection of my resolution, which was along similar lines except couched in stronger terms.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. Gore and Mr. Kefauver] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] is absent on official business for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Malone] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Malone] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Curtis
Daniel
Dirksen
Douglas
Duff
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright
George
Goldwater
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Ives
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Potter
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Williams
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Gore
Jenner
Johnson, Tex.
Kefauver
Malone
McClellan
Wiley

So the resolution (S. Res. 127) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

OPPOSITION TO COLONIALISM AND COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 863, House Concurrent Resolution 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bible in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 149) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "influence", to strike out "through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations", so as to make the concurrent resolution, with the preamble, read:

> Whereas Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man; and
>
> Whereas the people of the United States have traditionally supported other peoples in their aspirations to achieve self-government or independence and in their struggle against tyranny or domination: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations, House Concurrent Resolution 149 expresses the sense of the Congress that "the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."

It is apparent at once that this is good American doctrine. Indeed, the sentiments expressed by the resolution are so obviously in accordance with our traditional policies that the question can well be asked as to why they should be restated.

The answer is that our position is unfortunately not so clear to the rest of the world as it is to us here in the United States.

Because of our North Atlantic Treaty alliance with the traditional colonial powers of Europe, we have been tarred with a kind of colonial guilt-by-association in many parts of the world. The Communists busily seek to promote the impression in Asia and Africa that the United States is an imperialist power. The fact is, of course, that the worst imperialism on the face of the earth is centered in Moscow.

The Bandung Conference last April showed that many of our friends in Africa and Asia recognize this fact. A clear restatement of the American position, as embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 149, will strengthen our friends in those areas in their own efforts to combat hostile Communist propaganda.

The pending resolution was introduced in the House May 21, 1955, by the majority leader, Representative John W. McCormack. It passed the House June 23 by a vote of 367 to 0. On yesterday, the Foreign Relations Committee heard testimony from Mr. McCormack, and then considered the resolution at some length in executive session. The concurrent resolution was favorably reported by a vote of 13 to 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee on House Concurrent Resolution 149 be printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 855) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 149) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism reports the concurrent resolution favorably with an amendment and recommends that it do pass.
>
> ### 1. MAIN PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION
>
> The main purpose of the resolution is to restate the traditional policy of the United States in support of the efforts of other peoples "to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."
>
> ### 2. BACKGROUND AND COMMITTEE ACTION
>
> The concurrent resolution was introduced in the House May 21, 1955, by Representative John W. McCormack and was passed by the House June 23 by a vote of 367 to 0.
>
> On July 13, the Committee on Foreign Relations heard testimony from Representative McCormack and considered the resolution in executive session. The committee agreed to an amendment to delete the reference to membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations, and then ordered the resolution favorably reported by a vote of 13 to 1.
>
> As it passed the House, the resolution expressed the sense of Congress that "the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence *through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations* so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."
>
> The committee amendment deleted the phrase in italics in the foregoing paragraph.
>
> The effect of the amendment is to express the sense that American influence to the stated ends should be exercised generally and not solely or particularly through the United Nations and other international organizations. The committee felt that it was preferable to couch the resolution in general terms so as not to give special emphasis to any particular means of accomplishing the objective which is sought.
>
> ### 3. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE RESOLUTION
>
> The resolution does no more than restate the traditional foreign policy of the United States, a country which itself emerged from colonial status to "assume an equal station among the free nations of the world" only after a long and difficult war. The United States quickly recognized the independence of the Latin American Republics when those nations severed their ties with Europe. Moreover, our Government was directly responsible for the independence of Cuba and the Philippines, and has played a role in establishing the independence of such other nations as Panama, Indonesia, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Libya.
>
> In the Pacific Charter of September 8, 1954, the United States joined seven Asian

> and European nations in declaring that "they * * * will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities."
>
> Further, in the Mutual Security Act of 1955 it is declared to be the sense of Congress "that assistance under this act shall be administered so as to assist other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world and to fulfill their responsibilities for self-government or independence."
>
> The urge for independence, and the tide of anticolonial feeling which is now running in many parts of the world is as strong as that which swept the Western World in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and which in fact was sparked by the American Revolution. Communist propaganda, however, constantly attempts to create the impression that the United States is an imperialist power and that the only true anticolonial power is the Soviet Union. The truth, of course, is precisely the opposite, as is plainly demonstrated by the record of the United States in promoting independence and the record of the Soviet Union in subverting it.
>
> In the circumstances, therefore, it seems to the committee particularly appropriate at this time for the Congress to emphasize once again this traditional American policy. The resolution is, in essence, a reaffirmation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, a document which, it should be recalled, was described by Abraham Lincoln as meaning "liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world, for all future time."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as the concurrent resolution passed the House, it expressed the sense of Congress that the United States should exercise its influence to achieve the stated ends through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations. It seemed to the committee that this reference to the United Nations and other international organizations unduly limited the manner in which our influence should be used, and therefore the committee agreed to an amendment striking out this phrase. As explained in the committee report, the effect of this amendment is that the influence of the United States should be used generally, and not solely or particularly through the United Nations and other international organizations.

Mr. President, the whole history of the United States—and particularly our record in regard to Cuba and the Philippines—is eloquent affirmation that we practice what is preached in this resolution. In view of the situation in the colonial and formerly colonial areas of the world, however, a restatement of these principles should be helpful at this time, and I hope the Senate will give its overwhelming support to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the resolution open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, before the word "peoples", it is proposed to strike out the word "other" and, after the word "peoples", to insert "under alien despotisms."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not expect to detain the Senate long on a busy day like this, but I should like to have the attention of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators so that, if the Senate should adopt the pending resolution, it will do so with its eyes open, knowing exactly what the resolution proposes to do.

I should like to point out that Senate Resolution 127 was agreed to unanimously. I think it is a very splendid resolution, and points up our opposition to alien despotism, and our desire to help people under alien despotisms, whether they are to the right or to the left, to attain some form of independent self-government.

Let me call attention to what is proposed in the pending resolution:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

The resolution says nothing about alien despotisms. It says nothing about tyrannies. It says nothing about communism, fascism, nazism, or aggression. It says to every country in the world, "If you do not have self-government, if you are not enjoying the democratic process, if you are living in a country which is under the rule of a king or emperor or military dictator or sovereign who is not permitting you to have the right of franchise, the right of self-government, it has become our American foreign policy to support, if we can, incipient revolutionary governments, or to support such de facto governments as they arise."

I think that is going too far, because there exist, rightly or wrongly, some countries in South America, some countries in Europe, and some countries in Asia, which, unhappily, do not have self-government, countries in which people do not have the right of franchise, but which, happily, have alined themselves on our side in the present great global struggle against atheistic and aggressive communism.

My amendment would directly bring this House concurrent resolution into harmony with Senate Resolution 127, by including the words "so as to support the peoples under alien despotisms in their efforts to achieve self-government and independence."

I think that is as far as our foreign policy has ever gone. I believe we should keep our Senate resolutions in harmony with our foreign policy, unless we propose here and now to put the great power of the United States behind any little revolutionary movements which may develop in countries in which efforts are made to overthrow in their own area an autonomous government which is indigenous to them, but under which the people do not yet enjoy the full right of the franchise or of self-government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the preamble of the concurrent resolution. Although it is not strictly a part of the resolution, nevertheless I think it gives some of its background. The preamble reads as follows:

> Whereas millions of people in Europe and Asia are living in subjection to a totalitarian imperialism; and
>
> Whereas the domination of free peoples by an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own; and
>
> Whereas the people of the United States cherish a heritage and tradition of freedom and self-determination; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress give expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore be it.

The language stricken out by the Foreign Relations Committee was that shown in lines 4 and 5 of the resolution itself which would seem to limit the general policy to activity through the United Nations, whereas the committee felt that the general policy was one which historically the United States has followed.

I also invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that when the Spanish colonies in South America and Central America sought their independence, the United States was the first government which recognized all of them as being independent; and then we took the additional step, under President Monroe, of enunciating the Monroe Doctrine, which prevented the Old World powers from returning there and destroying the new-born nations. I think the United States has generally been interested in helping and encouraging the ultimate independence of nations.

I quite agree with the Senator from South Dakota that certainly it does no particular good for a nation to get out of the frying pan and into the fire. If such a nation were to throw off the yoke of a country which might be termed a colonial power, but which was trying to advance the country temporarily held as a colony to the point of ultimately having self-determination and independence, and if that country were to free itself from the so-called colonial power, and were immediately to be absorbed behind the Communist Iron Curtain, it would be far more closely held and unfortunately held than it might have been under the power which had been exercising temporary sovereignty over it.

Would not the Senator's problem be met if—rather than inserting the language he has suggested, which might tend to vitiate the resolution, as it was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 367 to 0, I believe—on page 2, after the word "assume," there were added the words "and maintain," so as to make that part of the concurrent resolution read, "assume and maintain an equal station."

In other words, in the case of the Philippines—to take an example, and I believe it to be one of the great examples for the other nations of the world—our entire policy was to train the Filipino people in administrative, educational, and municipal positions and in the work of the various other governmental units. In the later stages of our own sovereignty over the Philippines, we even had Filipinos as opposite numbers to the Americans who were occupying governmental positions there, so that at every governmental administrative desk, an American and a Filipino would be sitting on opposite sides and would discuss the problems which arose.

We promised that in 1946 the Filipinos would have their complete independence. A great many persons thought that because of the war, the date of Filipino independence should be delayed. But the Government of the United States had made its promise; and as an example to all the other nations of the world, we had set a fixed date. So regardless of the intervening events, we gave the Filipinos their complete freedom and complete independence; and at that time the Filipino people had been sufficiently trained so as not only to be able to obtain their independence, but also to be able to maintain it. In the last election in the Philippines, when President Magsaysay was elected, I think the Filipinos gave a clear demonstration that they had the foundation not only for gaining their independence, but also for maintaining it.

It seems to me that perhaps the amendment I have suggested might meet the situation, without at the same time giving the impression that we have no interest in ultimate freedom from the same type of colonialism from which we ourselves broke away. I also point out that when we did so, we had had the background of the Magna Carta and of the traditions of the Old World parliaments and of our own operations in State legislative bodies. So not only were we able to gain our independence, but we were also able to maintain it, after having gained it; and we did not become the victim of an even worse totalitarianism.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, let me point out that the change made by the committee was what finally activated me to suggest the amendment. I saw the language adopted by the House of Representatives, and it worried me at the time, because it seems to me this is a rather serious proclamation on foreign policy which can go a long way if we simply adopt the concurrent resolution as it now is written. When the committee changed the language, and deleted the words "exercise its influence through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations," and, instead, included language which is much more direct and much more meaningful—we amended the concurrent resolution so as to make it read, at that point:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence.

This, then, becomes a unilateral statement of American foreign policy.

Next I invite the attention of my friend, the Senator from California, to the fact that I do not quarrel with the use of the word "independence"; I would let that word remain in the concurrent resolution, but I would make it more important by having the language read, at that point, "peoples under alien despotisms to achieve self-government or independence."

As a matter of fact, I believe there is another way by which we can approach this matter; I have in mind an alternative. Of course in this instance we had to move rather quickly. I had to draft my amendment very quickly in order to get the floor before the vote was taken. If the Senator from California will turn to page 2, I should like him to consider an amendment I have in mind at that point. Perhaps he will agree with me that we can reach the common objective which I believe we have by means of the amendment I shall now indicate to him. I repeat that the concurrent resolution deals with a serious matter, and it is serious business for the Senate to adopt such a resolution, for this is the Senate of the United States, which is supposed to have an affirmative part to play in the foreign policy of the United States. I grant that the House of Representatives has adopted the concurrent resolution unanimously. I served for 10 years in the House of Representatives, and during that time I served on its Foreign Affairs Committee, where we cooked up a good many persuasive and sugar-coated resolutions, and whooped them through the House of Representatives, but the House as a whole did not pay much attention to them. It is the Senate that has special responsibilities in the area of foreign policy.

The Senate plays a definite part from that of the House regarding our foreign relations for, under the Constitution, the advice and consent of the Senate are required for the ratification of treaties. So it is that we should not simply shrug off our responsibility in the matter and act hastily in adopting resolutions of this sort.

Let me read the language again to the Senator from California. The concurrent resolution does not provide "that the United States should support other countries in their efforts to achieve self-government." Of course, that would be one thing. But, instead, the concurrent resolution uses the words "so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence."

In fact, Mr. President, that means that we propose to support other peoples, no matter where they may be—for instance, the people of Portugal, if they were to revolt against Salazar, or the people of Saudi Arabia, if they were to revolt against Ibn Saud or his successor. Certainly that is serious business.

In fact, Mr. President, I believe that the amendment I shall now propose might obviate the difficulty; and for the time being I would ignore the amendment I have already proposed, which I offered hastily, in order to obtain the floor and to have an opportunity to call other possible modifications to the attention of the Senate.

So I ask my colleagues to consider the following amendment: On page 1, beginning with the end of line 5, amend the concurrent resolution so as to make it read:

> So as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government and independence.

In other words, I propose that, on page 2, after the word "government", the word "or" be changed to "and", so as to make that part of the concurrent resolution read: "self-government and independence." That is what we really propose to do.

As now written, when it comes to stirring up revolts, or to holding up a beacon-light to restless peoples under local autonomies or kings or monarchies, under governments which are not self-governing, insofar as the peoples concerned are affected, the concurrent resolution says that the peoples shall have our support in obtaining self-government.

Do we want to divorce ourselves, by this resolution, from the friendly support we are now getting in the cold war from Portugal, from Spain, from Saudi Arabia, from some of the South American countries, and from certain countries in Asia? I do not think we do. If we were to strike out the word "or" and insert the word "and," I believe we would help make our meaning clear and avoid what I conceive to be pitfalls, certainly of a propaganda nature, and possibly of a very real nature, because in all those countries, in lands where they do not do the job by the ballot, as we do, but by the bullet, there are those who are out who would like to get in. We have trouble enough on the free side of the cold war without doing anything which might stir up and incite revolt among our friendly associates.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I invite attention to the fact that the principle which is being discussed here today has been discussed a great deal in the past year or two. I have attended a number of conferences. Among others was the conference in Manila last September which resulted in the Southeast Asia security pact, and also the so-called Pacific charter, by unanimous vote of seven nations, including both Asian and European nations. England, France, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines were all represented. The Pacific treaty, which was a product of that conference, and which we confirmed and ratified when we ratified the Southeast Asia pact, declared that these nations will earnestly strive, by every peaceful means, to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose people desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities.

Mr. MUNDT. In that instance there was used the word "and," which I propose to do in this instance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Personally I have no objection to the word "and," but I invite attention to the fact that the principle we are discussing was definitely endorsed by the Senate a short time ago when it ratified the southeast Asia pact.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Also, in the Mutual Security Act of this year, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that assistance under the act shall be administered so as to assist other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence, under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world and fulfill their responsibilities for self-government or independence.

I read from the report of the committee on the concurrent resolution the following language, which I can confirm as a result of my personal observations:

> The urge for independence, and the tide of anticolonial feeling which is now running in many parts of the world, is as strong as that which swept the Western World in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and which in fact was sparked by the American Revolution. Communist propaganda, however, constantly attempts to create the impression that the United States is an imperialist power and that the only true anticolonial power is the Soviet Union.

Communist propaganda has been trying to get away from what we are insisting upon. The Communists are saying, "We are doing all this."

In our discussion in committee yesterday, when the House leader, Mr. McCormack, was present, he explained that after the action by the House indicating our strong support of the principle of self-determination, freedom, and independence, we should be very careful about modifying, in a way which would be misunderstood, the expression contained in the concurrent resolution, which we thought was pretty well worded.

I am entirely sympathetic toward what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is trying to do in making our meaning perfectly clear. I see some of the dangers, to which he calls attention, but we must ally ourselves on the side of those countries which believe in freedom, independence, and self-determination for themselves and other peoples. That is one of the greatest keys to world peace today.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with that statement. My effort is to bring this concurrent resolution into harmony, first of all, with that intention; and secondly, with the "whereas" clauses. The "whereas" clauses are not a part of the resolution. They refer to Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism, which the language of the resolution itself gets away from entirely. We say that we propose to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government, which may mean a revolutionary effort against their established government. We might place ourselves on the side of some Communist revolutionaries, who always carry that kind of propaganda flag whenever they revolt against the established government, in Guatemala or elsewhere.

We want those people to be independent and free from foreign colonialism. We can approach the problem, as I say, by either of the amendments which I have suggested, one of which is probably simpler than the other. When I say "to support peoples under alien despotisms in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence," that is clear.

I think it is equally clear, and simpler, merely to change the word "or" in line 1 on page 2 to the word "and" and say, "to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government and independence."

That is different from trying to bring the focus of the foreign policy of the United States into play in the tricky old world in which we live to upset some established government which is not so democratic as we would like it to be and which is not self-governing at all.

With respect to some of those governments, we must admit that they are allowing us to use the Azores. They are allowing us to use airbases. They are cooperating with us because they share with us either an abomination or a fear of communism. I do not like to do anything which might strike a wedge between them and us in this particular era. We need more allies, not fewer. I should like to improve other governments and make them all as democratic as the State of South Dakota is, or as democratic as the United States is, but it will require time. I am not sure that we want to stir up any undue excitement abroad, or encourage some faction to seek to overthrow whatever government may be in control, with the hope that by gaining de facto recognition it can obtain arms and other forms of support from the U. S. A.

I should like to inquire of the Foreign Relations Committee members whether they would care to accept either of my suggestions, or some other similar suggestion which we might work out which would make our meaning crystal clear. That is all I am seeking to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the committee I was opposed to the concurrent resolution. I did not oppose its general purpose, but I thought the timing was bad. Also, I see the possibilities of misinterpretation by our friends, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out. However, regardless of my vote, the concurrent resolution was reported, and it is before the Senate.

I think the phrase "under alien despotism," if I understand it correctly, would have the result of limiting the effect of the concurrent resolution, in a sense. Is not that true?

Mr. MUNDT. It would limit it to a degree. It would say that we are presently proclaiming our support of efforts of the people within any country to throw off the yoke of alien despotism. It would not commit us at the moment, in writing, or by an official vote, to saying that we are supporting the efforts of people anywhere who are seeking to overthrow their existing government, merely because it is not one that we like. We would not be offering a bonus for revolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think I agree with what the Senator is saying. It was stated in committee that the last phrase "under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world" was a limiting phrase. For example, at the present moment there is no great movement in the Belgian Congo for independence. It should be made clear that we are not, in effect, condemning the relationship between Belgium and the Congo. The language "under circumstances," and so forth, at least gives room for orderly development, and for saying that, at the proper time, after they have achieved some degree of experience in self-government, we will then look forward to the time when they can achieve independence. That would make the concurrent resolution more acceptable.

If I correctly understand the Senator's suggestion, "under alien despotisms" as limiting the effect of the concurrent resolution to those countries where there is actually a despotism imposed by an alien people, I think it would improve the concurrent resolution somewhat, although I still think the concurrent resolution is dangerous because it is subject to so many different interpretations.

Mr. MUNDT. It would remove the possibility of certain hypocritical and nonsensical pronouncements. I have been in Saudi Arabia. I know that the people of Saudi Arabia have no more self-government than have the people of Argentina. Probably they have not even the machinery for self-government, which is said to exist in Argentina. I am not prepared to say that they would be able to handle self-government if they got it tomorrow; but I do not see how, on the one hand, we can do business with the established Government of Saudi Arabia and seek access to their oil while helping to improve their economy and make additional money available to the established government—as we are presently committed to do—and, at the same time, as a part of our foreign policy, stir up or encourage revolution among the Arabs. We should not be placed in the position of saying that if someone over there will start a revolution for self-government we will administer our foreign policy so as to use our influence in helping to obtain self-government. It just does not make sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the Pacific charter which was signed in conjunction with the Manila Pact. I read from the President's message transmitting the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, and the protocol thereto, transmitted to the Senate on November 10, 1954. I read from page 12, as follows:

> PACIFIC CHARTER
>
> The delegates of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the Kingdom of Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America;
>
> Desiring to establish a firm basis for common action to maintain peace and security in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific;
>
> Convinced that common action to this end, in order to be worthy and effective, must be inspired by the highest principles of justice and liberty;

> Do hereby proclaim:
>
> First, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities;
>
> Second, they are each prepared to continue taking effective practical measures to insure conditions favorable to the orderly achievement of the foregoing purposes in accordance with their constitutional processes;
>
> Third, they will continue to cooperate in the economic, social, and cultural fields in order to promote higher living standards, economic progress, and social well-being in this region;
>
> Fourth, as declared in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, they are determined to prevent or counter by appropriate means any attempt in the treaty area to subvert their freedom or to destroy their sovereignty or territorial integrity.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with every word that is written there. That charter was agreed to mutually by countries which are certainly on the road toward self-government. Certainly they hold to self-government as a goal. They expressed their desire to attain that goal through constitutional processes, and we rightfully agreed we would do all we could to help them attain that goal.

That is different from striking out on our own to encourage revolutions and even throwing overboard membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations, as we propose to do in the pending resolution. In other words, we say we will go our own way. We say that we will support other peoples in their effort to achieve self-government or independence. We say we will go it alone. I believe that is something which we should not hastily walk into. Of course, this concerns the Senate and the rest of the people as much as it does me, but it does seem to me that the sort of phraseology used could very well come back to plague us later.

We could very well be faced with an incipient revolution somewhere and have the revolutionaries wave this resolution before us and say, "We are acting on the request of Uncle Sam. Where are our guns and ships and tanks? We are in revolt. We are seeking self-government for ourselves."

I do not believe it is quite cricket or very wise.

The good people of Saudi Arabia are a great people, and I have every sympathy for them. Some day I hope they will have independence and self-government. But I suppose before they will reach those goals, they will first have to have communications and newspapers and schools. All those things will take time.

Undoubtedly there are now many Arabs, among them many youngsters, who feel like old King Ibn Saud felt generations ago, when he and his followers sneaked up on Riyadh, the capital, in the middle of the night and killed those who were in control of the government and took over the government themselves. Some revolutionaries in Saudi Arabia might well want to do the same thing to the present government. Perhaps some Communist cell will undertake to foment and stir up a revolution against the present government, all in the pious name of self-government, of course.

I believe we should at least bring the resolution into conformity with the "whereas" clauses, which it is not now.

It might be good to have the Senate concur in the House resolution in accordance with what the Senate said in its own resolution. We were very careful and very cautious in our resolution. We referred to alien despotism. Yet 15 minutes later we are writing a new foreign policy and bringing forth a formula for supporting self-government toward which people anywhere in the world can move by revolutionary or violent means in expectation that this resolution promises them our support.

I do not believe a resolution of this type should contain the kind of language which is carelessly adopted, and then we must simply hope for the best.

This is a serious business, Mr. President. We have allies whom we need. Of course, we are trying to help the world move toward freedom and self-government and independence, but at best the pending resolution is subject to very serious misinterpretations by anyone who reads it. At worst, it is an invitation to revolution on the part of citizens in every country of the world wherever such citizens do not enjoy the blessings of self-government. Unhappily, there are many countries in that category. Happily, however, some of them at least are helping our gigantic program of trying to maintain the security of the Western World against the Communist clutches of Moscow.

I wish the Foreign Relations Committee would take the resolution back to committee or to conference and rewrite it or change it or modify it, or interpret it in such a way that not every demagog abroad can write his own interpretation of it.

I have no patent medicine remedy to suggest. However, this is one place where haste is not a necessary ingredient to utilize in formulating permanent American foreign policy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. With that understanding, I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Curtis
Daniel
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright
George
Goldwater
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Ives
Jackson
Jenner
Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Malone
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Potter
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Williams
Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had the floor when the absence of a quorum was suggested. I now ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the amendment which I offered earlier, and that I may offer a substitute for that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota is withdrawn.

Mr. MUNDT. During the quorum call, I conferred with the minority leader and with the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have prepared substitute language which I believe will express what all Members of the Senate have in mind, and will certainly place the matter before the committee of conference which will have to consider the resolution in any event.

I now propose no changes on page 1; but on page 2, line 2, it is proposed to change the words "self-government"—the word "self" being the last word on page 1—to "self-determination."

Also, on page 2, line 2, after the word "assume", it is proposed to add the words "and maintain," so that the language, beginning at the end of line 5, page 1, will read as follows:

> So as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-determination or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume and maintain an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GREEN. I make no objection to the incorporation of the proposed amendment in the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the Senate is placing altogether too much reliance on resolutions of this kind. By doing so, we are not contributing materially to the stability of world affairs. I voted yesterday to report this resolution from the committee and would like to make clear why I did so.

One trouble with such resolutions is that if we vote against them, our action is likely to be misinterpreted and misunderstood by the people of the United States. If we vote for them, our action is likely to be misinterpreted and misunderstood by everyone outside of the United States.

The concurrent resolution now before the Senate is a very good example of that. If we vote against it, we shall be put in the position before the country as having voted for colonialism; if we had voted for it as it was reported, we would have been put in the position before the world as having encouraged revolution and as having taken a slap at our most dependable allies.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I could not more fully agree with the Senator from Vermont. A plethora of resolutions at this time is likely to get us into difficulty. When we frame and lay a matrix of resolutions and weave them into our foreign policy, sometimes it is dangerous to vote either for or against them. We want to approve neither despotism nor colonialism. Neither do we want to encourage nor invite revolutions.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the amendment which has just been agreed to greatly improves the concurrent resolution. In voting for it, Senators will not be encouraging revolution in any country; we shall simply be expressing our willingness to help the people in such countries in every way possible to arrive at the point where they can have self-determination at an early date. That is my understanding of the resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Vermont is correct. That was the point I was trying to make. To me, the resolution as originally written could not have been construed as anything else but an incitation to revolution elsewhere. We wanted to express ourselves, of course, in favor of having independent, self-governing, God-fearing people everywhere. We must not get into the position of saying to our allies that we are working together as friends, and then, on the other hand, pass resolutions which incite revolution against the very governments whose cooperation and support we are courting.

Mr. AIKEN. The two resolutions which the Senate has considered today should be harmless, and probably will be helpful; but I still maintain that to try to regulate world affairs by resolution is a rather risky business.

Mr. ERVIN. On this resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the resolution, I wish to clarify my own position.

I said a moment ago that in the committee I was opposed to the resolution for the reason which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and other Senators have stated. I think we are on very dangerous ground when we seek to reduce a complicated formula to a simple resolution. It simply is not a fitting instrument to convey what the United States Government really means. I do not think this country intends to stir up revolution. I do not think the Senate desires the executive department to move into areas of the world where there is not self-determination and to stir up revolution.

I believe we realize that there are still many areas of the world where the people are striving to achieve self-government and self-determination, but that for many reasons they are not yet ready or able to maintain democratic systems, such as the one we have.

So I regret very much that the committee saw fit to report the resolution, and that the Senate is to be forced to vote on it. I sincerely regret having to vote against it, not because I disapprove of democratic self-government or the gradual evolution of the people who have not yet achieved it; but I must express my disapproval of passing a resolution which will complicate matters in a way which is relatively unsuitable to deal with such affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). Present.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—88

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Curtis
Daniel
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Flanders
Frear
George
Goldwater
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Ives
Jackson
Jenner
Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Potter
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Williams
Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fulbright

NOT VOTING—7

Duff
Gore
Johnson, Tex.
Kefauver
Malone
McClellan
Wiley

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 149), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives regarding Senate Joint Resolution 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was, on page 17, strike out lines 7 through 20, inclusive and insert:

> SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make an annual report to the Congress for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas as to whether or not the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana please explain this matter?

Mr. LONG. It relates to the interstate oil compact which was passed on the consent calendar in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. There was a minor difference between the Senate and House versions of the bill.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TIMBER-ACCESS ROADS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber-access roads. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 13, 1955, pp. 10435–10436, Congressional Record.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this measure relates to the right of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire access roads in order to reach certain property under the management of the Department of the Interior. This measure would give the Secretary of the Interior rights similar to those now enjoyed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Senate conferees are willing to agree to the House language in this instance.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

STATUS OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee on refugees, escapees, and expellees, I wish again to present the weekly report furnished by the Department of State on the status of visa applications under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

During the period covered by this report, which began on June 20 and ended June 24, 1,178 immigrant visas were issued. The number for the previous 1-week period was 1,137; and for the preceding 1-week period the number of issued visas was 1,020.

There has now been a total of 36,274 visas granted under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 203, 83d Congress. The distribution by country based on the report of June 24 is as follows:

Country	Total issued June 20–June 24	Total issued to date
Italy	610	21, 930
Greece	133	5, 945
Netherlands	0	617
Germany	228	3, 232
Austria	65	2, 954
Far East	44	933
Others	0	68

Under the terms of the act 4,000 orphans under the age of 10 years may be admitted for adoption into homes in the United States. On June 17, a total of 1,174 orphan visas had been issued. Of this number, 859 orphan children have been admitted into this country. When it is realized that 3,141 more orphan visas will be issued in order to comply with the terms of this act, it seems most improbable that this may be done by December 31, 1956, the cutoff date under the act.

Of the total of 36,274 visas issued under sections of this act, other than the orphans, actually 25,524 such persons have entered the country. This means that before the expiration date, there still remain to be issued approximately 169,000 additional visas, and approximately 180,000 people will actually have to come into this country.

I shall continue to report to the Senate on the status of visa applications under Public Law 203, 83d Congress, which was enacted to benefit victims of the postwar world in one of the greatest humanitarian movements of our time.

I wish to point out that I have recently conferred with persons in various sections of the country who are interested in the refugees. I am convinced that this law is being construed just as liberally as possible. The slowness of its operation is, in my opinion, due entirely to the very strict provisions of the act, provisions which are in no sense directory but are mandatory, and under which the administrator may go only so far and no farther in trying to be as liberal as he possibly can be in his interpretations. The realization of this fact led President Eisenhower to send his recent message to Congress asking for certain changes. As a result of that message, three bills were introduced and are now pending before the subcommittee of which I am chairman. They are S. 1794, S. 2113, and S. 2149. Extensive hearings have been held before my subcommittee, and it is anticipated that a bill of some kind will be reported in the near future. In the meantime, I shall continue to submit facts and figures based on the present administration of the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement relating to the status of visa applications under the refugee relief program as of June 24, 1955.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Refugee relief program—status of visa applications, June 24, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	France	Great Britain	Belgium	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	69, 493	19, 403	1, 472	23, 677	12, 480	2, 190	918	1, 571	2, 719	444	134, 367
2. Visas issued	21, 930	5, 945	617	3, 232	2, 954	131	207	257	933	68	36, 274
3. Visas refused	1, 698	766	34	2, 100	1, 062	152	121	29	622	23	6, 607
4. Canceled action	568	147	140	1, 143	733	101	131	118	75	44	3, 200
5. Applicants still in process	45, 297	12, 545	681	17, 202	7, 731	1, 806	459	1, 167	1, 089	309	88. 286
6. Assurances received by Administrator	7, 231	10, 299	449	12, 909	4, 925	1, 280	1, 005	708	3, 186	1, 462	43, 454
7. Assurances cancelled/returned	712	752	121	809	167	86	135	14	439	381	3, 616
8. Assurances verified and sent to field	6, 190	9, 163	297	11, 603	4, 564	1, 139	785	652	2, 545	939	37, 877

Note.—All figures cumulative. Items 1 through 5, status of applicants; items 6, 7, and 8 reflect principal aliens only; items 6 through 8, status of assurances.

Admitted, 25,524 (June 17); actual admission, 1,174 orphans; 859 orphans came in June 17.

STRENGTHENING OF RESERVE FORCES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 848, House bill 7000.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate *proceeded to* consider the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Act of 1955."

AMENDMENTS TO THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

Sec. 2. (a) Section 205 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (50 U. S. C. 925 (b)) is amended by striking out the words "one million five hundred thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two million nine hundred thousand."

(b) Section 208 of such act is amended by (1) redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) thereof as subsections (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively, and (2) inserting, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(f) Except as specifically provided by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), each person inducted, enlisted, or appointed in any armed force of the United States under any provision of law after the date which is 30 days after the date of enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 who becomes a member of the Ready Reserve, by reason of any provision of law other than section 208 (c) of this act, shall be required while a member of the Ready Reserve, to (1) participate in not less than 48 scheduled drills or training periods and to perform not more than 17 days of active duty for training, during each year, or (2) perform annually not more than 30 days of active duty for training. Any such member of the Ready Reserve (except any member enlisted therein under sec. 6 (c) (2) (C) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act) who in any year fails to perform such training duty satisfactorily, as determined by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may be ordered, without his consent, to perform additional active duty for training for not more than 45 days. If such failure occurs during the final year of any period of obligatory membership in the Ready Reserve, such membership shall be extended for such time, not exceeding 6 months, as may be required for the performance by such member of such additional active duty for training."

(c) Section 208 of such act (50 U. S. C. 928) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(k) Under regulations prescribed by the President, each armed force of the United States shall provide a system of continuous screening of units and members of the Ready Reserve to insure that—

"(1) no significant attrition will occur to those members or units during a mobilization;

"(2) there will be a proper balance of military skills;

"(3) members of the Reserve forces possessing critical civilian skills will not be retained in numbers beyond the requirements for those skills except for persons who have military skills for which there is an overriding requirement;

"(4) with due respect to national security and military requirements, recognition is given to participation in combat; and

"(5) members of the Reserve forces whose mobilization in an emergency would result in extreme personal or community hardship are not retained in the Ready Reserve.

"(l) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard), any member of the Standby Reserve who has not completed his obligated period of military service in the Ready Reserve, may be transferred to the Ready Reserve whenever the reason for his transfer to the Standby Reserve no longer exists."

(d) Section 233 (a) of such act (50 U. S. C. 961 (a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No member of the Standby Reserve may be ordered to active duty under this subsection until the Director of Selective Service has determined that such member is available for active duty."

(e) The proviso contained in section 233 (b) (1) of such act (50 U. S. C. 961 (b) (1)) is amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That not more than 1 million members of the Ready Reserve of all Reserve components may be required to perform active duty involuntarily at any time unless the Congress shall have authorized the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection with respect to a larger number."

(f) Section 233 of such act (50 U. S. C. 961) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(h) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, any person who, while a member of a reserve component, becomes a regular or duly ordained minister of religion shall be entitled upon his request to a discharge from the Reserve component of which he is a member. No member of any Reserve component shall be required to serve on active duty, or to participate in active training and service, active duty for training, or inactive duty training, while preparing for the ministry in a recognized theological or divinity school.

(g) Chapter 7 of part II of such act is amended by inserting, immediately after section 259 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 260. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, each military department of the Department of Defense shall cause to be prepared and maintained an accurate record of the number of members of each class of each Reserve component who during each fiscal year have satisfactorily participated in (1) active duty for training, and (2) inactive duty training with pay.

"(b) In January of each year the Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the President and to the Congress a report which shall contain an account of the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the progress made in the strengthening of the Reserve components, during the preceding fiscal year."

(h) Part II of such act, as amended by preceding subsections of this section, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 8—SPECIAL ENLISTMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 261. (a) Under such regulations as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe, any person who is qualified for enlistment for active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, and who has not been ordered to report for induction into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, may be enlisted in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, respectively, pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(b) Each enlistment under this section shall be for a period of 8 years. Each person so enlisted shall be required during such enlistment to perform—

"(1) active duty for a period of 2 years;

"(2) satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve for a period which, when added to service rendered under paragraph (1), will total 5 years; and

"(3) the remainder of such period of enlistment as a member of the Standby Reserve.

"SEC. 262. (a) Until August 1, 1959, whenever the President determines that the enlisted strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained at the level which he determines to be necessary in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the acceptance of enlistments in organized units of such Ready Reserve pursuant to the provisions of this section under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments under this section may be accepted only within quotas prescribed by the appropriate Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and specifically provided for in annual appropriations made by the Congress. No enlistment shall be accepted under this section in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component if such enlistment would cause the strength of such Ready Reserve to exceed the authorized strength of such Ready Reserve.

"(b) Enlistments under this section may be accepted from persons who—

"(1) are qualified for induction;

"(2) have not been ordered to report for induction into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; and

"(3) have not attained the age of 20 years. In addition, the President, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may authorize the enlistment under this section, without regard to the provisions of paragraph (3), of persons who fulfill the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) and who have critical skills and are engaged in civilian occupations in any critical defense-supporting industry or in any research activity, affecting national defense.

"(c) Each enlistment under this section shall be for a period of 8 years. Each person so enlisted shall be required during such enlistment (1) to perform an initial period of active duty for training of not less than 3 months or more than 6 months, and (2) thereafter to perform satisfactorily all annual training duty prescribed by section 208 (f) of this act, except that persons specially enlisted because of their having possession of critical skills may be relieved of any obligation to perform the annual training duty prescribed by section 208 (f). Each such person shall be deferred from training and service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily, as determined by regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, and upon the completion of 8 years of such satisfactory service pursuant to such enlistment shall be exempt from further liability for induction for training and service under such act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person performing an initial period of active duty for training under this section shall—

"(1) during such period, and during any period of hospitalization incident to the performance of such duty, receive pay at the rate of $50 per month;

"(2) be deemed to be serving in pay grade E–1 (under 4 months) for the purpose of determining his eligibility to receive allowances for subsistence or for travel and transportation, or to receive any benefit under title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended; and

"(3) be deemed to be a member of a reserve component called or ordered into active service for extended service in excess of 30 days for the purpose of determining eligibility for any benefit made available to members of reserve components by the act entitled 'An act to provide for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in active duty training,' approved June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 201), except that (A) no such person shall be entitled to any benefit under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and (B) the indemnity accorded to such person under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended, shall terminate 30 days after the release of such person from such initial period of active duty training.

Except as specifically provided by this subsection, no person shall become entitled, by reason of his performance of an initial period of active duty for training under this section, to any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law for persons who have performed active duty in the Armed Forces.

"(e) The National Security Training Commission shall advise the President and the Secretary of Defense, and shall report annually to the Congress, with respect to the welfare of persons performing initial periods of active duty for training under this section, but shall have no authority with respect to the military training of such persons during such periods.

"(f) Any person who completes satisfactorily the initial period of active duty for training required of him under any enlistment pursuant to this section shall be entitled, upon application for reemployment within 60 days after (A) his release from such required initial period of active duty for training after satisfactory completion thereof, or (B) his discharge from hospitalization incident to such duty continuing after such release for a period of not more than 6 months, to all reemployment rights and benefits provided by section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for individuals inducted under the provisions of such act, except that (1) any person so restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of this section shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 6 months after such restoration, and (2) no reemployment rights granted by this subsection shall entitle any person to retention, preference, or displacement rights over a veteran with a superior claim under the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended.

"SEC. 263. (a) Within quotas prescribed by the appropriate Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and specifically provided for in annual appropriations made by the Congress, each person who has been honorably released from active duty of not less than 18 months' duration in the Armed Forces of the United States, and who before July 1, 1957, is accepted in conformity with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary for assignment or enlistment under this section as an enlisted member of an organized combat unit of the Ready Reserve of the Army or Marine Corps for a period of 3 years, shall be entitled to receive a bonus in an amount equal to the monthly basic pay to which such person would be entitled for 2 months' service on active duty in the grade in which he is so assigned or enlisted.

"(b) Under such regulations as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe, any individual who on the date of enactment of this section is serving under an enlistment entered into under any other provision of law in an active unit of the Ready Reserve which is designated under this section as an organized combat unit, may be discharged therefrom for the convenience of the Government for the purpose of reenlistment in such unit under the provisions of this section.

"(c) No assignment or enlistment may be accepted under this section in the Ready Reserve of any reserve component if such assignment or enlistment would cause the strength of such Ready Reserve to exceed the authorized strength of such Ready Reserve. No member of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States may be assigned, enlisted, discharged, or ordered to active duty for training under this section without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

"(d) Any enlisted member of any such organized combat unit who, during any year of any period of assignment or enlistment for which he has received a bonus under this section, fails to perform satisfactorily all training duties prescribed for members of such unit, and whose failure is not excused under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, may be ordered, without his consent, to perform additional active duty for training for not more than 45 days. If such failure occurs during the 3d year of any such period of assignment or enlistment, such assignment or enlistment shall be extended for such time, not exceeding 6 months, as may be required for the performance of such additional active duty for training by such member.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'organized combat unit' means a unit so designated by the appropriate Secretary whose members are trained for combat or combat-support service and are required to perform satisfactorily annual training duty equal to that prescribed under section 208 (f) of this act."

Universal Military Training and Service Act Amendments

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6 (c) (2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 456 (c) (2)), is amended by—

(1) adding at the end of clause (A) thereof the following new sentence: "No such person who has completed 8 years of satisfactory service as a member of an organized unit of the National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for 3 consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after the date of enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955."

(2) striking out in clause (B) thereof the words "or clause (A)" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the words "or clause (A), clause (C), or clause (D)"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof the following new clauses:

"(C) Whenever the President determines that the enlisted strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained at the level which he determines to be necessary in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the acceptance of enlistments in organized units of such Ready Reserve under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments authorized by this clause may be accepted only (i) within quotas prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned and specifically provided for in annual appropriations made by the Congress, and (ii) from persons who have not been ordered to report for induction under this act and who have not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months. Any person so enlisted shall be deferred from training and service under this act so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of an organized unit of such Ready Reserve. No person deferred under the provisions of this clause shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces by reason of subsection (h) of this section after he has attained the 28th anniversary of the date of his birth.

"(D) Within the quotas prescribed pursuant to section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, each person deferred pursuant to the provisions of clause (C) hereof may volunteer to perform a period of active duty for training as provided by and subject to the provisions of such section. No such person who has completed 8 years of satisfactory service as a member of an organized unit of the Ready Reserve, and who during such service has performed active duty for training for a period of not less than 3 months or more than 6 months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after the date of enactment of this clause.

"(E) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may provide that any person enlisted or appointed in the Ready Reserve of any reserve component of the Armed Forces pursuant to authority conferred by this subsection or under section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, who fails to serve satisfactorily as a member of such Ready Reserve may be selected for training and service and inducted into the armed force of which such reserve component is a part, prior to the selection and induction of other persons liable therefor."

(b) Section 6 (d) (1) of such act (50 U. S. C., App. 456 (d) (1)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Upon the successful completion by any person of the required course of instruction under any program listed in clause (A) of the first sentence of this paragraph, such person shall be tendered a commission in the appropriate Reserve component of the Armed Forces if he is otherwise qualified for such appointment. If, at the time of such appointment, the armed force in which such person is commissioned does not require his service on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by him in compliance with clause (B) of the first sentence of this paragraph, such person shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force in the grade in which he was commissioned for a period of 6 months. Upon completion of such period of active duty for training, such person shall be returned to inactive duty and shall be assigned to an appropriate Reserve unit until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission pursuant to the provisions of this section. So long as such person performs satisfactory service in such unit, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, he shall be deferred from training and service under the provisions of this act. If such person fails to perform satisfactory service in such unit, and such failure is not excused under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, his commission may be revoked by the Secretary of the military department concerned."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, in the absence of the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is before the Senate. The committee amendment is a complete substitute; and the Chair understands that any amendment which may be offered to the committee amendment may be considered as though offered to the original text of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending bill is House bill 7000, entitled "An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes."

As stated by the Chair, the bill has been rewritten by the Senate committee, and an amendment in the nature of a substitute is presented to the Senate for its consideration.

The purpose of the bill is to improve the effectiveness of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of our country. The bill was favorably reported by the committee after a series of public hearings at which the committee received testimony from a very broad segment of public opinion, and also from the executive branch of the Government.

In association with the majority of the members of the Armed Services Committee, I have long been an advocate of a strong military Reserve. The so-called national Reserve plan, as it was originally approved by our great Commander in Chief and the present President of the United States, called for a very comprehensive and, in my opinion, an extremely effective Reserve porgram.

A part of the President's plan provided for a flow of trained non-prior-service men into the Reserve components. It would have secured these trainees through voluntary methods, if possible, but if sufficient numbers were not available through voluntary methods, the original plan called for induction to make up for the shortage.

That was, of course, in the nature of a compulsory training-for-service plan. It was not universal in its concept, as was the universal military training and service plan twice reported by the Armed Services Committee and passed by the Senate in 1951. But could the plan have been adopted, it would have assured a steady flow of nonprior servicemen into the organized Reserve components of the Nation to achieve the strength which was set forth in the President's plan.

As has been the case in prior years, this compulsory feature of the President's plan for filling the ranks of the Reserve with non-prior-service men has not secured the approval of the other body.

I have felt that, out of simple fairness to the men who have already served in the Armed Forces, compulsory features for securing trainees are completely justified, and I have grave apprehension that it will be found necessary yet to resort to some such program before we can have a strong reserve. However, I hope I am realistic enough to realize that at this late date in the session of Congress any effort to write a compulsory feature into this bill to bring it more nearly in line with the President's original recommendations would tend to jeopardize any legislation dealing with a more effective Reserve plan, and leave us exactly where we are at the present time.

There is no compulsion in this bill with respect to training of men who have had no prior service. The only compulsion in the measure is directed to those who have already been inducted or who have enlisted for service in one of the regular components of our armed services.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator from Georgia inform the Senator from Indiana whether or not this bill is in any way related to what we know as the universal military training bill, which has heretofore been before this body?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not. As I have just stated, there is no compulsion whatever in this bill on any young man with respect to the Reserve program. It is wholly voluntary as applied to any young man who has not had prior service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. In view of the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia that there is no compulsion in this program for those who have not had previous military service, I should like to ask a question on a subject which has been of some concern to me and about which I have received a number of letters.

What happens in the case of a young man who lives at a distance of 20 or 40 miles from the Reserve component? How are we to take care of the training of such a young man under his obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the terms of the bill, if he cannot attend the 48 weekly drills which are held during the course of the year and the 2 weeks of summer training, he can discharge his obligation by 30 days of active duty with the Reserve component.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Georgia will further yield, I am sure he realizes that it is not the fault of the young man himself that he does not live near a training unit. I do not wish placed upon such a man any obligation that is not placed on some young man who lives in a community where he has only 3 blocks to go to the Reserve component.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee received considerable testimony. The views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas were voiced in the committee by 2 or 3 persons. The subject is of concern to all of us. Under the alternative features of the plan, a man who is not conveniently located to attend the 48 weekly drills held during the course of the year can discharge his obligation by serving 30 days on Reserve duty.

Mr. CARLSON. I am very much concerned over the problem. I am not sure that the alternative which the Senator suggests would constitute equality of service. I know that the problem has received very careful consideration by the committee. It is one which concerns all of us.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a very acute problem for young men who live at great distances from the Reserve units. The Department of Defense indicated that it intended to create more Reserve units and to have more armories and facilities to attempt to cope with the problem which the Senator has mentioned. It cannot be completely eliminated, but it can be mitigated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with the question which the able Senator from Kansas raised, I think Senators will be interested in the table which appears at page 353 of the printed hearings. The table is headed "Estimated percent of population residing within standard metropolitan areas including Reserve units and within 25 miles of Reserve units located outside of standard metropolitan areas." The table contains studies for the Army Reserve, including current units and current and proposed units; Army National Guard; Naval Reserve; Marine Corps Reserve; Air Force Reserve; and Air National Guard.

I invite the able chairman's attention to the fact that in my State of South Dakota only 35 percent of the population resides within standard metropolitan areas, or within 25 miles of Reserve units located outside metropolitan areas, so far as the Army Reserve is concerned. That means that 65 percent of the young men in my State do not live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit. It does create a very serious situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from South Dakota brought that question to the attention of the committee, and we discussed it. Other members of the committee also mentioned it, notably the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. My State is not so large in area as the great State of South Dakota, but it happens to be the largest State east of the Mississippi River, without having anything like the largest population. Therefore, I know something about the problem first hand in my own State.

I believe that the Department of Defense will administer the program on a sensible basis. Where a man lives too far removed to serve, and there are particular reasons why he cannot perform his 30 days of duty, the Defense Department, for hardship reasons, can assign him to the Standby Reserve, instead of the Ready Reserve. I am sure that under the present administration of manpower policies by the Department of Defense no one will be treated arbitrarily and compelled to endure any unusual hardship in order to comply with his Reserve obligation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that the State of Georgia is the largest State east of the Mississippi River. It is a fact which was brought out during the hearings. However, in the State of Georgia, 90 percent of the people live within the 25-mile limit. In my State only 35 percent live within such a limit.

Therefore, I trust that what the distinguished chairman of the committee has suggested will be noted by the Department of Defense in administering the bill, should it become law in this form.

It is not merely a question of 25 miles, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. There are counties in my State in which a substantial number of people are scattered over the wide open spaces. A round trip would involve a journey of 100 or 150 miles, or even more than that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have some idea of the vastness of the State so ably represented in part by the Senator from South Dakota. I have traveled through it by automobile and by train, and I have flown over it on 2 or 3 occasions. I know that in his State probably there would be as many problems as in any other State with respect to the difficulty of active participation on a weekly basis with an organized Reserve unit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, it is implicit in the chairman's response to my questions that the Secretary of Defense does have authority to establish regulations which will take care of that situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there can be any question about that. It is not only implicit, but it is spelled out in the law. It is section 208 (i) of the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1952. That is the specific provision covering that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it is implicit also, is it not, in the whole bill that the obligation of a man who serves in the military service 30 days after the act takes effect is to keep himself in training, so to speak, by attending 48 drills during a year, plus 2 weeks——

Mr. RUSSELL. Seventeen days.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Plus 17 days in a training camp, until he has completed a period of at least 6 years of duty?

Mr. RUSSELL. Five years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Five years?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Of course he can perform all of it in 30 days within a year, as I pointed out to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] as an alternative to the 40 drills and the 17 days in camp.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The very able Senator from Georgia, who also serves as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who has been associated with agricultural legislation, recognizes the fact that in many instances where men live at some distance from metropolitan centers or from places where Reserve organizations are organized, their principal occupation is that of ranching or farming.

If it happens that a young man is the sole proprietor of a farm in his own name or if he works the farm for a widowed mother, perhaps, it is very difficult for him to get away for 30 days when he has to milk the cows and carry on the other chores of the farm.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is difficult for him to get away for a week, even. There is an old hoary joke in my State which has been told many, many times, about the man who sold his bed and Sunday clothes after he went into the dairy business, because he knew he would not be able to sleep or go out on Sunday. We all know that there is nothing more confining than a dairy farmer's business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a 7-day-week job.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, I believe that the Defense Department will deal fairly with men in that category and give them every consideration. Certainly if the Department does not do so, we can amend the act and provide some definite standards. However, in my judgment, we will not find that the Department has set up arbitrary rules in dealing with hardship cases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is true that the bill is not compulsory in the sense that it requires anyone to go into the Ready Reserve as a matter of enlistment. Is it not correct to say that a man who enters the active military service 30 days after the bill becomes law will have an obligation to keep himself in training during a 5-year period?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that. There is compulsion on every man who enlists or who is inducted into a component of the Armed Services to complete a 5-year period of duty of either active service with the Regular Establishment or with a Ready Reserve unit. If he serves an enlistment of 3 years in the Army, he has a Reserve obligation of 2 years. If he is a member of the Air Force, and he performs 4 years of service, he has 1 year of obligated Reserve duty. The total is 5 years in each case.

Anyone who enlists after the passage of the pending bill does so with full knowledge of the obligation he assumes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true; but if he is drafted, he has no choice in the matter. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he has no choice in the matter.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I note, on page 17 of the bill, that a young man, before he reaches the age of 20 years may join the Ready Reserve. I should like to ask the Senator, in line with the questions asked by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], if in the small towns of the country, where the Ready Reserve is not available, whether the young men of those areas would be placed in a somewhat prejudiced position because they could not take advantage of that provision of the law, and would have to enlist before they were 18½ years of age. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe it would be any handicap on the men living in small towns. There are a number of units which are made up of men as individuals rather than as members of a unit. I do not believe it would be a handicap on anyone in a small town. He would enlist and be subject to the same duty I have just outlined. If he could not attend 48 drills, he would have to perform active duty for a 30-day period in each year.

Mr. BARRETT. I confess that I am not too well informed about the matter. However, I am advised that in my State we have one Ready Organized Reserve unit at the present time. That unit is located in the city of Cheyenne and there is no other unit anywhere else in my State. Consequently, a young man in a town two or three hundred miles from Cheyenne could not possibly serve in the Ready Reserve by assignment with the Organized Reserve unit in Cheyenne.

Mr. RUSSELL. Most of the smaller towns have units composed of individuals who live in widely scattered areas. The men would have specific skills and they would be trained in those skills in the 30-day period when they would discharge their Reserve obligation.

Mr. BARRETT. In other words, if no Ready Reserve unit were available in a community, the young men of that community could comply with the other provisions of the law, but they would have to enlist under provisions of section 3 before he attained the age of 18½ years. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; not as to the page of the bill to which the Senator has referred. That is the 8-year program. Under the bill as reported by the committee, he could enlist at any time before attaining the age of 20 years rather than 18½ years.

Mr. BARRETT. That is in the Ready Reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. All we are discussing now is the Ready Reserve. There has been no discussion of Standby Reserve.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I understand that according to the provisions on page 17 of the bill that a young man who lives in a town that is located a long way from the location of a unit that it will be possible for him to make arrangements to serve in an individual capacity in the Ready Reserve?

Mr. RUSSELL. As an individual rather than as a member of a unit. In any case, rather than calling up the whole company. He could live in Casper and be a member of the military district Reserve organization, and take training, and he would be called as an individual in case of an emergency, rather than as a member of the component at Cheyenne.

Let me point out to the Senator that in the case of the war in Korea, we called up tens of thousands of Reserves as individuals. We did not call up any of the Reserve units, but we called up tens of thousands of young men as individuals who had particular skill and training, and they were placed in a unit and sent to Korea.

Mr. BARRETT. They were trained personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The men in the Ready Reserve must have from 4 to 6 months of active duty. That is the very heart of the present plan.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that, but the point which has been disturbing me, is how the men were going to continue their training on an individual basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have an obligation of 30 days of training or of 48 drill periods, not more than 17 days of active duty.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that those are alternative programs?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are alternative programs. Where a man is a member of a unit he is due to have 48 drills, with 17 days of summer camp. If he is not a member of a unit and is trained individually, he would be called in for 30 days a year to receive his training.

Mr. BARRETT. The last question I should like to ask is this: Will the Defense Department make it possible for many of these boys who want to enlist in the Reserves to do so on an individual basis?

Mr. RUSSELL. We were assured by all the representatives of the Department of Defense, including Mr. Secretary Burgess, who has had the program under his direction, and Admiral Radford, Chief of Staff, that the Defense Department intends to do all that is possible to have units that are adapted to the men who enlist. There would be a substantial increase in the number of reserve units; in the very nature of things, there would have to be. I think approximately $2 billion will be necessary for the Reserve.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question which goes back to the questions asked by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I notice on page 2 of the report that the language calls for 48 assemblies for drill or training, annually. During the hearings was the fact brought out that that does not necessarily mean 48 days of training?

Mr. RUSSELL. Nearly all that training is done at night. An hour and a half at night is done in the Army.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the sparsely inhabited States of the West we have found that this approach will work and will provide National Guard training in isolated areas. Is it not the opinion of the Senator that it would be possible to have 48 drill periods on 24 days, or any multiple of 48?

Mr. RUSSELL. The proviso in this case is the same as that which applies to the National Guard. In every State of the Union there are 48 assemblies for drill and 2 weeks of active duty for the National Guard. That has been the case for a number of years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I wished to point out was that the people might become confused with reference to 48 assemblies. They might think it meant 48 different evenings a year. Would it not be possible to make it a little more clear when the bill is considered in the conference with the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is already provided for in other laws.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not suggest that it be put into this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It can be done in 24 days now, and is being done in a number of units.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from South Dakota would have found the solution to his question had he been cognizant—and he possibly is cognizant—of the fact that all over the United States the 48 drill assemblies are now given in 24 days, and many absorb 4 drill periods in 1 day. So that the problem of bringing a man in every week does not exist.

That is all I wanted to bring out. I am not suggesting any changes; I am merely suggesting a clarification of the language so that the public will understand it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume the Senator from South Dakota referred to men who cannot get to a Reserve unit for 12 periods during the year. The alternative is there. It is not necessary for a man to make 48 different trips. I had not heard of its being done in less than 24. I know it is done on the basis of 24 meetings a year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the comment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona is possibly based upon conditions in Arizona. I find that 74 boys out of 100 live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit. Seventy-nine percent live within 25 miles of a National Guard unit, but when only 35 out of 100 live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit, a number of them living at least 100 miles distant, which means a 200-mile trip, there is a different situation.

Unless we have some assurance that the organized Reserve unit or the National Guard unit in conducting training will have in mind those areas—and there has been no evidence of that in the past—there is a need for a very definite expression of intent that the Defense Department will recognize.

The State of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is very much like mine. Thirty-eight percent live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit; 65 percent within 25 miles of a National Guard unit, but possibly 65 boys out of a hundred do not live within the 25-mile limit, and when the weather is not favorable, as is sometimes the case in Wyoming and western South Dakota, a real hardship is caused. Again thinking in terms of the occupation which many of these young men have, it is impossible for them to be gone any great length of time without disrupting the employment in which they are engaged or without letting the ranch go to pot.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator is well aware that this is a voluntary program. A man volunteers for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If he is inducted for 2 years of active service it will be a hardship, under the bill as it is written.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Defense Department would have to find it was a hardship and certify the man to stand by, as it would have a right to do under existing law in extreme cases.

Speaking for myself, I have always favored whatever degree of compulsion was necessary to apply to build up our Armed Forces for the security of the Nation.

I am concerned, however, that compulsion shall be applied in an equitable manner. It would be unfair to repeat coercion of an individual American citizen again and again, while thousands of other American citizens have never experienced any form of coercion or have not rendered one day of military service to their country.

For that reason, I was seriously concerned, as were many other Senators, and other persons, about the provision of the President's program which sought to impose upon younger men, who are now serving in the Armed Forces—and, I emphasize, those who have already been inducted or who have voluntarily enlisted—a liability to participate actively in Reserve training and drills after their period of service with the Regular forces was completed. I felt that those young men would be ready to return to their homes, having the firm feeling that they had performd their full duty under the law, except for such additional duty as a future war or a future national emergency might require.

I might say that practically the only important issue involved in the bill now being considered by the Senate is centered around that difference of opinion. I believe there has been great misunderstanding as to the specific obligation which has heretofore been fixed by law on the men on active duty to participate in Reserve drills after their period of active duty has ended.

The bill provides that within 30 days after its enactment, any man who enlists or who is inducted into the service does so with the full knowledge that he is assuming a 5-year period of obligation for active duty or in the Ready Reserve.

I have already pointed out that the time of obligation in the Ready Reserve will vary, depending upon the length of the tour of duty in the service from which the man has emerged. It will be 3 years in the case of the Army; 2 years in the case of the Marine Corps, which has a 3-year enlistment period; and 1 year in the case of the Air Force, which has a 4-year enlistment period. The pending bill differs from the bill as it passed the House in that very material aspect.

Under the bill approved by the committee and reported to the Senate, there will be a hiatus of 2 years before the compulsory Reserve obligation will attach to men who are emerging from active duty. In an effort to bridge that gap, the committee has recommended that, with respect to prior service, men who are now serving with the combat Reserve units of the Army and the Marine Corps, who have had 18 months of prior service, and who are accepted for enlistment in vital assignments with the Ready Reserve, under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, may receive an enlistment bonus for Reserve enlistment equal to two-thirds of that granted for similar grade enlistment in the Regular forces. The numbers that might be enlisted under the program will be controlled, first, by the regulations of the Secretary of the appropriate agency; and second, by the appropriations which will be made for that purpose.

I am certain that all Senators are aware of the fact that at present a reenlistment bonus applies to those reenlisting in the various branches of the Armed Forces which is the equivalent of 3 months' pay for the rank and grade of the individual involved.

In order not to compete with the Armed Services, or to make reenlistment so attractive that a man would leave the regular service and enlist in the Reserve, the bonus has been made two-thirds of the present amount, or about the equivalent of 2 months' pay of the man in the rank and grade in which he served.

This is a temporary provision. It will last for only 2 years. I would not offer it as a permanent program for the Reserve forces. However, nothing new is involved in the question of a reenlistment bonus.

In the days when our Nation was striving for independence, when the 13 Colonies were fighting to throw off the yoke of Great Britain, every one of the 13 States, as they called themselves after the 4th of July, 1776, offered bonuses of one kind of another to induce men to enlist in the Continental regiments of the Revolutionary Army—the Regulars, so-called, as contradistinguished from the Militia.

During the War Between the States, bonuses, which in some cases were perfectly fantastic, were offered for enlistment in order to fill the ranks, so that the various States might be able to complete the quotas assessed against them by the War Department.

There have been enlistment bonuses of one kind of another in the Regular Military Establishment for a great many years. During World War I and World War II there was what was called a combat infantryman's bonus, a small addition in pay for that particular duty.

In like manner, the bonus here proposed is an effort to get the reservists into the combat units of the Army and Navy where they are needed during the 2-year period before the obligation attaches to the men who are being released from active duty.

This is nothing unusual; it is merely an effort to bridge the gap of 2 years by making it attractive to the men to participate in the Reserve units, which are either combat units or combat-support units.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the Senator during the hearings determined how it will be possible to guarantee that the men to whom the bonus will be paid will remain in the outfit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. In the first place, these men will all be screened. The bonus provision will not apply as a matter of right. Every man who ends his period of active duty will not be able to say, "I want to enlist in the Reserves."

Every man will be screened, in the first instance. After men have accepted a bonus, if they do not then comply with all the requirements of the Reserve Corps, there is authority in the bill to call them up for 45 days of active duty with the Regular force.

Mr. GOLDWATER. After the bonus has been paid?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; after the man has accepted a bonus.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If he does not comply with the requisites of the particular service?

Mr. RUSSELL. If he does not comply with all the requirements imposed upon him as a member of the Ready Reserve, as is found on page 22 of the bill, subsection (d), of section 2, he can be called up, without his consent, to perform additional active duty, for training, for not more than 45 days.

If the failure occurs in the last year of the 3 years he must enlist in order to receive the bonus, and the bill provides that his enlistment may be extended for a period of 6 months. So I think there is adequate means to insure that any person who disregards his obligation will regret very much that he has done so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate the thought which has gone into the bonus suggestion. I think I understand very fully the attitude of the committee and the attitude of the chairman concerning it.

I was very much tempted, when I read the bill this morning, to offer an amendment to delete that particular part of the bill, but I decided against doing so, because I am hopeful that in conference better judgment will prevail.

As one who has spent more than half his life in the Reserve, I do not think it is necessary to pay American boys for patriotism. I do not think we are lending anything to strength when we put materialism in the Armed Forces Reserve above the natural desire which should exist in the heart of every young man to serve his country.

It has not been necessary to use this system in the National Guard, and the National Guard has historically been the great strong arm of the country. I recognize the truth of the statement by the distinguished Senator from Georgia when he cites evidence that in the history of this country the Government has had to offer bonuses.

Mr. RUSSELL. We offer them today in the regular establishment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct, but I maintain that is a different thing, because we are asking men to come back into a profession. What we are asking a person to do in joining the Reserve or National Guard, or any of the other branches of the service, is to exercise his patriotism, and also to do it as a sideline. He is going to be engaged in private business. We are asking him to devote a little time each year to preparing himself so that he may participate in the defense of his country, if that should become necessary.

I am speaking only my own feelings on this subject. As I have said, I have decided not to offer the amendment I had in mind. I have some questions to submit, some of which are based on how much the system will cost initially, and how much it will cost in the long run, because of the attrition rate.

I ask, Is it fair to the hundreds of thousands of persons who now belong to Reserve forces of some kind who have volunteered their services in different branches? Are we opening ourselves up to further legislation providing some kind of bonuses to those who are already in a Reserve status?

I should like to call attention to my basic feeling in this matter, which is that it will tend to destroy patriotism in the young men of our country. As one reservist, I should like to see our Reserve Forces remain on a purely voluntary basis. If we cannot obtain them on that basis, I join with the Senator from Georgia when he says that some type of universal training will have to come.

I have confidence in the young men of our country. If the Air Force and the Navy and the Army will provide the material with which they can train men, if they will provide adequate armories, then men will join the Reserves. The services have not been successful in the past because those who offered themselves have been treated as stepchildren by the Armed Forces. Now they have come into their own. A good example of that is the Air National Guard, which was organized on a real basis 10 years ago, and today is one of the strongest elements in the Air Force itself.

I merely wished to have an opportunity to precent my views about the portion of the bill to which I have been alluding. Outside of that part of the measure, I think the Senator and the committee have done unusually well with a difficult subject. I hope what they have suggested will be the basis of a strong Reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to have had the Senator from Arizona express his views. Frankly, I am convinced that without some inducement there will not be an adequate number volunteering so as to enable us to reach the 2,900,000 goal which has been set by the Commander in Chief.

I do not share the fears of the distinguished Senator from Arizona with respect to the temporary offer of an enlistment inducement. Frankly speaking, the branch in which the Reserve is weak today is the ground combat forces. There is no difficulty in filling the Reserves in the legal unit, the procurement section, or other similar elements. The great attraction of flying hazardous and dangerous as it is, results in filling the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard organization with adequate and well-trained men.

As the Senator has pointed out, our Air National Guard is perhaps the best trained and most efficient Reserve component this country has ever had in any branch of the service. I think some 80 percent of the pilots of the National Air Guard have had actual combat experience.

I may add that the Air National Guard has been having 2½ months of training with the Air Force, and that has contributed to its efficiency. No other Reserve branch has had actual training with a Regular component. But the bald fact is that the difficulty is in securing reservists in the ground combat units. I do not think that difficulty is altogether due to the danger involved in fighting on the ground. Personally, I would feel safer fighting on the ground than I would fighting in a jet plane. I am sure other Americans share that feeling.

But Americans have become accustomed to a high standard of living. We are accustomed to taking a shower, putting on a fresh shirt, and getting a hot meal, when we wish to, and in wartime men who are in the ground combat units do not get those things. They are not luxuries, but have become a part of our high standard of living. It is our high standard of living that has made enlistment in the ground combat forces so unattractive. The fact is that a member of a ground combat unit has to go into a mudhole, where rats are likely to run across his body, and that he will have to face the elements. The fact also is that he likes to have a warm meal. If anyone is entitled to a bonus or an inducement in the form of supplemental compensation, it is the man who will have to live in a mudhole, in all kinds of weather, and face all kinds of hardship.

Men in the Navy have also been killed, and in large numbers, but when they were killed it happened suddenly, and they were not hungry or dirty. They went down in the sea in clean clothes and with full stomachs. The same comparison applies to personnel in the Air Force. When a foot slogger is killed, he probably has not had a bath in 2 or 3 weeks, and has not had a change of socks for a long time. That is why it is difficult to fill the ground combat force units. I think such men are entitled to special consideration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am in hearty accord with the statement regarding the dangers involved in foot soldiering. I think such duty is hazardous above every other type of combat that any other member of the Armed Forces may be called upon to perform. I agree with the Senator that in World War II and in the Korean war, foot soldiers were entitled to some extra pay—call it bonus or combat pay.

However, I wish to reiterate one point, though I do appreciate the Senator's remarks. I have spent much of my lifetime in the Reserves. I remember the time when we had to pay our own way to go to camp, when we had to take correspondence courses, and when we had to use wooden rifles. If the plan now suggested shall be adopted, I should like to see sufficient appropriations made for the ground forces so that adequate armories might be built, so that a reservist might actually use machineguns and bazookas, so that he could get his hands on them and learn to use them. There is nothing that will discourage reserve training more than a man's having to sit week after week before a blackboard, with an old colonel telling him what a bazooka will do. Furnishing reservists with the necessary materiel and equipment will accomplish wonders.

That has been the secret of the National Guard. It has not been because the men fly. Only a few of them fly. Far more perform their duties on the ground. But members of the National Guard have received training. For that reason there are standing lines waiting to get in the National Guard program.

I am sure General Thurmond will agree with me that proper equipment for the Reserve forces and interest by the armed units will produce a good Reserve.

I have often thought that the Committee on Armed Services might have a subcommittee devoted entirely to studying Reserve problems. I have often felt that the Defense Department could spend more time on Reserve problems. I feel that if that shall be done, and we show the reservist that we have an interest in him, we will not have to resort to bonuses. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree in large measure with what the Senator from Arizona has said. I do not think our Reserve units are suffering from lack of equipment at this time, as they did in the days to which the Senator from Arizona has referred. But I believe that earlier the Senator from Arizona put his finger on what I regard as the weakest point of the Reserve program, namely, the attitude of the Regular Military Establishment toward the Reserve. I care not what laws Congress may pass or the amount of equipment Congress may supply to the Defense Establishment, or the number of armories which may be built; if the Reserves are not accepted as a part of the national Defense Establishment, but if, instead, they are regarded as a second-class service, our Reserve program will not be successful. We must build among the Regular Military Establishment or the Regular forces a different attitude toward the Reserves.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me, so that I may complete my statement in regard to this line of reasoning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield further to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to point out that the Marine Corps pays attention to the Marine Reserve, and has a strong Reserve; and the Navy pays attention to its Reserve, and has a strong Reserve; and the Air Force pays attention to the Air National Guard, and has paid tremendous attention to its Air Reserve in the past year and one-half, and is beginning to obtain good, concrete results.

The ground forces are beginning to show a real interest in the Reserve. Following World War I, however, no real interest was shown in the ground force Reserves until the last 2 or 3 years. However, results are now beginning to be obtained.

So I think there is concrete evidence in support of what the Senator from Georgia and I have been discussing, namely, that a real interest on the part of the Regular forces in the Reserve units is essential to the success of the Reserve program. We can provide all the bonuses or other benefits which may be desired; but until the Reserves are treated as parts of the Regular services, there will not be success with the Reserve program. The members of a Reserve unit will not have pride in their outfit if it is kicked around at the top level.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I desire to endorse what the able chairman of the committee has said regarding the requisite respect for the Reserve components, if they are to play in the National Defense Establishment the part they should play.

As somewhat related to that point, I wish to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, based upon a quiet colloquy I have been having with the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. He has asked me whether it would be possible for men who have such training liability, and who live at some distance from an organized Reserve unit or Reserve facility, to obtain training with a National Guard unit.

In that connection, I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that in Wyoming, for example, 65 percent of the young men affected live within 25 miles of an Army National Guard unit, whereas only 38 percent of them live within that distance of an Army Reserve unit. In my State, 74 percent live within 25 miles of a National Guard unit, whereas only 35 percent live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit. In North Dakota, 67 percent are within 25 miles of a National Guard unit, but only 40 percent are within that distance of a Reserve unit. In Tennessee, 97 percent live within 25 miles of a National Guard unit, but only 77 percent live within 25 miles of a Reserve unit. In other words, from 20 percent to 40 percent more could be taken care of if the Army would recognize the National Guard as a fit implement to provide the requisite drill and training.

Is it possible, under the language of the bill, for the Secretary of Defense to recognize the training provided by a National Guard unit for those who might be members of the Ready Reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from South Dakota refer to those who have had no prior service, or does he refer to those who have had prior service?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I refer to those who have not had prior service. As I understand, there are two categories.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator from South Dakota knows, a man who has had no prior service can enter the National Guard at this time, on the same basis on which he will be able to enter the Reserve, under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, he can join a National Guard unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and he can do so today. Such authority has existed for several years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In some instances the National Guard units are up to their full authorized strength.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it important to increase their strength. As the Senator from South Dakota knows, the overall strength of the National Guard is fixed by the annual appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have particularly in mind the specialized units, for I know that in my hometown there is a specialized unit which is not very large, and the authorized strength for it is not large. If the program now proposed becomes law, in that area there will be more men who might wish to join that National Guard unit than the authorized strength of that unit would permit to join it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not perfectly clear in my own mind whether a man with no prior service, and who is now in the Reserve, could be assigned to a National Guard unit for training. Such authority may exist; but I wish to say frankly that, in my judgment, it is most unlikely that such a man would be so assigned by the Defense Establishment, because the defense program, as President Eisenhower sent it to Congress, requests authority to require 6 months of active training or service on the part of the National Guard. So it is highly unlikely that the Defense Establishment would assign to a National Guard unit, for training, a man who enlisted in the Reserve. However, one who enlists in the National Guard has all the rights and benefits which under this program will accrue to those who enlist in the Reserve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is true. The problem to which I have referred would arise when the nearest National Guard unit was up to its full authorized strength, with the result that there would be no vacancies in it for additional enlistees.

Mr. RUSSELL. There might be individual cases of that sort; but the Reserve program contemplates the establishment of additional units, as was testified before our committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize that. However, in the table in the hearings there is a column for current and proposed units and another solumn for current or existing units. It so happens that for my State the same figure appears in each column, namely, 35. So in the case of my State there would be no change in that situation.

I understand there are two categories in the Ready Reserve in which men may enlist. One is under the first provision, when the President determines that the enlisted strength is not sufficient. In that category, a man who enlisted would be liable for 6 months' active training to start off his Reserve service.

Mr. RUSSELL. From 3 to 6 months, as the bill was finally reported.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. However, on page 23 there is a proviso which permits an enlistment when the training period is not required, provided the enlistment occurs before the age of 18 years and 6 months.

Mr. RUSSELL. With liability running until the man attains the age of 28.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Whereas, under the other program, if he takes from 3 to 6 months' training, as prescribed by the Department of Defense, his liability is extinguished after 8 years. So in the case of a 17-year-old boy, he would have 3 years less liability in the Ready Reserve, if he took the training of from 3 to 6 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad the chairman has pointed out the distinction between the two classes of enlistments in the Ready Reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are really three different categories of enlistments provide by law for the Ready Reserve units. First, under existing law, there is the National Guard. A man can enlist between the ages of 17 and 18½ in the National Guard. So long as he satisfactorily performs the equivalent of 48 weekly drills and 2 weeks of training, he is exempt from induction under the Selective Service if he carries on until age 28.

To give the National Guard men some part of the reduced period which is afforded the Reserves under this bill, the committee inserted an amendment, so that if the National Guardsman reports for 3 months of active duty for training with the Regular forces, his Ready Reserve liability shall expire after 8 years, just as it does in the case of the Reserve who has from 3 to 6 months of active duty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is a wise provision. It was due to the foresight and analytical judgment of the chairman that that provision was inserted. It dovetails very nicely.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I slept with this question—or, rather, I wrestled with it—for 2 or 3 weeks, in an effort to coordinate the program as well as possible. Whether we have a good program or not, only time will tell. At least it is coordinated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is coordinated. I think the explanation of the three categories is fine for the Record.

I also invited the attention of the chairman to this subject because of one possible oversight on my part, or possibly on the part of the staff in not calling my attention to it.

In connection with the enlistment with respect to which a 6 months' training period is provided, we inserted, in the provision on page 16, line 16, the words "Until August 1, 1959."

The chairman will recall that I suggested that it would be well to have a date inserted so as to insure a review of the program. I had intended that that date, insuring a review, should also apply to the second category of enlistments in the Ready Reserve, with respect to which the 6 months' training is not required. By reference to page 23, line 25, it will be noted that the words "Until August 1, 1959" do not appear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why should there be a cut-off date in that instance? Why should not the Reserve units have the same benefits, by permanent law, as are accorded to the National Guard? I can see some reason for reviewing the 6 months' training, but the maintenance of our Regular Reserve units has been one of the prime purposes of our military organization since the beginning of the country, when George Washington recommended a strong and well-trained militia. I can see why the cut-off date should apply in the case of 6 months' training, but I can see no substantial reason why we should apply a cut-off date to voluntary enlistment in the Reserve components.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My thought is that in this instance it establishes deferment under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but why not give to the Reserve units the same thing the National Guard has? The National Guard has that benefit today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is a deadline with respect to the life of the Selective Service Act, and I thought we were thinking of a date which would be coordinated with the period during which the Selective Service Act would be in force, without reenactment.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is merely the induction which stops under the Selective Service. But there is no reason why we should cut off the time when a man might enlist in the Reserve.

I hope the Senator will not insist on such an amendment. I was glad to go along with him in connection with his other amendment, because I thought it strengthened the bill to have a review of the 6 months' training period. But the amendment he now suggests relates only to the Regular Reserve establishments, and they feel that they should have the same opportunity as the National Guard in competing for young men.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It may be that that is sufficient, but I think there should be a review period.

Mr. RUSSELL. We will review the program when we review the Selective Service Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Selective Service Act will expire, and that will accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will accomplish the purpose the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. If a boy between the ages of 17 and 18½ enlists in the National Guard, and is assigned to a company in his home town, and then leaves his home town, either for employment or for some other reason—perhaps for school—can he transfer to a company in the community to which he goes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that is provided for in the Reserve Forces Act of 1952. Under those circumstances a man could transfer, with the same rights preserved that he had under his original enlistment.

Mr. BEALL. Suppose he goes to another State?

Mr. RUSSELL. His rights are preserved, provided the Governor has approved that system within the State. The right which accrues to be exempt from induction applies only when the Governor of the State has requested that it be done. I think all 48 governors have done so, but in case the man should move to a State in which such a request had not been made by the Governor, he would lose his exemption.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But otherwise he could transfer from one State to another.

Mr. RUSSELL. With the approval of the Governor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have quite a few questions to ask for the purpose of establishing the legislative history. I wish to follow the Senator's pleasure. I do not know whether the Senator from Georgia has completed his explanation of the bill or not, or whether he would prefer to have me withhold my questions until he concludes any further statement he may wish to make. I desire to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am willing to yield for questions at any time the Senator sees fit. There are one or two other features of the bill which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate, but I can do so just as well after undertaking to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. MORSE. Perhaps it would be better if I asked them now.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to yield at this juncture.

Mr. MORSE. By way of preface, permit me to say that I have not had the time to study the hearings on the bill. I am sure that if I had had the time I would not be asking many of these questions now. However, I know that the plan is to vote on the bill this afternoon, and I feel that these questions should be asked and answered.

Also, as a former associate of the Senator from Georgia on the Armed Services Committee, I wish to say in his presence what I have said in many places in the United States—that I think he is the best informed man on military problems in the entire Congress; I think he has few equals, if any.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator flatters me far beyond my deserts. Nevertheless, the praise is sweet, and thankfully received.

Mr. MORSE. I express my judgment on the basis of years of service with the Senator from Georgia.

Next, I wish to make very clear, by way of preface, that these questions are entirely impersonal. The Senator from Georgia is entitled to know the basis for them.

Last night I was called into what might be called an emergency conference. I was invited to the conference by representatives of various groups, including some civil-rights groups, which apparently disagree with certain features of the bill. I think the Senator from Georgia knows me well enough to feel confident that when I ask questions on any issue it is for the purpose of getting information into the Record, leaving to each Senator the right to reach his own valued judgment as to the course of action he should follow.

However, the people to whom I refer are citizens of the United States, and they are entitled to present their point of view to their elected officials and, if in the judgment of those officials, the point of view is a meritorious one, to have a legislative record made; and they are entitled to have their elected officials elicit for them the information I now seek from the Senator from Georgia. I know I shall get the information from the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall try to answer the Senator's questions, in whatever field they may be, in the best of good faith.

Mr. MORSE. If some of the questions I shall ask are answered in the hearings, I should like the Record to show that I have not had time to read the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings are rather voluminous.

Mr. MORSE. I did not get a copy of the report or of the hearings until earlier today. I have not had time to go through the hearings. I shall make my questions as brief as I can. Some of them may call for a little explanation of the points of view expressed in the conference last night, to which I have alluded, preliminary to stating the questions themselves.

First, I should like to ask the Senator if it would be correct to describe the bill, as reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as a bill which seeks to provide a system of universal service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would say that the bill could not possibly have that effect. I should like to see some system of universal service established, but the pending bill does not have any universality and no compulsion on any men who have not been inducted into the military service.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Georgia knows, he and I have supported, and I still support, a universal military service bill. I am still of the opinion that the general principles of the American Legion bill of 1944 constitute the best plan I have studied to date. There may be better plans, which I have not studied, but the Senator from Georgia will recall that during my 8 years of service on the Committee on Armed Services, I supported a universal military service bill along the lines of the American Legion bill. I would still support such a bill, because I believe the security and defense needs of my country call for much to be done along that line.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon was a coauthor with the Senator from Georgia in 1951 of the universal military service bill, which was passed by the Senate after long and exhaustive hearings. I believe that bill substantially incorporated the principles of the American Legion bill.

Mr. MORSE. I must say to the Senator from Georgia that the representatives of some of the organizations with whom I met last night completely disagree with respect to my views on the needs of a universal training bill to protect the security of our country.

However, that fact in no way lessens their right to have me consider their point of view and to present their point of view, as I seek to do in asking my questions this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that earlier the question was asked about the universality of the pending bill. As it relates to men who are not prior servicemen, there is absolutely no compulsion. Therefore, it cannot be called a universal bill.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be correct to say that the pending bill continues the exemption from induction into the military service under the Selective Service Act of persons who enlist in the National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does. It not only continues that exemption, but it creates in the Reserve a similar exemption, which has not heretofore existed.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, one of the major results of the bill, if enacted into law, will be to give to the youth of the country who can qualify under its terms a choice of whether they will await selective service or, if the allotment is not filled, to seek enlistment in the National Guard. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Of course, where there is no National Guard unit available, such persons can enlist in the Reserve under some form of the National Guard exemption which has been a matter of statutory provision for several years. That right is created in the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be correct to say that one of the effects of the pending bill, if passed, would be to give the white youth of the country an opportunity to avoid active service and, on the other hand, to discriminate against the colored youth who, because the National Guard of their particular State excludes or segregates Negroes, must enter active duty away from home?

Mr. RUSSELL. The assumption on which that question is predicated is entirely erroneous. The bill in no way affects the National Guard in States where it is segregated at the present time. It does for the first time open up Reserve units in which colored youths—we might as well use the term—can enter and obtain the same exemptions from selective service that the white youths have had in States which do have a segregated National Guard at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. These first questions deal with the relationship of the white and colored youths to the National Guard. It is true, is it not, that in some States the National Guard is not open to colored youths, and in other States the National Guard is open to colored youths, but on a segregated basis?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly correct. In some States I understand there are no units of the National Guard which are open to colored youths at the present time. In some other States there are units which are open only to colored youths. In other States there are units which are open only to white youths. In the Reserve units, since they are Army of the United States units, such restrictions do not apply.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator's answer needs to be emphasized in the Record, so that men who do not now understand the situation, will understand that, so far as the letter of the proposed law is concerned, it in no way changes the existing law in respect to the administration and operation of the National Guard in the respective States as of the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Historically, the establishment of the National Guard and the selection of its officers and of the composition of its units have been a matter for determination by the States. The pending bill in no way undertakes to impose any Federal restrictions on that historic concept.

Mr. MORSE. That raises the next question. Can it be said that the pending bill, being Federal legislation, brings the Federal Government into the National Guard program, and grants an exemption on a much broader basis to white youths and restricts, on a much broader basis, colored youths, although one of the purposes of the bill is to increase the number of men in the Reserve?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill in no way affects the situation which the Senator has in mind. That situation is created by other law, which is not involved in the pending bill. The pending bill does not create any exemption in the case of members of the National Guard. It does not deal with the National Guard, except for the provision for 3 months' volunteer training on the part of any member of the National Guard who wishes to volunteer for training in the armed services. The bill does not create any exemption or benefit for any member of the National Guard. The benefits to which the Senator from Oregon refers were created by law which was passed in 1948, 7 years ago. The bill in no way affects that existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Perhaps a little discussion of this point with the Senator will make clear the objection that was raised at the conference of last night to which I have referred. Although, as was admitted, the bill does not change the 1948 law as to its letter, nevertheless, one of the objectives of the bill now pending is to broaden the base of our Reserves by increasing the number of men in the Reserves, and the National Guard is to be one of the very important components of the Reserve.

Therefore, to the extent that the pending bill will affect a greater number of men, it extends and expands what to these people is already an existing discrimination in the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That argument is wholly erroneous. The bill does not increase the total number of men in the National Guard by one man.

It does propose means which will greatly increase the Reserve units of the Army, but the number of men in the National Guard is controlled by the annual appropriation bill, and this bill does not affect them in the slightest degree. The Senator heard the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] complain because the ranks of the National Guard in his State are filled up. There was no question of color involved there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to my colleague from Oregon that I think the opposite may be true. One of the reasons why the National Guard did not wish to be included in the bill was that there might be a question whether voluntary enlistments would be cut. As the Senator from Georgia has said, the National Guard total is fixed at around 450,000 men. It may be less than that today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts speak more loudly?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was saying that one of the problems which the committee faced was the question of the National Guard being included or not included in the bill, and the committee decided not to include it. One of the reasons for that was to make it possible for the National Guard to sustain its enlistments. If it should be included in the bill, the enlistments might suffer because the Reserve would become more desirable. Therefore, so far as the question of the Senator from Oregon is concerned, as I see it, it is not a question of building up the National Guard and making a discrimination, but, rather, that the National Guard now has its quota, and we wish to see it maintain its quota despite the fact that there may be a greater inducement for men to go into the reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that the question was predicated upon the completely erroneous conception that it increases the Ready Reserve by perhaps a million men. It does open up an almost unlimited number of places in the Reserve, with the same rights which accrue to members of the National Guard under the 1948 act.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know the Senator from Georgia is correct in his statement that it does not affect the size of the National Guard; but what will happen in those States which do not permit colored enlistments in the National Guard? I am told that there are at least a million Negro youths in those States. What opportunity will they have to claim the same exemption given to the white boys and on an equal basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have none unless this bill is passed. The bill opens up the reserve units of the United States Army, which presently are nonsegregated. There has been a great clamor throughout the Nation for a number of years for nonsegregated armed services. This bill opens up reserve units in which men may enlist without regard to color, and obtain the same rights accorded the National Guardsmen at the present time.

Mr. LEHMAN. With the same exemption?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will they be required to leave home to serve in the reserve units if they live 100 miles away?

Mr. RUSSELL. They will not. They have exactly the same requirement as that which applies to the National Guard. A National Guardsman must have the equivalent of 48 drills. It has been pointed out by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] that that does not mean 48 days, but 48 periods of drill, and 2 weeks of military training. This bill would afford for the first time the same privilege and benefit to those enlisting in the reserve units which will be created under this bill in an effort to bring the Army up to the point set by the Department of Defense.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly, the National Guard is considered a very important component in our Military Establishment and in our effort to create a Ready Reserve; and I am strongly in favor of creating such a Reserve. But in States where Negroes are not permitted to enlist in the National Guard, and, according to the best information I have, there are about a million Negro youths so affected, they will have to enlist in the Reserve or in segregated units. They will obviously again be tragically discriminated against.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figure of a million is not significant, because there are perhaps 2 million white youths who will have no opportunity to enlist.

Mr. LEHMAN. They may have the opportunity of enlisting in the National Guard in some States providing they are accepted, but they do not have the opportunity, of course, if the law or accepted custom forbids integrated units to be set up. Even in States where there is no prohibition against Negro National Guard units, no Negro can enter the National Guard save in a very minor degree, because in few States are Negros welcomed in most Guard regiments. They find it difficult, if not impossible, to enlist in many Guard units, and certainly in those States which have the prohibition to which I have referred they are completely excluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not know about all the States. I am not familiar with the policy in all the States. But I answered the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] very frankly, and I always try to be forthright, by saying that there are States where Negroes cannot enlist in the National Guard at the present time. That is undoubtedly a fact.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not know that was on the RECORD. I am glad that it is again on the RECORD. I have the highest respect for the Senator from Georgia, and I appreciate the amount of work he has done in connection with this bill, but he knows that he and I do not see eye to eye on this issue even if we do on many others. I have a very strong feeling that while I very greatly wish to see the Reserve bill pass—and I have wanted to see it enacted for a great many years—I think there are many injustices and inequities in the bill which is now before us.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's statement is wholly in error. This bill does not create any inequity or any injustice because it does not deal with the National Guard. If it is an inequity or an injustice to have segregated units—and, in my opinion, it is not—the bill creates a large number of Reserve units in the Army which are totally under Federal control, where segregation cannot obtain, because of orders which have been issued by the Department of Defense and the Commander in Chief, starting with President Truman and strengthened greatly by President Eisenhower.

So, instead of creating or perpetuating any injustice, the bill does not affect the National Guard, but it does afford to the Negro youths in States where the National Guard is white the right to enlist in Reserve units and obtain the same exemption from the draft as is applicable to those who enlist in the National Guard units.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me we could help to clarify the situation by suggesting that the Ready Reserve will be a sort of parallel organization with the National Guard, except that it will be completely a Federal organization, and the National Guard will remain a State organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the parallel Federal Ready Reserve will start off with a period of 3 to 6 months of active training?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. The Senator knows this bill contains the provision that a man can enlist in the Reserve under the same requirements which apply to the National Guard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct, if a man enlists at an earlier age.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The States historically have always controlled the National Guard. As a matter of fact, it is written into the State constitutions that each governor is the commander in chief of the National Guard of his State. That is one of the few examples of State sovereignty that remain in this highly centralized Government of ours.

The bill does not affect the situation of the National Guard, but it opens up innumerable opportunities to the youth of every race and belief to enlist in the Reserve units and to have exactly the same privileges accorded them as are accorded the members of the National Guard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to try to make this point as clear as I can, from my point of view. I may say to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that, taking Massachusetts as an example, every unit, so far as I know, is nonsegregated. I do not believe anyone has been refused enlistment in Massachusetts because of his color, race, creed, or belief.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is the Senator referring to the National Guard?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am referring to the National Guard. I reviewed the National Guard last year. I think every unit contained members of the Negro and white races, without any question. I will not say that that was true of every unit, but I watched the whole National Guard of Massachusetts pass by in review and I would say that is true.

The National Guard, including the air wing, comprises about 450,000 men. The

Reserve which the Senator from Georgia is supporting in the bill would be comprised of 2,900,000 men. So there are about 6 chances to go into the nonsegregated Reserve to 1 chance to go into the National Guard. In other words, with a total component of 2,900,000, the Reserve will be 6 times the size of the National Guard, and there will be 6 times greater opportunity for a boy to join the Reserve as there is to enlist in the National Guard.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, that I may make an observation in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am surprised to hear my friend from Massachusetts make the statement that no discrimination is practiced in any of the National Guard units.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of Massachusetts.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of Massachusetts. Of course, I am not familiar with the Guard in Massachusetts. I say I am surprised because, from my observation in other States, that is not the fact. If it is true in Massachusetts, I congratulate Massachusetts—and I feel certain it must be true, otherwise, the Senator from Massachusetts would not have made the statement.

But my observation indicates that conditions generally are quite different. I believe discrimination is practiced on many grounds, notably the ground of color, in many of the National Guard units of most of the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. During the 6 years I was Governor, and in the years since I was Governor, I reviewed the National Guard in my State, and have seen no evidence, and have never had a complaint brought to my attention, that there has been any question of segregation in the Massachusetts National Guard.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can match that length of service as the Governor of a State with that of my friend from Massachusetts. Unfortunately, I have seen many evidences of discrimination in many Guard units in many States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not become involved in the debate on the question other Senators are discussing. There are observations I should like to make, but I think they would bring on more discussion.

I now yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator from Georgia tell me whether the passage of the bill would in any way result in any financial obligations being undertaken by the Federal Government with respect to the State National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill does not increase the financial obligation or responsibility of the Federal Government to the State National Guard by one thin dime.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that the State National Guard which enlists youths, who then become exempt from the draft under the terms and regulations of the law, is to that degree performing a financial service for the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. The Federal Government spends a large amount of money on the National Guard. It pays the National Guardsmen for their drills. But the Senator's question was concerning the pending bill. I said the bill would have no effect whatsoever on the financial obligation of the Federal Government to the National Guard. As the Senator well knows, the Federal Government provides for the drills by the National Guard and furnishes a large part of the equipment for it. But that is not under any provision of this bill; it is under laws some of which have been on the statute books for as long as 75 or 80 years.

Mr. MORSE. Perhaps I did not make my question very clear. It was to lead up to the information I was seeking that I asked the question.

Does the Senator know whether there have been, during the past several years and are at present, National Guard units which have had difficulty in keeping their quotas filled?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not advised as to the details of that matter. It would be very remarkable if there were not some units in the National Guard throughout the country which had not had some difficulty in filling their quotas. But in the past 7 years the National Guard has experienced less difficulty in filling its quotas than ever before in its history. In the majority of instances, there are men who are seeking to enter the National Guard units.

Mr. MORSE. Once the bill becomes law, is it contemplated that the governors and the legislatures of the respective States may be induced to increase the number of men who can be taken into the State National Guard units?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know what the States might do about it, because members of the National Guard are paid by the Federal Government; and the control on the number of National Guardsmen is in Washington, with the Federal Government. The only obligation of the Federal Government is as to the 450,000 guardsmen who are distributed throughout the United States under a formula. That is the only activity which entails any Federal responsibility, I may say.

On the other hand, the bill contemplates 2,900,000 Reservists, including 450,000 National Guard men.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator will pardon me for dwelling longer on this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can dwell on it as long as he wishes to do so.

Mr. MORSE. I am dwelling on the point which involved an expression of fear at the meeting last night which I frankly told the Senator at the beginning was the basis for these questions. The fear was expressed as follows, that under the bill, if it becomes law, there would not be anything which would restrict the Pentagon from recommending an increase in the membership of the National Guard of certain States in which segregation policies now exist, or in which Negro youths are not allowed to enlist in the Guard at all; and that that would mean an expenditure of additional Federal funds to those States, which would result in giving an additional advantage to the white youths of those States and a greater disadvantage to the colored youths of those States, with respect to the National Guard, but not with respect to the Reserves.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment, if I may speak without prejudice with respect to the overall question which the Senator has involved in his series of questions, the bill does not affect that in the slightest degree. The Pentagon cannot increase in any degree the size of the National Guard. That can be done only by Congress, because the National Guard is controlled by the annual appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. MORSE. That was my understanding; I wanted the record to show it.

May I ask the Senator to explain what provision there is in the bill with respect to the creation of a so-called Federal National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no change in the National Guard. The bill does not affect the National Guard.

Mr. MORSE. If anyone should refer to a so-called Federal National Guard, he necessarily would have to be talking about the so-called Ready Reserve, would he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. He would have to be talking about some unit of the organized Reserve force of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Is my understanding correct that as to the existing Reserve units of the United States, no matter where located, colored youths would be on an equal footing with white youths in their opportunities to enlist in the Reserves?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would be under the orders of the President of the United States and the regulations of the Defense Establishment. Of course, there might be cases of discrimination, as the Senator from New York said he had seen or knew about. But the Reserve units certainly, by law, will be open, without regard to race, color, or creed.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I wanted to stress. That affords a transition to my next comment, which will be followed by a question.

In the Selective Service Act, the original act of 1940, contains the following provision:

> That in the selection and training of men under this act and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

The substance of that provision became section 5A of the Selective Service Act of 1948, and remains a part of the basic law to which the pending bill is an amendment. That is my understanding, and I judge, from what the Senator from Georgia has said, that is his understanding.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill has to do with Reserves, but it does amend the Selective Service Act. It does not amend the section to which the Senator has referred. That section is unaffected by the bill. As a matter of fact, that section has been implemented by Executive orders by at least two Presidents of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I think we have made the record clear. The pending bill is an amendment of the Selective Service Act, and section 5A of the Selective Service Act of 1948 remains unchanged by the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It becomes absolutely unchanged by the bill. In other words, I can assure the Senator that the pending bill in nowise affects the provision of law to which he has referred.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I saw the Senator from Maryland in the Chamber a moment ago. Because I used the State of Maryland in the example I gave, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to a situation which I understand exists in Maryland. Maryland offers an example of the National Guard policy. In Baltimore there are segregated National Guard units. Colored youths can enlist in colored Guard units and white youths can enlist in white Guard units in Baltimore; but on the Eastern Shore of Maryland there is no Guard for colored youths. The question has been raised as to what would be the effect of this bill upon the colored youths in those areas of Maryland. As to the Baltimore colored youths, my understanding is that the status quo would be maintained. They could, if eligible, enlist in colored Guard units. As to the Eastern Shore of Maryland, colored youths would now have an opportunity to enlist in the Reserves, in which they heretofore have not had an opportunity to enlist. Therefore, if the bill is enacted into law, they could be exempted from induction under the Selective Service Act, whereas at the present time they would have to be inducted. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with the situation in Maryland.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to treat that as a hypothetical situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. But, hypothetically, if the Senator's statement is correct, the pending bill would open up to colored youths on the Eastern shore, as the Senator has said, the right to enlist in the Reserve, and have the same privilege which accrues to those who are in the National Guard, without regard to color. The privilege attaches to the unit, and not to the individual. If the youth gets into the unit before he is 18½ years old, whatever his race or creed, and does his work, and stays in until he is 28 years old, he is exempted from the draft.

Mr. MORSE. I have one final question. The Senator in his comments has cleared up a good many of the questions I had intended to propound. My question deals with the new Reserve units, if *any, that will* be made available under the bill. Will the Senator describe to us what the bill provides by way of new Reserve units?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Congress has never sought to select individual units. The pending bill proposes to increase the overall Reserve strength from 800,000—I believe by law it is 1,500,000—to 2,900,000. The Department of Defense representatives will appear before committees of Congress, and may say that an Army unit will be created in one area, a naval unit in another, or an Air Force unit in another. Congress has never sought to designate specific units. That will all be done administratively within the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. But under the bill, it is contemplated, is it not, that a sufficient number of those units will be distributed across the country, so as to make it possible to secure enlistments in the Reserves to fill up the total number of Reserves which are being sought under the proposed legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Defense will, very naturally, put the units where the men are located. However, as I said earlier in my colloquy with the Senator from South Dakota, if a man lives 100 miles from a Reserve unit, he has a right to enlist. Instead of having 48 drill periods, he may get his training during 30 days in any 1 year. There is no question of race involved, and I do not suppose that there are more than one or two thousand colored people in the State of South Dakota. I feel sure the Department of Defense will distribute the units on the basis of fairness, in an effort to achieve the desired total of 2,900,000. Personally, I think the Department is going to have a great deal of difficulty doing it without some compulsion. I do not believe it is going to get the desired number, even with the means provided in the bill, and even with the inducements for men to enlist and maintain their status in the National Guard or Reserves and thereby become exempt from the draft.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator say it is his opinion that the pending bill in no way would increase the degree of discrimination based upon color, if any discrimination now exists under the law, over and above that which exists under the present law?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon and I might debate for a long time, without agreeing, on the question of what is discrimination. I have never felt it was discrimination for a man to be allocated with those of his own kind. There is only one race in the world I know of that believes that is discrimination. The pending bill does not increase, by one, any unit in the United States that would be composed solely of members of the white race, because it does not deal with the National Guard as such. It does open up Reserve units which under existing law, and policy, and Executive order are open to all people in the country, without regard to race, creed, or color.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me to that extent the bill would really increase the opportunity for a colored youth to enlist in a Reserve unit, which will free him from induction under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill will, for the first time, in some States of the Union, offer to colored youth an opportunity to enlist in a Reserve unit and be exempted from the operations of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question with respect to Federal financial contribution, in light of the trend toward so-called educaional nondiscrimination and other trends. We have seen in the past few years, certainly in the minds of those who hold to the general philosophy which the Senator from Georgia very well knows the Senator from Oregon holds to, that discrimination is diminishing rather than increasing in America. Does the Senator think there is any basis for the contention of minority groups that the enactment of the bill in is present form will result in money going to the States for the support of the National Guard, and, in the sense that the Government pays for the training of the enlistees in the Guard, the payment will be a discriminatory use of Federal funds, on the basis of the color line?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I have said, I do not believe that is discrimination. But in the bill there is nothing which will increase by one dime the expenditures in the National Guard.

The bill does open up a 3 months' training course in the Reserve Establishment for the members of the National Guard who desire to take the course on a voluntary basis. But that is merely for the purpose of increasing the training of the National Guard and to bring the National Guard into line with the new Reserve units which are created by the bill for the first time. Nothing in the bill will increase the expenditures for the National Guard; the National Guard, as such, is not dealt with basically in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his very fair and objective answers to my questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have several questions to ask of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and my questions are in two different categories.

My first question is as follows: In the event the Reserve bill is passed by Congress, is there any assurance that the Department of Defense will make an effort to reach the goals set by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only statement I can make about that is to repeat the assurances given by the witnesses from the Department of Defense who appeared before the committee. They said they were very anxious to reach the President's objective of 2,900,000 men in the Ready Reserve; and in his message to the Congress, the President said it was vital to have that many men in the Ready Reserve.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956 was based on certain strengths for the armed services. Do the current plans of the Defense Establishment for 1956 provide for the size of the Armed Forces called for by the Congress when it passed the Defense Establishment appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956? Will the armed services be permitted to build up their strengths to the figures envisioned by the Congress when it passed that appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think there would be some administrative determination in that field. Whether it will be done, I do not know. In the case of the Reserve units other than the National Guard, I do not know that the Department of Defense will follow that course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee knows what I am driving at. Specifically, will the Marine Corps be allowed to build up to the 215,000 sought by Congress under the Symington amendment, when the appropriation bill for the Defense Establishment for the fiscal year 1956 was passed by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. That specific question was asked of some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. But I must say that we did not receive a very specific answer. It was stated that it was the opinion of the witness that that would be the case, but that no formal determination had been made. I think that is a reasonably fair digest of the testimony on that score.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to a situation which exists in the Rocky Mountain States of Arizona, Idaho, Utah, and Montana. There we have the 96th Infantry Reserve Division, one of the best trained and, I understand, one of the best equipped and best manned division in the Reserve. It is an active Reserve unit. Rumors about that Reserve division have come to the attention of the Senators from those States. I have discussed the rumors with Senators HAYDEN and GOLDWATER, BENNETT and WATKINS, WELKER and DWORSHAK, and my colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]; and they are extremely worried lest this division be deactivated and its present units transferred elsewhere.

Because of the great importance of keeping the division alive, I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the committee can give us assurance that the 96th Infantry Reserve Division in the Rocky Mountain area will not be deactivated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Montana—indeed, I think all the Senators from the area affected—have undertaken to discuss this matter with me. I shall not undertake to call the roll of all the Senators who did so; but I am sure that if any one of them has not discussed the matter with me, it was because he was out of the city.

I have undertaken to obtain the information from the Department. Within the hour I have received a communication which I have not yet had an opportunity to read. So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will forgive me for doing so, I shall now read it aloud, so that all Senators will have as much information in that field as I shall have.

In the letter, after the preliminaries, in which it is stated that the letter is in reply to my inquiries regarding the status and the future of the 96th Infantry Division, the following is set forth:

> In planning a stronger and more usable Reserve force, a constant review of mobilization requirements is conducted by the Department of the Army in consonance with new developments and techniques. This review has resulted in a determination, among others, that the number of combat divisions in the United States Army Reserve exceeds the present authorized mobilization need. It was also determined that a need does exist for other type units which are not now organized. Therefore, the Army commanders were requested to recommend which of the divisions under their jurisdiction were to be converted to other type units requiring retention of their division staff organization, the Army commanders, with their more intimate knowledge of local conditions, being better able to make any such definite recommendations.
>
> At present writing, no public press release has been made by the Sixth Army as to a change of status of the 96th Infantry Division, but it is understood that the commanding general of the 96th Infantry Division has received a confidential letter stating that a change of status was contemplated.
>
> Details as to why the Sixth Army commander selected the 96th Infantry Division for a change of status is being forwarded to this headquarters. Upon receipt of the information you will be informed.

That concludes the letter.

I may say to the Senator from Montana that, from my long experience with the Department of Defense, I would say that although the letter says nothing, it indicates very clearly that some very drastic revision is about to be undertaken in the case of the 96th Division. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is an odd letter. It says a great deal, while trying to say nothing. The Defense Establishment is asking for the enactment of a Reserve bill, and is saying it needs to build up the Reserve, for the security of the country; but at the same time the Defense Department seemingly is attempting to tear down what is probably the best Infantry Reserve Division in the entire Nation.

How does the Senator from Georgia explain that? What can we do to keep the 96th Infantry Reserve Division in operation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I shall not undertake to get into a debate regarding the merits of any infantry division. I have knowledge of some which are very competent.

Of course, I do not undertake to say what is contemplated. The Defense Department may be attempting to reorganize the division into several combat teams, or to make it a division for combat training. But certainly it is difficult to understand why anything adverse should be done to the division. The letter says, in part:

> The number of combat divisions in the United States Army Reserve exceeds the present authorized mobilization need.

I am quite sure that nothing will be done which will affect or curtail any specific unit of the division which may be located in any of the States involved; but it may well be that the entire composition of the division will be changed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there any possibility of incorporating in the bill an amendment which will make it possible to see to it that the 96th Infantry Reserve Division is continued as an active Reserve division?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has been in Congress a long time, and he knows that it is exceedingly difficult to legislate on such a basis in respect to any one division. But I can assure the Senator from Montana that when I receive the further information as to what is contemplated in respect to this division, I shall be very happy to meet with the Senators from the States affected and to cooperate with them to the fullest extent, so as to see to it that the Reserve opportunities of the various units comprising the 96th Infantry Reserve Division are in no wise curtailed or adversely affected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will do what he can to help us to enable the Division to remain active.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly. It may be that the plan developed will appeal to the Senator from Montana. I do not know what is involved. I shall be glad to do what little I can to contribute to the combined efforts of the very able and distinguished Senators from the States affected, to see that the Reserve work in their States is carried on as it should be, in the interest of national security.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator, because I know that that little will be a great deal.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah was pleased to hear the colloquy regarding the 96th Infantry Reserve Division.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of the very deep concern of both Senators from Utah with respect to this Reserve Division.

Mr. BENNETT. I had prepared a brief statement relating to this question. I wonder if the Senator will yield in order that I may ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement which I have prepared with regard to the 96th Infantry Reserve Division.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Inasmuch as the Senate is considering the Reserve bill, I feel it would be appropriate to make some observations at this point. I have heard unconfirmed reports that the Army's future plans for Reserve units contemplate the deactivation of the 96th Infantry Division. The 96th Division is composed of personnel from the States of Utah, Montana, Idaho, and Arizona. It numbers approximately 3,000 men—the largest Reserve division in the country, I understand. Its record is outstanding among Reserve divisions, both in recruitment and performance. I understand further that 87½ percent of its membership is attending its encampment presently underway at Yakima Firing Center. This is a remarkable record.

Since 1948 this division has been working hard to carry out the mission assigned it. Because its units are dispersed through literally dozens of communities in the Intermountain area, the division has had to work unceasingly with the local citizenry to get the kind of cooperation required. The response from these communities has been splendid.

It would seem very unfortunate to disrupt a unit of this quantity and quality after all these years. Hundreds of men have been recruited on the assurance unit integrity would be maintained. Men have left the inactive Reserves to join this organization and participate in the kind of Reserve program the Nation needs. To deactivate this division—unless there are compelling military and budgetary reasons—would be to break faith with the thousands of young men, veterans, and officers who have put their time and talent into making this division what it is today.

I have no desire to tie the Army's hands in its planning operations. But I do urge that the Army take cognizance of the many factors involved before acting. If the Army's future plans involve concentrating Reserves in large urban centers, special consideration ought to be given large-quality units. While I have full confidence in the Army's ability to plan a Reserve program which will meet the needs of the Nation, I also feel that one of the weaknesses of the Reserve program has been the tendency to have too much "map reading in big city gymnasiums." Small and medium-size communities should be given every opportunity to participate fully in the Reserve program, and I have merely mentioned the 96th "Deadeye" Division as an example of what such communities can do. I hope this unit will be given every consideration, for certainly where we have something that is working well we should be very cautious about disturbing in favor of a new untried program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to refer briefly to the 96th Reserve Infantry Division, which was mentioned earlier in the colloquy between the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I think this is an excellent example of what the Senator from Georgia and I were discussing earlier, when we referred to the problem of morale in the Reserve forces. It stems from proper attention on the part of those at the top.

The 59th Combat Team, a part of the 96th Reserve Infantry Division, is now in training. I am sure that the commanding officer of that combat team knew nothing of the contemplated change. If he did, he did not tell me about it; and he happens to be the State chairman of the Republican Party, so I have reason to be rather close to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. At least he would not withhold secrets of that kind from the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Everything between us is open and above board in that connection.

I merely wish to call attention to this as an example of what has gone on in the past with regard to the ground Reserves. I do not think it pertains to the Air Force Reserves, the Navy Reserves, or the Marine Reserves. I hope the tactics with respect to the ground forces Reserve will be changed.

The men who compose this Reserve division should not be told that they are to be a permanent outfit, and then find out, after a course of difficult summer maneuvers, that they are only a paper outfit, reduced to a negative status.

I join with the Senators from Utah, with my senior colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], with the Senators from Montana, and, I am sure, with the Senators from Idaho and Wyoming, in thanking the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his assurance to us that he will be concerned with this situation, and will do all in his power to see that the 96th Reserve Infantry Division is continued in its present status; or, if a change is contemplated, that those of us who are vitally interested are told about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can certainly repeat such assurance.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am fully aware of all the work that has been done on this problem. Yet there is one part of it which causes some concern to a great many of us who come from agricultural States.

As I understand the bill, in order to take advantage of the Reserve program, the boys who enter the Reserves will have to take active service, depending upon the type they take, from 2 weeks to 30 days, and in one instance from 3 to 6 months. In many places in the Midwest and West there are young men just starting on farms and ranches which are strictly one-man operations. Can the Senator tell me whether any consideration was given, or whether any consideration will be given, to young men of this type, so that they may select, or have an opportunity to select, the time of their service during the year?

For example, I am thinking of young men who are in the potato farming business in Idaho or Colorado. They could not possibly select the Reserve program if their active duty were to be performed, we will say, between the 1st of May and and 1st of November. The situation poses a real problem, because, in a sense, they would be deprived of the opportunity of participating in the Reserve program, unless they were to sell their farms and enter some other occupation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is dealing with a question which is very acute in certain vocations and certain localities in the United States. That problem is now being studied, and a great deal of improvement is being made in affording men the opportunity to take their active duty for training at a time which fits into the activities of their civilian life. The Department of Defense, of course, must improve and expedite the program, and see to it that men are afforded the opportunity to take their training at a time when it will be of the least disadvantage to the individual concerned.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. This is a problem which concerns many young men. To the extent that they were engaged in individual agricultural enterprises, they would be deprived of the opportunity of taking advantage of the Reserve program. I am glad to have the words of assurance of the chairman concerning this problem.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly shall insist that the Department do what it can to alleviate hardship cases. The main concern, of course, is with the man who has done his active duty and has come back, and is compelled to remain in the Reserve. If the Department cannot adapt the fulfillment of the obligation to participate to his circumstances, it will be necessary for him to apply for transfer from the Ready Reserve to the Standby Reserve, in which he will not have a training obligation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the first place, let me express my sincere gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the conscientious work he has done over so many weeks in connection with this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know how conscientious and sincere the Senator from Georgia is. I know that when he expresses his opinions they come from his heart, and are based upon the experience of his lifetime. I hope he will give me credit for the same sincerity.

Mr. RUSSELL. I accord to the Senator from New York the same degree of sincerity. I know that he is completely sincere in any position he assumes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether a statement which was recently given to me is substantially correct. It is very brief. It reads as follows:

> The following States, which have substantial Negro population, operate their guard units on a policy of segregation or exclusion, or both: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

The statement goes on to say that nearly 1 million Negroes between the ages of 18 and 28 are draft registrants in those States, and are denied the choice of National Guard Service. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman will tell me whether, in his opinion, this statement is substantially correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that statement is substantially correct. I know that in all the States mentioned, with the possible exception of Kentucky, the pattern of segregation has obtained for a great many years. I assume that the National Guard units would be segregated in those States. I cannot state that as a fact. I know that that would be the case in the State of Georgia.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may assume therefore that the statement is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Knowing, as I do, the customs and mores of the people in those States, I assume that that statement is correct.

I assume also that there are approximately 1 million Negro youths living in those States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. What concerns me is that we have in our Military Establishment three branches of defense.

One consists of the regular services of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force.

The second is the organized Reserve.

The third is the National Guard. The National Guard looms very large in my mind, because it was under my command for 10 years in New York State. I followed its course, both in the camp here and later, when it went abroad in the service of its country. I was on close and intimate terms with it. I realize the very important part the National Guard plays in the defense of our country. Yet here we are adopting a plan——

Mr. RUSSELL. The conditions in the National Guard in the States to which the Senator has referred have obtained for many years. The bill does not affect those conditions in any way.

It all grows out of the State militia system of those States. That is as old as the Republic. That matter is under the control of the governors of the States, as the Senator has stated. The bill does deal with and create many Reserve organizations in which those conditions cannot obtain, because they are purely Federal organizations.

However, as the Senator knows, having been Governor of his State, the National Guard has a dual status.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe we have done a wonderful job bringing about integration in our armed services, and the Senator from Georgia deserves a great deal of credit for helping to integrate the races. There is relatively little——

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to be able to deserve any encomium which the Senator from New York would like to bestow on me. However, I must say that I deserve no credit for integration of the races in the armed services.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to give the Senator credit anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not deserve any credit for it, because I was very violently opposed to it. I am opposed to it today. I see no reason why any man of any race is handicapped by being permitted to serve in an organization composed of his own race.

We know that during the war the Nisei battalions, composed of native Americans of Japanese descent, did not contain any white men at all. The Nisei did not feel discriminated against because their organizations consisted entirely of Japanese men. Yet they made one of the most illustrious battle records on the hills and in the valleys of Italy, a record which perhaps was not equalled by any other organization.

Therefore, I cannot take any credit for any integration of the races. I believe that any man who goes into the armed services should have a right to say, when he enlists or is inducted, that he wants to serve with a unit composed altogether of his own race. If he does not so choose, he ought to be permitted to serve in a nonsegregated unit.

Every man in public life, I suppose, likes to claim any credit that is being passed around. However, I cannot claim any credit in that respect.

Mr. LEHMAN. I reluctantly withdraw my encomium of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I stood on the floor of the Senate for more than 3 days in an effort to persuade my colleagues that it was unfair and un-American to intermingle the races, over their protests, in the armed services.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdraw with great regret and reluctantly my encomium of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have very great admiration in most matters.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator making that statement after my disclaimer.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do feel very strongly, as the Senator knows, that in time of war, no greater risk is taken by a white boy than by a Negro boy, and no greater demands are made on one than on the other. Both have the same responsibilities and both face the same dangers. While I understand the sentiments of some of my friends in the South, I nonetheless deeply deplore and am saddened by the fact that in the military service there should be the slightest discrimination. I can see no excuse or justification for it.

The Senator from Georgia states that the bill before the Senate does not in any way affect the National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. It increases the Reserves, in which colored youths may enlist.

Mr. LEHMAN. It does not give the Negro boys in many States even the slightest opportunity of joining the National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the National Guard.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I am getting at. Yet the National Guard is one of the three great components of the defense structure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have yielded to the Senator from New York. If he wishes to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts at this juncture, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Reserve components of the United States are as follows: The National Guard of the United States, the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

Therefore, from the point of view of segregation, which the distinguished Senator from New York is arguing, in the few States he has named, taking the statement he has read as a correct statement, segregation would exist in one unit, namely, the National Guard of the United States, which would be composed of approximately 450,000 men.

Mr. RUSSELL. The National Guard in those States would not consist of more than 75,000 men.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And segregation would exist in those States alone.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There would be an opportunity for service in the Army Reserve, in the Naval Reserve, in the Marine Corps Reserve, in the Air Force Reserve, and in the Coast Guard Reserve. Therefore, assuming that the total Reserve is built up to 2,900,000 men, there would be eight times the opportunity in a nonsegregated unit to every one opportunity in a segregated unit. Actually it would be less than one, because, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, it is only in those States that the situation would exist, not in the State of the Senator from New York or in my State, for example.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been in the Senate for 6 years, and I hope the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that I am not trying to legislate for my State alone. I am trying to give consideration not only to the problems of my own State. I believe that I am not only a Senator from the State of New York, but also a Senator of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join with the Senator in that expression.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am interested in people all over the country. I may be wrong in my belief, but that has been my concept and my political philosophy all my life.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my concept, too, and I hope the Senator will give me credit for it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will not change my position on it. The Senator has mentioned a long list of various Reserve units. However, I believe my own classification still is fairly accurate. The Armed Forces of our country are the Regular Military Establishment, the Organized Reserve, and the National Guard.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that my interest in building up the Reserve goes back 15 or 18 years, and possibly longer than that. I could show Senators in my State papers speeches which I made in 1938 and 1939 and 1940, and many in later years, in which I urged universal military training and the building up of an adequate Reserve. I do not believe I am wrong in saying that my continuity of service in the Organized Reserve is perhaps as long as that of any other Member of the Senate. I joined the Reserve immediately on its creation—I believe in 1920 or 1925. While I will not be given a rifle or a hand grenade, the Reserve Corps has been good enough to reenlist me last year as an honorary member of the Reserve Corps—so I have been in the Reserve for at least 34 years.

Therefore, I believe I can honestly say that my interest in the whole question of building up the Reserve forces is deep and sincere and abiding.

As I said before, I believe it is very tragic that in our military forces, on whom we depend to defend our security and our survival and the very life of the

Nation, we should still be willing to permit discrimination.

I deplore it. I am glad to have this opportunity of speaking frankly to the Senator from Georgia and to my other colleagues. I expect to vote for the bill, but with deep misgivings because of what I believe to be discriminations against some of our fellow citizens. But I have been told often and forcefully and with sincerity by men who know most about our military requirements, including the President of the United States, who was a great general in the last war and who is now the Commander in Chief, other leaders in our defense efforts both military and civilian, and the distinguished chairman as well as other members of the Armed Services Committee, that Standby Reserve is absolutely necessary for our security. I cannot reject the testimony of these experts. So I expect to vote for the bill but with misgivings and heartaches because of what I think are unjustifiable discriminations in the legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his frank and forthright statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has been very kind to me on different occasions, and I wonder if I may ask him a few questions as a neophyte and as one who is not acquainted with the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from North Dakota has means of taking care of himself, and I shall do the best I can to answer the questions which he desires to propound.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me about the situation of a boy just out of high school and entering the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill does not put him into the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. He can volunteer. The bill is a voluntary bill. It does not put a single man into the service.

Mr. LANGER. What about the requirements for training as provided in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under one of the programs, a man will be on active duty for 6 months, with a reserve obligation of 7½ years.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Selective Service Act, how long will he be in the service?

Mr. RUSSELL. He will serve 2 years on active duty, with a Ready Reserve obligation of 3 years, and a standby obligation of 2 years, which simply means that he is available in case of an all-out war.

Mr. LANGER. In answer to a question by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator stated that if a force of 2,900,000 men was not obtained, compulsion might have to be applied.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that in my opinion 2,900,000 would not be obtained under this bill. The President asked for compulsion when he sent the plan to Congress. He asked that he be permitted to try to get men by volunteer means, and if he failed in that, to bring them in under the Selective Service Act. But the Congress has denied him that right, and I have expressed some doubt that he will reach the figure of 2,900,000.

Mr. LANGER. The present bill will not give him that power?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will not.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know, or has he a list of the length of the service periods in NATO countries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have that information before me, but I have seen it.

Generally speaking, I would say that the active duty requirement in the United States is somewhat longer than it is in the nations associated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that some of those nations do not have any compulsory military service at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of one that does not have compulsory military service. There is a difference in that most of them have a universal requirement of service, though it is shorter than our own. Ours is on a selective basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To supplement what the chairman has said, the time in NATO countries is shorter, but the liability for service is much longer. The liability runs up to 50 years in some of those countries, while ours runs to a maximum of 35 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I have been surprised with reference to some of those nations. I have noted that in Belgium the period has been lowered from 18 months to 1 year. Every man in England is supposed to take military training service for 24 months, and remain subject to military service up to 5½ years. Some nations have reduced their service period. I share the apprehensions of the Senator in regard to those countries. In view of the vast amounts of armament we are sending overseas, I think we should take that into consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to say that I have profited a great deal from the colloquies which have taken place. I refer particularly to the analysis of the bill given by the Senator from Georgia to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It has been very, very helpful, and I think we are getting a splendid legislative record as to the full intent and purpose of the proposal.

I should like to ask a few questions of the Senator from Georgia with relation to the Ready Reserve.

I understood the Senator to say that this particular bill does not apply to the National Guard or does not deal with the National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not alter the present status of the National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Only in that it does permit a Guardsman to volunteer for active duty for training with our regular forces. He can take active duty for training with the Regular Army for a 3-months period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But after his 3-months period do I correctly understand that he would be returned to his National Guard unit?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or would he return to a Ready Reserve unit?

Mr. RUSSELL. He would return to his National Guard unit. There is provision in other laws for transfer from one to the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I have stated privately to the Senator from Georgia, I have been very deeply concerned about the very question which has been discussed here, namely, the matter of the segregation or non-segregation of National Guard units. I have weighed the problem very, very carefully. It has been a very difficult one. I have listened and tried to study what the bill provides and what the intent of the proposed legislation really is. As I understand, there are 450,000 men in the present National Guard establishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my recollection of the authorized strength. It will not vary more than a few thousand, one way or the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it is the expressed purpose of the bill for the proposed Reserve to be approximately 2,900,000 men, if and when that figure can be reached.

Mr. RUSSELL. When it can be achieved; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My question is this: In an area where there is a segregated National Guard, under present laws, before this bill is enacted, a Negro youth would not be permitted to enlist in the National Guard and thereby substitute that service for service under the Selective Service Act, but if this bill is passed it would set up a Ready Reserve which would give that Negro youth exactly the same privileges made available under the old National Guard establishment for white youth?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. It does not necessarily establish a Reserve unit. They are all over the country now. But, for the first time, a person who enlists in it receives the same exemption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it a theoretical exemption, or a practical exemption; is it a theoretical privilege or a practical privilege? Is it possible that in some areas the so-called Ready Reserve units would not be established, thereby denying a Negro youth the same exemption and the same privilege now accorded to white youths in the so-called segregated National Guard States? Does the Senator understand what I mean?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I understand what the Senator is contemplating. I do not believe there is a State in the Union which does not now have units of the Reserve. I doubt that there is a State which does not have Reserve units of 1 of the 3 Military Departments. It may be that the Air Reserve is not activated all over the United States; but I am confident that every State has a Naval Reserve unit and an Army Reserve unit somewhere. A man has been able to get into any of those units. The units have been there. But until they were geared to the Selective Service Act, the young man naturally tried to get into the National Guard, where those who were under 18½ when they joined would be exempt from induction under the selective service.

The bill opens up the same benefits to those going into the Reserve units. It will be necessary, under the bill, to create a great many more Reserve units. The Department of Defense witnesses said that this was their purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That will be a matter of executive action, will it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Administrative action. The situation is as simple as this. The States historically have decided who would be eligible for the National Guard. The Federal Government has complete control over who will be admitted to the units other than the National Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, is it the feeling of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that the express desire and plan of the National Defense Establishment is to create many additional Reserve units and to establish them on the basis of geographical and population areas, so that there will not be discrimination in terms of exclusion from the same privileges because of race?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite confident that that is the purpose of the Department of Defense. President Truman issued an Executive order to that effect, and is was augmented by orders issued by President Eisenhower, when he assumed the Presidency. So far as I am aware, there is no segregated unit anywhere in the regular establishment, within the Federal service. The Reserve units come under the Federal service. I do not know how anyone could apply a different policy to the Federal Reserve unit from that which applies to the standing forces of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The problem with which I am wrestling on this issue is the fact that while the National Guard, under the law, comes under the jurisdiction of the chief executive of a State, and the National Guard has a historical pattern of State management, the truth is that under the Reserve program coming into being, and with the law that now pertains to the National Guard, the National Guard is actually a reserve. It fills in a part of the requirements of what would ordinarily be taken care of by selective service.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is by statute a part of the first line of national defense, along with other organized Reserve units.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet we are applying a dual standard.

Mr. RUSSELL. The National Guard cannot be called by the Federal Government except in case of a national emergency. The Federal units can be called at any time; but the National Guard units must be nationalized in case of war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But to obtain the privilege of exemption from selective service, and to have the privileges or responsibilities of the Reserve program, the National Guard serves the same function as the Ready Reserve to be created under the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; the National Guard had the sole privilege in that field, until this bill was drafted. Only in the National Guard could one secure exemption from selective service. No other organization could. The Reserve does not enjoy it until this hour; and it will not do so until the President implements the statute that may result from this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the bill shall be passed, it will provide equal privileges and exemptions.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the Ready Reserve, the same as is true in the National Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So far as privileges and exemptions are concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With that as an agreed fact, once the bill shall be passed, if we can get these provisions through conference, then there will be, will there not, one set of rules relating to segregation and nonsegregation in the National Guard, and another set of rules relating to the Ready Reserve?

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be in some areas. That would not be the case in the Senator's State of Minnesota, I feel certain. I am quite confident that the Senator has seen to it that in his State men are not required to serve only with those of their own kind. That policy, I understand, has been adopted in Minnesota long since. The National Guard has been open to people without regard to race or color.

But in my State, I think there are some segregated Negro units in the National Guard. Undoubtedly Negro units are segregated, and Negroes are not accepted for enlistment in white units.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The problem we face in the case of segregation in the military service is in giving equal privileges, rights, and responsibilities. I think that is one problem. I recognize what the Senator from Georgia has said. I think it is crystal clear that the bill improves the situation rather than impairs it. I think this ought to be a matter of record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have endeavored to make it a matter of record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has done that very well. The Senator from Georgia for a long time has felt there should be an option, even at the time of the passage of the selective service law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed, I have felt that way. However, the majority of my colleagues have disagreed with me on two occasions, and I have not pursued the matter any further legislatively. But I have not changed my mind individually, although I have not achieved any legislative results.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia is about to obtain his objective in this particular proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; this will not affect the situation at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It affects, does it not, all reservists?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the bill does not affect the National Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not affect the National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill does not affect exemption from selective service of one who joins the National Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recognize the fact that the bill does not affect that situation directly. It supplements the National Guard, which is the first line of our Reserve, by creating a Ready Reserve, but applies different standards in terms of integration.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It applies different standards in terms of integration for the Ready Reserve than it does for the National Guard in some States.

Mr. RUSSELL. That results because the national policy with respect to the armed services is to integrate, whereas in a few of the States the National Guard is segregated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator have any doubt in his mind, or any feeling of uncertainty, about the fact that if the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, can, by Executive order, rules, or regulations impose integration in the Ready Reserve, he cannot do it and supposedly is not doing it in the case of the National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident the President has no authority whatsoever to do so in the case of the National Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Despite Federal expenditures?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. In the absence of legislation, he would have no such authority. Of course, the Federal Government can withdraw its expenditures for the National Guard. It can cut off those expenditures. But under every law we have, and have had since the time of George Washington, the National Guard is a State organization.

Although the Government has become greatly centralized, no President has said he could take command of the National Guard except in case of a national emergency. In that event, he can Federalize the National Guard and impress it into Federal service. But in time of peace, the National Guard very clearly is a State organization, not only by State laws, but also by Federal statute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly respect the integrity of the position of the Senator from Georgia. There is no more able an exponent of any position than is the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have felt woefully inadequate on occasions when I have presented many matters which were meritorious and have seen them rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator argues his case well. Sometimes the case may not have as good a foundation as the argument. Nevertheless, the Senator argues his case well.

I will ask the Senator to bear with me for a moment in this expression. While we can technically differentiate between the National Guard in peacetime——

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not a technical differentiation; it is one which is created by statute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us call it a legal differentiation. If we now need 2,900,000 reservists, conditions must not be so peaceful. What bothers me is that we have had a national tradition with respect to the National Guard during a time when we never really looked upon a large military establishment as being necessary. Now the administration asks for a rather substantial military establishment. I hope the majority of Members think we need one, because it appears to me that we need a strong defense. But in the process of creating a larger military establishment, we take what once was a limited pattern of segregation in the National Guard and aggravate it, because it is entirely possible, is it not——

Mr. RUSSELL. How will it be aggravated?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not entirely possible, under the proposal, that in areas where the National Guard is segregated, persons who do not want to go into a nonsegregated National Guard will simply go into a segregated Guard, and thereby greatly enlarge the pattern of discrimination in larger dimensions and proportions.

Mr. RUSSELL. That could not be done because the number of guardsmen is limited.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator says that the number of guardsmen is limited, he means it is limited at present by the number of dollars which Congress appropriates at the request of the Pentagon.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A little later on the Pentagon representatives may come forward and say, "We are going to have difficulty with the Ready Reserves in certain areas of the country. We are going to have difficulty because under Executive orders they are nonsegregated, so we are recommending to the Appropriations Committee not the sum of $400 million for the National Guard, but $1,500,000,000." Is there not a possibility of a greatly expanded recommendation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would that I could answer that question in the affirmative, because I should like very much to see the National Guard greatly expanded; but, in my opinion, the National Guard will be played down in regard to expansion, and the Reserve units of the Armed Forces will be played up. That is my frank opinion. I wish it were the other way. I will be sincere with the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to see the National Guard increased, but, unquestionably, under the program being advanced, and as was indicated in nearly every line of the testimony, from now on, the emphasis is going to be placed on the Reserve units rather than the National Guard. I would rather have it the other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we could have the same principle applied to the National Guard as is provided in section 5A of the Selective Service Act of 1948, I should like to see the program expanded, as the Senator desires, because I think it serves a very great and important role in the whole defense and community structure of our Nation. I should not like to see the National Guard become a thing dying on the vine. It may very well be that, with the Ready Reserves now coming into the picture, we may see emphasis on that program. My hope was, and is, that the program of integration which has been established by the Department of Defense could and would be expanded into the areas of the Reserve program, the National Guard, and the Ready Reserves.

I want my position made clear that I cannot help but feel integration should apply in the military service much more so than in housing, education, and anything else. So there will be no doubt as to my position, when we come to the question of military service, when we come to the question of equal responsibility, when we come to the question of equal duties, regardless of racial background or national origin, when the National Government puts its finger on a person and says, "We want you," I think there ought to be equal rights, equal responsibilities, and equal duties, much more so than in the social and economic pattern.

It is that question which has caused me concern. I say most respectfully the President has made it somewhat difficult to argue the point. The President, in a recent press conference, set forth that the question was extraneous to what the junior Senator from Minnesota is now speaking about. I most respectfully say I do not think it is extraneous. I think the fact that the chairman of the committee has been so courteous and patient in his comments indicates that it is a subject worthy of discussion among honorable men.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede the sincerity of the Senator's opinion. I think when a man is sincere in his position, he ought to have a right to discuss it fully. I am not here to defend the President or his statement. I do not wish to be drawn into a lengthy debate as to what is and what is not discrimination. I attach a different interpretation than does the Senator from Minnesota to the meaning of discrimination. I say if a man goes into the armed services and receives the same pay, eats the same food, wears the same uniform, has the same opportunities for advancement to sergeant, corporal, or any other rank, and has exactly the same kind of barracks, he is not discriminated against if he serves with men of his own race. I cannot conceive of that being discrimination. If he got different pay, if he was compelled to do different type of work, or more menial work, I could see how that would be discrimination. It is my own view that in the old Army when colored members of the Armed Forces drew the same pay, wore the same kinds of uniforms, had the same mess, and performed the same duties, there was no discrimination merely because white men were permitted to serve with white men, and colored men with colored men. But that question has been decided adversely to my contention.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand, and may I say to the Senator, he makes his contention well. I am not trying to discredit it; I simply disagree with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota and I understand we widely disagree in this field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My hope is that under the proposal before the Senate, not only will integration be possible in the Ready Reserve—possible and practical and utilized—but that actually the Ready Reserve program will be a fact in being in areas where now we have merely the National Guard on a segregated basis. If that is not done, while the law may be written to equalize the privileges and the responsibilities, there will be an equality of law only on the statute books, and there will not be an equality in life itself and in terms of the service.

Does the Senator have good reason to believe that Ready Reserve units will be readily available? Does he have reason to believe that they will not be bypassed? Does he have reason to believe that Ready Reserve units will be available in areas where there is difference of opinion over segregation in the National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. In answering that question in the affirmative, the only authority on which I can rely is the fact that the testimony of all of the officials of the Department of Defense was to the effect that there they were going to greatly expand existing Reserve units; that they were going to create new Reserve units, and that they would be composed under existing orders in the Military Establishment. I apprehend that the Defense Department will receive into those Ready units youth of any color who can qualify, physically and mentally, for admission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a short statement which I have prepared printed in the body of the RECORD at the point where the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and me occurred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I rise to discuss the question of segregation in the National Guard as it affects the provisions of the pending bill.

I have given a great deal of careful, thoughtful soul-searching to the advisability of offering an amendment which would require that segregation be eliminated in the National Guard before the provisions of the bill affecting the guard can become operative. My decision not to offer the amendment has not been an easy one. I am thoroughly convinced the objective of the amendment is in the national interest and is thoroughly consistent with our Nation's ideals. My reason for not offering the amendment today is based on the fact that the President of the United States by virtue of his public statements has made constructive debate on this issue impossible. He has been wrong in his comments, but he has been effective to the point where an antisegregation amendment to this bill would not be accepted by the Congress.

The President has said that an antisegregation amendment would threaten the very existence of our Reserve program. With this view I thoroughly disagree. Yet, Senate debate on an amendment to eliminate segregation, would be, and has been so interpreted, clouded with the issue of its effect on the national security of our Nation.

My colleagues and I would be prepared to face the onslaught were there a possibility that our amendment would be approved. The facts are overwhelmingly clear, however, that the President's influence on the Members of his own party plus those Members on this side of the aisle who come from States that maintain segregated units would spell the death of the amendment.

I must in all conscience express my strong feelings on this question.

Our Nation has made tremendous progress toward eliminating segregation in our Armed Forces. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has testimony of my own activities toward that end, and I am proud of whatever role I played to thus help to democratize our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The success of the integration program has strengthened our society and improved the armed services and has made it possible for our Nation to stand with head high as we face the peoples of the world and as our service men and women acting as ambassadors of good will for this Nation have traveled to every corner of the globe.

National Guard units are the only units in our armed services where the pattern of segregation still remains. This is, of course, not the case in all States. Many, perhaps most of our National Guard units are integrated. We in Minnesota are pleased that our own National Guard is so integrated without racial segregation or discrimination. There are, however, I am informed, segregated National Guard units in at least 21 States. I am further informed that in 14 States our Negro citizens have no opportunity to participate in the National Guard program. To pass a bill, therefore, calling upon all of our young men to serve in the active and reserve units of our Nation without regard to their color and then to say to those men of dark color who are so forced to serve that they cannot serve equally is a gross violation of my conscience and our Nation's sense of justice.

I am well aware of the argument that the National Guard is in reality a State program and that the Federal Government should not interfere with its operation. This States' right argument, however, is not in the least persuasive to me in view of the fact that we are now passing a national bill affecting the National Guard and in view of the fact, furthermore, that the National Guard today receives about double the Federal funds given to the existing Reserve program. I am told that about $437 million was appropriated by the Federal Government for the National Guard in 1955.

In concluding this statement I desire to make one final comment with regard to the statement of the President that an antisegregation amendment to this Reserve bill is not a germane amendment. Let me say first that it ill-behooves the President who has himself not proposed any civil-rights legislation to the Congress to pointedly and vigorously criticize those who offer amendments in order to allow the Congress to express itself on these matters. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the President has it within his executive authority to end segregation in the Military Establishment, I suggest that he himself had and now has it within his power to avoid this controversy.

I respectfully call upon the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and as President of all the people, to end segregation and discrimination in all areas of the Armed Forces, including the Reserves and the National Guard.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Oregon. I yield to him now.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to say that as a new Member of this body, I have been very favorably impressed by the ease and the assuredness with which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has answered so many questions, without having taken food, and having had very little to drink, and that only of a very mild variety.

Mr. ERVIN. If I may interject, it consisted of sweet milk.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I hope it came from the wonderful dairy farms of North Carolina, may I add?

Long before the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota asked the question about what other nations allied with us were doing in this respect, I was interested in the matter, and early today I asked the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress to obtain for me the terms of service of the members of the armed services in the countries which I regard as most similar to our own from the standpoint of political institutions, language, and general cultural background, and those are the self-governing countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I wondered if I could read, very briefly, what I obtained. It comprises only one page. Then I should like to ask a question based on that information.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to have anything put in the RECORD that deals with the question, even if it is not directly related to the bill, if it deals with the national and international policy of the United States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The information I obtained certainly bears out the comments of the Senator from Georgia about the British Isles.

In Great Britain the term of active service is 24 months, followed by 3½ years with training liability and 5 additional years without training liability.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is universal. That applies to all men.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

In Australia the man who serves is eligible for 5 years' military training, during which time he must receive 140 days of actual training. In the event the 140 days of training are completed before the expiration of 5 years, there is no exemption from compulsory obligation until the 5 years expires. Of the 140 days, 98 days are spent in camp on full-time military duty. In the case of university students, the time in camp is reduced to 77 days. At the end of 140 days, the conscriptee is free from future compulsory military training.

What I have just read applies to military training in Australia.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee stated, in Canada there is no conscription.

In New Zealand, first there is a period of full-time service of 14 weeks in a training camp, temporarily reduced to 10 to 12 weeks, with the aim of building up the establishment, followed by a period of part-time service of 3 years, in which a total of 60 days—made up of 14 days in camp and 6 days of out-of-camp training each year—must be served. Finally, there is a 6-year term of service in the reserve, but involving no training liabilities.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee can see, with the exception of Great Britain itself, the period of service in the case of the Dominions of the British Commonwealth of Nations is substantially less than the one required in the bill. I should like to ask why the United States must impose upon its young men a period of military obligation so much more strenuous and prolonged than that imposed by the self-governing Dominions of the British Commonwealth?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that would be a matter of opinion. In the first place, the United States is the backbone of the free world, today. I would not be in favor of having us weaken ourselves merely because the Dominions of the British Empire, which are dependent upon us to keep the free world free, do not require what we regard as an adequate period of service. I have thought, and I have discussed the matter in some of the very highest circles, that we should make representations to some of our allies—not only to the Dominions of the British Empire, but also to the other NATO countries—in an effort to have some uniformity of military service on the part of all the nations which are associated together in the defense of the free world.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I certainly hope the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services will do that, because it does not seem to me to be fair to our young American men to have imposed upon them so much heavier a military obligation than the one imposed on the young men of the other countries which share with us the dangers which must be faced by the nations that opposed aggression and tyranny.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think we must get them to increase the period of military service they require, rather than to make any material reduction in the military service provided for our young men. Merely because the nations associated with us are not willing to make the sacrifices we are willing to make in the defense of man and the defense of freedom throughout the world, is certainly no justification for our depending upon a weak reed, in the case of the amount of training required in New Zealand or in Australia or elsewhere. The training they require should be increased, instead of having us weaken or decrease the amount of training we require on the part of our young men.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask another question, based upon procedure, rather than going to the substance of the pending bill. I wish to ascertain whether the yeas-and-nays have been ordered on the question of the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have not.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I have said earlier, I am a new Member of the Senate, and am not too well acquainted with the procedure here. Yet it seems to me that in the case of a bill as important as the pending one, and one which directly affects so many families of the country, there should be a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate on the question of the passage of the bill. Regardless of how each Member may feel about the bill, I believe that the vote on the question of its passage should be a matter of public record, by means of having a yea-and-nay vote.

My only previous experience with legislative matters, before coming to the Senate, was in our State legislature. There it is impossible to pass a bill under which our people will have to live, without having a recorded vote or a so-called roll-call vote. I imagine that it would be impossible to have such a requirement here in the Senate, in view of the vast number of both important and relatively unimportant bills which are handled. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in the case of a measure of the great importance of this one, which affects intimately the people of the country, there should be a roll call or yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to have a yea-and-nay vote, if a sufficient number of Members are present.

However, I may say that the only effect the bill will have on the families of the country will be that which may be voluntarily assumed by the young men; there will be no compulsion upon them.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. WELKER. I shall be glad to defer to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; the distinguished Senator from Idaho was first on his feet.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I would not think of having the distinguished Senator from Kentuky defer to me. Instead, I shall be happy to have him proceed at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to avoid an Alphonse and Gaston situation, I shall proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to be relieved of the necessity of making the decision. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Georgia knows, all over the country there are now Reserve units in existence, and in some cases the men attend their meetings once a week. There are certain requirements to which they are subject, in order that they may preserve their status and whatever benefits and responsibilities go with it.

In my home town of Paducah there is a very active and very large Reserve unit, and in some cases its members drive 50 miles, in order to attend the meetings. What effect will the bill have upon existing units of the sort to which I refer, if the bill will have any effect upon them?

Mr. RUSSELL. It should augment their strength, if they are not already up to their full strength. Otherwise, the bill will have no effect whatever upon them.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if they are not already up to their full strength, the new men can integrate themselves into the exiting units; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or if the existing unit has reached its maximum strength, they can organize a new unit, can they?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; with the approval of the Department of Defense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only effect the bill could possibly have on such a unit would be to augment its strength. The bill would not affect those who are already enrolled; they could still continue to receive their drill pay for the 48 drill periods each year, and they would still accumulate their retirement benefits, and so forth, and they would still be liable for service in the event of war.

Mr. BARKLEY. After the men who come under the provisions of the bill have performed their tour of duty and have joined units already in existence, then the privileges accruing to all of them will be identical; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; except in the case of a man who comes out of a Regular Army unit with a particular rating. Undoubtedly he will take his existing rating with him when he enters the Reserve—for instance, if he had been a sergeant in a Regular unit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. But they would be integrated, would they?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; and the units to which the Senator from Kentucky refers will, after the enactment of the bill, undoubtedly be augmented by men who have served their period in the Regular forces.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Georgia will yield for an observation and an explanation as to why I have missed a great portion of the debate on the pending bill, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho for whatever purpose he may desire. I have used a considerable amount of time, and I am glad to yield to him whatever time he desires to have.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, it is not often that a Member of my age is permitted to serve on so great a committee, under the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. In fact, Mr. President, I am a junior-junior member of the committee. I can testify to the difficult hours, days, and months our distinguished chairman has spent—sometimes singlehandedly—in studying the bill and working on it. I cannot pay him too high a compliment in that connection. He knows how much I admire him personally. Furthermore, Mr. President, as a legislator, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia is without a peer in this country. I commend him most heartily for his outstanding service. I cannot think of any compliment too high to be paid to him for the great work he has done.

Mr. President, I should now like to refer briefly to a matter previously discussed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I desire to refer at this time to the proposed disembowelment of the 96th Infantry Division. As a junior member of the Armed Services Committee, I must inform my distinguished friend and colleague from Georgia that I appreciate very much, indeed, the kindness with which he received the remarks made by those two distinguished Members, because I am well aware of the problem and of the struggle we shall have in explaining to the officers and men of the 96th Division and to the citizens of our respective States the proposal to take the action which it has been intimated will be taken.

It goes without saying that my friend, the great Senator from Georgia, knows how very readily and quickly officers of the armed services come from the Pentagon to talk to the members of the Armed Services Committee or the other Members of the Senate about almost any and every overt act such officers in the Defense Establishment desire to take. But until this afternoon, when the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] called me, I had no knowledge whatsoever that the 96th Reserve Infantry Division was to be disemboweled and ruined. That is something which I will resent as long as I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I think it is unfair, and I will tell any of the brass at the Pentagon exactly what I am telling my colleagues.

I do not know the reason for secrecy in this matter. The brass at the Pentagon is very long on asking, but short on delivery. I do not know who is responsible for the situation, but I expect to find out.

A moment ago I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia say that he felt that the Reserve should be increased rather than decreased. Here, by one overt act, the Defense Department is proposing to destroy one of the largest infantry Reserve divisions in the United States, composed of fine young men from Idaho, Montana, Arizona, and Utah.

I cannot answer the question why such a thing is suggested; I do not know how I am going to answer to my colleagues and my friends.

I hope and pray that my distinguished friend, the great head of the Armed Services Committee, upon which I am honored to serve, will use his every effort to see that the brass at the Pentagon are told exactly what they can do and what they cannot do in this connection. As one member of the Armed Services Committee I am serving notice on them that if they think they are going to hold something in secret from these four sovereign States, and not even communicate with a member of the Armed Services Committee, perhaps on some other occasion, when there is a doubt, it may be resolved the other way.

I shall appreciate it if my good friend, the chairman of the committee, will help us. We need help. I know that he is the type of man who will do exactly as he promises.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Why does not the distinguished Senator from Idaho offer an amendment to the bill to prohibit the disemboweling of the 96th Reserve Infantry Division?

Mr. WELKER. I thought of that when word came to me while I was in a committee hearing a few moments ago, but I have so much confidence in the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that I do not believe an amendment is necessary. He has sufficient command of the language to make the brass at the Pentagon stop and consider. I do not believe any legislative act would accomplish more than the distinguished Senator from Georgia could accomplish.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly would not be fair to whatever instincts of appreciation I have if I did not thank the Senator from Idaho for the very great tribute he has paid me. I think he exaggerates the power I possess, but I stand on what I said. I shall be glad to confer with Senators from the areas affected, to see that nothing is done to impair the efficiency of this great Reserve division, or that is inimical to the best interests of its various components.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I preface my remarks by saying that I hesitated to ask the Senator from Georgia to yield, because I realize that he has been on his feet for a long time. However, it became obvious to the Senator from Arizona that there were Members of this body who did not understand the relationship of the National Guard to the Federal service. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a few brief questions to clarify the situation.

Is it not true that when a man enlists in the National Guard he enlists in a State organization?

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly. It is a State military organization. I do not think there is a constitution in a single one of the 48 States which does not establish the Governor of the State as commander of the National Guard when it is not in active Federal service.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I intended to lead up to that point. When a man enlists in the Army Reserve, the Marine Reserve, or the Navy Reserve, or in the Federal service, he enlists in a United States component; does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Federal Government has complete authority to say who shall or shall not be admitted into any of the active or Reserve components of the Federal services, which, of course, comprise—or will when this bill goes into effect—approximately 2,900,000 men.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator from Arizona correct in assuming that when an officer receives his appointment in the National Guard, the appointment comes from the Governor of the State?

Mr. RUSSELL. The appointment does come from the Governor of the State in the first instance, although there is some working arrangement between the States and the Federal Government under which an officer must be federally recognized before he may draw his drill pay from the Federal Government.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is true; but I believe the warrant is signed by the Governor.

Mr. RUSSELL. The National Guard is a State military organization. It has a dual nature. Of course, the Federal Government is interested in it because it is a part of the national defense, and under the power bestowed upon the President of the United States he can, in case of national emergency, federalize the Guard by calling it into service, in which case it comes under the laws of the United States rather than the laws of the State.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not also true, in relation to officers, that when an officer receives his commission in any branch of the Federal service, or its Reserves, he receives the commission over the signature of the President of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not also true that the orders which a National Guard officer or enlisted man receives, other than those calling him into Federal service, are signed by the Governor or by his adjutant general, as his representative?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The adjutant general, who is appointed by the Governor of the State, usually signs all orders affecting the National Guard of the respective States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I correct in assuming that when an officer or enlisted man receives orders in any of the Federal establishments, including the Reserve, he receives such orders over the signature of a duly appointed officer of the Federal service or the Federal Reserve?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator from Arizona correct in assuming that the Governor of a State is the commander in chief of the National Guard of that State?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I stated a moment ago, so far as I know, every one of the 48 State constitutions contain a provision that the Governor is the commander in chief of the National Guard. I know that is the case of all the original 13 States, because the State militia really antedated the Revolution.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If that be the case, the problem of segregation or nonsegregation, or any other question pertaining to the National Guard of a State, comes under the jurisdiction of the commander in chief of the State, and not of the Federal Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my concept of the law and the Constitution. However, I must say that my views on those matters are somewhat suspect in some quarters. But, as a lawyer, I think I can reach an objective decision. There is no doubt in my mind that the control of the National Guard is purely a State function, until it is federalized in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. I feel certain that the answers to these questions will clear up for our colleagues in the Senate the question of who controls the State National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think perhaps our colleagues have a better concept of that question than the Senator has indicated, but I appreciate his effort in making the situation so crystal clear.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I confess that I was obliged to miss most of the debate because of a very important committee hearing. But because of what I have heard, I am compelled to ask my distinguished and able friend from Georgia, who is a great lawyer and a great Senator, if he agrees that the disemboweling of the 96th Reserve Infantry Division is merely another step by a Federal monstrosity, a large Federal Government, in taking over States rights?

Mr. RUSSELL. The 96th Division is a Reserve Division, but I certainly do not want to see it disemboweled. I assure my distinguished friend from Idaho that I will work with him as closely as I can to see that nothing is done which will adversely affect the Reserve program which is now being carried on in the area affected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished chairman knows that I have talked with him about an amendment which I should like to offer for his consideration, to see whether or not he is free to consider it or to accept it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to have the Senator send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

> Within 60 days after the effective date of this act, the National Security Training Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a program containing recommendations for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the members of the Ready Reserve, including regulations concerning the dispensing of alcoholic beverages on training establishments, in conformity with the laws of the several States.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, because I am afraid the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona may have left a misconception so far as the National Guard of the United States is concerned. I believe I can resolve the difficulty with 2 or 3 questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is an authority in this field, as he has not only achieved high military rank in the National Guard, but he has also served as Governor of the great Keystone State.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the courtesy of both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Dakota. The National Guard has always been considered the first line of defense of our country. The National Guard in each State is under the jurisdiction of the Governor of the State until it is called into Federal service.

Before an officer can be commissioned and receive Federal pay, it is necessary for him to pass an examination for Federal recognition. Then, when that is accomplished, he serves in a dual capacity, in that he is under the jurisdiction of his Governor for State service, and under the jurisdiction of the President of the United States in a national emergency. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Pennsylvania has stated the situation clearly, succinctly, and in a very few words. The commission of the officer is issued in the first instance by his State. He must then go before a Federal recognition board and qualify according to the standards of the Federal service. He then serves in a dual capacity under the circumstances described by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I thank him for the contribution.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The reason I am bringing this fact out is that I am afraid there may be some erroneous press comments sent out over the Nation. The members of the National Guard are very proud of the fact that they are subject to Federal call.

Mr. RUSSELL. The National Guard is, by Federal statute, a part of the first line of defense of the United States. That is written into the law.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is my recollection that much of the work of writing that provision into the 1916 statute was done by General Pershing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on several occasions during the hearings expressed concern over proper precautions being taken to protect the health and morals of the members of the Ready Reserve, particularly the young men who enlist in the Reserve. The Senator's amendment proposes that the Security Training Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Defense recommendations to deal with that very important phase of this subject, which is of great concern, particularly to the parents of the country. I am perfectly willing to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator. I have also submitted the amendment to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I believe he is in accord with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I discussed it with him.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the amendment accepted by the Senate, if possible. Does the Senator wish to comment on the amendment?

Mr. BARRETT. I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to commend the Senator from South Dakota for offering the amendment, and also to commend the chairman of the committee for accepting it. It is a very fine and splendid amendment. It is one that I believe ought to be added to the proposed legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the Senator's statement. The amendment is in keeping with the recommendations of the Commission in its report to the President.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I, too, would like to be associated with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in their remarks

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to say a word of appreciation for the openminded way in which all members of the Committee on Armed Services approached the problem before them.

I had the very definite feeling that in the action which the committee took with reference to the men now in the service, it was laying the foundation for public confidence in the Reserve training program.

I had the very definite feeling that if we had taken advantage of what one of the witnesses from the Defense Department called the fine print in existing law, we would have destroyed the confidence to which the Reserve program is entitled, if it is to be successful.

I believe the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is to be commended for the fairminded attitude he took and for the leadership which he displayed in connection with the provisions with reference to the men who are now in the military service or those who have joined the service within the past 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yesterday I received considerable correspondence on that one item alone .

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the voluminous file which the Senator from Georgia holds in his hand is evidence of the fact that if the committee had not taken the action it did take, the Reserve program would have gotten off to a bad start.

As it is, I believe we can get it off to a good start, with the people of the country feeling confident that Congress will deal fairly with the men in the military service, and that Congress will establish the whole program on a basis on which it will have the confidence of the people of the country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I must ask the Senator so many questions. However, I believe that all proposed legislation must be judged in terms of how it will work in individual cases, either now or after a 2-year period. I shall have something to say about the 2-year period in a moment.

I wish to suggest a specific case to the chairman of the committee and ask his judgment as to the effect of the pending bill upon such a case.

I have from a very prominent and responsible citizen of my State a letter, in which he asks me to do what I can to be of assistance in the case of Lt. Howard F. Potter. The facts seem to be about as follows:

> Mr. Potter appears to be the innocent victim of an unfortunate quirk in the laws concerning the recall of Air Force commissioned personnel. Although he has asked for such recall in order to make a career in the Air Force, and although the Air Force considers him highly desirable as an officer, the Air Force appears to be unable to call him to active service.
>
> It is my understanding that some 13,000 Air Force commissioned officers are being called up from ROTC Reserves, but Mr. Potter's commission, granted in June 1955, is from Officers' Candidate School of the Air Force. It is this fact alone which is causing Mr. Potter's difficulty.
>
> Meanwhile, he is faced with Selective Service induction as a buck private. His situation is of concern not only to the Air Force which wants him as an officer, but to his wife and family as well. He is unable to enlist in the Air Force for subsequent promotion to his rightful rank because of his two (soon to be three) dependents.
>
> I am sure anything you can do to unravel this puzzle will not only be of help to Mr. Potter but will be in the public interest, since it will insure utilization of his training in the appropriate service and rank.

I believe the chairman will be interested in the reply I received from the Air Force, over the signature of Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly:

> I refer to your recent inquiry concerning the case of 2d Lt. Howard F. Potter. Lieutenant Potter enlisted as a Reserve of the Air Force on March 26, 1954. Under a special program, he volunteered and was entered into the Air Force Officer Candidate School on December 23, 1954. This special program provides that up to 5 percent of any Officer Candidate School class may be filled by members of the Air Force Reserve, not on extended active duty. The purpose is to augment the Reserve with additional junior officers.
>
> Lieutenant Potter graduated from Officer Candidate School on June 16, 1955, and was released from active duty for training and reverted to the Air Force Reserve.
>
> The Air Force is unable to order Lieutenant Potter to duty as an officer at this time. Programed resources such as the service academies and the flying training and Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs are of such numbers as to preclude entry on extended active duty of other nonprofessional type officers. The only time the Air Force deviates from this practice is when a requirement arises for an exceptionally qualified officer needed for a critical duty, and only then when an existing resource is not available within the active establishment.

Mark this:

> Although Lieutenant Potter may not be ordered to duty as an officer, the Air Force desires to retain him as an officer in the Air Force Reserve. He was recently furnished an authorization to enlist in the Regular Air Force for a 2-year period. By doing so, he will become eligible for active duty in commissioned grade at such time as Air Force officer ceilings will permit. If inducted into the Army, he will be discharged from his appointment.
>
> Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

I have two questions to ask the Senator. First, will the passage of this bill solve, as of now, Lieutenant Potter's problems, or must he wait and be inducted into the Army, even though he has graduated from the Officer Candidate School and wishes to engage in active duty in the Air Force?

Second, would he, 2 years from now, with this bill on the statute books, receive different treatment than that which he may receive now, so far as being called under the draft law is concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to my friend from Oregon that I have had a number of cases to the same effect in my own State. Young men have been commissioned in the Air Force as second lieutenants, the Air Force did not accept them for active duty, and they were compelled to enlist in the Air Force to avoid being selected under the Selective Service Act for training. I am afraid this bill would not help Lieutenant Potter, but it might prevent any Lieutenant Potter in the future being treated in that way.

I read from page 26 of the bill, beginning in line 8:

> If, at the time of such appointment, the armed force in which such person is commissioned does not require his service on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by him in compliance with clause (B) of the first sentence of this paragraph, such person shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force in the grade in which he was commissioned for a period of 6 months. Upon completion of such period of active duty for training, such person shall be returned to inactive duty and shall be assigned to an appropriate Reserve unit until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commision pursuant to the provisions of this section.

I will say to the Senator that this question has caused me some concern.

Mr. MORSE. What would be wrong with an amendment providing that the act shall be immediately applicable to all pending cases? It seems to me we are doing great injustice to those persons in Lieutenant Potter's class who have graduated from the Officer Candidate School. They have dependents. This man really wishes to serve on active duty, but what we are going to do is take him out of the Air Force entirely, and he will be subject to induction into the Army as a draftee. That strikes me as a great injustice to this group of men.

Would the Senator be willing to take to conference an amendment which would make such a provision applicable to pending cases as of the date of the passage of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Such an amendment could be made applicable as of the date of the passage of the bill. But as I understand, this lieutenant has graduated from ROTC——

Mr. MORSE. He has graduated from the Officers' Candidate School of the Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did he finish his course successfully, and was he commissioned?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. When was he graduated?

Mr. MORSE. I read again from the letter:

> Lieutenant Potter enlisted as a Reserve of the Air Force on March 26, 1954. Under a special program, he volunteered and was entered into the Air Force Officer Candidate School on December 23, 1954. This special program provides that up to 5 percent of any Officer Candidate School class——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am familiar with that letter. If the Senator will prepare an amendment and will let me see it, I shall not commit myself to accept it, but if he will prepare one I shall be glad to take it under advisement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We worked together long hours on this bill. I certainly agree with the objective of the bill which the Senator from Georgia has supported so ably this afternoon. I believe there are a few technicalities which must be straightened out when the bill goes to conference because there are differences with the House bill which will have to be worked out to mutual advantage.

I should like to commend the chairman for what he has done. The objective is a very sound one and he has described it and has explained it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to work with the Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking Republican member of the committee. He was my predecessor as chairman, and is fully informed on all legislation of this character. We have approached all these problems without the slightest regard for partisan considerations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. I think the committee has done a very fine job in handling a most difficult problem.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should not like to see the RECORD closed without saying a word about the services of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, as I have observed them. He had a responsibility to present certain points of view in connection with the subject before the committee. As I listened to the deliberations of the committee, I thought I had never seen a person discharge his responsibilities on a committee any better than did the Senator from Massachusetts. While the committee as a whole did not always sustain his viewpoint, he made several contributions to the shaping of the bill which I think contributed to a reasonably good result. It is a difficult question, one with which the Congress has wrestled many times. It does not entirely satisfy me. Probably it does not satisfy some other members of the committee in every respect, but it represents, I believe, the most practical approach which has been made to the problem, and if, with patience and understanding, it works out the way I think it may, 10 years from now the people will look back and say the bill constituted a landmark in the development of a trained citizen army.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I came to the floor at noon with some mixed thoughts and ideas concerning the bill which we have been considering this afternoon. But with the able explanation by the chairman, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, many of the questions which were in my mind have been completely answered.

Not only do I wish to thank him, but I also wish to compliment the minority members of the committee, especially the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The committee had before it a difficult problem, and has resolved it well.

Many persons were greatly disturbed because they believed that the universal military training program might have been included in the bill. I believe the committee has reached a solution which has avoided the phase of universal military service, and in doing so, they have developed what promises to be a Reserve which will provide military strength and security for the Nation in the atomic era in which we live.

I sincerely compliment all the members of the Committee on Armed Services who deliberated upon and studied the question so long, and then came forth with a clear-cut plan for a Reserve component and a Reserve training program. The Nation will be assured of security under trained military strength by having a reserve of manpower which can be drawn upon if it is necessary to mobilize for a great emergency.

I commend the committee for reporting an acceptable bill, thus solving a problem which seemed to be almost impossible of solution 2 months ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Speaking for myself and on behalf of all the other members of the committee, for whom I am honored to act as chairman, I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for his complimentary statement.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, at the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

> SEC. 4. Section 4 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "(4) No person who, after the enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, shall at any time be assigned for duty at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within its boundaries."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. The amendment I have offered is better known as the Bow amendment, which was offered in the House.

The Halls of Congress have rung this year with passionate denunciations of what we call the status-of-forces treaties. While other legislation was passing through Congress on an assembly line basis, this one debate on the status-of-forces treaties was able to hold up the works.

What is the status-of-forces issue? What is wrong, and why? The issue is very simple.

The United States has vast numbers of American youth serving in the American Armed Forces, but on foreign soil—in Germany, France, Britain, Africa, Japan, Korea, and other countries.

Whenever there are such vast numbers of active young men there will be some crime. A few men have criminal tendencies which would have shown up at home. A few are frightened or confused by their strange new surroundings, and do things they would never do at home.

The Government of the United States agreed, about 2 years ago, to permit our young fighting men to be tried by the laws of the country to which they were sent, in return for which we may try soldiers from allied countries who commit civil crimes on our soil. These are the status-of-forces treaties.

If the agreement is reciprocal, why is it not fair? If the French are willing to have their youth tried in our courts, why are we not openminded enough to allow Americans to be tried in their courts?

The reason goes back 800 years. For 800 years the English-speaking people have established their courts and police and criminal procedures on the basis of protection of the individual, not of the state.

These protections for the individual include trial by jury, prohibition of excessive bail, prohibition against cruel and unusual punishments, and habeas corpus.

Under that magnificent principle, private citizens or their counsel can go into court and demand that the government produce an accused person, and set him free, if it does not have evidence enough to bring him to open trial.

In nearly every part of the world except the English-speaking countries, justice is designed to protect the state.

The state tries to maintain justice as between two private offenders, but no one has the right to demand justice for an individual against the state itself.

The rights of Americans to a speedy, fair, and open trial rest on the liberties of medieval Englishmen, which made all government subordinate to law.

The systems of continental Europe rest on Roman law, which was reintroduced in the renaissance by ambitious kings.

In Roman theory, the state is exempted from the rule of law.

English-speaking people have always held the right to challenge the government, in the name of justice for individuals, as among the most precious of their rights. The English put it into the *Magna Carta*. They reasserted it again and again against their kings. They fought a bloody civil war against the Stuarts to preserve that right.

The American people set such store by these protections that, before they adopted the Constitution, they insisted the rights of individuals be spelled out in the first 10 commandments, which we truly call the Bill of Rights.

This precious body of rights, won in blood and tears in a thousand years of struggle, our Government gave away in the status-of-forces treaties.

We said by those treaties that Americans who were drafted into our Armed Forces would no longer enjoy these ancient rights.

Imagine, if you can, Mr. President, how we could have taken from our servicemen the rights for which our people fought at Lexington and Valley Forge.

Our young men, serving our country abroad, can now be put in foreign jails, without the rights of habeas corpus, speedy jury trial, or protection against excessively cruel punishment.

I have been told that an official report exists, but has not been made public, which shows that 7,416 American servicemen in overseas forces had been brought before foreign courts in 11 months of 1954.

There were 4,424 from the Army, 1,001 from the Navy, and 1,991 from the Air Force.

Cases against 255 were dropped.

Fines were imposed in 1,164 cases; short term sentences against a few others; and 166 were called serious cases; that is, the time of imprisonment was substantial.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Would the Senator from Indiana like to know the exact number of Armed Forces personnel serving prison sentences, and the length of their terms?

Mr. JENNER. I would like to know.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been sitting as a member of the subcommittee which is investigating the operations of the status-of-forces treaties, and the committee is prepared to file its report.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask that the interruption appear at the end of my prepared remarks.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is substantially correct in the figures he gave.

During the 11 months preceding November 30, 1954, there were 7,416 Americans charged with criminal offenses in the courts of the foreign countries where the status-of-forces treaties or executive agreements of like nature exist. But of the 7,416, the foreign courts waived their jurisdiction to American courts in 5,424 cases. Two hundred and fifty-five charges were dropped and 1,475 were tried in foreign courts. There were 122 acquittals; 1,163 were punished by fines.

Our investigation showed that on February 10, 1955, there were only 58 American soldiers who had been tried in foreign courts serving sentences in foreign prisons. Of that number, 9 were serving sentences in excess of 5 years. Of those 9, 4 of them were serving sentences for murder, 3 of them were serving sentences for rape, and 2 of them were serving sentences for robbery.

In the next highest category, there were 16 serving sentences of from 4 to 5 years; 13 were for robbery, and 3 for rape.

In the next highest category, 9 were serving sentences of from 3 to 4 years; 8 were for robbery, and 1 for rape.

In the next highest category, there were 12 serving sentences of from 2 to 3 years; 5 were for rape and related offenses, and 7 for robbery.

In the next highest category, 6 were serving sentences of from 1 to 2 years; 2 were for larceny, 2 for rape and related offenses, 1 for negligent homicide, and 1 for felonious assault.

In the next highest category, 1 person was serving a sentence of 1 year or less, and that was for injury by negligence.

In the lowest category there were 5 serving sentences of 6 months or less; 4 were for aggravated assault and related offenses, and 1 for a lewd and lascivious act.

Mr. JENNER. Are those figures for 1955?

Mr. ERVIN. The figures I first gave were for the 11 months next preceding midnight on the 30th of November 1954. The ones I have just enumerated, relating to the terms of sentence and the kinds of crimes, related to those serving sentences on the 10th of February of this year.

Mr. JENNER. The figures I had—and of course they did not come from an official source, and I do not know whether they are official or not—are for the 11 months of 1954.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator's figures were substantially correct. I will say this to the Senator: If I could have gotten my clients off in North Carolina courts with as light sentences for crimes committed in North Carolina as the sentences I have listed given by foreign courts, my clients would have been happy. Their sentences would have been about half of what they normally got, and my fees would have been higher.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I should like to say that the committee investigated the matter a couple of years ago. The Senator from Indiana is absolutely right in offering his amendment, because we found that our soldiers in foreign countries who were accused of crime were kept in jail month after month, and were denied bail. I certainly hope the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be adopted.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I do not wish to make my statement too lengthy. A deplorable situation exists. It must be corrected. Now is the time to correct it, when the Senate is considering legislation which will affect the future lives of American boys.

How many Americans are languishing in foreign jails today? I do not know, and I do not think anyone knows. I have been unable to get the figures.

How many Americans are today languishing in foreign jails, without the protection of their Constitution? Some are being punished for real crimes, some for youthful pranks; but all are being punished without having the safeguards to which we believe every American is and must be entitled.

The question is this: Does our Government have a moral or legal right to draft

American youth, and then take away their centuries-old right to their day in court?

Mr. President, I care not whether the sentences in North Carolina are lighter than the ones being meted out in foreign countries. I say that our servicemen are being sentenced without the protection of the Constitution of the United States; and no Government official has a right to ignore that moral and legal obligation.

I am sorry to admit it, but today our Government has a legal right to strip our young men of their constitutional liberties. Under the new fashion in interpreting the Constitution, the Supreme Court now holds that any treaty is above the Constitution, whereas we used to belive that no officer serving under the Constitution could honestly make a treaty which violated the Constitution.

So today, if Congress approves a treaty, or if the President makes an executive agreement—and I am told that thousands of such agreements are in existence—stripping our citizens of their constitutional rights, that treaty or agreement is above the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. That is the legal situation at the present time. It is the situation against which Senator Bricker has been so valiantly fighting.

But I also ask whether Congress has the moral right to draft our youth for military service, and then strip them of their constitutional rights? I say the answer is "No." Congress can never have a moral right to destroy any part of the Constitution.

Representative Bow, of Ohio, submitted to the Military Reserve bill an amendment providing for revision of these shocking treaties. His amendment was upheld by a vote of 174 to 56. But the bill itself was redrafted, and he introduced a separate resolution calling on the executive branch to renegotiate the status-of-forces treaties.

I am fully aware that it is not the best legislative draftsmanship to attach to the military Reserves bill an amendment setting a policy on the status-of-forces treaties. But I am far more deeply convinced that we cannot and must not take a mortgage on 8 years in the lives of our young men, and then tell them that the mantle of the Constitution is not broad enough to go wherever the American flag may go.

Mr. President, no issue before the American people is more important than this one. We must reverse this fateful step by which young men are compelled to forfeit their rights as free Americans so long as they are in the service of their country.

Mr. President, some persons talk about making second-class citizens; but that is what will happen to our own soldier boys, if the Senate does not adopt this amendment. We must provide this safeguard. Before we impose on young Americans any new obligations to serve their country, they must have the protection of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have before me an article appearing on page 25 of Time magazine for February 14, 1955. The article is entitled "Justice on Trial," and refers to the situation in France. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Justice on Trial

In the week when the French Assembly proved again its willful capacity for chaos, French justice also came in for well-deserved attack. "What is wrong with our justice?" demanded France Dimanche. "Henceforward," added Paris' Paris-Presse, "it is hard to see how we can have the nerve to give lessons to totalitarian police."

French justice, based on the Napoleonic Code, has long been viewed with cynicism by its friends and alarm by disciples of Anglo-Saxon procedures. "The Code exists to protect society from the criminal, not to protect the criminal from judicial error," explains one French expert. "We run our courts to convict the guilty, not to acquit the innocent." Last week the case of a Nantes stevedore, only the most recent of a series of setbacks of justice, touched off a storm of indignation.

GETTING CONFESSIONS

Seven years ago, someone accused Stevedore Jean Deshays of killing an old man, beating his wife, and robbing them of $50. Police briskly beat a confession out of Deshays, and he was sentenced to 10 years hard labor. Last year police discovered that three other men had committed the crime. At his retrial last week, Deshays explained why he had confessed: "I was afraid. There were a lot of people and police there."

Newspapers angrily recalled other cases of police brutality. One woman, acquitted last month of poisoning her lover's wife, had been held illegally by police for 3 days while they kicked her, pulled her hair, and insulted her in an effort to get a confession. In 1948 a sanitarium worker was kept standing for 28 hours without food to force her to confess killing a man who later was proved to have died of cerebral hemorrhage.

PREPARING THE DOSSIER

But more serious critics assailed the French judicial system itself. Under French law, there is no grand jury; instead, there is the juge d'instruction, whom Balzac called the most powerful man in the Republic. He performs the role of investigating magistrate. His great power is that, on his decision, and his alone, he can put any suspect in jail under "preventive detention" while he investigates the case and prepares a dossier for the trial. Such "preventive detentions" can last for years.

Of 10 defendants now awaiting trial at the Paris Assizes this week, 1 has been in jail for 32 months; the average is 18 months. Even if the defendant is eventually acquitted, he has no redress, receives no compensation for his long imprisonment. Bail is almost unheard of; Frenchmen consider it an undemocratic favoring of the rich over the poor.

The juge d'instruction is usually young, inexperienced, so ill-paid that he often has no telephone or typewriter. Originally, magistrates were recruited from men of substance anxious to perform civic duty. Today, the underpaid magistrate has become the refuge of law graduates who fear failure as lawyers, and the juge d'instruction is the lowest rung on the judicial ladder. In the case of Marie Besnard, accused poisoner of 13 relatives and friends, the juge d'instruction was a 26-year-old, newly promoted from clerk, who never visited the scene of the crime, sent out to the local grocery for canning jars to hold the viscera of the 13 alleged victims, and the jars ended so badly mixed up no one was sure which was which. But he kept Marie Besnard in jail for 5 years in "preventive detention." The 28-year-old juge d'instruction investigating young Brazilian playboy Jonsine da Silva Ramos' wife's death announced to the press: "I believe him guilty. It's up to him to prove his innocence."

JUDGE AND PROSECUTOR

After the juge d'instruction comes a trial before three magistrates. In theory, the chief judge is impartial, explaining the arguments to the jury. In practice, he does not arbitrate, he prosecutes. French judges are generally considered honest and conscientious; the role is forced on them by the system. The chief judge must operate from the dossier prepared by the juge d'instruction, and the dossier is obviously the state's case against the accused. In effect, the chief judge challenges the defense counsel to disprove the dossier; he himself questions the defendant and the witnesses. The prosecutor merely keeps notes until it is time to sum up.

Then the seven-man jury files out—and the three magistrates go along too, to join in the deliberations and to vote with the jury. In case of a tie vote, the verdict is the decision of the chief judge. Because a record of convictions is the road to advancement, magistrates are almost automatically for conviction. Thus, the defendant is faced with the uphill battle of trying to convince 6 out of 7 jurors against the prestige, persuasiveness and presence of the three magistrates in the jury room.

TROUBLE GOES DEEP

Some French critics argue that all that is needed is higher pay to attract better men as magistrates. France's 4,000 magistrates average barely $200 a month. (A few years ago, one was fished out of the Seine, and colleagues discovered his wife and four children living in an abandoned factory, sleeping on old rags.) Others think the trouble is deeper seated, and will not be settled until judges are confined to judging, and kept out of jury rooms. Wrote prizewinning novelist Francois Mauriac last week: "There is no criminal case today in which the principal defendant is not French justice."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Military Reserve Bill," which was published in the New York Times for June 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Military Reserve Bill—An Analysis of Present Objections to Defense Measure Before House

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The compulsory military Reserve bill was the subject of intensive artificial respiration by the administration this week.

But the breath of legislative life appeared to have vanished, at least for this session, from a law that had been intended to be one of the cornerstones of the administration's new military policies.

The immediate causes of death were amendments barring segregation in the National Guard, but the bill was sick—almost to the point of death—even before these amendments caused it to be withdrawn from House consideration.

The Reserve bill in the form in which it was presented to the House is a compromise, a hybrid, about which nobody, not even the Pentagon, was really happy. If it should prove to be dead for this session, the outcome need not be the disaster so freely predicted; the interval between now and next January can be used to draw up legislation more in keeping with the military realities of the atomic age.

There are many objections to the current legislation. One of them is the inherent hostility of many Americans to any form of universal military training. Representative

DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, senior Republican on the House Armed Services Committee, and a conscientious and enlightened legislator, voiced this objection in a speech opposing the current bill:

"This may not be UMT (universal military training)," he said, "but it is an attempt to get a foot in the door."

EQUITY OF SERVICE DOUBTED

Another objection to the current legislation is that it would not accomplish one of the purposes it was intended to accomplish: to provide equity of service for all.

The bill would permit, as amended, the voluntary enlistment of youths for 6 months training, followed by 7½ years in the Reserve. No fewer than 100,000 annually, nor more than 250,000, would be so enlisted.

At the same time, regular draft calls for 2 years active service would continue, and voluntary enlistments in the regulars for various periods would be accepted—both to be followed by commitments to Reserve duty.

The manpower pool of the Nation is increasing steadily with increasing population. The induction age for draftees is steadily being pushed back into older age brackets as draft calls are reduced. The budget and active duty manpower for the regular services are being reduced.

There are elements of incompatibility in these facts that the Pentagon will not admit but that make it certain that the new bill cannot provide equity of service. Indeed, the chances are that some able-bodied men may not have to serve at all.

The cost of the new program is another factor that has aroused misgivings.

By the fiscal year 1959 the proposed program would cost a minimum of more than $2 billion annually—more than double the cost of the present Reserve program. This increased Reserve cost would provide still another squeeze on the regular forces, if the balanced budget concept was retained. If the current Reserve plan should be adopted our commitment to greatly increased Reserve costs would probably mean further cuts in the regular services.

The greatest and most important objection to the Reserve plan is the emphasis it places on the militia concept in an age when military professionalism of the highest order is the primary requirement.

WEEKEND WARRIORS

The program would provide eventually a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 men, with a Standby Reserve of perhaps 2 million more. Undeniably this Reserve would be in a better state of organization and training than our Reserve today. But it would necessarily be a half-trained Reserve, an organization of weekend warriors. The bulk of it would still need an additional 3 months or so of active training after war started before commitment to battle.

And it would be organized and trained for what? World War II battlefields? Repulse of ground invasion? A force as large as this could not be transported overseas for many months after mobilization, if then.

Its primary use, therefore, at least in the initial stages of any war, would be to stiffen and strengthen our civil-defense organization.

Yet there is to be no real training provided for this purpose, and the tactical organization of the new Reserve, strictly tailored to the battlefield, would not seem to fit civil-defense needs.

We should take a leaf from Britain's book and specially train and specially organize Reserve components for civil-defense duties.

But most important is to remember the preeminent role of the specialist, the highly trained soldier, sailor, and airman in the atomic age. Brig. Gen. Dale O. Smith, USAF, in his provocative study, United States Military Doctrine, very rightly stresses professionalism as one of our fundamental necessities today. If any Reserve bill strengthens the Reserves at the expense of the regulars it is not worth the price.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it is said that such an amendment cannot be adopted—I have heard that said many times—because it would tie the hands of our Chief Executive. It is said that we have already entered into these treaties with many countries. I say it is time we should do something, and do it quickly.

Mr. President, do my colleagues think this situation is not serious? I read now a statement prepared by Representative Bow, of Ohio, to be delivered if the amendment was subsequently submitted by him in the House of Representatives to House bill 7000:

Mr. Chairman, the debate in the House on yesterday revealed a great many Members shared my conviction that the status-of-forces agreement as it relates to criminal jurisdiction over our men is evil and unnecessary. However, there were those among us who felt that the subject should not be considered in connection with the foreign-aid authorization and even some who appeared to feel that the House of Representatives has no right to express itself on this subject.

I feel certain that we will find with us today those who objected to amending the foreign-aid bill, for they must clearly understand that the subject is germane and is a part of the pending legislation on the Armed Forces. This is a highly appropriate place to express ourselves and express ourselves forcefully on the treatment that is accorded American servicemen who are stationed abroad.

To those who feel that the House of Representatives has no authority with regard to treaties or may not express itself on this subject, let me say that there is ample precedent in the history of the House for our action. On several occasions Presidents of the United States have in fact asked the House and the Senate to adopt resolutions authorizing a change in or the renunciation of treaties. On other occasions the House has initiated, the Senate has adopted, and the President has complied with provisions in legislative measures requiring that provisions of treaties be set aside. Although it is perhaps uncommon, it is nothing new that we propose today. The House not only has the right to express itself—it has the duty under the Constitution, along with the Senate, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. We have the right and duty to do what I propose with regard to the safety of our troops abroad.

I do not know how much needs to be said at this time with regard to the agreements and to the effect they have had on the American men who have fallen into the hands of the law in the foreign nations where they have been stationed. I have compiled and am prepared to offer all of the information any Member may desire concerning the methods of trial, conditions of imprisonment, and all of the other unsavory factors that enter into this matter. In no nation do we find anything comparable to the minimum standards required by our own concept of justice.

After consultation with the many Members who have expressed their support of my amendment, I have made an extremely important change which removes the basis for criticism we received on the amendment adopted May 18. At that time it was said that my amendment would tie the hands of the Commander in Chief, would block rotation of our forces, and would hamper the operation of the Reserve program. There need have been no such concern, for I believed then, and still believe, that the nations concerned are so anxious to have the protection of our Army and Air Force that they will willingly and promptly accede to any Presidential request that we be released from the criminal jurisdiction provisions of article VII.

Nevertheless, the treaties concerned provide that they cannot be denounced or renounced until 4 years after the date of ratification. With regard to both the NATO nations and Japan, the 4-year period expires in 1957. The treaties further provide, in themselves, that a nation wishing to renounce them must give 1 year's notice. Thus, the earliest date at which the United States can properly withdraw from the treaties, without requiring the consent of the other parties, is August 23, 1958.

The amendment now before you provides that it shall become effective on August 23, 1958.

We are giving the President and the Department of State notice that the Congress, exercising its power to govern and regulate the Armed Forces, desires to return to the historic principles of international law under which our troops are subject solely to the jurisdiction of their own military courts, and we are giving them ample opportunity to proceed to this objective in a legal and orderly manner.

No one can say that this amendment hamstrings the Armed Forces.

No one can say that we are not proceeding in an orderly manner.

No one can charge that we are requiring the repudiation of an obligation.

When my more stringent amendment was proposed during consideration of H. R. 5297, 174 Members voted for it and it carried by a margin of more than 3 to 1.

Subsequent developments give us every reason to believe that the margin in favor today should be even larger.

Since that time we have learned of the imprisonment of Airman Jose Montijo, of Arizona, arrested and held by the French. We have had several additional men imprisoned in Japan. We have learned that agreements extend criminal jurisdiction to Libya, Saudi Arabia, Iceland. The first is in the throes of organization of a new nation. The second is an Arab nation with barbaric laws which include amputation, decapitation, and castration for various offenses. The third is very largely Communist and highly antagonistic to our troops. How can our men expect justice in any of these nations?

Remember this. The United States Army Court-Martial Manual, which has never been repealed, provides in section 12 that a soldier of the United States enjoys the full protection of the Constitution of the United States and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Jose Montijo had that manual and his father and mother, though Mexicans and not citizens of this country, were aware of the protection it implied. But Montijo is in a French prison, facing the guillotine, and the United States Constitution guarantees him nothing. He is denied the right to have freedom on bail. He is denied the presumption of innocence. He is denied a jury trial. He is denied counsel of his choice, or even counsel of his own nation or language. He is denied the guarantee that he will be convicted only if his guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. He has no guarantee against cruel and unusual punishment. And if he reads, he knows that Frenchmen themselves are aroused and indignant over the archaic Napoleonic code which is the basis for French justice. I refer you to Time magazine for February 14 of this year for a fuller explanation of what French justice really is.

Knowing all of these facts, I cannot believe otherwise than that the House, as it did on May 18, will once again express itself overwhelmingly in favor of my amendment and against the nefarious treaties and secret agreements that place our men in jeopardy all over the world.

We are proposing to give the President and the Department of State notice that the Congress, exercising its power to govern and regulate the Armed Forces—and that is our power, given to us by the Constitution—desires to return to the historic principles of international law, under which our troops are subject solely to the jurisdiction of their own military courts. We propose to allow the President and the executive department ample opportunity to proceed to this objective in a legal and orderly manner, because this bill does not go into effect, and actually does not apply to the men in service for 2 years and 30 days, as I understand. So by Executive decree, Executive action, we can start action to break down these treaties and renounce them. That is our right. We must give 1 year's notice. Now is the time for Congress to give such notice to the Executive. We should give notice that we are going back and live under the Constitution of the United States, and that our boys in uniform are not to be subjected, under executive agreements, to decapitation or castration while wearing the uniform of an American soldier.

No one can successfully contend that this amendment would hamstring the Armed Forces. No one can successfully contend that we are not proceeding in an orderly manner. No one can properly charge that we are requiring the repudiation of an obligation.

Mr. President, I know that the Committee on Armed Services has given great consideration to the bill. But, for my part—and I presume the same statement applies to other Senators who are not members of that committee—the report was placed on my desk at noon. The hearings were finally placed on our desks today at noon. This is a very comprehensive bill, affecting the lives of millions of American boys. I would feel much better if I knew that this amendment was in the bill.

I have before me a statement by Hon. FRANK T. BOW before the House Foreign Affairs Committee as recently as July 13, 1955. I commend it to the reading of every Member of this body. It is an intelligent, forthright analysis of the problem confronting us in the status-of-forces treaty situation. He cites the rules of international law. He shows that such a treaty is against the rules of international law. He enumerates the powers of Congress, and he gives many examples of the injustices possible under such treaties. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK T. BOW, RE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 309, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JULY 13, 1955

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and present the case in support of House Joint Resolution 309, which I introduced on May 18, 1955, and the number of similar resolutions offered by my colleagues.

This resolution seeks the revision of the status-of-forces agreement so that foreign countries, which are parties to this agreement, will not continue to have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

The Status-of-Forces Agreement, more properly designated as a "treaty," was signed at London on June 19, 1951, after being under negotiation since early in 1950. It was ratified by the President of the United States on July 24, 1953, under advice of the Senate given on July 15, 1953.

The countries now bound by this agreement are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, Turkey, and the United States.

On September 28, 1953, an agreement was signed in Tokyo, covering the status of United States forces in Japan, which agreement contains the same provisions as the original status-of-forces agreement with the preceding countries. This agreement was made in compliance with the terms of the security treaty with Japan which had been ratified earlier in 1952.

In due course Germany will be added to this list.

House Joint Resolution 309 refers particularly to article VII of the status-of-forces agreement, which gives criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel stationed within the respective countries. I assume that all of you are familiar with this article VII, but I am submitting the full text as part of the record of this hearing.

I call your attention to section 2b of article VII, which provides that the authority of the receiving state shall have the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over members of our forces or civilian components and their dependents with respect to offenses punishable by the law of the receiving state but not by the law of the sending state; and that under section 3b the authorities of the receiving state have the primary right to prosecute our soldiers for offenses which may be punishable under the laws of our country as well as the laws of the receiving country.

These provisions abrogate the basic constitutional rights of our American soldiers serving on foreign soil.

RULE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

This treaty repudiates one of America's oldest and finest traditions—that the American flag and the American Constitution follow our soldiers wherever they go. It repudiates the principles of international law, which were universally recognized before our Chief Justice Marshall so clearly enunciated them in 1811, in the case of *The Schooner Exchange* v. *McFaddon* (11 U. S. 116). The Supreme Court held in this case that the *Exchange*, as a public armed vessel of a friendly power, entered a port of our country upon an implied promise of exemption from the justice of the local courts. The chief justice likened the armed public vessel to a public armed force entering the territory of another nation with the latter's permission, and said, in effect, that the armed forces of a friendly nation stationed within the territory of another, with the latter's permission, are not subject to the local laws of the host country, but are subject only to the laws of their own country. The fact that Chief Justice Marshall had ample precedent for his statement of international law has been generally ignored in discussions of this subject.

Two other cases decided by the Supreme Court, after the Civil War, followed this decision with approval. In *Coleman* v. *Tennessee* (97 U. S. 509), the Court said:

"It is well settled that a foreign army, permitted to march through a friendly country or to be stationed in it by permission of its government or sovereign, has exemption from the civil and criminal justice of the place."

The same dicta is found in *Dow* v. *Johnson* (100 U. S. 158). In *Tucker* v. *Alexandroff* (183 U. S. 424), decided partly upon the authority of a treaty between this country and Russia, the Court discussed the case of the *Exchange* at length, and with approval.

In *Chung Chi Cheung* v. *The King* (1939 A. C. 160), Lord Atkin, speaking for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, called Chief Justice Marshall's opinion, in the case of the *Exchange*: "A judgment which has illumined the jurisprudence of the world," and concurred fully in the general principle that the armed forces of one power, allowed by another to enter its territory, enjoyed an immunity from the local courts, although he held in the case before him that the Chinese Government had waived that immunity.

In the Casa Blanca case the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague (1909), recognized the exclusive jurisdiction of the officers and military tribunal of a nation over its own troops in a friendly foreign country.

Many authoritative writers on international law have enunciated the same doctrine as laid down by Chief Justice Marshall, including several English writers, French, Dutch, and Latin American authorities.

These cases I have mentioned did not depend on any treaty or exchange of diplomatic notes, but upon the theory that the exemption of friendly foreign troops from the jurisdiction of the courts of the nation in which they were was a principle of the "unwritten law of nations."

It is, therefore, inexplicable that our State Department should abandon such principles when considering the status of our own forces abroad.

POWERS OF CONGRESS

One of the arguments advanced by representatives of the State Department in favor of the ratification of the agreement, in hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was that the rights of our soldiers had already been surrendered to foreign powers by a number of secret executive agreements, and that the provisions of this treaty were an improvement over such existing agreements (p. 27 of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, 83d Cong., 1st sess.). Thus was disclosed a violation of the constitutional law of our land which vests in Congress the sole power "to make rules for the government and regulation of our land and naval forces," which apply outside as well as inside the limits of continental United States. This provision of the Constitution has never been changed and the execution of such secret agreements is a usurpation by the State Department of the power of Congress.

These various agreements were claimed to be classified so their terms are not a part of the hearings, but if it is conceded that the present treaty was an improvement, then consider how callously the rights of our servicemen must have been treated in these secret agreements. It is not disclosed how the treaty is better, but even if an improvement, it is still wrong. A lesser wrong does not make a right.

Under its constitutional power the Congress established a Uniform Code of Military Justice and included a uniform code of procedure for the trial of military personnel, both at home and abroad, which is still in full force and effect.

Every enlisted man takes an oath that he will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over him according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The United States Manual of Courts-Martial of 1951, which is still in effect, and a copy of which may be purchased from the

Government Printing Office, states in paragraph 12, as follows:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

Thus we have our men obligating themselves to abide by the regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice, particularly exemplified by this Manual on Courts-Martial, containing a paragraph which, although stating a correct rule of international law, yet has been flaunted and superseded by the status-of-forces treaty and sundry secret agreements.

I might add here that there are in effect today secret executive agreements with countries not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, entered into in violation of this constitutional provision, and of the terms of which we are kept in ignorance. Under these agreements our soldiers all over the world have been surrendered to the criminal jurisdiction of other countries without regard to whether or not such jurisdiction will be exercised in accordance with the constitutional rights which our soldiers should have.

The speculation is not pertinent to the resolution before us, but, one may wonder if Russia or Communist China, in their disregard for the rights of our American soldiers, enjoy the protection of some secret agreement.

STATISTICAL APOLOGIES

Department of Defense statistics relative to the exercise of criminal jurisdiction by foreign tribunals over persons subject to the United States military law for the period of January 1, 1954, through November 30, 1954, show that 7,416 members of our Armed Forces had been subjected to foreign jurisdiction throughout the world, of which 3,720 cases were within the jurisdiction of NATO countries, so that there were almost as many men, during that period, prosecuted under the agreement with Japan and various secret agreements, as were prosecuted under the status-of-forces treaty. I have sought to have this information brought up to date, but at the time of preparing this statement had not yet received the report from the Defense Department which this committee may now have.

All statistics and statements emanating from the Defense Department seeking to minimize the overall effect of the status-of-forces treaty will never justify the execution of this treaty or sundry secret agreements consenting to the abandonment of the constitutional rights of members of our Armed Forces. If the surrender of such rights had been proper or had been necessary it would not now be so important to try to excuse it by throwing the dust of statistics into the eyes of Congress. I believe the Defense Department has actually been placed in a false position. After having this treaty, and sundry agreements, imposed upon it by the State Department, the Defense Department is left with the unhappy task of supporting and justifying the action.

It has occurred to me that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not have all the facts properly presented to it in the hearings regarding this treaty, and that some of the Government witnesses, in turn, have been misled or misinformed by others who were in the State Department or Defense Department when these agreements were worked out—in an effort to vindicate their actions or to cover up and ratify the prior secret agreements. The committee was also confronted with the argument of fait accompli, which has become a working tool of bureaucracy.

I call your attention to the exclusive jurisdiction given a foreign country for offenses relating to the security of that state which is defined as "treason or sabotage, espionage or violation of any law relating to official secrets relating to the national defense of that state." If a foreign state has a law making it a security offense to make a public statement critical of the government of that country, any uninhibited American boy drafted into our armed services and ordered to that country, accustomed to the rights of free speech as we have them, might readily find himself punishable for some innocent remark under the laws of that foreign country. In fact there may be many acts in countries throughout the world defined as offenses under their laws which are not offenses in our country. Particularly, such offenses which might seem to be somewhat political, or offenses against the government of that country.

BILL OF RIGHTS NULLIFIED

Whoever in the State Department negotiated this treaty ignored completely all of the provisions of our Bill of Rights. It is true that in section 9 of article VII you will find a list of seven things which presumably protect the member of the Armed Forces, or civilian components or dependents who happen to be under prosecution. If you read them rapidly you might think that protection has been given to our people, but you will find no provision requiring an indictment, or trial by jury, or public trial. No right to bail. No protection against double jeopardy. No protection against self-incrimination. No right of appeal. No prohibition of excessive fines or cruel or inhuman punishments. The accused does not have the protection of a presumption of innocence. He might be found guilty by less than a preponderance of the evidence. A confession procured by any means, however irregular, including force and duress, may be used against him.

Our diplomats, snug and smug within their cloak of diplomatic immunity, did not mind sacrificing our American soldiers in this way. The high brass of our Armed Forces would probably never be arrested, prosecuted, or imprisoned by a foreign court, so they accept the recommendations of those diplomats. The provisions of that treaty will never reach any Member of the United States Senate who, by reason of misinformation, misrepresentation, or ignorance on the part of the Government, witnesses advising them, voted to advise the President to ratify the treaty. But, the provisions of the treaty have reached and affected Richard Keefe and Anthony Scaletti, of whom you have no doubt already heard; and the loss of the constitutional safeguards which I have mentioned before has practically convicted Jose E. Montijo of the charge of murder—even before he is tried.

FRENCH JUSTICE

It has been difficult to secure information concerning the Montijo case because originally the Chief of the Allied Air Forces in Europe imposed a rigid censorship, and such information as was given seeped out through a public relations officer of Great Britain. It appears now that Montijo and two other members of the Air Force became involved in an altercation with a young Frenchman by the name of Mallet, over the attention paid by Mallet to a French girl who Montijo proposed to marry. One version of this case is that Mallet and his friends attacked Montijo and that in the fight that ensued, in order to defend himself, Montijo inflicted wounds from which Mallet subsequently died. I do not condone this killing in any respect. But, if it is true that Montijo acted in self-defense he should have an opportunity to prove it as part of his defense, and I feel confident that in this case, under the procedure in French courts, he will never have this opportunity. He has already been tried and is being tried publicly by an extensive newspaper campaign, and it is entirely possible he will have assigned to him, as his attorney, a Frenchman who is a Communist or a red sympathizer. Also, he may be tried before a judge with similar connections.

If you think my opinion of French justice is unwarranted, I would like to have you consider the article appearing in Time magazine on February 14, 1955, which I am sure was not written with the status-of-forces treaty in mind. It described what happens to Frenchmen in French courts. With the hostility there is against America, why expect different or better treatment. The article, entitled "Justice on Trial," is submitted as part of the record herein because it so graphically described the actual procedure, rather thas theoretical practice. The article quotes one French expert as saying "We run our courts to convict the guilty, not to acquit the innocent."

It has been claimed as a virtue of this treaty that the provisions thereof are reciprocal and we, of course, have secured the right to try members of the Armed Forces of other nations party to the agreement, stationed in our country. What is the effect of this reciprocity?

In America any spy, subversive, or criminal of whatever kind, which, of course, would include members of Armed Forces, is guaranteed a fair jury trial in open court. He can invoke the fifth amendment, and refuse to testify, and heap abuse upon official representatives of our Government. All of the protections of our Constitution are afforded, but an American soldier who is drafted and forced to serve abroad can now be arrested on trumped-up charges by foreign police officers, or upon the accusation of a Communist conspirator or sympathizer; be questioned by any methods they care to use; held in prison for an indefinite period awaiting trial; tried in secret without a jury, without the safeguard of a presumption of innocence; sentenced and punished possibly by some cruel and inhuman punishment. It is possible that no representative of our Government would be present at his trial since he is only entitled to such representative when the rules of the court so permit.

You must remember that we have the same kind of an agreement with Japan as with the NATO countries respecting the status of our troops. Also, please remember, after the last war Japan was not an ally, but in the position of a conquered country. In spite of our occupying the position of conquerors who should have been able to insist on their troops enjoying at least the same privileges as they would have in their own country, we tossed those rights and privileges away and have placed our soldiers at the mercy of a hostile, conquered people. It is well known that as soon as the peace treaty with Japan was signed the country was flooded with derogatory, defamatory, and hostile literature and propaganda, including many motion pictures, carrying the communistic anti-American line. What type of justice do you expect to be meted out to our soldiers under these conditions? The whole procedure is analogous to setting up a court of prisoners to try their guards for such offenses as their whims may dictate.

NO BARGAIN FOR THE UNITED STATES

As to the idea that our diplomatic representatives drove a hard bargain in securing the right to try members of the Armed Forces of other nations in this country in exchange for turning our soldiers loose at the mercy of those foreign countries, what measure of reciprocity is there in subjecting hundreds of thousands of our soldiers to the forms of justice which may be meted out to them, when, at the most, there are no more than 12,000 soldiers of all the foreign nations in this country during a year, and possibly not more than 4,000 at any one time.

It is conceded by the Defense Department that most of the members of foreign armies in this country are here for training purposes and are, therefore, not members of a military component and do not come under the terms of this treaty. Furthermore, this country has never objected, and did not object prior to the enactment of this treaty, to any foreign country keeping and enforcing criminal jurisdiction over members of its Armed Forces.

On June 30, 1944, we adopted a law entitled "An act to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign sovereigns within the United States, which act was solely for the purpose of assisting foreign nations in maintaining their criminal jurisdiction and implied the existence of such jurisdiction without legislation or treaty. We have never been interested in prosecuting soliders of foreign nations. We do not have the hostile feeling toward our allies or the nations we hope to call our friends that would dictate the urge to prosecute.

Our Defense Department is hard put at times to minimize the actual effect of this treaty upon our soldiers abroad, and to try to make everything look good and fair and just and reasonable. The Department will furnish statistics showing a large number of offenses committed throughtout the world since January 1, 1954, stressing the fact that foreign courts waived their jurisdiction in many of these cases, and that where foreign courts retained jurisdiction, what seems to be a comparatively small number were sentenced to confinement. They also say that some of these sentences were suspended. It is admitted that as of February 10, 1955, there were 58 American soldiers imprisoned throughout the world. I do not care if this number seems to be only a few of those who were first arrested and charged with offense. As long as only one American soldier can be subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of a foreign court, without the consttiutional safeguards which he is told by the United States Courts-Martial Manual go with him, then this treaty is wrong and should be modified.

DEPARTMENTAL EXCUSES

The public was reassured on June 9, 1955, by the Defense Secretary Wilson as to the results of this treaty, when he reported to an Armed Services Committee of this Congress that only one American soldier, thus far, has been given an unfair trial by a friendly country. It would seem either that Mr. Wilson had been misinformed or the report of his statement is incorrect.

The case which he reported was that of a private in France who was fined $36 by a court at Orleans, France, for allegedly pushing a Frenchman off a bicycle. It was stated in his report that the case was carried to the French Ministry of Justice, and that a correction had been made of the errors committted by the French Court and his fine refunded. Isn't it rather absurd to say that this one case is the only one in which a miscarriage of justice might have occurred, particularly when you consider the procedure in French courts which was reported in Time magazine?

The Defense Department apparently has ignored the thousands of cases where Americans perhaps paid fines in minor cases, under the impression that it was the best thing they could do under the circumstances, since they had no protection from our Government as to their constitutional rights; and have ignored other cases where the accused or convicted did not complain because he feared such complaint would only result in increasing the animosity of a court and the severity of his sentence.

The report of the Secretary also stated that American servicemen tried in foreign courts are provided with legal aid to make sure their rights are protected, but the report did not state that the only rights left to be protected were such as the foreign court might deign to recognize and that the legal aid was not American legal aid, but would be some local attorney appointed by that court, and in many cases subservient to the court. The report further claimed that Americans convicted and sentenced to jail are also given the protection of the United States Government—an obvious misstatement, since there is no protection left to a United States soldier who has been tried and convicted under this treaty.

PRISON CONDITIONS

American officials are said to inspect foreign prisons and determine that Americans are receiving the food, medical aid, clothing, and health and comfort provisions they would receive in this country. When you consider that the housing conditions generally in many European countries are not comparable to ours, how can you expect the prisons to be comparable to ours? Or, how can you force any foreign government to provide the same facilities?

In Japan, for instance, the system of heating in prisons is very inadequate. Some of the factories in which the prisoners are made to work long hours, are heated in winter. However, no heating is provided in the prison cells. A justice of the supreme court of Japan, in writing about prison conditions there, said that the ordinary Japanese house is very poorly heated and the people are not accustomed to much heat in their homes, but that the prison cells, built in European style, are colder than the average Japanese houses. He also said that this fact might explain why Japanese prisoners do not complain about the excessive long hours which they are obliged to work. (Perhaps they preferred a little heat to no heat.)

The persons who negotiated this treaty obviously were not concerned with the provisions of foreign laws as to punishment or the conditions of penitentiaries or jails where our men might be serving sentences. You might be interested in this translation from a French work on prisons written in 1945. Speaking of sanitary installations the report said:

"These installations are generally speaking inadequate. Thus, in the majority of our institutions, there are no cesspools, and the deplorable system of mobile waste-tanks still prevails.

"It is unnecessary to dwell on the undesirability of this state of affairs. With such conditions prevailing, it is absurd to speak of prison hygiene.

"Disinfection of the premises and fight against parasites (vermin) have often been recommended and applied more or less successfully."

Another translation of a work written in 1951 on French prisons has this to say concerning food given to inmates:

"They get three meals: breakfast, consisting of a quart of coffee and the bread ration for the day; luncheon, and dinner, each with a soup, made of vegetables, plus 'trimmings' (such as fish, pickles, etc.)

* * * * *

"It is normal for convicts to receive only subsistence rations, but, since they are obliged to work, they have a chance, with the produce of their work, to make purchases in the canteen to improve their regular food."

The correctness of this report is shown by the report of a visit made by a representative of the United States Consular Service and an Army officer to Privates Scaletti and Keefe on March 11, 1955, after they had served over 16 months of their sentence. The report of this visit I have attached to my statement to be a part of this record.

Privates Scaletti and Keefe at that time disclosed that the dormitories in which they slept were unheated, the food bad, and the medical care not considered good. Private Keefe indicated that he received a package that contained canned goods, but was obliged to pay duty thereon and, therefore, hesitated to ask his mother to send him further packages.

With these indications of conditions as they exist in France and Japan, we can only speculate as to what some of the dungeons may be like in other countries with which we have secret agreements, giving them criminal jurisdiction over our men.

Since the extension of the status of forces agreement to Germany is a current subject, I wish to call your attention to a brief statement of procedure in German courts, made by Mr. Worth B. McCauley, a lawyer of Bristow, Okla., in the December 1954 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. He was formerly chief attorney for the courts of the Allied High Commission in Western Germany. He says:

"One must visit a German courtroom to understand how different their procedure is from ours. The state's attorney sits at the bench with the three judges while the defense attorney has little participation except to take notes of the proceedings for possible appeal. All questioning is done by the judges who have before them the police dossier of investigation and interrogation. This in itself is a predetermination of guilt by a police magistrate. There is no right against self-incrimination and hearsay evidence is admissible. It is much easier to convict in a German court than in an American because of the difference in procedure and theory which boils down to a presupposition of guilt rather than innocence."

The men who negotiated this treaty seem to have forgotten that our troops were abroad to protect the soil of other nations from aggression because those nations were not able or willing to defend themselves. Our diplomats must have shuddered at the thought that these other nations would consider us a favored group if we asserted our rights in any way, or demanded an observance of the international law, which would insure our country keeping jurisdiction over its own citizens in its Armed Forces.

Wherever our troops have gone, throughout the world, we have taken our civilization to other countries and shared the fruits of our industry and knowledge with that other nation. Why should we abandon our standards of living, our constitutional rights and guaranties merely to appease and seek favor of our allies? We are told there is a feeling of hostility toward us in many countries with whom we have these agreements, public and secret, and we know this to be true. Then, why should we force our men into foreign courts to be tried in a hostile atmosphere, before hostile courts, without the humane rules of procedure set forth in our Constitution and laws?

REVISION OF THE TREATY

By the terms of the treaty its provisions can be denounced at the expiration of a period of 4 years from the date on which it became effective, which period would expire on July 24, 1957. It is for this reason that House Joint Resolution 309 directs the President to request the North Atlantic Council for a revision of article VII of the agreement, acting under the provision of article XXII thereof; and as an alternative, if such revision cannot be brought about, that the President shall then denounce such agreement at the earliest date permitted.

There are several methods by which action by the President to secure revision of article VII of the treaty might be directed and there is ample precedent to support a joint resolution as one of the methods. It is conceivable that supporters of the Status of Forces Agreement may contend that action by the House is not necessary, and also a possibility that the President may seek to ignore the resolution even though adopted;

but in spite of these contingencies we owe it to our Armed Forces to let the world know that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of this country is against depriving our forces of the protection of our Constitution.

Certainly we have every right to initiate a request for revocation forthwith of all secret agreements made by the executive department which gives criminal jurisdiction over our soldiers to foreign powers.

SUMMATION

In summation, let me say that the NATO Status of Forces Agreement was a tragic abdication of sovereignty that should be repudiated at the earliest possible date.

Constitutional, moral and practical considerations dictate that the United States should never surrender to any foreign sovereign its right to protect and control the personnel of our Armed Forces.

At least 58 servicemen, deprived of their constitutional rights as Americans, sentenced and convicted under foreign laws, are now confined virtually incommunicado in filthy, unheated foreign prisons without proper food or medical care. They are martyrs to internationalism.

The Congress has the power under the Constitution to regulate and govern the Armed Forces. The Congress has the responsibility to protect the constitutional rights of men in the Armed Forces. The sentiment of the American people on this issue is clear and plain. I strongly urge the committee to delve deeply into this subject, uncover the facts, and take appropriate action at the earliest possible date.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I agreed that I would speak for only a very few minutes on this important subject. If this amendment is not adopted, I cannot possibly understand how any Member of this body who took an oath to support the Constitution can vote for the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that if one of our soldier boys should go into Yugoslavia, and there commit an offense, he would be tried under Communist law, unless this amendment should be adopted?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in answer to the last observation, let me say that we have no troops in Communist countries, and we have no status of forces treaties with them, nor any executive agreements. Therefore, our soldiers would not be tried under Communist law.

If I were debating this question as a question of constitutional law——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to have a point straightened out. How does the Senator know what executive agreements are in existence? No one else does.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been investigating the subject as a member of a special subcommittee. So far as I know, we have no executive agreements with Communist countries, and we have no troops in Communist countries.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. Who has the floor? I thought the Senator from Indiana had the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Indiana yielded the floor.

Mr. WELKER. He did not yield the floor.

Mr. JENNER. I yielded only for a question. All I wish to know is, How can we find out from the executive department of Government what executive agreements are in existence?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I assumed that the Senator from Indiana had yielded the floor, and that I was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. JENNER. Very well. The Senator may have the floor. I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. If we were engaged in the discussion of a question of constitutional law, and if that were the primary question before us, I would frankly concede that I have some misgivings about the Status of Forces Treaty. But whether the Status of Forces Treaty is valid or not valid under the Constitution is not the question we are now called upon to decide. That is a question primarily for the courts. The treaty was approved by the Senate. Either the Status of Forces Treaty or similar executive agreements are in force in 60 nations—practically every nation allied with us in our fight against communism. Every nation in which we have soldiers is governed by similar laws.

This amendment reminds me, in its effect on national defense, of a little poem which we recite down in North Carolina:

> Mother, may I go out to swim?
>   Yes, my darling daughter.
> Hang your clothes on a hickory limb
>   But don't go near the water.

The amendment would say that the United States, which is trying to make itself militarily strong by this Reserve Act, cannot fight anywhere on the face of the earth except in the United States. That would be the situation if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Not until I finish. Then I shall be glad to yield to my friend.

If this amendment were adopted and the Russians were to invade western Europe today, the United States could not send a single soldier from this country then to aid our own soldiers or our allies to fight communism. The hands of the United States would be tied. In effect, we would be saying to our enemies, "The only place these reservists or any other American soldier not now abroad can fight you is on American soil."

If we must fight communism, I am in favor of doing so on foreign soil. I want no wars in America. I will not be bothered with any scruples as to whether everything is constitutional when it comes to fighting. If we must fight, I want to fight on foreign soil, rather than on American soil.

If we want to tie the hands of the United States or to render this bill useless, then let us vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana. But if we wish to strengthen America so that she can fight on foreign soil rather than on our own doorstep, then we should vote down this amendment.

Mr. WELKER and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I noted what my distinguished friend the Senator from North Carolina had to say with respect to executive agreements relating to Yugoslavia. The Senator knows, does he not, that we have given hundreds of millions of dollars to Tito, the head of the Government of Yugoslavia?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not know how much, but I know we have given Yugoslavia a sight of money.

Mr. WELKER. Yes; it is more than the Senator from Idaho would have liked to give them.

I should like to ask another question. How would we be hurt by protecting our boys in Yugoslavia, in the Malay States, or any other place in the world under the canopy of heaven where our armed services are stationed?

Mr. ERVIN. I would say that we would hurt those who are already there if we refused to send any Reserves to aid them if the enemy attacked. That is what the amendment would do.

Mr. WELKER. Does not the Senator believe that those countries would be glad to receive our soldiers even if the amendment were adopted?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator does not know?

Mr. ERVIN. I have not had a conversation with them on that subject.

Mr. WELKER. I am sure the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. ERVIN. I know that if a couple of French soldiers in Idaho or in North Carolina committed a murder, under the existing status of forces treaties they could be tried in Idaho or North Carolina rather than in French military courts, and I am sure the Senator from Idaho is glad that they could be tried by the local courts, rather than by the French military courts.

Mr. WELKER. That is exactly where the Senator and I differ. If I were to agree with the Senator, I believe we would lose the last concept of our Constitution. I should like to ask the Senator why our soldiers could not fight on foreign soil if the foreign people are the loyal advocates and friends they are alleged to be?

Mr. ERVIN. That is not the point before the Senate. The point before us under the amendment is whether, if the American forces now in Europe were attacked by Russia, for example, we could send Reserves or other soldiers over there to aid them or whether we would have to keep any possible reinforcements tied up in this country.

Mr. WELKER. What is wrong with that? Let us consider the Mexican case. Let us think about the little boy from Mexico to whom the Senator from Indiana referred so brilliantly a moment ago. Would that situation not shock the hearts of anyone who has been brought up in the cradle of liberty, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has been?

Mr. ERVIN. I am not concerned with that now. I have some misgivings about the status-of-forces treaties. I do not like them too well. On the other hand, I do not believe we should tie the hands of the 2,900,000 Reserves and our other Armed Forces and declare we cannot use them anywhere outside the borders of the United States, even if the liberties of all free men in the world are threatened. To take such a drastic step, in order to test some question of constitutional law, is, in my judgment, about as sensible as taking an atom bomb to destroy a mouse.

Mr. WELKER. Is it a drastic step to protect the most sacred document in the world, the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. ERVIN. If we prohibit the use of our Reserves in foreign countries——

Mr. WELKER. Why can they not fight in Europe?

Mr. ERVIN. Because if the amendment is adopted we cannot send our Reserves or any other Armed Forces outside the country. We have these agreements with 60 other nations, and with every country that is our ally.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator believe that our allies should be permitted to subject our boys in uniform to cruel and unusual punishment? I am sure the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. ERVIN. Is that a question?

Mr. WELKER. It is a question. Does the Senator believe that? Does the Senator mean that?

Mr. ERVIN. I would say that Canada, France, England, Belgium, and Holland are some of the countries with which we have status of forces treaties. I say that we should pass the bill and strengthen our national defense. Then we can bring up the question in a direct attack on the validity of the treaties by way of a resolution. When one's life is at stake it is very foolish for him to argue whether someone is trespassing on his land.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator is as much interested in this matter as I am. I know him to be a fine lawyer and in intimate friend of mine. I note that the Senator in his illustration picked out the countries which are the best countries with whom we have status of forces treaties in effect. The Senator did not pick out countries which inflict cruel and unusual punishment and where our boys are deprived of the concept of constitutional rights which belong to every American.

I still should like to have an answer to my question as to why our soldiers could not fight even if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. ERVIN. Because the amendment provides that they cannot be assigned to serve in any country with which we have a status of forces treaty or a similar executive agreement in effect. The whole question about the Constitution in a case like this was answered by Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans in the War of 1812, when he broke into a man's warehouse and took his cotton bales to make a breastwork out of them. The man came running out of the warehouse and said to Andrew Jackson, "I want you to surrender my cotton bales. Those bales of cotton are my property. It is unconstitutional for you to seize them."

Andrew Jackson said to him, "If those are your cotton bales, get behind them with a rifle. After we have defeated the British we will talk about the Constitution."

Mr. WELKER. If it is necessary to fly high over the Constitution of the United States by going back to Andrew Jackson's day, when we have an opportunity to protect our boys, then in my opinion, we have reached a low ebb in our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief observations on the amendment. It so happens that when the status of forces treaties were being considered in the Senate I was one of those who voted against them. I forget how many other Senators voted against them, but I know it was a small number.

Mr. JENNER. Fifteen Senators voted in opposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am proud that I was included in that number. I believe the status of forces treaties are very bad treaties for this country to have entered into. They were adopted in an excess enthusiasm and in a spirit of good fellowship, without regard for the constitutional rights of the men who are taken into our armed services.

Every man who follows the flag is entitled to have the Constitution follow him.

I am perfectly willing to vote to withdraw from the status of forces treaties. We can do it by adopting a resolution in both Houses of Congress by a majority vote. In that way we can dissociate ourselves from the treaties. We can do it forthrightly and straightforwardly.

I am very much opposed to the amendment. I do not exactly understand why it is presented in this form. We have status of forces treaties in effect with I do not know how many countries. We also have other treaties in effect and also other arrangements.

It has been said that because we made a mistake in ratifying the status of forces treaties we should tie our own hands and break faith with the people with whom we entered into those treaties and with whom we entered into mutual-defense arrangements, and leave our forces already in Europe in such a position that they would be destroyed in the event they were attacked, because we could not send Americans over there to their relief.

That is certainly not a proper way to approach the problem of extricating ourselves from the status-of-forces treaties. If there ever has been a case of biting off one's nose in order to spite one's face, the amendment pending before the Senate is such a case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not also true that if the condition of a troubled peace should remain, the problem of finding replacements for the men already in Europe would arise? If we could not send men to relieve those already on duty in Europe, we would have to retain those who are already over there, unless we wished to completely renege on our understandings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course that is the case. It would be disastrous in any event. It is a very unusual approach to the problem. We can dissociate ourselves from the status-of-forces treaties by means of a resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, even if a country were willing to give us back that which we have surrendered, the right to try our men, until we had passed through another treaty process we could not send any soldiers there. The fact of having in effect a treaty containing provisions which permits them to exercise jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel, enables us now to send our soldiers there.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have here the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 15, 1953, when the agreement was ratified by a vote of 72 to 15. It has apparently affected only the countries which were affiliated with or signatories to the NATO organization. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my understanding. I was not an expert in that field, not being on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I asked for a quorum call. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] made a statement about the treaty and the effect it would have, and my conclusions as a lawyer were in accord with those expressed by the Senator from Ohio. I stand ready to vote to rescind that treaty. I do not think it was necessary at all. As a matter of fact, I think in the long run it will be harmful to our international relations, rather than a help.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment is agreed to, does it not come down to the fact of having 2 types of boys in our armed services, 1 which we can send to this place and the other which we can send to another place? As the Senator has said, we are biting off our nose to spite our face.

Mr. RUSSELL. A man is sent overseas and is left there until a replacement is sent.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. In answer to that, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, who has had a great deal of experience on the Armed Services Committee, if he does not believe that our supposed allies wish us to live under the Constitution of this country? Does he not think that England, France, and other nations who wish our dollars and our boys so badly would be glad to sit down with President Eisenhower and say, "Yes; we want you to be a constitutional government; we want your boys to be protected under your Constitution; we do not want them subject to decapitation, castration, the guillotine, and so forth"? If not, would they not be pretty weak reeds to lean upon?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the reason why I stated I would vote for a resolution to rescind the treaty. That is the orderly approach, rather than this amendment which would endanger the lives of American boys who have been overseas——

Mr. JENNER. I know the Senator's honest belief. I know he is willing to do exactly what he has said. I have admitted that this is not exactly the proper approach, but, certainly, I think it is time Congress should, under the Constitution, call the attention of the Executive to the fact that this must be done, and it can be done. If other nations want our billions of dollars, if they want our equipment and our boys, surely they will leave us our Constitution under which to live.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to protect the Constitution, and I shall do so as a Member of this body, but I cannot think of anything which would so put us astride of 2 barrels, 1 foot on 1 and 1 foot on the other, with the barrels rolling in opposite directions and making us come a cropper.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business for the Subcommintee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 70, as follows:

YEAS—14

Barrett
Capehart
Carlson
Curtis
Goldwater
Hruska
Jenner
Langer
Malone
McCarthy
Mundt
Schoeppel
Welker
Young

NAYS—70

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Daniel
Dirksen
Douglas
Duff
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Frear
Fulbright
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Ives
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Williams

NOT VOTING—12

Flanders
George
Gore
Green
Johnson, Tex.
Kefauver
Kennedy
McClellan
Murray
Neely
Potter
Wiley

So Mr. JENNER'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. The Senator from Georgia will recall that a few minutes ago we were discussing an example of the problems of certain Air Force officer candidate school graduates. I find there are a considerable number of similar examples of young men, graduates of an Air Force officer candidate school, who must now be subject to induction into the Army, unless an appropriate amendment is adopted. The chairman of the committee suggested that if I would draft an amendment covering the situation, he would give it consideration.

I have prepared such an amendment. It is designed to provide the same rule for officer candidate school graduates as ROTC graduates insofar as participation in the training program is concerned. If my amendment becomes law, it will correct a serious inequity that now exists in the program of the Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am familiar with the drafted amendment. It seems that something should be done, not only with reference to the Air Force officer candidate school, but with reference to other officer training schools. I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MORSE. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 27, after line 3, to insert the following language:

(C) Clause (a) of the first sentence of section 6 (d) (1) of such act is amended by inserting, immediately after the words "officer procurement programs of the", the words "Air Force".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The distinguished chairman of the committee, as well as the Senator from Idaho, voted, on July 15, 1953, along with other colleagues, against the ratification of the Status of Forces Treaty. It is possible, because of the situation which arose as a result of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, that there will be a wrong interpretation placed upon the vote which rejected that amendment. From the observations which were made by many of those who participated in the brief debate on the amendment, and also because of the fact that most of the 15 Members who voted against ratification of the treaty on July 15, 1953, today voted against the amendment, I am sure it is apparent there will inevitably be some confusion. But on the basis of the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, I think steps should be initiated to see whether the treaty can be abrogated, because undoubtedly there is overwhelming sentiment in this country today against subjecting American boys who serve in the Armed Forces overseas to the jurisdiction of courts in foreign countries for criminal violations or offenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator's statement. In my opinion, the majority of the people were opposed to the treaty. I do not believe the matter is very acute yet because of the general fashion in which it has been handled up to date. When the foreign countries start applying the treaty to some of our boys, no doubt there will be considerable public outcry. However, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which would handle a resolution to abrogate the treaty.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 15 Senators who voted against ratification of the status-of-forces treaty be inserted in the RECORD at this point, showing that they were against entering into any agreement such as that.

There being no objection, the names of the Senators were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER, DIRKSEN, DWORSHAK, FREAR, JENNER, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, LONG, MALONE, MCCARRAN, MCCARTHY, RUSSELL, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, WELKER, and WILLIAMS.

Mr. DANIEL subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the fact that the junior Senator from Texas was absent on official business when the status-of-forces treaty was approved, I ask unanimous consent that my position appear at the end of the list of Senators who voted against the treaty, showing that I was opposed to the treaty and would have voted against it had I been present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of paying my respects to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], who, in my opinion, has handled the bill magnificently. Perhaps this may be considered as a political speech, but I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I have been going to political conventions every 4 years since 1924, and when a convention is held in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or any other large city, I become tired of hearing that someone below the Mason-Dixon line cannot be elected President. I say this in all sincerity. If we have good people in the United States, and the country is united within the continental United States, why cannot a person from below the Mason-Dixon line be elected President? I am here in the Senate through the kindness of the people of New Mexico. Believe it or not, I would not mind having someone from below the Mason-Dixon line as President, and I would not mind if that person were the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Mexico overwhelms me, and I am sure he views me through glasses that are colored by a friendship which has existed since we have been in Congress together, a friendship which I appreciate very much.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not a question of friendship. I become tired of hearing it said that a person from below the Mason-Dixon line cannot be elected President. Why cannot we get someone from that area, who is able and distinguished, as is the junior Senator from Georgia, elected President? I am for him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I had intended to make extended remarks on the bill, but because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not do so. I do desire to say to the Senate, however, that the pending bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has come before the Senate during this session. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] for the able and fair manner in which he held the hearings, and also for the masterful manner in which he has handled the bill on the floor of the Senate today. I do not believe I have ever seen any piece of proposed legislation handled in a more skillful manner than this bill has been handled by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. The bill contains some provisions which I think can be ironed out in free conference, and which I believe should be ironed out there. I have discussed them with the Senator from Georgia, and I am very hopeful that that will be done.

Taking the bill as a whole, I wish to say that I believe it is a practical, workable one. It might have been improved; but, on the other hand, I feel that the bill will enable the armed services to go forward and give our country a first-class Reserve—something we have never had in all our history.

Back in 1917, Lenin, the father of Communism, stated that the aim of the Soviets was to be the grave diggers, the heirs, and the successors of the other governments of the world. The Soviets have followed that policy. Since World War II, 15 countries, with 800 million people, have been taken behind the Iron Curtain.

There is no question that America must remain strong. The only way we can avoid attack, the only way the United States can survive, is to remain strong. The only language a dictator understands is the language of force; and we must remain strong if we are to survive as a nation.

There are only two ways by which we can keep our country strong. One is to have a large and expensive Regular Military Establishment. The other is to have a Regular Military Establishment of reasonable size, backed up by a large, combat Ready Reserve. I am confident that the latter method is the American way and, further, that it will give us the most economical and best defense.

Today, we have planes which will fly faster than sound. Today, a bomber can fly from Moscow to Los Angeles in 10½ hours, from Moscow to Chicago in 7½ hours, and from Moscow to Washington in 8½ hours; and faster planes are being built every day. Today, a bomber can bomb New York City, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington within a total of 22 minutes. Certainly we realize how close together the countries of the world now are. Today, the United States and the other nations of the world are living very close together, indeed.

So it is essential that we keep the United States of America strong. I believe that the way for us to do so is to have a large, combat Ready Reserve.

Mr. President, our economy will not stand the expense of the maintenance of a Regular Military Establishment of the size which would be required to keep America strong militarily. Therefore, the sensible and the practical way for us to proceed is to have a Regular Military Establishment of reasonable size, backed up by a large, combat Ready Reserve. I am pleased that the sentiment of the Senate seems to be in favor of the passage of the pending bill. I hope it will be passed promptly.

Mr. President, before I close, I should like to take this opportunity also to congratulate a member of the Defense Department for his fine work on this bill. I refer to Mr. Carter L. Burgess. Mr. Burgess is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and is a native of Virginia; but for several years before he came to Washington, he was connected with the University of South Carolina. Mr. Burgess has been the main cog in the wheel—to use a common expression—in connection with the handling of this Reserve bill in the Defense Department. At this time I wish to have the record show that this tribute is paid to him because he has done a magnificent job in working out the details of the bill. He has given to it hours and hours of work, and has spent long nights on it. I feel that no one has contributed more to the bill than has Mr. Burgess.

Mr. President, I believe that by means of the enactment of this bill, we shall be taking a long step forward in terms of providing a preparedness program for the United States. We cannot say how the Military Establishment is going to administer the bill; we cannot guarantee that. But it is my firm conviction that if the bill is administered properly, we shall have a strong Reserve, which is so essential to the protection and the survival of the United States in this critical period of history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Amendments to Internal Revenue Code of 1954

Sec. —. (a) Section 1 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on individuals) is hereby amended by striking out that portion of the table contained therein which follows:

"Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$7,260 plus 51 percent of excess over $20.000."

and inserting in lieu there of the following:

"Over $22,000 but not over $25,000.	$8,380 plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000.
"Over $25,000--------	100 percent of excess over $25,000."

(b) Section 1 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on heads of households) is hereby amended by striking out that portion of the table contained therein which follows:

"Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,260 plus 47 percent of excess over over $20,000."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Over $22,000 but not over $25,000.	$7,200 plus 49 percent of excess over $22,000.
"Over $25,000--------	100 percent of excess over $25,000."

(c) Section 531 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 531. Imposition of tax.

"In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every corporation accumulating earnings and profits instead of dividing or distributing such earnings and profits a tax equal to 100 percent of its accumulated taxable income."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply only to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order, namely, that the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment is not in order, for the Constitution of the United States is specific in providing that all revenue legislation must originate in the House of Representatives. On that constitutional point, I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota—a revenue amendment offered by him to the committee amendment—is not germane to it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my amendment to the committee amendment is a very simple one; it merely provides that if the boys of the country are drafted, the wealth of the country can also be drafted, and that any amount in excess of $25,000 that anyone earns in any particular year can be taken by the Government. So the amendment is a very simple one, and is perfectly in order, because if we have 2,900,000 of our young men in the Reserve, a considerable amount of money will be required in order to pay them; and my amendment provides a very simple way of paying those 2,900,000 men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment has a great deal of merit. If I correctly recall, the same amendment was offered about 6 years ago, and at that time was held germane. I recall that because I offered a similar amendment in the House of Representatives, and at that time it was not held germane in that body, but it was held germane in this body. I think the Senator from North Dakota is right. If we are to take men, we had better take excess dollars, too.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, may we have a ruling on the point of order?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a moment the point of order.

The amendment is unconstitutional, but under the rules of the Senate that does not make it out of order. If it were adopted, the House of Representatives would not receive the bill, because of the constitutional provision that revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives.

There may be a germ of goodness in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, but it is unconstitutional. However, in order that the rules of the Senate may be observed, it is not subject to a point of order. The Senate can pass an unconstitutional act if it sees fit to do so, but that does not make it, under the rules, subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the procedure of the Senate, the question of constitutionality of a measure must be submitted to the Senate itself for a decision.

The question is, Is the amendment in order? [Putting the question.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. LANGER's amendment was held to be not in order.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that, had I had an opportunity to vote on the substance of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I would have voted in favor of the amendment. I remember that when I was somewhat younger than I am now, there was a great deal of talk in this country about drafting money as well as men. It seems to me that the Senator from North Dakota offered a reasonable amendment, from a standpoint of fairness and consistency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JENNER (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I am informed that, if present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). Present.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "Yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—80

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Barkley
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bible
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clements
Cotton
Curtis
Daniel
Dirksen
Douglas
Duff
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Frear
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hennings
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Ives
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Malone
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
McNamara
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Williams
Young

NAYS—1

Langer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Jenner
Schoeppel

NOT VOTING—13

Flanders
George
Gore
Green
Johnson, Tex.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Mansfield
McClellan
Murray
Neely
Potter
Wiley

So the bill (H. R. 7000) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the form in which it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF CAREER ATTORNEYS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 1 week ago today it became my duty as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to acquaint the Senate with a ruling of the Civil Service Commission which was either utterly ridiculous or deliberately designed to remove certain positions from the career service and make them available for political purposes.

The ruling referred to was put into effect on January 24, 1955, and had the effect of taking away the status of career attorneys when their positions or titles were changed in any manner. The ruling applied to veterans and nonveterans alike.

As pointed out in my statement last week, the matter was first called to the attention of Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, on March

31. His office was contacted weekly since that date in an effort to obtain correction of the ruling. These efforts proved futile until public attention was focused on the matter here in the Senate last week.

I am gratified to now announce that Mr. Young has finally been moved to action. Out of consideration for the morale of the employees involved, I regret that he took so long to correct the ruling.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Mr. Young's letter of July 12, 1955, in reply to my letter of March 31, informing me of his belated decision.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: I regret the delay which has occurred in giving you a final answer to your letter of March 31 concerning Departmental Circular 789 which outlined the rights of employees with civil service status serving in excepted positions. We have now reached a decision on this matter. It has not been an easy one to make in view of the conflicting points of view held by equally serious and informed people.

Our decision has been to maintain the basic policies which we set forth in the Departmental Circular. On the other hand, we feel, as you do, that the application of those basic principles in certain situations is unnecessary and inequitable. We are, therefore, issuing a supplement to Departmental Circular 789 to that effect. I am attaching for your full information a copy of the basic circular and an advance copy of the supplement.

Briefly, the present decision is not to apply the basic policies of Departmental Circular 789 when there is a personnel action which continues an employee in substantially the same assignment although there may be a change in grade or in the classification series of his job as a result of reorganization or other classification action. We feel that in these situations an employee for all practical purposes, continues in the same position and that there has been no vacancy to be filled under the procedures of the basic circular. Employees in the competitive service continue in the competitive service, therefore, when they are assigned to successor positions under these circumstances. I believe the decision now reached is substantially that proposed in your letter.

While I have assumed above that you are familiar with the principles in the basic circular, may I take a moment to relate several of the objectives which we sought. One of the persistent problems of the Commission has been the confusion on the part of employees and agencies as to the line of demarcation between the competitive service and the excepted service. This has been most troublesome in determining the rights of employees under the Lloyd-La Follette Act. It has been our primary purpose to establish a clear-cut distinction between competitive positions and excepted positions so that employees may be fully aware of their rights. We believe that the accomplishment of this objective is not only good administration but also best for the career service.

In setting the line of demarcation we had, of course, to make sure that the legal interpretation of the Lloyd-LaFollette Act by the courts was carried into practice in letter and in spirit, and further, we felt we should recognize certain equitable situations over and above the legal requirements. We, therefore, did not and, in fact could not, draw a completely rigid line. With due regard to the legal and equitable requirements, however, we believe we have set that line of demarcation so as to achieve the primary objective. Our action, we believe, will ultimately lead, and in fact has already to a limited extent led, to less demand for exception of positions from the competitive service. In this respect, I think the principles in Departmental Circular 789 should be contrasted with the earlier principles which permitted certain benefits of the competitive system to be enjoyed by agencies and employees without the concurrent responsibilities of a competitive merit system—thus inviting requests for exception.

In reaching our decision we have not been unmindful of certain special problems relating to attorneys. However, we feel that those problems are not to be solved by making a distinction between attorneys and other excepted employees in these matters. You recognize, of course, that this issue is applicable to the attorney situation only because attorney positions have been outside the competitive service in view of the action of the Congress in passing riders to the appropriation bills for the last 10 years prohibiting the use of Civil Service Commission funds for examining attorneys. We have noted the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and of other organizations and persons that attorneys be under a career system. The Commission is presently studying the Hoover Commission proposals and hopes that out of the consideration of these and similar proposals by the administration and the Congress, solutions to the special problems of attorneys may be found.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP YOUNG, *Chairman.*

PURCHASING POWER OR ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE FARM DOLLAR

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, attention should be called to phenomenon that Secretary of Agriculture Benson is attempting to accomplish during his short but much too long a term as a Cabinet officer under the Eisenhower administration.

The phenomenon to which I refer is his attempt to double the value of the farm dollar by a cleverly designed use of words.

Now, I do not mean that he has made any attempt to double the real purchasing or economic value of the farm dollar. But I do mean that he has attempted to double the political value of each such dollar.

How has he attempted to accomplish this? How has he attempted to expose two sides of the coin at one and the same time? This is how he has done it.

In the rural areas he takes great credit for bolstering farm prices. In Wall Street he cries in anguish at the great losses that supposedly result from the price-support program for our basic agriculture commodities.

I guess I should not be surprised, though, for it follows the true form of the present administration. "Divide the people and conquer the votes" is Mr. Benson's theory—and he is apparently backed to the hilt by President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, in early June of this year, Mr. Benson issued a statement to the press which was headlined "Farm Prop Loss Tops Half Billion."

In the story, the Agricultural Department reports that "it lost more than half a billion dollars in supporting farm prices during the first 10 months of this fiscal year."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Of the total losses of $563,966,000 referred to in the Star story, $245,505,000, or more than half, were donations, and this does not include an item referred to as "other program losses (net)" of $32,496,000, which figure includes $29,723,000 used to increase fluid-milk consumption in school pursuant to section 201c, Public Law 439, as amended.

It should also be noted that included in the $245,505,000, $198,015,000 consisted of dairy products which were donated.

I believe attention should be called to the many agencies which have participated in the donations which have been exported. Thirteen agencies are listed, and other agencies accounted for $340,000 of the total export donations of $107,292,000. It should also be noted that our domestic donations include $36,746,000 to schools, $17,566,000 to institutions, $28,031,000 worth of commodities have gone to needy persons, $41,374,000 have been used for distress and disaster relief, while $14,496,000 worth of commodities have gone to the Veterans' Administration and the Defense Department without reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a slippery, misleading statement. More than half the losses reported by Mr. Benson's Department were not because of the support program at all. I had a breakdown made of this report by the Agriculture Department because I thought the story was misleading and unfair. The breakdown, which I submit for the RECORD, with note of explanation, shows clearly that of the so-called loss reported by Mr. Benson's Department actually more than a quarter of a billion dollars went for donations in welfare and giveaway programs, both domestic and foreign, which have absolutely nothing to do with the support program.

For example, of the huge "loss," as Mr. Benson's Department calls it, $29,723,000 went to increase milk consumption in our public schools in accordance with Public Law 439. Here we have the President's "Cabinet farmer" declaring that milk fed to our city and country schoolchildren is a loss. It is a typical Benson trick.

Other portions of the so-called losses went for food for needy persons, schools and other public institutions, food for disaster relief, and food for our overseas allies, including CARE and church overseas welfare programs designed to make Christians and good citizens out of downtrodden, hungry people.

I cannot see how Mr. Benson has the gall to call this a loss.

Mr. President, these things cannot be chalked up as a loss resulting from the support program. They are investments made by the Government as a result of laws passed by this Congress to feed hungry people, and I resent any implications that the farm program is to blame. Why does not Mr. Benson issue a statement to show how many millions of dollars the program has saved the farmers, or why does he not tell how many hungry mouths were fed with this food that he calls a loss?

Mr. President, I shall tell you why.

The entire Agriculture Department's program of propaganda and slippery statements is designed to divide the city voters from the farmers. By branding everything done for the farmers a loss and a tax burden, by using the farmer for a scapegoat and a sacrifice on the altar of false economy, Mr. Benson hopes to capture the city vote under the guise of saving them money and taxes. He preaches loss, taxes, and pays other lip service to the city vote, while, on the other hand, he issues great promises to the farmers and dashes about the country from one trouble spot to another fingering dust in the Dust Bowl, dead trees after freezes and fires, and boll weevils in the cotton fields.

I hope the city people and the farmers of this Nation are not going to fall for Mr. Benson's Trojan horses. I think the city people know well that the farmer is still the basic backbone in our economic structure and that when the present administration strikes at the welfare of the farmers it will in short time be reflected back to the main streets of our cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement by the United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, showing distribution of realized program losses by type of distribution and commodity for the fiscal year 1955 through April 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Distribution of realized program losses by type of distribution and commodity, fiscal year 1955 through Apr. 30, 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of disposition	Total	Barley	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	Wheat	Cottonseed products	Dairy products	Flaxseed and linseed oil	Other
Sales:										
Export	192,524	6,668	9,782	8,886	946	87,872	35,733	20,873	17,410	4,354
Domestic:										
Regular	58,084	137	2,706	155	3,592	6,396	3,067	43,848	1,506	[1] 3,323
Not storable	22,512	1,099	18,470	32	297	1,544	-----	-----	76	994
Deteriorated	6,774	4	4,080	788	6	1,506	13	-----	-----	377
Other	1,284	-----	204	-----	5	120	[1] 385	-----	-----	1,340
Other sales, including inventory adjustments	4,787	66	881	213	208	1,483	206	80	1,032	618
Total sales	285,965	7,974	36,123	10,074	5,054	98,921	38,634	64,801	20,024	4,360
Donations:										
Export:										
American Friends of Austrian Children	231	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	231	-----	-----
American Friends Service Committee	1,884	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	264	1,620	-----	-----
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee	497	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	145	352	-----	-----
Assemblies of God Foreign Service Committee	95	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7	88	-----	-----
CARE	12,817	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	191	12,626	-----	-----
Catholic Relief Services, NCWC	69,996	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	4,270	65,726	-----	-----
Church World Service	7,079	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	775	6,304	-----	-----
International Rescue Committee	342	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	342	-----	-----
Lutheran World Relief	3,457	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	422	3,035	-----	-----
Mennonite Central Committee	231	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	21	210	-----	-----
Unitarian Service Committee	252	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	252	-----	-----
United Lithuanian Relief Fund	128	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	128	-----	-----
United Nations Children's Fund	9,943	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	9,943	-----	-----
Other agencies	340	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	21	319	-----	-----
Total export donations	107,292	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	6,116	101,176	-----	-----
Domestic, Public Law 439, amended:										
Sec. 416:										
Schools	36,746	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	36,746	-----	-----
Institutions	17,566	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	17,566	-----	-----
Needy persons	28,031	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	28,031	-----	-----
Sec. 407, distress and disaster relief	41,374	84	24,470	14,621	2,199	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Sec. 202:										
Veterans' Administration and Defense Department	14,496	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	14,496	-----	-----
Total domestic donations	138,213	84	24,470	14,621	2,199	-----	-----	96,839	-----	-----
Total donations	245,505	84	24,470	14,621	2,199	-----	6,116	198,015	-----	-----
Other program losses (net)	[1] 32,496	20	2,348	2	54	504	[1] 1	[2] 29,720	52	[1] 203
Total program losses	563,966	8,078	62,941	24,697	7,307	99,425	44,749	292,536	20,076	4,157

[1] Indicates program gains.

[2] Includes $29,723,000 used to increase fluid milk consumption in schools pursuant to sec. 201 (c), Public Law 439, as amended.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 18, at 2 o'clock p. m., there be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 775.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House, and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign any duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the discussion of the conference report on the appropriation bill yesterday, with special reference to the provisions of the report affecting the Atomic Energy Commission, I thought I had asked unanimous consent to insert in the Record a memorandum of the history of appropriation action by the House and the Senate in the case of the Atomic Energy Commision. I did send the memorandum to the desk, but the Record shows that I did not request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record. I now ask unanimous consent that a memorandum from Mr. Don S. Burrows, Controller of the Atomic Energy Commission, dated July 11, 1955, be printed at this point in the Record. It is a study of the history of appropriation action by the Senate and the House with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

History of Appropriation Action

July 11, 1955.

The President requested a total obligational authority of $1,525,251,000 for the operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission. This consisted of the following:

Appropriation	$1,045,000,000
Transfer from "plant and equipment"	220,804,000
Unobligated balance	259,447,000
Total funds available for obligation	1,525,251,000

The House of Representatives passed a bill consisting of $1,358,847,000, consisting of the following:

Appropriation	$618,000,000
Transfer from "plant and equipment"	481,400,000
Unobligated balance	259,447,000
Total funds available for obligation	1,358,847,000

The amount as passed by the House, together with an estimated additional unobligated balance under the operating-expense appropriation of $65 million (which amount was over and above the unobligated balance indicated in the President's budget), would have provided a total of $1,423,847,000 which would have been $101,404,000 less than the amount requested by the President.

The Commission made an appeal to the Senate for the restoration for the $101 million by increasing the proposed transfer from plant and equipment appropriation by $101 million. The Commission pointed out to the Senate that it would have $65 million additional available from the prior year operating-expense appropriation. The Senate approved the increase in the transfer from plant and equipment but reduced the appropriation by $43 million which would have provided a total obligational authority of $1,481,847,000, as follows:

Appropriation	$575,000,000
Transfer from "plant and equipment"	582,400,000
Unobligated balance	324,447,000
Total funds available for obligation	1,481,847,000

The conferees rejected the Senate amendment providing for the increase in the transfer of $101 million but accepted the Senate reduction in the appropriation of $43 million, providing a total obligational authority of $1,380,847,000, as follows:

Appropriation	$575,000,000
Transfer from "plant and equipment"	481,400,000
Unobligated balance	324,447,000
Total funds available for obligation	1,380,847,000

Thus, after giving consideration to transfers from the plant and equipment appropriation and after giving consideration to the availability of unobligated prior year funds, the amounts of obligating authority available to the Commission are as follows:

Request of the President	$1,525,251,000
House allowance	1,423,847,000
Senate allowance	1,481,847,000
Conference report	1,380,847,000

Thus it can be seen the conference report provides an amount which is $43 million less than the amount which would have been available from the House Report and $101 million less than was available by the Senate action.

The Commission in its proposal to the Senate declared the total of all free unobligated balances in the plant and equipment appropriation and its maximum estimate of the amount which could be available from the prior year operating appropriation and can, therefore, state categorically that there are no further funds available to the Commission for operating expenses in fiscal year 1956.

DON S. BURROWS,
Controller, Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have had a further study made of the result of the action of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House, and of the conference committee, with reference to title 1, which is the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation. This study further amplifies and clarifies my contention of yesterday that the net result of the conference committee report was a total of $43 million less for the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission than even the low House figure which came from the House Appropriations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been some confusion concerning the effect of the committee on conference version of H. R. 6766 which makes money available to the AEC for operating expenses. The situation is as follows:

As of April 30, 1955, the AEC had an unexpended balance of operating funds of $1,055,519,084.

Included in this amount was $259,447,000 which the AEC clearly knew to be unobligated and therefore available for reappropriation under the fiscal year 1956 Appropriations Act.

Included also in the $1,055,519,084 was $65 million which, upon reexamination after the passage of the House version of H. R. 6766, was found by the Commission to be releasable from obligation. This $65 million was acquired by reestimating costs of the fissionable material and other programs and anticipating under-runs in the actual cost of power delivered and reductions in the cost of power to the AEC.

Thus, at the time of the passage of the House bill, the fiscal situation as concerns operating money in which the Commission found itself was as follows:

Unexpended balance of operating moneys as of Apr. 30	$1,055,519,084
Less unobligated balances	−259,447,000
Subtotal	[1]796,072,084
Plus funds authorized by the House bill	1,358,847,000
Subtotal	2,154,919,084
Less expenditures for May and June operations	−185,000,000
Total funds available to the Commission under House bill	1,969,919,084

[1] At the time of submission of the budget to the Congress by the President, the Commission estimated that the $796,072,084 was required to liquidate obligations of the Commission.

The Commission appealed to the Senate for relief from the House bill and informed the Senate of the $65 million which it found itself able to declare unobligated and asked the Senate to transfer an additional $101 million from plant and equipment. The Senate transferred the $101 million from plant and equipment, increased the unobligated balance from $259,447,000 to $324,447,000 (the result of $65 million increase in unobligated balances) and reduced the appropriation figure by $43 million.

The situation facing the Commission after passage of the Senate bill was as follows:

Unexpended balance of operating moneys as of Apr. 30	$1,055,519,084
Less unobligated balances	−324,447,000
Subtotal	[1]731,072,084
Funds authorized by the Senate bill	1,481,847,000
Subtotal	2,212,919,084
Less expenditures for May and June operations	−185,000,000
Total funds avaliable to the Commission under Senate bill	2,027,919,084

[1] At the time of passage of the Senate bill after reexamination of its obligations the Commission estimated $731,072,084 would be required to liquidate obligations.

The bill went to conference. In the conference the conferees agreed to the $43 million reduction in appropriations instituted by the Senate; agreed to the increase of $65 million in unobligated balances; and rejected the Senate amendment increasing the transfer from plant and equipment by $101 million.

The situation facing the Commission after adoption of the conference report by both Houses is as follows:

Unexpended balance of operating moneys as of Apr. 30	$1,055,519,084
Less unobligated balance	—324,447,000
Subtotal	[1]731,072,084
Plus funds available by the conference report	1,380,847,000
Subtotal	2,111,919,084
Less expenditures for May and June operations	−185,000,000
Total funds available to the Commission under the conference report	1,926,919,084

[1] At the time of passage of the conference report after reexamination of its obligations the Commission estimated $731,072,084 would be required to liquidate its obligations.

From the above it can be seen that the final bill adopted by the conference makes available to the Commission $43 million less than the bill first passed by the House. It makes available to the Commission $101 million less than the bill passed by the Senate and it makes available to the Commission $144 million less than the amount requested by the President.

ICE HARBOR DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Ice Harbor Dam is one of the Pacific Northwest projects which received construction funds from the recent Senate-House conference report, providing public-works appropriations for the fiscal year 1956. The sum of $1 million was appropriated for Ice Harbor. This project is designed for generators with 270,000-kilowatt capacity. It also will greatly improve navigation on the Snake River, which is the principal tributary of the Columbia River.

However, Ice Harbor Dam is under attack from certain groups which claim it will have a disastrous impact upon migratory fish runs. I think it is necessary that certain facts be discussed very candidly upon the floor of the Senate about these attacks.

I have undertaken to do so, Mr. President, because conservation is one of my principal interests. I have written about conservation ever since I was 17 or 18 years old. My wife and I have camped and hiked throughout much of the vast outdoor fastnesses of the Northwest, the Canadian Yukon, and Alaska. I belong to such groups as the Wilderness Society, Izaak Walton League, and many others. On the floor of the Senate I sponsored the amendment which sought to protect the Dinosaur National Monument, a part of our national park system, from invasion by a federally built dam. On the floor of the Oregon State Legislature both Mrs. Neuberger and I were active in trying to protect the Deschutes River from invasion by a private power dam. So my position in this matter is not doctrinaire. I believe our fisheries should be protected as much as possible, and I will do everything feasible within my means to encourage that protection.

We know that the Northwest desperately needs kilowatts, as well as flood control and navigation. These things mean jobs and payrolls, and my own State suffered the biggest proportionate drop in the country in income-tax collections between the years 1952 and 1954. That is some measure of the economic urgency confronting Oregon and the Northwest.

Every dam on the main stem of the Columbia and its principal tributary has some adverse impact on fish. Let us not fool ourselves about that. Even if the adult salmon can be gotten over the dam on their way upstream through the use of ingenious fish ladders, a certain number of the tiny fingerlings often are killed on their crucial voyage down the river to the distant sea.

The goal must be to construct those dams that will have the least effect upon fish like salmon and steelhead, which must pilgrimage to upstream spawning grounds in order to perpetuate the species.

Every great biologist has recognized the fact that the impact of a dam upon migratory fish is in direct ratio to the height of that dam. This fact applies particularly to the life-or-death values involved when the fingerlings are swept over the great maelstrom of the spillway as they go downstream.

Ice Harbor Dam will be approximately 95 feet in height. Many of the fisheries groups assailing Ice Harbor Dam are silent regarding John Day Dam on the Columbia, which will be about 100 feet in height. Yet both Ice Harbor and John Day will likewise stand between the salmon coming in from the ocean and the mountain spawning grounds in Idaho, where most of the Chinooks go to spawn. How do these fisheries groups decide that they must object to Ice Harbor and yet acquiesce in John Day? Is it because Ice Harbor is to be a Federal dam, whereas Pacific Power & Light and other private utilities have a scheme for securing ownership and control of all the energy generated at John Day?

I refuse to believe that a migrating salmon detects any fundamental difference between a concrete wall controlled by the United States Government and a concrete wall controlled by Electric Bond & Share. Yet, why do certain fisheries groups bewail the dam built by Uncle Sam but stay silent concerning the dam at which private utilities may win domination over the powerplant? This is something which I do not understand.

Secretary of the Interior McKay and his friend, Governor Patterson, of Oregon, have suggested, as alternatives to Hells Canyon Dam, that the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers be tapped for power and flood control. These are the principal migratory-fish spawning grounds in the Northwest. Such dams would range in height from 222 feet to 576 feet. Yet the State president of the Izaak Walton League in Oregon, who wrote me an abusive letter over my support of an appropriation for Ice Harbor's 95-foot-high dam, is not to my knowledge similarly on record with abusive letters to Secretary McKay and Governor Patterson over their advocacy of dams many hundreds of feet high on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. By what mysterious alchemy does the State president of the Oregon Izaak Walton League decide that NEUBERGER deserves censure for support of Ice Harbor but that McKay and Patterson shall go unchallenged for support of far higher dams on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers?

Is it, perhaps, a partisan alchemy, Mr. President, heavily tinged by political partisanship? Is it, perhaps, an alchemy which has much to do with the fact that the Ice Harbor Dam is to be a Federal dam whereas a great private-power combine has plans to acquire the power sites on the Clearwater River, for example? Let me say this, Mr. President, that the Izaak Walton League is a grand and valuable organization, and I deplore seeing it made a pawn in the controversy between Republicans and Democrats, between private power and public power. Yet its Oregon State president is doing exactly that by picking and choosing as to what figures in this controversy he will single out for denunciatory correspondence.

Mr. President, a great many deliberate distortions of truth have been spread by so-called fisheries groups which want to shape political destinies far more than they want to save salmon.

Furthermore, Mr. President, and this is the most significant circumstance of all, Ice Harbor Dam was authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers in 1945, a full decade before I came to the United States Senate. My predecessor sat here then, as a Member of this distinguished body. There is no record to my knowledge that he was assailed by these so-called fisheries groups for his support of the Ice Harbor authorization. Yet, I am attacked 10 years later, when the authorization of Ice Harbor already is a fait accompli, merely because I have supported an appropriation for Ice Harbor. How ironic it is, Mr. President, that some of the very fisheries groups which attack me over Ice Harbor, a dam authorized 10 long years ago, have given me no support or backing whatsoever in my determined efforts today to forestall authorization of future dams which will be many, many times higher than Ice Harbor and which will be athwart the great Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, the main fish-spawning areas in the Pacific Northwest.

Again, I ask, Do these groups seek to save fish or are they more concerned about changing votes?

The Astorian Budget, a daily newspaper in Astoria, has claimed that my predecessor in the Senate, the Honorable Guy Cordon, could have been counted upon to block Ice Harbor Dam. Indeed, this newspaper even insists that Senator Cordon blocked Ice Harbor Dam on many occasions. These claims are made, of course, in an effort to embarrass me with the paper's readers. However, one would think that a daily newspaper at least would check the CONGESSIONAL RECORD before thus discoursing on the Honorable Guy Cordon's stand concerning Ice Harbor Dam.

What are the facts?

On September 14, 1950, the Honorable Guy Cordon told the Senate about the fate of Ice Harbor Dam in the Appropriations Committee:

> I was among the 5 who voted in favor of it (Ice Harbor). We needed 6 votes but we only had 5.

On June 27, 1953, the Honorable Guy Cordon said he recognized the right of Astoria to object to a threat to the salmon industry, but when the need for Ice Harbor became clear—

> I went into the battle for Ice Harbor, and had something to do with putting Ice Harbor in the bill on the Senate side, certainly twice, and I think three times. I spent hours in the battle in conference to maintain Ice Harbor in the bill.

So, the claim of the Astoria newspaper turns out to be precisely 100 percent false. The Honorable Guy Cordon, far from being a foe of Ice Harbor, actually told the Senate with pride of his zealous work in behalf of Ice Harbor.

I cite all these things, Mr. President, to show that some of these so-called fisheries groups are far more interested in political shenannigans, in distorting the truth for partisan purposes, than in saving fish.

Mr. President, I believe the RECORD should reveal a good many signficant items on this controversy. I ask unanimous consent, first and foremost, to have printed in the RECORD a letter from one of the greatest conservationists and biologists in America, Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson of the Wildlife Management Institute, in which he points out the great peril to fish and to other wildlife posed by the pending dams on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. I also wish to include the abusive letter sent to me by the Oregon State president of the Izaak Walton League, Mr. Dan P. Allen, of Eugene, and my reply. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Grim News," published in the Astorian Daily Budget of July 2, 1955, together with a letter from me dated July 12, 1955, replying to the misrepresentations and the distortions of fact contained in that editorial.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD a serious and thoughtful letter from a capable man, Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Corps of United States

Army Engineers, telling of plans for softening the impact of Ice Harbor Dam upon migratory salmon. These are the things we should be thinking of, Mr. President, rather than trying to twist the facts about past senatorial records on Ice Harbor Dam, rather than attempting to shape truth to meet partisan goals.

In conclusion, let me say that the Astorian Daily Budget told its readers that it now was up to Representative WALTER NORBLAD, of the 1st Oregon District, to block Ice Harbor Dam. I have not consulted the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD on this subject, but I think that readers of the Astorian Budget should know that Congressman NORBLAD, during a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives July 13, 1955, voted "yea" on the Senate-House conference report which included $1 million in construction funds for Ice Harbor Dam.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I have read with interest your speech which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 1 concerning the Hells Canyon Dam and the proposed dams on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers. I wish to emphasize that the national conservation organizations are opposed to any dams on the Salmon and the Clearwater for the reasons which you advance. These are the two most important spring Chinook salmon spawning streams still available in the Columbia-Snake River system, and they should be kept clear of dams at all costs.

In addition to their disastrous effect on the important salmon and steelhead runs, dams on the Salmon and the proposed Penny Cliffs and Bruce's Eddy Dams would destroy essential big game wintering range. Those on the Clearwater would destroy some of the most important part of the range for one of the largest remaining herds of elk in the country. I am quite sure that all national conservation organizations have taken a position in opposition to these dams and will do anything in their power to prevent their being authorized.

Conservation organizations generally have never opposed the Hells Canyon development and have taken no part in the controversy over that area. The development of the Hells Canyon site will not interfere with any major runs of fish and will not cause any important loss of wildlife resources. I am sure that generally we would rather see the needs of the Northwest for power met by the development of Hells Canyon power than see any developments on either the Clearwater or the Salmon Rivers. From our standpoint, it is a choice between a major impairment of wildlife, fishery, and scenic values as against one that has no great significance in any of these fields.

Sincerely,

IRA N. GABRIELSON,
President.

OREGON DIVISION,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Eugene, Oreg., July 7, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It was with deep concern that I read of the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations concerning Ice Harbor Dam projects on the lower Snake River. My concern is heightened by the fact it has just come to my attention that you, together with Senator MORSE and Representative GREEN, appeared before the House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations recently in support of this same project, and urging the identical amount included in the Senate committee report.

Perhaps you are not aware of the fact the Izaak Walton League, both in Oregon and nationally has officially gone on record in opposing the Ice Harbor proposal. Knowledge of this fact would certainly place you in an inconsistent position. This I infer from information contained in your recent newsletter, Washington Calling, in which you state, "Salmon fisheries and scenic grandeur will be irreparably damaged if the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers are dammed as alternatives to Hells Canyon."

Perhaps this inconsistent attitude toward our salmon resource may be explained in the light of political expediency, but it will be difficult to explain to conservationists in the Northwest. Ice Harbor project would in our opinion be the most destructive method ever devised, outside of poison or dynamite insofar as either commercial or sports fishery for salmon is concerned.

As you know, the league has not officially expressed itself on the controversial question of public versus private power. Nor is it likely to do so, since it appears to us to be of little consequence who develops the resource as long as maximum development to the ultimate benefit of all the people and all the resources ensues.

We respectfully suggest it is long past time to lay aside politics in favor of your avowed beliefs concerning conservation. When this is accomplished we feel certain your conscience will dictate your work vigorously toward elimination of the Ice Harbor project from the current appropriations bill. Failure to act in this manner would, we feel certain, result in passage of the bill, despite the fact it has been deleted by four previous Congresses.

Very truly yours,

DAN P. ALLEN,
President.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR
AFFAIRS,
July 9, 1955.

Mr. DAN P. ALLEN, *President,*
Izaak Walton League of Oregon,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Thank you for your letter, in which you accuse me of "inconsistency" in supporting an appropriation for construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

For your information, Ice Harbor Dam was authorized by Congress 10 years ago—long before my election to the Senate. It was actively supported by my predecessor, Senator Cordon, and other members of Northwest congressional delegations. Since coming to the Senate, my efforts have been directed toward forestalling pressure to build dams on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, with fatal effects on fisheries, scenery, and wildlife. Loss of Hells Canyon Dam to partial private development would increase the threat to these great fish spawning grounds.

The Northwest is faced with the crucial problem of securing low-cost power for new payrolls without desecrating outdoor values. An indication of Oregon's economic problem is revealed by the fact that our State suffered the largest proportionate decline in the Nation in tax revenues between 1952 and 1954. The modest appropriation for Ice Harbor Dam will start construction of a project producing 270,000 kilowatts of power to help bring new industries to our region. Furthermore, it would improve navigation to the advantage of wheat growers, orchardists, and other shippers.

These benefits from Ice Harbor would be realized although the impounded water would average only 95 feet in height. This is only slightly higher than the head at the Dalles and McNary dams. The damage inflicted on migrating fish by a dam is in direct relationship to its height. John Day dam, proposed by private utilities as a "partnership" dam and by Senator MORSE and me as a Federal dam, will have an average drop of about 100 feet, slightly higher than Ice Harbor.

Secretary of the Interior McKay and Governor Patterson are on record with suggestions to dam the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers as substitutes for Hells Canyon. These Clearwater dams—Bruce's Eddy with a height of 570 feet and Penny Cliffs, 590 feet—would be 6 times as high as Ice Harbor. They would not only flood out spawning areas, but would also ruin the most colorful and productive elk forage range in North America.

The Salmon River is the principal salmon-spawning stream in the Northwest. The proposed Crevice Dam on the Salmon would be 511 feet in height, Freedom Dam would be 222 feet, Growler Rapids Dam would be 305 feet, Pinnacle Creek Dam would be 376 feet and Black Canyon Dam would be 322 feet. It is obvious that all of these Salmon River dams would dwarf Ice Harbor, so far as height is concerned.

On behalf of the Izaak Walton League, you have written me a critical letter because I supported an appropriation for Ice Harbor Dam, 95 feet in height. Is there any record that, on behalf of the league, you have written letters to Secretary McKay and Governor Patterson because they suggested dams across the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers which are many, many times 95 feet in height? Is there any record that you have written critical letters to the private utilities who back the "partnership" dam at John Day with a height at least equal to Ice Harbor?

You accuse me of "political expediency," but I am willing to match my record as a conservationist with anyone in public life in our State. In the legislature, both Mrs. Neuberger and I opposed power company bills for Pelton Dam. We led the fight against billboards marring our scenic highways. In the United States Senate, I sponsored the amendment to prevent invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by a publicly owned dam. I spearheaded the fight to prevent the Army from turning historic Wichita Mountains Refuge into an artillery range, urged extra teeth in mining-claims bills to spare public forests from looting, and am backing legislation to prevent the Interior Department from disposing of reserves such as the Tule Lake wildfowl area and Hart Mountain antelope range.

My office files contain many letters from leaders and members of national conservation organizations expressing appreciation for my part in crusades to save our natural resources. Yet, you choose to write me a deliberately abusive letter over the 95-foot Ice Harbor Dam, but remain silent on the huge dams proposed by leading Oregon Republicans for blockading the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

On returning to Oregon, I shall welcome an opportunity to state my position on conservation for my fellow members of the Izaak Walton League. Meanwhile, I am sending copies of this letter to other Izaak Walton League officers, in whose judgment and knowledge I have confidence.

For your interest, I am enclosing a letter of July 1 from one of the greatest biologists and conservationists in American history, Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson. He warns of the dangers to fish and wildlife by any damming of the Salmon and Clearwater. For your information, Dr. Gabrielson's letter was received several days before your own critical message, so there is no connection between the two communications—other than fortunate coincidence.

Thank you for writing to me.

With good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Astorian Budget of July 2, 1955]

GRIM NEWS

The United Press quotes Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER as hailing Thursday's actions of the Senate appropriations committee as "wonderful news," with particular reference to Cougar, Green Peter, Hills Creek, John Day and Ice Harbor dams.

It was grim news for the fishing industry, one of the major industries of the State which these two Senators represent.

Ice Harbor Dam, a barrier across the lower Snake just above its mouth, is the dam project the fishing industry most fears, for it could virtually eliminate the Snake as a salmon-producing stream. And the Snake is the most important salmon-producing stream left in the Columbia River Basin.

Senator MORSE has long been an outspoken advocate of Ice Harbor Dam. Apparently Senator NEUBERGER went along with it—if he didn't approve the item there is no evidence that he opposed it.

When Senator Cordon was on duty in Washington, he could be counted upon to block Ice Harbor appropriation items, and he did so effectively several times. Now he is gone and his successor has not apparently even tried to block it.

To add insult to injury for the Columbia River salmon industry, the Senate appropriations committee lopped a half million off the annual appropriation for the lower Columbia fisheries rehabilitation program, cutting it from $1.4 million to $900,000.

The two Oregon Senators sent the Astorian-Budget a telegram in which they jubilated over getting a $750,000 item for the Columbia River bar project, and over getting more funds for various Williamette Basin flood control projects—but not one word did the telegram mention about Ice Harbor or the rehabilitation program's reduction.

Senator NEUBERGER, asked by the Astorian budget about the Ice Harbor item, said it might do a little damage to the fishing industry, but not as much as dams which have been proposed upon the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, which are tributaries of the Snake.

How Senator NEUBERGER figures that a dam across the main Snake River, below all its tributaries, can be less damaging than dams across a couple of tributaries is beyond our comprehension.

We are naturally pleased that our two Democratic Senators can point pridefully to the $750,000 appropriation obtained for the Columbia River bar project—although Astoria port officials are dubious that much good can be done with such a small sum.

But the good they did with this item for the lower Columbia was more than offset by the damage they did with Ice Harbor and the reduction of funds for the lower Columbia fisheries rehabilitation program—a reduction which no doubt made possible the addition of funds for Ice Harbor's vast "boondoggle" and the other dam jobs for the benefit of the Willamette Valley farmers.

The fishing industry will naturally not give up the fight against Ice Harbor—a "boondoggle" which it has beaten five times in Congress.

It will rely upon Representative WALTER NORBLAD, now that our two Senators have shown so clearly their position regarding an issue which the fishing industry considers vital to its well-being, if not to its continued existence.

What NORBLAD can accomplish we do not know. He had a powerful senatorial ally in Senator Cordon when it came to protecting the interests of the fishing industry. He now has no such ally—just Senators who are either hostile or who would cheerfully sacrifice the fishing industry to the furtherance of their holy war for Federal development of power rather than private development.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1955.

To the EDITOR OF THE ASTORIAN BUDGET:

I do not resent editorial disagreement with positions I take in the United States Senate, but I think I have a right to expect that the facts on which criticism is based will be reasonably true. Your editorial of July 2, entitled "Grim News," and the followup on July 7, were loaded with misrepresentations.

In an effort to belittle Senator MORSE's and my success in obtaining $750,000 toward deepening the channel across the Columbia River bar to 48 feet, you quoted unnamed Astoria port officials as "dubious that much good can be done with such a small sum."

Perhaps the Corps of United States Army Engineers, in charge of all our harbor work, are a more authoritative source on this question. This is what the engineers have declared:

"The funds included in the conference report of the public-works appropriation bill, 1956, in an amount of $750,000 for the abovementioned project, are considered to be sufficient to initiate a well-balanced program for construction of the 48-foot channel. In this connection, I am pleased to inform you that the preliminary steps for programing work, with a view of completion of dredging operations during a 2-year period, are currently in progress."

I believe the Columbia River Bar Pilots, who have had to ease big deep-draft tankers and freighters through the present winding, shallow channel, will believe the dredging they see rather than the sour grapes second guessing they read in the Budget.

Your editorials deplored the appropriation of $1 million to begin construction of Ice Harbor Dam on the Snake River. Contrasting my position unfavorably with that of my predecessor, you said, "Senator Cordon could be counted upon to block Ice Harbor appropriation items." Why do you not consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, rather than your own political prejudices, about what happens in the United States Senate? On September 14, 1950, Senator Cordon told the Senate about the fate of Ice Harbor Dam in the Appropriations Committee: "I was among the five who voted in favor of it. We needed 6 votes, but we had only 5. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will see fit to include the appropriation in the bill and let it go to conference." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 11, p. 14818). And on June 27, 1953, he said that he recognized the right of Astoria to object to a potential threat to a $10 million or $15 million industry, but when the need for Ice Harbor power became clear, "I went into the battle for Ice Harbor, and had something to do with putting Ice Harbor in the bill on the Senate side, certainly twice, and I think three times. I spent hours in the battle in conference to maintain Ice Harbor in the bill." He went on to tell the Senate that the main reason Ice Harbor had never actually been started was "that those engaged in the fishing industry had made a sale on the House side, and the House was adamant. The result was that each time we took the item to conference we lost it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 6, p. 7437).

I quote these excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not in criticism of the position taken by my predecessor, but because your partisan attack on Senator MORSE's and my own position is falsely based on the misstatement that Cordon "could be counted on to block Ice Harbor appropriation items."

It is apparent that your position on dams is dictated by political partisanship rather than by engineering and biological facts. Fish biologists emphasize that the danger to migrating fish is in direct ratio to the height of the dam. Why do you berate Senator MORSE and me for Ice Harbor Dam on the Snake, which will be 95 feet high, but remain silent about John Day Dam across the Columbia, which will be slightly higher? Could it be because certain private utilities covet the power facilities and revenues from John Day Dam?

Since coming to the Senate, my efforts have been directed toward forestalling pressure to build dams from 300 to 590 feet high on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, which would have far more fatal effects on fisheries. Loss of the Hells Canyon damsite would greatly increase the threat to these great fish spawning grounds. Yet you have restrained any condemnation of Secretary McKay or Governor Patterson, although those prominent Republicans have suggested dams across the Salmon and the Clearwater as substitutes to a high Hells Canyon Dam.

I also worked to add to the recent Interior Department appropriation bill the item of $78,500 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's river basin studies, which had been stricken in the House. Years ago, I protested against the power-company dams that choked off the valuable fish runs of the Clackamas, and I opposed Pelton Dam, on the Deschutes, in the Oregon Legislature.

In view of my efforts on behalf of our valuable fisheries resource, I regret that the daily newspaper published in the principal fishing community of Oregon bases its editorials not on facts, but on blind political prejuidice. There can be no other explanation for your belittling of the channel project, for your misrepresentation of my Republican predecessor's record on the Ice Harbor project, and for your violent protests against this 95-foot high dam on the Snake while you voice no attack on Republicans who suggest dams many hundreds of feet high on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Reference is made to discussions with Mr. Tupling of your staff relative to communications you have received from a number of your constituents expressing their concern about the effects of Ice Harbor Dam on the salmon fishery of the Columbia River Basin. The Corps of Engineers has cooperated with the State and Federal fishery agencies in a continuing study of that subject for several years. In accordance with your request I am glad to review some of the facts that give assurance that Ice Harbor Dam can be constructed and operated without serious detriment to the runs of salmon at that site.

The successful operation of fish passing facilities at Bonneville Dam over the past 16 years without evidence of any serious adverse effect of the dam upon the fishery is in itself a sound demonstration that fish arriving at Ice Harbor Dam in condition to move on upstream to spawn can be passed over the dam by adequate fish passing facilities. In addition to the main fishways, screened water intakes and fingerling bypass channels both through and over Bonneville Dam have been in operation for downstream movement of young fish without evidence of adverse affect upon the runs of salmon.

This had led to incorporation of the same type facilities in other dams and the belief that such facilities, with improvements developed since the construction of Bonneville Dam, will adequately serve to pass fish both upstream and downstream at Ice Harbor Dam. There is also no reason, from available evidence developed by extensive studies, to believe that the power facilities at Ice Harbor would adversely affect the downstream movement of young fish or that losses in passing over the dam might exceed losses under natural conditions or otherwise result in diminution of future runs of salmon.

It is significant to note that one of the largest salmon runs of record was successfully passed at McNary Dam during the construction period with temporary facilities and the permanent facilities installed there passed the runs of 1954 with no evidence of detrimental effects upon the fish. A great deal of knowledge has been gained in the design and operation of fish facilities since construction of Bonneville and McNary Dams, which has been applied in the design of fish facilities for the Dalles Dam. There is no doubt that the facilities at the Dalles Dam will operate successfully and adequately for the passage of fish.

Construction of the Dalles Dam and other dams downstream from Ice Harbor Dam brings into play a number of favorable effects upon the salmon runs that somewhat offset the fears and conjectures that have been raised in the past about the effects of Ice Harbor upon the fish. In the first place, inundation of the Dalles will remove the greatest single barrier to the movement of fish below Ice Harbor. Many fish are physically unable to climb over Celilo Falls and the exhaustion and time required by the ceaseless efforts of those that do succeed are undoubtedly critical factors in the migration of salmon beyond that point. The ultimate effect of creating slack water from Bonneville to Ice Harbor is unknown but certainly the time and energy required for fish in passing through that reach will be greatly reduced. In fact, it is probable that negotiation of the fishways at intervening dams and passage through the reservoirs will be much less of a hazard to the fish than the swift currents and natural barriers that existed under natural conditions.

It should not be overlooked that elimination of most of the commercial and subsistence fishery at Celilo Falls, which consumed nearly half of the escapement of fish passing Bonneville and in recent years nearly three-fourths of the important fall run of chinook, will spontaneously increase the escapement to the headwaters. This will substantially lessen the all-inclusive concept that has grown up about the effects of Ice Harbor Dam while at the same time increase the runs of fish that pass the Ice Harbor site.

Real facts about the fishery in the Snake River are being developed for the first time. Aerial surveys have shown salmon spawning at depths of 30 feet or more which indicates use of main stem areas formerly thought to be unsuitable for spawning and may dispell some of the earlier concepts of detrimental effects of flooding spawning grounds in the Ice Harbor backwater area. Records to date show that the large number of blueback salmon formerly believed to spawn in Redfish Lakes do not reach that area and no fall chinook have been taken in the river.

The Corps of Engineers is conducting a comprehensive fisheries-engineering research program, with the assistance of the Federal and State fishery agencies and technical educational institutions, to develop the best possible methods, procedures, and equipment to avoid interference by construction and operation of its dams with the fishery.

The facilities that will be installed at Ice Harbor Dam and the system for passage of fish will represent the culmination of knowledge of the requirements backed up by an extensive research and development program and successful experience in dealing with the fishery-engineering problems involved. These measures give very real and practicable assurance that no foreseeable major difficulties will be experienced in successful passage of the fish that arrive at the Ice Harbor Dam site.

Sincerely yours,

WM. WHIPPLE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers.
For E. C. ITSCHNER, *Brigadier General, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.*

THE SO-CALLED COUNCIL OF CONSERVATIONISTS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I had intended to deliver as a speech in the Senate today. However, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, together with the exhibits, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. Fred Smith of New York City, the paid propaganda oracle for the so-called Council of Conservationists, in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald which was published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, announced a new policy for his organization of opposition to the "sheared Colorado River storage project bill" now under consideration in the House. This action was taken in spite of the fact that elimination of the important Echo Park Dam unit in the House Interior Committee represents a major victory for the southern California water lobby and its coattail riders, including many misguided but sincere conservationists.

In view of this action, announced by Mr. Smith, director of the council and a member of its executive committee, I have come here today for the purpose of pointing out to the Members of the Congress and the general public that this organization definitely appears now to have been taken over by selfish interests and other Johnny-come-latelies in the organization, which have long been opposed to the Colorado River storage project and to water resource development generally.

In view of their previous statements and the obvious sincerity of their cause, I am sure that the honest conservationists who have contributed their hard-earned dollars to this organization will deeply regret this development, because it is a blow to the conservation movement and will tend to discredit honest endeavors to protect natural resources. People so deceived, I am sure, will be eager to disavow this now-perverted organization and to back up their previous affirmations that they are mindful of the "extreme importance of water in the West," and that they are "sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the National Park System." These quotations are from statements incorporated in the original policy statement of the Council of Conservationists drafted at an organization meeting, conducted under auspices of the National Parks Association last fall. Such honest statements, and the repeated statements of most of the respected leaders of conservation groups that they would not oppose a Colorado River storage project bill without Echo Park, are sincere statements, and I am not criticizing these dedicated people in making this statement today.

Conservationists in general are honorable people, and I am proud to consider myself one of their number. Even if and when I disagree with them on matters of fact or opinion, I respect these good people and their views.

But the real conservationists represent just a small, and now definitely minor, part of the Council of Conservationists. Consider the statement of Mr. Fred Smith himself in announcing the council's campaign policy and strategy only last December. This excerpt is taken from an interview with Mr. Smith, conducted by William G. Wing, of the New York Herald Tribune News Service, and published in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, one of the scores of newspapers which subscribe to this particular news service:

"He (Mr. Fred Smith) said the council's supporters consist of, roughly, three groups. One group is the pure conservationists, who are upset at the prospect of the park's being ruined as a wilderness area.

"The second is made up of persons concerned about breaking the principle of public parks free from commercial activity.

"'The third,' he said, 'was born last year and consists of a fast-growing group led by the Hoover Commission, appointed to develop a national water policy, and Raymond Moley, the columnist at Newsweek magazine, who were drawn in by all the noise we were making and then went after the Echo Park Dam themselves as a bad economic business.'"

For the edification of others who did not see this article in the Herald Tribune or other newspapers, I hereby request unanimous consent to introduce the entire article at the conclusion of these remarks (exhibit 1).

I deny Mr. Smith's libel of the Hoover Commission. He may have meant some members of the Hoover Commission, such as Leslie J. Miller, who to the chagrin and embarrassment of his fellow citizens in his native Wyoming, has made some considerable contributions to the large volume of half truths and misrepresentations directed against this project. But he certainly didn't include Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah, who was a member of the task force on water-resource development, and he couldn't have included President Herbert Hoover himself, who is vitally interested in water-resource development and has never publicly expressed any antipathy toward the Colorado River storage project with or without its Echo Park unit. In fact, the Commission report itself makes no specific recommendations of any kind against the Colorado River storage project, and in fact, does not even mention the name of the project.

It is significant, however, that Mr. Smith let the cat out of the bag in disclosing that the Council of Conservationists was composed of more "than pure conservationists" who oppose Echo Park Dam and those conservationists who oppose commercial activities in the public parks.

Furthermore, he labeled this mysterious third group as a "fast-growing group," and indicated, in giving it a separate category apart from the conservationists, that it was a group that did not come into the anti-Colorado River storage project propaganda effort because of a conservation interest. This group, in joining the Council of Conservationists, he might have added, was primarily motivated by a desire to kill the Colorado River storage project. Their motives have nothing to do with conservation.

You will notice that he did not provide any names for this "fast-growing" coterie of enemies to water development embracing the four-State area of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. And I am certain that one of the reasons he did not do so is that this group, and much of its financial backing, undoubtedly would be studded with names of individuals and groups representing directly, or indirectly, the million dollar water and power lobby of southern California, which has been engaged for years in efforts to delay and defeat the development of water allocated by the 1922 Colorado River compact to the four States of the upper Colorado River Basin.

In fact, I feel sure that one wouldn't have to probe too deeply to discover the influence of the $80,000-a-year lobbyist, Mr. Northcutt Ely, who has been the directing genius behind southern California's still strenuous efforts to steal a multibillion dollar water and hydropower resource from the four upper basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. With respect to the million-dollar southern California water and power lobby and its chief lobbyist, Mr. Ely, I shall have more to say at a later date.

Under the circumstances, this possible tie-in of a powerful water lobby with an organization purporting to represent honest conservation interests, might well be the subject for investigation by the Senate Interior Committee. And I am sure that the honest conservationists would enthusiastically support such an investigation, if undertaken, because I do not think that they relish the possibility of having a conservation organization serve as the front for, or the unsuspecting pawn of, a waterpower lobby, or any other selfish interests for that matter.

The reason I feel so strongly on this subject and why I come before this body to discuss Mr. Smith's letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald in the light of previous statements by spokesmen for the various conservation groups, is that for years now conservation groups have been telling us that they are not opposed to development of water for the upper basin States; that they are not opposed to the Colorado River storage bill; that they object merely to inclusion of Echo Park Dam in that project.

Mr. President, so that the Senate and the general public can see for themselves that what I say is true, I have assembled a small number of statements and excerpts from statements to that effect made by conservation spokesmen before congressional committees. Some of these statements, taking such a position were made by members of the executive committee of the Council of Conservationists, including such honest conservationists as Howard Zahniser and Ira N. Gabrielson of Washington, and Joseph Penfold of Denver, Colo. I hereby request unanimous consent to introduce these statements at the conclusion of these remarks (exhibit 2).

And to point up the contrast between the new position of the council against the background of its original statement of policy, I hereby request unanimous consent to introduce at this point in my remarks a leaflet prepared and distributed by the Council of Conservationists after its organization last fall (exhibit 3).

You will notice that this policy declaration announces that the Council of Conservationists is opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would flood any portion of any national park or monument.

Furthermore, this declaration made this positive statement: "We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system.

On the basis of this declaration, support of private citizens was solicited widely and funds were requested and, undoubtedly, collected in considerable amount.

Furthermore, Mr. Fred Smith himself, on the letterhead of the council, made this statement to me on April 16, 1955, in discussing my position on power withdrawals in Dinosaur Monument:

"So the matter falls back into the lap of Congress. There is no easy way out. If Congress decides to continue protection of the area which is now threatened, the area which the monument was proclaimed to protect, then it can strike Echo Park from the upper Colorado project, and can do it without seriously interfering with the lives or economics of the 3 million people you speak of, a small portion of whom will be served by Echo Park Dam and no other."

Now in view of these oft-repeated assurances that the conservation groups would support the Colorado River storage project bill if the controversial Echo Park Dam unit were eliminated, then let's take a look to see what happened to the position of the Council of Conservationists when the House Interior Committee complied with its own repeated requests and eliminated Echo Park from the House Colorado River storage project bill. In my opinion, I should add, however, this action was not warranted by the historical and legal background of the establishment of Dinosaur National Monument, and it was also in my opinion an action that may seriously curtail the ultimate development of the upper basin's water and power resources, but it was the considered action of the House committee and represented an effort to produce a compromise measure that would not be opposed by the conservationists.

And what did the Council of Conservationists do at news of this victory for their concentrated and expensive propaganda-pressure campaign? They flip-flopped. They continued opposition to the entire Colorado River storage project with or without Echo Park. They changed their minds—or at least the propaganda oracle for the three groups represented therein—announced that the organization had changed its mind.

And this is the way the agile Mr. Smith announced a new policy for an organization that ostensibly represents, collects, and spends money in the name of conservation:

In his Thursday letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald Mr. Smith made a reference to the very sound editorial of that newspaper which endorsed the "sheared" Colorado River storage project as a "conservation measure in the largest sense of the world."

Then Mr. Smith makes this statement:

"The position of the conservationist forces on this issue should be made abundantly clear. The conservationists of the country have supported in a gratifying way the campaign to prevent the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument. This is all we oppose. We do not oppose water for the West. We would not oppose the upper Colorado River project which did not invade protected public lands in which we are interested."

After this disarming statement, which generally complies with the position originally taken by the council, Mr. Smith begins his course on a devious route to explain why his council must now take a position of opposing a bill which now complies 100 percent with the demands his organization made more than half a year ago.

I will not bore you with an analysis of manipulations which in his own mind prove that the House committee is now dead wrong and devious for reporting out a bill for the development of the upper Colorado River, which Mr. Smith and his associates vehemently demanded that they approve in the first place. I will merely present his concluding statement, Mr. President, which announced the complete flip-flop in policy by the director of this self-styled "council of conservation":

"In the face of this evidence (sic), what course do we have, except to continue to bring about the defeat of the present project, which we are repeatedly told by its designers must include Echo Park Dam to be successful? How can we take any different position with the proponents of Echo Park reiterating, over and again, that they will get Echo Park Dam back into the project if it passes the House?"

In other words, Mr. Smith is serving notice on the House of Representatives that even if they pass a bill without Echo Park Dam in it, the great Mr. Smith, who has publicly acknowledged that he can "get all the money he wants," and that he can push a button and start "three-quarters of a million people" buttonholing Congressmen, will "continue to bring about the defeat of the present project." (See exhibit 1.)

I am glad that Mr. Smith finally admitted that his group was endeavoring to "bring about the defeat of the present project." Because it has been well demonstrated that the Manhattan propaganda office of the council has not been content with opposing the Colorado River project on conservation grounds and confining its fire to the Echo Park Dam unit. Instead, this so-called conservation propaganda crusade had done everything in its power to bring about the defeat of a water project vital to the expansion and continued economic progress of the 4-State desert area containing 3 million hard-working and deserving descendants of the pioneer West. This, in spite of the fact that this four-State area contains the largest acreage of both public land and national parks and monuments of any comparable area in the country.

Of all the vicious and destructive propaganda directed against this well-planned and sound water resource project, perhaps none of it has been more dishonest or misleading than the expensive propaganda brochures prepared and widely distributed by the council. These dishonest publications have tried to tell the public that a project costing slightly over a billion dollars, and virtually all repaid by the water and power users in the four-State area, would cost the taxpayers of all the States $15 billion. How true conservationists can permit, even a propagandist like Mr. Smith, to distribute such an outrageous lie in the name of conservation, I will never be able to comprehend.

Now, Mr. President, I did not mention one member of the announced executive board of this Council of Conservationists who should be included in this matter. He is David Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club of California, one of the most persistent and passionately dedicated foes of water development in the upper Colorado River Basin.

In view of Mr. Brower's association with the council, and its amazing flip-flop in policy, I think it justifiable to reproduce as part of these remarks an excerpt from the Senate hearings on S. 1555, conducted in the Senate Office Building about a year ago. This exchange is found on pages 508 through 516 of the official hearing record, and is submitted as exhibit 4.

It contains my cross-examination of Mr. Brower, after he had offered, in all seriousness, a plan which he, a layman, had worked out over a period of 6 months, and which he proposed as a substitute for the Colorado River storage project, which was developed over a quarter century, and at an expenditure of about $10 million in funds allocated to the upper basin from Hoover Dam power revenue, by some of the world's foremost reclamation engineers.

The significant point in this exchange is that Mr. Brower, now a member of the executive board of the Council of Conservationists, admitted to the Senate Interior Committee that he had called his organization in California, on arriving here in Washington for the hearing, and was instructed to contact the $80,000-a-year chief lobbyist for the southern California water and power interest, Mr. Northcutt Ely. He further admitted that he conferred with Mr. Ely and an engineer associate for an hour and a quarter the day before he testified in opposition to the Colorado project, ostensibly on conservation grounds.

I think that Mr. Brower, and the council of conservationists, have much to explain to the country, and to the propaganda abused people of the four upper Colorado River Basin States, on what transpired at this admitted conference between the country's No. 2 conservation lobbyist and the country's No. 1 water lobbyist. It also is significant to me that since he came into the controversy on the Colorado River storage project, Mr. Brower has virtually concentrated his attack on many economic and engineering matters pertaining to the entire project, instead of Echo Park and conservation issues. It is plain that he, like Mr. Smith and this mysterious fast-growing group of nonconservation members of the so-called council of conservationists, is out to kill the Colorado River storage project, with or without Echo Park.

As a conservationist of long standing, and as a representative of part of the 3 million people who vitally need the water and hydropower from their allocated half of the Colorado River, I resent such tactics. Our project is eminently sound and vitally necessary to the intermountain West's growth and progress, and this fact was recognized in the Senate by passage of a Colorado River storage project bill, with Echo Park included, by a larger majority than that received by the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

I hope that the House will not be deceived nor intimidated by such deviousness and that it will prevail upon the Rules Committee to bring the House bill—which does not contain the controversial Echo Park unit—to the floor and pass it, so that this long-delayed project can get underway and contribute to the general economic well-being and progress of the country.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Deseret News of December 9, 1954]

POWERFUL EASTERN COUNCIL SETS AIMS FOR ECHO FIGHT—OPPOSES COLORADO PROJECT IF DAM REMAINS AS PART

(By William G. Wing)

NEW YORK.—Unyielding opposition to the construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument, for and to the upper Colorado River project as long as Echo Park Dam is a part of it was expressed Wednesday by Fred Smith, director of the Council of Conservationists.

Mr. Smith, a professional public relations consultant here, discussed the council and the strategy it expects to use to fight construction of the dam in an interview Wednesday.

He said the council is a coordinating agency formed to unify the political efforts of conservationists all over the country.

He said the council could get all the money it needed to carry on the fight and that it would never stop until Echo Park Dam was a dead issue.

He said that although he is a public relations man by profession, the council is representing no commercial or private interests. He said it took the initiative in fighting Echo Park Dam to prevent Congress from establishing the precedent of allowing national parks and monuments to be used for commercial purposes.

"Our interest," he said, "is simply to get that dam out of the park. Congress set aside that area as a national wilderness preserve, and it's probably the most beautiful in the country. Now an attempt is being made to break the principle that these refuges must never be used for commercial purpose."

Mr. Smith said he had never visited the area concerned.

"We don't care about the upper Colorado project as such—we have no interest in it. But as long as Echo Park Dam remains a part of it, then we are forced to fight the project, too."

PUSHED A BUTTON

He said that when the project was to be introduced in the last session of Congress, "We pushed a button and our three-quarters of a million people got in touch with their Congressmen and Senators. Because of the political pressure engendered," he said, "the last Congress shelved the proposal."

The council spent about $25,000 to $30,000 in this effort last year, Mr. Smith said, adding that this money was supplied by Edward Mallinckrodt, the 80-year-old chairman of the Mallinckrodt Chemical Works in St. Louis. Mr. Mallinckrodt has no personal or business interest in an Echo Park Dam, he said, but is simply an ardent conservationist.

"But this year," Mr. Smith said, "we anticipate the battle will be a bad one. As far as we know, the same proposal for the Upper Columbia River project will be submitted and we have reason to believe that various political deals have been made so that certain Senators and Congressmen are committed to vote for the project.

MONEY AVAILABLE

"Thus the council has been settled upon by conservationists as the group to receive money to fight the battle. I don't know where the money is coming from, but I'm told we can get all the money we need. We will take money from any source, on one condition. If Echo Park Dam is dropped from the project and no loophole is left so it can be put back in—and further, that the project isn't passed without Echo Park Dam mentioned but designed in such a way that Echo Park Dam is absolutely necessary—then we drop out of the fight completely."

He said the council's supporters consist of, roughly, three groups. One group is the pure conservationists, who are upset at the prospect of "the park's being ruined as a wilderness area."

The second is made up of persons concerned about breaking the principle of public parks free from commercial activity.

The third, he said, "was born last year and consists of a fast-growing group led by the Hoover Commission, who were appointed to develop a national water policy, and Raymond Moley, the columnist at 'Newsweek' magazine, who were drawn in by all the noise we were making and then went after the Echo Park Dam themselves as a bad economic business."

BENEFIT UTAH

Mr. Smith said the dam unquestionably would benefit Utah. But he said "from the standpoint of the national interest and of western interest, there is no reason to believe that the dam is even advantageous. Furthermore, there are alternate sites available up the river that will do as good a job and can be built cheaper.

"We contend that if there is any virtue in the upper Colorado River project—and it's none of our business whether it is or isn't—substitutes can be found just as good that will not invade the Dinosaur National Park."

Mr. Smith, born Maurice Frederik Smith in Fort Wayne, Ind., in 1908, has been active in many fields as a promoter and politician over a fairly long career.

EARLY POLITICIAN

In politics, he directed the publicity for Wendell Willkie's preconvention campaign in 1940 and was public relations director for the New York State Republican committee the same year. He got his start in politics 3 years earlier, managing the congressional campaign of Bruce Barton.

He has been public relations director and advertising manager for many firms. He was a vice president of the American Broadcasting Co., handled publicity for a time for Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and was appointed by President Truman in charge of public relations for the national labor-management conference in 1945.

After that he founded his own firm and is now a business consultant to such firms as the Prudential Insurance Co., the General American Transportation Co., and the Book-of-the-Month Club.

The Council of Conservationists was organized about 4 years ago when Mr. Smith was hired to lead a publicity campaign against a proposed power dam in the Adirondack Mountains.

At that time, the council consisted only of Mr. Smith and an assistant in his firm named Roy Provins. When the public relations firm took on the fight against Echo Park Dam, five nationally prominent conservationists were asked to become members of the executive council with Mr. Smith and Mr. Provins.

Although all five head official conservation organizations, they were asked to serve as individuals, since the council was to be a lobbying organization. Conservation groups, as tax-free organizations, are not permitted to lobby.

Mr. Provins was detached from his other duties and now devotes himself to the Echo Park fight and the pending Adirondacks case.

Mr. Smith said that as soon as the council was expanded, "in effect, we were able to organize about three-quarters of a million persons across the country interested in opposing a dam in Echo Park."

Members of the executive council include two residents of New York, a Denver man, a Californian, and three Washington, D. C., residents.

EXHIBIT 2

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, H. R. 4443, H. R. 4449, AND H. R. 4463

STATEMENT OF U. S. GRANT 3D, AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. GRANT. On behalf of the American Planning and Civil Association, of which I am president, I have the honor to appear before you in protest against the inclusion in the upper Colorado storage project of the Echo Park Dam, or any other dam inside of the Dinosaur National Monument, or in any other monument or national park in the region. In case you are not familiar with our association and its work, let me add that, starting with the Park and Outdoor Art Association in 1897 and its merger with the American League for Civic Improvement in 1904 to form the American Civic Association, by a succession of affiliations with others in the same field the association has for 57 years now been in the forefront of the fight for the conservation of our natural resources, the preservation of our marvels of scenic beauty, and for the protection of national parks and State parks against commercial and other encroachments that violate the primary purpose for which they were set apart. It is proud to claim having had an effective part in securing the establishment of the National Park Service.

It is therefore with a background of more than half a century's connection with the citizens' efforts to make our country a more attractive and agreeable place in which to work and live, and to save for future generations those natural areas and formations from which we have drawn improved health and inspiration, and with a sincere desire to provide for the sound economic development of the upper Colorado Basin, that we strongly recommend to your committee the passage of legislation (1) authorizing the immediate construction of the following dams, namely, Flaming Gorge, Cross Mountain, White Water (Bridgeport), and Glen Canyon; and (2) authorizing and directing the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with the revision of the 1950 upper Colorado storage project eliminating therefrom the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams and any other projects which would encroach upon or damage any national monument or national park.

STATEMENT OF J. W. PENFOLD, WESTERN REPRESENTATIVE, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, WHEATRIDGE, COLO.

Mr. Penfold. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate those kind words from the gentleman.

Of course, it is typical of Wayne Aspinall to be kindly, even when I don't seem to have enough sense to see eye to eye with him on some subject as this one.

My name is Joseph W. Penfold. I am western representative for the Izaak Walton League of America.

My headquarters are in Denver. My home is in Wheatridge, a suburb of Denver.

My duties take me throughout the Western States.

The league is a membership organization, not for profit, and supported by the dues of the membership which is scattered throughout every State and Alaska, mostly organized in local chapters and State divisions.

Colorado and western members of the league, and the league nationally, are not opposed to the development of the Colorado River. We endorse the fundamental purposes and objectives of the upper Colorado storage project. We recognize that if the West is to develop along sound resource lines there must be a sound and coordinated program for the conservation and use of limited supplies of water. We recognize that much of the water originating at elevations up to and exceeding 14,000 feet and dropping nearly 3 miles on its journey to the sea can and should create energy to serve human, agricultural, industrial, and commercial needs.

We recognize that world demands as well as those of our expanding populations mean that America must plan for the optimum production of foods and fibers from all suitable lands including those suitable for irrigation. We recognize that under the 1922 compact there must be some such storage plan as that now proposed, if the upper basin States are to be able to make full beneficial use of the waters allotted to them.

Mr. Saylor, let me repeat—we are not protesting development of the Colorado River. We are protesting one unit in one proposed scheme for that development. We are questioning the advisability of one unit, not in opposition to the program as a whole but in sincerely seeking the ultimate and highest development of a region in order that it may provide abundantly for all the elements that go to make up the kind of future we want to leave our successors.

As mentioned, we are urging against one small segment of a vast project. Secretary McKay has recommended certain units of the overall plan for early authorization and construction. They total $1,134,643,000. That's the initial phase. Just adding the balance of the proposed main storage dams and without computing costs of other participating projects which will come along in the future, we must add another half billion. That means a total projected cost of at least $1¾ billion.

Of this we are protesting Echo Park, and in the eventual overall plan Split Mountain, which together total but 15 percent of the whole program, moneywise. The projects we urge against would account for but 14 percent of the storage, 18 percent of the installed power capacity.

Nor are we urging that the West do without even that portion of storage and power. As will be brought out by others, it seems most likely that it can be provided by alternative dam and reservoir sites and/or other operating schemes.

We urge respectfully that the Congress delete Echo Park from its present position as a priority unit in the upper Colorado storage project and that it be placed at the very bottom of the list.

We urge likewise that the engineers and other scientists in government be directed to devote their great talents to finding ways and means whereby the purposes of the overall project can be achieved without ever having to destroy the prime values of Dinosaur National Monument.

In the future, if their abilities and ingenuity have not been adequate for the task, if nuclear energy, solar energy, or energies not yet dreamed of, will not have come to our aid, the Echo Park Dam site will still be there. I think even the most stanch proponent of Echo Park will agree that the dam site 100 years from now will be worth incalculably more than it is worth today.

In the meantime, there is enough in Glen Canyon, Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, and the other storage units, and in the highly important participating projects to keep us all mighty busy for many, many decades.

STATEMENT OF FRED M. PACKARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Packard. Mr. Chairman, I am Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association.

The National Parks Association is a citizens' organization with membership in every State and some foreign countries, dedicated to the continued welfare of the national park system. Its activities are conducted entirely in the public interest. Its members derive no other benefit than the conviction that they are promoting the welfare of their country. It is for them, and for the members of the other conservation organizations of the Nation which have supported the position taken by the National Parks Association that this statement is presented.

The national conservation organizations have not opposed the upper Colorado River project and have no desire to impede orderly development of the water resources of the Western States. They have objected unanimously to one aspect of the plans for this project, namely, the inclusion of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams proposed to be constructed within Dinosaur National Monument. They have predicated their opposition to these two dams fundamentally on the grounds that these structures would irreparably impair paramount values that led to the reservation of the canyons affected as part of the national park system. If these two dams are deleted from the project, a highly controversial factor will have been eliminated and the realization of the project as a whole simplified. The question at issue is not whether the upper basin States shall have the water and power benefits desired. All of us are agreed this water is needed. The controversy is entirely over the method by which this goal should be achieved. * * *

* * * * *

In summary, we urge that Echo Park Dam be deleted from the project. This action is in accord with the recommendations of the two Secretaries of the Interior who were directly concerned with the planning of the project and who devoted years of attention to it. We urge that the desirability of authorizing now other dams outside the national monument be considered by this committee, dams that are not injurious to other significant values, and about which no serious controversies have arisen. We suggest to the people of Utah and Colorado that they support the proposed revision, not only because it is in the national interest but also because they stand to gain from it. They can realize the maximum local benefits in water and power and still have available the great resource of a magnificent national park system area as an attraction to people from all over the country. We have been assured by delegates to Congress from these States that they will welcome a practical alternative proposal that will safeguard the national monument. We have presented such a proposal and hope it will be adopted, with such refinement as may be desirable, as being in the interest of the local economy as well as of the Nation.

* * * * *

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Packard, the National Park Association is not opposed to the upper Colorado River Basin development?

Mr. Packard. Certainly not.

Mr. Saylor. You are not opposed to any participating projects in the upper Colorado River Basin project?

Mr. Packard. No; that is correct.

Mr. Saylor. The opposition which you bring before this committee is directed to the erection of two dams within Dinosaur National Monument?

Mr. Packard. That is correct.

Mr. Saylor. That is all.

* * * * *

Mr. Packard. I think perhaps to sum that question up, it sounds—a lot of debate here has sounded as though there is a conflict between the national interest and the local interest. We do not believe that that exists. Certainly we do not want to stimulate any such conflict. We believe that the people of Utah and Colorado should emphatically have these water benefits. There is no question about that at all. We believe the indications are they can have those benefits without interfering with the national monument.

* * * * *

EXTRACT FROM LETTER BY HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, FORMERLY DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Dinosaur National Monument—Echo Park Dam

All conservationists are undoubtedly in sympathy with further development of the upper Colorado River. However, there are a number of dam sites that can be utilized without invading the Dinosaur National Monument. While some might be more expensive and others might not be quite as effective from other standpoints as the proposed Echo Park project, this is the price that America can pay for the maintenance of its national park and monument system in its natural condition.

It is respectfully submitted that the Echo Park Dam project should not be recommended to Congress by the administration, that it should not be included in messages to Congress regarding the budget or public works or the state of the Union, and that the upper Colorado River plan be reconsidered with a view to adopting one or more other sites in lieu of Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument.

* * * * *

STATEMENT OF CHARLES H. CALLISON, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

We will not go into the question of this Echo Park Dam project being necessary for its power revenue to sustain the feasibility of other participating projects in the upper Colorado River storage program. For I do not wish to obstruct the whole project. But I do feel there is sufficient weakness in the Echo Park proposal to merit more than a passing consideration of alternate sites.

* * * * *

We do not oppose the entire upper Colorado storage project. We recognize the need for additional water storage on the Colorado River and tributaries. We recommend and urge, however, that Cross Mountain Dam or others of the so-called secondary projects be moved up to the initial phase of the overall development, and that Echo Park be deleted from the initial phase.

* * * * *

STATEMENT BY DR. OLAUS J. MURIE, PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 18, 1954, ON H. R. 4443, H. R. 4449, AND H. R. 4463

* * * * *

In representing the Wilderness Society in opposition to the Echo Park proposal I do not in the least commit its members on the general question of the upper Colorado water project as such. We are concerned only with defending dedicated public property.

* * * * *

We are not here concerned over interstate controversies about water. We do wish each State to prosper. The American people who cherish their national parks are distributed throughout all the States—East, West, North, and South. Each one has State loyalties on sovereign State matters and by neighborly association. Collectively we also cherish each national park in whichever State it is found. On these national issues we who live in these many States are interested beyond the boundaries of our own. That, we believe, is what makes a nation.

HEARINGS ON S. 500, 1955

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

Mr. GUTERMUTH. My name is C. R. Gutermuth. I am vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, one of the oldest national conservation organizations in North America. The institute is dedicated to the better management and wise utilization of all renewable natural resources in the public interest, and its nonprofit activities have been continuing since 1911.

We appreciate the invitation of this subcommittee to present a statement concerning S. 500, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper Colorado River storage project. In your invitation, Mr. Chairman, you requested that the testimony be restricted as much as possible to new information supplementary to statements presented relative to S. 1555, reported to the Senate in 1954, inasmuch as the two bills are identical—and that means that this statement can be brief. In fact, it might really be ended here by stating again, emphatically—there is no justification for Echo Park Dam.

There has been no change in the attitude of the Wildlife Management Institute in respect to the upper Colorado River storage project. While we recognize that some features of the overall project may be needed, we still are unalterably opposed to the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the initial phase of this program. We feel that Dinosaur National Monument is an invaluable part of the national park system. The proponents of Echo Park Dam never have given adequate justification for the selection of this dam site over available sites outside the national monument that could provide comparable storage facilities.

Nothing has happened in the past year to cause us, and the majority of other national conservation organizations, to alter our views in this regard. The only new development in the picture has been an organized campaign on the part of the proponents of Echo Park Dam to throw up a smokescreen in an effort to deceive the public into thinking that the proposed reservoir will become an outstanding recreational area.

STATEMENT OF SIGURD F. OLSON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. OLSON. The National Parks Association, with all other conservation groups, are in favor of a sound water-development program for the upper Colorado which will conserve the water of this great basin and make an equitable distribution to the States concerned; but they believe sincerely that such a program need not violate any national park or monument, and that alternative methods of securing the desired results make the proposed violation absolutely unnecessary.

We have heard a great deal of talk of acre-feet, power potential, irrigation, storage, concrete and steel, and money values. As I have listened to these presentations and to others, I wonder if we are not sitting in judgment on something far greater than we realize.

The real values back of our opposition to Dinosaur National Monument construction are the spiritual values that really concern the people. I called a conference in New York on November 17 to which conservation groups from all over the Nation came. We met to discuss what to do about Dinosaur and crystallize our own thinking and we arrived at what we thought was a very fair conclusion which was broadcast through the Nation by the press that we were not opposed to a sound water-development program for the upper Colorado, realizing the great need of water for the area concerned, but that we were opposed to any invasion of any national park or monument in the development of this program.

I think that makes our position very clear. It has been stated before. We are not against water storage; we are not against a sound program. We agree with you, Senator, when you said—and I was glad to hear you say it—that you were in favor of any program, if it could be worked out, that would not violate the monument.

That was very encouraging to us. We feel that a solution can be worked out that will give the West the water it needs, that will take care of the various problems raised by you and the other Senators, but that it need not be done by violating the monument.

STATEMENT OF FRED M. PACKARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PACKARD. I am Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association.

Other witnesses have discussed the importance of preserving Dinosaur National Monument and the national park system as a whole from the disruptive impact of Echo Park Dam. I shall confine my statement to a few matters that have not been discussed thoroughly, to avoid repetition.

In November 1954, representatives of more than 20 national organizations met in New York, where they defined their common position. They agreed on the following statement of their objectives:

1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.

2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would flood any portion of any national park or monument.

3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.

4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or destroyed.

Signed by the American Museum of Natural History, the American Nature Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Conservation Department, Yale University, the Conservation Foundation, the Council of Conservationists, the Dartmouth Outdoor Club, the Emergency Conservation Committee, the Garden Club of America, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Izaac Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Conference of State Parks, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Life Conservation Society, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute.

HEARINGS ON S. 1555, 1954

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH

Mr. GUTERMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I am C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D. C., which is one of the oldest, nonprofit, national conservation organizations in this country. The institute is dedicated to the better management and wise utilization of renewable natural resources in the public interest, and the work of this private organization dates back to 1911.

I should like to make it clear at the start that we are not opposed to the upper Colorado River storage project in its entirety, since there probably is need for certain of the developments that are proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. We do, however, want to voice vigorous objection to the inclusion of the Echo Park Dam in the initial phase of the project. We are opposed to, and will continue to oppose, any invasion of the national park system, of which the Dinosaur National Monument is an invaluable unit. In view of the increasing human population, it is imperative that we safeguard the comparatively small proportion of the total land acreage that has been set aside in the national park system for the cultural and recreational needs of this great Nation.

Granting that the upper Colorado should be developed, we have not been given ample justification for the construction of the Echo Park Dam. It will take years to build the other dams that are planned for that area, and we urge you to insist that they go ahead with those that are not in dispute, and that a detailed study be made of the alternate dam sites outside the Dinosaur National Monument. Then again, in view of the real and urgent need for preserving our few publicly owned park areas in order to provide for those other equally important and essential needs of the people, is it illogical to suggest that it might be wise to sacrifice some efficiency and utility by staying out of the Dinosaur with this construction, and by using some of those so-called inferior dam sites?

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF CHAS. H. CALLISON, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. CALLISON. In conclusion, I wish to restate in unmistakable terms the position of the National Wildlife Federation. It has not changed since the House Irrigation Subcommittee held hearings on H. R. 4449. We are opposed to the phases of this legislation which would authorize Echo Park Dam. We believe the purposes of the upper Colorado storage project can be achieved without this particular reservoir. We urge the consideration of alternate sites.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF HOWARD ZAHNISER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, AND EDITOR OF THE LIVING WILDERNESS

Mr. **ZAHNISER.** We are thus in no sense breaking faith with the people of this region in urging the preservation of this area. In emphasizing this I should like also, in as friendly a fashion as possible, to remind the people of Utah and Colorado that all of us from all parts of the country share with them the public ownership of this unit in our national park system, and I would appeal to them to recognize that they have a responsibility to all of us for its protection. I recognize that our national welfare depends on the welfare of this region, and I feel that my own personal welfare is related to the personal welfare of my fellow citizens in Utah and Colorado. I am interested in the national importance of the upper Colorado River program for the benefit of this region and its people. At the same time I would urge all of them to keep faith with all of us throughout the Nation, and with those of future generations, by cherishing these scenic wild canyons and helping to preserve them unimpaired.

During the public debate that followed the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal of this Echo Park Dam some 4 years ago, it has been clearly shown, I believe, not only that (1) the scenic wild canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument are superb and unique, a wilderness resource irreplaceable, invaluable, and increasingly popular; but also (2) that it is not necessary to destroy this national monument in order to realize the purposes of the upper Colorado River project. Others have spoken, and will yet speak, in greater detail and with better understanding of alternative programs. All of us conservationists have shown real interest in them. Far from wishing to enforce any denial of water storage or power potential on the people of the region, we have extended ourselves to demonstrate that there can be a program that will serve all public purposes, including national park preservation. Neither evaporation loss, which was once officially described as the fundamental issue, nor any other supposed sacrifice, I am sincerely convinced, will ever become any severe penalty on the people of Utah and Colorado for the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument. I am confident that in no way will they eventually regret joining with all of us in its preservation.

STATEMENT BY FRED M. PACKARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. **PACKARD.** The national conservation organizations approve the development of a sound plan to produce necessary water and power benefits from the natural resources of the upper basin States. Such a plan should be justified by demonstrated need for the results anticipated; it should produce them by whatever method is the most efficient and economical; and it should cause as little damage to other values as possible. It is the responsibility of the engineering authorities to develop such plans and to investigate and evaluate all possible methods of achieving the desired results. They must demonstrate concretely that the proposal they recommend is the wisest way to do the job.

The Bureau of Reclamation has submitted its upper Colorado River storage project to the Congress. Is this, as it stands, the best solution to the problem? It contains at least one serious defect of national significance, the proposal to utilize a reserved national park system area for dam sites. Our organizations have expressed the view unitedly that this invasion of the national park system is contrary to the national welfare. As we have studied the proposal, we have noted that justification for doing so is based on faulty calculations. It is becoming increasingly evident that it is not necessary to achieve the desired results. We believe Echo Park Dam should be deleted from the project, and that the overall proposal should not be approved as long as Echo Park Dam is a part of it.

While our direct concern here is the protection of the national park system, we are keenly interested in the wise development of the water resources of the Nation. They must be utilized for the welfare of our people, and we hope they will be used wisely. Dedication of every acre of land and water to the best possible purpose is the foundation of the conservation program, whether that use be economic, social, or cultural. It is encouraging that the Members of Congress for many decades have consistently insured that this principle shall be followed, and have made their decisions in such matters on that basis. In such hands, we are confident this problem, like others that have preceded it, will be resolved in a fashion that will produce the greatest national good.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE, PRESENTED BY JOHN F. CLAGGETT, WASHINGTON, D. C., IN BEHALF OF J. W. PENFOLD, WESTERN REPRESENTATIVE OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE, DENVER, COLO.

First, it should be made quite clear that the league endorses the basic purposes of the upper Colorado project. This is not idle lip service, but rather is the result of study by league members living in all the States of the Colorado Basin who have devoted attention to the problem over the years. It is correct to state that development of the Colorado River is essential and inevitable.

We appreciate the fear in the hearts of upper Colorado River folk that delay in plans for development of their river, their "last waterhole," might result in permanent loss of opportunity for development of their share of the river, so absolutely essential to the development of the great natural resources of that region. They should be given tangible assurance that this opportunity shall not be denied them. At the same time, and because in a very real sense we are dealing with a "last waterhole," we cannot afford any major mistakes. Whatever plan of development is adopted, we shall, for better or worse, be placing our future in a straitjacket. The obligation and responsibility of this generation of citizens is to make certain that the jacket will fit the future comfortably and well. There can be no second guessing once projects as huge as the upper Colorado have been constructed.

We urge, consequently, that your distinguished committee, which has consistently over the years supported and protected the great public institution which is the national park system, support and protect Dinosaur National Monument, as yet little known, but destined to be a key and strategic area in that system.

We urge also that your committee consider for as early authorization as possible an initial phase of development for the upper Colorado, excluding Echo Park Dam, but including such units as are clearly sound and feasible and will contribute to desirable utilization of the region's great resources.

EXHIBIT 3

URGENT MEMORANDUM TO ALL CONSERVATIONISTS

On Wednesday, November 17, 1954, leaders of 28 national conservation, nature, garden and women's clubs met in an all-day conference to coordinate their efforts in the fight to prevent the construction of Echo Park Dam. The conference was called by Mr. Sigurd F. Olson, president of the National Parks Association.

It was reported that the upper Colorado River Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation, in addition to several Senators and Representatives, have announced that a bill will go before Congress early in January to authorize the upper Colorado River project, and that this bill probably will be essentially the same as the one introduced by several Western Senators in the last session of Congress, which was not brought to a vote upon the floor of either the House or Senate.

This bill calls for the construction of Echo Park Dam, which would flood out part of Dinosaur National Monument, as the first step in the $15 billion upper Colorado River project.

The first phase, including construction of Echo Park Dam, is expected to cost in the neighborhood of $1 billion, but—most important—it would establish the damaging precedent of using national parks and monuments for commercial purposes—and it is known that plans for such use, involving many parks and monuments, are already in the blueprint stage.

It is obvious, therefore, that every conservation-minded person, and everyone who is sincerely interested in saving our great national parks system, should regard the Echo Park Dam crisis as a personal responsibility, and should do whatever is possible to call attention to the dangers that lie ahead. It is vitally important that Congressmen and Senators recognize the dangers inherent in the upper Colorado River project so long as Echo Park Dam is part of it.

At their meeting on November 17, the conservationists established a clear-cut policy to guide all conservation-minded organizations and individuals in their activities during the coming year. The policy adopted is as follows:

1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.
2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would flood any portion of any national park or monument.
3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.
4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

EXHIBIT 4

EXCERPT FROM THE OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD ON S. 1555, A HEARING CONDUCTED BY THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE 83D CONGRESS, JUNE 28 THROUGH JULY 3, 1954

(Pp. 508–516, inclusive)

Senator **WATKINS.** Is it your preparation?

Mr. **BROWER.** Yes, sir.

Senator **WATKINS.** You say you are an editor?

Mr. **BROWER.** I point out that I am the son of an engineer, the brother of an engineer, I am an editor, and I should put there I think pretty much the same statement that I tried to explain to the House committee, that in my editorial training I was working not on novels or poetry, but on technical papers in many scientific fields. The editor is trained in that sort of work for nothing else than for an objective attempt to appraise the logic of a given subject and a paper in its presentation. In various fields that I have been editing in——

Senator Watkins. What papers have you written for? Where have you been employed as an editor?

Mr. Brower. At the University of California Press, in its book publishing and scientific monograph publishing program. We have papers in practically every field you can name, from economics, agricultural economics, on down through engineering and down to zoology, with a "Z."

Senator Watkins. And you have lived with engineers?

Mr. Brower. I have lived with engineers, and I know a great many top engineers of the country and, of course, have had great opportunity in the last few months and some opportunity in the preceding 4 years to be very concerned with the details of this project and the various possibilities.

Senator Watkins. Do you think this is a sound program?

Mr. Brower. I think it is.

Senator Watkins. You recommend it. And what do you base that on?

Mr. Brower. I think that will come out as I finish here, that some of the answers that will be needed are in the few remaining steps here, a few words left, and I will be ready to answer questions that may be raised on that thereafter.

Senator Watkins. I am very much interested, because if the thing you say can be done, instead of a lot of people working for the Bureau of Reclamation we should have had an editor who understands better than the engineer how these things should be built.

Mr. Brower. It is not a matter of checking the engineer's details. I am not concerned whether it should be a gravity flow or forced flow, or how you compute the mathematics of that.

Senator Watkins. Did you compute all of those costs yourself?

Mr. Brower. These costs——

Senator Watkins. Can you answer the question?

Mr. Brower. I have taken these figures from the Bureau of Reclamation and such adjustments as I have made are explained in the little note there in the table. The source throughout is the basic data of the Bureau of Reclamation, which of course, is all we have except for notes from here and there on various aspects.

Senator Watkins. As an editor you have read over this report and you have come out with what you think is a good project, a good program; is that right?

Mr. Brower. Yes, sir. I have read over these things, this report, the 1950 report, the 1947 House document, the various supplemental documents of the other Government agencies that have gone forward in two batches with the documents, plus supporting material from other engineers and other experts in a good many fields that we have discussed this with month after month.

Senator Watkins. You tell me the experts you discussed it with, the outstanding engineers, for instance. Let's get the list of them.

Mr. Brower. Sir, the list of engineers I can prepare for the committee file. There are some whose names cannot be used now.

Senator Watkins. Why not? This is a public service, as you said. They should not be ashamed of having their names used.

Mr. Brower. Well, some of these have requested that their names be left in confidence, and that is all I can do, respect that. I feel I have that obligation.

Senator Watkins. Did you ever discuss it with any of them that have actually made any engineering study on the Colorado River?

Mr. Brower. Yes, sir.

Senator Watkins. Out in the field?

Mr. Brower. Yes, sir.

Senator Watkins. Can you name them for us?

Mr. Brower. The name of the engineer that I would have to give there is this special adviser to the president, and I cannot give that now.

Senator Watkins. Have you discussed it with the engineer for the California-Colorado River Board?

Mr. Brower. He has seen a few of my statements.

Senator Watkins. Have you discussed it, I am asking? You say he has seen a few of your statements. I am asking you if you have discussed it with him.

Mr. Brower. I have seen him, I have discussed it with him very briefly. I would not want to say, I would not want in any way to commit him for being for or against this.

Senator Watkins. Did he make any of the suggestions or give you any of the facts that you have included in your program?

Mr. Brower. No, sir. I had never met the gentleman before I reached town.

Senator Watkins. What is his name?

Mr. Brower. I believe it is Mr. Matthew.

Senator Watkins. You are sure about that, are you?

Mr. Brower. I am not sure of the title. There is a State engineer, a State water engineer, the Colorado Water Board engineer, and there are several in that group.

Senator Watkins. How many of the Colorado River Board's engineers or lawyers or others have you discussed this with?

Mr. Brower. I have discussed this—I have not discussed it particularly, I have let them look this over——

Senator Watkins. Tell us what you have done with it. Have you talked with them?

Mr. Brower. I have talked to them.

Senator Watkins. And they have talked to you?

Mr. Brower. I have talked to them and they have talked to me.

Senator Watkins. A good many times?

Mr. Brower. No, sir.

Senator Watkins. How many times?

Mr. Brower. Since I arrived in Washington, and I would say twice.

Senator Watkins. What about when you were in California?

Mr. Brower. No, sir.

Senator Watkins. Do you have any letters from them?

Mr. Brower. No.

Senator Watkins. Have you ever written them about this project?

Mr. Brower. I have not written them about this project.

Senator Watkins. Have any of your officials of this Sierra Club written to the California water officials of southern California about this project?

Mr. Brower. I do not believe so, sir. I do not know. I could not speak for the 9,500. None have written that I know of.

Senator Watkins. You don't have that many officials. I am talking about officials.

Mr. Brower. Well, of the officials, no, none that I know of.

Senator Watkins. What is the connection between the Sierra Club and the California River Board?

Mr. Brower. Sir, there is no connection whatever.

Senator Watkins. Or water conservancy. I think you understand the organizations down there. You know that, of course, the California-Colorado River Board has objected to this project; do you not?

Mr. Brower. I know that, sir. I have seen their statement along with all the others that went forward with the documents.

Senator Watkins. You joined forces with them; did you not?

Mr. Brower. No, sir.

Senator Watkins. Why were you talking to them?

Mr. Brower. It happens that in some respects there are parallel purposes.

Senator Watkins. That is right. You want to defeat this project; do you not?

Mr. Brower. No, sir; I do not. I cannot speak for them. I think they will have the opportunity to speak for themselves.

Senator Watkins. In this little book, Dinosaur Parks and Dams by David R. Brower, in 1954 the book was published, I think, or reprinted. There is an excerpt here. Did you write this paragraph?

"The intelligent layman can also ask for answers to the objection by other Government agencies. I further wonder how fervently the Federal Government should support at financial risk to all the Nation a 1922 river allocating compact which in 1954 emerges as a costly device to lift Colorado River economy by its bootstraps."

Did you write that?

Mr. Brower. Yes, sir.

Senator Watkins. You do not like the 1922 compact, do you?

Mr. Brower. No, sir; I did not say that, sir, and I have no criticism of that compact. I say that the intelligent laymen may ask some questions about it.

Senator Watkins. You are one of those intelligent laymen, I take it, that was asking the question when you wrote that. What did you intend by that sentence? What do you mean by it?

Mr. Brower. Sir, I can answer this perhaps in this manner, that that is one short paragraph out of a fairly long article, not very long, that perhaps might go into the record at this point so that that could be seen in its whole context in the way it fits in with the whole proposal.

Senator Watkins. We will determine that later. I am asking about this now. I want to know what you mean in this particular paragraph.

Mr. Brower. In this particular paragraph?

Senator Watkins. It won't be taken out of context because I am giving you a chance to explain it.

Mr. Brower. I have suggested various points in here that still need resolution. This is one point that still seems to need some resolution or at least review.

Senator Watkins. As I remember, you started out in this paper today by telling us that you are not against this project.

Mr. Brower. Sir, begging your pardon, I am not against the—the Sierra Club is not against a sound upper Colorado River storage project which does not invade the national park——

Senator Watkins. Suppose you take Echo Park out of it. Are you against it then? Would you be against it then if we took Echo Park out of it?

Mr. Brower. If you took Echo Park out of it and also the plan for Split Mountain Dam out of it.

Senator Watkins. Well, take Split Mountain out.

Mr. Brower. Both the dams that invade Dinosaur National Monument. This organization, so far as I can speak for it now, without checking that once again with our board of directors, would no longer oppose.

Senator Watkins. Even though it is a costly device, this 1922 compact is a costly device, to lift Colorado River economy by its bootstraps?

Mr. Brower. That question—wait a minute. What was I going to say? There would be in our membership, which includes people all over the country, West and East, people who I am sure would continue to oppose it, so long as it was unsound.

Senator Watkins. Well, it wouldn't be sound if it attempted to lift the Colorado River economy by its bootstraps, would it? That is what you think this whole thing is?

Mr. Brower. No, I do not think so. I suggest, sir, that that question be asked. There are various answers that I could suggest. One is that you consider the population to be served. Another is that you consider where you get the most production. But a third, as I bring out later in my paper, which is probably the most important one, is where——

Senator WATKINS. I will get to something later in your paper. Right now it is this paper I am reading from. The next sentence: "Or to take what 4 Peters are using in the lower basin, population 12 million, and can continue to use at its own expense in order to give it to 1 Paul in the upper basin, population 3 million, a Paul that has not used it, but he thinks he can, if Uncle Sam will stake him to it and throw in Dinosaur free."

What do you mean by that?

Mr. BROWER. That is one aspect of the question, that various people over the country might well ask.

Senator WATKINS. You are asking, aren't you? Who is the intelligent layman you had in mind when you wrote it? Wasn't it a fellow by the name of Brower?

Mr. BROWER. Brower said intelligent people might ask the question and I don't think that comments upon Brower's intelligence.

Senator WATKINS. Is that not your own sentiment, as a matter of fact?

Mr. BROWER. Not necessarily. That is part of it.

Senator WATKINS. What part of it?

Mr. BROWER. I might point out that it is a minor part of my sentiment.

Senator WATKINS. It is quite important to this project, if you are saying those things about it, Uncle Sam will stake to us, in fact give it to us, and throw in the Dinosaur project free. You certainly were not showing friendship when you wrote that.

Mr. BROWER. I cannot show friendship for a project that has claimed repeatedly that the keystone is Echo Park. If the project were derived from the Bureau of Reclamation and various studying agencies without an Echo Park in it, that would be a completely different matter, if it did not invade the park system. But when it starts out, and with that as the alleged keystone or wheelhorse or piston or any number of terms, and whenever the attempt to suggest that we try something else is just met with very strong objection, then we have no recourse but to be against that project until some other system is worked out.

Senator WATKINS. Do you think the Echo Park is an uneconomical dam?

Mr. BROWER. It so happens that I do at this point.

Senator WATKINS. That is irrespective of whether it is a park or not. Take it on the basis of just being a project, as a dam for the storage of water and the generation of power, and to help regulate the river. Do you think it is an uneconomical dam?

Mr. BROWER. I would say, sir, that I do.

It comes rather as a hypothetical question. I would answer it by going back.

Senator WATKINS. It is not hypothetical at all. You have made a study and you have given us an alternate program. I want to know if this is an uneconomical dam from your point of view.

Mr. BROWER. I think that I do believe it is.

Senator WATKINS. You believe what?

Mr. BROWER. I believe it is uneconomical.

Senator WATKINS. Point out where it is.

Mr. BROWER. I was going to say had it been built perhaps 40 years ago when costs were different it might be a different situation. But in *our present*——

Senator WATKINS. Suppose it is going to be built, if it is going to be built at all, several years from now. Suppose that prices should not be as high in a few years as they are at the present time. Would your opinion still be that it is an uneconomical dam?

Mr. BROWER. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Tell us why it is uneconomical.

Mr. BROWER. It is uneconomical because the costs are quite high, we do not know really what the current estimate is. The last figure we have, for example, is January 1953. We have various interpretations of how the costs on the various elements, including transmissions, should be allocated. We do not know exactly what they can produce their power for per mill. We know it comes out about 6.3, if you average Echo and Split. The thing that is more important in the current trend of upper basin development and with atom power closer on the horizon than even News and World Report indicate it, because of yesterday's development where Russia is ahead of us already, we have to step that up, and a study of our other energy resources shows that you can produce Echo Park's power if you federally subsidize the plant for from 1 to 2 mills less per kilowatt-hour by hydro.

Now, with that difference, and the advantages which accrue to your upper basin if you exploit this wonderful reserve of coal, I would say that Echo Park Dam is uneconomic, that it is——

Senator WATKINS. You can produce power cheaper by using coal?

Mr. BROWER. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have any figures on that?

Mr. BROWER. Yes, sir. I have a statement here which I would like to——

Senator WATKINS. I mean of your own now. You are talking about what you know about this.

Mr. BROWER. I am talking about what I know, sir. What I know, as I have tried to explain, comes from various people. Quite a bit of it I can commit to memory.

Senator WATKINS. You got a lot of it from your father and brother who were engineers?

Mr. BROWER. I beg your pardon.

Senator WATKINS. And you got some of it from your father and brother, who are engineers?

Mr. BROWER. I got an approach from engineering, I had to learn how to live with engineers. But on this specific problem I got figures from the Federal Power Commission and from the present Sierra Club vice president, who is an engineer, who knows a great deal about energy sources, Alex Hildebrand. I have his statement here, which I think would be well worth putting into the record where the other Senators could see it, to follow his logical line of reasoning on what this opportunity is, because I think it is a real opportunity for the upper basin.

Senator WATKINS. Is his statement the basis of what you put in here as your program?

Mr. BROWER. His statement is the basis of this one aspect on steam. That is the major part of the basis.

Senator WATKINS. Now let's get back a few minutes to your associations within the California Water Board of Southern California.

Mr. BROWER. I know Utah is very suspicious and the Salt Lake Tribune is awfully suspicious, but they are wrong.

Senator WATKINS. I found out from you that you apparently have the same purpose.

Mr. BROWER. No, sir.

Senator WATKINS. You said something about it, and you are running along a parallel course in having the same purpose. I thought that was what you said a few minutes ago.

Mr. BROWER. Could I correct the wording on this?

Senator WATKINS. You can say what you want to say now, but you cannot take away from the record what you have already said.

Mr. BROWER. I wouldn't want to take that away. They are opposing this project, as I understand it, because they do not think it is sound. We are opposing this project because we do not think it is sound, because it invades the park system.

Senator WATKINS. And because it comes out of that 1922 compact which emerges as a costly device to lift the Colorado River economy by its bootstraps. Is that not right?

Mr. BROWER. That is a question I asked. That is not a position I took. There is one point——

Senator WATKINS. Well, when you ask questions, sometimes you state your views in the form of questions, not quite having the courage to come out flatly and state them.

Mr. BROWER. I think, sir, there are statements in here where I was expressing the opposition of it, too. I was trying to do a roundup of 2,500 words for an audience that knew nothing about it.

Senator WATKINS. When you put the words into the mouths of some of these intelligent laymen, because you say an intelligent layman could ask for answers to these——

Mr. BROWER. I don't think you would want to say that he should not ask those questions.

Senator WATKINS. I am assuming you are the intelligent layman.

Mr. BROWER. Well, whoever the intelligent layman is, I think that is a question he should consider. How he answers it, I don't know. My own answer at the moment is that the criteria of population, of agricultural production, are not the ones which should govern. And I think Mr. Clyde here has presented very ably the criterion which should be used which is of great importance to the Nation, and that is decentralization.

Senator WATKINS. Then you ought to be for this project.

Mr. BROWER. I am for this project that I am trying to complete the presentation of, but not against the present Bureau project, because I think it is an expanded manner in doing it.

Senator WATKINS. What was your idea of contrasting the population of 12 million people in the lower basin against 3 million in the upper basin?

Mr. BROWER. The idea was to show—that was part of the business of the bootstraps.

Senator WATKINS. The idea was to show that the compact after all was a bad mistake, that that water should go down to the 12 million people and not be held by 3 million people up there; isn't that right?

Mr. BROWER. No, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Is that not actually what you had in mind?

Mr. BROWER. No, sir. That is a question I would like answered, but I would like it answered by people who know more about it than I. I would like to see the answer.

Senator WATKINS. Do you think that the upper basin States ought to have their rights under the contract?

Mr. BROWER. I think the upper basin States should probably have more than they are presently getting under the present plan, and that is what this would provide.

Senator WATKINS. And cheaper?

Mr. BROWER. And cheaper. I realize it is a rather shocking presentation, but it did not just arrive from Mount Sinai, or anything else. It is something I started thinking about when the Salt Lake Tribune put me over the coals on this thing, that same paragraph, and then started to say what my motives were, and make all sorts of implications which were incorrect.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this question about your motives and so on. Who is financing your expenses in connection with this campaign against the Echo Park Dam?

Mr. BROWER. The expenses of this, of our entire conservation effort, come entirely from the membership, the dues paid by our members, and from an occasional modest bequest. The largest bequest we have ever received was $25,000. These bequests go into permanent funds and we can use, on most of them, only the interest as part of our operating expense.

Senator Watkins. Do you have any acquaintance with the money income of the Sierra Club?

Mr. Brower. Yes, sir.

Senator Watkins. Are you its treasurer as well?

Mr. Brower. I am not its treasurer, but I have to struggle with the budget every year. What question would you have there?

Senator Watkins. Have you received any help directly or indirectly from the southern California interests who are objecting to this project?

Mr. Brower. Absolutely none, sir, nor would we accept any if offered. That is an answer that I wrote back to the Tribune after they had asked the same question, and it took two efforts to get them to answer it, to put my letter in.

Senator Watkins. Now you say you came to Washington to confer with these people after you arrived in Washington?

Mr. Brower. I conferred——

Senator Watkins. When I said these people, I am referring to these officials of southern California who have been objecting to this project.

Mr. Brower. I have never conferred with these people before. We have been working on our own information. All I had seen before, expressing their view, and this is a point to bring out, was this report in blue covers that I think you have seen, the State of California's objections. That report was published in February, I believe. Prior to that, the State of California's position had been that was almost adamant, you might say. Back in their comment first on the 1950 report, I think you may recall, if you refer to the record, that the State raised hardly a murmur. At that point, the Sierra Club was raising quite a murmur. We got interested in this about 1950, and by 1952 we had taken a strong position, which is the same one we have today, while the State of California insofar as I know, the Colorado River Board, were saying nothing, and what they thought, I do not know.

Senator Watkins. Let's get back to the question I asked you. What did you do when you came to Washington? Did you have a conference with the representatives of this group?

Mr. Brower. I spoke briefly with the representative——

Senator Watkins. You did have a conference?

Mr. Brower. And an engineer.

Senator Watkins. The answer is "Yes." Who did you have the conference with?

Mr. Brower. I spoke briefly with Mr. Matthew and Mr. Ely.

Senator Watkins. Who else?

Mr. Brower. That is all.

Senator Watkins. Just those two?

Mr. Brower. Those two.

Senator Watkins. Did you seek them out or did they seek you out?

Mr. Brower. I sought them out.

Senator Watkins. Did you have an appointment before you came here?

Mr. Brower. No, sir; I had no appointment, and I had wondered in view of the great suspicion that Salt Lake entertained about Sierra Club motives whether I should even say "boo" to these people. I called home and found out that I should say "boo." That was it. I saw them about, I would say, it totaled perhaps an hour and a quarter of the entire time I have been in Washington. The rest of my time I have been in consultation for the most part with our other organizations who share our position, and who, in fact, led us into taking this.

Senator Watkins. You discussed what you were going to present today; did you not?

Mr. Brower. I discussed it briefly, for instance on this thing that I am trying to complete now. When you kick these things around in your mind for a while, you get the idea, and you want to check with quite a few other people to see just how your own logic is going. You needed editorial suggestions, in effect, from other people. I felt a strong need to see if I had made some great big glaring mistake, right at the start here, in my logic. I am not saying that they say my logic is good or bad, I don't know what they think. But I do know that I did feel the need of getting checks by several people while here on something that I had stayed up to about 2 o'clock in the morning in my hotel room on two occasions trying to get into shape.

Senator Watkins. You tell me how long you actually spent for working out this program which you say is a better program for the upper basin.

Mr. Brower. Well, it has its beginnings back in about 1950 when I first heard of Dinosaur, and all this background must go into it.

Senator Watkins. How much time did you spend on concocting this scheme?

Mr. Brower. In developing this counterproposal, sir——

Senator Watkins. Yes; that is what I want to know. If you really have something here, we certainly ought to get you on our payroll in a hurry before we spend a lot of money that is not necessary and we do a lot of damage to the country. I think you ought to tell us now how long it took you to get this together.

Mr. Brower. I don't know whether you want it estimated in days or months or hours.

Senator Watkins. Yes; I think you ought to give us the details.

Mr. Brower. For the last 6 months I have really been thinking awfully hard on this subject, so hard——

Senator Watkins. You have been writing articles, all the time for the magazines, publicity to get out against this project?

Mr. Brower. I have had quite a bit to write; yes, sir. But a lot of it has been reading what I call now my bible, which is the 1950 report and which I think I have written more in the margins than there was written in the report.

OREGON FISH CANNERIES OPPOSE BAN ON IMPORTS OF FRESH FROZEN TUNA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the canners of tuna and salmon at the mouth of the Columbia River in Oregon have won an enviable reputation for the uniform excellence of their products. Because of the distance of these canneries from the main fishing grounds of the American tuna fleet, they have recently had to rely on imports of fresh frozen tuna, much of which is caught by Japanese tuna fishermen.

It now appears that, because of current dislocations in the market and price structure of tuna, efforts are being made to impose restrictions, by quota or otherwise, on this source of tuna upon which the canneries in Oregon must rely. I hope, Mr. President, that such restrictions—which would be inconsistent with our policies toward international trade that have recently been reaffirmed when the Congress extended the reciprocal trade agreements program—will not be adopted in this instance.

I have received a copy of a letter, dated July 8, 1955, to the Undersecretary of State from Thomas F. Sandoz, president of the Columbia River Packers Association, Inc., in Astoria, Oreg., and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed with my remarks in the Record, along with a supporting letter I have today addressed to Under Secretary Herbert C. Hoover, Jr.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Columbia River Packers Association, Inc.,
Astoria, Oreg., July 8, 1955.

The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover, Jr.,
Under Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover: It has been called to our attention that a number of the administrative departments of the Government, including the Department of State, have been approached by certain groups and individuals, speaking in behalf of southern California tuna boat owners and fishermen, urging that steps be taken to place an embargo or quota upon importations into this country of frozen tuna, particularly shipments of that product from Japan.

As the largest canners of tuna in this country located outside the San Diego and San Pedro area, and in view of the fact that we are dependent upon imports of frozen tuna for a substantial portion of our annual pack, we are vitally interested in this matter.

We feel that any impartial and comprehensive investigation of this problem will reveal that practically all tuna canners in this country, including Hawaii, are in agreement with us in opposition to the establishment of any embargo, quota, or other limitation upon the importation into this country of frozen tuna from any source. The exceptions may be one or more of the larger southern California packers who have most of the boats of the southern California tuna clipper fleet under contract. It is our understanding that the California Fish Canners Association is on record opposing any embargo or quota upon imports of frozen tuna.

We believe that such an investigation would clearly reveal that more people, located in various parts of this country, would be adversely affected by the imposition of a quota or embargo on such imports than are presently affected by the temporary tieup of tuna boats in San Diego and San Pedro.

Factually, the present tieup of southern California fishing boats is not due to imports of frozen tuna. An analysis of frozen imports so far this year shows that approximately one-half of the same is frozen albacore which is not produced by the southern California clipper fleet. Further, the remaining half of the imports includes the skipjack and yellowfin tunas caught by American-owned clippers operating in Central and South American waters and landing their catches there. This production is then transported by private carriers or conference vessels to San Diego or San Pedro. These catches are declared by our Customs as imports. We say that a sizable portion of the imports of these species of tuna is from this source. Other than these catches, the balance of imports is very nominal and could in no way be considered as the primary cause of the southern California's industry's present problems.

On the contrary, the southern California industry is suffering from the fact that imports of Japanese canned tuna in brine have taken practically all of the large institutional market for canned tuna in this country and are encroaching more and more upon the consumer market.

Beyond this, the fish-buying agreements entered into between the members of the American Tunaboat Association and the major California canners as of January 1954 called for substantial advances in raw fish costs over 1953, together with the unprecedented requirements that canners take 25 percent more production than in the prior year. Advances in prices on canned tuna were announced by southern California canners, but the market would not absorb the increased production at the advanced prices. About June 1954 the market on domestic canned tuna broke sharply and has continued in a depressed and unsettled condition to this date. Early in 1955 California canners and tuna boat owners agreed on some reduction in raw fish prices. It is our understanding that negotiations are now underway for some additional reductions in raw fish prices. Until an agreement is reached, it is natural that canners are hesitant to unload boats and increase their inventories.

In other words, we feel strongly that the cure for the current troubles of the southern California tuna industry rests largely in their own hands and that some of the contributing causes of the present situation are of their own doing. It would be entirely inequitable, through the imposition of a quota, to force tuna canners in other sections of the country to go out of business for the prime benefit of the segment of the industry in southern California.

When the production costs for canned tuna get down to a point where the canner, the distributor, and the retailer can each make a reasonable profit, then fishermen's catches will move, but at a lower price, based on the lower price at which the canner must sell his product.

We face a simple economic problem that has constantly occurred and reoccurred in the fish-canning business. Sharp production and price changes are the rule rather than the exception. A short supply tends to advance prices. A larger supply tends to depress prices. Our Nation does not have a high per capita consumption of fish. America does have a high per capita consumption of other protein foods, all of which are in plentiful supply. Fishery products, including canned tuna, therefore have to adjust their prices to compete in the overall protein food market.

To fully explain our stand in this matter we would like to outline our own situation. We have been established canners of fish and seafood products for over 50 years. We entered into the tuna-canning industry in 1938, processing, for the most part, catches from heavy runs of albacore tuna which appeared off the coasts of Oregon and Washington. Our product met with gratifying consumer acceptance, and we increased our operations in this field. As market demands surpassed the ability of local fishermen to supply our needs for raw material, we went further afield, seeking sources of supply in Central and South American waters. We found the cost of this venture prohibitive. We established receiving points along the coast as far south as Monterey Bay, stopping there because, again, transportation and other costs made any move further to the south uneconomical. In addition, we turned to the importation of frozen tuna from Japan and found that, after paying transportation and the many other costs entailed in such an operation, we could place tuna in our cannery at a cost approximate with that prevailing in the case of southern California canners and also approximating the cost of deliveries from local fishermen.

The albacore runs off this coast disappeared in 1950 and have not returned. We had established a substantial business in the marketing of canned tuna under our Bumble Bee brand at the cost of time, energy, advertising, and other forms of promotion. We found ourselves practically without any source of assured supply except frozen imports and the fish we were able to buy at northern California ports. The canned tuna industry is very competitive and we must be able to supply our customers' requirements throughout the year. Lost markets through inability to supply them are practically impossible to regain.

Other canners particularly those outside the southern California area, are in the same predicament. We cannot be assured of a supply of tuna from the southern California clipper fleet. This matter has been closely investigated and the answer is that the San Diego-San Pedro based tuna clippers will not travel an additional 2,200 mile round trip to deliver tuna to us at f. o. b. California prices, except when canners in their home area will not purchase their catches. It is evident that no business of any substance could base its provision for raw materials on such an uncertain source.

Representatives of this company have gone to Washington and have appeared before the Tariff Commission and committees of the Congress; and have conferred many times with departmental representatives, including those from the Department of State. We have emphasized the fact that the basic elements behind recent periods of distress in the tuna market in this country have not resulted from imports of frozen tuna. The principal effect of imports on the American tuna market stems primarily from the unrealistic canned tuna tariff rates. This has permitted canned tuna in brine to enter this country and sell to the consumer at 10 to 12 cents a can below the price which the American canner must obtain if he is to realize a reasonable profit.

In closing, the reputation and policy of this company in the major markets of the Nation are well known. It cannot be said that we are a disturbing factor in the market. On the contrary, we put out a carefully packed line of quality seafood. We would like it clearly understood that our company in recent months has also suffered from the effects of price reductions on inventories, and, in turn, loss of profit in meeting the competitive situation in moving our inventory of canned tuna.

The American tuna market has shown a healthy and consistent growth in recent years. If the product is competitively priced, we think the growth will continue. We believe that we have an inherent right to participate in serving this growing American tuna market. We believe, as businessmen, that it is wrong to place quotas, embargoes, or tariffs on the importation of raw material for manufacture here. We think it is better for this country to import frozen tuna rather than canned tuna. The product canned here acquires American costs and goes into the market on a cost basis comparable to that of domestically caught tuna. It furnishes employment for American labor in American canneries and brings revenues to the concerns engaged in its transportation and the sale of cans, oil, and other items used in its manufacture.

If any emergency action is necessary now, we think the present situation could be relieved by a temporary embargo or a limited quota on canned tuna imports. At the same time there must be a realization on the part of the southern California tuna fishermen that they cannot expect to sell their product for more than the American consumer will pay in our highly competitive food market.

We respectfully urge that our Congress, or any executive branch of our Government, take no action on the current demands for an embargo or quota on imports of frozen tuna.

Yours very truly,

T. F. Sandoz, *President.*

United States Senate,
Committee on
Interior and Insular Affairs,
July 14, 1955.

Hon. Herbert C. Hoover, Jr.
Undersecretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover: I understand that the Department of State and other interested agencies are being urged to limit the importation of fresh frozen tuna, particularly from Japan, by quotas or other means. I hope that no such action will be taken.

Frozen tuna constitutes an essential raw material for the canning industry, which plays an important role in the economy of western Oregon. An outline of the facts and the history of the tuna canning industry in Oregon is contained in a letter to you of July 8, 1955, from the Columbia River Packers Association, Inc., of which I have received a copy. This letter points out that, if there are temporary dislocations in the market for tuna caught elsewhere this is not the result of imports of frozen tuna from Japan.

I am sure I need not stress the significance which our Government's attitude toward the specific case of tuna imports has in the context of our overall foreign economic policies. The administration has just obtained Congressional approval for an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program, and I was pleased to be among those who supported the program. Purchases of tuna from Japanese fishermen make available to Japan dollars which can in turn be spent for grain, timber or other products from the Northwest or elsewhere in the United States. The frozen fish purchased by American canneries in turn provides employment for cannery workers as well as for workers in the industries furnishing cans, oil, and transportation for the finished product.

This readiness to draw upon sources anywhere in the Pacific for tuna for the growing American market seems to me a sound application of our principles of international trade. In the light of these principles, and the economic data of the canned tuna industry which have been submitted to you, I trust that you will not take restrictive action against this particular segment of our international trade and of the American fish canning industry.

Very truly yours,

Richard L. Neuberger,
United States Senator.

THE FREE-TRADE BRIGADE: HEADS THEY WIN, TAILS WE LOSE—AMERICA CANNOT WIN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the executive branch has invented a new plan to slash tariffs and cut down American industries and payrolls.

It is embodied in H. R. 6040.

Like all tariff-chopping schemes of the past 21 years it bears a spurious label and is being sold to us under a phony slogan.

The sufferers are the American workingmen and small investors of this Nation.

That was how the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was sold, and how it has been resold whenever it has been extended.

The slogan under which the Trade Agreements Act was originally sold was the phrase "reciprocal trade," invented by the London bankers with the active participation of the State Department—our own State Department.

Mr. President, it is not the traitors and the down-to-earth Communists in the United States who will do the harm to this country. There are relatively few such traitors. For the most part, they are exposed, sooner or later, and the harm they do can be somewhat alleviated.

HONEST CITIZENS DUPED BY SLOGANS

The real harm is done by the good, honest people of the United States, who adopt the slogans and the catchwords and phrases invented by the Harry Dexter Whites and the Alger Hisses. People like the Whites and the Hisses are too smart to come out into the open. The minute they come into the open, they are destroyed. But they are the ones who invent the slogans which are mouthed by the good, honest people. They are the ones who will finally destroy us, and they will do so innocently, for the most part.

The words "reciprocal trade" do not appear in the act itself, either in the title or the text. There is nothing reciprocal about it. But the false label was applied to it by free-trade orators and newspapers to sell free trade to the American people.

"TRADE, NOT AID" SLOGAN COINED IN BRITAIN

"Trade, not aid" is another deceptive slogan which is used to sugarcoat the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. It was invented by Mr. R. A. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain. The State Department has merely adopted it, as it has adopted other foreign slogans, to divide the wealth of the United States.

Whenever legislation is proposed to turn over American jobs, markets, and money to our foreign competitors, the proponents invent a slogan which good, honest American people can use when they speak with one another, and about which they can make speeches. Then the good, honest legislators say to themselves, "The people believe this, so if I am to be reelected, I must vote for it."

"DOLLAR SHORTAGE" SLOGAN COST UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS $3,750,000,000

The slogan "dollar shortage" sold Congress on the loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain. It was supposed to cure all the ills.

Then came the Marshall plan, because the ills not only were not cured, but were getting worse. After the Marshall plan came the ECA; then came the MSA; after that the FOA, the ICA, and all the other alphabetical agencies which are dedicated to spending the American taxpayers' money in Europe and Asia, and to placing foreign interests above the interests of the United States and its people.

Our foreign policy and our economic policy are ruled by slogans and phony labels. The current slogan becomes our foreign policy or what passes for a foreign policy, whether it be foreign aid or foreign trade.

STATE DEPARTMENT INVENTS NEW SLOGAN TO PLUG NEW INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Right now the State Department is trying out a new slogan in its effort to spur action on its program for an international organization for trade cooperation, still another tariff-cutting scheme.

The bill to approve OTC is H. R. 5550. It is sponsored by the State Department so Assistant Secretary of State Samuel C. Waugh has come up with a slogan. It is "Flight for Fifty-five Fifty."

Later in my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent that a news dispatch discussing OTC and the slogan of its sponsors be printed in the RECORD.

LATEST TARIFF-CUTTING BILL GIVEN "PHONY" TITLE

Slogan and title are combined in H. R. 6040, mislabeled a "customs simplification" bill.

"Customs simplification" has a pleasing sound. All the other catch words and phrases have pleasing sounds. If they meant what they said, that would be good; but they never mean what they say.

So the phrase "customs simplification" is as phony as a three dollar bill. The only thing the bill will simplify will be the ability of foreign producers to flood the markets of the United States with the products of slave-wage and low-living standard foreign labor.

BILL SCUTTLES PRESIDENT'S PLEDGES

What the bill does do is provide for automatic, arbitrary, and immediate reduction of tariffs wherever tariffs are based on ad valorem rates.

The bill violates the pledges made by the President in his famous letter to Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN during House consideration of H. R. 1.

It throws away even the fictitious concept of reciprocity.

It goes far beyond the Trade Agreements Extension Act which the Senate passed only several weeks ago, and subjects industries, wage earners, and investors to double, and in some cases triple, jeopardy from tariff slashes.

It puts American producers at the mercy of foreign cartels, foreign dumping, and double pricing practices.

It ties us more tightly to GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which Congress has never officially approved.

It is a slippery scheme to reduce tariffs on imports, the values of which are set by the foreign exporter.

OTC A SCHEME TO WIN BACK-DOOR APPROVAL OF GATT

To return to the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—let me say it cannot be repeated too many times on the Senate floor that it is a scheme to secure the approval of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva. It has been said by the administration that the GATT organization will be brought before the Senate to be passed upon. It not only has never been brought before the Senate, but it never will be brought before the Senate, in my earnest opinion.

The bill before the Congress is not to approve GATT but to approve OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—which is a reorganized version of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If OTC is approved, GATT will be approved, and if OTC is not approved, we will still have GATT, which has never come before the Senate, and never will. In other words, heads they win, tails we lose. They are clever over there, just as clever as they were in 1934, when the first phony foreign trade bill was passed.

IMMEDIATE FREE TRADE AIM IS TO WEAKEN CUSTOMS LAW

But the immediate free-trade goal is to put over the so-called customs simplification bill.

The present law bases ad valorem rates on either the export value of the product or the value of the product in the foreign market, whichever is higher.

H. R. 6040 would abandon this principle. It would substitute export value, as determined by the foreign exporter, as the sole basis on which ad valorem duties would be levied.

COTTON MANUFACTURERS EXPOSE PURPOSE OF NEW CUSTOMS BILL

The National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, employing 176,000 workers in affiliated mills, most of which are in New England, pointed this out to the Senate Finance Committee during hearings on the bill, adding:

> (This) is simply a device for tariff reductions under the guise of customs simplification.

LAST WEEKS OF SESSION TIME WHEN QUESTIONABLE BILLS SLIP IN

This is not the first time that has been attempted. It was attempted last year, and the Senate Finance Committee reported a bill, deleting all the trick paragraphs which it could detect on short notice. But such bills are brought in toward the end of a session, when everyone wants to close up the Congress and go home, passing only necessary legislation. So they hope to slip it through without proper consideration.

OPPONENTS ANALYZE TRICKY BILL

Section 2 of the bill, the association continued—

> enables foreign producers to take unilateral action in lowering the United States tariff on goods which they are exporting to the United States. This can be done by the simple expedient of selling textile products—

Or any other products, I might add—

> in the United States market at a lower price than in their own domestic market.
>
> Foreign producers organized into cartels can use a two-price system—a high price in their own country where they control the market, and a lower price for export to the United States.
>
> Section 2 of H. R. 6040 places a very desirable premium on the use of this system and is an open invitation to foreign producers to exploit the American textile market.
>
> Even in situations where a cartel does not control the foreign market, textile producers in other countries are offered a strong temptation to maintain an export price lower than the price in their own market in order to break into the American market.
>
> Foreign producers would be given a free hand to abuse and distort our ad valorem rates of duty. There would be no real protection for the domestic textile industry against price manipulation by foreign producers.

NO PROTECTION FOR INDUSTRIES COMPETING AGAINST AD VALOREM DUTY CUTS

Or for any other industry forced to compete against foreign producers flooding the American market with products on which ad valorem duties are imposed.

Mr. President, there were many witnesses, representing many American industries, who testified at the Senate Finance Committee hearings in opposition to H. R. 6040.

Among them were David H. Harshaw, president of the John B. Stetson Co.

Stetson is an honored name in hats, particularly in the Western region, where men have been wearing this company's product since pioneer days. It is a pioneer name in hats, an American name.

Here, in part, is what the president of the Stetson Co. had to say about H. R. 6040:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the purpose of this presentation is to register my opposition, on behalf of my company and the felt hat industry, to H. R. 6040, particularly section 2 of the bill.

DISCRIMINATION

> First of all, the bill, in its efforts to accomplish simplification of customs procedures, opens the door to a discriminating practice frowned upon in international trade circles—a practice the United States looks down upon in all its trade conferences.
>
> The bill not only substituted the "export value" for the "foreign value," but it substitutes "the export value for exporation to the United States" for the "foreign value"—a deliberate discrimination.
>
> The bill deliberately justifies and encourages selling at lower prices to the United States than to other countries, to say nothing about selling to the United States at lower prices than charged for the same product at home.

LOWER PRICES TO THE UNITED STATES

> The bill encourages the foreigner to sell to the United States at lower prices than he sells to either his home market or to other foreign markets. This means the price will be artificially set for exportation to the United States.
>
> It is an invitation for the foreigner to enter our markets with "rigged" prices to meet domestic competition.
>
> The bill is made to order for cartels and monopolies abroad. They can enter our markets and, if strong enough, drive domestic producers out of business, of course anticipating the time when they can have their own way and sell at higher prices.

BUYER OF FOREIGN PRODUCTS ULTIMATELY PAYS HIGHER COST

Diverting at that point from the quotation, Mr. President, I should like to say that many times on the Senate floor the senior Senator from Nevada has explained that phenomenon. Advocates of this system of lower tariffs or duties say a customer of the United States is entitled to the lower price. That would be a sound argument if the lower price were permanently secured.

FOREIGN PRODUCERS CHARGE WHATEVER TRAFFIC WILL BEAR

The lower prices obtain while competition exists, and then when the domestic producer is destroyed, foreign producers will charge what the traffic will bear. I can mention instances, but they are so evident and so well known that the statement cannot be refuted.

Mr. President, I continue the quotation:

> This principle is in restraint of trade and contrary to the laws of our land.

DUMPING

> The bill opens the door for dumping, even though the amendment to the bill states "that nothing in the bill shall be considered to repeal, modify, or supersede directly or indirectly the provisions of the 1921 Dumping Act."
>
> Exporters can bring merchandise into our country at ridiculously low prices and be justified under the proposed bill. At a later date, their action may be determined to be dumping, or it may not. The exporter has the law with him until it is determined.
>
> In the meantime, the damage to the domestic producer will have taken place, and before the case is settled he may be forced out of business. As they say in medical circles, "the operation was successful, but the patient died."

LOWER TARIFFS

> The bill will lower tariffs. There's no question about it. The Treasury Department admits it, and they state that as a result of their survey some reduction in valuation will result; however, they add that the percentage will be small on the average.
>
> It may be all right for the Treasury Department to work on averages. A particular company or an industry cannot work on averages. Averages will lead you astray. I know it will in the hat business.
>
> The export value of hats and hat bodies out of Italy, France, and Czechoslovakia have been as much as 50 percent below the real or foreign value. Dumping charges have been brought. Perhaps some have been sustained in other industries, but not in ours.
>
> In fact the situation got so serious that our industry was one of the few industries in the United States that received some relief under the escape-clause procedure. The relief was granted for hat bodies in the price brackets between $9 and $24 per dozen. Now we find the exporter bringing in the same goods at prices a few pennies below the $9 bracket—the price at which the relief applied.
>
> In other words, we find ourselves in almost the same place we were before relief was granted.

FOREIGNERS EXPERT AT TRADE MANIPULATION

Mr. President, at this point let me say that these nations have been working on this system for 150 years, and they know how to manipulate foreign trade. The American people are neophytes at that; and those in our own State Department who are attempting to manipulate foreign trade for us are worse than neophytes. Apparently they believe that ultimately this principle, if applied, will help the United States. I hope they are honest in that view, because if they are not the situation is even worse.

PLEDGES NULLIFIED

Mr. President, Richard B. Tucker, vice president of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., presented powerful points in opposition to this bill. I shall summarize those points. They were:

President Eisenhower, in transmitting to Congress his report on foreign economic policy, declared that any reductions in tariffs would be gradual, selective, and reciprocal, and that "across-the-board revisions of tariff rates would poorly serve our Nation's interest."

H. R. 6040 is an automatic, across-the-board, downward revision of tariff rates. It is not gradual, selective, or reciprocal. Reductions would be made with no study of the facts or of the effect upon industry, and would, in many cases, equal or exceed rate reductions made possible by H. R. 1 in any one year.

Peril-point determinations would be eliminated

PERIL-POINT PROVISION ONLY SHAM

Mr. President, at this point let me say that the peril-point provision of course was a farce, to begin with. It could be nothing else, because the State Department could or could not, as it chose, ask that a peril point be determined by the Tariff Commission. What would be a peril point, Mr. President? It would be a point at or below which the industry would be imperiled. That is the point at which a tariff should be imposed; in other words, a tariff should be imposed in order to provide for fair and reasonable competition.

Should the Tariff Commission be asked to determine the peril point; and should the State Department adopt the peril point recommendation of the Tariff Commission—which it rarely did—nevertheless, 10 minutes after the ink on the compact or trade agreement was dry, the foreign nation or nations concerned could change the value of their currency or currencies in relation to the United States dollar, and by that means and by other manipulative means they could nullify any such compact.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE JUGGLING LEAVES NO RECOURSE

We would have no recourse, because the agreement we signed would apply for 3 years. So, we have no recourse in case of a change in the effect of the compact or agreement by means of such manipulation.

Mr. President, the peril-point provision was a farce to begin with. I said that here on the floor of the Senate the year the peril-point provision was first conceived and was included in the bill; and of course that is what the peril-point provision proved to be.

To return to the points made by Mr. Tucker in opposition to H. R. 6040:

Industries to be sacrificed would receive no notice, no study, and no opportunity to be heard.

Elimination of the foreign value as the duty base would impair administration of the dumping statute.

Finally, as Mr. Tucker put it, the only real result of passage of H. R. 6040 would be to bring about across-the-board tariff reduction, which the President has condemned.

FIELD DAY OFFERED SCHEMING FOREIGN EXPORTERS

R. Houston Jewell, vice president of the Crystal Springs Bleachery, Chickamauga, Ga., and representing the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and Underwear Institute, declared:

> The bill invites foreign exporters as individuals to have a field day at the expense of the American treasury and American industry.
>
> It also specifically encourages foreign governments to continue the practices of trade discrimination and exchange manipulation which are the avowed enemies of world trade recovery and which for 10 years we have been struggling to overcome.
>
> Export bonuses, exchange retention certificates, the grants of export credits at rates lower than for other purposes, the conversion of dollar proceeds into national currency at rates above the market—all of these and many more devices influence directly, or determine, the market in which "export value" is determined.

In other words, the very manipulation of currency values and other manipulative practices for trade advantage that I have outlined so many times on the floor of the Senate.

COTTON INSTITUTE CHIEF LISTS SIX OBJECTIONS TO BILL

Mr. Jewell pointed out that imports of cotton piece goods increased 130 percent in the first quarter of 1955 over the first quarter of 1954. He listed six specific objections to the pending bill, which he said would—

First. Subordinate the tariff function to considerations of "easy" administration.

Second. Transfer the power of value determination to foreign exporters without the offset of legally dependable correctives.

Third. Establish a pattern of legalized price discriminations in international trade.

Fourth. Remove the factor of competition, whether national or international, from price determination.

Fifth. Establish dumping as a legalized practice, by removing the means of identifying it.

Sixth. Distort the dollar measurements of imports, thus crippling their use in trade analysis.

Mr. President, Mr. Harry A. Moss, executive secretary of the American Knit Handwear Association, testified that its members have lost 60 percent of its domestic market to imports, with commensurate loss of employment and production, and that because of higher labor costs, there is no export market for their products.

TAXPAYERS PAY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND WORLD PRICE

Of course, Mr. President, we have deliberately, over the years—23 years—of this deliberate inflation, priced ourselves out of all world markets. The only way we have to compete is to have the American taxpayer "pick up the check" for the difference between the United States price and the world price.

Mr. Moss called the bill "an unreciprocated gift to foreign producers."

WOOL EXECUTIVE SUGGESTS BILL BE GIVEN HONEST TITLE

Mr. President, Mr. Edwin Wilkinson, executive vice president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, declared the bill should not be called a customs simplification bill, but instead, should be called "a bill to reduce tariff revenues, reduce duties, emasculate the anti-dumping act of 1921, to amend currency conversion procedures and to prune obsolete provisions."

Albert C. Cramer of the Albany Felt Co., Albany, N. Y., representing it and the woven woolen felt industry, charged that the bill would have an immediate automatic effect of reducing tariffs on competitive imports 10 percent and on some products 20 percent. He pointed out that trade agreements and GATT already had cut the ad valorem rate 75 percent, and that prices charged by English mills for foreign export to the United States are 10 to 20 percent lower than the prices for the same product in the British domestic market.

TWO-PRICE CARTEL SYSTEM SHOWN

> England, France and Sweden are members of a European trade system that has a dual price system, one for exports and one for domestic sales.

He amplified.

> If H. R. 6040 is adopted the export price, not foreign price, will determine duty and American tariff protection will drop 10 to 20 percent.

I say again that these nations understand foreign trade, because they have lived by their wits for 150 years. Our people have been so solid and so sound for so long a time that for 23 years foreign nations have moved in to destroy us and divide the wealth. We can still exist. But I call attention to the fact that we are treading water economically. We are living on the $32 billion of the taxpayers' money appropriated annually for national defense. We are on a war economy.

INFLATION TRICK CANCELS OUT WAGE INCREASES

Only last week my own committee voted to raise the debt limit. We are on another cycle of inflation. We raise wages, and then we inflate the currency to lower wages. That is one of the oldest tricks in the trade. It is successful for a nation until the point is reached where pockets are not big enough to carry enough money to buy a plate of ham and eggs for breakfast. Then we write off everything and start over. It could happen here.

DINNERWARE IMPORTS INCREASE 300 AND 700 PERCENT

Lyle W. Jones, representing the United States Potters Association, called the pending bill an "open invitation to foreign exporters to specifically price goods for export to the United States and thus name their own low values on which duties are assessed. It removes the only readily available means of determining whether imported goods are being unloaded at dump prices," he added significantly.

Jones told the committee that imports of dinnerware have increased over 300 percent since 1947 and of China dinnerware more than 700 percent. The new GATT-engineered trade pact with Japan cut rates a further 5 to 25 percent, and the pending bill would give Japan another cut.

OTHER NATIONS RAISE TARIFFS WHILE OURS BEING LOWERED

Of course, Mr. President, we have been told for years that in order to hold friends and influence people we must divide our wealth with them. So long as we have a standard of living higher than they have, we cannot expect friends to stay with us. Now we have reached the stage where we are being blackmailed. Our so-called friends say, "You do this, or we will retaliate."

How are we going to meet this challenge when most of the foreign nations have already raised their tariffs, and have raised them while ours are being lowered? Currencies are being manipulated for trade advantage. There are exchange permits, and permits for imports and exports. To export our goods we must go to some foreign government bureau which, in turn, is under instructions from a higher official not to issue a permit if it would intefere with the production of that foreign country.

Previously on the floor of the Senate I have said that I am a great admirer of the British. I am a great admirer of any country which takes care of itself. I am a great admirer of the British on two counts. First, they have brains; and second, they are for England. We are the only nation on earth, so far, which breeds people who are not for it.

H. R. 6040 CALLED JOB EXPORT BILL

The Potters Association representative was one of several witnesses who pointed out that the bill violates the President's pledge that the program would be "gradual and selective."

Matthew H. O'Brien, secretary of the rayon and acetate fiber producers group, said:

> The only certainty in the bill is that it provides for the export of jobs in undetermined and uncertain numbers.

John Hilldring, vice president of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and president of General Aniline & Film Corp., declared:

> This bill would, by one stroke, bring about reductions in amounts of duty which in some cases would exceed the total amount of reductions in rates authorized under H. R. 1.

Further testimony on this point came from Richard F. Hansen, assistant to the president of the Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. He said:

> Average reductions on commodities actually affected would not be 2.5 percent (as claimed by the Treasury Department) but 15 percent in value, and not 2 percent but 12 percent in duties.

Mr. President, these and many other witnesses testified in opposition to H. R. 6040. Not one of their allegations or charges has been refuted by the Treasury Department.

Sponsors of the new tariff-reducing legislation have not and cannot challenge, for example, the testimony of Robert E. Canfield of the American Paper and Pulp Association that it would be possible under the construction of the proposed act "to reduce very substantially all ad valorem duties; and in fact it would be possible to eliminate them virtually entirely."

WOMAN TEXTILE DIRECTOR TESTIFIES AGAINST BILL

Nor can they challenge the testimony of Irene Blunt, executive director of the National Federation of Textiles, Inc.

Members of the federation operate 266 mills in 19 States. Of these mills 125 are located in the Southern States of Alabama, Georgia, North and South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. Forty-six are located in the New England States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, and 94 are located in the Middle Atlantic States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The industry employs 100,000 workers, and uses principally man-made fibers and silk in the production of fabrics.

Miss Blunt testified in part:

> Our branch of the textile industry is particularly affected by this change in the method of valuation since tariffs on textiles of man-made fibers and silk are almost exclusively assessed on ad valorem basis and since it is ad valerom tariffs which are affected by the proposed legislation.
>
> In terms of dollar imports as shown by the customs survey, synthetic fibers and manufactures were imported into the United States in 1954 at the rate of $25 million annually. The importation of synthetic fibers and manufactures is exceeded by only 4 other commodity groups of the 17 which would receive a valuation decrease of more than 4 percent.

In other words, although $25 million worth of synthetic fibers and manufactures are already imported into the United States, the proposed legislation, the Treasury witness testified, would reduce the valuation of this commodity group by at least 6.83 percent. This would naturally result in a decrease of existing tariffs on this commodity group and a corresponding increase of imports to the detriment of our industry and its 100,000 employees.

CONGRESS PUT ON NOTICE HOW BILL WOULD HURT 19 STATES

Mr. President, these 100,000 wage-earners who would be hurt are citizens, as Miss Blunt has testified, of the United States and of 19 States which I have listed above. The Treasury Department's own survey shows they will be hurt.

In other words, the Treasury Department has given notice, indirectly, that the interests of 19 States are to be adversely affected by this bill which the Department sponsors. The Senators from these States have been put on notice, and if they choose to support this bill they will know what they are doing.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND LABOR BEING SOLD DOWN RIVER

Mr. President, we are selling American industry, American investors, and American wage earners down the river.

Our foreign economic policy is directed toward prosperity and preferential privilege for foreigners and unemployment and distress for the producers of America.

We have abandoned the historic principle of economic independence and substituted for it international socialistic free trade.

We have swallowed the free-trade slogans hook, line, and sinker.

We have followed the socialistic free-trade leadership of such men as Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, V. Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, and Victor Perlo.

ALGER HISS TOP FREE-TRADE SPOKESMAN

Hiss was a free-trade specialist in the State Department in the late 1930's and official spokesman for the so-called Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade at hearings on the 1947 act to extend the Trade Agreements Act, held before the Senate Finance Committee.

His testimony will be found on pages 174 through 198 of the printed hearings. As chairman of the executive committee of this national organization, he opposed the peril point and the escape clause, which, of course, were a farce on their face in any case.

The organization contained many fine citizens, unwitting followers of the Hiss line, but unfamiliar with his Red contacts and connections.

Had they been familiar or had they had knowledge of Mr. Hiss' foreign interests, Mr. President, they would not have chosen him their spokesman before the Senate hearings. Of that I am sure. *But they did* place him at the head of their organization, and it is in the record.

INNOCENT CITIZENS DUPED BY FREE-TRADE SLOGANS

That is the trouble, Mr. President. Innocent people have listened to the pleasing slogants of free-trade Socialists and, worse, have been "brain washed" by them, if you please, and that goes also for some Members of this Congress.

Records show that Harry Dexter White, V. Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, and Victor Perlo were in the forefront of our free traders while employed by the Government.

All of them had a hand in shaping GATT, the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which has so recently put American industries on the auction block for the advantage of Japan.

Perlo, in addition, once served on the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which singles out the industries to be sacrificed to free trade and the markets to be turned over to foreign countries.

FREE-TRADERS INTENSIFY ATTACK ON UNITED STATES PRODUCERS MARKETS

The free trade conspiracy has continued now for 21 years, Mr. President, brain washing the American people and their lawmakers, and officials in the State and Treasury Departments with their labels and their slogans.

This year it has intensified its offensive against American industry, wage earners, and investors. This year it is attacking on all fronts and is making the most dangerous drive since 1934.

H. R. 1 extended the trade agreements program, adopted originally as an emergency measures, for 3 more years.

Comes now this new tariff-cutting bill disguised as a customs simplification measure which abandons all pretext of reciprocity, denies American industry notice or hearings, and cuts duties automatically and arbitrarily at the whim of the Executive branch and without even pretended negotiations with the benefited foreign countries.

UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES SINGLED OUT AS TARGETS IN LATEST GATT PACT

The recent trade pact with Japan was negotiated not by the State Department, dealing directly with our former enemy, but through GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Industries were singled out for destruction or partial destruction, among them chinaware and pottery, textiles, glassware, binoculars, microscopes, and telescopes, sewing machines, tuna, and shell fish, wallpaper and many others.

It was no accident, Mr. President. The favorite attack on the people of this Nation who seek to defend the workingmen and small investors is to call them high-tariff advocates. No one I know advocates a high tariff or a low tariff. They are for the American workingmen and small investors.

FLEXIBLE DUTY WAS SET IN 1930 TARIFF ACT

What they want is a flexible duty, as it is called in the Constitution, article I, section 8, based on fair and reasonable competition. The 1930 Tariff Act provided such a duty. It was not a high or a low tariff. The purpose was to meet, roughly, the difference of cost of production between our own wage standard of living, taxes, and other costs of doing business in this country, as compared with those of the chief competitive foreign nation on each product. Under this principle, as a foreign country raises its standard of living, the tariff or duty on that product goes down automatically as provided by Congress and carried out by its agent, the Tariff Commission. When a country's standard of living is about like ours, automatically free trade results.

PROTECTION OF JOBS, INVESTMENTS, INDUSTRIES SHOULD BE NATIONAL OBJECTIVE

Of course, that is the objective of everyone, namely, to protect and keep a country's people in business and to keep the people in their jobs and to protect their investments, and to keep that evener in effect until the foreign country raises its standard of living. Certainly we should not lower our own standard of living to an average world standard.

DISCREDITED ITO REVIVED UNDER NEW LABEL

The plot for an international trade organization, rejected 6 years ago, has been revived under a new label. Now it is to be called the International Organization for Trade Cooperation. Is that not a wonderful thing?

The State Department is trying to sell it to the Congress and in doing so have dropped the word "International." But it is international. It is to run GATT, and the State Department already has signed the OTC agreement at Geneva, just as it signed the ITO—International Trade Organization—charter at Havana, Cuba, in 1948, 2 years before the Congress turned it down.

They always sign first, hoping Congress will not catch up with them and hoping we will not understand it.

SLOGAN INVENTED TO AID DRIVE FOR NEW WORLD TRADE SCHEME

Now they are trying to sell OTC with slogans, as I stated earlier in my remarks. The Wall Street Journal, issue of May 25, 1955, carried an interesting article on this phase of the OTC campaign under the heading "Fight for 5550—Some Freetraders Try a Slogan in Battle To Let United States Join OTC—Trade-Pact Policing Unit Draws Support From Ike, Farm, Labor Groups—Many Lawmakers Opposed."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this interesting news article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fight for 5550—Some Freetraders Try a Slogan in Battle To Let United States Join OTC—Trade-Pact Policing Unit Draws Support From Ike, Farm, Labor Groups—Many Lawmakers Opposed

(By Philip Geyelin)

Washington.—If you're baffled by the initials "OTC" or "GATT," you're a prime target for a massive education campaign that's just been launched by some free-trade advocates in and out of the Government.

Their aim: To generate heat behind legislation to permit the United States to join an as yet unborn international setup entitled "Organization for Trade Cooperation"—otherwise known as OTC. The United States and 33 other nations have tentatively agreed to create OTC to police trade pacts negotiated under the equally awsome-sounding General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—or GATT.

PROTECTIONISTS OPPOSED

The United States is already a part of GATT, which is not an organization, but simply a multilateral agreement on tariff cuts and other trade concessions that GATT members agree to grant each other. However, Congress' approval is required for United States membership in OTC. Right now there's almost no chance of final action this year. Protectionist forces are fighting the scheme. So are such leading lawmakers as Virginia's Senator Harry Byrd who don't like the idea of Congress surrendering its grip on foreign trade matters to international bodies.

But OTC has influential friends, too. One of them is President Eisenhower, who thinks congressional refusal to sanction United States membership in OTC would "play directly into the hands of the Communists." Others include the AFL and CIO, some business organizations, such farm groups as the American Farm Bureau, and no less a legislative kingpin than Senator Walter George, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Not all OTC supporters are adamant on the subject, of course, but a lot of them are joining in a campaign to drum up enthusiasm for OTC.

FIGHTING FOR 5550

Evidence of their efforts crops up increasingly. Yesterday Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and for 40 years a Nebraska banker, returned to his native Midwest with this rallying cry: "Fight for 5550."

He derived the slogan from the number, H. R. 5550, assigned to the OTC bill in Congress, and was quick to admit it probably wouldn't take its place in history with Fifty-Four Forty or Fight, a United States slogan in the Oregon boundary dispute of the 1840's. (The United States did not succeed in establishing its boundary at the 54th parallel; nor did it fight.)

The new slogan's chances of catching on, Mr. Waugh asserted at a World Trade Week luncheon at Kansas City, would be much better if "intrinsic importance were the sole standard of public enthusiasm." He put his finger on one of OTC's major problems by noting "it is unlikely that any foreign economic proposal would be sufficiently exciting—or sufficiently understood—to be eligible for slogan treatment."

Diplomat Waugh wound up with an exhortation to free trade supporters "who care" about their cause to "take responsibility for helping bring about wider public understanding of OTC."

Just a few days earlier, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thorston V. Kalijarvi, made a similar pitch at a Philadelphia dinner of the Foreign Traders Association. "One of the big jobs ahead," he declared, "is to explain to the American people the importance of this organization (OTC) to stable world trade and therefore to the security and well-being of this country."

THE TOKYO POSITION

Only last week in Tokyo, over 1,000 delegates to the International Chamber of Commerce Convention went on record unanimously in favor of OTC, with a hefty push from the United States Council of the International Chamber. The United States Chamber of Commerce itself doesn't take a position on OTC; nor does the National Association of Manufacturers, on the ground that its members are hopelessly split on the issue. But the United States Council of I. C. C. includes many leading American trade associations and a lot of individual United States companies engaged in foreign trade and it has "strongly urged" Congress to okay United States participation in OTC.

There's no official connection, of course, between the events in Tokyo, Kansas City, and Philadelphia in recent days. But State Department officials make no secret that they're "doing everything we can legally do" to spur drumbeating for OTC by private groups. "We're trying to mobilize support for OTC," says one high official, adding somewhat ruefully: "But mobilizing free trade support for something like OTC isn't nearly as easy as stirring up the protectionists in opposition."

A TAFT'S POSITION

One group the Department is counting on for help is the Committee for a National Trade Policy, which represents one segment of free-trade opinion. Set up 2 years ago by businessmen, the committee claims 1,000 members; the president is Charles Taft, brother of the late Senator, and members of the board include John Coleman, head of the Burroughs Co., Chase Bank Chairman John J. McCloy, and Harry Bullis, president of General Mills.

Not all friends of free trade ideas are friends of OTC, of course. Some oppose OTC because they believe it could not by itself "free" trade and could decrease Congress' powers in the foreign trade field.

Through House hearings on OTC won't start for several weeks—and there's no assurance Senate Finance Committee Chairman Byrd will get around to hearings at all—the Committee for a National Trade Policy has already begun sending material on OTC to key Congressmen. Literature on the subject has also gone out to the committee's members, to trade associations, labor and farm groups and others. A special issue of the committee's bi-monthly publication, Trade Talk, was devoted recently to OTC.

Despite all this activity, State Department officials themselves concede that winning approval for OTC this year is going to be "darn difficult." The administration's real goal is House approval this year and Senate passage in 1956. Even this may prove troublesome; as one State Department man puts it: "Next year is an election year, and it may be harder then to get Congress to approve something as controversial as OTC."

One thing's certain; the administration will use its influence on Capitol Hill to keep OTC from coming to a vote at all, unless approval is assured. Government officials believe rejection of OTC would be a heavy "psychological blow" to GATT and the United States Reciprocal Trade program, which Congress is about to extend for another 3 years.

Suppose Congress simply does nothing about OTC? There's a sharp difference of opinion on just what that would mean, and to understand why requires a bit of background on OTC and GATT.

HOW THEY GREW

Congress first yielded up some of its authority over foreign trade in 1934, when it passed the Reciprocal Trade Act, giving the President authority to negotiate tariff cuts on foreign wares, in exchange for concessions from foreign countries on United States goods. At first such pacts were reached bilaterally—between just two countries. They included agreements on trade practices—such as promises not to nullify tariff cuts by slapping import quotas on foreign goods.

Finally, after World War II, the United States and other big trading nations decided the bilateral approach was too cumbersome; so they agreed in 1948 on a multilateral system, named GATT, which permitted many countries to join in one big trade agreement, covering all sorts of commodities; the present GATT agreement, recently revised in Geneva, lists 50,000 tariff concessions, and its signatories do about 80 percent of all world trade.

Congress, having lost some of its control over foreign trade through the Reciprocal Trade Act, never really liked the idea of GATT—and in successive extensions of the law Congress was careful to state it wasn't specifically authorizing, or forbidding, United States participation in GATT.

THE LAST STRAW?

Now the idea of a formal, permanent organization, OTC, to administer the GATT agreement strikes a lot of lawmakers as the last straw. OTC isn't supposed to determine tariff rates or establish trade rules; it's designed partly as a housekeeping agency, to handle complaints from GATT members of violations of the agreement and to sponsor periodic trade conferences to revise GATT and eliminate further trade restraints.

OTC advocates argue that United States businessmen who sell abroad will benefit from OTC simply because it will permit the United States Government to get faster action in cases where foreign countries discriminate against United States products in violation of GATT agreements. As it is now, the GATT members meet no more than once a year.

A lot of United States industries that are opposed to increased imports of competitive goods from abroad are naturally opposed to OTC. To the extent that it would promote tariff-cutting conferences, the organization would be likely to lead to more tariff cutting by the United States.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

But congressional opposition to OTC is also based on constitutional questions; the lawmakers are afraid that the authority of GATT and OTC might be broadened at some future date, giving an international body even more power over United States internal affairs, and giving Congress that much less authority.

Moreover, opponents argue that GATT has gotten along for 7 years without OTC, so no harm would be done by simply doing nothing about the new scheme.

State Department officials don't agree. They're prepared to argue that failure to approve OTC would have disastrous results. This is the line they'll take:

Pressure is already strong in Europe and elsewhere, the United States diplomats contend, for breaking up GATT. A lot of nations would prefer not to try to compete with the United States on equal terms or make reciprocal-trade concessions. Instead, these countries would just as soon organize smaller trade blocs, embracing Europe and the sterling area, for example. The result, as one official sees it: "Organized discrimination against United States products."

OVERSEAS ARGUMENT

If Congress doesn't pass OTC, says one State Department man, "the people in foreign countries who'd rather not compete with the United States anyway will have more influence with their governments; they'll be able to point to OTC's rejection as an example of just how willing the United States is to reduce trade barriers and promote freer trade. And the result will be revival of the sort of trade warfare that GATT was set up to eliminate."

The administration and private trade groups will throw plenty of statistics into the debate, too. Samples: Over 4 million United States jobs depend on United States exports and the transporting and first processing of imports; if all United States tariffs were reduced 50 percent from present levels, only 200,000 workers at the most would be idled because of competition from foreign goods; roughly 5 percent of all the goods and services produced in the United States are marketed abroad—some $18 billion worth last year.

Whether such figures will impress Senator Byrd and like-minded lawmakers is hard to predict. Chances are they won't be won over quickly. Already this year, one administration official notes, Mr. Eisenhower has urged Congress to pass a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act this session, broadening his tariff-cutting powers; to simplify customs regulations, which would have the effect of reducing duties a bit; to approve a trade agreement with the Philippines in which the United States makes important concessions.

"Throwing in OTC may be asking Congress to swallow too much free trade in 1 year," this official observes. He adds, however, that this won't stop OTC proponents from trying to coax down one more morsel.

STOP SOCIALIST FREE TRADE CONSPIRACY BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, when is the Congress going to put a stop to this socialistic free trade conspiracy which is gnawing at our economy?

When are we going to stand up for American industry, American investors and American wage earners instead of supporting foreign finance, foreign labor, and foreign industrial cartels?

When are we going to follow our commonsense instead of silly slogans invented by the State or Treasury Departments?

When are we going to put American interests above the ambitions of foreign competitors?

I say the time is now before it is too late.

SENATOR DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN SMALL AND LARGE INVESTORS

When I speak of small investors and large investors, for the purpose of the debate I shall define those terms. I call small investors any investors who are of such a size or of such a disposition that they cannot or will not go behind the low-wage curtain and establish competitive enterprises there, whether it be manufacturing, mining, or farming.

Large investors, for the purpose of this debate, are investors who are large enough or of such a nature that they can go behind the low-wage curtain, establish production there, and ship their products into this country without a duty or tariff evening the wage standard of living costs of this country and the lower taxes and costs of doing business in the competitive foreign country.

SCHEME TO LOWER INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN-EARNED INCOME PENDING

There is one other dangerous thing in the Senate Finance Committee. I suppose it will be pressed, even though it is late in the session. The only chance it will have to get out is that the people might think Senators are not paying proper attention to the debate. I have reference to lowering the income tax on foreign-earned income from 52 to 38 percent. That would be the last straw.

Mr. President, this would be an invitation to go behind the low-wage curtain and use low-wage labor with low taxes and so bring in the income at a reduced rate over the domestic-earned income.

EXPATRIATE INDUSTRIALISTS OUTSMART THEMSELVES

Who would invest in the United States of America? It seems to me that these people, smart as they are, who run these industries in foreign countries, are outsmarting themselves, because every man, woman, and child with a job in this country is a potential purchaser of an automobile, a washing machine, a radio, and a hundred and one other things which go to make up the comfort of the people of this Nation. Persons in foreign nations who receive 50 cents a day are not in the market for those products.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT BEFORE MORE MILLS AND FACTORIES CLOSE DOWN

Mr. President, the time to act is before more American plants and factories, mines, and mills are closed down; before more tens of thousands of our industrious citizens are thrown out of work, before more of our markets are taken over by the products of low-wage, low-living-standard foreign labor, working in foreign plants subsidized by American taxpayers.

Mr. President, peace and prosperity are to be an important campaign slogan in the coming year.

How can we support legislation to destroy industrial peace and ruin our commercial prosperity while boasting that we are for peace and prosperity?

DON'T TRADE NATURAL PROSPERITY FOR IMPOVERISHED ONE ECONOMIC WORLD

Why tear down what we are so proud of having built and of our forefathers having built? Why trade a rich America for a poverty-stricken one economic world?

Mr. President, we have caused enough harm in this session already by our free-trade actions without compounding the damage we have inflicted on wage earners, investors, and American industries.

Mr. President, diverting at that point, we have now been able to build Washington to the point where the contracts for a $32 billion national defense plant are being doled out. Many of the industrial heads know that this is not a healthy situation, but they also know that if they come out against it their contracts or proposed contracts or the contracts they hope to secure will fade out of the picture.

SUIT CHALLENGING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 1934 TRADE ACT GATT CITED

Mr. President, there is a case in the Federal courts at this time questioning the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the Geneva General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. Industries of this country that are being destroyed should be filing briefs in this suit. Why do they not file briefs? Because they know that would be the end of the hopes they have to get a contract out of the $32 billion. That is why.

My advice to them would be to fight while they are able to fight, before they are destroyed.

CONGRESS SHOULD PUT END TO PUNISHMENT OF UNITED STATES PRODUCERS AND TAXPAYERS

Mr. President, the destructive Trade Agreements Act has been extended for 3 years. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was given the job of selling out many of our industries and markets to Japan. Should not that be enough punishment for our producers and our taxpayers?

What folly could prompt us to vote for a new tariff-cutting bill such as H. R. 6040, when we have already cut tariffs up to 75 percent through GATT and authorized the executive branch to make further cuts of 15 percent?

What folly could prompt us to vote for this new ITO, now called OTC, in which the United States would have 1 vote of the 35, the same voting strength that would be enjoyed by Communist Czechoslovakia?

UNCLE SAM SUPPLIES POT IN GENEVA GATT SUCKER GAME

Mr. President, on the Senate floor I have previously described the sucker poker game going on at Geneva, with 35 members, the United States being the only one contributing any money or markets to the pot, with 34 boosters in the fight to divide the markets of this Nation.

1934 TRADE ACT ILLEGALLY AMENDED CONSTITUTION

Mr. President, how did that come about? Let us look at it a moment.

First, the Constitution of the United States of America places in the legislative branch the regulation of foreign trade, the regulation of our national economy, and the fixing of duties, imposts, and excises which we call tariffs. The legislative branch, without further ado, in 1934 transferred that constitutional responsibility to the Executive.

We amended the Constitution of the United States by a simple act of Congress, and the President then proceeded, in 1947, by Executive order, to transfer that constitutional responsibility of Congress which was transferred to him by a simple act of Congress, to the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, 3,000 miles away, where there are 35 votes, we having 1 vote—1 sucker with the markets, against 34 boosters. That is a Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance play. That is all it is. It is very simple.

SUPREME COURT WILL MAKE FINAL DECISION IN CONSTITUTIONALITY TEST CASE

We have not had guts enough on the Senate floor to stop it, so there is now in the Federal courts a case to be decided, and we shall see what the judge says. This suit, regardless of who wins it, will go to the circuit court of appeals. It will then go to the Supreme Court to decide whether it shall stay in court. If the judges rule that it shall stay in, the evidence which will be produced will dumbfound the United States. It is the greatest constitutional test case since the Blue Eagle, and like the Blue Eagle case involves an unconstitutional delegation of power.

It is the most important issue in the United States today, and still we continue to follow the method of doling out and dividing the wealth of our country on a worldwide socialistic principle. We not only divide our wealth by taxing our people, and by sending aid all over the world to every foreign nation, but we are now dividing the source—the markets of the United States of America.

Mr. President, in the Organization for Trade Cooperation the British Commonwealth would have 9 votes against 1 of ours. Continental Europe would have 12 votes, exclusive of the British Commonwealth.

PUT AMERICA FIRST, NOT EUROPE, ASIA

Mr. President, I was simply describing that sucker poker game in which we sit down and furnish the money. We have 1 vote out of 34.

It is time to stop this nonsense of putting Europe and Asia first, of giving them preference and priority in American markets over the United States of America.

DEFEAT H. R. 6040 AND REJECT OTC SCHEME

We can begin putting the brakes on by defeating the new tariff-cutting bill, H. R. 6040.

We can apply the brakes further by rejecting the State Department's new international trade scheme, OTC, which is a resurrected ITO.

OTC is a reorganized General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If we accept it, we approve GATT. If we do not accept it, GATT goes on. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade goes on. It is a very clever operation.

STANDING UP FOR AMERICA WILL STOP TREND TO WORLD SOCIALISM

We should start being for America, just as Englishmen are for England. We had better begin soon, if the economy of America is to be saved.

We must stop the headlong rush into world socialism through the division of our markets and our wealth with the nations of the world.

REGULATION OF PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS BY PUBLIC UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke in connection with the introduction of a bill which sought to give to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia power to regulate the payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia.

The bill became lost between my desk and the clerk's desk. It is not shown in the Record as having been officially introduced.

Therefore, I now offer the bill and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the permanent Record, at the close of my remarks on the bill yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2555) to authorize the public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR NEELY TO JOHN L. LEWIS, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the evening of the 12th of July the National Broadcasting Co. carried an hour's program entitled "Biography in Sound," featuring the life of Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America. The junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Neely] participated briefly in that program. His contribution consisted of an excerpt from a recorded eulogy of Mr. Lewis which the Senator recently delivered. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the eulogy be printed in the body of the Record.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia for this tribute to a great labor leader.

Without objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the 12th of February will forever be notable in American history because it is the day on which Abraham Lincoln, one of the greatest Presidents of the United States, and John L. Lewis, the greatest president of the United Mine Workers of America, were born. These both came to earth after the manner of the Man of Galilee, to give more abundant life to the children of men. Mr. Lincoln rendered priceless service to the crusade for the emancipation of an enslaved race. Mr. Lewis has long rendered and is still rendering priceless service not only to a half million American coal miners, but to all the toiling men and women of the Nation and the world.

One and thirty of the most momentous years of all the ages have passed away since it became my good fortune to become intimately acquainted with President Lewis. Our meeting was occasioned by his testifying before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which it was then my privilege to be a member. His impressive testimony was befittingly in favor of reformatory legislation for labor.

During these past 31 fleeting years the friendship between Mr. Lewis and me has been as dear to my heart as the scenes of my childhood; it has been as sincere as that between David and Jonathan; it has been as constant as the Northern Star.

During this epoch Mr. Lewis' labors have been Herculean, manifest and manifold. His most amazing characteristic is picturesquely indicated by the beloved Walt Mason in the following lines:

"There's a man in the world who is never
turned down,
Wherever he chances to stray;
He gets the glad hand in the populous town,
And out where the farmers make hay.
He's greeted with pleasure on deserts of
sand,
And far in the aisles of the woods;
Wherever he goes, there's a welcoming
hand—
He's the man who delivers the goods."

John L. Lewis has long been this preeminent man.

Let me specify just a few of the particulars that make up the foregoing generalization. Among countless other things, Mr. Lewis has in the years of our acquaintance rendered unsurpassable service to the United States and the liberty-loving of the world by serving during our greatest crisis as a member of the National Council of Defense. This agency, for many weary months, without slumber or sleep effectually helped the forces of freedom to win the First World War.

On too many other occasions to specify, Mr. Lewis has patriotically and generously rendered outstanding service to his country. As president of the United Mine Workers, he has obtained for that great organization the best miner's contract ever written. He has established for the United Mine Workers the best welfare fund ever provided for those who live by toil. He has given the American coal miner the highest standard of living the miners have ever enjoyed since God first said, "Let there be light." Mr. Lewis has long been active and successful in promoting the welfare of labor in many other countries besides our own.

A thousand other achievements of this outstanding man deserve not only mention but commendation and emulation. But the red hand of the clock admonishes me that there is no time for additional exposition. Therefore, let me conclude with the declaration that my gratitude to the matchless and inimitable John L. Lewis is much greater than the power of expression of either my tongue or pen. The fond recollection of the service he has generously rendered me and the friendship with which he has graciously blessed me will be—

"A rainbow to my storms of life,
The evening beam that smiles the clouds
away,
And tints tomorrow with prophetic ray."

John, my very dear friend, it is my fervent hope that goodness and mercy will follow you all the days of your life, and that you will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

THE ILLNESS OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on Monday I placed in the Record certain editorials published in Texas newspapers concerning the unfortunate illness of my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record additional editorials published in the Fort Worth Press, the Austin Statesman, the Gatesville Messenger, the Texarkana Gazette, the San Angelo Standard-Times, the El Paso Herald-Post, and the San Antonio Light.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Press of July 6, 1955]

Lyndon Johnson

It is ironic that Lyndon Johnson was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a "natural" as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. Johnson earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics.

A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive departments "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about Lyndon Johnson.

An urbane, wise and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. Johnson has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. Johnson's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the loyal opposition. To the contrary, there is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. Johnson's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart atack. His physicians say that Senator Johnson will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the Austin Statesman]

LYNDON'S ILLNESS NOT YET FOR ASSUMPTIONS

The sudden illness of Texas' senior Senator LYNDON JOHNSON from a heart condition which is described as serious and may prevent him from functioning as Democratic leader in the Senate for some time is regrettable and unfortunate, both for the Senator, the slim Democratic Senate majority, and it must be emphasized for the country.

Approaching the zenith of a career which has been remarkable for the assertion of qualities of national leadership recognized all over the country, Senator JOHNSON of late had been increasingly mentioned as a highly qualified potential candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

The possibility of such a climax to his career could be affected adversely by a heart condition unless a rigorous period of enforced rest and inactivity combined with a virile physical reserve would produce results that would enable him energetically to continue his leadership and bear up under increasing responsibilities.

The Senator's illness has introduced a new complex in the national and State political scene where he has been a moderating factor.

Texas politics at times can be turbulent indeed. The Senator has been able to exercise an influence of moderation by refusing to become partisanly identified on either side of the rival groups while working to achieve a composite of attitude by both that would not impair the Texas Democratic Party's ability to project unity in the forthcoming 1956 elections.

Some of the talk about the changed political picture resulting from Senator JOHNSON's illness has been highly speculative and to a considerable extent fails to make any real contribution to the best interests of the State, the party, or the national program.

The Senator is still Senator and in all fairness must be accorded his place in the present picture until and unless events which the vast majority of Texans would join in regretting deeply take him actively out of the picture. This would be a loss to the State and it can be added in all truth the Nation as well.

Happily there is no present indication of such a withdrawal. Senator JOHNSON still is a major factor in the party's national leadership and in seeking to compose, for the great and popular good, the stresses, tensions, and animosities that have crept into the Texas Democratic Party.

Until there is reason for it it would be seemly to reject with finality any suggestion or assumption that the Senator is other than he is, an ill man who has overworked himself in the responsibility of national leadership, must have rest, and will respond to it.

[From the Gatesville Messenger]

JOHNSON ILLNESS SETBACK FOR TEXAS

Coryell County leaders read with alarm of the heart attack that has sidelined Texas' senior Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. The sooner the brilliant Senate majority leader can regain his health and resume his Washington work, the better it will be for this county and this State—and the Nation as a whole.

JOHNSON, whose political star is in its ascendancy and who is recognized as one of the most powerful figures in Washington, has never lost interest in and regard for the people whom he represents in the Nation's highest legislative body, and Texans have come to recognize him as the man to contact when something needs to be done in Washington. There's many a Gatesville and Coryell County resident who can testify that every request for help receives JOHNSON's sympathetic consideration and effective assistance. JOHNSON has proven himself a friend in need and in deed to this area.

Texas needs this great champion of the State and its people at his post in the Senate in vigorous health. We can only hope that such will be the situation in the not too distant future.

[From the Bellville Times of July 7, 1955]

ROUNDUP

The serious illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is a cause of great concern to the Nation. What is especially interesting and heartening is the evident respect members of the opposition party have for Senator JOHNSON. As majority leader of the Upper House in Congress, the tall Texan wields tremendous influence and for his work to go far beyond and above party lines, means he has the qualities of statesmanship. The Nation hopes for his early recovery.

[From the Texarkana Gazette of July 4, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

News that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic majority leader, has been stricken with a heart attack and will be incapacitated for the remainder of the congressional session will be received with grave concern not only by his constituents in Texas but by the Nation as a whole.

Senator JOHNSON has demonstrated that he is a power in the Senate and the key to much constructive legislation that must or should be enacted at this session of Congress.

His illness points up the fact that men in his position are under almost unbearable pressure. In our infrequent visits to his office in Washington, we have seen him talking over two telephones at the same time while conferring with constituents and receiving reports from the Senate floor. We are not surprised that he has overdone himself.

Senator JOHNSON is a man of tremendous energy and great legislative skill. We have been impressed with his middle-of-the-road tactics and his apparent determination to keep the welfare of the Nation above partisan politics.

We wish him a speedy recovery for he will be sorely missed in the Senate.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times of July 5, 1955]

EVEN "TAKING IT EASIER," JOHNSON INFLUENCE LARGE

While the illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is considered by many a grave blow to hopes for northern-southern Democratic Party harmony, there is no reason to write the Senator off. A heart attack can be a temporary thing if the person so afflicted has the will to live and to resort to the disciplines of life that are demanded.

A heart malady is a grave thing, frequently brought on by long hours of hard labor, taking the problems of office to bed with one, and ignoring the routines of physical checkups at intervals of a year or more.

Senator JOHNSON has been much in the public eye because he was getting more done as the majority party leader in the Senate than any other leader in recent years. He could be compared only to the best ever to hold that job. He was mentioned as a presidential or vice presidential candidate because of the excellent job he has been doing. This talk may, in itself, have stimulated more activity on the part of the tall Texan, than his heart would bear.

At any rate the fate of Senator JOHNSON rests more with himself than any other person. If he takes this as a warning and operates within the limits of his physical capacity, he can undoubtedly recover his health to render vast service to his country and his party.

[From the El Paso Herald Post of July 6, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

It is too bad that LYNDON JOHNSON was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a "natural" presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Senator JOHNSON earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble-rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about LYNDON JOHNSON.

A wise and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. JOHNSON has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON's Democratic Party has gained stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the "loyal opposition." There is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. JOHNSON's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator JOHNSON will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will hope for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the San Antonio Light of July 7, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

The unfortunate illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON strikes at a most inopportune moment. In the 84th Congress, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas has been the leader—one might say—of the Republicans as well as his own party.

His support of President Eisenhower has been more effective than that of any Republican.

His opposite number on the Republican side, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, has often been opposed to the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration, but JOHNSON, Democrat, has been a tower of strength to the President, who is also a Republican.

This is not usual except in wartime.

LYNDON JOHNSON, in recent months, has often been mentioned as the probable Democratic candidate for President.

Democrats who have been concerned over the defection of Texas in 1952 have regarded JOHNSON as a gift from heaven, a Texan with an exceptionally good record in Congress.

It was believed that his nomination for Vice President was inevitable, if Gov. Averell Harriman of New York were nominated for the Presidency. Such a combination, it was believed by practical politicians, would strengthen the Democratic Party in both States and might win a difficult election.

The toll that congressional work takes out of those who really tend to business is greater than the people realize.

It can only be hoped that the present illness of Senator JOHNSON is not the end of a brilliant and useful career.

HELLS CANYON BILL PROVIDES BEST PROTECTION TO IDAHO UPSTREAM WATER RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer my apologies to my colleagues, to the employees of the Senate, and to the members of the press for finding it necessary to make a brief speech at this late hour. However, I am in a situation in which others of my colleagues sometimes find themselves. I had expected to make the speech very much earlier today. It is a speech which has been mimeographed and sent to the press gallery, and has been made available to the Oregon press. Therefore, in fairness to those to whom the speech has already been released, I have no other course of action than to deliver it tonight. I shall do so just as quickly as possible.

The speech is entitled "Hells Canyon Bill Provides Best Protection to Idaho Upstream Water Rights."

The Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and most recently an examiner of the Federal Power Commission have declared after intensive study that the high Hells Canyon Dam would provide the best development of the Middle Snake River as it runs between Idaho and Oregon. In addition, they agree that it would contribute to the maximum multipurpose benefits to the full use of the rich water resources of the Columbia River Basin.

There has been a great deal of propaganda inspired by the Idaho Power Co. that the Hells Canyon Dam should not be built, that a new economic era for the Pacific Northwest should not be opened, because the dam allegedly would imperil present and future irrigation in Idaho.

This rebuttal, which I present in the form of a legal argument, is recommended to the special attention of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who has expressed concern over the water rights aspect of the Hells Canyon project.

I spoke to the Senator from Utah earlier this evening about the argument I am now presenting, because I thought it was only fair to him that he should know that I intended to present this argument. He very graciously told me that it was perfectly satisfactory to him for me to present my argument in his absence, and that he would read it in the RECORD tomorrow and make any comment in the future on the subject that he might decide to make.

The Senator from Utah has presented arguments heretofore in which he has expressed great concern about the Hells Canyon Dam project from the standpoint of the alleged effects it might have on the water rights of upstream users. I have prepared this legal argument in rebuttal of the argument of those who entertain the fear that the Hells Canyon Dam bill would, in some way, jeopardize the legal rights of upstream users of water.

TESTIMONY CONCLUSIVE THAT WATER SUFFICIENT FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

Expert testimony was given before the Federal Power Commission and the Senate reclamation subcommittee that stream-flow studies show there is sufficient water to supply the 3,880,000 acre-feet of Hells Canyon storage without denying an acre-foot of water needed in Idaho for irrigation from the Snake River Basin.

This is the conclusion of fact reached by the FPC examiner after a year of hearings. It is his finding No. 116:

> With ample allowance for all foreseeable upstream irrigation water uses, a dependable water supply can reasonably be expected for the efficient and economic operation of the High Dam project during its payout period.

This conclusion was supported by the testimony of Bureau of Reclamation experts before the reclamation subcommittee this spring.

That testimony was based upon studies of the most adverse streamflows. It is reinforced when the following fact is taken into account: The Hells Canyon Reservoir would not be refilled anew each year. Once it is filled only small amounts of water would be required to maintain the 3,880,000 acre-feet required for maximum operation.

S. 1933 GIVES IRONCLAD PRIORITY TO UPSTREAM

The physical fact that there is adequate water for the operation of the high Federal dam and all planned irrigation should set to rest any of the emotional fears that Idaho irrigation is imperiled. Indeed, the maximum future irrigation upon which the studies were based would take many decades to achieve.

To remove all fears, section 2 of S. 1333, the Hells Canyon Dam bill, provides:

> The operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be only such as does not conflict with present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing valid under State Law, of the upstream waters of the Snake River and its tributaries.

I submit most respectfully that no more ironclad protection could be provided to insure the upstream irrigation—and that is the only kind involved—will have an absolute priority over all other uses of the waters of the Snake.

This provision, incidentally, is far stronger than the corresponding provision of the Hells Canyon bill, S. 3556, introduced by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] in 1950. Listen to what the Senator from Idaho provided in his own bill with regard to the matter of upstream water:

> The operation of Hells Canyon Dam and Reservoir for the generation of power shall be without prejudice to future depletion of stream flows arising from upstream diversions for beneficial consumptive uses under water rights established under State laws in a total amount which are determined to be reasonable, having regard for the upstream beneficial consumptive use of water for the new and supplemental land developments indicated in chapter IV of the Substantiating Materials, Hells Canyon Project Report, approved by the Acting Secretary of the Interior June 9, 1948.

Mr. President, I ask you to compare the language of my bill with the language of the Dworshak bill. I think the conclusion is inevitable that the language of my bill is more ironclad in the protection of the upstream users than is the Dworshak bill.

There has been an attempt to place in doubt the effectiveness of section 2 of the present bill by using a memorandum dated March 23, 1954, provided by the Legislative Reference Service to the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman BUDGE. That memorandum appears in the Senate hearings on S. 1333, at pages 29–39.

In fact, that legal analysis supports the contention that the Hells Canyon bill provides the maximum legislative protection to upstream water rights.

It is not a memorandum that justifies the conclusion that upstream users are in any way jeopardized by S. 1333. I would have the Senate keep in mind the fact that the analysis which was prepared by the Library of Congress was of H. R. 4648 in the 83d Congress.

That was identical to my bill, S. 1664 in the 83d Congress. Section 2 of S. 1333 of this Congress is the same in legal effect as section 2 of my bill, S. 1664 in the 83d Congress. The language has been streamlined to eliminate repetitiousness, and, if anything, it is clearer.

The Library of Congress report reads:

> We are unable to state that the language of these bills would not protect both present and future diversions. It would protect such diversions to the extent that other areas are now similarly protected by similar provisions. Such protection, as we have heretofore indicated, is not absolute, and cannot be absolute, because of the constitutional powers of Congress that are involved.

In the remaining part of my argument, I am going to comment on these constitutional powers of Congress, but I wish to dwell for just a moment on what the report of the Library of Congress stated, because as we listen to the opponents of my bill on the upstream water-rights matter, they seek to give the Senate the impression that the research department of the Library of Congress has found my bill defective in this regard. To the contrary, the report on which they rely points out that my bill gives protection that is given in other laws in respect to similar projects. The only thing on this issue that is not settled by my bill, because it cannot be settled by any bill, is the matter of the constitutional powers of Congress. Mr. President, you cannot legislate away those constitutional powers.

Thus, I say there can be no justification for opponents of the Hells Canyon bill asking for more protection for upstream water rights than is presently given "other areas similarly protected by similar provisions." Indeed, S. 1333 gives more protection than does legislation governing similar projects. Moreover, the Pacific Northwest has abundant water supply, whereas other areas with similar projects have water-scarcity problems.

The next argument of the opponents of my bill on the water-rights issue is that we ought to have an interstate compact. I wish to say—and I speak most respectfully about this—in my judgment that is a dilatory tactic, because an interstate compact could accomplish no more for upstream users than my bill would protect.

AN INTERSTATE COMPACT COULD DO NO MORE

Despite the fact that there is no problem of water scarcity in the Snake River Basin and that S. 1333 provides complete protection and priority for upstream-water use, the argument is made that the Congress, in the absence of a controlling interstate compact, could eliminate that protection.

This implies that Congress would be guilty of bad faith at some future time. I suggest that this argument is highly fanciful. The Congress of the United States deserves greater confidence than that. But, the opponents counter:

> Let us make sure. An interstate compact with the required approval of the Congress would prevent any future Congress from changing the water-use priorities contained in such a compact.

As a matter of law, that just is not the case. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a memorandum prepared by the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service on this issue.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

To: Hon. WAYNE MORSE.
From: James P. Radigan, Jr., senior specialist in American law.
Subject: Amendability and revocability of interstate compacts with particular reference to the distribution of water.

Subject to congressional consent, amendment of a compact is a matter for the decision of the contracting States. (*Henderson* v. *Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission* ((1949) 66 A. 2d 843, 848, cert. denied, 338 U. S. 850).) An agreement solemnly entered into between States by those who alone have political authority to speak for the State cannot be unilaterally nullified; nor is it to be given its final meaning by an organization of one only of the contracting States. (*West Virginia ex rel. Dyer* v. *Sims* ((1951) 341 U. S. 22).) While Congress may refuse consent to a compact it has no authority to vary its terms. (*Green* v. *Biddle* ((1823) 8 Wheat. 1, 37).) Congress, however, may condition its consent. (See 41 Stat. 1447 and 45 Stat. 300.)

On the other hand, compacts between States cannot diminish the power of the Congress to improve waterways, *South Carolina* v. *Georgia* ((1876) 93 U. S. 4), nor diminish the power of Congress to pass acts pursuant to any other constitutional powers granted, otherwise a compact between two States might annul a constitutional power granted the Federal Government. (*Wilson* v. *Mason* ((1801) 1 Cr. 45, 91–92).) Occupation of a delegated field by Congress is conclusive of any contrary State right. (*Wisconsin* v. *Duluth* ((1877) 96 U. S. 379, 387); *Green Bay and Mississippi Canal Co.* v. *Patten Paper Co.* ((1898) 172 U. S. 58, 81).) And this is true even with respect to rights under a compact entered into prior to the adoption of the Constitution. (*South Carolina* v. *Georgia*, supra; see *Missouri* v. *Illinois & Chicago District* ((1901) 180 U. S. 208, 228).)

While an interstate compact may not be modified by direct amendment or inconsistent subsequent legislation of a State, *Green* v. *Biddle*, supra; *Hawkins* v. *Barry* ((1831) 5 Pet. 457, 464); *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.* ((1852) 13 How. 518, 565); *Missouri* v. *Illinois* ((1906) 200 U. S. 496, 519); *Virginia* v. *West Virginia* ((1921) 220 U. S. 1); and *Olin* v. *Kitzmiller* ((1922) 259 U. S. 260), it may be modified by inconsistent Federal legislation when within the field of a delegated power. (*Wilson* v. *Mason*, supra, and *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.* ((1855) 18 How. 421, 433).)

Compacts with reference to the distribution of water are likely to fall into the category of compacts which might be affected by subsequent Federal legislation enacted under the commerce clause. These compacts will control distribution, notwithstanding water rights of claimants granted before the State entered into the compact. (*Hindenlider* v. *La Plata River & C. Creek Ditch Co.* ((1938) 304 U. S. 92).)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would stress the conclusion of the memorandum which reads:

> While an interstate compact may not be modified by direct amendment or inconsistent subsequent legislation of a State, *Green* v. *Biddle*, supra; *Hawkins* v. *Barry* ((1831) 5 Pet. 457, 464); *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.* ((1852) 13 How. 518, 565); *Missouri* v. *Illinois* ((1906) 200 U. S. 496, 519); *Virginia* v. *West Virginia* ((1921) 220 U. S. 1); and *Olin* v. *Kitzmiller* ((1922) 259 U. S. 260), it may be modified by inconsistent Federal legislation when within the field of a delegated power. (*Wilson* v. *Mason*, supra and *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.* ((1855) 18 How. 421, 433).)

The report goes on to say it may be modified by inconsistent Federal legislation when within the field of delegated power, citing cases in support thereof.

Mr. President, let me dwell on that for just a minute as to its legal meaning. It means that a so-called interstate compact could not possibly take away from the Congress its constitutional power to modify a compact subsequent to its adoption, by inconsistent Federal legislation, provided that legislation falls within the field of a delegated power.

So I say most respectfully to my opponents, do not answer me with the argument that we ought to have an interstate compact before we vote to build Hells Canyon Dam because an interstate compact cannot take away from the Congress of the United States its constitutional power to act within the sphere of its delegated power by the passing of legislation sometime in the future which may be inconsistent with the terms of the compact.

This conclusion was obviously shared by the drafters of the proposed Columbia Basin Interstate compact. The proposed compact, which was ratified this year by the Idaho Legislature, but which could not be adopted in the States of Oregon and Washington, specifically conditions the operation and duration of the compact not only upon congressional approval, but, in addition, upon independent legislation incorporating the provisions of the section on water rights. It provides that when and if such a law is repealed, the compact would thereafter be inoperative. Section VII D of the compact provides:

> This compact shall become effective only if Federal law accepting and implementing the provisions of subdivision A of this article with respect to developments wholly or partly in downstream States constructed by or under the authority of the United States is enacted as part of the legislation giving the consent of the Congress to this compact and shall continue to be operative only while such law remains in effect.

There could hardly be a clearer recognition that Congress would retain under the compact the power to alter or amend the disposition of water rights contained in the compact.

I see in this body tonight a very distinguished lawyer from a Western State, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and I know of the open-minded fairness with which he has approached the Hells Canyon issue. If I were a Senator of the United States and a member of the bar coming from a State outside of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, I would pay great attention to the issue as to whether or not the building of this dam will in any way destroy upstream water rights.

Therefore, I wish particularly to direct his attention to what I consider to be the fallacy of an argument of the opponents of Hells Canyon Dam, namely the contention of those who believe that, someway, somehow, upstream water rights would be threatened by Hells Canyon Dam. In my argument here, I wish to stress, for the benefit of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], that the upstream water rights would not be strengthened by any interstate compact, insofar as concerns the power of a future Congress to pass legislation inconsistent with the compact, when it comes to the exercise of a power within its delegated authority.

Yet, Mr. President, again—as sort of a diversionary-tactic argument I believe—we hear some of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate argue that Oregon and Washington should agree to a compact similar to the one which Idaho has already adopted. But they do not stop to point out to the Senate that this very compact recognizes in its own language the constitutional authority of future Congresses to pass legislation inconsistent with the compact, if in the exercise of the delegated power a future Congress should decide so to do.

I repeat that the part of the compact which reads "shall continue to be operative only while such law remains in effect" is the proof of the argument I have just made.

PROPOSED COMPACT PROTECTION LESS BROAD THAN S. 1333

Mr. President, it should also be pointed out that the proposed compact, already approved by the State of Idaho, provides the selfsame kind of protection for upstream water diversion as does S. 1333, and no more. Section VII–A reads in a pertinent part:

> No apportionment of waters or determination of rights to the use thereof is made by this compact.

I repeat that part of the quotation, Mr. President:

> No apportionment of waters or determination of rights to the use thereof is made by this compact.

I read further:

> Rights to beneficial consumptive uses within the upstream area, whether established heretofore or hereafter prior to the controlling date, under the laws of the States

> involved, if validly established under those laws, shall be recognized as against, and shall not be limited by, any rights existing or future to such waters for nonconsumptive uses by means of developments located wholly or partly within a member downstream State whether the rights to such nonconsumptive uses are established under the laws of a member State or are being asserted under the authority of the United States in connection with any water use or control development constructed by or under the authority of the United States, subject to these provisions and limitations.

But that protection would last only until the year 2000. Thereafter, the apportionment of water use and rights would be the subject of negotiation. Clearly that negotiation, if it results in agreement, could provide less protection for water use in Idaho.

Mr. President, when negotiations are opened up under the compact it does not follow that the negotiations will result in more protection. They might conceivably result in less protection.

Negotiations under the compact draft must be complete by the year 2000. Any extension of the time must be by unanimous vote of all State representatives. Idaho is supposedly fearful that the downstream States of Oregon and Washington have designs upon upstream water use. If that is so, it is clear that the compact provision gives Oregon and Washington a veto power on future negotiation. If negotiations were unsuccessful by the year 2000, there would be no further compact "protection" for future water use in Idaho.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that, really, the language of my bill gives much greater protection to upstream water users than they could get under the proposed compact.

COMPACT NEED A "FEAR" ARGUMENT

The alleged superiority of the compact approach is clearly nonexistent because of constitutional principles and the shortcomings of the compact itself.

S. 1333, the Hells Canyon bill, not only provides the best hope for development of the Snake and Columbia River Basins; it also provides the best protection available to upstream irrigation, both present and future, in Idaho.

COMPACT REQUIREMENT WOULD CRIPPLE RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Some Senators who are interested in water rights may have been misled by the opponents of Hells Canyon on this interstate compact argument.

I wish to borrow an effective counterargument from a great fighter for western water development, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If interstate compacts were to be made a condition of multipurpose project authorization, these vital developments would grind to a halt throughout the West. There is no compact for the Missouri Basin, the largest drainage area in the country. If a compact were required before project approval, many pending projects could not be authorized—as an example, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Mr. President, I speak most respectfully when I say this, and I speak without any personal criticism. But I raise the question, Where are the Senators, who are opposing Hells Canyon Dam on the ground that first we should require an interstate compact, going to be when a project such as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is before the Senate for consideration? Will we hear them then ask for an interstate compact on the part of the States involved in such projects? Yet, Mr. President, if that is a requirement which should be insisted upon in the case of the Hells Canyon Dam project, I respectfully submit that consistency would require them to ask for it in connection with the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. But let me make very clear that in my judgment it is not desirable for any of these projects, because the compact itself can in no way change the constitutional power of the Congress of the United States in the future to pass legislation inconsistent with the provisions of the compact, so long as Congress is acting within the sphere of its delegated power.

Compacts can serve a useful function in adjusting the competing claims of States. They have not been used to foreclose and are not adaptable to foreclosing the United States from the exercise of its constitutional power.

Yet the argument of Senators who are urging the adoption of an interstate compact before the passage of the Hells Canyon Dam bill has been directed toward possible Federal activity. Yet the very instrumentality that they propose for checking Federal action could not be effective because a compact would not bar the constitutional power of the Congress to legislate within its delegated powers. Thus if we accept what I think is their fantastic assumption, namely, that some Congress in the future might act in bad faith, there is nothing about a compact that could prevent such a congressional course of action.

Of course, we have the record of Congress. The provisions of Senate bill 1333 in regard to the rights of upstream users are identical in legal meaning and effect with similar provisions which have been passed in bygone years in connection with other projects. Who will suggest that any Congress in the past has ever considered violating the interests of upstream water users in connection with such projects? Let me say most respectfully that I am willing to predict that what has been true of those projects in the past would be true also of the Hells Canyon Dam project in the years ahead.

The Congress of the United States can be relied upon to act equitably when it adopts legislation guaranteeing local water rights. Congress has not tampered with the provisions of the reclamation law which are decades old and recognize State law governing water rights.

The water rights objections to Hells Canyon are phantom. Such fanciful obstructions should not be permitted to block the benefits of new cheap power, industry, jobs, navigation, flood control, and irrigation which Hells Canyon would bring to Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and the Nation.

I close this argument by saying that I am convinced that any Senator who will go into the law on this question will reach the conclusion which I have submitted here tonight, that is, that there would be no legal danger to the rights of the upstream users as a result of the passage of Senate bill 1333.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Morris A. Soper, retired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, July 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 14, 1955:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Morris A. Soper, retired.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, Public Law 773, 83d Congress:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Wayne Russell Allen, O171232.

Col. Anthony Joseph Drexel Biddle, Jr., O544174 (formerly Brig. Gen., AUS).

Brig. Gen. Henry Cotheal Evans, O124891.

Brig. Gen. Charles Ralph Fox, O347935.

Brig. Gen. Whitfield Jack, O267915.

Brig. Gen. Paul Kistler MacDonald, O296004.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Hendricks McKee, O234931.

Brig. Gen. Spencer Hurley Mitchell, O270810.

Brig. Gen. George Clifford Moran, O184043.

Brig. Gen. Charles Eskridge Saltzman, O275984.

Brig. Gen. Irving Otto Schaefer, O110672.

Brig. Gen. Lilburn Halsey Stevens, O275376.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Girard Tuckerman, O181648.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Gibbs Barrett, O182445, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Paul Bela Bell, O215450, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Ridgely Brown Bond, Jr., O237069, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Grady Stoddard Brooks, O248317, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Spencer Jennings Buchanan, O231626, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Edward Lee Carmichael, O256012, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. John Purley Cooper, Jr., O274573, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Harold Stone Dillingham, O315416, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Charles Herman Gardner, O273050, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. John Williams Guerard, O253797, Armor, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Wesley Burt Hamilton, O172732, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Richard Townsend Henshaw, Jr., O313288, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Frank Leo Howley, O299977, Armor, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Oscar James Jahnsen, O943408, Military Police Corps, National Guard of the United States.

Col. John Wallace Kaine, O360270, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Arthur Dickson Kemp, O254584, Infantry, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Harold Charles Lueth, O285937, Medical Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Stuart de Jong Menist, O337970, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Chauncey Dean Merrill, O112486, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. de Lesseps Story Morrison, O302989, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. James Hadlow Myers, O297521, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Byron Evans Peebles, O339282, Infantry, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Frank Ira Pethick, Jr., O248060, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Dillman Atkinson Rash, 0274004, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Fred Galligher Rowell, O399384, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. George Roy Schmucker, O141906, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Carroll Lee Wood, Jr., O901329, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Ninian Lindsay Yuille, O270933, Artillery, United States Army Reserve.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14, 1955:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following officer for permanent appointment on the retired list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the provisions of Private Law 95, 84th Congress, approved June 22, 1955:

Paul A. Smith to be commissioned rear admiral (lower half).

UNITED STATES ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be major

Buscemi, Michael D., MC, O382088.

To be captain

Thomas, Charles A., Jr., MSC, O996986.

To be first lieutenants

Baker, Roger W., VC, O1941750.
Camp, Melvin J., MSC, O1893779.
Dohnal, June P., WAC, L1010084.
Fountain, Edmund L., VC, O2041165.
Funk, John C., MSC, O1917698.
Kawas, Elias E., MC, O4021973.
Keep, James C., VC, O1878029.
King, Zane K., MSC, O961354.
Lyday, James M., VC, O1934051.
McCandless, Earl R., MSC, O2050887.
Rosa-Perez, Cesar E., MC, O1893306.

To be second lieutenants

Bullock, Howard R., MSC, O1928022.
Estrada, Betty A., WMSC, R2665.
Fowler, Harland W., Jr., MSC, O1887446.
Heath, Jack F., MSC, O1937254.
Hoggan, Malcolm D., MSC, O1928155.
Johnson, Wirt V., MSC, O2102734.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

To be first lieutenants

Bennett, Delmer R., O1853003.
Cox, William A., O2273233.
Klemme, William M.
Story, Stratton R., O2273732.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Burckert, James F., O1876377.
Jacobs, Kenneth R., O2265452.
Richards, Abraham L., O1924883.
Svoboda, Charles J., O1876597.

To be second lieutenant

Warner, Paul B., O4000076.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenant

Bass, Bobbie R.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenants

Abraham, Albert, III
Ashley, Clarence D., Jr.
Bentley, Thomas N.
Boyer, Henry, Jr.
Dahl, Hans E.
Dutton, Howard M., O4025292.
Glasson, Robert P.
Hamilton, Milton H., Jr., O4034391.
Harris, James W.
Jeffries, Charles O.
Melville, Royall T.
Murphy, John J., Jr.
Nugent, Frank J., Jr.
Lueptow, Lowell E.
Lundin, Keith E.
Sentell, Joseph W.
Torno, Harry C.
Underwood, Elvin H.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A (major general, Regular Air Force), USAF, for temporary appointment as lieutenant general, USAF, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Maurice E. Curts, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation by the President in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The nominations of Barton LeR. Smith and 313 other officers for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on July 1, 1955, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Barton LeR. Smith, which appears on page 9735, and ending with the name of Joseph W. Ziskovsky, which is shown on page 9736.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 14, 1955:

POSTMASTER

Elnore M. Shields to be postmaster at Grassrange in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may our life daily be illumined by Thy spirit and reflect the likeness of our blessed Lord, who was moved with compassion toward humanity and went about doing good.

We beseech Thee that our aspirations and ambitions may be large and magnanimous and always include the welfare and happiness of our fellow men.

Hear us in our prayer of intercession for the poor and needy, the sick and sorrowing, the lonely and discouraged, and all who are victims of hard and difficult circumstances.

Grant that, at the close of each day, we may be worthy of receiving the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful, the humble, the pure in heart, the merciful, the righteous, and the peacemakers.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1619. An act to amend the provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

H. R. 4946. An act to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act;

H. R. 5792. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments;

H. R. 6419. An act to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended; and

H. R. 6832. An act to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1617. An act to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940;

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 633, for the relief of certain alien sheepherders.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3990) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill of the Senate (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–1.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, while we have been warned time and again not to expect any concrete achievements nor to place too much faith in any good coming of the summit conferences in Geneva, I am one who fails to share this pessimistic attitude.

Certainly I am wary of Red chicanery. Certainly I question automatically Red motives. Certainly I do not think this dramatic meeting will serve to heal the wounds of the world.

However, there are many shadows that are integral components of any picture. And the shadow which may prove the West's most valuable ally is the people of Russia.

The strength of this shadow may determine whether the international nuisance and danger of cold war will continue, or whether we can hope for a real and lasting peace.

This may be world communism's last stand, this meeting at Geneva. For this is one meeting where the Reds will not enjoy the strong, almost frightening, position they enjoyed previously. This time they have got to be careful, for a major blunder at Geneva may prove the beginning of the end for world communism.

At Geneva it will be Marshal Nikolai Alexandrovich Bulganin who heads the Soviet mission. But he will not be calling the signals.

His dilemma will be to act in such a manner that he will appease the Soviet Communist boss Nikita S. Khrushchev on the one hand, and the ordinary citizen of Russia on the other.

Should Bulganin resort to the old Red technique of aggressive attack and propaganda, he cannot but help bolster and unify the free world's growing abhorrence and resistance to Soviet Russia. If he backs down, he faces the possibility of the eventual disintegration of worldwide communism.

Khrushchev represents the clique desirous of furthering the spread of communism throughout the world. The Russian people are grumbling and rumbling with discontent. They would like a little more light behind the grim Iron Curtain. It is because of the Russian people that the Soviets have acquiesced and almost sought the summit talks.

It is somewhat of a passive revolution that is taking place in Russia. The big Russian bear has a bellyache, caused by the discontent of the Russian people.

The Soviet Union has always been the crux of world communism. It has stood strong and inspiring and fearless above its subjects. Now its power, prestige, and fearlessness are faltering.

The satellite nations may soon find themselves a band of helpless homing pigeons, forced to make their own way on untried wings in the vast horizon of the world, fluttering about without a nest to turn to.

I am inclined to believe that Russia's new personality—and we all admit it is a more pleasant personality—is more a reflection of the Russian people than some kind of new trickery. I believe the Reds are practically forced to change their tactics.

And this augurs well for the United States and the free world.

There is no longer an iron-clad dictatorship in Red Russia. There is a collective leadership, and it is being pulled in two directions.

It is not too much to hope that the Russian people, desiring some of the comforts and privileges of modern civilization, are tired of being deprived while Russian economy is geared for war production.

Perhaps now we can sanely discuss disarmament and international control of nuclear weapons with rigid inspection.

I believe there is hope. And it is on a note of hope and with faith in Divine Providence that we should approach the meeting on the summit.

The Congress and all of the people of this Nation and the free world extend their prayerful blessings on our President and his staff as the Geneva Conference approaches. It is not too much to hope that July 18 may be the date that marked the beginning of a new era in international relations.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is altogether fitting and proper, with the Geneva Conference so close at hand, that the Nation join in prayer for the successful outcome of this vital meeting. Last Sunday a prayer for its success was offered by the pastor of the church attended by our President. That prayer should be repeated in every pulpit throughout our country. As the poet says—and as we all know—"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of."

That is my purpose now. I ask the Members of the House to join with me in urging the pastors of their own churches to set aside a few moments of this Sunday, July 17, for prayer for the success of the Geneva mission.

Let all of the pastors of the many churches of our land lead their congregations in prayer and meditation in the hope that the Almighty will grant to our great President the power and resourcefulness to bring to the world the most cherished of possessions—peace.

A VICTORY FOR WHOM?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the mayor of Memphis gave his definite promise that his city would build a powerplant to supply its own electric needs, and the Dixon-Yates contract for a privately owned powerplant was immediately canceled by the President. Whereupon, the mayor rather jubilantly declared to the press: "This is a victory for public power."

Time will prove that he is quite wrong, and for the record I should like to make this brief statement to explain why.

Mr. Speaker, the real winners in the Tennessee Valley power uproar are not the mayor of Memphis and the "master crime sleuth of Tennessee," as the Senator from Tennessee is now known in the newspapers. The real winners are the taxpayers of north central Illinois, whom I represent, and folks like them throughout the United States—for they will not have to pay for several more TVA steam plants from which they could not possibly derive an ounce of benefit, either now or hereafter.

And I should like to note further, Mr. Speaker, that the losers in this hassle are not Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates and the people of West Memphis, Ark., however real their grief and indignation may be. The real losers are the taxpayers of the city of Memphis, Tenn., whose United States Senators have euchred them into the unfortunate position of assuming a heavy burden of unnecessary debt that will hang around their necks like a millstone unto the third generation—and this without the yea or nay of a referendum asking their approval of this city-owned powerplant.

Another loser—and this I record sadly as a member of the taxwriting Ways and Means Committee of the House—is the Treasury of the United States. Had the crime sleuth of Tennessee kept his mouth shut, Dixon-Yates would have supplied the city of Memphis with ample electric power at reasonable cost—with no addition to municipal taxes to pay for the burden of debt—but Dixon-Yates would have paid a very substantial Federal income tax on its earnings and the possibility of tax reduction for everybody would have been materially enhanced.

If I may venture a prediction, Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Memphis has cut his socialistic throat, and the "coonskin capped Davy Crockett from Tennessee" has quite likely lost the votes of the taxpaying Memphis delegates to the convention that will nominate a Democratic candidate for the Presidency a year from now.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum of the House is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Buchanan
Celler
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Eberharter
Engle
Fernandez
Gathings
Gavin
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Hébert
Hess
Holifield
Kearney
Keating
McDowell
Miller, Calif.
Moulder
Mumma
Powell
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Short
Vursell

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 409 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON DUTY ABROAD

Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 7205, Rept. No. 1175) to extend for 3 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed not to exceed 4 hours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is nothing in the request about the control of the time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is sure that that is understood.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I supplement that with the request that the time be equally divided, half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] and half by myself.

Mr. TABER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it expected that the bill will be concluded today?

The SPEAKER. It depends on how fast the committee in charge of it works.

Mr. TABER. That is what I was trying to do.

The SPEAKER. It is hoped that it may be completed today.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that 3 hours would be sufficient to cover whatever we would need on the bill. I wonder if the gentleman could not reduce that request to 3 hours.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of requests for time. The request is not to exceed 4 hours. If we can conclude it in 3 hours or 2 hours or 1 hour, I would be very happy. We shall consume no more time than is absolutely necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Mr. Mills in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Rabaut].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, with malice toward nobody but with determination to do my duty as I see it, I want to report to this House that yesterday I appeared before the Committee on Rules, as was the request of the full Committee on Appropriations. I told the Committee on Rules that this bill was filled with paragraphs that were subject to points of order; that the bill probably contained very few pages where a ruling could be denied against points of order, and the bill would be bad. I said there were so few pages that I limited it to about four pages that would not be subject to a point of order.

I read to the committee a prepared statement and said the bill contained many of the paragraphs that were in the final supplemental bill as handled by the Committee on Appropriations every year, and that a rule is usually granted.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber], the gentleman from California [Mr. Phillips], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] were present and opposed a rule. Mr. Davis lent his moral support.

Past history always allowed a rule. To my surprise the committee failed to act, and we find ourselves with a bill involving approximately $1,650,000,000. Twelve subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations worked on this bill, practically the entire membership of 50; the hearings comprise several volumes, yet under the situation the House will not be able to work its will as to accepting or rejecting the many provisions and amounts in this bill before us because a point of order would lie in most instances.

Rather than to have a field day on points of order I intend to ask unanimous consent to ask for deletion from the bill of all the paragraphs subject to a point of order so the House may work its will on that part of the bill on which the decision of the Rules Committee permits us to function. This will represent a big saving in time and much useless talk.

I regret that under the circumstances the normal procedure of originating an appropriation bill in the House in this instance, due to the denial of a rule, passes over to the other body. We pass over to them our prerogative of initiating appropriation bills. It will be entrusted in this instance to the Senate.

This, incidentally, is probably a new inconvenience to the House as a result of the Dixon-Yates fiasco. Previous to the consideration of the public-works appropriation bill on the floor of the House, Republican Members held two caucuses, and there is no denial of the fact that they were concerned over Dixon-Yates. As a result, when the public-works appropriation bill came to the floor of the House, we had a demonstration of logrolling never equaled in my long years of service in this body, and there was pork on both sides of the aisle. The committee completely lost control under the policy of "You rub my back and I'll scratch yours." As a result, we took the bill to the Senate with little or no grounds on which to argue with that body, inasmuch as, living in a glass house, we were unable to throw a stone. That there is a connection between Dixon-Yates and that which is taking place here today there is no doubt.

Then, when the public-works bill emerged from the Senate-House conference we had the camel's nose under the tent with new expenditures that eventually will hit proportions of from $10 billion to $20 billion. And today with a bill up for consideration in the sum of $1,650,000,000, approximately, we still hear the echo of the Dixon-Yates controversy. I think they are now talking about settlement of the controversy with damages running into a few million of dollars and the word being spread around is to be liberal. So there seems to be no need under the circumstances for the House to waste its time since we come without a rule on a bill that could prove of no use to us or to those who sought to embarrass the 50 members of the Appropriations Committee who worked long and hard, as is evidenced by the testimony compiled in several volumes before us. So this is my notice that I intend to cite the paragraphs that are subject to points of order and ask for their deletion from this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the rule because there was a paragraph in the bill that I felt was not proper, and I do not believe that the Members of the House will feel it is proper if they read it. When that point is reached I propose to offer a point of order against it.

On the other hand, there are in the bill an enormous number of items, as always appear in a supplemental bill at the end of the session, that contain language that makes them particularly subject to a point of order. Those paragraphs have been before the House time after time and very seldom, if ever, have points of order been raised against them.

Frankly, I do not see how we can meet our responsibility in connection with the Government without consideration of a very large number of items that are covered in this bill. I cannot understand just why any Member of the House would feel that he should want to make a point of order against an item unless that item was, in his opinion, against the interests of the Government. That will be my approach to the problem and I will confine my points of order to what I believe may not be in the interests of the Government.

With that statement, I shall feel obliged to object to an omnibus request to be made before the reading of the individual paragraphs.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the United States—its Government—its institutions—and its people are in dire danger.

They are confronted by the greatest, the most powerful, the most ruthless, the most modern, military organization in the history of the world—ready to attack at the first sign of weakness.

The Bolsheviks have announced, and it has been their position from the beginning, that communism and democracy cannot live side by side and that they propose to take over by force and violence the rights and property of every people in the free world, as they have already taken over the satellite nations which surround them.

It has not only been their open objective, their philosophy, their program, but they have steadily and consistently organized and drilled armies, and equipped them with modern armament, in order to be in a position to carry out that objective at the first opportunity.

We are in danger not of defeat; not of a situation which can be retrieved in case of disaster. We face extermination.

The Russian dictatorship still adheres to the Marxian philosophy of world revolution and proletarian dictatorship. It is arming and has continued to arm feverishly. Their factories running in three 8-hour shifts per day, are preparing to take over America, to destroy our cities, to drive what is left of our population into concentration camps and slave-labor barracks. Do not say it cannot be done. It has taken place before our eyes in Russia and every Russian conquest.

And, they have driven a knife between us and our allies. In every former war we have had powerful allies who held the enemy in check until we could get ready, until we could mobilize and prepare. Today every potential ally is under the guns of the Communist regime. They could not survive 24 hours against the barrage of atomic weapons which Russia is prepared to launch within an hour or sooner.

And therein lies our greatest danger. War has developed so drastically that it is now largely matter of who gets in the first blow. The battleship is now as obsolete as the bow and arrow. The mighty *Missouri* is a museum piece. At one time our first line of defense, the battleship and heavy naval guns, developed to a point where the ship that got in the first shot, that made the first hit, was practically in control of the situation.

To practically the same extent today a Nation with sufficient bombs and the planes to deliver them can with one stroke simultaneously attacking every center of communication, production, transportation, and population, so paralyze us that there could be no recuperation. The theory of retaliation upon which we have depended so strongly in recent years is no longer applicable Our military authorities tell us that with a simultaneous attack with weapons which Russia now has at her command they could destroy at the first blow 53 of our major cities, including Washington. The only defense that has been suggested is evacuation.

The President this week asks Attorney General Brownell to conduct a study of methods of invoking martial law, government by the Army, over the entire country. Nothing could more vividly and more emphatically delineate the situation in which we find ourselves—the danger of the country today than the study of this stark measure of last recourse. Only the most imminent potential menace could have prevailed on the head of the Government to resort to such significant measures.

And the President has moved none too soon. Russia today has military superiority over all the combined powers of the entire free world. They have more modern submarines by far.

Within the last fortnight we are told it has just been discovered that Russia has superiority in numbers and design of planes with which to deliver the atomic bomb around the globe. They have acres of modern tanks. They have a manpower which the free world cannot approach. Within 30 to 60 days they could sweep every free nation from the continent.

And this situation is deplorably illustrated by the supine attitude of the United States Government today.

Ah, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, a foreign power detained one private American citizen and President Teddy Roosevelt sent one message. He said, "Pericardis alive or Raisouli dead." And in 6 hours that American citizen was released.

Mr. McCormack, the majority leader, placed in the Record this week a long list of civilian and military personnel, including priests, rabbis, ministers, nuns, now detained without any authority of law whatever and in contravention of all international jurisprudence—American citizens—and we do not dare to send the Roosevelt telegram.

You will remember that when they sank the *Maine* President McKinley declared war. No one ever knew whether the *Maine* was sunk by accident or by a military enemy, but on the mere suspicion that a foreign power had sunk an American ship in neutral waters we declared war.

You remember the *Lusitania*. She was not an American vessel. She sailed under the flag and the commission of another nation, but we had a few American citizens on board, and on the strength of that insult to our national honor Congress declared war.

Just the other day Russia deliberately shot down an American plane under conditions about which there could be no question whatever. They did not deny it. There was no excuse. What did we say? We said, "Oh, don't pay any attention to that. It was merely a local incident." What would Teddy Roosevelt have said to that? What would McKinley have said? What would the American Congress, which declared the last World War, say about that?

We have fallen on evil days. We cannot defend our own nationals. We do not dare to assert our national integrity under the most insulting circumstances. They shot down an American plane and then they came in as if they had knocked us down on the street and said, "Well, we'll pay half of your hospital bill." They say, "We'll pay half of the loss of your plane." And they laugh behind their hands, and all of the communistic world takes note that we dare not call them to time. Here were international criminals of the worst order destroying our planes in time of peace, and we did not dare resent it.

Mr. Speaker, we won the last war. We did not negotiate with the enemy. We called them in and said, "These are the terms of peace. Sign on the dotted line." And they signed. But today bands of lawless brigands in Asia bushwhack American citizens and we say, "Now, now, now, you ought not to do that. Be nice. Let us have a truce." But we have to wait for months even to get them to agree to a truce.

Mr. Chairman, that it was not the intrepid valor of our troops that won that war. It was not the superb generalship of the American command that won that war. It was not the patriotic support of the American people that won that war—it was the superiority of American science that won the war and ended the war. It was the landing duck; it was the proximity fuze; it was the all-seeing radar; it was the atomic bomb that won that war against European nations which had always insisted, and which the world had always conceded, were superior in research, and leaders in every scientific field of development and invention. American science coming from behind created the scientific instruments and agencies that won the war.

It was the TVA that made these scientific achievements possible. We could not have developed them; we could not have developed the bomb or the aluminum for the wings of the planes that carried the bombs had it not been for the TVA. And in this moment of dire national peril, confronted by the most menacing situation in the history of American arms, there are those who are moving to shackle TVA so that they can have more dividends, so they can profiteer on the American consumer.

Why are they opposed to TVA? Why do they seek to destroy REA and AEC?

Oh, they say it would create a Government monopoly. No; statements like that are as obviously false as any statement made by the Russian Government.

When our armies closed in on Japan, when hundreds of thousands of American boys were poised for the drive in which vast numbers of them would surely die, at that supreme moment one American plane with material supplied by TVA power—with one atomic bomb which could not have been made without TVA power—ended the war.

TVA saved the boys and sent them home to their families; TVA saved billions of dollars to the American taxpayers; TVA ended the war. But they say TVA should never have been built. It is socialistic. The natural resources of the Tennessee Valley rivers belong to the people. But they should be paying dividends to private enterprise—to men like Samuel Insull and Dixon and Yates.

How can they justify such piracy? Oh, they say, "We want freedom." What freedom? Freedom to plunder the American consumer.

And they invariably wind up with "The Government is trying to establish a monopoly." No more barefaced effort to deceive was ever made. We are opposed to a government monopoly. We believe in private enterprise. We demand that the private utilities control at least 85 to 91 percent or more of the business of production and distribution of electric energy in the Nation. But the last 2½ percent at least, TVA and REA municipal ownership, should be retained—TVA by the Government, REA by the private cooperatives, farmer cooperatives, and municipal plants by the cities which have built and developed them. We must have these small yardsticks; we must have a policeman on the corner. The American consumer must be protected from exploitation and profiteering by the giant nationwide private monopolies.

"Oh," they say, "private monopolies cannot overcharge the consumer. We have Government regulation." The trouble is that Government regulation never regulates. We have an example of that in my State.

Some years ago when competition between buses and passenger trains—and between trucks and freight cars—became heated, a cry went up for the State of Missouri to establish a public utilities commission to regulate passenger fares and freight rates. And, thinking it would keep down transportation charges, we agreed to it.

The first thing they did was to call in the bus companies and order them to increase fares. "But," said the bus companies, "we are getting a good return on our investment. We are making good money at the present rates." "That has nothing to do with it," said the public utilities commission—the government regulation agency—"your rates are unfair competition with the railroads. Raise your rates on the consumer." And the buses raised rates that were already producing an adequate income.

Government regulation does not regulate. The only effective regulation is to keep a yardstick and the TVA, REA, and municipal ownership must be retained to protect the standard of living of the American family.

Of course when Dixon and Yates start their creeping monopoly there is danger of forgetting the real value of TVA. But Russia does not forget it. Our scientists have just learned that Russia built and has operated successfully since 1949 the largest synchro-cyclotron in the world.

The largest we have ever built in America has a maximum capacity of 450 million electron volts. But the Russian plant has a capacity of 680 million volts. The Dixon-Yates backers are proposing to destroy even the small one we have. But Russia is already outbuilding it. Russia is looking ahead. And the President is trying to make arrangements to maintain military government when the Russian TVA and its products devastate 53 American cities—and tells Attorney General Brownell to try to figure out a place where Congressmen can assemble when Washington is destroyed—if there is a quorum left after the dust settles.

I appeal to the Congress to stop these men who are scheming, who are maintaining here in Washington such vast lobbies, who are intimidating Members back in their districts in a way that amounts practically to blackmail, as you have seen in the last 2 or 3 weeks. They are trying to take over TVA. But they cannot do it unless this Congress grants them the power to do it.

Mr. Chairman, will we in time of dire national peril give an irresponsible private monopoly control of the economic welfare of the Nation?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the portion of this bill to which I will address my comments has to do with military construction, which forms the principal item as far as the money involved in this measure is concerned. Of the over $1.6 million provided by the various chapters, there is some $1.4 million that has to do with military construction throughout the world set forth in chapter III.

While this comes to you in a supplemental bill, that huge sum for military construction is really an integral part of our military program and would normally come in the Defense Department appropriation bill for the current fiscal year had it not been for the fact that the thousands of items involved had to be processed. It was only in recent weeks that the details of the needs requested were presented to our committee. It required long, hard sessions, but even so, the time was too short to adequately cover such a large program.

One thing that you will note about the setup with respect to this chapter is that included are projects the cost of which totals roughly 25 percent more than the money that has been allotted by appropriation or transfer. That unusual situation comes about due to the fact that the services believe that inevitably in a program of this magnitude, which requires construction all over the continental United States and in many foreign countries, there will be slippages. They have requested that selected projects that have been authorized be appropriated for, as they would like to get them under way this year; but it is conceded it will not be possible to get them all under way during the fiscal year. They cannot, however, at this time definitely determine the ones that may or may not be delayed.

Our committee in its wisdom, has reduced the amount requested for the overall program even further because we felt that the slippage was sure to be even greater than for which the services had made allowance. But, there is still nothing in the way of an austerity program as far as the military portion of this bill is concerned. While it is true that there are only a limited number of permanent establishments provided for, the amount spent this year will greatly improve the living conditions of the men in uniform both at home and abroad. Our committee has urged those carrying out the programs to concentrate on necessary operational facilities, and quarters for the soldiers, sailors, and airmen; that first priority be given these items wherever possible.

It is not practical to be arbitrary about various categories, because where in one location a post theater, for example, might be in the nature of a luxury and it may be that there are facilities that can be used, in other areas, if the post happens to be far away from civilization, if it happens to be in a locality where there are no amusements available, it might be almost a necessity. So it is that in a program as vast as this, with so many thousand line items, it is hardly the proper approach to say we will not approve any type of building across the board because it does not come within a certain priority category, when at a particular location it might be far more important than would seem to be the case in another locality.

The services, I think, are to be commended in that there is a program going forward and beginning to bear fruit of standard types of construction to be used for the most part in permanent installations. A new type of barracks has been developed for 2 units rather than for 1 with a capacity of 327, I think it is, troops in the Army, and a similar program for the installations on land in the other services. Standard types of bakeries, or post-exchange buildings, theaters, and so forth, have been worked out, and the program is going forward with the effort made to make living conditions and the so-called fringe benefits better for the men in the service. One of the very important elements in this program is the housing program for dependents, and there are a good many million dollars authorized to provide better living quarters in proper localities for dependents of those stationed in the area.

This chapter having to do with the Department of Defense has received the most careful study of the subcommittee during the limited time available. Of necessity, it was impossible to analyze the thousands of line items in great detail. However, I am confident that we have brought you a sound bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it would seem quite certain that this bill is to some degree controversial. However, I think probably the major items in the bill, from the standpoint of money, are not very controversial. This bill provides $1.8 billion for military public works within the continental United States and outside the limits of the continental United States.

This is not an austerity program. We have come to the acceptance of the philosophy that we are probably going to be in a state of peril as a nation over a considerable number of years. We have abandoned the idea of temporary construction, theater of operation type construction. We are building our military installations on a more or less permanent basis. They cost a little more that way, but I, for one, feel that the best interests of national defense and economy are served by more substantial construction practices.

One of our troubles is the members of the Committee on Appropriations are not adequately prepared fully to comprehend and discuss all the features of the military portion of this bill. That is through no fault of our own. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, did not send down the budget requesting $2.2 billion for military public works until about the first day of July. The authorizing legislation upon which this portion of the bill is predicated is, I believe, to be signed perhaps this afternoon. So we have not had the opportunity which we desired and deserved in which to screen these requests for funds.

It is true that in the overall picture we have been pretty adequately briefed. We are building in the Army toward a reduced structure but a structure that will take care of our people on a permanent basis within the framework of our present regular forces.

In the Navy we have about 1,000 operating ships and with all the support required on land and at sea we are building to meet that requirement.

The Congress has been urging the Executive over a period of years to hasten the construction of a 143-wing Air Force program. That program in the last couple of years had been reduced to the 137-wing program. We are building the base, so to speak, for that sort of Air Force. And we have been told at great length and with some degree of clarity by the officials of the Department of Defense that these items in this bill are essential toward the realization of our demand for a 137-wing program.

As I say, this is not an austerity program. It costs us about $5,000 every time a serviceman does not reenlist; and there are millions who do not reenlist. For good or ill, we are trying to make military life, since apparently it is going to be with us for a long, long time, more attractive to the young men of our country. In the desert we are building swimming pools. In other areas we are building gymnasiums. We are seeking to provide adequate recreational facilities. We are building clubs for noncommissioned officers and for enlisted men. We are building officers' clubs. We are doing a lot of things that perhaps some people would like to be critical of us for doing. But if we are going to undertake to have these American men of the Armed Forces live somewhat like the rest of us and if we are going to try to make military life more attractive and keep them in the service as a career, I think we have got to do that sort of thing. At least, that is the philosophy which we have accepted in approving this bill. I am not ashamed of the fact that we are building solidly in military construction. I think that is a step in the right direction.

Since we did not have an opportunity to explore each individual project as thoroughly as we should like to we are selecting some engineers to spend their time between now and the reconvening of Congress making on-the-spot studies of these various projects. I for one think that such action is in the public interest and will be very helpful to the committee. It is impossible and I do not think it was ever intended that the Congress should inspect the way every nail is driven and every plan is laid out in every installation around the world. It is our duty to initiate policy, to make policy, and our overall policy with respect to this bill, as far as military construction is concerned, I think is good.

The bill is a little misleading if you look at the table of figures. The Army portion of the military public works is not to be financed out of any new appropriation to be made today. It is to be financed out of funds already available to the Army and unused and unrequired at this time for production and procurement, funds which the Army had but which it does not require now by reason of the fact that we have slowed down our military effort since the end of the Korean war. So that generally is the situation.

This bill provides for 523 projects in many nations including our own. We struck from the bill 14 projects. Of course, some of the projects are small and some of them are very large indeed. We struck from the bill certain proposed bases overseas. I for one have some very serious concern about this farflung program of base construction by the United States taxpayers in other sovereign countries of the world. I have no special alternative to offer, but I shall not be surprised if we wake up a number of years hence and find that these bases are no longer available to us. If those countries remain friendly, then perhaps we will continue to draw considerable benefit from the construction of these bases. I think the construction of these bases has meant a great deal in deterring aggression, but I think it would be foolish if we should fail to overlook the perils and dangers which are inherent in this operation, which almost seems fantastic when you sit and think of it soberly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman on that statement and want to say to him that I certainly share his fears.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Here is the picture in brief and in round figures. There are $2 billion worth of projects authorized. In the new bill, which I think the President will sign today, there are $2 billion more authorized. The President through the budget has asked for appropriations in the sum of $2.2 billion. We have reduced that sum in this bill by $394 million, and the bill includes money in the amount of $1,800,000,000. So that briefly and in rough figures is the picture.

For those who want to know about projects in their States and in their areas, let me refer you to the committee report because the committee report has, I think, a very excellent breakdown. I think the committee report is a very excellent document. I believe that by reading it you will get perhaps a better picture than you will be able to get from this sketchy discussion on the floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Your report came somewhat as a surprise to us in Colorado, particularly in view of the fact on Monday we went out and dedicated the Air Force Academy, and then on Tuesday, on page 32 of your report, you say that all new funds for the construction of the Air Academy are withheld, and it is the wish of the committee that no construction whatsoever be started until it has been approved by this committee. Also, I want to direct your attention to page 207 of the hearings of your subcommittee wherein it was outlined that there was $15 million previously appropriated for the Air Force Academy. The first question is: Is it the intention of this committee that the Secretary for Air should not stop all plans that he has in connection with the Air Force Academy until his plans have been submitted and approved by your committee?

Mr. MAHON. There is no disposition whatever to insist that the plans for the Air Force Academy be approved by the committee because we are not engineers or architects, but the Department of Defense asked us to appropriate $79 million for the Academy, which is to cost over the long pull probably about $150 million. But, the Secretary did not know what the plans would be. He was not sure of the design. We were being asked to approve $79 million of the taxpayers' money to buy something that even the Department of Defense did not know what it was going to look like. I think the gentleman from Colorado and I, myself, would hesitate personally to give the money for a house to be built or an edifice to be constructed when we did not know what it was going to look like. After the plans are drawn, and after the matter is agreed upon by the Secretary, then we hope that the Department can come back and get the money.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is that due to the fact that the testimony on page 206 of the hearings reflects that the plans themselves will not be ready, that is, the designs will not be finished before September of this year; and is it due to this fact that the committee hesitated to approve the complete $79 million for the going ahead of the construction at this time?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the plans, as we observed them, which are not final and which have not been accepted by the Secretary, did not impress us very much. It would appear to be an appropriate edifice for a modern factory or something of that kind, but there was so much controversy about these plans and so many reservations by members of the committee that we hesitated to put the money in the bill.

Of course, we realize we take some criticism for not putting the money in, but the gentleman will recall the lines of the Melancholy Dane who preferred to bear the ills he had rather than to fly to others that he knew not of. We did not know just what this leap was going to be, and so in some degree of caution we clamped down on the purse strings for a time. I would like to exhibit this artistic drawing of the chapel. This seems to look like a tent of sorts, and when I saw it a very familiar line from an old hymn came to mind—tenting on the old campground. I suggest that a little bit of caution in the closing days of the session might serve us well when we return home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Certainly it does not subscribe to the testimony of Mr. Wright, the architect, that this chapel should be built up on the mountain about a thousand feet, and that they provide escalators to take them to and from the services.

Mr. MAHON. I will say that we did not undertake to pass on any design. Personally, I was unable to hear the testimony of Mr. Wright, except for a very few minutes, but looking at these buildings in the artist's drawing now before us, the Academy looks pretty flat. Maybe we ought to go a little higher up and see if we cannot get a little more glory for our country out of this project.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is my understanding that it was the intent of the committee that when the Secretary has submitted definite plans, which may remove some of the objections, particularly that of glass, and substituting stone or marble, and making it fit more into the picture against the mountain side.

Mr. MAHON. I am inclined to think it would. I thank the gentleman for making a contribution.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to relieve the gentleman's mind of the concern and apprehension over this particular design of the chapel. I was in Denver on Monday with other Members of the House and Senate to attend the dedication ceremonies of the temporary Air Academy at Lowry Air Force Base. I was very pleased to note that the design of the chapel has been changed, and in my opinion, greatly improved.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. I think they were originally proposing to make the sides quite considerably out of glass. It would have been quite expensive to hire workers to keep this glass bright and shiny. But I think we have been able to get them to recommend less glass. If we keep hammering away, we will have an edifice of which we can be proud.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman will be pleased with the new design of the chapel.

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to hear that. I do not want to ridicule this project. I think we are trying to do a good job, but we do not want to get so far out in the bright blue yonder that we lose the American people. The American people are paying for this Academy, and they ought to get something that would please Americans generally.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. I know he wants to see the Air Force Academy the finest school that can be constructed, and one of which we can all be proud.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I note that the committee has not seen fit to allocate moneys for the proposed Buckingham Center in Fort Myers, Fla., in my district. I have studied the needs thoroughly, and have gone over the testimony and discussed it with the Air Force. It is my understanding that this is a training center and the present facilities that the Air Force have do not allow them to properly train the Air

Force for the defense of our country. I wonder what comment the chairman may have on that.

Mr. MAHON. There are rare exceptions when military facilities are located on a political basis. In all my experience I do not think I could name very many. I know there are no political implications to this project in Florida. We did not have time to go thoroughly into it. I have looked into this matter further since the hearings were concluded, and I am inclined to feel that the project is necessary if we are going to train these air-defense squadrons that guard our cities and would be available to us in the event of enemy attack. But it is true they have another facility of this general type in Yuma, Ariz. There are other areas over the ocean that would be available for use of the Armed Forces. We were hoping that this installation could be suspended and some of the other installations could be used. But I think the Defense Department was very probably correct, and I do not think the gentleman should be concerned about this problem. It should work out. It is one of those things about which there was a difference of opinion. I think we made several mistakes in the bill, I will say to the gentleman; perhaps this is one.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Directing the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to page 29 of the report, I find there an item of $285,000 for an air-reserve base at Fort Wayne, Ind., my home town. In communicating with people in that community I find some differences of opinion. There are those there who feel that adequate quarters might be had on a rental basis rather than on a construction basis. The question I am addressing to the chairman, therefore, is: If continuing study should develop that it would be better, in the interest of economy and in the interest of national defense, to rent rather than build in that community, is it the intent of the committee that that might be done?

Mr. MAHON. I shall take the liberty of directing a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force requesting that he hold plans in abeyance on this construction until he has thoroughly explored the feasibility of renting facilities.

When we make these funds available it does not mean that officials have to spend them. If in the light of other circumstances and developments they can get along without this project in Fort Wayne or elsewhere we want them to do it. That is the policy of the committee. I think the gentleman is rendering a great public service in raising this issue.

Mr. ADAIR. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee very much, as I am sure we both want proper defense facilities. Yet at the same time to have the American taxpayer in mind.

Unanimous consent having been granted, I wish to insert at this point a portion of the committee report:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

The budget estimate of $2,250,000 for advances to the Bureau of Public Roads for access roads is approved. These funds are used for the construction of roads to military installations and defense plants upon certification by the Secretary of Defense under authority of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

The bill includes the full amount of the budget estimate, $4,200,000 for the construction of additional Loran stations by the Coast Guard. The contemplated program will extend to certain vital areas the present Loran system.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Submission of budget estimates

The most important comment the committee can make with respect to this chapter in the accompanying bill is to call to the attention of the Congress the apparent disregard on the part of responsible officials of the executive branch of the statutory responsibilities of the Congress to fully evaluate and pass upon the fiscal requirements of the executive branch. Why this committee and the Congress should be obliged to consider during the closing days of each session of the Congress measures of this magnitude and importance is difficult to understand. A valid reason has not yet been advanced.

It was testified that the services originally requested of the Office of Secretary of Defense approximately 10,500 items, totaling nearly $3 billion. While the number of items and requested appropriation were somewhat reduced by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, formulation of the final budget estimates, received July 1, did take approximately 1 year. The Congress, having a responsibility for the efficient and economical application of appropriated funds, was obliged to give only hurried consideration to the budget estimates because the new fiscal year had already begun.

The committee is in position to appreciate the mass of detail encompassed by the estimates for military public works, but must, nonetheless, insist that this program be submitted to the legislative committees during the month of January in order that time may be available for full consideration of the budget estimate. Mr. Franklin G. Floete, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, has testified to the effect that insofar as his office is concerned, the program will be transmitted to the Congress early in January of each year.

Status of authorizations

The total amount of authorizations remaining unfunded as of June 30, 1955, is approximately $2,057,000,000. Total authorizations provided for in H. R. 6829, recently enacted by the Congress, is $2,306,000,000, or a total authorization availability in fiscal year 1956 of $4,363,000,000. It should be noted, however, that section 501 of H. R. 6829 provides for the repeal of certain prior authorizations as of July 1, 1956. The identifiable total that will be so repealed is $811 million, although it may reach a much larger figure.

Committee recommendations

Against the total currently available authorization of $4,363,000,000 the Department of Defense has programed for construction in fiscal year 1956 a total of $2,630,055,000. Against this program a total adjusted appropriation of $2,220,800,000 was requested, the difference being considered as unnecessary because of general fluidity in a program of this magnitude and because of normal and expected slippage generally accepted by the construction industry. The original budget estimate, transmitted to the Congress prior to the enactment of H. R. 6829, totaled $2,273,550,000, of which $800 million was to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Procurement and production, Army."

The committee recommends a decrease in the program to a total of $2,471,745,000. To implement this proposed program a total appropriation of $1,879,491,000 is included in the bill, a reduction of $394,059,000 in the budget estimates. Of the total recommended, the amount of $483,612,000 is to be derived by transfer and $1,395,879,000 represents new appropriations. It is fully recognized that so long as we have an Army, Navy, and Air Force we must have adequate facilities and bases to maintain and house these services, and the reduction effected in the appropriation request should not be interpreted as a reduction in the needed program. Action is predicated solely on the considered judgment of the committee as to money requirements based on its analysis of the program and the history of military construction funding.

The difference between the contemplated program and the appropriation recommended is $592,254,000. The Department of Defense, however, should not consider the entire list of facilities included in the report as permanently approved, and it is expected that all projects in this or previous programs not specifically financed from available funds and for which financing is requested in the future, will again be presented in the detail program supporting future fund requests.

During fiscal year 1955 the amount of $1,964,000,000 is estimated to be obligated out of a total availability of $2,903,000,000, leaving an unobligated balance on June 30 of $939 million. While a reasonable unobligated balance is necessary in this type program, 32 percent obviously is excessive.

The recommended appropriation of $1,879,491,000, together with the unobligated balance, provides an availability for obligation in 1956 of $2,818,491,000. This compares with a total availability of $2,903,000,000 in fiscal year 1955. The elimination of specific projects in the amount of approximately $150 million will, of course, reduce the total estimated obligations in 1956, which is reported in the amount of $2,235,000,000 for all three services. Thus, even should the total obligations approach $2,100,000,000, the remaining unobligated balance of something over $700 million should enable the services to continue without interruption an orderly construction program into the first quarter of fiscal year 1957. While the fiscal situation is slightly different in each of the three services, it is believed that, generally, each service will be in position with the funds provided to pursue its program as initially planned.

Miscellaneous

Military considerations should be the paramount factor in decisions made by the Department of Defense with respect to the location of facilities and defense spending generally. The committee has sought to reduce the land-acquisition program to a minimum. The Department now owns approximately 29,500,000 acres, representing a total investment, including facilities, of about $21,400,000,000.

The committee is somewhat concerned over the growing centralization of military activities in the vicinity wherein Camp Carson and the Air Defense Command are now located and the new Air Force Academy is proposed. It is suggested, therefore, that a further study be made of this area with especial reference to the water situation, bearing in mind the potential growth in population that the water and other resources will serve in the foreseeable future.

Considerable discussion was had during and subsequent to the hearings on the matter of single bedroom family housing. It is recommended that the programs of each of the services for this type construction be reviewed to insure that only those single-bedroom dwellings will be constructed as definitely meet the long-term demands of the services.

It is trusted that the existing understanding with the committee calling for the allocation of adequate funds required for the construction of a usable facility will continue. Disruption of the construction processes, no matter how short the duration, is costly and should be avoided.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Department of the Army has requested $545,000,000 for the appropriation "Military Construction, Army," to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Procurement and Production, Army." The committee recommends an appropriation of $483,612,000, to be derived by transfer as proposed in the estimate, a reduction of $61,388,000. This is the first time since fiscal year 1953 that the Army has requested funds for this appropriation due to large unobligated balances that were available and now have been reduced through reprograming authorized by the Congress. In addition, request has been made for permission to reprogram $15,091,000 of prior authorizations and the committee recommends that this authority be granted in the manner justified to the committee, as set out in the following table:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md	$150,000
Fort Dix, N. J	1,972,000
Fort Bragg, N. C	339,000
Fort Campbell, Ky	4,180,000
U. S. Military Academy	8,450,000
Total	15,091,000

The item in the above tabulation for the United States Military Academy is to be specifically noted. In accordance with the committee's report last year a survey was made of the proposal to convert the riding hall to classroom spaces and authority is now given to proceed with this construction as originally planned out of funds previously authorized. Testimony indicates that the rise in construction costs have increased the current working estimate to $8,950,000. In addition to approving the request to reprogram $8,450,000 permission is granted to use additional available funds to cover the increase in costs totaling $500,000.

The appropriation recommended, $483,612,000, is to finance a program totaling $553,880,000 as set forth in the following tabulation. Those projects that have been specifically denied are set out in the paragraphs following the tabulation. These amounts may be compared with a program request of $566,533,000 and a funding request of $545,000,000. The committee recognizes the need for latitude in a construction program of this magnitude, and feels that it has provided such latitude in approving an amount only $70,268,000 below the estimated cost of the recommended 1956 program. This amount takes into consideration a slippage of approximately 13 percent. It was testified a slippage of 10 to 15 percent is generally accepted as normal.

The committee feels that as the program is developed and as deletions are made due to slippage in programing or construction, first consideration should be given toward providing quarters and necessary operational facilities. If there are items which can or must be deferred they should be in other categories.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The program

For the Navy military public works program, the committee had before it for consideration a tentative program request for 1956 totaling $646,196,300, of which $596,140,900 is new authorizations in the House version of H. R. 6829 and $50,055,400 is previously approved but unfunded projects. Conference adjustments on H. R. 6829 had the effect of reducing the total to $614,279,700 as shown in the table on page 15 of the printed hearings. The committee has approved for funding projects totaling $606,479,700, a reduction of $7,800,000, representing reduction in one item and deletion of two projects. These are commented upon below. The approved total includes $64,987,700 for 3,650 family housing units.

The funding

The budget estimate for appropriation purposes to fund the 1956 program is $528,550,000—somewhat less than the program presented for funding authority. The committee recommends appropriation of $439,950,000, a reduction of $88,600,000. The appropriation for 1955 was $98 million under which, in combination with unobligated balances from prior years, the Department indicates estimated obligations in 1955 of $248 million. Approximately $122 million unobligated will carry over into 1956, most of which, however, is stated to be committed to previously approved projects.

Basically, the reasons advanced for not requesting appropriation to an amount equal to the total of the projects on which the Department seeks funding authority are unforeseeable delays on projects occasioned by land acquisition problems, timing of granting of base rights, etc. The total list of projects, however, is justified as urgent, and if delays occur on certain ones the Department can proceed on others and thus expedite consummation of the total long range construction requirements.

The reduction of $88,600,000 is based on several things. One is the final adjustment in the conference on H. R. 6829 wherein several projects in the original budgeted program were dropped. Further, the committee has reduced or deleted three items as previously indicated. Still another reason—and this is the foremost—is the fact that to get this large program underway, the Department does not need as much as requested. The budget projects, as of the end of fiscal year 1956, an unobligated balance of about $242 million. A substantial portion of that balance will be supported by detailed project plans and specifications and thus required to permit orderly flow of contract placement in the ensuing few months pending availability of 1957 funds to keep the program in motion. On the other hand, the evidence is clear that a sizable part will not be supported by detailed plans. Contracts cannot be advertised and construction obligations incurred without such plans.

The committee's action should in no way slow down the orderly prosecution of the approved program. The Department should proceed, within the amount allowed, to have detailed plans and specifications prepared and ready on all approved projects as originally planned. Funding requirements for actual contractual purposes can be further determined in the 1957 bill.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Department presented a program including several thousand individual projects at over 250 Air Force bases totaling $1,449,242,000. The committee has deleted specific projects from this total in the amount of $137,857,000. For appropriation in the new fiscal year the Department requested $1,200,000,000, of which $255,000,000 was to be derived by the transfer of unobligated funds available to the Army. The committee is recommending for direct appropriation $955,929,000, a reduction of $244,071,000 in the overall funding request. This amount for appropriation together with the balances carried into the new fiscal year should be sufficient to keep essential Air Force construction going throughout fiscal 1956 and provide adequate balances to keep the program going into fiscal 1957.

The difference between the amount programed for specific projects and the amount to be appropriated is $355,456,000. In other words this is the amount in the Air Force program for which funds are not provided. However, the projects which might have been covered by this amount are not identified, and no priority list has been established. A program as diversified as the Air Force program must of necessity have a certain amount of flexibility in order that full advantage may be taken of continually changing requirements. The committee is, accordingly, approving as eligible for construction air bases and facilities at the above stated cost in excess of the funds provided.

The committee is certain that many of the projects still remaining in the program should be given further study. It is expected that this will be done and that with the funds appropriated only those projects most vital to the Air Force program will be undertaken.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to find myself in some disagreement with our committee chairman, the genial gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], but I do not share his alarm as to the comparative situation between the United States and Russia. I do not concede that they are ahead of us in any way except perhaps in the number of jet planes. We are as smart as they, and a little smarter. They possibly have a greater number of jet fighter interceptors, that is logical, because the jet fighter is used to intercept bombers, and we have the largest number of bombers that can carry death and devastation to any corner of Russia today any time we want to give the signal. We not only have the machines, but also we have the trained pilots who are superior to any, and we proved our superiority in Korea by a ratio of 15 to 1.

Furthermore, we have the adequate bases, a circle of bases from which we can attack, if necessary. We have superior crews in every way, including navigation, and we have the years of experience in long-range bombing which they cannot possibly have and which they cannot now get.

So I am not going to lose any sleep at all tonight worrying about any statement the gentleman has made. I am going ahead and plan my life with a full sense of security; I am going to urge my daughter to educate her son, my grandson and not worry for 1 single minute about reports of Russian superiority or threats to this country.

Much as we may dislike it, we have got to face the facts with which we have to live for the next 25 or 50 years. When we came out of World War I we thought we were in for perhaps a century of peace. We did not have it. We came out of World War II thinking perhaps we might have a quarter of a century or maybe half a century of peace. We do not have it. The Korean war is ended. With those three examples we should finally realize we must face facts which are simply these: We must expect for the next 25, 30, to 50 years we are to have a large military force. If we are to have that force—they are situated in widely scattered areas in all parts of the world—we must give them facilities with which to work. We have to give them adequate housing. As a matter of fact, there are quite a few million dollars in this bill for family housing for the military services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In years past in connection with appropriations we have heard about "self-liquidating projects." We have seen few, if any, of them. This public housing—and this is a very, very big public housing program, make no mistake about that—this military public housing will be perhaps the nearest to a self-liquidating project of anything we have ever undertaken because we are required by law to furnish our military men with either housing or a rental allowance in lieu of military housing. So that the more military housing we have the less money we pay out for rental allowances which will then in turn pay for these projects we are now building. Not only that, but some of these bases are located at some far away and out-of-the-way places where there is no adequate housing for our men until we build them. Even giving them the best housing we can for the family, the duties they are going to undertake will be pretty strenuous and arduous no matter how good we make it.

I do not worry too much about some of the situations we are told about. Actually, however, I have visited some of these military bases here and abroad. I have seen some of the housing quarters in which some of our military people have been trying to live with their families. I am quite frank in telling you if someone told me that I had to serve at a certain place and live in certain quarters which I have seen them live in, I would find it difficult to refrain from resigning.

So this is not just doing something out of the goodness of our hearts. We are doing it for the good of the service and to fill a very necessary need.

We have been told by the gentleman from Texas that we are building up to the 137-wing base. That is quite true. For every new squadron, for every new wing, we must have adequate bases. You can put it down just as simply as that. And according to the mission, every new base is going to cost from 15 to 150 million dollars and in connection with some of the bases it is going to cost you considerably more than that. You cannot operate 137 wings without bases. You have to have everything that goes with a base—you have to have, among other items, runways, taxiways, hangars, shops, administration and operations buildings, fuel systems. All of those things cost money. As we look at this bill, it is merely a defense public works bill. The big military part has already gone through. Anyone can see that our national defense is costly. It takes men, it takes machines, it takes money, not mere millions but billions of dollars—thousands of millions of dollars, which all comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. The job we have to do, working with the military, is to see that we get a dollar's worth of defense for every defense dollar we spend.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Since the gentleman has referred to the cost of the Department of Defense, I think it would be well to place in the RECORD at this point the complete figures. We appropriated for the Army, Navy, and Air Force—the Department of Defense—$31.8 billion. In this bill there are appropriations of $1.8 billion for military public works, which would make $33.6 billion for the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for making that observation.

What this public works bill is doing in part is to build up our bases for this long pull, whether it is 10, 20, 30, 75, or 100 years.

The buildings we are now seeking to construct for the main part are what we term permanent buildings. We found that our investment in semipermanent types of buildings and barracks just did not pay off. They were comparatively low cost in the first place, but in the long run they were not cheap. They are now becoming dilapidated. Their maintenance is expensive. But, we just must face the realization that without bases our Navy and the Air Force and the Army cannot operate. We must have them.

It is a big bill, yes, but we should expect, as soon as the 137-wing base structure is completed, that there will be a gradual tapering off of requests for new construction, of public works money. Maybe from 3 to 5 years should see the tapering. We have bases some of which probably existed for 100 years. All of the buildings are not that old, but I can show you military buildings that are 100 years old. And we have to go through our old established bases and begin reconstructing some of our worn out, dilapidated structures to carry on in the future if we are to do the job that we feel we are called upon to do. It is a big bill. It has got to be paid. It must be faced. We must face the fact that we are going to be presented with similar requests to this for some time to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why is it that the Defense Department does not use permanent installations such as the one we have in Iowa constructed during the war and has not been utilized since?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not recall at the moment what permanent base the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. GROSS. The Navy base at Ottumwa, Iowa.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has called attention to the need for additional bases because of the extension and expansion of the Air Force, and perhaps in line with what the gentleman from Iowa has alluded to, I am wondering whether the committee in its hearings has discussed the question of the number of bases that were closed after World War II. I have in mind, for example, the one at Herington, Kans., which was quite an important base.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only this year but in years past we have discussed many of those bases in detail. The one the gentleman is referring to was a training base, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There were many bases which were used for training in World War II which are not usable now. If they were to be used, you would have to practically start from scratch because the type of planes that our fliers are training in now cannot take off and land on those fields today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but still I have the feeling that there is a tendency on the part of those in the Air Force to sort of overlook some of these bases that we have.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If you will read the hearings, you will see that the request made by the Air Force for land is very, very, very small. As far as I can recall now, the only new land we are buying is where it is absolutely necessary for the extension of runways, because with our B–47's and B–52's you have to have 10,000- to 12,000-foot runways, and many of our bases during World War II were established with 6,000-, 7,000-, and 8,000-foot runways. That was all right for the planes that we had then, but the planes you have now just cannot operate on those short runways.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the Air Force were to come up and say "We want to go out and buy a block of ground right here someplace for a new base," they would not get very far, because we would point out just what the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Iowa have pointed out and say, "You have some bases; you have land that you own, that you bought in World War II. Use that. Do not ask us to buy more land." Of course, our Air Force activities were larger then than they are now. Our Navy activities were larger in World War II than they are now. Our Army was far larger in World War II than now. While we are still large, we are not as large as in World War II, and as a result we do not need as many bases as we did then. Perhaps some day we will need them. Who knows? Maybe we will continue to expand. We may have to go back to the bases in Kansas and other States of the Union and make use of them, as well as those we are presently using. But that does not seem probable in the foreseeable future.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will permit, I am making the inquiry and the observation largely on the basis of what the gentleman has said, that we are going to have expansion and extension in respect to planes and bases.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have the 137-wing base structure pretty well under way right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard], vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Will the vice chairman of the committee inform me as to whether or not there is any money in this bill for the construction of hospitals abroad, outside continental United States?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the gentleman referring to the Navy portion of the bill, or the whole bill?

Mr. BAKER. Any place in the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to refer that question to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], as to how many hospitals there are outside continental United States in the bill. I do not have the answer at hand.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that the budget request originally contained about 10,000 line items, such as hospitals, dormitories, quarters, and what not. Those were for the authorization bill. There are some hospitals outside of continental United States to be sure. There are hospitals in north Africa where we have many men. There are hospitals available to our Armed Forces in all important areas. Upon checking our records, I find that there are no new hospitals in this bill for overseas areas. These have been provided in past appropriations and undoubtedly there will be some future requests. This bill specifically provides for a few infirmaries and dispensaries. These are, of course, set up to care for patients on a temporary basis at each major facility until the patients can be transferred to a regular hospital.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield, certainly.

Mr. BAKER. Are there funds in this bill for hospital purposes outside the United States?

Mr. MAHON. I think so, but I would have to take a little time to list the locations, and I shall undertake to supply the information.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to address myself strictly and specifically to the presentations of the Navy. I was, of course, privileged to sit in on the policy evidence that was submitted by the Secretary of Defense and the respective Secretaries and their comptrollers.

I want to pay my compliments to my colleagues on my committee, Messrs. Norrell, Andrews, Wigglesworth, and Ostertag, also Mr. Wilson, of our staff, for the manner in which we were able to handle the problem in a short period of time and do the very best we could under the circumstances that prevailed.

In order that the House may have my views pertinent to the Navy aspect, I will present to you these facts:

As in the case of the Army and Air Force, the Navy presented for approval a group of projects totaling more than the request for actual appropriation. Within the time available, the committee has reviewed the total list of projects presented and with exception of those I will mention in a moment, has given the Navy the go-ahead on them. The report contains the actual list by location. Several hundred separate line-item projects are involved.

The program is presented on this lag or slippage basis, if I may use that terminology, because experience shows they always have difficulties and delays in getting base rights, land acquisition, and other unpredictable delays or changes of one kind or another.

The program presented to the committee totaled $646,196,300 but the actual request for appropriation is $528,550,000. The presentation was made on the basis of the House version of the authorization bill and now that the conference has resolved the differences on that bill, we have had to make some deletions from and additions to the original program. We have also disallowed 2 projects and reduced 1 other. Then, on top of that, we examined into the status of the projected unobligated carryover, particularly as to availability of detailed plans and specifications without which they cannot advertise and award contracts. We found that we could withhold some funds on account of this factor.

All told, we have reduced the program from $646,196,300 to $606,479,700, which is a cut of $39,716,600. As to the appropriation request, we have cut it from $528,550,000 to $439,950,000, a cut of $88,600,000. I think under all the circumstances we have cut about as much of their money as we should. The money cut is about 17 percent.

Now to recap the situation, and give you the specifics on the projects deleted, let me give you these figures:

The Navy originally presented projects for our approval totaling $646,196,300.

There were several projects which the conferees on the authorization bill dropped out and a couple which they added, so we took them into account. A list of them appears on page 15 of the Navy hearings. They make a net reduction of $31,916,600.

That left a total revised amount of $614,279,700.

Then the committee cut out two projects and reduced another, totaling for all three, $7,800,000, which we took out.

That leaves the total which is approved for funding listed in the report and it totals $606,479,700.

The three projects we deleted or reduced are:

First. We took $2 million off the $6 million request for replacement of facilities destroyed or damaged by fire, hurricane, and so forth. That gives them the same as they had last year.

Second. We took out the $2 million put in by the other body for plans for a new drydock at the Puget Sound shipyard to handle Forrestal carriers that may have been battle damage. It was not budgeted, and we had no hearings on it, so we did not feel we could include it at this time.

Third. Then we deleted the item of $3,800,000 for a new building at the naval ordnance plant at Macon, Ga., for manufacturing inert ammunition parts. With the administration's present policy prevailing having to do with getting the Government out of competitive business, it seemed to your committee rather doubtful whether we should go ahead at this time and expend $3,800,000 for a new building and a business that would keep the Navy in a fabricating category wherein the field has a lot of competition from private business.

There is a difference of opinion about this issue. In fact, there was a difference of opinion within our committee, and an amendment was offered to correct that situation. However, the committee as a whole sustained your Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations in keeping the deletion in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in general, and rather briefly, that covers the actions that have been taken by the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Navy. I have been associated with this committee and with this work, as you Members know, for a good many years and so have my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Wigglesworth], and others of my able associates. We feel that so far as the Navy is concerned, we have done the best job we could on the basis of the evidence they presented and considering the availability of the properties of the Navy, which the Navy is presently using and which it is contemplating using. Whether or not in the final analysis what we are recommending will be ultimately accepted by the House, of course, remains to be seen. I assure each and every one of you that in this instance as in every other instance, I am perfectly willing to submit to the will of the House as to the final conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations' defense subcommittee and more particularly on the Navy panel, I want to pay tribute first of all to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard], for his able and considered guidance of the work of our subcommittee, and also pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Wigglesworth], who is the ranking minority member of our subcommittee. Both of these gentlemen have been courteous and fair and I am grateful to them for their many considerations and kindnesses. The gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard] has ably described the general changes and adjustments that have been made in this particular phase of the military construction appropriation bill. I might point out that in the Navy's presentation to us, there were some 632 projects involved. It was pointed out that the Navy plant, the construction plant, the property itself, is valued at some $7 billion. And, too, it has been pointed out that it will take approximately $12.5 billion more to bring the Navy's establishment up to modern standards and requirements. I think it might be well for us to pause a moment to reflect the changes in the overall picture so far as our Military Establishment is concerned. With the Navy being called upon to meet tremendous responsibilities worldwide, and with the increased importance of naval aviation in our defense picture, it is reasonable to understand why we must begin to move toward modernizing the facilities that are so essential to our security and to our defense. Another point I would like to make, which perhaps might be overlooked in a general discussion, is that the Navy has within the military construction appropriation bill some $15 million allocated for the purpose of pollution abatement within the continental United States.

I am not sure at this point whether all of the other services have followed the directive of the Executive order calling for plans, programs, and steps to eliminate pollution caused by our Military Establishment, but the Navy has in this instance provided some $15 million to eliminate pollution in the waters and streams of the United States of America.

These particular projects and this $15 million does not complete the job, but it is a logical step forward, and I hope that all of the services and the Defense Department will move in unison in this task, which is so essential to the preservation of our water resources and to public health. To my mind it does not make much sense for the Navy to spend millions of dollars to eliminate waste and pollution and treat sewage with the Army and the Air Force right alongside of that very facility dumping waste and sewage into the same waters and streams.

Mr. Chairman, there is much that might be said about the many projects that are approved and incorporated in this bill. Among them, of course, are the facilities for the shipyards, for the fleet bases, aviation facilities, fleet support air stations, Marine Corps air stations, and many facilities overseas, including places such as Hawaii, Okinawa, the Philippines, French Morocco, Alaska, Guam, Japan, Newfoundland, Italy, and other points of vital importance to our defense.

As has been previously pointed out, the committee approves and recommends a total of $439,950,000 in new money, which is a reduction of $88,600,000 over the budget estimate for funding during fiscal 1956. Bear in mind that $122 million in unobligated funds will carry over into this fiscal year but it is understood that these moneys are committed to projects previously approved.

In the Navy, as in all other services in our Defense Establishment, a general fluidity in the program applies because of slippage and other construction factors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in general agreement with the statements which have been previously made in connection with the military construction program we have before us today, and it is entirely to that program that I wish to devote my allotted time.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], mentioned the difficulties under which we were required to work in conducting the hearings on the military-construction program. That certainly was true. It seems that in this program, as long as I have known it, we have always been required to labor under extreme difficulties in trying to bring to the floor of this House an appropriation bill for military construction. The major responsibility for that, of course, must lie with the executive department, because the representatives of the Department of Defense have failed to bring legislation before this Congress in a timely fashion. I know that the Committee on Armed Services has gone out of its way to bring authorizing legislation to the floor of this House promptly after it has been submitted to it. There ought to be a reasonable lapse of time after the authorizing legislation has been before the Congress, so that the staff of the Committee on Appropriations could go through the justifications of the things that have been authorized, so that the committee would be prepared to conduct hearings in an orderly and informative manner after that legislation has been passed. In my experience that has never been the case.

I can recall that back in 1951, which was the first year I served on the subcommittee that handled this appropriation, we were called back here in September, and a huge stack of justifications was submitted to us; because at that time we feared, with no little justification, that the war going on in Korea might well be the beginning of world war III. So we attempted to get some grasp of what was submitted to us, and finally, because the executive department itself had not formulated a program for the expansion of the physical facilities of the Armed Forces commensurate with what we thought might be ahead as a result of Korea, we finally had to end up with a lump sum without any pinpointing of the appropriation whatsoever.

In 1952, it was substantially the same story over again. Shortly before the Congress had made up its mind to adjourn, huge stacks of justifications to the extent of $1,800,000,000 were submitted to the committee. Members of the committee, after some consideration of what they might possibly do, finally ended up again with a lump sum appropriation of about $1,200,000,000.

We did a little better in 1952 than in 1951. At that time there was set up a grid of so much for each command, and so much for each purpose, broad categories such as pavements and utilities within the amounts allotted by those commands, and that grid plan was put into operation for funding Air Force construction, being known generally as "the Davis grid." During that year, 1952, the executive branch and the Congress were both pretty much at sea as to what was going on in the field of military construction. The Riley subcommittee was established and an attempt was made to go into the standardizing of facilities and the charges of waste and inefficiency in this program that were reported to the committee, including the much-publicized situation in French Morocco. I think the work of that subcommittee still stands as an example of judicious, conscientious investigation into this kind of program, and I think this entire Congress is indebted to the gentleman from South Carolina for the work which he accomplished in that session.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to concur in the gentleman's statement in regard to the work of this subcommittee upon which the gentleman from Wisconsin served so effectively.

Does not the gentleman think that the sort of job that was done there has paid dividends and been helpful to us with respect to further developments in military public works?

And does not the gentleman think that the public works program as it has progressed through the years since Korea has gradually improved and is improved now over last year and the year before?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am sure that is the case, and I think we can trace the standardization of facilities both in terms of physical structures and the costing structures in the Military Establishment to the work which was done by that subcommittee in 1952.

It was not until the late autumn of the year 1952 that the executive department finally began to attempt to get these things under overall control. We had the three branches of the service running off in three different directions with different criteria of construction and no attempt to standardize the structures or costing. Late in 1952 Frank Creedon was appointed as a Director of Installations within the Department of Defense, by the Secretary of Defense, in an attempt to coordinate the military public-works program. There was a conscientious man. He did as much as he was permitted to do under the circumstances. The trouble is that he was not given the authority to do the job that needed to be done.

Then came 1953, and in that year there was an overall revision that took place, because Defense Department officials were attempting to get their feet on the ground with respect not just to installations but to the whole operational concepts of the armed services; and in that year our subcommittee attempted to pinpoint each particular line item, and there was a grant of funds to construct each of the approved line items. The difficulty was that the Armed Forces simply were not equipped in terms of organization and manpower to proceed in an orderly fashion on the size of the construction program that was contemplated. So there were slips and lapses here and there. Therefore, we went into the 1955 fiscal year with huge unobligated balances.

Last year we adopted a new system. We tried to work out something that represented a workable compromise between the years of 1951 and 1952 when we had to literally give them a lump sum and say: "You put it wherever you think it will do the most good," and what we attempted to do in 1953, the pinpointing of a certain amount of money for every single line item. That was the dual system that was put into effect by the subcommittee last year of setting up a program and saying: This is the program upon which you can build, but we know you are not going to be able to build all of those things. You are going to have trouble acquiring land here, you are going to have difficulty with architecture there, difficulty with planning somewhere else and difficulty with letting contracts; so we will appropriate a lesser amount and let you use that money across the broad field of the specific items of the program we have approved.

That permitted them a flexibility which proved, in my opinion, to be very effective. At the time of the hearings this year it was clear that this huge unobligated balance had disappeared in all three branches of the service. It is true there is what may appear to be a large amount of money carried over unobligated into this 1956 fiscal year, but in any construction program of this kind and of the magnitude that it involves, there has to be, in my opinion, an obligated carryover in the neighborhood of about 20 percent in order that the pipelines will be filled for the first quarter of the new fiscal year before the new money becomes available. That has been accomplished substantially as of this date and I would say under the flexible program which this subcommittee instituted last year, we are in pretty good shape as far as the unobligated balances of this program are concerned.

The executive branch apparently thought it was a good idea too, because the program that was submitted to the committee this year was geared to that basis: a program on the one hand and a smaller amount of requested money on the other that could be obligated across the field of the approved program of construction items.

Our programs for military construction in past years, at least in recent years, have been characterized by a couple of things that I think should be called to your attention, primarily because they do not apply to the program that we have before us now. One of them was what we used to call an austerity program. We were dealing with the bare essentials, we were doing things plainly, without frills, at what we thought was a minimum reasonable cost.

The second characteristic of that program as we knew it then was that we were going to get it done in about the 1957 fiscal year. We anticipated that requests for appropriations would taper off in the next fiscal year after this one.

Neither of those things is applicable to the program we have before us. It is not proper to call this an austerity program because instead of dealing mainly in operational requirements without frills, this program, for the first time, is geared to a number of frills. In other words, there is emphasis on welfare activities, service activities, and recreational activities, and that is completely consistent with what apparently is the prevailing view and part of the prevailing program to make life pleasant enough in the armed services so that enlistment rates will remain high and we will not need to resort to selective service to such a large extent.

The second thing is that we forgot any thought of tapering off in the 1957 fiscal year. I suppose the program submitted to you next year will be just as large as the one we have before us this year, and I will be surprised if the one that is submitted for fiscal 1958 is much smaller than the one we now have before us. I do not know when we can reasonably anticipate a tapering off of the requests for military construction.

The only major criticism that I would have with respect to the bill as it is now reported would be a failure to pinpoint the limitations on the overall program. I think the money that is involved—and I suppose that is a major consideration—is completely consistent with my own personal point of view. But, I do feel that we have failed to pinpoint limitations on the overall program, and, of course, where the commitments are made. When you commit yourself to the building of a program, it does not make too much difference whether you are going to put the money in this year or next year it is going to cost just as much, and if the cost of construction continues to go up, it will cost more, perhaps, if the money is put in in a subsequent year. But there again I cannot place any immediate responsibility on the part of the members of the committee. It is part of the failure of the executive branch to submit this program to the Congress in a timely fashion. We have been promised improvement on that score in the next year by Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete, because I think we on the committee owe a responsibility to the Congress and the people of doing a better job than it has been physically possible for us to do in presenting this year's program.

So, with those weaknesses, which are not important weakness on the part of anyone in this room, or for which they must accept major responsibility, I support the bill as it stands before us, and I hope the majority of this House will do likewise.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just want to say that this House and the Congress and the country are indebted to the gentleman from Wisconsin who just addressed the House and the group to which he belongs for the splendid service rendered this country in dealing with this most intricate problem.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin about the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], but I believe he has been unduly modest, because the gentleman from Wisconsin labored with the gentleman from South Carolina on that committee and helped bring about that possible result.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

I suppose it might be proper for me to add here, if the gentleman from South Carolina who has just risen will bear with me, I think I took more than the normal amount of disappointment when the subcommittee organization for handling this program was changed in this 84th Congress, because I felt there was an unusual affection and understanding and conscientious cooperation that existed among the members of the subcommittee that handled this program during the 83d Congress, and that certainly includes a man who devoted all his working hours to furnishing the members of the subcommittee with the information they needed to attempt to do an intelligent job with respect to this program, and, of course, I refer to Frank Sanders, who served as the executive clerk of this subcommittee during the 83d Congress.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. I wish to concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas in regard to the splendid contribution of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin for the very extravagant remarks he has made about me. The study referred to was a cooperative movement on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in order to bring about a more realistic and a more practical program in the construction of military bases. This committee was originally set up by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in an effort to coordinate the military construction program and work out a useful and at the same time an economical construction program in the services. Through the efforts of the staff and the members of the committee, with the exception of the gentleman who is speaking, they did work out a program and spotlighted it to the Army, Navy and Air Force. I think the program has progressed and is still progressing. I think it has become more realistic and more practical and I believe will continue in that direction as a result of the study made by this committee and the spotlighting of the weaknesses and the recognition on the part of the military defense forces of the suggestions of this subcommittee.

I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I am sure the House appreciates the very fine service that he has given. He has given unstintingly of his time and efforts and talents to bring success to this program. It has been a bipartisan movement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say when these remarks are submitted to me for revision, I intend to take the liberty of striking out the exception which the gentleman made with respect to himself.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this college, the Command and General Staff College, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., is the senior tactical school of the United States Army and the only Army school of combined arms. Upon the proper accomplishment of its mission depends the successful tactical implementation of our war plan. It is an extremely critical component of our national defense.

The course of instruction at this college is being conducted in three buildings which were originally constructed and used respectively as a stable, riding hall, and World War II temporary gymnasium. They are inadequate for the accomplishment of the mission of the college and have been uneconomical to maintain since they were converted to college classroom space and are becoming progressively more expensive to keep in a a serviceable condition. They do not measure up to the facilities provided for similar level colleges operated by the other services and are not in keeping with the dignity of this college and United States world leadership in the eyes of the many foreign dignitaries who visit here each year and of the select allied officers in the student body—85 from 42 allied countries this year.

Further, the Department of the Army program planning is aimed toward an increase of over 25 percent in the student load of selected Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve officers by September 1957, the date planned for the opening of this building.

Throughout the years many of our greatest military leaders have studied at this institution and I know of by own personal knowledge that this new facility is a necessity. Furthermore, to deny this much-needed academic building is to detract from the dignity and prestige of our country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in looking through the report of the subcommittee I note, on page 11, at the bottom of the page, the committee reports that they eliminated $12,650,000 to provide for the design and construction of a hull of a new atomic-powered merchant ship. And, on page 51, at the bottom of the page of the report, it says:

> The merchant ship *Reactor*, for which $21 million was programed, has not been authorized, and the funds have been disallowed.

I want to compliment the committee on this particular action. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception, I believe that I can state, without exaggeration, that I am one of those on the committee who wants to see an atomic reactor of a type that would be available for a surface ship developed just as quickly as it can be developed. In fact, we put into the authorization bill for construction several items along this line, one of which for $25 million was to be used for research and development in reactors, which I regret to say has been eliminated by the committee. But I shall speak at some length on that at a different time.

But in regard to the $21 million reactor fund that was disallowed for a merchant ship, the committee followed the general thinking of the majority of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. There are several reasons why we were against that $21 million item. The main reason was that an attempt at this time to build a *Nautilus*-type reactor which would have been merely an enlargement of the reactor which is used in the submarine *Nautilus* would have been very expensive. It would have involved, for the ship, the hull, and the reactor, anywhere from $34 million to $47 million. It would have produced a ship which had an obsolete atomic reactor in it. It could not have carried a pound more of cargo. It would have cost, according to our estimates, approximately 10 times as much to run as an ordinary merchant ship. In other words, for a quarter of the cost and for a tenth of the operating cost you can have a merchant ship that will do all the functions which this ship would perform.

In the authorization legislation from the Atomic Energy Commission there was a $50 million item for the development of what we commonly call a carrier-type ship reactor. This carrier-type reactor would not be a single reactor, it would be created in multiples of 2, 4, 6, 8, something on that line. When those reactors are developed any one or more of those reactors can be placed in a merchant ship and used for ship propulsion, so, in effect, that type of research and development work is going on. It will go on under Admiral Rickover, who is the best man I know of to get the job done, with the limited number of physicists, scientists, and engineers who are capable of doing that high-class work. I am sure under the program already authorized this work of building a reactor which is appropriate for a merchant marine ship will be done. Therefore, I compliment the committee on recognizing these facts and deleting these amounts from the appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There are a great number of merchant ships moored up and down the Hudson and in other harbors that are available in case of necessity. As I understand, if this reactor is developed, it will be of a type that can perhaps be placed in those ships to make them fast and usable and bring them up to date.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think there is a possibility of that being done, all right, although the hull that may be needed may be of a special type.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not belabor the committee by going into the various phases of our military program and the system of handling the military programs in our appropriation and legislative process. The hearings clearly point this out.

I have served on the Armed Services Appropriations Committee, being back on it this year after being off for a number of years. You could not be on a committee where the members are more able or one where they work harder or where it is more of a pleasure to serve with them. My complaints have been directed toward the expansion of permanent real estate bases and on the size of the whole military operations continuing at present levels for 20 or 30 years. I have also raised the question if perhaps by appropriating the full amount of money that completed contracts might cost in advance, we were not inviting the actual expenditure of those funds. In our efforts to restrict or to contain the public works expansion of the military, I wonder if sometimes we have not followed a program which tends to make the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee really the Public Works Committee. It is to them that chambers of commerce, cities and towns look for spending military money by locating military establishments there. I say that without any criticisms of any individuals involved, but it has come to our attention in these hearings in several instances where selections were made, expenditures were made, where certain military considerations and costs to the Government seem to be laid aside for pressure of various kinds.

I hope we can go into these matters more fully next year and get some correction.

For one I have tried to point out the reasons in the hearings and have urged investigations to substantiate the case I believe the hearings have made.

We have succeeded in our efforts to get these matters investigated. I am pleased to state at the present time we have in the Committee on Appropriations investigations either cleared or going on at the moment on procurement, public works and on many, many other activities of the Department of National Defense. This information will be made available to the committee next year, and at that time we will be able to sustain many of things, I think, which we see should be corrected.

Mr. Chairman, my prime purpose in taking this time is to put into the RECORD and to bring to your attention actions of the appropriations' subcommittee for agriculture. I know it has been noised abroad in the last day or two that the Committee on Appropriations had put various legislative provisions in the appropriation bill. There are several of those in the agricultural subcommittee's part of this bill. In every instance, these are at the request of President Eisenhower in connection with aid to the low-income farmer. I have been serving on this appropriations' subcommittee for some 10 years, for 5 years I have been chairman of it. During that period of time I have never written legislation in that bill nor has our subcommittee, where we did not first go to the leaders of legislative committee on agriculture and asked if they did not wish us to do it. This is no exception. I went to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and to the gentleman of Texas [Mr. POAGE] pointing out that this was the last appropriation and that the President had asked for certain relatively minor and small amounts of money to carry out his program, and asked if they did not think it wise to put it in this bill. They said it would be O. K. to go ahead; then the amounts were put into this bill. The only exception to that is we have in the bill provided a grade 17 for a salesmanager of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is a $7 billion corporation. It has had no sales policy and no sales manager.

In our recent report on our regular appropriation bill, we pointed out those facts and I am pleased to note that subsequent to that the Department of Agriculture has appointed a sales manager for the Commodity Credit Corporation. He was appointed July 1. In other words, while that item appears in the bill, it is only a question of whether you pay him at the same rate as others in the Department who do similar work. We do not have to pass any authorization for the creation of the position. The right, already existed with the Department. We just found fault because they did not see fit to exercise it. Personally, I do not know whether objections will be made to the items in this bill or not. Personally, I cannot see that the items we have in our bill are going to in any way cure the present ills that face the low-income farmers. I do feel, and our committee felt, and we so expressed ourselves in our report that the farm situation is bad enough; and we felt we should give the President and the administration these requested funds to try to relieve the situation. Again, may I say I cleared that with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. We acted after they said the thing to do was to go ahead, and if subsequently any change was made in attitude, we could raise it when it reached the floor of the House. If the items go out, I do not think we will have lost a great deal. But, I will say to the committee that your subcommittee on agricultural appropriations have put these items in the bill because, certainly, we want to be in a position of supporting the President in his efforts to relieve this low-income farm situation. I cannot help but say, however, in our report we also pointed out that the suggested course of the administration was missing the boat and would not relieve the situation which they attempt to relieve.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has stated the position exactly as it exists. We have placed these items in the bill at the request of the administration and both the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and I hope that in spite of the fact that points of order would lie against them, that they will remain in the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. May I say there has been one exception insofar as legislation we have had in this bill in former years is concerned.

One exception where we have asked for a rule was at the request of the legislative committee on agriculture. Two or three years ago the committee had failed to pass a new authorization bill for the ACP program, and at their request we included funds and asked for a rule. Except for that, may I again say the legislative provisions have always been cleared with the leaders of that committee. The ones we have today are at the request of the President. I do not think it will do a great deal, but I am willing for him to have his chance to bring about some relief for the low-income farmers.

I have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks, and I will include a copy of our report and such other information which we have, which more clearly shows this picture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

On April 26, 1955, the President submitted to Congress a message calling attention to the need for further assistance to the more than 1,500,000 American farm families which now have an income of less than $1,000 per year. In the words of the President:

"In this wealthiest Nation where per capita income is the highest in the world, more than one-fourth of the families that live on the farms still have cash income of less than $1,000 a year. They neither share fully in our economic and social progress; nor contribute as much as they would like and can contribute to the Nation's production of goods and services."

In an effort to meet this problem, the Bureau of the Budget on May 26, 1955, submitted to the Congress supplemental budget estimates (H. Doc. No. 171) to enlarge the programs of the Department of Agriculture in the following amounts:

Direct appropriations

Agricultural Research Service	$380,000
Extension Service	1,285,000
Soil Conservation Service	150,000
Agricultural Marketing Service	250,000
Farmers' Home Administration	850,000
Office of General Counsel	36,000
Office of Secretary	19,000
Office of Information	30,000
	3,000,000

Loan authorizations

Farmers' Home Administration:	
Production and subsistence loans	15,000,000
Small-farm development loans	15,000,000
	30,000,000

The program for which these funds are requested, as outlined to the committee by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, proposes to find solutions to the problems of these farmers through improving production and marketing practices, by shifting from full-time to part-time farming, by encouraging off-farm employment wherever possible, and by appealing to local States and communities to help at the local level. The additional funds provide for increased research, extension, and soil-conservation work by the Department and an expansion of the loan program of the Farmers' Home Administration.

With some misgivings, the committee is approving the full amount requested, since the serious plight of the farmers throughout the country is such as to require the encouragement of every action which may help, even if only in a small way. The committee believes that the Department of Agriculture, State, and local agencies, and the people themselves should be given every opportunity to foster and promote those measures which the Secretary feels will contribute to solving the unfortunate plight of these 1,500,000 low-income farmers. According to the Department's own survey, 130,000 additional low-income farmers were added by cotton-acreage reductions this year and 58,000 farmers were forced off of farms entirely by such action. The committee is going along with the President's proposal in the hope that it will enable him and the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize that reductions in the level of price support, without proper provision for meeting increased farm costs, and reduced acreage made necessary by failure of the Department to sell in world markets at competitive prices, are the factors which are creating the very conditions which they hope to correct.

At the same time, the majority of the members of the committee do not consider the Secretary's proposal as a real farm program, nor do they feel that it reaches the basic causes of the problem. They are of the opinion that it can in no way substitute for a farm program which would meet present rising costs, decreased volume, and reduced prices; and they are certain that it will not provide sufficiently adequate income to the farmer, in the immediate future, to enable him to stay on the farm.

While the committee recognizes that off-farm employment has been helpful to rural families in maintaining a reasonable standard of living in some areas, the majority of its members have little confidence in a program designed to encourage them to look to city employment in preference to considering agriculture as a worthwhile occupation and a wholesome way of life. They can see some real dangers to the American way of life if the present trend away from the farm is allowed to continue and actually encouraged by the Secretary. Further, since the present problem in many areas of the country is one of creating additional employment for people now living in the cities and towns, they cannot accept this feature of the administration's proposal as a long-range solution to agricultural problems.

Mr. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, speaking for the Department, told the committee that the increased costs incident to the President's requested increase in minimum wages for labor would not appreciably hurt the low-income farmers. Mr. Morse further stated that reducing price supports had not and would not appreciably hurt the farmer. He also attempted to defend the Department in its refusal to sell in world markets at truly competitive prices, which thereby cuts the farmer's acreage, production, and income.

Now, with the small farmer in bad financial shape, as recognized by the President, the United States Department of Agriculture is asking the committee to believe that to lower his price, increase his cost, and curtail his production will not appreciably hurt him. Perhaps the only thing left for the Department of Agriculture to recommend is that the low-income farmer get a job in town. And that is largely what the President, his Bureau of the Budget, and his Department of Agriculture have recommended to the committee in support of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

The farmers of this Nation received 12 percent of the national income in 1946, 11.6

percent in 1948, 9.4 percent in 1951; and in 1954 the farmer's share of the national income dropped to 7.2 percent. This year the indications are that this percentage will go down still further, with a drop of $1 billion in farm income in sight. It is expected that the national income will increase another $20 billion at the same time.

Supporters of flexible supports frequently contend that a 75 percent of parity support program will not hurt the farmer, because he is already hurt under 90-percent support. It is true that he has been in very bad financial shape, but in the absence of price supports his situation would have been much worse.

The farmer's income is dependent upon the volume he produces, multiplied by the price he receives, less his cost. In recent years the farmer's prices have been reduced, and his cost has gone up greatly, more than 12 percent in the last few years. The President has requested an increase in the minimum wage for labor and has supported increases in income for other groups. As a result, farm costs are bound to continue to go up. With his income dependent upon price times volume, reducing the price can only make the farmer's situation worse. A majority of the committee believes that what is needed is to at least maintain the price the farmer has been receiving, and to increase his volume of production by selling competitively in world markets what he produces.

In the opinion of a majority of the committee, what has really hurt the farmer is that his production has not been sold in world markets—because the Department of Agriculture has not offered such commodities for sale at truly competitive prices. According to the Department's own testimony, almost $4 billion worth of farm commodities are in the hands of the Government, and are not being offered in world trade at competitive prices. The United States is the only country which follows such a shortsighted policy.

By refusing to sell, the CCC has built its stocks up by billions of dollars, paying huge amounts of storage. Such storage expense will soon reach the staggering total of $1 million per day, largely on commodities which are not offered in world trade at competitive prices.

Then further, such commodities, under the formula in the law, are counted to reduce the farmer's acreage and marketing quotas. Thus, the farmer's trouble and his reduced income under 90-percent supports have come about largely because of his constant price—now a reduced price under the parity formula of the administration—multiplied by a constantly reduced volume, less ever-increasing costs.

It is the belief of the majority of the members of the committee that to solve present difficulties Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture must correct two weaknesses in present programs. The first is to adopt a plan which will maintain reasonable prices for agricultural commodities. Nearly every segment of this country's economy is supported by one means or another, and it appears entirely reasonable to provide some comparable protection to the agricultural producer. If this fact were fully understood by all the people of the country, there is no doubt in the minds of the majority of the committee that there would be little objection to such a program.

The second solution which must be fully recognized and vigorously pursued is to make certain that agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a part of a price-support program are sold on a truly competitive basis as authorized by law. The majority of the committee would point out that the Commodity Credit Corporation has full authority in its basic charter to sell agricultural commodities abroad at competitive prices, which will move them into world trade channels.

Committee hearings disclose that, while the Department holds a convenient price umbrella over world production, American financial interests have increased their production in foreign countries as fast as the American farmers have been reduced at home. A recent study by the investigative staff of this committee shows that in Mexico, cotton production has increased from a prewar average of 324,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 577,000 bales and to 1,780,000 bales in the crop year 1954–55; at the same time, cotton exports have increased from 105,000 to 1,150,000 bales. This study also shows the following with reference to cotton production increases in other areas of the world:

In the Middle Eastern countries of Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Iraq, cotton production decreased from a prewar 5-year average of 459,000 bales to a postwar 5-year average of 390,000 bales and then increased to 1,260,000 bales in the crop year 1954–55. Cotton exports for the same periods decreased from 157,000 to 85,000 and then increased to 684,000 bales. It is believed that there will be continued increases in cotton production in the Middle East.

Cotton production in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala has increased steadily from approximately 50,000 bales 4 years ago to an estimated 300,000 bales in 1954–55. A further increase of about 100,000 bales is expected in 1955–56, and potential annual production estimates after several more years of development range from 700,000 to 900,000 bales.

In Peru, cotton production has increased 25 percent during the past 5 years to 505,000 bales in 1954–55. During the same period exports, which are a large proportion of production, increased 25 percent. However, it is reported the Peruvian Government holds cotton and sugar production (the most profitable crops) under strict control in order to insure the production of adequate food crops.

This same situation also exists for other crops. For example, this same committee report reveals the following with reference to wheat:

Sharp increases in wheat acreage and production have been recorded in a number of the European and Middle Eastern countries which have received substantial foreign aid grants in recent years.

France, although reducing slightly the acreage devoted to wheat in 1954 as compared with the 1935–39 average, produced over a third or 100 million bushels more wheat in 1954 than in the prewar years.

Turkey has almost doubled her wheat acreage since the 1935–36 to 1939–40 average and more than doubled her total production in 1953–54. Unfavorable yields in 1954–55 resulted in a sharp drop in wheat production as compared with a year earlier, yet it remained a third higher than in the prewar years.

Greece although on a net import basis has increased her wheat acreage 20 percent and production by 50 percent as compared with prewar years.

Most Latin American countries, as a part of their programs to increase home food production, have expanded their wheat acreage and production. The acreage in wheat in Mexico has increased 50 percent while production has more than doubled since the period 1935–36 to 1939–40. Although wheat is a minor crop in Peru, the acreage has increased 50 percent and production has almost doubled as compared with prewar years.

TOBACCO

World tobacco production increased from an annual average of 6.5 billion pounds in the 1935–39 period to 7.8 billion pounds in 1954 or an increase of 20 percent. During this same period the world acreage devoted to tobacco production increased from 7.5 million acres to 8.6 million acres or an increase of 15 percent.

United States production of tobacco increased from 1.5 billion pounds in the period 1935–39 to 2.2 billion pounds in 1954, an increase of 47 percent, in spite of the fact that the acreage devoted to tobacco in 1954 was slightly smaller than the 1935 to 1939 acreage.

Canada and southern Rhodesia are among the more important countries from the standpoint of tobacco production increases. In both of these countries the expansion has been encouraged by long-term contracts offered by British tobacco companies.

Increases in acreage and production from 1935–39 to 1954 are as follows:

	Percent increase in acreage	Percent increase in production
Canada	91	135
Southern Rhodesia	250	360

Japan has increased her tobacco acreage from 92,000 acres in 1935–39 to 172,000 acres in 1954 and from a production of 149 million pounds in the prewar years to 256 million pounds in 1954.

Turkey has increased her production of tobacco sharply from 128 million pounds in the prewar years to 206 million pounds in 1954 and acreage from 194,000 acres to 323,000 acres during the same period.

Italy also has increased both acreage and production of tobacco over 50 percent during the same period.

Brazil, by far the largest tobacco producer in Latin America, has increased her tobacco acreage from 250,000 acres in 1935–39 to 433,000 acres in 1954. Tobacco production in Brazil increased from 203 million pounds a year in the 1935–39 period to 296 million pounds in 1954, an increase of 46 percent.

Colombia almost doubled both tobacco acreage and production in the same period, and Mexico more than doubled her production with about 50 percent increase in acreage.

Tobacco production has declined in India, Pakistan, and Iran.

Flue-cured tobacco usually accounts for about 80 percent of all United States exports. World production of this type of leaf has shown striking increases. The acreage of flue-cured tobacco in the major present and potential competing countries increased from 384,000 acres to 1,045 million acres, 172 percent, between 1935–39 and 1954 and production increased from 370.6 million pounds to 986.1 million pounds, 166 percent, during the same period.

Tobacco production is expected to increase further in the sterling area countries where British interests are stimulating increased production. Further increases in acre yields also are expected in most countries, especially in Latin America.

The committee study also developed the following with respect to American financial interests behind these increases in production abroad:

The survey made to date on this phase of the directive indicates that the major portion of private United States capital investments, financing and management, has been concentrated to a large extent on one of the basic commodities, cotton, and that this activity has been substantially limited to Mexico, Central and South America, generally referred to as Latin America.

Here the increased agricultural production, extensive in cotton but also to a lesser degree in other basic commodities, has been generated to an important extent by United States private interests. Although it is not now indicated that much actual farming or production has been undertaken by Americans, in many instances the establishment of markets, cotton gins, elevators, processing plants and the financing of production has provided the incentive and impetus for an important part of the increased output.

In Mexico, Anderson, Clayton & Co. has increased its net capital investment account in plants and equipment by $8,911,709 to a total of $12,653,316 during the period July 31, 1947, to July 31, 1954; and in Brazil by $7,140,303 to a total of $15,354,158 for the same period. This company has increased total net capital investment in plants and equipment in all Latin American operations by approximately $18,791,214 to a total of $33,073,037 for the same period. As of March 1955 Anderson, Clayton's foreign plants consisted of 15 compress and warehouse units, 22 oil mills, 112 cotton gins, 10 oil refineries, 5 finished product plants, and 5 soap plants. The company operates through a number of subsidiaries in Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Paraguay, all of which are mostly wholly owned. Operations were started in Mexico about 1924 and in Peru, Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay during 1933–35. Crop loans in all foreign operations as of July 31, 1954, were $14,955,477. (Source: SEC records and company reports.)

The Corn Products Co. has plants, and grain operations at Guadalajara, Mexico, in Argentina, and in Brazil. It manufactures and distributes products using corn or milo-maize as the raw materials. As of December 31, 1954, investment of this company in foreign subsidiaries built up over some period of time is listed at $14,749,000. During 1954, foreign sales of corn products by the company's domestic plants total $11,888,041 or approximately 5 percent of total sales. Latest figures for sales of its foreign subsidiaries show that in 1953 these amounted to $95,313,550. (Source: SEC records and company reports.)

The W. R. Grace Co. has one of its principal foreign operations in Peru. Peruvian subsidiaries of the Grace Co., jointly owned with leading local industrialists, operate 4 integrated cotton mills, the largest in Peru; 2 sugar estates of approximately 10,000 acres each, and numerous other merchandising, exporting, and importing activities. These subsidiaries buy large quantities of cotton, mostly for their own mills, although some is exported. The Grace Co. has other cotton mills in Colombia and Chile. In the latter country it produces 20 percent of Chile's cotton and rayon blend cloth and, in addition, some woolen goods. Overall, Grace's Latin American affiliates produced in 1954, 97,600,000 yards of cotton, rayon and woolen fabrics. W. R. Grace & Co. owns a large percentage of the stock in the Grace National Bank of New York City. The foreign branch of this bank is closely connected with banking institutions in Latin America.

The Hohenberg Bros. Co. of Memphis is one of the largest companies in the cotton business. It finances and gins cotton in Mexico with its subsidiaries Algodonera Hohenberg S. A. de C. V. in Mexico City, and Empresas Hohenberg of Torreon. It also owns Hohenberg, S. A., in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and has a substantial amount of business in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

POINT 3

The extent to which such United States financial interests receive special tax concessions from the United States Government on income from production in other countries.

Federal income tax treatment of United States interests on income from without the United States corporations

1. Introduction: The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides certain credits or tax advantages for United States corporations doing business in United States possessions or in foreign countries. In some instances the credits are allowed to avert double taxation; in others special treatment is permitted to encourage United States trade and investment abroad, particularly in this hemisphere.

The following is an outline of Federal income-tax treatment accorded income of domestic corporations from without the United States. The section references are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Public Law 591, 83d Congress, approved August 16, 1954.

2. Foreign Tax Credit (secs. 901–905): A domestic corporation may elect to take credit against its total income tax for any income, war profits, or excess-profits taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States. The term "income, war profits, and excess-profits taxes" includes taxes paid in lieu thereof, such as taxes based upon gross sales or unit of production. The credit is not allowed against the following United States taxes: The tax on accumulated earnings, the additional tax on war-loss recoveries or the personal holding company tax. The amount of credit for foreign taxes is limited to the proportion of United States tax applicable to that particular foreign income.

A credit is also permitted a domestic corporation for the proportionate part of foreign taxes paid on income by a foreign corporation which results in dividends to the domestic corporation. At least 10 percent of the voting stock of the foreign corporation must be held. A further proportionate credit is allowed if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of another foreign corporation and receives dividends therefrom, and such dividend becomes part of the dividend paid to the domestic corporation.

An example of the latter situation would be: The A corporation, a domestic corporation, receives $100,000 in dividends from B corporation, a foreign corporation in which A corporation holds more than the requisite 10 percent of the voting stock. B corporation in turn holds all of the stock of C corporation, another foreign corporation. The accumulated profits of B corporation amount to $400,000 (including a $50,000 dividend from C corporation). The foreign income taxes paid by B corporation with respect to such accumulated profits amount to $120,000. C corporation has accumulated profits of $300,000 with respect to which foreign taxes of $90,000 have been paid.

Under these circumstances there would be added to the $120,000 tax with respect to the accumulated profits of B corporation:

$\frac{\$50{,}000}{300{,}000}\times\$90{,}000$, or $15,000 representing the foreign income tax paid upon that portion of the accumulated profits of C corporation used in the payment of $50,000 dividend to B corporation. The total tax paid or deemed to have been paid by B corporation with respect to its $400,000 accumulated profits is $120,000 plus $15,000, or $135,000.

The amount of tax deemed to have been paid by the domestic corporation with respect to the $100,000 dividend received from B corporation would then be:

$\frac{\$100{,}000}{400{,}000}\times\$135{,}000$, or $33,750, which may be claimed as a foreign tax credit.

3. Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. (secs. 921–922): A Western Hemisphere trade corporation is a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, and which satisfies the following conditions:

(1) if 95 percent or more of the gross income for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for the part of such period the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources without the United States; and

(2) if 90 percent or more of its gross income for such period was derived from active conduct of a trade or business.

A deduction in computing taxable income is allowed Western Hemisphere trade corporations as follows:

(A) First determine the taxable income of the corporation.

(B) Multiply the amount determined in (A) by the fraction—

(a) the numerator of which is 14 percent; and

(b) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate for the taxable year.

The effect of this computation is to allow a deduction which results in a 14-percent reduction in tax rate. It is understood that Western Hemisphere trade corporations are being rather widely used for United States trade and investment in Canada, Central, and South America.

4. Income From Sources Within Possessions of the United States (sec. 931): Domestic corporations engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States are exempt from tax on income from sources outside the United States, if for the 3-year period ending with the close of the taxable year (or the applicable part of that period)—

(a) at least 50 percent of gross income is from that trade or business; and

(b) at least 80 percent of gross income is from any source within the possession.

The Virgin Islands of the United States are expressly excluded by statute from "possessions of the United States."

The credit for taxes paid to foreign countries and possessions, discussed in section 2 above, is not allowed to corporations receiving the benefit of this section of the Code.

5. China Trade Act Corporations (secs. 941–943): Corporations organized under the China Trade Act, 1922 (15 U. S. C., ch. 4, sec. 141 et seq.) are allowed a special deduction derived from a proration of taxable income from sources within Formosa and Hong Kong, such deduction being limited to the amount of the special dividend which must be certified by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of the Treasury.

China trade act corporation benefits are believed to have an inconsequential effect on the agricultural situation under study.

6. Dividends Received From Certain Foreign Corporations (sec. 245): Foreign corporation dividends (other than from a foreign personal holding company) received by a domestic corporation are subject to a deduction if—

(a) the foreign corporation is subject to United States income tax; and

(b) if it has derived 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources within the United States for an uninterrupted period of not less than 36 months, ending with the close of such foreign corporations' taxable year in which such dividends are paid (or, if the corporation has not been in existence for 36 months at the close of such taxable year), for the periods the foreign corporations have been in existence as of the close of such taxable year.

The dividends received credit is 85 percent but is limited to the percentage which the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources.

7. Tax Treaties (sec. 894): The code in section 894 provides: "Income of any kind, to the extent required by any treaty obligation of the United States, shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt under this subtitle."

The development of United States business abroad and the increasing business done in the United States by aliens throughout the years have created complex tax problems. To solve these problems equitably for taxpayers and to protect United States revenues a number of tax treaties have been concluded, or are in negotiation.

Basically, these treaties are designed to eliminate international double taxation and to assist in mutual tax enforcement. An essential of such treaties is, therefore, the establishment of bases for determining sources of income.

Tax treaties have been concluded with the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom.

Negotiations are under way with: Austria, Colombia, Cuba, Honduras, Israel, Italy (awaiting exchange of ratification), Mexico, Philippines.

An idea is being explored to consider in future treaty discussions an item of taxes spared. The principle involved is that when a foreign country offers the inducement of waiving taxes for an initial limited period of years to encourage new industry to enter the country, the treaty could provide that the taxpayer be allowed a credit for the taxes which would have been paid but for the tax sparing. The purpose would be to encourage the investment of United States capital in enterprises in friendly nations.

8. Foreign Corporations Not Subject to United States Taxes: Foreign corporations owned by United States interests and not subject to United States taxes are naturally not covered by the Internal Revenue Code, but may be an important vehicle for employment of United States capital abroad. Such corporations can be utilized to accumulate earnings, with such earnings being ultimately liquidated and brought under United States taxation only as gains subject to the limitation on taxation of capital gains.

Such corporations would fall essentially into two categories:

(1) Those incorporated in the country in which operations are conducted.

(2) Those incorporated in countries in which operations are not conducted but which have laws favorable to corporations. Panama, for instance, imposes no income tax except on business conducted in Panama. Panama, Bermuda, Bahama, and Liberia corporations have been frequently used.

Such foreign corporations are not under United States authority and information as to the extent of their utilization is not now available. Even though such foreign corporations are subsidiaries of domestic corporations, United States taxation is avoided unless dividends are paid to the parent companies.

Individuals

9. Introduction: The tax benefits to individuals from residence abroad, or from income from United States possessions or foreign countries, are important in encouraging United States citizens to accept employment or to invest abroad. The following sections outline these benefits.

10. Foreign Tax Credit (secs. 901, 903–5): The foreign tax credit described under section 2 above on corporations is also applicable to individuals. All features enumerated therein apply except for the credit allowed a domestic corporation for a proportionate part of taxes paid by a foreign corporation.

11. Earned Income From Sources Without the United States (sec. 911): An individual citizen of the United States, who has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries for an uninterrupted period which includes an entire taxable year, is exempt from tax on amounts received from sources without the United States (except amounts paid by the United States or any agency thereof) if such amounts constitute earned income attributable to such period. The individual is not entitled to any deductions related to such exempt income, but is allowed personal exemptions.

Exactly the same treatment is accorded individual citizens who are present in a foreign country or countries at least 510 full days during any period of 18 consecutive months. Under this provision, if the 18-month period includes the entire taxable year the amount excluded shall not exceed $20,000. If the 18-month period does not include the entire taxable year the amount excluded from tax is the ratable portion.

"Earned income," under these provisions, means amounts received as compensation for personal services actually rendered, but does not include any payment which represents a distribution of earnings or profits. If the taxpayer is engaged in a trade or business in which both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 30 percent of his share of the net profits, is considered to be earned income.

12. Income From Sources Within Possessions of the United States (secs. 931 and 933):

The provisions relating to income from within United States possessions described under section 4 on corporations are also applicable to individual taxpayers.

In addition, section 933 of the code contains a special provision for individuals on "Income from sources within Puerto Rico." This section provides that in the case of an individual who is a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the entire taxable year income derived from sources within Puerto Rico (except amounts received for services performed as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof) shall not be included in gross income. No deductions assignable to such excluded income (other than personal exemptions) are allowed. Also, if an individual citizen of the United States has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico for at least 2 years before the date on which he changes his residence therefrom, income derived from sources therein (except amounts received for services performed as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof) which is attributable to the Puerto Rican residence is excluded. Deductions relating thereto (except personal exemptions) are not allowable.

13. Tax Treaties (sec. 894): The tax treaties mentioned in section 7 under "Corporations" also cover individual taxpayers.

14. Partnerships (secs. 701–771 and sec. 1361): Since partnership returns are informational only and the distribution to partners is taxable on individual returns, the preceding sections dealing with individuals cover the tax benefits arising from partnership operations in possessions and foreign countries.

Section 1361 of the code, added in 1954, provides that partnerships in certain circumstances may elect to be taxed as domestic corporations. This provision is not considered significant to the present study.

POINT 4

The extent to which such financial interests are tied into the Department of Agriculture and national farm organizations, through representation on advisory committees and similar groups.

The Department of Agriculture has furnished the committee staff a listing which purports to include every advisory committee of the Department as well as all its consultants. These advisory committee lists have been reviewed to segregate those which are germane to the survey and those which are not, such as Farmer Cooperative Service, Rural Electrification Administration, etc.

The staff is presently engaged in studying the composition of relevant committees to determine the extent of representation of private United States interests which are engaged in agricultural activities in foreign countries. To date it has been found that the following officials of companies either believed or known to be engaged in such activities are currently serving on the indicated committees:

Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade and Technical Assistance: W. C. Schilthuis, Continental Grain Co., alternate; Lamar Fleming, Jr., Anderson, Clayton & Co., alternate.

Cotton Export Advisory Committee: Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman, board of directors, Anderson, Clayton & Co.

Cotton Price Support Advisory Committee: A. M. Crawford, Weil Bros.

Grain Export Advisory Committee: André Hinschler, Bunge Corp.; Harold E. Sanford, Continental Grain Co.; W. C. Schilthuis, Continental Grain Co.

Wheat Advisory Committee: H. E. Sanford, vice president, Continental Grain Co.

Corn Advisory Committee: William F. Brady, Corn Products Refining Co.; Robert C. Woodworth, vice president, Cargill, Inc.

Dairy Export Advisory Committee: George M. McCoy, Borden Food Products Co.; A. W. Sigmund, Kraft Foods, Inc.; Leslie J. Lindell, General Milk Co.

Dairy Industry Task Committee: Arthur W. Sigmund, Kraft Foods, Inc.; D. M. Dent, Borden Food Products Co.

CCC Storage Committee: Loren Johnson, Continental Grain Co.

National Agriculture Advisory Commission: Jesse W. Tapp, Bank of America.[1]

In connection with the Cotton Export Advisory Committee listed above it should be noted that a temporary committee of the same name was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 13, 1953, and was comprised of the following individuals:

D. W. Brooks, general manager, Georgia Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

C. R. Sayre, president, Delta Pine & Land Co., Scott, Miss.

Everett R. Cook, Cook & Co., Memphis, Tenn.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., president, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

William A. McGregor, vice president, Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N. Y.

Charles H. Cannon, president, Cannon Mills, Kannapolis, N. C.

Walter L. Randolph, president, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, Montgomery, Ala.

This is the committee referred to on February 28, 1955, by Senator EASTLAND, page 49, part I, of hearings before the Subcommittee on Disposal of Agriculture Surpluses of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The committee staff has been informed that it held several meetings during the calendar year 1953, submitted a report to the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the Secretary considered it dissolved.

The present Cotton Export Advisory Committee was appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 24, 1955, to serve for the coming year, and is comprised of the following individuals:

Walter L. Randolph, vice president, American Farm Bureau, Montgomery, Ala.

Alan G. Patteson, producer, Jonesboro, Ark.

J. B. Hubbard, president, J. B. Hubbard & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, Dallas, Tex.

Allison Pell, president, Pell Cotton Co., Charlotte, N. C.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman, board of directors, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

---

[1] This name is included as the Mexican press has reported that the Bank of America has issued credit of $10 million for financing cottongrowers in Mexico. Several other banks have representatives on committees but it has not yet been determined whether they finance foreign production.

E. F. Creekmore, president, Creekmore & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, New Orleans, La.

S. Y. West, president, S. Y. West & Co., Memphis, Tenn.

D. W. Brooks, general manager, the Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

The committee staff is continuing its study to determine the extent of representation of private United States interests, engaged in agricultural activities in foreign countries.

POINT 5

The amount of foreign-aid funds which have been used to encourage increased agricultural production in foreign countries.

As of March 31, 1955, cumulative obligations of the Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor agencies aggregated approximately $19.1 billion. Around 63 percent or $12.1 billion represented obligations for assistance activities in 20 selected countries where agriculture relatively is most important. (See table I.) In these 20 countries slightly less than $1 billion has been obligated for agricultural assistance including health and industrial assistance activities having a direct bearing on agricultural production and processing. In addition, approximately $710.8 million in local counterpart funds created by assistance activities in these 20 countries have been programed for the furtherance of agricultural production and processing.

Because of the outstanding importance of agriculture and substantial increases in agricultural production, particularly cotton in recent years in Iran, India, Pakistan, and Turkey as compared with the other countries receiving assistance the activities in these countries are being analyzed in detail.

Thus far detailed data are available only for Iran. (See table 2.) As of March 31, 1955, approximately $201.2 million United States foreign assistance funds have been obligated for the Iranian program, of which amount $47.3 million has been incurred for agricultural assistance, including those health and industrial activities bearing directly on agricultural production. The breakdown on these funds by field of activity and between projects and technical assistance is as follows:

"[Amount in millions]

Activity field	Projects	Technicians and trainees	Total
Agriculture	$17.7	$5.6	$23.3
Health	9.9	2.5	12.4
Industry, transportation, and community development	11.6	--------	11.6
Total	39.2	8.1	47.3

TABLE 1.—*Promotion of agriculture abroad—Funds obligated by Foreign Operations Administration and predecessor agencies, Apr. 3, 1948, through Mar. 31, 1955—20 selected countries*

Country	Projects [1]	Technicians and trainees [2]	Commodities [3]	Total for promotion for agriculture [4]	Total aid by FOA and predecessor agencies [4]	Approved withdrawals from counterpart funds for promotion of agriculture [5]
Latin America:						
Brazil	$2,058,489	$3,233,006	------------	$5,291,495	$10,643,471	------------
Colombia	930,588	1,877,536	------------	2,808,124	3,509,826	------------
Mexico	764,500	1,010,064	------------	1,774,564	3,774,289	------------
Nicaragua	480,550	1,047,994	------------	1,528,544	2,413,211	------------
Peru	2,615,341	2,951,383	------------	5,566,724	7,696,890	------------
Total	6,849,468	10,119,983	------------	16,969,451	28,037,687	------------
Europe:						
France	------------	458,000	$179,910,434	180,368,434	3,204,153,586	$253,000,000
Italy	------------	286,000	30,140,821	30,426,821	1,613,736,268	259,000,000
Western Germany	------------	351,000	180,648,397	180,999,397	1,494,547,839	106,400,000
United Kingdom	------------	242,000	103,266,620	103,508,620	3,812,513,529	700,000
Total	------------	1,337,000	493,966,272	495,303,272	10,124,951,222	619,100,000
Near and Middle East:						
Turkey	------------	3,030,637	63,845,967	66,876,604	369,018,922	18,600,000
Greece	424,964	1,766,000	43,177,927	45,368,888	835,508,760	64,800,000
Syria	------------	------------	------------	------------	88,140	------------
Iran	39,246,650	8,087,472	------------	47,334,122	201,229,759	------------
India	167,830,500	6,638,367	------------	174,468,867	261,562,195	------------
Pakistan	42,621,235	1,554,772	5,576,495	49,752,502	118,531,295	2,100,000
Iraq	612,207	2,250,259	------------	2,862,466	6,557,732	------------
Total	250,735,556	23,327,507	112,600,386	386,663,449	1,792,496,803	85,500,000
Africa: Egypt	32,022,964	1,478,261	------------	33,501,225	39,244,551	------------
Far East:						
Burma	6,079,003	450	1,492,906	7,572,359	21,181,588	800,000
Japan	------------	------------	7,000,000	7,000,000	10,140,145	------------
Thailand	34,271,100	377,654	2,500,926	37,149,680	51,329,453	5,400,000
Total	40,350,103	378,104	10,993,832	51,722,039	82,651,186	6,200,000
Grand total	329,958,091	36,640,855	617,560,490	984,159,436	12,067,381,449	710,800,000

---

[1] Project obligations primarily represent total equipment and supply costs which will be borne by the United States in conducting specific activities, e. g., locust control, dam construction, etc., under signed project (activity) agreements with the respective countries.

[2] Technician and trainee obligations represent salary, per diem, transportation, and other costs incidental to furnishing United States technicians to the respective countries and the training of local nationals in the United States.

[3] Commodity obligations primarily represent the cost of agricultural products, machinery and supplies, textile-mill machinery, and food-processing equipment furnished. Local currency counterpart funds are created by the local sales of these and other commodities in the recipient countries.

[4] Includes the dependent overseas territories of the European countries, nonregional, and other program obligations of FOA and its predecessor agencies.

[5] Counterpart fund withdrawals for the promotion of agriculture are primarily directed toward land reclamation and irrigation, research and extension, and farm credit.

General technical assistance is being provided to Iran in the field of agriculture, health, and industry. Inasmuch as cotton and wheat are grown throughout the country, all technical assistance rendered to Iran is indirectly beneficial to the production of these two commodities.

As of March 31, 1955, approximately $3.4 million in obligations have been recorded for projects related specifically to cotton, wheat, and general agricultural production and the introduction of new seed strains. The amount devoted specifically to cotton and wheat is not available.

Now let us see what the effect is on American agriculture this year alone:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.

To Extension Directors in Cotton States:

Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, has requested that a survey be made immediately to secure the best possible answers to the two questions on the attached sheets, a supply of which we are sending you.

On Wednesday, February 2, a group of State representatives from the cotton States and the Department met and recommended the following procedure to obtain this information.

Will you please proceed immediately along the following lines:

A. Contact other agency heads in your State and work out any mechanics necessary to get the information for each cotton county.

B. We suggest that the county agent call together appropriate USDA personnel operating within the county to discuss the questions and to answer them to the best of their ability.

C. Send to the Federal Extension Service, Washington, D. C., your county replies to arrive not later than February 16. Due to time limitations we suggest counties send report directly to the Federal Extension Service with copies to you for your information.

Sincerely yours,
E. T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

STATE CONSERVATIONISTS, SCS.
CHAIRMAN OF STATE ASC COMMITTEE.
STATE DIRECTORS, FHA.

Please give your best estimates for your county on—

1. How many renter families (tenants and sharecroppers) have been or will be forced off farms due to 1955 reduction in cotton allotments? The question is concerned only with the number of renters (as defined above) forced off farms due to the 1955 reduction in cotton-acreage allotments and not for other causes such as mechanization, drought, etc.

Answer ______________________________

2. How many small cotton farmers (i. e., those with 5 acres or less of cotton allotted in 1954) will have net income for the farm reduced by $100 or more due to the 1955 cotton acreage reduction? Do not include in this estimate the number who may have income reduced due to not planting full allotments. The value of crops produced on acres diverted from cotton should be considered in arriving at the net income loss.

Answer ______________________________
County ______________________
State ______________________
Date ______________________

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCE ON SURVEY ON COTTON ACREAGE REDUCTION, ROOM 218-A, FEBRUARY 2, 1955

C. A. Vines, State extension service, Arkansas.

Clay Lyle, director, State extension service, Mississippi.

G. G. Gibson, director, State extension service, Texas.

C. B. Ratchford, State extension service, North Carolina.

Shawnee Brown, director, State extension service, Oklahoma.

James T. Lunsford, State director, Farmers' Home Administration, Alabama.

R. L. VanSant, State director, Farmers' Home Administration, Georgia.

James W. Cross, Jr., chairman, agricultural soil-conservation committee, Tennessee.

Ben Boatwright, chairman, agricultural soil-conservation committee, South Carolina.

Cecil Collerette, member, agricultural soil-conservation committee, Arizona.

Charles A. Sheffield, Federal Extension Service.

E. L. Langford, Agricultural Research Service.

R. B. Bridgeforth, Commodity Stabilization Service.

C. M. Ferguson, Federal Extension Service.

M. H. Holliday, Farmers' Home Administration.

J. C. Wheeler, Office of Budget and Finance.

Milan D. Smith, Office of the Secretary.

J. A. McConnell, Office of the Secretary.

E. C. Betts, Jr., Office of the Secretary.

Number of counties with 1,000 or more acres of cotton and number of counties reporting

State	Number of counties having 1,000 or more acres of cotton	Number of counties reporting
Alabama	67	67
Arizona	7	7
Arkansas	63	54
California	8	9
Florida	11	27
Georgia	138	139
Illinois	0	3
Kentucky	2	2
Louisiana	46	29
Missouri	8	8
Mississippi	77	80
New Mexico	11	10
North Carolina	55	64
Oklahoma	59	74
South Carolina	46	44
Tennessee	35	44
Texas	205	212
Virginia	6	14
Total	844	887

Summary of answers from 887 counties to the following question:

"How many renter families (tenants and sharecroppers) have been or will be forced off farms due to 1955 reduction in cotton allotments?" The question is concerned only with the number of renters (as defined above) forced off farms due to the 1955 reduction in cotton-acreage allotments and not for other causes such as mechanization, drought, etc."

	Renter families
Alabama	7,554
Arizona	127
Arkansas	4,426
California	0
Florida	279
Georgia	8,157
Illinois	40
Kentucky	60
Louisiana	3,395
Missouri	2,202
Mississippi	11,981
New Mexico	137
North Carolina	2,783
Oklahoma	1,477
South Carolina	4,147
Tennessee	3,075
Texas	5,580
Virginia	108
Total	55,348

Summary of answers from 887 counties to the following question:

"How many small cotton farmers (i. e., those with 5 acres or less of cotton allotted in 1954) will have net income for the farm reduced by $100 or more due to the 1955 cotton-acreage reduction? Do not include in this estimate the number who may have income reduced due to not planting full allotments. The value of crops produced on acres diverted from cotton should be considered in arriving at the net income loss."

Alabama	17,595
Arizona	38
Arkansas	1,496
California	0
Florida	2,348
Georgia	14,888
Illinois	147
Kentucky	203
Louisiana	6,649
Missouri	1,881
Mississippi	34,414
New Mexico	64
North Carolina	17,397
Oklahoma	378
South Carolina	10,400
Tennessee	14,944
Texas	6,129
Virginia	1,632
Total	130,603

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I was able to spend a few days in my home district. While there I had the opportunity of talking with a number of people concerning the financial position of farmers.

I found there are two groups of farmers these days. One is the group of farmers that was fortunate enough to be able to pay off debts during and after the war, and before the present farm recession started. These farmers are established. While they are not getting anywhere under present conditions of income, they are able to keep farming even with the lower prices and reduced acreages of the Benson administration.

The other group of farmers is the less fortunate group that has been forced to accumulate debt at the tail end of a prosperous period in agriculture. This group is now caught in the nutcracker of declining prices, low income, and the urgency to maintain earnings high enough to provide a decent living and meet debt payments at the same time. This group is in a tough position and is having a difficult time. Unfortunately, many of the members in this group are the younger farmers, and the GI's who have returned to the land after serving their country.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who went through the difficult period of the twenties which eventually led to the deep depression of the thirties cannot help but find similarities in the situation in agriculture today with that of 30 years ago.

One of the better agricultural letters published in Washington has a good article on this subject in its issue of July 9. I am speaking of Wayne Darrow's Washington Farmletter, and would like to quote from it:

> More credit will be needed for land purchases in the period ahead than is required now, USDA studies indicate. Recent trends point to this already. The trend will pick up when the social security program for farmers gets into full swing.
>
> A higher percent of farm purchases require credit now than at the close of World War II. About 3 out of 5 farms bought need credit now against 2 out of 5 farms at close of the last big war.
>
> The amount loaned per acre has about doubled—up from around $30 average debt per acre after the war to about $60 an acre now.
>
> Average size of new mortgages also has jumped—from approximately $3,500 at close of the war to around $6,000 now. However, good land is not considered too high now. In fact, it's sought after. Mortgage debt is not too high yet in relation to total investment.
>
> Are we heading for another big debt, farm foreclosure period like the late 1920's? Officials don't think so. But there are similarities.
>
> The farm mortgage debt climbed 7 percent last year. It's now 72 percent above the low of 1946. Officials are not concerned over size of the debt, so far. Present total of $8.2 billion, though large, is smaller than the peak of $10.8 billion in 1923. This year's debt represents only 8.9 percent of the value of farm real estate, against 21 percent in 1923.
>
> Mortgage debt is concentrated on fewer farms now. About 29 percent of all farms are mortgaged now—the lowest percentage since 1890.
>
> The reason is: We've just passed through the most prosperous period for agriculture in this century—the period of the 1940's. This is shown in many ways, including the number of years it takes for net farm income, or earnings, to equal capital investment—capital turnover.
>
> This is a measure of ability to pay off debt. During the 7 years 1942–48 it took 5½ to 6½ years for net income to equal the value of all physical assets—the most favorable period in this century.
>
> The ratio has been on the rise since. Now it takes about 10 years for net income to equal total investment. This is roughly comparable with the last half of the 1920's and with the late thirties.

Darrow's Farmletter also comments on the greater concentration of farms in fewer hands. It says:

> Net migration from farms to cities averages over 1 million yearly. There's been a net movement away from farms every year since 1920, except in 1945 and 1946—years when veterans were returning.
>
> For every 5 people on farms in 1947, there were only 4 in 1954. Farm population decreased 8 percent from 1947 to 1950—12 percent from 1951 to 1954. Net migration away from farms (excess above movement back to farms) averaged 4.6 percent of the total farm population yearly during 1947–53.
>
> Census reports so far show fewer farms than in 1950—but no reduction in farm acreage. The trend is unmistakably toward fewer but bigger farms. Commercial farming is becoming more pronounced.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intent to dwell unduly on the unhappy experiences of the twenties. However, a few reminders may be in order.

Today's situation makes me think of the previous time our boys marched off to save the world. When the war ended the farm boys came back to their homes only to find high mortgage debts, prices inflated for the things they had to buy, but prices down for the things they had to sell. It was the kind of situation calculated to place young farmers in an impossible debt situation. And the administration then in power was unhappily the kind that had no real understanding of the problems of farmers.

Many of the young farmers of the day were unable to provide their families with a decent standard of living. Debts mounted. Health needs were neglected. Surpluses accumulated, and while the stock market boomed, farm prices sank lower and lower and the whole shaky structure collapsed into the big depression of the early thirties.

Mr. Chairman, it is almost frightening to contemplate the similarities between the situation in the early twenties and that of today.

The income position of agriculture is almost identical. Prices have gone down, down, and down. Costs have stayed consistently high. Income is thus pinched, squeezed, and diluted. While the rest of the country is enjoying a fairly high degree of prosperity, the farmer is losing ground.

Veterans who were forced to purchase their livestock at prices prevailing at the time of their return have seen their livestock inventory reduced in value from a third to a half.

These farmers eventually may be faced with debt adjustment, possible foreclosure and forced departure from the land.

In our free economy we do not expect persons to be in business only for their health, yet many farmers are literally.

This shows up in nearly all major products, especially in the livestock products. Farmers have been giving the consumer more than he has ever had, and for less and less money—so far as the farmer's income is concerned. Let me give you a few concrete examples:

In 1948 farmers produced a little more than 21 billion pounds of the red meats for consumers, receiving over nine and a third billion dollars. But last year farmers produced a little over 25 and a half billion pounds of the red meats, receiving only $8.8 billion.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, last year farmers received 6 percent less money for 20 percent more production than just 6 years before. Putting it in terms of the value of 1948 dollars, farmers last year received 14 percent less money for supplying each consumer with 10 percent more red meat. The year we are in now is the third straight year of producing more than 150 pounds of the red meats for each man, woman, and child in the United States. And all the production above 150 pounds a person has, in effect, been given away by farmers.

Here is another example: In 1954 per capita consumption of poultry meats was 6 pounds a person higher than in 1948. Total production was a fourth higher than in the earlier year. Yet, in dollars of the same buying power for both years, farmers received practically the same for their poultry in the 2 years. In other words, the extra 6 pounds of meat provided each consumer was given free, so far as farm income was concerned.

Mr. Chairman, we would expect this kind of thing during a serious depression, but we do not expect it in a time which we are told is the most prosperous in history. What might apply to the rest of the country does not apply to those who live on the land.

Actually, the farm-debt situation is better now than in the twenties. Those forced into debt just prior to the present farm depression are having a hard time of it. But the prosperity of farmers in recent years has enabled many of them to pay off debts. And while the mortgage debt is growing, it is concentrated on fewer farms. It is a situation that needs careful watching, but it is not yet critical.

There is one other important difference between the fifties and the twenties. Today we have established farm programs that can be used to protect agriculture in this period of obvious inequity—if we have the will to use them, that is.

What is the difficulty?

I am afraid the real trouble lies with the administration, Mr. Chairman. It is in the unconcern of the Eisenhower-Benson direction of agricultural programs that we have a situation frighteningly close to that of the twenties.

It is a statement of simple fact that the Department of Agriculture, under Secretary Benson, has not faced up to its responsibility. Secretary Benson has engaged in the easy sport of buck passing. He has tried to fasten blame for his own indecision and inaction on the preceding administration.

He has taken liberties with laws placed on the statute books by this body.

He has shown himself to be more interested in the welfare of processors than in the welfare of the producers.

He has failed to meet situations squarely—as witness his still lack of an adequate program for the dairy industry and his "too little and too late" proposals for wheat.

He has sat around hoping that something favorable would happen, and not doing anything to make it happen.

He has sought excuses for inaction when he should have been seeking answers on which to base action.

He has used per capita income as a cover up for the severe decline in national farm income—as though it were his policy to increase per capita income of farmers by cutting down the number of farmers. Mr. Chairman, this is a bloody way of bringing about prosperity in agriculture. It is based on the assumption that to bring prosperity to a few you must liquidate the others.

I do not believe that such a policy can be continued, or should be condoned in the name of our free-enterprise system.

One of the high purposes of the Department of Agriculture should be to use its brain, its brawn, and its ample bank account in helping farm people achieve an ever-rising standard of living along with the rest of the economy, and to give aid in bringing to those in agriculture an equality with all groups.

Having had a good deal of experience with the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, having sat through a good many hearings with its top officials; having had some part in the legislation enacted for agriculture by this body, and having observed the functioning of those in the Benson administration, I am forced to the conclusion that the Secretary is a failure. He may not yet realize the extent of his inadequacies. I am also forced to conclude that the President has a blind spot which prevents him from knowing any of the real problems of farmers, let alone understanding them, or desiring to understand them. What else can be concluded from one who not only condones the inadequacies of Secretary Benson, but praises them?

Mr. Chairman, if anything is to be done to check the present system of drift, decline, and eventual disaster; if we are to lay away the ghost of Hooverism, it must be done by the farmers themselves and by the Congress. Or, we will all go bust with Benson.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very great appreciation to the members of the Army panel for their splendid cooperation throughout the conduct of the hearings on the Army's requirements for construction during fiscal 1956.

The Congress and the Nation have been very fortunate in having such experienced and able men as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] to carry on this extremely important work. In particular do I express appreciation to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], who acted as chairman during much of the hearings, and who brings to the committee a wealth of valuable experience from his work in this field in previous sessions of Congress. All of them have given tirelessly of their efforts and unselfishly of their time.

I also want to commend the executive secretary of the committee, Earl Silsby, for the fine manner in which he has assisted in all of our efforts. I have never seen a young man develop and progress more than he has in the short time he has been with this committee. His work has been very helpful, and very valuable to us.

As speakers before me have pointed out, we were confronted with a very difficult situation, due to the lateness of the hour when the military construction figures reached us from the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, we were confronted with the necessity for crowding our work much more than is desirable, in order to have this bill ready for consideration. This work, in addition to all the other duties that attach themselves to all of us in the closing days of a session of Congress, has resulted in most difficult problems. I can see no justification for the delays in submitting the administration's recommendations to Congress, and I trust that we may have a higher degree of cooperation from administration spokesmen in the future.

Be that as it may, we have tried to ferret out the facts that should be learned by a congressional committee in connection with this request for military construction items. We have attempted in this bill to provide those essential activities that we felt should receive first consideration. We have given prior consideration to troop housing, to dependents' housing to necessary operational facilities that are a part of any military base. We have tried to delete or to postpone those items which could safely be deferred until a later date. It should be borne in mind that in practically every military installation a great part of the facilities are of the World War II temporary construction type. It was expected that they would be demolished years ago. Unfortunately there has been a continuing need for vast military installations, and we have had to continue their use. They are not the type of facilities that we should want our troops to live in and work in. They are neither comfortable nor adequate. Maintenance costs are excessive.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have been interested in the gentleman's observation about these certain deletions that have been made by the Military Construction Subcommittee. I was particularly interested in his remark that some of these installations were of World War II variety, and were somewhat unsatisfactory.

I notice that a deletion was made for the Academic Building of the Commanding Generals' Staff College at Leavenworth. I would like to say to the gentleman this particular installation is not of World War II vintage; it is of Civil War vintage. This particular installation was put first into operation in about 1859 to accommodate a class of about 150 student officers. We have now enrolled approximately 1,000 and expect to reach an enrollment of 1,200 for a peacetime army strength. I wonder if the gentleman feels that in view of that this particular item here would fall into the general category he has described so ably.

Mr. SIKES. I am going to comment on the item that the gentleman has referred to in a very short time. I know of the gentleman's interest and I think it is most commendable interest. When I reach that point in the bill I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Now, if I may return to the general considerations observed by the committee in marking up this bill, we emphasized construction first of troop housing, family housing, mess facilities, and necessary troop operational facilities. We deleted or recommended postponement of theaters, swimming pools, branch exchanges, and similar projects.

Undoubtedly in the consideration of a budget request as large as this, containing many hundreds of separate items, it is possible that the committee has made mistakes in its selection of items which are to be constructed. We cannot claim any unusual vision in these matters; we simply do the best we can under the circumstances with the limited time in which we have to work. There are two items in particular I would like to discuss.

The first item is the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. This is an old established facility. It has been one of the most important, I think, of all the Army facilities. For many years it has been recognized as the center of advanced training for the higher officers of the Army. Practically every ranking officer in the service has attended this school. In addition many officers from Allied Armies receive important training at Fort Leavenworth.

Request was made of the committee for $5,433,000 to build an academic building for Fort Leavenworth. Although we recognize the importance of the school, the committee decided that it is an item that can be deferred. The present buildings are masonry structures. They meet present requirements. New buildings will provide improved working and living conditions and are desirable. However the information that was given to us by the Department of the Army showed that only preliminary plans are available for the new building. Therefore there is serious doubt that anything could be accomplished toward providing new facilities prior to the first of the next year, and accordingly the committee deferred the item.

Perhaps a stronger case could have been made by the Army for this facility. As a matter of fact, since the action of the committee has been made known, strong pleas have been received from official sources for reconsideration because of the importance of the work that is done at Fort Leavenworth.

I have suggested to them that if there are additional considerations that should have been brought to the attention of our committee, that these can still be presented to the other body. If this item is included by the other body then of course we in the House committee can have second look, in which case I shall certainly review very carefully all the facts.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for the interest he has shown in this proposed academic building at Fort Leavenworth.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt at that point may I say again that one of the determining factors in the decision of the committee was the fact that only preliminary plans are available for the new academic building. We felt it would be the first of the year before complete plans could be prepared and that no great damage would be done if the construction were deferred until the next construction bill is under consideration.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman to the extent that the deferring of this will not disrupt the morale entirely of the whole Army of the United States; on the other hand, referring back to some of the masonry buildings that have been converted into use at Fort Leavenworth for the commanding generals' school, I know from my own observation that some of these masonry buildings that are being used are as follows: A stable is now converted to a classroom. An old riding hall has now been converted to a classroom. I have seen both of these.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AVERY. This old riding hall has temporary partitions in and it is about as soundproof as a hotel room. Then a gymnasium has been converted into a classroom. I will grant they are conducting a college out there and a very efficient one, as the gentleman has mentioned. There are exchange officers there from some 42 other countries but it is not a very impressive school that we can show the other countries that send their officers over here for observation and training, that are sent to this college to be trained, and find themselves being schooled in an old converted stable.

Mr. SIKES. I commend the gentleman for his interest in that institution.

If I may proceed, I would like to point to another item of great interest to me and I think of great interest to the committee. It concerns the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. One of the major items of land acquisition in this bill is for acquiring an additional 20,320 acres of privately owned land at a cost of $2 million for Fort Sill, in Oklahoma. It is also proposed to acquire by transfer from the Department of the Interior 10,700 acres from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. That would be 10,700 acres out of a total of 30,554 acres in the refuge.

I think we all realize this is one of the most important wildlife refuges that we have in this Nation. Every person who loves wildlife and loves the outdoors appreciates the important activities that are being carried on there. The committee heard the Army justify its requirement for this land and a strong case was presented. Fort Sill is the Army artillery school. That is where essential gunnery practice is carried on. More and more are we dependent on very long-range weapons, including the atomic cannon, and guided missiles. We have a very large investment at Fort Sill, and no other base provides comparable facilities for artillery training. Gunnery practice with modern weapons is being carried on at Fort Sill with greatest difficulty. The present ranges simply are inadequate for the job. In addition there already is an element of danger in that it is now necessary to fire across Fort Sill and across a double highway and a railroad. Undoubtedly it is necessary that we make it possible for our soldiers to receive proper training in the use of weapons. We would be derelict in our duty here if we failed to provide facilities for that training. Accordingly the committee acquiesced in the request for additional land and in the transfer of a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge.

In this connection I think I should point out that the Army testified the ground to be taken from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge is the least desirable land and the least used land in the refuge, that it has but few recreational facilities.

After the committee had completed its deliberations and had reported its recommendations to the full committee we received a request from the Wildlife Management Institute and others that they be heard on the transfer of this land from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. Their request came very late because already the authorization bill had passed both Houses of Congress, had been cleared by the conferees, and had gone to the White House. Our committee had completed consideration and markup of the bill. Nevertheless, because of our interest in this matter, a special hearing of the committee was called to hear all those who asked to be heard on the proposed transfer.

I must point out that to my great surprise I found some of the statements made by those who oppose the transfer of this land are almost exactly opposite to the statements that have been made by the Army. They stated that the land to be transferred is some of the most valuable land in the refuge, that it is used to a great extent by tourists who visit the area, and that important recreational facilities are located in the area. The committee wants to be fair to both groups. It does not believe it has enough information to change its recommendations at this time, but I do feel that I should say to the House that I personally have a great deal of interest in this matter. I feel we should do what we can within reason to protect our wildlife resources. I suggest the possibility of working out a joint use program or of writing in safeguards which would insure a continuation of the wildlife management and conservation work at the Wichita refuge, without denying needed training facilities to the Army.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Our record also showed, did it not, that there had been a full day of hearings not only before the Committee on Armed Services, the legislative committee of this body, but also the legislative committee of the other body, and after hearing full discussion both committees approved this transfer? Did not our committee feel that we would be a little presumptuous to overrule the action of these two committees without very careful consideration?

Mr. SIKES. I always welcome the comments of my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his interest in this wildlife refuge. I would like to say as one who has been keenly interested in its preservation I am perfectly content to leave the matter in his hands and certainly will urge those who are interested in it to see to it that it is taken care of in the Senate.

Mr. SIKES. I know of the gentleman's interest in this and other wildlife matters, and I commend him for this great interest.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Many of us have been concerned about the future of wildlife refuges, especially as the gentleman from Florida was concerned about this unique refuge at Wichita. We are gratified that the gentleman has taken this attitude that they will explore and investigate all of these alternative plans in order that we may, if possible, preserve the integrity of this very beautiful and very important and very historic refuge at Wichita. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter up and trying to preserve this refuge, if it is possible, and at the same time protect our Nation's interest.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for his interest, and I know that he has contributed much in this important field.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I appreciate the remarks about the wonderful fish and wildlife facilities in Oklahoma. This happens to be located in the district I represent. And, it is not easy, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services, representing both the edges and the Wichita refuge, to make a decision. But I think any decision that we might make or that we have reached should be in the interest of the country first. Of the 60,000 acres, approximately in the Wichita wildlife refuge, Fort Sill is taking only 10,500 acres. That part that is being taken is not doing any serious damage to the fish and wildlife. It is not affecting the recreational facilities, Buffalo, Texas longhorn cattle, the fishing, the swimming, the boating, the Easter pageant, the wild turkeys, the antelope, the birds, nor the native grass. Approximately 80 percent of the area in the fish and wildlife reserve to be acquired is behind locked gates and is not accessible to the public. The inaccessibility of this area is due to the very rugged terrain and lack of development on the part of the Wildlife Service.

I think in the interest of the country it is essential, where you have millions of dollars of investment in the finest artillery field in the world, to see to it that they have sufficient range not only for the ammunition mentioned but other types as well.

Not only is this in the interest of Fort Sill and of the country, but it is in the interest of the safety of all those living adjacent to the area; as far as the farmers and ranchers are concerned, it takes the homes of 55 families. I dislike to see that, but again I say it is in the best interest of the country that that land be taken. And it will enhance the value of Fort Sill where we train the men who will protect us in the future.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very important contribution.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it should be pointed out in considering this situation that while we do have a regard for wild life, we also have a greater regard for human life. With the added range of the heavy artillery that we have and the rockets and missiles, it is now necessary for them to go to the eastern extreme of Fort Sill and fire across a heavily traveled highway, across the post itself, where the classrooms and the quarters are, and on into the hills. This is not in my district, but I trained there as a much younger man, and I think I know those hills fairly well, having walked over, ridden over, and dug into them.

I feel that if it is necessary to increase the skill of our artillerymen to protect the lives of those who are there in order to give us more security for this Nation, that should outweigh any of the arguments made in behalf of wildlife refuges which are nice to have, of course. But as I said a moment ago, human life comes before wild life.

Mr. SIKES. I assure my good friend that all of these considerations and those brought out by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] were carefully weighed by the committee. It was upon these considerations that the committee concurred in the request for funds for the additional land needed by the Artillery School at Fort Sill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. The Army request for funds for military construction during the fiscal year 1956 was based on a program of $566,533,000. Our committee has recommended an appropriation of $483,612,000, a reduction of $61,388,000, and a 13-percent reduction in percentage below the request that came to us.

In addition, we authorize the reprograming of $15,091,000 of prior authorizations. I think I should point out that this entire Army construction program is not to come out of new appropriations. All of the money for this program is from funds that were carried over in the Army's procurement and production program for prior years. The Army had a tremendous buildup in its procurement and production program during the Korean and immediate post-Korean war years. That money, of course, was for weapons, tanks, trucks, and all the other thousands of allied items that are necessary for the Army to carry on its very important missions. When it was found that it was not necessary to spend that money, a part of it was held for future use by the Army. Now that money is being diverted to Army construction rather than having new money appropriated from the Treasury.

Of this appropriation of $483 million, approximately 32 percent or $160,500,000 of the total, is for antiaircraft facilities worldwide, including land acquisition and construction of additional Nike guided missile positions, $48,283,000 is for permanent barracks spaces to provide 25,222 spaces to house troops in the continental United States. Nineteen million dollars is for supporting facilities; battalion and regimental buildings, dispensaries, classrooms, and other standard facilities; $122,264,000 is for family housing to provide 8,308 units of permanent on-base family housing owned by the Government and issued to troops in lieu of quarters allowances. Of this, all but 806 units are in continental United States; $37,800,000 of this money is for land acquisition. Most of it is for 51,637 acres in Okinawa made necessary by the fact that Okinawa is a permanent bastion of the American forces.

I would like to point out that of the thirty-odd million dollars for land acquisition in Okinawa only $7,500,000 is for Army use. The remainder is for the Navy and Air Force. It has been customary under our method of procedure for the Army to acquire land for the other services. Thus this item appears as a charge against the Army budget, and it makes the Army budget look $22 million bigger than it actually is.

Here is one important item that I want to discuss. We are providing for improvements at the United States Military Academy that have long been overdue. I think everyone here who has been to the Academy realizes we do not have adequate classroom facilities or adequate barracks facilities for the boys who are training there. It is highly improper that this situation has been allowed to exist so long. This bill will help to correct that situation.

Seventy-nine percent of the money carried in this program shall be expended in the continental United States, the remainder primarily in Iceland or in Okinawa.

I believe that takes care of the primary items I wanted to discuss, but I shall point out that among the items deleted were funds for the west coast, Ammunition Loading Terminal in California, theaters which we felt could be postponed, the academic building of the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and in addition, the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, and some units at Fort Huachuca which are not budgeted and on which the House has had no discussion and has had no justification from the Department.

I am disturbed by the fact that not only the Army but also the Navy and the Air Force still fail to bring us plans for dispersal of facilities. We appear to have learned little in this atomic age about the very essential requirement for dispersal of military facilities. We still are concentrating our buildup of installations. They are huge installations which grow bigger and bigger around central key activities. This, of course, makes them highly strategic and susceptible to atomic bombing or to attack by guided missiles. I feel that this is a very dangerous thing, and that additional stress should be placed on the dispersal of those facilities.

I think more particularly is this true of naval and Air Force facilities which are more subject to crippling blows because of the fact that they are more completely tied down by dependence upon boat facilities and airfields. It has been testified again and again that small operations which can be carried on from many points are the key to this problem. But I see little that indicates a willingness to cope with threat at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, when further investigation is made of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge and the need for the perpetuation of the refuge is balanced against the national defense needs continuing the operation of Fort Sill and its magnificent artillery school, I am sure the committee will come to the conclusion there are alternative methods for continuing long-range artillery instruction at Fort Sill.

The Wichita Mountain area is the last primitive area in Oklahoma. It is likewise Oklahoma's greatest scenic and recreational area. This year close to 1 million people have already used its invigorating mountains and scenic valleys for relaxation, picnicking, fishing—1,200 fishermen a week—camping, hiking, mountain climbing, and viewing the big-game herds of buffalo, elk, deer, and lesser species, such as wild turkey, quail, squirrels, and other small game. The most important preservation herd of the original Texas long-horned steer is maintained here by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The area wanted by the Army is the most important watershed in the refuge, supplying the water for the many swimming and fishing lakes and for the luxuriant stand of prairie shortgrass on which the herds wax fat.

The proposed firing of the atomic cannon and the 722 millimeter corporal rocket here will aggravate the existing fire hazard, which is a serious threat from July 1 of each year. The above firing on the refuge area will speedily burn over the mountain area of 10,700 acres being taken over by the Army. The Service, on the basis of its past experience, feels that the fires cannot be controlled in the mountain and that they will sweep through both the recreational grounds and the big-game pasture. It should be noted that approximately half of the refuge's recreational area will be involved in this transfer.

Many species of plant life and several species of birds are found in Oklahoma only on the refuge lands.

The proposal of the Army is totally unnecessary. The Service has suggested a compromise plan whereby they would close the lower two tiers of sections across the south portion of the refuge as a buffer area when the Army is firing its big cannons. The public would be kept out of the area during that period, but allowed to use this most fascinating portion of the refuge when no firing was taking place.

During World War II and since, the Army had under permit from the Service 35,000 acres from the refuge for maneuvers. They complied with the terms of the permit thoroughly, and the best of cooperation existed between the Fort Sill authorities and the refuge manager. Except for some damage to roads by heavy equipment, the Army exercised its permit without damage to the refuge. This permit could be continued indefinitely and, with the addition of the buffer area that the Service is prepared to close when the guns are fired, would in the Service's opinion meet the immediate needs of the Army at this point. This is especially true if the Army buys the private land as announced. However, to our knowledge the Army made no effort to investigate the alternate plan offered by the Service.

During the past 15 years the Service has had to permit Fort Sill to emplace some of its biggest guns on the refuge so that they could be fired and the shells land on Fort Sill's impact areas. This was necessary all during World War II. The Service in the present controversy has offered to provide Fort Sill authorities with a larger gun emplacement anywhere on this 10,700 acres on which they can fire the big guns and rockets contemplated and land the shells on Fort Sill proper. The Army did not investigate this plan at all. Apparently the invasion of the Wichita Refuge is part of a general plan on the part of the Army to move in on the national wildlife refuge program. It would appear that the large areas of wildlife land which the Service has set aside for preserving disappearing big-game herds are particularly attractive to the Army authorities for their testing and training purposes. The Air Force has recently informed the Service that instead of their present firing permit on the Desert Game Range in Nevada, they want to take over primary jurisdiction. This would close the door on the wildlife interests of the area. Likewise, the Army has asked for three-fourths of the Kofa Game Range in southwestern Arizona, the home of the remnant Galliard mountain sheep, for use in testing poisonous gas on a battlefront scale. It takes little or no imagination to perceive what will happen to the resident Galliard sheep, mule deer, white-winged doves, and pygmy antelope and many other interesting species if this comes about.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the serious cut in funds for the White House Conference on Education being proposed by the committee. Only $50,000 has been recommended out of $238,000 requested for this purpose.

I should like to point out to the House that the committee decision on the funds for the White House Conference was apparently based on a misconstruction of facts. Let me quote the committee statement:

> Salaries and expenses, White House Conference on Education: The committee has allowed $50,000 of the request for $238,000. The request included $170,000 to provide travel funds for 1,700 of the 2,000 delegates

> expected to attend the White House Conference on Education. The additional $68,000 was for Federal staff costs in connection with the Conference. The committee was informed that the legislation which authorized the White House Conference on Education does not authorize the use of Federal funds for the travel expenses of delegates to the conference. Therefore, no funds for travel expenses of the delegates are included in the bill.

I have, and I should like to read, the opinion of counsel that there does exist adequate authority to spend funds for the transportation of delegates from the States. Mr. Parke Banta, General Counsel for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, describes the situation as follows:

> Public Law 530 authorizes appropriations to enable the President to hold in Washington, D. C., "a conference broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation, to be called the White House Conference on Education, to consider and report to the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of education."
>
> Section 2 of the act authorizes grants to States for the purpose of bringing together "prior to the White House Conference on Education, educators and other interested citizens to discuss educational problems in the State and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken at local, State, and Federal levels."
>
> Section 3 rounds out the picture by authorizing "to be appropriated to the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1955, and June 30, 1956, such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this act, including the expenses of the Office of Education in making available to the public the findings and recommendations of the Conference."
>
> There is, of course, no specific reference to payment of travel costs contained in Public Law 530. There is, however, specific authority to hold a conference in Washington, D. C., to be attended by individuals "from all parts of the Nation," coupled with a specific authorization for appropriations "necessary for the administration of this act." As was pointed out in the testimony before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, hearings before subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session, page 608 et seq., it is essential to the achievement of the broad representation contemplated by the act that funds for transportation costs be available. Certainly, the Congress must have intended that such expenses be paid, since it would not be reasonable to expect those individuals chosen to advise the President to attend at their own expense; indeed, many, even though willing to do so, could not afford it.
>
> In view of the foregoing it is our opinion that Public Law 530, 83d Congress, when read as a whole and in the context of its general purpose to bring together in Washington, D. C., a "broadly representative" group of individuals "to consider and report to the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of education," can and *should be construed* as authorizing appropriations to pay the travel costs of persons officially invited to attend the conference.

I am sure it is not the intent of this Congress to torpedo the biggest and most important program on education in history.

We in this House, by Public Law 530, 83d Congress, authorized the State and White House Conferences. We cannot scuttle the program at this point. Even if no action is taken here today to rescue this program, perhaps action can be taken by the other body.

The 83d Congress required that the White House Conference be "broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation." Without funds to pay travel expenses of the participants, the intent of Congress will not be achieved.

Without such funds, those who reside in the Washington area may be expected to attend. So, too, will those who have the funds and the time. Finally we may expect representatives of various organizations which are well financed and deeply committed to proconceived points of view. To draw only from these three groups, I think we can agree, will mean that the White House Conference will not be broadly representative, contrary to the expressed intent of Congress.

In establishing the State and White House Conferences on Education, the Congress set in motion a citizen study of education in all 53 States and Territories. Literally tens of thousands of people are taking part in this program. By denying the funds with which these States may send their designated representatives to Washington to take part in the White House Conference, we would be, in effect, scuttling the program which Congress inaugurated by passing this law.

There are no other funds which can be used to bring to the White House Conference the people who would constitute a broad national representation from all parts of the country. We need that kind of representation.

The chairman of the White House Conference on Education committee, Neil H. McElroy, has stated in a recent letter to Mrs. Hobby the committee's position as follows:

> The committee does not want to hold a conference which, because of lack of funds to pay travel expenses of participants, is attended primarily by persons residing near Washington, by representatives of organizations who may wish to use the conference as a national sounding board, and others who for personal reasons alone desire to be part of the White House Conference. We consider that participation of this kind would represent failure of the requirement placed upon us that the Conference be broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation.
>
> The President's committee has reviewed this matter very carefully and believes unanimously that balanced representation is an essential element of the White House Conference. The administration strongly supports these recommendations of the President's committee for the White House Conference.

Some might say that expenses of participants to the White House Conference should be paid by the States. Let me make two points:

First, the White House Conference is not a State meeting, but a national meeting which we in this Congress authorized and to which we wanted citizens to come. Second, a poll of 45 States indicates that only 1 State has both the State funds and authority within State law to pay the travel costs of representatives to the White House Conference. For the first time we have the opportunity here to find out what the American public wishes to be done. If we deny this conference, we have denied the voices of those whose only interest is the public interest. This is not a partisan program. State conferences have been called by the governors, 27 of whom are Democrats and 21 Republicans.

Let me give you some examples of where these funds will go. They are not to send Federal employees to the States, they are to bring representative citizens from the States to Washington. For example, California would be asked to send 98 persons chosen in California. The travel expense is more than $23,000. New York would have 123 participants whose travel cost is almost $6,000. Texas would have 67 representatives; Ohio, 68; Illinois, 73; Washington State, 20, etc.

Is it reasonable to assume that in order to advise on solutions to the Nation's school problems that California, Florida, Montana, and the other States distant from Washington should be required to spend more money to give this information to the Federal Government than those States immediately surrounding the District of Columbia?

The money requested is $170,000. It is for the payment of travel expense only. It does not include funds for hotel rooms, meals, and other expenses of participants. The participants at the White House Conference are willing to pay these expenses, but they should not be expected to pay also the cost of travel to and from a meeting which was authorized by the Congress of the United States.

What are we to tell our people at home if we say to them, "we are not sufficiently interested in your opinion on school problems that we would vote to share with you your expense in taking part in this national conference?"

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Air Force Panel of the Department of Defense appropriation bill I am impressed with the total dollars appropriated by the Department of the Air Force. I point out that the Army is receiivng $483,612,000; the Navy $439,950,000, a total of $923,562,000. While the Air Force is receiving under this appropriation bill $955,929,000. Thus you see Mr. Chairman a heavy responsibility rests upon the Air Force to consider a wise use of the dollars herein recommended.

Mr. Chairman, the Air Force panel is chairmanned by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]; other members include the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. Your panel was faced with a serious problem in the amount of time needed to consider an appropriation bill of this size.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is pointing out the very significant fact that in view of the fact that the budget estimate came down so late we were not able to do the thorough job we want to do. For a number of years we have had this problem, but I am persuaded to believe that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations is correct in assuring us that they will come much earlier next year.

I would like to say that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Deane] who is now addressing the committee made a very substantial contribution to this bill. He presided most of the time over the Air Force panel and he did a good job. I think the House would want to know of the conscientious effort he made in that regard. Other Members working on the full subcommittee and on other panels, of course, also made a contribution, but I did want to refer to the particular contribution of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I feel the House owes a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scrivner] who served as chairman of this committee in the last Congress. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] each made a significant contribution.

Each member of the committee holds certain convictions about the committee work. We urgently need an enlarged staff. Our executive secretary, Sam Crosby, has served with distinction. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] has indicated that any time we feel there is need for additional staff, if we will make the request, it will be granted. I trust that next year we will have the staff that is necessary to adequately go into the many ramifications of this military construction program.

Mr. Chairman, the military construction program of the Air Force was presented chiefly by Maj. Gen. L. B. Washbourne, Assistant Chief of Staff for Installations, and Brig. Gen. J. F. Rodenhauser, Director of Real Property for the Department of the Air Force.

The overall public-works program of the Air Force was outlined to the committee by General Washbourne and the detailed justification, base by base, was the duty and responsibility of General Rodenhauser and specialized witnesses associated with General Rodenhauser. I was impressed with the sincerity of all of these witnesses. In most all instances they were conversant with the problems facing the Air Force panel. There were a few glaring examples where witnesses were asked to testify who had only recently been brought into administrative jobs and who were sadly lacking in the information needed by the committee.

NEED OF CONTINUED LIAISON

Mr. Chairman, my service on the Air Force panel reveals the urgent need of keeping operational officers in a spot long enough that they can give intelligent answers which must be a part of the record if the program is to have the proper support by your committee.

This gives me real concern. Several witnesses appeared before our committee who had only recently been brought from the field and placed in administrative positions to justify a budget that they knew very little about.

It was not the fault of the officers. The responsibility must rest upon individuals in the Pentagon for requiring an officer to be placed in such a position.

BRIG. GEN. J. F. RODENHAUSER, DIRECTOR OF REAL PROPERTY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly express my appreciation to General Rodenhauser, Director of Real Property, the principal witness before our Air Force panel on the base-by-base justification.

General Rodenhauser has served in headquarters, Army Service Forces, and headquarters, United States Air Force, since June 1944, with appropriate breaks for service outside the Washington area. On his current tour beginning in 1951, he has served as Director of Real Property, and in similar capacities, in the Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations, Headquarters, United States Air Force. In this capacity he has been responsible for the procurement, development, and issuance of military construction program guidance; for the assembly, validation, and defense of military construction programs; for the selection and planning of installations world wide; for validation of qualitative and quantitative requirements for installations facilities; for inventory of real property; for real estate acquisition and disposal actions; and for management of real property utilization.

General Rodenhauser made his initial presentations of military-construction programs to the congressional committees beginning with the fiscal year 1954 military construction program. Since that time he has presented each subsequent program, including the fiscal year 1956 military construction program.

General Rodenhauser has completed his present tour in the Washington area and is being assigned for overseas duty, to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I feel I speak for our Air Force panel in expressing our appreciation for the faithful and constructive service of General Rodenhauser and wish for him a successful tour of duty in his new assignment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. A report is being circulated that there may be in this bill funds for construction of two hotels in Germany for service personnel. Does the gentleman have any knowledge of any such appropriation?

Mr. DEANE. I would suggest to the gentleman that so far as the Air Force is concerned, if he will look at pages 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, of the committee report he will see the items that are appropriated for the Air Force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Deane].

THE OVERALL AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. DEANE. As a part of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to place in the record the overall Air Force construction requirements for fiscal year 1956 which were given to the committee by General Washbourne.

Mr. Chairman, we must keep in mind that the objective of the base construction program of the Department of the Air Force is to support 137-wing force level.

As I quote below from the statement by General Washbourne, you will keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the dollar amounts for the various programs, as indicated, are not the amounts finally approved by the Air Force panel. It was the feeling of the committee that by a careful analysis of all construction contracts that the amounts indicated by General Washbourne could be considerably reduced. The committee could be in error. On the other hand, we felt that the Department of the Air Force should attempt to shape the figures as indicated below to conform to the overall final appropriated dollars.

Your Air Force panel received the following information concerning the number of bases, construction objectives, program summary, and command distribution:

NUMBER OF BASES

The Air Force will, by the end of 1957, have a base structure consisting of 346 principal operational, training, logistic, and research installations which are required to operate and support the 137-wing force; 186 of these installations are in continental United States and 160 are in overseas locations. Excluded from these totals are over 2,000 ancillary installations such as communications sites, navigational aids, radar stations, and classified locations. This bill includes construction at 255 of the principal bases, 152 of which are in continental United States, and 103 are overseas. In addition, it provides funds for construction of Reserve Forces facilities at 18 flying training bases and at 25 nonflying training centers; the construction of offbase navigation aids; area POL systems; aircraft control and warning system sites; and facilities at classified locations, all details of which will be provided during discussion of the appropriation request.

CONSTRUCTION OBJECTIVES

The construction objective of the Air Force is to have the facilities for sustained operations of the 137-wing force in place by end of fiscal year 1957. This involves, first of all, the provision of bases to "bed down" the force in locations at which it can train and attain full operational capability and from which it could launch defensive and offensive operations. To accomplish this goal the principal remaining requirements are:

(a) Operational, staging, and training requirements for the new long-range heavy bomber, the B–52, being phased into the SAC striking forces.

(b) Development and expansion of the air-defense net, including warning sites in the United States and Canada and fighter-interceptor bases.

(c) Family housing.

(d) Aircraft-fuel storage.

(e) Guided missile and pilotless aircraft facilities.

(f) Research and development projects, including development of nuclear-powered aircraft.

(g) Phased development of the base complex in Spain.

(h) Air Force Academy.

(i) Facilities for bases deferred from previous programs due to lack of base rights.

(j) Reserve forces facilities.

(k) Replacement of deteriorated, obsolete, and substandard temporary structures with initial emphasis on medical facilities, dormitories, and dining halls.

(l) Personnel and recreational facilities.

In meeting our objective to provide a permanent home for the 137-wing force, we have been, and are, constantly striving to improve standards of living and operational facilities within the limits of prudent expenditures. We plan to construct under this program facilities of durable, long-life usage comparable to good, commercial practice. The projects are priced accordingly. We believe this to be necessary to achieve minimum cost of maintenance for the extended period of time it is now anticipated we will need a 137-wing base structure.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Air Force fiscal year 1956 appropriation request is summarized on the first chart.

CHART NO. 1—*Summary of Air Force fiscal year 1956 military construction appropriation request*

		In thousands
Continental United States		$929,113
Outside continental United States		453,212
Minor construction		20,000
Planning		32,331
Total program		1,434,656
Less:		
Peseta counterpart funds	$2,000	
Unforeseeable delays	232,656	
		234,656
Total appropriation request		1,200,000

As explained earlier, the Air Force is requesting approval of a program totaling approximately $1,434,000,000. Of this amount 65 percent, or $929,113,000, are for projects in continental United States. Thirty-two percent of the total, or $453,212,000, is for overseas locations. The $20 million for minor construction provides for the construction of facilities which fall within the statutory limitations of section 707, Public Law 458, 83d Congress, and which have not been provided by specific authorizing legislation. The $32,331,000 for planning will provide those funds which will be needed in fiscal year 1956 for base master planning, investigational engineering, advanced planning of projects not yet authorized by law, and for project planning of authorized projects which have not been funded. The appropriations being requested to finance the program of $1.4 billion amount to $1.2 billion, or $234,656,000 less than the program. This reduction has been made by consideration of the anticipated availability of $2 million of peseta counterpart funds for base construction in Spain and by allowing for possible unforeseen delays in the overall construction program in the amount of $232,656,000.

COMMAND DISTRIBUTION

The next chart indicates the distribution of the program by Air Force commands:

CHART NO. 2.—*Command distribution of Air Force, fiscal year 1956 military construction appropriation program*

[Dollars in thousands]

	Amount	Percent of total
Continental United States:		
Strategic Air Command	$261,140	18.2
Aircraft Control and Warning System	122,192	8.5
Air Defense Command	113,455	7.9
Air Research and Development Command	90,730	6.3
Air Materiel Command	82,076	5.7
Air Force Academy	76,478	5.3
Tactical Air Command	58,546	4.1
Air Training Command	52,720	3.7
Continental Air Command (Reserve)	31,598	2.2
Military Air Transport Service	22,837	1.6
Air Proving Ground Command	7,803	.5
Continental Air Command (Regular)	5,695	.4
Air University	2,936	.2
Headquarters Command	520	.1
Various	387	.1
Total, continental United States	929,113	64.7
Outside continental United States:		
USAF Europe	222,962	15.5
Aircraft Control and Warning System	105,883	7.4
Strategic Air Command	37,026	2.6
Alaskan Air Command	28,829	2.0
Northeast Air Command	23,601	1.6
Military Air Transport Service	19,847	1.4
Far East Air Force	14,082	1.0
Communications and NAVAIDS	526	.1
Various	293	.1
Caribbean Air Command	163	.1
Total, outside continental United States	453,212	31.6
Minor construction	20,000	1.4
Planning	32,331	2.3
Total program	1,434,656	100.0

Mr. Chairman, there are two significant programs of the Air Force that I desire to mention.

DEW

I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the so-called distant early warning line, commonly referred to as DEW. Through 1957, we are going to spend on this line $268 million. DEW has evolved through these steps:

During the summer of 1952 considerable study was underway to determine the requirements for and the means of providing early warning of air attack for the continental United States. Agencies such as the Department of Defense, the National Security Resources Board, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the Lincoln laboratories, and others were involved in various aspects of the problem. Inevitably two big questions emerged from these studies. Both involved time: "How much time do we need" and "how much time can we get?"

There is no single statement of how much time is needed. The warning time required for effective civil defense in one city is different from that required in another. The warning time required by one military force differs from the requirements of another. The time of day, the weather conditions, the seasons of the year, all have a direct bearing on the amount of warning time needed.

The answer to the question of "How much time can we get" can be more specific. One group of prominent scientists and technicians serving as the Lincoln summary study group concluded that it was technically and economically feasible to install a detection system in the Arctic which would provide from 3 to 6 hours' warning of air attack. This chart illustrates what that means geographically.

Each of these lines depicts a possible route of a 450-knot bomber toward a specific target in the United States. Take this route toward Minneapolis as an example. If we could be satisfied with 1 hour warning of attacks against the Minneapolis area, a detection system placed approximately 450 nautical miles north of the city would suffice. On the other hand, such a system would provide Winnipeg about 20 minutes warning. If we need 3 hours of warning of attacks on Minneapolis, our detection system would have to be about 1,350 miles north. If the speed of the bomber increases, we have to go farther north with our detection system in order to provide the same amount of time. The warning time will differ according to the target selected, the route flown by the bomber to the target, and the speed of the bomber.

As a result of these activities and interest in the development of a warning system in the north, the President authorized the release of a statement of policy on the 31st of December 1952, which stated in part "such an early warning system should be developed and made operational as a matter of high urgency." Mr. Lovett, then the Secretary of Defense, requested the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to undertake the task of developing and testing communication and electronic equipment and techniques which would make possible the operation of an early warning system in the far north. Subsequently a contract was let with the Western Electric Co. to install and operate a test warning system in northeast Alaska and northwest Canada. In February 1953, agreements had been completed with the Canadian Government for the installation of the test stations. By November 1953 the sites were completed and the development program was underway.

In February of 1954, the National Security Council again directed that a distant early warning system be established as soon as proven feasible by the testing program that was being conducted in the north. By late summer of 1954, the equipment and techniques being tested showed sufficient promise to enable Air Force to start action to implement a complete system.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, acting on a study prepared by the representatives of Canadian and United States Air Forces, approved the location of the entire distant early warning system. The land-based segment, with which we are concerned today, generally lies along the most northerly practicable part of the North American Continent. The line will be made up of radar stations located so as to assure detection of any aircraft crossing the line. In addition to operating detection equipment the DEW line stations are linked together with a communications system which makes possible direct contact with the air defense headquarters of the Alaskan Air Command, the Royal Canadian Air Defense Forces, the Northeast Air Command, and the Air Defense Command in the United States.

Following the decision on the location for the line, a contract was let with the Western Electric Co. in November 1954 to proceed with the installation of the facilities. The Air Force and the Department of Defense established a management fund to finance the project. The first increment of money into the management fund totaled $79.1 million of which $42 million was for construction. A distant early warning project office was formed to manage the contract with the Western Electric Co. Personnel from the Air Materiel Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, the Air Research and Development Command, the Air Force Installation Representative in the North Atlantic Area, and the Royal Canadian Air Force man the office.

Western Electric has let contracts for the actual construction to three major construction firms. The Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co. and Johnson, Drake & Pipe, Inc., of Seattle, Wash., have the job for the western portion of the line. Northern Construction Co. and J. W. Stewart, Ltd., of Vancouver, British Columbia, are doing the construction in the central portion. Foundation Co. of Canada, Ltd., of Montreal, Quebec, has the job in the eastern section.

The movement of men and materials to the line has been and will continue to be a major undertaking. There are four major methods of transportation involved. We have used airlift and "cat" train operations during the winter months. This summer sea transports in the Atlantic and Pacific and barge traffic down the MacKenzie River will be used. In order to get the line in and operating at the earliest possible date, the airlift had to be started immediately. By January 1954, commercial aviation companies of the United States and Canada, augmented with military aircraft of the USAF and the RCAF were starting to move a mountain of materials to the north. Our objectives were to move 8,000 tons to the western section, 10,500 tons to the central section, and 11,600 tons to the eastern section before the ice broke up this spring. When it is considered that there were no landing strips in the arctic areas concerned the magnitude of the task becomes apparent. This problem was overcome by landing small parties of men with small tractors on the sea ice with DC–3 type aircraft. The small tractors were used to level off an area long enough to permit C–119 aircraft, the "flying boxcars" of the Tactical Air Command, to land with more men and a larger tractor. The larger tractor made possible the clearing of a strip long enough for C–124's to land which brought in D–8 "cats." With the heavy equipment the strips could be kept open for a flow of aircraft bringing in men, supplies, and construction materials. Aircraft weighing as much as 168,000 pounds were landed on these strips of leveled sea ice. As of May 27, the combined efforts of commercial aviation companies and military squadrons had airlifted to the stations along the line, 8,444 tons in the western section, 10,601 tons in the central section, and 10,582 tons in the eastern section. The USAF alone flew over 1,100 "sorties" on trips to and from the line between February and May.

The success of the winter airlift made possible considerable progress in the construction of the facilities at the various sites. As of May 27 all the sites have been surveyed and detailed plans completed. Gravel hauls are progressing on schedule. Many foundations are in and some of the buildings are up and are being lived in. Many new techniques have made possible this exceptional progress. Many of the foundations are being put in by using steam jets to thaw holes in the permafrost for piling. In other areas we are using power augers to drill holes through the frozen tundra and gravel typical of the region. The buildings are made of prefabricated plywood panels and are set well above the ground. This permits the wind to sweep under the buildings, thus preventing the accumulation of large snowdrifts. Work is progressing on the preparation of gravel airstrips which will make future airlift to the sites a much more simple job than that we experienced this last winter and spring.

I would like now to answer the big question of how much? How much, in manpower and in money.

The Air Force is now studying two major proposals concerning manning the line. Although no decision has been reached on this matter to date, the question is whether to use a civilian contractor to operate and maintain the equipment with a small group of military officers to make military decisions, or to use military personnel throughout. There are a number of good points for both proposals.

The dollar costs of the line can be more specific. As indicated earlier, the project was started with an initial fund of $79.1 million. Of that amount, 42 million was for construction. On May 31 an additional 23 million was added for construction. At the present time there is an additional 6.5 million for construction awaiting approval of the Bureau of the Budget. This latest addition will bring the total expended in fiscal year 1955 to 108.6 million, of which 71.5 million is for construction.

The fiscal year 1956 budget request contains a total of 104.78 million for the DEW project. Of this amount, 7.02 million is for procurement other than aircraft, 10.76 million is for maintenance and operations, costs, and 87 million is for construction.

The fiscal year 1955 funds of 108.6 million, plus the fiscal year 1956 estimate of 104.78 million brings the total to 213.38 million. While a detailed estimate is not available at this time, we believe the fiscal year 1957 requirement will be about 55 million. The 3-year total for this portion of the DEW line will be about 268 million.

After you detect the aircraft, what are you going to do about it?

SAGE

The next program is referred to as the semiautomatic ground environment commonly referred to in the service as SAGE. It staggers the imagination when you think that that program is going to ultimately cost $1,056,000,000. That is the capital cost.

SAGE is the abbreviated short title for semiautomatic ground environment. The system was formerly known as the Lincoln transition system.

The SAGE system is that portion of the air defense system that provides the means for the semiautomatic processing of data and weapon control. It consists of:

(a) Those facilities required to process and transmit air surveillance data from existing and planned data gathering sources to the SAGE direction center.

(b) The direction center where air surveillance data, by means of electronic computers is processed, evaluated, and developed into air situations at subsector level from which threat evaluation, weapons assignment, and appropriate weapons guidance orders are generated.

(c) Those facilities required to transmit situation data from direction centers to combat centers.

(d) The combat centers, where data from the direction centers, by means of electronic computers is processed, evaluated, and developed into sector level air situations so that the utilization of weapon resources can be monitored and directed.

(e) Those facilities required to transmit instructions from combat centers to direction centers.

(f) Those facilities required to transmit the output data from combat centers to direction centers to the appropriate user, such as adjacent direction centers, combat centers, data-line transmitters, CAA and AA facilities.

Those facilities included in or directly associated with the SAGE program include such items as: Operation-building, fuel storage, power and air-conditioning plant, communication, external and internal, for the automatic transmission of information from data-gathering sources to the direction centers and cross telling between direction centers and the combat centers.

It also includes such support facilities as: Administrative facilities, officers' quarters, airmen's and officers' messing and recreation, post exchange, auto maintenance, installation administration and shops, supply warehousing, utilities and heating, security facilities, officer and airmen family housing.

These are typical support facilities. Quantitive requirements will vary with each location depending upon availability of existing facilities.

Parts of the existing and/or programed air defense system feed into the SAGE system.

These may include such items as gap filler radars, long-range radars and their associated height finders, airborne early warning and control aircraft, picket ships, Texas towers, air route traffic control centers, weather facilities, interceptor bases, GOC filter centers, civil defense, the antiaircraft operation center and its associated weapons, such as Nike and AA guns, missile-launching bases, and the radio facilities through which guidance instruction are given to the manned interceptors and missiles.

The requirements for SAGE stems from the need to improve the present air-defense system in light of an enemy threat so that we can reduce the time required to gather data, evaluate it, and reach a decision. This would permit us to attain a high kill capability for the related weapons systems. The Air Force must be capable of coping with any potential threat to this country.

SAGE introduces the semiautomatic data-processing and weapons control improvement which will provide the air-defense system with the capability to conduct the air battle effectively and flexibly.

The air defense of the continental United States is a responsibility of the commander in chief, Continental Air Defense Command. The prime concern of CONAD is the protection of retaliatory forces, population, natural resources, and industrial potential against any initial or sustained attack by hostile forces. This defense must be sufficiently effective to counterattack and assure the eventual successful conclusion of war.

In order to carry out its assigned mission, CONAD has assigned certain air-defense tasks to subordinate echelons. Responsibility for these tasks apply geographically as well as operationally. The organizational structure of the force of each service which forms CONAD vary; however, the operational arrangement applies for the complete air-defense system.

The highest echelon of command is the Continental Air Defense Command with headquarters at Colorado Springs, Colo. CONAD will operate a combat operations center and exercise general and overall battle supervision over the lower echelons of command.

Next is the Joint Air Defense Force. There will be three Joint Air Defense Forces—Eastern, Central, and Western—as in the present Air Defense structure. Each joint Air Defense Force will also operate a combat operations center for general supervision of the air battle within its area of assigned responsibility.

The Joint Air Defense Division, or Sector, is the next level of command in our Air Defense structure. At this location the Combat Center will be equipped with semiautomatic equipment.

The next level in our operational structure is the Joint Air Defense Wing whose area of responsibility is called a subsector. The direction center at this level will be equipped with an electronic computer arrangement. It is at this level that the air battle will be directed. Under the operational control of the subsector commander there will be manned interceptors, unmanned interceptors, long-range radars, gap-filler radars, picket vessels, Texas towers, AEW and C aircraft and AAOC's.

The direction center is an installation equipped with a combat direction-control computer. The increased capability of this system represents a tremendous gain in capacity over the present system. Radar data and other information are transmitted over communication lines to the computer where in combination with the human crew it processes the radar data and other air-situation information, performs identifications, and directs weapons.

Search radars, beacons, and height finders and Texas towers automatically report the positions of aircraft over the data circuits to the direction center. Mappers and moving-target indicators remove false data caused by stationary objects, clouds, and so forth, before the wanted radar returns are fed to the direction center.

Target data from airborne early warning airplanes, picket ships, ground observers, and other auxiliary data such as weather reports enter the computer by the way of machine-punched cards. Data from other direction centers and the combat center feed via data circuits to the direction center. The computer takes the data and makes correlate with previous data, and prepares displays to be shown to operators. The human operators monitor the computer operation, determine the identity of aircraft, and assign weapons. The type of weapon selected and assigned to targets, whether manned or unmanned interceptor missiles, will be as the situation dictates. After the operator has made his decision this decision will be made known to the computer via manual inputs. The computer then prepares weapons commands and summary reports and makes distribution via automatic data links to weapon sites, interceptors, and other centers. There are between 475 and 575 personnel, officers, airmen, and civilians required to operate and supervise all the functions carried on at the subsector. It is estimated that between 500 and 900 leased communications circuits are required in each subsector. The total number will vary with the number and types of installations within each subsector.

No longer will it be necessary for people to scan scopes for initial radar returns nor to pass this information over slow voice communications to other humans. This will be done automatically by new techniques such as slowed-down video and fine-grain data. Humans, however, will monitor the functioning of the equipment. The processing of data and the generation of filtered display is also accomplished automatically, and again personnel will perform primarily a monitoring function. Instructions will be automatically transmitted by the computer via data link to the appropriate users. This high degree of automaticity will do much to reduce the human errors now inherent in the present system.

In order to accomplish a program of this magnitude, unprecedented actions were required and will continue to be required until the complete system is installed and operating. To achieve this the Air Force has negotiated a contract with the Western Electric Co. to provide the assistance necessary to assure successful evolution and integration of the SAGE system. Specifically, the tasks consist of:

(a) The design and construction of the technical buildings and related facilities at the direction center and combat center sites.

(b) Services essential for systemwide administration, coordination, test, and training schedules.

It is estimated that the SAGE system will cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,086,000,000 and annual operating cost will be approximately $400 million.

In fiscal year 1954, $44.07 million was spent.

In fiscal year 1955, $144.07 million was obligated, and the Air Force requires $282.12 million in fiscal year 1956.

After SAGE is installed it will cost $300 million to $400 million annually for operation.

MID-CANADA LINE

Mr. Chairman, our friends to the north, Canada, are responsible for and are assuming the total cost of the so-called Mid-Canada Line.

Mr. Chairman, if you will refer to pages 32 and 33 of the committee report, you will see the deletions and reductions which our chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has described. Each of the services, including the Air Force, indicated there was some 15 to 16 percent slippage. To that extent, plus deletions, your committee felt a reduction was required.

HOW THE AIR FORCE PROPOSED TO SPEND CONSTRUCTION DOLLARS

Mr. Chairman, I think it is of importance that the Congress be generally familiar on how the Department of the Air Force proposes to spend the dollars we appropriate.

Earlier I indicated that the Air Force panel, supported by the entire Defense Appropriation Committee, made a down-the-line reduction in each program outlined below.

The program of the Department of the Air Force was changed to this extent as indicated in our report.

DELETIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Funds for hospital facilities at the Lincoln Air Force Base have been deleted pending a decision regarding use of the existing veterans hospital near this base.

The committee feels that swimming pools are a very desirable recreational and training facility, but the Department failed to explain the need for more than one such installation as proposed at a number of bases. Accordingly, second pools at Hunter, Lake Charles, Travis, and England Air Force Bases have been eliminated.

All new funds for construction of the Air Academy are withheld, and it is the committee's wish that no construction whatsoever be started using previously appropriated funds until a further specific request for construction money has been approved by the committee. The committee and individual Members of Congress have received a great deal of adverse comment on the recently publicized preliminary designs of the Academy and feel strongly that it would be most unwise to provide funds for construction until the design is more firmly established. The new Academy should reflect the best traditions in American architecture; the design should inspire the confidence and respect of the American people. It is suggested that the Secretary consult with the Commission of Fine Arts before accepting a proposed design for this national institution.

For fiscal 1956 the Department has requested a new item for this appropriation under the heading Minor Construction. Such work has previously been done with maintenance and operations funds. The committee is approving this request but with the understanding that the Department will submit quarterly reports on projects undertaken with these funds. Such reports should include a description of the project, the total estimated cost and funds allocated during the quarter.

On the overseas portion of the program the committee has reduced requested funds on the basis that the Department will not be ready to go ahead with part of the program during fiscal 1956. Some small reductions were made to trim the excessive square foot cost of a cold storage facility at Hickam Air Force Base, T. H., and to eliminate a proposed exchange sales store at Keflavik, Iceland.

Specific deletions and reductions are as follows:

Installation	*Amount*
Buckingham WPS Center, Fla	$11,577,000
Duluth MAP, Minn	60,000
Ent AFB, Colo	3,015,000
Grand Forks Site, N. Dak	5,822,000
Traverse City Area, Mich	1,881,000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	6,000,000
Chanute AFB, Ill	3,000
McConnell AFB, Kans	3,000
Beale AFB, Calif	1,928,000
St. Louis ACIC, Mo	494,000
Biggs AFB, Tex	890,000
Hunter AFB, Ga	142,000
Lake Charles AFB, La	155,000
Lincoln AFB, Nebr	2,667,000
Travis AFB, Calif	218,000
England AFB, La	129,000
Air Force Academy	79,527,000
Outside Continental United States	23,346,000
Total deletions and reductions	137,857,000

WHAT THE AIR FORCE PROPOSED AS THE NEEDED PROGRAM TO ACHIEVE THE 137-WING FORCE

Mr. Chairman, now that I have indicated the reductions and deletions made by the Air Force panel and supported by the full Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I think it only fair that we give the Air Force position on their needs and requirements. I now indicate what the Air Force proposed as their dollar requirements if their mission was to be completed on schedule. The following brief summary indicates the Air Force construction programs in the order of their dollar requirements as originally presented to the Air Force panel. A careful study of these program summaries will indicate how the Air Force proposes to spend the dollars we have authorized in the bill. It remains to be seen whether or not the Air Force can project its program, as originally submitted, with the dollars we are recommending for appropriation. We hope so.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The largest portion of the continental United States program, $261,140,000, or 18.2 percent of the total program is for the Strategic Air Command bases. Almost one-third of the SAC program is for airfield payments, principally wider and longer runways and wider taxiways to provide capability for operation of the B-25 heavy bomber and safe sustained operation of the B-47 medium bombers of the SAC striking forces.

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

In keeping with the emphasis upon increasing our retaliatory and air defense capabilities, the Air Defense Command has the next largest share—16.4 percent—of the continental United States program; $122,192,000, or 8.5 percent expands and increases the facilities of the continental aircraft control and warning system, and $113,455,000, or 7.9 percent provides additional operating facilities at fighter-interceptor bases. The ADC base program initiates construction on the two new bases Buckingham Weapons Center, Fla., and Greater Wilwaukee area, Wisconsin, and provides a second increment at the six new interceptor bases initially programed last year.

One-third of the ADC base program is for family housing. In an emergency, immediate and maximum readiness is jeopardized by crews having to travel long distances from home to duty posts. This housing is essential not only from the personnel or welfare viewpoint but also because it will allow crews to be close to their planes and stations in the event of an all-out fight.

Over half of the aircraft control and warning system program is for expansion of the electronic communication and control system, the essential link between the warning net and the weapons systems. The program also adds facilities at existing permanent and mobile radar sites and constructs 20 new gap-filler sites. Directly tied in with the continental United States aircraft and warning program is that 7.4 percent, or $105,883,000, shown under outside continental United States, much of which is to continue construction of the distant early warning—DEW—line across the most northerly practicable part of North America. The balance provides additional facilities at warning sites in Alaska, Canada, and other overseas locations. A security classified presentation of all of the operational aspects and status of the air-defense system is available for the committee immediately prior to line item examination of that portion of the project books.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

The next largest segment in the United States is for the Air Research and Development Command with $90,730,000 or 6.3 percent of the total. The research and development program provides facilities for continuing the development of nuclear powered aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles, and includes funding of approximately $15 million of construction authorized but not financed last year for the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

The Air Materiel Comand program of $82,076,000 represents 5.7 percent of the total program. Almost half of the AMC program is for airfield pavements, the major portion of which provides capacity for receiving jet-type aircraft for maintenance in the depot complex. Also included under Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are facilities for the USAF Institute of Technology and relocation of the Research and Development Command headquarters from leased property at Baltimore, Md.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The Air Force Academy program amounts to $76,478,000 or 5.3 percent of the total program. As you will recall, the Air Force Academy was authorized last year by Public Law 325, 83d Congress and an initial appropriation of $15,338,000 was also enacted. Since that time, a concerted effort has been made to develop and finalize requirements, translate these requirements into facility design, and determine the functional relationship of these facilities on the site at Colorado Springs, Colo.

Progress to date may be summarized as follows:

Interim Academy: Facilities at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., have been modified and rehabilitated at a cost of $1 million. The first class of 300 cadets will enter the Academy on July 11, 1955.

Permanent Academy: An intensive investigational program related to the topography, geology, climatology, environment, utilities, and construction labor and materials has virtually been completed. Based on carefully determined facility requirements, a preliminary master plan has been prepared and the architectural concept tentatively established. The basic road net and utility systems are well along in design and design of principal structures is proceeding on schedule.

From the standpoint of total cost, a program has been developed for the permanent Air Force Acedemy, totaling approximately $125 million. The appropriation request being submitted for your consideration today contains those additional facilities required for the initial opening of the Academy in the fall of 1957, and for which design schedules indicate construction contracts will be let prior to July 1956.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command receives $58,546,000, or 4.1 percent of the total program, the majority of which is for airfield pavements and family housing.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The major portion of the Air Training Command program of $52,720,000, 3.7 percent of the total, replaces World War II dormitories and dining halls and constructs additional family housing.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND—RESERVE

Thirty-one million five hundred and ninety-eight thousand dollars, or 2.2 percent of the total program, are included to provide for construction of facilities for the Reserve Forces at 18 flying training bases and 25 nonflying training centers.

OTHER ZI COMMANDS

The other Air Force commands in the continental United States have smaller programs percentagewise as indicated, amounting to 2.8 percent of the total.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES—EUROPE

Over half of the overseas program $222,962,000, or 15.5 percent of the total program, is for the United States Air Forces in Europe, that is, France, United Kingdom, Spain, French Morocco, and so forth. The Europe program consists primarily of airfield pavements, fueling facilities, and aircraft maintenance facilities to provide additional operational capability.

At one base in the United Kingdom, the Burtonwood depot, replacement is requested of the World War II quonsets being used as troop shelter. Substantial replacements of this character at other United Kingdom bases will be deferred until next year.

The program for Spain continues construction of the four phase I bases and the area POL system.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

The second largest portion of the overseas program is the aircraft control and warning system, which was outlined above in conjunction with the air defense system of the continental United States.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND OVERSEAS

The SAC overseas program of $37,026,000, or 2.6 percent of the total program, consists almost wholly of airfield pavements, aircraft fuel storage and dispensing faciilties, and operational facilities required at bases in Puerto Rico and Guam to support the SAC missions.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command program of $28,829,000, representing 2 percent of the total, consists in the main of airfield facilities to support SAC missions and the fighter interceptor units of the Alaskan defense system. The Alaska program also contains the first-phase replacement of deteriorated and substandard dormitories and dining halls.

NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND

The $23,601,000 program for the Northeast Air Command represents 1.6 percent of the Air Force total and includes facilities at Argentia Naval Air Station to permit return to the Navy of facilities now in use by Air Force units.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE OVERSEAS

The overseas program for the Military Air Transport Service of $19,487,000, 1.4 percent of the total, encompasses bases in both the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean areas, and includes facilities to support the civil Reserve Air Fleet.

FAR EAST AIR FORCE

The smaller Far East Air Forces program of $14,082,000, or 1 percent of the total again, as in the case of USAFE, provides principally airfield pavements, and aircraft maintenance facilities required to support operations of the command forces stationed in that theater and the strategic forces.

The balance of the overseas program includes global communications facilities at Albrook AFB in the Caribbean Air Command and special facilities and area control navaids at various locations.

Without command identity in the Air Force appropriation request are minor construction and planning—3.7 of the total.

CATEGORIES OF CONSTRUCTION

The next chart shows by category the proposed use of the appropriations in the fiscal year 1956 program:

CHART NO. 3.—*Category distribution of Air Force, fiscal year 1956 military construction appropriation program*

[Dollars in thousands]

	Amount	Percent of total
Airfield pavements	$272, 846	19. 1
Operations facilities	247, 365	17. 2
Family housing	168, 422	11. 7
Liquid fuel storage and dispensary	125, 201	8. 7
Aircraft maintenance facilities	105, 757	7. 4
Troop housing and messing	103, 121	7. 2
Research, development and test facilities	78, 841	5. 5
Utilities	64, 997	4. 5
Miscellaneous facilities	57, 543	4. 0
Storage facilities	42, 473	3. 0
Training facilities	42, 432	3. 0
Personnel facilities	40, 642	2. 8
Medical facilities	27, 808	1. 9
Administrative facilities	26, 285	1. 8
Communications and navigation aids	12, 522	.9
Real estate	9, 189	.6
Shop facilities	8, 477	.6
Harbor facilities	735	.1
Total	1, 434, 656	100. 0

An analysis of the type of facilities being requested emphasizes the highly operational nature of this program. As in preceding years, the major categories are airfield pavements, operations facilities, family housing, liquid-fuel storage, aircraft-maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, research and development and utilities. In all, these categories represent over 80 percent of the total program.

The largest single category is airfield pavements, representing 19.1 percent of the total. Almost one-third of this category is at SAC bases in the United States to provide additional runway lengths required to launch maximum-loaded medium bombers and to provide capability for operation of the B-52 heavy bomber. In addition, a major portion of the airfield pavements in the overseas program is for direct support of the SAC operation.

Operations facilities, the second largest category with 17.2 percent of the total program, consists almost wholly of facilities for the aircraft control and warning system.

The troop-housing category, which is 7.2 percent of the total program, establishes the first phase in a program for replacement of deteriorated, obsolete, and substandard theater-of-operations and mobilization-type dormitories, bachelor officers quarters, and dining halls.

The miscellaneous facilities category, 4 percent of the program, consists principally of the funds for minor construction and planning.

Though the personnel facilities category is only 2.8 percent of the total program, it is a significant factor in our program to make the Air Force more attractive to the trained airmen and officers and induce more men to continue in the Air Force as a career.

The medical-facilities category, representing 1.9 percent of the total, includes the construction of new, or additions to, 14 hospitals, 12 infirmaries, and 21 dental clinics.

FAMILY HOUSING

Inclusion of family housing in this program, 11.7 percent of the total constitutes a milestone of tremendous importance to the Air Force. Not since 1949 have family quarters been provided in quantity at domestic bases within the annual military construction program. Last year, the Air Force's share of housing funded under Public Law 663, 83d Congress, was 2,252 units; and funds requested this year will be used to build the 4,107 authorized units not covered by current funding. Fiscal year 1956 requirements for 15,000 units were assembled for inclusion in separate legislation, but only 8,118 units are included in the authorization bill and in the appropriations request under consideration today by this committee. This makes 12,225 units for which appropriations are being requested this year in the amount of $168,236,000; all but 60 units are on continental United States bases as indicated on the chart.

CHART NO. 4.—*Family housing in Air Force—Fiscal year 1956 military construction appropriation program*

	Number of units			
	Prior authorization	Fiscal year 1956 authorization	Total units	Amount in thousands
Continental United States:				
Strategic Air Command	994	3, 384	4, 378	$59, 212
Air Defense Command	1, 165	1, 664	2, 829	38, 085
Air Training Command	875	825	1, 700	22, 913
Tactical Air Command	210	1, 187	1, 397	18, 922
Military Air Transport Service	455	622	1, 077	14, 540
Air Force Academy	403	0	403	7, 737
Air Materiel Command	0	178	178	2, 403
Continental Air Command	0	113	113	1, 525
Air Research and Development Command	5	85	90	1, 256
Continental United States total	4, 107	8, 058	12, 165	166, 593
Outside continental United States: Military Air Transport Service	0	60	60	1, 643
Total new units	4, 107	8, 118	12, 225	168, 236
Modification of existing housing	------	------	(1)	186
Total	------	------	------	168, 422

[1] LS.

In addition to the new units, a small amount—$186,000—is included for the improvement of existing family housing units.

The twelve-thousand-odd units provided in this request were carefully selected in order to provide at least minimum coverage to some of the new bases coming into the program, especially where their need could not be met under provisions of other legislation. Over 70 percent of the units are allocated to the fighting commands, that is, Strategic Air Command, Air Defense Command, and Tactical Air Command.

Mention is warranted of continuing urgent requirements to house Air Force families in the overseas garrisons.

REAL ESTATE

In the 1956 military-construction program the Air Force proposes to continue realistic real-estate land-acquisition policies; 113,338 acres, exclusive of those required for aircraft and warning sites, will cost $8,834,000 in the continental United States. These land interests are required to develop two new air-defense installations, extend runways at existing installations, expand operational and troop-housing facilities, and acquire and develop ammunition-storage facilities. In addition, interests in 404 acres will be acquired for aircraft and warning sites at a total cost of $214,000. The chart summarizes the land items in this program.

CHART NO. 5.—*Land summary—Fiscal year 1956 military construction appropriation*

Interest	Acres	Cost
Continental United States:		
Fee purchase	18,846	$6,651,000
Clearance easement	20,125	1,485,000
Restrictive easement	2,111	330,000
Right-of-way easement	182	36,000
Mineral rights	72,074	332,000
United States subtotal	[1] 113,338	[1] 8,834,000
Outside continental United States:		
Fee purchase	128	304,000
Right-of-way	1	1,000
Extinguishing outstanding rights in public-domain lands	2,472,800	50,000
Overseas subtotal	2,472,929	355,000
Grand total	2,586,267	9,189,000

[1] Excludes land for aircraft and warning sites; fee purchase, 205 acres, at $63,000; right-of-way easement, 199 acres, at $151,000.

One of the important items in this program is 20,125 acres of clearance easements, at a cost of $1,485,000, to protect approach zones to existing airbases where large investments in runways and facilities have been made. This is the second annual increment of a long-range phased program essential to protect Air Force bases from needless obsolescence due to community buildups around them.

The acquisition of land interests at overseas bases consists principally of the purchase of land for airfield expansion at Ramey AFB in Puerto Rico and extinguishing outstanding interests in 2,472,800 acres of public domain land in Alaska, at a cost of $50,000. Concurrently, we plan to return to the public domain approximately 807,890 acres now under Air Force jurisdiction. The land items in this program are based on the best estimates which could be obtained in advance of appropriation and represent a continuing improvement in the accuracy of our estimates over previous years.

While the total cost of real estate in this program is less than 1 percent of the total amount involved, these real-estate items are especially urgent since they are required either to provide a place for new construction or for the protection of the Government's present investment in facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the Air Force panel gave considerable thought to the family housing program. Not since 1949 has there been much if any housing provided for either branch of the service. The committee is of the opinion there is a serious deficiency in the program and to that end approximately $150 million to $160 million is provided in this appropriation bill for the Air Force family housing. I submit for the RECORD the following general comments as submitted to the committee on the fiscal year 1955 family housing program. It will give some idea of the background of the overall program.

The following general comments on the fiscal year 1955 family-housing program give the background of the overall program. Comments apply to the individual items which follow:

Public Law 765, 83d Congress, dated September 1, 1954, authorized the design and construction of family housing by use of appropriated funds. The Family Housing Division initiated implementation of the program by requesting site and utility plans from the major commands for all bases included in the program. This was done in increments, the first increment being requested on September 7, 1954, and the last on September 23, 1954. Upon receipt and review by Family Housing Division, the plans were forwarded to air base planning for approval. The normal lapse of time from request of approval of site approximated 75 days.

Guidance instructions from OSD for the prosecution of the housing program were received in the Air Force by letter, dated September 14, 1954. Among other things, these instructions required that each base commander survey the housing situation in the area adjacent to his installation to determine whether or not adequate rental housing was available. A certificate of this statement of need for housing was a required attachment to the request to OSD for certification for construction. Normal time for this action was approximately 30 days. Except for special cases most bases received OSD certification in November or December 1954.

An opinion had been obtained from the office of counsel, OSD, to the effect that funds could not be expended for design prior to actual certification. Thus design could not begin prior to certification.

Upon certification of a base, a design directive is sent to the command to negotiate, sign and approve a contract with an architect-engineer. The normal time for this action is 30 days. The A-E is given 30 to 45 days to prepare preliminary plans and 60 to 75 days for final plans, specifications and cost estimates. An additional 15 days is required by the Air Force for review of plans and specifications and approximately 40 days for reproducing plans and specifications and advertising for bids. Thus the normal time from request for site plans to award of construction contract takes approximately 10 months. Delays caused by siting, acquisition of land, A-E design not meeting Air Force requirements, and consideration given to title VIII of the National Housing Act for certain bases, all add to this time.

Fiscal year 1955 appropriated fund program

Base	Number of units	Authorized cost	Design cost	Preliminary plan approved	Final plan approved	Estimated date of contract	Remarks
Beale	225	$3,017,250	$70,125	----------	----------	Oct. 8, 1955	Siting problem.
Clovis	170	2,279,700	56,200	X	X	June 15, 1955	Amount of bid, $2,110,000; total cost, $2,167,000.
Davis-Monthan	5	108,000	5,450	----------	----------	Sept. 1, 1955	Plans submitted by architect engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Dow	300	4,023,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	Title VIII found to be impractical because of cost of construction. OSD certification for appropriated fund housing held up until June 15, 1955, because of title IX housing in vicinity of airbase.
Duluth	100	1,341,000	31,000	X	----------	Oct. 7, 1955	Normal design for time span.
Fairchild	5	108,000	5,165	X	X	Aug. 15, 1955	Advertising for bids.
Gary	100	1,341,000	28,500	X	X	Aug. 20, 1955	Advertising for bids to start July 15, 1955.
Geiger	50	670,500	17,703	X	----------	Sept. 1, 1955	Normal design span.
Great Falls	4	87,750	5,187	----------	----------	do	Preliminary plans submitted by architect-engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Greater Pittsburgh	50	670,500	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 23, 1955	Siting problem.
Greenville	120	1,609,200	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 12, 1955	OSD certified May 26, 1955.
Hunter	5	108,000	5,076	X	----------	Sept. 1, 1955	Normal design time span.
Hurlburt	275	3,687,750	90,000	----------	----------	Nov. 10, 1955	Delay caused by consideration of project under title VIII of the National Housing Act.
Kinross	90	1,206,900	35,000	X	----------	Oct. 15, 1955	Normal design time span.
Kirtland	5	108,000	5,200	X	X	Aug. 1, 1955	Advertising for bids.
Lake Charles	200	2,682,000	63,400	----------	----------	Oct. 11, 1955	Preliminary plans submitted by architect-engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Larson	5	108,000	5,523	X	----------	Aug. 15, 1955	Normal design time span.
Lincoln	400	5,364,000	125,500	X	----------	Sept. 15, 1955	Do.
Lockbourne	4	87,750	4,438	X	X	June 28, 1955	Bids received. Contract not yet awarded.
Loring	4	87,750	5,100	----------	----------	Oct. 22, 1955	Preliminary plans submitted by architect-engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Luke	125	1,676,250	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 11, 1955	Land required.
Mather	4	87,750	4,471	X	----------	Oct. 1, 1955	Normal design time span.

Fiscal year 1955 appropriated fund program—Continued

Base	Number of units	Authorized cost	Design cost	Preliminary plan approved	Final plan approved	Estimated date of contract	Remarks
Minneapolis-St. Paul	70	$938, 700	----------	----------	----------	Nov. 23, 1955	Site plan approved, June 7, 1955. Only economical site owned by VA.
Mountain Home	4	81, 000	$5, 100	X	----------	Sept. 1, 1955	Normal design time span.
McConnel	4	87, 750	3, 955	X	----------	do	Do.
McGhee-Tyson	50	670, 500	----------	----------	----------	Jan. 5, 1956	Siting problem.
McGuire	5	108, 000	5, 250	X	X	Aug. 1, 1955	Advertisig for bids.
Nellis	5	108, 000	5, 200	----------	----------	Oct. 1, 1955	Preliminary plans submitted by architect-engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Newcastle	100	1, 341, 000	27, 288	X	X	Aug. 20, 1955	Advertising for bids to start July 10, 1955.
Niagara Falls	50	670, 500	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 23, 1955	Land to be acquired.
Otis	200	2, 682, 000	69, 867	----------	----------	Nov. 8, 1955	Title VIII project investigated. Not eligible due to leased land.
Paine	70	938, 700	24, 000	X	----------	Aug. 15, 1955	Normal design time span.
Parks	85	1, 139, 850	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 17, 1955	OSD certified May 26, 1955.
Portland	60	804, 600	18, 600	----------	----------	Oct. 27, 1955	Canceled.
Sedalia	400	5, 364, 000	135, 500	X	----------	Oct. 15, 1955	Normal design time span.
Shaw	5	$108, 000	$5, 311	----------	----------	Nov. 12, 1955	Preliminary plans submitted by architect-engineer not acceptable to Air Force.
Sioux City	50	670, 500	18, 000	X	----------	Sept. 22, 1955	Normal design time span.
Stead	90	1, 206, 900	30, 000	----------	----------	Nov. 17, 1955	Siting problem.
Suffolk County	100	1, 341, 000	----------	----------	----------	Nov. 1, 1955	Land to be acquired.
Travis	6	128, 250	5, 517	X	X	Sept. 1, 1955	Advertising for bids.
Truax	100	1, 341, 000	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 14, 1955	Land to be acquired.
Webb	85	1, 139, 850	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 10, 1955	Do.
Wurtsmith	50	670, 500	25, 000	X	----------	Oct. 15, 1955	Norman design time span.
Youngstown	50	670, 500	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 23, 1955	Land to be acquired.

NOTE.—In addition to the locations listed above, Public Law 765 also provided authorization for family housing at 12 other locations and 146 more units for McConnell Air Force Base. It is anticipated that Wherry housing projects will be built at these locations in lieu of utilizing Public Law 765 authorization as prescribed by Public Law 663, 83d Cong.

PAYING FOR FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for family housing is a wise move, not only because it is in the best interest of our troops, but it will be self-liquidating. For example, the Air Force appropriation for quarters allowance totals $394,100,000. The commanders can so direct that post housing be used and there will be great savings.

ANALYSIS OF WHERRY HOUSING

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I feel that it would be of interest to insert an analysis of the Wherry housing program:

Analysis of Wherry projects

Project No.	Base	Number of units	Average monthly rent	Vacancy factor upon which initial rent was established
059-80001	Barksdale	692	$68. 33	[1]7
059-80002	do	------	71. 13	[1]7
115-80006	Bergstrom	480	75. 32	[2]3
116-80005	Biggs	800	70. 09	[2]3
116-80006	do	------	69. 90	[2]3
060-80001	Brookley	175	68. 59	[1]7
113-80001	Carswell	600	73. 17	[1]7
121-80010	Castle	700	76. 64	[1]3
121-80012	do	------	73. 39	[2]3
072-80007	Chanute	800	86. 08	[2]3
072-80006	do	------	68. 28	[2]3
112-80003	Connally James	500	73. 48	[2]3
062-80005	Craig	225	66. 55	[2]3
123-80007	Davis-Monthan	550	76. 06	[1]7
123-80008	do	------	78. 50	[1]7
122-80001	Edwards	1, 250	71. 45	[1]7
122-80005	do	------	64. 93	[1]7
122-80008	do	------	86. 50	10
063-80001	Eglin	750	70. 69	[1]7
091-80001	Ellsworth	891	68. 75	[2]3
091-80002	do	------	77. 55	[1]7
171-80002	Fairchild	1, 000	70. 22	4
171-80003	do	------	69. 96	4
171-80004	do	------	70. 45	6
131-80001	George	650	72. 07	[1]7
131-80002	do	------	63. 30	[1]7
093-80002	Great Falls	[3]400	64. 83	[2]3
121-80001	Hamilton	500	76. 01	[1]7
105-80005	Hill	350	81. 58	[1]7
116-80010	Holloman	400	77. 06	[2]3
061-80006	Hunter	500	65. 10	[2]3
065-80001	Keesler	858	67. 05	[1]7
065-80004	do	------	56. 50	[1]7
065-80005	do	------	68. 50	[1]7
115-80009	Lackland	600	72. 95	[1]3
171-80001	Larson	800	$65. 62	[1]7
171-80007	do	------	80. 03	[4]5
171-80008	do	------	71. 58	[4]5
022-80003	Limestone	1, 500	85. 52	[2]3
022-80004	do	------	85. 49	[2]3
022-80005	do	------	85. 45	[2]3
022-80006	do	------	85. 54	[2]3
043-80001	Lockbourne	500	70. 01	[2]3
101-80002	Lowry	480	73. 83	[1]7
101-80005	do	------	74. 33	[4]5
067-80001	MacDill	800	87. 24	[1]7
067-80002	do	------	86. 56	[1]7
136-80008	McClellan	105	75. 74	[2]3
138-80004	March	644	66. 22	3
136-80003	Mather	750	71. 84	[2]4
136-80004	do	------	71. 35	[2]3
012-80003	Mitchel	628	88. 81	[2]3
012-80004	do	------	89. 56	[2]3
124-80001	Mountain Home	500	74. 56	[2]3
125-80001	Nellis	800	76. 69	[2]3
125-80003	do	------	79. 98	[2]3
103-80001	Offutt	611	67. 02	[2]3
066-80004	Patrick	680	71. 82	[2]3
066-80005	do	------	75. 31	[2]3
112-80005	Perrin	300	69. 63	[2]3
056-80001	Ramey	575	73. 09	[4]5
115-80007	Randolph	612	71. 05	[2]3
115-80008	do	------	72. 02	[2]3
113-80005	Reese	418	77. 93	[4]5
061-80002	Robins	500	61. 55	[2]3
061-80005	do	------	61. 55	[2]3
061-80008	do	------	74. 50	[2]3
072-80001	Scott	1, 000	65. 48	[2]3
072-80002	do	------	65. 26	[2]3
044-80001	Selfridge	511	79. 89	[1]7
086-80001	Sewart	600	68. 19	[2]3
054-80002	Shaw	500	69. 03	[2]3
113-80004	Sheppard	612	67. 98	[2]3
012-80005	Stewart	284	75. 40	[2]3
121-80003	Travis	980	68. 32	[2]3
121-80007	do	------	69. 50	[2]3
063-80002	Tyndall	450	74. 28	[1]7
116-80003	Walker	800	68. 26	[1]7
116-80004	do	------	68. 88	[1]7
104-80001	Warren	500	68. 54	[1]7
023-80001	Westover	1, 150	79. 46	[1]7
023-80002	do	------	79. 59	[1]7
023-80003	do	------	81. 12	[1]7
023-80004	do	------	81. 14	[1]7
023-80008	do	------	80. 00	[1]7
023-80002	do	------	70. 00	[1]7
023-80009	do	------	78. 36	[4]5
123-80001	Williams	500	52. 18	[1]7
123-80002	do	------	67. 00	[1]7
123-80003	do	------	51. 83	6
123-80004	do	------	52. 05	[4]5
123-80005	do	------	71. 05	[2]3
113-80008	Wolters	500	69. 51	[2]3
040-80001	Wright-Patterson	2, 000	77. 09	[1]7
040-80002	Wright-Patterson	------	$76. 69	[1]7
040-80003	do	------	74. 50	[1]7
040-80004	do	------	74. 66	[1]7

---

[1] 7 percent vacancy factor equals 25.55 rent days.

[2] 3 percent vacancy factor equals 10.95 rent days.

[3] The Wherry projects at Kelly, Maxwell, and Great Falls No. 1 are off-base projects.

[4] 5 percent vacancy factor equals 18.25 rent days.

NOTE.—The vacancy factor is an assumed rate based on long-time operation. It is a figure upon which initial rent was established to assure economic stability and is taken from the project analysis, form 2264W, prepared by FHA before construction started and does not reflect actual experience.

APPROPRIATIONS, OBLIGATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. Chairman, one of the serious problems facing the Air Force panel and the Department of the Air Force involves unobligated appropriations that are carried over from year to year. Earlier I have touched on this subject but at this point I insert a schedule of the military construction program, fiscal year 1950 through fiscal year 1956, which will indicate significant accomplishments in the reduction of the unobligated appropriations carried over from year to year. It is the contention of the Air Force that the estimated 1955 and 1956 carryover is the very minimum that should be required to stabilize their operations.

The committee has supported no-year funds; at the same time it is our conviction that the military construction program should be so geared as to reduce these carryover funds to the very minimum. It is not the intention of the committee that contracts be entered into with speed and undue haste just in order to obligate funds. It is the belief of the committee that a sound and constructive program can be formulated which will continue to reduce these carryover funds to the very minimum.

Department of the Air Force military construction programs, fiscal year 1950 through fiscal year 1956

[Amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year (all data as of year end)						
	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956 (estimated)
Authorization:							
Annual	$437,331	$1,146,909	[1] $2,856,433	$1,698,975	$253,533	$961,552	$1,165,453
Cumulative		1,584,240	4,440,673	6,139,648	6,393,181	7,354,733	8,520,186
Appropriation:							
Annual	194,280	1,455,648	[1] 2,224,500	1,200,000	240,776	[2] 640,700	1,200,000
Cumulative		1,649,928	3,874,428	5,074,428	5,315,204	5,955,904	7,155,904
Obligations:							
Annual	49,775	923,134	1,080,989	1,251,339	803,175	1,300,000	1,300,000
Cumulative		972,909	2,053,898	3,305,237	4,108,412	5,408,412	6,708,412
Expenditures:							
Annual	2,902	234,926	1,092,119	1,050,910	916,495	1,000,000	1,200,000
Cumulative		237,828	1,329,946	2,380,857	3,297,352	4,297,352	5,497,352
Unobligated appropriations (carryover) as of year end	144,505	677,019	1,820,530	1,769,191	1,206,792	547,492	447,492
Funds not obligated but committed to contracts	10,225	34,091	75,102	49,763	187,588	242,588	235,588

[1] Includes $51 million for MSA (Public Law 249, 82d Cong., 1st sess.).

[2] Includes $10.7 million reimbursements.

NOTE.—A detailed tabulation reflecting like information for each Air Force base is being forwarded under separate cover.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to call to the attention of the House the record which is now unfolding in the matter of the Dixon-Yates contract.

The facts are these:

In the interest of national defense Congress vested extraordinary powers in the Atomic Energy Commission.

The President of the United States ordered this agency to use these extraordinary powers to execute a contract. It was alleged that this contract was necessary to supply electric power for national defense and atomic energy purposes.

It is now proven that the power contract was conceived only to meet the needs of a single municipality, totally unrelated to the AEC or the atomic energy program.

This is misrepresentation.

The President stated that the full record of the negotiations surrounding the contract would be revealed. But this was no concession. A public contract is public record. There is no excuse for concealment.

It is now proven that the record so presented was falsified and incomplete.

The details of critical negotiations and the identities of key participants were withheld.

Adolphe Wenzell, a director of the largest financial agent of utility companies in the United States, whose corporation was vitally interested in this contract, was welcomed into the inner circle of policymakers in the Government as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget. But he occupied many roles. He participated in negotiations at the AEC, at the Budget Bureau, and perhaps elsewhere.

The President has stated that Wenzell had nothing to do with the matter.

The Director of the Budget Bureau has denied any knowledge of Wenzell's affiliation with the adverse interest of the Wall Street company.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission denied knowledge of Wenzell's Budget Bureau affiliation and stated yesterday that he only knew him as representing the Wall Street company and on this basis alone admitted him to the Government's negotiating conferences.

Wenzell has testified that he informed all parties of his dual role and expressed surprise at any concealment.

The official chronologies of both the Bureau of the Budget and of the Atomic Energy Commission failed to mention Wenzell's name and left most of the meetings he attended unrecorded.

This is deceit.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been granted extraordinary statutory powers in national interest. The Attorney General ordered that agency to investigate the intentions of a municipal corporation created by the chapter of a sovereign state. This was a misuse of national powers and an unconstitutional interference with state sovereignty.

Congress has created many administrative agencies, granting to them powers vested in itself and in the judiciary by the Constitution. These are the so-called quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers.

The Securities and Exchange Commission is one such body. In its quasi-judicial role, it acts as a court of law.

For anyone to interfere with or influence the disposition of any matter before this tribunal is as evil as interfering with a court of law or fixing a jury.

On the very day that this House of Representatives was considering legislation for the Dixon-Yates transmission line, Mr. Wenzell was to appear before the SEC. His testimony would have laid bare the record of which I speak today. It would have affected our voting.

Sherman Adams, the Presidential Assistant, contacted the Chairman of the SEC and arranged for a postponement. He interfered with that quasi-judicial proceeding, for obvious political ends.

That interference was said to be only to inform the SEC that the Government was to intervene in the matter and needed time to prepare it. In fact, the Government had already appeared in the proceedings and had counsel in attendance at all times. The proper action would have been for the Department of Justice through its attending counsel to present a petition to intervene or to stay the proceedings to the SEC hearing examiner. Furthermore, no new motion to intervene further or to stay the proceedings was ever made to the hearing examiner of the SEC. The action of the President's assistant in interfering with the orderly proceedings in a quasi-judicial hearing was fantastically improper.

I call upon Congress to examine the full details of this record; to see the perversion of its intentions and delegated powers. I say what you will find is an ugly picture.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the significant feature of the military construction bill is that it is for permanent installations. The significant feature of this statement is that we are dealing in this military public-works bill with what will be the permanent Army, the professional Army.

There has been much talk in this hall in the last several months about the Reserve bill, the Reserve portion; what kind of Reserve Establishment are we going to have? And everybody has been more upset about the Reserves, yet this House in its wisdom saw fit to cut the appropriations for the Regular Army. As you know, I opposed that cut in the Regular Army; I oppose it still.

We were successful in having this House reconsider its action on the Marine Corps. After cutting the Marines you were prevailed upon to change your action and to restore the cut in the Marine Corps. That judgment was sound, and you are to be complimented for it. However, I persist and insist that your judgment was and is wrong in cutting the Regular Army at this time. You will recall that you were not asked to increase it, you were not asked to add $1, 1 gun, or 1 soldier; we asked you only to let it alone for another year.

The good thing about this bill is that it looks toward the thing that I like in the Army. I want to see, and there are many coming to this thought, a very large professional standing army. I do not agree with this concept of the trained Civilian Reserve under which at the blowing of a whistle 3 million brave and strong Americans are going to spring to arms for the defense of America as they have for a hundred and fifty-odd years. That day is past. Now we must have in being a large, professional, trained service. It must be the best paid, it must be the best uniformed, it must be the best trained, the best equipped, and the best armed that this Congress and this Nation can conceive. That is why, Mr. Chairman, this bill is here today giving to these troops good barracks, good operational facilities, good basic equipment for the permanent Army bases and the permanent air or naval bases. This is not to be temporary construction, this is to be permanent construction, the best we can find and the best we think these men should have.

I am not satisfied yet with the type of barracks that is going to be built. These are good barracks, understand, superior to what we have had, but I am not satisfied with the design or the cost ceiling now provided by law. I am not satisfied with the cost per unit, which is $1,750. I think it should be about $2,300 to $2,400 per unit.

Mr. Chairman, the committee and this House certainly are acting well on this military construction.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" for research, $380,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of funds appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1956, for research, shall be available for construction of a building at the United States Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in this paragraph as being beyond the scope of this bill and I ask the deletion of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri concede the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman's point of order correctly? Does he mean to strike the entire paragraph from line 5 through line 11?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional amounts for "Loan authorizations," for (a) loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $15 million; and (b) loans to low-income farmers (including part-time farmers), who are unable to obtain needed credit from private or cooperative sources or under the provisions of titles I or II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to assist them in fully utilizing land resources, increasing the efficiency of their operations and improvement of living conditions and for other agricultural purposes except land purchase, $15 million: *Provided*, That no loan may be made from funds authorized by clause (b) of this paragraph which shall result in the borrower's principal indebtedness on account of such loan or loans exceeding $10,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions set forth under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 3, line 8, over to line 2, page 4. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] concedes the point of order; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed $5 million of the appropriation under the head "Agricultural Conservation Program Service," in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for the purposes specified under the head "Agricultural conservation program," in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, and shall be merged with the amount provided therein.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 16 down to and including line 23 as being beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of assisting the Commodity Credit Corporation in selling its agricultural commodities, the position of sales manager is hereby authorized in grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the standards and procedures of that act.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 5, line 2, down to and including line 7 as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Construction, Washington National Airport," including construction, alterations, and repairs, $2,600,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 5, after line 14, insert:

ADDITIONAL WASHINGTON AIRPORT

For an additional amount for necessary plans, surveys, land acquisition, and other costs to commence construction of an additional Washington Airport to be located at Burke, Va., $10 million.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The amendment is authorized by law.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman cite the statute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to produce the authority.

Mr. FLOOD. I have asked the law clerk, and I think he is now searching for it, to produce the citation. I am aware of this procedure and this technique, and I am now waiting to have that done.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania know when the law clerk will have the information?

Mr. FLOOD. I think he will be here very shortly.

May I say this, Mr. Chairman? If in the meantime he does not appear, I propose to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I shall have to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. I am not so sure but what the point of order is not well taken, but I am willing to make this proposition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that since this matter is of such importance and is receiving the attention of the White House and the subcommittee of the Department of Commerce plans to pursue this matter further, if the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, I will give him my personal assurance that it will receive prompt and careful attention.

Mr. FLOOD. That is exactly what I will do, and I will now notify the clerk that he no longer needs to produce the evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent that it be withdrawn?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some member of the committee when it is proposed to increase the rates for usage of the National Airport comparable with rates charged at other similar airports throughout the country.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is the policy of the subcommittee, and we have so stated in our report, and we expect that to be done forthwith.

Mr. GROSS. But the appropriation is going to be made for expansion of the National Airport under the terms of this bill without regard to the fact that fees charged to the airlines using the Washington Airport, are far below those of comparable airports elsewhere in the country.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct, but we are handicapped in trying to use language which would not be subject to a point of order, because it would be subject to a point of order. However, we have included in the report a statement that we expect it will be done immediately, and we hope it will be done.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, "a rose by any other name" should be the prefix to what I have to say. I am back under the same colors. I would like to say this in connection with the need for a new National Airport, and which should be constructed at Burke, Va. Now, I am not attempting to rise to the heights of statesmanship when I speak of the need for this new airport. I fly in and out of the National Airport, and so do many of you. One of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], came in on a plane within the last 24 hours that may or may not have been suffering from mechanical failures, but if it had not been stacked as long as it was, then there may not have been a mechanical failure and 49 lives, including that of the gentleman from New York, for whom we have a high regard, would not have been, in my judgment, unnecessarily endangered.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Chairman—and I have heard this testimony—that the point of saturation for safety of passengers at the present National Airport has been exceeded, and that you are taking your life in your hands every time you take off or land at the present National Airport. Make no mistake about that. I examined the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration at some length and he said in the testimony—the hearings are available—that they have reached their caseload at the National Airport.

This committee, 3 years ago, appropriated the money, but unfortunately, the House struck it out, to begin construction of a new airport at Burke, in Virginia. I am concerned about your safety and your welfare. You are my friends, and my heart bleeds for you. I am concerned, with great affection, for your safety and your welfare, and you are not concerned with them when you do not build a new airport for the Nation's Capital and build it at once. Three years ago was too late. We should do this job and do it at once. Ten million dollars will do the first year's planning, acquisition, and work. You own $1 million worth of real estate at Burke, Va.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you this. Nobody asked me to make this speech. I have not been consulted by any committee or chamber of commerce from Virginia, or citizens' organization, or anybody else. I am thinking about the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], for whom I have a very high regard.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. We of Maryland are very much concerned about the safety of the Members of the House. I might add that we have a very fine airport at Friendship, willing, ready, and able to take any of the overflow traffic from the National Airport.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to my friend, the distinguished general, that I am aware of that. But the technical information that I have—and the gentleman knows that Tommy d'Alesandro, the Mayor of Baltimore, was on this subcommittee and is an old friend of ours—but the technicians tell me that Friendship is too far away; I do not know.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] has brought up the point that I wanted to mention. That is the suggestion I was going to make. I do not think there is much difference in time or distance to Washington from either Burke or Friendship, particularly with the new highway that we have between Baltimore and Washington. I think you could get to any hotel in downtown Washington in a matter of 25 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say that I do not know. I am just telling you what the technicians say, the men who have made the measurements and figured this all out. They tell us that under all the circumstances that is not the case and they prefer not to go there. I hold no brief for either one.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that I fly in here about once a week. I had the misfortune one time to be put down at Friendship Airport and I was further away from Washington in time when I got there than I was when I left the airport out in Ohio.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not want to get into that. I simply say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not doing this with any sense of facetiousness. I am serious. This is a deadly serious problem. From all the testimony, from all we know, and from what I have heard and read and seen, and from what the technicians and air scientists and safety people tell us, the Washington National Airport, because of its case load is a death trap and this new airport should be built without delay.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maritime activities

Maritime Training

For an additional amount for "Maritime training," $100,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered to the Maritime Administration is increased by $5,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 19 on page 5, down to and including line 2 on page 6, that it is beyond the scope of existing law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,020,000; and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed $2,865,000 from the Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed $535,000 from the fund for Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation Disaster Loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided*, That the amount authorized for transfer from the Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by not to exceed $100,000, as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 3, on page 6, and extending down to and including line 6, on page 7, that it is without legislative authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had read only through line 20 on page 6.

Mr. RABAUT. I make the point of order against the language up to that point, then, Mr. Chairman. There is no legislative authority for it.

Mr. CANNON. If part of the paragraph is out of order, all of it is out of order. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Revolving funds

For additional capital for the Revolving Fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation and the appropriation to the Small Business Administration for "Salaries and expenses", for the fiscal year 1956, shall be available only upon the enactment into law of S. 2127, 84th Congress, first session, or similar legislation, continuing the Small Business Administration during the fiscal year 1956.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 21, on page 6, down to and including line 6, on page 7, for the same reason, that there is no legislative authority for it.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Construction

For the preparation of detail plans and specifications of a Central Intelligence Agency headquarters installation, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, as authorized by the act of ——, 1955 (Public Law ——), to remain available until expended, $3 million, to be derived from the unobligated balances of appropriations made available to the Central Intelligence Agency for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 7, from line 7 to line 16, that there is no authority in law for it; it is beyond the scope of existing law.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of the Army

Military Construction, Army

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities, for the Army, as authorized by the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of ——, 1955 (Public Law ——), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; to remain available until expended, $483,612,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Procurement and production, Army."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 8, from line 11 down to and including line 24, that it is not authorized by law and is beyond the scope of existing law.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, do I correctly understand that the gentleman from Michigan is striking out the entire paragraph, including the portion of line 23 and all of line 24 which authorizes the transfer of Army production and procurement funds for the use of the military construction program, the net effect of which is that so far as the House is concerned there will be no funds made available for the Army military construction program for the fiscal year 1956?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the gentleman has gone beyond a parliamentary inquiry. For the information of the gentleman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has made a point of order against the language in the bill on page 8, lines 11 through line 24. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has conceded the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I should have included line 10, so as to take out the title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought that the gentleman from Michigan intended to include that in his point of order.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the language on page 8, lines 10 to 24 inclusive. The gentleman from Missouri concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that a point of order has been raised against this entire section, I presume that that precludes the offering of any amendments to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must advise the gentleman that he has properly interpreted the situation.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman thought that that was the situation. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the Chair has ruled that the point of order is proper?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the point of order is proper and has sustained the point of order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not seem to understand all the high strategy and masterminding in the making of points of order. I can only say I regret exceedingly what has been done in each instance. And, if I think it is wrong in this specific instance on Army funds, I must think it is wrong elsewhere. It is most unfortunate that a point of order has been made against this part of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I find myself in the same quandry as the gentleman from Michigan, and I wonder where this strategy is going to lead us because I strongly suspect that many of these items being objected to will be inserted in the bill when it reaches the other body, and that the House will subsequently accept them.

Mr. FORD. I certainly wish to reaffirm what I said before, which seems to be concurred in by the gentleman from New York. My point is, and I guess about 49 members of the Committee on Appropriations feel the same way about it, that we have for the last month or more put in a good many hours listening to witnesses from the various agencies and departments of the Government, trying to find out what is right and what is wrong in the budget requests. It does not make sense to me for a capricious reason to find the bill gutted on the floor of the House. If someone can straighten me out on the high strategy, I am most anxious and willing to listen.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I cannot tell you what the high strategy is, but I can tell you what the result of what is being done here is—there are no funds in this bill for public works for the Army.

Mr. FORD. That is very evident, and I suspect the same may be true for the Navy and the Air Force, which means that all we have done for a month goes for naught. There is only one compensating factor and that is when we deal with the other body in conference, we will start with zero and that will put us in a very advantageous bargaining position.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I think that some issues are being brought out here this afternoon which are of a very educational nature. I am under the impression that in the future we Members who hold hearings on these bills should know the results of our labors so far as the procedure pertains wherein the House may consider our efforts and act as they see proper.

Mr. FORD. I repeat, I just do not understand what the super strategy is.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The section which has been stricken out obliterates the conclusions reached after taking a great many pages of testimony representing hours of work for many of us, does it not?

Is it not also a fact that our committee has seen fit to criticize the armed services for being a little slow in presenting some of these facts? Are we not in a rather awkward and inconsistent position if we abandon this program irresponsibly to engage in an argument over parliamentary procedure.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] knows that I have the highest regard for him personally. We worked together on one subcommittee ardently, and I think effectively, for a period of 2 years. We do not always see eye to eye on some legislative matters, but I personally like him and admire him. I do not understand what the reason for this action is, and if he could enlighten me I would be the first one to understand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder where the responsibility for this so-called gutting operation lies.

Mr. FORD. I cannot give the gentleman that information.

I would like to say something with reference to one item that appeared in the committee report, as far as the Department of the Army portion of the bill is concerned. It pertains to facilities at Fort Leavenworth. The information is contained on page 20 of the committee report. The committee did strike from the line items $5,433,000 for the Academic Building, Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. For myself, I think the committee was on sound ground in deleting that item in fiscal year 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. FORD was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD. As I said before, it seemed to me at the time, and I believe it still holds true, that we were probably right in deleting this line item. With few exceptions our subcommittee or panel went along with the Department of the Army in allowing funds for operational facilities, for housing and barracks for the enlisted personnel. It seemed to the subcommittee that this specific item could logically be deferred for a year. They have had the present facilities for a long period of time and they have gotten along.

Subsequent to the markup of the bill, additional information was subsequently given to the committee which to some extent casts doubt on the wisdom of our decision on this item. I would like to say for the record that I feel the committee might well strike from the committee report this paragraph referring to this particular line item. This would in effect do away with the prohibition of the construction of the Academic Building, provided the Army would take the money for the construction out of the total funds they would have under this bill.

I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AVERY, because of the point of order, is precluded from offering his amendment to reinsert in the bill the funds for this particular project. I think our subcommittee would have had to oppose the amendment, but nevertheless we could have in the proper way explained the reasons for the committee action, and given him an opportunity, as he should have had today, to present his case on this particular project. I hope that in the other body they will take action that will give us an opportunity to work out a sound solution in conference.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. As I understand the gentleman, you expressed your sanctioning of the deleting.

Mr. FORD. I do not understand the gentleman. I personally feel that we should have stricken the restrictive paragraph from the committee report, but we did not have an opportunity under the parliamentary circumstances. Regrettably all corrective action will have to come in the other body.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the paper that I took with me yesterday to the Rules Committee. This is the logic that I tried to use on them.

Now we want to know whether 50 Members of this House can work so diligently and so long as is evidenced in these books of hearings on this bill and then the Rules Committee upstairs can turn a deaf ear on a measure subject to this great number of points of order. I want you to see how many times a person is able to sustain a point of order in this bill and ask you if there is reason for the indifferent treatment we received from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield now.

Here is the statement I presented to the Rules Committee.

> The Committee on Appropriations is requesting a rule to waive points of order during the consideration of H. R. 7278, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1956.
>
> This bill is "loaded"—

And I said that probably is not the word, it is "pregnant" with items which are technically subject to a point of order, for example:

> Several items which relate to the use of appropriations heretofore made, as well as limitations carried in other appropriation bills. Reference to money in other bills makes such language in this bill subject to a point of order under the rules.
>
> Items in the bill which are contingent upon passage of legislation in the closing days of this session such as the Small Business Administration, the Mexican farm labor program, and legislation increasing the minimum wage.
>
> The bill authorizing military construction has recently cleared Congress, but at the time the bill was reported had not yet been signed by the President.
>
> The bill, H. R. 6795, authorizing construction work by the Atomic Energy Commission, also awaiting enactment.
>
> The above items are the sort of thing that have been carried many times in appropriation bills for which you gentlemen have granted rules in the past.
>
> There are some new items in the bill which show in the report beginning on page 66: Four of these relate to the chapter dealing with the Department of Agriculture, 3 of them deal with the independent offices chapter; another deals with the Public Works chapter (Dixon-Yates); and one deals with the salaries of employees of the Committee on Appropriations.

I said that I was keeping nothing hidden from the committee, that these were the facts. They took it under advisement.

I was not there alone; I was accompanied by three members from the minority: The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. Mr. DAVIS said to me that he was only lending his moral support as we chatted together. It was a very agreeable meeting.

To my surprise no action was taken.

Now this procedure today is initiated forcibly to bring to the attention of the House just how far the Rules Committee can go to frustrate the work of the Congress. In my opinion the committee should be an asset rather than a deterrent to House procedure.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House should have this situation clearly in mind and that is the thing I want to call to the attention of the Members now. No member of the Rules Committee is present making points of order.

The reason I was opposed to the rule was because I desire to make a point of order against section 902, on page 25. When that item is reached I shall make the point of order. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, was also present and he objected to the rule because there was an item in there for the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions appearing on page 17, line 22, to page 18, line 2.

If the committee itself and the majority in control of the committee throw out the things themselves that the committee has been working on, that is their doing and not the Rules Committee. The only thing it demonstrates is this: It makes us wonder why they have reported the bill if they felt that way about it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it ought to be pointed out that the paragraph to which the gentleman from New York objected and to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and I also objected, section 902, was not written in when the bill was originally prepared, but was written in at a specially called meeting of the subcommittee, which four members of the minority were unable to attend. In the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] himself suggested that this paragraph be stricken and asked unanimous consent to do so, but due to the confusion, shall I say, the difficulty of understanding quite what was being said and going on, the paragraph was not stricken. So what is unusual about going before the Rules Committee and asking that they permit a rule which would allow this to be stricken out on a point of order?

I have been here, as the gentleman from New York will recall, for 13 years. I have seen many bills come on this floor without a rule. It is a custom. But I have never seen a member of the majority party take the attitude that because there was not a rule he was obligated to get up and make points of order against every paragraph of the bill, even though the members generally might approve some of the paragraphs. A year ago the Rules Committee denied a rule to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, but I did not come to the floor and raise the possible points on all items which were subject to them.

Where does the obligation lie? The responsibility, the gentleman from New York will agree, must lie at the majority table for striking out these paragraphs. No points of order are being made by those on the minority side.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think that is a fair statement. The gentleman from the majority going before the Rules Committee championed this bill. It was the minority that went up and asked that no rule be granted. I am championing this bill, I am standing here today championing the action of the Appropriations Committee. I do want to agree with the gentleman, he did ask for the deletion of that one section, and that is why I am finding fault with the Rules Committee, because of the fact that one section could have been exempted if they wished to do so, but instead of that, they went whole hog on the thing to the detriment of our procedure here today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, frankly, if I had a bill to present I would not myself be making points of order against it. I would not take the responsibility of destroying the work that the committee had done. But if that is the way the majority wants to proceed on this and that is the way we must proceed, that is up to them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. As I understood the gentleman from Michigan, he explained to the Committee on Rules that there were many, many places in this bill where a point of order would lie. Is that right?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct, and could not be avoided.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. Then I ask, in all fairness to the Committee on Rules, after you pointed out so many places in the bill where a point of order would lie, how could the Committee on Rules do other than they did by not allowing a rule? I must say this, in all frankness, irrespective of the high regard I hold for the gentleman from Michigan, because he is a great legislator and a grand gentleman, the facts are that you pointed out to the Committee on Rules, as I understand it, so many places in this bill where points of order could lie that you scared the Committee on Rules to death, and so they decided not to give a rule for fear they would be criticized on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, having worked for a number of weeks on this bill, it is, of course, a bit frustrating to see this sort of thing happen. This bill has many items in it, but it is principally a bill for military public works. The military public works provisions in the bill are subject to a point of order for a couple of reasons. The authorizing legislation upon which the appropriation is based, in many instances, has passed the House and the Senate. It has gone to the President, and the indications are that the President will sign it today, but we have not received word that it has been signed. So, of course, the military part of the bill so far as military public works are concerned is subject to a point of order. But there is nothing we could do about it if we were going to cooperate toward an early adjournment of the Congress. We did place another legislative provision in the military part to which I want to refer. We said that the Army, having $800 million that it did not need in procurement funds, should transfer to the public works program sufficient money to cover the program in this bill for the Army. Of course, that is legislation. But, generally speaking, that is the extent to which the military part of the bill is subject to a point of order, and as to the tactics being used here today in handling this bill, I have no responsibility.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not a fact, as brought out before our subcommittee, the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Texas is chairman, that the section of this bill which contains by far the greater part of the money, the chapter that has to do with national defense, is very important to our national defense? It involves many items that are urgently needed for the safety of the country, does it not?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I have great sympathy for the members of this committee and their prerogatives, but actually is it not desirable that at least that chapter of the bill go through without a point of order? I know of nobody who has any important reason for making a point of order against that chapter.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Texas is not making any points of order and is quite concerned over the procedures being followed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor again to refer to the farm provisions in this bill because I feel that perhaps some of the Members did not hear the earlier explanation.

On April 26, President Eisenhower sent down a request to help the low-income farmer. The budget request was not in any huge sums of money. Our committee waited 4 or 5 weeks for legislation. At that time I went to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and asked if they thought I should go ahead and put these provisions in the bill. They advised me that if we wished to go ahead to do so. On that basis we did put in this bill the amounts of money which the Bureau of the Budget had approved and sent down in line with the request of the President.

In our report we pointed out that we did not feel that these sums of money or the enlargement of these programs would meet the need of the low-income farmer at the present time, but that we did feel, as a subcommittee, that we should go along with his efforts to relieve this situation, although we thought it would relieve it only to a small extent.

I want to say again that in our actions we were cooperating with the leaders of the Committee on Agriculture and that is the basis on which it came to you.

I regret that points of order have been made against what I consider to be sound legislative procedure. But be that as it may, it is for my friend to make his own determination on that.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say that my position in this is that I went upstairs to champion this bill. If they wanted this bill laid open for a riddling, which it might get because of the refusal to grant a rule, that is one thing. But I want to know who is championing this bill. I championed this bill and the work of these people. I gave a citation of these volumes of hearings. And that is why I shall make no exceptions. I am not singling out any particular provision in this bill. I am going to raise a point of order whenever a point of order lies in the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have always been told to let the other fellow do as he has decided to do, because if you do not let him do it, he will anyway. I have nothing to say to my friend except this. In espousing the provisions of this bill to the Committee on Rules, I would take it that the gentleman was vouching for the soundness of those provisions. Having vouched for the soundness of them, my friend was acting differently when he made points of order against provisions that he earlier had thought were sound, because he had asked for a rule. But again, that is a matter of opinion.

I want to keep the record straight so far as our subcommittee is concerned. Definitely we were not trying to take advantage of anything. We went to the proper people to see if they wanted us to go ahead and they told us to do so.

In the time that I have been on the Subcommittee on Agriculture we never wrote legislation into the bill unless we got the legislative committee to approve it and to tell us to go ahead. We never asked for but one rule and that rule was requested by the leaders of the legislative Committee on Agriculture, a few years ago, when they had failed to pass the ACP authorization act. So that it was at their request that we asked for that rule. I merely wanted to keep the record straight so far as our own subcommittee is concerned.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does it not seem rather strange that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] goes before the Committee on Rules and asks for a rule waiving these points of order, which would mean that he was in full support of the bill, and then makes points of order against these provisions? The Committee on Appropriations, made up of 50 members, reported it out and the gentleman is on the floor today making the very points of order against those provisions, instead of leaving that prerogative to some member of the Committee on Rules, if they find any fault with them. It is something I cannot understand.

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall not attempt to pass judgment on that. I have enough to do passing judgment on my own actions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two paragraphs.

Mr. Chairman, I have hesitated, since the very inception of this debate, to rise on this floor and get into any controversy with my friends. And I assure you now I have no such purpose. I have no desire to criticize or to praise anybody for the position they have taken on this matter. I merely rise to attempt in my humble way to throw a little light on the matter. I know of no man in this House for whom I have a higher regard than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. Therefore, I should be the last person to raise my voice in criticism of him, and I shall not do so.

It is true that the gentleman from Michigan came before the Rules Committee on yesterday and asked for a rule waiving points of order. He read from a prepared statement which he has exhibited here today giving his reasons for it. I recall that he emphasized on 2 or 3 occasions that there would not be 4 pages in this bill unless points of order were waived.

There were a number of things that he pointed out. There were a number of things objectionable to this person or that or the other on the committee. Frankly, when the gentleman started his statement, personally, it never occurred to me that a rule would not be granted.

I am not going into anything that transpired in the executive session in the Rules Committee and I am not going to either praise or criticize any member of that committee, but I think I can lay my finger on the trouble here.

I know that the Rules Committee becomes a whipping boy at one or more sessions of this Congress, and usually more than once. I know we are patted on the back sometimes because we prevent the Members from having to vote on some controversial matter, and then again I know that we are the recipients of brickbats that come our way because we have offended somebody with a pet measure.

If I am any judge of this situation, the trouble is in section 1301 on page 32 of this bill, where the Committee on Appropriations set out to legislate the salaries of their employees, and other committees were left out. I am going to say now what I said in open committee on that subject yesterday, not in executive session, that so far as I was concerned I had no objection to that; that while there was objection to it from some quarters, these boys on the Appropriations Committee worked hard, they were courteous, they deserved their pay, and possibly an increase if any House employees did. Of course sometimes I think we are going wild on this thing of increasing everybody's salary, raising everybody's wages. But here was a group that worked hard, and if anybody was entitled to it maybe it was that committee's employees. But there were other committees represented that thought that if the thing was going to be done, it ought to be done across the board.

Then there was opposition, it has been shown here, from the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee appeared before our committee and objected to waiving points of order on an item setting up a study committee, duplicating the work his committee was doing.

Other committees were represented as objecting to certain items in the bill which were considered as encroaching on the prerogatives of their respective committees.

Now, I do not know, maybe we are entitled to this chastisement as members of the Committee on Rules. As one member of the committee, I am willing to take my part of it whether I am innocent or whether I am guilty. It is all part of the game. I might say in passing I have a project in the bill. So I had no reason for not wanting points of order waived. It would have been to the advantage of my district to have them waived. I say to you that this is an unfortunate situation. Those who want to raise points of order against everything in the bill, of course, are permitted to do so. But maybe there was some reason or some justification not aimed at agriculture or at the armed service or at these other agencies that guided the Committee on Rules in taking the action that it did.

I am sure the members of the Committee on Rules need no defense at my hands. They can and will bear their share of the responsibility. But those responsible for mutiliating the bill here today must likewise take their full share of the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the session this afternoon is reminiscent of the good old times when I first came to the floor 34 years ago. In those days it was estimated that a third of the time of the House was taken up in the discussions of points of order. We had long sessions, during which all the parliamentary authorities and would-be parliamentary authorities of the House rose and expressed themselves practically every day, taking up a large part of the daily program.

And in those halycon days the Committee on Rules governed the House. There were three men on the Committee on Rules in those days. And the Speaker of the House was a member of the committee. As I recall it, the Committee on Rules in the 61st Congress consisted of Speaker Cannon; John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, on the part of the majority; and James Richardson, of Tennessee, on the part of the minority. Every day or so they would send around and tell Richardson to "Come on out to the Speaker's room, we are going to have a meeting of the Committee on Rules." They would go into session for about 3 minutes and tell him what the report of the committee would be. Then when they came out on the floor with the resolution Richardson would take up his portion of the time telling what an outrage it was, until finally Speaker Cannon would beckon Dalzell up to the Speaker's stand and say, "John, go down there and tell Jim Richardson to come out to the Speaker's room—we are going to commit another outrage."

Eventually the reaction against the government of the House by the Committee on Rules became so pronounced that in the election of 1910 it was the sole issue before the country in the congressional campaign. The Committee on Rules dominated the House of Representatives. No measure could be considered unless the committee sponsored it. Finally, the reaction against the Committee on Rules became so great that it resulted in an overturn of the House and for the first time in 16 years, the people elected a Democratic Congress.

The proposition before us today is a very familiar one. At the end of every session of Congress there are many odds and ends, many deficiencies, items which must be disposed of at the last minute in preparation for the hiatus between sessions; and, as everybody knows, all of them are thrown into a hodgepodge, the one last supplemental bill. Necessarily, a large number of these items are subject to points of order. It could hardly be otherwise, handling the tremendous volume of business of the average session. Every year, as you all recall, we bring in a bill like this, the last thing at the end of the session. We always get a rule on it. I have never known a rule to be refused before. There is no ulterior motive of any kind. The Committee on Appropriations has no desire to take away from any Member of the House a single right or prerogative. All we are trying to do is to wind up the business of the session and get ready to quit, as we always do.

The only effect of a lack of a rule here is to deny the House the right to pass on these items. All the Committee on Appropriations is trying to do is to give you an opportunity to debate, to amend, and to vote. If you approve an item you can vote for it, and if you do not approve of it you can vote against it. Why should the Members of the House be denied the right to vote on any proposition? That is what we are here for.

Lack of a rule denies the House the right to vote on these propositions. The Committee on Appropriations has tried to give you that right. What is wrong about that?

What has the Committee on Rules to gain by refusing to give you that opportunity?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of undertaking to clarify, for myself at least, this issue. The Constitution says, I believe, that revenue bills must originate in the House. I believe it has been held that appropriation bills, though not specifically so designated in the Constitution, must originate in the House. When we knock out all of these appropriations for military public works and we permit the appropriation to be initiated in the other body, are we acquiescing in a violation of the traditional rules of the Congress? That is the issue that I think the gentleman from Missouri, being an able parliamentarian, should be able to enlighten us upon.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman should propound that question to the Rules Committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman has raised a very vital and important problem, not only with reference to the whole bill but the military portions of the bill specifically. I would dislike to have any cloud whatsoever put upon the appropriation of funds for the defense of the country, on the mere whim or caprice of one person. I am not speaking for or against the Committee on Rules. But I just wonder about the wisdom of one person, zealously guarding the rights and prerogatives of 434 other Members of Congress, who, if they wish, could or would make a point of order against any appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. I am not a parliamentarian, but if we permit the bill to originate in the Senate and we later improve it, it would probably be law when the President signed.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. This is a supplemental bill and it contains appropriations for many different items. It has always been the prerogative of the Senate to add certain amendments to a supplemental bill.

Mr. MAHON. It is a supplemental bill, but it is the only bill of the session that contains military public works.

Mr. RABAUT. It is still in the supplemental bill.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of ——, 1955 (Public Law ——), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; furniture for public quarters; and personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; $439,950,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 19, line 3, to and including line 16, on the ground that it is not authorized by law and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all know exactly what we are doing and we are not doing a very responsible thing. I can understand the feelings of my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and he is my friend. I am not concerned with taking part in any jurisdictional fight between the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, and the Committee on Rules. The country is not concerned with this parliamentary struggle. What I do know is that in the last 15 minutes we have succeeded in striking out a billion dollars' worth of appropriations for necessary construction for the Army and Navy. The country is concerned with that.

We should not permit this fight to distract the attention of the committee and the entire House. I now ask my friend from Michigan if he intends to continue making points of order against these paragraphs.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to play no favorites, so I shall continue to raise points of order against all items subject to a point of order.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman is always fair, but in this case, he is bearing a heavy responsibility. Apparently we are not going to be allowed to legislate.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because it is obvious that when we get this bill again it will be in the nature of a conference report, and we all understand the limitations of discussion on a conference report.

I would like to call attention to page 10 of the bill and the appropriation for the Export-Import Bank. And I should like to call to the attention of some Members of the House, who feel as I do, that we have overstepped ourselves in dishing out money to Yugoslavia, that the hearings show the Export-Import Bank has loaned some $40 million to Yugoslavia.

Thus, despite the millions given to Tito in military and economic aid, the Export-Import Bank has financed this dictator to the tune of another $40 million.

I would also call your attention to the fact that the Export-Import Bank is making loans in furtherance of offshore procurement. According to the hearings they have made loans to foreign manufacturers until they can receive payment from the Defense Department of this country.

I wonder if the Export-Import Bank or any other bank would make loans to the people in my district in Iowa upon the same basis?

Mr. Chairman, this bill also carries a continuation of one of the finest boondoggles I ever heard of, in fact a couple of them. One is this international trade fair business. Do you know that in the past year we have had international trade fairs to which this country has paid for the hauling of brassieres and girdles to Bangkok, Siam, or Thailand, as it is called now. According to the hearings of the committee, the American experts who staged this affair, indicated that some Thailand women wear brassieres, but they had no information as to whether they wear girdles.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman is entitled to the commendation of the House for having read the printed committee hearings. It becomes very apparent that he has thoroughly read them. I am sure he recalls some of the articles which were exhibited at the Bangkok Fair, including a Squibb Co. toothbrush, a can of Ajax cleanser, four boxes of Kotex, and a hair net. The gentleman recalls all that?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I certainly do, and I also recall the fact that this Government or, rather, the taxpayers of this country paid to send some 10 people, in addition to Department employees, to accompany these exhibits at the various fairs. One of them, I recall, was a Wall Street banker, another the sales manager for the International Harvester Co.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be well to get down to business instead of talking foolishly.

Mr. GROSS. If my colleague from Iowa can think of anything more foolish than to carry on the procedure that was carried on at Bangkok, Siam, and elsewhere in connection with this international trade business, with the taxpayers of this country paying the bills, I would like him to tell me about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I might remind my friend from Iowa that there are $5 million worth of this foolishness in the pending bill.

Mr. GROSS. Exactly, and if the gentleman from Michigan does not attempt to take it out on a point of order, I assure the gentleman from Mississippi that I will make a point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the 17th session I have served in this House. This is the silliest and the most uncalled for ceremony I have ever witnessed in this House of Representatives. Some one got their tender toes stepped on so they are going to take their marbles and go home. We used to see that kind of kid play in school. I thought we had outgrown it but it seems we have not.

Now, there are some things in this bill, of course, that I do not like, but there are a mighty lot of things in this bill that are very necessary, and the longer we wrangle the worse the confusion is going to be. There is $4.5 million in this bill for poliomyelitis research, matching funds with the States. I hope when we get to that item, even though it might be legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law, that that section will not be stricken. We have a colleague in this House who has dedicated his life to the cause of suffering humanity and to the cure of these dread human diseases, and that gentleman is our friend and colleague from Rhode Isand, Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for what he has said about me. As I understand, all the items on page 24, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are authorized by law.

Mr. JENSEN. They are authorized by law? Good; we must not hinder or set back that program a minute.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the matter which the gentleman is discussing is not subject to a point of order, and there is no intention on the part of the Committee to raise a point of order against it.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to hear that.

There is another provision in this bill for the little farmer, for the little-business man who most of us are concerned about.

Now, let us not act like kids. Let us not talk about something that amounts to just about nothing, as was just talked about a minute ago on this floor. I have been in Thailand, and I will tell you there is not a finer group of people in this world than the Thailanders. They are a great people; let us not make jokes about them as was just done here on the floor of this House. It is not good for our relations with that country. They are our friends. Let us have no more of that kind of little talk.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not rise for the purpose of delaying this procedure this afternoon. There have been a lot of things said about a lot of people and a lot of criticism by some of certain action that has been taken. And, while the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] does not need anybody to defend his action, I do want to say if he had not made some of these points of order that have been made, they would have been made by some of the other Members, including myself.

I also want to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules for at least making it possible for points of order to be raised on this bill. I was interested in the expressions about the great volumes of testimony that were taken on certain legislation by the Committee on Appropriations. I have every appreciation for the ability of all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, but at the same time I know that we have other committees that have been assigned to certain duties in this House, and I think we should expect them to discharge those duties.

It has been brought out here that we are trying to reach an adjournment at some fixed date. Well, I am not so much interested in the time of adjournment as I am in seeing that the proper kind of job is done.

I do not think it is necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to take upon itself the responsibility of passing upon legislation that this House might be interested in and then go to the Committee on Rules and expect them to grant a rule waiving points of order so that no points of order could be raised in the bill. I want to say that I was one of the members of the Committee on Agriculture who requested that the Committee on Rules not grant a rule waiving points of order on this bill. I think I can speak for the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and say that he did go to the Committee on Rules at the request of and following a vote of more than two-thirds, a majority, of our committee yesterday requesting that an open rule prevail so that points of order could be made.

Finally, in closing, I want to say that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] does not make the point of order, I think I shall make a point of order on page 32, section 1301; because during the past several weeks, with other members of the Committee on House Administration, we have been trying to bring into this House an orderly bill on the adjustment of salaries of employees of the House and employees of committees. I think it should be done through that committee. Unfortunately the Committee on House Administration passed out a bill this morning that I have no doubt they will go with to the Committee on Rules and ask for a closed rule. And I am saying now that if that bill is brought to this House under a closed rule and is passed without any opportunity of amendment, we are going to take another dip into the Treasury for unwarranted increases to employees, increases that are not justified, and leave without raises other employees who are carrying on the work of this House, aside from any partisan political patronage.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is talking about something that never has happened and never will happen. This committee has never asked for a closed rule at any time or under any circumstances. On the contrary, we encourage both debate and amendment. That is why we asked for a rule. The rule we asked opens the bill to debate, and amendments are always in order. You can neither debate nor amend these items without a rule. The idea that the Committee on Appropriations would ask for a closed rule is absurd.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The Committee on Appropriations has asked for a rule waiving points of order on appropriation bills.

Mr. CANNON. And that opens these items to debate and amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman said that he would make a point of order against section 1301 if I did not. I suggest to the gentleman that he need not worry. I am going to make a point of order against section 1301.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if the Appropriations Committee has not brought in appropriation bills with a rule waiving points of order, permitting legislation on appropriation bills to stay in the bills.

Mr. CANNON. The only purpose of waiving points of order is to permit the House to debate and amend and vote. We wanted the House to have an opportunity to vote on these items. Without a rule the House cannot vote for or against.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The committee has asked for rules waiving points of order in order to include legislation on appropriation bills. I am against that policy.

Mr. CANNON. Practically every appropriation bill the gentleman has ever voted for carried legislation. The gentleman has frequently voted against his policy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Applicable current appropriations of the Department of the Navy shall be available for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General to be otherwise due, in the amounts stated below, from the following appropriations:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", fiscal year 1943, $171.48;

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", fiscal year 1943, $3,344.24;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Ships", fiscal year 1946, $5,838.42; and

"Transportation of things, Navy", fiscal year 1948, $1,359.86."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 9, beginning at line 18 and concluding with line 6 on page 10, that it is beyond the scope of the present law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of the Air Force

Military Construction, Air Force

For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as authorized by the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of ——, 1955 (Public Law ——), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; to remain available until expended, $955,929,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 7 on page 10, and concluding with line 21, that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell the House at this time what the program is for the rest of the week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad that the gentleman asked about the rest of the week.

This bill is the last order of business for this week. If a rule had been reported out on the minimum-wage bill that would have come up tomorrow. I hope the rule will be reported out tomorrow, but, of course, it could not be brought up tomorrow.

If this bill is disposed of today, I intend to ask unanimous consent at the proper time that the House adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MARTIN. I was going to inquire about the outcome of the bill under consideration today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would think that with my announcement that if this bill is disposed of today I am going to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday, the bill ought to be finished today.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be five suspensions:

H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955.

H. R. 7205, relating to the free importation of gifts for members of the armed services.

S. 1855, to amend the Federal Airport Act.

H. R. 6243, a bill from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries authorizing the construction of nuclear vessels.

H. R. 5844, to increase the fee in connection with applications for passports from $1 to $3.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that a suspension?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to make an inquiry about that bill, if I may. I understand this increases to $3 the amount to be paid to the clerk. That actually comes out of the Treasury. There is no increase in the fee that is to be charged for the passport. The result is that the Passport Division may be seriously crippled. Is that a fact?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will have to confess my ignorance as to that.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought if that was the case you might have difficulty in suspending the rules and passing that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer the question.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. While I am not enthusiastically for the bill, it increases the fee the clerk of the court in the local jurisdiction gets, which the Passport Division never got, anyway. Before the fee was a dollar, which the applicant paid to the clerk of the court in cases in the local jurisdiction, in Ohio, Massachusetts, or wherever. This raises it so they can charge $3.

Mr. MARTIN. Does that change the amount charged for the passport? Is the total charge $10?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This raises the amount the person applying for the passport pays, and it does not delete anything from the amount the State Department gets.

Mr. MARTIN. That is what I was anxious to know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thereafter on Monday, if a rule is reported on the minimum-wage bill tomorrow, that bill will be considered.

Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday:

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday. Thereafter, this is the proposed program for next week, although these bills may not necessarily be called in the order in which I am stating them:

H. R. 5614, to amend the Communications Act of 1934. That was on the program for this week.

H. R. 6373, the extension of the Mineral Program Act. That also was on for this week. I may say in connection with both of these bills that the reason they were not brought up was that there was some discussion going on among the Members about them, and I was requested not to call them up pending the outcome of the discussions that were taking place. I may say that the Members concerned are all satisfied with the bills coming up next week.

If the following bills are reported and rules are granted, they will be in order for consideration:

H. R. 7072, the Federal aid highway construction bill.

S. 2126, the housing bill.

There is a bill from the Committee on House Administration to equalize salaries of employees of the House and to increase the clerk-hire allowance of Members of the House.

The foregoing bills will be called up in the order cited.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program or changes in the program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. I take it from what the majority leader has said that that does not preclude the taking up of other legislation, if it is ready to be acted on next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. Of course, I am expressing my own personal opinion and offering it gratuitously, but there is no reason in my mind why we should not be able to adjourn 2 weeks from Saturday—having in mind the legislation pending. As I say, I am expressing only my own personal opinion as to what I think the Congress should do and what I hope the Congress will do so that we can get through with the program for this session, so that we will be able to adjourn 2 weeks from next Saturday.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the distinguished minority leader, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Have any plans been made by the leadership to adjourn a week from next Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am only expressing my own personal opinion.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] just said that he hopes we can adjourn 2 weeks from Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I went even further than that to say that I do not see any reason why we cannot. But, that is my own personal opinion.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe that we can get the gentleman from Cape Cod back to the seashore by August 1.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the colloquy concerning the legislative program between the two gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARTIN], action was taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] raising a point of order against the language on page 10 starting on line 7 to line 21, which language relates to military construction for the Air Force. That point of order was conceded by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I want to call the attention of the committee to exactly what has happened in these brief moments. By that action there has been stricken from this bill $959,929,000 for needed bases for our Air Force. These are bases scattered all over the world both here in the United States and abroad. They provide, among others, necessary facilities for our strategic Air Force and for our air defense command and for our farflung radar centers. Mr. Chairman, even though consistency may be a virtue and even though the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has said that he is not going to play any favorites, I can hardly see how anyone who is so vitally concerned with the defense of our country, as he has expressed himself to be, cannot for once be inconsistent. The situation which faces us, inasmuch as the Committee on Rules did not grant a rule waiving points of order, has been thoroughly explained. I can very well understand why, perhaps, if a member of the Committee on Rules thought that certain points of order should not be waived that they might be present today raising those points of order. But the gentleman from Michigan is 1 of 50 members on the Committee on Appropriations. That 50-member Committee on Appropriations reported this bill out unanimously. The 15 members of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee reported out this military construction item unanimously. To let some personal pique or peeve interfere with the defense of our country is something that, for the life of me, I cannot understand. If it were possible, Mr. Chairman, I would plead with the gentleman from Michigan for whom I have a great personal regard, to relax his determined consistency and ask unanimous consent that the committee go back and start to reread the portions of the bill relating to military construction, and then not raise points of order against these sections providing for much needed and strategic vital military construction.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Even if the money were in the bill, it still has to go to the Senate.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman's comment raises the point that some of us talked about in committee. We felt it was not the wise and fair thing to do to put military construction funds in a supplemental bill, but that we should be allowed to bring it out as a separate military construction bill. However, we were asked to speed up hearings and prepare all of this and bring it in in this supplemental bill. I am positive that if this measure had come up as a military public works bill there would not have been a single objection raised to it, even though the authorization legislation, due to delays over which the Committee on Appropriations has no control, and certainly over which the minority in the House has no control, even though the authorization had not yet become law, I know there would not have been a single voice raised objecting to the passage of this bill so that they could have this much needed public defense construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I dislike to take the time of the Committee at this late hour, but I want to discuss the Air Force Academy briefly.

I am concerned about the action of the committee in denying funds to continue the construction of the Air Force Academy, which is to be located near Colorado Springs, Colo., in my district. I know there are other Members of the House who are equally concerned, because the Air Force Academy has been the subject of great interest over the years. Many Members have been stressing the need for an Air Force Academy and are anxious to see the Academy completed at the earliest possible date. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], for the diligent manner in which his committee checked the many details of the Air Force Academy. I have read the hearings and I have been very much impressed with the thorough manner in which you have inquired into the many phases of the construction program of the Air Force Academy. I understand the committee is not opposed to the construction of the Academy, but does have some question concerning the architectural plans and designs of the Academy. I am aware of the criticism of the model of the Academy which was first placed on exhibit last May.

On Monday of this week, along with other Members of the House, I had the great privilege of seeing the first class of air cadets sworn in at Denver, Colo. The temporary Academy is located at Lowry Air Force Base in Denver. We visited the different buildings which have been prepared for these 306 cadets who come from every State in the Union. It was an inspiring sight to see these boys take their oaths. They are a fine group. The present quarters are adequate and will be comfortable. However, as the number of cadets increases from year to year it will be necessary to have the permanent buildings as soon as possible. I have discussed the action of the committee with the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott. He informs me that he has issued instructions for the architects, and also the consultants who have been working with them, to come to Washington next Monday and they will appear before the Senate Committee on Appropriations to present an architectural plan for the Academy. Mr. Talbott hopes at that time they will have a plan and design for this Academy which will meet with our approval.

There has been considerable criticism of the designs of some of these buildings. Some of you have seen the exhibit which was on display at the Fine Arts Center in Colorado Springs, and which has now been moved to the site of the temporary Academy in Denver. I might state that these models were preliminary in nature and were never intended to be the final pattern.

As I remarked to the chairman of the subcommittee I took special pains to look at the chapel in this exhibit, which has been the subject of so much comment. A change in design has been made and I believe the cause of much of the criticism removed. Many other changes will be made. I have not been happy with all of the architectural designs. However, I feel it is most important to proceed with the construction of this Academy so that the permanent buildings will be ready in 1957 as scheduled. I am anxious to see the necessary funds provided in this bill to carry on during the present fiscal year, so there will be no interruption in this work.

I personally feel that Secretary Talbott has tried in every way possible to carry out the wishes of Congress in the construction of this Academy. He appointed a board of six members, consisting half of civilians and half of military leaders, to select the architectural firm. An outstanding firm was selected. In addition the Secretary brought in three prominent architects to act as consultants. The Secretary advised this group that they would have to reach a unanimous decision before he would approve the final plan.

The Secretary was not satisfied with the first exhibit and so notified the architects. The complaint was received that the designs were too modernistic and that too much glass was being used. The Secretary informed me today that 40 percent of the glass has now been eliminated from the designs. I know of the enthusiasm of the Secretary to make the Air Academy the finest institution of its kind in the country, and he wants to get value received for every dollar spent.

I was happy that the subcommittee heard testimony on the water supplies at Colorado Springs. There has been a rumor that there would not be sufficient water for the Air Academy. I feel confident that the committee is now convinced that water is available. There have been repeated studies of the water supply and in each case the amount has been found to be adequate, and more. I was talking to the mayor of Colorado Springs just this week and he advised me that the present water storage is five times greater than it was at this time last year. The figures submitted to me by the city manager clearly show there will be a surplus of water for all present needs, including the Academy and all other military installations at Colorado Springs.

I am also sorry to see the committee delete the item of $3,015,000 for construction at Ent Air Force Base in Colorado Springs. The Continental Air Defense Command is located at this base. I am advised that this money is needed in order to furnish necessary housing at the base and an administration building. The committee indicates in its report that there should be a study of the effect of this construction on the water supply at Colorado Springs. In my opinion there is no question of the water supply. The city manager indicates a prospective use of about 20,000 acre-feet of water, including the Academy and all present military installations. He estimated that there will be available about 34,000 acre-feet, making a surplus of some 14,000 acre-feet over and above anything that is contemplated at this time. I am hoping that this item may be included in the bill before the final passage so that this work may be done this year.

Mr. Chairman, while there has been criticism of the architectural plans and designs, I have heard no criticism of the site that has been selected for the Academy. All of those who have visited the site are loud in their praise of the same. The cadets who will attend this Academy in the years ahead will receive inspiration from the majestic view they will have of the Pikes Peak area. I want to see the buildings in keeping with this beautiful and challenging site. I am confident this can and will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

General provisions

SEC. 302. Funds appropriated to the military departments for military public works in prior years are hereby made available for military public works authorized for each such department by the act of ——, 1955 (Public Law ——).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 23, on page 10, and concluding in line 3, on page 11, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 303. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 11 beginning in line 4 and concluding in line 9, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and specifies additional duties.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies such costs to be necessary to protect the national interest and establishes a reasonable completion date for each such project, taking into consideration the urgency of the requirement, the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of section 304 beginning in line 10 on page 11 and concluding in line 18, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and specifies additional duties.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facility in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of section 305 beginning in line 19, page 11, and ending in line 2, page 12, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and specifies additional duties.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the gentleman from Indiana if it would not be in order and if he would be willing at this time to ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read with the right reserved to him to make such points of order as he deems in the best interest for the public interest, in order to conserve the time of the House for the rest of the day.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As soon as the gentleman from Indiana answers my question.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman does not come from Indiana; he comes from Michigan.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am so confused I placed the gentleman in the wrong *State—not* the state of confusion. I should have said the State of Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I am in such state that I have no hard feelings against anybody.

Mr. Chairman, I think such procedure would be confusing.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Would not the more expeditious and sensible procedure be to strike out all after the enacting clause, quit this nonsense, and go home?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did not understand the gentleman's suggestion. Were we to strike only those paragraphs to which the gentleman from Michigan objected?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My request was that some gentleman on the committee ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read with the right reserved to the gentleman from Michigan to make points of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would have to object to that. The bill must be read by paragraphs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under this situation, Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time, but I am constrained to take a little time as long as the time of the House is being taken.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in this body some 12 or more years and I hesitate to see the House engage in an act of futility such as we are engaging in this afternoon. I hesitate also to place myself between the millstones of the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee, both powerful committees of this body, committees before which every Member sooner or later has to appear with his hat in his hand to request consideration. But in this case I am just wondering where the equity of this procedure lies.

As a Member of the House I have many, many times suffered disappointment at the hands of the Appropriations Committee. Every Member of this House has suffered disappointment at the hands of that committee. Every committee of this House has suffered at the hands of the Appropriations Committee by seeing them perform the functions of a legislative committee. At the same time, we have suffered at the hands of the Rules Committee by their not giving us a rule that we thought and the majority of a legislative committee thought was desirable or in not giving us the kind of a rule we wanted. I cannot understand why the Members of the House this afternoon have to suffer and be ground to pieces between the millstones of the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman because of the manner in which he has expressed himself if during the years of his experience this has not been more or less the truth. When the Rules Committee has jurisdiction and in their wisdom presents a rule to the House, that could not pass and become effective unless the House acquiesced in it. Is that true?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So if the Appropriations Committee has transgressed upon the feelings of the membership of the House by and through the Rules Committee, there is ultimately vested in every Member of the House the power as to whether or not he or she shall vote for that rule.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly agree to that, but at least we have had a chance to vote on it. Under this procedure today we are not getting the chance to vote upon these points in the bills. I concede that points of order could have knocked a lot of these things out and the gentleman from Michigan is certainly within his rights under the rules of the House. I am not complaining that he is breaking the rules, but we who have been in this body a few years realize that sometimes there have to be concessions made to the Rules Committee, to the Appropriations Committee and to the legislative committees in order that the business of the House may be accomplished. I hesitate to see the prerogatives of the House given up and transferred to another body in an appropriation bill of this kind. This procedure is in fact an abdication of our customary function and in effect places upon the other body our duties. I fear that it will set an unwise precedent.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all points of order on the remainder of the bill be waived.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 306. Funds appropriated to the military departments for construction are hereby made available for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, as authorized by section 504 of the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 306, line 3, page 12, down to and including line 7. The language is beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the next section of the bill be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Michigan. Public Law 776 passed in the 1954 session provided for the appropriation of $5,384,000 under the Rivers and Harbors Flood Control Act. The Bureau of the Budget recommended that that amount be included in this supplemental appropriation bill under civil functions. My question is why was this not included in the appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. We had no hearings on it.

Mr. BERRY. Would the gentleman have any objection to its inclusion?

Mr. RABAUT. If it is authorized, it will be taken up when it comes up in the other body. All of these other matters will be taken up, I will say to the Members of the House.

Mr. BERRY. It has been authorized?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. And had it been included, it would not have been subject to a point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. It will be taken up in the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Department of the Army

Government and Relief in Occupied Areas

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of the Ryukyu Islands, including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals not to exceed 10 in number; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $3,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,210,000 shall be available for administrative and information and education expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151–161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in the Ryukyu Islands in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of titles II and III of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and in the manner authorized by sections 505 (a) and 522 (e) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertaking specified in section 303 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean-transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against chapter 4, beginning on page 12, line 8, and ending on page 15, line 24, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and imposes additional duties.

Mr. CANNON. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

International Claims

For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to settle certain claims as authorized by the act of March 10, 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1621–1627), including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and employment of aliens; $400,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6382, 84th Congress, first session.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 17, beginning with line 10 and ending on line 21, on the ground that there is no authority in law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the desire has been expressed on both sides of the aisle that we be allowed to consider these items as we come to them. Now, that is a very simple matter. I ask unanimous consent that all points of order be waived and that we proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

President's Commission on Veterans Pensions

For expenses necessary for a special study of the veterans compensation and pensions program, to be expended as the President may direct, $300,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

General provisions

SEC. 502. Appropriations contained in title I of the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1956, available for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language from line 3, on page 18, down to and including line 10, that it is beyond the scope of existing law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Operations," $650,000.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: On page 18, line 15, strike out "$650,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a related amendment to the following paragraph which would have the same effect of raising the figure in the bill to the budget figure and ask unanimous consent that it may be read at this time and that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: On page 18, line 23, strike out "$8,000,000," and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the simple effect of these two amendments is to restore the amount requested by the President and the budget for operations, for surveys, plans, and research, of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. I refer the membership of the House to the report of the committee at page 39 dealing with these items. Part of the first paragraph reads:

> The additional amounts at this time are to initiate a program to obtain detailed evacuation, shelter, and other operational plans and related research for each of the critical target areas during time of danger.

The surveys, plans, and research relate directly to the 92 critical target areas in this country and the great pressing problems resulting from radioactive fallout.

For my own part, I confess to this House that I do not believe I have in the past given to the problem of civil defense the earnest attention to which I believe it is entitled. I doubt very much that the House of Representatives or any part of our Government until recent months has given to this pressing problem the attention it merits. Those of us who have been out to Nevada and who have seen the atomic bomb demonstrated and those of us who recently read the letter of the group of scientists who pointed out that we are at the very brink of extinction today from radioactive fallout; those of us who have carefully in recent months looked at this problem a second time should hesitate a long time before we cut the figures which the President has requested for this very urgent purpose.

The amount involved is less than one-half of 1 percent of this entire bill and yet this one-half of 1 percent may mean life or death, literally life or death, to millions of American citizens. If we have an atomic attack in the future and we have not laid full and adequate plans for civil defense and radioactive fallout, it will mean unnecessary death, destruction, and tragedy from one end of our country to the other.

This is not a great deal of money, as defense expenditures go. Personally I seriously doubt that it is enough—that is, the amount in the budget request. But I have been one of those who have at times criticized the President and this administration for not having an adequate civil defense program. How can we criticize in good faith an inadequate program and yet cut the amount which is requested for that program by one-third? I urge that this House allow the President at least the amount of money he requests for this program. Let not any of us be in a position some day of saying, "Well, we should have given him more money, because that meant life or death for millions of fellow-Americans."

I urge the adoption of these two amendments in order to restore the President's request on the budget items for civil defense.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the 5 minutes to be consumed by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments here. One seeks to increase the administrative costs from $650,000 to $1 million. Let us speak of that one first.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration has in the appropriation bill $11,300,000, so with this additional $650,000 we give them for administrative expenses for next year approximately $12 million.

Why do they seek this additional $1 million? To implement a program seeking $12 million additional in the form of a deficiency, but for 1956, for their new endeavor. Your committee instead of giving them $12 million gave them $8 million. Frankly, if we go strictly by their own justifications, we should not have given them the $8 million. They want to spend $100,000 in 92 different cities, and they admitted they could not make these tests during the fiscal year 1956 in all of the 92 cities; maybe no more than 45 or 50 of them. If that be true, they need but $6 million.

The other point is, How are they going to spend the amount they asked for? They asked to spend $100,000 in each of the cities. "For what?" we asked. When they got through they said, "Well, frankly, we do not know. We are going to make some tests. We are going to count the people here. We are going to find out how many live on the east side, how many live on the north side, how many on the west side, and how many on the south side."

"Well, how much money is that going to cost you to do it?"

"Well, frankly, we do not know. It is an estimate." The local communities are not putting up 1 red cent.

I said, "Instead of spending that money, go to the local communities and they will tell you now where they live. They will tell you now how many bridges you are going to have to cross in the north side of town to get over to the south side of town. The local traffic department in that city already has that information."

So, Mr. Chairman, we have been very generous with them here. There is no question about that. They cannot possibly make these studies in 1 year in all of the 92 cities. So if you are going to change this figure of $8 million, you ought to cut it down a couple of million more, and cut down the administrative expense accordingly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I say that the minority side concurred with that, and thought it would be difficult to spend that amount of money in fiscal 1956. When we adjourn 2 weeks from tomorrow, and I say that hopefully, we are not adjourning forever; we are coming back in January.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on both of the amendments. They go hand in hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Sites and planning, purchase contract, and public buildings projects

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 518), $15 million, to remain available until expended and to be in addition to and available for the same purposes as any unobligated balances which have been or may be made available, by any law enacted during the first session of the 84th Congress, for carrying out the purposes of said act: *Provided,* That any such unobligated balances may be consolidated with this appropriation.

Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service," $200,000; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for travel expenses is increased by $1,000.

Expenses, general supply fund

For an additional amount for "Expenses, general supply fund," $1 million, of which $300,000 shall be for nonrecurring moving and space costs in connection with the relocation of warehouse management and other employees into office space in regional warehouses; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased by $22,500.

Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service," $100,000.

Strategic and critical materials

The appropriation granted under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, shall be available for necessary expenses for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for the supplemental stockpile pursuant to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1704 (b)).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 19, lines 1 to 23, inclusive, and on page 20, lines 1 to 18, inclusive, on the ground that the language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JOHN MARSHALL BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

For an additional amount for "John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission" for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 702), including entertainment, $82,500, to remain available until December 31, 1955.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 22, lines 4 to 10, inclusive, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Museum of History and Technology

For necessary expenses of construction of a building for the Museum of History and Technology, as authorized by the act of June 28, 1955 (Public Law 106), including the preparation of plans and specifications, not to exceed $75,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and incidental expenses of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and of the Joint Congressional Committee established by said act, $2,288,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the expenses of the Joint Congressional Committee shall be paid upon certification of the chairman of said committee.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill on page 22, lines 11 to 24, inclusive, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Employment Security

Salaries and Expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program," $650,000: *Provided,* That this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 3822, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, extending authority for the importation of Mexican agricultural workers.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 23, beginning at line 7 down to and including line 15, on the ground that there is no authority in law for such language.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is authority for a Mexican farm-labor program. This provides money for that program. There is a Mexican-labor program at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has conceded the point of order. The Chair is constrained to hold the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the fact that someone concedes a point of order, notwithstanding that legislation is on the statute books authorizing the appropriation, does not mean that the concession would necessarily prevail; does it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled on the point of order merely on the basis of the fact that the point of order is conceded. If the gentleman will cite the authority of law authorizing this appropriation, the Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not carry my law in my pocket.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wage and Hour Division

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $1,100,000: *Provided,* That this amount, and the amount appropriated in this act for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor," shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 2168, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 23, line 16, down to and including line 23, that there is no authority in law for the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of the Commission in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of aircraft; purchase (not to exceed 479 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $138,577,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That only $37,400,000 shall be available prior to the enactment into law of H. R. 6795, 84th Congress.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 25, line 14, after the last word in line 13 strike out the figure "$138,577,000" and insert the figure "$163,577,000."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is getting late, but I think this body should take time to consider items that seriously affect a program such as atomic energy.

Now, what does this bill do? It simply cuts our peacetime development of atomic energy reactors. What are reactors? Reactors are key parts of the atomic energy program. This joint committee of yours has insisted that the Commission develop the most outstanding program which will probably ever be developed in this world on reactors. It has been said that this program is not definite enough. When we adopted the peacetime act last year to go into the development of power, we knew we would have to have a number of reactors. We also knew we would have to have more out in the Idaho test station. This $25 million request was gone over with a fine-tooth comb by your joint committee that first authorized this item. We felt very much as some members of the Committee on Appropriations felt, that probably this thing was rather undefined, but when you begin to look at it and go into it, it is a basic research program. It is one you have got to carry out if you expect to be in the forefront of the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. We are in a field today by which a type of reactor would come into being overnight that would mean the expenditure of funds. That applies to research and development reactors, among other things. I am asking that this $25 million be restored. I could talk about it for hours, and your joint committee has gone into it carefully. We did not authorize these items without first trying to justify them on the basis of whether or not they could be used. The funds this amendment adds may also be used for development of reactors for research in cancer, in medical fields, and in metallurgical testing fields.

I hope this House will restore this item to the measure which is before us this afternoon. If it were not so important I would not take the time of the House at this hour of the day and with all the confusion we have seen here this afternoon. I have been here quite a long while, and I have not seen anything like what we have had here this afternoon; but that is neither here nor yonder; we are here and we are with it.

But let us not destroy this program. I would not say it would destroy it, but it will damage it to a point where it will slow down and we will be in the position of not being in the forefront of the development of atomic energy which we all know is so important.

Let me now discuss the amendment and certain other points in the bill in a bit more detail.

Chapter IX of H. R. 7278 covers expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. I would also like to point out to the House that the substantive programs covered by these funds are authorized by H. R. 6795, Public Law 141, 84th Congress. Public Law 141 authorized the appropriation to the Commission of $269,159,000 for the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

This was the first authorizing legislation passed in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In addition, the present bill, that is, H. R. 7278, includes money for the purpose of acquisition of equipment not included in construction and which did not require authorization and so was not included in Public Law 141, and it includes money for the AEC headquarters building which was authorized by Public Law 31.

H. R. 7278 in total makes available $55,123,000 less than the amounts contemplated by the authorizing legislation and budget estimates.

The excellent report of the Subcommittee on Public Works which accompanies the bill clearly identifies the programs and projects from which these funds have been cut. While I do not wish to dispute with the Appropriations Committee in their judgment as to the proper amounts to be allocated to these programs and projects, I would like to point out here that the joint committee went into great detail on the need for these programs and projects during hearings on authorizing legislation on May 2, 9, 10, and 31, 1955, and believes the amounts indicated in Public Law 141 for these projects are realistic and needed.

The Appropriations Committee has moreover, indicated it believes the objectives of these programs and the projects involved could be accomplished with somewhat less money. However, as I have said, I do believe that there are several reductions included in this bill which should be corrected. Specifically—and my amendment will correct this deficiency—the present bill does not include any money for project 56b (1), the reactor acceleration project which was authorized in Public Law 141. The joint committee believed the $25 million should be allocated for the purposes of this project. In its report the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee said:

> The committee is fully in accord with the philosophy and purposes of the power reactor development acceleration project but feels that insufficient data was presented to justify the budget request of $25 million.

I cannot emphasize too strongly to the House that if we are to maintain our atomic leadership we must rapidly develop civilian power. To my mind this program measures second in importance only to the importance of production of nuclear material and the development of new and better weapons.

This program for civilian atomic power is one of the strongest weapons we have in the battle we are waging for the mind and hearts of men in the free world. So I am very happy that the committee is in full accord with this program. I also can understand to some extent the committee's reluctance to appropriate funds for the program because it is not fully and clearly identifiable at this time. There are technical developments which must be accomplished. The Commission has, therefore, not been able to supply the reactor or reactor's programs which the money under this item would be used for. Nonetheless the joint committee is in complete accord with the Commission's need for this money. This money will cover work on joint projects in industry; it will cover work pushing ahead on the type of reactor which for some reason industry does not consider amenable to develop with their own funds but which will be of national interest, and should be supported by the Government. It also might be used for development of a 10-megawatt reactor, a small reactor. The Commission is unable at this time because of the rapidly developing technological programs to say exactly where this money will be spent. But the joint committee has complete confidence that the money will be used only in accord with programs authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and that any facilities required by the $25 million will be constructed on Government-owned sites, and that if any of the money made available under this item is used to provide facilities or plant and equipment for the providing of research assistance in the atomic field, the title to those facilities will remain with the United States Government.

I cannot say too strongly that the joint committee feels that this program is a valid one. I urge, therefore, that funds for this project be added to this bill by the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to have to disagree with my good friend from North Carolina who is one of the Members of longest service and one of the most beloved Members of the House, and one in whose judgment I have the greatest confidence.

But, Mr. Chairman, here is an impossible situation. They asked us for this money for four firms, all of them private firms, all of them without any connection with the Government whatever. We said, All right, we are anxious to do anything that can be done to promote this important development. What do you propose to do with this money? They could not tell us. At least they would not tell us, and they did not tell us what they wanted the money for or what they would do with it if they got it; as a matter of fact they did not seem to know; they just thought it would be nice if Uncle Sam would just hand over this substantial sum of money, apparently without any definite plans at all. If they had any plans they did not take the committee into their confidence.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, we have already made provision for research and development of this character. We have provided the Duquesne plant, at Pittsburgh, Pa., with $32 million for this purpose. Now seeing that it is so easy to get money, four other groups rush in and want their handout, but no one would tell the committee what they are going to do with it. We can't appropriate money that way.

So, Mr. Chairman, the committee could find no reason why they should grant these additional funds. I hope the House will deny them.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the pending amendment I should like to take just a minute to clarify the situation with respect to appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Although this item of $138 million is contained in the pending bill as a supplemental appropriation bill, actually so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned this is the regular appropriation to the Commission for the purpose of plant expansion and construction. On yesterday the House completed action when it adopted the conference report on the public works appropriation bill, completed action on appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for operating expenses. The Atomic Energy Commission budget request of the Congress for operating expenses was approximately $1,500 million. That was the smallest request for appropriations that the Atomic Energy Commission has ever submitted to the Congress in the last 6 or 8 years. Yet as it left the Congress yesterday the request was reduced by $144 million or approximately a reduction of 10 percent in the operating expenses of the Commission.

What does that mean? Ninety percent of the operating costs of the Atomic Energy Commission are for making weapons, buying raw materials, processing raw materials, fabricating the weapons, and storing them. So when we cut the appropriation for operating expenses by that very severe amount of 10 percent we are placing in jeopardy, and in serious jeopardy, in my opinion, our production of atomic weapons which all of us must admit is largely responsible for the fact there is peace in the world today.

The argument may be made that the operating expenses of the Commission for the past 2 years actually have been 10 to 15 percent less than the money that was appropriated to them. That is true, but it has been occasioned by reason of the fact that the experiences which the Commission has had, the lessons it has learned out of its operations has resulted in its being able to effect savings. We cannot anticipate for the coming fiscal year that we will be able to make comparable savings in operations.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that when you reduce the operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission by as much as 10 percent you assume a serious responsibility.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am not certain from the statement of the gentleman from New York nor from the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina whether this is just a general increase of $25 million or it is for a specific purpose, having to do with the reactor department.

Mr. COLE. The purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, and now I may discuss that, is to reinstate the activity requested by the Commission and to have available $25 million to give assistance in the development of peacetime reactors.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If it were a general addition, I might raise objection or question to it because there has been anywhere from 10 to 17 percent left over each year. There was only a 9-percent cut in this bill. But on that particular item there was some argument in the committee and I personally would raise no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, to apply to reactor development.

Mr. COLE. I am happy to hear that statement.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 3 years the joint committee has been pressing and demanding and whipping the Commission to get into the business of finding out to what extent this energy can be used for the good of mankind. The Commission has responded to that very effectively and cooperatively. It has laid out a program of one new reactor each year for the next 5 years. And let me tell you that there are as many types of reactors as, as one scientist put it, that you can put into a wagonload. What we are trying to find out is the best type, the most effective and efficient type. That can be done by the Commission doing it alone, as it is with the 5-year reactor program, or the Commission may do it by cooperation or in partnership with private capital. That is the purpose of the $25 million. Naturally, the Commission does not know what private capital is going to come in to make propositions, therefore its request is necessary and certainly the objective is desirable.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. In order that the Members of the House may pass upon this question intelligently, I hope the gentleman will tell us why they would not tell the committee what they were going to do with the money, how they expected to spend it or for what purpose they were going to use it.

And if the House should appropriate money without knowing what it is being appropriated for.

Mr. COLE. I have just tried to indicate the impossibility of the Commission specifically telling the committee just how it is going to do it. It has made invitations, open invitations, to the public generally, to industry and capital, "If you have any idea of a new kind of reactor that you think will work and you are willing to put up some of your money with Government money, come in and tell us what it is; perhaps we can give you a little assistance." But I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that whatever funds are contributed by the Commission in a joint effort with private capital, the Government's interests will be protected by the Government having a proportionate interest in whatever the reactor may be, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

My distinguished colleague, vice chairman of the joint committee, has explained in some detail the background of the items covered by this bill for the AEC. I share his views completely.

The bill removes $25 million which was authorized to be appropriated by Public Law 141 for the power reactor development in accordance with the President's atoms-for-peace program for harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The House will recall that one purpose of the revision of the Atomic Energy Act last year was to enable rapid development of atomic energy by Government and private industry. The passage of that act was a major step in the atomic-energy program and was, as it were, a pledge to the peoples of the world that we would harness the atom to the ways of peace. Of course, legislative acts and executive-branch programs are fruitless if there is no money appropriated for their purposes.

It is indeed a shallow gesture to, with one hand, authorize by legislative action the achievement of economic civilian power, and with the other hand withhold moneys necessary for its development.

I am aware of the concern, and I think it is a reasonable concern, in the minds of the members of the Appropriations Committee, that projects to be covered by the $25 million are not clearly identified. I would only point that this is a rapidly developing technical field and it is not unreasonable that the Commission has not found it possible to completely identify each and every project it will support.

I think it is most reasonable to allow some flexibility to the Commission in this instance; to do otherwise would be to forward programs that the growing technological development might show not to be the best. But the Commission is absolutely certain that the program of civilian power will require about $25 million for the purpose of acquiring and building plants and facilities and equipment.

My distinguished colleague has pointed out some of the programs and projects of the Commission. I do not intend to go in great detail and I do not believe it necessary to take up much of your time. I only want to impress with every power at my command upon the Members of this body that until we make available to the Commission adequate amounts of money for the development of civilian power, we will lose the race for the minds of men and we will sacrifice our atomic preeminence.

Let me point out that the first major break in our dealings with the Soviet Union, to my mind, has resulted from peaceful applications of the atom in the atoms-for-peace program. The $25 million is crucial for program development because from it will flow economic uses of atomic energy which could be made to relieve the tensions in the rest of the world—the very tensions that require us to appropriate billions and billions for military armaments.

By cutting $25 million from the appropriations to the Commission we may well sacrifice gains made to date—gains resulting from the pledge, not only by the President, but by Congress in passing the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, that we would with all expeditiousness pursue peacetime uses of the atom.

I urge you to reinstitute funds for this vital program.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to this same paragraph, and I would object if it applies to that.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will revise my request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, my amendment would be an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that the gentleman's amendment is not an amendment to the pending amendment, but can be considered as a separate amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and concur in the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

As to the remarks which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made, I very kindly suggest that he does not understand the problem that is involved here, and I say that in all kindness. The Atomic Energy Commission has a five-reactor program. These are small reactors, experimental research type reactors which they are building and operating. Also, there have been at this time five of the big industrial companies who have offered to build reactors of different kinds. As the gentleman from New York said, there are many different kinds of reactors.

Now, this $25 million which is included as the No. 1 item in Public Law 141, which was signed by the President yesterday, is an item for $25 million for power reactor development acceleration. Now, that means in common language research and development by the Atomic Energy Commission for reactors which they are building and for research and development on any of the five or many more reactors which may be built by private industry. The Atomic Energy Commission has certain laboratories and facilities and scientists who are of top grade and who are in a class that can only do the type of research which may be necessary to make these different reactors work.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] said, this would be a contribution on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission to research and development. It might be that any one of these reactors which are being built by industry at their own expense would run into scientific research problems which they could not solve because they do not have the physicists, nor the laboratories and facilities to do the experimental work. They would then go to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission would do that work for them. When they did that work for that specific corporation, however, the result of that research and development would be public property. It would be owned by the Government and every reactor builder in the United States would have access to that information free.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask, if that be the situation, why did they not tell the committee?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will answer the question. I hold in my hands the hearings on the authorizing legislation, hearings of the subcommittee of which I was chairman; on pages 7 and 8, pages 14, 48, and several pages thereafter, pages 53, 54, and 57, there is an adequate explanation by the Commission as to the purposes of this amount $25 million.

Mr. CANNON. But there is no explanation in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot express myself on that because I was not there. But it has been adequately explored. It has been authorized by the Congress. It has been signed into law by the President. And I tell you in all seriousness that the elimination of this particular item of $25 million will strike at the heart of the program of the 5 reactors which the AEC is building, and also the 5 reactors for which permits have been applied for by private industry. If I had additional time, I could go into this matter in greater detail.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It will also eliminate the possibility of acting favorably upon such applications as one from a big REA cooperative in my State that wants to join with the Atomic Energy Commission in building a small reactor for use at grassroots' level. Maybe a reactor of such size cannot yet be made economically feasible. They want one that will produce about 60,000 kilowatts for use by the REA in Minnesota which has pioneered in this whole field. Failure to adopt the gentleman's amendment would make impossible that sort of cooperation for the peacetime use of the atom for the benefit of our own people.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. I respectfully suggest that this was a unanimous authorization by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. There is not one member of the subcommittee who did not go into this in great detail. The answers are contained in the hearings. We are all unanimous. I certainly hope that this $25 million will be afforded to the Commission. The Committee on Atomic Energy will watch its expenditure. Under the law they have to keep us completely informed, and we will see that it is not wasted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the best speech I could make here at the moment would be to say that I fully corroborate the statements made by the other members of our joint committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I sat through the committee hearings chairmaned by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], as these reactor items were fully justified by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Without the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, there will be no funds in this bill to carry on the reactor program of the Atomic Energy Commission. This is one of the keys to our atomic leadership. If we are to maintain the lead in the atomic energy program throughout the world we must lead in the development of civilian power. The reactor program which is to be continued with the funds which will be appropriated by the House, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted, is necessary to maintain this leadership. There is complete justification for the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I call to the attention of the House the fact that there are five applications by industrial groups to build reactors. The first is for a 180,000-kilowatt-hour reactor to be built by the American Gas & Electric Co., the Bechtel Corp., Commonwealth Edison, the Pacific Gas & Electric Corp., and the Union Electric Co. They have joined together to build this tremendous power-producing reactor.

Then there is the Yankee Atomic Electric Co., composed of 12 New England companies, who are also going to build one.

Then there is the Detroit-Edison Co. and eight other power companies. These are all different kinds, I may say.

There is the Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska, which is a cooperative, that is going to build one.

Also, there is the Consolidated Edison Company of New York, which is going to build a reactor.

All of these reactors will depend on the research and development made possible by this $25 million appropriation.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This is necessary for the success of our own Atomic Energy Commission's program. This program in private industry will fall flat on its face and cannot have any hope of success unless the Commission itself can carry on this program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I want to emphasize that the amounts mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be spent by the corporations he named and will supplement funds to be allocated by the Atomic Energy Commission from the amount provided for in the amendment.

Mr. PRICE. That is right.

I should like to comment briefly on the point raised by the gentleman from California. As a matter of fact, he contributed to our cause, because he pointed out that there may be some reason for confusion on the part of the House since we have submitted an amendment for a $25 million increase in the overall appropriation. He wanted to be certain that this $25 million applied to a reactor program. I think that is pointed out in the committee's own report. The committee said this:

> The committee is fully in accord with the philosophy and the purpose of the power reactor development acceleration project, but feels that insufficient data was presented to justify the budget request of $25 million. More specific information should be furnished as to how and where it is contemplated the funds will be expended.

This $25 million is placed in here expressly to take up the $25 million which the committee deleted on the reactor program.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission itself has given full justification to the Congress for its program.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I was a little curious to know if the gentleman would not agree that failure to adopt this amendment would place in serious jeopardy the possibility, even, that this Government may maintain its leadership in the peacetime use of the atom.

Mr. PRICE. Yes. As I remarked at the outset of my statement here, I think if we are to maintain leadership it is important that we have it not only in the field of weapons but in the field of civilian power. If we fail to adopt this amendment, we fail in that leadership.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This is a request for $25 million for plant and equipment in the civilian power-reactor program. As I understand it, this amount is a floating fund of $25 million which, as the different reactor programs are developed, the Atomic Energy Commission may assign, on the judgment of the Commission, such amounts as it feels necessary for each of these reactor programs. If the power reactor development acceleration program is to go forward at all, this item is necessary. It is also a must for development projects of the Atomic Energy Commission itself, and is not tied down to industry alone. Without this fund, the Atomic Energy Commission could not go ahead with the various industrial power proposals that are now before it. One of these is that of the Yankee Atomic Electric Co., composed of 12 New England power companies. The application of the Yankee Atomic Electric Co. is now before the Commission. The failure to adopt this amendment would completely stymie the Atomic Energy Commission from giving the go-ahead signal to this New England enterprise as well as four other applications of similar nature presently before the Atomic Energy Commission. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 25, line 14, after "to remain available until expended", insert "and $2,900,000 which shall be available for the construction of a community hospital at Oak Ridge, Tenn."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the Atomic Energy Commission some months ago recommended a new hospital to be built at Oak Ridge. This recommendation was concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget. The hospital was authorized in the bill which we passed a few days ago, and was signed by the President this morning. There is a little hospital at Oak Ridge now. It was built in 1943 at the inception of the old Clinton Engineering Works with 50 beds. It has been built onto in every direction out of wood and fiberboard until it now has 300 beds. I have seen it time and time again and have been all through it. It is an absolute fire trap. Just a few days ago, and this was not publicized too much, a most serious explosion occurred at Oak Ridge injuring 22 workers who were immediately put in that hospital. They have 28 of the finest doctors in the world at Oak Ridge. They tell me that they will not operate that hospital if we dispose of Oak Ridge and do not give them a new hospital. They do not have the facilities. The Government is losing $100,000 a year there now because it is absolutely uneconomical to run it the way it is. Dr. Libby, the acting chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a letter written just a few days ago to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] strongly recommended this hospital.

I am sorry that I have to talk rapidly because too much cannot be said in 5 minutes, but the only objection in the committee report is that we are about to dispose of Oak Ridge and that, therefore, we should not build them a hospital on the very eve of disposal. Now that is true. I do not know whether we are going to pass the bill or not, but I hope so, and I hope that we will do it next week, but we do have a bill to make Oak Ridge a normal, American community, and it is estimated that when we sell these homes, of which there are about 6,000, the Government will realize about $42 million. In this bill which I hope we will pass soon, we give them their municipal facilities including a fire department, schools and a hospital, but they will have no money. There is no industry at Oak Ridge and there is nothing on earth down there except these tremendous plants which, as you know, cost something a little under $2 billion. Here you have a newborn child which we, the Congress, brought into being with no money to build a hospital. This is at a place which I consider to be the most potentially dangerous spot in the world today. That is Oak Ridge. I have had clergymen through the place, and I am sure a number of you also have. It is just inconceivable to me that we would for a moment not provide for this community of 35,000 people among whom are scientists from all over the world. There is not a man in this Chamber, in my opinion, who does not have a constituent or a former constituent there. The people who are at Oak Ridge come from practically every congressional district in the United States. The most important thing about this disposal program is that it must work. The people must be happy with it. According to the first bill that was introduced, the tax rate for the people in Oak Ridge would have been twice what the average American citizen pays in his local community. That is so because you have nothing to tax down there except these houses and very few business properties. Nobody knows what the in lieu of taxes will be.

It just seems to me to be of tremendous importance that funds for this hospital be included in this bill, for when early this year it was decided to transfer these facilities out of Government ownership, in the transaction was a new hospital. The people agreed in town meetings and other ways to accept the responsibilities of self-government, and a part of that integral and essential proposal was this $2,900,000 hospital.

It seems to me it almost amounts to bad faith not to provide this hospital but just to say to them as the Appropriations Committee has that we will give them $50,000—with all respect to the Appropriations Committee—that is what they did, they substituted $50,000 to repair a firetrap—when we have hospitals of the most modern type all over the United States in Army camps, in defense installations, and all over the world. I cannot emphasize too greatly the importance of this amendment and I do hope the additional $2,900,000 will be appropriated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the time to be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Cole] is recognized.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I confess that when this item was before the Joint Committee my impluse and inclination was to be against it. I could not see why the Federal Government should build a brand-new hospital for this community which within the near future was going to be an independent community. I learned that this was an old hospital that was costing $100,000 a year to maintain, and I realized that even though we may turn Oak Ridge loose as an independent community, we must, as a mother hen mothers her chickens, nurture and support this new community—it cannot go it alone, we have got to help it. So it is just a question of building a new hospital and saving $100,000 a year over a course of 10 years, having the cost of the hospital repaid, give them the old dilapidated hospital and subsidizing the care and upkeep.

So I have reversed my thinking and support this item for the hospital at Oak Ridge and urge that you do so likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Durham] is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, we have been very fortunate at Oak Ridge that we have not had a major catastrophe. It has been one of the most fortunate things in the world, because we all know what type of operation has gone on there for years. The present hospital is in such rundown condition that you would not want anyone that you knew to go to it.

We have been advocating turning this town over, letting it become independent, and we are going to do it, but that does not relieve us of the obligation of building a hospital at Oak Ridge, because that operation there is primarily our responsibility and we cannot take a chance on the employment of highly technical personnel which is worth millions and millions of dollars, yet today they could not be properly treated. I assure you of that fact; and I think we owe it to the community regardless of what we do on turning it over to civilian ownership, which I am in favor of.

But let us build them a decent hospital there so that we may not some day wake up to face a disaster there and realize we have no facilities at Oak Ridge to meet it.

This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Rabaut].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. The community known as Oak Ridge is before us with a request for $2,900,000 for a hospital. They have a hospital down there that they have been using, but it has been rather expensive to use. That I want to concede to the Members who have made that point.

But Oak Ridge is to be sold. Is there any reason for the Congress to appropriate another $2,900,000 to this community? We are going to take a tremendous loss when we sell it without adding $2,900,000 more to it at this time. This year we allowed $50,000 for any repairs they wanted to make. The last reported figures that we have showed that they had suffered a loss of $78,255 in 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Baker].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Baker) there were—ayes 72, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General provision

Sec. 902. No money appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other act shall be used for construction of transmission facilities for connection with generating or transmission facilities of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., as contemplated by the so-called Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 25, beginning with line 18, down to and including line 24 that it goes beyond the scope of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, all that this is is a limitation upon an appropriation bill. It says "no money appropriated or otherwise made available by this act shall be used for a certain purpose." If that is not a limitation I do not know what is and, therefore, I think the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman overlooks in his statement the language in line 20, page 25, of the paragraph that makes it subject to a point of order "by this or any other act." The paragraph is definitely subject to a point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if those words were eliminated the rest of it "no money appropriated or otherwise made available by this act" would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will pass on that when the question presents itself.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the language on page 26, and on page 27 up to and including line 41 on page 28 be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "International contingencies," $1,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the language on page 26 under the title "Department of State" to which I desire to address myself includes an appropriation of $1,820,000. I assume that includes the appropriation for the education of the children of Foreign Service personnel. I wonder if I am correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The amount requested for education abroad of Foreign Service officers' children was in the amount of $600,000. The committee, because of the fact that admittedly the figures on which their request was based were 5 years old and because in one instance they talked of sending a youngster to a school in Switzerland where the tuition would be $1,800 a year, cut the request in half with the idea that they must come up with some firm current figures when we meet again so that we may intelligently understand exactly what they propose to do.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

In view of the criticism heaped on the committee today, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY, chairman of the subcommittee, and the members of the subcommittee for cutting this amount by 50 percent in view of the testimony that was given to the committee. As I understand, they even proposed spending $2,000 per pupil, that is, grade and elementary pupils, in order to send them to a boarding school.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his comment on the work of this committee. I want to point out that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the House itself and the other body and its committee authorized the expenditure of money for the education abroad of Foreign Service officers' children, and I propose to carry out the wishes of Congress. I am going to appropriate the money insofar as I am personally concerned, but I do want to make sure that we are getting full value for each taxpayer's dollar before I appropriate such money.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure we all want to do that. But, when you read the hearings and learn that $240 is allowed dependents of servicemen and the State Department comes along and wants up to $2,000 per pupil for educational purposes, in other words, wants the taxpayers to send their children to school, provide them with uniforms if uniforms are required, and feed and board them while they are in some foreign school, I say that that is entirely inconsistent and the taxpayers of this country should not be saddled with any such deal.

Mr. ROONEY. The subcommittee developed these things in the course of the hearings, and as the result of the things developed and the fact that the proposed program was based on figures 5 years old, cut the amount requested in half.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to point out, since the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been mentioned, as I recall, when the bill was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs it only provided funds in case there were no schools available, in hardship posts, in order to send them to some base in order to get them into a suitable school.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that when the Department of State came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, they asked for $442,000 and a few days later, when they came before the Committee on Appropriations they asked for $600,000.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am not disputing that; neither am I taking issue with the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from New York. But I just wanted to point out to you what the intent of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was, and if the State Department tried to go beyond that, then I am glad we have watchdogs around here to look after the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am wondering if this $233,000 to be made available for rents in the District of Columbia is for office rent for the State Department, if the gentleman knows. I think that should be made clear to the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is inquiring as to the $233,000 available for rents in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a provision which applies to the passport office and agency of the Department of State. The building in which they are presently located, the Winder Building on 17th Street, is altogether inadequate. It has become dilapidated. It is in very poor repair. This money would provide for their moving and occupying a new and justified location.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another item that has just been read by the Clerk, "International contingencies," an appropriation of $1 million.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. That appropriation is for the purpose of the so-called summit meetings and would provide for the top level meeting and five subsequent Ministers meetings and another set of meetings at a third level. The subcommittee thought we had no alternative but to furnish the funds for these meetings, and in the report directed that if the money is not used exactly as was justified before the committee that the Department of State shall see that the money reverts to the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman that it is my opinion that there are enough special funds kicking around in the executive department and the Department of State that the expenses of this summit meeting and other conferences incident to that meeting could very well have been paid without coming to the committee for a special $1 million appropriation.

Let me say one other thing. It is my understanding that there is another entertainment allowance or fund set up within this $1 million appropriation. This House just a few days ago, voted $575,000 for entertainment for the State Department. I opposed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this House just voted $575,000 for entertainment for the Department of State. I think we all understand what entertainment means, in a large measure. We are asked to vote another $1 million here in another contingent fund, and I know that there is some more entertainment money earmarked in this item of $1 million. Where is this business of entertainment in the Department of State and elsewhere in Government going to stop? That is the question I would like somebody to answer.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that the gentleman from New York understands what the gentleman from Iowa is speaking about, but only in a small measure.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I know you do. But it is still going on, and we have already voted $575,000 for that purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For an additional amount, fiscal year 1955, for "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," $275,000, for the payment of claims authorized by the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 1981-7).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 26, after line 21, insert the following:
>
> "Federal Prison System, buildings and facilities: For an additional amount for buildings and facilities $17,100,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, but I reserve that point of order so that he may be recognized.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] in apologizing to the committee for offering an amendment at this late hour. I know everyone is tired and it is getting late. That seems to be the story of my life. I am always a day late and a dollar short. But I shall briefly explain my amendment.

This amendment would add to this supplemental appropriation bill $17,100,000 for the construction of two Federal penitentiaries that are badly needed in this country. One would be a close-custody reformatory, for $7,500,000; and another would be a maximum-security penitentiary for $9,600,000.

This request was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by the Department of Justice. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

In connection with the point of order, I would like to state that the reasons given by the committee for not reporting this item out, according to the hearings is this. They say:

> The committee is of the opinion that this is an item which should be a part of the regular annual budget submission rather than a supplemental request.

As far as the authorization is concerned, I cannot of course rule on that, but I think certainly this is in order. I should like to have a ruling at this time, if I may, whether or not it is in order. There is no use of my putting up an argument for this appropriation if it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York renew his point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York contend that there is no authorization for this construction?

Mr. ROONEY. That is the committee's position.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois know of any statute authorizing the construction of these buildings?

Mr. GRAY. Nothing other than that the Bureau of Prisons holds the belief that authorization is contained in their regular Justice Department laws now in effect allowing security facilities to be built. This of course would come under the Justice Department, in building Federal penitentiaries. I brought this question up with the Parliamentarian, and no one seemed to know exactly whether this had come in form of an authorization from the committee or whether they could request direct funds for the present prison system.

The CHAIRMAN. As the gentleman from Illinois realizes, the burden is on the gentleman from Illinois to advise the Chair of legislation authorizing this construction. If the gentleman is in position so to advise the Chair, the Chair would appreciate his doing so.

Mr. GRAY. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I do not have that, other than the fact that I did try to run it down and find out if it was authorized. I took the committee report to mean that it was authorized, because they held extensive hearings on it and said the only reason they were turning it down was that they felt it should come up in the regular appropriation and not in the supplemental appropriation bill. So I would take it from this report that they meant it was authorized, otherwise there would have been no point in holding hearings on the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that no specific legislation authorizing the construction of these buildings has been submitted to the Chair, the Chair is constrained to hold that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is well taken. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the Chair for the ruling.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out why the subcommittee at this time denied the requested $17 million for these two new penal institutions. In the first place, the Bureau of Prisons would not definitely state whether or not they planned to close the maximum security prison at Alcatraz which is now occupied below capacity and in the second place, I here hold in my hand the entire justification for this request for $17 million. This is the front cover, and I take that off. I take off the back cover, and we now have the small two-page justification for an expenditure of $17 million of the taxpayers' money. A proposed expenditure such as this requires some looking into, and should be considered in a regular, not a supplemental bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Emergency fund for international affairs

For expenses necessary to enable the President to take such measures as he deems appropriate to meet extraordinary or unusual circumstances arising in the international affairs of the Government, $5 million, to remain available until expended, for use in the President's discretion and without regard to such provisions of law as he may specify: *Provided*, That the President shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, not less often than quarterly, a full report of expenditures under this appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language appearing on page 28, lines 5 to 16, inclusive, that it is not authorized by law and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, next week President Eisenhower goes to Geneva to begin negotiations with the Russians aimed at bringing about a lessening of world tension and reaching some sort of modus vivendi with the Soviet Union. As many of us said on this floor last Tuesday, we wish him well and hope that he has great success in this supremely important venture.

Whatever the nature or degree of success at Geneva, however, I think we can all safely assume that the United States will still be faced with the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, to use the phraseology of William Randolph Hearst. This struggle has been going on for several years and seems likely to continue into the indefinite future. One of the most important aspects of this competitive coexistence lies in the field of cultural relations. For years the Communists have been charging the United States with being a nation of materialistic barbarians. Their campaign, until recently, had met with much success as we had done little or nothing to combat it. Today we are being asked to vote money for the continuance of the President's Emergency Fund which is used to counter the propaganda offensive the Russians are waging against us. To date, our program has been a great success, but it has now used up the money at its disposal. We have, therefore, been asked to provide an additional $5 million to continue this supremely important and worthy program.

Five million dollars is certainly a great deal of money in terms of our own individual pocketbooks, but in terms of national defense, it is almost in the nature of a drop in the bucket. For example, one battleship is likely to cost several hundred million and an aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* type takes over $200 million to construct. In today's divided world, the battleships and the carriers are vitally necessary, but I would maintain that our cultural weapons are equally important, especially in a struggle which is as much ideological as it is military.

The funds we are asked to vote today are a very important part of our defense effort. They are also part of a great program we have launched to build understanding between our people and the other peoples of the world, in the hope of establishing a future in which battleships, bombers, and carriers will be obsolete.

The trade fair program and the cultural offensive have been tested by time and have more than proven their value. To cite only one example, let me call to your attention the tour recently undertaken in the Far East by the NBC Symphony of the Air. As one Far Eastern expert pointed out following this tour, the orchestra changed almost overnight the attitude of the Asian peoples toward the United States. It may seem unlikely that such a change could have been effected so quickly, but when one considers the numbers of people who were able to hear the orchestra, the people with whom they discussed the event and the fine reviews and comments in the newspapers, it is perhaps not quite so surprising. This was the first great Western symphony to visit the East and it was American. What better way could there be to combat the Communist charge that we are "materialistic barbarians"?

The trade fairs in various European countries have been another important source of favorable reaction to the United States. Initially, we did not take part in these showings of industrial might. The Communists were then able to walk off with many of the honors and convinced people quite easily of the superiority of their own system. Since we have entered this competition, we have garnered top honors time after time in public reaction and as a result the Russians have refused to participate in several such fairs when they discovered the United States would exhibit.

Quite obviously, the peoples of the world are intensely interested in the American way of life. This is well illustrated by the fact that two of the most popular volumes in the United States Information Agency's libraries overseas are the Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward catalogs. Both are literally thumbed to pieces, though obviously not for the same reason that they are here in the United States. What better example of the interest in our life can be given? How much better this interest is when, through the trade fair programs, the actual goods are shown, not just pictures of them.

In reporting out this bill, the Committee on Appropriations stated that over $2¼ million of last year's $5 million remained unobligated as of June 1. This was technically true as of that date in that formal contracts had not been signed. However, firm plans for definite projects had already been made for most of this amount.

For example, some $400,000 was definitely committed on the books of the Department of State for a tour by the Porgy and Bess company in South America, and some $120,000 for a similar tour by the Martha Graham Dance Group.

Therefore, the implication that the original fund is still almost 50 percent intact is far from a fact. As of now, only $4,697 of the State Department's funds remain unobligated. The portion of the fund assigned to the Commerce Department was $2,592,456. Yesterday the Department addressed a letter to the United States Information Agency asking for an additional $295,000. In other words, Commerce has not only committed its entire portion, but will also need an additional quarter of a million dollars by the end of this month.

I think these figures effectively show the definite need for this money. I hope the arguments I have advanced show what a useful and important weapon these funds are in meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence. As the Washington Post and Times Herald said in an editorial this morning:

> We can think of no better or more inexpensive way to advertise America's good name overseas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Corporation

Federal Facilities Corporation Fund

The amount of the Corporation's funds made available under this head in title I of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1956, for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$800,000" to "$975,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill appearing on page 9, beginning on line 10 down to and including line 15, on the ground that it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Capital outlay

Public Building Construction

The appropriation for "Capital outlay, public building construction," contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1956, shall be available for preparation of plans and specifications for a warehouse at the Children's Center and the erection of the following structures, including the treatment of grounds: Branch library building in Woodridge, new Metropolitan Police Women's Bureau Building (including the installation of telephones, telephone switchboard, and teletypewriter system), and new fire engine house in the vicinity of 24th and Irving Streets SE. (including instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house to the fire alarm system).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning on page 31, line 20 down to and including line 9 on page 32, on the ground that the language goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House of Representatives

General Provision

SEC. 1301. After June 30, 1955, salaries of employees of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall be fixed on the basis of grades and rates of compensation provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in such manner as the Committee may determine.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in the bill appearing on page 32, line 16, down to and including line 25, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Uniform allowances

SEC. 1501. The following appropriations and funds available to the departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1956, shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1114 and 69 Stat. 49):

Legislative branch:
Architect of the Capitol:
"Capitol Buildings";
"Senate Office Buildings";
"House Office Buildings";
Independent offices:
Civil Service Commission: "Salaries and expenses";
Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses";
General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses";
Interstate Commerce Commission: The appropriation available for the pay of employees entitled to uniforms or allowances therefor under said act;
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: "Salaries and expenses";
National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses";
Securities and Exchange Commission: "Salaries and expenses";
Smithsonian Institution: "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art";
Veterans' Administration
"General operating expenses";
"Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses";
"Maintenance and operation of supply depots"; Department of Agriculture:
"Office of the Secretary";
Commodity Credit Corporation: "Limitation on administrative expenses";
Department of Commerce:
Office of the Secretary:
"Salaries and expenses";
"Working capital fund";
Bureau of the Census: "Salaries and expenses";
Civil Aeronautics Administration: "Operation and regulation";
Maritime activities: "Salaries and expenses";
National Bureau of Standards: "Working capital fund";
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Freedmen's Hospital: "Salaries and expenses";
Public Health Service:
"Assistance to States, general";
"Venereal diseases";
"Tuberculosis";
"Communicable diseases";
"Sanitary engineering activities";
"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska";
"Hospitals and medical care";
"Foreign quarantine service";
"Indian health activities";
"National Institutes of Health, operating expenses";
"National Cancer Institute";
"Mental health activities";
"National Heart Institute";
"Dental health activities";
"Arthritis and metabolic disease activities";
"Microbiology activities";
"Neurology and blindness activities";
St. Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses";
Social Security Administration: "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance";
Department of the Interior:
Office of the Secretary:
"Salaries and expenses";
"Working capital fund";
Bureau of Indian Affairs: "Education and welfare services"; and
Department of Labor: Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expense".

SEC. 1502. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. RABAUT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the language on pages 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to dispense with the reading of the remainder of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill starting on page 34, line 1, and including all of pages 35, 36, 37, and 38, on the ground that the language goes beyond the scope of the bill and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending supplemental appropriations bill represents the considered judgment of the members of the various subcommittees and the full Committee on Appropriations with regard to additional funds needed at this time by various agencies of the Government, including the Department of Defense.

The supplemental funds for the Defense Department has been discussed at length and further detailed discussion appears unnecessary. The recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations should be supported in this regard.

With respect to the work of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices on Appropriations the committee has recommended funds in the amount of $15 million additional for acquiring lands, drawing up plans and specifications and such for public buildings, including post-office buildings, under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act.

The committee has urged the General Services Administration to go forward with greater acceleration in this important and needed work. There have been practically no Federal buildings provided for the past 12 to 15 years and the time has come when we should move forward in the direction of meeting this great existing need.

The Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations has recommended $138,577,000 additional for the Atomic Energy Commission and its many defense-supporting programs. In addition it should be pointed out that the AEC has available to it some $101 million in unobligated funds available from prior authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, while it is generally recognized that the provisions of section 902, page 25 of the bill constitutes legislation in connection with the pending appropriations bill, I would like to point out that this is language that is both needed and desirable and should not be deleted from the bill.

It was the intent of the committee, clearly and definitely, that no funds appropriated should be used for the purpose of construction of any power transmission lines for the now defeated Dixon-Yates scheme. In view of the President's recent action canceling the Dixon-Yates contract, it is not to be expected that any funds will be needed or used for this purpose. The committee wanted to tie the matter down in definite terms and so as not to be misunderstood and so have put into the bill the language to which I have referred. I trust that the bill will be approved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FORD. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. FORD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 24, line 13, strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to correct section numbers and headings in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RUFINO MERINO JIMINEZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 633.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 63) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, to make the following change, namely: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "Rufino Merino Jiminez" and the comma.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1617) to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> On page 2, line 18, after "clause" insert ", except that premiums shall not be automatically waived with respect to any policy where the amount of the dividend earned would exceed the amount of the premium waived."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill about which the gentleman spoke to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, for printing under the rule.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 127.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and United Kingdom are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective-defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Department of State should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I understand this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "Department of State" and insert in lieu thereof "President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The House concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill (S. 1855) to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there minority views?

Mr. PRIEST. There are no minority views.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR NEXT MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the Speaker has agreed to include in the list of bills that may be called under a suspension of the rules on Monday next the bill (H. R. 7201) relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies, introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

THE "AT THE SUMMIT" CONFERENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as a part of my remarks a letter I have written to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusets?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I have addressed the following letter to the President of the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You are about to engage in one of the great adventures of statesmanship. This great conference at the summit, as you well know, might be the most important ever engaged in in the history of time. Decisions made and agreements concluded will have a bearing upon the life of every individual in the world. The great civilization man has so far developed upon this earth is now at the crossroads of decision.

Peace and good will among men and nations is so greatly desired by people everywhere in the world, it is utterly silly and unthinkable for man to destroy in a moment that which has required centuries upon centuries to build. No person engaging in this great conference knows these facts better than do you.

Today, once again, I visited President Lincoln sitting in his great chair in the great memorial to his life and all that he stood for. In his great honest face once again I read the meaning of honor, integrity, courage, and character. Again I realized that some leaders of nations in our time do not commit their successors unless the nation is honorable through and through to its core. Authority today somehow does not bind authority tomorrow unless the honor of the people of the nation is committed. This is a most important consideration in this great conference at the summit. As you so deeply know, sir, the honor of your great country and mine, from Washington to Lincoln to President Eisenhower, is completely behind you. This is the heart core of America. It is our strength.

In the distinguished and honorable life you have had as a soldier and a statesman, you know the full meaning of this honor. The honor of this great Nation cannot be pledged in agreement with any other nation unless that nation also can pledge the lasting honor of its people. To do otherwise would be to break the faith with hundreds of thousands of men and women of America, some of them having the honor to serve in the fury of combat under your leadership.

As you depart for the most strategic conference in our world's history, I wish you God's speed, God's direction, and God's blessing.

Very sincerely yours,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

REVISION OF CURRENT IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, referring to my press release of June 5 concerning various signers of an open communication which calls for public hearings on revising current immigration laws, I have been furnished with information concerning certain of these individuals by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This information is contained in the public records, files, and publications of the committee.

I understand that these reports are not necessarily to be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of the committee. It should also be noted that these individuals are not necessarily Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers.

As a matter of fact, I am making no accusations, but am merely presenting a summary, which is necessarily not complete, of the information regarding these persons and which is of public record in the committee files. Information is set forth regarding the organizations to which these persons have belonged or with which they are otherwise identified and the last-recorded connective date. The date is also given regarding each organization as to its listing by the Attorney General or the committee as a subversive and/or Communist organization. Other information of a supplemental nature regarding certain individuals is also set forth.

It would appear to me that the enclosed information, if carefully evaluated, would show a derogatory character in some cases. In others it would be more reasonable to assume that the person in question acted in ignorance of the true nature of the organizations with which he may have been identified.

The right of petition is a sacred right to all Americans, and I have no thought of restricting or limiting it. Petitions sponsored or circulated by organizations of an un-American character are to be guarded against, however, even if they allegedly have a worthy motive. Indiscriminate association with such petitions may be no reflection on a person's loyalty, but can hardly do credit to his mature judgment.

I see no reason to alter my previous statement that persons who sincerely desire to liberalize our immigration laws should not look to receive any real assistance from associations and individuals of a left-wing, fellow-traveling nature.

Names of Individuals and Lists of Organizations to Which They Have Belonged or With Which They Have Been Identified as Well as Other Summary Information

(2) 1. Walter Allmendinger, Royal Oak:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953); American Continental Congress for Peace (1949); China Welfare Appeal, Inc. (1951); Civil Rights Congress (1951); Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949); International Workers Order (1951).

Also sponsored the Call to a Bill of Rights Conference (1949) which opposed the trial of Communist leaders on charges of conspiracy.

(3) 2. Rev. Paul Johnson Allured, Lansing:

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1943); Michigan Civil Rights Federation (1943); Civil Rights Congress (1951); American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953); Jefferson School of Social Science (1953); American Youth for Democracy (1947); Committee for Citizenship Rights (1942).

Publicly defended Communist Party (1941); requested amnesty for convicted Communist leaders (1952); opposed deportation of Harry Bridges (1942).

(11) 3. Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit:

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1940); American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1941); American Peace Crusade (1952); National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1940); National Federation for Constitutional Liberty (1943); Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949).

(12) 4. Harold A. Cranefield, Detroit:

Midcentury Conference for Peace (1950); National Lawyers Guild (1954).

(13) 5. George W. Crockett, Jr., Detroit:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1954); American Youth for Democracy (1954); Civil Rights Congress (1951); National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1951); National Lawyers Guild (1950); Michigan Council for Peace (1951).

Publicly praised Communist Party; has defended witnesses who invoked fifth amendment; served as counsel for convicted Communist leaders; cited by Judge Medina for contempt of court and served sentence of 4 months; has had disciplinary proceedings instituted against him by State Bar of Michigan.

(14) 6. Max Dean, Flint:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953).

Identified in committee hearings as member of Communist Party while attending University of Michigan; invoked fifth amendment when questioned in this respect.

(15) 7. Arthur Dunham, Ann Arbor:

Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949).

Financial contributor to Social Work Today; cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist magazine (1944).

(17) 8. Morton A. Eden, Detroit:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1952); International Workers Order (1951).

Favored release of convicted Communist leaders on bail (1949); supported lawyers for Communist cases (1950); urged clemency for Rosenbergs (1952).

(18) 9. G. Leslie Field, Detroit:

Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949); National Lawyers Guild (1950).

Has defended witnesses who invoked fifth amendment; urged clemency for Rosenbergs (1952).

(24) 10. Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit:

International Workers Order (1953); American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953); American Peace Crusade (1952).

Spoke at memorial meeting in honor of Rosenbergs (1953); appealed for amnesty for convicted Communist leaders (1953).

(27) 11. Rev. Albert W. Kauffman, Lakeview:

Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949); World Peace Appeal (1950); American Peace Crusade (1953); National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1952).

Wrote article for Soviet Russia Today; cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front (1944).

(30) 12. Virgil Lacey, Dearborn:

Civil Rights Congress (1949).

Opposed withdrawal of CIO from World Federation of Trade Unions, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as international Communist-front organization (1949).

(31) 13. Morton Leitson, Flint: Has defended witnesses who invoked fifth amendment (1953); identified in committee hearings as having attended closed Communist Party meeting while attending University of Michigan (1954); invoked fifth amendment during committee hearings (1954); has defended American Youth for Democracy (cited by Attorney General—1947).

(32) 14. Rev. Henry Lewis, Ann Arbor: American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953).

(35) 15. John E. Marvin, Adrian: Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949).

(36) 16. Ernest Mazey, Detroit: American Peace Mobilization (1941).

(40) 17. Lloyd F. Merrell, Morrice: American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1950); American Peace Mobilization (1941); Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges (1943); Civil Rights Congress (1949); Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1941).

(41) 18. Rev. F. Ricksford Meyers, Detroit: National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims (1953); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1943).

(42) 19. James Montante, Detroit: Civil Rights Congress (1949); National Lawyers Guild (1950).

(43) 20. Joe Morgan, Dearborn: Michigan Council for Peace (1951); National Negro Labor Council (1952).

(44) 21. Arthur W. Munk, Albion: Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949).

(46) 22. Walter M. Nelson, Detroit:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1950); American Youth for Democracy (1947); National Lawyers Guild (1950).

Has defended witnesses who invoked fifth amendment (1954); protested arrest of Communist leaders (1951); urged clemency for Rosenbergs.

(47) 23. Prof. Theodore M. Newcomb, Ann Arbor:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1950); American Youth for Democracy (1947).

Sponsored call to a Bill of Rights Conference (1949) which opposed the trial of Communist leaders on charges of conspiracy.

(53) 24. Rev. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit: People's Institute of Applied Religion (1948); Protestant Digest (1947).

(54) 25. Nathan Rosenshine, Detroit: Urged amnesty for convicted Communist Party leaders (1952); identified with National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims (1953); cited by Attorney General (1955).

(56) 26. Prof. Philip L. Schenck, Ann Arbor: American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1953); Michigan Civil Rights Federation (1943); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1942).

(57) 27. Prof. John F. Shepard, Ann Arbor:

Civil Rights Congress (1949); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1945); American Council on Soviet Relations; Mid-Century Conference for Peace (1950).

Publicly defended Communist Party (1941).

(58) 28. Prof. Jay J. Sherman, Detroit: Michigan Civil Rights Federation (1943).

(60) 29. Rev. E. H. Soderberg, Hamtramck: Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges (1943).

(64) 30. I. R. Starr, Detroit:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1950); Michigan Civil Rights Federation (1943); Civil Rights Congress (1949).

Protested conviction of Communist leaders (1949); sponsored Call to a Bill of Rights Conference which opposed the trial of Communist leaders on charges of conspiracy (1949); spoke at memorial meeting in honor of Rosenbergs (1953); has defended witnesses who invoked fifth amendment (1954).

(65) 31. Dr. J. M. Steinhardt, Detroit: Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1949).

(68) 32. Maurice Sugar, Detroit:

Was candidate for recorder's judge in Detroit in 1936 on Communist ticket; no organizational affiliations listed.

Named as Communist Party member in committee hearings (1938); named as having attended closed Communist Party meetings (1938).

(69) 33. Rev. I. Paul Taylor, Detroit:

National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims (1953).

Urged amnesty for convicted Communist leaders (1952).

(71) 34. Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, Dearborn: American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1950); Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1950); Mid-Century Conference for Peace (1950); Civil Rights Congress (1949); First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States (1939); National Conference on American Policy on China and the Far East (1948); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1942).

(72) 35. Prof. Leroy Waterman, Ann Arbor: Civil Rights Congress (1947); Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America (1940); National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1942); American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1951); National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1946); Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1951); National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (1952); American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1940); New York Conference on Inalienable Rights (1940).

The numbers in parentheses pertain to the individual's standing among the signers of the open letter.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS MENTIONED

1. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, cited by Attorney General as subversive and Communist (1948).

2. American Continental Congress for Peace, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as part of Communist peace offensive (1951).

3. China Welfare Appeal, Inc., cited by Attorney General (1954).

4. Civil Rights Congress, cited by Attorney General (1947).

5. Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as "furthering the cause of American Communists" (1951).

6. International Workers Order, cited by Attorney General (1947).

7. National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, cited by Attorney General (1942).

8. Michigan Civil Rights Federation, cited by Attorney General as Communist affiliate (1942); cited (1947).

9. Jefferson School of Social Science, cited by Attorney General as adjunct of Communist Party (1947).

10. American Youth for Democracy, cited by Attorney General (1947).

11. Committee for Citizenship Rights, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as "defending interests of Communist Party" (1944).

12. American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front (1942).

13. American Peace Crusade, cited by Attorney General (1954).

14. National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization (1944).

15. Mid-Century Conference for Peace, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as "sounding board for Communist propaganda" (1951).

16. National Lawyers Guild, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization (1944).

17. National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, cited by the Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization.

18. Michigan Council for Peace, cited by Attorney General (1955).

19. World Peace Appeal, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as "approved by international communism" (1951).

20. American Peace Mobilization, cited by Attorney General (1947).

21. Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, cited by Attorney General (1949).

22. National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, cited by Attorney General (1955).

23. National Negro Labor Council, cited by Attorney General (1954).

24. People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc., cited by Attorney General (1948).

25. Protestant Digest, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as "propagating Communist Party line" (1944).

26. American Council on Soviet Relations, cited by Attorney General (1948).

27. First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization (1944).

28. National Conference on American Policy for China and the Far East, cited by Attorney General (1949).

29. Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization (1944).

30. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, cited by Attorney General (1947).

31. Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, cited by Attorney General (1947).

32. New York Conference for Inalienable Rights, cited by Un-American Activities Committee as Communist front organization (1944).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members of the House, who have been appointed Members by the Speaker to attend the NATO Conference, be excused for the week of July 18: Messrs. HAYS of Ohio, ANFUSO, UDALL, JOHNSON of California, CRUMPACKER, and BECKER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WHO IS TYING WHOM IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, just a few days from today the representatives of the United States will meet with the leaders of Great Britain, France, and the U. S. S. R. at Geneva, Switzerland. This has been ballyhooed as the Conference at the Summit. The hopes of the American people have been stimulated to a point that suggests we are on the threshhold of a just and lasting peace. This situation is best reflected by the tip toe artists in the Department of State who scream and shout that there should be no rocking of the ship of state lest we change the wooing mood of the Russian bear. These tiptoe artists do not lack uninformed supporters in this House any more than Nero lacked a fiddle to soothe his ego as he watched the destruction of a great civilization in which he was a recognized leader. Since these advocates of delicate diplomacy have had their generous share of alloted time, I consider the time opportune for some old-fashioned, down-to-earth American talk.

For some strange reason there has been a steady and well-planned effort to prevent Members of Congress from getting into a full blown discussion of the issues which should be taken up at the conference. There has been a companion maneuver to confuse and dissipate all efforts calculated to bring about a clear and concise expression from Congress on the minimum goals which we should seek in our efforts to ease world tensions and pry open the door to the road which leads to peace and freedom.

How strange it is that here in the Congress of the United States, the very seat of free speech, it should be even alleged that if we dare to speak out on this critical issue which has to do with peace or war—freedom or slavery—we will thereby tie the hands of the President in the so-called conference at the summit. Those who support this fallacy, in effect, hold that the conduct of our foreign affairs is above the test of congressional debate and that we, the representatives of the people, are or should be disinterested in the causes of war and the path to peace. Such people as make this allegation had best turn their attention to preventing the Russians from tying a rope around the throat of American freedom rather than crying wolf about tying the President's hands. Let us ask the question, "Who is tying whom?"

There can be no question that the Chief Executive of the United States is charged by our Constitution with the formation of our foreign policy and the carrying out of our foreign relations. Similarly, there can be no doubt that the Constitution imposes an obligation upon Members of Congress to speak out on all those issues which bear upon the security, the welfare, and the preservation of the American way of life. We dispatch that obligation in our consideration of specific legislation as well as using the floor of the House for general debate. In no way are those constitutional obligations in conflict or are they contradictory of one another. In a most fundamental way, these responsibilities supplement and buttress each other. We are elected to Congress to represent the people of the district from which we come. We are, therefore, more than any other organ of the Government, the voice of the American people. It seem reasonable that any Chief Executive of the United States would be anxious to hear and be sensitive to the expressions of the American people having to do with their own future and possibly their own survival. Because I believe these truths to be self-evident, I feel it my duty to do everything I possibly can to bring about a forthright and pointed discussion here on the floor of the House of Congress on all the basic questions having to do with the so-called conference at the summit.

Only 3 days ago, one of our distinguished Members, the Honorable THOMAS DODD, in the course of debate on the mutual security appropriation bill, made a penetrating analysis on the forthcoming meeting between the four great powers and threw much needed light upon the issues involved in this conference. It will be recalled that our colleague, Congressman DODD, was the chief American prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials where he tried and convicted a band of Nazi tyrants who had once been bosom pals and collaborators with the Russians, the same tyrants who will now take part in the conference at the summit. I know of no other Member in this distinguished House who has had more intensive experience in dealing with tyrants and tyranny. While serving with him as a member of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, I came to know and appreciate his keen knowledge of all forms of tyranny and his dedication to the noble cause of freedom. He has turned his many talents to the critical issues created by the greatest tyranny ever known in the history of mankind—Russian imperialist communism.

Congressman DODD warned that the campaign of silence which has been directed at Members of Congress and American leaders outside the Halls of Congress has highly dangerous implications for the future. He pointed out that such a silence can only reduce our moral strength which is our greatest weapon. He also recalled to memory the unhappy fact that the dismal failure of all previous conferences with the Russian Communists could be attributed to the false belief that by avoiding the fundamental questions and by simple professions of good faith plus toasts and social tricks, all would be settled and the problems of the troubled world would be resolved.

I would urge every Member of this House to read the remarks of Congressman DODD which appear on page 10228 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11.

As long ago as June 5, in the public address which I delivered on the occasion of the commissioning ceremonies of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at John Carroll University, in Cleveland, Ohio, I set forth four basic issues which should in all justice be raised at the so-called conference at the summit. Since that date I have received hundreds of endorsements for the position I took on those issues from large national organizations as well as from public-spirited individuals. Because those same issues go to the heart of the problem of world tensions and must be met and resolved by any conference of world leaders looking to a just peace, I am encouraged to restate those issues here today.

First, we must regard such a conference as that now scheduled for the summit, as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism, and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Secondly, as a logical followup to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Thirdly, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must recognize without reservation that the Iron Curtain is a basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourthly, we must abide by the proven principle of "open covenants openly arrived at." There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

On June 23 this House passed unanimously the far-seeing statesmanlike resolution offered by our distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK. That resolution had the effect of putting Congress, and thereby the American people, clearly on record as opposing all forms of colonialism and imperialism and restating our time-honored position in support of the right of all nations to national self-determination and self-government. That resolution, when it passed the House, gave great hope and added courage to all those small nations of the world who have but recently acquired their independence as well as to all those nations, large and small, now enslaved by Russian imperial communism. Only yesterday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by unanimous vote, approved the McCormack resolution and, as I understand it, the Senate is prepared to take action on it today. I fervently hope that the Members of the other House will take full advantage of this unusual opportunity not only to pass this inspiring resolution, but on this occasion to recall to memory how we have supported the moral and political principles reflected in the McCormack resolution.

It seems to me that President Eisenhower goes to the conference at the summit well fortified as to the course he should take in causing the Big Four Conference to reject all forms of colonialism and imperialism as a threat to peace, and that the four great powers should pledge themselves to the eradication of all forms of colonialism and imperialism which now beset mankind. Moreover, this resolution should be a great help to the President in his efforts to point out to the Russians that the people of the United States consider that all peoples of the world have the right to self-determination and self-government and that there can be no just and lasting peace until all nations stand as equals in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity, that the President of the United States would be well advised to give the most careful thought and consideration to these four basic points I have suggested, together with the inspiring thought expressed in the McCormack resolution which passed this House unanimously and which has been reported out to the Senate floor and perhaps by this hour has already been adopted by the other House. I am convinced that if our leaders who will attend the Geneva Conference pursue a course of action based upon the proposals I have made, including the McCormack resolution, the forthcoming conference will, from the point of view shared by the overwhelming majority of all mankind, be a reasonable success. This may sound like a large claim, but the hard cold record of experience of all free nations with the conspiracy of Russian imperial communism provides incontrovertible evidence that what I have suggested is a practical lever for prying open the door leading to a just and lasting peace.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the question: What is the hard, cold record of free nations which engaged in conferences with the Russian Communists?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That record has been spelled out by the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. In a nutshell, I would put it this way: There are few exceptions among those free nations which did not become the victim of Communist aggression through the very treaty of mutual assistance or cooperation they entered into with the Russians. Moreover, not one single nation now occupied by the Communists voluntarily accepted communism as a way of life. In each and every case communism was imposed upon every one of those nations by acts of violence and terrorism. For those who want to see the record of Communist aggression summarized on one page, I refer them to page 44 of the Summary Report of the Select Committee, which I have here in my hand. That page is titled "Table of Communist Aggression." It spells out on a simple chart in essential detail facts concerning the Communist aggression against and occupation of the once free and independent nations of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, why are the Russian Communists now pleading the cause of peaceful coexistence and what lies back of their propaganda campaign?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The Russians never yielded on anything that they were not compelled by force to yield on. In this instance, hundreds of millions of non-Russian people enslaved by the Russian Communists, have brought such pressure against their enslavers that the Kremlin knows it must yield or there will be an explosion hundreds of times more powerful than that caused by a hydrogen bomb. The failure of the agricultural program within the Russian Communist empire is, in my opinion, a classic example of the pressure the enslaved people are bringing against the Russian tyrants. Another example is the failure of the Russians to provide consumer commodities both in quality and quantity necessary to pacify the people. The Russians are begging for trade in which they will use gold which drips the blood of slave labor to purchase our surplus foods and other wonderful commodities of free labor in order to stem the rising tide of resistance by the common man throughout the entire slave empire. There can be no doubt whatever but what the Russians will appear at the Geneva Conference in the weakest position they have been in since 1941, the year when the tyrant, Hitler, could have won victory over the conspiracy of communism were he not possessed by the evil theories of racism and superstateism. Therefore, the Russian pleading for peaceful coexistence is nothing more than a plea for time—time to tighten the chains of slavery—time to liquidate millions more of those people who oppose the regime—time in which to mold a new generation of racial fanatics responsive only to the will of the masters in the Kremlin. That is what lies back of that Russian propaganda line of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. TUMULTY. Have the Russians eased up on the captive people? Are they giving any freedom or human rights to the people?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The Russians have been attempting to create the notion that they have eased up their tyrannical hold on the captive people. They have created all sorts of slogans which serve as a cover for their infamous treatment of the non-Russian nations and people which they now enslave. A classic example of my point can be found in what that popularity contest boy, Khrushchev, has called a volunteer program for the development of new agricultural areas on the desert lands of Turkestan and in the tundra regions that lie above the Arctic Circle. Through this program, which has also been likened to the efforts of the sturdy pioneers who built America, funmaker Khrushchev has concealed the forced deportation and ruthless exploitation of additional millions of non-Russian anti-Communist patriots. There is also much talk coming out of the Russian propaganda machine about amnesties for those who cease to be enemies of the state. Such talk of amnesties is another boobytrap which the Russians are using to ensnare leaders of resistance movements behind the Iron Curtain, as well as those who escaped from the tyranny of the Communist empire into the free world. While all these things are being given lipservice by the Communist leaders, there has been no breath of freedom allowed by them and human rights are trampled under boots of finer grain, but just as heavy as those in the past.

Mr. TUMULTY. From your study of the problem, is it possible for the Russians to enter into any agreement within a reasonable period of time with the representatives of other nations?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am of the firm conviction based on experiences related to me by responsible United States officials who have dealt with the Russians in matters affecting the joint occupation of territories by the United States, Russians, Great Britain, and France, that the Russian representatives could never make a decision, except in a very limited sphere. The Russians would always have to contact a higher echelon before any decision or even small agreement would be entered into by the Russian representatives.

President Eisenhower, while at the Geneva Conference will be in a somewhat similar position in his efforts to negotiate with the Russians. The Russians will be represented by Bulganin who may be the titular head of the presidium, but everyone should realize that the top man in the international Russian Communist conspiracy is Khrushchev. While Khrushchev can speak with authority for the conspiracy, we should not mislead people into believing that he will yield one single inch of real estate confiscated by the Russian autocrats or ease the chains of slavery which bind all the nations and people in the empire. Nor should we be so foolish as to believe that Zhukov, should he appear at the summit, will use his personal influence on Khrushchev or that he possesses any real sympathy for our ideals and way of life. To put it bluntly, personal diplomacy is a dangerous practice when it involves the welfare of a nation or the cause of human freedom.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I asked permission to address the House today I did not know that I was about to be scooped by Drew Pearson this morning. I should like to state here, therefore, that while Mr. Pearson appears to have read some of the thoughts on my mind, he has not taken the words from my mouth.

Many of us were startled to learn, during the recent civil defense exercise, Operation Alert, that the President had issued a hypothetical proclamation of martial law. Traditionally, we as a Nation have looked with alarm and suspicion upon any least hint of a rising militaristic power in our midst—for the concept of civilian supremacy in government is deeply ingrained in the very fibers of our national being—so that even to entertain the thought of martial law has ever been repugnant to us.

Apparently, therefore, the full implications of the Presidential "make-believe" have not yet dawned upon the American people. A more important point might be: Have they dawned upon the Congress?

For how else shall we explain the general apathy to this unprecedented action which, in the past, would have aroused a storm of indignation and protest?

Here, it would seem to me is one more dangerous manifestation of public indifference to the growing trend on the part of the military to dominate the national scene—to encroach upon and dominate what we have historically regarded as exclusive areas of civilian authority and responsibility in our national life.

Ever since World War I, of course, civil-military relationships have been drawing immeasurably closer. But it is only since the end of World War II, and more particularly within the past several years, that we have witnessed the accelerated pace of the military's growth in power and influence on the national scene. Perhaps it is the total impact of three decades of war and uneasy peace which has lessened public resistance to this intrusion of the military upon its special provinces.

Yet the fact remains, that whatever the causes, today the military wields its influence to an unprecedented degree over every phase of our educational, economic, and political affairs. The drift away from our traditional concepts is marked and can no longer be discounted or ignored. Surely, the time has come when we must ask ourselves: Is this the way we want it to be?

In Government, in business, in industry and in the scientific fields, the military seemingly trespasses more and more upon those preserves which the American people have constitutionally and historically reserved for the exercise of civilian authority and control. Mr. Speaker, let me document this statement. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two lists which I have had prepared. One list contains the names of high-ranking retired officers, principally generals and admirals who, within the past several years, have replaced civilians in traditionally civilian-held jobs in the Federal Government. I do not believe it is by any means a complete list. Nevertheless its very length should prove disturbing to the Congress which has ever remained vigilant against such military incursions into policymaking and high-level administrative positions of Government.

Is not the existence of such a list as that which I am now introducing into the RECORD, an indication that, perhaps without being consciously aware of the fact, we are getting farther and farther away from that belief in the rightness of civil supremacy over the military which, since the founding of the Nation, has been one of the guiding principles of our form of government?

Nevertheless, today we see generals of the Army retire from active duty on one day only to become the heads of such civilian agencies as TVA, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the State Department on the day following.

But to me, Mr. Speaker, the second list which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD is even more disconcerting than the first. It consists of retired generals and admirals who as of December 31, 1954, or later, were employed by a goodly percentage of the 100 principal firms doing business with the Department of Defense. In every instance these high-ranking officers serve their firms in such capacities as chairman of the board, director, or vice president of the corporation. Moreover, let me point out that in most instances the firms so represented fill more than 50 percent of all contracts entered into by the Defense Department in their particular fields.

I do not wish to reflect in any way upon the high qualifications and undoubted integrity of these retired officers who have so ably served their country with honor and distinction. I am well aware that the Nation owes them a debt of gratitude for their unselfish response to the call of duty. And I, for one, am more than eager to help in the recognition and payment of that debt.

Nevertheless, I find it a too startling coincidence that so many of the corporations employing them could not find qualified civilian personnel within their own organizations, or in industry generally, to fill their positions. Instead, these companies have resorted to the employment of men whose professional careers have, for the most part, been spent almost exclusively in one branch or other of the Armed Forces.

Now there may be absolutely no intent of wrongdoing and absolutely no semblance of the use of undue influence on anyone's part. Yet, inevitably in such situations, circumstances can arise and have arisen where the question must properly be raised.

Let me remind the Members that section 281, title 18, United States Code, specifically prohibits any retired officers from representing any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds retired status. The legislative history of this section of the Code is especially signficant at this time.

Prior to its enactment, section 113 of the Criminal Code applied to the employment of retired officers, and prohibited them from receiving compensation for services performed for others in connection with matters pending before any department, court-martial, bureau, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission of the United States.

The 76th Congress rightly, I believe, felt that such all-inclusive prohibitions were too severe and enacted what is now the second paragraph of section 281 to which I referred earlier. It is also the same paragraph originally added to former section 203 of title 18 by the act of October 8, 1940.

In House Report No. 2330, 76th Congress, 3d session, on the then proposed 1940 amendment, it was stated:

> As the primary purposes of the statute seem to be to discourage the use of undue or sinister influence by those in a position to exert it * * * (and) * * * as said by the court of appeals, their "activities are wholly separated from official life" * * * it is absurd, therefore, to think that retired officers, particularly while not on active duty, as such can exert any undue influence in the departments or bureaus, or with commissions or agencies * * * of the Government.

It is, consequently, of especial significance that the 76th Congress retained in the amended law the present provision against retired officers participating in sales to the Government.

But how shall we differentiate between actual direct sales and the sometimes even more effective indirect selling? With modern selling methods such as they are, who is to say where research, technical knowledge, and public relations leave off and selling begins?

Certainly, I should be the last to wish to deprive those who have served our country of the right to gainful employment once they are no longer on active duty. But under the circumstances it would seem that their own interests and those of the country would be better served by avoiding relationships which might at one time or another expose them to criticism.

It is in this way that such unwholesome situations can arise as one which came to light in an Armed Services Subcommittee hearing only last week. Here, a retired general recalled to active duty, stated quite frankly and honestly that the business firm which had employed him during his retirement had since been making up the difference between his Government pay and his former salary.

But even though such incidents are in themselves regrettable, I feel we should be still more greatly disturbed that the public seems cynically to shrug them off and remain indifferent to the increased power which our Armed Forces continue to exert even while we are in a period of so-called peacetime existence.

The still widening influence of the military would seem to pervade every branch of the Federal Government, frequently with results that clearly and demonstrably do not serve the public interest. Today, even so plebeian an agency as the Department of Commerce now attempts to clamp voluntary censorships upon unclassified developments in scientific and industrial fields where exchanges of information have heretofore always served to advance our national progress.

Even in the business and industry of the country, the Armed Forces now take a prominent part in the planning of industrial mobilization and this has, in numerous instances, adversely affected the status of thousands of the Nation's small businessmen and the economy of less favored areas throughout the country.

It would, therefore, seem to me, Mr. Speaker, high time that Congress take cognizance of this state of affairs. From the philosophy of the Founding Fathers to the convictions of our present-day leaders, it has always been recognized that the interests of this Nation were best served when the power of the military was kept subordinate to the civilian.

No less an authority than the President has said:

> It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained and our people will have great confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers, in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. * * * In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces.

To which I should like to add a fervent amen with this postscript "for the most important office in the world" or for any other office which, throughout our Nation's history, has been regarded as within an area of civilian responsibility.

Ex-Military Officers Who Are Directors or Executive Heads of Industrial Organizations and Cumulative Percent of United States Total

Berner, T. R., lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, retired: Member, board of directors, General Precision Equipment Corp., 63.7.

Blandy, William H. Purnell, admiral, United States Navy, retired: president, Health Information Foundation. Organization set up by drug and chemical companies to improve health standards, block socialized medicine.

Bradley, Omar N., general, United States Army, retired: Chairman, Bulova Research and Development Laboratories, Inc.

Campbell, H. Donald, United States Navy, lieutenant, junior grade, retired: Chase National Bank, New York City; director, General Precision Equipment Corp., 63.7.

Campbell, Levin H., Jr., lieutenant general, United States Naval Academy; transferred to Army: Director, General Precision Equipment Corp., 63.7; executive vice president, International Harvester Co. since 1947; director, Curtiss-Wright Corp.; American Steel Foundries Universal Oil Co., 35.8.

Clay, Lucius D., general, United States Army, retired: Member, board of directors, General Motors Corp.; chairman, Continental Can Co.

Delafield, Edward C., colonel, Finance Department, United States Army, retired: Member, board of directors, Normandy Realty Corp.; trustee, Greenwich Savings Bank; director, Corona Brewing Co., Pameta Oil Co., General Precision Equipment Corp., 63.7.

Devers, Jacob Loucks, general, United States Army, retired: Technical adviser to president of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., 46.6.

Eaker, Ira C., general, United States Army, retired: Vice president, Hughes Aircraft Co.

George, Harold L., lieutenant general, Regular United States Air Force, retired: Vice president and general manager, Hughes Aircraft Co.; vice president, Hughes Tool Co., 39.7.

Groves, Leslie R., lieutenant general, United States Army: Vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Hoffman, William J., first lieutenant, United States Air Force, retired: Vice president (engineer), Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., 33.7.

Hopkins, Frederick Mercer, Jr., major general, United States Air Force, retired: Vice president, director, Cleveland Pneumatic Tool Co., principal product, aircraft landing gear.

Ingram, Jonas H., admiral, United States Navy, retired: Vice president of executive sales, Reynolds Sales Co., 66.3.

MacArthur, Douglas, general, United States Army, retired: Board chairman, Remington Rand, Inc.

McNarney, Joseph T., general, United States Army and Air Force, retired: President, Convair division, General Dynamics Corp., 31.4.

Martin, Daniel J., colonel, United States Army, retired: Vice president (engineer) Hughes Tool Co., 39.7.

Maxwell, Russell L., major general, United States Army, retired: Vice president, American Machine & Foundry Co., 59.0.

Mills, Earle W., vice admiral, United States Navy, retired: President and chairman, Foster Wheeler Corp.

Moreell, Ben, admiral, United States Navy, retired: Chairman, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Power, Edward M., major general, Regular United States Air Force, retired: Vice president, Curtiss-Wright Corp., general manager aeronautical division, 35.8.

Quesado, Elwood R., lieutenant general, United States Air Force: Vice president and director, Lockheed Aircraft Co., 27.7.

Ramsey, DeWitt Clinton, admiral, United States Navy, retired: President and general manger, Aircraft Industries Association of America.

Scanlon, Martin F., brigadier general, United States Air Force, retired: Vice president, Republic Aviation Corp. Principal product: Military aircraft, 37.8.

Schoeffel, Malcolm F., rear admiral, United States Navy: General Precision Equipment Corp.; director, weapons planning, 63.7.

Smith, Walter Bedell, general, United States Army, retired: Vice chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co.; chairman and president of AMF Atomics, Inc., 59.

Somervell, Brehon Burke, general, United States Army, retired: Chairman and president, Koppers Co., Inc.

Towers, John H., admiral, United States Navy, retired: Special assistant to Juan Trippe, Pan American Airways, 64.3.

Turner, Asby Sinis, Jr., United States Military Academy, Army officer: Vice president, Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp.; assistant general manager, Hamilton Standard Division of United Aircraft Corp. since 1951, 46.6.

Wedemeyer, Albert C., lieutenant general, United States Army: Vice president and director, Rhum Manufacturing Co.

Chidlaw, Benjamin W., Air Force general, retired May 31, 1955. Member of the staff of Thompson Products, Inc. He serves as a consultant. Principal products: Aircrafts and automotive engines, 59.3.

Ridgway, Matthew B., Army general, retired June 1955. Member of the staff of Mellon Research Co., Pittsburgh. That is an endowed nonprofit organization that carries on long-range scientific researches for professional and industrial goods and for human betterment.

Vogel, Herbert Davis, Army brigadier general, retired August 31, 1954: Chairman, Board of Directors of TVA.

FEDERAL OFFICIALS WHO HAVE HELD FLAG OR GENERAL RANK IN THE MILITARY SERVICE

A SELECTED LIST (APPOINTED 1953–55)

Julius Ochs Adler, major general, United States Army Reserve; Chairman, National Security Training Commission.

Frank B. Berry, M. D., brigadier general, United States Army Reserve, retired; Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical).

Henry C. Byroade, brigadier general, United States Army, resigned: Assistant Secretary of State.

Lucius D. Clay, general, United States Army, retired: Chairman, President's Highway Advisory Committee. Position created August 30, 1954.

Everett R. Cook, brigadier general, United States Air Force Reserve; Commissioner, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. Commission established August 7, 1953.

Robert J. Cutler, brigadier general, United States Army, resigned: Special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. Position created March 23, 1953.

Benjamin O. Davis, brigadier general, United States Army, retired: Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Walter S. Delaney, vice admiral, United States Navy, retired: Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, Foreign Operations Administration.

William J. Donovan, major general, United States Army, retired: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Thailand. Left State Department August 31, 1954.

James H. Doolittle, lieutenant general, United States Air Force Reserve: Member, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Special Assistant to Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, reappointed.

Glen E. Edgerton, major general, United States Army, retired; Managing Director and President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Position occupied earlier by Herbert E. Gaston.

Graves B. Erskine, general, United States Marine Corps, retired: Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations). Position redesignated from Director, Office of Special Operations, replaced Gen. John Magruder, of the old Office of Psychological Policy.

Edward C. Kalbfus, admiral, United States Navy, retired; Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission. Reappointed.

Thomas C. Kinkaid, admiral, United States Navy, retired: Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission; reappointed; National Security Training Commission. Reappointed.

Herbert Bernard Loper, brigadier general, United States Army, retired: Chairman, Military Liaison Committee to Atomic Energy Commission. Replaced Robert Lebaron.

Melvin J. Maas, major general, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired: President's Committee on Employment of Physically Handicapped. Reappointed.

George C. Marshall, General of the Army, United States Army: Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission; reappointed.

Raymond S. McLain, lieutenant general, United States Army, retired: Commissioner, National Security Training Commission. Reappointed. Died December 17, 1954.

E. C. McNeil, brigadier general, United States Army, retired: Special assistant to the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army. Reappointed.

Hugh M. Milton II, major general, United States Army Reserve, resigned: Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Forces, Department of the Army. Filled vacancy, position occupied earlier by Earl D. Johnson.

Thomas North, brigadier general, United States Army, retired: Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission; reappointed.

W. S. Paul, lieutenant general, United States Army, retired: Assistant to the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization for Plans and Readiness. Newly created position.

Wilton B. Persons, major general, United States Army, retired: Deputy Assistant to the President, the White House office. Position created September 5, 1953.

Charles E. Saltzman, brigadier general, United States Army Reserve: Under Secretary of State for Administration. Left State Department December 31, 1954. Replaced Donald B. Lourie.

Carl Spaatz, general, United States Air Force, retired: Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Lewis L. Strauss, rear admiral, United States Naval Reserve: Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission. Replaced Gordon Dean.

Joseph M. Swing, lieutenant general, United States Army, retired: Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service. Replace Argyle R. Mackey.

Elbert Parr Tuttle, brigadier general, United States Army Reserve: United States circuit judge (fifth circuit), United States Court of Appeals. Appointed August 4, 1954, to fill position created February 10, 1954, (Public Law 294).

Alexander A. Vandergrift, general, United States Marine Corp, retired: Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission; reappointed.

Lt. Gen. Charles D. Cabel: Assistant Director, CIA.

Brig. Gen. Josh S. Bragdon, public works coordinator.

Brig. Gen. Julius Holmes: Ambassador to Iran.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include a statement on behalf of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. POWELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. HALEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

H. R. 6766. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a study and report on the most appropriate treatment necessary to preserve and interpret Ford's Theater in Washingthon, D. C., pursuant to Public Law 372, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

987. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the

Secretary of Commerce under civil-service laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

988. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

989. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the Smithsonian Institution during the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

990. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

991. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

992. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the transportation of mail by Highway Post Office Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7205. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 847. An act to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5889. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6743. A bill to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3675. A bill to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5469. A bill to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5894. A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 12. Joint resolution to request the Secretary of State to arrange for the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, to conduct a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1138. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so as to provide that upon the expiration of his term of office a member of the Board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7218. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7126. A bill to provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 386. Joint resolution reaffirming the rights of the people of the world to freedom of religion; without amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of conference. H. R. 4904. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years (Rept. No. 1188); Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7225. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 7379. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7380. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7381. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7382. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7383. A bill to extend the time during which the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7384. A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota and to facilitate the orderly termination of Federal supervision and control over Indians and Indian property in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7385. A bill to amend subsection 172 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 7386. A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota and to facilitate the orderly termination of Federal supervision and control over Indians and Indian property in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7387. A bill to increase the annual compensation of members of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 7388. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 7389. A bill to provide that the basic allowance for quarters shall not be paid to personnel of the uniformed services for their dependents when such dependents are serving jail sentences after conviction of a crime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 7390. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 7391. A bill to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 7392. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 7393. A bill to make certain changes in the administration of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 7394. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of Navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 7395. A bill to establish a national cemetery near Chillicothe, Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 7396. A bill to provide for a special bronze gravemarker for the graves of members and former members of the Armed Forces who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution to declare Sunday, July 17, 1955, a day of prayer for the success of the four-power meeting of heads of governments opening at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 18, 1955, and designating said day as Pray for Eisenhower Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of proceedings at unveiling of statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 7397. A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife, Gertrude Mazartzian, and their children, Mario Mazartzian and Abram Mazartzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 7398. A bill for the relief of Flavio Parlati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7399. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Nacinovic and Josip Nacinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 7400. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7401. A bill for the relief of Miss Katherine Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim all interest of the United States in certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7403. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Milton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7404. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria A. Maresch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 7405. A bill for the relief of Otto Deligdisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7406. A bill for the relief of Cho Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7407. A bill for the relief of Philip I. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7408. A bill for the relief of Gerald C. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 7409. A bill for the relief of Edmund Yick Ming Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Chin Geoy Shiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Mark Yee Ling, Mark Sue Ling, and Mark Yen Kai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berna Lee Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7413. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Leonard Maillaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 7414. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Virginia Lalley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

352. Mr. WOLCOTT presented a petition of Louis L. Yaroch and 100 others favoring support of H. R. 6645, and/or its companion bill introduced to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Strengths and Weaknesses of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week it was my privilege to address the Seventh Annual Foreign Policy Conference sponsored by Colgate University, at Hamilton, N. Y. The conference had gained national and international fame and reputation for its deliberations and discussions in the fields of international relations and American foreign policy.

I considered it a high privilege and honor to be asked to participate in the conference. The subject matter assigned to me as a topic for discussion was the strengths and weaknesses of our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the Colgate University seventh annual foreign policy conference, July 11, 1955)

It is a singular honor to be a participant in the seventh annual conference on American foreign policy sponsored by Colgate University. I extend my personal thanks and heartiest congratulations to Dr. Everett Case, president of Colgate University, and to Dr. Charles R. Wilson, director of the Colgate Conference on American Foreign Policy. The general theme of the conference, "The Strengths and Weaknesses of our Foreign Policy," reveals that we Americans do realize that our foreign policy does have areas of weakness and also areas of strength. The theme of the conference sets the pattern for our deliberations. The motto of this conference as indicated on your brochure is equally pertinent, "Foreign Policy Is Everybody's Business."

Never were truer words written or spoken. Our very survival, our hope of a better future, the continuance or defeat of the principles of freedom and justice are intimately related to our foreign policy.

Permit me to digress for a moment, however. This term "foreign policy" has always disturbed me. The word "foreign" has a negative meaning. It indicates something apart, different, unusual. I suggest that our relationships with other nations are no longer something apart from our everyday life. Nor should these relationships be different from our domestic policy. I prefer to recognize our relationships with other nations as an international policy, a policy of interdependence rather than a foreign policy. Just to show how strongly I support this contention, I have introduced a resolution in the Senate to change the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on International Relations. Foreign policy seems to suggest the 19th century, the era of colonialism and imperialism. International policy speaks of the 20th century. It has its roots in the United Nations, in a spirit of interdependence without sacrificing national independence.

Now that I have pleased myself by talking about my pet peeve, let me proceed with some observations on the general theme of the conference.

The greatest challenge of our time is to recognize the kind of world in which we live, and to profit and learn from the lessons of history—a world in revolutionary change.

We here in America have learned that peoples of different backgrounds, races, national origins, and creeds can live together, work together, and build together. This achievement was made possible by a belief in and dedication to the universally accepted principles of a free society—the dignity of man, freedom of conscience, and a recognition of fraternity and brotherhood. Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the principles of the French Revolution and the Magna Charta are the historical testimonials to the practical adaptation of these democratic ideals and principles. If it is possible to build a great nation whose destiny and progress is guided by these ideals, it should give us faith and hope that we are capable of doing our part in building a world order that will not sacrifice these principles and the institutions of freedom and justice.

Our history, our heritage and experience in self-government, yes, our own revolution, are in fact the sources of our strength. Our foreign policy is weakened and limited only insofar as we forget or fail to apply the yardstick of our democratic experience to the complex and intricate problems of the world in which we live. The enchancement of freedom is not made possible by aping the enemies of freedom. Democracy and free institutions are not made more secure or advanced by utilizing totalitarian techniques. To be strong we must be true to ourselves.

Now having philosophized with you for a few moments, let me get down to the particulars. In the main, I am proud of what our country has done in the field of international relations.

Fortunately, we have learned that national independence can be sustained and made meaningful only by a recognition of international interdependence. It took us two world wars and a worldwide depression to have this fact driven home.

It is to our credit, however, that we have learned our lesson and to our sorrow that we have had to pay so dearly for this belated knowledge. Today the climate of public opinion in America is one of acceptance of international responsibility. Isolationism is a thing of the past. The acceptance of our role in the affairs of the world is the most prominent political fact of our generation.

The crowning glory of the 20th century is the creation of the United Nations. We can be ever proud of our leading role in this greatest of all achievements in the realm of international politics. Once the victory on the battlefield was won, we did not turn our backs upon a war-weary and stricken world. Our finest hour was yet to come. We mobilized our resources to help the needy, to feed the hungry, to heel the sick, to rebuild the devastated cities, to help others reconstitute free government, to reestablish commerce and trade, to rehabilitate the exhausted economies of friend and foe alike. Here was the true expression of the spirit of American democracy. Here was a practical blending between applied democratic policy and the spirit of our religious teachings. Here was compassion and charity, here was forgiveness and kindliness, here was the full expression of American generosity and faith.

I have little time for those who are critical of the details—the little mistakes—when great decisions had to be made. Of course we made mistakes. We were neither prepared by experience or knowledge to undertake all the responsibilities that befell us. We recruited people from all walks of life to administer these huge programs of relief and economic rehabilitation. It was a difficult assignment just to find the people, much less to find people competent and trained for the task. We Americans had been so absorbed with the challenges of American political and economic life that we were not prepared, either psychologically or professionally, for international administration or participation, but we did the best we could.

We worked with what we had. We compensated for our lack of expert knowledge and training with a will to succeed, an abundance of resources, and a spirit of compassion and generosity. The strength of our foreign policy in this period was the strength of a good heart and a willing spirit. It was the strength of practicing our ideals. It was the strength of doing when something needed to be done. It was the strength of action when those of lesser courage might have hesitated.

Nor should we forget or underestimate the incredible accomplishment of creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the most successful and the greatest alliance in the world's history. We did not content ourselves merely with a paper structure. We set ourselves to the task of building muscle and sinew around the structural anatomy of a collective security pact. The programs of military assistance, the Marshall plan, and mutual security gave spirit and strength to nations that only yesterday were weak and helpless. The Marshall plan will live in the pages of history as the most successful program of economic rehabilitation and recovery of recorded history. Not only was it great and imaginative in its design and purpose, but it has been equally great in its accomplishment.

I wonder sometimes if we have forgotten the terrible destruction of World War II. Not only were things ruined and demolished, but human spirit was almost destroyed. Established social patterns were uprooted, millions of people were wandering on the roads, dying in prisons and concentration camps. All of this was but only yesterday. Fear and frustration stalked the land. The political and economic climate was ripe for demagogues, dictators, and opportunists. The forces of communism moved in, backed by the power of the Red Army. It was this unhappy event that compounded the problems and difficulties which faced mankind after this most hideous of all terrible wars. It was almost beyond human capacity to rebuild a war-weary world. But to this awful burden was added the even more intolerable burden of resisting and defeating the inroads of Communist imperialism and subversion. It is nothing short of a miracle that the areas of human freedom are as great as they are.

Again, not because of plan or design, but simply because we were the only nation with the resources and the strength, we were compelled to meet and challenge this evil force. Here again we were not prepared by experience or expert knowledge. But we did not shirk from the ordeal. We moved into action. It was here that NATO played such a significant role, because supporting Communist subversion was the power of the Red Army. The Marshall plan met the Communist aggressor on the economic front. In both areas we checkmated the Communist conspiracy. The Red Army did not move. The Western European economies did not fall prey to collectivism and communism. Germany did not fall into the hands of the Kremlin. Berlin was not strangled into submission. Soviet troops were removed from Iran. The Mediterranean area did not become a Soviet lake. Greece and Turkey were not destroyed by Communist subversion and armed attack. The Truman Doctrine, backed by the Greek-Turkish aid program, filled the power vacuum that was left by the withdrawal of British strength from the Mediterranean. Men like Mayor Reuter, of Berlin, Chancellor Adenauer, of West Germany, supported by American aid, defied the Communists and brought Germany and Berlin safely through the Communist onslaught.

These developments represent the strength of American foreign policy, but a strength that was always fortified by the wholehearted cooperation of our allies and associates in the great North Atlantic Treaty alliance.

Communist aggression and subversion checked in Western Europe moved to a new front and the attack was launched on South Korea.

The decision of our Government and of the United Nations to resist aggression in Korea may well be recorded in history as the turning point in the struggle against Communist totalitarianism. The design and plan of the Kremlin, thwarted in Western Europe, was now challenged and defeated on the battlefield in Korea. Collective security had met its first test and it succeeded. The free nations stood together.

I call to your attention the meeting of the Communist chieftains in Moscow in September and October of 1952. It was here that Joseph Stalin outlined the change of Soviet tactics and strategy. The program of open violence and aggression was to be replaced by a policy of political maneuver, economic warfare, stepped-up subversion, and dividing the United States from her allies. I recommend to the attention of every participant in this conference a careful study of the 19th Annual Communist Party Conference at Moscow in the fall of 1952. You will note that it was timed to take place during our presidential election. We were immersed in domestic politics. I regret to say that far too little attention was given to this important meeting by those presently responsible for our foreign policy.

The tipoff of the present Soviet peace offensive is to be found in the proceedings of this conference. Even Malenkov was unveiled at this meeting. General Zhukov came back into the limelight.

A weakness in our foreign policy is the failure on the part of Congress and appropriate committees of Congress to carefully study the strategy and tactics of Soviet foreign policy. We are always being caught off base, thereby placing us on the defensive. We seem to spend far too much time in counterattack rather than in planned programed political offensive. I have urged and recommended that a special subcommittee be appointed to maintain constant review and study in this field. Likewise, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, has sponsored a resolution to provide a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The recent United Nations Commemorative Conference at San Francisco revealed the weaknesses and strengths of our foreign policy. Much that I have said here today was underscored and verified by the series of addresses delivered by U. N. delegates on the historic occasion of the commemorative conference. It was my privilege to attend these meetings. I digress to say I was the only Member of Congress to attend this conference. This fact within itself reveals a weakness in our foreign policy. Members of Congress should do more than issue statements on foreign policy. We must actively participate, whenever it is possible, in the meetings or conferences that lead to the discussion, review, or formulation of our foreign policy. If our foreign policy is everybody's business, then indeed it is above all the business of the Members of Congress.

I left the U. N. conference convinced that we had won our case against the Kremlin in the court of world public opinion. Even the hardbitten, disciplined Soviet delegates could not ignore the climate of political friendship and association of free nations. The address of Mr. Molotov was an unintentional testimonial to the solidarity of free nations. Every point that Mr. Molotov emphasized related directly to what we had or had not done. It was clear from his speech that NATO is successful, that the Soviet has given up in Western Europe. It was evident that our foreign policy this past decade has, in the main, been effective, particularly in those areas where we have an intimate knowledge and understanding of the political and economic forces.

The most significant observation to be made about the United Nations meeting was the unity of free nations despite all of the Soviet tactics to divide us and create distrust. You may recall that the address of Mr. Molotov was carefully analyzed and answered by our Secretary of State. Mr. Dulles did a good job in refuting Molotov's arguments. If I were to have judged these two addresses as a debate I am sure that Mr. Dulles would have won. But there is no reward in debate at this time. We have already won the argument, but we have not won the cold war. Regretfully, we have permitted ourselves to get bogged down in proving the fallacy and duplicity of Soviet pronouncements. We have won this argument, yes, won it over and over again. We win it in every United Nations session. It is one thing to prove the Soviets to be wrong, and yet another thing to prove ourselves to be right. The margin of clear-cut victory lies with the new, the underdeveloped, and the yet uncommitted nations. It is just in this area that the policy of the present administration is weak, confused, and at times petty.

Let me explain what I mean by relating this world struggle to the American political scene. You do not win elections by continuing to convince the convinced, or by discrediting an opponent already discredited. We in American politics understand it is the independent vote that determines the outcome. You gain that vote by standing on principle and coming forth with a program that has a wider appeal than just to the partisans you have already won. To put it another way, I have a feeling that we have become more concerned about the importance of exposing Soviet tactics than we have of expounding a dynamic and constructive American foreign policy.

One could not help but sense at the San Francisco United Nations Conference that people were looking to the United States to offer inspiration on a new level, to emphasize our positive goals for an honorable peace, and strengthening of underdeveloped areas—this was not done. The world is hungry for peace. The Soviet talks peace. They seem to sense world public opinion. To be sure, the Soviet is not able to convince the leaders of the nations that their program for peace is honorable and true. These leaders, however, are always subject to public opinion of their respective countries, and I noticed that Mr. Molotov again and again appealed over the governments to the people. He subtly intimated that the leaders of the Western nations were blocking Soviet efforts for peace. He attempted to drive a wedge between the governments and the people. He identified governments with the United States. He identified peoples with the Soviet Union. Soviet propaganda has never convinced delegates to the United Nations, but it has been effective in the villages, cities, and rural areas of countries that have delegates in the United Nations. The Soviet propaganda repeats the word "people" again and again, and regretfully the statements of our present diplomatic officials reveal that we are permitting our diplomacy to become the special privilege of the elite—of the diplomat—or even more unfortunate, sacrificing sound policy for domestic political advantage.

We must remember that there has always been and still continues to be a natural suspicion on the part of people everywhere over the so-called "art of diplomacy." Too many times in history of the world, people have been deceived by their diplomats. There have been too many secret agreements, too much duplicity, and Machiavellian expediency. The Soviet propagandists seem to sense this natural suspicion by people in free countries of their State Department and foreign ministries. Therefore, Mr. Molotov called upon the people to join with the Soviet in seeking peace—peace on Soviet terms. Now let us not underestimate the impact of this carefully conceived strategy. It could very well be dangerously effective, particularly if we permit it to go unnoticed or unchallenged. You do not successfully challenge this political strategy by merely pointing out that it is a fraud. More needs to be done. Surely the representatives of democratic republics and free nations should be the first to appeal to the people, to take their case to the people, to interpret their policy in language the people can understand.

Governments come and go, but the people go on forever. A successful foreign policy is one that has the support of the people back home as well as the acceptance of the people abroad to whom it is directed. A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the embassies and the foreign ministries and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the natives in the villages. How paradoxical this is.

Here we see the ironical situation of the dictators speaking like democrats, with a small "d," appealing to the people; of the tyrant extolling the virtues of freedom; of the oppressor dramatizing himself as the liberator and the emancipator. Yes, the irony of an imperialist extolling the virtues of self-determination. In our anxiety to win the debate point by point, to discredit our opponent on each and every occasion, we sacrifice the affirmative case that we need to make.

To be sure, this is not always the case. The President's proposal of use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is an example of what I mean by accentuating the positive and stating the affirmative case. Whenever we have done this we have been on the march to victory. The Marshall plan is another example where we literally ignored the arguments of the Kremlin and proceeded with our own program. NATO again provides a concrete example of action. The point 4 program is another example where a positive and constructive proposal left the Communists bewildered, confused, and weakened. We have examples of seizing the initiative, but all too often once we have seized it and are parading down the boulevard of a better world, we lose our trail and end up in a side street or back alley of bitter argument with the Communist protagonist. There has been far too much "playing to the domestic political galleries" for purposes of partisan political expediency. Too much doubletalk—a policy for home consumption and another for foreign use. What is worse, this doubletalk has come from the State Department.

Within a few days the leaders of the four great powers will be meeting in Geneva. Surely this is the most significant meeting of recent years. People everywhere are hoping and praying that this important meeting will lead to a just and enduring peace. As could be expected, there are those who feel that this meeting by itself may well solve the problems that beset the world. There are others who look upon it as a fruitless and hopeless effort. I am sure that we should all agree that somewhere in between these two extremes lies the practical possibility.

I think we would all be misguided if we expected sudden and spectacular results. The cold war has been very cold a long time and it is going to take more than a brief ray of sunshine to thaw it out. But the fact that there is a meeting is a good sign. If it does nothing else but to cause us to reexamine or reevaluate every facet of our foreign policy, it will be well worth the effort.

We may very well have to shift the emphasis in our foreign policy in the days to come. I am personally convinced that the Soviet Union has given up any hope of any further success in Europe. She may well seek to stabilize Europe even to the point of cooperating in the reunification of Germany and granting her satellite states a degree of independence and autonomy. We have no accurate way of knowing how much trouble, economically or politically, exists within the Iron Curtain area. We do know that all is not well. We do know that if the burden of rearmament is heavy upon rich America, it rests much heavier upon the much weaker Soviet economy. Remember it costs money to build guns, tanks, and planes in the Soviet just as it does here.

I am always shocked and disappointed when I hear spokesmen of American finance and industry expound upon the fear of bankruptcy for our country if we maintain a strong defense program. They show little faith in free political and economic institutions, or possibly they reveal gross ignorance of what the burden of such a rearmament race is upon a relatively poor and collectivized economy.

Then I imagine it is fair to assume that all has not been well in the satellite countries. They were impoverished and destroyed by the war, as were huge areas of the Soviet Union itself. Add to this, the costs of the Korean war to the Soviet, her aid to China, the admitted deficiencies of Soviet agriculture, the difficult task of rebuilding the areas destroyed by World War II, and it seems reasonable to say that there is and has been trouble behind the Iron Curtain.

But it would be equally wrong to assume that economic difficulties alone would prevent the Soviet from being an aggressor or engaging in war. Possibly the most compelling factor, if there is only one, that has temporarily changed the Soviet attitude is the terrible reality of nuclear warfare. We now know that the Soviet military has a closer identity with the present regime than before. Possibly General Zhukov and some of his associates have been able to explain to the Soviet leaders what would happen if the United States and the Soviet Union were to engage in war. The awful potentialities of the hydrogen bomb, and the guided missile with hydrogen warheads cannot help but have an effect upon men who now hold power and position and wish to continue in that favored role.

There is more reason to believe that the men in the Kremlin want time to consolidate their empire, time to strengthen their economy, time to consolidate their position—a position which has been very unstable since the death of Stalin. Whatever may be the reason for the Soviet peace talk, there is ample evidence to lead one to believe that concessions will be made, that tensions, at least temporarily, will be eased, that there will be a period of time when the possibilities for peace look more inviting and encouraging.

The one word that seems important to me is time. But this concept of time is meaningless unless it is used, and the question is who will use the time and for what purpose. If there is to be a time period for easing of tensions, will this mean less effort on our part? Are we to assume that the long-range objective of communism—namely, to dominate the world—will be given up or set aside? I see no convincing evidence to lead to that conclusion. Therefore time is an ally to whomever preempts it—uses it. We can be sure the Bolsheviks will not waste it—whether we like it or not, coexistence will be competitive. We had better plan our future around this fact, and to announce the broad outlines of our design and program at the Geneva Conference—yes at every important conference.

It would be a mistake on our part to assume that the Soviet will attend the Geneva Conference in a position of weakness. It is an even greater mistake to publicly talk about this, as was done by the Secretary of State and then released to the press, and thereby to taunt and irritate the egocentric men in the Kremlin. The recent air show over Moscow should dispel any doubts as to the Soviet's weakness, at least in arms. We Americans are prone to underestimate the technical competence of the modern Soviet system. The record should be clear: The Soviet has made remarkable strides in technical and scientific advance. She emphasizes in her educational structure, science and technology. Every policy and every directive is concentrated on producing military strength. Civilian goods, the needs of the consumer, are subordinated to the production of capital goods and modern armaments. The police state is not responsive to public opinion as is a demoncratic state. We must never forget that dictatorship removes dissident elements through the cruel and heartless process of liquidation, murder, and banishment. Public demonstrations of protest are crushed, at the same time that the dictator arouses in the minds of the people a fear of foreign intervention, encirclement, or attack.

I say these things because even some of our own policymakers have, on occasion, indicated that there may be a split between the Russian people and the Communist Party. The people have nothing to say about the government of the Soviet. The Communist Party and the government are one and the same. They are political Siamese twins, but with only one head—the Communist Party apparatus.

It is wishful thinking to base a foreign policy upon any major upheaval in the Soviet Union, or even in the satellite states. What is more, when one such upheaval did take place, namely, the riots in East Germany and Czechoslovakia in June of 1953, we were unprepared, we had no policy. All the loose talk of liberation that was so much a part of the 1952 presidential campaign, was either forgotten or forsaken. We were without an Ambassador in the Soviet Union on the death of Stalin. Our Central Intelligence was unable to obtain any information that indicated the demotion of Malenkov and the elevation of Bulganin. We were short of facts and information, and therefore unprepared to make any policy shift that might have worked to our advantage.

Every conceivable effort should be made to expand our intelligence service to give us more information. We were caught short even at the time of the North Korean invasion, despite the fact that our own military had been in North Korea for at least 2 years prior to the agreement on the 38th parallel as a line of demarcation between North and South Korea.

Therefore, wishful thinking about the condition of the Soviet will get us nowhere. What is more important is to build strength and cooperation between ourselves and our allies. To use every means at our command to expand the area of freedom, to strengthen the independent and neutral nations so they can resist subversion from within and aggression from without. Yes, to be prepared for every eventuality, recognizing we face the most powerful and diabolical menace the world has ever known.

Having said this, what do we do? I offer these suggestions:

(1) Until some foolproof, ironclad universal system of disarmament can be arrived at and fully agreed to with proper supervision, or other protective devices, we must maintain in cooperation with our allies a powerful defense force. The heart and core of that defense force must be continuing and expanding emphasis upon research and development. This includes both basic and applied research. Here the present administration flounders and vacillates. Nor will slogans suffice—"bigger bang for a buck" does not mean greater defense.

I am not a military expert, but I do suggest that it should be a matter of firm national policy that this Nation have the greatest air force in the world—modern, available, combat effective. The Air Force, of course, must be supported by modern weapons. We cannot afford to be second-best, nor can we be satisfied with having the planes on the drafting board or the modern weapons at laboratory research stage of development. I am talking about a defense force in being. Whatever the cost of that defense force may be, we must be prepared to pay it.

I reemphasize the importance of scientific and technological development. This means giving our scientists greater leeway, being less suspicious, recognizing that scientists frequently are unorthodox in their social and political views. There is a wide difference between disloyalty and nonconformity. We must protect our Nation from disloyalty and subversion. But this does not necessarily mean discharging a scientist of foreign birth who maintains his citizenship in a country like Switzerland, who is a known anti-Communist. We need the intelligence and scientific know-how of freemen everywhere. Just as we have created a collective defense force in NATO, I suggest we build a collective scientific force among the free nations, pooling ideas and knowledge, and drawing from that common pool for the development of defense and the expansion and progress of the partners.

To summarize, in the kind of world in which we live, a protective shield of strength is the first essential of a program of security. That shield must never be lowered, that sword must never be sheathed, until all nations are willing to beat their swords into plowshares and make war no more.

(2) I have emphasized military strength, but I want it clear that military strength must be supported by a dynamic and expanding economy. Therefore, the relations between defense policy and domestic political and economic policy are one and inseparable. The margin of superiority that we now maintain over the Soviet and its satellites is not in arms, but in the reservoir of economic and political strength that is ever present in free nations. The shield of strength that I have emphasized need not be brandished before friend and foe alike. It should be a shield, consistently maintained and quietly regarded.

I suppose Teddy Roosevelt put it in the layman's language when he said, "Speak softly and carry the big stick." Regretfully, we have spoken loudly—very loudly—and the big stick that supposedly we were carrying wasn't nearly as big as we thought it was, and most of the time not available.

We have frightened our friends more than we have our foes by irresponsible talk. Too frequently public officials have talked of dropping bombs to solve different international situations. These A-bombs do not solve problems—they just dissolve things and people. Politically designed speeches, incorporating clever catch phrases, such as "massive retaliation," "agonizing reappraisal," "New Look," may make good headlines for an emotional public, but they do not make good policy, nor do they provide even stronge defense. I suggest we get on with the business of building a security force second to none, and quit bragging, threatening, and boasting. Actually, if the present administration would be more frank and open about our state of preparedness—and less addicted to official secrecy and censorship, it would have a sobering effect on both the Congress and the public. Censorship compounded by propaganda is no substitute for freedom of information supported by facts.

Having once developed the kind of military security that is essential for the defense of free nations, let us remember that the ultimate answer to the problems that beset us is not to be found in war. Military strength in this day and age is but a part of the apparatus of diplomacy, unless mankind indulges in the madness of thermonuclear warfare. No one can predict what the future will offer if such a catastrophe befalls us. We must look upon military strength as a means, one of several means, to arrive at agreements, to participate in negotiations, yes, as the precarious road to the conference at the summit. This has been referred to as negotiation from a position of strength. But that position of strength needs to be more than military power. The position of strength that we need, and must maintain, encompasses the closest cooperation with our allies. We must speak in one spirit—in unity for common objectives.

The first principle of Soviet strategy is to divide us from our allies, to break up the grand alliance. To portray America as the real threat to the independence and self-determination of peoples and nations. Therefore, every conceivable effort must be made for a meeting of the minds, for a common understanding by the leaders of the nations of the free areas of the world. This requires patience along with respect for and confidence in our partners. We have allies, not satellites. We cannot bully and coerce. We can only seek to persuade and give counsel. But decisions arrived at through consultation and discussion are firm decisions—the privileged possession of all participants.

I also urge that we give special attention to the attitudes and policies of our Asian, African, and Latin American neighbors.

Negotiating from strength, therefore, means military power and political unity, based on mutual respect and confidence amongst the free nations.

If we are correct in assuming that the Soviet does not now seek war, but rather seeks time and the easing of tensions, then we must reexamine our policies in light of this development, without sacrificing the first two essentials—military strength and political unity.

Any step in the direction of relaxed tensions must be welcomed by us and we should lead in this effort, making it ever clear to the simplest soul in the far corners of the world that the Nation of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt is a nation of peace, of freedom, of compassion, and justice.

I have been disturbed because of the reluctance of some of our top officials to recognize the opportunity that was at hand once the plan of a Big Four conference crystallized. This is no time for timid souls. This is the time for men of imagination, courage, and daring. The peoples of the world are weary of the constant threat of nuclear war, and particularly when that threat keeps coming from us in the strident voices of small men. The peoples are looking for a clear and challenging political faith that will arouse them to self-determination and liberation from both political and social tyranny. The toxin of fear has run its course. A tired and suffering humanity seeks the nourishing food of applied idealism. This is to our advantage. We are not warriors in the strict interpretation of the word. Our history is traditionally one of an expanding democracy—the fulfillment of equality of opportunity, the relation of human equality of law in the social order, and the dedication to a rising standard of living for all. It is these very virtues that fit the present world scene.

It is time, therefore, that we walk confidently in the stature, strength, and competence that our history and our present circumstances verify. In a world that is desperately in need of capital, we have the greatest capital resources among all nations. In a world where people are anxious for the blessings of science and technology, we are richly endowed with these blessings. In a world where the majority of people are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad, we are privileged to have an abundance of food and fiber and the knowledge of scientific progress for health and shelter.

We have that intangible source of strength that was so brilliantly emphasized in the recent Bandung conference, the spiritual values of freedom, the history of a people that cast off the yoke of colonialism, the thrilling and inspiring story of a new Nation conceived in liberty, with a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Our leaders were far too pessimistic about the Bandung conference. Official statements indicated that the Asian-African conference might very well become a propaganda springboard for the forces of Communism in the Far East. We again underestimated the importance of this conference. Our Government hesitated to even send official greetings. We apparently underestimated the great reservoir of good will that still exists in Asia and Africa for the America—for the America that had given freedom to the Philippines and Cuba, for the America that has always championed the self-determination of peoples. It was spiritual values and political idealism—yes, the moral forces that have made our country great—that served as our ally, our defender in this unique and all important meeting of the Asian and African nations.

I know we Americans take all of this for granted, but it truly is the good news of the 20th century. Millions of people in Asia and Africa are repeating in their own way the dramatic story of American independence. They are doing what we did. We, above all people, should be understanding and sympathetic to their cause. There is an identity of interest, of purpose, and of history, if we will but see it and make ourselves a part of it. National independence, self-determination, liberation from colonialism—all of this we have experienced. This is our message to the world. This message, found in the Declaration of Independence, has given faith to millions of people seeking dignity in all corners of the globe. This message of faith in human brotherhood and in human equality is our reservoir of good will in the world. It was this message that found its way into every speech at Bandung, save that of Chou En-lai. It is the spiritual and political values that make our society what it is, that really topped the news in the Asian-African conference. America was respected not for her atom bombs or her wealth, but for her ideals and her history. We must be true to these.

To the extent that we have lost friends, we have done so because we have forgotten the message of human brotherhood and equality, or forgotten to preach and live that message.

The time is ready for us to dedicate our talents, our resources, to winning the cold war, not just stabilizing it.

Specifically, I suggest, first, we join with the spirit of nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries. Remind these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence.

Second, respect the so-called neutralism of newborn nations, and make it clear that we understand their neutralism be one predicated on independence, self-determination, and self-government.

We must understand this neutralism and what it is—namely, a spirit of nationalism in former colonial areas. These neutral nations do not want to be appendages to Soviet imperialism or Western collective security. They have unhappy memories of exploitation by certain Western European countries who are now our allies. Their leaders have a keen awareness of the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion and have taken strong measures to defeat the Communist conspiracy. These neutrals are not pro-Communist—they are pro-themselves. And I suggest that as long as nations remain free, as long as the new nations of Asia and Africa work for themselves, create self-government, build their own economies, they are in fact strengthening the forces of freedom in the world. Why are we so much more critical of the neutralism of Burma and India than we are of the neutralism of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden. Surely we realize that our friends of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden are pro-democratic, pro-freedom. We admire their qualities, we admire their democracy, we herald their accomplishments. Let us be equally tolerant with the Asian nations.

Third, we should engage in greater use of our capital through international organizations such as the U. N., the World Bank, and other international financial development groups. Doing much more than we ever contemplate, not on the basis of gifts, but on the basis of long-term loans.

Fourth, we should step up our own point 4, but even more important, work through the U. N. and offer to greatly expand U. N. technical assistance. Let us take the initiative in this area.

Fifth, let us use our blessings of food and fiber. We can proceed through the U. N., offering vast quantities of food and fiber to be placed under the general direction of the U. N. Food and Fiber Reserve. Here we can seize the initiative. We have the food and fiber—we can call upon others to share.

Sixth, we must set a good standard at home—revise our immigration laws, immediately liberalize our refugee act, implement our program of civil rights. Any act of Congress that gives offense to large segments of free peoples of the world adversely affects American foreign policy. Our present immigration laws reflect adversely upon many people and do a disservice to the true tradition of the United States.

Seventh, we should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, laborers, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communication.

Eighth, unstinting support of the U. N., with particular emphasis on the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture, Children's Emergency Fund. These programs represent America's compassion and generosity exercised in a spirit of international cooperation.

Ninth, the systematic reduction of tariffs and other artificial obstacles to world trade, including reexamination of East-West trade restrictions.

Tenth, we must make unceasing efforts toward the reduction of armaments and the realization of universal disarmament.

Let us instill spirit and meaning into the disarmament discussions by demonstrating imagination. Let us offer to join with the rest of the world in reducing and then eliminating our armaments race, accompanied by a joint pledge that we spend a portion of the money we thereby save in helping to eliminate poverty in the world. The proposal of the late Senator Brien McMahon is one which should constantly be in the forefront of our minds as we participate in the disarmament discussions.

I welcome the proposal of the President in creating the Office of Special Assistant in Charge of Disarmament. I now hope that my own proposal for the creation of a Special Subcommittee on Disarmament that is to match the action of the Executive and strengthen our hand for disarmament will be accepted.

I have emphasized our more active participation in the United Nations, and its related agencies, because I am convinced that the most practical approach to the areas of Asia and Africa is through the United Nations. This great organization will be only as strong as the use that is made of it. It can only do as much as it is permitted to do by the great powers. Our entire international policy is based on our adherence to and respect for the Charter of the United Nations. We must become champions of that charter. On every occasion, in every conference, in every policy statement, we must relate our actions to the fulfillment to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Charter of the United Nations is for the world what the Declaration of Independence is for us. It is a world charter of freedom and justice. It is the 20th century Declaration of Interdependence.

I recognize the weaknesses of the United Nations. But I also recognize that if this great instrument of international cooperation fails, then the law of the jungle prevails and modern civilization is on the precipice of disaster.

The achievements of the United Nations are significant. Its future possibilities are unlimited. The time is right for the Government of the United States to lay before the United Nations Assembly a comprehensive program for building a true and honorable peace—and pursue it relentlessly, boldly, and confidently.

The program I have outlined here today, while not new, is, in my mind, a proper emphasis of what needs to be done.

Let us again and again challenge the Soviet Union to fulfill the requirements of the charter. Ask her to join with us in the expansion of the agencies and services of the United Nations. Ask her to join with us, not only in a program of disarmament, but in a program of economic rehabilitation under the guidance and direction of the United Nations. Let us be so bold and daring and imaginative with our program and proposals that a refusal on the part of the Soviet to go along will leave her alone and forsaken.

It is time we recognized that power is more than armaments and wealth. Power is people and ideals—people who aspire to freedom and dignity; ideals that make possible an enlightened and civilized society.

I shall long remember what the Prime Minister of Burma had to say on his recent visit here to Washington. He said, "American ideals are more explosive than your atom bombs."

Here is the voice of the new Asia asking us to reassert our faith; asking us to live by the inspiration of our own traditions. Reminding us that the strength of the spirit is mightier than the sword.

It is this strength of spirit that represents our superiority over communism. It is this God-given strength that appeals to God's children.

Miss Rosalind Russell Plays Leading Role in Kansas Disaster Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, during the month of May my home State of Kansas had the misfortune of experiencing several tornadoes which caused a tremendous amount of property damage and the loss of lives.

One of these tornadoes completely razed the town of Udall, killing one-tenth of the population and creating tragedy and disaster for those fortunate enough to have survived.

Since then many individuals and organizations have given contributions to aid the Udall survivors and to help rebuild their homes and businesses.

One such individual who played a leading role in raising money for this cause was Miss Rosalind Russell, who was on location at Hutchinson, Kans., at the time making a new motion picture, Picnic, directed by Josh Logan and produced by Columbia Pictures.

Throughout her entire career as one of the most successful actresses in motion pictures, Miss Russell has repeatedly distinguished herself for her great humanitarian work and her unselfish support of men and women in the armed services and of exigent charitable and humanitarian fund-raising campaigns.

Throughout the war years Miss Russell gave unselfishly of her talents and time to entertain our Armed Forces.

As stated above, Miss Russell was in Kansas when the tornado struck Udall, and without waiting for an invitation from any source she immediately volunteered her services to any agency equipped to provide necessary funds and service to aid the Udall survivors and to help rebuild their homes. She helped to organize a successful and large rally in the Wichita ball park Sunday, May 29.

Despite the fact that she had been working on location, playing the most difficult role of her career for an average of 12 hours a day, she gave her 1 free day to travel by auto, 110 miles round trip between Hutchinson and Wichita, to personally appear at the ball park.

Her efforts in organizing this rally and in appearing and entertaining at the ball park realized $14,800 for the Udall sufferers with half again that amount subsequently donated.

Appealing to fellow actors in her motion-picture company for contributions because they had not appeared at the rally themselves, she secured a number of large cash donations for the fund including $1,000 from her friend and director, Josh Logan.

Through this humanitarian act Miss Russell won the respect, love, and support of the entire State of Kansas.

The people of Kansas are appreciative of these kind acts, and all contributors are to be commended for the part they have played in aiding these unfortunate citizens.

Death of Former Representative John Gregg Utterback, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, John Gregg Utterback, Representative from the 3d District of Maine in the 73d Congress and one of the foremost citizens of the city of Bangor, Maine, passed away. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, as well as an editorial from the Bangor Daily News of July 12, 1955, regarding Mr. Utterback, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN GREGG UTTERBACK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

In the passing of John G. Utterback, the city of Bangor and the State of Maine have lost a distinguished citizen. In his long and able career as a city official and businessman, and later as a Representative in the United States Congress, John Utterback served his city, State, and Nation with distinction.

Born in Franklin, Johnson County, Ind., on July 12, 1872, he attended the public schools of his native city. Before 1905 when he settled in Bangor, he was a traveling salesman. Mr. Utterback engaged in the selling of carriages and later of automobiles in Bangor, where he served as a councilman and as mayor from 1914 to 1915. In 1932 he was elected to the 73d Congress, and in 1935 he was appointed United States marshal for the district of Maine, serving in that position until 1944.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of July 12, 1955]

MAINE LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN

The State and city have lost a remarkable and valuable citizen through the death of John Gregg Utterback. The Indiana native came to New England as a young man. He had been prominently identified with civic, business, and political life of Bangor for more than a half-century.

Mr. Utterback first came to prominence here when he established his carriage business after having toured northern Maine as a salesman. Elected to the Bangor Common Council in 1912, the voters chose him to serve as mayor in 1914.

He was a lifelong Democrat—never wavering from the party, although living and working in a strongly Republican locality. He was elected to Congress in 1932, but was defeated for a second term in 1934 by Owen Brewster. He served as United States marshal until 1946.

Mr. Utterback will be long remembered for his lifelong interest in young people. He was first president of Katahdin Council, Boy Scouts of America, and maintained an active interest in the scout movement until shortly before his death. His passing leaves a void in the community that won't be quickly filled.

The President Earnestly Considers Expanding Cultural Interchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 10 Members of the House of Representatives, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, last Saturday urged President Eisenhower to give serious consideration to discussing exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union at the forthcoming Big Four Conference at Geneva.

The House Members who signed the letter to the President were the gentleman from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT; the gentleman from California, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD; the gentleman from Utah, HENRY ALDOUS DIXON; the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.; the gentleman from New Hampshire, PERKINS BASS; the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.; the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS; the gentleman from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; and myself.

The text of the letter to the President follows:

JULY 7, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have noted with interest certain recent events which point toward a lessening of tension between this country and the Soviet Union: the visit of the American athletes and chess players to Moscow, the proposed exchange program for farmers, and a recent editorial in an American newspaper suggesting an expanded cultural and sports program which was received favorably in an answering editorial in Pravda.

It has come to our attention that Senator KARL MUNDT, coauthor of the Smith-Mundt Act, has recently suggested to you that the encouraging and expanding of such exchange visits might be discussed at the forthcoming Big Four Conference at Geneva.

We believe this suggestion merits earnest attention, and we hope that you can give it your serious consideration. If agreement could be reached at Geneva to expand such contacts and establish regular tourist travel there would appear to be a greater opportunity for mutual understanding and world peace.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH SCOTT, W. S. MAILLIARD, H. A. DIXON, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., PERKINS BASS, FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., HARRISON WILLIAMS, HENRY S. REUSS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, LEE METCALF.

Hearings are currently being held by a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on several bills which would greatly expand the President's Emergency Fund under which leading artists, athletes, and industrial exhibits are sent abroad. The chairman of this Subcommittee on Distinguished Civilian Awards and Cultural Interchange and Development is the able gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on July 12 reported the bill—H. R. 7278, Report No. 1116—making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, which was read and referred with the accompanying report to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This bill includes $5 million, a reduction of $1 million in the amount of the budget estimate, for the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. The Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies, which held hearings on this item under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from New York, JOHN J. ROONEY, is to be complimented for their support of this important program. It is to be hoped that the Congress will quickly adopt this program which was recommended to the Congress last year by the President as one of major importance to enable our country to meet and counter the gigantic propaganda offensive of the U. S. S. R. Wide support has developed for this program and the Hearst newspapers, following the historic address by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., at the National Press Club in February, have been outstanding in their support of this important program.

I would also like to include at this point in my remarks the text of a letter from President Eisenhower which I have just received:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 11, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I appreciate your and your colleagues' July 7 letter suggesting that our meetings at Geneva include discussions of expanded contacts between the people of Russia and the United States.

When Senator MUNDT made this suggestion to me a few days ago, I assured him that we would give the proposal our earnest consideration. To you and your colleagues I gladly give the same assurance, and am grateful to each of you for giving me your thoughts on this important matter.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Washington Evening Star, and signed articles which appeared in the New York Daily News, the San Francisco Examiner, and the Washington Daily News in regard to the cultural interchange program now under consideration by the Congress are included here also.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 14, 1955]

AMERICAN OVERSEAS

In the last year the United States Government has helped make it possible for several of its leading cultural organizations and some of its leading business concerns to display their wares abroad. Both have been enormously successful. In the first group were the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, the Symphony of the Air, the New York City Ballet and the Porgy and Bess company. They received enthusiastic receptions wherever they went. In Helsinki, the Philadelphia Orchestra won tremendous applause when it performed a Sibelius concert. The Symphony of the Air, formerly Arturo Toscanini's NBC Symphony Orchestra, received spectacular ovations on its far-eastern tour.

Similarly, the Commerce Department's sponsorship of American exhibits at trade fairs has been acclaimed in foreign journals. These fairs make it possible for American products to be sold on a much wider basis because they introduce American products to foreign buyers. Trade fairs abroad are not for show purposes as a cattle fair might be in this country but are meeting places for buyers who examine the samples and make purchases months in advance. President Eisenhower especially urged support of the trade fairs.

Congress today will vote on the appropriation for continued aid to these trade and cultural displays. The President asked for $6 million but the House Appropriations Committee cut the figure to $5 million. There is opposition to this amount and attempts will be made further to reduce the appropriation. We trust that the House will repulse these efforts. The Government does not pay the full cost of these projects but helps make up the deficits incurred. In the case of the Philadelphia Orchestra's tour of Europe the Government contributed only about $40,000. We can think of no better or more inexpensive way to advertise America's good name overseas.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 18, 1955]

Good Investment

At relatively small cost in public funds—about $2.5 million—the Department of Commerce in cooperation with private industry has put American enterprise on display at approximately a dozen international trade fairs during the past 6 months. Most of these have been in European cities where the holding of these exhibits has gained wide popularity and has proved a successful medium for advertising products and techniques of the participating countries. This initial experiment on the part of our own Government—one of the steps advocated by President Eisenhower in his program for expanding free world commerce—already has brought approximately 20,000 inquiries on American production methods, market possibilities, and trading exchanges.

The Commerce Department and more than 1,000 American firms already are planning further participation in fairs not only in Europe but in Asia, Africa, and South America. It is a program fully worthy of public support and the necessary modest amount of funds required to finance the Department's collaboration.

[From the New York Daily News of April 11, 1955]

D. C. Wash

(By Ruth Montgomery)

Washington, April 10.—Uncle Sam's most pulchritudinous envoy is shortly to receive a painting lesson that should make President Eisenhower green with envy.

Clare Boothe Luce, after shepherding Italian Prime Minister Scelba around our eastern shores, will return Tuesday to her desk at our Embassy in Rome. As soon as she catches up on her work, she plans to accept an invitation from Sir Winston Churchill to visit him at his Sicilian vacation spot.

As if a bid from the indomitable Winnie was not enticing enough, the doughty retired statesman has added an irresistible clincher: "Come to Sicily and I'll teach you to paint."

An amateur named Ike had better look to his laurels.

Rumors to the contrary, Clare is not—repeat, not—about to replace C. Douglas Dillon as our Ambassador to France. There are three good reasons why this will not come to pass.

First, Dillon has almost recovered from his illness and has no intention of resigning. Secondly, Clare is completely enamored of her Italian post and feels that the anti-Communist task she has undertaken there will require at least another year or two for completion.

Most important of all, neither Ike nor anyone else has offered her the Paris post, or even mentioned it to her.

The former Congresswoman from Connecticut has not, however, been lacking a crusade during her current visit to America. Both at the White House and the State Department, she has seized every opportunity to press for an enlargement of our cultural program abroad.

Last years' most successful single venture in spreading American culture in Europe was our sponsorship of the musical, Porgy and Bess. This year Clare has arranged for its premiere in Italy by the same American company.

IKE HAS FUND FOR OVERSEAS CULTURAL TOUR

She is also making a heavy bid for Oklahoma! and Showboat, in order to counteract Communist claims that the only plays and movies Americans can produce reek with crime.

Ike has at his command a special President's fund, with which to pick up the tab for overseas cultural appearances of American symphony concerts and theater groups.

Clare would like to see this extended to include official American participation in international art fairs and film festivals. To date, because the State Department has declined to give Government sanction to the festivals, Communist-tinged members of the international committees have deliberately selected American box office hits which depict the seamier side of our life.

If anyone objects, the Reds shrug: "After all, these are the biggest moneymakers in America, so you obviously prefer that sort of thing."

This is the argument Clare has presented to the State Department in urging that we officially enter the fairs and festivals. Then, like Russia and other participants, our Government can select only those films that present America at its typical best.

Our lady Ambassador, weary of Red strutting about the superior Russian ballet, would like to see groups from our City Center in New York travel abroad on the propaganda circuit. She is also plumping for a European tour by Radio City Music Hall's famed Rockettes.

A mutual dream of most of our American envoys, however, is unlikely to be realized in the near future.

WE STOLE SHOW AT ISTANBUL WITH CINERAMA

At the international trade fair in Istanbul last year, Uncle Sam stole the show with the presentation of This Is Cinerama. So sensational was the cross-country camera tour of America—from the Coney Island roller coaster ride to the flight through Grand Canyon—that the Russian and satellite exhibits stood virtually empty as long queues formed to watch the all-American entry. While the Russians screamed unfair competition, United States stock soared higher than a million-dollar grant-in-aid could have effected.

Since then, our United States Ambassadors have been clamoring for the State Department to send the film to their capitals. Unfortunately, for the richest country in the world, the cost of erecting the special triplicate screens and multiple projectors appears currently prohibitive.

On other cultural fronts, however, things are looking up. Until recently, our envoys abroad have viewed with anguish the international trade fairs, with practically every flag flying except our own Stars and Stripes.

This month Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks leaves for a tour of at least a dozen international trade fairs in Europe. There he will try to convince our friends and foes alike that America is not merely an international cash register, a lucky monster of resources, but actually a vigorous, idealistic nation with a unique culture and know-how that could benefit all mankind.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1955]

Japs Go Wild Over Our Touring Symphony

(By Oland D. Russell)

Tokio, May 25.—Time was when American major-league baseball players would come to Japan, winning friends and influencing people far and wide.

But the newest sensation among the volatile and impressionable Japanese is the 94-man American orchestra "Symphony of the Air" which has just concluded a 20-day tour here.

Judging from attendance figures and the orchestramen's own enthusiasm, Japan really went all out in its devotion and acclamation for this former Arturo Toscanini symphony, which has stuck together since the departure of the old maestro.

The final performance at the former Ernie Pyle Theater yesterday brought the audience to its feet in a near frenzy as if some crooner had just appeared. The crowd wept and tossed paper streamers.

Everywhere they've gone, from Tokyo to Sendai, from Yokohama to Hiroshima, these 94 men—without a single girl vocalist or side attraction—literally were mobbed by Japan's bouncy, emotional lovers of music.

Said Don Gillis, of Fort Worth, Tex., former Texas Christian University professor, now one of the three conductors:

"It's been a musician's honeymoon. Seemed like every note we struck made someone fall in love—with us."

The two other conductors who rotate with Mr. Gillis are Walter Hendl, formerly of the Dallas Symphony, and Thor Johnson, of the Cincinnati Symphony.

The players wear lapel badges with individual numbers. In all the principal cities where they played, Japan's young musicians quickly would identify artists by their numbers and waylay them individually for autographs or just the chance to touch their hero.

They would wait by groups, violin students swarming over violinists, aspiring flutists surrounding the piccolo players, etc., while drum pounders and bull-fiddlers, less agile logistically, often caught the brunt of the onrush.

Press Agent Abe Savage, of the New York Musicians Union, was one of the few nonmusical individuals on the trip, but he also wore a "symphony of the air" badge. When Japanese would surround him asking what instrument he played, Abe would tell them deadpan, "typewriter." And the kids would bow in politeness and awe of this curious addition to orchestration.

Everywhere they went that lapel badge opened more doors and hearts and brought them more favored treatment, at least among the mass of the Japanese people, than the resplendent cultured pearled badges of the International Chamber of Commerce, which just ended sessions here.

The orchestra leaves today for Korea for 2 days and then heads for Okinawa, Formosa, Manila, Bangkok, Ceylon, Singapore, and

Kuala Lumpur. Everywhere the house is already sold out.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1955]

ORMANDY CREW WOWS FRENCH; GOES TO LISBON

PARIS, May 25.—The Philadelphia Orchestra, under the direction of Eugene Ormandy, left for Lisbon, Portugal, on the next step of its European tour today.

It wound up its triumphal appearances in France with a well-received concert in the Palais de Chaillot last night.

It was the fifth and last concert in France for the Philadelphia Orchestra, which drew record crowds in 2 previous concerts in Paris and 2 other performances in Bordeaux.

Last night's program consisted of Bloch's Concerto Grosso No. 2, Brahms' Symphony No. 2, Chopin's Concerto No. 2 in F minor, and Ravel's Daphne and Chloe, suite No. 2.

The audience applauded soloist Alexander Brailowsky's playing of the Chopin number and was enthusiastic over the orchestra's interpretation of the Brahms symphony.

The orchestra was in France under the auspices of the State Department's Salute to France program. The remainder of its tour includes:

May 26, Lisbon; May 27, Porto; May 28, Lisbon; May 29–30, Madrid; May 31–June 1, Barcelona; June 2–3, Milan; June 7, Geneva; June 9, Lugano; June 11–12, Strasbourg; June 13–14, Vienna; June 15, Berlin; June 16, Stockholm, and June 17–18, Helsinki.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of June 15, 1955]

HEARST AID WARNS ON SOFT WAR WITH RUSS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Frank Conniff, editorial assistant to William Randolph Hearst, Jr., today told a House Appropriations subcommittee that the world conflict with communism had entered a new phase which might be described as the "soft war."

Conniff, representing Hearst, editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers, who is in Europe, warned that the impending competitive coexistence struggle with Red Russia might be more difficult to win than a shooting war.

NEW WEAPONS

"Soft words instead of threats are the new Communist weapons," he said, "and we must be prepared to counter these different tactics. Perhaps even the terminology of recent years has been outmoded.

"But just as the cold war was a continuation of the hot war by other means, the soft war will be a form of a hard war by means other than actual combat.

"The shooting has stopped for a while but the Communists will intensify their drive for world dominance in every field and on every front."

The subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, was told by the witness that Hearst, after his visit to Moscow, where he interviewed the four new top Kremlin leaders, had concluded there should be a more dynamic presentation of the American way of life to the world.

SUGGESTIONS MADE

Conniff, who accompanied the publisher to Russia, listed the following Hearst suggestions:

Creation of a competitive coexistence council to plan strategy and tactics in the forthcoming struggle against world communism which might last into the next generation.

Carrying to the youth of the world the story of democracy and dispelling the picture of America as a sheer materialistic power.

Having our athletes and artists abroad act as good-will ambassadors with more direct availability to students and youth groups, thereby countering the blatant propaganda activities of touring Soviet athletes and artists.

Realization that the current Russian coexistence approach was influenced by domestic difficulties now faced in the Soviet Union, including desperate problems of agriculture and transportation.

TRADE FAIRS

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, another witness, urged the subcommittee to approve the requested $5 million appropriation for the Presidential emergency fund being used to support cultural missions and psychological cold warfare.

He pointed out that in the past 5 years, the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented.

However, THOMPSON continued, the United States awakened in time to what was happening and last year put in a last-minute entry at Damascus with an official exhibit of the film Cinerama. The picture stole the entire show despite a $500,000 Red Russian exhibition, he said. And when the Communists heard this country was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok, they withdrew entirely.

At the recent Frankfort fair, THOMPSON testified, American producers displayed over 300 products commonly used in the average American home.

He said:

"The exhibit, entitled 'America at Home' featured a completely furnished full-scale five-room modern American home with actors impersonating an American family. Brand names that are household words in the United States were displayed.

"These fairs have given us an opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the 'myth' of the American way of life. Communist goods exhibited at trade fairs have often been of inferior quality but how are other peoples to know if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear?"

The Monopoly in the Antibiotic Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have heard complaints from several sources that big business is pushing out small business firms in the field of antibiotic products. Certain major producers of these products are virtually exercising a monopoly in the field. They are charging the public fantastic prices for antibiotics. They are fixing prices, and generally pursue other unfair practices which are seriously hurting the smaller firms.

A good example is the case concerning penicillin, the first really important antibiotic and probably still the most valuable from the clinical standpoint. Penicillin was introduced into this country from England during the early years of World War II. Because of its obvious military importance, it became overnight a joint Government-industry sponsored project. Many millions of dollars of public funds, as well as huge sums from private funds, were poured into the development and the establishment of the necessary facilities for the production of penicillin.

Either through rapid tax write-off or through actual plant construction with an option to purchase the plant later, several large corporations in the pharmaceutical or related fields entered into the production of penicillin. Over a period of years their efforts proved quite rewarding. At one time there were 21 basic manufacturers of penicillin, many of whom later also produced streptomycin, bacitracin, and other antibiotics.

As time progressed and the markets for penicillin became more saturated, the smaller producers were unable to compete with the larger producers. They were gradually being forced out of the market and found themselves in the unenviable position of being dependent on a few large basic manufacturers for their raw materials or dosage forms in order to supply their customers.

To be sure, there was quite a large number of small nonbasic manufacturers of antibiotic products several years ago. They were well-established businesses, but small in scope and in operations. They were dependent on the large basic manufacturers for their supply of raw materials, but as the latter began to exercise a greater degree of monopoly the smaller firms were driven out of the field.

Practically all of these small firms are by now out of business, with the exception of the Bio-Ramo Drug Co., Inc., of Baltimore, Md., which also may be forced to close down soon because of these unfair competitive practices. This firm has always been fair in its dealings with the supplier as well as the consumer, it has a fine business record and was conducted on a sound financial basis.

Mr. Frank R. Cusumano is the head of the Bio-Ramo Drug Co. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut, where he received a Ph. D. degree in pharmacy in 1929. For nearly 10 years he represented the E. R. Squibb Co., in the New York metropolitan area as professional service representative. He came to Baltimore in 1940 to represent in a similar capacity the Hoffman-LaRoche Drug Co.

In 1945 Mr. Cusumano established the Bio-Ramo Drug Co., manufacturing drug products and pharmaceuticals. Several years later he became interested in antibiotics. He developed three preparations which were accepted by the American Medical Association as pioneers in the oral administration of vitamin B–12, and also obtained a patent on impregnated gauze pads for surgical use with antibiotics.

Today the Bio-Ramo Drug Co. is the largest nonbasic manufacturer of penicillin products. The firm has a research staff of trained experts and pharmacists. It is serving hospital purchasing agencies which are distributing antibiotic products to more than 500 hospitals affiliated with these purchasing agencies. In other words, it is not a fly-by-night company, but one that has built up a large clientele which depends on its services.

Mr. Speaker, I cite the case of the above-named firm to show what is going on in the antibiotic field and how the whole field is gradually falling into the hands of a few people. Their practices in driving out competition and pushing out the small firms are not only unfair and ruthless, but they are also un-American.

I feel that something concrete should be done in this instance, whether through legislation or investigation. I have assembled a good deal of material on the subject, and I intend to present it to the appropriate authorities to conduct a full-scale investigation of these evil practices. Meanwhile, I want to call the matter to the attention of Congress.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Proposes Congressional Investigation of Railroad Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

REPRESENTATIVE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., PROPOSES CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF RAILROAD INDUSTRY

At the request of Richard W. Smith, international vice president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., which represents 90 percent of the Nation's railroad dining car workers, I have recently surveyed employment conditions in the railroad industry. As a result of this survey, I am convinced that these conditions warrant a full-scale congressional investigation of the railroad companies, with a view to amending the Railway Labor Act in order to insure that we have suitable legislation on the statute books to limit employee workloads.

Sufficient evidence already exists to indicate that these increased workloads are now, and have been for some time, endangering the health and safety of railroad employees as well as passengers.

Mr. Smith, who is also secretary-treasurer of the Joint Council of Dining Car Employees, the railroad division of the Hotel and Restaurant Union, advises me that the railroads have severely cut train crews in the dining cars in line with their recent economy and modernization policies. These curtailments have been so drastic as to lower the morale and the health of the dining-car crews to the extent that their very lives are endangered. Mr. Smith cited one example wherein a so-called buffet-car attendant, the sole employee in a dining-luncheon car consisting of 32 seats, is not only expected to serve the passengers but also to prepare hot meals. I am advised that similar conditions obtain in dining car departments on many major railroad lines.

The railroads, on the other hand, argue that the dining cars must pay their own way. This argument, according to Mr. Smith and other high-ranking labor officials, is fallacious because, technically speaking, apart from the ticket sellers, no other employee or department on the railroad takes in any money at all to directly cover his own wages and expenses.

I am equally disturbed by the unequivocal fact that, although the various fair employment practice (FEPC) laws have struggled valiantly with the problem of discrimination against Negro employees, additional legislation is necessary to insure that jobs in all departments and divisions of the railroads are open to colored employees. The policy of most railroad companies is such that jobs outside the departments traditionally filled by Negroes are closed to Negroes with as much as 20 and 30 years of tenure on the same line.

With the increased workloads and severe curtailment of dining-car crews, unless other branches of the railroad industry are opened to colored employees, the displaced dining-car workers, despite their long years of faithful service, will find themselves unemployed.

Mr. Smith has informed me that an election is presently under way among the dining-car employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad. These employees are now represented by the Dining Car and Railroad Food Workers Union, a small, independent organization. Local 858 of the A. F. of L. is seeking to represent the Pennsylvania dining-car workers and the National Labor Mediation Board is conducting an election beginning on July 11.

The A. F. of L.'s Hotel and Restaurant and Bartenders International Union was motivated to initiate and participate in the current election because of the marked discontent among the Pennsylvania employees. Underlying this discontent are many of the abuses which I seek to correct by a thorough investigation and subsequent legislation.

Without question, the best interests of the dining-car employees involved will be served most by effective representation, and by fair, just, up-to-date legislation, which requires a revamping of the obsolete Railway Labor Act. I am confident that Congress will back up this contention after a full-fledged investigation, which I shall demand in the immediate future.

Report: Hearings on Alleged Coercive and Discriminatory Practices by Oil Company Suppliers Against Retail Gasoline Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives has completed its interim report for presentation to the full committee.

This report deals with the subcommittee's hearings on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices by oil company suppliers against retail gasoline operators. The full report covers so many pages that the subcommittee has prepared and released to the press the conclusions of the subcommittee and its recommendations.

I believe that this summary will be of interest to many of my colleagues in the House.

I would also like to take this opportunity, as chairman of the subcommittee, to express to my fellow committee members, the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois, my appreciation for their full cooperation in striving to achieve an objective and constructive report on a highly controversial matter. The fact that the subcommittee is unanimous is due entirely to the splendid spirit of cooperation among all of the members.

The matters follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S HEARINGS OF ALLEGED COERCIVE AND DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES BY OIL COMPANY SUPPLIERS AGAINST RETAIL GASOLINE OPERATORS

Subcommittee No. 5 consisting of the Honorable TOM STEED, the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, and myself as chairman have unanimously reached the following conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the testimony received in our hearings:

1. A substantial proportion of all sales of refined gasoline of major oil companies is made through retail outlets where the dealer has a short-term lease from the oil company supplier, usually for 1 year. The importance and the proportion of the total retail market serviced by such short-term lessee dealers has been increasing.

2. The dealer operating his station under a short-term lease with the oil company supplier frequently is not in fact independent and is subject to control by the oil company supplier. The freedom of choice of the dealer with respect to the manner in which he operates his station is circumscribed by the economic power of his oil company supplier, whether or not such power is specifically exercised against him.[1]

3. The short-term leases and sales practices of major oil companies in relation to sponsored products have had the effect of operating against a dealer's freedom of choice in using or dealing in competitive products, and operate to substantially lessen competition and tend to eliminate price competition.

4. Price Discrimination: Oil company suppliers, for the avowed purpose of having their dealers reduce their retail prices at particular locations to meet the competition of a dealer selling at a lower price, including off-brand gasoline, have held the level of their prices generally while at the same time cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations the lower price has prevailed until the low-price off-brand dealer saw fit to increase his price. This policy or practice has had the immediate effect of fomenting price wars among the retail dealers, and results ultimately in eliminating a substantial amount of price competition between and among both brand and off-brand gasoline. Moreover, short-term lessee dealers in many instances have been coerced or induced by their oil company suppliers into so-called price wars in an effort to secure the business enjoyed by the low-price off-brand dealer. It was also established that on occasion price wars have been started when some dealers engaged in price-cutting activities on their own initiative.

5. The lessee dealer needs immdiate and permanent relief to enable him to fulfill his role as an independent businessman. The present laws, procedures and enforcement

---

[1] Representatives of some of the oil companies testified that such control is necessary in order that the oil companies may protect their substantial investments. Other witnesses testified that many retail stations have been maintained at locations long after economic reasons for the substantial investment therein and their operation had disappeared.

policies are inadequate to achieve effective and permanent relief.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Subcommittee No. 5 recommends:

1. That the antimonopoly laws designed to protect and preserve small and independent business enterprises as necessary to our free and competitive enterprise system be strengthened. In that connection the subcommittee subscribes to the stated purposes and the principles embraced in H. R. 7096, for freedom of choice in trade, and H. R. 11, to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business.

2. That all oil company suppliers consider (a) the conversion of all leases with retail dealers, who have a satisfactory record of operation for a year or longer, into leases with a minimum term of 3 years, as is presently being done by some of the oil companies; (b) granting a new or untried lessee dealer a probationary period of from 6 months to a year after which period he should be tendered a 3-year lease if the company desires to retain him as a lessee; and (c) protecting the dealer during the probationary period by keeping his investment at a minimum and guaranteeing the return of his investment in the event the company does not wish to retain him as a lessee at the conclusion of the probationary period.

3. That the full House Select Small Business Committee continue and expand its study of the problems of the small businessmen in the petroleum and other industries who are dependent upon large suppliers, to determine whether legislation is feasible which would provide for an administrative agency with the duty and authority to order divorcement, divestiture, or other types of relief when certain conditions or standards, to be legislatively set, are found to exist in the petroleum or any other industry.

4. That the record of the hearings be forwarded to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission and that these agencies (a) consider the utilization of existing laws to eliminate the deleterious practices shown in the record and the committee's report, and (b) to report to Congress those areas in which existing laws are not adequate to achieve relief and what further legislation is necessary in order to achieve comprehensive and permanent relief.

Facts Versus Fiction on Surplus Crops From the Colorado River Storage Project—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my reply to the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who on May 19, 1955, attacked the upper Colorado River storage project, I explained that the crops to be grown on project lands are not in surplus and not likely to be. Today I want to discuss his contention that bringing this project land into production would be done at exorbitant cost and then to discuss the economic need for bringing the construction of this project to conclusion as soon as possible.

The gentleman from California continued his denunciation of the irrigation pastures of the Colorado River project by stating:

> Every one of these irrigation crops (projects) would produce hay and pasture. Five thousand dollars an acre is somewhat expensive for grasslands, especially grasslands lying at altitudes up to 7,000 feet, some of which suffer from frost the year round. (RECORD, May 19, p. 6683).

Let us examine this statement in two parts, Mr. Speaker. First, the higher altitude in the upper basin States does provide for a shorter growing season than that which exists at lower altitudes. However, this does not mean irrigated agriculture in the upper basin States is not economically sound and desirable.

There are several factors apparently unknown to the gentleman from southern California which bear out the truthfulness of this statement:

First. The irrigated land in the upper basin States requires less water than that at lower altitudes due to the shorter growing season itself.

Second. Experiment station research studies in this area indicate that with short growing seasons, an adequate water supply reduces the period required for plant maturity with two major results:

(a) Better quality crops produced, and

(b) Larger yields per acre.

In a few words, additional supplemental water means better utilization of limited agricultural resources.

Second, it is incomprehensible to me how anyone can examine the testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation before the Senate and House Interior Committees with respect to the estimated costs of the Colorado River storage project and come to the conclusion that the per acre cost to the Government will be $5,000. This is sheer nonsense.

On Friday, June 17, 1955, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, placed in the RECORD a statement in answer to a distorted article, which is written by Raymond Moley, full of half truths. Mr. Moley also made the same nonsensical statement that "the hidden cost would be $5,000 per acre." Well, here are the costs per acre by participating projects as authorized by S. 500, which were provided Senator WATKINS by the Bureau of Reclamation. Senator WATKINS said, and I quote:

> The facts: The average cost per acre for the 12 participating irrigation projects conditionally authorized in S. 500 actually is $537. Per-acre costs for the 12 units are as follows: LeBarge, $210; Paonia, $398; Florida, $343; Pine River, $332; Emery County, $400; central Utah $794; Hammond, $627; and Gooseberry, $349. The net average cost per acre for central Utah project is only $620 when project power revenues are subtracted. RECORD, June 17, p. 8619).

Now since the House bill does not authorize outright, as does the Senate version, the proposed storage projects known as Echo Park and Curecanti, it is evident that the per-acre costs of the participating projects authorized by the House version will be even less than those contained in the Senate version.

Mr. Speaker, there is yet another aspect of this surplus problem as it has been related to the upper Colorado River project by its critics. One of these critics, the gentleman from southern California, in his attack upon this project rested his case upon the false assumption that if this project were authorized it would be immediately constructed and additional land brought into production. But as my colleague from Utah, Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON, pointed out in a talk on this subject on May 23, 1955:

> Here again, he (the gentleman from California) made the false assumption that should this project be authorized it would be constructed and its irrigation features would be in production by next year in competition with other acreage growing supported crops. Surely he could not be serious.
>
> The legislation to authorize this project contemplates an orderly development of our entire river basin over a long period of years. * * * Before we can use the water we are entitled to, we must store up replacement water in mountain dams along the Colorado and its tributaries. The construction schedule, the first irrigation project will not reach full development until 1966. Irrigation features of the central Utah project—largest participating project in the legislation—will not be completed until 1983 if construction were to begin a year from now (RECORD, May 23, p. 6826).

This conclusion is amply supported by the experts of the United States Department of Agriculture who contend, based upon the rate of population increase, the trend in dietary habits, and the shift from the production of cereal crops to high-protein foods, that it is reasonable to expect that by 1962 production will be brought back into line with demand. This was the essence of the testimony given by Dr. Byron Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the USDA, on February 1, 1955, to the House Appropriations Committee. Specifically Dr. Shaw said:

> It would take until about 1962 to bring production into balance with demand. (Hearing, Agriculture Department appropriations 1956, pt. II, p. 449.)

But the following questions, I realize do still remain: What evidence does Dr. Shaw base his statement upon? How will our present surpluses actually be liquidated? Is it desirable to increase the production of livestock and feed and forage crops for livestock—the primary agricultural commodities which now are produced and which will continue to be produced in the upper Colorado basin States?

Dr. Shaw answered these questions in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last February. He said:

> In considering what the shifts ought to be and what possibilities we would have of making shifts that may be profitable to farmers, I think the greatest single factor that has an influence on the use of substantial acres of land is the meat consumption of the United States population.
>
> Now, if we were to have per capita consumption at the average of the last 3 years, or the 151 pounds, by 1962 it would require 27 billion pounds of red meat. That is roughly 19 percent more than was actually consumed in 1954. This would require

> about 3½ million more cattle, about 2 million more sheep, and about 9 million more hogs to supply the increased meat that would be needed by 1962.
>
> If you take the upper level or 156 pounds of red meat per capita, you would have to add still another 3½ million head of cattle, another million sheep and another million hogs to provide for the needs in 1962.
>
> The feed for that livestock would require 20 million acres more to produce the feed based on the 151 pounds per capita consumption (1952 to 1954 average) over the land than was used in 1953.
>
> In other words, it would require 10 million more acres of feed grains than was used in 1953 and 10 million more acres of hay and pasture than we used in 1953. This is a 3 million acre smaller increase in feed grains than actually took place between 1953 and 1954. There was no shift to hay and pasture going from 1953 to 1954. It would require a 10 million acre shift in that direction by 1962.
>
> If we were to consume 156 pounds of red meat, which was the consumption in 1954, it would require in 1962 some 35 million acres more land to grow feed than was used in 1953.
>
> That again would provide opportunity for the use of the 17 million acres that were used for growing wheat and cotton in 1953 that would not be needed in 1962. But it would indicate a deficit this time of roughly 18 million acres. In other words, the small difference in meat consumption—from 151 pounds per capita, which was the average 1952 to 1954, to 156 pounds which was the average per capita consumption in 1954—would take an extra 15 million acres of feed to provide that meat. (Hearings, Agriculture Department Appropriations, 1956 pt. II, pp. 447–451.)

In a few words then, according to Dr. Shaw, livestock production must be doubled on land in production at the present time if the increasing consumer demand is to be satisfied. The farmers and ranchers of the four upper Basin States can help supply much of this needed increase in livestock production, but this will require additional forage and feed crops as well as pasture to supplement the range used in grazing livestock as President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission pointed out in 1950. The production of much needed forage pasture requires additional water. This in turn necessitates the construction of the proposed participating and storage projects, so that the last major water reserve, the Colorado River, can be developed.

As Senator WATKINS pointed out in his talk on Friday, June 17, 1955, three major and independent studies on population and food supply indicate that by 1975, if the present birth rate continues, the population of the United States will be around "190 to 205 million people and that to provide food and fiber even at present dietary standards will require that approximately 100 million acres of additional cropland will be needed"—RECORD, June 17, 1955, page 8618.

How can this 100 million acres be provided? The President's Water Resources Policy Commission concluded in 1950 that it couldn't actually be met from domestic sources. Even when the reduced need of cropland for horses and mules, as well as increased maximum efficiency on present lands under cultivation and reclaimed lands are taken into consideration, this country will probably be some 24 million acres short of that required to supply our anticipated needs. To the extent that we fail to develop our potential production, this added deficiency will also have to be met by importation.

But we do have, as the President's Commission pointed out, the potential resources to bring into production the equivalent of 76 million acres as follows:

Source:	*Acres*
1. Acre equivalent of ordinary land reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection	21,000,000
2. Newly irrigated land equivalent (9 million acres of land in the humid areas will produce about as much as 6 million under cultivation)	9,000,000
3. Increased productivity on present lands under cultivation (liberally assuming that productivity would increase 18 percent by 1975 over the low period 1945–49)	46,000,000
Total available	76,000,000

(A Water Policy for the American People, vol. 1, pp. 17, 160, 65.)

In summary, it is evident:

First. By the time the Colorado River storage project is completed there will be no surplus agricultural commodities problem as far as we can now determine.

Second. Instead of agricultural production from lands supplied water from the Colorado River adding to a surplus, these products will be in great demand.

Third. Since by 1975 our ability to supply our food and fiber requirements is questionable, concern for the health and welfare of our citizens requires that reclamation projects having the economic feasibility of that which the Colorado River storage project has, must be now rushed to completion.

Every Member of Congress should keep these facts firmly in mind as we approach a vote on the upper Colorado River storage project. The economic justification of this project was, in my opinion, very expertly and concisely summed up by Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of streams for Utah, in his testimony on March 15, 1955, before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Dr. Clyde, it may interest you to know, was for 10 years dean of the School of Engineering at Utah State Agricultural College and more recently the Chief of the Division of Irrigation Research of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. In his statement to the House Interior Committee on that occasion he observed that—

> This country has become great because it has great natural resources, but also because its people looked forward. They did not wait for crises to develop. They anticipated them and prepared for them. We must anticipate our agricultural needs and prepare for them. The future needs are evident; the way of meeting them is clear. Begin now to develop the means of production of food and fiber to meet our needs 25 years from now.
>
> This is the reason why * * * the Colorado River storage project, and participating projects, a basinwide development which will require at least 25 years to bring into full production the lands in the initial phase, should be authorized and construction started as soon as possible. It is a self-liquidating project and an investment in the Nation's future.

That is good advice. Let us anticipate our agricultural needs and take steps to meet them. We must face up to the problem which the President's Water Resources Policy Commission expertly described for us 5 years ago.

This, Mr. Speaker, concludes my reply to the gentleman from southern California. But tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss the real reason why Mr. HOLIFIELD, and California in general, opposes the construction of the Colorado River storage project.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it will not be possible for me to be present tomorrow when the House will consider the minimum-wage bill, due to the fact that I am leaving for Paris as a member of the congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

On the eve of my departure I cannot let the opportunity go by without briefly expressing my views and support of minimum-wage legislation.

I had hoped that the committee would report out a bill providing for $1.25 minimum wage per hour, but it limited the wage floor to $1 per hour. President Eisenhower's proposal to increase the present minimum from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour is unrealistic. It does not go far enough and, in my opinion, is not economic justice to millions of people who are in the lowest income group. At the rate of a 40-hour week, a 90 cents minimum wage will provide a family with an income of only $36 per week.

These are substandard wages which we should not tolerate in a country like ours. A realistic floor beneath wages would be an important factor in preventing industrial dislocation and exploitation of low-income workers. It would also help increase purchasing power, improve living standards, and be a stabilizing factor in our economy. A higher minimum wage will be beneficial to some 10 million low-paid workers and their families for whom it is vital to keep pace with the increase in the cost of living during the past 5 years.

The existence of substandard wages hurts everybody. It affects not only the low-income families, but it hurts the business people, the manufacturers, and the farmers because millions of consumers cannot afford to purchase the goods they produce. A higher minimum wage is a means for assuring continuation of America's economic prosperity. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the $1 minimum-wage proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram signed by four outstanding American labor leaders, heads of AFL and CIO unions, whose memberships reach into the hundreds of thousands. I have the greatest respect for their views on the subject. I am pleased to insert the text of the telegram into the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 13, 1955.*

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand House of Representatives will consider the minimum wage bill on Friday, July 15. As spokesman for the four undersigned unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations especially interested in achieving a fair and realistic minimum wage because it directly affects many employees in our industries, we would like to urge you as strongly as possible to be present in the House at that time and to support in every way you can the passage of a bill that will raise the minimum wage to at least $1 an hour. It is most important that any attempt, under any guise, to substitute a 90-cent minimum for the $1 minimum be defeated. We urge you, therefore, to oppose and to vote against all such proposals. Congress has the opportunity now to raise the minimum wage to a more realistic level. It is high time that this be done, and we trust that this objective will have your full support when the House considers the minimum wage bill on Friday.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.
DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL.
EMIL RIEVE,
President, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.
ALEX ROSE,
President, United Hatters Cap and Millinery Workers Union, AFL.

Building the Nation's Health from the Ground Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the subject "Building the Nation's Health From the Ground Up," which I delivered before the Alabama Association of County Agricultural Agents, at Birmingham, on Friday evening, June 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING THE NATION'S HEALTH FROM THE GROUND UP

(Address by Hon. LISTER HILL, Senator from Alabama, before the Alabama Association of County Agricultural Agents, Birmingham, June 24, 1955)

Thomas Jefferson declared that man is happiest who lives closest to the soil. His truth becomes self-evident when we observe the goodwill among you men of the soil gathered here tonight—you who have dedicated yourselves to the care of the good earth—to respecting her, to conserving and enriching her, that she might in turn give forth her bounty for the health, the strength, the happiness and the wellbeing of our people.

The Bible teaches us that it is from the good earth that all life springs. Civilization had its beginning when man first learned to cultivate the soil. The world is littered with the relics of civilizations that perished because man abused the land and unknowingly destroyed her lifegiving qualities. We see nations today pursuing the same road—leading to the same inevitable end. The menace of Red China's aggression and of the other danger spots of Asia and the Middle East are the results of generations of soil exhaustion—of peoples whose soils will scarcely support them. As you gathered here tonight so well know, the destruction of the soil breeds poverty and its handmaiden—disease.

It is about disease that I want to talk with you tonight—soil disease, plant disease, animal disease, human disease.

Basic to the health of all living things is the health of our soil.

Basic to the strength and prosperity of our country is the strength and prosperity of agriculture.

These truths were recognized by our Founding Fathers when the Continental Congress in the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 set aside public lands for the establishment of schools of agriculture and mechanic arts. Their importance gained further recognition in the Morrill Act of 1862 which devoted more of our public lands for the establishment and support of our land grant colleges for agricultural training and agricultural research, such as Auburn and Alabama A. and M. at Normal. Through the years we have built upon these foundations and passed law after law—to further strengthen and endow our institutions for agriculture training and research and to bring their benefits to the farmers and to all our people. To this end, it was my pleasure for years to work shoulder to shoulder with my late distinguished colleague, that great farm champion, John H. Bankhead.

We know that the first job of agriculture, and of agricultural research, is to produce enough food and fiber for everybody.

Abundant food supplies have become one of the hallmarks of life in America. This abundance we owe to the farmers of America and to our great advances in science and technology to which you men gathered here have contributed so much.

Agricultural research is also making vital contributions to the health of our people. Agricultural research and medical research are so interrelated—one so dependent upon the other—that they have become comrades-in-arms in the common battle against disease. As one who serves on the committees of the Senate that are responsible for matters of agricultural research and of medical research, I can tell you the two are bound together like Siamese twins. Medical research discoveries have conquered diseases of the soil, of plants and of animals. Agricultural research discoveries have protected the health and saved the lives of millions of our people.

There is no better example of the way in which agricultural research has served the health needs of our people than the story of penicillin. The story was recalled for us a few days ago by the distinguished co-discoverer of penicillin, Sir Howard Florey, the eminent scientist of Oxford University in England. Dr. Florey, visiting the United States, was my guest at a luncheon attended by a number of my colleagues on the Agriculture and Health Appropriation Committees of the Senate and House, who like myself are deeply interested in agricultural and medical research.

Dr. Florey told us how he brought penicillin to America in 1942, in the early days of the war. Four years of research with the antibiotic at Oxford had convinced him of the promise it held for fighting disease and for treating the mass casualties of the war. But with the limited facilities of his laboratory, only a tiny amount could be produced.

In fact, Dr. Florey had struggled 3 years with soil molds to produce less than one teaspoonful of penicillin. This tiny amount was given to an Englishman dying with a blood infection. The sick man's fever dropped rapidly and he seemed to be getting well. But the penicillin ran out. The infection returned and the patient died.

In 1942 England was fighting for her life. There wasn't the slightest chance that the laboratories at Oxford could be expanded. And so, Dr. Florey came to the United States to see if he could interest someone in this country in penicillin. A friend in New York suggested that he talk with scientists in the Department of Agriculture, who directed him to the Department's regional research laboratory in Peoria, Ill. There agricultural scientists found a way to increase the yield of penicillin so it could be produced on a commercial scale. They did it by feeding the mold on a new diet composed of agricultural products—corn steeping liquor, a by-product of the manufacture of cornstarch, and lactose or milk sugar.

Penicillin production throughout the world today is based largely on the methods worked out in the Peoria agricultural laboratory. Thanks to these methods, the cost of penicillin for an ordinary injection has dropped from some $35 to less than 20 cents. Drug manufacturers in this country are now producing about 20 tons of penicillin a month.

Dr. Florey's experience points up—in a very dramatic way—the contribution of agricultural research to human health. Without the research facilities that the Department of Agriculture made available to Dr. Florey, we could not have broken—as we did—all previous recovery records among battle wounded. Common use of the wonder drug might still be a dream.

The production of penicillin has been worth all the money we have spent on agricultural research since the beginning of our Government.

And along with penicillin has come a host of other powerful antibiotics derived from soil organisms.

The soil of New Jersey gave us streptomycin—our first effective weapon against the deadly and dreaded killer, tuberculosis, with which man and animals infect each other.

From a sample of soil in Caracas, Venezuela, came chloromycetin. Before its discovery, a victim of typhoid fever would lie in bed for weeks and months at a time, his family doctor helpless to aid him, and many victims died.

A sample of soil from a Missouri grain field gave birth to aureomycin. To its discovery we owe our most effective weapon against cholera and brucellosis. Our livestock production in this country today has reached its present height because this great drug has freed animals of several killing diseases.

Terramycin, derived from a pinch of Indiana soil, conquers a wide range of infections.

The list could be extended almost endlessly.

Stimulated by our achievements, the search for new and better antibiotics is going on at a rapid rate today. Nobody knows how many species of these disease-killing soil organisms exist. Soil from all parts of the world is being examined in the expectation that each variety will yield some antibiotic that is unique unto itself. Last year 16 drug-manufacturing companies spent more than $20 million in soil-screening programs, searching for priceless new antibiotics.

Feeds fortified with antibiotics have brought about a revolution in livestock and poultry production. Very small supplements of antibiotic—a third of an ounce to a ton of feed—give a tremendous lift to the growth of animals, with consequent savings and profits to our farmers.

Many examples could be cited. With the antibiotics we know that a 200-pound hog can be readied for the market on 40 pounds less feed. The farmers of America are today saving 2 million tons of feed a year in the production of hogs. This is the equivalent of 100,000 boxcar loads.

Antibiotic feed supplements have had equally spectacular effects on poultry. Before the introduction of antibiotics, it took 12 to 14 weeks to produce a broiler weighing 3 to 3½ pounds, and poultrymen obtained only 3 crops a year. Thanks to antibiotic supplements, they can put a broiler on the market in 9 weeks, giving poultrymen 4 and more crops a year. Furthermore, they can get their birds to market on 9 pounds of feed each instead of 10, and with a considerable saving in labor, overhead, and losses from disease. Likewise, turkey raisers can get their turkeys ready for market several weeks sooner at a saving of 3 to 4 pounds of feed for each week saved.

And now we are learning to apply antibiotics to plants. The recent development of a spray combination of streptomycin and terramycin has been used against a wide range of bacterial plant diseases and has been found to increase sharply the yield of crops and the size of vegetables and fruits.

Think what it means to our potato growers of Baldwin County to be able to increase their potato yields up to 72 bushels per acre by antibiotic treatment of their plants.

We see there is a continuing, renewing cycle of benefits, with the soil as the basic source. The soil produces the antibiotics. The antibiotics make men healthier. Healthier men use the antibiotics to increase Nature's yield.

The wonder drugs mean health and wealth for our people and stress once more our dependence on the soil and agricultural research for health, strength, and prosperity.

But the antibiotics are by no means all that agricultural and medical research have taught us about the strong influence the soil exerts upon the health of people, plants, and animals.

In Deaf Smith County, Tex., the people have practically no tooth decay. This is due, we are told, to the abundance of certain minerals in the soil of that section.

We have long known there is a direct link between goiter and a deficiency of iron in the soil. Today, scientists and doctors associate many other diseases with soil deficiencies—night blindness, anemia, heart disease, and pellagra—to mention only a few.

We know there is a direct relationship between soils and animal nutrition. Animals get their food from plants grown on soils. If these soils are deficient the animals suffer.

Missouri didn't just happen to be a mule-raising State. Farmers there are able to raise big, tough mules because of certain minerals in the soil of Missouri.

Scientists are constantly expanding their knowledge of the relation of soils to plant and animal and human nutrition. A dramatic discovery was made just a few days ago as a result of studies of the soils near Blairsville over in our neighboring State of Georgia. Researchers of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Georgia Experiment Stations found that turnip greens grown there produce vitamin B12, the important growth factor found in milk. This is the first time researchers have established that this vitamin can be formed in plants as well as in animals.

Laboratory rats fed on greens from Blairsville were found to grow much larger and faster than those fed on greens of the same variety grown at Experiment, Ga. Since this discovery, the scientists have observed that cattle do better in the Blairsville area than in other sections of the State.

This finding is expected to lead to new methods of treating our soils—to making plants and animals more nutritious, to reducing costs and raising profits for our farmers, to improving the health and strength of our people.

Agricultural research has opened the way to sharp increases in crop yields, in milk per cow, and in eggs per hen.

Development of grains resistant to rust has added an estimated $500 million a year to farm income.

Cotton insect control methods developed by Auburn's own agricultural experiment station are giving our Alabama cotton farmers protection against cotton losses ranging as high as $50 million a year.

Methods for chemical treatment of seed developed at Auburn are cutting deeply into seed and crop losses.

The emergence of poultry as Alabama's No. 2 crop symbolizes the series of lightning-like changes that have altered the character of our agriculture in recent years.

Beef and dairy cattle, once near-monopolies of the West, the Lake Region, and the North, have become mainstays of farm production in Alabama and throughout the South. Hog raising, originally pretty much a sideline, and a convenient way of converting farm garbage into extra cash, has now become a scientifically managed enterprise in its own right.

Nothing better demonstrates the importance which medical science places on agricultural research than the grants which the National Institutes of Health and the United States Public Health Service are making to Auburn for such projects as research on the relationship of nutrition to cancer, research on the dietary aspects of muscular dystrophy, research on hookworm, and research relating to the insecticide control of blood-sucking ectoparasites.

I am happy to report to you that we have just won our fight in Congress to increase greatly the funds for medical research that the vital work of our agricultural-medical research team may go forward and be expanded.

It is with particular pleasure that I report to you that the funds which we voted for agricultural research and for extension work for the fiscal year beginning next Friday are the largest in the history of the programs—raising Alabama's share of research funds to well over a million dollars and her share of funds for extension work to well over $1,600,000.

When we consider all that has been done—all that is being done—all that remains to be done—does it surprise you that I have long named the soil and agricultural research as 1 of our 6 pillars of health?

The other five pillars are: Doctors, dentists, nurses and medical technicians; hospitals, health centers, and other health facilities; preventive medicine; medical research; and education—each vital to every one of us and to the strength and well-being of our country. None can be neglected if we are to wage effectively the total war we are waging against disease, if we are to build the health of our people.

I have long sponsored legislation to strengthen our pillars of health. Our Hill-Burton Hospital Act has, for example, greatly strengthened Alabama's hospital and health resources. Under the act we have built some 62 new hospitals and health facilities in rural and other areas of the State. We know what it means to our farmers and all our people to have hospitals when they need them. But we do not overlook the tremendous role that agricultural research and the application of its discoveries is making in keeping people healthy so they will not need to go to hospitals.

Our gains in health may be measured by the fact that in the last 12 years we have lengthened the life span of the average American by over 6 years.

This achievement is a tribute to the scientists of American agriculture, to the educators of American agriculture, in the high schools and colleges, to you men of the extension service, to the women of the home agent program, and to the men and women in our other great agricultural agencies, as well as to our health personnel and services, and our medical research programs.

You of the Alabama Association of Agricultural Agents are the educational extension arm of our agricultural research agencies. As we look to the future new and difficult problems challenge us. It is upon your shoulders that the responsibility will rest for carrying knowledge of our agricultural research developments and our technological advancements to our farmers, that their benefits may continue to be enjoyed by them and by all our people.

May I say here that practically all Government employees have had an increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living, and I strongly feel that there should be an increase for our agricultural agents and extension workers. I shall continue to work and to do my best for such an increase.

We know that the mounting demands of our rapidly increasing population for food and fiber will not be met by bringing new land into cultivation and that we must apply new knowledge for increased production on the land we now cultivate.

We will have to draw in ever-increasing measure upon our greatest asset, the human mind and its ability to meet difficult situations by imaginative new approaches.

Our first and immediate concern must be to make certain that we do not lose the gains that we have made, that the tools which you and our farmers must have for protecting the soil and for doing the job are not weakened or destroyed. We must preserve our great farm programs and build upon them: Soil conservation, price supports, agricultural research and extension work, TVA, REA, rural telephones, vocational education, and all the rest. As co-author of our Vocational Education Act and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Vocational Education appropriations, I am happy to report to you we have just secured the largest appropriation in the history of vocational education to bring sharply increased funds to Alabama for training in vocational agriculture, home economics, and the other training which the act provides.

The terrible losses from 4 years of drought and the severe freeze this year remind us that our highly diversified, mechanized agriculture of today represents the largest investment of capital in the history of farming. Each crop year in the practice of scientific agriculture involves, as we know, a tremendous outlay of money by our farmers and usually the incurring of large financial obligations by the farmers for seed, fertilizer, pesticides, farm machinery, tractor fuel, livestock, electric bills, telephone bills, labor costs and other expenses.

Scientists tell us that the drought which has moved up from the Southwest over much of the country is among the eight most severe droughts in centuries. Water levels over much of the Nation are now at a record low. We must employ new ways of conserving and replenishing this vital resource—water.

With the passage of our Water Facilities Act, irrigation is now available to our farmers in Alabama. We know that it will take research and education to show our farmers how to apply its benefits wisely and soundly. Auburn and our experiment stations are indeed to be congratulated on the pioneering work which they have done in the South in the possibilities for irrigation and the application of supplemental water.

Our losses from drought and freeze and the danger of losses from them in the future and the great investment of capital in irrigation facilities add new urgency to the need for more adequate farm credit and for strengthening and extending crop insurance for the protection of every farmer. I am sponsoring legislation for these purposes.

Agriculture's possibilities for the future are limited only by our vision and our determination. As we move forward, meeting the challenges of each day, month, and year, I have faith that your splendid record of the past will be excelled only by your contributions in the future to the health and prosperity of the farmers of Alabama, to the health and prosperity of the people of America, and to the strength and security of our country.

A 10-Year Moratorium on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I have issued on the eve of my departure for Paris to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference as a member of the United States congressional delegation. In it I am proposing the idea of a 10-year moratorium on war. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO ON A 10-YEAR MORATORIUM ON WAR

I am grateful to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for appointing me a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris. I hope that the information acquired abroad and the conversations we shall have with the various heads of the NATO governments will be helpful in the development of suitable plans for maintaining peace and security.

When I was elected to Congress last November I had pledged to myself to do everything in my power to further the cause of lasting peace and the abolition of war. Since the beginning of this year I have given much thought to this problem and on several occasions I spoke on the subject.

Last January Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in an address in Los Angeles, urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war in concert with the other powers of the world. I then wrote to General MacArthur and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes." He subsequently replied that it would require more than a congressional declaration "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war," and suggested that I pursue the matter in Congress and there seek to obtain action "to implement the basic concept."

On April 18, I delivered an address in Congress on the subject The Search for Peace, in which I developed the need for a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace, and I concluded by offering three proposals for Congress to consider. The proposals were: 1. A resolution along the lines suggested in my letter to General MacArthur expressing the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes; 2. revision of the United Nations Charter by extending to the U. N. authority to halt aggressions, facilitate universal disarmament, enforce international law, etc.; 3. set up a mission for peace to be comprised of elder statesmen who would conduct private discussions leading toward peace.

On May 4 I introduced three resolutions in the House incorporating these proposals, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A few days ago I was gratified to read the dramatic statement by the late Prof. Albert Einstein and seven other eminent scientists appealing to mankind to abolish war or face the risk of extinction by slow torture from radioactive dust and rain. The appeal stressed that neither side can hope for victory in such a war and that there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race. The question raised by the scientists was: "Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war?"

It is my opinion that we cannot have an out-and-out declaration to abolish war without certain conditions. Such a declaration against war is unquestionably a lofty ideal for which civilization has been striving for many years, but it has little meaning unless we can find a means for enforcing it. I would suspect that even if the Soviet Government agreed to a joint declaration in concert with other powers abolishing war, we would have no guaranty that she would abide by this declaration. From past experiences with the Soviet Union, it would be natural for us to suspect that she would use their international agreement as an opportunity for strengthening her position, while at the same time we would be weakening ours by curtailing our military power.

Nevertheless, there is much to this idea of abolishing war. We should not dismiss it lightly. If we could only put it on a practical basis, I am convinced that it would work. Great powers should not refuse to deal with each other on a basis of reason. Only fear, greediness, and a lust for power can lead to such acts of folly. The leaders of great nations in this atomic age can and should rise above the lust and fear. If they are true leaders they must help the peoples of the world rise to a higher level of self-interest—and they will forever be rewarded by the gratitude of all mankind.

Consequently, I am suggesting the United States should invite the principal powers of the world to join in a declaration establishing a moratorium on war for a period of 10 years. In order to give this idea a practical basis, it is necessary that full right of inspection be granted to all parties concerned, or to a central group agreed upon by all parties, to determine whether the moratorium is being carried out. In turn, to help ease world tensions and bring about greater international cooperation, any nation willing to abide by the principles established under the moratorium on war may be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

The question would, naturally, be raised: What would be the effects of such a moratorium? The effects would be almost limitless in their benefits to all mankind:

1. Of primary importance is that a universally agreed moratorium on war would bring peace for at least 10 years to a world which is hungry for peace.

2. It would result in a drastic reduction of the armed forces and the war potentials of all countries.

3. It would make possible universal disarmament for a period of a decade.

4. It would give a breathing spell to all countries, and particularly to the United Nations, during which time better ways of maintaining a lasting peace could be found.

5. During this moratorium period scientists of all countries would be enabled to concentrate on peaceful uses of atomic energy and the use of scientific inventions for the welfare of mankind.

6. Much of the wealth of the world, which ordinarily goes for military purposes, would be saved and used to aid the underdeveloped countries by helping to raise the standard of living and improve health conditions everywhere.

Undoubtedly other beneficial effects would result from a 10-year period free of war and free from the fear of war. It would be a period of great peace of mind to all of humanity. That, in itself, would be of valuable mental, physical, and moral benefit—truly a blessing for all.

Would Russia accept such a moratorium on war? No one can answer this question with utmost certainty. I believe that she would. Why?

After 10 years of the cold war, Moscow appears to be in a difficult economic situation. The food shortage in Russia and its satellites is no longer a secret; industrial development has fallen behind that of the West; the standard of living in the Communist countries is way below that of the non-Communist countries; there are definite signs that the people are becoming restive, impatient, they need a period of relaxation—in other words, a breathing spell—to strengthen their economy and to gain some respite from the constant strain under which they live and work.

All of this is supported by the current indications that Russia desires to find a solution to world problems, that it has become somewhat more conciliatory and that it wants an end to the cold war. If such be the case, then she will grasp at the opportunity of a moratorium on war. Should Russia be willing to accept a moratorium, then there is genuine hope for peace in our time. On the other hand, should Russia reject the idea of a moratorium, she would stand condemned by the whole world as a hypocrite and potential aggressor and not as the white night of peace which she claims to be.

For all these reasons I feel that Russia would be inclined to accept the idea of a moratorium.

It is clear that the entire world would benefit by it. We would be using our resources and manpower not for the preparation of war but for the betterment of mankind and improving the standard of living everywhere. The peaceful uses of atomic energy offer great prospects and hold out great hopes for all mankind. Coupled with the possibility of greater development of natural resources, this should result in a substantial improvement in living standards. New areas could be opened up and old ones rehabilitated—and all that at less than the cost imposed on nations at the present time to build up their armed might in their efforts to attain security.

In this way we could remove the discontent which exists in certain parts of the world and upon which communism thrives. Furthermore, if we would use our resources and our manpower dedicated for this purpose, at the end of the 10-year period not only would the United States itself be a stronger nation but we would also have stronger allies. By the same token, those who are today neutral or undecided peoples would have no room and no desire for communism because of the changed situation and the improvements achieved.

In any event, I believe the moratorium on war is worth a try for all countries, because it would remove all present fears and dangers threatening the peace. Those precious 10 years would be used to prove that in this world of abundance of all material necessities no nation need be in want, nor need any nation resort to war for its survival.

In the event some of us, whether here or abroad, may have forgotten the great losses in human lives and material wealth during

World Wars I and II and the Korean war, let me cite just a few figures. In World War I about 10 million men of all countries lost their lives in battle and another 10 million civilians as a direct result of the war, making a total of 20 million lives sacrificed in vain. In World War II, 17 million were killed in battle and another 17 million civilians died because of the war, or a total of 34 million lives lost. In the Korean war, approximately a million were lost in battle on both sides, and perhaps 1 or 2 million civilians died. In all, a total of 55 to 60 million human lives were sacrificed in those three wars alone.

As for the loss and destruction of material wealth, the figures are truly astronomical. Let me just cite the figures for the United States alone. World War I cost the United States a total of $66 billion, including military expenditures, interest on war debts, veterans' pensions and compensations. In the same manner, World War II has cost us the sum of $450 billion, but interest on war debts, pensions, and other compensations will increase this figure considerably in the years to come. The Korean war thus far has cost us $151 billion, and this, too, will continue to rise as the interest and pensions accumulate over the years. In all, the United States has spent more than $667 billion on these three wars—and we are now nearly $275 billion in the red.

These lives need never be sacrificed again, nor need the wealth of America and of the world be dissipated if in the 10 years during which the moratorium on war would be in effect we could prove that the needs of the world can be satisfied by peaceful means. This is the point we wish to prove to the nations of the world. We want to convince them that war has been not only a waste of manpower but also of material resources. We want to prove to them that by saving our manpower and material wealth we can provide a sufficiency of all human needs and security for all the nations of the world.

I propose to bring this suggestion of a 10-year moratorium on war to the attention of the world's leaders meeting at the summit conference in Geneva for their consideration.

Whose Ox?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the old saying that a man's position depends upon whose ox is gored was strikingly illustrated yesterday on the floor of the House.

The House had up for consideration a supplemental appropriation bill calling for $1.4 billion for the construction of military installations all over the world together with $200 million for other Government agencies.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RABAUT, had charge of the bill.

As happens, the bill called for specific appropriations which some members of the committee wanted, some which they did not favor. The bill was probably the result of a compromise—not logrolling or trading.

In order to transact business, the House has adopted rules of procedure. One is that the legislative committees, but not the Appropriations Committee, shall write legislation, that is, determine where the tax dollars shall be spent and for what purpose. The Appropriations Committee recommends the amount to be spent.

The Rules Committee is the safety valve or gate through which legislation reaches the floor of the House. The Rules Committee is necessary because otherwise a Member might introduce any number of bills, demand consideration, and the House might never get to more important measures favored by the administration or the party in power.

So it has long been the custom to channel proposed legislation through the Rules Committee, subject to the right of the House on petition of a majority—218 Members—to bring a measure before the floor and subject to the call of the committees on Calendar Wednesday, at which time a legislative committee chairman on order of his committee may call up a bill favorably acted on by his committee.

Now the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is an expert parliamentarian, the author of several books published for the guidance of the Congress. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is also familiar with the rules. Both knew that the appropriations bill which they brought before the House contained appropriations which the House had not by previous legislation authorized.

Because the Rules Committee refused to report out a rule waiving all points of order against their bill and because the House overwhelmingly adopted that rule, the two gentlemen evidently became angry and by points of order scuttled their own bill, which called for $1,600,000,000, so that when adopted by the House it carried but some $222 million. Probably most of the stricken items will be restored in the Senate.

The sole apparent purpose was to take a slap at the Rules Committee. The proceedings remind one of the boy who, owning the ball and bat, gets mad, picks them up, and goes home.

The House wasted a day. The Members realized that the Rules Committee is necessary and that on many occasions it saves the Members from being placed in a ridiculous position. The incident again demonstrates that Members are just like other folk.

Perhaps the proceedings further demonstrate that the Appropriations Committee when writing a bill should itself comply with the rules of the House.

Back-Breaking Job: Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles concerning the untiring and overwhelming work brought about by our well-known and admired Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, whose recent illness was a shock to the Nation:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar of July 5, 1955]

BACK-BREAKING JOB: MAJORITY LEADER—JOHNSON'S COLLAPSE DRAWS ATTENTION TO SENATE MANKILLER

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON.—The heart attack which struck down Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) over the weekend focused attention on what has become one of the toughest jobs in Government—that of Senate majority leader.

Outside the Presidency itself, the Senate floor leadership is perhaps the most taxing and vexing post in Washington.

It is said around the Press Galleries that this job either maims men physically or kills them politically. It has done one or the other to many who have held it.

Senator JOHNSON, in the 6 months he has been majority leader, has demonstrated the rare combination of abilities needed for the job.

He has made the Senate run on the track—and on time.

And he has done so as leader of a split party which had only a two-vote margin and a role to play as opposition to a popular Republican administration.

FURTHERMORE

Making the Senate operate on schedule is only one of his accomplishments. He also has:

1. Reunited the members of his own party as they have not been in the Senate for 20 years.

2. Pushed through much of the Eisenhower legislative program without bringing down on his own head more than a smattering of criticism from Democrats.

The chief ingredient in LYNDON JOHNSON'S success formula has been sheer hard work—12 to 15 hours a day.

A close associate told this reporter less than 24 hours before Senator JOHNSON'S heart attack that the Senator was near the edge of sheer exhaustion.

His hope had been to hold on for a few more weeks, then take a long trip with his wife before going back to his Texas ranch to relax.

Senator JOHNSON has not been a flashy floor leader. He has made few speeches, indulged in no tirades. He has rarely held the Senate in night sessions.

But he gets thing done. The bulk of his work is done in the cloakrooms, in conferences in his office and over the telephone.

SPEED-UP

He has prodded chairmen constantly to get key bills out of their committees.

He has worked for days with leaders of both parties to compromise most of the fight out of measures before they reached the floor.

His tact, his knack of getting politicians to settle their differences quietly and his consuming interest in politics have helped him and the Senate.

As a result, controversial bills which normally would have tied up the Senate for weeks have slipped through in a few hours or 2 or 3 days at most.

The results show in the statistics of this session compared with the 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953.

As of June 30, the Senate calendar—which lists all bills reported by committees but not yet acted on—contained only 19 measures. On June 30, 1953, the Senate calendar listed 135 unpassed bills.

On June 1, committees had reported 445 bills and acted on 408. At the same time in 1953, only 366 bills had been reported and 296 disposed of.

LYNDON JOHNSON

It is ironic that LYNDON JOHNSON was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a natural as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about LYNDON JOHNSON.

An urbane, wise, and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. JOHNSON has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the loyal opposition. To the contrary, there is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. JOHNSON's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator JOHNSON will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 18, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, by thronging duties pressed we come seeking light upon our darkened way, for we grope with uncertain steps amid the encircling gloom; but we come knowing that in Thee is no darkness at all, the fog which envelops us arises from the earth and seeps up from man's hatred and his denials of human brotherhood. Above it all the sun is shining, the clouds are lies; the blue sky is the truth.

With chastened spirits we pray at the beginning of this momentous week for all the world that the leaders of the nations, as they sit at the summit, may catch a breathtaking view of a fair world so different from the one in which multitudes now huddle in fear, a world of peace and plenty and joy and durable satisfactions for all peoples. Endue with wisdom and understanding, and with due caution as the trustees of freedom, those who, speaking for freemen everywhere, and for those who yearn to be free, face those who have made half the world enslaved. Above all other voices at the Geneva summit may there be heard the awesome voice of the Father of all men: "I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse. Choose life." We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 14, 1955:

S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato); and

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air-pollution control.

On July 15, 1955:

S. 609. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons;

S. 1318. An act to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water-supply feature of that reservoir.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 219)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 633, for the relief of certain alien sheepherders.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1617) to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 127) relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 127) relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and United Kingdom are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KEFAUVER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet at 2 o'clock during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment there will be the regular morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriations, Department of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 68)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $8,700,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, District of Columbia Auditorium Commission (S. Doc. No. 69)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, in the amount of $25,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Exchange of Certain Land at Beltsville, Md.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Paperwork Management

A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, its task force report (pt. II) on the Nation's Paperwork for the Government an Experiment, dated June 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Real Property Management

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its task force on real property management (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Granting Permanent Adjustment of Status of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of certain aliens, with the request that their cases be re-examined with a view to the permanent adjustment of their status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Public Health Service Act

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Transportation of Mail by Highway Post Office Service

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmiting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the transportation of mail by Highway Post Office Service and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Purchase of Blanket or Schedule Bonds

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of State to purchase blanket or schedule bonds and pay bond premiums for employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Comimttee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Training School and Sector Headquarters for Immigration Border Patrol

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and for sector headquarters for the Immigration Border Patrol, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Memorial 421

"Memorial to Congress, the President of the United States, and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations urging that the Federal Soil Conservation Service, the Federal soil-conservation program, and the organization, administration, and operations of said Service and program not be abolished, abridged, amended, altered, or in any way changed, but rather that they be allowed to remain and continue to operate as they now exist and operate as has been their custom in the recent past

"Whereas it appears that the abolition, alteration, abridgement, amendment, or change in organization, administration, procedures, powers, duties, or operations of the Federal Soil Conservation Service or the Federal soil conservation program or both, is imminent; and

"Whereas the Federal soil-conservation program as carried on by and under the Federal Soil Conservation Service and the organization, administration, procedures, powers, duties, and operations thereof, has produced bountiful blessings and benefits, which blessings and benefits have accrued to, achieved, and accomplished, the immeasurable and inestimable edification and enrichment of this Nation through conservation of its precious natural resources, the people of this Nation through richer lands, better crops and lower consumer costs made possible by sound conservation practices of the program, and to the farmers of this Nation and of Florida through better, more practical, and more reasonable farming practices and procedures; and

"Whereas the several States possess neither the funds, the administrative machinery, the physical facilities, the valuable experience, nor the trained technicians to adequately carry on the service now performed by the Federal Soil Conservation Service under the Federal soil-conservation program; and

"Whereas to make such changes in the Service and program as are presently proposed would seriously hinder, interfere with, retard, impair, or possibly even destroy our national soil-conservation program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, are hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to take all possible appropriate action to insure that the Federal soil-conservation program and the Federal Soil Conservation Service, and the organization, administration, operations, and procedures thereof are not abridged, altered, abolished, or in any way changed, and further to take any and all actions which may be calculated to make doubly certain that the said service and program shall continue as it now is and operates and that the present law on the subject shall not be amended or changed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the Federal Congress from the State of Florida."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the United Irish Counties Association of New York, Inc., signed by Sean P. Keating, public relations chairman, relating to the partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the Port of Portland, Oreg., favoring the enactment of H. R. 5789 to expedite the construction of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTER:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Civilian Aviation Board to open the great circle route to the airlines of this Nation

"Whereas Pan American World Airlines pioneered the great circle route to the Orient prior to World War II; and

"Whereas it is to the benefit of the commerce and industry of the State of Michigan that the United States opens this route on a competitive basis established on free enterprise; and

"Whereas foreign airlines, including Japanese, Canadian, and Danish airlines, are flying the short northern track to the Orient or are prepared to establish such service to the detriment of the interests of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas Pan American Airlines is now restricted to a route via San Francisco, Honolulu, and Wake Island, which is 1,897 miles longer than the route this company originated; and

"Whereas the use of the great circle route will save the taxpayers of the United States $220,000 a year per weekly round trip; and

"Whereas the application of Pan American World Airlines for permission to fly the short route is now before the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate,* That the members of the Michigan Senate respectfully request the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States and the Civilian Aviation Board, to open the great circle route to the airlines of this Nation which desire to use it, to the end that no United States airline suffers from discrimination; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and the Civilian Aviation Board.

"Adopted by the senate May 26, 1955.

"FRED J. CHASE,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

COST OF CRIMINAL LAW ENFORCEMENT—MOTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a motion adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., expressing their support of H. R. 5957, an amendment to Public Law 280, 83d Congress, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with any State or political sudivision to share in the cost of criminal law enforcement within Indian country.

There being no objection, the motion was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS,
OFFICE OF COUNTY AUDITOR,
Duluth, Minn., June 30, 1955.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following motion was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of St. Louis, Minn., at its meeting held on June 27, 1955:

"Upon motion of Commissioner Hultstrand, H. R. 5957, being a bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law No. 280, 83d Cong.), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with any State or political subdivision to share in the cost of criminal law enforcement within Indian country, was concurred in and ordered referred to Senators THYE and HUMPHREY and Representative BLATNIK for their consideration."

Very truly yours,
W. H. BORGEN,
County Auditor.
By J. L. PERRY,
Clerk of County Board.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER INTERESTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a recent resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs calling for the establishment of a Department of Consumer Interests.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER INTERESTS

Whereas, the General Federation of Women's Clubs recognizes the fact that the well-being of the home and family are dependent upon consumer education and skills in buying wisely and using effectively consumer goods and services; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has long been seeking a solution to the problem of the consuming public; and

Whereas the interests of business and of labor are protected and advanced by a Department headed by a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and the consuming public whose welfare is equally important to a sound economy, is not so represented and protected: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 1955 recommends the establishment of a United States Department dedicated to the education of consumers, good management by the consumers, and protection of the interests of the consuming public, which is headed by a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and further

Resolved, That such Government Agencies as the Bureau of Standards, the Food and Drug Administration, Education and Inspection Services of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, and Information Bureau, and other such bureaus, agencies and board as can render services, be contributing agencies to the proposed Department of Consumer Interests.

Presented by:
Mrs. THEODORE S. CHAPMAN,
President, General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Mrs. A. N. SATTERLEE,
Chairman, Consumer Division, Home Department.

RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL (MINN.) TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly of St. Paul, Minn., expressing their opposition to the passage of the Harris bill, H. R. 4560, to exclude distributors of natural gas from Federal control.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Trades and Labor Assembly of the City of St. Paul, Minn., a voluntary organization composed of the representatives of 90 American Federation of Labor unions, representing 40,000 members, having been advised that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, by a 16 to 15 vote, has recommended to pass the so-called Harris bill, a legislative proposal designed to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in such a manner as to provide for the exemption from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and from all Federal regulation and control, of the so-called independent producers in the natural-gas field in connection with the transmission of gas in interstate commerce by interstate pipeline carriers; and

Whereas said assembly is further advised that a companion bill to the Harris Act has been introduced in the Senate of the United States, and that hearings have been held before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee thereon; and

Whereas in the State of Minnesota we have no native sources of fuel and therefore must rely on the transportation of fuel from considerable distances; and

Whereas the citizens of St. Paul, Minn., are served in the supply of natural gas for home and industrial use by the Northern States Power Co., the local distributing company, which purchases this supply of gas from that certain interstate pipeline carrier, the Northern Natural Gas Co.; and

Whereas since the advent of natural gas into this community, the use thereof for industrial and home consumption has grown to a point where, at the present, there is in excess of 24 million M c. f. of natural gas used per annum in this city; and

Whereas upon a study of the proposed legislation embodied in the Harris Act, which is designed to remove the production segment of the gas industry from all control by regulation, the trades and labor assembly of the city of St. Paul is sincerely of the mind that action by the Federal Congress to remove this part of the gas industry from all regulation can only lead to a higher cost of natural gas for industrial and home use to the local citizens and corporations resident in the city of St. Paul, and users of natural gas; and

Whereas it appears self-evident to this assembly that the retention of control by the Federal Power Commission over the producers of natural gas, insofar as that cost is reflected in a part of the ultimate cost to the users in the city of St. Paul, does not preclude the recognition by the Federal Power Commission of all factors involved in the process of production and the ascribing of proper weight to such factors to the end that such producers can receive a fair and reasonable price for said gas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, in convention assembled, by the Trades and Labor Assembly of the City of St. Paul, speaking in behalf of its full membership, That it does hereby express opposition to any proposed legislation in Congress seeking to exempt the independent producers from regulation and control by the Federal Government, through the Federal Power Commission and the said Commission's regulation and control of interstate pipeline carriers carrying the said natural gas in interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That the proper officers of the trades and labor assembly of the city of St. Paul are hereby authorized and directed to dispatch copies of this resolution to the executive secretary of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor, and to the Honorable Senators from the State of Minnesota, and to each of the Honorable Representatives in the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 473. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y. (Rept. No. 873);

H. R. 4747. A bill to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city (Rept. No. 876); and

H. R. 4894. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain (Rept. No. 875).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 4001. A bill to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 874).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 2972. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights (Rept. No. 880);

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 896. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth, of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 882);

H. R. 897. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 883);

H. R. 902. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 884);

H. R. 904. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 885); and

H. R. 905. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 886).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment;

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Julius G. Watson (Rept. No. 877);

H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Gray (Rept. No. 878); and

H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Duncan McQuagge (Rept. No. 879).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 218. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, New Mex.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 881).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Manual Rodrigues (Rept. No. 889);

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Hsi-Lin Tung (Rept. No. 890);

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman (Rept. No. 891);

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak (Rept. No. 892);

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Chieko Suzuki (Rept. No. 893);

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen) (Rept. No. 894);

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Catherine Samouris (Rept. No. 895);

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Mary Ishii (Rept. No. 896);

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Cirilo Jose (Rept. No. 897);

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, and Vaclav Majer, Jr. (Rept. No. 898);

S. 763. A bill for the relief Chocura Yoshida (Rept. No. 899);

S. 836. A bill for the relief of Wong Nan Ling and Wong Nan Fee (Rept. No. 900);

S. 893. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus Hergt (Rept. No. 901);

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb (Rept. No. 902);

S. 1036. A bill for the relief of Gust Kostas Kountoupis (Rept. No. 903);

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Angel Feratero Madayag (Rept. No. 904);

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Mareanthe Baicou (Rept. No. 905);

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of Maria de las Nieves Dufurrena (Rept. No. 906);

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Angel Castanedo Del Llano (Rept. No. 907);

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Theresa Yik Mun Woo (Rept. No. 908);

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You (Rept. No. 909);

S. 1253. A bill for the relief of Peter Skole (Rept. No. 910);

S. 1322. A bill for the relief of Maria Ioannou Karvelis and her three minor daughters, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis (Rept. No. 911);

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Hong Ban, also known as George Mon (Rept. No. 912);

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Corazon A. Manayan (Rept. No. 913);

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Clorinda Perri Sturino (Rept. No. 914);

S. 1496. A bill for the relief of Ruriko Hara (Rept. No. 915);

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Harold George Jackson (Rept. No. 916);

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Yee Loy Foo, also known as Loy Foo Yee, or Ted Yee (Rept. No. 917);

S. 1563. A bill for the relief of Elidora Yanguas Perez (Rept. No. 918);

S. 1612. A bill for the relief of Miss Young Hi Yun (Rept. No. 919);

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child (Rept. No. 920);

S. 1716. A bill for the relief of Cheuk Wa Leung and his wife, Camilla Ying Ling Leung (Rept. No. 921);

S. 2145. A bill for the relief of George Poulio (Rept. No. 922);

S. 2269. A bill for the relief of Mualla S. Holloway (Rept. No. 923);

S. 2270. A bill for the relief of Nadia Noland and Samia Ouafa Noland (Rept. No. 924);

H. R. 914. A bill for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl (Rept. No. 925);

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz) (Rept. No. 926);

H. R. 1180. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson (Rept. No. 927);

H. R. 1185. A bill for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar (Rept. No. 928);

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring (Rept. No. 929);

H. R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale) and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffiro) (Rept. No. 930);

H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Paul Compagnino (Rept. No. 931);

H. R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Ervin Benedikt (Rept. No. 932);

H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz (Rept. No. 933);

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe (Rept. No. 934);

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser (Rept. No. 935);

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson (Rept. No. 936);

H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca (Rept. No. 937);

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Frank Budman (Rept. No. 938);

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Anne Cheng (Rept. No. 939);

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm (Rept. No. 940);

H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens (Rept. No. 941);

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall (Rept. No. 942);

H. R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo (Rept. No. 943);

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan (Rept. No. 944);

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio (Rept. No. 945);

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo (Rept. No. 946);

H. R. 2241. A bill for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio (Rept. No. 947);

H. R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon (Rept. No. 948);

H. R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli (Rept. No. 949);

H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder (Rept. No. 950);

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner (Rept. No. 951);

H. R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby (Rept. No. 952);

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas (Rept. No. 953);

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child (Rept. No. 954);

H. R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic (Rept. No. 955);

H. R. 2749. A bill for the relief of George Risto Divitkos (Rept. No. 956);

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Johnson (Rept. No. 957);

H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang (Rept. No. 958);

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo (Rept. No. 959);

H. R. 3048. A bill for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo (Rept. No. 960);

H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena (Rept. No. 961);

H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal (Rept. No. 962);

H. R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou (Rept. No. 963);

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of George Vourderis (Rept. No. 964);

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara (Rept. No. 965);

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza (Rept. No. 966);

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista (Rept. No. 1010);

H. R. 3864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield (Rept. No. 967);

H. R. 3871. A bill for the relief of Orville Ennis (Rept. No. 968);

H. R. 4146. A bill for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega) (Rept. No. 969);

H. R. 4147. A bill for the relief of Angelo DeVito (Rept. No. 970);

H. R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 4289. A bill for the relief of Vladislav Bevc (Rept. No. 972);

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Christa Harkrader (Rept. No. 973);

H. R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Scislotzki (Rept. No. 974);

H. R. 6396. A bill for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson (Rept. No. 975); and

H. R. 6613. A bill for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi (Rept. No. 976).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 19. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Landow and Irina Landow (Rept. No. 977);

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines (Rept. No. 978);

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde (Rept. No. 979);

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker (Rept. No. 980);

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Beri Denovi (Rept. No. 981);

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Ballora (Rept. No. 982);

S. 753. A bill for the relief of George Roland Lavoie (Rept. No. 983);

S. 843. A bill for the relief of Gerda Graupner (Rept. No. 984);

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Gabor Lanyi (Rept. No. 985);

S. 910. A bill for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez (Rept. No. 986);

S. 997. A bill to provide punishment for certain confidence-game swindles (Rept. No. 987);

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez (Rept. No. 988);

S. 1082. A bill for the relief of Ramon Notario Boytell (Rept. No. 989);

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing (Rept. No. 990);

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Helene Margareta Jobst (Rept. No. 991);

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family (Rept. No. 994);

S. 1474. A bill for the relief of Valdis Mikelsons (Rept. No. 995);

S. 1493. A bill for the relief of Dorin Ursulesku Baron (Rept. No. 996);

S. 1615. A bill for the relief of Hilde Schiller (Rept. No. 997);

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Rosa Birger (Rept. No. 998);

H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang (Rept. No. 1001);

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Karlis Abele (Rept. No. 1002);

H. R. 1552. A bill for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz (Rept. No. 1003);

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Sada Zarikian (Rept. No. 1004);

H. R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt (Rept. No. 1005);

H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Ofelia Martin (Rept. No. 1006);

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball (Rept. No. 1007);

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice (Rept. No. 1008);

H. R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams) (Rept. No. 1009);

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider (Rept. No. 992);

H. R. 3635. A bill for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann (Rept. No. 993);

H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Bock (Rept. No. 1011);

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 999); and

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 1000).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Mary Freida Poetl Smith (Rept. No. 1012);

S. 509. A bill for the relief of Dolores Maria Seijo (Rept. No. 1013);

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen (Rept. No. 1014);

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Mellton T. Tapawan (Rept. No. 1015);

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of Miss Kaithe Steinbach (Rept. No. 1016);

H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi (Rept. No. 1017);

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer (Rept. No. 1018); and

H. R. 3786. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America (Rept. No. 1019).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2375. A bill to provide for 5-year terms of office for members of the Subversive Activities Control Board with one of such terms expiring in each calendar year (Rept. No. 887); and

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations (Rept. No. 888).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island, vice Jacob S. Temkin, resigned.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Caleb M. Wright, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 2556. A bill to provide assistance for certain landless Indians in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2557. A bill for the relief of Mary Mancuso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2559. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2560. A bill to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2561. A bill for the relief of Herbert Reginald Davis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2562. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2563. A bill for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2564. A bill for the relief of Julian D. Dycaico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2565. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to permit, in certain cases and in the discretion of the local public housing agency, the utilization of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects which are occupied by blind tenants for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2566. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2567. A bill to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 2568. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2569. A bill to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2570. A bill for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2571. A bill to amend section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; and

S. 2572. A bill to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN LANDLESS INDIANS IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide assistance for certain landless Indians in the State of Montana. The distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], joins with me in the introduction of this bill.

The Department of Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are perpetually faced with many problems facing the Indian population in the United States. One of the most difficult and pathetic situations in America exists on Hill 57, in Great Falls, Mont. Hill 57 is the home for several hundred so-called landless Indians.

These people live in conditions almost unbelievable. The Indians on Hill 57 do not have proper sanitation or health facilities. They live in shacks, and they are continually faced with a shortage of food and proper clothing.

These Indians have not been admitted to a reservation, for various reasons, and, therefore, they do not receive Federal aid. Since these people do not receive any formal aid, they have been forced to live under the most squalid conditions, similar to those of the Navajo Nation in the Southwest, with which all of us are familiar. Conditions have always been bad on Hill 57, but in recent weeks reports from the State indicate that the situation has reached a point where immediate attention and relief are required.

Local authorities have attempted to resolve the situation, but they need outside aid, because of the immensity of the problem. The Federal Government is the caretaker of the Indian, and should come to the aid of the people in this instance.

This proposed legislation would direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide immediate relief and welfare services to these Indians on Hill 57, at Great Falls, Mont. The proposed legislative would make funds available under the heading "Education and Welfare Services," in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1956.

Representative LEE METCALF, of the First Congressional District of Montana, has introduced a companion bill in the House.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has assured me that his committee will give this bill prompt consideration. It is imperative that the relief proposed to be granted under the bill be made available as soon as possible to the Indians on Hill 57.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2556) to provide assistance for certain landless Indians in the State of Montana, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to permit, in certain cases and in the discretion of the local public-housing agency, the utilization of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects which are occupied by blind tenants for commercial purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain remarks and letters regarding the bill, which would amend the Housing Act to allow, without reference to the maximum income limits for families occupying low-rent housing projects, discrimination within the agency to permit the rates to be varied in the case of a head of a family who may be blind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2565) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to permit, in certain cases and in the discretion of the local public-housing agency, the utilization of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects which are occupied by blind tenants for commercial purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The matters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

SIGHTLESS COUPLE IN CLARKSTON FACE HOME, STORE LOSS

CLARKSTON, WASH., July 1.—A blind middle-aged couple who struggled to independence from the State pension rolls face a return to the dole because of Government red tape.

Mr. and Mrs. Swen Snoden, who collected the pensions as handicapped persons until about a year ago, are faced with the loss of the grocery store which has made them self-supporting.

The Snodens opened the little store in their home when they moved into a 10-home Government-housing project here about a year ago. Their neighbors shop in the store, paying on the honor system, and the couple live and manage the store without aid.

But the Federal housing authority found out about the business. An agent from San Francisco investigated and ruled the Snodens would have to go. FHA rules forbid the operation of businesses in its projects.

Local FHA authorities, however, refused to order the couple either to leave or to close the store. Neighbors and customers have written letters of protest to Senators HENRY JACKSON and WARREN MAGNUSON, both Democrats, of Washington.

Matters now are stalemated with the Snodens still in business but with the threat of eviction hanging over them. If forced to move, it will mean they must return to pensions.

They want to stay where they are. Business has been good, they said, and at long last they are independent, adding, "we're healthier and happier than we've been in years."

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1955.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Your letter of June 28, 1955, regarding a telegram addressed to you by Mr. O. J. Ward concerning the operation of a grocery store by a blind couple in project Wash-17-1, Clarkston, is acknowledged.

The facts regarding this situation have been fully explored and the decision to require the termination of the use of a dwelling unit for commercial purposes was made on March 31, 1955, after the most careful possible consideration.

The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, under which this project was developed, provides in section 1:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States * * * to remedy the unsafe and insanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income."

It has been the uniform policy of this Agency that no statutory authority exists for the provision of commercial facilities in connection with low-rent projects developed under the United States Housing Act. To permit the use of a dwelling for commercial purposes is, in our opinion, a violation of the law.

Nothing in the United States Housing Act, the legislative history, the annual contributions contract, or the policies of this Agency permits the use of dwelling units for the purpose of assisting tenants to earn a livelihood, regardless of the humanitarian considerations involved.

We sympathize with the laudable desire of this blind couple to be self-supporting and respect the motives of the local authority in endeavoring to assist them in their efforts. However, to permit this violation in one case would initiate a policy which could equally be applied to many other cases in all low-rent projects.

Among other considerations is the possible effect on the tax-exemption provisions of the various State housing laws and the possible objections of the taxpaying owners of commercial enterprises in the vicinity of our projects.

The precedents cited in the telegram regarding the operation of stands on Government property by the blind are not applicable to low-rent housing projects. These projects are owned and operated by local housing authorities and are subject to the specific provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and also to the applicable State housing legislation. The use of space in Government-owned buildings is governed by Federal codes and regulations of the departments having jurisdiction.

In the March 31, 1955, decision it was suggested that the local authority contact the established community agencies to work out a solution of this problem for the blind couple involved and a period of 3 months, terminating not later than June 30, 1955, was provided to permit the necessary adjustments.

It is with sincere regret that we have been forced to terminate the use of a dwelling unit for commercial puposes by this blind couple; however, you will appreciate the difficulties of our position.

The telegram from Mr. Ward is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN D. CURRIE,
Acting Commissioner.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *June 27, 1955.*

Senator MAGNUSON:

Public service broadcast repeatedly urge employment of the handicapped because earnest effort make them capable and self-sufficient. A case has come to widespread attention of Lewiston and Clarkston. A totally blind couple was allowed to establish a small grocery in Clarkston veterans village. They operate successfully and are happy to forego any Government aid. The mayor, Dr. Weeks, and the prosecuting attorney, Mr. Sharp, and all the residents of vets village are eager to have them continued in operation. Lack of capital prevents them locating elsewhere. We have knowledge that blind operate stands in Government parts and POS San Francisco office has notified prosecuting attorney no business project can operate on Government property. June 30 has been set as deadline. This will mean they will have to return to Government support; the encouraging example for the blind will be lost. We need your help at once.

O. J. WARD.

JUNE 28, 1955.

O. J. WARD,
Lewiston, Idaho:

Have contacted Public Housing Administration reference to Clarkston veterans village and urged position reference eliminating small grocery of blind couple be changed.

WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

JUNE 28, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. SLUSSER,
Commissioner, Public Housing
Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER SLUSSER: Enclosed is a self-explanatory telegram from O. J. Ward, Lewiston, Idaho, with reference to a blind couple who have been operating a small grocery in the Clarkston veterans village, a housing project of PHA.

It is hard to believe that the present administration desires to eliminate an opportunity for these blind people to make a living, and I know that it has been the policy of the Government to aid the blind as much as possible, particularly with small concessions on Government property.

I would appreciate your checking into this.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES OVER POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, the Senator from Maryland, [Mr. BEALL], the ranking minority member of the committee, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes." This bill is a modification upon which agreement has been reached by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Fine Arts Commission, the Interior Department, and the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2568) to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," introduced by Mr. Case of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. Neely, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Beall), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSOR OF A BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 2121, to enlarge and extend the special school milk program, introduced by me on June 1, 1955, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

Address entitled "Human Dignity and the Quest for Peace," delivered by him before a sacred patriotic assembly at Provo, Utah, on July 3, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him before a civic gathering in Chicago, Ill., on July 17, 1955, on various aspects of United States foreign policy.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement prepared by him, together with letter from Spokane Chamber of Commerce, regarding power for the development of the metallurgical industry in Spokane, Wash.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him before the San Francisco Labor Council on June 24, 1955.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "Douglas Assails $600-Million-a-Year Grab To Exempt Natural Gas Rates from Federal Control," written by him and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

By Mr. IVES:

Address entitled "Brotherhood: The Corner Stone of Democracy," delivered by the Secretary of Labor at the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America, at Fallsburg, N. Y., on July 11, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article by Joseph F. McCaffrey concerning leadership of Senator Clements.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Panama, and Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now Minister to the Kingdom of Laos, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Kingdom of Laos. I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

ROCHAMBEAU CELEBRATION AT NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for insertion in the body of the Record two addresses delivered at the Washington-Rochambeau celebration held in Newport, R. I., for 3 days beginning last July 9. It was the 175th anniversary of the arrival there of the French Fleet and the landing of some 6,000 French troops under the command of General Rochambeau. They were sent to join the American troops under General Washington, and this proved to be the turning point in the Revolutionary War.

So the French and American Governments joined in the celebration, and the two addresses of high American Government officials were balanced by addresses of high French Government officials who were sent over on the largest warship of the French Navy to take part in this international celebration.

One of these addresses was delivered by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, and the other by Hon. Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, and they will, I know, be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

The celebration, conducted by the Preservation Society of Newport County, was under the general direction of Mrs. George Henry Warren, and proved to be a memorable international event in our history. Mrs. Warren, the members of her committee, and the members of the General Rochambeau Commission of the State of Rhode Island, are to be complimented on the excellence of the program they presented.

I ask unanimous consent that the addresses to which I have referred be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORGOTTEN FACES AND FACTS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY WAR

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, on the occasion of Washington - Rochambeau celebration, Newport, R. I., July 9, 1955)

Ambassador Couve deMurville, Governor Roberts, Secretary Murphy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it was a great honor for me to receive the following letter from the President of the United States this week, and I would like to read it to you:

"Dear Mr. Secretary: With the landing of the French forces under General Rochambeau at Newport 175 years ago, a turning point occurred in the American Revolution. For the first time, French manpower—professional soldiers with splendid leadership—supplemented the supplies and arms the French had been sending since Saratoga 3 years before. This event marked the beginning of the end, for the victory at Yorktown, in which these same French forces played a valiant part, came in the fall of the following year.

"All this is familiar history. Less well known, perhaps, is the close accord in which General Washington and General Rochambeau worked during these final days of our War of Independence. This year's celebration at Newport makes those stirring times and that warm partnership live again.

"Today the free nations of the world are united in a quest for a just peace in a troubled world, a cause which demands an unwavering allegiance—like that of our forefathers—to the principle of human freedom. In this quest France and the United States are linked in close alliance. It is a source of the deepest gratification to me that those links with America's first ally, forged 175 years ago in our war for freedom and tested in two terrible world wars, are today stronger than ever.

"To all who join with you at Newport on this anniversary, I send my best wishes for an inspiring celebration.

"Sincerely,

"Dwight Eisenhower."

Across from the White House in Washington is a lovely park and in it are two statues facing the Presidential Mansion. One of these figures is very well known. Indeed, the park is named for him: General Lafayette, a dashing, high-spirited, red-headed, and courageous French nobleman, who did so much to advance the cause of American liberty. Lafayette spoke excellent English. He commanded American troops, who loved his daring and dash. He was the perfect figure of a noble cavalier.

It is for these reasons that he is so well remembered as the symbol of the decisive and timely French aid which gained this country its freedom.

The other statue in Lafayette Square commemorates a French soldier whose role in that war was equally significant, General Rochambeau. It is this man whom we honor today.

Every schoolboy knows that on October 19, 1781, Lord Cornwallis surrendered the British forces to Gen. George Washington at Yorktown, Va. And every schoolboy knows that this momentous victory brought a new nation into being—the United States of America.

But few remember two facts about that crucial battle. First, it was largely won by French forces, and, second, seapower made it possible. The French forces numbered approximately 26,000 sailors and soldiers. There was a 28-ship French fleet under Admiral deGrasse and a 6,000-man French army under General Rochambeau.

By contrast, there was no American Navy in the Chesapeake, and our Continental Army numbered only 8,500 men. Three thousand of these were militia commanded by General Lafayette.

This timely victory represented a near miracle of military precision by the soldierly genius of Washington. Without benefit of radio or telephonic communications, his forces separated by hundreds of miles, his troops facing a march across unpaved roads from New York to Virginia, Washington ordered three separate forces to redezvous with a French fleet he had never seen at an obscure beach at Yorktown, Va. And yet, General Rochambeau has recorded that the forces came together within an hour's time of each other.

Both Washington and Rochambeau had long prepared for this one vital victory which would end the war and win American freedom. It is extraordinary that both of these generals, one French and one American, saw so clearly that a decisive victory on land could only be won with control of the seas.

Ever since the end of 1778, Washington had done little with his Army except to hold it in readiness for cooperation with naval superiority. He had repeatedly asked Benjamin Franklin in Paris to plead with the French Government to send a French fleet to neutralize the British control of our Atlantic coast. Lafayette himself had carried the same message from Washington to the French court.

General Rochambeau, too, had foreseen that before any victory on land was possible, control of the seas had to be wrested from the British. Among the preparatory notes that General Rochambeau made for the passage of his army to Rhode Island were these: "take with us a quantity of flints"; "siege artillery is indispensable"; "have bricks as ballast for the ships to be used as baking ovens" (these ovens, incidentally, were later to help deceive the British General Clinton holding New York City and prevent him from sending aid to Lord Cornwallis in Virginia until it was too late).

But among General Rochambeau's notes was one more meaningful than all the rest: "nothing without naval supremacy."

And so it was that the arrival of the French Fleet under Admiral deGrasse in the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay made the surrender of Lord Cornwallis inevitable. It was the opportunity that Washington and Rochambeau had sought for so long. In his entrenchments in Yorktown, Cornwallis waited for a mighty English fleet which would never come in time. Instead, in response to Washington's plea, came the French fleet of Admiral deGrasse.

General Rochambeau himself recorded the scene when Washington learned that the French Fleet, not the British Fleet had arrived first off Yorktown.

"When I reached Chester, Pa.," wrote Rochambeau, "I saw General Washington waving his hat at me with great joy. When I rode up to him he told me he had just received word from Baltimore saying that Count deGrasse had arrived in the Chesapeake with 28 ships of the line. I never saw a man more thoroughly delighted than George Washington."

Because of a brief but vital period of control of the seas, the battle of Yorktown was won. Cornwallis surrendered, and the United States won its freedom—thanks to Admiral deGrasse's victory over the British Navy, thanks to Rochambeau's army, thanks to Washington's patience, patriotism and persistence. His first written words to General Rochambeau not only emphasize the fact which would make Cornwallis' surrender certain—naval superiority—but his words have a prophetic ring even to this day:

"In any operation and under all circumstances a decisive naval superiority is to be considered as a fundamental principle and the basis on which every hope of success must ultimately depend."

Today, ships of the Navies of France and the United States are anchored together in mutual friendship and common purpose in Newport harbor. They are the symbols of that seapower which both General Washington and General Rochambeau considered so vital, which was indispensable to victory in their time, and which is no less vital in ours.

It is indeed a great pleasure for me to bring this Washington-Rochambeau celebration the best wishes of the United States Navy.

Address by Hon. Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State

Governor Roberts, Yours Excellency, Secretary Thomas, Admiral McCormick, ladies, and gentlemen of this distinguished gathering, it is an exceedingly great privilege to attend this celebration as a representative of the Department of State. Speaking for the Secretary of State and all of us in the Department of State, I would like to pay tribute to the Committee for the Washington-Rochambeau Celebration, under the cochairmanship of Mrs. Warren and Mrs. Prochet. French battleships or United States carriers even in this day of rapid communication, don't just appear off Newport Island without good staff work. Parades don't just happen, nor do programs such as the 10-day one the committee has arranged spontaneously spring full grown into being. This splendid celebration, in which past and present are so skillfully fused, is a model of good timing and good planning, and our congratulations go to those, including our naval authorities, who worked so effectively for its success.

We are especially grateful to the French authorities and to the officers and men of the *Jean Bart* who have made this possible.

The presence of the French Ambassador and Madame Couve de Murville is deeply appreciated. Those of us who have enjoyed the privilege of their acquaintance through the year can testify to their qualities, so representative of their great country. It was my particular privilege to have seen something of the patriotic work of M. Couve de Murville in the critical days of the war, both in metropolitan France and in French North Africa. Throughout the days of adversity he enjoyed the steadfast support of a most courageous and devoted wife. It is a pleasure to say a sincere word of admiration for both of them in behalf of their American friends, who are so happy to have them in our midst.

If I may, I want to express the pleasure I know we all share in enjoying the charm of Newport and Rhode Island in the company of the distinguished dean of American legislators, Senator GREEN. It has been my good fortune to greet him in various parts of the world, but it is doubly pleasant to be with him on his native heath.

Franco-American friendship is not a fragile orchid. It fortunately is a hardy growth with its roots sunk deep in mutual understanding and affection, nourished by many sacrifices in the cause of liberty and sharing a common heritage of political tolerance. When Marshal Rochambeau bravely embarked on his pilgrimage to the far distant and struggling colonies to fight for their independence, many Americans were finding their intellectual and political inspiration and guidance in the writings and sayings of Paris political scientists. Their stamp remains clearly visible today in our governmental structure and our political philosophy.

The contribution that this splendid French patriot and his seasoned troops made to the ultimate victory in our War of the Revolution was a vital one. It must, indeed, be a special source of pride to you, who call Newport home, that the meetings between General Washington and Marshal Rochambeau at the Vernon House here, in March of 1781, laid the groundwork for the strategy that had its triumphant climax at Yorktown in the fall of the same year.

The timing of that forced march to the south was exemplary, but the timing of the original landing of the Comte de Rochambeau was prophetic. For how could Rochambeau have known that July 11, 1780, the day of the landing, would in future years fall so neatly between the two national holidays—our own glorious Fourth and the Quatorze Juillet that was to make history 9 years later? There is a quotation on a Government building in Washington I often pass which reads: "What is past is prologue."

The relationship of France and the United States is the exemplar and embodiment of that quotation. France was our first ally in our early hour of need. The spirit of comradeship and of courage which animated those first dealings has been woven into the fabric of our relationship down through the years.

It was my good fortune to live and work among the French people for a good many years, in time of peace and in time of war.

The anxious days of the recent occupation, the struggles in north Africa and elsewhere tested character and revealed qualities that had not always been visible in the more serene atmosphere of prewar Paris. Throughout the long period of sacrifice and trial, French love of liberty and their determination to be free again sustained them through the dangers and the darkness and provided inspiration for many other peoples caught up in the fury of war.

Today France and the United States work together in ever closer alliance. This alliance is based upon similar objectives in the international field and upon a friendship which makes possible both a mutual frankness in our relations; a deep and sympathetic understanding of the problems with which each country is faced.

It requires no crystal ball to foresee the future of France and of America, for the span of our history proclaims it. Our past is indeed prologue.

Today, when we do honor to Jean-Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, Comte de Rochambeau, marshal of France, to our beloved George Washington, and to their meeting in this fair city, we honor as well the 175 years of Franco-American friendship. We are confident that our friendship, our mutual trust, and mutual reliance will continue down through the years and the centuries yet to come.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT APPROPRIATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been deeply disturbed over the cut by the House of Representatives of $627,900,000 in this year's mutual security appropriation. I have therefore written a letter to the chairman and to all the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, urging, with all the vigor at my command, that the committee restore the amount cut by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I have addressed to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] be printed in the body of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 13 entitled "Job for the Senate," and an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 12, entitled "Foreign Aid. Half Won."

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 14, 1955.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing this letter to you and the other members of the

Appropriations Committee in order to express my strong conviction that the cut of $627,900,000 by the House of Representatives from this year's Mutual Security Act is a critically serious mistake.

This hasty reduction might well threaten the success of the entire program, which in the words of President Eisenhower, is in the "interwoven self-interest" of both America and its allies. I am particularly disturbed to note that the House has cut in half the $200 million special fund for Asian development. I am confident that this was done without a full appreciation of the significance of this particular fund.

I have had the great privilege, Mr. Chairman, of traveling in the Far East and in all the countries which this fund would affect, and I am absolutely confident that this is one of the strongest weapons for peace in the Far East. What we have discussed with them, and I have had the privilege of participating in the discussions, is freedom, independence and self-determination. Of course, we cannot and would not buy them. However, with funds available for the President and our distinguished Secretary of State, and the new director of the International Cooperation Administration, we will be able to sit down on a partnership basis and develop with the free people of Asia those necessary programs, which will help them to attain their goal of freedom and prosperity.

To cut this particular fund at this particular moment, just as the President and Secretary Dulles are starting for the Big Four Conference, almost seems to be a vote of lack of confidence in our own great leaders. Development assistance and economic aid represent our primary peaceful weapon against the expansion of Soviet and Chinese communism.

At this time, with the crucial Geneva Conference underway, to permit this ill-considered slash in the nonmilitary side of our aid program to stand, would do great damage to our efforts to confront the Communists with our position of strength and our determination to work for a better and more peaceful day.

Our past aid program for the countries of Europe had a tremendous effect in rebuilding those nations and in strengthening them against the Communist onslaught.

It may be, in fact, that the success of the aid program to those now self-sustaining countries of Europe was one factor in the recent more peaceful tack taken by the leaders of Soviet Russia.

This year the bulk of the aid is slated for Asia and the Near East, where the threat to freedom is greatest. We will not be successful in Asia, as we were in Europe, if we fail to meet this present threat.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I feel very deeply on this subject because, as a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 8 years, and as chairman of that subcommittee for the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, I have been living with the situation week in and week out.

We begin to see light, but with the great masses of these Asian people on the brink of the precipice, doubtful which way to turn because they are not sure whether we will stand by them or not, it is, to my mind, one of the tensest moments in the history of the Far East. Should the entire Far East slide behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, as well it may, the immediate danger to our own country would be precipitated.

Mr. Chairman, with all the sincerity at my command, I urge that the Senate Appropriations Committee restore the $627,900,000 cut by the House from this year's Mutual Security Act.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 13, 1955]

JOB FOR THE SENATE

The House of Representatives has had its little picnic with the foreign-aid appropriations bill and gone on to other things, leaving a litter of ill-considered economies and petty political spites (for all the world like empty beer cans and rumpled sandwich wrappers) for the Senate to clean up. Having just passed a bill authorizing a $3.28 billion program, very much in line with President Eisenhower's revised request, the House appropriated only $2.6 billion.

There is certainly no criticism in this quarter of economy in government, and $2.6 billion is no paltry sum. But the House was dealing with what the President has called the interwoven self-interest of this country and its allies, and making a hasty 20 percent slash in funds allocated for a purpose such as this hardly seems to be intelligent economy. The House had been irritated by the fact that the Pentagon, finding itself at the end of the last fiscal year with money it had to spend quickly or turn back, committed $614 million on the day before deadline. One can agree that this looks like strange fiscal management, yet not go along with the House's notion that the proper corrective measure is to chop $420 million from this year's military aid.

President Eisenhower's original foreign-aid proposals were sound and well organized. The fact that no money at all was requested this year for the original Marshall plan countries because they no longer need it was final proof of the fact that foreign aid is not habit-forming, that it can achieve specific goals and then be stopped.

The bulk of this year's aid is slated for Asia, with the Near East and Latin America coming in for a lesser share. It is our principal peaceful weapon—the only kind we want to use—against the manifold expansionism of the Soviet Union and Red China.

The Senate is deciding now what it will do with the bill. Let us hope for more responsibility than has been shown in the House.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 12, 1955]

FOREIGN AID: HALF WON

As every congressional correspondent knows, authorization of an expenditure is only half the battle for an outlay of United States funds. After authorization, it is only appropriation that makes the money actually available.

The foreign-aid authorization bill this year passed both Houses of Congress with singularly little opposition as compared to other years, carrying approval for $3,285,-800,000—almost what the administration requested. This even included funds for Yugoslavia and India, which were the targets of hostile amendments because of the neutralism of those countries. The action signified a mature understanding that nations which defend their independence from the Communist bloc are assets to the free world.

But with the authorization bill sent to the White House, the House of Representatives, following its Appropriations Committee, quickly passes an appropriation bill which represents a cut of $627,900,000 from the authorization.

The committee may have put its finger on a serious abuse in the handling of military-aid funds earlier appropriated. Or there may be a very reasonable explanation of the situation it criticizes. It finds that an estimated $8,717,100,000 of unspent balances remains from funds appropriated in previous years and objects that hasty year-end allotments of funds have been made to keep the appropriations from expiring.

It may be that there has been inadequate planning or inordinate delay in utilizing some of the money Congress has made available in previous years. Yet both in military and nonmilitary aid there is great need for programs that will run more than a year or two. In "offshore" purchases of arms, foreign plants cannot afford to tool up until appropriations are made and contracts let; thereafter it may be some time before tanks, planes, and other munitions are delivered for payment.

Most of the carryover funds were appropriated to help in rearming Western Europe, whereas most of the current and prospective need is in Asia. If large parts of the unexpended balances are earmarked for goods under production in Europe, those balances will not be of much use to get production started in the Far East.

But the foreign aid bill does not consist wholly of military items. It includes also "defense support" to help countries maintain the forces they build, "development assistance" to strengthen the economies of friendly nations, and "technical assistance" both directly on the United States account and through the United Nations.

Only a week ago the U. N. Technical Assistance Board reported that its ability to plan what "should be an essentially long-range program" is handicapped by year-to-year financing and the lateness of many governments in paying their pledges. The United States, the largest contributor, promised $13.8 million in 1954, but did not appropriate the last $9.9 million of this until August.

There may be reasons why some appropriations need not measure up immediately to the full authorizations in the 1955 foreign aid bill, but as the Senate takes up the subject it should seriously question and examine any such assumption.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for about 3 minutes in order that I may make a brief comment on the recent report of the Hoover Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the Hoover Commission, since its Chairman was our distinguished former President, has recently concluded the herculean task assigned to it by the Congress. In fact, this was the second Hoover Commission, the first having been created in 1947. However, the earlier Commission concerned itself chiefly with the structural reorganization of departments and agencies, and their relation to each other, while the second Hoover Commission was given a much broader mandate to examine and report on policy questions.

The Commission submitted a total of 20 reports to the Congress, including the progress report made at the end of last year. These reports contained three categories of recommendations: First, those requiring action by the President; second, those within the authority of the various departments and agencies to adopt; and, third, those requiring legislation by act of Congress. While I am, of course, hopeful that the executive branch will give immediate and serious attention to recommendations within categories 1 and 2, as a Senator I am particularly interested in securing prompt and full consideration by the Congress of those recommendations—perhaps the most important of all—which fall into category 3 and require congressional action.

I share, with many of my colleagues, a general interest in moving ahead expeditiously on the Commission reports. In addition, at the request of President Hoover, a long-time friend and former associate of World War I days, I have undertaken to see that the recommended bills are introduced and referred to the appropriate committees for early consideration. I am hopeful that the vast bulk of the recommendations requiring legislative action will be enacted early in the next session.

As is recognized by the outstanding men in American life who have recreated the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, the filing of the Commission reports is only a beginning. Now we must swing into action and translate the written word into savings to the taxpayer, higher efficiency in Government, and improved service in the transaction of the public business.

Mr. President, our former President, Herbert Hoover, who is held in the highest esteem by all of us, deserves the heartfelt gratitude of every American for the energy and devotion with which he applied his encyclopedic knowledge of our complex system of Government to the challenging office of Chairman of the Commission. "The chief," as he is affectionately known to all who over the decades have been privileged to work closely with him, has a record of public service unmatched by that of any living American and few of the giants of our past history. But I am convinced that history will rank high among his many notable achievements the monumental study and invaluable recommendations produced by this second Hoover Commission.

Mr. President, I have had two tables prepared. The first shows the date each of the Hoover Commission reports was submitted to the Congress, and the committee of the Senate to which each was referred. The second lists, under separate headings for each report, the bills introduced pursuant to Hoover Commission recommendations, by whom introduced, and the committee to which each was referred. This second table is complete through July 14, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the tables be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committees to which Hoover Commission reports have been referred

Report	Date	Senate committee
Progress Report	Jan. 5, 1955	Government Operations.
Personnel and Civil Service	Feb. 14, 1955	Post Office and Civil Service.
Paperwork Management, pt. I, U. S. Government.	Feb. 21, 1955	Finance.
Federal Medical Services	Feb. 28, 1955	Labor and Public Welfare.
Lending Agencies	Mar. 14, 1955	Banking and Currency.
Transportation	Apr. 4, 1955	Government Operations.
Legal Services and Procedure	Apr. 11, 1955	Do.
Surplus Property	Apr. 18, 1955	Do.
Food and Clothing	Apr. 25, 1955	Armed Services.
Business Enterprises	May 16, 1955	Government Operations.
Depot Utilization	May 26, 1955	Government Operations
Research and Development	May 31, 1955	Armed Services.
Overseas Economic Operations	June 6, 1955	Foreign Relations.
Real Property Management	June 13, 1955	Government Operations.
Budget and Accounting	June 20, 1955	Do.
Business Organization of the Department of Defense.	June 27, 1955	Do.
Intelligence	June 29, 1955	Do.
Water Resources and Power	June 30, 1955	Do.
Paperwork Management, pt. II	do	Do.
Final Report	do	Do.

Legislation introduced into Senate to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations (as of July 14, 1955)

Commission report and bill No.	By whom introduced	Committee to which referred
Personnel and Civil Service:		
S. 2331*	Mr. Carlson	Civil Service.
S. 2332*	do	Do.
S. 2333*	do	Do.
S. 2334*	do	Do.
S. 2335*	do	Do.
S. 2336*	do	Do.
S. 2337*	do	Do.
Federal Medical Services:		
S. 2405*	Mr. Smith of New Jersey	Labor and Public Welfare.
S. 2406*	do	Do.
S. 2407*	do	Do.
S. 2408*	do	Do.
Lending Agencies:		
S. 2230* [1]	Mr. Williams	Government Operations.
S. 2314*	Mr. Capehart	Banking and Currency.
S. 2315*	do	Do.
S. 2316*	do	Do.
S. 2317*	do	Do.
S. 2318*	do	Do.
S. 2319*	do	Do.
S. 2320*	do	Do.
S. 2457	Mr. McCarthy	Do.
S. 2459	do	Do.
S. 2469	do	Do.
S. 2461	do	Do.
S. 2464	do	Do.
S. 2528	do	Agriculture.
S. 2529	do	Do.
S. 2530	do	Do.
S. 2531	do	Do.
S. 2532	do	Banking and Currency.
S. 2533	do	Do.
S. 2534	do	Do.
Lending Agencies—Con.		
S. 2535	Mr. McCarthy	Banking and Currency.
S. 2536	do	Do.
S. 2537	do	Do.
Transportation:		
S. 2366*	Mr. Smathers (for Mr. Kennedy).	Government Operations.
S. 2467	Mr. McCarthy	Do.
Legal services:		
S. 2502*	Mr. Wiley	Armed Services.
S. 2503*	do	Judiciary.
S. 2504*	do	Do.
Surplus Property: S. 2247* [2]	Mr. Saltonstall	Government Operations.
Business Enterprises:		
S. 2363*	Mr. Smathers (for Mr. Kennedy).	Do.
S. 2474	Mr. McCarthy	Do.
S. 2475	do	Do.
S. 2468	do	Do.
Depot Utilities:		
S. 2361*	Mr. Smathers (for Mr. Kennedy).	Armed Services.
S. 2365*	do	Government Operations.
Real Property Management:		
S. 2360*	do	Do.
S. 2362*	do	Armed Services.
S. 2368*	do	Do.
Budgeting and Accounting:		
S. 2369*	do	Government Operations.
Business Organization of Department of Defense:		
S. 2538	Mr. McCarthy	Do.
S. 2539	do	Judiciary.

[1] S. 2313, subsequently introduced by Senator Capehart and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, contains 1 provision of S. 2230.

[2] S. 2367 subsequently introduced by Mr. Smathers (for Mr. Kennedy) is similar to S. 2247.

NOTE.—Bills marked with an asterisk (*) indicate that a similar bill subsequently has been introduced by Senator McCarthy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in making these comments I am aware of the fact that legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission cannot be enacted before the present session ends, but it is my hope that in getting the proposed legislation before the appropriate committees, early action on the recommendations may be taken in the session beginning next January.

TRIBUTE TO THE BUTTE, MONT., HIGH SCHOOL BAND FOR ITS PERFORMANCE IN CANADA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today I wish to join the multitudes who are praising one of the finest high school bands in the Nation, the Butte High School Band, from Butte, Mont. The Butte band has recently returned from Calgary and Banff, Canada, where the 138-member band scored triumphs in concert and parade showings.

The Butte High School Band headed the Calgary Stampede parade, and staged a spectacular field concert and marching show. The band also performed at Banff. A great deal of credit for these fine performances is due to the showmanship and ability of its directors, Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Schiesser.

Notable among the laudatory statements coming from our neighbors to the north were their references to the commendable behavior of the Butte boys and girls. Montana and the Nation could not ask for a more impressive group of traveling ambassadors of goodwill than the Butte High School Band.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted two articles from the Montana Standard of July 15, 1955, relative to the Butte Band's triumphant visit to Canada.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Standard of July 15, 1955]

BUTTE HIGH BAND BACK FROM TRIP

The Butte High School Band which scored a signal triumph in Calgary where it headed the Calgary Stampede parade on Monday, after staging a splendid field concert and marching show Sunday, returned home after midnight Thursday.

The 138 boys and girls and their directors, H. J. Schiesser and his wife, Jean, did not have to wait until their return home to receive expressions of appreciation for the fine manner in which they represented their hometown and the Treasure State.

En route to Butte they stopped over in Great Falls Thursday night where they were feted by the Great Falls Lodge of Elks. The Great Falls Elks were hosts to the tired, but happy band members and the adults in the party at a dinner. T. Joseph Semmens, president of the Butte High School Band Parents Association, who was in charge of arrangements for the Calgary trip, and the trip to Banff, where the band played before several thousand people on Tuesday night, expressed appreciation of the group for the hospitable action, and compliments extended by the Great Falls Elks.

Among other adults traveling with the band by bus, all assistants to Mr. Semmens on the trip which involved scores of detail assignments, were:

Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Carpino, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Collins, Mrs. Viola Flint, Mrs. William E. Tonkin, John Maleyvac, Mrs. Everett Reed, Mrs. Clyde Scott, Dr. and Mrs. H. F. Winiecki, Ray Sims, assistant band director, who with Ben Pezdark were in charge of props; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Vigus, and the bus drivers, Leo Durbin, Billings; John Silta, Billings; Clyde Smith, Wally Fitz, and Willard Kramer, Butte.

George Haney, city superintendent of schools and treasurer of the Band Parents Association, accompanied the band on its Calgary and Banff visits but returned earlier Thursday to arrange for reception of band equipment at the high school.

Arrangements for the dinner honoring the band in Great Falls were made by Leroy Seymour, former Butte resident who is exalted ruler of the Great Falls Lodge of Elks, and James E. McCarthy, past exalted ruler of Butte Lodge, working in cooperation with John Cunningham, exalted ruler of the Butte organization. Several congratulatory telegrams from Butte and other cities were read during the dinner party.

Several letters complimentary to the band on its Calgary appearances were received here Wednesday. Typical of them is one written by Paul Dempsey, Holiday on Ice, which pretty well covers the band's entire Calgary showing from pageantry to behavior. It follows:

"Butte High School Band is most talked about part of the whole parade. Too bad you couldn't stay over to hear comments I heard tonight (Monday) from the officials and the commoners who came out to our show. They were all in accord in praising the Butte High School Band as the best band they ever had in the Calgary Stampede parade. They loved the precision, the good music, the playing of familiar Canadian tunes, the majorettes, and the use of Canadian, British, and American flags. Whoever staged Butte High's participation in the stampede parade deserves a world of credit. And, your Butte boys and girls behaved wonderfully every minute they were here. That means much to people from all over the world. Mr. Tyson (producer of Holiday) and others of my company think your band is just 'The Most.' What more can I say."

Andrew Pierce, manager of Prudential Insurance Co., Calgary, wrote Warren Meade, district manager of Prudential Insurance of America:

"Always did like Butte and its people. Like it better than ever after seeing your boys and girls in such a wonderful showing in the parade here Monday. They are wholesome youngsters with a flare for music, marching, and pageantry which will long be remembered here."

[From the Montana Standard of July 15, 1955]

BUTTE HIGH BAND SCORES ANOTHER TRIUMPH

The Butte High School Band has scored another triumph. It turned in outstanding performances both in concert and parade showings in Calgary. Butte is not surprised, for it knows the quality of the band, and the showmanship and ability of its directors, Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Schiesser.

However, there is a more important phase to the band's appearance in its travels—the behavior of the 138 boys and girls. Everywhere the band has appeared, Pasadena, Portland, Seattle, Spokane, and Las Vegas residents of the host communities have been impressed by the well-mannered conduct of Butte's traveling ambassadors of goodwill. Calgary was no exception. It is a fine thing for Butte to have had such representation in the Calgary Stampede which attracted visitors from all over the world. The behavior of the Butte boys and girls not only in their performances in Calgary, and later in Banff, but in their recreation time on this 1955 band trip is effectively related in a letter received here from Calgary. Written by Paul Dempsey, New York City, a long-time public relations man, it said in part:

"Your Butte boys and girls behaved wonderfully every minute they were here. That means much to people from all over the world."

Too often cities receive unfavorable publicity as result of actions of a few undisciplined or heedless youngsters. Butte is no exception. It is boys and girls like the members of the Butte High School Band who are truly representative of the mining city, and of their associates in Butte High School, Boys Central High School, and Girls Central High School, who are Butte's greatest investment for the future. Judging from the reports emanating from Calgary that future is in good hands.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there is to be found an article entitled "Now Democrats Assail Mess in Washington—They Point to Republican Retreats and Plan New Investigations." The article is by one of the staff writers of that newspaper, and reads in part as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 16.—Politically, this was a rough week for the Eisenhower administration, causing Democrats to plagiarize and revive the old campaign cry about the mess in Washington.

It was a week of changes—or "retreat," as the Democrats viewed them—on many fronts for the President and his administration leaders. Democrats, back in control of Congress, stepped up their investigatory efforts, hinting that revelations of big scandals were just around the corner. The "retreats" and advances of the last few days were tactical in nature, indicative only of the strategic nature of next year's campaign for the big prizes.

Mr. President, I was here all week; and if the actions of last week indicated that there were any great scandals or great revelations involving the Eisenhower administration, or indicated any corruption or any wrongdoing, I did not see it. Certainly I was not away from Washington; and I observed the action of the committees.

I wish to say that certainly our great President, who enjoys the confidence of the American people to a degree which very few previous Presidents attained, does not want to cover up anything. If our Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle have anything they wish to reveal, or if they know of anything that is wrong, I am sure the President of the United States would be the first to say to them, "Come on, trot it out, and let us have it out in the open. Let us talk about these things in the open."

There has never been any effort on the part of this administration to cover up in any respect; and certainly the President's admonition to every person in the administration has been to tell the truth; and, if they make a mistake, to admit it.

All of us know that in his administration the President has many holdovers from previous administrations; about 90 percent of the Government employees with whom the President has to deal are holdovers. Under our civil service system, practically all the employees of the present administration are held over from previous administrations, and it is impossible to get rid of them, because the Congress is controlled by the opposite party.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about what is happening in the country. Without being engaged in war, we have prosperity. We have peace, peace with prosperity, with a great administration in power.

Mr. President, the Census Bureau tells us that 64 million Americans are at work in our country as we swing into the last half of 1955. Our national output, measured in terms of goods and services, is up to an annual rate of more than $375 billion. Big business, concentrated largely in steel and automobile production, has been operating at almost unbelievable levels, with 4½ million automobiles turned out in the first half of 1955.

No one expects this rate of manufacture to continue. Building construction will tend eventually to flatten out somewhat. The automobile business may fall off, but not so much as some people suspect. This will not halt the American productive machine. There is a tremendous and presently unfilled demand for metals. Factories turning out durable goods have more than 45 billion dollars worth of business still on their books. It will take at least 3 months to fill these orders.

Everything points to a continued period of steady and enduring prosperity. If we can couple these developments with a tax cut in 1956, the business curve should keep moving along in the pleasant upward swing which sounds like sweet music to America.

Mr. President, this administration is doing more in the way of stabilizing our economy and increasing the value of the American dollar and helping business proceed in a steady, orderly fashion than has any other recent administration. Insofar as we can control the Government the Government is conducted in a clean, wholesome way. We cannot be responsible for the large number of holdover employees; but certainly wherever we know of any corruption, wherever the President or his Cabinet knows of any corruption or any wrongdoing the President and his Cabinet want it to be brought out into the open and revealed; and if there is anything not wholesome that anyone knows about such persons should tell of it openly, and should stop engaging in innuendoes.

Under President Eisenhower's administration, we now have, in my opinion, the best Government the United States has had for many years past; and all of us applaud the outstanding leadership of our great President, who is doing so much for peace and prosperity.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for a period of not more than 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, some of us have come to the Chamber during the morning hour for the sole purpose of making insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or presenting other routine matters. We are compelled to spend 15, 20, or 30 minutes waiting for the conclusion of the 5-minute, 6-minute, and 8-minute speeches delivered by unanimous consent. I do not object to that, but I find that often we must spend the entire morning hour sitting and waiting to be recognized while there are committee hearings to which we should return promptly. Therefore I must object.

Mr. FLANDERS. I withdraw my request until the Senator from Minnesota has made his insertion.

RUSSIA'S AIRPOWER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 17, many newspapers carried a highly interesting and informative article entitled "Russia's Airpower Shames Ours," written by the well-known author and columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop. This article, which merits the prayerful consideration of the Congress, is based on Mr. Alsop's personal observation of the relative air strength of the Soviets and the United States. The article, which shows our serious inferiority, both in quantity and quality, is so interesting and timely that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S AIRPOWER SHAMES OURS

(By Joseph Alsop)

Despite the strictly phony talk in Washington, the Soviet delegation will go to the summit meeting at Geneva with more military strength behind them than the Soviet Union has ever before possessed. That, no doubt, was the real fact behind Nikita Khrushchev's warning at the July 4 party in Moscow, that the Soviets were not going to Geneva to negotiate from weakness.

From the straight military viewpoint, in truth, the American negotiators are the ones who should feel a bit nervous. For the one great trump this country has always held since the end of the last war—a wide air-atomic lead over the Soviet Union—is now being snatched away by a massive Russian effort.

On the other hand, the superior American stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons are ceasing to matter very much because the Soviets are now accumulating sufficient stocks of their own to wreak total destruction on the United States.

On the other hand, the Soviets are now beginning to lead the United States in quality as well as quantity of aircraft production.

The change in the bomb balance has been going on for a long time. The truly revolutionary development of the last 12 months has been the change in the air balance. A series of reports in this space in the last week have touched on some aspects of that change. Overall, it can be summarized as follows:

The Soviet air program first began to catch up with the American air program in the field of fighter production. Here the United States has been altogether outclassed.

The Soviets have produced about 4,000 supersonic MIG-17s, while we have produced a few scores of the F-100 fighter which is comparable to the MIG-17 in all ways except in its inferior altitude characteristics.

The Soviets have already gone into full production with their still newer, still faster "Farmer" fighter, whereas we have produced two prototypes of the comparable F-104. The Soviets are now starting production of a first-class, jet-powered, all-weather fighter, while we have nothing comparable that is anywhere near real quantity production.

Second, as far as current output is concerned, the Soviets have now passed the United States in the field of long-range jet bombers. They are now producing their T-37 bomber at a considerably higher rate than we are producing the comparable B-52 in this country, and their monthly output will still be 4 or 5 bombers per month higher than ours when the recently ordered increase in B-52 production finally takes effect.

They also are producing their T-39 bomber comparable to our B-47, at a rate of 20 to 30 per month, and this rate is expected to rise. And whereas the output of fast tankers suitable to air refuel the B-47 is extremely unsatisfactory, the Soviets have in quantity production a 4-engine turbo aircraft well suited for air refueling the T-39.

Third, the Soviets have achieved certain technical successes of a distinctly alarming character. The new Russian air engine with 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust, which powers the T-37s and T-39s, was ready for use at least 2 years before the comparable jet engine, the J-75, which is just emerging from the experimental stage.

And Soviet air-lead time—the time from the conception of an aircraft until the beginning of quantity production—now appears to be only one-half of American air-lead time.

Fourth, because of Soviet air gains already achieved, our one existing advantage is being quite largely neutralized. This advantage is the Strategic Air Command's large force-in-being of B-47 bombers.

But the B-47, being a short-range aircraft, depends on overseas bases to reach Russian targets. And the allies who control these overseas bases are more and more reluctant to allow the bases to be used when the chips are down—because they are being more and more intimidated by the combination of growing Soviet airpower and growing Soviet stocks of H-bombs.

Fifth, and finally, there also are excellent reasons to believe that the Soviet effort to produce the true ultimate weapon, the high-speed guided missile of intercontinental range, is well ahead of the American long-range missile effort, which is on a strictly business-as-usual basis.

That is the true balance sheet.

Maybe President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin will make real progress in the disarmament talks in Geneva. But until disarmament is a solid reality, this kind of air-balance sheet is a national scandal, made all the more shocking by the tremendous coverup that is going on at the Pentagon.

While the cold war continues, the Soviet capture of the traditional American lead in the air constitutes a national emergency. It should be treated as such, instead of being hidden behind huckstering phrases.

INCREASE IN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have been calling the attention of Senators to the increased imports of oil. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Total Oil Imports Rise Sharply for Week—Exceed 1954," published in the Oil Daily of July 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL OIL IMPORTS RISE SHARPLY FOR WEEK—EXCEED 1954

Paced by a sharp climb in receipts of foreign crude, total imports of crude and products soared 49.2 percent in the week ended July 8.

Total imports in the latest week averaged 1,240,600 barrels daily, a gain of 409,100 barrels daily from the average of 831,500 in the preceding week, and were 180,900, or 17.1 percent, higher than the average of 1,059,700 barrels daily in the like year-earlier week.

Total imports in the 4-week period ended July 8 averaged 1,078,600 barrels daily, 99,800, or 10.2 percent, above the average of 978,800 in the like 1954 period, according to the report of the American Petroleum Institute.

Total crude imports reached an average of 929,300 in the latest week, up 379,500, or 69 percent, from the average 549,800 in the preceding week, and were 229,100, or 32.7 percent, higher than the average of 700,200 in the like year-earlier week.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Will the able Senator state the amount of the increase in importations of foreign oil during the past week, over those of the preceding week?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has called my attention to that increase. Importations of oil have been increasing each week for several months. This is the third occasion upon which I have asked to have material on this subject printed in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues. I hope Senators will give close attention to the subject.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the promises relative to the restriction of oil importations, which were recently made by the importing companies, are being kept?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, those promises are not being kept.

Mr. NEELY. Is it not a fact that they are being shamefully violated every day, and that oil is being imported at a constantly increasing rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

OUR PRAYERS ARE WITH GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the hopes and prayers of the peoples of the world are with the President of the United States and with Prime Ministers Eden of England and Faure of France, who have within the past few hours commenced their talks with Soviet delegates at the Geneva Conference.

So much has been said, and so much has been written and will be written, about the significance of this conference, that little more need be said at the moment.

However, because there will be such tremendous coverage through all the media of communication, it is important to remember that what counts is not so much the minute-by-minute or hour-by-hour byplay, but the overall results, if any.

Sometimes there is a tendency in some quarters to watch an international conference as though it were a prizefight. Some people almost seem to want to "keep score" after each day's session as if it were a blow-by-blow or round-by-round slugging match. They seem to want to keep score of every success of "our side" and every defeat of "the other side." But this conference is not a prizefight, or a baseball game, or a competition for headlines. It is not a place for grandstand oratory, and I know that the great American delegation, headed by President Eisenhower, full well realizes that fact.

Our delegates have made this trip to Geneva for the greatest mission in the world—the maintenance of a just and lasting peace. They are seeking earnestly and honestly to identify and start toward solution of various East-West problems.

No one could reasonably expect that East-West problems, which have been 38 years in the making—since 1917—are to be solved within a period of but a few days. But we can hope, with faith, with confidence, with realistic optimism, for some progress.

War has ceased to be an answer for settling international difficulties. As President Eisenhower has said, "there is no alternative to peace."

If the Soviet Union chooses to make this conference a success, it will be a success, because there is every determination on the part of allied delegates to make it a success. If the Soviet Union, instead, chooses to make this conference another propaganda forum, "full of sound and fury and signifying nothing," then this conference, through no fault of our own, will be a failure.

We hope, however, that it will be a success, that the peoples of the world will not be disappointed. We urge all Americans not to let their hopes ride too high, lest they be built up for another "awful letdown."

We hope, moreover, that they will not misconstrue or exaggerate the hour-by-hour or day-by-day byplay, because, as I stated at the outset, what counts is the overall results, and not the temporary phases of negotiation.

NEW DECISIONS FOR AMERICA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this meeting at the top in Geneva can become a move of real progress toward complete, universal, controlled disarmament. There is hardly an American who would not be ready to hail so great an achievement. But have we counted the cost in economic dislocation and in loss of sovereignty?

A sudden end to the building of armament, a sudden reduction of our Armed Forces, will produce economic results in this country which will be of very serious magnitude. The recession resulting from clipping only $6 billions off our defense budget has given us fair warning. Unforeseen, unprovided for, there would result serious unemployment and attendant widespread distress. Remedies are available.

One remedy will be the diversion of part of the funds we are now spending on preparations for war into providing benefits for the people of the earth. Production and distribution of the materials and the greater well-being of persons in this greatly expanded undertaking will reduce the resulting unemployment. Only a part of this will be available for American reemployment.

A further remedy lies in expanding worthwhile Government peacetime projects. It is better to build highways than tanks.

The third and major resource is an immediate decrease in taxes so designed as to raise the general purchasing power of the people as a whole. We must not use the surplus revenues resulting from our decrease in defense expenditures for direct, immediate, complete application to reducing the national debt. We must shift defense taxes and expenditures to potential public purchasing power, so that a maximum of new employment through new expenditures of new personal prosperity can take up a major part of the unemployment resulting from the decrease in defense.

Aside from the economic difficulty we have a political one. The political difficulty lies in a widespread hostility to international government. We find it hard to relinquish any part of our national sovereignty.

The notion of world government has fascinated idealists and theorists for many years. Tough-minded folk have cast the idea out of their consideration, realizing full well the manifold difficulties which lie in the way of establishing it. They are skeptical as well of any good results flowing from it.

We must stop short of the notion of complete world government. This is far from being a good idea. We do not want to bring the whole race of men under one jurisdiction except in those particulars in which it becomes necessary. When we conclude that disarmament is possible as well as necessary, we must willingly work out the institutions required to make it effective.

The instinct is a strong one which resists any demand that we give up any part of our sovereignty. We should not give it up carelessly. Only when and to the extent that it serves the national interest should we ever give consent.

As a native of Vermont I have, in the background of my own history, a case in which sovereignty was relinquished. Vermont was 1 of only 2 States which were independent nations before joining the Union. Texas, of course, was the other.

It was no theoretical discussion which the citizens of Vermont faced in making their choice. There were some who would join the Union, some who would retain their independence. There were even some who thought of joining Canada. But after all was said and done, it became clear that it was in the interest of the people of Vermont to surrender a certain measure of their sovereignty for the sake of the benefits which would come to them by accepting the Federal Constitution. Such careful consideration today may well reduce the degree of sovereignty to be surrendered.

A peaceful world is a wonderful thing to look forward to, but unless we are prepared politically and economically to endure the required changes in our lives, the prospect will fade and only confusion remain.

The future is in our hands to make. Let us make it.

Mr. President, this is the last of seven short speeches which I have made on the prospects for the meeting at Geneva and on the prospects for universal, complete, and controlled disarmament. This particular speech, which relates to the problem the American people will face, is one that should have the serious attention of every citizen.

THE PHILIPPINE TRADE BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly consider a bill, now pending on the calendar, revising the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 and implementing an agreement recently negotiated between the Governments of the United States and the Philippine Republic. The bill should, and will, I know, not only be approved, but approved with acclaim.

It is well, in passing on this proposed legislation, to allow our minds to dwell for a moment on the larger meaning of this act and its provisions. In themselves the provisions of this bill are not of world-shaping scope or content. They will not vastly promote nor tremendously affect our economy, although, I gather, they are not without commercial advantage for us.

No, the real importance of this bill lies not in its actual terms and details, as important as these may be for those immediately affected.

This is an act approving an agreement entered into between two sovereign powers—two nations which are equals in the assembly of nations. Yet only 25 years ago, the Philippines were a dependency of ours, a colonial possession, 16 million people—now there are 20 million—over whom the United States was sovereign, and whose destiny was ours to propose and dispose.

Twenty-one years ago, the Congress passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act granting the Philippines commonwealth status, and the promise of independence in 1946. And in 1946, 9 years ago, on July 4, we crowned that promise with performance. The American flag was hauled down in Manila, not in defeat, but in glory; not by force, but by free and deliberate act. We gave up our sovereignty; we yielded our title and possession. We embraced, as an equal, our former ward and colony.

In 1946, also, we passed the Philippine Trade Act, establishing special commercial relations with the Philippines for a limited period, in recognition of the intimate ties which had existed for half a century between us. It was also a recognition of Filipino heroism and devotion to democracy, so deathlessly demonstrated during World War II, at Bataan and Corregidor, and throughout the years of Japanese occupation.

That act was unilateral. We, the Congress, decided what would be right and proper in the way of commercial relations between our two countries for the limited period of postwar and post-independence adjustment. Of course we consulted with the Filipinos. But we decided, and asked the Filipinos to approve. They approved.

There were terms in that Trade Act to which some of of their people objected. The claim was made that the United States had taken advantage of its powerful position to exact conditions of special advantage for Americans. Great fears were expressed that Americans would exploit their special position in the Philippines, and make a mockery of Filipino sovereignty.

But the leaders of the Filipino people at the time, led by that great Filipino statesman, the late President Manuel Roxas, placed their trust in America, and carried the case to the people in a great nationwide plebiscite. The Filipino people voted their confidence in President Roxas, and in America the controversial provisions of the Philippine Trade Act were approved and implemented.

Today, Mr. President, we, the Congress, are asked to approve amendments to the Philippine Trade Act which will, among other things, place every feature of Philippine-American commercial relations on a completely reciprocal and coequal basis. The fears expressed in 1946 were never realized, in any event. Today we are approving provisions which clearly spell out a formal equality and reciprocity.

I would be in favor of doing whatever is necessary and proper to strengthen and support the Philippine democracy. It is to our enlightened self-interest to assist the Philippines in every possible way, to achieve economic well-being, and to raise the standard of her freedom-loving people.

There are in the Philippines 20 million people—Asians, if you will—who practice democracy on the American model. Their constitution is almost indistinguishable from ours. Their institutions are patterned after ours. They speak our language as well as their own. Their faith and belief in democracy is as fierce as our own.

The Filipino people have shown that they can fight for freedom. Their President, Ramon Magsaysay, succeeded in revitalizing democracy in the Philippines when he fought communism successfully. He showed Asia and the world that an Asian country can fight communism and win. President Magsaysay is concentrating on improving the economic welfare of the masses of his people. This bill will help him achieve that end. We must exert every effort to assist him so that democracy in the Philippines may continue to flourish and the peoples of Asia will see how willing and ready we are to cooperate with leaders who, like President Magsaysay, believe in freedom and can fight for it.

I need not recall what the Philippines recently did for the free world in the Bandung Conference. In that historic meeting, it was the Philippines that led the forces of democracy against communism and neutralism. It was a Filipino voice, that of the eminent world statesman, Carlos T. Romulo, which gave expression to the dignity of man and turned the tide for freedom. Again, it was the Philippines, led again by General Romulo, which, at the San Francisco conference of the United Nations last month, beat Molotov to the punch when it came to proposing a peace declaration.

We recognized and appreciated Filipino loyalty to democracy when Filipino troops and Filipino guerrillas fought and died in America's cause in World War II. Neither can we forget that the Philippines was among the first of the nations to send its troops to Korea.

This trade agreement with the Philippines is only a token of the respect and regard that we hold for the noble and courageous Filipino people.

Mr. President, let us, of course, approve the pending bill and the pending agreement. But let all of us, in casting our votes, know that we are voting not only for an amendment to the Philippine Trade Act of 1946, but for democracy in the Far East.

NEW WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement concerning the Pacific Northwest power development, which will take not longer than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last Friday, following the signing of the public works appropriations bill for 1956, the White House issued a statement which clearly confirmed the fact that the present administration is unalterably opposed to the start of vitally needed new water resource development projects in the Pacific Northwest.

The administration statement criticized the inclusion in the appropriations act of 107 items that had not been included in the budget for fiscal 1956. Of this total, six projects are of vital interest to the people of my State.

Mr. President, if the administration refuses to go ahead with these projects, for which funds have been provided by this Congress, then the Pacific Northwest will suffer its greatest setback in half a century.

When the budget was originally drafted, the administration either failed to provide any funds or included inadequate amounts. This budgetary action and the subsequent disapproval of increased funds by the White House can only be interpreted as proof that the administration is opposed to further Northwest development in the public interest.

By singling out power projects for censure, the administration again has revealed that it evidently favors Northwest dams only when the profitable hydroelectric features of those projects can be surrendered to private utility corporations.

It is extremely significant that this assault against Northwest river projects has—through its entire course—been fostered by action of the Bureau of the Budget, the agency which engineered the nefarious Dixon-Yates proposal. This agency, whose manipulations in favor of the private utility lobby were recently revealed in Senate hearings, is the channel where hatchetwork on Northwest projects originates.

Administration rejection of the 107 unbudgeted projects could mean that Congress will have lost all real control over appropriations. For all practical purposes, the White House action represents an item veto by the executive department, thwarting the mandate of this Congress.

The appropriations were made by the House and Senate only after careful and detailed study of the need for the start of new projects. These items involved such major Northwest gains as deepening the Columbia River bar and channel to 48 feet, starting actual construction on Ice Harbor, Cougar and Hills Creek multipurpose dam projects, additional planning funds for John Day and Green Peter Dams, the Talent irrigation project, and harbor improvements at Tillamook and Coos Bay.

The White House threat to prohibit start of these projects until detailed engineering plans have been completed completely ignores the status of their development. The Ice Harbor Dam is ready for construction. Planning on Hills Creek is 95 percent complete. Only a small amount of additional preconstruction technical work needs to be done to start the Cougar Dam, and no additional plans are needed to start the dredging of the Columbia River mouth and bar.

But there is a major inconsistency revealed by the administration's most recent statement. A few weeks ago, the President stated at his press conference that Cougar Dam was one of the items on his so-called must legislative list. The Congress has provided the money to start this dam as another unit of the Federal system. Does the President mean that he wants the Cougar project, or that he does not want it? Will he order the Army engineers to hold up work on this dam merely because the Congress has provided adequate additional funds to get it under way?

Mr. President, the White House statement said that in the case of new power projects in the Northwest, "we must be assured that satisfactory arrangements have been completed for return of the Federal investment." The White House need only turn to the report of the Bonneville Power Administration to determine whether the arrangements for return of the reimbursable power costs are satisfactory. That report shows the Bonneville power system, of which the dam projects recently provided for by Congress will be a part, was $65 million ahead of its payout schedule at the end of the 1954 fiscal year. I am sure that nothing could be more satisfactory than a project which returns money to the Federal Treasury at a rate far in excess of original estimates.

The White House statement threatening the start of new projects in the Northwest is an affront to Congress which cannot be ignored. We desperately need these projects in order to progress economically. Delay in their start can only lead to economic paralysis in the Northwest region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the White House statement of July 15, 1955, may be printed in the Record in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EISENHOWER

I have today approved H. R. 6766, "making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes." I have approved this bill with great reluctance. There are two matters which are of deep concern to me.

The first is the reduction made in the funds available to the Atomic Energy Commission. The amount provided in the bill, together with the estimated amount carried over from 1955, would provide the Commission with total obligational authority of $1,380,847,000 for operating expenses in 1956. This amount is $144,404,000 less than was requested. A reduction of this magnitude could seriously interfere with the Commission's plans to produce atomic weapons, to develop propulsion reactors for the Navy and the Air Force, and to develop peaceful applications of atomic energy, including the production of electric power.

CALLS PROGRAMS CRUCIAL

These are most crucial programs in maintaining a strong national defense and in maintaining this Nation's leadership in bringing the benefits of atomic energy to the service of mankind, both here and abroad.

For these reasons, I would hope that the Congress would reconsider its action and make supplementary amounts available so as to avoid serious disruption in this most vital program.

The second matter which concerns me is the large increase in the number of new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Many of these projects which have been added by the Congress have not had detailed engineering studies completed. As a result, we have no basis for determining their financial soundness and their ultimate cost to the Federal Government.

In all, 107 unbudgeted projects were added by Congress. We can only guess what their total cost to the taxpayers will ultimately be because of this lack of detailed engineering studies on many of them. The best guess that can be made at the present time is upward of $1,500,000,000, but when planning is completed, this guess, in the light of past experience, may well prove to be far too low. While the first-year appropriations made in this bill amount to only about $47 million, the appropriations and expenditures in future years will increase sharply and quickly reach a half-billion-dollar level.

As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates. In the case of projects involving reimbursable items, such as electric power and water supply, we must be assured that satisfactory financial arrangements have been completed for return of the Federal investment.

The public is entitled to this measure of protection to the tax dollars that go into the construction of these projects.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AT THE OPENING OF THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record the address delivered today by the President of the United States at the opening of the Geneva Big Four summit parley.

Mr. President, it is appropriate, I think, to have this speech in the Congressional Record today. Without doubt, this address is one of the most significant utterances by any President, as it is one of the most significant statements by the head of any government in the past 10 years.

In my opinion, President Eisenhower has approached the problems that disturb the world in a manner well calculated to lead to desirable results.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRESIDENT VIEWS GENEVA AS FIRST STEP TO PEACE

We meet here for a simple purpose. We have come to find a basis for accommodation which will make life safer and happier not only for the nations we represent but for people elsewhere.

We are here in response to a universal urge, recognized by Premier Bulganin in his speech of July 15, so that the political leaders of our great countries find a path to peace.

We cannot expect here, in the few hours of a few days, to solve all the problems of all the world that need to be solved. Indeed, the four of us meeting here have no authority from others that could justify us even in attempting that. The roots of many of these problems are buried deep in war, conflicts and history. They are made even more difficult by the differences in governmental ideologies and ambitions. Manifestly, it is out of the question in the short time available to the heads of government meeting here to trace out the causes and origins of these problems and to devise agreements that could with complete fairness to all eliminate them.

Nevertheless, we can, perhaps, create a new spirit that will make possible future solutions of problems which are within our responsibilities. And equally important we can try to take here now at Geneva the first steps on a new road to a just and durable peace.

PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED

The problems that concern us are not inherently insoluble. Of course, they are difficult, but their solution is not beyond the wisdom of man. They seem insoluble under conditions of fear, distrust, and even hostility, where every move is weighted in terms of whether it will help or weaken a potential enemy. If those conditions can be changed, then much can be done. Under such circumstances, I am confident that at a later stage our foreign ministers will be able to carry on from where we leave off to find, either by themselves or with others, solutions to our problems.

No doubt there are among our nations philisophical convictions which are in many respects irreconcilable. Nothing that we can say or do here will change that fact. However, it is not always necessary that people should think alike and believe alike before they can work together. The essential thing is that none should attempt by force or trickery to make his beliefs prevail and thus to impose his system on the unwilling.

The new approach we of this conference should seek cannot be found merely by talking in terms of abstractions and generalities. It is necessary that we talk frankly about the concrete problems which create tension between us and about the way to begin in solving them.

As a preface, may I indicate some of the issues I think we should discuss?

First is the problem of unifying Germany and forming an all-German Government based on free elections. Ten years have passed since the German armistice—and Germany is still divided. That division does a grievous wrong to a people which is entitled, like any other, to pursue together a common destiny. While that division continues, it creates a basic source of instability in Europe. Our talk of peace has little meaning if at the same time we perpetuate conditions endangering the peace. Toward Germany, the four of us bear special responsibilities. While any conclusions we reach would be invalid unless supported by majority opinion in Germany, this problem should be a central topic for our meeting here. Must we not consider ways to solve it promptly and justly?

In the interest of enduring peace, our solution should take account of the legitimate security interests of all concerned. That is why we insist a United Germany is entitled, at its choice, to exercise its inherent right of collective self-defense.

By the same token, we are ready to take account of legitimate security interests of the Soviet Union. The Paris agreements contain many provisions which serve this purpose. But we are quite ready to consider further reciprocal safeguards which are reasonable and practical and compatible with the security of all concerned.

RIGHT TO CHOOSE GOVERNMENT

On a broader plane, there is the problem of respecting the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live: And of restoring sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of them. The American people feel strongly that certain peoples of Eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of this pledge of our United Nations wartime declaration, reinforced by other wartime agreements.

There is the problem of communication and human contacts as among our peoples. We frankly fear the consequences of a situation where whole peoples are isolated from the outside world. The American people want to be friends with the Soviet peoples. There are no natural differences between our peoples, or our nations. There are artificial barriers such as now interfere with communication. It is time that all curtains whether of guns or laws or regulations should begin to come down. But this can only be done in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence.

There is the problem of international communism. For 38 years now, its activities have disturbed relations between other nations and the Soviet Union. Its activities are not confined to efforts to persuade. It seeks throughout the world to subvert lawful governments and to subject nations to an alien domination. We cannot ignore the distrust created by the support of such activities. In my nation and elsewhere, it adds to distrust and therefore to international tension.

ARMAMENT CAUSES DISTRUST

Finally, there is the overriding problem of armament. This is at once a result and a cause of existing tension and distrust. Contrary to a basic purpose of the United Nations Charter, armaments now divert much of men's efforts from creative to nonproductive uses. We would all like to end that. But apparently none dares to do so because of fear of attack.

Surprise attack has a capacity for destruction far beyond anything which man has yet known. So each of us deems it vital that there should be means to deter such attack. Perhaps, therefore, we should consider whether the problem of limitation of armament may not best be approached by seeking—as a first step—dependable ways to supervise and inspect military establishments, so that there can be no frightful surprises, whether by sudden attack or by secret violation, of agreed restrictions. In this field nothing is more important than that we explore together the challenging and central problem of effective mutual inspection. Such a system is the foundation for real disarmament.

As we think of this problem of armament, we need to remember that the present burden of costly armaments not only deprives our own people of higher living standards, but it also denies the peoples of underdeveloped areas of resources which would improve their lot. These areas contain much of the world's population and many nations now emerging for the first time into political independence.

ECONOMIC GROWTH STRESSED

They are grappling with the urgent problem of economic growth. Normally they receive assistance particularly for capital development from the more developed nations of the world. However, that normal process is gravely retarded by the fact that the more developed industrial countries are dedicating so much of their productive effort to armament. Armament reduction would and shoud insure that part of the savings would flow into the less developed areas of the world to assist their economic development.

In addition, we must press forward in developing the use of atomic energy for constructive purposes. We regret that the Soviet Union has never accepted our proposal of December 1953 that nations possessing stockpiles of fissionable material should join to contribute to a world bank so, as in steadily increasing measures, to substitute cooperation in human welfare for competition in means of human destruction. We still believe that if the Soviet Union would, according to its ability, contribute to this great project that act would improve the international climate.

HOPES FOR SUGGESTIONS

In this first statement of the conference I have indicated very briefly some of the problems that weigh upon my mind and upon the people of the United States and where solution is largely within the competence of the four of us. As our work here progresses I hope that all of us will have suggestions as to how we might promote the search for the solution of these problems.

Perhaps it would be well if each of us would in turn give a similar indication of his country's views; then we can quickly see the scope of the matters which it might be useful to discuss here and arrange our time accordingly.

Let me repeat, I trust that we are not here merely to catalog our differences. We are not here to repeat the same dreary exercises that have characterized most of our negotiations of the past 10 years. We are here in response to the peaceful aspirations of mankind to start the kind of discussions which will inject a new spirit into our diplomacy, and to launch fresh negotiations under conditions of good augury.

In that way, and perhaps only in that way, can our meeting, necessarily brief, serve to generate and put in motion the new forces needed to set us truly on the path to peace. For this I am sure all humanity will devoutly pray.

SPECIAL SEGREGATION STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me, dated July 16, 1955, entitled "Special Segregation Statement."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL SEGREGATION STATEMENT, JULY 16, 1955

Nothing has given me more concern in the past years than the decision of the United States Supreme Court on the question of segregation in our public schools. That decision on May 17, 1954, foretold many years of litigation in South Carolina and other States of the South.

The implementing decree of the Supreme Court on May 31 of this year was another step in the destruction of constitutional government. The Constitution provides for the separation of the Federal Government into three separate branches. The meaning of the decision of last year and the implementing decree of this year is that the judiciary—the Supreme Court—has usurped the authority of the legislative branch—the Congress of the United States.

Not only did the decisions mean usurpation of the authority of the Congress, it also meant virtual seizure of the powers granted the States under the Constitution in the 10th amendment.

Thursday's decision by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, that the State of South Carolina does not have the power to establish laws regarding transportation of persons within State borders, was still another step in the attempts to destroy the rights guaranteed the States and individual citizens under the Constitution.

What the courts have done was without color of law under the Constitution. Instead the decisions hinged on the testimony of sociologists and psychologists in the school segregation case. Now it is clear that the lower courts feel bound in any question involving segregation to follow the political decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases.

I was not in public office at the time of the 1954 decision, but on May 31 of this year when the implementing decree was handed down by the Supreme Court, I said publicly:

"I am opposed to the original decision and its implementation. The failure of the court on May 17, 1954, to recognized well-established constitutional principles and legal precedents cannot, at this time, be offset by its recognition that local conditions differ. Today's decision did not change the decision of May 17, 1954."

How little comfort was to be found in the May 31 decree is proved by the decision Thursday of the court in Richmond going into the field of transportation—beyond the decision on the schools.

Following the line of the Supreme Court in its decision on the schools, the court of appeals stated in a unanimous decision that the "separate but equal" doctrine no longer applies to transportation within a State. Thus, the lower court, like the Supreme Court, has substituted "discrimination" for "segregation" as a definition in spite of previous decisions of the Supreme Court, beginning with the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* case in 1896 which declared separate but equal facilities were not discriminatory. There were many distinguished men who sat on the Supreme Court through the years from 1896 to 1954. Among them were many able jurists who maintained constitutional government in the United States by the simple process of interpreting the Constitution and the law instead of trying to legislate new laws by the decisions they rendered.

I regret I cannot say the same about the Court today.

Even prior to the implementing decree of the Supreme Court in the school cases, I foresaw the troubles which would come to attack our way of life after the decision was rendered in 1954. On February 9 of this year, I introduced a bill in the Senate which I hoped would at least give us the right to have our protests against usurpation of States' rights in courts of our own State.

This bill would limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the courts of appeals in cases relating to the schools. Simply, this means that instead of the complainants being permitted to appeal decisions of the Federal District Court in South Carolina, they would have to abide by the decisions rendered by the district court in the State.

Several times I have requested action on this bill which was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee and recently I wrote the chairman urging that this bill be reported to the Senate so it could be voted on.

In Washington, there seem to be few persons who still believe that the Constitution of the United States is a living document which embodies principles as sound now as they were when the Constitution was drafted by our forefathers. Even on new appointments to the courts, which require Senate confirmation, there is little apparent concern over whether the new members of the courts will follow the Constitution instead of the psychology books. Legislation by court decree could be halted or at least stemmed if enough Members of the Senate held the views of South Carolinians.

I intend to exert my efforts in every direction open to me as a Senator to halt the destructive attacks on our Constitution. But without the help of others, I can only be a voice crying in the political wilderness.

Bills cannot be passed without the approval of a majority of the Congress.

Every legal means at their command must be employed by South Carolinians and all southerners in this fight to retain legal processes of government.

The State courts must continue faithfully to interpret the laws of the States.

The State legislatures must carefully enact laws and amend existing laws to meet the onslaughts against the rights of the States and individuals.

The governors of the States must devote themselves to advocating and defending the rights guaranteed the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution. That amendment declares:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

We must all think clearly and act calmly as we devote ourselves to the preservation of the rights guaranteed to us by the Constitution. I pledge my efforts to this end.

ILLNESS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, one of the most unusual events of recent times has been the widespread outpouring of newspaper tributes that followed the illness of our distinguished majority leader.

These tributes cut across all lines. They have come from every section of the country and from newspapers representing every shade of American political opinion.

I think this is the proof of the unanimous acceptance of the responsible policies which Lyndon B. Johnson laid down for his party. The majority leader from the beginning has insisted that partisanship should be subordinated to patriotism and the American people have responded.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks numerous editorials bearing upon this question.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner of July 11, 1955]

The Lyndon Johnson We Knew

The tragic illness of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, has grieved members of both parties. His serious heart attack, apparently removing him indefinitely from a place of active leadership, is a blow to the Democratic Party and to the Nation.

We had the good fortune to become acquainted with Mr. Johnson during our assignment in Texas during part of World War II. He was then a recently elected Congressman on active duty with the Navy.

A valuable commentary on Johnson in those days appears in the book, Queens Die Proudly, by W. L. White, in which the author tells what happened after the crash landing of the *Swoose*, a flying fortress, on a remote Australian ranch. Johnson, then on duty as a Navy lieutenant commander, was aboard.

One of the crew said afterward, "Pretty soon Australian ranchers began crawling out of holes in the ground—I don't know where else they came from—and right away Lieutenant Commander Johnson gets busy. He begins to get acquainted. They tell him where we are and some of them go off to get a truck and take us into town where we can telephone and more keep coming, and Johnson is shaking hands all around, and he comes back and tell us these are real folks—the best damn folks in the world, except maybe the folks in his own Texas. Pretty soon he knows all their first names and they're telling him why there ought to be a high tariff on wool, and there's no question he swung that country for Johnson before we left. He sure was in his element. I know he sure swung the *Swoose* crew. He can carry that precinct any day."

Later we knew him in Washington and spent an afternoon in his home. He was a restless man, constantly on the move, yet one incident of significance in his recent history remains vivid.

About midafternoon, despite the presence of 3 or 4 guests, he calmly excused himself and napped for an hour on a couch out on the big porch where the rest of us continued to talk. We've remembered that and thought, as he climbed from Congress to the Senate and to majority leader and even to frequent mention for the Presidency, that this man probably was continuing to guard his health even as he approached the pinnacle of success.

But apparently we were wrong. He gave all he had to the struggle and paid a heavy price. Americans everywhere—and especially southerners—are hoping this brilliant young leader will recover his strength and return to the political arena.

[From the Grand Island (Nebr.) Daily-Independent of July 6, 1955]

Senator Johnson's Illness

The serious illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, Democratic leader in the Senate, has cast a note of sadness over the current session of Congress. Members of the Senate did the unprecedented thing the other day of rising for a minute of silent prayer for a respected colleague.

As majority leader, Senator Johnson has shown an efficiency in keeping legislation moving which has seldom been seen in the Senate. He has been partisan as a party leader must be, but he likewise has worked cooperatively with the minority party and its leader, Senator Knowland, of California.

He also has given President Eisenhower a tremendous lot of assistance on legislation in which the President has been interested, despite the fact that they are in different political parties.

It is to be hoped that with complete rest, his heart condition may improve so that he can once more take his place among his fellow Senators.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of July 5, 1955]

Lyndon Johnson

The unfortunate illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson strikes at a most inopportune moment. In the 84th Congress, Lyndon Johnson of Texas has been the leader—one might say—of the Republicans as well as his own party.

His support of President Eisenhower has been more effective than that of any Republican. His opposite number on the Republican side, Senator William Knowland, of California, has often been opposed to the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration, but Johnson, Democrat, has been a tower of strength to the President, who is also a Republican. This is not usual except in wartime.

Lyndon Johnson, in recent months, has often been mentioned as the probable Democratic candidate for Vice President. Democrats who have been concerned over the defection of Texas in 1952 have regarded Johnson as a gift from heaven, a Texan with an exceptionally good record in Congress. It was believed that his nomination was inevitable, particularly if Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, were nominated for the Presidency. Such a combination, it was believed by practical politicians, would strengthen the Democratic Party in both States and might win a difficult election.

The toll that congressional work takes out of those who really tend to business is greater than the people realize. It can only be hoped that the present illness of Senator Johnson is not the end of a brilliant and useful career.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of July 11, 1955]

Congressmen Overworked

The current illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson, following as it does within 2 years of the death of the late Senator Taft, calls attention to a fact that has not been given the consideration it deserves.

Members of Congress are overworked, and their leaders are worked even harder. There are exceptions, of course. Speaker Sam Rayburn and former Speaker Joe Martin appear to thrive on the grueling schedules they follow. But other Speakers have not been so fortunate. Mr. Rayburn has not only served as Speaker longer than any other man, he has served longer than the four Democrats who were his immediate successors, combined. And 3 of those 4 died in office.

There is no simple remedy for congressional overwork, except to ignore unreasonable demands by constituents, the chief cause of overwork, and those who follow that course do not remain in Congress long.

It would help greatly, though, if every constituent would ask himself whether his demand is reasonable, before making that demand.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of July 6, 1955]

Lyndon Johnson's Leadership

The heart attack that has put Lyndon B. Johnson temporarily out of action will have greater repercussions than if it had hit almost any other Member of the Senate. As Senate Democratic leader, Texan Johnson has, along with Senator George, of Georgia, exerted more influence on the conduct of that body than any of his other colleagues.

A quick look at the harmony that exists between the Republican President and the Democratic Congress is sufficient to indicate that he has been doing an excellent job. His reign as Senate majority leader differs markedly from that of the late Senator Taft during the administration of President Truman, when the Republican Congressional majority ignored the Democratic President and passed only the legislation it wanted to pass without reference to the White House program.

A fairly respectable list of legislation which has been put on the books since Congress convened in January is testimony to both the cooperation and the leadership exerted by Lyndon Johnson. He has been a tireless worker, and he has succeeded in buttressing the unity of the Democratic Party, which is not particularly noted for that characteristic. There have been differences within the party, and between the party and the administration, but these have been kept to a minimum because of the energy expended by Senator Johnson in his "politicking"—and that word is used in its best sense.

Perhaps a classic example of the Senator's political astuteness was the Senate's defeat of Senator McCarthy's resolution insisting that the status of the satellite nations be put on the Big Four agenda. Senator Johnson saw that the resolution was rushed through committee (where McCarthy apparently hoped it would be buried) and out onto the Senate floor. "The issue before the Senate," explained Johnson, "is a very simple one. It is whether the President of the

United States shall be sent to the Big Four conference in a straitjacket." Thus, the Senate had to choose the President or the Senator from Wisconsin. The result is well known. At the same time, by getting all but four of the Republicans to go on record opposing the McCarthy resolution, he took away from them a political weapon they have used before and might have used again—the charge that the Democrats are doing nothing to help the Russian satellites gain their freedom. That is mixing smart politics with high statesmanship.

The doctors' report that Senator JOHNSON will not be able to resume his duties as Senate majority leader for the rest of this season. He will be sorely missed at a time when he was playing a leading part in doing the impossible—keeping a politically split Government functioning efficiently and in relative harmony.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of July 6, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S serious illness is cause for deep regret. The Texas Democrat has proved an outstanding leader not only for his party in the Senate, but for the Nation itself.

When the 84th Congress convened in January, there were fears that division in Government might lead to frustration and stalemate. Instead, the Democrats in the legislative branch and the Republicans in the executive have gotten along remarkably well—so well, indeed, there have been few Congresses which have functioned so smoothly or which have a better record of accomplishment. President Eisenhower may have been denied some of his must legislation, but the overall record is good.

Much of the credit for this happy state of affairs must go to Senator JOHNSON. Although operating only on his side of the Capitol, he has helped set the tone for both Houses of Congress, and in the Senate his statesmanship and mastery of the art of politics have accomplished wonders. The wild men among the Democrats have been tamed. The wild men on the other side of the aisle have been frustrated in their wrecking attempts. And all this has been done despite a hairline division of party power.

There are far too few men in public life of Senator JOHNSON'S stature or sagacity. His illness, brought on by overwork, creates a vacancy that will be difficult to fill. Though the Senator is reported making progress, it is obvious that he will be away from Capitol Hill for a long time. We pray for his recovery, as, we are confident, do all Americans. The country needs him.

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune of July 6, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

It is ironic that LYNDON JOHNSON was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a "natural" as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about LYNDON JOHNSON.

An urbane, wise, and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. JOHNSON has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON'S Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the loyal opposition. To the contrary. There is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. JOHNSON'S wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator JOHNSON will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the St. Petersburg Times of July 7, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S CONTRIBUTION

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S heart attack, which will knock him out of the Senate for the rest of this session, focuses national attention on one of the remarkable characteristics of our American political system.

And that is the ability of the Federal governmental process, which at times may appear gangling and inadequate, to carry on when one of its parts fails to function as intended.

Our entire concept of National Government provides for a strong Chief Executive, who not only administers the law but—as elected representative of all the people and leader of his party—guides the course of legislation.

How has President Eisenhower performed as Chief Executive and Republican Party head?

For the first 2 years of his term, while he had a Republican Congress, President Eisenhower's ship of state was without a rudder. He was a captain who would not or could not take the bridge, leaving the crew to quarrel over which way to sail.

The captain could not be replaced, but in 1954, the American people, apparently well aware of this floundering, took steps to straighten out the crew. They elected a Democratic Congress, despite the President's dire warning that all politics would break loose.

Before that election, President Eisenhower's program was becalmed in stagnant waters of the very Republican Congress he had requested in 1952. Since then, his program has gotten underway. Time and time again it has been only because of Democratic votes in Congress.

The man who made those votes possible is LYNDON JOHNSON, Senate Democratic majority leader, along with his House counterpart, Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

The American political system had through the grinding of the two-party system, provided that leadership which the White House could not supply.

In matters of legislation, LYNDON JOHNSON has been more the President than Eisenhower. When Capitol newsmen as well as politicians wanted the word on what was to happen, they asked JOHNSON, not Eisenhower. What Eisenhower thought about a piece of legislation was important, but what JOHNSON said and did about it was what mattered.

Eisenhower Republicans owe a great debt to JOHNSON, and so do all Democrats. He has helped bring his party together by offering leadership to which all elements could repair.

JOHNSON'S out of the picture now, and there is every reason to believe the role he played will be carried on by another Democrat, Senator EARLE CLEMENTS of Kentucky.

The same process which produced the leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON will bring forth leadership in Congress so long as the President's party hangs back.

This is the process of a properly functioning political party. Like an individual, a political party must face up to its responsibilities.

The Democratic Party is doing it, while the Republican Party is sniping at its own President and catering to personal aspirations of some of its powerful members.

[From the Wilmington Evening Bulletin of July 6, 1955]

LET'S HOPE SENATOR JOHNSON WILL BE BACK SOON

The immediate regret is that it should have happened to such a thoroughly nice guy as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON; and the hope is that he will successfully pull through a bad heart seizure and return to his career (with bright promise for a man only 46) of usefulness and reputation.

If the country is now traveling on a course of pleasant waters approximating an era of good feeling, a very considerable share of the credit belongs to Senator JOHNSON. He is a practicing professional politician, in the highest meaning of that term, in the sense that it was applied to the late Senator Taft. His sensitivity to the currents of public feeling advised him that under present circumstances it would be political folly for the Democrats to butt antagonistic heads against the wall of favorable popular sentiment that supports President Eisenhower. The cooperation of the Democratic Party with the Eisenhower administration, as engineered by Senator JOHNSON, has smoothed the way for much of the President's program.

It was the brains, the will and the measured judgment of Senator JOHNSON that were responsible for this situation. This is not to say that the majority leader had turned Republican or lost the spirit of fight, though certain Democrats lamented his amiable cooperation. In his reckoning, it was the best kind of politics, and it placed the Democrats in a strong position when the bombardment really began. The question that arises is whether, with Senator JOHNSON inactivated, succeeding leadership will take the party on another course.

[From the Akron Beacon-Journal of July 6, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

Just as Americans generally were beginning to realize the excellence of the job being done by LYNDON JOHNSON as Senate majority leader, the Texas Senator has been immobilized by a severe heart attack.

Senator JOHNSON is credited with having shown a great deal of organizing ability and personal leadership in guiding the legislative activities of the Upper House.

Unlike the deadlocks which have often occurred when the majority of the legislators were of a different political party than the Chief Executive, constructive accomplishment has featured the session now nearing a conclusion.

The differences of opinion expressed last week by President Eisenhower and Senator Johnson only served to accentuate the rather unusual harmony which has prevailed for months.

Democrats and Republicans alike will join the President in his deep regret over the Senator's illness and in hoping for his early recovery. He is too young and too valuable a man to be taken from his important work at the Capitol.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle of July 5, 1955]

Beyond His Strength

Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, stricken by the overexertions of the majority leadership during a lengthy and politically important session, is out of action despite his comparatively young years. He has yielded to heart attack, the occupational hazard of Members of Congress.

A man can go to Congress, of course, and take things easy. Some do. But anybody worth his salt soon becomes so absorbed in the maneuvering around great issues and problems that he starts stepping fast to keep pace with affairs. Constituent demands hurry him up. And when he reaches a place of high leadership, as Johnson did, no number of secretaries or other helpers can guard him from overwork. His physique becomes expendable during long hours of legislative generalship. No doubt Johnson lived his job day and night.

Much was expected of the Texan who occupied middle ground between the Northern and the Southern wings of his party. He was getting the fractions together for legislative purposes. There was a rising hope that he might reunite the party for the 1956 campaign. But he went far beyond his strength as many a man has before him. Maybe the Houses of Congress ought to change the rules in some way so that at least a part of leadership can be delegated. Certainly being a leader and a Senator at the same time is too much.

[From the Rocky Mountain News of July 6, 1955]

Lyndon Johnson

It is ironic that Lyndon Johnson was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a "natural" as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Johnson earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics.

A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about Lyndon Johnson.

An urbane, wise and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Johnson has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Johnson's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the loyal opposition. To the contrary. There is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Johnson's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator Johnson will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

[From the Youngstown Vindicator, July 5, 1955]

Senator Johnson Stricken

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson's tireless work as the Democrats' Senate leader made him the most influential man in Congress, and many have considered him the ablest. His heart attack may have far-reaching effects on both national politics and the affairs of Government. He has been talked of as a presidential possibility in 1956 or 1960, but this would seem to be out of the question, as a man who has had a heart attack is not likely to stand the strain of a campaign or the duties of the White House. Nor would the voters choose a man whose health might fail him in an emergency.

Senator Johnson has been an extremely shrewd, capable majority leader of the Senate. As one commentator remarked, he has been "almost matchless in terms of political skill and in giving the Democrats a new and almost monolithic unity on every high occasion."

The Democrats are specially worried lest Mr. Johnson may not be able to return for the second session of Congress, in the election year of 1956. As much the most influential Southern in Congress he might well be the deciding factor as to whether such States as Texas, Virginia, and South Carolina will support the Democratic nominee for President.

In respect to affairs of state, Mr. Johnson was entitled to observe last week that President Eisenhower had been mistaken, during last year's campaign, in predicting a cold war between the White House and the Capitol should the Democrats win control of Congress. Under Johnson's leadership such controversial administration bills as minimum wage, reciprocal trade, and foreign aid have been passed with hardly a ripple.

As the President retorted, a great deal of necessary legislation remains to be passed. However, Mr. Johnson established a program; probably the Democratic whip or assistant leader, Senator Clements of Kentucky, will be able to carry out the details.

Yet to a substantial extent for this session, and to a much greater degree for the next, the country has cause beyond the personal consideration to hope for a speedier recovery than now seems probable for an opposition leader who is as much a "middle-of-the-roader" as the President himself.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 4, 1955]

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson

In every successful free legislative body there is one man whose job it is to keep the ball rolling, to oil the way for consideration of bills, especially the ones vital to the Nations' welfare or the controversial ones likely to win or lose votes at the next elections.

To do this job well he must know the rules thoroughly; he should combine the best features of a psychologist, a juggler, an efficiency expert, and possibly a martinet; he may be a good mixer; he doesn't have to be a politician of great eloquence or a proposer of profound legislative reforms. He has to keep the support of the colleagues in his own party, and win the respect, however grudging, of those in the opposition.

House Speaker Joe Cannon of a generation ago was such a man, and so was Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, who became "Mr. Republican" before his untimely death 2 years ago. In this session of Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson, the Senate's majority leader, rapidly assumed impressive stature as a law pusher. The heart attack which invalided him Saturday—his condition is still serious as this is written and he will not return to his role as leader at this session—thus is a matter of national concern. The ailment takes, at least temporarily, a vital personality from Capitol Hill.

Some Washington observers who like a good scrap think this session of Congress has been dull because of Johnson's work behind the scenes and sharpshooting on the floor of the Senate. Some Democratic firebrands lament that there hasn't been enough opposition-for-opposition's-sake, to make issues for the 1956 Presidential campaign. But Johnson's reasoning—and it appears sound—is that the people like President Eisenhower, and that they also like a responsible majority leadership. A realist, he has been looking beyond Mr. Eisenhower. The year 1960 thus seemed to have an especial meaning for him, or so many of his friends, in Texas and elsewhere, believed. Some have been ready to promote him for President in 1956.

Senator Johnson's heart ailment would seem to remove any such possibility for next year; it will cast doubt in the minds of many of his prospects 5 years from now. We hope that he will be able to resume his duties, safely, for the Nation needs dedicated and experienced men like him.

[From Labor of July 9, 1955]

Johnson, Stricken, Extolled by Leaders of Both Parties—Senate Pays Tribute to Outstanding Leader in Speeches and in Silent Prayer

A week ago Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas was working hard, driving hard and planning hard in his role as Senate majority leader. This week, he was in a hospital bed, seriously ill from a heart attack, and under orders from his physicians not to resume his activities during the rest of this session of Congress.

In his place Senator Clements of Kentucky, heretofore majority whip, was named acting majority leader until Johnson can return to the helm.

Johnson had made an outstanding record in welding party unity among liberal and conservative Democrats in the Senate. At the same time he performed a remarkable job of rolling his party's program through the Senate and modifying administration proposals where they fell short of Democratic objectives.

His associates stressed that these achievements were the result of unremitting personal contacts, wise strategy, a "human touch" and intensive labors, often virtually around the clock. He drove himself until his heart gave way.

As a most touching tribute, Senators stood silently for 75 seconds, heads bowed, in prayer, for Johnson's quick recovery. Also, conservatives and liberals alike paid tribute to him. Among the latter, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Republican, of Maine, declared: "I have never known a more effective or considerate majority leader. * * * We will sorely miss him." And Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, added: "He is a big man from a big State with a big heart."

Leaders of railroad unions joined others in voicing hope for his quick recovery. They stressed that he had throughout his years in the Senate been a stanch friend of rail labor, and in his campaigns was always supported by the "railroad boys."

Clements, like Johnson, has had a good voting record and was backed by railroad labor when he ran for the Senate. He stressed that the majority leader had left things in so smooth a shape that it should be possible for the Senate to meet its July 31 target date for adjournment.

"Lyndon Johnson has always," Clements said, "regarded his position as one that goes beyond narrow partisanship, into the realm of advancing the interests of the Senate and the Nation. It is my hope that I can carry on in the same spirit."

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Morning Democrat of July 9, 1955]

Senator Johnson Has Been Gaining Stature

The post of party majority leaders is not often one that leads to political advance. Senators McFarland, of Arizona, and Scott Lucas, of Illinois, found being Democratic leaders in the Senate put them on the spot so much that it led to defeat. Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, saw interparty squabbles with which he had to deal as Republican leader rise up to haunt him and deny him a Presidential nomination.

Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, who suffered a heart attack this week which will keep him on the sidelines during the rest of this session, had been gaining stature as Democratic Senate leader in recent months in spite of these precedents. His patience and political skill was beginning to pay dividends to his party.

Johnson's leadership was most effective. He succeeded in a difficult assignment, directing Democratic forces in the Senate under a Republican President.

In this respect Johnson followed a policy of constructive opposition to the Eisenhower legislative program. He supported a considerable part of this program and rallied his Democratic colleagues behind it. On and off the Senate floor, he was a deft manipulator who got results with a minimum of fanfare.

Johnson's absence from the political scene will hurt the cause of the Democrats. The Texas Senator was accepted as a standard bearer by all wings of the party, including the several factions in his home State. He was adept at healing differences in the party and bringing unity to it.

Senator Earle Clements, of Kentucky, his successor, may be counted on to continue the policy of constructive opposition in the few remaining weeks of the session this summer.

[From the London Economist of July 9, 1955]

The President and Mr. Johnson

Only a few days before being stricken by a severe heart attack, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, the leader of the Democrats in the upper Chamber, had stated with justifiable pride that the Democrats had proved, by their support for the President's legislative program, that Mr. Eisenhower's prediction of a cold war in the event of a Democratically controlled Congress had been utterly wrong. When queried on this point at his weekly press conference, the President grinned and whipped out a list of legislation "which I think the American people would be interested in because I can conceive of nothing that is more important to them." This list included various measures asked for by the President but not yet acted upon by Congress. Among them were the military Reserve program and the appropriation of some $35 million for an atom-powered peace ship to tour the world. This idea, proudly conceived by Mr. Eisenhower, was rejected in the Senate by one vote amid ungracious Democratic comments on smokestackless wonders. No doubt the President was trying to get back for himself some of the credit for the good deeds done by Congress, to spur it on to further works and to nettle the parsimonious torpedoers of his argosy. Senator Johnson promptly riposted that his party was not going to carry out instructions like a bunch of second lieutenants.

Such skirmishes are a traditional accompaniment of the closing weeks of a session of Congress—especially when the President and the majority in the Capitol are of different parties. In fact, however, there can be no doubt that the President is sincerely sorry about Senator Johnson's removal—for some time, at least—from the helm of the Senate. Mr. Eisenhower knows that it has been to Mr. Johnson's unfailing tact and political skill that he owes the speedy support given to his foreign policy at the time of the Formosan crisis, the utter defeat of Senator McCarthy over the issue of the Big Four meeting, the passage of his foreign-aid program, and many other vital bills. No man since Senator Taft has so intelligently managed the Senate or sensed the instincts of its majority with as much certainty. In fact, some of Mr. Johnson's most virulent critics have not been in the White House or among Republicans but in the liberal wing of his own party. But the Democrats as a whole can only hope that Mr. Johnson will be restored to them as Congress enters the difficult eddies of a presidential election year.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record several editorials which appeared recently in the Orlando Sentinel paying tribute to the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Johnson].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel of July 3, 1955]

The Sentinel Nominates Lyndon Johnson for United States President

(Editor's Note.—The Sentinel's editorial was written prior to revelation of Senator Johnson's sudden and severe heart attack. Our opinion of Lyndon Johnson, the man, is unchanged, and he has our prayers.)

The Democratic Party is in a pretty sorry-looking pickle.

It faces defeat in the next Presidential election unless it is smart and alert enough to regroup its forces under the dynamic leadership of a refreshing new personality.

This man is Lyndon Johnson, young and aggressive citizen not far removed from the historic and colorful Alamo region of Texas.

Only the nomination of Lyndon Johnson can extirpate and expiate the shameful and disgraceful insults heaped upon the South at the last convention.

Only Lyndon Johnson can win back such States as Florida, Tennessee, and Texas, which threw tradition aside, bolted the party, and elected Ike 3 years ago.

Only Lyndon Johnson can also appeal to other southern States, such as Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and others, which while not in the Ike victory column, gave him a tremendous support.

Only Lyndon Johnson can be the peacemaker, cement and solidify the Solid South once again.

The Harriman-Stevenson-Kefauver et als are through.

They bear the stamp and the stigma of the leftwingers and the big-city political machines.

Their names bear the brand of defeat. The people want a new name, a new face, a man with a general, rather than a specific appeal.

This new name and this new face is Lyndon Johnson, of Johnson City, Tex., whose record as Democratic leader in the United States Senate is nothing short of fabulous.

In Lyndon Johnson, the Democrats have a man of the farm. He not only pulled himself up by his own bootstraps, but when he got on top, he still had enough gumption and know-how to stay there.

It is a diversion to read of the wanderings of Democratic Chairman Paul Butler through the Solid South, picking up elephant guns from oldtimers such as John Nance Garner, once Vice President, and otherwise repairing political fences.

But as Butler goes through Florida, Texas, and Louisiana, he, too, leaves traces of bitterness.

Instead of the aimless, if well-intended journey of chairman Butler into the wildernesses of the Shivers, the Kennons, and the Byrneses, the Democrats could send a man, instead of a boy, to do a man's job down here.

No Butler, elevated to power by Truman, Stevenson, and company, will ever appease these southerners. They got fighting mad when the Northern liberals spit in their eye 3 years ago and nothing has been done since to make them glad.

These men—Shivers, Kennon, Byrnes, and a host of other leaders and newspapers throughout their own and other Southern States, who have sympathized with them—these men alone can consolidate the South. Without them, the Democrats haven't got as much as a fighting chance.

Lyndon Johnson will appeal to this powerful group. He can make the peace, bring them back into the fold.

We believe Allan Shivers, the Texas Governor, will go along with Lyndon.

As Allan Shivers goes, so go Governor Byrnes, Governor Kennon, and thousands of other Eisenhower Democrats.

We have known Lyndon Johnson as man and boy for nigh on to 35 years, which is half a lifetime.

We knew him as a struggling schoolteacher back in Johnson City, Tex., where he was born.

We knew him when he was secretary to a Congressman; then, suddenly, almost overnight he was a Congressman.

We knew him when he was a confidant of Presidents.

Now we know him as master of the United States Senate. We use the word "master" here to denote the admiration and loyalty of his colleagues in his successful, friendly imaginative leadership.

In all these years and under all these circumstances, Lyndon Johnson has been a humble, outstanding, useful public servant.

Although he came from a country a whole lot closer to the Alamo than Estes Kefauver, he has never worn a coonskin cap. Over the mountains from Johnson City, not too many miles, is the town of Goliad. From there Davy Crockett and his comrades in the Alamo hoped for reinforcements.

Lyndon Johnson has come a long way without coonskins or other gimmicks. And all along the trail he has matured in the turmoil of serving. But, unlike many shooting stars that illuminate the Halls of Congress, he has retained his character. While he has fought for the most for the mostest, he has refused to stoop nadirlike in the gutter of socialism, bootlicking the voters in exchange for votes.

Lyndon Johnson is an able, capable, experienced executive in Government.

Throughout the long years of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal and Mr. Truman's Fair Deal that followed, Lyndon Johnson, although occupying high places in the party for all those years, has come out of it all with name unblemished.

His rich experience with 3 Presidents in time of war and in peace, has given him a stature the like of which is equaled by few men today.

Coupled with his acquaintanceship with the problems of the War Department at a time when he was their congressional leader and champion, the tall Texan is still a fairly young man. In a tough battle with Ike this fact may well sway the balance of votes as Ike will be the second oldest President in the history of the Nation, should he be reelected. And he would be 72 if he finished a second term.

So this newspaper, having reviewed Lyndon Johnson's qualifications and believing he represents the traditions which made the Democratic Party great and that he has the courage and leadership required to rescue the party from the radicals who have tried to capture it, hereby urges his nomination as the next Democratic candidate for the United States Presidency.

He is the one man who can return the party to the thousands of people who have been explaining in recent years: "I did not leave the Democratic Party, it left me."

[From the Orlando Sentinel of July 3, 1955]

CAN HE REPLACE THE RADICALS?—DEMOS NEW MIRACLE MAN: LYNDON JOHNSON OF TEXAS

(By Henry Balch)

WASHINGTON.—A rangy, soft-spoken young Texan is the Democratic Moses, well on the way to leading his party out of the political wilderness.

He is LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, 46, of Johnson City in the Lone Star State and majority leader of the United States Senate, although is majority is razor thin.

Washington is abuzz about the successes of this hard-working, hard-hitting Senator, the youngest majority leader in the history of Congress and most effective either party ever boasted.

Success is what you think of when Texas is talked and success is in the atmosphere around anything LYNDON JOHNSON puts his big hands behind.

Despite his victories and his reputation as Senate topman and the dominant force in Congress, nobody accuses him of being a boss. He leads by persuasion and by reason.

Among his triumphs have been pushing through the Democratic highway construction bill, the $1 an hour minimum wage bill, the Colorado River basin project, a foreign aid bill which for the first time added to rather than cut the administration's figure, and a big public housing program for areas which want public housing aid.

SQUELCHED JOE

But he can slug, too. Just 10 days ago he gave Senator JOE MCCARTHY a vote spanking which some say may squelch the Wisconsin firebrand for a long time to come.

Against the advice of some, he insisted the committee report the bill out, although MCCARTHY could have been beaten by tabling his resolution which would have tied President Eisenhower's hands at the Four Power meetings. It was reported out 14 to 0 and MCCARTHY was beaten 77 to 4 on the floor.

The Eisenhower Republicans give Senator JOHNSON credit for keeping the Democratic side solidly behind the administration's foreign policy. He took a cue from his old political mentor, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, veteran Speaker of the House, who told him "the difference between Republicans and Democrats is that we don't hate their Presidents."

Nothing succeeds like success and that's why the Capitol corridors seemed filled with subrosa talk that here might be the man who could capture the imagination of the Nation as Democratic presidential nominee, if not in 1956 then certainly in 1960.

HE WON'T TALK

Senator JOHNSON himself is completely mum about his future ambitions but his friends and foes alike are whispering that the former schoolteacher and youth leader is the man to watch.

Look magazine said recently Senator JOHNSON is one of the 10 most powerful men in the United States Government.

The Wall Street Journal said "were he not from the South, there's little doubt he'd have to be reckoned with for the Presidency. There are those who think he might wind up in the White House anyway."

Newsweek commented "Senator JOHNSON is big these days even for a Texan. In Washington they say he puts his imprint on every new law.

"In Texas they predict he'll be President of the United States when Dwight D. Eisenhower—another Texan—gives up the job."

That's pretty tall talk from some big publications and the Sentinel sent me to Washington to find out what makes the big fellow tick.

It didn't take long to find out.

No. 1 reason is work, hard work with mankilling hours and a total disregard for self.

No. 2 is know-how. Senator JOHNSON schooled himself to become a Senator and not just one of the 96 on the floor of the world's most exclusive club. He schooled himself to be a leader—the leader if possible.

His Washington career started as a Congressman's secretary. Then he took a pay cut to become a doorboy in the Capitol. He wanted to know, who, what, when, and why.

In 1937 he beat a field of a dozen for Congress and his career as a lawmaker was underway.

FIRST VOLUNTEER

But Pearl Harbor postponed his legislative activities, and he became the first House Member to volunteer for active service. He won a Silver Star for gallantry and many other decorations in the Navy.

He came to the Senate in 1948 [after having lost a close race in 1941]. During 1951 he was chosen as party whip [or assistant floor leader]. The post didn't mean much in prestige with the Demos out of power, but as usual it meant a lot of hard work for the Texan.

Senator DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, sponsored Senator JOHNSON for this first honor and sponsored him for the Senate leadership after the 1952 election.

Senator RUSSELL chose wisely and well for the country and his party.

Even the old pros in Congress accept this comparative newcomer as one of their own.

They like him.

They like the way he does things.

And the public is beginning to catch on to the talents this Texan is lending toward speeding up and modernizing the historic old processes of the upper Chamber.

The Senate now sometimes gets rid of issues in a few minutes which once would have taken days and weeks of bombast and oratory.

The Johnson method is simple in pattern but it takes a master to administer. And that's what he is—a good general manager, a topnotch organizer and doer.

As majority leader Senator JOHNSON'S budget for office help is liberal.

He uses it wisely by hiring some of the finest young talent in the Nation as research men and women, secretaries, writers, planners, and legislative experts.

And he works the daylights out of them, from early morning to long after other officeworkers have gone home. But they like it, seem to thrive on the feeling of getting things accomplished.

Senator JOHNSON himself gets up at the crack of dawn, reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Texas, Washington, and New York newspapers, then starts his daily chores, using six telephones to talk with other Senators, the White House staff, Cabinet officials, and the countless other wheels in the Capital with whom he must keep in touch.

BATTLE TACTICS

He's a nose counter in legislative fights. He knows exactly how every Senator is going to vote before he lets a bill get out of committee or to a vote on the floor. He uses his intimate knowledge of the philosophies, responsibilities, personalities, likes and dislikes of his colleagues to figure out the necessary moves in legislative battles.

He's a good compromiser, if necessary, and his sense of timing is as acute as that of a master boxer.

Best of all he's a sensitive human being. Last week, despite a heavy legislative load, he started each day by conferring with Georgia's aging but powerful Senator WALTER GEORGE, who was laid up in the hospital with a respiratory ailment.

Senator JOHNSON decided that it was a waste of talent and valuable brains to sidetrack newly elected Senators with minor committee assignments.

He decided the Democrats needed all the youth and push it had to make its one vote majority effective.

Preaching that "in adversity the family draws closer together," he was able to persuade some old-timers to give up their seniority claims to choice committee assignments so that he could give them to younger men like Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, of whom he says "he's been a tremendous help to me. I like him and admire his capabilities."

Personally there is probably no Senator to whom the majority leader is as close as he is to Senator SMATHERS. And the feeling is mutual.

PEACEMAKER

Senator JOHNSON has performed the miracle which only Franklin Roosevelt could accomplish before him—the welding together of the varied and warring factions of the Democratic Party.

Only the leftist Americans for Democratic Action continue to attack him for "bowing to Republican attacks on liberalism," and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, former ADA president, is a close legislative ally of Senator JOHNSON who stoutly defends his record.

Southern conservatives like RUSSELL and GEORGE swear by him, as does Senator HARRY BYRD.

Northern liberals continue to vote with him.

His colleagues think he has more power in Washington today than anyone except the President.

To learn more about Senator JOHNSON'S political philosophy the Sentinel asked him the following questions, the answers to which indicate that here is a progressive, yet conservative, American who has the qualities which the South needs and always has asked of its leaders.

Question. What do you consider the role of Government and party in the big business versus small business row?

Answer. There is room in our country for both big and small business. Each fulfills its particular function and is entitled to its rights. The role of Government, as I see it, is to try to give everyone a fair shake. The role of the Democratic Party, as I see it, is to try to keep the Government in position to give everyone a fair shake. We do not want a Nation in which all economic activities are monopolized by a few gigantic corporations. But at the same time, we must recognize that bigness is not in and of itself bad and that there are some segments of our economy which can be handled only by big business. It is a difficult problem to maintain proper balance and there are no easy answers. But we must continue to try if we value our free enterprise system.

Question. What about the Democratic stand on the housing problem?

Answer. The Democratic housing bill passed by the Senate recognized the fact that there are some areas in the country in which there is vital need for public housing and other areas in which public housing is not only unnecessary but would be wasteful. Consequently, the principle of flexibility and local control was written into the measure. Public housing can be constructed only where there is a clear demonstration of need and only where it is requested by the local people themselves.

Question. What about Demo stand on the minimum wage?

Answer. "The Democratic stand on minimum wages is based upon the belief that our economy is expanding and that a dollar an hour is not exorbitant. At the same time, we recognize the fact that there are some segments of the economy which would be injured by rigid application of this principle.

Consequently, there will be a thorough investigation of the whole problem this fall in the hope that we can improve the act next year by taking care of those industries which cannot survive on the flat $1 minimum wage."

Question. Is this an inflationary period in which we're living and what to do about its potential dangers?

Answer. "I do not think this is an inflationary period in the sense of runaway inflation. At the present time, price levels seem to have stabilized and there are some parts of industry which are actually suffering from deflation. We have no way of knowing whether inflation will result or whether there will be more deflation. Consequently, we cannot lay down a rigid program at this moment. The only thing we can do is to keep our economic watchdogs—such as the Joint Congressional Economic Committee—alert and ready to make recommendations at the first clear indication of change."

Question. What about Demo stand on foreign relations and foreign aid?

Answer. "The Democratic Party has consistently taken the stand that foreign relations should be removed as much as possible from the arena of partisanship. The international field is one in which America should be able to speak with one voice. Regardless of our views on domestic questions, we are all seeking the objectives of peace and security for our Nation.

"On this basis, we have pledged to cooperate with the President wherever we could do so, in conscience. So far, we have lived up to that pledge and frequently have given him more support in the field of foreign policy than have the members of his own party."

Question. Do you approve of the Four Power meeting and what do you predict it will accomplish?

Answer. "I am strongly in favor of the forthcoming Big Four Conference at the summit. I cannot predict what it will accomplish because no one has a crystal ball that will peer that far. Nevertheless, the United States must never be placed in a position where it refuses to discuss the tensions that are leading to war and possible solutions that will preserve the peace.

"These are times when we must proceed cautiously and with prudence. The men of science have developed devastating weapons that could destroy our whole Nation. We cannot afford to take chances with the lives of our people.

"Unless the Russians are prepared to deal with the facts at the forthcoming conference, it may well turn out to be fruitless. But we will not know that until we sit down with them and any advance speculation as to their motives would be useless. I think America should approach this meeting prepared to seek genuine solutions to world peace and if the Communists will not negotiate in the same spirit, then they will be exposed to the world as ruthless dictators who must bear upon their own shoulders the onus of world tensions."

Question. What about atomic energy and its possibilities for peaceful use?

Answer. "The peaceful use of atomic energy holds forth a tremendous promise for a future of happiness and prosperity. As the world's population increases, so does our need for energy sources. We have only begun to tap the potentialities of the atom and our atomic science may be the only road through which we can meet our ever-growing demands.

"Of course, we must first solve world tensions before we can fully develop our atomic potential. So long as the atom must remain on guard against a potential aggressor, our abilities to convert it to peaceful use will be limited."

Question. What about United States Asiatic relations?

Answer. "The most hopeful sign in recent years has been the Bandung Conference. Although many people viewed the conference with apprehension in advance, it turned out that we had firm friends in Asia who were willing to fight for the principles of freedom. It is my hope that they will form the nucleus of a group of Asiatic nations capable of maintaining their independence and freedom. We need have no fear of the future so long as such nations exist."

Question. Would you admit Red China as a U. N. member?

Answer. "Certainly I would be violently opposed to permitting Red China to shoot its way into the United Nations. We cannot accede to blackmail, and thus far that is the only tactics the Chinese Communists have tried."

Question. Do you think Democrats have been a responsible party during Republican administration?

Answer. "The Democratic Party has shown a degree of responsibility unmatched in our history. Although the White House is under the control of another party, the record of Congress can be searched in vain for mean, petty, sniping attacks upon the President. We have dealt with the President as responsible Americans, putting the interests of our country ahead of the interests of partisanship. We have taken the President's recommendations and studied them carefully. Some of them we have accepted; some of them we have modified; some of them we have rejected. But under all circumstances, we have acted on the basis of principle and not on the basis of personality. I think the country can be proud of the responsible relationship that has existed between a Democratic Congress and a Republican White House."

Question. Paul Butler keeps talking party harmony. Senate Democrats, at least, seem to have applied party harmony. But there still remain a great number of Democratic dissidents. In view of the signs of schism, do you think any Democratic candidate can receive the support of a united Democratic Party in 1956?

Answer. "There will always be differences in a country as large as ours. Nevertheless, I see no reason why the Democratic Party cannot find a candidate who can receive united support in 1956."

Question. There has been considerable recent talk, especially among northern liberals of the Democratic Party, that the party leadership in Congress is failing to provide issues for the 1956 presidential and congressional campaigns. It is said that the Democratic leadership is being too palsy with the Eisenhower administration and its program. What do you, as Senate leader, have to say of this criticism?

Answer. "The people of America do not elect men to Congress just to provide issues for an election campaign. They send their Senators and Representatives to Washington to transact the business of the American people and that is precisely what we have done.

"I believe the Democratic Party has made a responsible record of legislative achievement and that is the kind of record which will appeal to the American people in 1956 or any other year. The American people are far more concerned with the future of the next generation than they are with the fortunes of the next election.

"As far as our relationship with the President is concerned, I hope the day never comes when partisanship impels me to be bitter and personal toward the President of my country. I do not always agree with him and I think, like any other man, he makes mistakes. Nevertheless, he is the only President we have and there is no constitutional way of changing the administration until 1956. I supported the Democratic candidate for the presidency in 1952 and I shall support the Democratic candidate in 1956. But once the people of America make their choice, it is my belief that all of us should work together to advance the interests of our Nation."

Question. What do you think will be the issues for 1956?

Answer. "I think the principal issue in 1956 will be which party has proven itself best qualified to transact the business of the American people. I believe that the Democratic Party has proven itself to be the only one which truly represents the entire Nation and that that one issue alone will be sufficient for victory.

Question. Why should anyone vote Democratic in this period of peace and prosperity under a Republican administration?

Answer. "The reason for voting Democratic, regardless of the nature of the period in which we are living can be found very easily just by looking at the record. The American people watched the Republican majority in Congress during 1953 and 1954. By the end of 1954 they decided they had had enough, and they elected a Democratic Congress. Now they have the opportunity to watch the activities of the Democratic Congress, and I believe that by 1956 they will be ready to vote for a Democratic White House.

Question. Can anyone beat Eisenhower if he runs?

Answer. "I do not pretend to be able to forecast an election so far in advance, but I think that a Democratic candidate running on the record the Democratic Party has made will be able to win in 1956."

Question. If the Democrats were restored to the White House, would it mean a return to Government of the same New and Fair Dealers of the most recent administrations?

Answer. "I do not know who would be returned to the Government in the event of a Democratic election victory in 1956. It would depend to a great extent upon the candidate. However, after having watched both parties in operation for a period of many years, I am convinced that a Democratic victory would mean a Government of able, patriotic men, dedicated primarily to the preservation of America. It is my belief that the Democratic Party at its worst is better than the Republican Party at its best, and I think that fact has been demonstrated conclusively."

Question. Or do you think there is enough young blood in the Democratic Party to install an entire new "team" (as Eisenhower terms it)?

Answer. "The most encouraging aspect of the Democratic Party to me is the fact that it is constantly being renewed by young, vigorous, able men. Even in 1952 when the Republicans elected a President, the voters sent to the Senate for the first time such freshmen Democrats as ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri. I will match those five against any freshman class that the Republicans have installed and they will compare favorably."

Question. Who are these young Turks of the Democratic Party and what is their political philosophy (in comparison with New Dealers, Fair Dealers, Old Guard Republican reactionaries, middle-of-the-roaders, etc.)?

Answer. "I have never been quite sure of the meaning of the term 'Young Turk.' But I do know that I become very proud when I look around the Senate and see such able, dedicated legislators as GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and many others. They differ in their views on many issues. But they are united in their determination to advance the interest of our country and to represent our people as they should be represented. When their views conflict, they can sit down together as reasonable men and work out steps that are necessary to serve our people. The total effect is a party that is progressive without being radical and conservative without being reactionary."

Question. Do you favor direct talks with Red China (1) now (2) later in an effort (1) to secure release of imprisoned Americans and (2) to effect an easing of tensions in the Formosa Strait?

Answer. "If there is any possibility of securing the release of American prisoners or easing the tensions in the Formosa Straits on an honorable basis through discussion, I would favor direct talks with Red China. I do not think we should overlook any honorable possibility that might afford an effective solution to these problems."

Question. Do you think the United States will—or should—ever agree to giving up Formosa to the Reds?

Answer. "No; I do not think the United States should agree to give up Formosa to the Communists."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 6, 1955]

SENATE PAUSES TO HONOR JOHNSON

(By James Lee)

Each in his own fashion, Members of the Senate prayed yesterday for the swift recovery of Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, victim of a heart attack brought on by the rigors of his job.

The Senate rose in accordance with a resolution introduced by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, and the legislators stood in silence, with heads bowed, for 1 minute and 15 seconds. It was one of the most poignant occasions in congressional history.

Authorities at Bethesda Naval Hospital, where the strapping, 46-year-old Texas Democrat was taken late Saturday, reported "no essential change" in the Senator's condition and said that he remains on the "seriously ill" list.

JOHNSON was hit by what physicians called a moderately severe heart attack Saturday at the Middleburg, Va., home of a friend, George R. Brown. Medical men said his collapse resulted from the physical demands of what has been called a man-killing job.

Acting Democratic Leader EARLE C. CLEMENTS of Kentucky, told the Senate that JOHNSON is responding satisfactorily to treatment and that he should be able to resume his legislative duties next January.

CLEMENTS read a report from attending specialists who said that "under no circumstances" could JOHNSON return to work at this session of Congress and that he will be unable to exert himself in any way for "a period of months."

After the silent prayer, individual Senators of both parties paid tribute to JOHNSON. One, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, called the stricken majority leader "a big man from a big State with a big heart."

The White House announced that President Eisenhower, who dueled sharply with JOHNSON last week, had sent the Senator a personal letter and that the Chief Executive and Mrs. Eisenhower have sent flowers.

The acting majority leader called for bipartisan cooperation in the remaining weeks before adjournment, in the hope that "we can finish the work in a way that will make Senator JOHNSON proud of the Senate."

Besides the prayers of the Senators, formal prayers for JOHNSON'S recovery were offered by the Senate Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris.

[From the New York Times of July 6, 1955]

SENATE IN PRAYER FOR ILL JOHNSON—PRESIDENT SENDS A MESSAGE TO MAJORITY LEADER, NOW ON WAY TO RECOVERY

WASHINGTON, July 5.—The entire Senate, Republican and Democratic sides alike, rose and stood today in silent prayer for the Senate Democratic leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, who is gravely ill of a heart condition.

It was, so far as the authorities could find, a demonstration without example in Senate history.

President Eisenhower sent to Senator JOHNSON, who is in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., a private message of hope for a quick recovery.

Senator JOHNSON'S physician there said "his recovery has been satisfactory." He added that the Senator should be able to return to work in January.

As the Senate assembled at noon, the chaplain, the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, devoted his customary opening prayer to a petition for Senator JOHNSON'S recovery.

SENATE STANDS IN SILENCE

It was Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat of New York, who led the Senate in standing with bowed heads for a minute and a quarter in behalf of Senator JOHNSON.

Those in the galleries and all Senate employees stood as well.

Republicans and Democrats alike saluted Mr. JOHNSON'S leadership.

Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, in taking over as acting Democratic floor leader, read to his colleagues a special bulletin that had been prepared by Dr. James Cain, one of Senator JOHNSON'S physicians. This was as follows:

"Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON has had a myocardial infarction [a stoppage of an artery limiting the supply of blood to the heart] of a moderately severe character. He was quite critically ill immediately following the attack but his recovery has been satisfactory.

"His physicians agree that under no circumstances can he return to his duties during this session. He cannot undertake any business whatsoever for a period of months.

"However, if there are no further attacks of a severe character and his recovery continues to be satisfactory, he should be able to return to the Senate in January."

Having read this to the Senate, Senator CLEMENTS went on:

"During this session LYNDON B. JOHNSON has set standards of leadership that have won him the deserved acclaim of all who are devoted to democratic ideals of Government. His hard work and his tireless efforts have reflected credit upon the entire Senate.

"As a close, personal friend, I am deeply devoted to LYNDON JOHNSON. As an American citizen, I am proud of the opportunity to be associated with him in any capacity.

LAUDS JOHNSON AS LEADER

"I doubt if there is a Member of this Senate—on either side of the aisle—who does not look upon LYNDON JOHNSON as a friend. He has always regarded his position as one that goes beyond narrow partisanship into the realm of protecting and advancing the interests of the entire Senate and the entire Nation.

"It is fortunate that we are 'over the hump' of legislative activity for this year. We still face important and difficult issues but the great volume of work is behind us.

"This fortunate state of affairs can be attributed largely to the work of the majority leader and the splendid cooperation he has received from both sides of the aisle.

"As acting majority leader, it is my hope that I can carry on in the same spirit. I intend to devote all of my abilities to establishing the same relationship with all Members of the Senate.

"By working together, we can finish the work of this session in a way that will make LYNDON JOHNSON proud of this Senate which so strongly bears the stamp of his leadership."

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1955]

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

THE CROWDED PATH TO THE HOSPITAL

WASHINGTON, July 6.—The illness and hospitalization for months of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas are most unhappy reminders of the many recent entries on the casualty lists of party leaders in Congress. They are reminder, too, of the dominant reason for this situation—the heavy toll of mental and physical pressure on these leaders.

This pressure has grown steadily with the narrowing margin between the major parties at the Capitol and with the increase of complexities in legislation. Also each party has factional differences that appear with the issues which have produced them. The majority leader's task of holding his lines in committees and on the floor so that legislative control may be maintained, and the minority leader's task to the same purpose of holding his lines and at the same time snatching a vote or two from the other side, are deep and constant drains on their vitality.

The leaders also must keep abreast of a variety of complex legislative items, which means long overtime periods of conference and intense study. And for the very fact of their leadership they are endlessly sought out by individuals and groups for audiences which they must grant if they are to be successful in their duties.

The history of an hour last week which Senator JOHNSON set aside for luncheon is an indication of the strain that sent him to the hospital. To begin with, he was half an hour late because another Senator unexpectedly brought up a matter which required the presence on the floor of the majority leader. During luncheon he was called to the telephone 8 times, 3 times by colleagues with whom he found it essential to talk at length. Twice, to make certain that instructions to his deputy leader had been clearly understood, he left his place at the table to do this. In the end he had bolted half his frugal meal, and left the other half uneaten so he would not keep waiting a delegation of young farmers from the Midwest.

A GRIM LIST

All leaders of Congress have not squandered their vitality as JOHNSON has, the more spendthrift in his case because he is a recent convalescent from major surgery. But even robust health, and less exacting circumstances than those pressing on JOHNSON, have not spared several from what legislators fear is too often the price of leadership. Scott W. Lucas, who was a Democratic Representative and Senator from Illinois and now practices law in Washington and Chicago, was recounting these dismal statistics today:

The Member of the House to whose seat Lucas succeeded was Henry T. Rainey. In March, 1933, Rainey was elected Speaker, and in August, 1934, he died. His successor, Joseph T. Byrnes, of Tennessee, took office in January, 1935, and died in June, 1936. The gavel then went to W. B. Bankhead, of Alabama, who died in September, 1940.

During the bitter struggle over President Roosevelt's Supreme Court expansion, or packing, bill the majority leader, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, died suddenly of a heart attack. After a few months as Republican floor leader, Senator Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, was fatally stricken in November 1951. Robert A Taft had been majority leader of the Senate only briefly when, in July 1953 he died.

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, is a man of iron and oak, but during his service as majority leader—before he became Vice President of the United States—he was hospitalized for eye strain, a direct consequence of his labors. And Senator Lucas, who succeeded BARKLEY as leader, recalled today that he was in the hospital twice during his tenure. Lucas is a splendid specimen of vigorous manhood, but he is not at all sure that could be said of him at this juncture if he had continued as Democratic leader after 1952.

THE EXCEPTIONS

There are notable exceptions to the casualty list, however, three in particular, Representatives SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, have been wielding the House gavel alternately for years, and both have retained excellent health and energy despite this and the fact that each has passed the age of 70. In Uvalde, Tex., well beyond 80, John Nance Garner pursues the even tenor of his way, which always included hunting and still does. Yet he was Speaker of the House in a period of constant emergencies. And as Vice President of the United States for 8 years Garner was more active in the executive branch than any of his predecessors had ever been, and kept a close watch on legislation for President Roosevelt also.

Nevertheless, the list of the sticken is long enough and some of the casualties are youthful enough—JOHNSON is only 45—to lend substance to the belief that the leaders of Congress are overburdened and reorganization of their duties should be arranged to lighten them. But individual traits and destiny would continue to operate, anyhow. And each of these bears part of the responsibility for Lucas' catalog.

ORDER CONCERNING CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that an order has been made that the calendar be called at 2 o'clock p. m. for consideration of bills to which there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the call during the morning hour, under the rule, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read a very brief press release which I have sent to the Press Gallery concerning the very unfortunate, and, in my opinion, inexcusable statement which the President of the United States is reported to have made last Friday when he signed the public works appropriation bill. It is reported in the press that he objected to some unbudgeted projects which were added by Congress to the public works appropriation bill. According to the newspaper stories, the President implied such unbudgeted projects will not be initiated even though the Congress has specifically appropriated the funds until detailed engineering plans have been completed and "we have a sound basis for cost estimates." If the President did, in fact, threaten to block the will of Congress in this matter, it is something to be regretted, because it is further evidence of his lack of consideration for the prerogatives of Congress. Someone should explain to him the procedure that is followed by the Appropriations Committee in passing judgment on these projects. Someone should explain to the President that some of the money appropriated was for the cost of making the plans for these projects. It will be a sad day for government by law if a President is allowed to thwart the will of Congress as President Eisenhower apparently intimated he might do in regard to certain unbudgeted items in the public works appropriation bill.

President Eisenhower's statement on appropriations for public works projects for which he made no budget requests shows that the spirit of Dixon-Yates still lives in the White House and the Budget Bureau.

The Democratic Congress kept faith with the people by providing funds for three multipurpose dam starts in the Pacific Northwest—Ice Harbor, Cougar, and Hills Creek Dams. Congress also voted funds for Green Peter planning, despite the President's failure to ask appropriations for this purpose. The public works appropriations bill includes funds for badly needed harbor and navigation construction in Oregon and on the Columbia River.

The President's statement on Friday indicates the strong likelihood that he will not permit the appropriated funds to be used.

President Eisenhower said that he was concerned about appropriations for unbudgeted items and that these funds might not be used because engineering studies were not completed. He did not mention Ice Harbor, Cougar, and Hills Creek Dams, or any Oregon project, by name.

These projects have been studied for years, and their authorization in years past was based upon exhaustive engineering. It was in this fashion that these projects were brought to the point where construction could be begun. In the case of Hills Creek, planning has gone forward at an expenditure of $587,500, and only $10,000 is required to complete this work. Cougar has already received $150,000 for planning, and the President requested $100,000 for that purpose this year, as compared with $500,000 to complete planning and initiate construction provided by Congress this year. Ice Harbor planning was almost completed several years ago at a cost of $1,000,082. There is urgent need for the flood control that Green Peter, Cougar, and Hills Creek would provide. The Green Peter project will take some 6 years to plan and build; Cougar 5 years; and Hills Creek 4 years; yet there is the President's threat to withhold the funds appropriated for these projects.

He also said that project funds for which he did not ask probably would be held up unless financing were assured and their costs determined. He indicated that cost estimates tend to go up once they are made. In this the President is echoing the allegations of the Hoover Commission and the State chamber of commerce—but that does not make the allegations true. In fact, the most recent evidence is that the cost for multipurpose projects in the Columbia Basin have gone down on the basis of actual experience in building Hungry Horse Dam. Based upon that experience, the cost estimate of completing Pacific Northwest projects were reduced when the Army engineers presented budget data this year to the Budget Bureau. Apparently the President is unaware of this or chooses to ignore it.

The President's statement appears to be based upon the financing aspects of these projects. No partnership proposals have been made for Hills Creek or Ice Harbor.

Is the President going to hold up planning and construction funds for Cougar and planning funds for Green Peter until he can have his way on partnership? Partnership is supposedly designed to expedite construction of these badly needed projects. The President apparently is considering delaying them in the interests of partnership, not in the interest of the people of Oregon or the Nation.

Congress has answered the argument of partnership advocates by providing appropriations for these projects. As I have contended all along, partnership will only delay resource development in the Pacific Northwest.

The people of Oregon and its neighboring States will be outraged if the funds appropriated for Hills Creek, Cougar, Green Peter, and Ice Harbor are not used.

The people of Oregon will be incensed if they do not receive the benefits of the funds appropriated for deepening the channel at the mouth of the Columbia and for Tillamook Bay and Bar and Coos Bay Harbor because the President did not ask for them, to begin with. Such action would compound the original shortsightedness of not including them in the administration budget.

The President's statement is uncalled for and inexcusable. I say to the President of the United States from the floor of the Senate today: Come out to the Pacific Northwest and explain any such threat to the people of the Northwest. The people of my State and region will make clear their disapproval in a form that I am sure the President will be able to understand. I now ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point of my remarks in the RECORD a copy of the President's statement, as it appeared in the New York Times of July 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EISENHOWER

I have today approved H. R. 6766, "making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes." I have approved this bill with great reluctance. There are two matters which are of deep concern to me.

The first is the reduction made in the funds available to the Atomic Energy Commission. The amount provided in the bill, together with the estimated amount carried over from 1955, would provide the Commission with total obligational authority of $1,380,847,000 for operating expenses in 1956. This amount is $144,404,000 less than was requested. A reduction of this magnitude could seriously interfere with the Commission's plans to produce atomic weapons, to develop propulsion reactors for the Navy and the Air Force, and to develop peaceful applications of atomic energy, including the production of electric power.

CALLS PROGRAMS CRUCIAL

These are most crucial programs in maintaining a strong national defense and in maintaining this Nation's leadership in bringing the benefits of atomic energy to the service of mankind both here and abroad.

For these reasons, I would hope that the Congress would reconsider its action and make supplementary amounts available so as to avoid serious disruption in this most vital program.

The second matter which concerns me is the large increase in the number of new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Many of these projects which have been added by the Congress have not had detailed engineering studies completed. As a result, we have no basis for determining their financial soundness and their ultimate cost to the Federal Government.

In all, 107 unbudgeted projects were added by Congress. We can only guess what their total cost to the taxpayers will ultimately be because of this lack of detailed engineering studies on many of them. The best guess that can be made at the present time is upwards of $1,500,000,000, but when planning is completed, this guess, in the light of past experience, may well prove to be far too low. While the first-year appropriations made in this bill amount to only about $47 million, the appropriations and expenditures in future years will increase sharply and quickly reach a half-billion-dollar level.

As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates. In the case of projects involving reimbursable items, such as electric power and water supply, we must be assured that satisfactory financial arrangements have been completed for return of the Federal investment.

The public is entitled to this measure of protection to the tax dollars that go into the construction of these projects.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the following two sentences:

> In all, 107 unbudgeted projects were added by Congress. We can only guess what their total cost to the taxpayers will ultimately be because of this lack of detailed engineering studies on many of them.

I read this further sentence which occurred later in the statement:

> As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates.

I only wish to add that apparently the President is not aware of the very careful procedures followed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations before it passes on such projects as this. The Senate committee is always well informed regarding what is involved in these requests. The committee has the Army engineers or other appropriate Government officials submit to it testimony in regard to all of the requests. I wish to say that the Appropriations Committee brought to us a report which was thoroughly documented in support of the projects. In my judgment, the President has the clear duty of carrying out the will of the Congress, as manifested in the action we took.

It is no sound precedent to attempt to justify this statement of the President to say that because in the midst of the Korean war President Truman impounded some funds it would be proper for President Eisenhower to do so now. The Truman action was taken during the war period. At that time we needed to use all the production resources of the country for the prosecution of that war. No such situation exists today. Furthermore, as I recall, the Korean war was not contemplated when the hearings on and plans for those particular projects were considered by the Appropriations Committee. If President Eisenhower did not like our action, he should have vetoed that bill. Then he would have found what would have happened to his veto message if he had sent it to the Senate. I repeat that President Eisenhower is threatening our legislative process by arbitrary Executive action. Once the country understands his conduct in these matters, it will disapprove.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the senior Senator from Oregon on the statement which he just made. I desire to amplify it by saying that the issue raised by the President's statement in signing the public works bill is one of the deepest issues before free government.

DIXON-YATES PATTERN THREATENS LEGISLATIVE POWER

I think it is extraordinary that while the President of the United States is sitting at Geneva, ostensibly negotiating to prevent executive government from taking over the world, he is acting here at home to impose executive government upon the people of the United States.

I am glad the Senator from Oregon made special reference to the Dixon-Yates proposal. That contract has not been clearly understood, it seems to me, in spite of all that has been revealed by the subcommittee of which the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is chairman; namely, that the pattern which was developed in the Dixon-Yates transaction is a pattern designed to transfer completely to the Bureau of the Budget and the anonymous assistants in the White House the legislative power which the Constitution vests in Congress.

If it shall continue to be true that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can defy the acts of Congress in making appropriations and can say, notwithstanding the appropriations, that the works will not be built because the executive department does not approve of them, although the President has signed the bill, it is useless to talk about saving free government.

I am certain every Member of the Senate at one time or another, and probably on many occasions, has heard it said that free government in the United States stands in no danger from any attack which may come from abroad, but that it does stand in danger of an attack from within.

I have been amazed to read some of the comments in the newspapers with respect to the revelations resulting from the investigation of the Dixon-Yates contract, as, for example, the statement by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of yesterday. Mr. Krock, who is one of the greatest and ablest of all Washington correspondents, said that while there were amazing blunders committed by the administration in the making of the Dixon-Yates contract, and in the effort to effectuate it secretly, without the knowledge of Congress as to what was being done by way of appropriation, nevertheless, Mr. Krock's statement was, the revelations disclosed that there were blunders, but no scandal.

NEED FOR APPROPRIATIONS BY CONGRESS NOT MENTIONED IN ORIGINAL DIXON-YATES ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. President, the greatest scandal in the world would be the destruction of the legislative power of the Senate and the House of Representatives. If we are continually to yield away our power and allow legislative questions of great public importance to be decided without our approval, it will be shocking. I am certain that the press and the radio, which have covered the Dixon-Yates transaction, have not yet reached a complete understanding of the importance of the matter.

Before I yield to the two Senators who wish to ask questions, let me add this word: First, the Dixon-Yates contract was announced as an effort to save money for the Government of the United States, by providing a private source of power to meet the additional needs of the Government through the TVA and the AEC. No statement was made that while the executive branch of the Government sought to authorize a private expenditure of money to build a powerplant to deliver power to Government agencies, Congress would be asked to appropriate funds for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate is still operating under the 2-minute limitation on speeches.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may be permitted to proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will indulge me for a moment, I wish to complete the thought I had in mind when the Senator from Massachusetts rose. It is this: That no public statement was made about the plan of the Bureau of the Budget and the executive branch of the Government to dig into the Treasury of the United States and spend $6,500,000 of the taxpayers' money for a power line to transmit energy which was supposed to be produced by a subsidiary company of the two holding companies with whom the Dixon-Yates contract was made.

In other words, there was being held up to the public the picture of the substitution of private investment for public investment, while at the same time the Government was asking for public investment for the benefit of special privilege. The Dixon-Yates contract was not made as the result of a public offering. It was not submitted to bids. There was another company which desired to bid, but it was crushed. Is that private enterprise? The activity of the executive branch of the Government suppressed all opposition or all competition with the favored holding companies that were to construct this project.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF ATTEMPTS TO THWART WILL OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, as well as those made by the two Senators from Oregon. The Senator from Wyoming has made note of the fact that the press and the people do not seem to have an idea of what is going on. I am wondering if the Congress itself knows what is going on, because the impounding order of the President on last Friday is an indication of a pattern which has come into existence. This holdup of funds by the executive branch—as they apply to public-works projects not approved by the Budget Bureau, creates a serious problem in relation to the equality of power between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Why should Secretary Wilson thwart the will of the Congress by saying he had impounded the $46 million authorized by the Congress to keep the Marines at their present strength? Later, as an afterthought, he said he had mentioned the matter to the President, and the President had agreed with him. This is something the executive branch is doing, regardless of the action taken by Congress. The people's representatives do not have anything to say about it. I think it is high time we did something about it. Congress is supposed to be coequal to the executive branch of the Government, but, practically, we are being subordinated more and more. I would remind Secretary Wilson and President Eisenhower that Congress has the constitutional responsibility to raise and support armies. Certainly with that right goes the responsibility as to its size and nature.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The unfortunate thing about it is that the acts are not being performed by the President himself. The action is being taken in his name by men who, in many instances, have never been confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

INTERFERENCE WITH QUASI-JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS WELL AS CONGRESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Pardon me for a moment. The revelations which were made by the committee headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] have shown that Mr. Sherman Adams called up the Securities and Exchange Commission and asked them to postpone the hearing which they were conducting under the law and under proper jurisdiction, and the request that the hearing be postponed was made at a time when there was to be a critical vote on the floor of the House on the question whether or not $6½ million of public money should be appropriated on the pretense that private enterprise was being invited into the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Securities and Exchange Commission is also an arm of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Securities and Exchange Commission is a quasi-judicial body. Newspapermen, such as Mr. Krock, who is a distinguished writer, say it is merely a blunder that the White House should have intervened and pressed the point with a quasi-judicial agency. "In order to avoid difficulty in Congress, hold it up for a few days until we get our appropriation through, and then you may act." That is what was said.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

SECRET ADVICE FROM PRIVILEGED GROUPS IS UN-AMERICAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator feel that the information contained in the testimony of Mr. Wenzell, which Mr. Adams was apparently trying to prevent the House of Representatives from getting, undoubtedly would have been so disturbing and scandalous in its nature that it would have changed the outcome of the vote on the so-called transmission line, had the information been made public prior to the vote?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about it. Why? Because Mr. Wenzell was an official, a vice president, of the First Boston Corp., one of the greatest private-utility financing institutions in the country, if not the greatest, and he had been invited by Mr. Hughes—or Mr. Dodge, I think, was then Director of the Budget—to come to Washington to advise the administration with respect to its program.

If the administration wants any advice with respect to a public power or private power program, the way to get such advice is not by secretly inviting the representatives of special-privileged groups to secret meetings at the White House, at the Atomic Energy Commission, at the SEC, and at the Bureau of the Budget, which meetings are concealed from Congress; the proper way to obtain the advice is to have it come from Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me complete my statement, because I wish to draw a comparison between what the Senator from Tennessee is doing and what the Senator from Oregon has just said. The construction of public dams in the Northwest has been brought to a halt by the President of the United States, although such projects have been approved by the Congress, and he brings such construction to a halt at the very moment when he attaches his signature to, and thereby approves, the bill containing the appropriation.

Was such action in the minds of the drafters of the Constitution? It certainly was not.

Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the partnership pattern which is being developed is being developed secretly, behind closed doors, in exactly the same way that the First Boston financing deal was worked out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

FOUNDATIONS OF LEGISLATIVE GOVERNMENT THREATENED BY EXECUTIVE DEALS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Has not the evidence fully exposed the fact that not only are the impounding of funds and other actions thwarting the will of Congress, but that by interfering with the operation of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is another very serious matter, the administration is intentionally keeping from the Congress of the United States facts to which the Congress is entitled, and which it should have before voting on important legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only is that true, but it is also true that while saying the purpose of the administration is to promote local initiative and private enterprise, so that the people of various localities may exercise their judgment as to what should be done for the development of their resources, there is being worked out a scheme of alliances with private utility companies, so-called, which not only are not incorporated in the cities, in the States, or sometimes even in the areas in which a development is contemplated, but which are incorporated in far distant States which have no interest in the matter.

I know of an incorporation of a utility company in the State of Maine which is now engaged in partnership negotiations with the Interior Department. If this partnership agreement is permitted to be entered into, then the Congress of the United States can easily be deprived of its power to say who shall build and how they shall build projects designed to develop the public resources of the United States, and indeed whether or not public resources—natural resources—shall be developed at all until distant corporations, which may be incorporated perhaps in Maine, Florida, New Jersey, or elsewhere—shall have entered into private agreements with the executive branch of the Government, not authorized by law or by the Congress at all. The very foundations of government by legislative bodies representing the people are being torn from under our institutions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was very much interested to hear the distinguished Senator from Wyoming refer to the fact that certain officials never confirmed by the Senate, were presuming to speak and to act for the President. I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming noticed a very significant inconsistency into which the distinguished President of the United States has been plunged by his advisers. A few weeks ago, before the illustrious senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, was tragically taken ill, the President submitted to the press a list of so-called must legislation, which he criticized the Democratic Congress for not enacting. On his list was the Cougar Dam project, in Oregon. Yet the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], added to the bill the Cougar Dam project, which the President claimed he wanted, when he had his controversy with Senator LYNDON JOHNNSON. The Cougar Dam project was included in the bill by the Senate, and was retained in the bill by the conference committee, although no construction funds for the Cougar project had been provided for in the administration's budget. Yet the President told the press it was one if the items which the Democratic Congress was derelict in not providing for.

Now the Congress has authorized the Cougar Dam. Yet the President issued that statement, saying he would not go ahead with the 107 unbudgeted projects, among which is the Cougar Dam.

What does the President mean? First, he criticizes the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the other Democratic Members of Congress for not providing for the Cougar Dam; and then the President announces to the world, in a press statement, that even though the Congress has provided for the Cougar Dam, he evidently does not intend to proceed with the spending of the money for it, although the appropriation has been provided by the Congress.

This is an example of what the Senator from Wyoming has referred to, namely, that others, acting for the President, are taking him into impossible situations.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET IS NOT A SECOND PARLIAMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, the shocking thing about what is happening before our eyes is that the executive branch of the Government assumes the right to name secretly those who are to receive the privileges of developing the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I wish to say to the Senator from Wyoming that we are deeply grateful for and appreciative of his remarkable address regarding the responsibilities of Government and how the Government should work and the way it does work.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] capsuled the situation when he spoke of the theoretical equality of powers and balance of powers as between the executive and the legislative branches. That theoretical balance, I may say, now is in imbalance, with the power in the hands of the executive.

I am intrigued to note that for more than 20 years our friends in the Republican Party could not get over what they considered the encroachment of the executive on the rights of the American people and, particularly, of the Congress. Yet within less than 3 years we see an executive pattern which goes far beyond anything ever before witnessed in this country.

The Bureau of the Budget, I say respectfully to my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, is an auxiliary to the office of the President. However, the Bureau of the Budget is taking on responsibilities and the cloak of being a second parliament, so to speak, without having been elected. Apparently it is impossible to discuss anything in the Government unless the Bureau of the Budget has given its stamp of approval and holy writ upon it.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ENTITLED TO FREEDOM FROM IRRESPONSIBLE INTERFERENCE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct. I have sat on the Appropriations Committee for many years, and I have noticed a perfectly proper attitude on the part of the committee, namely, that unless an item is budgeted, the committee wants definite proof that it is desirable and in the public interest, before approval will be granted. But the members of the committee have also noticed that representatives of the executive branch of the Government are under instructions, when they come before the committee to testify, not to say a word in support of any program which is not within the budget. Time after time we have said to witnesses, "Disregard your instructions. The Congress of the United States holds the purse strings, under the Constitution itself; and we want to know the facts. Tell us how much you asked the Bureau of the Budget for." The answer has been forthcoming, and no one has ever been penalized.

But I can say without the slightest hesitation that if we were to call upon the employees of the Bureau of the Budget, the employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, or the employees of the TVA, in connection with the study which is being made by the Antimonopoly Subcommittee, to speak the truth about what transpired in those agencies, and about how they felt about it, there would be immediately flashed the order that no information passing within the executive branch should be revealed.

I honor that rule; I consider it to be a sound one, because I think that without it, the morale of every bureau would be upset; and I believe the bureaus are entitled, within their own jurisdiction, to work out their judgment by full and free debate, inviting the opinions of all members. But when individuals from the White House, who are not members of these quasi-judicial bodies, undertake to interfere and to give the impression that they are speaking the mind of the President, they intimidate, necessarily, the members of these agencies, even those who are commissioners, whose appointments are confirmed by the Senate, and who are bound by oath to carry out the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana, who previously sought recognition.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that the President has said that he is threatening to impound the funds for more than 100 projects which Congress studied and authorized, and appropriated funds for their construction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask the Senator from Oregon to answer as to the exact figure. I have not seen the statement, but I have read the report in the press.

Mr. MORSE. That is the very clear impression the President left with the press at the time of the signing of the bill; and the newspaper stories are to that effect.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS OUGHT NOT BE SET ASIDE

Mr. LONG. If that is to be done, does not it rather clearly mean that although Congress studies these projects, passes the necessary authorizing legislation, and, by way of appropriations, provides funds for their construction, so that the Nation may be benefited, yet the President assumes the right to say, "No, that work shall not be done, although Congress has passed a law for them, and although I signed the law"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. Take the case the Senator from Oregon referred to a moment ago, namely, the Cougar Dam. In this instance, the Congress passed a law authorizing construction of the dam, and also authorized appropriations for the construction of the dam. As the Senator from Louisiana well knows, no money may be recommended for appropriation by an Appropriations Committee unless there is on the statute books a law, approved by the President, authorizing such an appropriation. The Committees on Appropriations may decide whether they will go all the way with the authorization, or whether they will go only a part of the way. That is purely a legislative function. But once the authorization is made, the power of the purse—which is the very heart of every representative government—lies with the representatives of the people in the House and in the Senate. When the authorization is made, if the House and Senate then appropriate for the item the appropriation bill goes to the President, he having already signed the bill authorizing the expenditure, if he then signs the bill making the appropriation, but says, "Despite these two laws, I will not obey the law of Congress which I myself helped to make," it is an extraordinary attack upon free government here at home.

Mr. LONG. Does not the thought occur to the Senator that if the President takes that attitude, he is in a position to say, perhaps with respect to Massachusetts, "Here is a project I would like to see constructed. Therefore, I will allow to be spent the money which Congress has authorized." Perhaps with respect to Louisiana there may be a different point of view. There may be various and sundry reasons—none of them political, of course—why the money should not be spent in Louisiana, so Louisiana does not get the money. If the President is to take such an attitude, will not that fact demonstrate that it would have been the height of folly to have voted for the Eisenhower road program and let the President determine how the $100 billion was to be spent, in building roads when he wants them, and where he wants them? If for some reason or other he did not think some particular State should get additional roads, we could wait forever and never see the highways constructed.

DANGERS OF SETTING ASIDE AND OVERRULING WILL OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy the Senator brought that subject up, because it demonstrates clearly, as the Senator suggests—inasmuch as that bill would have given the President complete authority to say where the money was to be spent—that the President could have done exactly what Sherman Adams did with respect to the Dixon-Yates contract. He could have determined whether the State of Louisiana should get a single mile of roads or whether the State of Wyoming or the State of Minnesota should get roads. The whole purpose of that bill, with its special provision creating a government corporation to issue bonds—which were supposed not to be a part of the public debt, although they would be obligations of the Government, through the corporation which was to have been created—was to transfer the legislative power of the Congress of the United States to the gentlemen who sit in the cubbyholes of the White House. That was only another effort in that direction.

Mr. LONG. Does not this issue highlight the wisdom of the Congress in substituting for the Eisenhower road program the program sponsored by the committee, or the so-called Gore bill, which spells out specifically how much money each State is entitled to expect, year by year, so that each State will have a certain amount of money to which it can look, and no more?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If Senators will bear with me a moment, I wish to place in the RECORD what I consider to be the most extraordinary release I have ever seen coming from the White House. It purports to state the position of the President of the United States.

LIMITATIONS ON PRESIDENT'S RIGHT TO GIVE ORDERS TO DEPARTMENT HEADS

Senators will recall that a day or two before the 30th of June, Mr. Hughes, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was being examined. He had agreed that he would furnish certain information which the committee wanted with respect to the papers and documents in the Bureau of the Budget which were used in building up the Dixon-Yates program. He agreed that the staff of the committee could go down the next morning and get those papers.

When the staff went down they were denied the papers, and Mr. Hughes came back and laid upon the table before the committee a letter addressed by President Eisenhower to the Secretary of Defense.

When the hearings were being held by the Government Operations Committee with respect to the operation of one of the Army installations under Secretary Wilson, the President advised Secretary Wilson that nothing which had transpired in the negotiations in the Department of Defense with respect to what were then known as the McCarthy hearings could be made public.

It was overlooked that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army; that the Secretary of Defense is a civilian head of the Army; and that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has tremendous powers within the Armed Forces. It was overlooked that section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which makes the President of the United States the Commander in Chief of the Army, also provides that he may ask the heads of the various civilian departments for their opinion. But nowhere in the Constitution is there the slightest word saying that he may direct the heads of the various departments as to what they may do, as Sherman Adams did when he picked up the telephone and called Chairman Armstrong, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and said, "Postpone your hearings." That was not an activity of the Commander in Chief.

So, as this program developed, it became necessary eventually for the Government to back down, and the Attorney General wrote a letter, and Mr. Armstrong testified. But before that, on the 30th of June, there came this release providing for the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract. This is an important document. It ought to be read by every Member of the Senate and House. It ought to be printed in boldface type in every newspaper of America, because of what it reveals with respect to the manner in which these objectives are sought to be attained.

JUST WHO IS "THE WHITE HOUSE"

I am reading from page 120 of the transcript of the hearings:

> Senator KEFAUVER. Just a little while ago members of the committee were informed of a statement issued by the White House which I will ask Mr. Keeffe to read the first page of.
>
> Mr. KEEFFE (reading). "At the direction of the President, the White House today made public the following letter from Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority:
>
> "'The administration has consistently advocated the development of power facilities through local initiative and operation wherever possible.'"

Whereupon I interrupted and said:

> Read the heading, please.
>
> Mr. KEEFFE. "Immediate release, June 30, 1955. James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President.
>
> "The White House."

It is clear that this is a statement issued by the press secretary at the White House.

> "At the direction of the President the White House today made public the following letter from Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The term "White House" is a sort of conglomerate word. Mr. Hagerty does not say that he was instructed. He merely says that the White House was instructed, as though the Senate or the House had been instructing the White House. At any rate, the White House had been instructed. This is the new body, the new organization which handles the law. That is the organization which was instructed.

Proceeding with the second paragraph:

> "The administration has consistently advocated the development of power facilities through local initiative and operation wherever possible."

REA DEPENDS ON LOCAL INITIATIVE

Let us read the record to find any instances of the advocacy by the executive branch of the Government of a substitution of local initiative in the building of such projects.

We all know that REA is being hemmed around by partnership agreements. There is nothing more local, more private, or more purely capitalistic than the REA cooperatives, which throughout the United States borrow money from the United States, pay it back, and then use their own money to build their electric transmission lines, and in that way create a market for electrical appliances.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wyoming understands, of course, that the REA's are not the agents of the private utilities, as the White House is fast becoming the chief spokesman of the private utilities. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The REA's are free, independent, local enterprises.

The statement of Mr. Hagerty continues:

> The President many months ago recommended that the city of Memphis develop its own powerplant to supply the needs of the people of that area for electric energy. In the absence of any action by the city to accept this responsibility, the Federal Government made the necessary plans to provide adequate power facilities for the Memphis area.

What does that sentence mean? The people are not told, and the newspapers are not told, that the city of Memphis has a municipally owned plant and that the city was buying power from TVA. No one was told that the real purpose of the Dixon-Yates plan was to prevent the city from buying its power from TVA, as it was doing perfectly legally, and to compel the city to buy its power instead from a nonexistent generating company, which had still to be incorporated, and which was to be financed in secret.

NEW DIXON-YATES COMPANY LOW IN CAPITAL AND HIGH IN DEBT

Of course, application had to be made to the SEC. There it speedily developed that the capital stock of this new generating company was only $5½ million and that it was undertaking to build a plant costing in excess of $100 million.

Later it developed that the legal advisers of the SEC in their report stated specifically that in an ordinary utility case such a disparity between debt and equity would not be approved. However, they went on to explain that they would approve it because the Government contract was so good that the payments from the Government for the power would largely carry the bonds which were to be issued.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that on the very face of the report of the SEC itself, the administration is convicted of going forward with a program to subsidize a private utility?

PLAN WAS TO BE FORCED ON CITY OF MEMPHIS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that. Let us read again what Mr. Hagerty said:

> The President many months ago recommended that the city of Memphis develop its own powerplant to supply the needs of the people of that area for electric energy. In the absence of any action by the city to accept this responsibility, the Federal Government made the necessary plans to provide adequate power facilities for the Memphis area.

The thoughts which should have been disclosed, but were not, were to this effect: "The Federal Government made the necessary plans secretly, behind closed doors, with the representatives of two of the largest utility holding companies in the United States, for those companies to build a generating plant, which would be a subsidiary and which would get a market in Memphis, and which the Federal Government would impose upon the city of Memphis."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The President's expression of hope is a very common expression of the present administration. It expresses a hope, rather than a policy, but after the President's expression of hope that Memphis would build its own plant, did anyone of the many Bureau of the Budget officials, or Department of the Interior officials, or assistants to the President, who speak for the President, publicly contact a Memphis official or go to the city of Memphis and say, "Will you build this plant?" Is there anything in the record which indicates anything like that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have seen nothing in the record to that effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, there was merely an expression of hope, a sort of radiation of good wishes and good will. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator is correct. I have seen nothing to the contrary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator remembers what Mayor Tobey, of Memphis, stated at the hearings:

> At no time has the city of Memphis, nor the Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Division, been consulted as to this proposed agreement. Even at this moment, the terms of the agreement have not been made known to the officials of the city. We learned from the newspapers that copies of the Dixon-Yates contract had been distributed.

Is it not strange that the city of Memphis should know nothing about it? I remember that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] about a year ago tried to get a copy of the Dixon-Yates contract. He appealed for an opportunity to look at a draft of the contract.

There has been a great deal of talk about top secrets. I may say that if the administration would protect every one of its defense secrets as it has protected the Dixon-Yates contract secret, there would be no need for counterespionage. In fact, we could disband all our intelligence services.

This new White House group, to which the Senator has referred, are not acting only in the name of the President; they are the champion Fearless Fosdicks of the times. They keep secret everything they want to keep secret.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to read the final paragraph. Incidentally, the testimony of Mayor Tobey, to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, was not given before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, but was given before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And before the SEC.

WHITE HOUSE UNDERTAKES TO DECIDE WHAT IS GOOD FOR MEMPHIS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the SEC. I now read the final paragraph from the White House release:

> In the light of the notification by the city of Memphis to the Tennessee Valley Authority, the President had requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to confer promptly with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority to determine—

Now let us observe these words—

> to determine whether it is in the interest of the people of the area now to continue or to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract.

What is meant by all the talk about local initiative, when the White House undertakes to hold a conference to determine what is good and what is not good for the city of Memphis? What is the use of it all if the responsibilities of the municipal government of the city of Memphis can be disposed of at secret conferences by the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the White House, not to mention numerous anonymous aides and assistants at the White House? If those things can be done for Memphis, they can be done for any city in the land. All talk about being in favor of local enterprise and local initiative is plain poppycock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the contribution he is making to the discussion of the theory of constitutional government on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. It is a theory to which the White House needs to pay some attention, because in my judgment, what has been demonstrated is the beginning of a very dangerous trend in government under the Eisenhower administration, namely, government by dictation and in secrecy. The interesting point is that although the President did not say at his press conference last week that he was going to impound the funds, he left that implication very clearly in the minds of newspapermen.

We find the same trend in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, when the President said to the city of Memphis, with reference to operating a publicly owned power system, "Unless you take my dictates and unless you proceed to build a plant yourself and cease to press for the matter being worked out by way of a coordinated program with TVA, we are going ahead with Dixon-Yates."

That is what it adds up to. It is a dangerous trend in America, and it is about time the American people awoke to that fact, because I think we must stop the President in the direction he is following of government by dictates.

COULD IT BE THAT SECRETS ARE KEPT FROM THE PRESIDENT AS WELL AS CONGRESS?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is not so much what the President does, because I firmly believe that his advisers are not laying before him the exact meaning of the things he permits to be done. I am just as confident as I can be of anything that the President of the United States has the same concept of a people's government under the Constitution that he had when he entered West Point, but he does not know what concentrated economic power has been doing through the years to take the Government away from the people.

What is happening at this moment in all this pattern is the attempt of special-privilege interests to use the power and authority of the White House, not to advance private enterprise, not to create opportunity, not to carry on a free government, open and aboveboard, but to find ways and means of fastening the power of big money upon the Government of the United States, so that the Congress itself may not be able to prevent big money from running the Government.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND THE RIGHT TO BE HEARD

Let us take a bill, any bill, which is introduced in the Senate or the House. It has to be introduced and printed so that every Member may know what it contains. If there is anything controversial about it, the committee to which it is referred must hold a hearing, and does hold a hearing, and those who object have a free opportunity to be heard. But largely, by reason of two great wars, largely, we have fallen into the habit of expanding the power of the President to issue Executive orders, and such Executive orders have come to be no longer the personal expressions of the opinion of the President. They are orders which have the force and effect of law, and which are worked out behind closed doors, so that the public knows nothing of what has been done until the effect is felt. That is not the free government which the constitutional fathers established.

I say again what I have said before, that back in 1937, when I was a member of the Judiciary Committee and President Roosevelt sent to this body and to the House a bill which most of the Members of the Congress, most of the newspapers, and most of the public felt would be an invasion of the judicial powers, and would make the Supreme Court acquiescent to the President's will, I felt it was an invasion of the Constitution and an invasion of the legislative power of Congress. So I opposed it, and the Senate killed the bill.

We were so concerned about it that although the majority of the Judiciary Committee was opposed to the bill and could have pigeonholed it, we submitted it to the Senate with an adverse report so that it might be publicly repudiated in such a manner that no one would ever again attempt such an invasion of the legislative power of the Congress.

BEWARE OF EXCUTIVE INVASION OF POWERS OF CONGRESS

Here we have another Executive invasion of the legislative power of Congress, an invasion of the quasi-judicial powers of various boards and commissions. Here we have a procedure which, if it is not now stopped, will permit secret conferences to work out partnership agreements and programs to become the law of the land without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Wyoming is pointing out with great understanding and clarity the dangers of the overexpansion of Executive powers, particularly as related to the companion branches of the Government, but I should like to invite the Senator's attention to something which I think is even more dangerous. Not only in the Dixon-Yates deal was there an example of the abuse of Executive power, not only was there public business being transacted in secrecy, behind closed doors, but when the city of Memphia indicated what it contemplated, through its duly constituted and elected representatives, its city council, its mayor, its gas, light, and power officials, and when the Legislature of Tennessee had authorized the issuance of bonds for the construction of an electric plant, the Government of the United States, through the most powerful branch of government, the Department of Justice, dispatched agents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to Memphis to find out whether that city was sincere, and whether there was going to be a carry-through on the part of the city of Memphis. With all this skulduggery being evident, with interference with a quasi-judicial body, with one man serving in the Bureau of the Budget and also in a private capacity, wearing two hats, never knowing which one was identifying him for the moment, why was not the FBI directed to look into the activities of Mr. Wenzell? Why was not the FBI ordered to look into the activities of the First Boston Corp.? Why was not the FBI directed to protect the integrity of the processes of government, rather than being sent to a municipality where the government is in the hands of local people?

AN ADVISER TO THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, WEARING 2 HATS, DROPS 1

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's language has brought to my mind a rather amusing incident which transpired during the hearing on the Dixon-Yates contract by the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Tennessee. Mr. Miller, one of the assistants to one of the prominent officials of the First Boston Corp., who was brought to Washington by Mr. Wenzell, vice president, was on the stand and testified. Seated beside him was one of the important members of Sullivan & Cromwell, the well-known and very able legal firm of New York City. I happened to ask a question—I have forgotten precisely what it was—as to why these prominent attorneys were necessary, when it was now being urged that no fee was to have been charged, and that the First Boston Corp., though it had completed the sale of the bonds to the Metropolitan and other insurance companies, was not to have any compensation.

Mr. Miller responded, "Oh, we called them in at the drop of a hat."

The question immediately arose in my mind: Which hat was Mr. Wenzell dropping? The hat of the vice president of the First Boston Corp., or the hat of the adviser of the Bureau of the Budget? The matter came to be rather a joke. Naturally, it was a joke, but it represented exactly the facts, namely, that the vice president of the First Boston Corp. was called in to advise the Bureau of the Budget; and though he regarded himself as an employee of the Bureau of the Budget, he was still receiving his salary from the First Boston Corp., and he registered, when he went before the Atomic Energy Commission, as vice president and representative of the First Boston Corp., although he thought he was a representative and an adviser of the Bureau of the Budget.

The situation became so ludicrous that finally Mr. Wenzell testified that he had actually become nervous because of the dual capacity which was developing. This was before there was any revelation.

It was really for that reason—the difficulty of wearing two hats—that the First Boston Corp. finally decided that it would not take any money for what it had done, which was, of course, the financing of more than $90 million of bonds and some $20 million of unsecured notes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

STILL OTHER INSTANCES OF INTERFERENCE WITH WILL OF CONGRESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming has been making a very cogent argument about the usurpation of legislative powers by agents of the Executive speaking in the name of the President. Is not this illustration similar to the recent action by the Secretary of Defense in canceling an added appropriation which Congress made for the Marine Corps?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming will recall that as a result of the debate on the floor, the Senate voted for an added appropriation of $46 million, to increase the size of the Marine Corps from 192,000 to 215,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point is clear, as we have discussed it earlier in the day. Congress expressed its will to expand the size of the Marine Corps, and provided the money with which to do so. A provision for the increased funds was written into the appropriation bill, which the President signed. But in signing the bill, the President said, in effect, "Notwithstanding the fact that I have placed my signature of approval on the bill, I shall undertake in my individual, sole character as President of the United States to refuse to spend the additional funds."

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a result of that action, the size of the Marine Corps will be decreased to 192,000, instead of being increased to 215,000, which was its size some months ago. Had the figure of 215,000 been restored, then, of the 23,000 increase, some 17,000 or 18,000 would have been direct combat troops, virtually the equivalent of a full division. So the decision by the Secretary of Defense measurably weakens the defense of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I have long felt that Congress should give the President the power to veto items in an appropriation bill. But Congress has never given him that power. So when the President attempts to veto an item in an appropriation bill, although he does not have the power to do so, he is doing exactly what the Senator from Illinois has said: He is usurping the legislative function.

The legislative power was used as prescribed in the Constitution by the votes of the House and the Senate to treat the Marine Corps in the manner Congress prescribed, and the President gave his approval. There is no power under the Constitution which gives the right to undo that law signed by the President. Not even he can do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the exercise of such power by the President will result in measurably decreasing the defense capacity of the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was because I felt that to be the case that I voted for the appropriation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must yield the floor now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted to obtain the floor in my own right, but first I wished to ask the Senator a question bearing on the same subject. I, of course, thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Wyoming has said. I could point out other instances in which the administration has acted in this manner. Congress has heretofore passed laws which were to be administered basically in a certain way; but because the executive branch did not like them, they refused to administer them. I could go from the Maritime Board to the Department of the Interior and to many other departments. Those things have happened before. All of us who entertain the view of the Senator from Wyoming know that such situations have arisen before. The latest instance is in the case of the public works bill. The President is responsible for the acts of his subordinates. I do not know what seems to be developing. If something bad happens, which is not in the interest of the people, immediately it is said that the President does not know anything about it. But if something good happens, then the President's assistants get busy and give him great credit.

I did not ask the President, first of all, to be a Republican. I did not ask him to run for the Presidency. But I say that when a man assumes the responsibility of the Presidency—and I believe he did so in all integrity and honesty—then not only is he the head of a major political party, but, as President of the United States, he must accept the responsibility of the acts of his subordinates, and not say he did not know anything about them.

In the case of the Dixon-Yates contract, I do not know whether Mr. Adams had conferred with the President when he communicated with the Securities and Exchange Commission, but certainly I cannot believe that in a matter so important as the Dixon-Yates contract, a matter which has become almost a cause célèbre in the United States, the President himself has not conferred with anyone. If he has not, then I do not know what will happen to the executive branch of the Government if the President does not accept responsibility.

Cabinet members make decisions. The Senator from Wyoming and I have had hassle after hassle with the officials of the Department of the Interior. They make important decisions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to keep another appointment. I am already a half hour late for it. But I am glad the Senator from Washington and other Senators have participated in the discussion. I think it is important that the facts should be spread upon the RECORD, and be made so clear that no one can misunderstand their implications.

I hope that an appropriate committee of Congress will see fit to invite Mr. Sherman Adams to come from his office in the White House before a committee and to tell us how the activities of the White House which are under his jurisdiction are being conducted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I simply cannot believe that very important matters, which require direct Cabinet-level action, are not discussed in Cabinet meetings, and that the Executive would not want to know what the Cabinet intended to do. But apparently that is not the case, although with respect to this latest order the President must have known what he was doing when he intimated to the press that he might withhold some funds. This is nothing new. The first year the new administration came into office there were literally hundreds of laws on the books which required continuing administrative action, but the administration decided that it did not like certain laws and was therefore going to make a study of them.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, under its order of Thursday last, will proceed to a call of the calendar of unobjected to bills, beginning with Calendar No. 775.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a call of the calendar of unobjected to bills be deferred, so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of conference reports on H. R. 4904 and H. R. 5559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I desire to have 5 minutes to discuss the matter of the public works bill as it affects the Pacific Northwest, but I did not have an opportunity to do so except to propound 1 or 2 questions to the Senator from Wyoming. I am wondering if I may have unanimous consent to proceed with my comments after the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] completes his statement on the conference reports.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I incorporate in my unanimous-consent request the provision that at the conclusion of the consideration of the two conference reports the Senator from Washington may be permitted to address the Senate for 5 minutes, before the Senate proceeds to the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend for a period of two years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad."

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBT. S. KERR,
By HARRY F. BYRD.
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the House bill proposed to make permanent the provisions of the act of December 5, 1942, granting the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. Senate amendment No. 1 provided that the privilege be extended until July 1, 1957, in lieu of being made permanent. The House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 2 added a new section to the House bill, which proposed to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide specifically for hardboard in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act. The Senate conferees receded.

Under the conference agreement, the title of the bill was conformed to the action taken on amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with the following amendments:

(1) Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and, on page 1 of the House engrossed bill, in line

11, strike out "section 106" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "section 106 (a) (8)."

(2) On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 3, strike out "SEC. 2." and in lieu thereof insert: "SEC. 3."

(3) On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 6, strike out "for civilian, industrial, or commercial" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "for general civilian industrial or commercial."

(4) On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 16, strike out "SEC. 3." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "SEC. 4."

(5) On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only to contracts with the Departments made after December 31, 1954."

(6) On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 8, strike out "SEC. 4." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "SEC. 5."

(7) On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 19, strike out "SEC. 5." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "SEC. 6."

(8) On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, beginning with line 19, strike out all through line 2 on page 7.

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBERT S. KERR,
By HARRY F. BYRD.
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in the conference on H. R. 4904, a bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, the House conferees agreed to all of the Senate amendments, with certain technical changes, with two exceptions. The first Senate amendment eliminated section 2 of the House bill which prevented the profit limitations of the Vinson-Trammell Act and the Merchant Marine Act from applying to contracts exempt under section 106 of that act. We took this action because of letters from the Comptroller General and the Budget Bureau. The House conferees agreed to confine this exemption to contracts under section 101 (8) of that act, that is, contracts for standard commercial articles and services. It is believed that this change will meet the objections raised by the Comptroller General and the Budget Bureau. We accepted the change.

The Senate amendment broadening the definition of standard commercial articles to include standard commercial services was accepted by the House conferees.

The Senate amendment providing for a mandatory exemption for competitive bid construction contracts was accepted by the House conferees with an amendment to make it apply only to contracts with the departments made after December 31, 1954.

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment relating to the definition of durable productive equipment which applied the exemption where an item was sold to another manufacturer who incorporated it into equipment which is sold to the Government.

The House conferees also accepted the Senate amendment providing a study by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the floor of the Senate to provide a review of renegotiation of contracts or subcontracts by the Renegotiation Board and the Tax Court with respect to World War II cases was not agreed to in conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Virginia knows how very disappointed I am that the conference committee did not agree to my amendment. Because of my confidence in the Senator from Virginia, I wish he would advise me what we can do to correct the injustice which was intended to be covered by the amendment. For the record, permit me to say that we are dealing here with a group of businessmen. True, there is one case in my State, but there are similar cases all over the country. We are dealing here with a group of businessmen who entered into arrangements with the Government for war contracts which extended over a period of years, let us say 4 years. In one of those years they made a profit. In the other 3 years they lost money. The Government is forcing renegotiation of the contract for the year in which they made money. The businessmen are getting no advantage of an offset because of losses incurred under the contracts in other years. The Renegotiation Board says there would have to be new legislation to correct what the Renegotiation Board admits is an injustice.

Have we gotten to a point in this country where we cannot correct that kind of injustice by the adoption of an amendment to a renegotiation bill which would give to the Renegotiation Board the discretion to go into such cases and see that justice is done?

What does the Senator from Virginia propose that a representative of a sovereign State try to do to correct that situation? It is no answer to say one should introduce independent proposed legislation, because this is legislation which deals with the subject. Are we supinely to take the position that our Government is going to be allowed to do an injustice to businessmen?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the House conferees simply would not agree to the amendment, which was presented as forcefully as it could be. I may say that the entire matter is going to be reviewed and studied by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and a report made to the Congress next spring. The Senator could present his proposal to that committee, or he could introduce a bill in the Senate to be considered by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. I would be less than appreciative if I did not thank the Senator from Virginia for the efforts made to have the amendment agreed to. As the Senator well knows, I am going to get expressions, perhaps not of criticism, but of great disappointment on the part of businessmen who asked me to foster the amendment. I want the businessmen to know that the Senator from Virginia cooperated with me. The Senator will recall that on last Wednesday afternoon I briefly commented on this matter, and I was aware then we would be faced with difficulty in the House; but I want the RECORD to show that I think the amendment which the Senator from Virginia tried to get through the conference on my behalf, and on behalf of the economic interests I represented, is a very sound amendment.

I think it is a sad day when American businesses cannot have the benefit of what amounts to a carryback principle on their losses, merely because of the existence of a situation, which I sought to correct and which is causing this great injustice not only to one company in my State, but also to companies in other States. I certainly will see to it that these businessmen submit their testimony before the joint committee.

Has the Senator from Virginia formed an opinion as to whether a private claim bill might be in order, at least as a procedural device, in an effort to handle this problem?

Mr. BYRD. I think anything of that character would be in order for consideration by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Then let the RECORD show that although I do not like the private-claim-bill approach, yet I think such a rank injustice exists in this case that, at least in order to call attention to it, I shall introduce such a bill.

I wish to say to the businessmen involved that I shall include in that bill any cases which are on the same footing with the so-called Rushlight case, which arose in my State.

Let the RECORD also show that, once before, we got this amendment, in principle, through the Senate, at the time when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was chairman of the Finance Committee. At that time he, like the Senator from Virginia, ran into the same difficulty with the House of Representatives. I do not favor the doing of injustice to anyone, whether it be a businessman or anyone else. This situation results in a terrible injustice, and we should do whatever is necessary in order to give the persons affected their day in court and to put the Renegotiation Board in a position to do justice.

I am advised by the Renegotiation Board that if it had this authority, it would iron out these cases and would correct these injustices. Therefore, with that statement in the RECORD, I serve notice now that I shall proceed to introduce whatever number of private claim bills may be necessary in order to do justice to these businessmen.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON PUBLIC WORKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be brief, because the matter I intended to discuss today has been quite adequately dealt with by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Members.

Like the Senator from Wyoming, I was shocked by the implication of the statement issued by the administration on Friday last, when the public works bill was signed, namely, that because the administration does not like certain items in the bill, there is a possibility that the funds for them will be withheld. It has been very well pointed out on the floor that this is not a new situation in the administration, but has occurred on other occasions.

If I were to take the time of the Senate, I could name many occasions when, after the Congress had passed the necessary law, it seemed that those who were to administer the law either did not like it or did not like the policy involved in it, and either they did not enforce it or they simply took no action, and thus the law became inoperative.

I believe that is particularly true in certain cases involving some of the so-called independent agencies which have been created by the Congress, and, therefore, are not independent in the true sense. Some of the agencies involved have been the Federal Communications Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the many other so-called independent agencies which, in many cases, are literally arms of the Congress. They were set up in connection with the administration of the laws, to do a detailed job which Congress itself could not do. However, in many instances the tendency has been not to follow what I consider to be the intent of the laws.

I do not know what the administration will do with regard to Ice Harbor Dam, Cougar Dam, and the other dams in the Pacific Northwest. I do know that, despite all the statements made by the administration—one of which was just read by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming—regarding the administration's attitude toward the development of our God-given natural resources, not a single new project has been commenced in the entire Nation since the Republican administration took office, although the time for the construction of many of these projects is long past due.

I know the administration has made many vague statements about favoring some form of partnership and about local participation; and the administration has made many other statements which, on their face, sound good. However, the truth of the matter is that in my section of the country, where there are great hydoelectric projects and great hydroelectric potentials, not only for more kilowatts but also for cheap kilowatts for the benefit of the people, although the administration's statements may sound good and may be good in theory, yet they do not work well.

From the beginning I have tried to be charitable about this matter. I have tried to figure out why there was insistence on the part of the administration, continuing up until Friday, upon withholding funds for the construction of certain projects which were covered by legislation passed by Congress. The opposition seems to occur in the Bureau of the Budget. But, after all, Mr. President, the Congress, not the Bureau of the Budget, passes the laws. The Bureau of the Budget is an adviser to the President. If Congress has seen fit to appropriate funds for certain projects, the funds should be spent in accordance with the will of Congress.

I have tried to ascertain why there has been such intense opposition to proceeding with the construction of such projects, which contemplate the development of the Nation's resources for the benefit of the people. In my section of the country we have done fairly well in the past 20 years in developing these resources. However, those in the administration who oppose such developments talk about a partnership. In the great Northwest we have had a partnership for twenty-odd years. The partnership has been between the Government and the people, and it has worked well, and has produced good cheap power, has created thousands of jobs, and has resulted in the establishment of thousands of new private enterprises and industries.

Mr. President, I care not how these hydroelectric projects are built, so long as they are built. But in view of the statement which has been made, I can only conclude that it has always been the private-utility theory that the people of the Northwest should be forced into a kind of partnership which will involve the sale of bonds at high interest rates—with the result that, although the kilowatts may become available, they will not be available at a low price, and will not be comparable with the cheap kilowatts which have resulted in such remarkable developments in many of the river basins of the Nation. That private-utility theory has forced those in my section of the country and those in other parts of the Nation to enter into such agreements; they have been forced to enter into them because of their dire need for power. For instance, in the Pacific Northwest the demand for power doubles every 10 years, even on the basis of the same population and the same industries.

Mr. President, we have waited a long time, hoping that the administration's power policy will work out in a satisfactory way. However, many persons who have been stanch advocates of the development of power in the great river basins have lost hope, and have said, "Oh, there is no chance of obtaining Federal appropriations for multipurpose projects." Despite that, Mr. President, we have been patient, and have waited a long time. The Ice Harbor project has been authorized by Congress for 11 long years. Now the funds for it have, in the wisdom of the committee and of the Congress, been authorized and appropriated.. Congress decided that the project was feasible; that it was of such a nature that the Federal Government should build it; and Congress has said that the project should be built, in order to furnish power to the private enterprises in the area and also to the Federal Government itself. Congress has made provision for the construction of the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Washington; but I call attention to the fact that there is to be a call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand, but we have ample time, inasmuch as the calendar call is the only business we are to transact today. Furthermore, I have been waiting for an hour to make these remarks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington may proceed for 5 minutes more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, anyone who has the temerity even to suggest, let alone to threaten, that such funds not be spent, is, I believe, doing a disservice to the people of the Northwest. It is time for the Congress to see that there is a partnership with the people of the country, not with particular groups.

I do not know whether the funds for these projects will be withheld; but I know there has been continued opposition in the administration to the construction of these necessary projects, and I also know that those who oppose the development, for the benefit of the people, of the hydroelectric resources of the great Northwest would like to see the appropriated funds for the construction of these projects withheld. But Congress acted, and said these projects should start. They should not be incompatible with a decent partnership, or with a feasible partnership. But all we know is that nothing has happened, and our needs are growing greater and greater. In my opinion, the only conclusion to which we can come with respect to the policy of the administration regarding public power is that described so ably by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The administration says, "Certainly you can develop those resources, but take your hat in hand and go down to the lower end of Manhattan Island and pay tribute to someone. Then we will all be for such development."

Another important fact is that these projects pay back to the Treasury the capital investment, with interest. We are years ahead of our repayment schedule. This program is the best investment the United States Government ever made. It is better for the people and the Treasury of the United States than Humphrey's bonds are for the banks.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not significant that the statement from the White House last Friday expressed grave concern about the fiscal wisdom of these projects which are authorized by the Congress, and yet all the dams which the Congress undertook to begin in the Northwest, including Ice Harbor, Cougar, and Hills Creek, would be a part of the Bonneville power system, which system is today $65 million ahead of schedule in paying back to the Treasury the principal invested in it, plus interest?

Is it not of further significance that the objection of the administration is not to the projects, but to the fact that there is no partnership gimmick in them by which the profitable revenue-producing features would be surrendered to private utilities?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course that is true. The Senator from Oregon and I have not opposed a feasible partnership. However, the trouble is that it is a partnership only in theory. The public utilities want to continue to do the milking. We know that we have these projects to develop. We were going ahead. Some of the private utilities were willing to go ahead, but the program has been fouled up for 3 long years, and now we are back on the track.

It was suggested today that perhaps the President should have the authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. I do not know. That is the rule in my State. But if the administration vetoes or withholds funds from any of these projects there will a minor political revolution in my area, not a Democratic revolution but one involving the people, because they understand the partnership which has existed with them for a long time. In our area they have seen private industries develop thousands of jobs; 100,000 kilowatts of cheap power produces 18,000 direct jobs in private industry.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Washington used the phrase "cheap power," because in the Northwest, through the great generosity of the Almighty, we can generate electricity more cheaply than it can be produced anywhere else on the North American Continent. We can produce it for a little more than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. The administration opposes that kind of power development. It says there are no adequate funds for that kind of development. Yet at the same time the administration is asking the Congress to appropriate $2 billion to develop in the Rocky Mountain region power which will cost between 6 and 9 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has again expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Vinson, Mr. Brooks of Louisiana, Mr. Kilday, Mr. Short, and Mr. Arends were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the several standing committees of the Senate be authorized to file reports during the recess or adjournment following the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On July 11, Calendar 716, Senate Resolution 124; Calendar 736, House bill 1408; and Calendar 767, House bill 6086, were ordered to be called on the next call of the calendar.

The clerk will proceed to state the measures referred to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

OPPOSITION TO SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Payne in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state Calendar No. 716, Senate Resolution 124 by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. PURTELL. Do I correctly understand that the Senate is about to consider Order No. 716, Senate Resolution 124?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 124) opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of Senate Resolution 124.

Mr. PURTELL. In the absence of an explanation, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 716, Senate Resolution 124. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilgore] is now on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 124) opposing the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the resolution deals with cases in which the Attorney General has exercised the discretionary authority granted to him under the Immigration and Nationality Act to suspend the deportation of certain deportable aliens pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of that act. The cases involved are among those referred to the Congress by the Attorney General for its approval.

I should explain at this point that all such cases are referred to the Congress by the Attorney General's Office, because that Office cannot finally defer the deportation of the aliens involved, until Congress has considered the cases.

All of the cases have met the approval of the Attorney General's Office, and that Office would like to have the deportation of these aliens deferred.

Under the procedure prescribed in the act, the action taken by the Attorney General becomes final unless either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the suspension of deportation within the session of Congress in which the cases are referred or in the session next following. In the 2 cases involved in this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary has carefully reviewed all the facts connected with the cases of the 2 aliens involved and has concluded that, on the basis of the record, there are insufficient equities present to make a finding, as required by the act, that the deportation of the aliens would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to them. Both cases involve seamen who are nationals of China and who deserted their vessels after arriving at ports in the United States. While they meet the minimum residence requirements of the statute for the discretionary relief, the committee was unable to find any other factors which would justify granting this extraordinary form of discretionary relief.

In the report of the Committee on the Judiciary (S. Rept. 1137, 82d Cong.) issued in connection with the Immigration and Nationality Act, the committee stated with reference to the suspension of deportation procedure:

> The bill accordingly establishes a policy that the administrative remedy should be available only in the very limited category of cases in which the deportation of the alien would be unconscionable. Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation.

In these two cases, out of a total of 301 referred to the Congress, one alien has a wife and five children residing in Hong Kong, and the other alien is unmarried with no close relatives or dependents in this country. Under those circumstances the committee could find no justification for favoring the suspension of deportation of the two aliens involved.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain to the Calendar Committee on the other side of the aisle that in connection with these matters we have been asked by the executive branch of the Government, through the Attorney General, to make these deferrals after he has considered the cases. After the Attorney General has done so the Committee on the Judiciary acts on the cases. They are not at all like the ordinary private immigration bills. These cases are cleared and recommended by the Attorney General before the committee makes its recommendations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that the committee was unanimous in its report on the pending resolution?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. The committee always checks into the matter before such a measure is reported, and the action of the committee has always been unanimous, as it was in this case. It will always be unanimous in future cases, because we do not wish to take a chance on such measures, since they do not involve merely one person but a number of persons, and we wish to check all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate does not favor the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)).
>
> T–2680311, Shuy, Low.
>
> A–9526311, Wong, Sau.

BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state Calendar 736, H. R. 1408, the next bill to be called today.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Caterina Ruello.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS OR LAWFULLY RESIDENT ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next measure which is to be taken up by unanimous consent on the call of the calendar today.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKEN] I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be considered at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will temporarily lie on the table.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the name "Almeida", to insert "Theresa Andriopoulos"; in line 5, after the name "Armstrong", to insert "Maria Bagley"; in line 6, after the name "Bakmazian", to insert "Josef G. Balzina"; in line 12, after the name "Ciccone", to insert "Joan K. Cooper, Erika J. S. Culbertson"; in line 14, after the name "Demos", to insert "Tilde Di Pietro"; in line 19, after the name "Gould", to insert "Antonios Gounaris"; in line 21, after the name "Hawkins", to insert "Rose K. Hedrick"; in line 22, after the name "Hendrix", to insert "Elfriede A. C. Higgins"; in line 23, after the name "Hood", to insert "Antonio Imbruglia"; on page 3, line 2, after the name "Levin", to strike out "Ramon Martin Lopez" and insert "Sin Hey Louie"; at the beginning of line 5, to insert "Margot Mentick"; at the beginning of line 7, to insert "Mavis C. Paxton"; and in the same line, after the name "Loretta", to strike out "Pereira" and insert "Verdi (nee Pereira)"; in line 10, after the name "Redding", to insert "Frieda Richardson"; and in the same line, after the name "Ritchie", to insert "Sylvia H. K. Roberts"; in line 12, after the name "Skipp", to insert "Dora C. Sorre"; in line 13, after the name "Gyula", to strike out "Sternberger" and insert "Steinberger"; in line 15, after the name "Tsoukalas", to insert "Elsie M. G. Van Bergen"; in line 17, after the name "Walther", to insert "Patricia A. M. West"; and line 20, to strike out "Charlotte S. Zornow" and insert "Yue-Pin Yee."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 7, following "Bratsis," it is proposed to insert "Helen Nazareno Brewbaker."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 6086) waives the excluding provision of existing law relating to persons afflicted with tuberculosis in behalf of 107 spouses or children of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens of the United States. The bill provides for the posting of a bond in behalf of each alien as a guaranty that he will not become a public charge. The bill also provides that the admission of the aliens be made subject to such terms and conditions with respect to care, hospitalization, and maintenance as the Attorney General may prescribe after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

A majority of the cases have been screened by the visa office of the Department of State and recommended to the Congress for the relief provided in the bill. The cases which were the subject of private immigration bills in the House of Representatives have been carefully screened by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

In this connection, the President of the United States, in a recent message to Congress proposing certain changes in the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, recommended that in order to prevent the separation of families certain otherwise eligible refugees afflicted with tuberculosis be admitted to the United States under safeguards provided by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States. All the cases included in the instant bill will be processed under such safeguards.

The case of each alien beneficiary will be processed individually under field instructions prepared by the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States. Each case will also be screened under the standards by our consular officers abroad.

Of course, it is to be expected that no cases involving a serious hazard to the health of the community in which the alien will reside will be approved.

I may say also that the disease, tuberculosis, has frequently presented a bothersome question. For instance, we have had the case of a soldier who married an English girl. Up to the time of departure neither one knew that she was suffering from tuberculosis. It was not in an aggravated stage; and no one knew anything about it. His family was willing to post bond, if necessary, that she would not become a public charge. But the plan for her entry was abandoned, and, as a result, a very unhappy soldier returned to this country, leaving his wife in England.

There have been several similar cases. The bill endeavors to more or less straighten out these cases, which result for the most part from what might be called a shortage of medical assistants in Europe. As a result, many cases of incipient tuberculosis have never been discovered.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 13, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of an amendment which I propose to introduce to H. R. 6086. The purpose of this amendment is to add the name of Mrs. Helen N. Brewbaker. I am setting out below some pertinent information on this case which I deem to be a most meritorious one.

Dr. James Lynn Brewbaker is a resident of Longmont, Colo. He holds a doctor of philosophy degree from Cornell University and was a member of a scientific team from Cornell University which was assigned to work in the Philippine Islands under the sponsorship of the Foreign Operations Administration. Dr. Brewbaker married a citizen of the Philippines while in the islands. He was desirous of bringing his wife and child to the United States upon his return from his overseas assignment. The family journeyed to Rome, Italy, en route to England, where Dr. Brewbaker was to undertake a research project prior to return to the United States. While in Rome, Dr. Brewbaker was examined by medical doctors and was found to be suffering from tuberculosis. He returned by air transportation and has been a patient at the Jewish Consumptives Relief Society Sanitarium at Denver, Colo. Prior to Mrs. Brewbaker's departure, she was examined and was also found to have tuberculosis. At the present time, Mrs. Brewbaker and their child are residing in Lund, Sweden.

I had hoped that this case could come before the Senate committee during consideration of H. R. 6086. However, the State Department's file was delayed in the mail and it did not reach the House Judiciary Committee until July 8, 1955. I have been assured by Congressman BYRON ROGERS, of the First District of Colorado, who is a member of the House Judiciary Committee, that the file on Mrs. Brewbaker is complete and that her name would be included in the next such omnibus bill to be processed by the House committee. However, it is difficult to determine when the next such legislation will be presented and conceivably many months of delay might be incurred. I am mindful of the fact that it is difficult to add additional names on omnibus bills from the floor of the Senate. I believe that favorable consideration of this amendment and subsequent acceptance by the House would materially facilitate the recovery of both Dr. Brewbaker and the beneficiary of this legislation. I know that you are aware of the great importance to be placed on keeping family units intact. In my opinion, these facts are important ones and weigh heavily upon the consideration of this matter.

I expect to bring this matter to the attention of Senators ERVIN, BIBLE, HRUSKA, and PURTELL in an effort to overcome any objections which they may have and I am hopeful that this proposed amendment will not be objected to when it is proposed on the floor of the Senate.

With reference to financial considerations in this matter, I should like to point out that Dr. Brewbaker's father is an official and stockholder of the Great Western Sugar Co. and that Dr. James L. Brewbaker has executed an affidavit of support and is willing to furnish a deposit of not less than $1,000 for a public charge bond if so required by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service. In addition, the Jewish Consumptives Relief Society Sanitarium, where Dr. Brewbaker is presently being treated, has furnished a statement signed by the acting medical director to the effect that there would be no charge at any time to Mrs. Brewbaker or any governmental agency for health services and treatment rendered to her. Under the circumstances presented in this case, the beneficiary of this legislation would not become a public charge.

I am enclosing a photostatic copy of the complete file maintained by the House Judiciary Committee on this case.

With very best regards, I am
Sincerely,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WOLODYMYR KRYSKO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state Calendar No. 775, the first measure to be called on the calendar under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 84) for the relief of Wolodymyr Krysko.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wolodymyr Krysko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PAULINE ELLEN REDMOND

The bill (S. 141) for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pauline Ellen Redmond shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GEORGES AND ATHENA DEMETELIN

The bill (S. 173) for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georges and Athena Demetelin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

APOSTOLOS VASILI PERCAS

The bill (S. 239) for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Apostolos Vasili Percas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. HELENA PLANINSEK

The bill (S. 240) for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I send to the desk an amendment and request that it be read at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 240) for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 7, to change the period to a comma and to insert the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I agree with the amendment. I understand it conforms to other legislation of a similar nature.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment. It is in conformity with the provisions of H. R. 6086, which was recently passed by the Senate. In other words, we are trying to make this bill conform exactly with the bill which the able Senator from West Virginia explained a short while ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Helena Planinsek may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SUMIE LEGASSE

The bill (S. 253) for the relief of Sumie Legasse was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sumie Legasse shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

STANLEY WILLIAM WHEATLAND

The bill (S. 314) for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Stanley William Wheatland. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Stanley William Wheatland shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

DOMENICO BOMPIANI

The bill (S. 358) for the relief of Domenico Bompiani was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Domenico Bompiani, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Domenico Bompiani shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

GERASSIMO TROIANOS

The bill (S. 379) for the relief of Gerassimo Troianos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gerassimo Troianos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DRAGUTIN SOSTARKO

The bill (S. 410) for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dragutin Sostarko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MERVIN WALTER BALL

The bill (S. 418) for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mervin Walter Ball shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

CHARALAMBOS ANASTASIOS PAPASPIRATOS

The bill (S. 671) for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALVARO A. JOSE

The bill (S. 698) for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alvaro A. Jose shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSE ARMANDO QUARESMA

The bill (S. 768) for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Armando Quaresma shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARIA ANNA COONE

The bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Maria Anna Coone was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Anna Coone may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

MRS. JEANNETTE S. HAMILTON

The bill (S. 1353) for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

EDITH KAHLER

The bill (S. 1540) for the relief of Edith Kahler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Edith

Kahler has resided or was physically present in the United States or any State since December 11, 1947, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence or physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said act.

MARIANNE ANITA ZELINKA

The bill (H. R. 1245) for the relief of Marianne Anita Zelinka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GENNARO SAVARESE

The bill (H. R. 1275) for the relief of Gennaro Savarese was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUDOLFO M. GOMEZ (CAPAZ)

The bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Rudolfo M. Gomez (Capaz) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN ISABEL HAY WATTS

The bill (H. R. 1538) for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JOAN CRAIG NEWELL

The bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of Mrs. Joan Craig Newell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIA DICRAN SIMON

The bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Dicran Simon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALVACION CARBON

The bill (H. R. 1549) for the relief of Salvacion Carbon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUALBERTO ALABASTRO AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1551) for the relief of Gualberto Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER LUIGIA PELLEGRINO, SISTER ANGELINA NICASTRO, AND SISTER LUIGINA DI MARTINO

The bill (H. R. 1648) for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KIM DONG SU

The bill (H. R. 1661) for the relief of Kim Dong Su was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BARBARA KNAPE

The bill (H. R. 1693) for the relief of Barbara Knape was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELENA GIGLIOTTI

The bill (H. R. 1750) for the relief of Elena Gigliotti was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARETE GARTNER

The bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of Margarete Gartner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUFEMIA BENCICH

The bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief of Eufemia Bencich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INGRID SAMSON

The bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Ingrid Samson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENGT WIKSTAM

The bill (H. R. 2073) for the relief of Bengt Wikstam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENTINO MUNOZ

The bill (H. R. 2274) for the relief of Florentino Munoz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ODABASHIAN, DOCTOR OF MEDICINE

The bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of John Odabashian, doctor of medicine, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONI RAJKOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 2495) for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MIHAI INDIG

The bill (H. R. 2721) for the relief of Mihai Indig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS ELVIRA BORTOLIN

The bill (H. R. 2724) for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK SCRIVER

The bill (H. R. 2756) for the relief of Frank Scriver was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAX STEINSAPIR

The bill (H. R. 2911) for the relief of Max Steinsapir was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARMELO RODRIGUEZ PEREZ, ALSO KNOWN AS CARMELO RODRIGUEZ FENALD

The bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAZARA CAMARGO BERNOUDY

The bill (H. R. 2929) for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The bill (H. R. 3560) to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUADALUPE ZUNIGA (ALSO KNOWN AS BENITA CHAPARRAO-VENEGAS OR GUADALUPE ACOSTA)

The bill (H. R. 3853) for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONIUS MARINUS KRONENBURG

The bill (H. R. 3972) for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BARBARA D. COLTHURST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Barbara D. Colthurst has resided or was physically present in the United States or any State since July 2, 1947, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence or physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PEARL O. SEILAZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Pearl O. Seilaz, of Miami, Florida, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by her employment as an employee in the Office of the Price Administrator, Miami, Florida, during the period 1943 to 1947, and her claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits other than hospital and medical expenses actually incurred shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GORDON THOMPSON BROWN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 602) for the relief of Gordon Thompson Brown, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gordon Thompson Brown shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PEDRO P. DAGAMAC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1368) for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "States", to strike out "for a period of 5 years immediately preceding the date of enactment of this act" and insert "during the period from February 1946 until November 7, 1952, while temporarily absent from the United States in the employment of the United States Government", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 316 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pedro P. Dagamac shall be held and considered to have been physically present in, and a continuous permanent resident of, the United States during the period from February 1946 until November 7, 1952, while temporarily absent from the United States in the employment of the United States Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNST FRAENKEL AND HIS WIFE, HANNA FRAENKEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1541) for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 6, after the word "until", to insert "3 years following the date of the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel, naturalized citizens of the United States, shall be permitted to reside in Germany until 3 years following the date of the enactment of this act without losing their United States citizenship under section 352 (a) of such act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEFA CHACON DE MOLEN, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1986) for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State of the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (24) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr., may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ESTHER RODRIGUEZ DE URIBE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (17), and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LUIGI CARDONE AND HIS MINOR CHILDREN, VITA CARDONE AND DIOMEDIO CARDONE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1218) for the relief of Luigi Cardone and his two minor children, Vita Cardone and Diomedio Cardone, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luigi Cardone may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Luigi Cardone."

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

(For context of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 17, 1955, pp. 6474–6475.)

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were on page 6, after line 10, to strike out:

A–8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.

On page 19, after line 21, to insert:

A–6903941, Dinces, Aleksander.
A–9799528, Fook, Shum Hang.
A–9708071, Hing Chung.
A–7073962, Sipajlo, Ema.
A–7073963, Sipajlo, Josef.
A–9533332, Woo, Sueh Dao.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

PRISCILLA LOUISE DAVIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the numerals "14", to strike out "1943" and insert "1942"; and on page 2, line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 129) to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to state for the Calendar Committee that we are not out of sympathy with the desires and aims of this resolution, but it is our opinion that it is a matter which should not be handled on the Consent Calendar, and, therefore, I ask that not only this resolution, but Senate Resolution 130, to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law, and Senate Resolution 13, relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6796) to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H. R. 6796 proposes to authorize the conveyance of approximately 41 acres of Veterans' Administration lands to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., without consideration. The land is a part of a 93-acre tract acquired by the Federal Government in 1947. The total cost of $62,500 was shared one-half by the United States and one-half by citizens of Clarksburg.

The act authorizing the acquisition of the 93 acres directed the Veterans' Administration to lease to the city of Clarksburg for a nominal sum such portions of the land as were not needed for Veterans' Administration purposes.

That was the original transaction and the intent of the parties at the time.

The 41 acres were leased to Clarksburg for a nominal consideration in 1948, but the lease contains a provision that it can be canceled upon 90 days' notice. The city recently asked that the 90-day notice clause be deleted, and that the city be granted a lease for a term of years. The Veterans' Administration does not have authority to grant that type of lease in the absence of congressional action.

H. R. 6796 goes beyond the request of the city and authorizes a conveyance without consideration, instead of a lease for a term of years.

There is no explanation in the committee report as to why a conveyance rather than a lease for a term of years is proposed.

The Morse formula would be applicable, were it not for the fact that the report indicates that the conveyance is to be consistent with the laws with regard to patients of the Veterans' Administration, under the direction of the Veterans' Administration.

There is no doubt in my mind that Federal benefits are to be derived from this arrangement. I have also gone into the history of this particular transaction. There is no question about the fact that the property was transferred, in the first instance, with the understanding that the hospital site, plus the use for park purposes to which the 41 acres of land will be put was for the benefit of the patients.

However, there is no reservation of mineral rights in the bill. I see no reason why the mineral rights should not be reserved. We should keep in mind the fact that Clarksburg would have been satisfied with the land. That is all they ever asked for.

There will be before the Senate shortly a similar bill, pertaining to Little Rock, Ark., which provides for the preservation of mineral rights. Therefore, I offer an amendment providing for the preservation of mineral rights in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 18, it is proposed to insert:

> (4) all mineral rights, including oil and gas, in such tract of land shall be reserved to the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that the reason why the tract of land is desired is that the Veterans' Administration cannot provide a park there. The land lies between the tract which they used and the main highway and the bridge.

I do not think the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will affect the city in the least. What is desired to be done is to build a very nice park, having shade trees, for the use of the veterans and their friends. If the land becomes city property, the city can improve it. The city could not improve it if it remained Federal property. Frankly, I question whether, under the laws of West Virginia, the city could have gone ahead and improved a piece of leased property. That is the only reason why the change was made from a lease to an outright deed.

I have no objection, because usually when Federal holdings are transferred in West Virginia, the mineral rights are reserved to the Federal Government, not with the idea of their development, but with the idea of support for the land.

I know the site very well. I think a park is very necessary.

Mr. MORSE. So do I.

Mr. KILGORE. The property should be developed, and I think the city of Clarksburg will develop a beautiful park. I do not believe the city would object in the least to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I am in complete agreement with the observations made by the senior Senator from West Virginia. I have gone into the transaction very carefully. Clarksburg wants only a long-time lease. They are not asking for a conveyance. The Federal Government will be giving the city more than it is asking for. The Federal Government paid half of the original $62,500 for the development of the property. The Federal Government built a hospital on it and has considerably improved the property over a period of time.

So far as the total 93-acre tract is concerned, this property is needed for park purposes, too. I think the bill will give Clarksburg much more than Clarksburg really needs. Clarksburg will not object to getting more. I think they are entitled to it, and I believe the patients will be benefited by the park facilities which will be provided. I think, however, that the common practice of the Senate to reserve mineral rights ought to be followed.

Mr. KILGORE. First, the whole purpose is to provide a park for the veterans. I might go one step farther and say that 4 years ago a petition was filed for a road connection at the rear of the hospital, so that bridges and facilities of that kind could be built, because a public highway could not be constructed. In West Virginia a public highway may not be built unless it will connect with another public highway. I was successful in having that matter taken care of. So I know that the whole purpose of the bill is to provide a park for the patients of the veterans' hospital and their guests and friends.

I wish the Senator from Oregon could view the location. There is a picturesque valley between the hospital and the road, and the plan is to build a park where the patients may meet with their friends.

Mr. MORSE. I think the proposal is fair and sound under all the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

The bill (H. R. 4225) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but for the purpose of the record, I desire to make a brief statement.

H. R. 4225 proposes to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to quitclaim to the city of North Little Rock, Ark., a tract of 656 acres of Veterans' Administration lands. The 656 acres constitute a part of a tract of 1,100 acres acquired by the Government in 1893 under a land-exchange arrangement with the city of Little Rock.

H. R. 4225 would authorize the conveyance for park purposes, with a reversion to the United States in case such use should cease.

The bill also contains a mineral reservation provision.

The bill is very similar to the bill just passed relating to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.

Again, a history of the transfer shows that the intention was that the property was to be developed for the benefit of veterans. A park at this location, as a part of the therapeutic treatment of the veterans, obviously is needed. I think the bill is clearly in line with the intention of the parties when they negotiated a conveyance in the first instance. This is another case, however, in which they did not set out, in the first instance, as clearly as they hight have done, the intent as to the limitations of the transfer. However, I am satisfied that the Federal Government will receive adequate benefits in view of the advantages which will accrue to veterans and the amendment relating to mineral reservations. Therefore, I do not object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that some 60 years ago city park district of Little Rock conveyed to the War Department approximately 1,100 acres in return for 36 acres, so there has already been a consideration from the locality?

Mr. MORSE. That is true. I mentioned that in my statement, though I did not dwell on it. That was the old MacArthur Arsenal. The benefit of that transfer should be considered very adequate consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that in the case of the Clarksburg, W. Va., land, the original cost of $62,500 was not paid entirely by the citizens of the United States, but that half of it was donated by the citizens of Clarksburg?

Mr. MORSE. I pointed out that half of the $62,500 was paid by the citizens of Clarksburg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4225) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVELYN HARDY WATERS

The bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I take the stand I am about to take, for I may say that the bill has great merit. However, in the opinion of the committee, if enacted, the bill will constitute the first case of waiver of the statute of limitations, so as to permit the filing of claims under the 1946 Federal Tort Claims Act. So I must reluctantly ask that the bill go over. I do not believe it should be considered on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The junior Senator from Connecticut extended me the courtesy this morning of telling me of the feelings of the members of the committee on the calendar toward the pending matter. I thoroughly appreciate his and their position.

Since the time of my discussions with the Senator from Connecticut, however, I have had an opportunity to take up the matter with one of my colleagues in the House, who is the author of the bill, and to gain from him information which supplements the very strong case already made in the report.

It appears that the claimant, who is a person of very modest means, she having been a waitress in Pensacola, was the wife of an enlisted man in the Navy. She went to the Pensacola naval hospital for an operation, where she was subjected, first, to a spinal anesthetic, and later to a general anesthetic. Due to some cause which as yet has been undetermined, she was subjected to long confinement and paralysis, from which she in part and at times still suffers, probably as a result of the spinal anesthetic. The time that she was under treatment by the Navy in various naval hospitals, including the one in Bethesda, was nearly 3 years. So it was obvious that the 1-year statute of limitations could not have been lived up to. While I thoroughly appreciate the position of the Senator from Connecticut, I hope he will not object if we ask the majority leader and the minority leader to allow the Senate to vote on the bill when the call of the calendar has been concluded.

Mr. PURTELL. Let me assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that the Senator from Connecticut will not object if the bill is brought up by motion. I understand the Senator from Wyoming, my colleague on the calendar committee, will not object if the bill is brought up by motion. It occurred to the calendar committee that the bill should not be considered on the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator. I think it should be a matter on which the full Senate should vote. I think the equities involved are so strong that the full Senate will appreciate them and decide that it is a case which justifies waiving the time limit so as to bring it under the procedure of the Tort Claims Act. I think that course is a reasonable one for the claimant to follow.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which had in mind the query whether the Senate would want to waive the provisions of the Tort Claims Act. The facts are as they have been stated by the Senator from Florida. We decided to report the bill so that there might be a determination by the Senate in a case of this kind, in which certain persons may have lost their rights under the Tort Claims Act. We would call it a test claim act in the courts. We are bringing the question to a test. As I say, the Senator from Florida has adequately stated the case. It is my thought that a precedent might be set which would give the Committee on the Judiciary a guiding mark or authority to go ahead.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his statement. As I have said, I shall have to object, but I shall not object if the bill shall be called up on motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

COL. McFARLAND COCKRILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2747) for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to insert a comma and "except as hereinafter provided," and in line 11, after the word "inclusive," to strike out the comma and "and said McFarland Cockrill shall be paid from the Treasury any and all moneys heretofore withheld from his retired pay or any and all moneys repaid by him to the United States because of his having received said salary and retired pay during said period" and insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That any sums heretofore withheld from the retired pay of Colonel Cockrill shall be retained by the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ASSISTANCE IN VACCINATION AGAINST POLIO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2501) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I should like to state that the Calendar Committee does not object to the bill at all. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the committee is very much in favor of the bill, as are the members of the committee. However, I must object by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN MINERAL LANDS IN THE STATE OF UTAH

The bill (S. 878) to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such

State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands in mineral character was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the present consideration of the bill, but I wish to make a statement. The present law, the act of March 11, 1948, 62 Stat. 72, permits the State of Utah to exchange its holdings within the Indian reservation area only for nonmineral land outside the reservation, and the State may retain mineral rights in the lands relinquished.

The bill (S. 878) proposes to authorize exchanges of mineral lands for mineral lands of equal value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 878) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 72), is amended by striking out the first sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The State of Utah may relinquish to the United States for the benefit of the Indians of the said Ute Reservation such tracts of school or other State-owned lands, surveyed or unsurveyed, within the said reserved area, as it may see fit (reserving to said State, if it so desires, such rights as it may possess to any minerals underlying such State lands as may be relinquished), and said State shall have the right to make selections, including mineral lands and the minerals therein (including oil and gas) if the lands relinquished are mineral in character and rights to the minerals in such lands are relinquished along with the lands, in lieu thereof outside of the area hereby withdrawn, equal in value, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to the lands relinquished, from the vacant, unappropriated public lands, within the State of Utah, such lieu selections to be made in the manner provided in the enabling act pertaining to said State, except as to the payment of fees or commissions, which are hereby waived. Valid rights and claims of individuals initiated under Federal law with respect to any lands so selected and prior to such selection shall not be affected by such selection."

RECOUPMENT OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3123) to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August, 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO MEMBERS OF THE CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4367) to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 2, line 13, after the word "purposes", to insert "except the proceeds of any final judgment entered in Docket No. 21, pending before the Indian Claims Commission, in which the Creek Nation (Oklahoma) is plaintiff, and McGhee, et al., on behalf of the Creek Nation East of the Mississippi are intervenors, and the United States is defendant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 535) to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 535 proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey, without consideration, "all the right, title, and interest of the United States and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians" in a 5-acre tract of land on the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota. The tract is described as the original burial site of Chief Sitting Bull.

The State desires to acquire this site for historical purposes, and proposes to erect a suitable monument at the burial site. The bill contains a reversionary clause applicable if the land ceases to be used for historic site purposes, and it also contains a reservation of minerals.

Officials of the Department of the Interior have informed me that the lands of the Standing Rock Tribe of Indians are classified as "tribal lands reserved for agency purposes." In legal effect, therefore, the tribe is the cestui que trust, and the United States is the trustee.

The Morse formula would be applicable if the lands were held in fee simple by the United States. However, in this instance, the United States holds bare legal title for the purpose of a trust. Inasmuch as the Standing Rock Tribal Council has, by resolution, approved the transfer of the lands in question, as shown on page 2 of committee report, it appears that this transfer is not within the Morse formula. No land of which the United States holds the ultimate beneficial interest are being conveyed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the bill provides for the conveyance of land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried. Can the Senator from Oregon inform the Senate as to whether Sitting Bull is now buried there, or have the remains of Sitting Bull been taken by some other State by force majeure?

Mr. MORSE. I have no intention of becoming involved in a controversy on the floor of the Senate with the Senators from South Dakota, North Dakota, and probably Senators from other Western States, many of whom I understand claim the honor of having interred in their State the bones of Sitting Bull. I do not know where he was buried, but, based on the fact that these, after all, are so-called trust lands, under the trust and guardianship of the United States, I think this particular bill is sound, since it does not violate the principle I have tried to protect, namely, that the taxpayers' property shall not be given away for nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senate find itself in a ridiculous position if other bills should be introduced by representatives of the States of Wyoming and South Dakota, relating to the burial place of Chief Sitting Bull? I take it that Sitting Bull was not buried in two other places, and perhaps he is not even buried where he is supposed to have been buried, as stated in the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. I am not so sure the Indian tribe should not be allowed to donate property in this manner for the benefit of Indian tradition, if they want to make such a donation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not to make a play on words, but is not the question before Congress, Where does Sitting Bull lie?

Mr. MORSE. Not only that, but the Senator inquired whether bills introduced by Members of Congress from other States would not make Congress look ridiculous. If that were the only thing that would make Congress look ridiculous, I might be concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the byplay, I think I should add that the committee felt it was altogether appropriate for the State of North Dakota to pay its tribute to the memory of this great Indian chief. Whether or not his bones lie within the State, it will be remembered that these Indians, who lived in the great West before the coming of the white man, roamed throughout that area before any State lines ever were thought of.

This action by the State of North Dakota, in paying tribute to Sitting Bull, by proposing to memorialize the plot in which he was originally buried, is not ridiculous at all, but is a tribute to the fact that he was there, that his tribesmen were there, that they wandered in this great area, and that they are entitled, in death, at least, to an appropriate memorial of this kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion regarding where the bones of Sitting Bull actually repose. I understand there is some dispute about the matter. I remember the afternoon in this body when Members from, I believe, five States claimed their States were the home State of Sacajawea, who accompanied Lewis and Clark on their famous expedition to the Pacific; and each of those five Senators claimed that Sacajawea was buried in his particular State.

So I urge the Senator from Wyoming to consider these matters very carefully and to find out where the bodies actually are buried.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Illinois does me the honor of coming to Wyoming and visiting that State, I shall be happy indeed to take him to the Wind River Reservation, and to show him where the guide of Lewis and Clark actually is buried.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the same offer has been made to me by the Senators from North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, all that testifies to the honor which is being paid by the States of the West to the guide of Lewis and Clark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "quarter", to insert "and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter", and in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "two and one-half" and insert "five", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of North Dakota for use as a State historic site all right, title, and interest, except as provided in section 2, of the United States and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians to that parcel of land within the Standing Rock Reservation, North Dakota, which is the site where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried and is more particularly described as follows: The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, township 130 north, range 80 west, fifth principal meridian, consisting of five acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall—

(a) exclude conveyance of any rights to oil, gas, or other mineral deposits in the land conveyed, but the development of any such mineral deposits, which would in any manner interfere with the use of such land as a State historic site, shall not be permitted so long as such land is so used; and

(b) be subject to the condition that in the event the land conveyed should cease to be used as a State historic site title to such land shall revert to the United States to be held in the same manner it was held prior to such conveyance.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESTRICTIONS ON LANDS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2198) to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 22, after the word "effective", to strike out "ninety days after the date it is issued" and insert "6 months after notice of the order is given to such Indian"; on page 3, line 32, after the word "Affairs", to strike out "the principal chief or governor of the tribe to which the applicant belongs,"; and on page 5, line 14, after the word "permit", to strike out "heretofore granted" and insert "that is outstanding when an order removing restrictions becomes effective", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act, the period of restrictions against alienation, lease, mortgage, or other encumbrance of lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma of one-half degree or more Indian blood, which period was extended to April 26, 1956, by the act of May 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 495), is hereby extended for the lives of the Indians who own such lands subject to such restrictions on the date of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Any Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for an order removing restrictions. Within 90 days from the date of the application, the Secretary shall either issue the order or disapprove the application. The order shall be issued if in the judgment of the Secretary the applicant has sufficient ability, knowledge, experience, and judgment to enable him, or her, to manage his, or her, business affairs, including the administration, use, investment, and disposition of any property turned over to such person and the income or proceeds therefrom, with such reasonable degree of prudence and wisdom as will be apt to prevent him, or her, from losing such property or the benefits thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, without application, to any Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes, who in the judgment of the Secretary is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, in accordance with the standard specified in subsection (a) of this section, an order removing restrictions that will become effective 6 months after notice of the order is given to such Indian, unless it is set aside by a county court in accordance with proceedings initiated prior to such time pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. The timely initiation of such proceedings shall stay the effective date of an order until the proceedings are concluded. When the Secretary issues an order pursuant to this subsection, he shall notify the board of county commissioners for the county in which the Indian resides.

(c) If the Secretary of the Interior disapproves, or fails either to approve or disapprove, an application within the 90-day period prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, the Indian affected may apply to the county court for the county in which he, or she, resides for an order removing restrictions. If the Secretary issues an order removing restrictions without application therefor in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, either the Indian affected or the board of county commissioners may apply to the county court for the county in which the Indian resides for an order setting aside such order. The court shall set a hearing date not less than 30 days from the day it receives the application, and, under rules adopted by the court, notify the board of county commissioners, the welfare departments of the State and county governments, the local representative of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and any other persons the court considers appropriate. At the hearing the court shall examine the Indian and may require the persons who appear before the court to give testimony in the matter of the ability of the Indian to manage his, or her, own affairs. The Secretary of the Interior, and the attorney for the county in which such court is located, shall be given an opportunity to appear at such hearings and to participate in the examination of the Indian and other witness. The evidence taken at the hearing shall be transcribed and filed of record in the case. In determining capability, the court shall apply the standard specified in subsection (a) of this section with respect to determinations by the Secretary. If the court finds that the Indian is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, it shall issue an order removing restrictions or deny the application for an order to set aside an order of the Secretary issued without application therefor, as the case may be. If the court does not find that the Indian is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, it shall deny the application for an order removing restrictions, or set aside an order of the Secretary issued without application therefor, as the case may be. The court shall furnish to the Secretary and to the applicant one certified copy of any final order issued by it. Any final order of the court shall be subject to appeal by the applicant, by the Secretary, or by the board of county commissioners in accordance with the probate laws of the State of Oklahoma, except that no appeal bond shall be required in an appeal by the Secretary.

(d) When an order removing restrictions becomes effective, the Secretary shall cause to be turned over to the applicant full ownership and control of any money and property that is held in trust for him or that is held subject to restriction against alienation imposed by the United States, issuing, in the case of land, such title document as may be appropriate: *Provided,* That the Secretary may make such provisions as he deems necessary to insure payment of money loaned to any such Indian by the Federal Government or by an Indian tribe: *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall abrogate the interest of any lessee or permittee in any lease, contract, or permit that is outstanding when an order removing restrictions becomes effective.

SEC. 3. Section 23 of the Act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), as amended by section 8 of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 312), which expires on April 26, 1956, is continued in force with respect to the restricted properties of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes as long as such properties remain restricted.

SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 2 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal or to limit the application of the Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 731), the provisions of which shall continue in effect until otherwise provided by Congress.

SEC. 5. Any existing exemption from taxation that constitutes a vested property right shall continue in force and effect until it terminates by virtue of its own limitations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE NAVAHO TRIBE OF INDIANS, NEW MEXICO

The bill (S. 1906) to authorize the pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the pueblo of Lorenzo, sometimes known as the pueblo of Picuris, and the pueblo of Pojoaque, in New Mexico are hereby severally authorized to sell to the Navaho Tribe of Indians all of the right, title, and interest of each of said pueblos in and to any of the lands situated in townships 6, 7, and 8 north, range 15 west, and township 7 north, range 16 west, New Mexico principal meridian, in Valencia County, N. Mex., the title to which is now held by the United States in trust for either of said pueblos; and the Navaho Tribe is hereby authorized to purchase all of the right, title, and interest of said pueblos in and to any of the above-described lands, whereupon the title to the lands so purchased shall be held by the United States in trust for the Navaho Tribe. All sales under this section shall be for such prices and on such terms as may be agreed upon by the governing bodies of the pueblo making the sale and of the Navaho Tribe, and as may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The consideration for each sale, when so agreed upon and approved, shall be paid out of such funds of the Navaho Tribe as may be designated for this purpose by its governing body. The Secretary of the Interior and the appropriate officers of said pueblos are authorized to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the transfer of title to any lands purchased by the Navaho Tribe under this section.

SEC. 2. All proceeds received from each of the sales authorized by section 1 of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of each pueblo making the sale in the account established for such pueblo pursuant to section 19 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636, 642), and together with any other funds heretofore or hereafter deposited in the same account, shall be available for expenditure or advance for such purposes, except per capita payments, as may be designated by the governing body of such pueblo and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of consolidating the lands of the Navaho Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the governing body of said tribe, may exchange any lands purchased under section 1 of this act for any other lands situated in McKinley or Valencia Counties, N. Mex., that are owned by the United States, by the State of New Mexico or a political subdivision thereof, or by any person; and, for the same purpose, the head of any department or agency having administrative jurisdiction over lands situated in said counties that are owned by the United States may exchange any such lands for lands purchased under section 1 of this act.

SALE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS ON THE YAKIMA INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 1801) to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEASING OF CERTAIN LANDS OF THE YAKIMA TRIBE TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The bill (H. R. 1802) to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and park purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The bill (S. 1746) continuing the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70v), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate on April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, Calendar No. 857, Senate bill 1746, a bill continuing the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962, was passed.

I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1746, Calendar 857, was passed, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO NELLIE OHLERKING ARCHAMBEAU MORAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1745) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "northeast", to strike out "quarter" and insert "quarter,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to her on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Montana: Northeast quarter northwest quarter section 20, township 26 north, range 26 east; west half southeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, south half north half northeast quarter, south half north half north half northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter northeast quarter section 14, township 26 north, range 25 east, principal meridian, Montana, containing 180 acres.

SEC. 2. Said patent in fee when issued shall contain a reservation to the Fort Belknap Indian Community, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1355), of all minerals, including coal, oil, and gas.

SEC. 3. Pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1355, 1357), and the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200–210), as supplemented by the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 565), said patent in fee when issued shall contain a provision that any of the above-described lands which may be situated within a Federal irrigation project are subject to a lien, prior and superior to all other liens for the amount of costs and charges due to the United States for and on account of construction, operation, and maintenance of the irrigation system or acquisition of water rights by which said lands have been or are to be reclaimed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT OF CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 2403) to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Administrator of General Services, may appoint custodial employees working under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration at Federal buildings occupied in any part by the postal service to positions in the postal service to perform postal duties in addition to their regular duties as such custodial employees, without regard to section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 62). Such employees shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for each position, without regard to the provisions of sections 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 58, 69, and 70).

LEASE OF UNASSIGNED LANDS ON THE COLORADO RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2039) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "lease", to strike out "for a term of not to exceed 25 years with an option to renew for an additional term of 25 years", and in line 9, after the word "tributaries", to insert a comma and "for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, and for those farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops as determined by said Secretary. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes with the consent of both parties may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases and renewals shall be made under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 2 years after the date of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., that were set apart by the United States for the Indians of the Colorado River and its tributaries, for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, and for those farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops as determined by said Secretary. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes with the consent of both parties may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases and renewals shall be made under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Income from leases on land in the southern reserve, as defined in ordinance No. 5 of the Colorado River Indian Tribes, dated February 3, 1945, shall be segregated from income from leases on land in the northern reserve, as defined by such ordinance, and from leases on land on the California side of the Colorado River. All income received within 2 years after the date of this act and prior to determination of the beneficial ownership of the lands, from leases on land in the northern reserve and land on the California side of the Colorado River may be expended by the Secretary for the benefit of the Colorado River Indian Tribes and their members. All income received within 2 years after the date of this act and prior to determination of the beneficial ownership of the lands, from leases on land in the southern reserve may be expended by the Secretary for the development or improvement of any land in the southern reserve. All income received more than 2 years after the date of this act, which is hereby declared to be a reasonable time within which the beneficial ownership of the land on the reservation may be determined by the Congress, shall be held in a special account until such ownership has been determined. All income received after beneficial ownership has been determined shall be held in trust for the beneficial owners of the land from which the income was derived and shall be expended as otherwise authorized by law.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2280) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the initials "U. S. C.", to strike out "title 33"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "than", to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-eight"; in line 3, after the word "of", to insert "the"; in line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "$20" and insert "$18"; in line 9, after the word "than", to strike out "$20" and insert "$18"; in line 12, after the letter "(c)", to strike out "(title 33, U. S. C., sec. 908)"; on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

Sec. 3. Section 8 (g) of the said act is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25."

In line 10, after the word "Sec.", to strike out "3" and insert "4"; and in the same line, after the letter "(e)", to strike out "(title 33, U. S. C. 909e)"; in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "$30" and insert "$27"; in line 17, after the word "Sec.", to strike out "4" and insert "5"; and in the same line, after the letter "(m)", to strike out "(title 33, U. S. C. 914 (m))"; after line 18, to strike out:

Sec. 5. The amendments made by the foregoing provisions of this act shall become effective upon enactment.

And after line 20, to insert:

Sec. 6. Section 18 of the said act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "(18)" at the beginning of the section and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In cases where judgment cannot be satisfied by reason of the employer's insolvency or other circumstances precluding payment, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion and to the extent he shall determine advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established in section 44, make payment from such fund upon any award made under this act, and, in addition, provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of the act in any case of disability where there has been a default in furnishing medical treatment by reason of the insolvency of the employer. Such an employer shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Secretary of Labor for the benefit of the fund shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer, and may by a proceeding in the name of the Secretary of Labor under section 18 or under subsection (c) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Secretary is possible, or the Secretary may settle and compromise any such claim."

Sec. 7. (a) Section 39 (c) of the said act is amended by striking out "education" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "rehabilitation."

(b) Section 39 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following two sentences: "Where necessary rehabilitation services are not available otherwise, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, use the fund provided for in section 44 in such amounts as may be necessary to procure such services, including necessary prosthetic appliances or other apparatus. This fund shall also be available in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations for the Department of Labor for the costs of administering this subsection."

Sec. 8. (a) Section 44 (a) of the said act is amended by striking out "of this act" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "of subsection (b) of section 18, and of subsection (c) of section 39 of this act."

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 44 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows: "The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under subsections (f) and (g) of section 8, under subsection (b) of section 18 and under subsection (c) of section 39: *Provided,* That payments authorized by subsection (f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund."

Sec. 9. The amendments made by the first section and sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act shall be applicable only with respect to injuries and death occurring on or after the date of enactment of this act notwithstanding the provisions of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 1701 and following).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C., sec. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 3 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however,* That in case the injury results in disability of more than 28 days the compensation shall be allowed from the date of the disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $18 per week: *Provided, however,* That, if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $18 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

Sec. 2. Subparagraphs (1) through (12) of section 8 (c) of the said act are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Arm lost, 312 weeks' compensation.

"(2) Leg lost, 288 weeks' compensation.

"(3) Hand lost, 244 weeks' compensation.

"(4) Foot lost, 205 weeks' compensation.

"(5) Eye lost, 160 weeks' compensation.

"(6) Thumb lost, 75 weeks' compensation.

"(7) First finger lost, 46 weeks' compensation.

"(8) Great toe lost, 38 weeks' compensation.

"(9) Second finger lost, 30 weeks' compensation.

"(10) Third finger lost, 25 weeks' compensation.

"(11) Toe other than great toe lost, 16 weeks' compensation.

"(12) Fourth finger lost, fifteen weeks' compensation."

Sec. 3. Section 8 (g) of the said act is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25".

Sec. 4. Section 9 (e) of the said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been more than $75 nor less than $27 but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

Sec. 5. Section 14 (m) of the said act is hereby repealed.

Sec. 6. Section 18 of the said act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "(18)" at the beginning of the section and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In cases where judgment cannot be satisfied by reason of the employer's insolvency or other circumstances precluding payment, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion and to the extent he shall determine advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established in section 44, make payment from such fund upon any award made under this act, and in addition, provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of the act in any case of disability where there has been a default in furnishing medical treatment by reason of the insolvency of the employer. Such an employer shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Secretary of Labor for the benefit of the fund shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer and may by a proceeding in the name of the Secretary of Labor under section 18 or under subsection (c) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Secretary is possible, or the Secretary may settle and compromise any such claim."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 39 (c) of the said act is amended by striking out "education" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "rehabilitation".

(b) Section 39 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following two sentences: "Where necessary rehabilitation services are not available otherwise, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, use the fund provided for in section 44 in such amounts as may be necessary to procure such services, including necessary prosthetic appliances or other apparatus. This fund shall also be available in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations for the Department of Labor for the cost of administering this subsection."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 44 (a) of the said act is amended by striking out "of this act" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "of subsection (b) of section 18, and of subsection (c) of section 39 of this act".

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 44 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows: "The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under subsections (f) and (g) of section 8, under subsection (b) of section 18 and under subsection (c) of section 39: *Provided*, That payments authorized by subsection (f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund."

SEC. 9. The amendments made by the first section and sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act shall be applicable only with respect to injuries and death occurring on or after the date of enactment of this act notwithstanding the provisions of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 1701 and following).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the bill to amend Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act be printed immediately following the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 853) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, having had under consideration measures to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of March 4, 1927, as amended (33 U. S. C. 901 et. seq.), report favorably on S. 2280 with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The major purpose of the bill S. 2280 is to modify certain provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act pertaining to the amount of benefits payable to injured workers or to the families of deceased workers in disability and death cases arising under this workmen's compensation law.

The Longshoremen's Act covers workers who are engaged in employments within the exclusive Federal admiralty and maritime jurisdiction in the United States, in Hawaii, and in Alaska. The principal categories of workers are as follows: Longshoremen or stevedores, ship repairmen, ship servicemen, harbor workers, and other workers on the navigable waters of the United States, but excluding seamen.

The Longshoremen's Act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for employees privately employed in the District of Columbia, it having been extended to those employees by the act of May 17, 1928, as amended (36 D. C. Code 501); and it is the basic law covering employees of contractors with the United States engaged in manifold employments outside continental United States, it having been extended to them by the Defense Base Act of August 16, 1941 (42 U. S. C. 1651). Whatever changes are made in the Longshoremen's Act will, without further legislative action, bring about equivalent changes in the two laws mentioned.

The benefits payable under these laws are provided by private insurance or self-insurance arranged by private employers in the same manner as in any typical State workmen's compensation law. The Government does not pay the benefits under the Longshoremen's Act.

Ths basic purpose of the act is to provide most covered workers with substantially two-thirds of their wages when totally incapacitated by industrial accident. Unless the maximum and minimum compensation rate levels are adjusted by legislative action as circumstances require, the security of the workers becomes impaired and the workmen's compensation law loses its effectiveness. This is not only an inequitable result, but the situation tends to lead to industrial disputes by triggering demands for nonstatutory supplementary benefits from employers to make up the deficit. The redressing of benefit levels is accordingly a necessary function of government designed to carry out the basic purposes of the act.

CHANGES IN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM COMPENSATION

According to information obtained by the committee the west coast longshoremen have been averaging close to $100 per week in wages, and the wages at points on the east coast closely follow at around $92 per week. Average weekly wages in manufacturing in the District of Columbia amount to $86 per week. The committee feels that under these circumstances a $50 weekly maximum compensation rate is fully warranted. This $50 per week is the ceiling or maximum weekly compensation for disability or death, the actual benefits for total disability dropping downward from that amount as the weekly wage rate of variously paid employees drops below $75.

In addition to a ceiling compensation the statute provides a floor by which to maintain a minimum level of compensation for low-paid employees. This floor is designed to keep the compensation rate from ceasing to have effective value as security for disabled workers or their dependents. The committee accordingly has considered the purposes of the floor (or lower limit of compensation) and recommends that it be increased from $12 per week to $18 per week, an increase which is substantially in line with the proportion by which the ceiling is increased. There is, of course, a provision in the statute that no employee shall receive more weekly compensation than his weekly wage so that compensation could not exceed the wage in any situation, even as regards the lowest paid employee.

SHORTENING OF WAITING PERIOD

The committee also recommends that the waiting period be shortened from 7 to 3 days. Under most laws, unless disability lasts a certain number of days, no compensation is payable for the waiting period. At least one State (Oregon) has no waiting period. In other State laws that period ranges from 3 days to 7 days. The Congress has established a 3-day waiting period in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act and the committee believes that it is more equitable than the period of 7 days.

The committee recommends that the period of protracted disability which must elapse before the time lost during the waiting period becomes compensable, should be reduced from the present 49 days to 28 days. The waiting period is designed more as an administrative convenience than as a necessary provision by which equitably to determine or measure benefits. The committee believes 49 days to be excessive. (The Federal Employees' Compensation Act has the shorter period of 21 days.) A 49-day period is to be found in only one State law; most of them provide a lesser period, some as low as 5 days.

CHANGES IN SCHEDULE FOR PERMANENT PARTIAL DISABILITY

The Longshoremen's Act contains provision for the payment of compensation in permanent partial disability cases, for the loss or loss of use of certain specified members or functions of the body, such as an arm, hand, leg, foot, eye, finger, etc. This provision is known as a schedule. The committee recommends restoration of the scheduled payments to the same levels as existed when the act was first enacted in 1927. At that time, the Longshoremen's Act placed an arbitrary length to the period for which compensation could be paid for temporary total disability. For example, the act in 1927 provided that if an employee's leg was injured and had to be amputated he could receive only 40 weeks' compensation for the time of healing or convalescence, plus the schedule value of the leg (then 288 weeks). In 1934 the act was amended to eliminate this arbitrary healing period, so that an employee could be paid temporary total disability compensation for the full duration of the disability during the healing. But in removing this inequity the scheduled value of the member itself was reduced by this former arbitrary healing period. The committee is eliminating this inequitable secondary effect by recommending restoring the schedule to its original levels. It should also be noted that the schedule proposed by the bill will accord precisely with the permanent partial disability schedule in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

ADDITIONAL USES FOR SPECIAL FUND

Another proposal of significance is to enlarge the uses of the special fund established under section 44 of the Longshoremen's Act. That fund consists of payments collected from insurers or self-insurers in death cases in which there are no dependents entitled to benefits. The amount of $1,000, to be paid in all cases of death when no person is found entitled to compensation, was fixed in 1927 when the act was originally enacted. This fund (and the similar funds established under the extensions of the Longshoremen's Act mentioned above) has over the years had substantial accretions and the outlay for present purposes does not use all of the increments.

The committee proposes that this fund continue to be used to pay compensation to employees who are totally disabled as a result of a second injury compensable under the act and that a priority be established for payments from the special fund for this purpose. Further, the maximum allowance which employees who are undergong rehabilitation may receive is increased from $10 to $25 a week. Rehabilitation services available to injured employees who are covered by the act will also be improved by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to use the special fund to procure such services where in exceptional cases they are not available through existing facilities. The Secretary of Labor also will be permitted to use the special fund for administrative expenses in such amounts as are authorized in annual appropriations for the purpose of encouraging and assisting employees to obtain rehabilitation. It is proposed further that this fund be used when appropriate to provide compensation for those cases—fortunately few in number—in which collection of benefits from the employer has failed by reason of insolvency or other condition precluding collection. The new and additional uses of this fund will greatly increase its value to disabled workers, without impairing orginally intended "second-injury" purpose.

The committee recommends that S. 2280 be favorably acted upon as amended by the committee. The changes in the Longshoremen's Act are long overdue and urgently needed to make this law actively effective for the purpose for which it is designed.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill, as reported by the committee, amends section 6 (a) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, so as to reduce the waiting period from 7 to 3 days, and to shorten the period of protracted disability, which must elapse before the compensation for the waiting period may be paid, from 49 to 28 days.

Section 1 of the bill also amends section 6 (b) of the Longshoremen's Act by increasing the ceiling or maximum weekly compensation from $35 to $50 per week, and by increasing the floor or minimum weekly compensation from $12 per week to $18 per week.

Section 2 of the bill amends the schedule in section 8 (c) (1) to (12), inclusive, of the Longshoremen's Act by increasing the number of weeks' compensation payable for the specified losses (of members of the body, such as hand, arm, leg, eye, finger, etc.) to the same levels as were fixed in the Longshoremen's Act at the time of its original enactment in 1927.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 8 (g) of the Longshoremen's Act by authorizing not to exceed $25 per week as an expense allowance for employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation. The present statute authorizes not to exceed $10 which is wholly inadequate for the intended purpose. The allowance is payable out of the special fund established under section 44 of the Longshoremen's Act.

Section 4 amends section 9 (e) of the Longshoremen's Act so as to adjust the wage ceiling and wage floor upon which benefits for death are computed, in conformity with the change recommended in section 1 of the bill.

Section 5 repeals section 14 (m) of the Longshoremen's Act. Section 14 (m) originally (in 1927) contained a maximum aggregate limitation upon compensation for disability or death. In 1948 the limitation was partially removed—that is, in cases of permanent total disability and in cases of death—with a remaining limitation of $10,000 and in certain cases $11,000. Any limitation terminating compensation before the termination of disability constitutes a departure from the basic principle of workmen's compensation, which is wage restoration. Limitations of this kind cannot be justified as in support of the purposes for which these acts are devised. About 95 percent of injury cases involve disability payments for temporary periods. About 4½ percent of the cases involve permanent total or permanent partial disability, with only about one-half of 1 percent of the total ultimately becoming death cases. Limitations such as would be removed cast the burden of their incidence upon the few cases in which the loss is the greatest to the worker. There is no limitation in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act equivalent to that in section 14 (m).

Section 6 amends section 18 by inserting "(a)" at the beginning of the section and adding a new "(b)" subsection designed to provide benefits for the occasional beneficiaries who are unfortunate enough not to be able to collect their compensation from the employer or his insurer. This new provision would permit use of the money in the special fund established under section 44 of the Longshoremen's Act for this additional worthwhile purpose.

The special fund is augmented by payments of $1,000 in all cases of death where no person is found entitled to compensation. Fines and penalties collected under the act are paid into this fund. The new provision safeguards the original purposes of the fund and states a priority in respect to "second injury" payments. The Secretary of Labor would in cases paid from the fund be subrogated to the rights of the employee in respect to compensation in default and may pursue a claim against the employer to enforce collection. Medical expense in disability cases could likewise be paid.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 39 (c) of the Longshoremen's Act by changing the last word in the first sentence from "education" to "rehabilitation," a more appropriate word.

Section 7 further amends section 39 (c) by adding a sentence designed to authorize use of the special fund to provide additional services, necessary appliances, or apparatus needed by employees undergoing rehabilitation. This authority was found needed in order to make such help available in the few cases where local rehabilitation facilities were financially or otherwise incapable of providing a service, appliance, or apparatus which a particular rehabilitation case should require. This provision is designed to provide the means by which to supplement where necessary the services of existing State and other facilities, using those facilities wherever possible.

Section 8 makes the necessary language and reference changes in section 44 of the Longshoremen's Act to coincide with the changes made by sections 6 and 7 of the bill and to accommodate those changes.

Section 9 of the bill amends no provision of the Longshoremen's Act but provides the transitional provision specifying the effective date. In applying the new levels, cases of injury which occurred prior to enactment would continue to be paid at the levels in existence when the injury occurred. The same would be true in death cases where death preceded enactment. In cases of death where the death occurs after enactment, but the injury occurred prior to enactment, the death award would be made under the amended provisions. This latter is in accord with the present state of the law which recognizes that death is a circumstance giving rise to a right of recovery in dependents separate and apart from the right of the employee to disability benefits.

This section also provides that notwithstanding the provisions of the act of December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), the amendments to the Longshoremen's Act shall not be retroactive, but shall apply only to injuries and deaths occurring on or after the date of enactment of S. 2280. This reference to the act of December 2, 1942, is directed at section 102 of that act as amended by section 4 (c) of the War Claims Act of 1948. In the amendment in that act, a proviso was included to the effect that any future amendments to the Longshoremen's Act, the effect of which is to increase the amount of the benefits for injury or death, shall be effective in cases covered by the 1942 act retrospectively from the date of the injury or the death. Without the prohibition in S. 2280 above referred to, any increases in the maximum weekly compensation rate to $50 would have to be applied in the old cases which arose from 1942 on and from the original date of injury or death, at that. Thus beneficiaries would receive a windfall consisting of the difference between the new $50 per week in maximum cases, and the old rate at which compensation was paid prior to enactment of the present bill; the difference would be received covering a back period of some 13 years. This kind of retroactive provision in the act referred to is not warranted by any circumstance known to the committee and so far as is known is a unique and discriminatory retroactive provision. It is the committee's intention that no monetary benefits accruing by reason of the enactment of S. 2280 shall be increased by reason of the provisions of section 102 of said act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"An act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain maritime employments, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc.,

* * * * *

"TIME FOR COMMENCEMENT OF COMPENSATION

* * * * *

"MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM COMPENSATION

"SEC. 6. (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first [seven] *three* days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however,* That in case the injury results in disability of more than [forty-nine] *twenty-eight* days, the compensation shall be allowed from the date of the disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed [$35] *$50* per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than [$12] *$18* per week: *Provided, however,* That, if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10 are less than [$12] *$18* per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages.

* * * * *

"SEC. 8. (c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66⅔ per centum of the average weekly wages, which shall be in addition compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section respectively and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:

"(1) Arm lost, [two hundred and eighty] *three hundred and twelve* weeks' compensation.

"(2) Leg lost, [two hundred and forty-eight] *two hundred and eighty-eight* weeks' compensation.

"(3) Hand lost, [two hundred and twelve] *two hundred and forty-four* weeks' compensation.

"(4) Foot lost, [one hundred and seventy-three] *two hundred and five* weeks' compensation.

"(5) Eye lost, [one hundred and forty] *one hundred and sixty* weeks' compensation.

"(6) Thumb lost, [fifty-one] *seventy-five* weeks' compensation.

"(7) First finger lost, [twenty-eight] *forty-six* weeks' compensation.

"(8) Great toe lost, [twenty-six] *thirty-eight* weeks' compensation.

"(9) Second finger lost, [eighteen] *thirty* weeks' compensation.

"(10) Third finger lost, [seventeen] *twenty-five* weeks' compensation.

"(11) Toe other than great toe lost, [eight] *sixteen* weeks' compensation.

"(12) Fourth finger lost [seven] *fifteen* weeks' compensation.

* * * * *

"(g) Maintenance for employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation: An employee who as a result of injury is or may be expected to be totally or partially incapacitated for a remunerative occupation and who, under the direction of the commission as provided by section 39 (c) of this act, is being rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation, shall receive additional compensation necessary for his maintenance, but such additional compensation shall not exceed [$10] *$25* a week. The expense shall be paid out of the special fund established in section 44.

* * * * *

"SEC. 9. (e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than [$52.50] *$75* nor less than [$18] *$27* but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased.

* * * * *

"PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

* * * * *

"SEC. 14. * * *

"[(m) The total compensation payable under this act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided*, That this subdivision shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further*, That in cases of disability compensable under paragraph (21) of subdivision (c) of section 8 the total compensation for such disability, and for any temporary total disability or temporary partial disability sustained in addition thereto, shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $10,000.]

* * * * *

"COLLECTION OF DEFAULTED PAYMENTS

"SEC. 18. (*a*) In case of default by the employer in the payment of compensation due under any award of compensation for a period of 30 days after the compensation is due and payable, the person to whom such compensation is payable may, within 1 year after such default, make application to the deputy commissioner making the compensation order or a supplementary order declaring the amount of the default. After investigation, notice, and hearing, as provided in section 19, the deputy commissioner shall make a supplementary order, declaring the amount of the default, which shall be filed in the same manner as the compensation order. In case the payment in default is an installment of the award, the deputy commissioner may, in his discretion, declare the whole of the award as the amount in default. The applicant may file a certified copy of such supplementary order with the clerk of the Federal district court for the judicial district in which the employer has his principal place of business or maintains an office, or for the judicial district in which the injury occurred. In case such principal place of business or office or place where the injury occurred is in the District of Columbia, a copy of such supplementary order may be filed with the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Such supplementary order of the deputy commissioner shall be final, and the court shall upon the filing of the copy enter judgment for the amount declared in default by the supplementary order if such supplementary order is in accordance with law. Review of the judgment so entered may be had as in civil suits for damages at common law. Final proceedings to execute the judgment may be had by writ of execution in the form used by the court in suits at common law in actions of assumpsit. No fee shall be required for filing the supplementary order nor for entry of judgment thereon, and the applicant shall not be liable for costs in a proceeding for review of the judgment unless the court shall otherwise direct. The court shall modify such judgment to conform to any later compensation order upon presentation of a certified copy thereof to the court.

(b) In cases where judgment cannot be satisfied by reason of the employer's insolvency or other circumstances precluding payment, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion and to the extent he shall determine advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established in section 44, make payment from such fund upon any award made under this act, and in addition, provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of the act in any case of disability where there has been a default in furnishing medical treatment by reason of the insolvency of the employer. Such an employer shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Secretary of Labor for the benefit of the fund shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer and may by a proceeding in the name of the Secretary of Labor under section 18 or under subsection (c) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Secretary is possible, or the Secretary may settle and compromise any such claim.

* * * * *

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 39 (c) The Secretary shall direct the vocational rehabilitation of permanently disabled employees and shall arrange with the appropriate public or private agencies in States or Territories, possessions, or the District of Columbia for such [education] *rehabilitation*. The Secretary may in his discretion furnish such prosthetic appliances or other apparatus made necessary by an injury upon which an award has been made under this Act to render a disabled employee fit to engage in a remunerative occupation. [If any surplus is left in any fiscal year in the fund provided for in section 44, such surplus may be used in subsequent fiscal years for the purposes of administration and investigation.] *Where necessary rehabilitaion services are not available otherwise, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, use the fund provided for in section 44 in such amounts as may be necessary to procure such services, including necessary prosthetic appliances or other apparatus. This fund shall also be available in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations for the Department of Labor for the costs of administering this subsection.*

* * * * *

"SPECIAL FUND

"SEC. 44. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a special fund for the purpose of making payments in accordance with the provisions of subsections (f) and (g) of section 8 [of this Act.], *of subsection (b) of section 18, and of subsection (c) of section 39 of this act.* Such fund shall be administered by the commission. The Treasurer of the United States shall be the custodian of such fund, and all moneys and securities in such fund shall be held in trust by such Treasurer and shall not be money or property of the United States.

* * * * *

"(c) Payments into such fund shall be made as follows:

"(1) Each employer shall pay $1,000 as compensation for the death of an employee of such employer resulting from injury where the deputy commissioner determines that there is no person entitled under this Act to compensation for such death. [Fifty per centum of each such payment shall be available for the payments under subdivision (f) of section 8, and 50 percentum shall be available for payments under subdivision (g) of section 8.] *The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under subsections (f) and (g) of section 8, under subsection (b) of section 18 and under subsection (c) of section 39: Provided, That payments authorized by subsection (f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund.*

"(2) All amounts collected as fines and penalties under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into such fund."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a few very brief remarks with respect to Calendar No. 861, Senate bill 2280.

In behalf of the authors of this bill, known as the Magnuson-Morse bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, I wish to thank the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the very favorable consideration they gave to our presentation of the evidence in support of this bill.

Particularly I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who did a great deal of work within the committee on this particular bill.

I also wish to thank the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

This is a very interesting bill, if we consider the history of American labor legislation, because the principles of this bill go back to a great landmark in the history of the Senate. The principles of this bill really constituted one of the early proposals for more liberal legislation for the benefit of the workers of the country who were engaged in various hazardous occupations.

The principles of this bill were originally fought for by a small group of liberals in the Senate headed by the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, the elder Bob La Follette.

It is very interesting to read, as I did in my preparation of the presentation in connection with this bill, the discussions which took place when Bob La Follette stood on the floor of the Senate and proposed what were considered at that time radical doctrines. Now we have a bill extending and expanding the application of those principles, passed on the floor of the Senate by unanimous consent. It furnishes a pretty good example, I think, of what happens in American public life when a sound liberal idea is implanted in a piece of legislation. In the first instance, a historic fight must be made on the floor of the Senate; yet not so many years later we find the framework of the same legislation being expanded and extended. We have come to accept the complete economic and social soundness of that piece of legislation.

I say this because I think it is appropriate that we give a little credit to the fighting liberals of bygone decades who really brought forth the principles of this piece of legislation. What happened in the meantime was that we went ahead with legislation which benefited workers in a good many other hazardous occupations, but the longshoremen fell behind. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I recognized that fact, and we introduced a measure designed to bring longshoremen, who are engaged in one of the most hazardous occupations in this country, up to a par with employees in other industries who are protected.

I thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the great assistance he rendered to us as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in granting us the hearings which we had, and giving us an opportunity today to vote favorably on this piece of proposed legislation.

We are also indebted to the longshoremen for the objective data and proof which they supplied the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oregon, which made it possible for us to make the case which caused the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to come forward with a recommendation of the bill which was passed by the Senate today.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4808) to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1352) for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that this bill and the next bill on the calendar, Senate bill 1584, for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner, are similar, and are of the category we have previously discussed.

These bills are far-reaching in nature. Because of the precedent their passage might establish, we reluctantly ask that they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut request that Calendar No. 865, Senate bill 1352, go over?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes; and also Calenendar No. 866, Senate bill 1584.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection until I have an opportunity to make a brief statement?

Mr. PURTELL. I am glad to withhold the objection, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that both these bills—Calendar No. 865, Senate bill 1352, and Calendar No. 866, Senate bill 1584—are of the same category.

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. In these cases, the giving of blood transfusions resulted in paralysis. The committee investigated the matter, and discovered that blood transfusions could result, at times, in paralysis, when certain conditions already were existing in the bodies of the persons who received the transfusions.

The committee has reported the bills to the Senate, with the idea of having the Senate establish a policy in this connection, because we realized that similar claims will arise in the future.

Let me say I shall not make a fight over the objection to the present consideration of these bills; but I believe that in all fairness to the Judiciary Committee, which also is the claims committee, the Senate should establish a policy in regard to claims of this nature.

So I hope the Senator from Connecticut will so request, and will help have this subject debated. If that is not done, the committee will be utterly harassed with similar claims, and in each case there will be the same objection and later, a floor fight.

In my opinion, it will be best to dispose of the floor fight as quickly as possible, and to have the Senate definitely establish the policy, because although the blood donation funds go to the Red Cross, the question is whether the Congress should pay for such claims, inasmuch as the Federal Government already has become the insurer of certain hospitals, and accepts liability in the case of certain traffic accidents, and so forth. It is most desirable that such a policy be established.

As soon as we have the opportunity, we shall submit to the Senate some of the other problems which confront the committee, and shall ask the Senate to establish for us a definite policy to be followed.

That is why these two bills have been reported directly to the Senate, with definite recommendations on the part of the committee.

I desire to have both the majority Members and the minority Members understand that we have reported the bills because so many claims of this kind are submitted to the committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, let me assure the Senator from West Virginia that I and the other Members who join me in the objection feel as he does, namely, that a policy in regard to such cases should be established. However, it is our feeling that such a policy is not established by having the Congress pass these bills during the call of the Consent Calendar.

I feel, as does the Senator from West Virginia, that it is desirable for the Senate to establish such a policy.

It occurs to the Senator from Connecticut that perhaps this very colloquy will further impress upon Senators the importance of establishing a policy by having the Senate consider and debate such bills.

Mr. KILGORE. There are cases of families of veterans flying in airplanes. Suppose an airplane crashes. The veteran is insured, but his family is not. They may be traveling in a ship. The ship may be sunk, by accident or by enemy action. What are we to do in such cases? I think it is time for the Congress to establish a national policy with respect to claims of that type.

Prior to World War II the claims which arose, and which called for equitable treatment, were relatively small in number. Now they have grown to gigantic proportions, and the entire staff of the Judiciary Committee is working overtime studying the claims. In the Judiciary Committee we decided to make the situation a test case. We shall furnish the Senate with additional guinea pigs on the basis of which to establish the policy of the United States Senate and determine what it wishes the Judiciary Committee to approve.

Mr. PURTELL. I must object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1584) for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REVISION OF BOUNDARY BETWEEN SECOND AND FOURTH JUDICIAL DIVISIONS OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 65) to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE, SALE, OR LEASE OF CERTAIN SHORELANDS IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6331) authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I inquire whether there is precedent for the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request an explanation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would appreciate an explanation.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I should like to make a brief explanation concerning House bill 6331.

The bill would authorize certain designated officials of the Territory of Hawaii to enter into agreements for the sale, exchange or leasing of some 6½ acres of specifically described tidelands along and adjacent to Waikiki Beach in Honolulu. Title to these lands now is vested in the Territory itself, but certain provisions in the Organic Act of Hawaii prohibit the Territory from taking the action this bill would authorize.

The negotiations authorized would enable the Territory to acquire littoral rights from abutting property owners for construction of a new public recreation area and tourist attraction to be known as Crescent Beach. In the opinion of the United States Army engineers, construction of this new area is necessary to prevent the continuing erosion of the sands of Waikiki Beach. Included in the contemplated development is a new luxury resort hotel to be built with private capital at an estimated cost of some $20 million.

The committee was informed by the popularly elected Delegate to Congress from Hawaii that this hotel is expected to bring an additional $10,800,000 in annual revenues into the Territory from tourism, create jobs for 1,100 persons, and provide added annual tax revenues of $1,240,000 for the Territory.

Enactment of H. R. 6331 would not involve any expenditure of Federal funds, nor does it transfer or authorize transfer of any Federal property. The lands which are the subject of the proposed legislation originally were public property of the Republic of Hawaii and were ceded to the United States when Hawaii voluntarily became a part of the Union in 1898. These 6½ acres are a part of a tract of 496 acres of former Republic of Hawaii lands title to which was transferred to the Territory by President Calvin Coolidge in 1928 under the authority conferred by the 56th and 61st Congresses.

Thus H. R. 6331 would merely authorize the officials of the Territory of Hawaii to deal with Territorial property for the benefit of the people of Hawaii. It is necessary because of the restrictions in the Organic Act.

The Delegate from Hawaii submitted to the committee documentary evidence that all of the adjoining property owners that would be affected are in favor of the legislation. It was initiated by petition of the Territorial legislature, and has the approval of the Governor of Hawaii.

In direct answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Illinois with reference to a precedent, it is my understanding that there is no precedent for legislation of this character. It stands simply upon its own merit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Nevada whether the suspension of the principle of obtaining competitive bids constitutes any precedent so far as future disposition of public lands is concerned?

Mr. BIBLE. It would not constitute such a precedent. The question of competitive bidding not being applicable was carefully considered by the committee. The Attorney General of Hawaii furnished the committee with information indicating that there were many statutory precedents for this type of negotiation, and cited various territorial acts, as well as some congressional acts, to that effect. The very nature of the land involved indicated that this was the type of authorization in which a negotiated sale was completely authorized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator believe that it will constitute any precedent so far as the future sale of nationally held land in the United States is concerned?

Mr. BIBLE. I do not believe it would constitute such a precedent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6331) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIPPINE TRADE AGREEMENT REVISION ACT OF 1955

The bill (H. R. 6059) relating to revisions of the Executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. ERVIN. I withhold it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I very much hope that the Senator will not object. The bill is a very appropriate, fair, and just measure. It has been agreed to by representatives of our Government and the Philippine Government.

There are now in the Philippines 20 million people who practice democracy based on the American model. Their constitution is almost indistinguishable from ours. Their institutions are patterned after ours. They speak our language, as well as their own. Their faith and belief in democracy are as fierce as our own.

As I said earlier in the day, when I expressed the very ardent hope that the bill would be passed this afternoon by an overwhelming vote, the Filipino people have shown that they can fight for freedom. Their President, Ramon Magsaysay, succeeded in revitalizing democracy in the Philippines when he fought communism successfully. He showed Asia and the world that an Asian country can fight communism and win.

President Magsaysay is concentrating on improving the economic welfare of the masses of his people. This bill will help him achieve that end. We must exert every effort to assist him, so that democracy in the Philippines may continue to flourish and the peoples of Asia will see how willing and ready we are to cooperate with leaders who, like President Magsaysay, believe in freedom and can fight for it.

I need not recall what the Philippines recently did for the free world in the Bandung conference. In that historic meeting, it was the Philippines that led the forces of democracy against communism and neutralism. It was a Filipino voice, that of the eminent world statesman, Carlos P. Romulo, which gave expression to the dignity of man, and turned the tide for freedom. It is very appropriate that General Romulo should be our guest in the Senate Gallery today.

Again, it was the Philippines, led again by General Romulo, that at the San Francisco conference of the United Nations last month, beat Molotov to the punch when it came to proposing a peace declaration.

We recognized and appreciated Filipino loyalty to democracy, as was demonstrated by the fact that Filipino troops and Filipino guerrillas fought and died in America's cause in World War II. Neither can we forget that the Philippine Republic was among the first of the nations to send its troops to Korea.

The proposed trade agreement with the Philippines is only a token of the respect and regard we hold for the noble and courageous Filipino people.

I very much hope that the bill will be passed without objection by an overwhelming vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ERVIN. I object. I should like to state that my objection does not have any connection with the merits of the bill. Because of the importance of the bill, some Senators believe that it ought to be brought up on motion, instead of passed on the call of the calendar. That is the basis of the objection. The measure is not opposed on its merits. Rather, the basis of the objection is the importance of the bill. It is felt that it should be brought before the Senate on motion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the bill will be brought up for consideration at an early date, and I shall do what I can toward that end. It is a bill which should be brought up on motion, rather than considered under the 5-minute rule on the call of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York. I also appreciate the procedural problem referred to by the very able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. It is gratifying to note that the Senator from Virginia will ask that the bill be brought up on motion at an early date.

I believe the proposed executive agreement is a very sound one. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I should like to say that it is proposals like this which point the way for a very real exporting of American economic freedom in the area affected by the bill, in which we can get the kind of cooperation that we can expect from the people of the Philippines.

The other night I spent a thrilling evening with Mr. Yen and Senator Cabili, of the Philippines, and heard them explain what the Philippines are trying to do by way of rural reconstruction.

To many of us, at first glance, it may seem that what they are asking for is something that is very nominal indeed, from the standpoint of our rural standard of living in America, and quite inadequate. Yet, when we see the great need for developing in the rural areas what the President of the Philippines is trying to bring to the rural population of that country, we realize all the more the importance of giving our support to the bill now being discussed.

I believe we have a great opportunity in this matter to demonstrate to Asia that the Philippines really are our exhibit A of economic freedom. They are, it seems to me, a very clear answer to the Communists, and demonstrates that we believe in something more than cliches, professions, and promises.

We have helped the Philippines obtain not only political freedom, but the economic freedom that goes along with it.

I hope that at a very early hour we may give a further demonstration of our belief in economic freedom by passing the bill now on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from North Carolina renews his objection, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief observation, if it will allay any concern that some Senators may have with reference to the programing of Calendar 869, H. R. 6059.

I do not believe any Senators who have expressed themselves about the bill question the fact that it is not normal calendar business. I can assure Senators that at a very early date the bill will be programed and brought before the Senate for final disposition.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILES FROM JAPAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 121) to investigate the effect of imports of textiles from Japan upon the domestic textile industry, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 2, after the preamble, to strike out:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to make an investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any textile product is as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting concessions granted by the United States under the agreement for the accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva on June 8, 1955, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities (either actual or relative) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic textile industry producing like or directly competitive products. The investigation required by this resolution shall be commenced with respect to any particular product on the date on which the concessions granted by the United States by the Geneva Agreement become effective with respect to such product.

And insert:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to keep currently informed regarding the impact of imports of textiles and textile products on the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products and to be prepared to act promptly on such investigations as may be requested by the President, or directed by resolution of either House of Congress, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or applied for by any interested party, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted in a trade agreement is, as a result in whole or in part of the concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas substantial reductions have been made in tariff rates on textile products in various trade agreements with foreign countries; and

Whereas more than 1 million persons are employed directly in the textile industry of the United States; and

Whereas in many sections of the Nation the entire economy of a community is tied directly to the healthy operation of the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry of the United States is a vital part of our national defense: Now, therefore, be it.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to study the effect of imports of textiles and textile products upon the domestic textile industry."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following the passage of Senate Resolution 121 a statement which I have prepared in support of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COTTON ON SENATE RESOLUTION 121

The pending resolution, which directs the Federal Tariff Commission to closely watch the effects on the domestic textile industry of the recent tariff reductions negotiated at Geneva, deserves prompt action by the Senate.

I have supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the general reduction of trade barriers throughout the world, but this can only be effectively accomplished if we know the full effect of such tariff reductions. The law directs the Tariff Commission to determine if the actual or relative imports of foreign-made products cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry. This resoluton will aid the Tariff Commission in carrying out its responsibilities in this matter.

There are a number of unusual conditions present in the domestic textile industry which seriously affect its health and vitality in New Hampshire and elsewhere. We cannot blindly accept drastic reductions ranging from 27 to 48 percent in textile tariffs without most carefully watching their effect on the United States industry and being prepared to move promptly if a danger to the domestic industry develops.

The textile industry in the United States employs more than a million persons. It provides almost 10 percent of the nonagricultural employment in the State of New Hampshire. It is one of the most competitive industries in the country. Not only is there keen competition within the industry, but competing products—such as plastics, synthetics, and other new fibers—have had a profound effect on the industry, especially since mills which handle cotton, rayon, or wool generally cannot produce the new fibers.

In contrast, the textile industry in many other countries is closely protected by government policy. It is often subsidized directly, through purchase of equipment or raw materials, or in the sale of goods to foreign countries. United States-made textiles have little or no opportunity to compete for markets in these countries, while their textile producers and their governments clamor for greater opportunity to sell in this country.

The American textile industry is also beset by a difficult problem in connection with the prices of raw materials resulting from the domestic farm price support program. If this country is to continue to protect the price and maintain the United States market for raw cotton, then a drastic reduction in the tariff will have a double-barreled effect, aimed at both the textile industry and the producers of cotton.

In addition, there are a number of other aspects which warrant the most careful review by the Tariff Commission. These include the national defense role of the textile industry, the unemployment which prevails in many segments of the industry—and which has left its mark in New Hampshire—the drop in exports of textiles produced in the United States, and other factors.

This resolution, of course, is a preventive measure. If the tariff reductions, which take effect September 10, 1955, do not affect the domestic industry, then no harm has been done. On the other hand, if serious damage should be threatened, then the Commission will be ready to move promptly and the time saved could easily mean the difference between continued operations or an early shutdown of many of our textile plants.

All of this indicates the importance of approving the pending resolution which I joined in introducing. I hope it will be approved and I hope the Tariff Commission will carry out its responsibilities with thoroughness and promptness.

While I hope nothing further will be needed, I shall be ready to take more affirmative action if the increased importation of textiles makes it necessary.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to all the Senators who joined in the resolution, and also to the Senate Committee on Finance and its able and distinguished chairman for prompt action upon the resolution which is of such great importance to the textile industry of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

The bill (H. R. 2406) to amend subsection (e) of section 1 title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared with reference to Calendar No. 871, H. R. 2406.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

The purpose of this bill is to amend the inheritance-tax law of the District of Columbia so that property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes, to the United States or the District of Columbia, or exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes, shall be exempt from any and all taxation.

At the present time, estate gifts specifically for charitable, educational, or religious purposes, would only be exempt provided the purpose for which such gift was to be put was entirely within the District of Columbia.

If this legislation is adopted, it will mean that all estate gifts, made for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, or to charitable, educational, and religious organizations would be exempt from the estate tax.

COMPENSATION TO OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE POLICE FORCE, THE UNITED STATES PARK POLICE FORCE, THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE, AND THE FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN EXTRA DUTY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2427) to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off when such days off are suspended during an emergency; which had been reported from the Committee on District of Columbia with an amendment on page 3, line 21, after the word "on", to strike out "the first Sunday following the date of its enactment" and insert "July 1, 1955", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force," approved August 15, 1950, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 4-904), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Whenever the granting of days off has been suspended and discontinued pursuant to this section, each officer and member shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his annual basic salary, compensation at the basic daily rate for each day of duty which he performs by reason of the suspension and discontinuance of his days off under this section. Any officer or member so performing duty shall be entitled to all rights, benefits, and privileges, and shall be subject to all obligations and duties to which he is entitled or to which he is subject on any regular workday. Such compensation shall be treated for the purpose of computing retirement compensation or relief payments, or for deduction, in the same manner as is compensation for duty voluntarily performed under subsection (e) of this section."

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 499), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Whenever the granting of days off has been suspended and discontinued pursuant to this subsection, each officer and member shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his annual basic salary, compensation at the basic daily rate for each day of duty which he performs by reason of the suspension and discontinuance of his days off under this subsection. Any officer or member so performing duty shall be entitled to all rights, benefits, and privileges, and shall be subject to all obligations and duties, to which he is entitled or to which he is subject on any regular workday. Additional compensation paid under this subsection shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing retirement compensation or relief payments under section 12 of the Act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1916, as amended, nor shall such additional compensation be subject to deduction as provided in section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia,' approved July 1, 1930, as amended."

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement concerning Calendar No. 872, Senate bill 2427.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Bible

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, when they are required to perform duties on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency.

This bill would take effect retroactively to July 1, 1955, the day on which it was found necessary to declare an emergency and to suspend days off for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force due to the current strike of employees of the Capital Transit Co.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, THE FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2428) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, and the Fire Department, of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (Public Law 74, 83d Cong.), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 101. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) or (c), the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force shall be at the rates set forth in the following table:

"Chief of Police	$13,438
Deputy Chiefs	9,094
Inspectors	8,335
Captains	7,085
Lieutenants	6,460
Sergeants	5,936
Corporals	5,472
Private, class 4 (3 or more years' service)	4,990
Private, class 3 (2 or more but less than 3 years' service)	4,707
Private, class 2 (1 or more but less than 2 years' service)	4,424
Private, class 1 (less than 1 year's service)	4,193

All original appointments of privates shall be made at the annual basic salary of $4,193 and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Metropolitan Police force shall be increased by—

"(1) $1,290, while he is assigned to duty as a detective sergeant:

"(2) $500, while he is assigned to duty as a precinct detective;

"(3) $323, while he is assigned to duty as a station clerk;

"(4) $291, while he is assigned to duty as a probational detective; or

"(5) $420, while he is assigned to duty as a motorcycle officer.

Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall apply to any officer below the grade of lieutenant.

"(c) Subject to the approval of the Commissioners, the annual basic salary of a private of the Metropolitan Police force shall be increased by an amount not to exceed $420 while he is assigned to duty as a technician."

Sec. 2. Section 102 (a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "$120" and "$200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$129" and "$215", respectively.

Sec. 3. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) or (c), the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be at the rates set forth in the following table:

"Fire Chief	$13,438
Deputy fire chiefs	9,094
Superintendent of machinery	9,094
Fire marshal	9,094
Battalion fire chiefs	8,335
Assistant superintendent of machinery	8,335
Deputy fire marshal	8,335
Captains	7,085
Pilots	6,803
Marine engineers	6,803
Lieutenants	6,460
Sergeants	5,936
Assistant pilots	5,416
Assistant marine engineers	5,416
Inspectors	5,174
Private, class 4 (3 or more years' service)	4,990
Private, class 3 (2 or more but less than 3 years' service)	4,707
Private, class 2 (1 or more but less than 2 years' service)	4,424
Private, class 1 (less than 1 year's service)	4,793

All original appointments of privates shall be made at the annual basic salary of $4,193 and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"(1) $420, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a deputy battalion fire chief;

"(2) $224, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator of a fire department hose wagon, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance;

"(3) $420 while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"(4) $224, while he is assigned to duty as a chief photographer.

"(c) Subject to the approval of the Commissioners, the annual basic salary of a private or an inspector of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by an amount not to exceed $420 while he is assigned to duty as a technician."

Sec. 4. Section 202 (a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "$120" and "$200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$129" and "215", respectively.

Sec. 5. (a) Retroactive salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that retroactive salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Congress), as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 63f–63k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. (a) This act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955.

(b) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in annual basic salary which result from the enactment of this act shall be sold and considered to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which has been prepared with reference to calendar 873, Senate bill 2428.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Bible

The purpose of this bill is to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, approximately 7.5 percent of each salary rate or other pay increment.

The bill would provide increases in the basic salaries, the special pay increments to which privates are entitled upon assignment, and the amounts of the longevity pay increments that are applicable to the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

The bill would take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955.

The cost to the District of Columbia would be $1,535,907.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

The bill (S. 985) to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there is hereby established an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 11 members, to be appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) five of the members of the Commission shall be Members of the Congress of the United States, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party;

(2) three of the members shall be selected from the executive branch of the Government, of whom, if practicable, one shall be from the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, one from the Department of the Interior, and one from the Department of State; and

(3) three of the members shall be selected from the general public, one of whom shall be a resident of Alaska and one of whom shall be a resident of the Pacific Northwest region of the United States.

(b) The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(c) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of six members. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(a) to make a thorough and complete study of the economic and military advantages of additional highway and rail transportation facilities connecting continental United States with central Alaska;

(b) to make a thorough and complete study of the most feasible and direct routes of rail and highway transportation between the United States and Alaska, in relation to the economic benefits to be derived therefrom by the United States, Canada, and Alaska; and

(c) to make a thorough and complete study of the most feasible feeder rail and highway routes connecting coastal ports and cities with the rail and highway facilities between the United States and Alaska, determined most feasible and beneficial by the Commission.

In making such studies, the Commission shall give particular attention to the feasibility of rail and highway facilities between the Pacific Northwest region and Alaska by the most direct route utilizing the Rocky Mountain trench. In determining the most feasible and beneficial routes for rail and highway facilities, the Commission shall take into consideration the proximity to such routes of suitable sites for airfields.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the Dominion of Canada and of the Province of British Columbia and with any commission or similar body appointed for such purpose by the Dominion of Canada, or the Province of British Columbia. The Secretary of State shall, at the request of the Commission, arrange for meetings with such officials and with such commissions or similar bodies of the Dominion of Canada or of the Province of British Columbia.

SEC. 4 (a) The Commission may, in carrying out its duties under this act, hold such hearings, take such testimony, sit and act at such places and times, and incur such expenditures as the Commission deems necessary. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in carrying out its duties under this act.

(b) The Commission is authorized to utilize the facilities, information, and personnel of the departments, agencies, and establishments of the executive branch of the Government which it deems necessary to carry out its duties under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to furnish such facilities, information, and personnel to the Commission upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman. The Commission shall reimburse each such department, agency, and instrumentality for the services of any personnel utilized. The furnishing of information by any such department, agency, or instrumentality shall be subject to such restrictions as the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality deems necessary for the security of the United States.

(c) In performing in duties under this act the Commission shall utilize all information available by reason of any surveys and plans made under authority of the act entitled "An act providing for a location survey for a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska," approved October 26, 1949.

SEC. 5. The Commission may delegate to any member of the Commission or to any committee composed of members of the Commission any of the duties and powers conferred upon it by this act, other than the duty of submitting reports and recommendations to the Congress pursuant to section 7.

SEC. 6. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall report the results of its studies and submit its recommendations to the Congress from time to time, and shall make a final report and submit its final recommendations to the Congress not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act. The final report shall include estimates of the cost of construction of rail and highway facilities along the routes determined most feasible and beneficial by the Commission, together with estimates of the economic benefits to the United States, Canada, and Alaska. The Commission shall cease to exist, and all authority conferred by this act shall terminate, 30 days after the date of submission of the final report.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $75,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties under this act. Until such time as funds may be appropriated pursuant to this authorization, the President is authorized to make available to the Commission, from any emergency fund available to him, such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement which I have prepared in explanation of Senate bill 985, to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Morse on S. 985, To Establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission

This bill would establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission to be composed of 11 members representing Congress, the executive branch, and the public at large. The members would be appointed by the President.

The Commission would be charged with making a thorough and complete study of the most feasible and direct routes of rail and highway transportation between the United States and Alaska, and of the economic and military advantages of additional rail and highway facilities. The Commission's report would be submitted to Congress within 2 years.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $75,000, and I want to emphasize that it does not in any way commit the Congress to any particular course of action beyond the study itself.

At the present time, the development of Alaska is hampered by the lack of transportation facilities between the Territory and the United States proper. It is the purpose of this bill to determine whether additional land transportation facilities are practical; and if so, what would be the most direct and feasible routes for highways or railroads to follow.

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING AND RELEASING RADIOLOGICAL INFORMATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 134) relative to the United Nations establishing a procedure for collecting and releasing radiological information was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate endorses efforts of our chief delegate to the United Nations to take appropriate steps to work to establish within the United Nations procedures to receive, assemble, and report on radiological information collected by the various States with particular emphasis on radiation effects on human health and safety.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which I have prepared with reference to Senate Resolution 134.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Morse on Senate Resolution 134, Relative to the United Nations Establishing a Procedure for Collecting and Releasing Radiological Information

This resolution was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations in lieu of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 which was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne] on behalf of himself and 27 other Senators.

In its original form, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 requested the President to "instruct our chief delegate to the United Nations to take whatever steps may be necessary to propose and urge the formation of an international scientific commission within the United Nations to study and determine the effects on living organisms of radioactivity released by nuclear explosions."

Senate Resolution 134 would endorse the "efforts of our chief delegate to the United Nations to take appropriate steps to work to establish within the United Nations procedures to receive, assemble, and report on radiological information collected by the various states with particular emphasis on radiation effects on human health and safety."

The resolution is in line with the position of the Department of State which intends to pursue the matter at the next meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

The problem of atomic fall-out is one which has been causing increasing concern in all parts of the world. The resolution would indicate that the Senate shares this concern and would lend support to the constructive proposal of Ambassador Lodge that the U. N. Assembly take steps to collate and disseminate such information as is available.

The Senator from Maine is to be commended for his initiative in this matter. The resolution should be a helpful contribution to the solution of a difficult problem, and I hope it will pass the Senate unanimously.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, calendar 875, Senate Resolution 134, has been agreed to today. I desire to commend the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne], the original sponsor of the resolution. I think it is the first time that a resolution of this nature, relative to atomic and thermonuclear information, has been brought before the Foreign Relations Committee; and I believe it is a very good beginning, because there is, of course, a close relationship between the development of nuclear and thermonuclear energy and the carrying out of a foreign policy and the promulgation of foreign relations.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne] is to be commended for taking this forward step; and I hope that much of what he is recommending will come to pass, because even to date we find that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, has advocated the establishment of a grouping on the order of the recommendation of the Senator from Maine, and that very likely something will be done at Geneva, next month, when the worldwide meeting on atomic energy will be held.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks relative to this outstanding resolution, which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne] be printed in the Record following the adoption of Senate Resolution 134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared relative to Senate Resolution 134, supporting efforts to provide within the United Nations procedures for collecting and reporting on information relative to radiation hazards to human health and safety, be placed in the Record following the action which was taken on that measure when it passed the Senate a short time ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Payne on Senate Resolution 134

The Senate now has before it for consideration Senate Resolution 134, supporting efforts to set up within the United Nations procedures for collecting and reporting on information on radiation hazards to human health and safety.

This resolution, which was unanimously reported out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is a substitute which I proposed to the committee in place of my original Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, introduced on April 13, 1955, and cosponsored by Senators Barrett, Beall, Capehart, Cotton, Duff, Douglas, Flanders, Fulbright, Green, Humphreys, Ives, Kefauver, Kilgore, Langer, Mansfield, McNamara, Monroney, Morse, Murray, Neely, Neuberger, Potter, Robertson, Sparkman, Stennis, Symington, and Welker.

My substitute did primarily two things: It made the concurrent resolution a simple Senate resolution in order to give the Chamber most directly concerned with foreign affairs a chance to act finally on this matter before adjournment. It also revised the wording of the original resolution in order to make it more closely conform to the proposal of a similar nature made by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in San Francisco on June 22, 1955.

Much has been said and written in the past year about the possible harmful effects nuclear explosions are having or might have on living things. The astounding and alarming fact, however, is that so many prominent experts disagree on the degree of danger. The Atomic Energy Commission, which has taken elaborate precautions and made extensive studies, have assured us that no harm is now being done.

But still the dispute rages on and with ever-increasing intensity, not only on the scientific but also on the political level. In studying this resolution, both the scientific and the political aspects of radiation hazards must be taken into consideration.

In considering for a moment the scientific aspects, the possibility that we could commit global suicide is a very real one. Cautious and limited testing of moderately powerful thermonuclear bombs by only a few nations probably would not lead to such a tragic result. But in addition to dealing with the current rate of experimentation, a United Nations study should also determine whether future stepped-up testing of even more powerful bombs will ultimately be a major menace to the life and health of all mankind. Thermonuclear devices of monstrous power greater than anything yet known are capable of being built by us and presumably by others.

President Eisenhower has said that our scientists were surprised and astonished by the results of the great bomb test in the Pacific in the spring of 1954. Human miscalculation can always occur. But we have reached the point where human error must be minimized.

This life-and-death question cannot be considered unilaterally by the United States or any other power. The problem surpasses national boundaries and must, therefore, be considered on an international level. Findings by the United Nations would receive wide publicity and would appear, not as self-serving pronouncements of the United States, but with a stamp of international impartiality which no one could misrepresent.

This resolution does not propose that the United Nations or any other international group be given any degree of control over our nuclear weapons testing or development program. But information on radiation hazards is not a proper subject for national secrecy. The nations of the world—both Communist and non-Communist—face the same danger on equal terms. It is just commonsense that every nation work together to collect and assess information on levels of radioactvity throughout the world and the degree of biological and genetic hazards presented by various levels. If and when it is determined that a danger threshold exists, then the United Nations might be able to take action to insure that no nation exceeds this threshold.

In wartime we know perfectly well that widespread use of hydrogen and atomic weapons would usher in a new dark ages for all of civilization. Consequently, we are working tirelessly for peace and for a sound program for the control of nuclear weapons.

But we must not be so foolhardy as to ignore the fact that potential peacetime dangers also exist. One way to help remove these dangers and to ease the mind and conscience of mankind is by pooling the scientific efforts of all the United Nations so as to facilitate collection and evaluation of information on radiation hazards. Once we have taken this first step toward international self-preservation through scientific and technical cooperation, we may find it easier to get together to settle outstanding political problems.

The second aspect of this problem—the political one—presents the United States with a great opportunity to demonstrate once again that we are a warm and human Nation, interested in the welfare of all people everywhere.

We know that the United States would be the first to call for self-regulation or international control if we felt that the health and welfare of a people was being endangered. But what we realize about ourselves, people abroad too often do not realize fully.

We should act now according to our principles of respect and love for our fellowmen, stepping out forthrightly to offer our full cooperation in an international attack on this terrifying problem. In terms of our own self-respect and the respect in which other nations hold us, we can indeed reap great benefits. Ambassador Lodge's proposal had already been well received by several Nations abroad. We can, in addition, give proof to the world of our humanitarian motives and of the fact that no nation need fear that the United States will ever, intentionally or unintentionally, use its mighty atomic power for any purpose but to defend itself in time of war and to advance the welfare of mankind in time of peace.

Ambassador Lodge has taken the first official step. Now it is important that the Senate back him up to show all the people of the world that the United States speaks with a single voice on this important question.

The late Senator Vandenberg, speaking of the atomic bomb, wrote shortly before his death, "I sometimes wonder whether the wit of man is competent to deal with this monstrous discovery." We can help prove that we in the United States are competent to deal with it by giving prompt Senate approval to this resolution and then by following it up with vigorous action in the United Nations.

In its report on Senate Resolution 134 the Foreign Relations Committee summed up the case for this resolution as follows:

"The committee believes that action of the sort proposed in the resolution here reported would be helpful in collating and disseminating such information as is available on the problem of atomic fallout. The resolution, which is approved by the Department of State, would put the Senate on record in support of the efforts of the executive branch to this end, and the committee recommends that the Senate take favorable action.

"In view of recent developments in the field of atomic energy there is no question about the importance of the problem covered by this resolution. The committee believes the United States should cooperate with other countries in setting up proper procedures so that available data may be assembled and the problem better understood."

I strongly urge that the Senate approve Senate Resolution 134.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelities, nervous disorders, mental illnesses, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 3, line 5, after the word "accredited", to insert "public"; and in the same line, after the word "and", to insert "other"; in line 7, after the word "other", to insert "public and"; in line 10, after the word "the", to insert "purchase and"; in line 15, after the word "palsy", to insert "tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "fees", to insert "and plans and specifications"; in line 20, after the word "representative", to insert "(and one alternate to serve in the absence of such representative)"; on page 5, line 4, after the word "appointments", to insert "Members of the Council shall receive the same compensation and allowances as are authorized in the case of members of national advisory councils in section 208 (c) of this act."; in line 12, after the word "the" where it appears the second time, to strike out "continental United States" and insert "States"; in line 20, after the word "Tennessee", to strike out "and Kentucky" and insert "Kentucky, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands"; on page 6, line 3, after the word "Utah", to strike out "and Nevada" and insert "Nevada, Alaska, and Hawaii"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "council and"; in line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "and have such applications approved" and insert "the Surgeon General for review and recommendation"; on page 7, line 9, after the letter "(b)", to strike out "If the Council approves the application, the Surgeon General shall make a grant-in-aid to the applicant in the amount applied for, or such lesser amount as the Council" and insert "The Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the Council, to make a grant-in-aid to the applicant in the amount recommended by the Council, or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General"; in line 17, after the word "construction", to strike out the comma and "including plans and specifications,"; in line 18, after the word "of" where it appears the second time, to insert "purchase and"; and in line 19, after the word "equipment", to insert "or both"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Medical Research Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. The Public Health Service Act (consisting of titles I to VI, inclusive, of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682)), is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE VII—MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 701. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(a) the ravages of certain devastating diseases causing widespread suffering, crippling, and premature death result in consequent loss of productivity to the Nation; an unnecessary economic loss to business and industry; severe financial impact on the families of the sufferers; an economic burden on local communities; and an impact on the defensive strength of the Nation;

"(b) promising new scientific developments remain unexploited because facilities for research are lacking or sadly deficient in those localities where research skills or patients are located;

"(c) there is a need to attract young scientists into this most important field, which need cannot be met if facilities to carry on research are denied them; and

"(d) it is sound public policy that, in our search for the causes of and cures for these devastating diseases, we encourage that freshness of vision and exploration of new ideas which can best be assured if research can be carried on in every region of the country and under competent local auspices in addition to that carried on directly by the Federal Government.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 702. It is the purpose of this title to provide for grants-in-aid to accredited public and other nonprofit universities and schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, hospitals, laboratories, and other public and nonprofit institutions, engaged in or competent to engage in research, for the purpose of defraying the cost of construction of facilities, or the purchase and installation of equipment, needed for the conduct of research into the causes of and possible cures for crippling and killing diseases, including cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, systic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 703. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, not to exceed $30 million, for the purpose of making grants-in-aid provided for in this title.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 704. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings; including architects' fees and plans and specifications, but excluding the cost of offsite improvements and the cost of the acquisition of land;

"(b) The term 'nonprofit' means owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(c) The term 'accredited' means approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the National Council on Medical Research Facilities (created by sec. 705).

"NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

"SEC. 705. (a) There is hereby created in the Public Health Service the National Council on Medical Research Facilities (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council'), to consist of the Surgeon General, who shall be Chairman, one representative (and one alternate to serve in the absence of such representative) of each of the national advisory councils attached to the National Institutes of Health, to be designated by the respective councils, and one additional member who shall be experienced in the planning, construction, or administration of a medical research facility, to be appointed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Vacancies on the Council shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. Members of the Council shall receive the same compensation and allowances as are authorized in the case of members of national advisory councils in section 208 (c) of this act. The Council shall cease to exist on June 30, 1958.

"(b) It shall be the function of the Council to act upon applications for grants-in-aid under section 706, and to make recommendations to the Surgeon General in connection therewith.

"(c) For the purposes of this title the States shall be divided into four regions as follows:

"Region I: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

"Region II: Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"Region III: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa.

"Region IV: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Alaska, and Hawaii.

"Grants-in-aid under this title shall be made in such manner that the sum obtained by adding (A) the total of such grants-in-aid made to any region, to (B) the total of the grants-in-aid made to such region by the Surgeon General for the same purposes from funds appropriated therefor prior to the date of enactment of this title, shall be approximately equal to the corresponding sum for each of the other regions. With respect to grants-in-aid made from the appropriations for the first 2 fiscal years for which appropriations are made pursuant to the provisions of this title, the Surgeon General shall be deemed to have complied with the provisions of the immediately preceding sentence if (A) there is utilized 80 percent of each such appropriation to make grants-in-aid in accordance with the provisions of such sentence, and (B) the total of the grants-in-aid to any region from the remaining 20 percent of each such appropriation does not exceed one-third of such 20 percent.

"APPROVAL OF PROJECTS AND PAYMENTS

"SEC. 706. (a) Applicants for Federal assistance under this title shall submit applications to the Surgeon General for review and recommendation by the Council. Such application shall be in such form and contain such information and data with respect to the applicant and the proposed facility or equipment, as the Surgeon General may by regulations prescribe, including a detailed plan of the contemplated construction, and a statement as to the purposes to which the proposed facility or equipment will be devoted.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the Council, to make a grant-in-aid to the applicant in the amount recommended by the Council, or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; but no grant-in-aid shall exceed one-half of the cost of construction of the research facilities, or one-half of the cost of purchase and installation of the equipment, or both, as the case may be."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO ACT OF JULY 1, 1944

SEC. 3. The act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the number of title VII to title VIII and by changing the numbers of sections 701 to 714, inclusive, and references thereto, to sections 801 to 814, respectively.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill does not provide for any additional authorization. There is in the law an authorization to grant assistance to non-Federal public and other nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy.

The authorization now in the act has no limit. It is an open-end appropriation under which any amount of money could be appropriated.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations declined to make appropriations under the existing authorization. It felt that there should be a limit on the amount of money to be authorized. The pending bill places a maximum of $30 million a year on the appropriation, and confines the authorization to a period of 3 years. It also provides for matching by the States, which existing law does not provide for. It also provides for an equitable geographic distribution, and spells out certain other conditions which do not now exist. The Committee on Appropriations insisted that all these provisions should be in the law.

It was at the suggestion of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report at the last session of Congress that I and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and at present the ranking member of that committee, introduced this bill conforming to the suggestions and requirements set out by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill broaden the scope of assistance?

Mr. HILL. No; it does not. On the other hand, it limits the money and also the period of time in which the authorization shall exist.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the bill is enacted, will it cost the Government any more money?

Mr. HILL. No. In the existing law far more money is authorized than will be authorized by this bill.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, beginning with line 4, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period in line 11, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Grants-in-aid under this title shall be made in such manner that the sum of such grants-in-aid made to any region shall be approximately equal to the corresponding sum for each of the other regions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes."

ANALYSIS AND REEVALUATION OF HUMAN AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 256) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the senior Senator from Alabama a question about the bill.

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to try to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MORSE. The Committee on the District of Columbia has been holding very interesting hearings on a bill which seeks to correct what its proponents claim are rank injustices in the legal principles which are applied by some courts in respect to the tests for insanity.

During the course of the hearings we have necessarily given consideration to some of the policies which still exist in the United States in the handling of persons who suffer from mental illness.

Take, for example, kleptomania. It is quite clear, as Dr. Overholser pointed out before the committee, that the kleptomaniac suffers from an irresistible impulse of some kind. We see its manifestation in the taking of the property of other people. But the kleptomaniac does not steal in the sense that a mentally healthy person steals. We know very well, as Dr. Overholser has pointed out, what the cause of the irresistible impulse is.

Am I to understand that under the bill which the Senator from Alabama is sponsoring this afternoon, it would be possible for those in charge of the study to give consideration also to some of what I think are the very archaic legal doctrines which are still being applied in the courtrooms to mentally ill persons?

Mr. HILL. I should say very definitely so. We are this afternoon considering House Joint Resolution 256, because it has passed the House. Of course, we wish to expedite the passage of legislation as much as possible; but there is also Senate Resolution 46, a companion resolution, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Alabama and approximately 31 of his colleagues, among whom the senior Senator from Oregon is one of the sponsors.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I have raised the question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon may recall that many years ago a very wonderful study was made by Dr. Flexner as to the problems and questions relating to the medical schools of the United States. I think everyone is in agreement that out of that study came many momentous changes. Much outstanding work was done as a result to give to our country the type of medical school we should have had and which we have attained, in succeeding years.

The study to be conducted under the joint resolution now being considered is of a kindred nature, with reference to mental health. It is proposed to conduct research into all the different phases of mental health.

The Senator from Oregon knows that today one-half of all the hospital beds in the country are occupied by persons suffering from mental illness. Mental illness alone is costing the taxpayers of the country a billion dollars a year. We know also that in years past we have not devoted the amount of study and research to mental illness that it should have been given. There has been too much of a disposition to commit persons suffering from mental illness to institutions, close the door on them, and more or less forget that such persons are so confined.

We find today that some institutions are doing very much more toward rehabilitating their mental health patients than are other institutions. The country should know why this difference. The resolution proposes a thorough and complete analysis and study of the whole question of mental illness.

Mr. MORSE. The reason why I raised my first point was that the language employed in the Senate Calendar in describing the resolution—"reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness"—is not as broad as that contained in the original Hill resolution.

I wanted to make a legislative history this afternoon which will leave no room for doubt that the group which will make the study will be expected, or at least will have the power, to make an analysis of the legal doctrines which are proving, or which may prove, to be a barrier to adequate treatment of the mentally sick at the present time.

Mr. HILL. It is under our laws, or what the Senator from Oregon refers to as legal rules, that so many of our people are committed to institutions today. I am quite certain that the laws pertaining to the mentally ill will be within the scope of the proposed study.

Mr. MORSE. The last point I wish to make is that the sponsorship by the Senator of the Hill resolution, and his acceptance of the House joint resolution in lieu of the Hill resolution, prompts me to say that the Senator from Alabama once again is demonstrating that he is one of the great humanitarians, not only of the Senate but of the entire country. In the field of mental illness, he is again taking the leadership, as he did a few years ago in connection with the Hill-Burton Act, and as he has done time and again on the floor of the Senate during his long tenure, when human values, human welfare, and human rights have been involved.

I commend the senior Senator from Alabama for the leadership he has given in the matter, and for his help in bringing to the voting point a resolution which ought to offer at least some ray of hope for the tens of thousands of men and women who are confined in the mental hospitals of America.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his exceedingly generous and kind words. I deeply appreciate them. But I must say that many others have worked on the resolution. The members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been very much interested in it, and have given of their best in behalf of the resolution.

Splendid associations such as the American Psychiatric Association, the American Association of Psychology, the Council on Mental Health of the American Medical Association, the National Mental Health Committee, and many other fine organizations, have made definite contributions to the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think this is a very important resolution. I should like to have the RECORD show that about 3 weeks ago, when the Committee on Appropriations was considering funds for the Selective Service, General Hershey testified that 37 percent of the young men who are called up are rejected. He said that 40 percent of the 37 percent were mental cases.

Two days following that, representatives of the Veterans' Administration appeared before the committee in behalf of their appropriation and testified that more than 42 percent of the patients seeking admission to Veterans' hospitals were mental cases.

In other words, while in the field of tuberculosis and other illnesses the charts have been going down, nevertheless, since World War II, both as to those who have been inducted and those who served in the war, the charts showing mental disorders have been constantly rising. Mental illness is a serious, terrible matter.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington, as chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations which handles funds for the Veterans' Administration, knows of the heavy burden which has been placed upon the people of the country, both for paying for hospitals to care for the mentally ill veterans, and to pay their disability compensation and pensions. In addition, there is very great distress over the fact that these fine, splendid young men are today suffering from mental illness. Every effort should be made to try to rehabilitate these persons.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The cost is terrific. There simply are not sufficient funds, apparently.

In connection with what the Senator from Oregon has said, in the State of Michigan alone approximately 600 veterans who would be eligible to enter veterans' hospitals for mental illness are now languishing in jail.

Mr. MORSE. That is true across the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true across the country. Likewise, alcoholism results in a great many mental cases, particularly among the young persons who are about to be inducted, and among those who are growing up. The condition is becoming most serious for both the Veterans' Administration and the Selective Service.

Any money which is spent to improve this situation will be money well spent, because of the tremendous sums which must be appropriated for hospitals alone for the veterans who have some form of mental illness.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not understand the figures given by General Hershey, as quoted by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. General Hershey said that 37 percent of those who were called up were rejected for one reason or another; and that 40 percent of the 37 percent were mental cases.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. More than 42 percent of those seeking admission and who were eligible to enter veterans' hospitals were mental cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not intend to object, by the widest stretch of the imagination, because I think it is a most desirable resolution. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of the committee, with whom I have had the honor of serving for 6 years. His leadership has been an inspiration to all of us. I think the committee has been a unit from the start in feeling that the resolution must be adopted.

I do not believe the people of the country have the slightest concept of the prevalence of the scourge of mental illness. In my own State of New York there are in the State hospitals more than 116,000 patients, at a cost to the people of nearly $150 million. The problem is growing, not becoming less serious. The resolution considered and reported by the committee, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama, will make it possible to study the causes, treatment, and care of the mentally ill. I think it is a fine resolution, a great step forward, and I congratulate the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind and generous words. As he so well stated, all the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been a unit in their support of the resolution. I wish to express my personal tribute to my colleagues on the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPERATION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The bill (H. R. 3253) to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the present law provides that the Commissioner of Education shall make arrangements for the education of children who reside on Federal property if, in his opinion, no local education agency is able to provide the children with suitable education.

The Commissioner of Education has interpreted the phrase "suitable" very strictly. He says, for example, that he cannot consider whether the local facilities are suitable if they do or do not have adequate space at the moment the decision is made. He insists he is precluded from considering not only prospective overcrowding, but transportation of students to the local schools, or problems of children of military personnel who are transferred in or out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know whether or not the bill would permit the erection of schools on Federal land by the State?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the State can do it, that is permitted, but the pending bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the construction of school buildings. As a matter of fact, the particular application of the pending bill is to high schools for children of marines at Quantico, Va. The schools are already in existence.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are already in existence?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are State schools, are they not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are Federal schools.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been trying to find out why there is a necessity for the proposed amendment of the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Commissioner of Education is saying he will close down the Marine Corps school, so that children of both enlisted and officer personnel may be forced to go to a local school 14 miles distant. That would require a trip of 14 miles each way. Though the local school is not at the moment overcrowded, it will be in the course of a year.

Furthermore, the term of the State school is not adapted to children of marine personnel, who are transferred in or out at times other than the beginning of a school term.

The bill takes away exclusive jurisdiction from the Commissioner of Education or the Secretary of the Military Department concerned, who, in the case of the Quantico school, would be the Secretary of the Navy. It requires joint agreement to close down the school, rather than the decision of only one. We think it is probable that the Secretary of the Navy would not consent to the closing down of the school at Quantico, and that therefore children would be permitted to continue going to that school.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I should like to say that Representative GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, who is chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, called me and advised me the pending bill was unanimously reported by the House committee, and also passed by the House of Representatives unanimously, and he urged me to do all we could to secure its passage in the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not opposing the bill; I was merely asking for an explanation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I may say that, so far as we can tell, the enactment of the bill into law would not result in any significant increase in Government expenditures, since otherwise the Government would have to pay the State of Virginia for tuition charges. Passage of the bill will permit children of Marine personnel to have schooling much closer to their homes, in a school that is not crowded, and in which a school term may be adapted to entrance and departure of military personnel, because in the Military Establishment the arrivals and departures of military personnel do not coincide with the beginning and ending of State school terms.

Mr. President, has House bill 3253, relating to the continued operation of certain schools on military installations, been taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3253), which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "education", to strike out "is" and insert "was", and in line 7, after the word "provided", to insert "on January 1, 1955, or thereafter."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CITATION OF EUGENE C. JAMES FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 135) citing Eugene C. James for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I am not at all in disagreement with the resolution, which has merit. When the resolution is brought up on motion, I expect to vote for it. But I believe the resolution is of sufficient importance to be considered on motion, and not during the call of the calendar. For that reason alone, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the resolution will be passed over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I have objected to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection by the Senator from Connecticut has been recognized by the Chair, and the resolution has been passed over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection, until I make a brief statement?

Mr. PURTELL. I am glad to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I concur in the position taken by the Senator from Connecticut, namely, that a measure relating to so grave a matter—the citing of a witness for contempt of the Senate, and the transmission of the papers to the Department of Justice—should not be acted upon during the call of the calendar.

However, I now ask unanimous consent that page 1 and down through the third paragraph on page 2 of the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that Senators may know about the acts which the subcommittee and the full committee regarded as contemptuous of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 872) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare investigating welfare and pension funds subject to collective bargaining as authorized by Senate Resolution 225 as amended, 83d Congress, 2d session, and superseded by Senate Resolution 40, 84th Congress, 1st session, caused to be issued a subpena duces tecum to Eugene C. James, 1640 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> Attendance pursuant to said subpena, which was duly served, was had on March 29, 1955, at which time the witness appeared.
>
> The said Eugene C. James, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said subcommittee to give testimony and produce documents and records as required by virtue of Senate Resolution 40, 84th Congress, 1st session. Eugene C. James, having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions, and to produce documents and records, which questions, documents, and records were pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, made answer as appears in the record of the said hearings on March 29, 1955, at Washington, D. C., which record is annexed hereto and made a part hereof and designated "Annex I."
>
> As a result of said Eugene C. James' refusal to answer questions and to produce documents and records pursuant to the said inquiry, as appearrs in the record annexed and designated "Annex I," the committee was prevented from receiving testimony, documents, and records concerning the mat-

ter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon this witness.

The committee was, therefore, deprived of testimony, documents, and records pursuant to the committee's inquiry propounded to and demanded of Eugene C. James, pertinent to the subject matter which under Senate Resolution 40, 84th Congress, 1st session, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions and produce documents and records as set forth in annex I is a violation of the subpena duces tecum under which the witness was directed to appear, answer questions, and produce documents and records pertinent to the subject under inquiry, and his persistent refusal to answer questions and produce the aforesaid documents and records deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent information and places this witness in contempt of the United States Senate.

After reviewing the testimony and other facts as set forth herein, the committee duly adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Eugene C. James to answer a series of questions and to produce documents and records before the said committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Eugene C. James may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law."

A copy of the committee minutes of July 12, 1955, follows. A copy of the subpena issued to Eugene C. James appears in annex I at page 576.

Mr. PURTELL. Let me assure the Senator from Illinois that I express the hope that the resolution will be brought up on motion very quickly. When that is done, I shall vote for the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made by the Senator from Connecticut, the resolution is passed over.

RECOUPMENT OF CERTAIN PUBLIC-SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first measure placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 3123) to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public-school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the Public School Board of Walker, Minn., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—let me say that I had the bill placed at the foot of the calendar because the bill involves school districts in Arizona, California, Washington, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. I wished to be certain of the facts in this case. Naturally these school districts are vitally interested because at the time when they received assistance, they were required to recoup certain amounts of money. I wished the record on this point to be crystal clear, for the purposes of the bill.

As the report of the bill so ably states, since that time the Federal policy has changed; and these districts have, as it were, been left out. The bill would repeal the recoupment provisions in the case of these districts.

I have received, as I suppose the Senators from the other States involved have also received, statements of some justifiable reasons for taking the proposed action. The bill would correct an inequity which developed, not when these districts were given help, but because of the change in Federal policy.

I wished to be sure to have the RECORD show that the bill involves the Marysville district in my State, the White Swan district, the Queets-Clearwater district, and the Moclips-Aloha district. There are several other districts involved. There are a number in Montana. There is 1 in Wisconsin, 1 in California, and 1 in Arzona. I do not see any listed in Minnesota.

I merely wished to have the RECORD clearly show the purpose of the bill, which has passed the House. I withdraw my objection, and hope for its immediate passage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator made reference to the State of Minnesota. The bill before us, House bill 3123, would amend the act of August 17, 1950, relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn., in Cass County, where the sum of $80,000 was to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of cooperating with the Indian school in that particular area. There is a proviso reading as follows:

> *Provided*, That in consideration of the amount heretofore appropriated and the amount which may be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, all Indian children residing in such district shall be admitted to the schools of the district without further cost to the United States for instructional, operation, and maintenance purposes.

In other words, if any additions are to be made to the school under this particular authorization, or to any other school, the recoupment features which were in the prior law would now be adjusted, so that all schools would be treated alike, rather than on the basis of the special legislation of the past.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I think it is a bill which should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3123) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France;

S. 1550. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada;

S. 1878. An act to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City., Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act; and

S. 2097. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, Virgin Islands.

EVELYN HARDY WATERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 845, House bill 3193, a bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this bill has already been discussed briefly while the calendar was being called. I shall not detain the Senate long.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the claimant to bring a suit against the United States under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act without regard to any statute of limitations or any lapse of time. The bill also provides that nothing contained therein shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

Briefly, the claimant is a woman 32 years of age. She was operated upon in the Naval Hospital at Pensacola, Fla. She is a woman of very modest means. As a result of the operation, she suffered paralysis, which was long continued, probably, as the claimant alleges, as the result of the spinal injection of an anesthetic.

For nearly 3 years she was under the care of Navy doctors either at Pensacola or Bethesda. As a result of the 3 years' delay she could not, of course, proceed under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The Senate is confronted with a choice of alternatives. It must either substitute its judgment for that of others better qualified and fix a sum of damages, which is obviously very difficult to do under such circumstances, or it must waive the statute of limitations and permit the claimant to go into court to prove her case and recover whatever damages may be just. It is my view that the latter course is highly preferable. It is that course which is provided by this bill, which I hope will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3193) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to advise that Calendar No. 700, S. 2391, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which has been the unfinished business for several days at the time of adjournment, will be taken up tomorrow.

Following the completion of action on that bill, a number of other bills will be taken up. I do not suggest that they will be considered in the order in which I shall announce them, but they will be taken up following the completion of action on the defense production bill either tomorrow or the days immediately following. They are:

Calendar No. 677, S. 59, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Calendar No. 830, Senate Resolution 129, to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Calendar No. 831, Senate Resolution 130, to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Calendar No. 832, Senate Resolution 131, relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee.

Calendar No. 879, Senate Resolution 135, citing Eugene C. James for contempt of the Senate.

Calendar No. 869, H. R. 6059, relating to revisions of the executive agreement concerning trade and related matters entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines on July 4, 1946.

Calendar No. 774, Senate bill 2253, to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Calendar No. 865, Senate bill 1352, for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

Calendar No. 866, Senate bill 1584, for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner.

There is no assurance that the bills will be taken up in the order in which I have stated them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ASSISTANCE IN VACCINATION AGAINST POLIO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 847, Senate bill 2501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2501) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill, reported unanimously from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is authored by 12 of the 13 members of that committee, meaning that the bill is authored by members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. The bill was unanimously reported to the Senate by all members of the committee present at the time.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had referred to it a number of bills relating to poliomyelitis vaccine. After public hearings and a series of executive sessions, the committee decided that the objective of protecting the Nation's children against paralytic poliomyelitis, which became a possibility as the result of Dr. Salk's discovery, could be realized without the creation of any new governmental mechanisms and without any major departure from established Federal, State, and local public health patterns.

The committee found and expert witnesses agreed that the established mechanisms through which the Federal Government for years has made grants to the States for public-health purposes could and should be used as the vehicle through which the Congress could best assist the States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis. Those grants have often been used by the States over the years for the purchase of vaccines and biologics used for the prevention of such diseases as smallpox, diphtheria, and whooping cough. Under such programs effective and smoothly working relationships between local physicians, local and county public health officers, State and Territorial health officers and the United States Public Health Service have become very well established and thoroughly accepted. The committee is convinced that we can best resolve the problem before us by using that same mechanism and following that same pattern, with only such minor adjustments as are necessary to meet the exigencies which may confront the several States during the months while poliomyelitis vaccine will be in short supply and legislatures will not be in session.

With these thoughts in mind, and with 12 members of the committee being authors of the bill—and I understand the 13th member does not object to the bill, and therefore the report is practically unanimous—the committee brings the bill to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to cooperate with the distinguished Senator from Alabama in supporting the pending bill.

Mr. President, S. 2501, the bill we are now considering, was reported unanimously from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is sponsored by 12 members of that committee, including all who were present at the meeting at which it was discussed and ordered reported.

S. 2501 is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis. It represents the answer found by the committee to many of the problems created by the impact of the announcement of the success of the Salk vaccine field trials.

Considering the diversity of viewpoints from which individual members of the committee approached the problem, as ranking minority member I am particularly gratified—as I think the Senate should be gratified—that this bill was reported unanimously. Much of the credit for this achievement of unanimity belongs to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the chairman, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who constituted an informal "working party" by request of the minority and majority members.

Unlike many bills resulting from such a situation, S. 2501 is a particularly good bill in that, insofar as I am aware, it is not merely a compromise. This bill represents the considered judgment of the members of the committee, individually and collectively, as to how the Federal Government can best assist the States in seeing to it that no child is denied the opportunity for vaccination, subject, of course, to the still-vexing shortage of supply, concerning which all witnesses agree the Government is unable to help.

The solution found by the committee is, as is so often the case in good things, a simple one. As the report states:

> The committee found and expert witnesses agreed that the established mechanisms through which the Federal Government for years has made grants to the States for public-health purposes could and should be used as the vehicle through which the Congress could best assist the States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis. Those grants have often been used by the States over the years for the purchase of vaccines and biologics used for the prevention of such diseases as smallpox, diphtheria, and whooping cough. Under such programs effective and smoothly working relationships between local physicians, local and county public health officers, State and Territorial health officers, and the United States Public Health Service have become very well established and thoroughly accepted. The committee is convinced that we can best resolve the problem before us by using that same mechanism and following that same pattern, with only such minor adjustments as are necessary to meet the exigencies which may confront the several States during the months while poliomyelitis vaccine will be in short supply and legislatures will not be in session. Therefore, the commit-

tee reports to the Senate the bill (S. 2501) amending section 314 of the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. President, the "expert witnesses" referred to above include representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the American Medical Association, and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. During the hearing I asked Secretary Hobby whether to the maximum extent possible the distribution of the polio vaccine should be handled on the basis of the same public health principles as are applied to the distribution of other vaccines. The Secretary's answer was unequivocal. She said: "I see no reason to upset the established public health practices, long established in the United States, in relation to this vaccine." The answer of the other witnesses to similar questions was in the same vein.

Since the committee reported S. 2501, I have been in contact with responsible officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as with the White House, and while they are frank to say that they would prefer a clearly defined level of Federal assistance, rather than the open-end authorization here proposed, they remain heartily in accord with the basic principles of the bill.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I believe sincerely that the pending bill is a good bill, and I urge that the Senate pass it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, first of all I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his very generous remarks concerning me, which I assure the Senate are not deserved.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The comments are very much deserved, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. IVES. In any event, I appreciate them. This was a case of teamwork. It was a case of everyone resolved to find a solution to an extremely vexing problem. It was a matter of finding a common denominator.

We were able to reach agreement and our goal through the outstanding leadership of the able chairman, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. That is how we were able to produce the result. All of us worked together, and we had a common goal. All of us intended to get there. We did not care particularly whether anyone received credit for it. We were after the product.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate the very generous comment of the Senator from New York, but I cannot sit here without expressing my appreciation to him for the very fine contribution he made to the bill.

Mr. IVES. That is very generous of the Senator from Alabama. However, I am sure I made no greater contribution than any other Senator. All of us were working toward a common goal. That is true of every member of the committee.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to comment briefly on S. 2501, which is now being considered by the Senate. It is gratifying that all except one of the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were able to reach agreement with respect to Federal legislation which will assist the States in providing children and expectant mothers with an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis. This bill would authorize additional appropriations by the Federal Government for the purchase and distribution of the poliomyelitis vaccine to the several States and Territories through existing machinery and procedures under the Public Health Service Act.

The authorization is open-end and distribution to the States will depend upon the actual appropriation made by the Congress pursuant to this authorization. If the Congress appropriates less than 100 percent of the cost of such vaccine to the several States and Territories, the available appropriation will be allotted to them in accordance with the existing provisions of the Public Health Service Act, which, in part, provides that the distribution of Federal grants will be in accordance with the population, financial needs, and special health problems of the States.

As the committee report clearly indicates, the Federal Government will make available to the States either funds to purchase the poliomyelitis vaccine or the vaccine itself. The Surgeon General will be authorized to promulgate regulations governing such distribution to the several States and Territories, including the establishment of priority groups, to whom the vaccine should first be made available. However, the distribution of the vaccine—and this is very important, Mr. President—within the States will be a matter solely within the jurisdiction of each individual State and Territory. I am hopeful that this bill will be favorably considered by both the Senate and the House of Representatives, in order that it may be enacted into law and the necessary appropriation made before Congress adjourns.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were able to reach agreement on the bill. It is testimony to the fact that problems which loom very large originally can be resolved if those taking part in the consideration of the problem try to approach it with an open mind and are charitable to the motives of those who at the moment differ from them.

We had a number of heated sessions. However, the ultimate solution reached by the committee is, on the whole, a desirable one. It represents not so much a compromise as a synthesis of the different points of view which were advanced.

It is very generous and characteristically modest of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to say that he did not have a very large share in the final decision. The truth of the matter is that he had a great deal to do with the final result.

I believe all members of the committee, and I hope the public as well, will appreciate the very constructive attitude which the Senator from New York displayed. It was a great aid to the committee.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], certainly deserves a very large share of the credit for this bill. He took great pains and explored every possible opportunity and every possible alternative, and he approached the whole problem with his characteristic kindness of spirit, keenness of mind, and ability to find a working agreement. It is very fitting, Mr. President, that the Senator from Alabama, who bears the name of the great surgeon, Joseph Lister, the father of antiseptic surgery, should see this bill through to its passage.

As we all know, Joseph Lister read a paper by Pasteur and came to the conclusion that in his time a large percentage of deaths in connection with surgery was due to infections caused by bacteria. He developed a method of using a carbolic acid wash to kill the bacteria, and thus revolutionized modern surgery. The work of Lister, in turn, inspired Pasteur to develop antitoxin, which, I believe, was developed in the 1870's in connection with rabies. From that time on, bacteria have been isolated and antitoxins found for them.

So I think, Mr. President, that Dr. Salk and those associated with him built on a great tradition established by Pasteur and by Lister. It is, as I say, extremely fitting that the implementation of this great work in the field of polio should be carried on by our distinguished colleague and friend who bears the name of Lister. I know that the inspiration which the father of the Senator from Alabama, one of the most distinguished surgeons in our country, gave to him, and the inspiration of Dr. Joseph Lister live on in the person of the Senator from Alabama, and the whole country is better for that fact.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his very kind and generous words. The bill comes here today as the result of the team play of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, all members of that committee making their contribution, and all working and cooperating together.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I desire to speak concerning polio as it exists in the State of Idaho. But, first, I wish to address my remarks to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is a friend of mine. I wish to commend him highly for his fine handling of the public health bills which have been considered and passed by the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. President, I wonder how many Members of this body have visited the Institute of Health in Bethesda, Md. I imagine but very few have been there, but I can say that institution, which is probably the world's most outstanding institution in the domain of public health, is a monument to America. I cannot pay too great tribute to the scientists and physicians who serve on its staff selflessly and devotedly for small pay.

I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that I commend him highly for his contribution to that great institution.

I hope nothing I may say will be construed as meaning that I am against vaccination of the youth of America to stamp out the dreaded disease, poliomyelitis.

On April 10, 1955, when the news of the great Salk discovery reached the American people, 650,000 Idahoans joined with all the rest of the world in saying, "God bless you, Dr. Salk. At last we have conquered this dreaded disease."

But, Mr. President, something has happened with respect to the State of Idaho. I expect to speak straight from the shoulder, first, about my feelings in this matter. I called the Surgeon General this morning and told him that if he desired to have a representative here, or if he desired to be present, I should like to have him hear my brief remarks upon this subject.

Instead of having the vaccine being a source of happiness and rejoicing in the State of Idaho, there are 650,000 people praying every night and wondering what is going to happen to their youngsters. Parents are crying on their pillows and praying that the treatment will finally prove successful. But as of this moment I feel that Idaho is a forgotten State because of the tragedy which has taken 7 human lives, directly traceable to the Cutter Laboratory vaccine, and the 118 cases of polio directly traceable to the use of that vaccine.

Those numbers are not very great, Mr. President, but when sheep eat a weed called halogetan and die as a result, the United States Government appropriates all the money which may be necessary to stamp out that poisonous weed. When a beetle attacks a piece of timber in the State of Idaho, money is lavishly appropriated to eradicate the pest. We do not hesitate a moment; we provide millions and millions of dollars to stamp out blister rust and other plant diseases.

Whenever heavy rains cause floods in the West or in other parts of the country, our Government is happy to go to the help of those in distress, and we give aid and comfort to them. Whenever too much sunshine or too much wind cause drought conditions, millions and millions of dollars are appropriated from the public treasury to give help to the suffering.

I ask Senators to examine the record to see what the United States Government has done with respect to the Salk vaccine program as it has existed in Idaho up to now. Three young men from the United States Public Health Service at Atlanta, Ga., came to Idaho, but they spent only a brief time there. I have been informed by reliable persons that those men were inexperienced. They did their best; they are not to be condemned.

The United States Public Health Service Laboratory at Hamilton, Mont., did a remarkable job for us. They helped us in an hour of distress and sorrow.

But what has the United States Public Health Service done about Cutter Laboratories? Have they asked Cutter Laboratories to come to Idaho and undo the damage which is traceable to their vaccine? We had in Idaho two batches of Cutter vaccine, namely, E–6058 and E–6039. Cutter Laboratories, of California, had the temerity to send one doctor to Idaho. He spent 2 hours there between airplanes. Cutter Laboratories seems to have forgotten that 7 deaths have resulted in Idaho from their vaccine; 118 cases of polio developed in Idaho from Cutter vaccine; 80 percent of those cases were paralytic.

Is that the way the United States Government should act? If I were the head of the United States Public Health Service, I would say, "Cutter, get busy in Idaho, or else you will go out of business. We will place a ban on you."

There has been a complete blackout concerning what has been happening to the Cutter vaccine. Why? The people of Idaho have been led to believe that everything has been cleaned up, everything has been washed up, and that everything is all right with Cutter. Yet the cases of polio continue to increase. The number of cases is building up daily. Only last week there was a buildup of four cases. Yet nothing is being done about the Cutter vaccine.

If the manufacturer of a hay baler found that his product was not working properly in Idaho, he would soon send a squad of experts into Idaho to make certain that the hay baler worked.

But Cutter Laboratories has not seen fit to assist in a human interest problem, which runs very deep in Idaho. Thousands and thousands of mothers and fathers of beloved little children—yes, and also of grown children—some of whom have died, are wondering what has happened in Washington, D. C.

Most of the tragedy in Idaho has resulted from batch No. E–6058. I am not concerned about all the fancy language that may be used. I have what is, in my opinion, positive proof that the tragedy has happened as a result of a batch of vaccine, No. E–6058 produced by Cutter Laboratories. What was it necessary to do in Idaho? We had to say to the American people that never again would Idaho accept mass inoculation with Salk polio vaccine. The record is very clear; 118 polio cases resulted among little children and other cases occurred among grown people who came in contact with the children. One father and two mothers who came in contact with vaccinated children died as a result. Four little children have died from inoculation with Salk vaccine. Eighty percent of the cases are paralytic cases. Yes, they are being cared for in hospitals throughout the State by the National Foundation. The National Foundation has done much valuable work in combating this dreaded disease.

But what will happen in the way of secondary treatment, after the patients leave the hospitals and are wearing braces and trusses, and are limping? Who will take care of them then? Who will give them the exercise they will need? Who will give them the treatment they will urgently need?

Idaho is proud to have as one of its facilities the Elks Crippled Children's Home, at Boise. That is a monument to the members of the Elks and also to the Shriners and the other organizations of Idaho which assist in supporting that great work. It is a small institution, composed of tarpaper-covered buildings which once stood on an airfield at Boise, Idaho, and were declared surplus.

After Idaho called off its series of mass inoculations, the great State of Utah, my neighboring State, followed suit on July 10, 1955.

What is happening in this matter, Mr. President? Do Senators realize that the polio season in the West never has started before July 15 in any year? That date usually marks the beginning of the polio season. But thanks to this terrible vaccine, which was used there, Idaho already has a backlog of 118 cases; and the normal season has barely begun. Thus far seven deaths have resulted directly from the vaccine. Utah has adopted the same rules as has the Idaho Department of Public Health.

When I first heard about what had happened, I was shocked, because I have a young daughter, as do many other Senators. I could not believe that the inoculation program would be announced, and that then the Government would sit by and smile at Cutter Laboratories, and do nothing whatsoever with respect to the almost criminal activity on their part.

I thought at first that it was almost a crime that that institution should suffer by the publicity it had received. But now I am wondering if they have received the punishment they so richly deserve.

Think of it, Mr. President. Think of it, Senator MORSE, of Oregon. Suppose a similar tragedy had happened in Oregon, and the manufacturer had sent there 1 doctor, who spent only 2 hours between airplanes. In all my public and private life I have never heard of any act so contemptible as that act on the part of Cutter Laboratories. Yet, the United States Public Health Service asks the American people to believe that something has happened to warrant the smoothing over of Cutter Laboratories. The Public Health Service says there is no more danger; that there is nothing more to be worried about concerning the Cutter vaccine.

Mr. President, try to tell that to the 650,000 persons in Idaho who love their children and who love their own lives. They will tell you, "Hogwash"; and rightly they should say that. I say it in a little stronger, rougher, western language.

It is about time for the United States Public Health Service to get busy. I mean exactly that. They are not going to fool the people of Idaho 1 day more. Neither will they fool the junior Senator from Idaho. We have been in constant contact with the situation. We know that Dr. Peterson, the administrative director of the Idaho Department of Public Health, in an interview published in the U. S. News & World Report, told the world of the activity and the danger of this vaccine. No; Idaho will not forget.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Idaho mentioned the great Dr. Peterson. I think he deserves much credit for the public service he has rendered in calling the attention of the people of the Nation to the facts as brought out in the U. S. News & World Report interview.

After reading that report, I sat down with persons who have been working on the problem within the Public Health Service and asked them for their rebuttal to Dr. Peterson. They confessed that they could give me no rebuttal to his statement.

I repeat what I said in the Senate weeks and weeks ago. No new techniques have been discovered. To the extent that anything is being done differently now, it is simply because techniques are being applied which have been known to exist from the very beginning, at the time the vaccine was released on April 12. That happens to be the sad fact about the matter.

I repeat on the floor of the Senate, we still need to call in the Public Health officials who have been working on the testing problem from the very beginning, put them under oath, and hear their story. Mr. President, if they are put under oath, they will verify what the great Dr. Peterson of Idaho has pointed out to the American people.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his fine remarks. Dr. Peterson and I were students at the University of Idaho. I have known him for many years as a man of unimpeachable integrity and great courage, a man who has dedicated his life to making people healthy in my State and in other States. There is not a bit of rancor or bitterness in the heart of Dr. Peterson. He only hopes and prays that Idaho may be saved from all this almost criminal activity, but he also prays that no other State in the Union will suffer as we in Idaho have suffered.

As I have stated, 32,000 of our first and second graders were vaccinated with the Salk vaccine. As I stated previously, that represents a large segment of our population, covering the entire State of Idaho. The problem can be realized, Mr. President, when I state that Idaho had four more cases last week directly traceable to the Cutter Salk vaccine. So the problem will go on and on. The polio season, Mr. President, is just now starting.

How about secondary cases? How many of us know about secondary cases? Do you realize, Mr. President, that if your little daughter were vaccinated with the Cutter vaccine, you, by coming in close contact with her, might very well lose your life, as has happened to 2 mothers and 1 father in the State of Idaho, to say nothing of the 4 little children who are now in graves, and to say nothing of those who have been paralyzed in the arm where the needle entered?

Mr. President, I do not care to have persons in the administration give me any high or fancy language about this problem. Let them go to Idaho, where paralysis has resulted in the member of the body where the needle entered. In the secondary cases, of course it is different.

When I heard of this tragedy, I prayed and begged the good Lord for guidance and counsel. I tried to do something for my State. Like the Senator from Oregon, I tried to get the best evidence I could in the locality where the problem is rampant. So I wrote a letter to Dr. Peterson, and I received a reply from him on July 11, 1955, in which he states:

> DEAR SENATOR WELKER: In response to your request, we are forwarding copies of letters sent to Idaho physicians as we believe this gives a good summary of the Idaho polio situation. We are also enclosing a graph showing the average of the past 5 years as this again will indicate the size of the problem. We do strongly believe that all except the first 12 cases were due to the vaccine used in Idaho as we had no reason to expect any unusual incidence this year. You will note from the letter to physicians that all virus isolations were type I polio and if this were a usual outbreak, we should be getting some type II and some type III.
>
> In addition to this information, we would like to call a few other items to your attention.
>
> 1. We have not received a report on the so-called Cutter incident.

Let me digress and leave the letter for a moment. The United States Public Health Service has not seen fit to investigate the Cutter incident. If it has, its officials have remained mute. They have not told the people of Idaho, who suffered so badly. Why the secrecy? I say to the Surgeon General and to others that the people of Idaho demand and are going to receive an answer. Why have we not received a report on the Cutter incident?

I resume reading the letter from Dr. Peterson:

> We believe that since Idaho was primarily involved, the Surgeon General should have forwarded us an early report. We recently read in a New York bulletin that their health officer was informed of the problems occurring in the Salk vaccine.
>
> 2. We object to the continuous statements of the Public Health Service in stating that the vaccination program should proceed as we do not believe the testing procedures can still be proven as adequate. It is believed that none of the safety tests being used for this vaccine are as sensitive as the injection of the vaccine in the human being.
>
> 3. Since the beginning of the outbreak, we have requested assistance from the Public Health Service and have now had a total of three men assigned to Idaho for short intervals to assist us in our investigation. While we deeply appreciate the aid given us, we believe the Idaho problem was of sufficient importance to have rated the assignment of a top epidemiologist. We are attempting to carry out rather complete studies, but we are not specialists in the field of poliomyelitis and would still like counsel and guidance in continuing these studies.
>
> 4. We note in the report today from the Public Health Service that the Cutter incident is apparently over. Further, that the need for epidemic emergency has passed. We in Idaho, who are still getting cases reported, cannot concur in that statement.

Leaving the letter of Dr. Peterson, let me digress to say this: It may well be that we are sitting on a keg of dynamite by which thousands and thousands of persons—yes, more than that—might be obliterated by primary and secondary cases. Of course, I am not a medical man, and they may laugh me out of the ball park, but I judge a poker player by his chips.

Mr. President, Idaho has suffered to the tune of 114 cases, because of the presence of this vicious serum. Cases are still occurring. If they are still occurring, and if there may be carriers as a result, what is to prevent the greatest epidemic of all time in the State of Idaho? It will not happen as long as the junior Senator from Idaho is able to do anything in behalf of his people.

Going back to the letter:

> 5. We wish to emphasize the assistance which has been given by the Rocky Mountain Laboratory of the Public Health Service.

That is the great serum center which developed the vaccine for what we call Rocky Mountain spotted fever. They have done a fine job, with their limited facilities, in helping the State of Idaho. The people of the State of Idaho had to go only a few miles, but they could not get available persons who had been testifying on television programs all over the Nation. None of them could come to Idaho and give their advice. In the letter Dr. Peterson is praying and asking for help. Where does he get his help? He gets it from right across the line, in Hamilton, Mont. If one goes fishing in Idaho, he passes through Hamilton to get there.

I continue reading from the letter:

> Please let us know if we can give you further information regarding our problem and we want you to know we do appreciate your inquiry and your interest.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> L. J. PETERSON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks letters sent to every doctor in Idaho by Dr. Peterson, telling of this tragic history of the Cutter Salk vaccine in the State of Idaho, which has resulted in a considerable breakdown of morale of every parent who loves his child or every person in Idaho who loves his fellow man, and who hopes and prays that he may forget the terrible scourge of polio.

No, it has not happened. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, all of the letters referred to by the Doctor in his statement.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boise, June 15, 1955.

DEAR DOCTOR: Dr. Carl Eklund and the staff at the Hamilton, Mont., United States Public Health Service Laboratory have inoculated 27 monkeys with Cutter vaccine shipped to Idaho for the mass vaccination program. All of these monkeys were inoculated about May 31.

Seventeen monkeys were inoculated with undiluted vaccine, 9 with vaccine from lot No. 6058, and 8 from lot No. 6039. One monkey inoculated from lot No. 6039 became ill in 4 days. Two monkeys inoculated wtih lot 6058 became ill on the fifth and the ninth day. The remaining monkeys are still healthy. The ill monkey inoculated with 6039 developed typical clinical poliomyelitis. This monkey was autopsied and microscopic findings were typical of poliomyelitis. Spinal cord emulsion from this monkey produced growth in tissue culture in 7 days and type I virus was isolated from this tissue culture. The ill monkey from lot No. 6058, also autopsied, showed microscopic evidence of typical poliomyelitis; the virus was grown on tissue culture and showed type I poliomyelitis. The study of the third ill monkey has not been completed.

Concentrated virus from lot No. 6058 was injected into 5 monkeys and concentrated vaccine from lot 6039 was injected into 5 monkeys. To date, none of these monkeys have shown any sign of illness.

A suspension of cord tissue was inoculated into two other monkeys from the monkey which developed poliomyelitis from 6039. Both of these monkeys developed clinical poliomyelitis. These two monkeys have been autopsied, but complete study results are not available at this time.

All of the remaining monkeys who do not become ill will be observed for a 30-day study period at the end of which time blood and microscopic studies will be done to determine any evidence of subclinical infection.

To date there have been 54 isolations of type I virus: Six of these have been from vaccinated children who were diagnosed as having poliomyelitis; 10 have been from individuals developing poliomyelitis who were associated with vaccinated children; 4 have been from individuals who developed no illness but were associated with vaccinated children; 30 have been from individuals who did not develop poliomyelitis but were exposed to individuals who developed poliomyelitis after association with vaccinated children; and 4 isolations have been from individuals who had no known association with vaccinated children or with individuals with poliomyelitis. Only type I virus has been isolated. Incidentally, one positive isolation was obtained from a physician who was a contact of a vaccinated case.

Attached is a complete tabulation of all the cases of poliomyelitis reported since the tabulation of May 27.

It seems to be almost impossible for the department to maintain a complete and accurate listing of physicians and their addresses. Some physicians in the State have not been receiving these letters only because of this lack of a complete listing.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.

Poliomyelitis cases reported from May 27 through June 14, 1955

Case	Initial	Town	Sex	Age	Date vaccinated	Date contact vaccinated	Onset of illness	Comment
58	D. L	Twin Falls	F	8 years	Apr. 21		May 6	Nonparalytic.
59	F. M. O	Tensed	F	do	Apr. 22		June 7	Stiff neck and back.
60	R. C	Lewiston	M	12 years		Apr. 19	May 23	Brother vaccinated. Nonparalytic.
61	R. B	Kamiah	M	1 year		do	do	Sister vaccinated. Left arm and leg paralysis.
62	D. B	Lava Hot Springs	M	40 years		do	May 21	Daughter vaccinated. Nonparalytic.
63	R. R	Nezperce	M	34 years		do	June 1	Son vaccinated. Paralysis both legs, right arm.
64	H. H	Idaho Falls	M	2 years		do	May 30	Brother vaccinated. Paralysis left leg.
65	F. H	Shelley	M	4 years		do	June 1	Sibling vaccinated. Stiff neck.
66	J. P	Paris	M	3 years		Apr. 20	May 17	Sister vaccinated, ill May 1, 1955. Leg paralysis.
67	A. N	Montpelier	F	33 years		do	June 4	2 children vaccinated. Died.
68	S. M. E	Boise	F	5 years		do	do	Sister vaccinated. Paralysis right leg.
69	M. S	do	F	2 years		do	June 7	2 siblings vaccinated. Nonparalytic.
70	W. J	Orofino	M	6 years		do	June 9	Sister vaccinated. Paralysis left leg.
71	R. M. F	Declo	F	14 years		Apr. 21	(?)	Brother vaccinated.
72	L. L	Boise	F	10 years		(?)	May 10	Sibling vaccinated. Nonparalytic.
73	R. A	Idaho Falls	M	14 years		(?)	May 18	Do.
74	J. M	Mountain Home	M	9 years		(?)	May 25	Contact with vacation school children. Nonparalytic.
75	K. K	Boise	F	3 years		(?)	May 21	Sister vaccinated. Paralysis unknown.
76	T. C	do	F	21 months		(?)	May 31	Sister vaccinated. Paralysis left leg.
77	L. M	Montpelier	F	14 years		(?)	May 29	Vaccinated relatives. Paralysis right leg.
78	J. A. B	Sandpoint	F	6 years			May 9	Associate of vaccinated children. Died.
79	E. K	Firth	F	22 months			May 21	Vaccinated playmate. Paralysis right leg.
80	J. W	Boise	M	2¼ years			May 23	5 vaccinated cousins. Site of paralysis unknown.
81	J. W	do	F	6 weeks			June 2	Cousin of case No. 80. Weakness in back and neck.
82	O. S	Twin Falls	F	32 years			May 23	No known association. Nonparalytic.
83	B. R	Burley	F	3 years			May 25	No known association. Arm paralysis.
84	C. S	Twin Falls	F	12 years			(?)	No known association. Nonparalytic.
85	K. N. J	Payette	F	3 years			May 27	No known association. Paralysis both legs.
86	D. S	Idaho Falls	M	18 years			(?)	(?).

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boise, Idaho, June 3, 1955.

To: All Idaho physicians.
From: F. O. Graeber, M. D.:

Dr. Louis P. Gebhardt, Department of Bacteriology, University of Utah, College of Medicine, reports the isolation of type I poliomyelitis virus from a vial of the vaccine forwarded from the stock of this department.

To date, there have been 6 isolations of type I virus from diagnosed poliomyelitis cases and 13 type I virus isolations from family associates of diagnosed cases. In addition, there has been an isolation from a child who had a minor illness following vaccination and another isolation from a well sister of this child. Both of these two isolations were also type I virus.

The total number of poliomyelitis cases reported during 1955 are 13 cases prior to vaccination, 19 cases reported in vaccinated individuals, and 42 cases in associates of vaccinated individuals.

As vaccines are released for use by the Public Health Service, the lot numbers are given to the Idaho Department of Public Health and if any physician has any vaccine on hand which he might wish to use, he can consult this department to see whether that particular lot has been approved for use.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boise, Idaho, May 27, 1955.

Dear Doctor: Stool specimen isolations of type I poliomyelitis virus have now been made from four patients who received the poliomyelitis vaccine. One isolation of type I virus has been made from a child who had a minor illness following vaccination and four isolations of the same type have been obtained from well family contacts of cases. The throat swab from 1 vaccinated child and from 1 well contact of a vaccinated child has also shown type I virus. Many specimens are still under examination.

It is felt that as much information as possible should be obtained about the present situation in Idaho. The proposed plan of study is as follows:

I. An attempt will be made to obtain three stool specimens and acute and convalescent blood specimens from every child who develops poliomyelitis following immunization or contact with a vaccinated individual. Stool specimens and blood specimens will be obtained from the members of the families of vaccinated individuals to determine whether poliomyelitis following vaccination is as contagious as the poliomyelitis which is usually encountered.

II. Stool specimens and acute and convalescent blood specimens will be obtained insofar as possible from individuals in whom poliomyelitis has been or is suspected and where a history of previous administration of vaccine or contact with a vaccinated individual cannot be obtained so that the type of virus may be determined. In these cases specimens from family contacts will not be secured.

III. To determine the extent of infection among children who receive the vaccine, it is planned to try to arrange to obtain blood specimens from approximately 400 children. An area where little disease has been reported following the administration of the vaccine and areas where there has been definite poliomyelitis and minor illness reported will be used. These specimens will be studied by Dr. Melnick at Yale with the complement fixation test and at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory in Hamilton, Mont., with neutralization tests to determine the extent of recent infections with the three types of virus known.

IV. Muscle evaluations by physiotherapists using standard procedures will be made on all diagnosed patients between 30 and 40 days after onset and again 90 to 100 days after onset. Information gained in these evaluations will be used to determine whether poliomyelitis following vaccination is more severe and has a different anatomical distribution than poliomyelitis generally seen. This study, it is thought, may also show the difference in severity in vaccinated as compared to contact cases. (Thus far it would appear that the contact cases have been much milder than cases in vaccinated children.) The physiotherapist making these checks will in each case contact the attending physician before making the evaluation and a report of the evaluation will be sent to the physician.

NOTE.—Blood specimens of patients and family contacts should be secured with sterile syringes and placed in sterile stoppered tubes. If possible, 10 cc. should be secured.

About 1 ounce of stool specimen is needed for examination. This should be placed in an ointment jar or a small container with an overlapping lid and as soon as possible frozen in the freezing compartment of a refrigerator or in a deep freezer. If a local or State representative of the health department can be notified, these specimens will be picked up for transshipment to Hamilton.

To date 138 physicians have returned the questionnaire which was mailed last week. Ninety-two physicians gave negative replies, 46 physicians reported that they had seen a total of 130 vaccinated children who showed some symptoms of poliomyelitis but in whom no definite diagnosis was made. Eighteen contacts of vaccinated children were reported who demonstrated some of the symptoms of poliomyelitis, but who were not definitely diagnosed as such. It is of interest that in several instances the physician's own children apparently were involved.

A complete tabulation of all cases of poliomyelitis reported to the State health department since January 1, 1955, and a map showing the distribution of the vaccinated and contact cases are enclosed.

IDAHO STATE HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.

Poliomyelitis cases reported from January through May 26, 1955

Case	Initial	Town	Sex	Age	Date vaccinated	Date contact vaccinated	Onset of illness	Vaccine lot No.	Comment
1	C. L.	Weiser	F	16 years					
2	D. C.	Idaho Falls	M	9 months					
3	M. S.	Boise	F	15 years					
4	D. P.	Twin Falls	M	4 years					
5	C. T.	Weiser	F	2½ years					
6	S. P.	Filer	F	17 years					
7	D. C.	Boise	F	20 years					Nonparalytic.
8	D. Y.	Murtaugh	M	17 years					
9	T. D.	Twin Falls	M	11 y ars					Do.
10	S. H.	Council	M	8 years					Reported Apr. 29, 1955.
11	T. P.	Boise	M	16 years					
12	G. R.	Felt (Teton County)	M	8 years					
13	S. P.	Pocatello	F	do	Apr. 18		Apr. 23	E6039 or E6058	Died. Bulbar. Left arm injection.
14	C. S.	Moscow	F	7 years	Apr. 19		Apr. 28	E6058	Bulbar. Left arm injected and paralyzed.
15	C. B.	do	F	do	do		Apr. 29	E6058	Nonparalytic. Left arm injected.
16	J. K.	do	F	do	do		Apr. 26	E6058	Died. Left arm injected and paralyzed.
17	D. C.	Orofino	F	8 years	do		do	E6039 or E6058	Quadriplegia. Intercostal paralysis.
18	S. V.	Malad	M	7 years	do		Apr. 27 to 29	E6039 or E6058	Right arm paralyzed. Weakness left arm, right leg involved.
19	J. S.	Pocatello	M	6 years	Apr. 20		Apr. 26	E6058	Involvement of left leg.
20	B. P.	Lewiston	F	8 years	Apr. 21 or 22		do	E6039 or E6058	Left and right arm paralyzed. Intercostal muscles.
21	D. C.	Preston	M	7 years	Apr. 21		Apr. 29	E6058	Left arm injected. Neck paralysis.
22	S. B.	Page	F	5 years	do		Apr. 27 to May 1	E6039 or E6058	Left arm injected and paralyzed.
23	G. K.	Strevell	M	7 years	do		Apr. 28	E6039 or E6058	Do.
24	U. C.	Jerome	M	do	Apr. 19		May 2 to 6	E6039 or E6058	Left arm injected. Nonparalytic.
25	C. H.	Cascade	F	8 years	do		May 2 to 8	E6058	Do.
26	D. E.	Idaho Falls	M	7 years	do		May 7	E6039 or E6058	Died. Bulbar. Left arm injected.
27	J. G.	Paul	F	do	do		May 14		Left arm injected. Paralyzed left leg.
28	K. A.	Grace	F	do	do		Unknown		Do.
29	J. G.	Orofino	M	do	Apr. 21		May 1 to 5	E6039 or E6058	Left arm injected and paralyzed.
30	G. E.	Caldwell	M	6 years	do		May 4	E6039 or E6058	Nonparalytic.
31	A. D.	Driggs	F	do	Apr. 25		May 5	E6058	Left arm injected and paralyzed.
32	B. K.	Oxford	M	13 years		Apr. 19	May 4		Brother vaccinated. Paralyzed right leg.
33	R. A.	Lewiston	M	3 years		do	May 14		Sister vaccinated.
34	N. P.	Preston	F	9 years		do	May 11		Brother vaccinated.
35	J. P.	do	F	3 years		do	May 8		Sibling—Case No. 34. Weakness in left leg.
36	J. B.	Jerome	M	7 years		do	May 19		Playmate—Case No. 24.
37	T. T.	American Falls	M	5 years		Apr. 20	May 12		Paralysis both legs.
38	C. M.	Kimberly	F	10 years		do	May 11		Nonparalytic.
39	R. M.	Rupert	M	32 years		do	May 14		Nonparalytic polio. Contact illness May 7, 1955.
40	V. H.	McCammon	M	20 months		Apr. 19	May 16		Paralysis right leg. Sister vaccinated.
41	P. R.	Boise	M	35 years		Apr. 20	May 15		Died. 2 children vaccinated.
42	P. P.	Bailey	F	4½ years		do	May 16		Paralysis legs. Minor illness contact.
43	C. O.	Caldwell	M	4 years		Apr. 21	May 1		Brother vaccinated.
44	R. H.	Bonners Ferry	M	13 years		Apr. 27	May 23(?)		Family contact.
45	R. C.	Mountain Home	F	20 months		Unknown	May 8		Minor illness vaccination contacts. Paralysis right leg.
46	A. G.	Boise	M	6 years		Apr. 22	do		Paralysis both legs. Sister vaccinated.
47	J. G.	do	F	4 years		do	do		Paralysis left leg. Sibling—Case No. 46.
48	L. S.	St. Anthony	F	do		April 21	May 13		Twin sisters vaccinated. Dysphagia. Paralysis right leg.
49	A. A.	Caldwell	M	8 years		Unknown	May 14		Sister vaccinated. Dysphagia.
50	C. D.	Lewiston	F	16 years			May 12		No close contact.
51	I. B.	Mountain Home	F	33 years		Unknown	do		Paralysis right arm. Daughter vaccinated.
52	S. S.	Deary	F	9 years		do	May 13		Niece vaccinated.
53	M. J. C.	Pocatello	F	2 years		Apr. 19	May 18		Contact with 2 vaccinated children. Paralysis right leg.
54	S. H.	Shelley	F	4 years		do	do		Questionable weakness left arm.
55	A. F.	Nampa	F	do			May 16		No close contact.
56	A. D.	Tyhee	M	12 years		Apr. 19	May 21		2 members family vaccinated. Nonparalytic.
57	P. S.	Murtaugh	F	11 years			May 16		Weakness of left arm.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
BOISE, *May 16, 1955*.

DEAR DOCTOR: In our May 12 memorandum we indicated that we had knowledge of three cases of poliomyelitis developing in close contacts of Salk vaccine inoculated children. At the time this is written (May 16, 3 p. m.) we have had a total of nine such cases reported to us. We have believed from the beginning that this was a new significant development. Data concerning the nine contact cases that have been reported to us is as follows:

Case	Age (months)	Contact of—	Vaccination date	Onset illness vaccinated child	Onset illness contact	County
1	20	2 neighbors	Apr. 28, 1955	May 8, 1955	May 8, 1955	Elmore.
2	6	Sister	Apr. 22, 1955	Apr. 29, 1955	do	Ada.
3	4	do	do	do	do	Do.
4	10	do	Apr. 20, 1955	Apr. 30, 1955	May 11, 1955	Twin Falls.
5	4	do	Apr. 21, 1955	(?)	May 13, 1955	Fremont.
6	8	do	(1)	(?)	May 14, 1955	Canyon.
7	13	do	Apr. 19, 1955	(?)	May 4, 1955	Franklin.
8	33	Daughter	do	(?)	May 12, 1955	Elmore.
9	5	(?)	Apr. 20, 1955	(?)	do	Power.

[1] Apr. 19 or 20, 1955.

We have appreciated the fine cooperation of the physicians in this trying situation. Because we believe that information that can be obtained now may have far reaching consequences and may influence vaccination programs for years to come, we believe that it is important that we have as complete information as possible. We, therefore, ask your assistance in completion of the attached questionnaire. If epidemiological studies are indicated in the cases that you report to us no investigation will be made without your prior approval nor will names be used in any other way without your permission. To avoid duplication of reporting we believe that we must have names, but if you wish to report by initials and age, we will have no objection.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.

POLIOMYELITIS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many cases have you seen in vaccinated children who showed some symptoms of poliomyelitis, but in whom no definite diagnosis was made? ☐

2. How many vaccinated children have you seen in whom a definite diagnosis of poliomyelitis was made? ☐

3. How many contacts of vaccinated children have you seen who demonstrated some of the symptoms of poliomyelitis but were not definitely diagnosed as such? ☐

4. How many contacts of vaccinated children have you seen in whom a definite diagnosis of poliomyelitis has been made? ☐

Name or Initials ______________________
Age ______________________________
Town _____________________________
Vaccinated?
Contact?
Onset _____________________________
Paralysis __________________________
——— ——— M. D.

POLIOMYELITIS

DEAR DOCTOR: This morning the health department received a phone call from the United States Public Health Service Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga., alerting us to the fact that cases of poliomyelitis were developing in close contacts of vaccinated children who themselves had not been diagnosed definitely as having polio.

At the time we received this call we had had no such cases reported in Idaho. However, shortly after the call we received reports of 3 such cases at Mountain Home and Boise. At Mountain Home a 20-month-old child developed polio who had been in close contact with 2 children who had received the vaccine. In Boise, a younger brother and sister of a vaccinated girl developed polio. In each case the vaccinated children had an elevated temperature and headache about the 7th day after vaccination, and the contacts developed polio on the 11th and 12th days following this minor illness of the vaccinated child. According to the information we received from Georgia, all the cases of this nature thus far reported, have been limited to contacts of children who had received Cutter vaccine.

A recapitulation of Idaho's experience in the poliomyelitis field to date is as follows:

Thirty-two thousand children given Salk vaccine between the 19th and 27th of April.

Two lots of Cutter vaccine used. Lot numbers were E6058 and E6039.

As far as can be determined about 14,000 children were inoculated with E6058. All of the cases have been reported in children who were vaccinated with lot E6058.

To date 15 vaccinated children have been reported to us as having paralytic polio. Three of these children died.

The inoculation period of these 15 cases has ranged from 6 to 17 days with the majority being the 7th day.

As of May 10 a total of 62 cases of poliomyelitis had been reported in the United States among children receiving the Salk vaccine. By company the number of cases and the number of children inoculated was:

Cutter Laboratories, 51	294,000
Eli Lily and Co., 10	2,250,000
Wyeth, Inc., 1	580,000
Parke Davis	635,000
Pittman Moore	390,000

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.
MAY 12, 1955.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boise, Idaho, May 20, 1955.

DEAR DOCTOR: Epidemiological evidence gained by the study of the Idaho poliomyelitis cases indicates that the poliomyelitis vaccine was the factor causing the appearance of these cases. Epidemiological evidence is as follows: There was no poliomyelitis in the State of Idaho at the time the vaccination was instituted. Following vaccination, 17 cases of poliomyelitis were reported with an average incubation period of 7 days. These cases were peculiar in that the first site of paralysis was always the extremity into which the poliomyelitis vaccine was injected. Since in Idaho the vaccine was administered into the arm, the polio cases showed a predominance of arm paralysis, intercostal paralysis, and bulbar symptoms. To attempt to gain further information regarding the causation of these poliomyelitis cases, throat swabs and stool specimens were obtained from patients and their family contacts. To date, type 1 virus has been isolated from the stool specimens of two of the paralytic poliomyelitis cases, from a family contact of another paralytic case, from a child who showed only minor symptoms 6 days after immunization. A family contact of this child, who remained healthy, also had virus in a stool specimen. Type 1 virus has also been reported to have been isolated from post vaccination cases in Montana and California. It is believed that it is more than a coincidence that only type 1 poliomyelitis virus has so far been isolated. In spontaneous poliomyelitis cases occurring over such a wide geographical area it would be expected that type 2 or type 3 poliomyelitis virus would also have been isolated. According to a representative of the manufacturer, the vaccine used in Idaho was prepared exactly according to the official Salk method. The vaccine was tested by the approved tests for safety and by these methods no live virus was detected. It would appear that the known methods of testing for safety, involving tissue culture methods and experimental animals, cannot assure one that there is not sufficient virus present to infect human beings. To increase the amount of formaldehyde to insure absolute safety would reduce the antigenicity of this type of vaccine so greatly that its value as a vaccine would be doubtful.

The isolation of virus from patients and from well family contacts readily explains the occurrence of the 13 secondary poliomyelitis cases which have been reported during the past week. Continuing studies of these contact cases are being made and a week from now perhaps we will have further information to present.

The time relationship of poliomyelitis cases to immunization has indicated that the use of these particular lots of vaccine not only caused clinical poliomyelitis in some recipients of vaccine, but what was more serious it may have caused carriers to appear in the contacts of the vaccinated individual.

At a meeting last night with the physician members of the State polio planning committee, it was agreed that the Idaho Department of Public Health would not participate in any mass poliomyelitis vaccine program for an indefinite period.

Since our report to you, we now have a total of 17 primary paralytic cases and 13 contact cases. A complete tabulation of the contact cases is as follows:

Case	Age (months)	Sex	Contact of—	Date of illness	Date of paralysis	County
1	20	Female	2 neighbors	May 8, 1955	May 12, 1955	Elmore.
2	6	Male	Sister	do	do	Ada.
3	4	Female	do	do	do	Do.
4	10	do	do	May 11, 1955	May 13, 1955	Twin Falls.
5	4	do	do	May 13, 1955	(1)	Fremont.
6	8	Male	do	May 14, 1955	May 15, 1955	Canyon.
7	13	do	7-year-old	May 4, 1955	May 10, 1955	Bannock.
8	33	Female	Daughter	May 12, 1955	May 15, 1955	Elmore.
9	5	Male	Neighbor	do	do	Power.
10	3	do	Sister	May 14, 1955	May 18, 1955	NezPerce.
11	9	Female	do	May 13, 1955	do	Latah.
12	9	do	Brother	May 11, 1955	do	Franklin.
13	3	do	do	May 4, 1955	do	Do.

[1] Unknown.

Eighty-one physicians who returned the questionnaire, which we sent to you earlier this week, have reported that they have seen a total of 57 inoculated children showing some of the symptoms of poliomyelitis, but in whom no definite diagnosis was made. Nine contacts of vaccinated children were reported as showing some symptoms of poliomyelitis in whom no definite diagnosis was made.

Sincerely yours,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Boise, July 7, 1955.

DEAR DOCTOR: A total of 102 isolations of type I virus have been reported to date. Thus far there have been no isolations of type II or III.

At the time that the new testing procedures for the Salk vaccine were announced, Dr. Eklund, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, had on hand 500 cubic centimeters of Cutter vaccine which was sufficient to conduct a test according to the new testing procedures as set up by the United States Public Health Service. Fifty tissue culture tubes, as the procedure calls for, were inoculated with this 500 cubic centimeters of vaccine. Only one tube has shown cell necrosis. It would seem evident that if only 1 tube out of 50 is positive in a test procedure using known live virus vaccine that the testing procedure is not very sensitive. The possibility of not detecting live virus under these circumstances might be great.

Dr. Eklund has completed study of 78 of the approximately 200 bloods that were drawn from vaccinated children in Bannock and Bingham counties. Of the 78 studied, 85 percent showed antibodies to type I virus; 90 percent showed antibodies against type II virus and 76 percent showed antibodies to type III virus.

Not only have the children thus far studied shown antibodies against all three types of poliomyelitis, but they have shown antibodies of very high titres. It can be said that these children's antibody titres are of the order of those found in adults and in individuals who have had an attack of the disease.

In the past, dead virus vaccines used in humans have not resulted in high antibody levels. The surprising fact that these children are showing high antibody titres against all three types might indicate that the vaccine used this spring in Idaho not only contained live type I virus but also contained live type II and III virus. The continued isolation of type I virus might seem to refute this. However, it could be explained on the basis that type I virus because of greater virulence, outgrows the other two types and thereby masks their presence in the testing procedures.

Dr. Melnick at Yale University has also been studying these bloods that were drawn from the vaccinated children in Bannock and Bingham counties. His work is not complete. He has reported, however, that a great majority of the tests thus far run have been positive to his complement-fixation test. This test is designed to indicate recent infection with poliomyelitis.

At a meeting on July 5 with the Medical Advisory Committee of the State Poliomyelitis Planning Committee and with several owners of drugstores in Idaho, it was agreed that:

1. The Idaho State Department of Public Health will not in the foreseeable future accept any vaccine from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for the completion of second shots.

2. If poliomyelitis vaccine is made available through congressional action, none of this vaccine will be accepted by the Idaho State Department of Public Health for a mass immunization program.

3. When the vaccine is again approved by national authorities, the Idaho State Department of Public Health will cooperate to the extent necessary so that commercial supplies of vaccine will be available through drugstores in Idaho for physicians desiring to use the vaccine.

Some of the reasons for the above decisions are as follows:

1. The high antibody titres being reported for children who were vaccinated this year would indicate that the second inoculation is not necessary. As mentioned above, it seems evident that the great majority of these children have protection comparable to that which they would have received if they had had poliomyelitis. It would, therefore, seem unwise to give booster shots at this time to children who have already obtained antibody levels far exceeding the level expected from a full course of dead virus vaccine.

2. With 107 cases of poliomyelitis having been reported to date and with the probability that Idaho has been heavily seeded with poliomyelitis virus, it is agreed that mass poliomyelitis vaccine programs should be avoided.

3. It is felt that there is some reason to believe that the only effective Salk poliomyelitis vaccine is a preparation containing live virus. If this assumption is correct, then a vaccination program involving only a portion of the population cannot be justified because of the carrier state which will inevitably follow the use of such a vaccine.

Some of the factors which have made the department feel that it should proceed with extreme caution are as follows:

1. The Francis report of the trial program in 1954 showed that there was no difference in nonparalytic poliomyelitis among children vaccinated as compared to the controls.

2. There was no significant difference in the incidence of paralytic poliomyelitis between vaccinated and control 6-year-olds in the trial program last year.

3. The Francis report of the trial study last year indicated wide variations in the antibody producing response of the various lots of vaccine used. A few lots were rated as very good with others being reported as fair down to lots of very poor. It would still appear it must be proven that the very good lots last year did not contain living virus.

4. One of Dr. Salk's basic concepts in the preparation of his vaccine was that inactivation of poliomyelitis in the presence of 1–4000 formaldehyde was a straight line phenomenon. It was Dr. Salk's premise that at the end of 72 hours all virus was dead.

The "White Paper" released by Surgeon General Scheele for the United States Public Health Service, states that instead of this being a straight line phenomenon, that it is actually curvilinear. (This same report indicates that some of the drug firms were reinactivating particular batches of vaccine 3 and 4 times and finally throwing some batches away. Under present regulation it is permissible only to reinactivate once, if after the original inactivation there is still found to be living virus in the preparation.)

5. The "White Paper" mentioned above states that no one knows how many live particles of poliomyelitis virus are necessary to infect a human being.

6. Again it is stated in the "White Paper" that it was felt that in great measure, the safety of this vaccine was dependent upon the manufacturing process itself. The paper goes on to say that in light of the Cutter incident, the safety testing procedures now become much more important. A little later it is stated that it is agreed that the monkey test is not sensitive enough. This places all of the reliance for safety on tissue cultures. It is believed by this Department that none of the safety tests being used for this vaccine are as sensitive as the injection of the vaccine into a human being.

7. It has been reported that millions of doses of vaccine are available. The continued delay in the release of vaccine for use is felt to indicate that things are not going smoothly.

8. It seems peculiar, that over two months later, what happened in the preparation of the vaccine at Cutter Laboratory is not known. One inference that can be drawn is that nothing was wrong.

9. Caution must be used in comparing the attack rates of poliomyelitis between vaccinated and nonvaccinated groups. As an example, if a small portion of a community's population were inoculated with live virus, the number of cases resulting would probably be small because of the unusual, artificial portal of entry. At the same time these vaccinated individuals would become carriers and there might result many cases in the nonvaccinated population. The variance in the number of cases among the vaccinated as compared to the nonvaccinated might then be interpreted to mean that the vaccine was effective in the prevention of poliomyelitis.

Attached is a map which shows the distribution of the cases which have occurred since the vaccine program began.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
F. O. GRAEBER, M. D.

Addendum.—Dr. Elkund has just reported that it would appear that Type III poliomyelitis virus is causing the necrosis in the single positive tube in the 1 out of 50 tubes mentioned above.

Incidence of poliomyelitis in Idaho, by month, ages 6, 7, 8, 1949–1955

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
January	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
February	2	3	1	0	0	2	0
March	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
April	0	0	0	0	1	0	11
May	1	0	1	1	0	0	14
June	6	2	0	0	0	1	5
July	12	0	1	8	0	2	(1)
August	28	3	3	10	2	4	-----
September	14	8	1	8	2	6	-----
October	14	6	5	12	1	2	-----
November	12	5	3	2	4	2	-----
December	6	0	7	3	0	1	-----
Total	95	28	22	45	11	21	-----

[1] To July 11.

Polio cases by month reported, Idaho—1938–55

Year	Total	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1955	------	3	2	3	13	51	28	[1] 10	---	---	---	---	---
1954	132	5	4	1	2	3	2	8	24	42	22	12	7
1953	97	3	2	3	3	1	2	5	13	21	11	17	16
1952	353	3	4	5	0	7	3	33	89	75	70	36	28
1951	144	3	4	3	1	3	0	6	24	24	36	15	25
1950	161	15	15	4	2	4	8	5	14	40	35	15	4
1949	510	5	6	3	4	4	26	76	155	95	71	46	19
1948	122	13	4	12	2	8	7	18	16	13	7	14	8
1947	371	9	0	1	1	1	1	16	50	43	110	75	64
1946	48	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	8	16	11	7	3
1945	24	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	10	7	4	---
1944	15	1	1	1	---	---	---	1	1	2	5	1	2
1943	15	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	1	10	2	---	---
1942	6	---	1	1	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	1	1
1941	10	2	---	1	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	4	---
1940	66	8	1	---	1	4	2	9	3	17	15	6	---
1939	35	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	1	2	8	16	6
1938	12	1	3	2	---	---	---	---	2	2	1	1	---

[1] To July 11.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in reading from an article appearing in the Idaho Daily Statesman—the largest newspaper in Idaho—under date of July 13, 1955, I desire to read first the headline appearing on page 20, as follows:

> Peterson Says Children Received Live Polio Virus.

I now read the article itself:

> Tests indicate that at least part of the 32,123 Idaho children who received Salk polio vaccine shots this spring were inoculated with live polio virus, L. J. Peterson, acting State health director, told the Boise Kiwanis Club during the group's noon meeting in the Owyhee Hotel Tuesday.
>
> The United States Department of Public Health's laboratory at Hamilton, Mont., has isolated live polio virus from both lots of vaccine used in the State, he said.
>
> Tracing the history of the polio outbreak in Idaho since the vaccine first was administered April 18 of this year, Peterson said that up to that time the incidence of that disease in the State was "very low" and that "we were not facing an epidemic."
>
> Through noon Tuesday, he said, Idaho has had 114 reported cases of the disease this year.

Mr. President, we should keep in mind that a few moments ago I talked to the doctor, and he told me there were 118.

I read further from the article:

> Twenty-one of these cases were among children who received the vaccine, Peterson said. On May 12, he added, "association cases" began to break out. These cases were among persons in constant contact with vaccinated children.
>
> Now, Peterson said, "tertiary" cases are being discovered among persons in contact with the latter group.

That means that we are having what amounts practically to murder on the installment plan. There is a primary case, and then a secondary case, and then a carrier who comes in contact with the secondary case. Where will this end, Mr. President?

I read further:

> "Where this will end," he said, "we don't know. It is difficult to cope with because it never has happened before."
>
> He pointed out that Idaho has not yet reached the polio season which usually begins about the middle of July.

> How many polio carriers have been created in the State through the polio-vaccine program, Peterson said, is impossible to determine. He said 30 Pocatello families were tested for virus after children in the families were inoculated. Although there was no illness in any of these famlies, he added, eight persons were found to have live virus in their bodies—they had become carriers.
>
> Only one bright spot has been found in the whole program in Idaho. Peterson said tests of inoculated children indicate that the single injection of live virus has made them more immune to polio than children who received two injections of ordinary virus.
>
> Peterson was critical of the handling of the polio vaccine problem by the United States Department of Health, Welfare, and Education. He said they have not properly publicized the fact that live virus was found in vaccine by makers other than the Cutter laboratories which furnished that used in Idaho and the fact that more than 199 polio cases followed the administration of the Salk vaccine in other States.
>
> NO MASS INOCULATIONS
>
> He said the State of Idaho definitely will not sponsor further mass polio inoculations but that, when it is cleared, it will be made available to pharmacists of the State and to physicians for use on their own initiative.
>
> He expressed doubts that the present type of vaccine ever will be completely safe because the line between safety and potency is so narrow. He said new tests formulated to test the safety of the vaccine are simply more of the same tests which failed to protect the children of Idaho this spring.
>
> Peterson criticized the Health Service because "we can't get a report from them on the Cutter vaccine," but said he believes that the Cutter laboratory was a victim of ineffective controls.
>
> "We made a bad mistake," he said, in reference to Idaho's mass vaccinations. "We admit our mistake and we won't make the same mistake again."
>
> * * * * *
>
> In Pocatello, Dr. Jacob E. Wyatt, director of the southeast Idaho health district, backed up Peterson's immunity statement.
>
> "In fact," he said, "a higher level of antibodies shows up this year after one shot than last year in the test of the three-shot series. It appears the Salk vaccine used in Idaho did not contain dead virus and was more potent that it should have been."
>
> Wyatt also said specimens from Bannock and Bingham County children had been tested at Yale University and the USPHS laboratory at Hamilton, Mont.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield at this point?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it should be pointed out once more, for the record, that if the vaccine which was injected into the Idaho children had been tested, batch by batch, by Government testers, the live virus would have been discovered and the vaccine would have been removed from circulation. I think that point goes to the whole heart of the failure of the Government to do the testing job which should have been done.

I repeat that I think it is inexcusable that a single batch of vaccine was ever made available to the public until the Government itself had subjected it to a second test. The theory was that the drug companies would do the testing, and that the Government would accept their tests, by way of protocol. However, I think such action was inexcusable. Each one of the batches should have been tested by the Government after the drug companies had placed on the batches their stamp of approval; and I believe that still should be the rule.

Mr. WELKER. Of course that should be the rule, Mr. President. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

I am trying to state some reason why this happened. Perhaps it was because of the sudden desire to get this program under way on April 10, the birthday of the man who did so much to find the means of preventing this dreaded disease. I am trying to find some way out. But, Mr. President, there is no way to explain the activity of the Public Health Service with respect to the after-effects and the after-action of this dread disease, which was brought about by bringing two batches of Cutter vaccine into my State, where it ruined the lives and the bodies of 118 precious little children, in addition to killing 2 mothers and 1 father merely by coming into contact with it. There can be no excuse for that, testing or no testing. It means that someone in the United States Public Health Service ought to be tested by the test which is applied to men who are elected to the United States Senate. They should be asked, "Are you sincere? Will you do the job you were sworn to do?"

I do not like the idea that those men can smile and overlook my State of Idaho. The people of Idaho have honored me highly, and I am proud to represent them. I do not like the idea that members of the United States Public Health Service think they are so smart, so cute, that they cannot let Dr. Peterson know the result of the Cutter examination.

I have made a little independent investigation of this subject. This will probably rock some Senators back on their heels. What do Senators think of this, Mr. President?

First, the United States Public Health Service at Atlanta, Ga., did a wonderful thing for the State of Idaho. They called Dr. Peterson and said, "Look out for secondary infection. The parent or anyone else who comes in contact with the person who has been vaccinated may come down with polio." That was a great thing that the Public Health Service did.

Then, what was the contemptible, lowdown thing that was done by members of the Public Health Service? They called Dr. Peterson and asked him to keep that matter secret, and not disclose it to the mothers and fathers of the State of Idaho, or of the Nation.

Let one of them stand up and tell me that they did not do that. Let one of them stand up and tell me that they did not say they would refuse to give any further publicity to the cases which arose because of the Salk vaccine.

Mr. President, I have spoken at length, and I have spoken with a good deal of emotion about this matter. But when a Senator is thousands of miles away from his people, and they are wondering whether or not he can help their State, is it not time for a Senator to stand up and say something about the Salk vaccine, about the coverup of the Cutter Laboratories, and the coverup of the secondary infection, which will not be denied, and cannot be denied? Is it not time for a Senator to stand up and say something about the coverup of the fact that the Public Health Service would not give any further publicity to this subject? Mr. President, why on earth should there be any secrecy on this subject? The truth ought to be told to the American people.

I venture to say that had these facts been related a few minutes ago when the proposed Salk vaccine legislation was being discussed, it would have caused Senators to pause and think twice. Like any other American, I pray my Heavenly Father that this vaccine will be perfected to the point where it can be used effectively and safely by American children, grownups, and teenagers alike. But I do not want to take any more double talk from the Public Health Service, or anyone else in authority on this subject.

This is not a political issue. I am not about to criticize Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, or the present Secretary, or the Surgeon General. I am criticizing the young men down the ladder, with a long string of degrees, who treated my State as they have treated it.

After all, a human life is just as valuable in Idaho as it is in New York, or as valuable as it might be on Meet the Press, or any of the other television shows I have been looking at, in justification of the Salk vaccine.

I digressed a moment ago. I must come back to Dr. Wyatt. Dr. Wyatt also said specimens from children in Bannock and Bingham Counties—2 of the 44 counties of my State, huge in area—had been tested at Yale University and at the United States Public Health Service laboratory at Hamilton, Mont. Reading further from the article in the Idaho Statesman of July 13:

> He said the tests of some specimens indicated presence of the type 3 polio virus, but more tests would be necessary to prove it. Up to now, only type 1 has been isolated in Idaho this year.

Mr. President, my colleagues have been very gracious in listening to me as long as they have listened. This matter affects me very deeply. I have a daughter, an only child, who might be taken away or paralyzed, as were the 118 others in the State of Idaho.

I wonder if Senators read an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning. The article is found on page 8. The dispatch is dated July 17. This is a dispatch from London, by Ernie Hill, of the Chicago Daily News Service. The headline is "British Seek Less Virulent Polio Shots."

I ask Senators to follow the thinking and logic of the British people, as compared with that of Dr. Peterson.

Moreover, the people of Britain were "free loaders." They were getting the Salk vaccine free, and they quit it. There must have been some real, tangible reason why they quit it.

I quote from the article:

> LONDON, July 17—British medical authorities are continuing their research to develop a safe and effective polio vaccine after deciding to abandon the use of Salk vaccine from the United States.
>
> That announcement was made by Dr. Graham S. Wilson, director of the Public Health Laboratories Service.

> "The Salk vaccine is out so far as we are concerned," said Wilson, "We are convinced it is wrong to inject a healthy child with something that can possibly make him ill."
>
> Wilson said that after 5 million children in the United States were vaccinated, some 100 cases of paralysis developed.

Mr. Wilson did not happen to know the Idaho story quite correctly.

Continuing with the quotation:

> He said it was indicated that 60 to 80 of these resulted from vaccination virus.
>
> Wilson said it appeared that one out of every 70,000 vaccinated contracted paralysis as a result. He said Britain wanted to reduce this danger before going into a program of public inoculation.
>
> Salk vaccine imported here probably will be destroyed, he said.
>
> Britain is continuing its researches based on the Salk methods but attempting to find a less virulent vaccine.
>
> Wilson said it appeared that the Salk vaccine contains some foreign matter derived from the tissues on which the virus is cultivated.
>
> This, he said, makes it difficult to insure that every particle of virus is acted on by the formaldehyde used to kill it. He said it was difficult to be scientifically certain of destroying all the bacteria or virus with such a substance as formaldehyde.
>
> "It appears," he said, "that there is a very narrow range of safety between effectiveness and danger."
>
> He said the conclusion was inescapable that children are more susceptible to the virus than are any animals used in testing. Monkeys, he said, might fail to develop paralysis if some living virus remains in the vaccine but a child would become ill.
>
> Wilson said the virologists in Britain were skeptical of the Salk method and favored instead trying to develop "a vaccine containing a living attenuated virus like those which had proved so successful against anthrax in man and swine fever and cattle plague in animals."
>
> He stated that this use of Salk vaccine, so far as Britain was concerned, had been thrown back into the experimental stage and that Britain was searching for a vaccine with fewer virulent strains.
>
> He said he believed that a less virulent vaccine would be safer to give children even though the formaldehyde had failed to kill any virus.
>
> The British are working at a research center in the Gambia, in West Africa, trying to develop a less virulent and safer vaccine.
>
> Most of the natives in the Gambia, it is stated, have had polio without developing paralysis and it is hoped that experiments there will lead to developing a milder vaccine.
>
> Kidneys of monkeys are being flown from the Gambia to London for research purposes. This overcomes the problem of importing live monkeys.

In conclusion, let me say that I know there is not a Member of the Senate who is not in sympathy with the people of Idaho and with the people of every other State, whether they have lost one child or whether they have lost 10 children, or whether other people have lost the use of members of their body. There is no one in the Senate who does not have a deep feeling toward the problem in Idaho.

It is my prayer and my hope that Dr. Salk will reach the place in history he so richly deserves, particularly when the vaccine has been perfected.

I heard the Senator from Illinois talk about men like Pasteur. It gives one a feeling of inadequacy to realize that he cannot do as much for human beings as those great men have done.

Let me say again, Mr. President, that the United States Public Health Service had better get on the job. They do not have any option on any job in the Government for any length of time, particularly if they fail to investigate one death, one batch of vaccine, or one paralyzed person in the United States.

I do not expect that there will be a mass horde of so-called experts going into Idaho.

They waited since April. They waited all this time. I wonder why they waited. It is possible to get to Idaho in a few hours. They waited. Why did they wait? They waited because they wanted public sentiment to be hushed up. They wanted people to forget what I believe was gross negligence on their part.

On behalf of the people of Idaho I beg Senators to stand as a bulwark and to make certain that the Public Health Service does the job it is supposed to do. They should do the same kind of job they have done in so many other fields.

A moment ago I paid tribute to my friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his work in connection with the great Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. The men in that institution are dedicated men. They are the best in the world. They see to it that what they do is sound and safe. Every overt act of theirs is sincere. We do not find people in such positions acting like little men, who cover up, and who one moment give warning to my people of a secondary infection which might cause paralysis, and then shortly thereafter call for a hushing up of the matter, so that the people of Idaho will not know about it. We do not find them acting like little men and saying, "We will not publicize any more of these terrible reactions to the vaccine."

Mr. President, I am not here to destroy any corporation, firm, or business. However, I would be ashamed if I were affiliated with Cutter Laboratories. I would hide my head in shame. To think that they should have the temerity, knowing of the tragedy in my State, knowing that parents were losing their loved ones, or seeing their little children paralyzed for life, knowing people that were losing the use of their arms or legs, to send to Boise, Idaho, one doctor who spent 2 hours there between airplanes.

I thank the Presiding Officer and my fellow Senators for honoring me by listening to what I have to say on this subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to the distinguished chairman of the committee, on which I have the pleasure of serving.

We tried long and hard to come to a proper decision as to how the program should be put into operation. I discussed at some length with the senior Senator from New York the amendment he proposed, and I was heartily in accord with him as he outlined the purposes of the amendment in his speech.

I supported the President's approach to the problem.

I make these remarks at this time because of the 13 members of the committee I am the one member who did not go along. Therefore, I wish to explain to the chairman why that was the case, and to state the decision I have reached after having had some of the objectionable features of the bill explained to me.

I approved of the President's approach, because it closed the open end. He asked for $28 million, and I was firmly convinced that that sum would do the job.

As the chairman of the committee will remember, other bills were introduced calling for expenditures of up to as high as $130 million.

When the senior Senator from New York first made his proposal, it more or less closed the open end. It was my misfortune, however, not to be able to attend the meeting when the amendment was finally adopted, because I had to be at another committee meeting, where two of my bills were under discussion.

I have sat here this afternoon and have listened to the explanation of the amendment, and I have read the report, which unfortunately was not available last weekend, when I wanted to have it.

My major objection arose from this provision in the bill, on page 1, in paragraph 2:

> To enable the Surgeon General to assist, through grants, the States to provide children (under the age of 20) and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis,

We discussed many times in committee the question of what was meant by vaccination.

In the report that point is covered. However, a casual reading of the bill would lead one to suppose that the United States Government would take the responsibility of placing the vaccine in the body of a person.

Then the bill provides:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1956, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

The purposes, as will be recalled, would be to provide vaccinations for all persons under the age of 20 years, and for expectant mothers.

On reading the report I found that objection to be adequately taken care of. That point was discussed with the senior Senator from New York when the matter first came up some weeks ago.

I wish the record to be perfectly clear in this respect, because I feel if it were not clear we could be subjected to some very severe criticism in the years ahead.

At page 1 the report states:

> The committee found and expert witnesses agreed that the established mechanisms through which the Federal Government for years has made grants to the States for public health purposes could and should be used as the vehicle through which the Congress could best assist the States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis. Those grants have often been used by the States over the years for the purchase of vaccines—

That language pins it down—

> and biologics used for the prevention of such diseases as smallpox, dyptheria, and whooping cough. Under such programs effective

> and smoothly working relationships between local physicians, local and county public health officers, State and Territorial health officers and the United States Public Health Service have become very well established and thoroughly accepted.
>
> The committee is convinced that we can best resolve the problem before us by using that same mechanism and following that same pattern.

Mr. President, because I feel the report clarifies the record and makes it perfectly clear to those who follow us that we did not intend 100-percent coverage of vaccine over the country, but only to follow the accepted and time-tested patterns of the Public Health Service in its relationships with the States, while my name does not appear as the 13th member of the committee as a cosponsor of the bill, I certainly shall not vote against it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions of the distinguished committee, and I shall put my questions in the form of hypothetical questions. Let us take two parents in State X. State X has no State program for applying vaccine. Under the bill, what benefits, if any do the people of that State receive?

Mr. HILL. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I would say that the State has to make its request. In making that provision I think we are following the proper pattern. I do not know of any legislation concerning health which provides that an individual appeals to the Federal Government. The State makes the request.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to make certain that the RECORD is clear on that point.

Under the bill, there is nothing which protects the parents of a child if a State does not ask the Federal Government to make available to it grants for the purchase of vaccine.

Mr. HILL. I would say that is true, as it would be true concerning other vaccines or biologics whether they be for diphtheria, malaria, smallpox, whooping cough, typhoid.

Mr. MORSE. It is not true of vaccine for Bangs disease in cattle.

Mr. HILL. I am not speaking about cattle. So far as human beings are concerned, the State makes the request.

Mr. MORSE. In the case of vaccination for Bangs disease, the Department of Agriculture will make the vaccine available and will send a letter advising that a man has a certified herd, free from Bang's disease. But the cattle have to be revaccinated periodically, and the letter will state that the man is entitled to have a veterinarian to do the vaccinating free of cost. The taxpayers of the Nation pay for the vaccine.

Am I correct in my first hypothetical question, that under this program we are not going to give to the children of America that which we would give to the owners of cattle?

Mr. HILL. Under this bill, we deal with the vaccine as we deal with other vaccines. We deal with the health authorities of the State, and not with the individual.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the development of this vaccine through the National Infantile Paralysis Foundation was paid for out of funds raised across the country without any State control whatsoever in the raising of funds?

Mr. HILL. The Foundation raised the funds as a private organization or institution, and then used the funds to purchase the vaccine.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in stating that the political philosophy underlying this bill is that the obligation for developing any public program for providing vaccine in the polio field is a State and not a Federal responsibility?

Mr. HILL. I would say that in the provision for the Federal Government to assist the State, to give the State the vaccine or payment for the vaccine, would very much stimulate, encourage, and inspire the State to go forward with the program of vaccination. Such programs have always been developed by local initiative.

Mr. MORSE. Under this program, the Federal Government does not offer to make vaccine freely available to the parents of America, but it does offer to the respective States, if they develop a State program and ask the Federal Government for a grant to assist in defraying the cost of the vaccine, the assurance that there will be a certain amount of money available to the State.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The Federal Government will assist by providing the vaccine for the people of the State.

Mr. MORSE. Let me state my second hypothetical question. Suppose we consider State Y. It develops a State program. I have read the bill and the report somewhat in vain to find out what the details of the program would have to be in order to qualify for Federal assistance; but let us assume that whatever the qualifications are, a request is made for Federal funds. The total amount of money provided for in the bill is how much?

Mr. HILL. The authorization of funds is not limited. It authorizes such funds as Congress, in its wisdom, shall appropriate.

Mr. MORSE. Suppose we provide for the supplying of free vaccine to the children of a State, from birth to age 18. Suppose the program calls for paying fees or charges for administering the vaccine. Can the State obtain a grant-in-aid for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. For the actual vaccination itself?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. No. The bill is limited to payment of grants for the vaccine just as in the case of the excellent program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

The bill does not undertake to have the Federal Government pay for the equipment, the hypodermic needles, and so forth, or to pay the personnel who inject the vaccine. The relation between the Federal Government and the States has been built up through a good many years. There are grants of assistance to States, as the Senator knows, and to the local public-health units. The Federal Government has no machinery in and of itself to give vaccinations. Fortunately, our States do have such machinery. In my own State we not only have a State health department, but every county in the State has a local public-health unit, with public-health physicians, nurses, and other public-health personnel. The States have the machinery. It is that machinery which with the assistance of public-spirited local physicians resulted in the program under which children gathered in the schoolhouses and received their inoculations under the plan of the local public-health authority. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis provided only the vaccine.

Mr. MORSE. So that the record may be perfectly clear, I have a series of hypotheticals. My first was that if parents in a State wish to get the vaccine they must look to the State government.

Mr. HILL. They look to their State government to request help from the Federal Government and assistance in securing the vaccine. This bill provides vaccine to the extent the State requests it subject only to Congress appropriating the funds.

Mr. MORSE. In my second hypothetical we have State Y. State Y adopts a program in which it seeks to provide free vaccine and free vaccination, and it comes to the Federal Government to obtain the funds. But this bill, at most, would give the State free vaccine, and I assume it would be prorated.

Mr. HILL. If Congress had appropriated the full amount of money which the vaccine would cost, it could give them all the vaccine requested.

Mr. MORSE. So if the bill shall be passed today, all it will do will be to announce that it is the legislative policy of Congress to assist the States to whatever extent Congress may appropriate funds for the purchase of vaccine.

Mr. HILL. That would be true in any program of assistance. The Senator knows that often Congress appropriates money which is not the full amount authorized.

I am privileged to be the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations which handles funds for public-health programs. As to many of the programs, I must frankly admit, however the Senator from Oregon and I may feel, Congress does not always appropriate the full amount authorized. This does not apply only to the field of health; it is true in many other fields, in which the authorization is greater than the amount appropriated, although the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama may favor larger appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. There is no language in the bill, if I understand it correctly, whereby, as a matter of legislative policy, Congress announces that it shall be the policy to supply free vaccine to the States which ask for free vaccine.

Mr. HILL. The whole purpose of the bill is to provide free vaccine. If it were not the intent to have the Federal Government provide free vaccine, the proposed legislation would not be before the Senate. The purpose of the bill is to provide free vaccine.

Mr. MORSE. I go back to my hypothetical question dealing with State Y, which wants the Federal Government to supply not only free inoculation service, but also free vaccine. I should like the Senator to call my attention to the language in either the report or the bill which would give that State any assurance that it would get the vaccine.

The Senator from Alabama says that all the bill does is to authorize the United States Public Health Service to make available to the State such appropriations, if any, as may be subsequently made by way of a grant-in-aid to that State.

I think that in the bill before the Senate today we should, I respectfully submit, make clearer than the bill now does that all Congress is doing is saying to the States of the Nation that Congress proposes to give them all the free vaccine they need for vaccination against polio in the States.

Our recommendation, in effect, is that the Committee on Appropriations make available whatever sum of money is necessary. There has been some talk about $21 million. When I heard that figure, I started looking through the report of the bill to ascertain where it might have come from. I could find no reference to that amount.

Mr. HILL. I do not know about the figure $21 million. It was estimated that the program under an earlier and entirely different bill would require $28 million to supply vaccine to children whose parents could not pay for it. But there is no connection in any way between the present bill and any figure of $21 million or of $28 million.

Mr. MORSE. Under the policy approved by the bill, is there any expressed limitation of supplying vaccine only upon submission to a means test?

Mr. HILL. No, no; very definitely there is not.

Mr. MORSE. If a child is so unfortunate as to be born in State Z, which is my third hypothetical question, a State which has no State program at all, there is nothing under the bill which the Federal Government is required to do to make certain that the child will receive the vaccine.

Mr. HILL. No. The Federal Government does not undertake to say to a State, "Thou shalt have a program." It does not say to a State that it must have a program. It provides free vaccine and stimulates and encourages a State.

The Federal Government will follow a policy which has been followed with reference to other vaccine which is distributed by the Public Health Service in its program of helping the States, by making grants of this vaccine, or payments in lieu of the vaccine, to the States, so that the States may carry out their programs through the local communities.

Mr. MORSE. Is there anything in the bill which goes into the question of the activities of the Public Health Service, by laying down a requirement that any vaccine for which the Federal Government appropriates money must meet certain definite tests approved by the United States Public Health Service?

Mr. HILL. No, the bill does not go into that field. The law now is very definite and clear on that point. What is called the Biologics Control Act places a very definite responsibility on the Public Health Service to properly and adequately test this vaccine, and other vaccines, as well.

Mr. MORSE. But that law was in existence when the Salk vaccine was tested, was it not?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct about that; but the responsibility still remains with the Public Health Service under the law.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me, on the basis of very sad experience with the administration, that the bill should contain some requirement which would not permit the continuation of the use of the so-called convention of protocol; but that if we are to spend Federal, tax-paid dollars in payment for the vaccine, the vaccine should meet tests more stringent than those which have been followed, and that the Gvernment should pay only for that vaccine which the public health authorities themselves have double checked by test.

Mr. HILL. Under the Biologics Control Act, the responsibility today is on the Public Health Service authorities.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conducted any investigation into the tests which were used, and the testing procedure which was followed, by the United States Public Health Service, to the end of seeing whether there is a need to require more stringent tests?

Mr. HILL. Although we have received testimony and evidence about the matter of testing it is not the subject of this proposed legislation.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the pending bill, General Scheele advised and assured the committee that new tests were being applied to all the vaccine, that a special committee was reviewing the operations of the new tests, and that no vaccine could be or would be released unless the vaccine met the new tests, and that certainly, in his opinion, the new tests assured the vaccine's being as safe as possible.

Mr. MORSE. I was going to speak briefly on the point raised by the Senator, but I shall digress to make a comment on it now. Was Dr. Scheele under oath?

Mr. HILL. No. He was before the committee, but was not under oath.

Mr. MORSE. Were there before the committee doctors in the Public Health Service who had been conducting the tests, and were they placed under oath to testify as to whether new tests were being used?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that Dr. Scheele did have certain members of his staff present with him when he was testifying, but the witnesses were not under oath.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly against the bill. I am perfectly satisfied the bill is going to pass, but I am convinced that it fails completely to meet the needs of the people of the Nation in respect to the polio vaccine problem.

I regret we have the bill before us in this form, but my reasons for objection are, first, we have a national health problem before us. We have a problem that is no respecter of State boundaries. We, of course, have a legislative problem before us in the pending bill that involved a very important concept of political philosophy.

Let me make clear that there is not a scintilla of States rights as a constitutional issue involved in this problem. The reason that there is not a scintilla of States rights involved in the issue is that there is absolutely no question about the power of the Federal Government to enact legislation that would make available to the children of this country, at the cost of the taxpayers of this country, free vaccine. As a matter of public policy the children of America are entitled to free vaccine, the use of which would help us solve a very serious health threat presented by the scourge of polio.

The reason I say there is no States rights issue involved, Mr. President, is that legislation providing for free vaccine in the field of animal husbandry is available to farmers. Such legislation has been sustained, and similar law would be sustained in the field of vaccination for human beings.

Secondly, I would point out that the polio vaccine program really was developed by people across this country, again not on a State line basis, but in a sort of great humanitarian association, by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and with the aid of dimes collected from parents and from school children. The dimes from American citizens, contributed over the years helped to develop the program which resulted in the Salk vaccine discovery.

I think, Mr. President, that fact puts it in a somewhat different class from the other vaccine for human use to which the Senator from Alabama has referred. Those other vaccines have been developed on a private research basis, and the United States Department of Health has followed a program of cooperation with the drug companies in this country in testing such vaccine by the so-called protocol and convention methods. There has been such a working arrangement between the drug companies and the United States Public Health Service for a good long time. However, it is argument by false analogy to contend that polio vaccine stands on the same footing. Here we have involved, I think, a plague which stands very much in a class by itself. The vaccine program to check it is one which has received widespread financial and moral support from the people. As a result it is recognized very much as a national program. I think we ought to see to it that the vaccine is made available to the parents of every boy and girl in this country, without there being attached to the program the test of whether or not the parents have the means to afford vaccination. I think we should pass Federal legislation that does not pass the original duty to act to the States. As a Congress we should provide for free vaccine and I think free vaccinations to all the children of America. They are worth it. This is a national health program that calls for national action. This bill is too much of a makeshift bill to suit me. It does not come to grips with the real need of seeing to it that the children of

America are assured the availability of vaccine.

As a Member of this body, I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill which fails to make available to the children of this country, irrespective of the States in which they live or the States in which they happen to have been born, at least free vaccine. I think they should also have made available free inoculation, to help at least check the scourge of infantile paralysis.

It is sound public policy to do so, and I do not think there is anything about such a program which would violate States rights, for the simple reason that Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to enact such legislation. If the legislation is constitutional, then no States rights would be involved.

A question of legislative policy is involved, and I direct myself to that question for a moment. I think that because there exists the responsibility of the Federal Public Health Service to see to it that the vaccine is a safe vaccine, it is all the more imperative that the Federal Government should assume the responsibility of paying for the distribution of the vaccine.

In my judgment, our committee has yet to be told the story about the Salk vaccine fiasco. Our committee has yet to be told what happened before April 12. Our committee has yet to be told the warnings by doctors which were made within the Health Service that trouble was ahead unless certain policies were adopted, which were never adopted.

I say most respectfully Dr. Scheele and Mrs. Hobby covered up gross incompetency in the handling of the polio program.

I am not going to sit on the floor of the Senate and vote for a piece of legislation today which, while it has been offered in good faith by the Senator from Alabama, would result in legislation which does not let the Congress of the United States come to grips with the problem. I think we ought to come to grips with the necessity for Federal legislation before we go ahead and pass a bill which I am convinced will prove to be an unsatisfactory solution of the problem before us.

We will not solve the problem before us by this bill and I want to say the American people are entitled to know what happened behind the scenes in this polio vaccine fiasco. They are entitled to know what happened in connection with the testing or the failure to test the vaccine which produced the release of defective vaccine.

I think the American people are entitled to know that not a batch of the vaccine is going to go into a vial which will be made available to a doctor of this country unless there has first been a Government test made of that batch, as well as a drug company test. This proposed legislation does not begin to touch that problem.

In conclusion, I wish to say I think we ought to do for the children of America what we seem perfectly willing to do for the farmers of America in the field of livestock vaccination. I think it is a very bad thing if we have reached the point in America, where, after we have developed the whole program on a national basis, under the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, that the children of the country are not assured free vaccine. Medical evidence seems to be clear that pure Salk vaccine would provide really a miracle in the matter of the polio plague. Yet by this inadequate legislation we are about to deny the vaccine to children, to use my series of hypothetical cases, unless a State enacts legislation which will cause the State to come to the Federal Government and ask for grants-in-aid, in order to provide free vaccine. Mr. President, I do not believe that is the way to meet a national health problem of this type.

Therefore, I say most respectfully that the pending bill only scratches the surface of our congressional obligation. It does not begin to dip into a solution of the problem confronting us. In my opinion, there still is needed a very thorough investigation of what is required by legislation in order to make the maximum use of pure Salk vaccine to check a constant threat of polio epidemic in the United States.

Again, this situation represents the great difference, I believe, on the part of a liberal philosophy based on a belief that the Federal Government has the duty of promoting the general welfare within a sphere of activity in which it is perfectly clear what the general welfare is. Mr. President, the general welfare of the boys and girls of the United States will not be protected, in my judgment, until we make pure polio vaccine available to all of them.

On the other hand, the Senate is about to pass a bill which will let the matter be determined by the States, and thereby a great diversity of administrative procedure will be developed. If we pass the proper measure, the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could be authorized to make available to every State in the country, free vaccine for every boy and girl in each State; and if any State did not make it available, it could be made available to the parents of the children in the State by the Federal Government so their children could be inoculated and the cost could be submitted to the Federal Government for payment. Mr. President, I think such a program would be a cheap one in the long run and it would pay rich dividends in healthier American boys and girls. Let the record show that I vote against this totally inadequate piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2501) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 246), is amended—

(a) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (c) (1) and by adding at the end of such subsection a new paragraph, as follows:

"(2) To enable the Surgeon General to assist, through grants, the States to provide children (under the age of 20) and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1956, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph. At the request of any State the Surgeon General may use all or any portion of any monetary grant authorized to be made to such State under this paragraph for the purchase of poliomyelitis vaccine to be furnished to the State in lieu of such grant (or such portion thereof). Vaccine so furnished shall be subject to the same requirements as to use as vaccine purchased from monetary grants to States under this paragraph. The Surgeon General may, in his discretion and in accordance with regulations designed to assure the most effective and equitable distribution of available supplies of poliomyelitis vaccine, specify certain categories of children and expectant mothers to be accorded priority in receiving an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, and during any period in which any priority group has been so established and is in effect all vaccine acquired by any State, through assistance provided pursuant to this paragraph shall be made available only to persons within any such group. As used in this paragraph, the term 'State' means a State or the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Canal Zone.";

(b) by striking out "(c)" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "(c) (1)";

(c) (1) by striking out "money paid" in the first sentence of subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "monetary grants (including grants of supplies of poliomyelitis vaccine purchased out of appropriations under subsection (c) (2))";

(2) by striking out "payments" wherever it appears in that part of the first sentence of subsection (i) which follows clauses (1), (2), and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "grants"; and

(3) by inserting in lieu of the last sentence of subsection (i) the following: "Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall deny further grants to such State, subdivision, or organization from appropriations under such subsection, or shall limit any assistance thereunder to activities in which there is no such failure."

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business to come before the Senate at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Laos, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe Ewing Estes, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, vice William Hawley Atwell, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Franklin P. R. Rittenhouse, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, for a term of 4 years, vice Madison B. Graves, resigning.

Paul W. Williams, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, for a term of 4 years, vice J. Edward Lumbard, appointed United States circuit judge.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Arthur C. Carmichael, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., in place of Ross P. Buell, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Charles J. Walker, Sr., of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors

Agnew, John P., Jr., O53985.
Albright, Jack A., O40870.
Albright, Shannon D., O40787.
Allison, Grant W., O25293.
Andersen, Eldon B., O35991.
Anderson, Andrew C., O36146.
Anderson, Brooks D., O35664.
Andrews, Stephen E., Jr., O33976.
Antonelli, Theodore, O46189.
Appleton, Irvine, O34867.
Arms, Thomas S., Jr., O24996.
Asbury, Barney B., O46788.
Athan, Byron D., O53273.
Austin, Benton McD, O35161.
Austin, John D., O46516.
Autrey, Paul, O46504.
Aycock, William B., O35051.
Ayer, Franklin A., O34199.
Aykroyd, Albert W., O35069.
Baccus, George W., O35670.
Barnum, Richard V., O36167.
Barrow, Thomas A., O35686.
Bass, Glenn L., O40818.
Bass, Koy McL., Jr., O39125.
Bates, Frank A., Jr., O53290.
Beaman, Horace E., O35583.
Beeson, John P., O24686.
Bell, Carl H., Jr., O35743.
Bell, Theodore S., O36122.
Benson, Walter R., Jr., O39180.
Beyer, Donald A., O40751.
Billings, Linwood W., O34831.
Billmyer, Carroll D., Jr., O34676.
Black, Don W., O36126.
Blackburn, William, O34244.
Blackwell, John R., O53789.
Blair, Robert M., O24934.
Blake, William R., O36162.
Blaney, Kermit B., O35591.
Blissenbach, Leonard J., O24938.
Boardman, Dumas H., Jr., O34963.
Bond, John R. F., O35986.
Bonta, James C., O34731.
Boswell, Jack, A25080.
Boyle, Thaddeus A., O35791.
Brabson, Kimberly, O35465.
Bragalone, Alfred A., O36080.
Brake, Ralph W., O35708.
Branch, Matthew D., O35799.
Brandon, Thurman McC., O24754.
Briggs, Richard F., O36032.
Brookreson, Wade Y., O35588.
Brooks, Engle R., Jr., O34764.
Browder, Jewell R., O45583.
Brownfield, Lee B., 2d, O36135.
Browning, Edward A., O53019.
Browning, Newton F., O46964.
Brownyard, Fred R., O35279.
Bruce, Edward C., O25404.
Bruley, Henry L., O35457.
Bryson, Ernest D., O47161.
Buchanan, Stephen C., O39182.
Buck, Charles A., O34641.
Buehler, Vernon M., O53373.
Bull, Richard T., O53984.
Burch, Jack P., O45948.
Burgess, Charles A., Jr., O53513.
Burgher, Frank E., O36180.
Burnes, Philip D., O34153.
Burr, Lynn S., O53788.
Burton, Johnathan R., O36198.
Burton, Lewis R., O34567.
Butler, Ernest C., O35578.
Cage, Lee E., O24909.
Cake, James M., Jr., O25372.
Calder, Henry L., Jr., O34671.
Caldwell, James A., O25315.
Calvert, George M., O36061.
Cameron, Ernest V., O40876.
Campbell, Gay, O35586.
Cannon, Joseph M., Jr., O24930.
Carson, Thomas M., O32918.
Casart, William M., O35848.
Cavender, James W., O46443.
Chambers, John S., Jr., O25357.
Chandler, Melbourne C., O37486.
Chilk, Samuel J., O53777.
Chrietzberg, James, Jr., O39129.
Christol, Max S., O34343.
Clagett, David C., O24952.
Coates, Harry R., O36067.
Cochran, Walter B., Jr., O53411.
Cockrell, James K., Jr., O24805.
Cockrill, John C., O24730.
Coley, Fred A., O40851.
Colladay, Edgar B., Jr., O24968
Conrad, Eugene B., O34204.
Cook, Benjamin T., O47175.
Cook, Charles H., O34201.
Cook, Charles W., O35737.
Cook, George L., O35450.
Cook, James H., Jr., O25296.
Cooperhouse, Jacob B., O24840.
Copmann, Chester J., Jr., O46636.
Coulter, John A., O24454.
Cox Junior N., O46561.
Coyne, John C., O46506.
Craig, John E., O24784.
Craven Virgil E., O34824.
Craven, William D., O53969.
Cravens, Gerald McA., O35188.
Cronin, Patrick M., O40786.
Cross, Kenneth W., O35852.
Crosswhite, Clyde C., O40750.
Crouch, Horace J., Jr., O46131.
Crumlish, William S., O45536.
Curry, Donald A., O46211.
Curtan, Eugene R., O40814.
Cutler, Elliott C., Jr., O24649.
Dabinett, John T., O47114.
Dailey, Howard M., O34702.
Dale, Joseph W., Jr., O36144.
Dalrymple, Robert C., O39100.
Daniel, Emile W., Jr., O34781
Danley, Earl E., O47136.
Dannenberg, Donald D., O40798.
Danner, James O. O53384.
Datnoff, Arthur R., O35053.
Datres, Eugene B., O35166.
Davies, John M., 3d, O25010.
Davis, Ernest H., O34740.
Davison, Frederic E., O45682.
DeLaney, Donald J., O34852.
Dellinger, William F., Jr., O53658.
Denham, Russell B., O53714.
Dennison, Richard F., O34040.
Diamantes, Thomas, O35694.
Dickenson, Robert L., O53199.
Doyle, Pierce A., Jr., O24891.
Ducey, Donald L., O35811.
Dudley, Robert L. O33746.
Duffy, David A., O34662.
Duren, Elton W., O35087.
Duty, Clifton O., O35981.
Eckert, Keneth R., O39196.
Edmunds, James M., O35174.
Ellis, Arthur P., Jr., O36150.
Ellis, Clarence H., Jr., O34762.
Ellis, Rodney C., O34872.
Ellis, William H. N., O53993.
Ely, John A., O24807.
Ervin, John W., O39216.
Evans, Frank J., O53630.
Evans, Thomas H., Jr., O39179.
Farley, Jack H., O53889.
Faulkner, Brock H., O45844.
Fazio, Vincent F., O46947.
Fechtman, Robert H., O46262.
Ferguson, Allen E., O45765.
Fergusson, Charles N., Jr., O24709.
Fish, Rue D., Jr., O46559.
Fisken, Archibald D., Jr., O24868.
Fleig, Raymond E., O47197.
Folsom, Charles D., O45951.
Folts, Rudolf H., O40784.
Ford, Wilfred C., O25005.
Foss, Russ C., O46767.
Foster, Randolph V., O45728.
Foster, Robert W., Jr., O25360.
Fox, Clifton C., O47142.
Francis, Ernest H., O40758.
Fraser, Joseph J., Jr., O53292.
Fredrikson, Graydon F., O35700.
Fritz, John E., O25021.
Fulbruge, Charles R., O34190.
Fulmer, Richard P., O39130.
Furey, Thomas P., O24876.
Gaby, Walter E., Jr., O34656.
Galbraith, John M., Jr., O33957.
Garnhart, George H., O25267.
Gaynor, Wayne J., Jr., O35222.
Geery, Billy B., O34877.
Geiger, Edward H., O46621.
George, Charles C., O24770.
Getchell, Wilmah M., O40737.
Gibb, Edward F., Jr., O45769.
Gibbs, Wells H., O34661.
Gibney, Raymond F., O36068.
Gibson, John S., O53145.
Gibson, Thomas A., Jr., O35478.
Godby, Garland D., O36189.
Godwin, Norman A., O46291.
Goodwin, Frederick C., O34335.
Goodwin, James W., Jr., O53694.
Gooley, William D., O53743.
Gordon, Herschell G., O46942.
Gordon, James L., O39213.
Gordon, Preston O., O35828.
Graham, Ralph W., O45995.
Grant, Francis A., O40643.
Grant, Jonathan M., O36083.
Grant, Joseph H., Jr., O25384.
Gueymard, Joffre L., O46963.
Guidera, Thomas F., O47165.
Hackwood, Arthur W., Jr., O36109.
Hakala, Wendell E., O53672.
Hale, William C., O36124.
Hall, Harold M., O47123.
Hambleton, Harry B., Jr., O40670.
Hamblin, James M., O25127.
Hamel, George F., O46167.
Hamilton, Stuart A., Jr., O36152.
Hamilton, William M., O53618.
Hampton, Rex H., O47211.
Hancock, Daniel W., O35281.
Hankins, Grat B., O35257.
Hanna, Loyd G., O35843.
Hargis, Lorne T., O53866.
Harlan, Edwin F., O25343.
Harps, Joseph F., O53692.
Harrison, James H., O46389.
Harvey, Ben, Jr., O40688.
Hatcher, Robert P., Jr., O53259.
Hayes Thomas F., O34738.
Healy, Richard D., O36033.
Heard, John W., O24953.
Henderly, Harold B., O36065.
Henley, Jack J., O33959.
Henne, Charles A., O46253.
Henry, Albert C., O34497.
Henshaw, Philip B., Jr., O34856.
Hensley, Emery M., O35720.
Hertzog, Jack McK., O40856.
Heske, Richard F., O35641.
Hickman, David, O33986.
Hiett, Joseph C., O34657.
Higgins, Hugh R., O36183.
Hill, Benjamin I., O24791.
Hill, Charles R., O24940.
Hill, Harry G., O34106.

Hoagland, Charles E., O34645.
Hobrecht, Alfred P., O34968.
Hodges, John, O34353.
Hokenson, Charles K., O35615.
Holcomb, William L., O53160.
Hollstein, Jean W., O35559.
Holmes, Henry B., 3d, O25348.
Horne, Richard C., 3d., O40863.
Howard, Charles E., O39153.
Howard, Herbert H., O46959.
Howard, Robert C., O53368.
Howell, DeWitt C., O45937.
Howell, Maurice W., O35883.
Howell, Samuel W., Jr., O24989.
Hrdlicka, Edward B., O33985.
Hurley, Frederick J., O46434.
Hutchinson, Robert C., Jr., O53429.
Hutchison, Mortimer J., O34727.
Irby, Pierce B., Jr., O34282.
Irvin, Richard, Jr., O25118.
Ish, George D., O36102.
Isner, Alvis E., O46626.
Jackson, Burwell B., O34840.
Jackson, Gordon E., O46950.
Jackson, Harry R., O53997.
Jackson, Robert L., Jr., O53104.
Janousek, Neal F., O36127.
Jeffress, Clarence E., O25255.
Jenkins, James R., O35054.
Jennings, Raymond J., O34120.
Jensen, Melvin M., O45771.
Jensen, Roland H., O53300.
Johnson, Benjamin E., Jr., O40646.
Johnson, Fredric E., O35885.
Johnson, Leonard L., O35441.
Jones, Charles A., Jr., O24533.
Jones, Kenneth M., O40829.
Jones, Lee G., O24757.
Jones, Lloyd E., Jr., O25396.
Jones, Wyly K., O46743.
Josephson, Stanton W., O24745.
Kadel, Edgar R., Jr., O35801.
Kalina, Edwin C., O33604.
Kasler, Charles L., O34599.
Kates, Robert C., O24787.
Kennedy, Clarence N., O53230.
Kennedy, Paul R., O35563.
Kerr, James W., O25417.
Kimball, Morton W., O47178.
King, James B., O46196.
KinKead, William W., O40838.
Kinney, Howard D., Jr., O34697.
Kirk, Leonard M., O36130.
Knutson, Sidney A., O36199.
Kohnstamm, Joseph W., O40645.
Kopf, John B., O40812.
Krueger, Herbert W., O39207.
Kuykendall, J. W., Jr., O35836.
LaBounty, Jack V., O34422.
Laird, Paul G., O45698.
Lake, Jack F. O34391.
Langley, Charles F., O40834.
Leavitt, Charles S., O40830.
Leonard, Richard M., O53957.
Levin, William B., O53865.
Lewis, Charles A., O53421.
Lewis, Hollis C., O25205.
Littleton, Augustine B., O46066.
Locke, Thomas W., O53105.
Longerich, Harry, O53791.
Lord, Nicholas A., O46045.
Lowe, Henry A., O34748.
Lucier, Alphonse F., Jr., O34832.
Ludington, Edward P., O47015.
Luk, William, O40642.
Lukens, Howard I., O53619.
Lumpkin, Claude C., Jr., O24941.
Lyle, James W., O35484.
Lynch, William J., O53175.
Lyon, David R., O53594.
Mabry, Ned B., O53148.
MacQueen, Lawrence P., O35614.
MacVeigh, Charles S., O25496.
Madden, Francis J., O46258.
Mahone, Thomas B., Jr., O46521.
Major, George C., O46041.
Marconi, Sabatine R., O36128.
Martin, Allen C., O34231.
Massingill, James H., Jr., O34274.
Mathews, Lawrence G., O25402.
Matthews, Milton A., O56906.
Matthews, Robert A., O46599.
May, David D., O24946.
Maysonave, Rene E., O45650.
McCaughey, Mack J., O36196.
McClure, Jaul J., Jr., O35640.
McClure, Richard, O35064.
McCuller, Louis P., O34636.
McFarland, James D., O53149.
McGuire, Paul M., O35705.
McMurtrey, Gail B., O46748.
McNamara, Harry, Jr., O35795.
Meara, William D., O35823.
Mehlinger, Walter E., O36149.
Meier, Arthur C., O35560.
Merkl, Earle C., O53306.
Messner, Spurgeon A., O53753.
Mewshaw, Charles T., O40832.
Miketinac, Anthony J., O45671.
Milberg, Arthur W., O35842.
Miles, Richard C., O24939.
Miller, Winthrop G., O45957.
Minch, Howard G., O34945.
Minson, Roscoe T., O34568.
Mizell, Charles M., O24728.
Monroe, Melvin C., O34552.
Monty, Percy A., O53945.
Moore, Clayton H., Jr., O35178.
Moran, John, O53964.
Morgan, Reuben T., O36154.
Morgan, William H., O24660.
Morris, Jack W., O45540.
Moseley, Woodford T., O35858.
Moss, Vaughn R., O34144.
Mullen, James J., O36191.
Mullenniex, Thomas E., O40991.
Mulliken, David F., O34948.
Mulroney, Frank A., O35833.
Mundhenk, William H., O36155.
Murray, Jack H., Jr., O35974.
Murrell, Hampden J., O53641.
Myers, Albert F., O35239.
Myers, Woodrow H., O53888.
Nash, Grover E., Jr., O36182.
Nealson, William R., O34407.
Neff, R. Wilson, O53439.
Neill, Dennis W., O46137.
Neubauer, William C., O35572.
Neumann, James D., O35956.
Newby, Gilbert U., O40858.
Nickell, John S., O35794.
Nielsen, Edward L., O40868.
Niles, Richard H., O35853.
Northcutt, Thadeus P., O40677.
Nottingham, Allen H., O36157.
O'Connor, Joseph P., Jr., O40648.
O'Hea, John T., O35486.
Olson, Arthur A., O36174.
O'Malley, John F., O46050.
O'Neal, Beverly F., Jr., O46929.
O'Rourke, Donald C., O36611.
Orr, Uriah, N., O53877.
Otis, Allen M., O24990.
Owen, Edwin B., O47079.
Palm, Eugene W., O35643.
Parker, Reuben D., O47214.
Parrish, Charles P., O53233.
Parson, Merlin H., O36084.
Patterson, Fred, O35446.
Payne, Irving P., O53878.
Perley, Robert L., O46454.
Peters, Ralph D., O46228.
Peterson, Eugene I., O36085.
Pettit, Morris W., O34100.
Pfeffer, Joseph M., O34836.
Phillips, William J., O46987.
Pickell, Wayne F., O46670.
Pike, Edwin G., O40720.
Pister, Carl E., O53390.
Pitts, Thomas B., O53951.
Pleasant, James C., O36059.
Popovich, Francis J., O40803.
Porter, Clark W., O46162.
Pratt, James M., O25135.
Pregaldin, Charles V., Jr., O34425.
Pressentin, Vernon F., O35391.
Rawls, Robert M., O24675.
Ream, Ellis A., O36165.
Redd, Thomas L., Jr., O35508.
Reed, John P., O35839.
Rees, James B., O35539.
Reese, Frellsen, O53349.
Reinert, Albert C., O24936.
Remick, Charles E., O34408.
Reppa, Robert B., O34978.
Rhodey, William A., O53943.
Rivette, Donald E., O34757.
Robinson, John L., O36134.
Rolak, Bruno J., O46725.
Romans, Warren L., O39150.
Rose, Charles E., O35066.
Rosell, Fred E., Jr., O24682.
Rottstedt, Vernon R., O53185.
Rountree, Councill P., O34050.
Rowe, Gerald W., O35810.
Ruby, Jack W., O45871.
Ruhsam, Harry E., O47135.
Rutherford, Robert D., O34355.
Salyer, Everett G., O36107.
Samusson, Lewis F., O36147.
Sanders, Paul F., O53770.
Savage, David B., O46184.
Scharf, Henry W., O40683.
Scherberger, Frederick, 3d., O53918.
Schroeder, Leonard T., Jr., O45879.
Schroeder, Martin F., O35548.
Scovill, Elmer B., O35851.
Scruggs, William B., Jr., O45775.
Scullen, Allan R., O24984.
Seab, James A., O46598.
Sells, Clarence K., O53600.
Semmens, Clifton P., O34857.
Senior, William G., O46632.
Sestito, Joseph B., O45893.
Sharp, John D., Jr., O46693.
Shaw, William G., 3d, O53248.
Sheridan, Francis P., O36170.
Sherman, Keith, O53812.
Shirley, Joseph A., O25065.
Shoultz, James C., O46792.
Siebeneichen, Paul O., O34729.
Simmons, Lionel C., O40797.
Simon, Donald E., O24776.
Simpson, George H., O34704.
Simpson, Leonard D., O46128.
Small, Eugene J., O47190.
Smith, Anderson Q., O34187.
Smth, Bowen N., O53523.
Smith, Edward W., Jr., O45586.
Smith, Norvin E., Jr., O34694.
Smith, Roy E., O35777.
Smith, William J., O35320.
Smith, William E., O34859.
Snyder, Neil N., Jr., O25319.
Sorbello, Rosario, O25066.
Spann, James H., O45979.
Spears, John H., O46027.
Speirs, Ronald C., O35820.
Standish, Frederick D., 2d, O24981.
Stanley, LeRoy S., O36112.
Stansill, John T., O40738.
Steckel, Glenn A., O46036.
Stefani, Louis J., O40707.
Stempin, Harry J., O45786.
Stephens, John M., Jr., O34689.
Stevenson, Don W., O34868.
Stewart, Claude C., O47006.
Stewart, Edward W., O46148.
Stewart, Lewis M., O46789.
Stewart, Willard C., O53438.
Stough, Charles S., Jr., O35187.
Stoutner, Everette A., O36105.
Strausbaugh, Donn P., O45681.
Strickland, James M. S., O35184.
Stroup, Ray B., O34267.
Styer, George D., O36034.
Sullivan, Lloyd S., O53326.
Sutton, George M., O35970.
Swartz, Alva W., O25077.
Swearngan, William R., O36143.
Sweeney, Arthur H., Jr., O40865.
Sweet, William J., Jr., O35814.
Swensson, John D., O46859.
Swofford, James L., O53451.
Tatsch, William D., O24822.
Thomas, Arthur J., O35564.
Thomas, Jesse, Jr., O24590.
Thomas, William G., 3d, O53386.
Thomas, William F., O45885.
Thompson, Shelden L., O35687.
Thomson, Donald E., O35490.
Thorne, John H., O36166.
Thornton, Warren G., O46663.
Tiffany, Willard D., O34230.
Timmons, Max E., O53965.

Tisdale, Charles F., O45925.
Tooley, Jack W., O46860.
Toomer, Harold K., O40849.
Topp, Alphonso A., Jr., O25408.
Touart, Anthony J., Jr., O25377.
Townsend, James M., O36089.
Townsend, Lester B., Jr., O53798.
Townshend, Charles S., Jr., O40833.
Tringali, Joseph A., O39152.
Tufts, Harry N., O40679.
Turner, Julian, O40697.
Uhler, Frederick C., O25003.
Ulsaker, Carl C., O24815.
Underwood, Charles, O34337.
Van Tassell, Frederick E., O36087.
Vias, Felipe, O36110.
Voegeli, Albert H., O56909.
Von Burg, Robert H., O35449.
Wagner, Paul R., O53850.
Walker, Frank E., Jr., O34691.
Wall, George R., O40836.
Waller, Marshall, O24758.
Ward, Robert J., O35689.
Warner, Edgar B., Jr., O53206.
Warren, Van Cleave P., O24856.
Warren, William C., O24852.
Watkins, George W., O34638.
Watson, Douglas H., O45908.
Watson, Richard R., O34354.
Webb, Robert M., O35571.
Weeks, Raymond W., O36173.
Wein, Joseph C., O46294.
Wells, Forest O., O46515.
Westbrook, Clyde H., Jr., O47007.
Wheeler, Robert F., O40872.
Whitmire, Charles G., O25257.
Wildes, Thomas, O40778.
Williams, Albert S., O25374.
Williams, Frank S., O34649.
Williamson, Robert H., Jr., O34560.
Williamson, James B., O35648.
Wilson, Francis H., Jr., O53452.
Wilson, Lloyd G., O34685.
Wilson, Russell J., O40848.
Wilson, Victor O., O25387.
Wing, Albert G., Jr., O46100.
Wise, Randall H., O53315.
Wiselogle, Candler R., O39271.
Woelfer, Carlyle P., O25350.
Woodman, John D., O40662.
Woods, James R., O35812.
Woods, Kenneth J., O53413.
Woodward, Joseph G., O39101.
Woodworth, George B., O35995.
Wooten, John H., O53968.
Wreidt, Niel M., O34753.
Wright, Edward McW., O24693.
Wright, Ernest C., O53926.
Yantis, Ray J., O47002.

To be majors, Chaplains

Bell, Richard R., O43201.
Lifshutz, Oscar M., O52023.
Taylor, Newell E., O52031.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Albrite, James P., O63715.
Amos, James D., O57990.
Ashford, Alexander W., O61183.
Bacharach, Theodore, O57987.
Baker, Stewart L., Jr., O57547.
Barnett, Robert J., O63452.
Benitez, Roberto E., O58706.
Bernstein, Robert, O60025.
Berte, Stephen J., O60132.
Blake, Hu A., O58708.
Blohm, Raymond W., Jr., O57559.
Bres, Edward S., Jr., O61178.
Britton, George T., O62778.
Bruce, Charles O., Jr., O63830.
Burkett, John W., O57731.
Bushard, Bruce L., O57730.
Caldwell, Samuel W., O63714.
Canfield, Irving H., O63713.
Cap, Thaddeus, W., O59681.
Carrasco, Enrico D., O65414.
Caskie, James D., O63670.
Castagno, Joseph, O61940.
Clemments, Ralph W., O57411.
Coffey, John J., O57950.
Cohen, Arthur, O65412.
Conte, Nicholas F., O62905.
Cowley, Ray G., O57992.
Cox, Lawson G., O63784.
Cranston, Robert W., Jr., O63826.
Deitz, Estill N., O59684.
Devine, Robert L., O57903.
Donovan, James F., O57546.
Eddy, Warren D., Jr., O57567.
Edwards, David J., O62907.
Eskridge, Jack, O63829.
Fancy, Henry F., O59523.
Fischer, Carl A., O63213.
Gale, Russell J., O63156.
Gallup, Samuel C., O57019.
Graf, Russell E., O59685.
Gray, Dell M., O59440.
Green, Charles R., O65413.
Green, James D., O57414.
Gumm, Melvin LeR., O63825.
Hansen, James L., O57011.
Harper, William H., Jr., O60130.
Harris, Frederick G., O57015.
Hemphill, James E., O63779.
Henderson, Harry McC., Jr., O57409.
Hendrix, Thomas L., O58206.
Herndon, Euclid G., Jr., O59435.
Houck, George W., O63667.
Hume, Robert D., Jr., O61067.
Jacobs, Herbert J., O59686.
Jenicek, John A., O57989.
Johnston, Edward H., O59536.
Johnston, Robert E., O57838.
Jones, Augustus B., Jr., O57733.
Jordan, Irvine G., Jr., O59532.
Joseph, Donald J., O60027.
Juel, Roger A., O58193.
Kingman, Allen F., Jr., O57556.
Kraul, Charles W., O61935.
Krauskopf, Frederick F., O57053.
Langdon, Edward A., O57722.
Lee, Samuel, O59687.
Levy, Arthur E., O57026.
Lewis, Evan L., O58205.
Lewis, James E., O62780.
Ley, Herbert L., Jr., O61942.
Liddell, Charles K., O59438.
Lionti, Joseph N., O57985.
Lorincz, Albert B., O57834.
MacDonald, William F., O63215.
MacQuigg, David E., O61174.
Maldonado, Leonard, O63475.
Marvin, Sidney L., O57063.
May, Stephen G., O57028.
Mayer, William E., O67979.
McClellan, John B., O63711.
McDowell, Marion E., O57399.
McKinney, Worthy W., O57725.
McLelland, John R., O57741.
Meroney, William H., 3d, O57010.
Miller, Frank L., O57564.
Miller, Ray L., O63827.
Modrak, Henry H., O65415.
Moffett, James B., O59441.
Moore, William A., O57415.
Mott, Loran E., O63153.
O'Donnell, James J., O64925.
Ogborn, Richard E., O58209.
Overholt, Edwin L., O60030.
Peczenik, Alois, O61181.
Plough, Irvin C., O57055.
Potter, Ralph H., Jr., O57017.
Price, Walter S., O61182.
Redner, Wallace J., Jr., O58767.
Reid, Spencer B., O64924.
Reynolds, George A., O63473.
Robbins, Thomas L., O57551.
Roberts, John E., O57833.
Rodriguez, Samuel, O63449.
Rosegay, Harold, O58766.
Scavone, Edmond, O57396.
Schirmer, Jacob F., O63158.
Scott, Norman McL., O57569.
Scott, Wilson R., O57070.
Seitzman, Leonard H., O60028.
Shannon, Frank J., Jr., O63157.
Shannon, George W., O58247.
Sheridan, John J., O57550.
Sieber, Paul E., O58707.
Spitznagel, John K., O59436.
Sproat, Harry F., O57416.
Stenberg, Edwin S., Jr., O60029.
Strand, Donald J., O57067.
Sube, Herbert P., O57723.
Summerson, Donald J., O60747.
Taylor, Richard R., O62785.
Umlauf, Harry J., Jr., O58198.
Vivona, Stefano, O63717.
Walker, Keith A., O62910.
Walton, William P., O58195.
Wannamaker, Gordon T., O57413.
Warren, Willard R., O58079.
Whelan, Thomas J., Jr., O59531.
Winslow, Donald J., O63828.
Wolfe, Walter McI., O67975.
Wright, Donald M., O57058.
Yessler, Paul G., O57027.
Zimmerman, Douglas A., O63159.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Alling, Charles C., O56253.
Arbuckle, Robert B., O52078.
Baranowski, Leo F., O56210.
Bates, Robert E., O56939.
Bethart, Hector, O56266.
Chandler, John R., Jr., O56983.
Clark, Robert R., O43250.
Edwards, Linus M., Jr., O57827.
Gladue, Wilfred H., O56951.
Goodman, Thomas K., O57984.
Jackson, Wendell T., O57897.
Kuhn, Marvin M., O57715.
Lister, Lloyd, O57718.
Margetis, Peter M., O57047.
McCall, Howard W., O57541.
Moll, Richard A., O49945.
Moody, Ashton A., O57826.
Pleasants, John E., O58701.
Roper, Jack, O56237.
Sawyer, Hosea F., O56262.
Shaffer, Francis W., O57896.
Snead, Ralph B., O43257.
Strong, William C., O57394.
Taylor, Thomas W., O57717.
Thompson, Henry C, 3d, O56973.
Thompson, James T., O49976.
Wian, George I., Jr., O56267.
Zack, Justin S., O57048.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Burns, Kenneth F., O31210.
Davies, Frank J., O40126.
Dietrich, William H., O31218.
Faust, Herbert R., O52036.
Gochenour, William S., Jr., O31211.
Luker, Charles T., O38883.
Miller, Everett B., O40132.
Reid, Joseph E., O31237.
Ross, Martin A., O31224.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Ahr, Lee A., O37439.
Albrecht, Lawrence S., O49937.
Alexander, Eugene S., O37488.
Allen, James F., O49955.
Arnold, Ralph D., O49947.
Barnett, Herbert C., O56236.
Barney, Leonard C., O37487.
Beaudry, Stephen J., O37503.
Breyfogle, William V., O37534.
Britt, Arthur E., O37551.
Brown, Byron W., O39340.
Brown, John A., O49963.
Bryan, Roy A., O37455.
Buchanan, Dee C., O37509.
Buckler, Phillip J., O37564.
Butler, Jesse N., O26983.
Caito, Thomas P., O37478.
Clegg, William J., Jr., O37542.
Collier, George T., O30898.
Colyer, Andrew J., O41138.
Conrad, George F., O37473.
Cowgill, Charles J., O37457.
Creamer, Raymond J., O37472.
Davis, Scott H., O37432.
DeGraff, George J., O49935.
DeSautels, Francis, O39337.
Dempsey, Richard W., O37529.
Dowless, Joseph D., Jr., O37460.
Edwards, Sam A., O37466.
Edwards, Thomas R., O37499.
Egense, Stanley W., Jr., O37475.
Flatter, Findlay F., O49941.
Francio, James R., O37440.
Fugitt, William K., O39346.
Funston, Howard J., O41136.
Gaines, Sidney, O39344.
Gans, Harry L., O37536.

Gelby, Walter H., O37560.
Gibson, Wilmot L., O37562.
Godwin, Frank D., O37525.
Good, Otto S., O37442.
Gordon, William M., O37430.
Gorrell, Charles J., O49942.
Gray, John T., O37480.
Greer, Richard S., O39343.
Grindell, James D., O37515.
Grow, George L., O37573.
Hallahan, John M., O37479.
Hammaker, Bernard W., O37492.
Handorf, William G., O49954.
Hill, Harold E., O41142.
Holt, John W., O41154.
Hooker, Claude L., O37482.
Howard, Kenneth G., O37550.
Huffman, James V., O37507.
Hutchinson, Melville C., O37449.
Hylden, Maurice W., O26980.
Jewell, Dean M., O49924.
Jonson, Wayne H., O37484.
Keegan, Hugh L., O49928.
Kifner, Daniel R., O37530.
Kowalsky, Matthew J., O37496.
Krause, William O., O37448.
La Manche, Philip L., O37501.
Larson, Harold P., O49936.
Lenn, Claude R., O37469.
Loisel, Vernon H., O37443.
Love, Jack P., O37436.
Lynch, Francis T., O56217.
Maher, Dale R., O37559.
Malone, Everett W., O49925.
Marks, Edward, O41139.
Martin, Edward J., O41143.
Murphy, Paul W., O37437.
Muschel, Louis H., O49922.
Nashold, Donald K., O37500.
Pitt, Marion J., O37458.
Plemmons, Sam A., O37517.
Powell, Harry C., O39336.
Rajecki, Felix G., O37574.
Richards, Ralph J., Jr., O37485.
Riddle, Hasty W., O37456.
Rivenbark, R. V. O49956.
Robbins, Walter F., O56929.
Rockstroh, Henry J., O56942.
Saling, James T., O37553.
Sandman, Otto H., Jr., O37476.
Schlicher, Norman R., O37452.
Scoggs, Howard R., O37453.
Snelling, James H., O49927.
Snider, Albert H., O37493.
Southard, William W., Jr., O37465.
Stewart, Thomas B., O39335.
Strnad, Joseph J., O37497.
Swall, Ross F., O37511.
Thomas, Hughie C., O37462.
Thompson, Jerry V., O37451.
Thompson, Willard E., O37495.
Traub, Robert, O37450.
Van Sickle, Floyd E., Jr. O41145.
Wright, Bertram S., O41137.
Wright, Lester J., O37434.
Watts, Foster LaM., O37569.
Wolf, Charles R., Jr., O37467.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Bailey, Mary J., L144.
Branch, Elizabeth H., L147.
Burns, Kathleen, L145.
Dunbar, Ellen V., L138.
Gonzalez, June P., L274.
Howes, Alice N., L146.
Linder, Lulu R., L265.
McCormack, Betty T., L149.
Meisner, Helen B., L148.
O'Nale, Louise, L273.
Sawyer, Alice V., L132.
Saxon, Martha E., L272.
Woodworth, Charlotte I., L137.

To be captains, chaplains

Bloxham, Earl S., O69862.
Blunk, James B., O68080.
Calter, John T., O71651.
Coleman, James V., O69885.
Eaheart, Karl F., Jr., O68816.
Elias, Woodrow L., O69912.
Harris, Thomas A., O71675.
Huffman, Cloma A., O69688.
Justice, Willard M., O71684.
McCarthy, Thomas H., O69983.
Meek, Charles A., O70431.
Price, Ben S., O70021.
Rowland, Ray M., O70032.
Spence, Edward L., O70510.
Stewart, Duncan C., O71728.
Sullivan, John J., O70520.
Williams, Robert W., O69834.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Abbott, Howard G., O69448.
Adams, Fae M., K68412.
Anderson, Eric I., O69846.
Bishop, Raymond H., Jr., O69592.
Breen, James L., O69866.
Burkett, Harry E., O71907.
Cooper, David S., O70306.
Copen, Estis G., O69626.
Cox, Dana D., O69472.
Cox, Robert S., Jr., O69473.
Cupp, Claude M., O70178.
Czarnecki, Stephen W., O69894.
Ferrell, Michael R., O69484.
Fred, Ann C., K71346.
Geiger, James P., O69489.
Gerard, Earl S., O69655.
Gomez, Alphonse C., O69493.
Gorby, Earl W., O69658.
Hanna, Homer H., O69499.
Jaffurs, William J., O70101.
Konwinski, Edward S., O69520.
Larson, Arlan P., O69522.
McCabe, Lloyd B., O68029.
McKeown, Eugene P., O67846.
Neidlinger, Robert W., O67852.
Pedrotty, Francis W., Jr., O69539.
Ransone, James W., O69547.
Schulte, John W., O71961.
Siebert, Paul E., O69557.
Spotnitz, Murray, O71284.
Stewart, George M., O66640.
Stokes, James A., O70045.
Thomas, Paul A., Jr., O69565.
Wever, Robert C., O71894.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Geller, George, Jr., O66621.
Hare, Charles M., O70361.
Jones, Rex D., O68191.
Millard, Robert J., O70142.
Osterholtz, Raymond H., O68392.
Schmitz, John F., O70120.
Schneider, Fred, O63845.
Schwartz, Donald E., O70231.
Sumner, Charles F., 3d, O70049.
Uohara, George I., O67971.
Warren, Ross W., 65555.
Worcester, Hal C., O65483.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Anthony, Wallace L., O69849.
Beerwinkle, Miltin A., O70269.
Benson, John H., O71642.
Billett, Rodney S., O69860.
Carter, Leland B., O69878.
Cooper, Irven R., Jr., O70307.
Ford, Duane F., O70337.
Garner, Floris M., O69930.
Hays, William L., O71508.
Lorentzen, Kay W., O68375.
McConnell, Stewart J., O68383.
Murnane, Thomas G., Jr., O70445.
Raulston, Gilbert L., O70025.
Rosser, William W., O67610.
Slider, Howard B., Jr., O68403.
Young, James B., O70071.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Arnberg, Wilber H., O69850.
Baker, Eugene M., 3d, O65140.
Barr, John W., O69854.
Bentley, Richard E., O69859.
Bisson, Roger R., O69861.
Blakesley, Lyman, O70279.
Blue, Jack T., O65556.
Borko, Harold, O68180.
Bost, William L., O58787.
Bynum, Robert M., Jr., O70293.
Canter, Francis M., O68332.
Carroll, Nicholas V., O65192.
Chadbourne, Ernest B., O69879.
Clapp, Marshall W., O69882.
Cohen, Milton, O69883.
Coleman, Rennie C., Jr., O69886.
Cook, Maxwell A., O59846.
Cook, Richard A., O67561.
Costello, Thomas A., O65132.
Crampton, George H., O71910.
Crimen, John C., O70315.
Davenport, James D., O69897.
Davidson, Louis F., O69899.
Davis, William V., O70321.
Deakins, John A., O58788.
Devlin, John P., O68796.
Diercks, Fred H., O60890.
Downing, Jack W., O69906.
Erne, Walter F., O69914.
Ess, Earl D., O69915.
Eveland, Charles L., O70332.
Foubare, Louis H., O65076.
Gillespie, Harold S., O69934.
Ginalick, Matthew, O70352.
Graham, Raymond E., O70353.
Harcus, Alan, O69942.
Hartman, Bryce O., O68357.
Hayes, Cecil H., O69944.
Hayes, William H., O69945.
Hedlund, James L., O71678.
Herbert, Frank, Jr., O64993.
Hino, Chester T., O69950.
Jones, Ernest O., O69955.
Lauterbach, Carl G., O69523.
Leifheit, Howard C., O63460.
Lindsey, William H., O69969.
Lord, Henry E., O69972.
Mandel, Adrian D., O60889.
Mason, Marshall A., Jr., O63462.
McAleer, Charles F., Jr., O69981.
McArthur, James E., O69982.
Moe, Wayne J., O69990.
Moore, James E., O69992.
Morgan, Ralph W., O60887.
Mullins, William S., O69996.
Murphy, Donald B., O71575.
Newton, Carlos E., Jr., O61082.
Pace, Erroll W., Jr., O70462.
Patch, Charles E., Jr., O71710.
Paul, Albert L., O63461.
Pavlo, Michael J., Jr., O70013.
Paxon, Earle A., O58790.
Pendrak, Theodore S., O70015.
Postle, John A., O70018.
Powell, Winston K., O70020.
Pratt, Roger F., O70474.
Prescott, William J., O70475.
Robinson, Arin F., Jr., O58793.
Rooney, William S., O60892.
Schein, Edgar H., O68840.
Schenker, Hanssen, O63181.
Shafer, Keith O., O65102.
Simpson, Wayne LaV., O70503.
Smith, Grayson, O70040.
Snyder, John S., O70507.
Spencer, Ralph A., O70512.
St. John, Frederick B., O58791.
Stone, Harold, O70517.
Stone, Robert A., O70046.
Turnbull, Samuel J., O70535.
Wegner, William M., O70554.
Wharton, Lyle H., O58123.
Wittlif, Charles L., O70068.
Young, James J., O70575.
Ziesenheim, Joseph C., O66130.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Baumgartner, Betty J., L338.
Butler, Margaret M., L391.
Buzzetti, Helen J., L337.
Eliker, Martha C., L354.
Hill, Georgia D., L398.
Leete, Alice W., L352.
Steir, Helen D., L390.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Aynes, Edith A., N94.
Braasch, Loraine J., N1955.
Briggs, Rachel V., N2120.

Burns, Helen E., N2355.
Hogan, Mary I., N2117.
McConnell, Viola B., N2231.
Owen, Louelia, N2229.
Price, Ida G., N2353.
Schultz, June B., N2351.
Vlahovich, Fanny E., N2573.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Beamon, Olga M., N2614.
Black, Helen L., N1786.
Bochman, Beverly E., N1794.
Campbell, Mayme V., N2661.
Chambers, June L., N1803.
Chaponis, Anastasia A., N1805.
Confort, Jeanette M., N1788.
Corbin, Mabel H., N2616.
Coxwell, Geraldine V., N1834.
Dolan, Gertrude A., N2637.
Donovan, Mary L., N2612.
Douglas, Maxine, N1810.
Duncan, Mildred, N2621.
Dunlap, Lillian, N1785.
Edman, Winifred L., N2677.
Embry, Nora E., N2678.
Fairaizl, Berniece I., N2617.
Galgano, Emma A., N1760.
Gallagher, Eleanor R., N1826.
Gaynor, Eleanor A., N1807.
Gilson, Shirley M., N1824.
Griffith, Margaret M., N2620.
Haegele, Ida L., N2640.
Hambrick, Julia E., N1775.
Hammerly, Aloha B–M., N1815.
Hill, Helen M., N2641.
Jones, Mary A., N2627.
King, Lois, N1771.
Koontz, Ruth L., N2643.
Knox, Grace E., N2666.
Kropski, Lena S., N2688.
Link, Lillian G., N2644.
Madden, Betty L., N1778.
Mahar, Mary E., N1762.
Mead, Pettrina M., N1797.
Moode, Helen E., N1835.
Moore, Daisy E., N2647.
Morris, Marie L., N2623.
Mortensen, Louise L., N2605.
Mulraney, Jean A., N1812.
Neirby, Gladys O., N2649.
Nichols, Barbara J., N2650.
Pettey, Florence L., N1792.
Pishak, Irene R. Z., N1818.
Quigley, Kathleen E., N2619.
Ramirez, Rosa J., N2628.
Senn, Minerva A., N1813.
Shea, Margaret M., N1780.
Smith, Marion L., N2685.
Tague, Lena M., N2674.
Thrush, Patricia A., N1795.
Travers, Veronica R., N2657.
Twohey, Barbara J., N2610.
Varner, Marjorie L., N2602.
Verhonick, Phyllis J., N1800.
Weeks, Nelda L., N2659.
Weirick, Lenora B., N1819.
Wilcox, Mildred A., N1832.
York, Elta R., N1766.
York, Elva M., N1765.

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Ben Dure, Mary L., M10008.
Forsythe, Lois M., R10039.
Jones, Elizabeth C., M10114.
Leonard, Katherine, M10054.
Moseman, Martha E., R10031.
Ness, Alene V., R10068.
Ryan, Barbara M., R10074.

To be captains, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Eason, Martha J., M10094.
Fauble, Phyllis H., M10087.
Glidden, Dorothy I., M10155.
Jaakkola, Irma L., M10095.
Kennon, Barbara L., R10100.
Kerce, Myrna H., M10090.
Owen, Catherine M., M10091.
Williams, June E., R10102.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Berry, Ray W., O71644.
Bickerstaff, Hugh J., Jr., O71645.
Bing, Tom L., O70277.
Bowman, George W., Jr., O66474.
Corley, Robert J., O71773.
Cunningham, Alfred J., O71776.
Frost, Theodore N., O71790.
Heath, Harry A., O71801.
Jenkins, William McG., Jr., O71927.
Jones, Bernel, O71817.
LeBlang, Alfred S., O71824.
Long, Johnny B., O71827.
Marlow, Thorne H., O67137.
McBride, Thomas F., Jr., O71698.
McGinnis, William A., O71838.
Mitchell, George W., O71844.
O'Keefe, Neil L., O71849.
Oksa, Reino O., O71850.
Sandel, Derrell, W., O71865.
Sheppard, Irving T., O71868.
Smith, William B., O71875.
Stipo, Vito D., O71877.
Terry, Bennett E., O71881.
Young, Edward R., O71899.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Capozzi, Henry P., O71909.
Dyke, Lester M., 2d, O71916.
McDonald, Billy A., O71939.
Pablo, John T., O71947.
Pearson, William G., O71948.
Petersen, Donald L., O71949.
Randolph, George B., Jr., O72354.
Reber, John A., O71954.
Thompson, John H., Jr., O71732.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Burn, Margaret T., L462.
Stauber, Ruby R., L465.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Bloxham, Carolyn A., N2660.
Engelhardt, Dorothy M., N2679.

The following-named person for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of Captain, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

MacGregor, John M., O1311177.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be first lieutenants

Black, Gordon C., MSC, O2047562.
Boykin, Thomas C., DC, O2270449.
Finkelstein, Zane E., JAGC, O2269030.
Fowler, James L., VC, O2204915.
Hammett, John W., MSC, O542749.
Stearns, Clarence L., MSC, O2266484.

To be second lieutenants

Oliver, Willemae M., WAC, L1010690.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Olsen, Ralph N., O4030403.
Richardson, Arthur W., O2273864.
Snyder, Dale R., O2273717.
Vargas, Manuel J., Jr.
Williamson, Harold G.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Bakarich, Michael N., O1914519.
Butler, Jack R., O993339.
Corkill, Harry L., Jr., O1599148.
Jackman, Donald L., O1881652.
Lund, Niels H., O1120250.
Tyson, Robert M., Jr., O1924664.
White, James R., O2263302.

To be second lieutenants

Chabot, Don W., O996231.
Sanders, Ralph D., Jr., O4010033.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Congress):

Dorsett, Herbert F., O4058912.
Daine, Robert H., O4058911.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Cortada, Rafael L.
Shepherd, Richard G.
Staples, William B.
Harris, Loston

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, Thou knowest our deepest longings as rulers and leaders meet today in solemn conclave to find the right solution to the difficult problems of international relationships.

We are dependent upon Thee and earnestly beseech Thee that all who assemble in Geneva may be inspired with a new sense of the worth and dignity of human life, its origin and destiny, and its glorious capacities and possibilities.

May the power of Thy divine spirit guide them in promoting and preserving the great moral and spiritual virtues and values of love and mercy, of friendship and good will.

Grant that they may courageously choose the lofty ways of righteousness and justice and sincerely commit themselves to the great enterprise of giving confused and baffled mankind a more radiant vision and hope of peace on earth.

Hear us now as, in a moment of silence, we pray especially for our President and our Secretary of State.

To Thy name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 18, 1955.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on Friday, July 15, 1955, and said to contain the ninth annual report on United States participation in the United Nations, covering the year 1954.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 166)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers and illustrations, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, the ninth annual report on United States participation in the United Nations, covering the year 1954.

In a decade of trying years, the United Nations has developed from a blueprint for peace into a living, functioning organization. It was fitting that an impressive commemoration of the signing of the United Nations Charter 10 years ago should have recently taken place in San Francisco to focus attention on the accomplishments and principles of the United Nations.

I was privileged to bring to this gathering a special message from the Congress expressing, on behalf of the people of the United States, our deep desire for peace and our hope that all nations will join with us in a renewed effort for peace.

Out of the United Nations' many actions in 1954, the following are of special interest to the United States, for they worked to the benefit of American foreign policy.

1. ATOMIC ENERGY FOR PEACE

The atom has unlocked untold opportunities in the world of peaceful progress. I know of no better way to improve the lot of mankind and raise its hopes than by pushing ahead vigorously in the development of the atom for the purpose of peace. That is why I went before the General Assembly in 1953 to ask that all nations apply their ingenuity and resourcefulness in a program of international cooperation in this field.

The faith of the American people in the world's readiness for this challenge have not been disappointed. The progress in a short space of time has been dramatic.

I authorized Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to announce to the General Assembly in the fall of 1954 the intention of the United States to make available 100 kg. of fissionable material to assist nations in their own programs.

On December 4, 1954, the General Assembly adopted a resolution entitled "International Cooperation in Developing the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy." This was done with historic unanimity, after the rejection of Soviet amendments, 60 to 0.

By this resolution the assembly endorsed the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency to organize the pooling of atomic knowledge and materials for peaceful ends, and decreed the holding of an international technical conference under United Nations auspices to explore the promise of the atom and develop methods for its practical use. That conference—which may well be the broadest exchange of scientific and technical information in history—is to begin August 8 in Geneva.

United Nations' action in this field made the atoms-for-peace project into an instrument for constructive international progress. It reminded people the world over that the United States is their partner in their search for peace and plenty. It renewed also the hope for real participation by the Soviet Union—a hope which was central to the original proposal. We will welcome the participation of all interested nations in these activities. But we will not slow the wheels of progress if some do not choose to join with us.

2. PRISONERS IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Of all the important matters before the United Nations in 1954, none so strongly engaged the emotions of the American people as the case of the fighting men detained by the Chinese Communists. A historic 47–5 vote by the General Assembly condemned their detention and directed Secretary-General Hammarskjold to leave no stone unturned to seek their release.

The limited success reached thus far proves: the potency of the United Nations in focusing world opinion; the diplomatic skill and irrepressible perseverance of Mr. Hammarskjold in a most difficult task; the steady helpfulness of friendly nations whom divisive propaganda could not frighten away from us; and, by no means least important, the patience and wise self-restraint of our own people. May these qualities serve to convince Communist China that it should end the wrongful detention of all surviving United Nations prisoners, whatever their nationality. The prolonged anguish of these men and their nearest kin arouses the sympathies of the civilized world.

3. GUATEMALA

The conflict in Guatemala was closer to our homeland than any other which the Security Council has ever faced. In June 1954, Guatemalan patriots began an armed revolt to eject a government whose Communist sponsorship was becoming ever more obvious and to restore a free government.

Immediately the pro-Communist government invoked its right to be heard by the United Nations Security Council. The Council met forthwith. The Guatemalan representative demanded, with conspicuous Soviet backing, that the United Nations intervene to stop the revolt.

The United States representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., insisted that the Soviet Union "stay out of this hemisphere"—a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine in contemporary terms. Further, he urged the Council to let the proper regional body—the Organization of American States—deal with the situation in Guatemala and neighboring countries. He pointed out that if the United Nations were to intervene in local disputes over the heads of responsible regional organizations, the entire system of regional security sanctioned by the United Nations Charter would be in jeopardy.

Today Guatemala is again securely restored to the community of free nations. A challenge by world communism within our hemisphere has been met and overcome.

4. DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY

Neither lasting peace nor the real reduction of international tensions can be realized until progress in disarmament becomes a fact. As nuclear capabilities have increased to staggering proportions, disarmament has become, literally, a problem of survival for all mankind.

In 1954 a subcommittee of Canada, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union held its first round of private discussions. In 5 weeks of meetings newly detailed proposals were laid before the Soviet representative, but with no result.

But, in the General Assembly in September, the Soviets gave the appearance of reversing their adamant position and stated their acceptance of at least some principles of a sound program. We are carefully weighing this Soviet step, and the subsequent Soviet proposal in May 1955, in the broad restudy of United States disarmament policy which is now in progress.

By this continuing exploration in the disarmament field, as well as by recommendations for strengthening collective action against any future aggression, and by watchful influence over the dangerous areas of the world, the United Nations in 1954 continued to serve the cause of peace.

5. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACTIONS

The spectacular potentialities of the atom for peaceful purposes must not be allowed to overshadow the slow but sound progress of the United Nations in the economic and social field.

The most far-reaching new step in 1954 was the approval by the General Assembly of the establishment of an International Finance Corporation to stimulate the setting up and expansion of productive private enterprises in underdeveloped countries. The Corporation will be set up as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and will provide capital in private enterprises without requirement of Government guarantees.

The work of the United Nations on behalf of refugees also received new impetus in a General Assembly decision authorizing the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to raise funds and undertake a 4-year program designed to achieve permanent solutions for certain refugees in Europe, most of them still unsettled since World War II, who are not eligible for other aid programs. The United States strongly supported this decisive step to solve a distressing human problem.

We were able, in 1954, through the power of the United Nations in shaping world opinion, to further expose the repressive system of forced labor in Communist countries. The outstanding report of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor was officially considered for the first time by the Economic and Social Council, which subsequently condemned the use of forced labor for political and economic purposes. The United States representative, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, was also able to expose before the General Assembly newly discovered facts and recent regulations which demonstrated that the system of forced labor had been extended with Soviet help to Communist China.

Other economic and social programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies—including technical assistance, Korean reconstruction, aid to Palestine refugees, the children's fund, food and agricultural assistance, labor, health, and education—continued to help in making the United Nations known to millions of people around the globe as a living, constructive force. The United Nations specialized agencies, specifically the International Labor Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, received the tribute of sudden participation by the U. S. S. R.

Whatever the reason for its changed attitude, we welcome it as further proof of the importance and world reputation of the specialized agencies; and also as an extension of points at which the Soviet rulers may, if they wish, broaden fruitful cooperation with the rest of the world. This development challenges the United States to maintain its watchfulness and constructive activity in all these fields in which the Soviet Union has at length shown an interest.

The United States representatives have actively used the United Nations forum to expound our ideas and ideals and reveal the fallacies of communism.

All these things have happened after reduction in the previous year of our American share of United Nations costs and while we worked out a program in which all Americans holding important office at the United Nations were screened in accordance with FBI procedures.

These are highlights from 1 year's activity in the United Nations' search for peace among nations. That year is chronicled in more detail in the attached report.

The vitality of the United Nations and American support for the United Nations were never more needed than now. We are in a period of great flux in international affairs. There are signs that the world may be entering a new phase in international relationships. For the first time since the United Nations Charter came into force, the heads of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the U. S. S. R. will be meeting. They will, I hope, be able to identify the outstanding divisive issues and develop methods to try to solve them. I for one will enter these discussions with a full awareness of the opportunities offered by the United Nations to contribute to the peace of the world. If these meetings reach useful areas of agreement in the handling of international problems, then they will open new vistas looking toward further agreement. This can only mean that the United Nations will have new and wider opportunities to build upon the foundations thus laid.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 15, 1955*.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House should know, if they do not already know, that this bill as it comes to the House from the other body imposes additional obligations upon the Treasury of the United States; and that it imposes quite different obligations upon the youth of America than was the case when the bill was considered in the House. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think all of the discussion that can be had on the bill ought to be had in the House of Representatives. Therefore, I object.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON DUTY ABROAD

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

ARMY LOSING SERVICES OF TWO OUTSTANDING FIGURES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the United States Army is losing the services of two outstanding figures. It is with great regret that I note the retirement of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway and the resignation of Secretary Robert T. Stevens. I have felt that these two men represent the finest traditions of a great service and that the Army's leadership in their hands has been sure and safe.

I do not think that any Chief of Staff in my time has served with greater courage and initiative than General Ridgway, or has shown more ability and foresight in the discharge of his duties. It is most unfortunate that our military forces are to be deprived of his knowledge at this significant period. He brought with him to the office of Chief of Staff a wealth of experience and a great record of accomplishment. These, together with his own forthrightness and devotion to duty have paid rich dividends in the development of a strong and proud Army.

In this period of overemphasis on push-button warfare and super weapons, men of sound balance and good judgment are essential. Too many people today have lost sight of the necessity for a balanced military defense which is strong in land, sea and air units. No other defense is adequate to cope with the threat of massed forces in all categories posed by the Communists. General Ridgway realizes this. So does Secretary Stevens.

It was Secretary Stevens who refused to be pushed around when few agencies of Government would stand up to the threat of censure from congressional investigating committees. He has been a devoted public servant, a conscientious and hard working official. He has earned the respect and regard of his colleagues in the Secretariat of the Department of Defense and of the men in the uniform of the Army. The Army has been in strong and capable hands and it has enjoyed in these men, leadership of the highest caliber.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. DEROUNIAN) was granted leave of absence to attend the Interparliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. Ray) was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

UPPER COLORADO CONTROVERSY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a special master appointed by the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California has made some recommendations with respect to California's motion to join the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming as necessary parties to the suit. Some of these recommendations are favorable to California and some of them are not. However, whatever course the opinions of the master take, they can in no way alter the bad provisions of the proposed upper Colorado River project.

The master's recommendation that Utah and New Mexico be made parties to the case as lower-basin States does not change the fact that the taxpayers of the Nation would have to pay a $4 billion subsidy for the upper Colorado River project. The irresponsible economics of this project can neither be removed nor improved by legal opinions.

The fact that the master denied California's motion to join the four States on upper Colorado does not change the fact that the project would grow enormous quantities of surplus agricultural products which in turn would have to be supported by the taxpayers.

The opinion of the master assumes that the lower basin has greater rights against the upper basin than California has asserted, but this in no way diminishes the fact that the upper Colorado River project would be detrimental to the national economy and is unneeded, unjustified, and unnecessary.

There is no doubt that California will file exceptions to the recommendations, but neither would this procedure have anything to do with the well established premise that the project would increase the national debt.

Whatever may be the final decision on the controversial water-rights questions the fact cannot be changed that Congress might as well waste money by appropriating funds to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. Vinson, Mr. Brooks of Louisiana, Mr. Kilday, Mr. Short, and Mr. Arends.

MR. GEORGE Y. HARVEY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with reluctance to note the retirement of the Clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. George Y. Harvey, who has been with the committee for many years.

He was appointed to the committee staff by Chairman Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado, October 29, 1937, and is the only member of the present staff who had the privilege of serving under Chairman Taylor. He has served under both Democratic and Republican administrations—under my own chairmanship and during the 80th and 83d Congresses under Chairman Taber—under the administrations of Speaker Rayburn and Speaker Martin.

He is retiring permanently at the age of 48, the youngest retirement in the history of the staff, on the imperative insistence of his physician.

His retirement is a great loss to the committee and is accepted only because there is no alternative. He is one of the ablest of the short line of particularly able men, Stevens, Courts, Sheild, and Pugh, who have occupied that position since the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations in 1865.

During his incumbency the work of the committee expanded until the amounts appropriated by the committee reached a total in excess of the entire expenditures of the Government from the administration of President Washington down to the world wars. The duties and responsibilities of the committee and the staff more than kept pace with the growth in volume of expenditures and accompanying studies and investigations. Under the pressure of war conditions he worked unceasingly, and with such indefatigable energy and devotion to duty as to contribute unquestionably to the condition which today forces him to relinquish at the prime of life one of the key positions in the Government.

It has been a brilliant service while it lasted. It would be impossible to estimate the total savings made in the budgets with which the staff dealt under his study and direction but it aggregates stupendous sums.

His record and his attainments have had wide recognition. I had the privilege of attending the exercises when Northeastern University conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws and, at my request, the president of the university favored me with a copy of the citation with which he was presented to the faculty and board of trustees on that occasion. It reads:

Presentation of Candidate for Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws

Mr. President, fellow members of the board of trustees, and faculty, I have the very great honor and pleasure of presenting this candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

This candidate was born October 28, 1907, in Chillicothe, Mo. He attended grammar school and graduated from high school in Norborne, Mo. He came to Washington, D. C., December 1, 1927, * * * and since that time has held positions in the following organizations: The Department of Justice, the Federal Security Agency (now Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

He, at present, is the fifth person to hold the position of clerk and staff director to the Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives. As you know, this is one of the key committees of Congress, particularly where the operations of the Federal Government are concerned.

His broad understanding of financial management in all of its aspects gained from firsthand experience in the executive branch of the Government makes him particularly qualified to assist the Congress in bringing about legislative changes that are beneficial to the Congress from the standpoint of being able to realistically evaluate the various Government agencies' requests for operating funds and maintain adequate control thereof, to the Federal Government from an operating standpoint, and to you and me as taxpayers, in that we receive more efficient governmental operations for our tax dollars.

He attended this university and graduated in June 1938, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Laws.

He is a member of the following organizations: Society for the Advancement of Management, American Political Science Association, and the Methodist Church.

Over the years this gentleman has given freely of his time and talents to the service of the United States Government. He has always made himself available to extend a helping hand to any agency, organization or person to improve financial management in the executive branch of the Federal Government in balanced relationship to the fuller development of the exercise of the constitutional function of the Congress in control of the public purse. There are few people who have the keen practical perception of the interrelated workings of executive and legislative fiscal procedures and how they can be blended together to secure maximum results from tax dollars expended.

He has never looked for or expected any personal glory for himself; in fact, he has always chosen to work in the background with only the end result (a more efficient operation of the Federal Government) as his goal. The many sacrifices of his personal time are little known except to some of us in the Government who have benefited from the time he has given us during and after

> office hours. Looking back over the many hours he has devoted to this cause, it would be surprising to many of us if his family got to see him except on rare occasions.
>
> It is said that Diogenes spent his life going around with a lighted lantern looking for an honest man. He had the wrong approach. The honesty, the character, the devotion to duty, the service to the United States Government of this candidate shine like a beacon in the dark. He is a living example of what all career Government employees should try to be. This university needed no lantern to find this candidate, even though he has always tried to stay in the background. His deeds shine for him.
>
> In recognition of his outstanding service to the United States Government, I present to you George Y. Harvey, Clerk and Staff Director, Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives, a gentleman, scholar, outstanding career employee of the United States and recommend that he receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

His capacity and faculty for cooperation also won the highest approval and collaboration in the Federal agencies with which he was associated. I am just in receipt of the following letter, typical of others, which I also include:

> UNITED STATES GENERAL
> ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
> *July 19, 1955.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just learned that George Harvey is leaving his post with the committee. Knowing the hazard to his family and himself that continued service would bring, his decision is an understandable one, regrettable as it may be.
>
> It has been my rare privilege over the years to observe firsthand the tremendous contribution that this one man has made to better and more economical government by his efforts. The far-reaching financial improvements with which he is identified include basic simplifications in central fiscal and accounting processes followed in making funds available, the strengthening of the Antideficiency Act, and control over foreign credits, simplification of agency appropriation structures, and improved accounting support for budget presentations—to name only a few.
>
> From its inception in 1947 he provided the Governmentwide joint accounting improvement program with understanding support and able counsel. This has contributed immeasurably to the progress which has been made under that program, particularly from the standpoint of keeping the improvements made tied in directly with the development of more effective congressional control.
>
> In mutually seeking the most advantageous course of action, we did not always readily agree as to method, but there was never any doubt as to his sincerity of purpose or his loyalty to the Congress. Many times the course he chose to follow was not the one which would win him popular acclaim, but time has proven the wisdom of the reforms for which he labored.
>
> Others will, no doubt, express much better than I the significance of the part George played in Governmentwide improvements in financial management in the past decade. However, I will ever be grateful for the helpful guidance and assistance he rendered to me and I felt impelled to convey to you my deep feeling of appreciation. I joint his many, many friends in wishing him the good things he so richly deserves.
>
> Sincerely,
> WALTER F. FREESE,
> *Director, Accounting System Division.*

I am certain I reflect the sentiment of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, on both sides of the table, in expressing the regret at his retirement and in wishing for him health, happiness, and contentment and length of days.

Mr. Harvey will be succeeded by Kennet Sprankle as of this date. Mr. Sprankle will have associated with him, in the expanded administration of the committee, Corhal Orescan with supervision over the Military Establishment and Paul Wilson, in charge of the nonmilitary establishment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

INCREASING FEE FOR EXECUTING APPLICATION FOR PASSPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the program to be taken up under suspension of the rules today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING EXISTING AUTHORITY FOR LOAN OF SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2 of the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363) is hereby amended by striking out the remainder of the sentence after the word "until" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 1, strike out line 6 and insert "June 30, 1958; however, such carrier shall be immediately returned to the Government of the United States if it is used at any time for the transportation of troops, supplies, or material to or from any French colony, or if it is used at any time in support of any of the activities of the French Armed Forces in any French colony."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment. Rather, I make this suggestion. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa is exercising his right under the rule, but on the call of the Consent Calendar amendments have usually been cleared.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. On what basis does the gentleman have the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts started to make a point of order. He has not made it yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is not germane to the bill reported out by the committee.

The SPEAKER. This bill provides for the loan to the Government of France of a small aircraft carrier. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa reads:

> June 30, 1958; however, such carrier shall be immediately returned to the Government of the United States if it is used at any time for the transportation of troops, supplies, or material to or from any French colony, or it is used at any time in support of any of the activities of the French armed forces in any French colony.

The Chair must say that the Chair thinks that is a proper limitation to put upon the bill and therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the bill and asked that it be passed over without prejudice when it was before the House 2 weeks ago.

I called the attention to House Concurrent Resolution 149, sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and adopted by the House only a few weeks ago without a dissenting vote, which says this:

> Whereas Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of inalienable right of man; and
>
> Whereas the people of the United States have traditionally supported other peoples in their aspirations to achieve self-government or independence and in their struggle against tyranny or domination: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*—

And so on and so forth. I submit to Members of the House that my amendment to the pending bill would limit the use of the United States carrier presently on loan to France and which the pending legislation seeks to extend until June 30, 1958; that it would circumscribe the use of this carrier so that it could not be used to support French exploitation of any colonial possession; that it could not be used to put down the independence movement in North Africa or anywhere else in French territory.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to labor this point. I think the amendment is a good one. If we are opposed to colonialism, if we are opposed to tyranny and domination, here is a good place to do other than give lip service to it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is one thing about the amendment that concerns me and I would like to ask a question concerning it: As I understood it this ship would have to revert to the United States even if the French were going to the assistance of one of its colonies which was having trouble with some third party. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. GROSS. I do not think it would bear that construction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, they could still use the ship to give assistance to a colony that might be having difficulty with some border country or some third country?

Mr. GROSS. I think that would be a proper use of it. This country is lending this carrier to the French for training purposes. If we are lending the ship to them for training purposes let us confine it to that use and that use exclusively, that of training purposes for the French Navy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. If I understood the gentleman's amendment it applied only to the French colonies. Is that true?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say for the information of the gentleman from Iowa that his amendment would not cover the larger part of north Africa, Algeria. This is the largest land area in North Africa and is an integral part of France by their constitution. Is the gentleman acquainted with that fact?

Mr. GROSS. What I am seeking to do is to confine the use of this carrier to the purpose intended, that of a training ship for the French Navy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will not be adopted. In 1953 we loaned a carrier to France. Bear in mind that the agreement was entered into in writing and it was specifically stated for what purpose the carrier would be used under the terms and conditions of the agreement. If that agreement is violated then that cancels the agreement.

The sole purpose of the lending of the carrier was for training purposes. The French are now building an airplane carrier to be called the *Clemenceau* and will not finish building that carrier until about 1958. The particular type of training that the French are engaged in is in connection with hunting submarines. It bears an important relation to our NATO agreement. Therefore I hope we will not disturb an agreement that has already been reduced to writing between the French Government and this Government and try to go outside of the original agreement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In what way would this disturb the NATO agreement?

Mr. VINSON. It would disturb it because the NATO agreement was drawn up in 1953 stating specifically what this carrier shall be used for. That agreement has been in effect, and is now in effect, and they are using it in accordance with the agreement. The gentleman now is trying to bring in here some collateral matter such as colonialism which has no relation whatsoever to that. It is there for one purpose and that is to enable the French to train crews so that it can be engaged in submarine detection work bearing a relation to our NATO obligation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. There would be some difficulty in trying to administer this kind of an amendment would there not?

Mr. VINSON. Of course it would be difficult.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I pointed out to the gentleman from Iowa, I am as much against colonialism as he is.

Mr. VINSON. So am I.

Mr. SPRINGER. If this were used to transfer men and supplies to Algeria, for instance, an integral part of the French Republic, which it is under the French Constitution, and the supplies and men were in turn transported across the border into the Colony of Morocco or into Tripoli, you can see the difficulties involved and what we would get into.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote and I trust the House will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING NUMBER OF CADETS PRESIDENT MAY SELECT FOR APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5269) to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question in reference to this bill. How many appointments will that give the President to each of the Academies? Does this increase that number?

Mr. VINSON. Fifty-three annually for both the Military Academy and the Air Force Academy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I understand the President now has the authority to hold 89 appointments in the Academy at one time. Under this legislation, the number will be increased from 89 to 300.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Well, now, what will happen to the appointments of the Members to the Naval Academy and to West Point?

Mr. PRICE. The Navy will not be affected.

Mr. VINSON. The Naval Academy is not affected at all.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Now, let me ask the chairman this: If we do not increase the authority of the President to make these appointments, then the appointments by the Members could be increased.

Mr. VINSON. No, not at all, because we will ultimately maintain the same relation at the Air Force Academy as we have at West Point.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Then, let me ask the chairman this: At the time the Air Force Academy is in operation, how many appointments will a Member of the House have to that Academy?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly the same as a Member now has for West Point.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This year there are only five from my State.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it does not apply this year, because it is taken now from the whole State. When the Academy is completed, then they will be named from the districts.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. All in the world this bill does is to give to the Air Force Academy and West Point the same number of appointments that we presently give the President for the Naval Academy, and as far as appointments to West Point are concerned, it will not interfere with our congressional appointments in any way whatsoever. As far as the new Air Force Academy is concerned, we are concerned about the very thing that the gentleman brought up, but we will not lose our appointments after the program starts in full operation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would rather wait and see about that before we pass this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Was not this bill passed over without prejudice heretofore?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS]?

Mr. VINSON. I object to the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee, Mr. YATES, and Mr. GROSS objected.

AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF CERTAIN REVERSIONARY RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4280) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) of section 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1011 (c)), the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, subject to the provisions of this act, to release on behalf of the United States the conditions, contained in 2 deeds, both dated December 22, 1954, conveying certain submarginal lands in Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens Counties, S. C., to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina, which require that the lands conveyed be used for public purposes and provide for a reversion of such lands to the United States if at any time they cease to be so used.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall release the conditions referred to in the first section only if the Clemson Agricultural College agrees—

(a) that all proceeds from the sale, lease, or other disposition of the lands conveyed to it by such deeds shall be used by it exclusively for one or more of the following purposes: (1) the operation, development, or improvement of any of the lands not sold, leased, or disposed of by the college, (2) the development and advancement of agriculture, or (3) general research;

(b) that all proceeds received from the sale, lease, or other disposition of such lands shall be maintained by the college in a separate fund and that the records of all transactions involving the use of such fund shall be open to inspection by the Secretary; and

(c) to pay to the United States any amount determined by the Secretary to be payable to the United States under section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that any of the proceeds from the sale, lease, or other disposition of the lands conveyed to the college by such deeds were used by it for any purpose other than one of the purposes enumerated in section 2 (a), the college shall be liable to pay to the Secretary, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States, an amount equal to the amount which the Secretary determines was so used. All proceedings under this section shall be held in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act and the findings and determinations of the Secretary hereunder shall be subject to judicial review in the manner provided in that act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 1, strike out ", subject to the provisions of this act."

Page 1, line 7, after the words "United States", insert "with respect to lands designated pursuant to section 2 hereof."

Page 2, line 7, strike out all of sections 2 and 3 and insert a new section 2, reading as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary shall release the conditions referred to in section 1 only with respect to lands covered by and described in an agreement or agreements entered into between the Secretary and the college in which the college, in consideration of the release of said conditions as to such lands, agrees—

"(1) that all proceeds from the sale or exchange of such lands shall be used by the college for the acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the project or for the development or improvement of lands within the project;

"(2) that any lands acquired by the sale or exchange of the lands covered by such agreement shall become a part of the project established on the lands conveyed by the two deeds referred to in section 1 and shall be subject to the conditions with respect to the use of such lands for public purposes contained in such deeds; and

"(3) that all proceeds from the sale, lease, or other disposition of the lands covered by such agreement shall be maintained by the college in a separate fund and that the record of all transactions involving such fund shall be open to inspection by the Secretary."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 4280, deals with submarginal land presently under title to Clemson College. Clemson College is in the district which it is my honor to represent in this Congress. Clemson is a land-grant college and is the A. and M. college of South Carolina. This bill has the backing of President R. F. Poole, whom many of you know as he has appeared before committees of this Congress. Dr. Poole is doing an outstanding job and is admired and respected by the entire State of South Carolina. This bill also has the unanimous backing of the board of trustees which boasts some of the most outstanding Americans of our time as members of the board and life trustees.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that Clemson was built on land formerly owned by the great statesman John C. Calhoun and bequeathed to the State of South Carolina by his distinguished son-in-law, Thomas G. Clemson, for the purpose of establishing Clemson College. Clemson is making a remarkable contribution to the advancement of agriculture and industry in the Southeast. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that with the present building program, Clemson in the near future will have one of the best agricultural schools in the world. In arts and sciences Clemson ranks with the best and as a military college it is second to none.

After introducing this bill I appeared before the subcommittee headed by the Honorable W. R. POAGE, along with members of the board of trustees and representatives of the Agriculture Department. Mr. POAGE suggested certain amendments which were agreed to by all concerned. The bill then was reported favorably by the subcommittee and later by the full committee. It has the approval of the Agriculture Department. This bill involves approximately 27,000 acres of land and will permit Clemson to sell or exchange parts of this land on the outer perimeter for land situated nearer the main campus. In this way, Clemson can protect and administer this property to the best advantage of the college and the country. This will afford better management and better utilization of the entire project for agricultural research and other purposes. In the language of the committee, this bill will "use all proceeds from the sale or exchange of such lands for the acquisition of other lands within the project or the development or improvement of the project; make any lands acquired pursuant to such sale or exchange a part of the project and subject to the conditions with respect to public use contained in the deeds conveying the land to the college; and maintain the proceeds from any disposition of lands covered by the agreements in a separate fund, the records of which shall be open to inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the favorable adoption of this bill as I believe it will be in the best interest of Clemson College, agriculture in general, and the taxpayers of the United States.

CONVEY INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS IN SAG HARBOR, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4717) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain lands, to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to quitclaim to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the former Sag Harbor Military Reservation, Sag Harbor, N. Y., more particularly described in section 2.

SEC. 2. All that piece or parcel of land situate in the incorporated village of Sag Harbor, town of Southampton, county of Suffolk, and State of New York, being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a drill hole placed in the southerly line of Union Street and the northwest corner of the premises herein described, said drill hole being south 78 degrees 30 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 84.03 feet as measured along the southerly line of Union Street from a drill hole set at the point of tangency on the southerly line of Union Street near its intersection with the easterly line of Madison Street; running thence south 78 degrees 30 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 15.50 feet as measured along the southerly line of Union Street to a point; running thence south 01 degree 31 minutes 20 seconds west along an existing fence a distance of 45.94 feet along land of the incorporated village of Sag Harbor through premises known as "Arsenal Lot" to a point; running thence south 80 degrees 43 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.00 feet along the Old Burying Ground to a point; running thence north 01 degree 16 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 51.12 feet along land of Leonard M. Berrara, and through an existing structure, to the point or place of beginning.

Said description being in accordance with the survey of Edward T. Archibald, licensed land surveyor numbered 23420, of Sag Harbor, N. Y., which survey was made November 1953, and said premises contain an area of 0.0156 acre, as shown by said survey.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Army, with respect to the land described in section 2 of this act, is authorized and directed to release by quitclaim deed to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y., the express condition and limitation provided in section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 382) and set forth in the deed dated February 3, 1926, by which the Secretary of War conveyed said land and other land comprising that portion of the Sag Harbor Military Reservation known as the 'Arsenal Lot,' situate in the port of Sag Harbor, Southampton Township, Suffolk County, N. Y., to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the Trustees of the Village of Sag Harbor, N. Y."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1614) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FORWARDING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFIT CHECKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1821) to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DELIVERY OF BURIAL FLAG TO FRIEND IN ABSENCE OF NEXT OF KIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4727) to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veterans where it is not claimed by the next of kin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I of Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"I. Where an honorably discharged veteran of any war, or a person honorably discharged from the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard after serving at least one enlistment or for disability incurred in line of duty, dies after discharge, a flag to drape the casket shall be furnished in all cases; such flag to be given to the next of kin after burial of the veteran: *Provided,* That in the event no claim is made for the flag by the next of kin, it may be given, upon request, to a close friend or an associate of the deceased veteran: *Provided further,* That the furnishing of a flag to any person under this proviso will constitute final and conclusive determination of rights under this veterans regulation."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the colon insert "*Provided further,* That the furnishing of a flag to any person under this proviso will constitute final and conclusive determination of rights under this veterans regulation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6727) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there is an amendment to be offered as a substitute to the committee amendment with which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is in agreement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land containing approximately 4 acres, which is presently under lease to the city of Milwaukee, Wis., for the Milwaukee Water Works Menominee Valley booster station, to the city of Milwaukee, a municipal subdivision of the State of Wisconsin: *Provided,* That the city of Milwaukee pay one-half of the market value of the said parcel of land, as determined by an independent appraiser elected by such city and the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed under this act is to be determined by a survey to be made under the supervision of the Veterans' Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, immediately following the word "land", insert a comma and "without improvements."

On page 2, line 2, before the period, insert "but paid by the city."

On page 2, line 6, before the period, insert "but at the expense of the city."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to the committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "paid by the city" and insert in lieu thereof "and paid jointly by such city and Veterans' Administration."

Page 2, line 6, insert a period after the word "Administration" and strike out the words "but at the expense of the city."

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "one-half of the" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the fair."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "elected" and insert in lieu thereof the word "selected."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISION OF TITLE 21, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6991) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics," is hereby revised, codified, and enacted into law, and may be cited as "Title 21, United States Code, § —," as follows:

TITLE 21—FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

Part	Section
I. Food, drugs, and cosmetics generally	1
II. Animals, poultry, and meats	451
III. Narcotics	711

Part I—Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics generally

Chapter	Section
1. Food and Drug Administration	1
3. Food, drugs, and cosmetics	21
5. Milk and cream	201
7. Tea importation	261
9. Caustic poisons	311

Chapter 1—Food and Drug Administration

Sec.
1. Establishment.
2. Functions of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 1. Establishment.

The Food and Drug Administration shall continue as a constituent organization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 2. Functions of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall perform the functions prescribed for him under part I of this title, and may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department.

Chapter 3—Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics

Subchapter I—Definitions, determinations, and representations

Sec.
21. Definitions.
22. Determination of misbranding.
23. Representation as antiseptic.
24. Short title.

Subchapter II—Enforcement and penalties
31. Prohibited acts.
32. Injunctions.
33. Penalties; exemptions.
34. Libel for condemnation.
35. Hearing before violation reported.
36. Report of minor violations.
37. Procedings in name of United States; subpenas.

Subchapter III—Food

41. Definitions and standards for food; procedure governing establishment; objections; hearings; applicability of other provisions.
42. Adulterated food.
43. Misbranded food.
44. Emergency permit control.
45. Exemptions.
46. Tolerances for poisonous ingredients; certification of coal-tar colors for foods.
47. Tolerances for pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural products.
48. Colored oleomargarines.
49. Sea food; examination on request of packer; fees.

Subchapter IV—Drugs and devices

51. Adulterated drugs and devices.
52. Misbranded drugs and devices.
53. Exemptions.
54. Certification of coal-tar colors for drugs.
55. New drugs.
56. Certification of drugs containing insulin.
57. Certification of drugs containing certain antibiotics.

Subchapter V—Cosmetics

61. Adulterated cosmetics.
62. Misbranded cosmetics.
63. Exemptions.
64. Certification of coal-tar colors for cosmetics.

Subchapter VI—Administrative provisions

71. Regulations; hearings; judicial review.
72. Examinations and investigations.
73. Records of interstate shipment.
74. Factory inspection; notice; reports; receipts for samples; copies of analyses.
75. Publicity.
76. Cost of certification of coal-tar colors.
77. Revision of pharmacopeia; development of analyses and tests.

Subchapter VII—Imports and exports

81. Examination and refusal of imports.
82. Exports adulterated or misbranded.
83. Suspension of adulterated imports.

SUBCHAPTER I—DEFINITIONS, DETERMINATIONS, REPRESENTATIONS, AND SHORT TITLE

§ 21. Definitions

As used in this chapter—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) "Butter" means the food product usually known as butter, and which is made exclusively from milk or cream, or both, with or without common salt, and with or without additional coloring matter, and containing not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, all tolerances having been allowed for.

(d) "Cosmetic" means articles other than soap, (1) intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, or otherwise applied to or introduced into the human body for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance, and (2) intended for use as a component of any such articles.

(e) "Device," except when used in sections 22, 31 (i), 43 (f), 52 (c), and 62 (c) of this title, means instruments, apparatus, and contrivances, including their components, parts, and accessories, intended (1) for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; or (2) to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals.

(f) "Drug" means (1) articles recognized in an official compendium; and (2) articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; and (3) articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and (4) articles intended for use as a component of any article specified in clauses (1), (2), or (3) of this paragraph; but does not include devices or their components, parts, or accessories.

(g) "Food" means (1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals, (2) chewing gum, and (3) articles used for components of any such article.

(h) "Interstate commerce" means (1) commerce between any State or Territory and any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce within the District of Columbia or within any other Territory not organized with a legislative body.

(i) "Label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon the immediate container other than a package liner, of any article; and a requirement made by or under authority of this chapter that any word, statement, or other information appearing on the label shall not be considered to be compiled with unless it also appears on or is easily legible through the outside container or wrapper, if any there be, of the retail package of such article.

(j) "Labeling" means all labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or (2) accompanying such article.

(k) "New drug" means—

(1) Any drug the composition of which is such that the drug is not generally recognized among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of drugs, as safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, unless at any time prior to June 25, 1938, it was subject to the Food and Drug Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, and at such time its labeling contained the same representations concerning the conditions of its use; or

(2) Any drug the composition of which is such that, as a result of investigations to determine its safety for use under such conditions, it has become so recognized, but which has not, otherwise than in such investigations, been used to a material extent or for a material time under such conditions.

(l) "Nonfat dry milk solids" or "defatted milk solids" is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from the sweet milk of cows, and containing (1) the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made, (2) not over 5 percent by weight of moisture, and (3) not over 1½ percent by weight of fat content unless otherwise indicated.

(m) "Official compendium" means the official United States Pharmacopoeia, official Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia of the United States, official National Formulary, or any supplement to any of them.

(n) "Package" includes wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

(o) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(p) "Pesticide chemical" means any substance which, alone, in chemical combination or in formulation with one or more other substances, is an "economic poison" within the meaning of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and which is used in the production, storage, or transportation of raw agricultural commodities.

(q) "Raw agricultural commodity" means any food in its raw or natural state, including all fruits that are washed, colored, or otherwise treated in their unpeeled natural form prior to marketing.

(r) "Territory" includes the District of Columbia and any Territory or possession of the United States, but not the Canal Zone.

§ 22. Determination of misbranding

If an article is alleged to be misbranded because the labeling is misleading, there shall be taken into account, among other things, in determining whether the labeling is misleading not only representations made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the labeling fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the article to which the labeling relates under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling thereof or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

§ 23. Representation as antiseptic

The representation of a drug, in its labeling, as an antiseptic shall constitute a representation that it is a germicide, except in the case of a drug purporting to be, or represented as, an antiseptic for inhibitory use as a wet dressing, ointment, dusting powder, or for such other use as involves prolonged contact with the body.

§ 24. Short title

This chapter may be cited as the "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Chapter."

SUBCHAPTER II—ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

§ 31. Prohibited acts

The following acts and the causing thereof ar prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(b) The adulteration or misbranding of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in interstate commerce.

(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise.

(d) The introduction of delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any article in violation of section 44 or 55 of this title.

(e) The refusal to permit access to or copying of any record as required by section 73 of this title.

(f) The refusal to permit entry or inspection as authorized by section 74 of this title.

(g) The manufacture within any Territory of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded.

(h) The giving of a guaranty or undertaking referred to in section 33 (c) (2) of this title which is false, except by a person who relied upon a guaranty or undertaking to the same effect signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person residing in the United States from whom he received in good faith the food, drug, device, or cosmetic; or the giving of a guaranty or undertaking referred to in section 33 (c) (3) of this title which guaranty or undertaking is false.

(i) Forging, counterfeiting, simulating, or falsely representing, or without proper authority using any mark, stamp, tag, label, or other identification device authorized or required by regulations promulgated under the provisions of sections 44, 46 (b), 49, 54, 56, 57, or 64 of this title.

(j) The using by any person to his own advantage, or revealing other than to the Secretary or officers or employees of the Department, or to the courts when relevant in any judicial proceeding under this chapter, any information acquired under authority of sections 44, 55, 56, 57, or 74, of this title concerning any method or process which as a trade secret is entitled to protection.

(k) The alteration, mutilation, destruction, obliteration, or removal of the whole or any part of the labeling of, or the doing of any other act with respect to, a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, if such act is done while such article is held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce and results in such article being adulterated or misbranded.

(l) The using, on the labeling of any drug or in any advertising relating to such drug, of any representation or suggestion that an application with respect to such drug is effective under section 55 of this title, or that such drug complies with the provisions of such section.

(m) The sale or offering for sale of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine, or the possession or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of subsection (c) or (d) of section 48 of this title.

(n) The using, in labeling, advertising, or other sales promotion, of any reference to any report or analysis furnished in compliance with section 74 of this title.

§ 32. Injunctions

(a) The United States district courts and the United States courts of the Territories shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of section 31 of this title, except paragraphs (e), (f), (h), (i), and (j), thereof.

(b) Any violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, which also constitutes a violation of this chapter, shall be tried by the court, or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury, in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of 42 (b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

§ 33. Penalties; exemptions

(a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 31 of this title shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year or fined not more than $1,000, or both. Any person who commits such a violation after 1 conviction under this section has become final shall be imprisoned not more than 3 years or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, any person who violates any of the provisions of section 31 of this title, with intent to defraud or mislead, shall be imprisoned not more than 3 years or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

(c) No person shall be subject to the penalties of subsection (a) of this section—

(1) for having received in interstate commerce any article and delivered it or proffered delivery of it, if such delivery or proffer was made in good faith, unless he refuses to furnish on request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary the name and address of the person from whom he purchased or received such article and copies of all documents, if any, pertaining to the delivery of the article to him; or

(2) for having violated section 31 (a) or 31 (d) of this title, if he establishes a guaranty or undertaking signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person residing in the United States from whom he received the article in good faith, to the effect, in case of an alleged violation of section 31 (a) of this title, that such article is not adulterated or misbranded, within the meaning of this chapter, designating this chapter, or to the effect, in case of an alleged violation of section 31 (d) of this title, that such title is not an article which may not, under the provisions of section 44 or 55 of this title, be introduced into interstate commerce; or

(3) for having violated section 31 (a) of this title, where the violation exists because the article is adulterated by reason of containing a coal-tar color not from a batch certified in accordance with the Secretary's regulations, if such person establishes a guaranty or undertaking signed by, and containing the name and address of, the manufacturer of the coal-tar color, to the effect that such color was from a batch certified in accordance with the applicable regulations promulgated by the Secretary under this chapter; or

(4) for having violated section 31 (b), 31 (c), or 31 (k) of this title by failure to comply with section 52 (f) of this title in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 53 (a) nor section 53 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article.

§ 34. Libel for condemnation

(a) Grounds and jurisdiction: Any article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded when introduced into or while in interstate commerce or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce, or which may not, under the provisions of section 44 or 55 of this title, be introduced into interstate commerce, shall be liable to be proceeded against while in interstate commerce, or at any time thereafter, on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found.

(b) Procedure: The article shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury.

(c) Libel for misbranding limited; change of venue: (1) No libel for condemnation for any alleged misbranding shall be instituted under this chapter, if there is pending in any court a libel for condemnation proceeding under this chapter based upon the same alleged misbranding, and not more than one such proceeding shall be instituted if no such proceeding is so pending, except that such limitations shall not apply—

(A) when such misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States, in a criminal, injunction, or libel for condemnation proceeding under this chapter, or

(B) when the Secretary has probable cause to believe from facts found, without hearing, by him or any officer or employee of the Department that the misbranded article is dangerous to health, or that the labeling of the misbranded article is fraudulent, or would be in a material respect misleading to the injury or damage of the purchaser or consumer.

(2) In any case where the number of libel for condemnation proceedings is limited as above provided the proceeding pending or instituted shall, on application of the claimant, seasonably made, be removed for trial to any district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties, or, in case of failure to so stipulate within a reasonable time, the claimant may apply to the court of the district in which the seizure has been made, and such court, after giving the United States attorney for such district reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, to which the case shall be removed for trial.

(d) Consolidation of multiple proceedings: When libel for condemnation proceedings under this section, involving the same claimant and the same issues of adulteration or misbranding, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the claimant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court after giving the United States attorney for such district reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

(e) Removal for trial: In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (c) or (d) of this section—

(1) The clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction.

(2) The court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of the case, which the court from which removal is made would have, or to which such court would be subject, if such case is not removed.

(f) Samples of seized goods: The court at any time after seizure up to a reasonable time before trial shall by order allow any party to a condemnation proceeding, his attorney or agent, to obtain a representative sample of the article seized and a true copy of the analysis, if any, on which the proceeding is based and the identifying marks or numbers, if any, of the packages from which the samples analyzed were obtained.

(g) Disposition after condemnation: Any food, drug, device, or cosmetic condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may direct in accordance with the provisions of this section. If sold, the proceeds thereof, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States. Such article shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this chapter or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold. After entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such article shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this chapter or the laws of any State or Territory in which sold, the court may by order direct that such article be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this chapter under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the article under bond. Any article condemned by reason of its being an article which may not, under section 44 or 55 of this title, be introduced into interstate commerce, shall be disposed of by destruction.

(h) Costs: When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article.

§ 35. Hearing before violation reported

Before any violation of this chapter is reported by the Secretary to any United States attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated shall be given appropriate notice and an opportunity to present his views, either orally or in writing, with regard to such contemplated proceeding.

§ 36. Report of minor violations

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for prosecution, or for the institution of libel or injunction proceedings, minor violations of this chapter whenever the Secretary believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable written notice or warning.

§ 37. Proceedings in name of United States; subpenas.

All proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this chapter shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States, in any district, may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

SUBCHAPTER III—FOOD

§ 41. Definitions and standards for food; procedure governing establishment; objections; hearings; applicability of other provisions

(a) Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary such action will promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations fixing and establishing for any food, under its common or usual name insofar as practicable, a reasonable definition and standard of identity, a reasonable standard of quality, and/or reasonable standards of fill of container.

The Secretary may not establish a definition and standard of identity or standard of quality for fresh or dried fruits, fresh or dried vegetables, or butter, but may establish definitions and standards of identity, relating only to maturity and to the effects of freezing, for avocadoes, cantaloupes, citrus fruits, and melons.

In prescribing any standard of fill of container, the Secretary shall give consideration to the natural shrinkage in storage and in transit of fresh natural food and to need for the necessary packing and protective material.

In prescribing any standard of quality for any canned fruit or canned vegetable, the Secretary shall give consideration to and make due allowance for the differing characteristics of the several varieties of such fruit or vegetable.

In prescribing a definition and standard of identity for any food or class of food in which optional ingredients are permitted, the Secretary shall, for the purpose of promoting honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers, designate the optional ingredients which shall be named on the label.

(b) (1) Any action under subsection (a) of this section for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of any regulation shall be begun by a proposal made (A) by the Secretary on his own initiative, or (B) by petition of any interested person, showing reasonable grounds therefor, filed with the Secretary. The Secretary shall publish the proposal and shall afford all interested persons an opportunity to present their views thereon, orally or in writing. As soon as practicable thereafter, the Secretary shall by order act upon such proposal and shall make such order public. Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection the order shall become effective at such time as may be specified therein, but not prior to the day following the last day on which objections may be filed under such paragraph.

(2) At any time prior to the thirtieth day after the date on which an order entered under paragraph (1) of this subsection is made public, any person who will be adversely affected by such order if placed in effect may file objections thereto with the Secretary, specifying with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable, stating the grounds therefor, and requesting a public hearing upon such objections. Until final action upon such objections is taken by the Secretary under paragraph (3) of this subsection, the filing of such objections shall operate to stay the effectiveness of those provisions of the order to which the objections are made. As soon as practicable after the time for filing objections has expired the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register specifying those parts of the order which have been stayed by the filing of objections and, if no objections have been filed, stating that fact.

(3) As soon as practicable after such request for a public hearing, the Secretary, after due notice, shall hold such a public hearing for the purpose of receiving evidence relevant and material to the issues raised by such objections. At the hearing, any interested person may be heard in person or by representative. As soon as practicable after completion of the hearing, the Secretary shall by order act upon such objections and make such order public. Such order shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at such hearing and shall set forth, as part of the order, detailed findings of fact on which the order is based. The Secretary shall specify in the order the date on which it shall take effect, except that it shall not be made to take effect prior to the 90th day after its publication unless the Secretary finds that emergency conditions exist necessitating an earlier effective date, in which event the Secretary shall specify in the order his findings as to such conditions. Such order shall be subject to the provisions of section 71 (f) and (g) of this title.

§ 42. Adulterated food

A food is deemed to be adulterated—

(a) Poisonous, insanitary, etc., ingredients: (1) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health unless the substance is not an added substance and its quantity in such food does not ordinarily render it injurious to health; or (2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance, except a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity, which is unsafe within the meaning of section 46 of this title, or if it is a raw agricultural commodity and it bears or contains a pesticide chemical which is unsafe within the meaning of section 47 (a) of this title; or (3) if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food; or (4) if it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health; or (5) if it is, in whole or in part, the product of a diseased animal or of an animal which has died otherwise than by slaughter; or (6) if its container is composed, in whole or in part, of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health.

(b) Absence, substitition, or addition of constituents: (1) If any valuable constituent has been in whole or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom; or (2) if any substance has been substituted wholly or in part therefor; or (3) if damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner; or (4) if any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality or strength, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is.

(c) Uncertified coal-tar coloring: If it bears or contains a coal-tar color other than one from a batch that has been certified in accordance with regulations as provided by section 46 of this title. This paragraph does not apply to citrus fruit bearing or containing a coal-tar color where application for listing of such color has been made under this subchapter but not acted on by the Secretary, if such color was commonly used prior to June 25, 1938, for the purpose of coloring citrus fruit.

(d) Confectionery containing alcohol or nonnutritive substance: If it is confectionery, and it bears or contains any alcohol or nonnutritive article or substance except harmless coloring, harmless flavoring, harmless resinous glaze not in excess of four-tenths of 1 percent, natural gum, and pectin. This paragraph does not apply to any confectionery by reason of its containing less than one-half of 1 percent by volume of alcohol derived solely from the use of flavoring extracts, or to any chewing gum by reason of its containing harmless nonnutritive masticatory substances.

(e) Insanitary ingredients in oleomargarine or butter: If it is oleomargarine or margarine or butter and any of the raw material used therein consisted in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or such oleomargarine or margarine or butter is otherwise unfit for food.

§ 43. Misbranded food

A food is deemed to be misbranded—

(a) False or misleading labeling: If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

(b) Offer for sale under another name: If it is offered for sale under the name of another food.

(c) Imitation: If it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word "imitation" and, immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated.

(d) Misleading container: If its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

(e) Package form: If in package form unless it bears a laber containing (1) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (2) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count. Under clause (2) of this paragraph reasonable variations shall be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages shall be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(f) Prominence of information on label: If any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this chapter to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

(g) Representation as to identity: If it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a definition and standard of identity has been prescribed by regulations as provided by section 41 of this title, unless (1) it conforms to such definition and standard, and (2) its label bears the name of the food specified in the definition and standard, and, insofar as required by such regulations, the common names of optional ingredients (other than spices, flavoring, and coloring) present in such food.

(h) Representation as to quality and fill of container: If it purports to be or is represented as—

(1) as food for which a standard of quality has been prescribed by regulations as provided by section 41 of this title, and its quality falls below such standard, unless its label bears, in such manner and form as such regulations specify, a statement that it falls below such standard; or

(2) a food for which a standard or standards of fill of container have been prescribed by regulations as provided by section 41 of this title, and it falls below the standard of fill of container applicable thereto, unless its label bears, in such manner and form as such

regulations specify, a statement that it falls below such standard.

(i) Label where no representation as to standard of identity: If it is not subject to the provisions of paragraph (g) of this section unless its label bears (1) the common or usual name of the food, if any there be, and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient; except that spices, flavorings, and colorings, other than those sold as such, may be designated as spices, flavorings, and colorings without naming each. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing exemptions to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition.

(j) Representation for special dietary use: If it purports to be or is represented for special dietary uses, unless its label bears such information concerning its vitamin, mineral, and other dietary properties as the Secretary determines to be and by regulations prescribes as necessary in order fully to inform purchasers as to its value for such uses.

(k) Artificial flavoring, etc.; exception of articles from (g), (i), and (k): If it bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless it bears labeling stating that fact. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing exemptions to the extent that compliance with the requirements of this paragraph is impracticable. The provisions of this paragraph and paragraphs (g) and (i) of this section with respect to artificial coloring shall not apply in the case of butter, cheese, or ice cream.

§ 44. Emergency permit control

(a) Whenever the Secretary finds after investigation that the distribution in interstate commerce of any class of food may, by reason of contamination with microorganisms during the manufacture, processing, or packing thereof in any locality, be injurious to health, and that the injurious nature cannot be adequately determined after the articles have entered interstate commerce, the Secretary then, and in such case only, shall promulgate regulations providing for the issuance, to manufacturers, processors, or packers of such class of food in such locality, of permits to which shall be attached such conditions governing the manufacture, processing, or packing of such class of food, for the period of time necessary to protect the public health. After the effective date of such regulations, and during such period, no person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any such food unless such manufacturer, processor, or packer holds a permit issued by the Secretary as provided by such regulations.

(b) The Secretary may suspend immediately upon notice any permits issued under authority of this section if it is found that any of the conditions of the permit has been violated. The holder of a permit so suspended may at any time apply for the reinstatement thereof and the Secretary shall, immediately after prompt hearing and an inspection of the establishment, reinstate such permit if it is found that adequate measures have been taken to comply with and maintain the conditions of the permit as originally issued or as amended.

(c) Any officer or employee designated by the Secretary shall have access to any factory or establishment, the operator of which holds a permit from the Secretary, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the conditions of the permit are being complied with. If access for such inspection is denied, the Secretary may suspend the permit until such access is freely given by the operator.

§ 45. Exemptions

(a) Regulations making labeling exemption: The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting from any labeling requirement of this chapter (1) small open containers of fresh fruits and fresh vegetables and (2) food which is, in accordance with the practice of the trade, to be processed, labeled, or repacked in substantial quantities at establishments other than those where originally processed or packed, on condition that such food is not adulterated or misbranded under the provisions of this chapter and upon removal from such processing, labeling, or repacking establishment.

(b) Meats and meat food products exemption: Meat and meat food products are exempt from the provisions of this chapter to the extent of the application or the extension thereto of sections 491–510 of this title.

§ 46. Tolerances for poisonous ingredients; certification of coal-tar colors for foods

(a) Any poisonous or deleterious substance added to any food, except where such substance is required in the production thereof or cannot be avoided by good manufacturing practice, shall be deemed to be unsafe for purposes of the application of clause (2) of section 42 (a) of this title. When such substance is so required or cannot be so avoided, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations limiting the quantity therein or thereon to the extent the Secretary finds necessary for the protection of public health, and any quantity exceeding the limits so fixed shall also be deemed to be unsafe for purposes of the application of clause (2) of section 42 (a) of this title. While such a regulation is in effect limiting the quantity of any such substance in the case of any food, such food shall not, by reason of bearing or containing any added amount of such substance, be considered to be adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 42 (a) of this title. In determining the quantity of such added substance to be tolerated in or on different articles of food, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which the use of such substance is required or cannot be avoided in the production of each such article and the other ways in which the consumer may be affected by the same or other poisonous or deleterious substances.

(b) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the listing of coal-tar colors which are harmless and suitable for use in food and for the certification of batches of such colors, with or without harmless diluents.

§ 47. Tolerances for pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural products

(a) Conditions of safety: Any poisonous or deleterious pesticide chemical, or any pesticide chemical which is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of pesticide chemicals, as safe for use, added to a raw agricultural commodity, shall be deemed unsafe for the purposes of the application of clause (2) of section 42 (a) of this title unless—

(1) a tolerance for such pesticide chemical in or on the raw agricultural commodity has been prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under this section and the quantity of such pesticide chemical in or on the raw agricultural commodity is within the limits of the tolerance so prescribed; or

(2) with respect to use in or on such raw agricultural commodity, the pesticide chemical has been exempted from the requirement of a tolerance by the Secretary under this section.

While a tolerance or exemption from tolerance is in effect for a pesticide chemical with respect to any raw agricultural commodity, such raw agricultural commodity shall not, by reason of bearing or containing any added amount of such pesticide chemical, be considered to be adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 42 (a) of this title.

(b) Establishment of tolerances: The Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing tolerances with respect to the use in or on raw agricultural commodities of poisonous or deleterious pesticide chemicals and of pesticide chemicals which are not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of pesticide chemicals, as safe for use, to the extent necessary to protect the public health. In establishing any such regulation, the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration, among other relevant factors, (1) to the necessity for the production of an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply; to (2) to the other ways in which the consumer may be affected by the same pesticide chemical or by other related substances that are poisonous or deleterious; and (3) to the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as submitted with a certification of usefulness under subsection (*l*) of this section. Such regulations shall be promulgated in the manner prescribed in subsection (d) or (e) of this section. In carrying out the provisions of this section relating to the establishment of tolerances, the Secretary may establish the tolerance applicable with respect to the use of any pesticide chemical in or on any raw agricultural commodity at zero level if the scientific data before the Secretary does not justify the establishment of a greater tolerance.

(c) Exemptions. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting any pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance with respect to use in or on any or all raw agricultural commodities when such a tolerance is not necessary to protect the public health. Such regulations shall be promulgated in the manner prescribed in subsection (d) or (e) of this section.

(d) Petitions for regulations; contents; procedure. (1) Any person who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act may file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a petition proposing the issuance of a regulation establishing a tolerance for a pesticide chemical which constitutes, or is an ingredient of, such economic poison, or exempting the pesticide chemical from the requirement of a tolerance. The petition shall contain data showing—

(A) the name, chemical identity, and composition of the pesticide chemical;

(B) the amount, frequency, and time of application of the pesticide chemical;

(C) full reports of investigations made with respect to the safety of the pesticide chemical;

(D) the results of tests on the amount of residue remaining, including a description of the analytical methods used;

(E) practical methods for removing residue which exceeds any proposed tolerance;

(F) proposed tolerances for the pesticide chemical if tolerances are proposed; and

(G) reasonable grounds in support of the petition.

Samples of the pesticide chemical shall be furnished to the Secretary upon request. Notice of the filing of such petition shall be published in general terms by the Secretary within 30 days after filing. Such notice shall include the analytical methods available for the determination of the residue of the pesticide chemical for which a tolerance or exemption is proposed.

(2) Within 90 days after a certification of usefulness by the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (l) of this section with respect to the pesticide chemical named in the petition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, after giving due consideration to the data submitted in the peti-

tion or otherwise before him, by order make public a regulation—

(A) establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the petition for the purposes for which it is so certified as useful, or

(B) exempting the pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance for such purposes,

unless within such 90-day period the person filing the petition requests that the petition be referred to an advisory committee or the Secretary within such period otherwise deems such referral necessary, in either of which events the provisions of paragraph (3) of this subsection shall apply in lieu thereof.

(3) In the event that the person filing the petition requests, within 90 days after a certification of usefulness by the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (1) of this section with respect to the pesticide chemical named in the petition, that the petition be referred to an advisory committee, or in the event the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within such period otherwise deems such referral necessary, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall forthwith submit the petition and other data before him to an advisory committee to be appointed in accordance with subsection (g) of this section. As soon as practicable after such referral, but not later than 60 days thereafter, unless extended as hereinafter provided, the committee shall, after independent study of the data submitted to it by the Secretary and other data before it, certify to the Secretary a report and recommendations on the proposal in the petition to the Secretary, together with all underlying data and a statement of the reasons or basis for the recommendations. The 60-day period provided for herein may be extended by the advisory committee for an additional 30 days if the advisory committee deems this necessary. Within 30 days after such certification, the Secretary shall, after giving due consideration to all data then before him, including such report, recommendations, underlying data, and statement, by order make public a regulation—

(A) establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the petition for the purposes for which it is so certified as useful; or

(B) exempting the pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance for such purposes.

(4) The regulations published under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection will be effective upon publication.

(5) Within 30 days after publication, any person adversely affected by a regulation published pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection, or pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, may file objections thereto with the Secretary, specifying with particularity the provisions of the regulation deemed objectionable, stating reasonable grounds therefor, and requesting a public hearing upon such objections. A copy of the objections filed by a person other than the petitioner shall be served on the petitioner, if the regulation was issued pursuant to a petition. The petitioner shall have 2 weeks to make a written reply to the objections. The Secretary shall thereupon, after due notice, hold such public hearing for the purpose of receiving evidence relevant and material to the issues raised by such objections. Any report, recommendations, underlying data, and reasons certified to the Secretary by an advisory committee shall be made a part of the record of the hearing, if relevant and material, subject to the provisions of section 1006 (c) of title 5. The National Academy of Sciences shall designate a member of the advisory committee to appear and testify at any such hearing with respect to the report and recommendations of such committee upon request of the Secretary, the petitioner, or the officer conducting the hearing. Any other member of the advisory committee may appear and testify at such hearing. As soon as practicable after completion of the hearing, the Secretary shall act upon such objections and by order make public a regulation. Such regulation shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at such hearing, including any report, recommendations, underlying data, and reasons certified to the Secretary by an advisory committee, and shall set forth detailed findings of fact upon which the regulation is based. No such order shall take effect prior to the 90th day after its publication, unless the Secretary finds that emergency conditions exist necessitating an earlier effective date, in which event the Secretary shall specify in the order his findings as to such conditions.

(e) Proposal of regulations by Secretary; procedure: The Secretary may at any time, upon his own initiative or upon the request of any interested person, propose the issuance of a regulation establishing a tolerance for a pesticide chemical or exempting it from the necessity of a tolerance. Thirty days after publication of such a proposal, the Secretary may by order publish a regulation based upon the proposal which shall become effective upon publication unless within such 30-day period a person who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act containing the pesticide chemical named in the proposal, requests that the proposal be referred to an advisory committee. In the event of such a request, the Secretary shall forthwith submit the proposal and other relevant data before him to an advisory committee to be appointed in accordance with subsection (g) of this section. As soon as practicable after such referral, but not later than 60 days thereafter, unless extended as hereinafter provided, the committee shall, after independent study of the data submitted to it by the Secretary and other data before it, certify to the Secretary a report and recommendations on the proposal together with all underlying data and a statement of the reasons or basis for the recommendations. The 60-day period provided for herein may be extended by the advisory committee for an additional 30 days if the advisory committee deems this necessary. Within 30 days after such certification, the Secretary may, after giving due consideration to all data before him, including such report, recommendations, underlying data and statement, by order publish a regulation establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the proposal or exempting it from the necessity of a tolerance which shall become effective upon publication. Regulations issued under this subsection shall upon publication be subject to paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of this section.

(f) Confidential character of data until publication: All data submitted to the Secretary or to an advisory committee in support of a petition under this section shall be considered confidential by the Secretary and by such advisory committee until publication of a regulation under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d) of this section. Until such publication, such data shall not be revealed to any person other than those authorized by the Secretary or by an advisory committee in the carrying out of their official duties under this section.

(g) Advisory committees; appointments and functions; compensation; clerical assistance: Whenever the referral of a petition or proposal to an advisory committee is requested under this section, or the Secretary otherwise deems such referral necessary, the Secretary shall forthwith appoint a committee of competent experts to review the petition or proposal and to make a report and recommendations thereon. Each such advisory committee shall be composed of experts, qualified in the subject matter of the petition and of adequately diversified professional background selected by the National Academy of Sciences and shall include one or more representatives from land-grant colleges. The size of the committee shall be determined by the Secretary. Members of an advisory committee shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Secretary shall by rules and regulations prescribe, for time actually spent in the work of the committee, and shall, in addition, be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The members shall not be subject to any other provisions of law regarding the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. The Secretary shall furnish the committee with adequate clerical and other assistance, and shall by rules and regulations prescribe the procedure to be followed by the committee.

(h) Right of consultation with committee: A person who has filed a petition or who has requested the referral of a proposal to an advisory committee in accordance with the provisions of this section, as well as representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall have the right to consult with any advisory committee provided for in subsection (g) of this section in connection with the petition or proposal.

(i) Judicial review: (1) In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any order under subsection (d) (5), (e), or (l) of this section any person who will be adversely affected by such order may obtain judicial review by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within 60 days after the entry of such order, a petition praying that the order be set aside in whole or in part.

(2) In the case of a petition with respect to an order under subsection (d) (5) or (e) of this section, a copy of the petition shall be forthwith served upon the Secretary, or upon any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his order. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside in whole or in part the order complained of. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole, including any report and recommendation of an advisory committee.

(3) In the case of a petition with respect to an order under subsection (l) of this section, a copy of the petition shall be forthwith served upon the Secretary of Agriculture, or upon any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his order. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the order complained of in whole or in part. The findings of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole.

(4) If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper, if such evidence is material and there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence

in the proceedings below. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, may modify his findings as to the facts and order by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file with the court such modified findings and order.

(5) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order under this section shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of an order. The courts shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this section.

(j) Temporary tolerances: The Secretary may, upon the request of any person who has obtained an experimental permit for a pesticide chemical under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act or upon his own initiative, establish a temporary tolerance for the pesticide chemical for the uses covered by the permit whenever in his judgment such action is necessary to protect the public health, or may temporarily exempt such pesticide chemical from a tolerance. In establishing such a tolerance, the Secretary shall give due regard to the necessity for experimental work in developing an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply and to the limited hazard to the public health involved in such work when conducted in accordance with applicable regulations under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

(k) Regulations based on public hearings before January 1, 1953: Regulations affecting pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities which were promulgated under the authority of section 406 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 upon the basis of public hearings instituted before January 1, 1953, in accordance with section 701 (e) of the 1938 act, shall be deemed to be regulations under this section and shall be subject to amendment or repeal as provided in subsection (m) of this section.

(l) Certification of usefulness by Secretary of Agriculture; hearing; time limitation; opinion; regulations: The Secretary of Agriculture, upon request of any person who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and whose request is accompanied by a copy of a petition filed by such person under subsection (d) (1) of this section with respect to a pesticide chemical which constitutes, or is an ingredient of, such economic poison, shall, within 30 days or within 60 days if upon notice prior to the termination of such 30 days the Secretary of Agriculture deems it necessary to postpone action for such period, on the basis of data before him, either—

(1) certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that such pesticide chemical is useful for the purpose for which a tolerance or exemption is sought; or

(2) notify the person requesting the certification of his proposal to certify that the pesticide chemical does not appear to be useful for the purpose for which a tolerance or exemption is sought, or appears to be useful for only some of the purposes for which a tolerance or exemption is sought.

In the event that the Secretary of Agriculture takes the action described in clause (2) of the preceding sentence, the person requesting the certification, within 1 week after receiving the proposed certification, may either (A) request the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the proposed certification; (B) request a hearing on the proposed certification or the parts thereof objected to; or (C) request both such certification and such hearing. If no such action is taken, the Secretary of Agriculture may by order make the certification as proposed. In the event that the action described in clause (A) or (C) is taken, the Secretary of Agriculture shall by order make the certification as proposed with respect to such parts thereof as are requested. In the event a hearing is requested, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide opportunity for a prompt hearing. The certification of the Secretary of Agriculture as the result of such hearing shall be made by order and shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at the hearing and shall set forth detailed findings of fact. In no event shall the time elapsing between the making of a request for a certification under this subsection and final certification by the Secretary of Agriculture exceed 160 days. The Secretary shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with any certification of usefulness under this subsection an opinion, based on the data before him, whether the tolerance or exemption proposed by the petitioner reasonably reflects the amount of residue likely to result when the pesticide chemical is used in the manner proposed for the purpose for which the certification is made. The Secretary of Agriculture, after due notice and opportunity for public hearing, is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this subsection.

(m) Amendment or repeal regulations: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe by regulations the procedure by which regulations under this section may be amended or repealed, and such procedure shall conform to the procedure provided in this section for the promulgation of regulations establishing tolerances, including the appointment of advisory committees and the procedure for referring petitions to such committees.

(n) Guaranties: The provisions of section 33 (c) of this title with respect to the furnishing of guaranties shall be applicable to raw agricultural commodities covered by this section.

(o) Payment of fees; waivers and refunds: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall by regulation require the payment of such fees as will in the aggregate, in the judgment of the Secretary, be sufficient over a reasonable term to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for the performance of the Secretary's functions under this section. Under such regulations, the performance of the Secretary's services or other functions pursuant to this section, including any one or more of the following, may be conditioned upon the payment of such fees: (1) The acceptance of filing of a petition submitted under subsection (d) of this section; (2) the promulgation of a regulation establishing a tolerance, or an exemption from the necessity of a tolerance, under this section, or the amendment or repeal of such a regulation; (3) the referral of a petition or proposal under this section to an advisory committee; (4) the acceptance for filing of objections under subsection (d) (5) of this section, or (5) the certification and filing in court of a transcript of the proceedings and the record under subsection (i) (2) of this section. Such regulations may further provide for waiver or refund of fees in whole or in part when in the judgment of the Secretary such waiver or refund is equitable and not contrary to the purposes of this subsection.

§ 48. Colored oleomargarine, etc.

(a) Congressional findings as to sale or serving: The Congress finds and declares that the sale, or the serving in public eating places, of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine without clear identification as such or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this chapter depresses the market in interstate commerce for butter and for oleomargarine or margarine clearly identified and neither adulterated nor misbranded, and constitutes a burden on interstate commerce in such articles. Such burden exists, irrespective of whether such oleomargarine or margarine originates from an interstate source or from the State in which it is sold.

(b) Sale in State where produced: Colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced shall be subject in the same manner and to the same extent to the provisions of this chapter as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce.

(c) Packaging and labeling: No person shall sell, or offer for sale, colored oleomargarine or colored margarine unless—

(1) such oleomargarine or margarine is packaged;

(2) the net weight of the contents of any package sold in a retail establishment is 1 pound or less;

(3) there appears on the label of the package (A) the word "oleomargarine" or "margarine" in type or lettering at least as large as any other type or lettering on such label and (B) a full and accurate statement of all the ingredients contained in such oleomargarine or margarine; and

(4) each part of the contents of the package is contained in a wrapper which bears the word "oleomargarine" or "margarine" in type or lettering not smaller than 20-point type.

The requirements of this subsection shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any of the other requirements of this chapter.

(d) Service in restaurants: No person shall possess in a form ready for serving colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place unless a notice that oleomargarine or margarine is served is displayed prominently and conspicuously in such place and in such manner as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual being served in such eating place or is printed or is otherwise set forth on the menu in type or lettering not smaller than that normally used to designate the serving of other food items. No person shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place, whether or not any charge is made therefor, unless (1) each separate serving bears or is accompanied by labeling identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine, or (2) each separate serving thereof is triangular in shape.

(e) Exemption from labeling requirements: If colored oleomargarine or colored margarine complies with the requirements of subsection (c) of this section when served with meals at a public eating place, it shall, at the time of such service, be exempt from the requirements of section 43 of this title, other than subsections (a) and (f).

(f) Color content: For the purposes of this section, colored oleomargarine or colored margarine is oleomargarine or margarine having a tint or shade containing more than one and six-tenths degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red, measured in terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent, and the term "oleomargarine" or "margarine" includes—

(1) all substances, mixtures, and compounds known as oleomargarine or margarine;

(2) all substances, mixtures, and compounds which have a consistence similar to that of butter and which contain any edible oils or fats other than milk fat if made in imitation or semblance of butter.

(g) Contravention of State laws: Nothing in this chapter or sections 45 and 55 of title 15 shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

(h) Oleomargarine, butterine, or imitation butter or cheese transported into a State subject to its police powers: All articles known as oleomargarine, butterine, imitation, process, renovated, or adulterated butter, or imitation cheese, or any substance in the semblance of butter or cheese not the usual product of the dairy and not made exclusively of pure and unadulterated milk or cream, transported into any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and remaining therein for use, consumption, sale, or storage therein, shall upon the arrival within the limits therein be subject to the operation and effect of the laws thereof enacted in the exercise of its police powers to the same extent and in the same manner as though such articles or substances had been produced therein, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise.

§ 49. Seafood; examination on request of packer; fees

(a) Upon application of any packer of seafood for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of this chapter, the Secretary may designate inspectors to examine and inspect such food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof. If on such examination and inspection compliance is found with the provisions of this chapter and regulations promulgated thereunder, the applicant shall be authorized or required to mark the food as provided by regulation to show such compliance. The Secretary may promulgate regulations governing the sanitary and other conditions under which the service herein provided shall be granted and maintained, and for otherwise carrying out the purposes of this section.

(b) Services under this section shall be rendered only upon payment by the applicant of fees fixed by regulation in amounts necessary to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate and efficient inspection service. Receipts from such fees shall be covered into the Treasury and shall be available to the Secretary for expenditures incurred in carrying out the purposes of this section, including salaries of additional inspectors when necessary to supplement the number for whose salaries Congress has appropriated.

SUBCHAPTER IV—DRUGS AND DEVICES

§ 51. Adulterated drugs and devices

A drug or device is deemed to be adulterated—

(a) Poisonous, insanitary, etc., ingredients.—

(1) If it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance; or

(2) If it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have been contaminated with filth or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health; or

(3) If it is a drug and its container is composed, in whole or in part, of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health; or

(4) If it is a drug and bears or contains, for purposes of coloring only, a coal-tar color other than one from a batch that has been certified in accordance with regulations as provided by section 54 of this title.

(b) Strength, quality, or purity differing from official compendium: If it purports to be or is represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in an official compendium, and its strength differs from, or its quality or purity falls below, the standard set forth in such compendium, determined in accordance with the tests or methods of assay set forth in such compendium. Whenever tests or methods of assay have not been prescribed in such compendium, or, if prescribed, are, in the judgment of the Secretary, insufficient for the making of such determination, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate body charged with the revision of such compendium, and if such body fails within a reasonable time to prescribe tests or methods of assays which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are sufficient, for purposes of this paragraph, he shall promulgate regulations prescribing appropriate tests or methods of assay in accordance with which such determination as to strength, quality, or purity shall be made. No drug defined in an official compendium shall be deemed to be adulterated under this paragraph because it differs from the standard of strength, quality, or purity therefor set forth in such compendium, if its difference in strength, quality, or purity from such standard is plainly stated on its label. A drug recognized in both the United States Pharmacopeia and the Homoeopathic Pharmacopeia of the United States shall be subject to the requirements of the United States Pharmacopeia unless it is labeled and offered for sale as a homoeopathic drug, in which case it shall be subjected to the provisions of the Homoeopathic Pharmacopeia of the United States.

(c) Misrepresentation of strength, etc., where drug is unrecognized in compendium: If it is not subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section and its strength differs from, or its purity or quality falls below, that which it purports or is represented to possess.

(d) Mixture with or substitution of another substance: If it is a drug and any substance has been (1) mixed or packed therewith so as to reduce its quality or strength or (2) substituted wholly or in part therefor.

§ 52. Misbranded drugs and devices

A drug or device is deemed to be misbranded—

(a) False or misleading labeling: If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

(b) Package form; contents of label: If in package form unless it bears a label containing (1) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (2) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count. Under clause (2) of this paragraph reasonable variations shall be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages shall be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(c) Prominence of information on label: If any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this chapter to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

(d) Habit-forming substance: If it is for use by man and contains any quantity of the narcotic or hypnotic substance alpha eucaine, barbituric acid, beta eucaine, bromal, cannabis, carbromal, chloral, coca, cocaine, codeine, heroin, marihuana, morphine, opium, paraldehyde, peyote, or sulfonmethane; or any chemical derivative of such substance, which derivative the Secretary, after investigation, finds to be, and by regulations designates as, habit forming; unless its label bears the name and quantity or proportion of such substance or derivative and in juxtaposition therewith the statement "Warning—May be habit forming."

(e) Designation of drug by name not in compendium: If it is a drug not designated solely by a name recognized in an official compendium unless its label bears (1) the common or usual name of the drug, if such there be; and (2) in case it is fabricated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each active ingredient, including the quantity, kind, and proportions of any alcohol, and also including, whether active or not, the name and quantity or proportion of any bromides, ether, chloroform, acetanilid, acetophenetidin, amidopyrine, antipyrine, atropine, hyoscine, hyoscyamine, arsenic, digitalis, digitalis glucosides, mercury, ouabain, strophanthin, strychnine, thyroid, or any derivative or preparation of any such substances, contained therein. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing exemptions to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (2) of this paragraph is impracticable.

(f) Directions for use and warnings on label: Unless its labeling bears (1) adequate directions for use; and (2) adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions or by children where its use may be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or methods or duration of administration or application, in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users. Where any requirement of clause (1) of this paragraph, as applied to any drug or device, is not necessary for the protection of the public health, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting such drug or device from such requirement.

(g) Representation as recognized drug: Packing and labeling: If it purports to be a drug the name of which is recognized in an official compendium, unless it is packaged and labeled as prescribed therein. The Secretary may consent to a modification of the method of packing. A drug recognized in both the United States Pharmacopeia and the Homoeopathic Pharmacopeia of the United States shall be subject to the rerequirements of the United States Pharmacopeia with respect to packaging and labeling unless it is labeled and offered for sale as a homoeopathic drug, in which case it shall be subject to the provision of the Homoeopathic Pharmacopeia of the United States.

(h) Deteriorative drugs; packing and labeling: If it has been found by the Secretary to be a drug liable to deterioration, unless it is packaged in such form and manner, and its label bears a statement of such precautions, as the Secretary by regulations requires as necessary for the protection of the public health. The Secretary shall not establish such a regulation for any drug recognized in an official compendium until the Secretary has informed the body charged with the revision of such compendium of the need for such packaging or labeling requirements and such body has failed within a reasonable time to prescribe such requirements.

(i) Drug; misleading container; imitation; offer for sale under another name: (1) If it is a drug and its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading; or (2) if it is an imitation of another drug; or (3) if it is offered for sale under the name of another drug.

(j) Health-endangering when used as prescribed: If it is dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof.

(k) Insulin not properly certified: If it is, or purports to be, or is represented as a drug composed wholly or partly of insulin, unless (1) it is from a batch with respect to which a certificate or release has been issued pursuant to section 56 of this title, and (2) such certificate or release is in effect with respect to such drug.

(l) Other drugs not properly certified: If it is, or purports to be, or is represented as a drug composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin, streptomycin, chlortetracycline, chloramphenicol, or bacitracin, or any derivative thereof, unless (1) it is from a batch with respect to which a certificate or release has been issued pursuant to section 57 of this title, and (2) such certificate or release is in effect with respect to such drug. This subsection does not apply to any drug or class of drugs exempted by regulations promulgated under section 57 (c) or (d) of this title.

§ 53. Exemptions

(a) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting from any labeling or packing requirement of this chapter drugs and devices which are, in accordance with the practice of the trade, to be processed, labeled, or repacked in substantial quantities at establishments other than those where originally processed or packed, on condition that such drugs and devices are not adulterated or misbranded under the provisions of this chapter upon removal from such processing, labeling, or repacking establishment.

(b) (1) A drug intended for use by man which—

(A) is a habit-forming drug to which section 52 (d) of this title applies; or

(B) because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, is not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug; or

(C) is limited by an effective application under section 55 of this title to use under the professional supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs, shall be dispensed only (i) upon a written prescription of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug, or (ii) upon an oral prescription of such practitioner which is reduced promptly to writing and filed by the pharmacist, or (iii) by refilling any such written or oral prescription if such refilling is authorized by the prescriber either in the original prescription or by oral order which is reduced promptly to writing and filed by the pharmacist. The act of dispensing a drug contrary to the provisions of this paragraph is deemed to be an act which results in the drug being misbranded while held for sale.

(2) A drug dispensed by filling or refilling a written or oral prescription of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug is exempt from the requirements of section 52 of this title, except paragraphs (a), (i) (2), and (i) (3), (k), and (l) of such section, and the packaging requirements of paragraphs (g) and (h) of such section, if the drug bears a label containing the name and address of the dispenser, the serial number and date of the prescription or of its filling, the name of the prescriber, and, if stated in the prescription, the name of the patient, and the directions for use and cautionary statements, if any, contained in such prescription. This exemption does not apply to any drug dispensed in the course of the conduct of a business of dispensing drugs pursuant to diagnosis by mail, or to a drug dispensed in violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(3) The Secretary may by regulation remove drugs subject to sections 52 (d) and 55 of this title from the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection when such requirements are not necessary for the protection of the public health.

(4) A drug which is subject to paragraph (1) of this subsection is deemed to be misbranded if at any time prior to dispensing, its label fails to bear the statement "Caution: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription". A drug to which paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply is deemed to be misbranded if at any time prior to dispensing its label bears the caution statement quoted in the first sentence of this paragraph.

(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to relieve any person from any requirement prescribed by or under authority of law with respect to drugs now included or which may hereafter be included within the classification stated in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or to marihuana as defined in section 4761 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

§ 54. Certification of coal-tar colors for drugs

The Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the listing of coal-tar colors which are harmless and suitable for use in drugs for purposes of coloring only and for the certification of batches of such colors, with or without harmless diluents.

§ 55. New drugs

(a) Necessity of effective application: No person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce, any new drug, unless an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section is effective with respect to such drug.

(b) Filing application: Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any drug subject to subsection (a) of this section, which application shall include (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether such drug is safe for use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such drug; (3) a full statement of the composition of such drug; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug; (5) samples of such drug and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require; and (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such drug.

(c) Effective date of application: An application provided for in subsection (b) of this section shall become effective on the 60th day after the filing thereof unless prior to such day the Secretary by written notice to the applicant postpones the effective date of the application to such time, not more than 180 days after the filing thereof, as he deems necessary to enable him to study and investigate the application.

(d) Grounds for refusing application to become effective: Prior to the effective date of the application, the Secretary shall issue an order refusing to permit the application to become effective if he finds, after due notice to the applicant and giving him an opportunity for a hearing, that (1) the investigations reported pursuant to subsection (b) of this section do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof; (2) the results of such tests show that such drug is unsafe for use under such conditions or do not show that such drug is safe for use under such conditions; (3) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity; or (4) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application, or other information before him with respect to such drug, he has insufficient information to determine whether such drug is safe for use under such conditions.

(e) Suspension of effectiveness of application: The Secretary shall order the suspension of the effectiveness of an application with respect to any drug after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, if he finds (1) that clinical experience, tests by new methods, or tests by methods not deemed reasonably applicable when such application became effective show that such drug is unsafe for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application became effective, or (2) that the application contains any untrue statement of a material fact. The order shall state the findings upon which it is based.

(f) Revocation of order refusing effectiveness: When the Secretary finds that the facts so require he shall revoke an order refusing to permit an application with respect to a drug to become effective.

(g) Service of orders: Orders of the Secretary issued under this section shall be served (1) in person by any officer or employee of the Department designated by the Secretary or (2) by registered mail addressed to the applicant or respondent at his last-known address in the records of the Secretary.

(h) Appeal from order: The applicant may appeal from an order of the Secretary refusing to permit the application to become effective, or suspending the effectiveness of the application by filing in the United States district court within any district wherein such applicant resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, within 60 days after the entry of the order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be set aside. The applicant shall serve a copy of the petition forthwith upon the Secretary, or upon any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such transcript the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside such order. The court shall not consider an objection to the order of the Secretary unless such objection was urged before the Secretary or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure so to do. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If any person applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court seems proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified findings which, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, and his recommendations, if any, for the setting aside of the original order. The judgment and decree of the court affirming or setting aside any such order of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review as provided in sections 1254 and 1291–1294 of Title 28. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

(i) Exemption of drugs for research: The Secretary shall promulgate regulations for exempting from the operation of this section drugs intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety of drugs.

§ 56. Certification of drugs containing insulin

(a) The Secretary, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary, shall provide for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin. A batch of any such drug shall be certified only if such drug has such characteristics of identity and such batch has such characteristics of strength, quality, and purity, as the Secretary prescribes in such regulations as necessary adequately to insure safety and efficacy of use. Prior to the effective date of such regulations the Secretary, in lieu of certification, shall issue a release for any batch which, in his judgment, may be released without risk as to the safety and efficacy of its use. Such release shall prescribe the date of its expiration and other conditions under which it shall cease to be effective as to such batch and as to portions thereof.

(b) Regulations providing for such certifications shall contain such provisions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including provisions prescribing (1) standards of identity and of strength, quality, and purity; (2) tests and methods of assay to determine compliance with such standards; (3) effective periods for certificates, and other conditions under which they shall cease to be effective as to certified batches and as to portions thereof; (4) administration and procedure; and (5) such fees, specified in such regulations, as are necessary to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate certification service. Such regulations shall prescribe no standard of identity or of strength, quality, or purity for any drug different from the standard of identity, strength, quality, or purity set forth for such drug in an official compendium.

(c) Such regulations, insofar as they prescribe tests or methods of assay to determine strength, quality, or purity of any drug, different from the tests or methods of assay set forth for such drug in an official compendium, shall be prescribed, after notice and opportunity for revision of such compendium, in the manner provided in the second sentence of section 51 (b) of this title. The provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 71 of this title shall be applicable to such portion of any regulation as prescribes any such different test or method, but shall not be applicable to any other portion of any such regulation.

§ 57. Certification of drugs containing certain antibiotics

(a) Regulations for certification: The Secretary, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary, shall provide for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin, streptomycin, chlortetracycline, chloramphenicol, or bacitracin, or any derivative of any of them. A batch of any such drug shall be certified only if such drug has such characteristics of identity and such batch has such characteristics of strength, quality, and purity, as the Secretary prescribes in such regulations as necessary adequately to insure safety and efficacy of use. Prior to the effective date of such regulations the Secretary, in lieu of certification, shall issue a release for any batch which, in the Secretary's judgment, may be released without risk as to the safety and efficacy of its use. Such release shall prescribe the date of its expiration and other conditions under which it shall cease to be effective as to such batch and as to portions thereof.

(b) Provisions of regulations: Regulations providing for such certifications shall contain such provisions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including provisions prescribing (1) standards of identity and of strength, quality, and purity; (2) tests and methods of assay to determine compliance with such standards; (3) effective periods for certificates, and other conditions under which they shall cease to be effective as to certified batches and as to portions thereof; (4) administration and procedure; and (5) such fees, specified in such regulations, as are necessary to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate certification service. Such regulations shall prescribe only such tests and methods of assay as will provide for certification or rejection within the shortest time consistent with the purposes of this section.

(c) Exemption of drugs not involving safety and efficacy of use: Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary, the requirements of this section and of section 52 (l) of this title with respect to any drug or class of drugs are not necessary to insure safety and efficacy of use, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting such drug or class of drugs from such requirements.

(d) Other exemptions: The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting from any requirement of this section and of section 52 (l) of this title, (1) drugs which are to be stored, processed, labeled, or repacked at establishments other than those where manufactured, on condition that such drugs comply with all such requirements upon removal from such establishments; (2) drugs which conform to applicable standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity prescribed by these regulations and are intended for use in manufacturing other drugs; and (3) drugs which are intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety and efficacy of drugs.

(e) Application of other sections; determination of compliance: No drug which is subject to this section shall be subject to section 55 of this title. Compliance of any drug subject to this section or to section 52 (l) of this title with sections 51 (b) and 52 (g) of this title shall be determined by the application of the standards of strength, quality, and purity, the tests and methods of assay, and the requirements of packaging and labeling, respectively, prescribed by regulations promulgated under this section.

(f) Procedure for issuance amendment, or repeal or regulations: Any interested person may file with the Secretary a petition proposing the issuance, amendment, or repeal of any regulation contemplated by this section. The petition shall set forth the proposal in general terms and shall state reasonable grounds therefor. The Secretary shall give public notice of the proposal and an opportunity for all interested persons to present their views thereon, orally or in writing, and as soon as practicable thereafter shall make public the Secretary's action upon such proposal. At any time prior to the 30th day after such action is made public any interested person may file objections to such action, specifying with particularity the changes desired, stating reasonable grounds therefor, and requesting a public hearing upon such objections. The Secretary shall thereupon, after due notice, hold such public hearing. As soon as practicable, after completion of the hearing, the Secretary shall by order make public the Secretary's action on such objections. The order shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at the hearing and shall include detailed findings of fact on which it is based. The order shall be subject to the provisions of section 71 (f) and (g) of this title.

SUBCHAPTER V—COSMETICS

§ 61. Adulterated cosmetics

A cosmetic is deemed to be adulterated—

(a) If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to users under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling thereof, or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual. This provision does not apply to coal-tar hair dye the label of which bears the following legend conspicuously displayed thereon: "Caution—This product contains ingredients which may cause skin irritation on certain individuals and a preliminary test according to accompanying directions should first be made. This product must not be used for dyeing the eyelashes or eyebrows; to do so may cause blindness.", and the labeling of which bears adequate directions for such preliminary testing. For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (e) of this section the term "hair dye" does not include eyelash dyes or eyebrow dyes.

(b) If it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

(c) If it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health.

(d) If its container is composed in whole or in part of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health.

(e) If it is not a hair dye and it bears or contains a coal-tar color other than one from a batch that has been certified in accordance with regulations as provided by section 64 of this title.

§ 62. Misbranded cosmetics

A cosmetic is deemed to be misbranded—

(a) If its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

(b) If in package form unless it bears a label containing (1) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (2) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count. Under clause (2) of this paragraph reasonable variations shall be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages shall be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(c) If any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this chapter to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

(d) If its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading.

§ 63. Exemptions

The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting from any labeling requirement of this chapter cosmetics which are, in accordance with the practice of the trade, to be processed, labeled, or repacked in substantial quantities at establishments other than those where originally processed or packed, on condition that such cosmetics are not adulterated or misbranded under the provisions of this chapter upon removal from such processing, labeling, or repacking establishment.

§ 64. Certification of coal-tar colors for cosmetics

The Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the listing of coal-tar colors which are harmless and suitable for use in cosmetics and for the certification of batches of such colors, with or without harmless diluents.

SUBCHAPTER VI—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

§ 71. Regulations; hearings; judicial review

(a) Regulations authorized: The Secretary may promulgate regulations for the efficient enforcement of this chapter, except as otherwise provided in this section.

(b) Imports and exports: The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of sections 81 and 82 of this title, except as otherwise provided therein, in such manner and to take effect at such time, after due notice, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines.

(c) Conduct of hearings: The Secretary or such officer or employee as he designates shall conduct the hearings authorized or required by this chapter.

(d) Standards of identity in other laws: The definitions and standards of identity promulgated in accordance with the provisions of this chapter shall be effective for the purposes of the enforcement of this chapter, notwithstanding such definitions and standards as may be contained in other laws of the United States and regulations promulgated thereunder.

(e) Hearings on regulations: The Secretary, on his own initiative or upon an application of any interested industry or substantial portion thereof stating reasonable grounds therefor, shall hold a public hearing upon a proposal to issue, amend, or repeal any regulation contemplated by sections 43 (j), 44 (a), 46 (a), 46 (b), 51 (b), 52 (d), 52 (h), 54, and 64 of this title.

The Secretary shall give appropriate notice of the hearing, setting forth the proposal in general terms and specifying the time and place for the hearing not less than 30 days after the date of the notice, except that the public hearing on regulations under section 44 (a) of this title may be held within a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Secretary, after notice thereof. At the hearing any interested person may be heard in person or by his representative. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, the Secretary shall by order make public his action in issuing, amending, or repealing the regulation or determining not to take such action. Such order shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at the hearing and shall include detailed findings of fact on which it is based. No such order shall take effect prior to the 90th day after it is issued, except that if the Secretary finds that emergency conditions exist necessitating an earlier effective date, then the Secretary shall specify in the order the Secretary's findings as to such conditions and the order shall take effect at such earlier date as the Secretary specifies.

(f) Judicial review: (1) In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any order under subsection (e) of this section, any person who will be adversely affected by such order if placed in effect may at any time prior to the 90th day after such order is issued file a petition with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, for a judicial review of such order. The summons and petition may be served at any place in the United States. The Secretary, promptly upon service of the summons and petition, shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which the Secretary based the order.

(2) If the petitioner applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence, and evidence in rebuttal thereof, to be taken before the Secretary, and to be adduced upon the hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court deems proper. The Secretary may modify the Secretary's findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and file such modified or new findings, and the Secretary's recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the Secretary's original order, with the return of such additional evidence.

(3) The court may affirm the order, or set it aside in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. If the order of the Secretary refuses to issue, amend, or repeal a regulation and such order is not in accordance with law the court shall by its judgment order the Secretary to take action, with respect to such regulation, in accordance with law. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

(4) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such order of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28.

(5) Any action instituted under this subsection shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Secretary or any vacancy in such office.

(6) The remedies provided for in this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other remedies provided by law.

(g) Copies of records of hearings: The Secretary shall furnish a certified copy of the transcript of the record and proceedings under subsection (e) of this section to any interested party at his request, on payment of the costs thereof. Such copy shall be admissible in any criminal, libel for condemnation, exclusion of imports, or other proceeding arising under or in respect to this chapter, irrespective of whether proceedings with respect to the order have previously been instituted or become final under subsection (f) of this section.

§ 72. Examinations and investigations

(a) The Secretary may conduct examinations and investigations for the purposes of this chapter through officers and employees of the Department or through any health, food, or drug officer or employee of any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Secretary as an officer of the Department. In the case of food packed in a Territory the Secretary shall attempt to make inspection of such food at the first point of entry within the United States when, in his opinion and with due regard to the enforcement of all the provisions of this chapter, the facilities at his disposal will permit of such inspection. For the purposes of this subsection the term "United States" means the States and the District of Columbia.

(b) Where a sample of food, drug, or cosmetic is collected for analysis under this chapter, the Secretary shall, upon request, provide a part of such official sample for examination or analysis by any person named on the label of the article, or the owner thereof, or his attorney or agent; except that the Secretary may, by regulations, make such reasonable exceptions from, and impose such reasonable terms and conditions relating to, the operation of this subsection as he finds necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this chapter.

(c) For purposes of enforcement of this chapter, records of any department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government shall be open to inspection by any official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare authorized by the Secretary to make such inspection.

§ 73. Records of interstate shipment

For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this chapter, carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and persons receiving food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics in interstate commerce or holding such articles so received, shall, upon the request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, permit him, at reasonable times, to have access to and to copy all records showing the movement in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic, or the holding thereof during or after such movement, and the quantity, shipper, and consignee thereof. It shall be unlawful for any such carrier or person to fail to permit such access to and copying of any such record so requested when such request is accompanied by a statement in writing specifying the nature or kind of food, drug, device, or cosmetic to which such request relates. Evidence obtained under this section shall not be used in a criminal prosecution of the person from whom it is obtained.

Carriers shall not be subject to the other provisions of this chapter by reason of their receipt, carriage, holding, or delivery of food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics in the usual course of business as carriers.

§ 74. Factory inspection; notice; reports; receipts for samples; copies of analyses

(a) For purposes of enforcement of this chapter, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized to (1) enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, for introduction into interstate commerce or are held after such introduction, or enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics in interstate commerce; and (2) inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials, containers, and labeling therein. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

(b) Upon completion of any such inspection of a factory, warehouse, or other establishment, and prior to leaving the premises, the officer or employee making the inspection shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a report in writing setting forth any conditions or practices observed by him which, in his judgment, indicate that any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in such establishment (1) consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or (2) has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health. A copy of such report shall be sent promptly to the Secretary.

(c) If the officer or employee making any such inspection of a factory, warehouse, or other establishment has obtained any sample in the course of the inspection, upon completion of the inspection and prior to leaving the premises he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained.

(d) Whenever in the course of any such inspection of a factory or other establishment where food is manufactured, processed, or packed, the officer or employee making the inspection obtains a sample of any such food, and an analysis is made of such sample for the purpose of ascertaining whether such food consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or is otherwise unfit for food, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

§ 75. Publicity

(a) The Secrtary shall cause to be published from time to time reports summarizing all judgments, decrees, and court orders rendered under this chapter, including the nature of the charge and the disposition thereof.

(b) The Secretary may also cause to be disseminated information regarding food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics in situations involving, in the Secretary's opinion, imminent danger to health or gross deception of the consumer. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from collecting, reporting, and illustrating the results of the investigations of the Department.

§ 76. Cost of certification of coal-tar colors

The admitting to listing and certification of coal-tar colors, in accordance with regulations prescribed under this chapter, shall be performed only upon payment of fees specified in such regulations, as may be necessary to provide, maintain, and equip an adequate service for such purposes.

§ 77. Revision of Pharmacopeia; development of analyses and tests

The Secretary, in carrying into effect the provisions of this chapter, may cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopeia and in the development of methods of analysis and mechanical and physical tests necessary to carry out the work of the Food and Drug Administration.

SUBCHAPTER VII—IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

§ 81. Examination and refusal of imports

(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the latter Secretary's requests, samples of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that the article (1) has been manufactured, processed, or packed under insanitary conditions, or (2) is forbidden or restricted in sale in the country in which it was produced or from which it was exported, or (3) is adulterated, misbranded, or in violation of section 55 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall refuse to admit the article, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section. He shall cause the destruction of any such article refused admission unless it is exported, under regulations prescribed by him, within 90 days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time permitted pursuant to such regulations. This subsection does not prohibit the admission of narcotic drugs the importation of which is permitted under section 763 of this title.

(b) Pending decision as to the admission of an article being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such article to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury. If it appears to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that an article included within the provisions of clause (3) of subsection (a) of this section can, by relabeling or other action, be brought into compliance with this chapter or rendered other than a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, the Secretary of the Treasury may defer final determination as to admission of such article and, upon filing of timely written application by the owner or consignee and the execution by him of a bond as provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, in accordance with regulations, authorize the applicant to perform such relabeling or other action specified in such authorization (including destruction or export of rejected articles or portions thereof, as may be specified in the latter Secretary's authorization). All such relabeling or other action pursuant to such authorization shall in accordance with regulations be under the supervision of an officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by the Secretary of the Department, or an officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) The owner or consignee shall pay all expenses, including travel, per diem or subsistence, and salaries of officers or employees of the United States, determined in accordance with regulations, in connection with the destruction provided for in subsection (a) of this section and the supervision of the relabeling or other action authorized under subsection (b) of this section, and all expenses in connection with the storage, cartage, or labor with respect to any article refused admission under subsection (a) of this section. In default of payment, expenses specified in this subsection shall constitute a lien against any future importations made by such owner or consignee.

§ 82. Exports adulterated or misbranded

A food, drug, device, or cosmetic intended for export is not deemed to be adulterated or misbranded under this chapter if it (a) accords to the specifications of the foreign purchaser, (b) is not in conflict with the laws of the country to which it is intended for export, and (c) is labeled on the outside of the shipping package to show that it is intended for export. Such article sold or offered for sale in domestic commerce, is not exempt from any of the provisions of this chapter.

§ 83. Suspension of adulterated imports

Whenever the President is satisfied that there is good reason to believe that any importation is being made, or is about to be made, into the United States, from any foreign country, of any article used for human food or drink that is adulterated to an extent dangerous to the health or welfare of the people of the United States, or any of them, he may issue his proclamation suspending the importation of such article from such country for such period of time as he believes necessary to prevent such importation. During such period no person shall import any of such articles into the United States from the countries designated in the proclamation of the President.

Chapter 5—Milk and Cream

Subchapter I—Importation of milk and cream

Sec.
201. Definitions.
202. Permits for importation.
203. Unfitness for importation.
204. Inspection; issue of permits; regulations.
205. Penalties.
206. State powers concerning milk and cream.
207. Short title.

Subchapter II—Filled milk

Sec.
221. Definitions.
222. Filled milk; Congressional finding concerning.
223. Regulations.
224. Penalties.
225. Short title.

SUBCHAPTER I—IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM

§ 201. Definitions

As used in this subchapter—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(b) "United States" means the continental United States.

§ 202. Permits for importation

No person shall import milk and cream into the United States unless the person by whom it is shipped or transported holds a valid permit from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 203. Unfitness for importation.

Milk or cream shall be considered unfit for importation—

(a) when all cows producing such milk or cream are not healthy and a physical examination of all such cows has not been made within 1 year previous to such milk being offered for importation;

(b) when such milk or cream, if raw, is not produced from cows which have passed a tuberculin test applied by a duly authorized official veterinarian of the United States, or of the country in which such milk or cream is produced, within 1 year previous to the time of the importation, showing that such cows are free from tuberculosis;

(c) when the sanitary conditions of the dairy farm or plant in which it is produced or handled do not score at least 50 points out of 100 points according to the current methods for scoring as provided by the score cards used by the United States Department of Agriculture;

(d) if the number of bacteria per cubic centimeter exceeds in the case of raw milk 300,000, in the case of raw cream 750,000, and in the case of pasteurized milk 100,000, and in the case of pasteurized cream 500,000;

(e) when the temperature of milk or cream at the time of importation exceeds 50 degrees Fahrenheit.

§ 204. Inspection; issue of permits; regulations

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cause such inspections to be made as are necessary to insure that milk and cream are produced and handled in compliance with section 203 of this title. When the Secretary finds that milk or cream is produced and handled so as not to be unfit for importation under section 203 (a) (b), and (c) of this title, the Secretary shall issue to persons making application therefor permits to ship milk or cream into the United States. In lieu of the inspections to be made by or under the direction of the Secretary, the Secretary may, in the Secretary's discretion, accept a duly certified statement signed by a duly accredited official of an authorized department of any foreign government or of any State of the United States or any municipality thereof that the provisions in section 203 (a), (b), and (c) of this title have been complied with. Such certificate shall be in the form prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary may, in the Secretary's discretion, waive the requirements of section 203 (d) of this title when issuing permits to operators of condenseries in which milk or cream is used when sterilization of the milk or cream is a necessary process, except that no milk or cream shall be imported the bacterial count of which per cubic centimeter in any event exceeds 1,200,000. Such requirements shall not be waived unless the farm producing such milk to be imported is within a radius of 15 miles of the condensery in which it is to be processed. If milk or cream imported when the requirements of section 203 (d), of this title, have been so waived, is sold, used, or disposed of in its raw state or otherwise than as condensed milk by any person, the permit shall be revoked and the importer shall be subject to fine, imprisonment, or other penalty prescribed by this subchapter.

(c) The Secretary shall waive the requirements of section 203 (b) and (e) of this title insofar as the same relate to milk when issuing permits to operators of, or to producers for delivery to, creameries and condensing plants in the United States within 20 miles of the point of production of the milk, and who import no raw milk except for pasteurization or condensing. If milk imported when the requirements of section 203 (b) and (e) of this title have been so waived is sold, used, or disposed of in its raw state, or otherwise than as pasteurized, condensed, or evaporated milk by any person, the permit shall be revoked and the importer shall be subjected to fine, imprisonment, or other penalty prescribed by this subchapter.

(d) The Secretary shall make and enforce such regulations as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the purpose of this subchapter for the issuance of permits to import milk and cream, for the handling of milk and cream, for the inspection of milk, cream, cows, barns, and other facilities used in the production and handling of milk and cream, and for the handling, keeping, transporting, and importing of milk and cream. Unless and until the Secretary provides for inspections to ascertain that section 203 (a), (b), and (c) of this title has been complied with, the Secreatry shall issue temporary permits to any applicants therefor to ship or transport milk or cream into the United States.

(e) The Secretary may suspend or revoke any permit for the shipment of milk or cream into the United States when the Secretary finds that the holder thereof has failed to comply with the provisions of, or has violated, this subchapter, or any of the regulations made under this subchapter, or that the milk or cream brought or shipped by the holder of such permit into the United States is not produced and handled in conformity with, or that the quality thereof does not conform to, all of the provisions of section 203 of this title.

§ 205. Penalties

(a) No person in the United States shall receive milk or cream imported into the United States unless the importation is in accordance with the provisions of this subchapter.

(b) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this subchapter shall, in addition to all other penalties prescribed by law, be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

§ 206. State powers concerning milk and cream

Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the powers of any State, or any political subdivision thereof, to regulate the shipment of milk or cream into, or the handling, sale, or other disposition of milk or cream in, such State or political subdivision after the milk or cream has been lawfully imported under this subchapter.

§ 207. Short title

This subchapter may be cited as the "Federal Import Milk Subchapter."

SUBCHAPTER II—FILLED MILK

§ 221. Definitions

As used in this subchapter—

(a) "Filled milk" means any milk, cream, or skimmed milk, whether or not condensed, evaporated, concentrated, powdered, dried, or desiccated, to which has been added, or which has been blended or compounded with, any fat or oil other than milk fat, so that the resulting product is in imitation or semblance of milk, cream, or skimmed milk, whether or not condensed, evaporated, concentrated, powdered, dried, or desiccated. This definition does not include any distinctive proprietary food compound not readily mistaken in taste for milk or cream or for evaporated, condensed, or powdered milk, or cream where such compound (1) is prepared and designed for feeding infants and young children and customarily used on the order of a physician; (2) is packed in individual cans containing not more than sixteen and one-half ounces and bearing a label in bold type that the content is to be used only for such purpose; and (3) is shipped in interstate or foreign commerce exclusively to physicians, wholesale and retail druggists, orphan asylums, child-walfare associations, hospitals, and similar institutions and generally disposed of by them.

(b) "Interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce (1) between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; (2) between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, or within the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or (3) within any Territory or possession, or within the District of Columbia.

(c) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

§ 222. Filled milk; Congressional finding concerning

Filled milk is an adulterated article of food, injurious to the public health, and its sale constitutes a fraud upon the public.

§ 223. Regulations

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make and enforce such regulations as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this subchapter.

§ 224. Penalties

Any person who manufactures within any Territory or possession, or within the District of Columbia, or ships or delivers for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce, any filled milk, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this subchapter, the act, omission, or failure of any person acting for or employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, within the scope of his employment or office, shall in every case be deemed the act, omission, or failure, of each individual, partnership, corporation, or association, as well as of such person.

§ 225. Short title

This subchapter may be cited as the "Federal Filled Milk Subchapter".

Chapter 7—Tea Importation

Sec.
261. Board of Tea Experts.
262. Board of Tea Appeals.
263. Substandard tea importation; materials for manufacturing.
264. Substandards; duplicate samples.
265. Standards; duplicate samples.
265. Importer's bonds and fees; sampling and examination.
266. Permit for delivery; inferior grades; partial delivery.
267. Examiners.
268. Examination according to usages of trade.
269. Re-examination by Appeals Board; disposition of tea.
270. Procedure for reexamination; assistance of experts.
271. Reimporting rejected teas; forfeitures.
272. Regulations.
273. Short title.

§ 261. Board of Tea Experts

Before February 16 of each year, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint a Board of Tea Experts of seven members who are experts in teas, for a term of 1 year subject to removal by the Secretary. The Secretary shall fill vacancies by appointment for an unexpired term.

The Board shall appoint a presiding officer, who shall be the medium of all communications to or from the Board. Each member of the Board shall receive as compensation the sum of $50 per annum, and necessary expenses in connection with his duties under this title, to be paid by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 262. Board of Tea Appeals

The United States Board of Tea Appeals shall consist of three employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 263. Substandard tea importation; materials for manufacturing

(a) No person shall import or bring into the United States any merchandise as tea which is inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the standards provided in section 264 of this title.

(b) Nothing in this chapter shall affect or prevent the importation into the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prescribes, of any merchandise as tea which may be inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the standards established by the Secretary, or of any tea waste, tea sifting, or tea sweepings, for the sole purpose of manufacturing theine, caffeine, or other chemical products whereby the identity and character of the original material is entirely destroyed or changed. Importers and manufacturers who import such tea, tea waste, tea siftings, or tea sweepings into the United States shall give suitable bond, to be subject to the approval only of the collector of customs at the port of entry, conditioned that said imported material shall be used only for the purposes provided in this subsection, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

§ 264. Standards; duplicate samples

The Board of Tea Experts shall prepare and submit standard samples of tea to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who, upon the Board's recommendation, shall fix and establish uniform standards of purity, quality, and fitness for consumption of all kinds of teas imported into the United States. The Secretary shall procure and deposit in the customhouses of the ports of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and such other ports as the Secretary may determine, duplicate samples of such standards, and the Secretary shall procure a sufficient number of other duplicate samples to supply the importers and dealers in tea at all ports desiring the same at cost. All teas, or merchandise described as tea, of inferior purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to such standards shall be deemed within the prohibition of section 263 of this title.

§ 265. Importer's bonds and fees; sampling and examination

(a) On making entry at the customhouse of all teas, or merchandise described as tea, imported into the United States, the importer or consignee shall give a bond to the collector of the port that such merchandise shall not be removed from the warehouse until released by the collector, after it shall have been duly examined with reference to its purity, quality, and fitness for consumption. For the purpose of such examination samples of each line in every invoice of tea shall be submitted by the importer or consignee to the examiner, together with the sworn statement of such importer or consignee that such samples represent the true quality of each part of the invoice and accord with the specifications therein contained, or in the discretion of the Secretary, such samples shall be obtained by the examiner and compared by him with the standards established by this chapter. Where entry is made at ports where there is no qualified examiner as provided in section 267 of this title, the consignee or importer shall furnish such samples and sworn statement to the collector or other revenue officer to whom it is committed the collection of duties, who shall also draw or cause to be drawn samples of each line in every invoice and shall forward the same to a duly qualified examiner as provided in that section. The bond required by this section shall also be conditioned for the payment of all customhouse charges which may attach to such merchandise prior to its being released or destroyed, as the case may be, under the provisions of this chapter.

(b) The collector shall not examine for importation, or release, any tea, or merchandise described as tea, under this chapter unless the importer or consignee thereof, prior to such examination, has paid for deposit into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, a fee of 3.5 cents for each hundredweight or fraction thereof of such tea and merchandise.

§ 266. Permit for delivery; inferior grades; partial delivery

If, after an examination as provided in section 265 of this title, the tea is found by the examiner to be equal in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the standards provided in this chapter, and no reexamination is demanded by the collector as provided in section 269 of this title, a permit shall at once be granted to the importer or consignee declaring the tea free from the control of the customs authorities. If tea, or merchandise described as tea, is found, in the opinion of the examiner, to be inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to such standards, the importer or consignee shall be immediately notified, and the tea, or merchandise described as tea, shall not be released by the customhouse, unless on a reexamination called for by the importer or consignee the finding of the examiner is found to be erroneous. If a portion of the invoice is passed by the examiner, a permit shall be granted for that portion and the remainder held for further examination, as provided in said section 269.

§ 267. Examiners

The examination provided for by this chapter shall be made by a duly qualified examiner at a port where standard samples are established. When the merchandise is entered at ports where there is no qualified examiner, the examination shall be made at that one of said ports which is nearest the port of entry, and for this purpose samples obtained in the manner prescribed by section 265 of this title shall be forwarded to the proper port by the collector or chief officer at the port of entry.

§ 268. Examination according to usages of trade

In all cases of examination or reexamination of teas, or merchandise described as tea, by examiners or the United States Board of Tea Appeals under the provisions of this chapter, the purity, quality, and fitness for consumption of the same shall be tested according to the usages and customs of the tea trade, including the testing of an infusion of the same in boiling water, and, if necessary, chemical analysis.

§ 269. Reexamination by Appeals Board; disposition of tea

(a) If the collector, importer, or consignee protests against the finding of the examiner, the matter in dispute shall be referred for decision to the United States Board of Tea Appeals.

(b) If the Board, after examination, finds the tea in question to be equal in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the proper standards, the collector shall issue a permit for its release and delivery to the importer.

(c) If upon final reexamination by the Board the tea is found to be inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the said standards, the importer or consignee shall give a bond with security satisfactory to the collector, to export said tea, or merchandise described as tea, out of the limits of the United States within a period of 6 months after such final reexamination, and if the same has not been exported within the time specified, the collector, at the expiration of that time, shall cause the same to be destroyed.

§ 270. Procedure for reexamination; assistance of experts

In cases of reexamination of teas, or merchandise described as teas, by the United States Board of Tea Appeals in pursuance of the provisions of this chapter, the examiner shall put up and seal samples of the tea, or merchandise described as tea, in dispute, in the presence of the importer or consignee if he so desires, and transmit them to the Board, together with a copy of his finding, setting forth the cause of condemnation and the claim or ground of the protest of the importer relating to the same. Such samples and papers shall be distinguished by an identifying mark.

The decision of the Board shall be in writing, signed by its members, and transmitted with the record and samples to the collector within 3 days after its rendition. The collector shall forthwith furnish the examiner and the importer or consignee with a copy of such decision.

The United States Board of Tea Appeals may obtain the advice, when necessary, of persons skilled in the examination of teas, who shall each receive for his services in any particular case a compensation not exceeding $5.

§ 271. Reimporting rejected teas; forfeiture

No imported teas which have been rejected by an examiner or by the United States Board of Tea Appeals, and exported under the provisions of this chapter, shall be reimported into the United States. Any such teas so reimported shall be forfeited.

§ 272. Regulations

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may enforce this chapter by appropriate regulations.

§ 273. Short title

This chapter may be cited as the "Federal Import Tea Chapter."

Chapter 9—Caustic poisons

Sec.
311. Definitions.
312. Misbranded shipments.
313. Misbranded imports.
314. Removal of labels.
315. Enforcement.
316. Libel for condemnation.
317. Penalties.
318. Institution of condemnation and criminal proceedings.
319. Construction; application of other provisions.
320. Short title.

§ 311. Definitions

As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Dangerous caustic or corrosive substance" means:

(1) hydrochloric acid and any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized hydrohloric acid (HCl) in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(2) sulphuric acid and any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized sulphuric acid (H_2SO_4) in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(3) nitric acid or any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized nitric acid (HNO_3) in a concentration of 5 percent or more;

(4) carbolic acid (C_6H_5OH), otherwise known as phenol, and any preparation containing carbolic acid in a concentration of 5 percent or more;

(5) oxalic acid and any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized oxalic acid ($H_2C_2O_4$) in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(6) any salt of oxalic acid and any preparation containing any such salt in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(7) acetic acid or any preparation containing free of chemically unneutralized acetic acid ($HC_2H_3O_2$) in a concentration of 20 percent or more;

(8) hypochlorous acid, either free or combined, and any preparation containing the same in a concentration so as to yield 10 percent or more by weight of available chlorine, excluding calx chlorinata, bleaching powder, and chloride of lime;

(9) potassium hydroxide and any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized potassium hydroxide (KOH), including caustic potash and Vienna paste, in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(10) sodium hydroxide and any preparation containing free or chemically unneutralized sodium hydroxide ($NaOH$), including caustic soda and lye, in a concentration of 10 percent or more;

(11) silver nitrate, sometimes known as lunar caustic, and any preparation containing silver nitrate ($AgNO_3$) in a concentration of 5 percent or more; and

(12) ammonia water and any preparation containing free or chemically uncombined ammonia (NH_3), including ammonium hydroxide and "hartshorn," in a concentration of 5 percent or more.

(b) "Misbranded parcel, package, or container" means a retail parcel, package, or container of any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance not bearing a conspicious, easily legible label or sticker, containing—

(1) the common name of the substance;

(2) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, seller, or distributor;

(3) the word "poison," running parallel with the main body of reading matter on the label or sticker, on a clear, plain background of a distinctly contrasting color, in uncondensed gothic capital letters, the letters to be not less than 24 point size unless there is on the label or sticker no other type so large, in which event the type shall be not smaller than the largest type on the label or sticker; and

(4) directions for treatment in case of accidental personal injury by any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance, except that such directions need not appear on labels or stickers, on parcels, packages, or containers at the time of shipment or of delivery for shipment by manufacturers and wholesalers for other than household use.

(c) "Interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce (1) between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (2) between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof, or (3) within any Territory or possession, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Person" means an individual partnership, corporation, or association.

§ 312. Misbranded shipments

(a) No person shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce or receive from shipment in such commerce any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance for sale or exchange, or sell or offer for sale any such substance in any Territory or possession or in the District of Columbia, in a misbranded parcel, package, or container suitable for household use.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section do not apply—

(1) to any regularly established common carrier shipping or delivering for shipment, or receiving from shipment, any such substance in the ordinary course of its business as a common carrier; nor

(2) to any person in respect of any such substance shipped or delivered for shipment, or received from shipment, for export to any foreign country, in a parcel, package, or container branded in accordance with the specifications of a foreign purchaser and in accordance with the laws of the foreign country; nor

(3) to any dealer who establishes a guaranty signed by, and containing the name and address of, the wholesaler, jobber, manufacturer, or other party residing in the United States, from whom he purchased such articles, to the effect that the articles are not misbranded within the meaning of this chapter. In such case the person giving such guaranty shall be amenable to the prosecutions, fines, and other penalties which would otherwise attach, in due course, to the dealer under the provisions of this chapter.

§ 313. Misbranded imports

(a) Whenever any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance is offered for importation and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has reason to believe that such substance is being shipped in interstate or foreign commerce in violation of section 312 of this title, he shall give due notice and opportunity for hearing thereon to the owner or consignee and certify such fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall thereupon either (1) refuse admission and delivery to the consignee of such substance, or (2) deliver such substance to the consignee pending examination, hearing, and decision in the matter, on the execution of a penal bond to the amount of the full invoice value of such substance, together with the duty thereon, if any, and to the effect that on refusal to return such substance for any cause to the Secretary of the Treasury when demanded, for the purpose of excluding it from the country or for any other purpose, the consignee shall forfeit the full amount of the bond.

(b) If, after proceeding in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is satisfied that such substance offered for importation was shipped in interstate or foreign commerce in violation of any provision of this chapter, he shall certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall thereupon notify the owner or consignee and cause the sale or other disposition of such substance refused admission and delivery or entered under bond, unless it is exported by the owner or consignee or labeled by him so as to conform to the law within 3 months from the date of such notice, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. All charges for storage, cartage, or labor on any such substances refused admission or delivery or entered upon bond shall be paid by the owner or consignee. In default of such payment such charges shall constitute a lien against any future importations made by such owner or consignee.

§ 314. Removal of labels

No person shall alter, mutilate, destroy, obliterate, or remove any label or sticker required by this chapter to be placed on any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance, if such substance is being—

(a) shipped in interstate or foreign commerce; or

(b) held for sale or exchange after having been so shipped; or

(c) held for sale or exchange in any Territory or possession or in the District of Columbia.

§ 315. Enforcement

(a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this chapter, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall enforce its provisions.

(b) For enforcing the provisions of sections 313, 316, and 317 of this title, the Secretary may cause investigations, inspections, analyses, and tests to be made and samples to be collected of any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall pay to the person entitled, upon his request, the reasonable market value of any such sample taken. If it appears from the inspection, analysis, or test of any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance that such substance is in a misbranded package, parcel, or container suitable for household use, the Secretary shall cause notice thereof to be given to any person who may be liable for any violation of section 312 or 314 of this title in respect of such substance. Any person so notified shall be given an opportunity to be heard under the Secretary's regulations. If it appears that such person has violated the provisions of section 312 or 314 of this title, the Secretary shall at once certify the facts to the proper United States attorney, with a copy of the results of the inspection, analysis, or test duly authenticated under oath by the person making it.

(c) For the enforcement of his functions under this chapter the Secretary may—

(1) prescribe and promulgate necessary regulations;

(2) cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, with any State, Territory, or possession, or with the District of Columbia, or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or with any person;

(3) appoint officers and employees necessary for the execution of this chapter and fix their salaries in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(4) make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, and for lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, required for the execution of the Secretary's functions under this chapter and as provided for by the Congress from time to time; and

(5) give notice, by publication in such manner as the Secretary prescribes by regulation, of the judgment of the court in any case under the provisions of this chapter.

§ 316. Libel for condemnation

(a) Any dangerous caustic or corrosive substance in a misbranded parcel, package, or container suitable for household use shall be liable to be proceeded against in the United States district court for any judicial district in which the substance is found and to be seized for confiscation by a process of libel for condemnation, if such substance is being—

(1) shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, or

(2) held for sale or exchange after having been so shipped, or

(3) held for sale or exchange in any Territory or possession or in the District of Columbia.

(b) If such substance is condemned as misbranded by the court it shall be disposed of in the discretion of the court—

(1) by destruction;

(2) by delivery to the owner thereof upon the payment of legal costs and charges and execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond to the effect that such substance will not be sold or otherwise disposed of in any jurisdiction contrary to the provisions of this chapter or the laws of such jurisdiction; or

(3) by sale. The proceeds of the sale, less legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Such substance shall not be sold in any jurisdiction contrary to the provisions of this chapter or the laws of such jurisdiction, and the court may require the purchaser at any such sale to label such substance in compliance with law before the delivery thereof.

(c) Proceedings in such libel cases shall conform, as nearly as may be, to suits in rem in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury on an issue of fact if the value in controversy exceeds $20. In case of a jury trial the verdict of the jury shall have the same effect as a finding of the court upon the facts. All such proceedings shall be at the suit and in the name of the United States.

§ 317. Penalties

(a) Any person who violates any provision of section 312 or 314 of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Any person who commits such a violation after one conviction under this section has become final shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, any person who violates any provision of section 312 or 314 of this title, with intent to defraud or mislead, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

§ 318. Institution of condemnation and criminal proceedings

Each United States attorney to whom the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report any violation of section 312 or 314 of this title or to whom any health, medical, or drug officer or agent of any State, Territory, or possession, or of the District of Columbia presents satisfactory evidence of any such violation, shall cause libel for condemnation and criminal proceedings under sections 316 and 317 of this title to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper court of the United States, without delay, for the enforcement of the condemnation and penalties provided in such sections.

§ 319. Construction; application of other provisions

(a) This chapter is not to be construed as modifying or limiting in any way the right of any person to manufacture, pack, ship, sell, barter, and distribute dangerous caustic or corrosive substances in parcels, packages, or containers, labeled as required by this chapter.

(b) The provisions of this chapter shall be held to be in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the following:

(1) chapter 3 of this title;

(2) chapter 6 of title 7;

(3) the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, as amended.

§ 320. Short title

This chapter may be cited as the "Federal Caustic Poison Chapter."

Part II—Animals, poultry, and meats

Chapter	Sec.
51. Department of Agriculture	451
53. Meat inspection	491
55. Animal and poultry disease prevention; transportation, import, and export	551
57. Serums and analogous products	611

Chapter 51—Department of Agriculture

Sec.
451. Administration of Part II; delegation of functions.

§ 451. Administration of Part II; delegation of functions

The provisions of this part shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except as otherwise provided herein. The Secretary's functions under this part shall be performed by him or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he designates.

Chapter 53—Meat inspection

Sec.
491. Definitions.
492. Ante-mortem inspections.
493. Post-mortem inspections.
494. Meat food products.
495. Canning or packing meats and products; labels.
496. Inspection of establishments.
497. Time of inspections.
498. Meat for export; inspection; clearance.
499. Inspector's certificates.
500. Inspection, stamps or marks.
501. Farmers and retail butchers and dealers, exemptions.
502. Inspectors; appointment, powers, and duties.
503. Regulations.
504. Cost of inspections.
505. Transportation of uninspected and unmarked articles.

Sec.
506. Transportation or sale in violation of chapter.
507. Forgery or misuse of marks or certificates.
508. Penalties generally.
509. Penalty for sale or transportation of unfit products by exempted persons.
510. Bribery; acceptance of gifts.
511. Horse meat.
512. Dairy products for export.
513. Reindeer.

§ 491. Definitions.

As used in this chapter—

(a) "establishment" means a slaughtering, canning, salting, packaging, rendering, or similar establishment;

(b) "farmer" means any natural person or partnership chiefly engaged in producing agricultural products on whose farm the number of cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, swine, or goats is in keeping with the size of the farm or with the volume or character of the agricultural products produced thereon, but does not mean any person or partnership engaged in producing agricultural products who—

(1) actively engages in buying or trading in cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, swine, or goats; or

(2) actively engages, directly or indirectly, in conducting a business which includes the slaughter, of cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, swine, or goats for food purposes; or

(3) actively engages, directly or indirectly, in buying or selling meat or meat food products other than those prepared by any farmer on the farm; or

(4) actively engages, directly or indirectly, in salting, curing, or canning meat, or in preparing sausage, lard, or other meat food products; or

(5) slaughters, or permits any person to slaughter, on his or their farm, cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, swine, or goats which are not actually owned by him or them;

(c) "inspector" means an inspector appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of this chapter;

(d) "retail butcher" or "retail dealer" means any person chiefly engaged in selling meat or meat food products to consumers only, except that the Secretary may permit any retail butcher or retail dealer to transport in interstate or foreign commerce to consumers and meat retailers in any one week not more than 5 carcasses of cattle, 25 carcasses of calves, 20 carcasses of sheep, 25 carcasses of lambs, 10 carcasses of swine, 20 carcasses of goats, or 25 carcasses of goat kids, or the equivalent of fresh meat therefrom, and to transport in interstate or foreign commerce to consumers only meat and meat food products which have been salted, cured, canned, or prepared as sausage, lard, or other meat food products, and which have not been inspected, examined, and marked as "Inspected and Passed" in accordance with this chapter and with the Secretary's rules and regulations;

5. "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

§ 492. Ante-mortem inspections

For the purpose of preventing the use in interstate or foreign commerce of meat and meat food products which are unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, the Secretary may cause to be made an examination and inspection of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, the meat and meat food products of which are to be used in interstate or foreign commerce, before they are allowed to enter into any establishment in which they are to be slaughtered. All such animals found on such inspection to show symptoms of disease shall be set apart and slaughtered separately from all other such animals. When so slaughtered the carcasses of such animals shall be subject to a careful examination and inspection, under the Secretary's rules and regulations, as provided for in this chapter.

§ 493. Post-mortem inspections

For the purpose set forth in section 492 of this title the Secretary shall cause to be made a post-mortem examination and inspection of the carcasses and parts thereof of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, which are to be prepared for human consumption at any establishment in any State or Territory or the District of Columbia for transportation or sale as articles of interstate or foreign commerce.

The carcasses and parts thereof of all such animals found to be sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food shall be marked, stamped, tagged, or labeled as "Inspected and Passed".

All carcasses and parts thereof found to be unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food shall be marked, stamped, tagged, or labeled as "Inspected and Condemned", and all carcasses and parts thereof thus inspected and condemned shall be destroyed for food purposes by the establishment in the presence of an inspector.

After the first inspection, the inspectors shall, when they deem it necessary, reinspect the carcasses or parts thereof and if upon such reinspection any carcass or any part thereof is found to be unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, it shall be destroyed for food purposes by the establishment in the presence of an inspector.

The Secretary may remove inspectors from any establishment which fails so to destroy any carcass or part thereof required to be destroyed by this section.

This section applies to all carcasses or parts of carcasses of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, or the meat or meat food products thereof which may be brought into any establishment, and such examination and inspection shall be had before the said carcasses or parts thereof are allowed to enter into any department wherein they are to be treated and prepared for meat food products. This section also applies to all such products, which, after having been issued from any establishment, are returned to the same or to any similar establishment where such inspection is maintained.

§ 494. Meat food products

For the purpose set forth in section 492 of this title the Secretary shall cause to be made an examination and inspection of all meat food products prepared for interstate or foreign commerce in any establishment.

The inspectors shall mark, stamp, tag, or label as "Inspected and Passed" all such products found to be sound, healthful, and wholesome, and which contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat, or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food.

The inspectors shall label, mark, stamp, or tag as "Inspected and Condemned" all such products found unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome, or which contain dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food, and all such condemned meat food products shall be destroyed for food purposes by the establishment in the presence of an inspector. The Secretary may remove inspectors from any establishment which fails to so destroy such condemned meat food products.

Subject to the Secretary's rules and regulations the provisions of this section in regard to preservatives shall not apply to meat food products for export to any foreign country and which are prepared or packed according to the specifications or directions of the foreign purchaser, when no substance is used in the preparation or packing thereof in conflict with the laws of the foreign country to which said article is to be exported. If the article is in fact sold or offered for sale for domestic use or consumption, this paragraph does not exempt it from the operation of all the other provisions of this chapter.

§ 495. Canning or packing meats and products; labels

When any meat or meat food product prepared for interstate or foreign commerce which has been inspected under this chapter and marked "Inspected and Passed" is placed or packed in any can, pot, tin, canvas, or other receptacle or covering in any establishment where inspection is maintained under this chapter, the person preparing said product shall cause to be attached to said receptacle or covering, under the supervision of an inspector a label stating that the contents thereof have been "Inspected and Passed" under the provisions of this chapter. No inspection and examination of meat or meat food products deposited or inclosed in cans, tins, pots, canvas, or other receptacle or covering in any such establishment is deemed to be complete until such meat or meat food products are sealed or inclosed in said receptacle or covering under the supervision of an inspector.

No such meat or meat food products shall be sold or offered for sale by any person in interstate or foreign commerce under any false or deceptive name. Established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

§ 496. Inspection of establishments

The Secretary shall cause inspections to be made by experts in sanitation or by other competent inspectors of all establishments defined in section 491 of this title in which cattle, sheep, swine, and goats are slaughtered and the meat and meat food products thereof are prepared for interstate or foreign commerce. The inspections shall be such as are necessary to inform the Secretary concerning the sanitary conditions of the establishments, and to enable him to prescribe the rules and regulations of sanitation under which such establishments shall be maintained. Where the sanitary conditions of any such establishment are such that the meat or meat food products are rendered unclean unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, the Secretary shall refuse to allow the meat or meat food products to be labeled, marked, stamped, or tagged as "Inspected and Passed."

§ 497. Time of inspections

(a) The examinations and inspections required by sections 492, 493, 494, and 495 of this title shall be made at night as well as during the daytime when the slaughtering of the animals or preparation of the meat or meat food products is conducted at night.

(b) For the purposes of any examination and inspection under this chapter, the inspectors shall have access at all times, by day or night, whether the establishment is being operated or not, to every part of the establishment.

§ 498. Meat for export; inspection; clearance

(a) The Secretary shall cause to be made a careful inspection of the carcasses and parts thereof of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, when the fresh, salted, canned, corned, packed, cured, or otherwise prepared meat or meat food products of such animals is intended and offered for export to any foreign country, at such times and places and in such manner as he deems proper.

(b) No clearance shall be given to any vessel having on board any fresh, salted, canned, corned, or packed beef, mutton, pork, or goat meat, for export to and sale in a foreign country from any port in the United

States, until the owner or shipper thereof shall obtain a certificate from an inspector that the cattle, sheep, swine, and goats from which such meat or meat food product was obtained, were sound and healthy at the time of inspection, and that their meat or meat food product is sound and wholesome, unless the Secretary has waived the requirement of such certificate for the country to which such meat or meat food product is to be exported.

§ 499. Inspector's certificates

The inspectors may give official certificates of the sound and wholesome conditions of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, their carcasses and products as described in this chapter.

One copy of each such certificate shall be filed in the Department of Agriculture, another copy shall be delivered to the owner or shipper, and when the carcasses of cattle, sheep, swine, and goat, and the meat and meat food products thereof are sent abroad, a third copy shall be delivered to the chief officer of the vessel on which the shipment is made.

§ 500. Inspection, stamps or marks

The inspectors shall refuse to stamp, mark, tag, or label as "Inspected and Passed" any carcass or any part thereof, or meat food product therefrom, prepared in any establishment subject to this chapter until the same has actually been inspected and found to be sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food, and to contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat food product unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food, and to have been prepared under proper sanitary conditions.

§ 501. Farmers and retail butchers and dealers, exemptions

(a) The provisions of this chapter requiring inspection to be made by the Secretary do not apply to animals slaughtered by any farmer on the farm and sold and transported in interstate or foreign commerce nor to retail butchers and retail dealers in meat and meat food products supplying their customers.

Meat and meat food products derived from animals slaughtered by any farmer on the farm which are salted, cured, canned, or prepared into sausage, lard, or other meat food products at any place other than by the farmer on the farm upon which the animals were slaughtered may not be transported in interstate or foreign commerce under the farmers' exemption provided in this section. All fresh meat and all farm-cured or prepared meat and meat food products derived from animals slaughtered by any farmer on the farm which are to be used in interstate or foreign commerce shall be clearly marked with the name and address of the farmer on whose farm the animals were slaughtered.

(b) The Secretary may maintain the inspection provided for in this chapter at any establishment notwithstanding the exemptions contained in this section, and notwithstanding that the persons operating the same may be retail butchers and retail dealers or farmers. Where the Secretary establishes such inspection, the provisions of this chapter apply notwithstanding such exemptions.

§ 502. Inspectors; appointment, powers, and duties

The Secretary shall from time to time appoint inspectors to make the examinations and inspections provided for under this chapter and to perform such other duties as are required by this chapter and the Secretary's rules and regulations.

§ 503. Regulations

The Secretary shall make necessary rules and regulations for the efficient execution of this chapter. All inspections and examinations under this chapter shall be made in the manner provided in the Secretary's rules and regulations which are not inconsistent with this chapter.

§ 504. Cost of inspections

The United States shall bear the cost of inspections rendered under the requirements of this chapter except the cost of overtime pursuant to section 394 of title 7.

§ 505. Transportation of uninspected and unmarked articles

No person shall transport or offer for transportation, and no carrier of interstate or foreign commerce shall transport or receive for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or to any place under the jurisdiction of the United States, or to any foreign country, any carcasses or parts thereof, meat, or meat food products thereof which have not been inspected, examined, and marked as "Inspected and Passed", in accordance with this chapter and with the Secretary's rules and regulations.

§ 506. Transportation or sale in violation of chapter

Until complying with this chapter no person engaged in the interstate commerce of meat or meat food products shall transport or offer for transportation, sell or offer to sell, any such meat or meat food products in any State or Territory or in the District of Columbia or any place under the jurisdiction of the United States, other than in the State or Territory or in the District of Columbia or any place under the jurisdiction of the United States in which the slaughtering, packing, canning, rendering, or other similar establishment owned, leased, or operated by by him is located.

§ 507. Forgery or misuse of marks or certificates

No person shall forge, counterfeit, simulate, or falsely represent, or without proper authority use, fail to use, or detach, or shall knowingly or wrongfully alter, deface, or destroy, or fail to deface or destroy, any of the marks, stamps, tags, labels, or other identification devices provided for in this chapter, or in and as directed by the rules and regulations prescribed under this chapter by the Secretary of Agriculture, on any carcasses, parts of carcasses, or the food product, or containers thereof, subject to the provisions of this chapter or any certificate in relation thereto, authorized or required by this chapter or by the said rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

§ 508. Penalties generally

Except as provided in sections 509 and 510 of this title, whoever violates any of the provisions of this chapter shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

§ 509. Penalty for sale or transportation of unfit products by exempted persons

Whoever, being a farmer, retail butcher, or retail dealer acting under the exemptions provided in section 502 of this title, sells or offers for sale or transportation for interstate or foreign commerce any meat or meat food products which are diseased, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, knowing that such meat food products are intended for human consumption, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

§ 510. Bribery; acceptance of gifts

(a) Whoever gives, pays, or offers, directly or indirectly, to any inspector, deputy inspector, chief inspector, or any other officer or employee of the United States authorized to perform any of the duties prescribed by this chapter or by the Secretary's rules and regulations, any money or other thing of value, with intent to influence such inspector, deputy inspector, chief inspector, or other officer or employee of the United States in the discharge of any duty provided for in this chapter, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being an inspector, deputy inspector, chief inspector, or other officer or employee of the United States authorized to perform any of the duties prescribed by this chapter, accepts any money, gift, or other thing of value from any person, given with intent to influence his official action, or who receives or accepts from any person engaged in interstate or foreign commerce any gift, money, or other thing of value, given with any purpose or intent whatsoever, shall be summarily discharged from office and shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

§ 511. Horsemeat

(a) No person shall transport or offer for transportation, and no carrier of interstate or foreign commerce shall transport or receive for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any place under the jurisdiction of the United States or to any foreign country, any equine meat or food products thereof unless plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "Horsemeat" or "Horsemeat Product," as the case may be, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) All the penalties, terms, and provisions in this chapter, except the exemption in section 501 of this title applying to animals slaughtered by any farmer on a farm and to retail butchers and retail dealers in meat-food products supplying their customers, shall be applicable to (1) horses, their carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat-food products thereof, (2) the establishments and other places where such animals are slaughtered or the meat or meat-food products thereof are prepared or packed for interstate or foreign commerce, and (3) all persons who slaughter such animals or prepare or handle such meat or meat-food products for interstate or foreign commerce.

§ 512. Dairy products for export

This chapter includes dairy products intended for exportation to any foreign country. The Secretary, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, may apply the provisions of this chapter for inspection and certification appropriate for ascertaining the purity and quality of such products, and may cause them to be so marked, stamped, or labeled as to secure their identity and make known in the markets of foreign countries to which they may be sent from the United States their purity, quality, and grade. All the provisions of this chapter relating to live cattle and products thereof for export apply to dairy products so inspected and certified.

§ 513. Reindeer

The provisions of this chapter may be extended to the inspection of reindeer.

Chapter 55—Animal and Poultry Disease Prevention; Transportation, Import, and Export

Sec.
551. Measures and regulations to prevent introduction or spread of disease.
552. Control of diseases; cooperation with States.
553. Research laboratories for foot-and-mouth and other diseases.
554. Appointment of agents to make recommendations.
555. Cooperation with Mexico; foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; reports to Congress.
556. Cattle grubs, research, and eradication.
557. International boundary fences.
558. Regulation of transportation and exportation generally.
559. Quarantine of infected areas.

Sec.
560. Regulations for transportation from quarantined areas.
561. Transportation from quarantined areas prohibited; exceptions.
562. Transportation of diseased livestock or poultry prohibited.
563. Cattle reacting to tuberculin test, transportation of.
564. Domestic animals reacting to test for paratuberculosis or brucellosis.
565. Regulation and promotion of exports.
566. Suspension of importation.
567. Importation of diseased or exposed animals and poultry prohibited.
568. Importation prohibited except at quarantine stations.
569. Quarantine of imported animals and poultry.
570. Inspection and disposition of imported animals and poultry.
571. Disease control in District of Columbia.
572. Inspection by Department as precluding other inspections and fees.
573. Penalties.
574. Prosecution of violations; venue.

§ 551. Measures and regulations to prevent introduction or spread of disease

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture may—

(1) make regulations and take measures to prevent the introduction or dissemination of the contagion of any communicable disease of animals or poultry from a foreign country into the United States or from one State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia to another, and

(2) seize, quarantine, and dispose of any hay, straw, forage, or similar material, or any meats, hides, or other animal or poultry products coming from an infected foreign country to the United States, or from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia in transit to another State or Territory or the District of Columbia whenever in his judgment such action is advisable to guard against the introduction or spread of such contagion.

(b) No regulations made or measures taken under subsection (a) of this section shall pertain to the introduction of live poultry into the Virgin Islands of the United States.

§ 552. Control of diseases; cooperation with States

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare rules and regulations for the speedy and effectual control and eradication of dangerous communicable diseases of domestic animals and poultry. He shall certify such rules and regulations to the executive authority of each State and Territory, and invite them to cooperate in the execution and enforcement of the provisions of this chapter. Whenever the plans and methods of the Secretary are accepted by any State or Territory in which any such disease is declared to exist, or whenever such State or Territory adopts plans and methods for the control and eradication of the disease and such plans and methods are accepted by the Secretary of Agriculture, and whenever the governor of a State or other properly constituted authorities signify their readiness to cooperate for the extinction of the disease in conformity with the provisions of this chapter, the Secretary may expend so much of the money appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this chapter as may be necessary in such investigations, and in such disinfection and quarantine measures as may be necessary to prevent the spread of the disease from one State or Territory into another.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States or political subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations, and similar organizations, and individuals, may control and eradicate tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, brucellosis of domestic animals, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, scabies in sheep and cattle, dourine in horses, scrapie and blue tongue in sheep, incipient or potentially serious minor outbreaks of diseases in animals and poultry, and communicable diseases of animals and poultry which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute an emergency and threaten the livestock industry of the country, including the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and poultry, or the destruction of such animals and poultry and the payment of indemnities therefor, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary prescribes. As used in this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

§ 553. Research laboratories for foot-and-mouth and other diseases

The Secretary of Agriculture may establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 427i (a) of title 7, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal and poultry diseases which in his opinion constitute a threat to the livestock or poultry industry of the United States.

No live virus of foot-and-mouth disease may be introduced for any purpose into any part of the mainland of the United States except coastal islands separated therefrom by waters navigable for deep-water navigation and which are not connected with the mainland by any tunnel, unless in the event of outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in this country, the Secretary of Agriculture permits such virus to be brought into the United States under adequate safeguards.

To carry out this section, the Secretary may employ not more than five technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, at a maximum compensation for each not exceeding $15,000 per annum. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress deems necessary and, in addition, the Secretary may utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such diseases.

§ 554. Appointment of agents to make recommendations

The Secretary of Agriculture may appoint two competent agents, who are practical stockraisers or experienced businessmen familiar with questions pertaining to commercial transactions in livestock or poultry who shall, under the instructions of the Secretary, examine and report upon the best methods of treating, transporting, and caring for animals and poultry, and the means to be adopted for the control and eradication of contagious pleuropneumonia, and provide against the spread of other dangerous communicable diseases. Agents shall receive $10 per diem, with all necessary expenses, while engaged in the actual performance of their duties under this section, when absent from their usual place of business or residence.

§ 555. Cooperation with Mexico; foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; reports to Congress

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture may cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, prevent, or retard, foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing such operations or measures, the Government of Mexico shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry them out on all lands and properties in Mexico and for such other facilities and means as are necessary in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this section on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this section, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for such cooperation shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this section is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

(b) For purposes of this section, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may also be used for (1) the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, (2) printing and binding without regard to section 111 of title 44, (3) the employment of civilian nationals of Mexico, and (4) the construction and operation of research laboratories, quarantine stations and other buildings and facilities.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a report to the Congress on the last day of each month with respect to the activities carried on under this section.

§ 556. Cattle grubs, research and eradication

In order to protect, promote, and conserve livestock and livestock products and to minimize losses, the Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States, the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States, or subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations, and other organizations and individuals, may increase and intensify research and investigations into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs and undertake measures to eradicate these parasites. Funds appropriated to carry out this section shall be expended in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

§ 557. International boundary fences

The Secretary of Agriculture may permit the erection of fences along international boundary lines, but entirely within the territory of the United States, to keep out diseased animals and poultry.

§ 558. Regulation of transportation and exportation generally

In order to enable the Secretary of Agriculture effectually to control and eradicate dangerous communicable diseases in cattle and other livestock and poultry, and to prevent the spread of such diseases he shall establish such rules and regulations concerning the exportation and transportation of livestock and poultry from any place within the United States where he may have reason to believe such diseases may exist into and through any State or Territory, and into and through the District of Columbia and to foreign countries. All such rules and regulations shall have the force of law.

§ 559. Quarantine of infected areas

The Secretary of Agriculture shall quarantine any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or any portion thereof, when he determines that cattle or other livestock or poultry therein are affected with a communicable disease. He shall give written or printed notice of the establishment of quarantine to the proper offices of railroad, steamboat, or other transportation companies doing business in or through any quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and publish such notice in such newspapers in the quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia as he selects.

§ 560. Regulations for transportation from quarantined areas

The Secretary of Agriculture shall, when the public safety permits, promulgate rules and regulations to permit and govern the inspection, disinfection, certification, treatment, handling, and method and manner of delivery and shipment of cattle or other livestock or poultry from a quarantined State or Territory or the District Columbia, and from the quarantined portion of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, into any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall give notice of such rules and regulations as in section 559 of this title for notice of establishment of quarantine.

§ 561. Transportation from quarantined areas prohibited; exceptions

(a) No railroad company and no owner or master of any vessel or boat may receive for transportation, or transport, no person shall deliver for transportation to any railroad company or to the master or owner of any vessel or boat, and no person shall drive or cause to be driven on foot or transport or cause to be transported by private conveyance, any cattle or other livestock or poultry from a quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from any quarantined portion thereof, into any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, except in compliance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 560 of this title.

(b) Subsection (a) of this section and sections 559, 560, and 573 (b) of this title apply to any railroad company or other common carrier whose road or line forms any part of a route over which cattle or other livestock or poultry are transported in the course of shipment from any quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, into any other State or Territory or the State or Territory or the District of Columbia, into any othe State or Territory or the District of Columbia.

§ 562. Transportation of diseased livestock or poultry prohibited

No railroad company within the United States, and no owners or masters of any vessel or boat, may receive for transportation, or transport, from one State or Territory to another, or from any State into the District of Columbia, or from the District into any State, any livestock or poultry affected with any communicable disease; nor shall any person deliver for such transportation to any railroad company, or master or owner of any boat or vessel, any livestock or poultry, knowing them to be affected with any communicable disease. No person may drive on foot, or transport in private conveyance, from one State or Territory to another, or from any State into the District of Columbia or from the District into any State, any livestock or poultry, knowing them to be affected with any communicable disease.

§ 563. Cattle reacting to tuberculin test, transportation of

Cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test may be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for immediate slaughter, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary may under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, permit cattle which have been shipped for breeding or feeding purposes from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and which have reacted to the tuberculin test subsequent to such shipment, to be reshipped in interstate commerce to the original owner.

§ 564. Domestic animals reacting to test for paratuberculosis or brucellosis

Domestic animals which have reacted to a test recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture for brucellosis, may be shipped, transported, or otherwise moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture prescribes to prevent the dissemination of said diseases from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory or the District of Columbia. The Secretary of Agriculture may, under such rules and regulations permit domestic animals which have been moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for breeding purposes, and which, subsequent to such movement, have reacted to a test for brucellosis or paratuberculosis recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture, to be reshipped in interstate commerce to the original owner at the point of origin.

§ 565. Regulation and promotion of exports

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture may take steps and adopt measures, not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, to prevent the exportation from any port of the United States to any port in a foreign country of livestock or poultry affected with any communicable disease.

(b) In order to promote the exportation of livestock and poultry from the United States the Secretary of Agriculture shall make special investigation as to the existence of any communicable disease, along the borders between the United States and foreign countries, and along the lines of transportation from all parts of the United States to ports from which livestock or poultry are exported, and shall, from time to time, establish such regulations concerning the exportation and transportation of livestock or poultry as the results of such investigations require.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, by such orders and regulations as he prescribes, may cause inspection to be made of cattle, sheep, other ruminants, swine, and poultry intended for exportation, and provide for the disinfection of vessels engaged in the transportation thereof, and of barges or other vessels used in the conveyance of such animals and poultry to the ocean steamer or other vessels, and of attendants and their clothing, and of all headropes and other appliances used in such exportation. If, upon inspection, any animals or poultry are adjudged, under the Secretary's regulations, to be infected or to have been exposed to infection so as to be dangerous to other animals or poultry, they shall not be allowed to be placed upon any vessel for exportation. The expenses of all the inspection and disinfection provided for in this subsection shall be borne by the owners of the vessels on which such animals or poultry are exported.

(d) The Secretary shall cause to be made a careful inspection of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats intended and offered for export to foreign countries at such times and places, and in such manner, as he deems proper to ascertain whether such animals are free from disease.

(e) No clearance may be given to any vessel having on board cattle, sheep, swine, or goats for export to a foreign country until the owner or shipper of such animals has a certificate from an inspector stating that the animals are sound and healthy, or unless the Secretary has waived the requirement of such certificate for export to the particular country to which they are to be exported.

§ 566. Suspension of importation

Whenever, in the opinion of the President, it is necessary for the protection of animals, including poultry, in the United States, against communicable diseases, he may, by proclamation, suspend the importation of all or any class of animals or poultry for a limited time, and may modify, revoke, or renew such proclamation, as the public good requires. During the time of such suspension the importation of any such animals or poultry is unlawful.

§ 567. Importation of diseased or exposed animals and poultry prohibited

No person shall import cattle, sheep, other ruminants, swine, and poultry, which are diseased or infected with any disease, or which have been exposed to such infection within 60 days next before their exportation. However, the Secretary of Agriculture may by regulations permit the admission from Mexico into the State of Texas and the admission into the Virgin Islands of cattle which have been infested with or exposed to ticks upon being freed therefrom.

§ 568. Importation prohibited except at quarantine stations

No person may import cattle, sheep, other ruminants, swine, and poultry except at ports designated as quarantine stations by the Secretary of Agriculture with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

If any animals and poultry subject to quarantine are brought into any port of the United States where no quarantine station is established, the collector of such port shall require such animals and poultry to be conveyed to the nearest quarantine station by the vessel on which they are imported or are found, at the expense of the owner.

§ 569. Quarantine of imported animals and poultry

The Secretary of Agriculture may, at the expense of the owner, place and retain in quarantine all cattle, sheep, other ruminants, swine, and poultry imported into the United States, at ports designated by him for such purpose, and under such conditions as he by regulation prescribes, respectively, for the several classes of animals and poultry above described.

For the purpose of such quarantine, the Secretary may purchase, construct, or rent necessary lands, buildings, animals, tools, fixtures, and appurtenance, and he may appoint veterinary surgeons, inspectors, officers, and employees necessary to maintain such quarantine and provide for the execution of the other provisions of sections 565 (c), 566–570, and 573 (e) of this title.

§ 570. Inspection and disposition of imported animals and poultry

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause careful inspection to be made of all imported cattle, sheep, other ruminants, swine, and poultry, to ascertain whether such animals and poultry are infected with communicable diseases or have been exposed to infection so as to be dangerous to other animals and poultry. Such animals and poultry shall then be either placed in quarantine or dealt with according to the Secretary's regulations.

All food, litter, manure, clothing, utensils, and other appliances that have been so related to such animals and poultry on board ship as to be judged liable to convey infection shall be dealt with according to the Secretary's regulations.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture may cause to be slaughtered such of the animals and poultry named in subsection (a) of this section, adjudged under his regulations to be infected with any communicable disease, or to have been exposed to infection so as to be dangerous to other animals and poultry. The value of animals and poultry slaughtered as being exposed to infection but not infected may be ascertained by agreement of the Secretary and the owners thereof if practicable; otherwise, by the appraisal by two persons familiar with the character and value of such property, appointed by the Secretary, whose decision, if they agree, shall be final; otherwise, the Secretary of Agriculture shall decide between them, and his decision shall be final. The amount of the value thus ascertained shall be paid to the owner thereof out of money in the Treasury appropriated for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry or for the use of such other bureau or agency, or of any officer, of the Department of Agriculture, to which or to whom the Secretary may delegate the functions heretofore or hereafter exercised by him through the Bureau of Animal Industry; but no payment may be made for any animals or poultry imported in violation of the provisions of sections 566–570 or 573 (e) of this title.

§ 571. Disease control in District of Columbia

Whenever any communicable disease affecting domestic animals or poultry, is brought into or breaks out in the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall take measures to suppress the disease promptly and to prevent it from spreading. For this purpose the commissioners may

(1) require that any premises or farms where such disease exists, or has existed, be put in quarantine;

(2) order that all or any animals and poultry coming into the District be detained at any place for the purpose of inspection and examination;

(3) prescribe regulations for and require the destruction of animals or poultry affected with communicable disease, and for the proper disposition of their hides and carcasses; and

(4) prescribe regulations for disinfection, and such other regulations as they may deem necessary to prevent infection or contagion being communicated.

The commissioners shall report to the Secretary of Agriculture any actions taken under this section.

§ 572. Inspection by Department as precluding other inspections and fees

Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture, or any inspector or assistant inspector of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary for such purpose, issues a certificate showing that such officer has inspected any cattle or other livestock or poultry which are about to be shipped, driven, or transported from one locality to another as stated in section 558 of this title, and has found them free from any communicable disease, such animals or poultry, so inspected and certified, may be shipped, driven, or transported from such place into and through any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or they may be exported from the United States, without further inspection or the exaction of fees of any kind, except such as may at any time be ordered or exacted by the Secretary of Agriculture. For the purposes of such inspection, all such animals and poultry shall at all times be under the control and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

§ 573. Penalties

(a) Whoever knowingly violates section 551, 558, or 572 of this title or the orders or regulations made in pursuance thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever violates section 561 of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall give notice of the existence of contagion in any infected locality by notice, in writing, to the proper officials or agents of any railroad, steamboat, or other transportation company doing business in or through such locality and by publication in such newspapers as he may select. Whoever, being a person operating any such railroad, or master or owner of any boat or vessel, or owner or custodian of or person having control over such cattle or other livestock or poultry within such infected district, knowingly violates section 562 of this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(d) Whoever violates section 565 (d) or 565 (e) of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(e) Whoever knowingly violates section 567 of this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years. Any vessel or vehicle used in such unlawful importation within the knowledge of the master or owner of such vessel or vehicle that such importation is diseased or has been exposed to infection as described in section 567 of this title, shall be forfeited to the United States.

§ 574. Prosecution of violations; venue

The several United States attorneys shall prosecute all violations of this chapter brought to their notice by any person making complaint under oath, in the United States district court or territorial court held within the district in which the violation has been committed.

Chapter 57—Serums and Analogous Products

Sec.
611. Preparation and sale of serum, etc.
612. Licensing and inspection of establishments.
613. Regulations for preparation and sale.
614. Importation regulated and prohibited.
615. Permits for and inspection of imports.
616. Revocation or suspension of licenses or permits.
617. Penalties.

§ 611. Preparation and sale of serum, etc.

No person may prepare, sell, barter, or exchange in the District of Columbia, in the Territories, or in any place under the jurisdiction of the United States, or ship or deliver for shipment from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia—

(1) any worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals; or

(2) any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured within the United States and intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals, unless and until such product has been prepared, under and in compliance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, at an establishment holding an unsuspended and unrevoked license issued by the Secretary under this chapter.

§ 612. Licensing and inspection of establishments

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture may issue, suspend, and revoke licenses for the maintenance of establishments for the preparation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, for use in the treatment of domestic animals, intended for sale, barter, exchange, or shipment as specified in section 611 of this title.

(b) All licenses issued to establishments under this chapter shall be issued on condition that the licensee shall permit the inspection of such establishments and of such products and their preparation. Any officer, agent, or employee of the Department of Agriculture duly authorized by the Secretary for the purpose may enter and inspect any establishment licensed under this chapter at any hour of the day or night.

§ 613. Regulations for preparation and sale

The Secretary of Agriculture may make and promulgate from time to time necessary rules and regulations to prevent the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment as specified in section 611 of this title of any worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product for use in the treatment of domestic animals.

§ 614. Importation regulated and prohibited.

No person may import into the United States, without a permit from the Secretary of Agriculture, any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product for use in the treatment of domestic animals, and no person may import into the United States any worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product for use in the treatment of domestic animals.

§ 615. Permits for and inspection of imports

(a) The Secretary of Agriculture may issue permits for the importation into the United States of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, for use in the treatment of domestic animals, which are not worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful.

(b) The Secretary may cause to be examined and inspected all viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, for use in the treatment of domestic animals, which are being imported or offered for importation into the United States, to determine whether such products are worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful. If it appears that any such product is worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful, such product shall be denied entry and shall be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner or importer.

§ 616. Revocation or suspension of licenses or permits

The Secretary of Agriculture may suspend or revoke any license or permit issued under this chapter, after opportunity for hearing has been granted the licensee or importer, when the Secretary is satisfied that such license or permit is being used to facilitate or effect the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment as specified in section 611 of this title, or the importation into the United States, of any worthless, contaminated, dangerous, or harmful virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product for use in the treatment of domestic animals.

§ 617. Penalties

Whoever violates any provision of this chapter shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Part III—Narcotics

Chapter	Sec.
91. Administration	711
93. Narcotics import and export	761
95. Domestic opium poppy production control	811

Chapter 91—Administration

Sec.
711. Administration of Part III; delegation of functions.
712. Departmental cooperation in discharge of international obligations.
713. Cooperation with States in suppression of abuse.
714. Payments for information.

§ 711. Administration of Part III; delegation of functions

Except as otherwise provided by law, the administration and enforcement of this part are vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. Such Secretary's functions under this part shall be performed by him or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers, agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Treasury as he designates.

§ 712. Departmental cooperation in discharge of international obligations

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cooperate with the Secretary of State in the discharge of the international obligations of the United States concerning the traffic in narcotic drugs.

§ 713. Cooperation with States in suppression of abuse

(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cooperate with the several States in the suppression of the abuse of narcotic drugs in their respective jurisdictions, and to that end he may;

(1) cooperate in the drafting of such legislation as may be needed to effect the end named; and

(2) arrange for the exchange of information concerning the use and abuse of narcotic drugs in said States and for cooperation in the institution and prosecution of cases in the courts of the United States and before the licensing boards and courts of the several States.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

§ 714. Payments for information concerning violations of laws

The Secretary of the Treasury may pay to any person, from funds appropriated for the enforcement of the narcotic laws of the United States, for information concerning a violation of any narcotic law of the United States, resulting in a seizure of contraband narcotics, such sum or sums of money as he may deem appropriate, without reference to any moieties or rewards to which such person may otherwise be entitled by law. All payments under authority of this section to any informer in any foreign country shall be made only through an accredited consul or vice consul of the United States stationed in such country, and every such payment shall be supported by a voucher with an accompanying certificate of such consul or vice consul that the payment of the amount stated on the voucher has been made to the informer named, and at the place and time specified on such voucher.

Chapter 93—Narcotics Import and Export

Sec.

761. Definitions.
762. Rules and regulations.
763. Importation; exceptions and restrictions; forfeitures.
764. Import for purpose of transportation to another country; transfer between vessels.
765. Penalty for unlawful import, receipt, transportation or sale; subsequent offenses; procedure; evidence; liability of masters and persons in charge.
766. Presumption and burden of proof as to importation of smoking opium.
767. Exportation; exception; laws of foreign governments.
768. Penalty for unlawful export.
769. Penalty for having in possession or control on board United States vessel.
770. Penalty for possession, receipt, or concealment of smoking opium; evidence; liability of masters and persons in charge.
771. Share of fine to informer.
772. Short title.

§ 761. Definitions

As used in this chapter, unless the context requires a different meaning—

(a) "narcotic drug" has the same meaning ascribed to the term "narcotic drugs" as used in the Internal Revenue Code;

(b) "United States," when used in geographical sense, includes the several States and Territories, and the District of Columbia;

(c) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury;

(d) "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation or association.

§ 762. Rules and regulations

The Secretary shall prescribe and publish all proper rules and regulations to carry into effect the authority vested in him by this chapter.

§ 763. Importation; exceptions and restrictions; forfeitures

(a) No narcotic drug may be imported or brought into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, except that, under such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe—

(1) such amounts of crude opium and coca leaves as the Secretary finds to be necessary to provide for medical and scientific uses may be so imported or brought in; but no crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin, and the Secretary may limit further or prohibit entirely the importation or bringing in of crude opium, to the extent that he finds that the medical and scientific needs of the United States for opium or opium products are being, or can be, supplied by opium poppies produced in accordance with chapter 95 of this title; and

(2) amounts of coca leaves in addition to the amount permitted under paragraph (1) of this subsection may be imported or brought in; but after the entry of such additional amounts into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, all cocaine, ecgonine, and all salts, derivatives, and preparations from which cocaine or ecgonine may be synthesized or made, contained therein, shall be destroyed under the supervision of the Secretary or his authorized representative.

(b) all narcotic drugs imported under subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the duties which are now or may hereafter be imposed upon such drugs when imported.

(c) any narcotic drug imported or brought into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, shall—

(1) If smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, be seized and summarily forfeited to the United States Government without the necessity of instituting forfeiture proceedings of any character; or

(2) If any other narcotic drug be seized and forfeited to the United States Government, without regard to its value, in the manner provided by sections 1607 and 1608 of title 19, or the provisions of law hereafter enacted which are amendatory of, or in substitution for, such sections.

(d) any narcotic drug which is forfeited in a proceeding for condemnation or not claimed under sections 1607 and 1608 of title 19, or which is summarily forfeited as provided in subsection (c) of this section, shall be placed in the custody of the Secretary and in his discretion be destroyed or delivered to some agency of the United States Government for use for medical or scientific purposes.

§ 764. Import for purpose of transportation to another country; transfer between vessels

No smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking shall be admitted into the United States or into any territory under its control or jurisdiction for transportation to another country, or be transferred or transshipped from one vessel to another vessel within any waters of the United States for immediate exportation or for any other purpose; and except with the approval of the Secretary, no other narcotic drug may be so admitted, transferred, or transshipped.

§ 765. Penalty for unlawful import, receipt, transportation or sale; subsequent offenses; procedure; evidence; liability of masters and persons in charge

(a) Whoever fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings any narcotic drug into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States, shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 5 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this subsection, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this subsection or in section 7237 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202 of the act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or sections 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this subsection.

Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

(b) No master of any vessel or other water craft, or person in charge of a railroad car or other vehicle, shall be liable under subsection (a) of this section if he satisfies the jury that he had no knowledge of and used due diligence to prevent the presence of the narcotic drug in or on such vessel, water craft, railroad car, or other vehicle; but the narcotic drug shall be seized, forfeited, and disposed of as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of section 763 of this title.

§ 766. Presumption and burden of proof as to importation of smoking opium

All smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking found within the United States is presumed to have been imported contrary to law, and the burden of proof is on the claimant or the accused to rebut such presumption.

§ 767. Exportation; exceptions; laws of foreign governments

(a) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Government may export or cause to be exported from the United States, or from territory under its control or jurisdiction, any narcotic drug to any other country except to a country which has ratified and become a party to the convention and final protocol between the United States Government and other powers for the suppression of the abuses of opium and other drugs, commonly known as the International Opium Convention of 1912, and then only if—

(1) such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with that convention, a system, which the Secretary deems adequate, of permits or licenses for the control of imports of such narcotic drugs;

(2) the narcotic drug is consigned to an authorized permittee; and

(3) there is furnished to the Secretary proof deemed adequate by him that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and scientific uses within the country to which exported, that it will not be reexported from such country, and that there is an actual shortage of and a demand for the narcotic drug for medical and scientific uses within such country.

(b) The exceptions contained in subsection (a) of this section do not apply to smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, the exportation of which is absolutely prohibited.

(c) The Secretary of State shall request all foreign governments to communicate through the diplomatic channels copies of the laws and regulations promulgated in their respective countries which prohibit or regulate the importation and shipment in transit of any narcotic drug and, when received, shall advise the Secretary thereof.

§ 768. Penalty for unlawful export

Whoever exports, or conspires to export, any narcotic drugs in violation of section 767 of this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

§ 769. Penalty for having in possession or control on board United States vessel

Any person who brings on board, or has in his possession or control on board, any vessel of the United States, while engaged on a foreign voyage, any narcotic drug as defined in section 761 of this title, or marihuana as defined in the Internal Revenue Code not constituting a part of the cargo entered in the manifest or part of the ship stores, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

§ 770. Penalty for possession, receipt, or concealment of smoking opium; evidence; liability of masters and persons in charge

(a) Whoever, being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States either as principal or as accessory, receives or has in his possession, or conceals on board of or transports on any foreign or domestic vessel or other water craft or railroad car or other vehicle destined to or bound from the United States or any possession thereof, any smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, or who, having knowledge of the presence in or on any such vessel, water craft, or vehicle of such article, does not report the same to the principal officer thereof, shall be punished as provided in section 765 of this title. Whenever on trial for violation of this section the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of such opium, such possession is deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction, unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

(b) No master of a vessel or other water craft or person in charge of a railroad car or other vehicle is liable under this section if he satisfies the jury that he had no knowledge and used due diligence to prevent the presence of such article in or on such vessel, water craft, car, or other vehicle; but any such article shall be forfeited and destroyed.

§ 771. Share of fine to informer

One-half of any fine recovered upon a conviction of an offense under this chapter may be paid to the person or persons giving information leading to such recovery, and one-half of any bail forfeited and collected in any proceedings brought under this chapter may be paid to the person or persons giving the information which led to the institution of such proceedings, if so directed by the court exercising jurisdiction in the case. No payment for giving information shall be made to any officer or employee of the United States.

§ 772. Short title

This chapter may be cited as the "Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Chapter."

Chapter 95—Domestic Opium Poppy Production Control

Sec.
811. Declaration of policy; assistance from Federal agencies.
812. Definitions.
813. Rules and regulations.
814. Licenses; qualifications; limitations; revocation and renewal.
815. Distribution by Federal Government; personnel of Treasury Department excepted from prohibitions.
816. Production, purchase, manufacture, sale or transportation by unlicensed persons.
817. Seizure and forfeiture of opium poppies illegally possessed; disposition.
818. Penalties.
819. Pleading, presumptions, and burden of proof.
820. Application to, and of, other laws.
821. Territorial application.
822. Short title.

§ 811. Declaration of policy; assistance from Federal agencies

(a) It is the purpose of this chapter to—

(1) discharge more effectively the obligations of the United States under the International Opium Convention of 1912, and the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 1931, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on December 11, 1946;

(2) promote the public health and the general welfare;

(3) regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies; and

(4) safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products.

(b) Other departments, bureaus, and independent establishments of the Government, when requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall furnish such assistance, including technical advice, as will aid in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

§ 812. Definitions

As used in this chapter—

1. "produce" or "production" includes the planting, cultivation, growth, harvesting, and any other activity which facilitates the growth of the opium poppy;

2. "opium poppy" includes the plant Papaver sominferum, any other plant which is the source of opium or opium products, and any part of any such plant;

3. "opium" includes the inspissated juice of the opium poppy, in crude or refined form;

4. "opium products" includes opium and all substances obtainable from opium or the opium poppy, except the seed thereof;

5. "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury;

6. "person" means an individual, company, partnership, corporation, or association.

§ 813. Rules and regulations

The Secretary may prescribe and publish all necessary rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this chapter.

§ 814. Licenses; qualifications; limitations; revocation and renewal

(a) Any person who desires to procure a license to produce the opium poppy, or to manufacture opium or opium products, shall make application therefor in such manner and form as the Secretary by rules and regulations prescribes.

(b) A license to produce the opium poppy shall be issued only to a person who, in the opinion of the Secretary, is determined to be a person—

(1) of good moral character;

(2) of suitable financial standing and farming experience;

(3) who owns or controls suitable farmland to be used as a production area, in such locality, as will, in the judgment of the Secretary, render reasonably probable the efficient and diligent performance of the operation of producing the opium poppy in appropriate number and quality; and

(4) who complies with such additional requirements as the Secretary shall deem and prescribe as reasonably necessary for the controlled production and distribution of the opium poppy.

Each license is nontransferable and is valid only to the extent of the production area and maximum weight of opium poppy yield specified in the license, shall state the locality of the production area, and is effective for 1 year from the date of issue and may be renewed, in the discretion of the Secretary, for a like period.

(c) A license to manufacture opium or opium products shall be issued only to a person who, in the opinion of the Secretary, is determined to be a person—

(1) of good moral character;

(2) who possesses a method and facilities, deemed satisfactory to the Secretary, for the efficient and economical extraction of opium or opium products;

(3) who has such experience in manufacturing and marketing other medicinal drugs as to render reasonably probable the orderly and lawful distribution of opium or opium products of suitable quality to supply medical and scientific needs; and

(4) who complies with such additional requirements as the Secretary deems and prescribes as reasonably necessary for the controlled production, manufacture, and distribution of the opium poppy, opium, or opium products.

Such license is nontransferable, shall state the maximum quantity of opium poppies purchasable or obtainable thereunder, and effective for 1 year from the date of issue and may be renewed, in the discretion of the Secretary, for a like period.

(d) Licenses issued under this section shall be limited to such number, localities, and areas as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to supply the medical and scientific needs of the United States for opium or opium products, with due regard to provision for reasonable reserves. Nothing contained in this section requires the Secretary to issue or renew any license or licenses under the provisions hereof.

(e) The Secretary may revoke or refuse to renew any license issued under this section, if, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, he finds that such action is in the public interest, or that the licensee has failed to maintain the requisite qualifications.

§ 815. Distribution by Federal Government; personnel of Treasury Department excepted from prohibitions

(a) The Secretary, whenever in his opinion the medical and scientific needs of the Nation will not be met by importation or licensed production, shall provide for the acquisition of opium poppy seed, for the production of the opium poppy, for the manufacture of opium or opium products, and for the use, sale, giving away, or other proper distribution of opium poppy seed, opium poppies, opium, or opium products by the United States Government either directly or through and with the approval of the head of any agency of the Government, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation.

(b) None of the prohibitions contained in this chapter applies to any officer or employee of the United States Treasury Department, who in the performance of his official duties and within the scope of his authority engages in any of the businesses or activities herein described, nor to any other officer or employee of the United States Government, who in the performance of his official duties, within the scope of his authority and with the approval of the Secretary, engages in any of the businesses or activities herein described.

§ 816. Production, purchase, manufacture, sale, or transportation by unlicensed persons

(a) No person who is not the holder of a license authorizing him to produce the opium poppy, issued to him by the Secretary, may produce or attempt to produce the opium poppy, or permit the production of the opium poppy in or upon any place owned, occupied, used, or controlled by him.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section, no person shall—

(1) purchase or in any other manner obtain the opium poppy, unless he is the holder of a proper license to produce the opium poppy or to manufacture opium or opium products, duly issued to him by the Secretary; or

(2) sell, transfer, convey any interest in, or give away the opium poppy to any person not so licensed.

(c) No person who is not the holder of a license authorizing him to manufacture opium or opium products, issued to him by the Secretary, may manufacture, compound, or extract opium or opium products from the opium poppy.

(d) No person who is not the holder of a license authorizing him to produce the opium poppy or to manufacture opium or opium products, issued to him by the Secretary, may send, ship, carry, transport, or deliver any opium poppies within any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or insular possession of the United States, or from any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or insular possession of the United States, into any other State, Territory, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or insular possession of the United States. Nothing contained in this subsection applies to any common carrier engaged in transporting opium poppies pursuant to an agreement with a person duly licensed under section 814 of this title as a producer of the opium poppy, or as a manufacturer of opium or opium products, or to any employee of any person so licensed while acting within the scope of his employment.

(e) No person may sell, transfer, convey any interest in, or give away, except to a person duly licensed under section 814 of this title, opium poppyseed for the purpose of opium poppy production, nor shall any unlicensed person purchase or otherwise obtain such seed for such purpose; but the seed obtained from opium poppies produced by licensed producers may be sold or transferred by such producers to unlicensed persons, and may thereafter be resold or transferred, for ultimate consumption as a spice seed or for the manufacture of oil.

§ 817. Seizure and forfeiture of opium poppies illegally possessed: disposition

(a) Opium poppies produced or otherwise obtained in violation of any of the provisions of this chapter shall be seized by, and forfeited to, the United States.

(b) The failure upon demand by the Secretary, or his duly authorized agent, of the person in occupancy or control of land or premises upon which opium poppies are being produced or stored to produce an appropriate license, or proof that he is the holder thereof, constitutes authority for the seizure and forfeiture of such opium poppies.

(c) The Secretary, or his duly authorized agent, may enter upon any land, but not a dwelling house, unless pursuant to a search warrant issued according to law, where opium poppies are being produced or stored, for the purposes of enforcing the provisions of this chapter.

(d) Opium poppies, the owner of which is unknown, seized by or coming into the possession of the United States in the enforcement of this chapter shall be forfeited to the United States.

(e) The Secretary shall destroy any opium poppies seized by, and forfeited to, the United States under this section, or deliver them for medical or scientific purposes to any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States Government, upon proper application therefor under such regulations as he may prescribe.

§ 818. Penalties

(a) Whoever violates any provision of this chapter shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Whoever willfully makes, aids, or assists in the making of, or procures, counsels, or advises in the preparation or presentation of, a false or fraudulent statement in an application for a license under the provisions of section 814 of this title, whether or not such false or fraudulent statement is made by or with the knowledge or consent of the person authorized to present the application, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

§ 819. Pleading, presumptions, and burden of proof

It is not necessary to negative any exemptions set forth in this chapter in any complaint, information, indictment, or other writ or proceeding laid or brought under this chapter and the burden of proof of any such exemption is upon the defendant. In the absence of the production of an appropriate license by the defendant, he is presumed not to have been duly licensed in accordance with section 814 of this title and the burden of proof is on the defendant to rebut such presumption.

§ 820. Application to, and of, other laws

Nothing in this chapter repeals any provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, but nothing in that code applies to the production, sale, or transfer of opium poppies, when such opium poppies are lawfully produced, sold, or transferred by persons duly and properly licensed under section 814 of this title in conformity with the regulations issued pursuant to such action.

§ 821. Territorial application

The provisions of this chapter apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the other insular possessions of the United States.

§ 822. Short title

This chapter may be cited as the "Opium Poppy Control Chapter."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the act approved May 29, 1884 (ch. 60, 23 Stat. 31; 7 U. S. C., sec. 391), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. There shall be in the Department of Agriculture a Bureau of Animal Industry. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint a chief thereof, who is a competent veterinary surgeon. The functions of the Bureau of Animal Industry are vested in the Secretary of Agriculture or, subject to his direction and control, in such officers and agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he designates. Such functions include the duty to investigate and report upon the condition of the domestic animals and poultry of the United States, their protection and use, and also to inquire into and report the causes of communicable diseases among them, and the means for the prevention and cure of the same, and to collect such information on these subjects as is valuable to the agricultural and commercial interests of the country."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 1 of the act approved March 28, 1928 (ch. 266, 45 Stat. 374; 31 U. S. C., sec. 529a), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out "Division of Disbursement," as now appearing in such paragraph, and, in lieu thereof, inserting "Fiscal Service;", and (2) by striking out, after the first semicolon, "the Act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes", approved February 9, 1909,' as amended, known as the 'Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act' ", and inserting in lieu thereof "chapter 93 of title 21, United States Code."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 302 of the act approved July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, title III, 58 Stat. 692; 42 U. S. C., sec. 242) is amended by striking out the reference "the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended," appearing at the end of such subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof "chapter 93 of title 21, United States Code."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 7 of the act approved August 9, 1939 (ch. 618, 53 Stat. 1293; 49 U. S. C., sec. 787 (d)), as amended, is amended by striking out the reference "the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act," appearing in such subsection.

SEC. 5. The opening clause of subsection (f) of section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 55 (f)) as amended, which subsection was added to such section 15 by section 4 (b) of the act approved March 16, 1950 (ch. 61, 64 Stat. 21), is amended by striking out "and section 407 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended."

SEC. 6. If any part of title 21, United States Code, as set out in section 1 of this act, shall be held invalid, the remainder of such title shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. No inference of a legislative construction is to be drawn by reason of the chapter in title 21, United States Code, as set out in section 1 of this act, in which any section is placed, nor by reason of the catchlines used in such title.

SEC. 8. All orders, rules, and regulations in effect on the effective date of this act, which were adopted under the authority of the acts of Congress from which title 21, United States Code, as set out in section 1 of this act, is derived, shall continue in effect until modified, amended, superseded, or repealed under the authority of such title.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title 21, United States Code, as set out in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1956, except that, with respect to pesticide chemicals for which tolerances or exemptions have not been established under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this act or under section 47 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as enacted by section 1 of this act, the provisions of clause (2) of section 42 (a) of title 21, United States Code, set out in section 1 of this act which relate to pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities shall not be effective—

(1) for the period of 1 year following July 22, 1954; or

(2) for such additional period following such period of 1 year, but not extending beyond 2 years after July 22, 1954, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may

prescribe on the basis of a finding that conditions exist which necessitate the prescribing of such additional period.

SEC. 11. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large numerated in the following schedule are hereby repealed. Any rights or liabilities now existing under such sections or parts thereof are not affected by this repeal.

Statutes at Large						U. S. Code	
Date	Chapter	Title	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1884—May 29	60		2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	23	31-33	21	112, 113, 114, 117-120, 130
Do	60		10	23	33	7 21	391 note 112 note
1887—Feb. 23	210		1, 2, 3	24	409	21	191-193
1890—Aug. 30	839		1, 2, 3	26	414, 415	21	1 note, 71 note
Do	839		4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	26	415-417	21	18, 101-105
1897—Mar. 2	358		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	29	604-607	21	41-46, 47-50
1902—May 9	784		1	32	193	21	25
July 1	1357		1, 2	32	632	21	16, 17
1903—Feb. 2	349		1, 2, 3	32	791, 792	21	111, 112, 113, 120-122
1905—Mar. 3	1496		1, 2, 3, 4, 6	33	1264, 1265	21	123-127
1906—June 30	3913 (part)			34	[1] 679	21	95
1907—Mar. 4	2907 (part)			34	[2] 1260-1265	21	71-92
1908—May 16	170			35	163	21	41
May 23	192 (part)			35	[3] 254	21	94a
1909—Feb. 9	[4] 100		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	35	614	21	171-173, 174, 176-184, 185
1910—May 26	256 (part)			36	[5] 440	21	131
1913—Mar. 4	145 (part)			37	[6] 832, 833	21	151-158
1914—June 30	131 (part)			38	[7] 419	21	128
Do	131 (part)			38	[8] 420	21	94
1915—Mar. 3	74		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	38	817-822	21	201-215
Mar. 4	144 (part)			38	[9] 1102	21	24
1917—Aug. 10	52		9	40	275	21	106, 107
1918—Nov. 21	212		3	40	1048, 1049	21	106, 107
1919—July 24	26 (part)			41	[10] 241	21	96
Do	26 (part)			41	[11] 271	21	321b
1920—May 31	217 (part)			41	[12] 699	21	
Do	217 (part)			41	[13] 712, 713	21	41-44, 46-50
1923—Mar. 4	262		1, 2, 3	42	1486, 1487	21	61-63
Do	262		[14] 4			21	64
Do	268			42	1500	21	321a
1926—June 28	700		1, 2	44	774, 775	21	104, 115, 115 note
1927—Jan. 18	39 (part)			44	[15] 984	21	26
Feb. 15	155		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	44	1101-1103	21	141-149
Mar. 4	489		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	44	1406-1410	15	401-409, 409 note, 410, 411
1928—Feb. 7	30			45	59	7 21	[16] 391 111-115, 117-126, 128, 130
May 16	572 (part)			45	[17] 548	21	26
1929—Feb. 16	22 (part)			45	[18] 1198	21	26
1930—June 14	488		6, 7, 8	46	587	21	173a, 197, 198
July 3	829			46	850	21	199
1931—Feb. 28	348			46	1460	21	104
1934—June 22	712			48	1204	21	372a
June 26	756		[19] 2	48	1225	21	95
1935—Aug. 27	739			49	871	21	372a
1938—June 25	675		All	52	1040-1059	21	301, 321, 321a, 321b, 331-337, 341-346, 346a, 351-357, 361-364, 371, 372, 372a, 373-376, 381, 391, 392, and notes thereunder, and notes preceding 61, 141.
June 29	810			52	1235	21	91
1939—May 2	107	I	1 (part)	53	[20] 631	21	376 note
June 23	242		1, 2, 3	53	853, 854	21	342 note, 343 note, 351 note, 352, 352 note, 361 note, 362 note.
1940—June 27	437	I	101 (part)	54	[21] 632	21	46a
1941—July 1	269	II (part)		55	[22] 478	21	46a
July 11	289		1, 2	55	584	21	184s, 184a note
Dec. 22	613		1, 2, 3, 4	55	851, 852	21	331, 352, 356, 356 note
1942—Dec. 11	720		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	56	1045-1049	21	188, 188 note, 188a-188n
1943—July 12	221	II	1 (part)	57	[23] 500	21	372a
1944—Mar. 2	77			58	108	21	321c
Sept. 21	412	I	101(a)	58	734	21	114a
1945—July 6	281		1, 2, 3	59	463, 464	21	331, 352, 357
1947—Feb. 28	8		1, 2, 3, 4	61	7, 8	21	114b, 114b note, 114c 114d
Mar. 10	16		1, 2, 3	61	11, 12	21	331, 352, 357
July 30	356	I	1 (part)	61	[24] 531, 532	21	97, 97a, 97b, 97c, 97d
1948—Apr. 24	229			62	198	21	113a
June 5	423			62	344	21	98
June 16	477		1, 2	62	458	21	114e, 114f
June 24	613		1, 2	62	582	21	331, 334
June 25	646		5	62	986	21	193
1949—June 29	280	I	101 (part)	63	[25] 331		
July 13	305		1, 2	63	409, 410	21	352, 357
Oct. 18	696		1, 2, 3	63	882, 883	21	381

[1] Only the second full paragraph on this page, of which the first sentence was classified to the United States Code, 1946 ed., as section 95 of title 21 thereof, and the remainder was not classified to such Code.

[2] Commencing with the paragraph headed "For meat inspection" on page 1260, and continuing on to the bottom of such page, inclusive; all that appears on pages 1261, 1262, 1263, and 1264, including the paragraph which commences on page 1264 and ends on page 1265; and the first full paragraph on page 1265.

[3] Only the proviso which commences near the bottom of this page, and ends on page 255 with the word "certified".

[4] As amended by Acts Jan. 17, 1914, ch. 9, 38 Stat. 275-277; May 26, 1922, ch. 202, §§ 1-4, 42 Stat. 596-598; June 7, 1924, ch. 352, 43 Stat. 657; July 1, 1944, ch. 377, § 8, 58 Stat. 721; Mar. 8, 1946, ch. 81, § 7, 60 Stat. 39; Nov. 2, 1951, ch. 666, §§ 1, 5 (1), 65 Stat. 767, 769; June 27, 1952, ch. 477, § 403 (a) (10), 66 Stat. 279.

[5] Only the third paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" appearing on this page.

[6] All of the paragraph commencing on page 832, "That from and after July first", and ending on page 833, except the final sentence of such paragraph commencing "That there is hereby appropriated".

[7] Only the first proviso appearing on this page.

[8] Only the proviso in the paragraph commencing "Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry" and appearing on this page.

[9] Only the proviso appearing on this page.

[10] All of the paragraph beginning "Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry" appearing on this page, except the first sentence thereof.

[11] All of the fourth full paragraph appearing on this page.

[12] Only the last two provisos in the paragraph which begins on page 698 and ends on page 699, said two provisos appearing on page 699.

[13] All of the paragraph which begins on page 712 and ends on page 713, except the final sentence of such paragraph.

[14] As added by act Aug. 27, 1935, ch. 743, 49 Stat. 885.

[15] Only the proviso in the paragraph headed "Meat inspection" appearing on this page.

[16] The amendments made by the act of Feb. 7, 1928, ch. 30, to sec. 1 of act May 29, 1884, ch. 60 (23 Stat. 31; 7 U. S. C., sec. 391), are also repealed, but such repeal shall not be construed as repealing such sec. 1 of the act of 1884 (7 U. S. C., sec. 391) which, as amended by another section of this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

[17] The 1st proviso appearing on this page.

[18] The proviso in the paragraph headed "Meat inspection" appearing on this page.

[19] Only that part of this section which amends that part of act June 30, 1906, ch. 3913, 34 Stat. 679 relating to a permanent appropriation for the inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats and the meat and meat food products thereof and expenses incidental to such inspection, including the proviso in subsec. (a) and item (3) of subsec. (b) of such sec. 2.

[20] In the paragraph beginning on page 631 and ending on page 632, only the words reading, "which section is hereby made immediately effective" appearing on page 631.

[21] Only the proviso in the paragraph headed "Food and Drug Administration," appearing on this page.

[22] Only the proviso in the paragraph beginning "Enforcement of Tea Importation Act," appearing on this page.

[23] Only the following words in the second paragraph appearing on this page: "which may hereafter be cited as section 702A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

[24] All of the paragraph beginning "Meat inspection:", which commences on page 531 and ends on page 532.

[25] The two provisos in the last paragraph on this page.

Statutes at Large						U. S. Code	
Date	Chapter	Title	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1950—Mar. 16	61	----------	3, 6	64	20, 22	21	331, 342, 347, 347a, 347b
1951—Oct. 26	578	----------	1, 2, 3	65	648, 649	21	333, 333 note, 353, 353 note
Oct. 30	637	----------	1, 2	65	693, 694	21	114a, 114a-1
Nov. 2	666	----------	1	65	767, 768	21	174
1953—Aug. 5	334	----------	1, 2	67	389	21	352, 357
Aug. 7	350	----------	1, 2, 3	67	476, 477	21	331, 334, 374
Aug. 8	381	----------	----------	67	493, 494	21	114a
Do	394	----------	8	67	506	21	171
1954—Apr. 15	143	----------	1, 2	68	54, 55	21	341, 371
July 22	558	----------	32, 33	68	510	21	104, 111
Do	559	----------	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	68	511	21	321, 342, 342 note, 346a, 346b
Sept. 3	1263	----------	37	68	1239, 1240	21	337

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement from the Department of Agriculture with reference to the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The Department of Agriculture has numerous suggestions for changes in H. R. 6991 which they believe desirable to accomplish the purposes of the bill and to avoid certain problems that may arise under the present language of the bill. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has not had an opportunity to consider these suggestions. There is no objection to the placing of this bill on the consent calendar at this time, however, because it is understood that the Department of Agriculture and members of the staff of the House committee are to bring the Department's position to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate for consideration when the bill is before the Senate. In order that the record may be clear, the Department of Agriculture amendments will be submitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary at the proper time.

TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "ARMED FORCES," and TITLE 32 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "NATIONAL GUARD"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that request?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. Otherwise I should have to object to consideration of the bill. I think it should be amended.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has no objection to the bill being called up later during the day?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. I feel I shall have to object to its being called up for approval. I am asking only unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been on the calendar for 3 weeks. I should like to talk to the gentleman before he makes his objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to do that. I should like to call to the attention of the House that this is a bill of something over 700 pages. It needs some explanation.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall be glad to explain that to the gentleman. I should be glad to do that now, if the gentleman wishes. This is a bill to codify the military law. This has been under consideration for 8 years. It has the approval of the Department of Defense, of the Secretaries of the Army, of the Navy, and of the Air Force, and of the Department of Justice, we are advised by the Committee on Armed Services. It is necessarily lengthy, but it is purely a codification of the law. It makes no changes in substantive law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of just what the gentleman has said, this bill is entitled to a full and complete explanation before the House. I think these are important omissions.

Mr. WILLIS. These codification bills always come up in this fashion because of the careful screening they receive at the hands of this specially set up committee, which works in close harmony and cooperation with the departments affected, in this case the Department of Defense. As I say, it has the approval of all the agencies concerned, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. We have advised with the committee which normally handles legislation along this line, the Committee on Armed Services. Of necessity this is a long bill, but it has been under study for all these years. We just passed a codification of the Food and Drug Act. All these bills have been considered on the floor by consent in the past. In view of the interest of the departments in this bill, I am afraid we are running short of time. That is why I hoped the gentleman might permit me to talk to him before he insists on his objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to talk with the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request only that the bill be passed over at this time without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6417) to revive and reenact the act authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., approved May 17, 1938.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 17, 1939, authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., as amended, be and is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3757) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended by renumbering subsection (l) of section 203 as subsection "(m)" and adding subsection (l) as follows:

"(l) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate to the American National Red Cross, for charitable purposes, such property, which was processed, produced, or donated by the American National Red Cross, as shall have been determined to be surplus property."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "numbering", delete "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections". Make the same change after "as."

After "(l)", insert a comma and the following after the comma "(m), and (n)."

After "'(m)'", insert a comma and the following after the comma "'(n)', and '(o)', respectively."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill, S. 614.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended by renumbering subsection (1) of section 203 as subsection "(m)" and adding subsection (1) as follows:

"(1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate to the American National Red Cross, for charitable purposes, such property, which was processed, produced, or donated by the American National Red Cross, as shall have been determined to be surplus property."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 614 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3757 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3757) was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7035) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes, approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of what relief is being granted as set forth in the delineation of this bill.

Mr. KILGORE. This bill was presented to the committee at the request of numerous Government agencies, and came with the approval of the Comptroller General. It is intended to meet a situation in which after approval by the Comptroller General the Congress may now consider specific individual relief bills, but this bill gives to the Comptroller General the authority to do that same thing without the necessity of the passage of individual relief bills on the part of the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not disturb the original act that has to do with the requirements and responsibilities of disbursing officers as such? It merely has to do with the relief of them if relief becomes inevitable?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. It deals with such situations only when there is involved a physical loss of property.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720, 31 U. S. C. 82a–1), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The General Accounting Office is authorized, after consideration of the pertinent findings and if in concurrence with the determinations and recommendations of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any such department or independent establishment of the Government charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers in his charge, or to authorize the reimbursement, from any appropriation or fund available for purposes of the activity in which the loss or deficiency occurred, of amounts paid subsequent to August 1, 1947, by or on behalf of the officer or agent in restitution of the loss or deficiency, if the head of the department or independent establishment determines (1) that such loss or deficiency occurred while such officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, or that such loss or deficiency occurred by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate of such officer or agent; and (2) that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of such officer or agent. This act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of such officers or agents resulting from illegal or erroneous payments. Whenever it is necessary in the opinion of the Comptroller General to restore or otherwise adjust the account of any disburing or accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer for relief heretofore or hereafter granted under this act, the amount of such relief shall, unless another appropriation is specifically provided therefor, be charged to the appropriation or fund available for the expense of the disbursing or other accountable function at the time the adjustment is effected."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7034) to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like an explanation as to the proposal incorporated in this bill.

Mr. KILGORE. This, sir, is a similar type bill to the one just passed dealing, however, instead of with physical losses, with an improper distribution through an incorrect interpretation of the law, but in no manner relieving the disbursing officer from his responsibility but rather permitting his reimbursement where the Comptroller General finds his action has been without culpability. The bill also contains a section dealing with the Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) whenever (1) any deficiency exists or occurs in the official disbursing accounts of any disbursing officer or former disbursing officer of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government in consequence of the making of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment, and (2) the Comptroller General or any officer of the General Accounting Office designated by the Comptroller General determines, upon his own motion or upon written findings and recommendations made by the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, or his designees for that purpose, that such payment was not the result of bad faith or lack of due care on the part of such disbursing officer, the Comptroller General or his designee is authorized in his discretion to relieve such disbursing officer of accountability and responsibility, and allow credit in his official disbursing accounts, for such deficiency. Such relief may be denied in any case in which the Comptroller General or his designee determines that the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned has not diligently pursued collection action in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Comptroller General.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall (1) affect the liability, or authorize the relief, of any payee, beneficiary, or recipient of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment, or (2) relieve any such disbursing officer, the head of any department, agency, or establishment, or the Comptroller General of responsibility to pursue collection action against any such payee, beneficiary, or recipient. This section shall not deprive any such disbursing officer of any right which he otherwise may have to obtain relief by any other means with respect to any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment.

(c) Whenever it is necessary in the opinion of the Comptroller General to restore or otherwise adjust in the account of any disbursing officer any amount as to which relief is granted under this section, such amount, unless another appropriation is specifically provided therefor, shall be charged to the appropriation or fund available for the expense of the disbursing function at the time the adjustment is effected.

SEC. 2. (a) The act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800 as amended; 31 U. S. C. 95a), is amended to read as follows:

"That whenever (1) any disbursing officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps incurs or has incurred a physical loss or deficiency of any Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in his charge and (2) the Secretary of the department concerned determines that such loss or deficiency occurred while the officer was in line of his duty and that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part, the General Accounting Office shall relieve such officer of the liability for such loss or deficiency, or authorize the reimbursement, from any appropriation or fund made available for that purpose, of amounts paid by or on behalf of such officer in restitution of such loss or deficiency. Any determination made by the Secretary of the department concerned under this act shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office. No relief may be granted under this act with respect to any deficiency in the accounts of any disbursing officer which results from any illegal or erroneous payment. This act shall not deprive any disbursing officer of any right which he otherwise may have to obtain relief by any other means with respect to any loss or deficiency covered by this act."

(b) No reimbursement shall be made under the amendment made by subsection (a) for any loss or deficiency occurring before the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. The second paragraph under the heading "Pay, miscellaneous," of the first section of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 132, as amended; 31 U. S. C. 105), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO VILLAGE OF NECEDAH, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2889) to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the village of Necedah, Wis., all right, title, and interest of the United States to the land described in section 2 in consideration of $1. The village of Necedah purchased such land and sold it to the United States in 1938 for $1. Since that time, such land has been declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The land referred to in the first section of this act is located in the village of Necedah, Juneau County, Wis., and is more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a stake on the north line of the right-of-way of the Chicago & Northwestern Railway, formerly known as the Princeton & Western Railway; said stake to the land described in section 2 in consideration of $1 bearing north thirty-three degrees east one hundred and sixty-one feet from the corner of block 1, original plat of Necedah, said corner of block being at the intersection of Main and First Streets (formerly known as Hilleboe's corner); thence north nine degrees and fifteen minutes east one hundred and fifty-five feet to a stake in the pond; thence north seventy-seven degrees thirty minutes west one hundred and twenty-two feet to a stake in the pond; thence south sixty-one degrees thirty minutes west two hundred and nine feet to a stake in the edge of the pond six feet north of dead birch tree; thence south eleven degrees forty-five minutes west fifty-two feet to a stake on the north side of the railway right-of-way; thence south eighty-four degrees east along the right-of-way two hundred and ninety-two feet to commencement point (magnetic variation for survey Zero) (November 24, 1898); reserving all water rights and right to overflow said land by backwater from dam in the village of Necedah 1898).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "$1", strike the period and insert: "and upon such terms and conditions as may in the determination of the Administrator of General Services be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That said property shall for a period of not less than 20 years be used for public purposes, and in the event of discontinuance of public use, shall, in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States as determined by the Secretary of Interior, revert to the United States."

Page 3, line 23, after "1898)", change the semicolon to a period. Strike the language beginning "reserving all water rights * * *" down through and including "Necedah." on line 23.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEXAS HILL COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

The Clerk read the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 276) to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex., and such county to convey a portion thereof to the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the second paragraph of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.," approved June 28, 1954 (Private Law 480, 83d Cong.), or any term, reservation, restriction, or condition placed in the deed of conveyance (dated February 1, 1955) granted by the Administrator of General Services under authority of such joint resolution, the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation is hereby authorized to convey to Kerr County, Tex., all of the land described in such deed February 1, 1955.

SEC. 2. Kerr County, Tex., is authorized to convey to the State of Texas for military purposes not in excess of 10 acres of any land which may be conveyed to it under authority of the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. Any deed of conveyance granted under authority of this act shall be subject to the same terms and conditions, and the land conveyed thereby shall be used for the same purposes, as required by such joint resolution of June 28, 1954, and the deed granted under authority thereof, except that the land conveyed to the State of Texas shall be used for military purposes for a period of not less than 25 years unless reconveyed to Kerr County, Tex., for the purposes required by the said joint resolution of June 28, 1954.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 5 through 8: Delete all of section 2.

Page 2, line 9, change "SEC. 3" to "SEC. 2."

Page 2, line 13, after "thereof", change the comma to a period.

Page 2, line 14: delete all the language beginning "except that the land * * *" and continuing through line 18.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex."

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF FORMER O'REILLY GENERAL HOSPITAL, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 482) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Services Administrator is authorized and directed, upon certification to him by the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of Missouri that the property described in section 2 of this act is needed for the training or support of the National Guard of Missouri, to convey the property to the State of Missouri by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to such reservations, restrictions, and other terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property to be conveyed to the State of Missouri is described as follows:

A parcel of land in the city of Springfield, Green County, Mo., being a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, and beginning at a point 31 poles and 20 links south of the northwest corner of northeast quarter of section 18, township 29, range 21, for a point of true beginning; running thence south 661.3 feet to a woven wire fence; running thence east along said fence 66 poles and 18 links; running thence north 661.3 feet to a point 31 poles and 20 links south of the north line of the northeast quarter of section 18, township 29, range 21; running thence west 66 poles and 18 links to the point of true beginning, being 16.5 acres, more or less.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Missouri.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, change "General Services Administrator" to read "Administrator of General Services," thus conforming to the statutory title.

Page 1, line 9, strike the language beginning "but subject to * * *", and continuing through page 2, line 2. Substitute therefor the following: "upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protect the interest of the United States: *Provided, however,* That such deed of conveyance by express terms shall—

"a. reserve to the United States all mineral rights including gas and oil,

"b. reserve to the United States right of exclusive use without charge therefor of such property together with any improvements thereon during any period of national emergency.

"c. specify that said property shall be used for the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes, and in the event of nonuse for such purpose within a reasonable time as determined by the Secretary of Defense or of discontinuance of use for such purpose, shall, in its then existing condition together with any improvements thereon, at the option of the United States as determined and exercised by the Secretary of Defense, revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PECWAN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 727) to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide a site for a school, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Pecwan Union School District of the State of California all of the right, title, and interest (other than mineral rights) of the United States and of the Hoopa Indian Tribe in and to that tract of land containing 15 acres and more particularly described as follows:

The southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter and northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter, section 7, containing five acres, and the south half northwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter and the north half southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter, section 8, containing ten acres, township 11 north, range 3 east, Humboldt meridian, California.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike the words "Hoopa Indian Tribe," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Indians who have an interest therein."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4047) relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, as an aid in the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska, for a period of 5 years after the approval of this act, is authorized to construct campgrounds and parking areas, including necessary access roads thereto, and other public recreation-area facilities in Alaska and to maintain them pending their transfer to appropriate Territorial agencies and communities: *Provided,* That no lodges, hotels, or other structures providing overnight accommodations for the public shall be constructed pursuant to this act. Such public recreation facilities may be constructed upon lands under the Secretary's administrative jurisdiction that are not needed for other public purposes. The Secretary is authorized to transfer, upon such terms and conditions as he may consider to be in the public interest, to appropriate Territorial agencies and communities for operation and maintenance such of the aforesaid public facilities and land relating thereto as he shall deem in the public interest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4096) to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon revocation of a withdrawal for highways, telephone lines, or pipelines, in Alaska, the lands involved shall be subject to disposal only under laws specified by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to easements as established by the Secretary. Notwithstanding any statutory limitation on the area which may be included in an unpatented claim or entry, the Secretary may permit the amendment of the land description of a claim or entry on adjoining lands to include the restored lands.

SEC. 2. The Secretary may sell such restored lands for not less than their appraised value, giving an appropriate preference right to the holders of adjoining claims or entries and to owners of adjoining private lands.

SEC. 3. Public lands in Alaska within an easement hereunder established by the Secretary of the Interior may not be utilized or occupied without the permission of the Secretary, or an officer or agency designated by him. If the lands crossed by an easement established under this act are under the jurisdiction of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, or other Government subdivision or agency, such permission may be granted only with the consent of such department, agency, or other governmental unit.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall affect adversely any valid existing rights.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the period on line 6, insert a new sentence as follows: "If such lands are under the jurisdiction of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, any sale thereof shall be made only with the consent of such department or agency."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. CROIX, V. I.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2097) to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Virgin Islands Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the United States of America upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture, without cost, the real property comprising 60 acres more or less, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, occupied and in use by the Department of Agriculture, which property is adjacent to the southwest corner of the intersection of Centerline Road and Airport Road on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands: *Provided,* Upon the transfer and conveyance of such property by the Virgin Islands Corporation to the United States, the interest-bearing investment of the United States in the Corporation shall be reduced by the net book value of such property.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FALL RIVER RESERVOIR, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4729) to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lake created by the Fall River Dam, on the Fall River, a tributary of Verdigris River, near Fall River, Kans., shall be known and designated as Lake Meyer. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is referred to under any other name or designation shall be held to refer to such lake as Lake Meyer.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMOPOLIS LOCK AND DAM, ALABAMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3235) to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in order to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real-estate requirement of the project, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to reconvey any such land or interests in land heretofore acquired to the former owners of such land whenever (1) he shall determine that such land or interest is not required for public purposes, and (2) he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided.

(b) The Secretary shall give notice, in such manner (including publication) as he shall by regulation prescribe, to the former owner of such land or interest, and any such sale of any such land or interest shall be made only after the Secretary has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interest from such former owner, in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

(c) Any reconveyance of land or interest therein made under this act shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest.

(d) Any land or interest therein reconveyed under this act shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the Demopolis lock and dam project), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restriction, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land or interest therein caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

(f) As used in this section, the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land, or interest therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be available for use in administering the provisions of this act and any surplus shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. This act shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 1, strike out all of section 3 and insert "Any proceeds from sales made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESERT LAND ENTRYMEN WHOSE ENTRIES DEPEND UPON PERCOLATING WATERS FOR RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4308) for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I am curious to know what is meant by "percolating water" in connection with reclamation.

The only percolating water I know of is that in a coffee pot.

Mr. ASPINALL. Percolating water is water which goes somewhere without a well-directed channel.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement of section 1 of the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), that the right to the use of water by a desert land entryman "shall depend upon bona fide prior appropriation" shall be waived in the case of all desert land entries which have heretofore been allowed and are subsisting on the effective date of this act, which are dependent upon percolating waters for their reclamation, and which are situated in States under the laws of which the percolating waters upon which the entries are dependent are not subject to the doctrine of prior appropriation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "States" and insert "the State of Arizona."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "appropriation", insert "but are usable under State law for irrigation and reclamation purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1177, a similar bill, strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House bill just passed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement of section 1 of the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), that the right to the use of water by a desert land entryman "shall depend upon bona fide prior appropriation" shall be waived in the case of all desert land entries which have heretofore been allowed and are subsisting on the effective date of this act, which are dependent upon percolating waters for their reclamation, and which are situated in States under the laws of which the percolating waters upon which the entries are dependent are not subject to the doctrine of prior appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 4308 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4308), was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MILES CITY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1878) to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1950 (64 Stat. 233), is amended by striking out "5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELEASE BY THE UNITED STATES OF ITS RIGHTS AND INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LAND LOCATED IN SAGINAW COUNTY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 622) to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to donate, convey, release, and relinquish to the city of Saginaw, Mich., all the rights and interests which the United States may have in certain land in Saginaw County by reason of the reservation to the United States (under article 7 of the treaty made with the Chippewa Nation of Indians in 1819 (7 Stat. 205)), of the right to construct roads through such land. Such land, which was granted by the United States to James Riley in 1823 pursuant to such treaty and subject to such reservation, contains approximately 640.0 acres and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a post on the bank of the Saginaw River, the northwest corner of the fraction of section 25, east of the Saginaw River in township 12 north of range 4 east from which an ash 10 inches in diameter bears south 24 degrees east distant 20 links and a maple 7 inches in diameter bears north 18 degrees west distant 12½ links, thence east 115 chains and 80 links to a post on the line between ranges 4 and 5 east from which an elm 20 inches in diameter bears south 17 degrees west distant 6 links, and an ironwood 8 inches in diameter bears north 17 degrees east distant 6 links; thence north 62 chains to a post from which a sugartree 8 inches in diameter bears north 26 degrees east distant 15 links, and a white oak 36 inches in diameter bears south 16 degrees 30 minutes east distant 44 links, thence west 72 chains and 46 links to a post on the east bank, Saginaw River, from which a maple 12 inches in diameter bears south 62 degrees west distant 20 links, and an ash 12 inches in diameter bears north 64 degrees east distant 113 links, thence up the said river with the meanders thereof to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of page 1 and the words "such land" on page 2, and insert "That the United States hereby relinquishes to the owner or owners of certain lands in Saginaw County all rights which it may have under article 7 of the treaty with the Chippewa Nation of Indians in 1819 (7 Stat. 205) to construct roads through such land."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "treaty", strike out "and subject to such reservation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE LEASING BY INDIAN OWNERS OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7157) providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any restricted Indian lands, whether tribally or individually owned, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for a term of not to exceed 25 years, and with the consent of both parties such leases may include provisions authorizing their renewal for one additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases and renewals shall be made under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Restricted lands of the deceased Indians may be leased under this act for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 380, as amended): *Provided,* That if the authority of the Secretary under this section is delegated to any subordinate official, then any heir or devisee shall have the right to appeal the action of any such official to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. The act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 783; 25 U. S. C. 396) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That if the said allottee is deceased and the heirs to or devisees of any interest in the allotment have not been determined, or, if determined, some or all of them cannot be located, the Secretary of the Interior may offer for sale leases for mining purposes to the highest responsible qualified bidder, at public auction, or on sealed bids, after notice and advertisement, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to reject all bids whenever in his judgment the interests of the Indians will be served by so doing, and to readvertise such lease for sale."

SEC. 4. No rent or other consideration for the use of land leased under this act shall be paid or collected more than 1 year in advance unless so provided in the lease.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall approve no lease pursuant to this act that contains any provision that will prevent or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities with respect to the land during the term of the lease.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "of", strike out the word "the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 34, a similar bill, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House bill just passed, and lay the House bill on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any restricted Indian lands, whether tribally or individually owned, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, and for those farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops as determined by said Secretary. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes with the consent of both parties may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases and renewals shall be made under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Restricted lands of deceased Indians may be leased under this act, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 380).

SEC. 3. The act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 783; 25 U. S. C. 396) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That if the said allottee is deceased and the heirs to or devisees of any interest in the allotment have not been determined, or, if determined, some or all of them cannot be located, the Secretary of the Interior may offer for sale leases for mining purposes to the highest responsible qualified bidder, at public auction, or on sealed bids, after notice and advertisement, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to reject all bids whenever in his judgment the interests of the Indians will be served by so doing, and to readvertise such lease for sale."

SEC. 4. No rent or other consideration for the use of land leased under this act shall be paid or collected more than 1 year in advance, unless so provided in the lease.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall approve no lease pursuant to this act that contains any provision that will prevent or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities with respect to the land during the term of the lease.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 7157 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7157) was laid on the table.

FLOOD PROTECTION ON SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6066) authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for construction of channel improvement works and levee construction and reconstruction on the San Joaquin River and tributary channels, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of furnishing flowage easements along the San Joaquin River upstream of the mouth of the Merced River as set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, 78th Congress, responsible local interests may construct levees and channel improvements, as required, to protect such lands against floods, subject to approval by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army: *Provided,* That the flood hazard to downstream areas is not materially increased thereby, and that due consideration be given to the timing and sequence of construction of the parts of the project to be accomplished by local interests in proper relation to the development of flood control storage on the tributaries of the San Joaquin River: *And provided further,* That construction and maintenance of such levees and channel improvements be undertaken at no cost to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MARINE WAR-RISK INSURANCE AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 741) to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1214 of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking out "5" and inserting in lieu thereof "10."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "12" and insert "XII."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUDE SERVICES RENDERED STATES TOWARD RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1041) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Civil Service Commission is definitely opposed to the bill and as it is one that should not be on the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is identical with a bill that passed the House bearing my name in the 83d Congress, was reported by the Senate committee, but died in the last days of the session on the Consent Calendar in the Senate.

I am aware of some objections the Civil Service Commission has, but I want to say that I think their objections are probably without full validity, because this would affect vocational teachers primarily who would have an opportunity to accept Federal employment but at the sacrifice of their retirement rights at the State level. This would permit them to accept Federal employment and acquire retirement status there by paying the required amount of money for back service represented by their years of duty in the State. It is a sound proposition and we already have a decision of a similar nature for the benefit of county agents. But those who wish to come in through the Smith-Hughes Act do not have that same eligibility, although their cases are almost identical. I think the present situation merely promotes and extends an inequity that should not be permitted to continue.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We have no assurance of the overall cost. Our information is that it is discriminatory and that the Commission is strongly opposed to the enactment of the bill. So there is nothing for the official objectors to do except to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice. There are other ways in which the bill can be brought up. We are here for the protection of the membership. If we permit the passage of bills by unanimous consent that do not have complete and substantial support of the departments then certainly we are opening the door wide and many of the Members will be embarrassed in the future. We are doing this for the Members' protection. I see no objection to passing this over without prejudice.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not know that it would make any difference to the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to call his attention to the fact that this bill passed in the last Congress on the Consent Calendar. During the present session I have been chairman of the subcommittee which heard it, and the subcommittee was unanimously in favor of reporting the bill out; so was the full committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Perhaps there was no objection from the Commission at that time. I do not recollect. We certainly have that objection now, and we have our rules to abide by.

Is there any reason why the gentleman cannot get the bill up under a suspension of the rules before the end of the session? Other bills are being called under suspensions today.

Personally I have no objection to the bill, but with this adverse report from the Commission, I see nothing else to do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We went into it very carefully and in great detail in the subcommittee and heard the objections which the Civil Service Commission offered. We were unanimously of the opinion that there is no discrimination in it, that it does not establish any precedent at all. We already have the precedent for this legislation in the matter of the county agents who already have been granted this right which this bill would give to these other agricultural employees. It does not open the floodgates; it applies only to the people who are set out on page 3 of the committee report.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not mean it would open the floodgates for all legislation, but it would open the floodgates to a certain extent if we passed bills by unanimous consent that are opposed by the departments. That in turn would be injurious to the Members. We are here for the protection of the membership. It seems to me there are plenty of other ways that this bill can be brought up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1792) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the objectors' committee on both sides of the aisle have a rule which states that any legislation costing more than a million dollars shall not be approved on the Consent Calendar. According to the information we have in reference to this bill the potential liability of the Federal Government could conceivably be $33 million. On the basis of that statement obviously this legislation would violate the rule and regulation of the objectors' committee.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ELIMINATION OF ACCOUNTING FOR PENALTY MAIL MATERIALS ON HAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5856) to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1048; 39 U. S. C., sec. 321i), is hereby amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN KOREA AND COMBAT ZONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7125) to extend to June 30, 1956, the free mailing privileges granted by the act of July 12, 1950, to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill is opposed by the Department of Defense and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FEE FOR FURNISHING VETERAN COPY OF CERTIFICATE SHOWING HIS SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6274) to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this matter was thoroughly considered by the Department of the Army panel on appropriations, not only during 1955 but in the 2 previous years. On the basis of the information which our subcommittee or panel obtained, it does not seem that this legislation is desirable. The record will indicate that in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956 it was recommended that one additional certificate over and above the original be provided without charge.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASING ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN RETIRED CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4672) to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092), as amended, is further amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"SEC. 7. (a) The annuities payable under this act to civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School retired before April 1, 1948, are hereby increased by $300 a year.

"(b) In addition to the increase in annuities authorized by subsection (a), the annuities payable under this act to all civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School retired before the date of enactment of this amendment shall be increased by $300 a year. No such annuity, however, shall thereby be increased to an amount in excess of $2,160.

"(c) The increase in the annuities of retired members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School authorized by subsection (b) shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors."

SEC. 2. Applicable current appropriations shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that before this session is over a bill increasing the annuities of other Federal employees will be passed by this Congress. There is such legislation pending at the present time. I notice in the newspapers that the administration is favorable to some increase. It is a very deserving group.

If the pending bill goes through it will be confined to a limited class. I therefore sincerely hope that favorable consideration will be given between now and the time the Congress adjourns to all of our retired Federal employees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time,was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 106 OF THE ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2150) to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 44, ch. 38), as amended, is further amended by inserting the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "SEC. 106." and by adding the following subsections at the end thereof:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Army shall, before January 1, 1956, adjust the dates of rank of all commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps of the Regular Army in the permanent grade of captain to reflect the total amount of service creditable to each such officer for promotion purposes under existing law. When that adjustment is made, such officer shall be given precedence for promotion purposes in accordance with their adjusted dates of rank. If two or more officers have the same date of rank, rank shall be determined—

"(1) by length of continuous active commissioned service in the regular components of the Armed Forces;

"(2) if the length of continuous active commissioned service in the regular components of the Armed Forces is the same, by rank established at the time of original appointment in the regular component of an armed force; and

"(3) in other cases, by the Secretary of the Army.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, before January 1, 1956, adjust the dates of rank of all commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain who are designated as nurses and women medical specialists to reflect the total amount of service creditable to each such officer for promotion purposes under existing law. When that adjustment is made, the names of the officers concerned shall be arranged on the promotion lists concerned in order of date of rank. If two or more officers have the same date of rank, rank shall be determined—

"(1) by length of continuous active commissioned service in the regular components of the Armed Forces;

"(2) if the length of continuous active commissioned service in the regular components of the Armed Forces is the same, by rank established at the time of her earliest appointment in the regular component of an armed force; and

"(3) in other cases, by the Secretary of the Air Force."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CREDITS UNDER ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4106) to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 101 and 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 41, 42), as amended (10 U. S. C. 166, 166a), are each further amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) In determining position on a promotion list, seniority in her grade in the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be, and eligibility for promotion, a person originally appointed as a commissioned officer under subsection (c) shall be credited, at the time of her appointment, with the active Federal commissioned service, after December 31, 1947, which she performed after becoming 21 years of age and before her appointment. However, not more than 5 years of service may be so credited. A person originally appointed as a first lieutenant who has not performed at least 3 years of such active Federal commissioned service after December 31, 1947, shall, for the same purposes, be credited with that amount of service. Service credited pursuant to this subsection shall be in lieu of and not in addition to service credited under section 105 of this act."

SEC. 2. The effective date of the amendments made by section 1 of this act is January 1, 1948. No person is entitled to any back pay or allowances because of those amendments.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7194) to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of subsection 301 (3) the following: "(f) Effective April 15, 1955, under such regulations and in such localities as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, enlisted members granted permission to mess separately whose duties require them to purchase one or more meals from other than Government messes shall be entitled to not to exceed the pro rata allowance authorized for each such meal for enlisted members when rations in kind are not available."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(3)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE FOR THE DEAN OF THE NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2149) to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 706), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There shall be at the United States Naval Postgraduate School the civilian position of academic dean. An academic dean shall be appointed, to serve for periods of not in excess of 5 years, by the Secretary of the Navy upon the recommendation of the Postgraduate School Council, which shall consist of the Superintendent, Deputy Supreintendent, and the Directors of the Technical, Administrative, and Professional Divisions of the United States Naval Postgraduate School. The academic dean shall receive such compensation for his services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, which compensation shall not exceed $13,500 per year. The academic dean shall be considered as a member of the civilian teaching staff of the United States Naval Postgraduate School insofar as provisions of law regarding retirement are concerned."

SEC. 2. The act of June 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 236, ch. 298), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE THE MARINE CORPS TO HAVE FIVE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7028) to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, as I understand it, proposes to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps. We have from the Defense Department in the last few days a statement that some $46 million is going to be impounded so that the Marine Corps cannot be increased; in fact, as I understand it, there is scheduled a 22,000-man reduction in the Marine Corps. At the same time we hear from the President, Mr. Eisenhower, that new weapons of unprecedented tactical and strategic importance have been incorporated in the Armed Forces in the last 2 years. We also hear from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, that the need in the Reserves is for a civilian force of 3 million men to be called up and made battle ready in 6 to 8 months. What I should like to ask someone—and I am not opposed to an adequate number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps—What is the policy in connection with the Armed Forces?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, since no one seems to be able to answer as to the necessity for these lieutenant generals, in view of the overall defense policy or lack of one, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold that, I will be glad to explain. The gentleman asked a question about the military policy, and I thought that should come from the other side of the aisle, inasmuch as the gentleman is raising a point as to what is going on in the executive branch of the Government. At the present time there are 5 lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps. In times of peace they are authorized only 2. Under this bill there will be no new lieutenant generals created, but the present 5 will be permitted to continue on active duty in the 3-star rank of lieutenant general. This limitation was provided in 1947 when the Marine Corps consisted of about 80,000 personnel. At the present time the strength of the Marine Corps is approximately 208,000, so that notwithstanding the proposed freezing of the funds, with which I do not agree, the strength is still such as to justify the continuance of 5 rather than 2 lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. In reply to the gentleman's first statement that he thought some response should come from this side of the aisle, may I say to him that it has been my observation that the Defense Department has spokesmen on both sides of the aisle, and I can see no reason why the question of the size of the Armed Forces should not be answered by Members who are conversant with the military needs of the Nation on either side of the aisle. The gentleman thinks that despite the fact that there is a proposed 22,000-man cut in the Marine Corps, and that $46 million of funds has been impounded, we still should increase the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. We should not increase the number, but we should retain the number we have. The strength of the Marine Corps was only 80,000 when the number of lieutenant generals was fixed at 2. Even though the proposed 20,000 reduction were carried out, we would still have approximately 185,000 on active duty as compared to 80,000 when the number of lieutenant generals was fixed at 2. So I think 5 are certainly justified.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been unable to ascertain what is really the defense policy of the administration. I have no desire to oppose the bill presently before the House. I withdraw my objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso to section 415 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended by deleting the word "two" and substituting therefor the word "five."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF DOCTORS OF OSTEOPATHY IN MEDICAL CORPS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 483) to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777), as amended, is further amended by inserting immediately after the word "medicine" wherever used therein, the words "or osteopathy."

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777), as amended is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "A doctor of osteopathy to be eligible for appointment in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy must be a graduate of a college of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or surgery in a majority of the States, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE MALE NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS TO BE APPOINTED AS RESERVE OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2559) to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That men may be appointed as Reserve commissioned officers in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve and as Reserve officers of the Air Force designated to perform nursing or medical specialist duties, under the same provisions of law as are applicable to women, except as may be necessary to adapt such provisions to male persons.

SEC. 2. The Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 is hereby amended as follows:

(1) In title I, by striking out "Women's" each time it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "Army"; and

(2) In section 116 (10 U. S. C., sec. 376), by striking out "female citizens" and inserting in lieu thereof "male or female citizens, or male or female persons who have made a declaration of intent to become citizens,".

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 307 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 (10 U. S. C., sec. 81-1) is hereby amended by striking out "Women's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Army".

(b) Section 307 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1837) is hereby amended by striking out "women's."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1003) is hereby amended by striking out "Women's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Army."

SEC. 4. In the computation of the pay, or retired or retirement pay, of any person appointed under the first section of this act, or of any person appointed under section 116 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, credit shall be given for all military and naval service rendered by such person with any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, including active and inactive service with the reserve components thereof.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in passing H. R. 2559, my bill to authorize men nurses and medical specialists to be appointed Reserve officers in the armed services is a logical and very important forward step. The action of the Department of Defense in its strong recommendation of the bill evidences a new recognition of the need to make fuller use of specialized skills in short supply. This legislation is important both to the military and to the whole area of health services throughout the country. Recognition of this fact by my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has made possible our action here today.

For the armed services, this authority to commission men nurses and specialists will increase the potential supply from which the military can draw for patient care.

As you know, only women can now receive commissions as nurses. But there are some nursing assignments for which men are better suited than women. We should not assign a woman to a frontline combat position—especially with the record that was established in the treatment of our prisoners during the Korean conflict. But frontline soldiers need trained nurses, and a man nurse can fill that assignment. A similar problem arises in military psychiatric wards where conditions are often too dangerous for a woman. Men have served in those positions with distinction.

Up to now men in service with full nurse training have been relegated to tasks as corpsmen, wardmen, and litter bearers, and they have received only enlisted men's ratings. It has been a serious moral problem and certainly discouraged enlistment by men graduate nurses.

But in a large sense enactment of this legislation can help relieve the nurse shortage that now grips this Nation. Today the country needs an estimated 50,000 more graduate nurses. But of the total nurse force only about 2½ percent are men. There are young men everywhere who long to give themselves to the relief of suffering but who do not have the time or the money to undertake the long medical training. This recognition by the armed services will greatly encourage them to enter nursing and the medical specialties.

In civilian nursing, besides filling routine positions, men again are best fitted for certain tasks.

One of the major problems facing the Nation today is the increase in mental illness. More than half of all hospitalized patients are in mental hospitals. Yet less than 5 percent of our hospital nurses are working in mental institutions.

It is understandable that women are reluctant to work in mental hospitals for patients are all too often dangerous. But men nurses are doing this work with excellent results now and we can assume any increase in the men nurse supply will help in the serious national problem of treating the mentally ill.

Recommended by the Armed Services Committee and the Department of Defense, H. R. 2559 has the endorsement of the American Nurses' Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the American Physical Therapy Association. Enactment of this legislation will not result in any additional cost to the Government, since appointments would be made within existing limitations.

I sincerely hope for prompt action by the Senate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING EMPLOYMENT BY GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS WHO ARE DISLOYAL, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6590) to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to get some information from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY], who is handling the bill on the floor for the committee.

I notice on page 2, paragraph 3, the language "participates in any strike." Then I notice a committee amendment, "or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency."

I should like to inquire of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] because it would be important in determining the intent of Congress to know what was in the minds of the members of the committee reporting out the bill, what it meant by the words "or asserts the right to strike." Does that mean the mere declaration of an expression of opinion by an individual or does it mean some overt act or act of advocacy of striking? I think that is very, very important.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the distinguished majority leader may I say that this bill does not mean a mere expression of opinion nor does it mean the mere assertion that a person has the right. The provision means an overt act must be done. It means the assertion of a right in the sense of doing something to set events in motion. I might say the word "assert" here is almost tantamount to the word "incitement." The language was put in to make the bill more restrictive. The language that had been in was, "to believe" in the right to strike. The committee felt that was too general, and was not in consonance with fundamental constitutional guaranties of liberty. So this language was put in so as to require some overt act; that is, an actual carrying out of the right to strike, doing something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has no relationship at all to one's individual opinion?

Mr. TUMULTY. It certainly does not.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I rise to ask this question: This will make unnecessary the rider we usually put in appropriation bills on this same subject?

Mr. TUMULTY. In answer to the distinguished gentleman, precisely so. The bill now being considered will make these riders unnecessary. The language here was derived from the language of previous riders. It does not add anything new. It simply brings into one bill legislation which has been adopted from year to year.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is to be commended for bringing the bill to the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman state what the bill contains in definition of the word "disloyal"? What does the term "disloyal" mean in this bill?

Mr. TUMULTY. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find what "disloyal" means.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman wants me to ask unanimous consent that the bill go over, of course I can read the bill. But I have not had the opportunity to read it yet. I am simply asking what the word "disloyal" means as used in this bill?

Mr. TUMULTY. It means advocating the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States. As the bill says if he is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates, he would be disloyal, or further:

> (3) Participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency.

That, of course, has already been explained.

> (4) Is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right.

So disloyalty would be defined as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) and in accordance with the statutes already existing thereto.

Mr. YATES. In other words, then, it would be equivalent to the definitions contained in other legislation which has been previously passed by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. TUMULTY. That is quite true. It does not add to the already existing definition of "disloyal."

Mr. YATES. It requires an appropriate finding before a person can be barred?

Mr. TUMULTY. They file an affidavit, and then the Government would have to come in with proof and they would have an opportunity to defend themselves.

Mr. YATES. Right.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the clarifying observations made by the gentleman from New Jersey on the language "or asserts the right to strike," I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see H. R. 6590 before us today on the Consent Calendar. This bill penalizes the acceptance or holding of office or employment in the United States Government by those who are disloyal or who strike or assert the right to strike against the Government.

This bill meets the need for a statute which consolidates, improves, and makes permanent existing laws on this subject. The only legislation at present making it a crime for such people to accept or hold Federal employment is the temporary riders which Congress has been including in appropriation bills during the last several years. Since 1946, such riders have appeared in all appropriation acts except three.

There are three other Federal statutory provisions on this subject: Section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949, Section 9A of the Hatch Act, and section 305 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Since this bill incorporates their substance, it provides for their repeal.

H. R. 6590 has several advantages over these riders and provisions, in preventing employment of these individuals.

First, it makes permanent a legislative policy which is completely accepted in Congress and which is more appropriate to our permanent laws than to temporary riders in appropriation acts.

Second, it makes it possible to shorten our appropriation bills.

Third, it brings together and consolidates into one act the uncoordinated provisions and riders described above.

Fourth, it embodies certain improvements and perfections in the wording and effectiveness of the earlier provisions.

There are several differences between this bill and the appropriation riders.

First, there is a requirement in the bill which is not present in the riders that the individual know of the disloyal character of the organization or of its assertion of the right to strike. If the individual is a member of such organization without realizing that it has these characteristics, he cannot be prosecuted under the bill. This not only makes this a fairer law, but also strengthens its constitutionality.

Second, there is a specific requirement in the bill that affidavits of compliance with this law be submitted by prospective Federal employees. In the riders this requirement was omitted although I am advised that Government departments and agencies now require such affidavits as a matter of convenience in carrying out the purposes of the riders. This change is an improvement in that under this bill hereafter the law will require that no one will be employed by the Federal Government who fails to sign such an affidavit.

Third, the length of the sentence for violators of the bill is a year and a day, instead of a year as specified by the riders. The Department of Justice has pointed out that although the riders make the crime a felony, it can only be a felony under the definition of felonies in title 18 if it carries a sentence longer than a year.

Fourth, there are minor changes in language in the bill to insure that it covers the same ground now covered by the Hatch Act, Taft-Hartley Act, and Housing Act provisions.

It has been noted that this bill will make unnecessary the riders which appropriation bills have carried in the past. The riders say that none of the appropriations shall be used to pay the salaries of certain people. This bill will penalize and make illegal such employment, and the payment of appropriations for such salaries is thus prohibited by the force of other statutes which prevent the payment of funds for illegal activity.

I want to express my appreciation for the wonderful support and cooperation I have received on this bill. In considering and reporting it, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has shown a commendable appreciation of the need for adequate legislation on this subject. I deeply appreciate their fine work on this proposal. The Department of Justice and Civil Service Commission rendered favorable reports on the bill and testified in favor of it at the hearing. Favorable testimony was also submitted by the following representatives of Federal employee organizations: Warren Bledsoe, for the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association; E. C. Hallbeck, for the National Federation of Post Office Clerks; Samuel E. Klein, for the United National Association of Post Office Clerks; John McCart, for the American Federation of Government Employees; Ross Messer, for the National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees; Luther Steward, for the National Federation of Federal Employees; Thomas G. Walters, for the Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all this fine support, and I hope H. R. 6590 will be enacted during this session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States;

(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates;

(3) participates in any strike against the Government of the United States or such agency; or

(4) is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), every person who accepts office or employment in the Government of the United States after the date of enactment of this act, shall, not later than 60 days after he accepts such office or employment, execute an affidavit that his acceptance and holding of such office or employment does not or (if the affidavit is executed prior to acceptance of such office or employment) will not constitute a violation of the first section of this act. Such affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the acceptance and holding of office or employment by the person executing the affidavit does not or will not constitute a violation of such section.

(b) An affidavit shall not be required from a person employed by the Government of the United States for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. This subsection shall not relieve any person from liability for violation of the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates section 1 of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year and a day, or both.

SEC. 4. The following parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1445);

(2) Section 9A of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118j); and

(3) Section 305 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 188).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after "any strike", insert "or asserts the right to strike."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6621) to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the Vice President-elect and to authorize Secret Service protection for the Vice President-elect.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 871, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 781 Threats against President, President-elect, Vice President, and Vice President-elect

"Whoever knowingly and willfully deposits for conveyance in the mail or for delivery from any post office or by any letter carrier any letter, paper, writing, print, missive, or document containing any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, the President-elect, the Vice President of the United States, or the Vice President-elect, or knowingly and willfully otherwise makes any such threat against the President, President-elect, Vice President, or Vice President-elect, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 41 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 871 of such title is amended by deleting

"871. Threats against President"

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"871. Threats against President, President-elect, Vice President, and Vice President-elect"

SEC. 3. The first independent clause of title 18, United States Code, section 3056, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3056. Secret Service powers

"Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States and members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President, and Vice President-elect at their request."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, the figure "781" is changed to read "871."

Page 2, line 20, should be amended to read as follows: "the President-elect, and the Vice President and Vice President-."

A new section 2 is inserted at page 2, line 9, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The terms 'President-elect' and 'Vice President-elect' shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained from the results of the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3 United States Code, sections 1 and 2."

On page 2, line 9, "Sec. 2" is changed to read "Sec. 3."

On page 2, line 13, "Sec. 3" is changed to read "Sec. 4."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6454) to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, entitled "To establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes" (68 Stat. 964), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after "resolution", insert the following: "but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized exceed a total of $41,500 in addition to the sum of $10,000 originally authorized by this resolution."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIM WOODRUFF RESERVOIR, GEORGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1599) to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in order to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Ga., to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real-estate requirements of the project, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to sell any such land or interests in land heretofore acquired to the former owners of such land whenever (1) he shall determine that such land or interest is not required for public purposes, and (2) he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided.

(b) Any such sale of any such land or interest shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as he shall by regulation prescribe, to the former owner of such land or interest, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interest from such former owner, in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe, within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice.

(c) Any reconveyance of land or interest therein made under this act shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest.

(d) Any land or interest therein reconveyed under this act shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements to the land made by the United States, or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restriction, or condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land or interest therein caused by the United States.

(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify (1) that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest, or (2) that within a reasonable time after receipt of a proper application for any reconveyance of such land or interest the parties have been unable to reach a satisfactory agreement with respect to the reconveyance of such land or interest.

(f) As used in this section, the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land or interest therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Any proceeds from sales made under this act shall be available for use in administering the provisions of this act and any surplus shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 4. This act shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Reservoir", insert "Florida and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "sell" and insert in lieu thereof "reconvey."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "sale" and insert in lieu thereof "reconveyance."

Page 3, line 2, add the following sentence: "In addition, the cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee."

Page 3, line 24, strike out section 3 and substitute the following:

"Sec. 3. Any proceeds from sales made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla., and Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that this concurrent resolution is a continuing expression of this country of support of 14 nations, all of whom have applied for admission to the United Nations, have had our approval, and not been admitted for one reason, and that was the misuse of the veto by Soviet Russia.

Mr. GROSS. What will this concurrent resolution do? How will this bring them into membership in the United Nations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It will not do anything, but it will show them we still stand behind them and support their efforts to gain admission.

Mr. GROSS. It would be a good deal like the resolution adopted in the House against colonialism that was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack]. It was approved unanimously, but when I offered an amendment today to prohibit the French from using one of our aircraft carriers to carry on their program of colonial exploitation it was soundly defeated.

It is stated in this resolution, after naming the nations, that they "have applied for membership and will abide by the principles of the United Nations." It seems to me before any further nations are invited into the United Nations, Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist member nations should be made to live up to the principles of the United Nations if it has any principles.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would say to the gentleman that these are all free and independent nations, and they will strengthen freedom within the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt that very much.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey whether or not the resolution includes the invitation for approval of North Vietnam to participation in the United Nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No, this is South Vietnam. The application was made by Vietnam, which means South Vietnam. North Vietnam has not made an application and, of course, we would not support that.

Mr. FORD. Is it set forth in the resolution that we are identifying it as South Vietnam?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Historically in the State Department that has been the meaning of Vietnam in applications for admission to the United Nations. There is no suggestion that North Vietnam is included.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE AT CALAIS, MAINE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1550) authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Croix River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities of the Government of Canada.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of eligible bills on the Consent Calendar today.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That this act may be cited as the "Social Security Amendments of 1955."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18

SEC. 101. (a) Section 202 (d) (1) of the Social Security Act (relating to child's insurance benefits) is amended by striking out "or attains the age of 18" and inserting in lieu thereof "attains the age of 18 and is not under a disability (as defined in section 223 (c) (2) and determined under section 221) which began before the day on which he attained such age, or ceases to be under a disability (as so defined and determined) on or after the day on which he attains the age of 18."

(b) The first sentence of section 203 (a) of such act (relating to maximum benefits) is amended by striking out "after any deductions under this section," each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "after any deductions under this section, after any deductions under section 222 (b), and after any reduction under section 224,".

(c) Section 203 (b) of such act (relating to deductions from benefits on account of certain events) is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following:

"For purposes of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), a child shall not be considered to be entitled to a child's insurance benefit for any month in which an event specified in section 222 (b) occurs with respect to such child. In the case of any child who has attained the age of 18 and is entitled to child's insurance benefits, no deduction shall be made under this subsection from any child's insurance benefit for the month in which he attained the age of 18 or any subsequent month."

(d) Section 203 (d) of such act (relating to occurrence of more than one event) is amended by inserting after "(c)" the following: "and section 222 (b)."

(e) Section 203 (h) of such act (relating to circumstances under which deductions not required) is amended to read as follows:

"Circumstances under which deductions and reductions not required

"(h) In the case of any individual—

"(1) deductions by reason of the provisions of subsection (b), (f), or (g) of this section, or the provisions of section 222 (b), shall, notwithstanding such provisions, be made from the benefits to which such individual is entitled, and

"(2) any reduction by reason of the provisions of section 224 shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such section, be made with respect to the benefits to which such individual is entitled,

only to the extent that such deductions and reduction reduce the total amount which would otherwise be paid, on the basis of the same wages and self-employment income, to such individual and the other individuals living in the same household."

(f) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of a child (as defined in section 216 (e) of the Social Security Act) who attained the age of 18 after 1953, and then only with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of such act for months after December 1955; except that—

(1) in the case of such a child whose entitlement (without regard to the amendment made by subsection (a), but with regard to the last sentence of this subsection) to child's insurance benefits under such section 202 ended with a month before January 1956 solely by reason of having attained the age of 18, such amendment shall apply—

(A) only if an application for monthly insurance benefits by reason of such amendment is filed by such child after the month in which this act is enacted and such child is under a disability (as defined in section 223 (c) (2) of the Social Security Act and determined as provided in section 221 of such act) at the time he files such application, and

(B) only with respect to such benefits for months after whichever of the following is the later: December 1955 or the month before the month in which such application was filed, and

(2) for purposes of title II of such act (other than section 202 (d) (1)), a child referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), be deemed entitled to child's insurance benefits before the month determined as provided in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection.

For purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), and for purposes of applying this subsection, a child who attained the age of 18 after 1953 and before 1956 and who did not file application for child's insurance benefits under section 202 of such act before he attained such age shall be deemed to have filed an application for child's insurance benefits under such section on the last day of the month preceding the month in which he attained such age.

Retirement age for women

SEC. 102. (a) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"Retirement Age

"(a) The term 'retirement age' means—

"(1) in the case of a man, age 65, or

"(2) in the case of a woman, age 62."

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (4), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1955 and in the case of lump-sum death payments under section 202 (i) of such act with respect to deaths after December 1955.

(2) In the case of any individual whose entitlement to wife's or mother's insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act (as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) ended with a month before January 1956, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply, for purposes of subsection (b) or (e) of such section 202, only in the case of monthly benefits under such subsection for months after December 1955 and then only if an application is filed by such individual after December 1955.

(3) For purposes of section 215 (b) (3) (B) of the Social Security Act (but subject to paragraph (1) of this subsection)—

(A) a woman who attained age 62 prior to 1956 and who was not eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of such act (as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) for any month prior to 1956 shall be deemed to have attained age 62 in 1956 or, if earlier, the year in which she died;

(B) a woman shall not, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), be deemed to be a fully insured individual before January 1956 or the month in which she died, whichever month is the earlier; and

(C) the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be applicable in the case of any woman who was eligible for old-age insurance benefits under such section 202 for any month prior to 1956.

A woman shall, for purposes of this paragraph, be deemed eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of such act for any month if she was or would have been, upon filing application therefor in such month, entitled to such benefits for such month.

(4) For purposes of section 209 (i) of such act, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 1955.

Disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50

SEC. 103. (a) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 222 the following new sections:

"Disability insurance benefit payments

"Disability insurance benefits

"SEC. 223. (a) (1) Every individual who—

"(A) is insured for disability insurance benefits (as determined under subsec. (c) (1)),

"(B) has attained the age of 50 and has not attained retirement age (as defined in sec. 216 (a)),

"(C) has filed application for disability insurance benefits, and

"(D) is under a disability (as defined in subsec. (a) (2) and determined under sec. 221) at the time such application is filed, shall be entitled to a disability insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the first month after his waiting period (as defined in subsec. (c) (3)) in which he becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits and ending with the month preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: his disability ceases, he dies, or he attains retirement age.

"(2) Such individual's disability insurance benefit for any month shall be equal to his primary insurance amount for such month determined under section 215 as though he became entitled to old-age insurance benefits in the first month of his waiting period.

"Filing of application

"(b) No application for disability insurance benefits which is filed more than 9 months before the first month for which the applicant becomes entitled to such benefits shall be accepted as a valid application for purposes of this section; and no such application which is filed in or before the month in which the social-security amendments of 1955 are enacted shall be accepted.

"Definitions

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) An individual shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if—

"(A) he would have been a fully and currently insured individual (as defined in sec. 214) had he attained retirement age and filed application for benefits under section 202 (a) on the first day of such month, and

"(B) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period ending with the quarter in which such first day occurred, not counting as part of such 40-quarter period any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in sec. 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

"(2) The term 'disability' means inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. An individual shall not be considered to be under a disability unless he furnishes such proof of the existence thereof as may be required.

"(3) The term 'waiting period' means, in the case of any application for disability insurance benefits, the earliest period of six consecutive calendar months—

"(A) throughout which the individual who files such application has been under a disability, and

"(B) (i) which begins not earlier than with the first day of the sixth month before the month in which such application is filed if such individual is insured for disability insurance benefits in such sixth month, or (ii) if he is not so insured in such month, which begins not earlier than with the first day of the first month after such sixth month in which he is so insured.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, no waiting period may begin for any individual before July 1, 1955; nor may any such period begin for any individual before the first day of the sixth month before the month in which he attains the age of 50.

"Reduction of benefits based on disability

"SEC. 224. (a) If—

"(1) any individual is entitled to a disability insurance benefit for any month, or to a child's insurance benefit for the month in which he attained the age of 18 or any subsequent month, and

"(2) either (A) it is determined under any other law of the United States or under a system established by any agency of the United States (as defined in subsection (e)) that a periodic benefit is payable by any agency of the United States for such month to such individual, and the amount of or eligibility for such periodic benefit is based (in whole or in part) on a physical or mental impairment of such individual, or (B) it is determined that a periodic benefit is payable for such month to such individual under a workmen's compensation law or plan of a State on account of a physical or mental impairment of such individual.

then the benefit referred to in paragraph (1) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount equal to such periodic benefit or benefits for such month. If such benefit referred to in paragraph (1) for any month is a child's insurance benefit and the periodic benefit or benefits referred to in paragraph (2) exceed such child's insurance benefit, the monthly benefit for such month to which an individual is entitled under subsection (b) or (g) of section 202 shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of such excess, but only if such individual would not be entitled to such monthly benefit if she did not have such child in her care (individually or jointly with her husband, in the case of a wife).

"(b) If any periodic benefit referred to in subsection (a) (2) is determined to be payable on other than a monthly basis (excluding a benefit payable in a lump sum unless it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments), reduction of the benefits under this section shall be made in such amounts as the Secretary finds will approximate, as nearly as practicable, the reduction prescribed in subsection (a).

"(c) In order to assure that the purposes of this section will be carried out, the Secretary may, as a condition to certification for payment of any monthly insurance benefit payable to an individual under this title (if it appears to him that there is a likelihood that such individual may be eligible for a periodic benefit which would give rise to a reduction under this section), require adequate assurance of reimbursement to the Trust Fund in case periodic benefits, with respect to which such a reduction should be made, become payable to such individual and such reduction is not made.

"(d) Any agency of the United States which is authorized by any law of the United States to pay periodic benefits, or has a system of periodic benefits, which are based in whole or in part on physical or mental impairment, shall (at the request of the Secretary) certify to him, with respect to any individual, such information as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under subsection (a).

"(e) For purposes of this section, the term 'agency of the United States' means any department or other agency of the United States or any instrumentality which is wholly owned by the United States.

"Suspension of benefits based on disability

"SEC. 225. If the Secretary, on the basis of information obtained by or submitted to him, believes that an individual entitled to benefits under section 223, or that a child who has attained the age of 18 and is entitled to benefits under section 202 (d), may have ceased to be under a disability, the Secretary may suspend the payment of benefits under such section 223 or 202 (d) until it is determined (as provided in section 221) whether or not such individual's disability has ceased or until the Secretary believes that such disability has not ceased. In the case of any individual included under an agreement with a State under section 221 (b), the Secretary shall promptly notify the State of his action under this subsection and shall request a prompt determination of whether such individual's disability has ceased. For purposes of this section, the term 'disability' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 223 (c) (2)."

(b) Section 222 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Rehabilitation services

"Referral for Rehabilitation Services

"SEC. 222. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that disabled individuals applying for a determination of disability, and disabled individuals who are entitled to child's insurance benefits, shall be promptly referred to the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for necessary vocational rehabilitation services, to the end that the maximum number of such individuals may be rehabilitated into productive activity.

"Deductions on Accounts of Refusal To Accept Rehabilitation Service

"(b) Deductions, in such amounts and at such time or times as the Secretary shall determine, shall be made from any payment or payments under this title to which an individual is entitled, until the total of such deductions equals such individual's benefit or benefits under sections 202 and 223 for any month in which such individual, if a child who has attained the age of 18 and is entitled to child's insurance benefits or if an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits, refuses without good cause to accept rehabilitation services available to him under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

"Service Performed Under Rehabilitation Program

"(c) For purposes of sections 216 (i) and 223, an individual shall not be regarded as able to engage in substantial gainful activity solely by reason of services rendered by him pursuant to a program for his rehabilitation carried on under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any such services rendered after the 11th month following the 1st month during which such services are rendered."

(c) (1) Section 202 (a) (3) of such act (relating to old-age insurance benefits) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) has filed application for old-age insurance benefits or was entitled to disability insurance benefits for the month preceding the month in which he attained retirement age,".

(2) Section 202 (k) (2) (B) of such act (relating to entitlement to more than one benefit) is amended by striking out "who under the preceding provisions of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "who, under the preceding provisions of this section and under the provisions of section 223,".

(3) Section 202 (n) (1) (A) of such act (relating to denial of benefits in certain cases of deportation) is amended by inserting "or section 223" after "this section".

(4) Section 215 (a) of such act (relating to computation of the primary insurance amount) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), in the case of any individual who in the month before the month in which he attains retirement age or dies, whichever first occurs, was entitled to a disability insurance benefit, his primary insurance amount shall be the amount computed as provided in this section (without regard to this paragraph) or his disability insurance benefit for such earlier month, whichever is the larger."

(5) Section 215 (g) of such act (relating to rounding of benefits) is amended by striking out "section 202" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 202 or 223".

(6) The first sentence of section 216 (i) (1) of such act (defining "disability" for purposes of preserving insurance rights during periods of disability) is amended by

striking out "The" at the beginning and inserting in lieu thereof "Except for purposes of sections 202 (d), 223, and 225, the".

(7) The first sentence of section 221 (a) of such act (relating to determinations of disability by State agencies) is amended by striking out "(as defined in sec. 216 (i))" and inserting in lieu thereof "(as defined in section 216 (i) or 223 (c))".

(8) Section 221 (c) of such act (relating to review by Secretary of determinations of disability) is amended by striking out "a disability" the two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "a disability (as defined in sec. 216 (i) or 223 (c))" the first place it appears and "a disability (as so defined)" the second place it appears.

(d) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1955.

(2) For purposes of determining entitlement to a disability insurance benefit for any month after December 1955 and before June 1956, an application for disability insurance benefits filed by any individual after January 1956 and before July 1956 shall be deemed to have been filed during the first month after December 1955 for which such individual would (without regard to this paragraph) have been entitled to a disability insurance benefit had he filed application before the end of such month.

Extension of coverage

Service in Connection With Gum Resin Products

SEC. 104. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers (A) under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, or (B) lawfully admitted to the United States from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and the other British West Indies on a temporary basis to perform agricultural labor;".

Employees of Federal Home Loan Banks and of the Tennessee Valley Authority

(b) (1) Section 210 (a) (6) (B) (ii) of such act is amended by inserting "a Federal Home Loan Bank," after "a Federal Reserve bank,".

(2) Section 210 (a) (6) (C) (vi) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(vi) by any individual to whom the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 does not apply because such individual is subject to another retirement system (other than the retirement system of the Tennessee Valley Authority);".

Share-Farming Arrangements

(c) (1) Section 210 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (14), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by adding after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

"(16) Service performed by an individual under an arrangement with the owner or tenant of land pursuant to which—

"(A) such individual undertakes to produce agricultural or horticultural commodities (including livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife) on such land,

"(B) the agricultural or horticultural commodities produced by such individual, or the proceeds therefrom, are to be divided between such individual and such owner or tenant, and

"(C) the amount of such individual's share depends on the amount of the agricultural of horticultural commodities produced."

(2) Section 211 (a) (1) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "except that the preceding provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any income derived by the owner or tenant of land if (A) such income is derived under an arrangement, between the owner or tenant and another individual which provides that such other individual shall produce agricultural or horticultural commodities (including livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife) on such land, and that there shall be material participation by the owner or tenant in the production of such agricultural or horticultural commodities, and (B) there is material participation by the owner or tenant with respect to any such agricultural or horticultural commodity;".

(3) Section 211 (c) (2) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The performance of service by an individual as an employee (other than service described in section 210 (a) (14) (B) performed by an individual who has attained the age of 18, service described in section 210 (a) (16), and service described in paragraph (4) of this subsection);".

Professional Self-Employed

(d) Paragraph (5) of section 211 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The performance of service by an individual in the exercise of his profession as a physician (determined without regard to section 1101 (a) (7)) or as a Christian Science practitioner; or the performance of such service by a partnership."

Effective Dates

(e) The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (c) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1954. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1954. The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1955. The amendment made by subsection (d) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1955.

TIME FOR FILING REPORTS OF EARNINGS AND FOR CORRECTING SECRETARY'S RECORDS

SEC. 105. (a) The second sentence of section 203 (g) (1) of the Social Security Act (relating to report of earnings to Secretary) is amended by striking out "third" and inserting in lieu thereof "fourth". The amendment made by the preceding sentence shall apply in the case of monthly benefits under title II of such act for months in any taxable year (of the individual entitled to such benefits) beginning after 1954.

(b) Section 205 (c) (1) (B) of such act (relating to period of limitation for correcting records) is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY WAGE

SEC. 106. (a) Section 215 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) An individual's 'average monthly wage' shall be the quotient obtained by dividing the total of his wages and self-employment income after his starting date (determined under paragraph (2)) and prior to his closing date (determined under paragraph (3)), by the number of months elapsing after such starting date and prior to such closing date, excluding from such elapsed months—

"(A) the months in any year prior to the year in which he attained the age of 22 if less than 2 quarters of such prior year were quarters of coverage, and

"(B) the months in any year any part of which was included in a period of disability except the months in the year in which such period of disability began if their inclusion in such elapsed months (together with the inclusion of the wages paid in and self-employment income credited to such year) will result in a higher primary insurance amount. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph when the number of the elapsed months computed under such provisions (including a computation after the application of paragraph (4)) is less than 18, it shall be increased to 18."

(b) Section 215 (d) (5) of such act is amended by striking out "any quarter prior to 1951 any part of which was included in a period of disability shall be excluded from the elapsed quarters unless it was a quarter of coverage, and any wages paid in any such quarter shall not be counted." And inserting in lieu thereof "all quarters, in any year prior to 1951 any part of which was included in a period of disability, shall be excluded from the elapsed quarters and any wages paid in such year shall not be counted. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the quarters in the year in which a period of disability began shall not be excluded from the elapsed quarters and the wages paid in such year shall be counted if the inclusion of such quarters and the counting of such wages result in a higher primary insurance amount."

(c) Section 215 (e) (4) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) in computing an individual's average monthly wage, there shall not be counted—

"(A) any wages paid such individual in any year any part of which was included in a period of disability, or

"(B) any self-employment income of such individual credited pursuant to section 212 to any year any part of which was included in a period of disability,

unless the months of such year are included as elapsed months pursuant to section 215 (b) (1) (B)."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply in the case of an individual (1) who becomes entitled (without the application of section 202 (j) (1) of the Social Security Act) to benefits under section 202 (a) of such act after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) who dies without becoming entitled to benefits under such section 202 (a) and on the basis of whose wages and self-employment income an application for benefits or a lump-sum death payment under section 202 of such act is filed after the date of enactment of this act, or (3) who becomes entitled to benefits under section 223 of such act, or (4) who files, after the date of enactment of this act, an application for a disability determination which is accepted as an application for purposes of section 216 (i) of such act.

Advisory Council on Social Security Financing

SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing for the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary after February 1957 and before January 1958 without regard to the civil-service laws and shall consist of the Commissioner of Social Security, as chairman, and of 12 other persons who shall, to the extent possible, represent employers and employees in equal numbers, and self-employed persons and the public.

(c) (1) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance, including actuarial services, as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such actuarial and other pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(2) Members of the Council, while serving on business of the Council (inclusive of travel time), shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per day; and shall be entitled to receive actual and necessary traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence while so serving away from their places of residence.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the tax rates in secs. 1401, 3101, and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1959, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. Such findings and recommendations shall be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees to be submitted to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959.

(e) Not earlier than 3 years and not later than 2 years prior to January 1 of the first year for which each ensuing scheduled increase (after 1960) in the tax rates is effective under the provisions of sections 3101 and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Secretary shall appoint an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing with the same functions, and constituted in the same manner, as prescribed in the preceding subsections of this section. Each such Council shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than January 1 of the year preceding the year in which such scheduled change in the tax rates occurs, after which date such Council shall cease to exist, and such report and recommendations shall be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees to be submitted to the Congress not later than the March 1 following such January 1.

Definition of Secretary

SEC. 108. As used in this act and in the provisions of the Social Security Act set forth in this act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Amendments preserving relationship between railroad retirement and old-age and survivors insurance

SEC. 109. (a) Section 1 (q) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "1955."

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "age 65" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "retirement age (as defined in sec. 216 (a) of the Social Security Act)"; and

(2) by striking out "section 202" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "title II."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

District of Columbia Credit Unions

SEC. 201. (a) Subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3113. District of Columbia Credit Unions.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16 of the act of June 23, 1932 (D. C. Code, sec. 26–516; 47 Stat. 331), or any other provision of law (whether enacted before or after the enactment of this section) which grants to any credit union chartered pursuant to such act of June 23, 1932, an exemption from taxation, such credit union shall not be exempt from the tax imposed by section 3111."

Stand-by pay

(b) Section 3121 (a) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(9) any payment (other than vacation or sick pay) made to an employee after the month in which—

"(A) in the case of a man, he attains the age of 65, or

"(B) in the case of a woman, she attains the age of 62,

if such employee did not work for the employer in the period for which such payment is made; or".

Service in connection with gum resin products

(c) Section 3121 (b) (1) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) service performed by foreign agricultural workers (A) under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (65 Stat. 119; 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), or (B) lawfully admitted to the United States from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and the other British West Indies on a temporary basis to perform agricultural labor;".

Employees of Federal Home Loan Banks and of the Tennessee Valley Authority

(d) (1) Section 3121 (b) (6) (B) (ii) of such Code is amended by inserting "a Federal Home Loan Bank," after "a Federal Reserve Bank,".

(2) Section 3121 (b) (6) (C) (vi) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(vi) by any individual to whom the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 470; 5 U. S. C. 693) does not apply because such individual is subject to another retirement system (other than the retirement system of the Tennessee Valley Authority);".

Share-farming arrangements

(e) (1) Section 3121 (b) of such Code is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (14), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by adding after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

"(16) service performed by an individual under an arrangement with the owner or tenant of land pursuant to which—

"(A) such individual undertakes to produce agricultural or horticultural commodities (including livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife) on such land,

"(B) the agricultural or horticultural commodities produced by such individual, or the proceeds therefrom, are to be divided between such individual and such owner or tenant, and

"(C) the amount of such individual's share depends on the amount of the agricultural or horticultural commodities produced."

(2) Section 1402 (a) (1) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "except that the preceding provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to any income derived by the owner or tenant of land if (A) such income is derived under an arrangement, between the owner or tenant and another individual, which provides that such other individual shall produce agricultural or horticultural commodities (including livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife) on such land, and that there shall be material participation by the owner or tenant in the production of such agricultural or horticultural commodities, and (B) there is material participation by the owner or tenant with respect to any such agricultural or horticultural commodity;".

(3) Section 1402 (c) (2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the performance of service by an individual as an employee (other than service described in section 3121 (b) (14) (B) performed by an individual who has attained the age of 18, service described in section 3121 (b) (16), and service described in paragraph (4) of this subsection);".

Professional self-employed

(f) Section 1402 (c) (5) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(5) the performance of service by an individual in the exercise of his profession as a physician or as a Christian Science practitioner; or the performance of such service by a partnership."

Filing of supplemental lists by nonprofit organizations

(g) The third sentence of section 3121 (k) (1) of such Code is amended by inserting "or at any time prior to January 1, 1958, whichever is the later," after "the certificate is in effect,".

Effective date for waiver certificates filed by nonprofit organizations

(h) The fifth sentence of section 3121 (k) (1) of such Code is amended by striking out "the first day following the close of the calendar quarter in which such certificate is filed," and inserting in lieu thereof "the first day of the calendar quarter in which such certificate is filed or the first day of the succeeding calendar quarter, as may be specified in the certificate,".

Effective dates

(i) (1) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after 1955. The amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1955. The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (e) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1954. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1954. The amendment made by subsection (f) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1955. The amendment made by subsection (h) shall apply with respect to certificates filed after 1955 under section 3121 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(2) Any tax under chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is due, solely by reason of the enactment of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of this section, for any taxable year ending on or before the date of the enactment of this act shall be considered timely paid if payment is made in full on or before the last day of the sixth calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted. In no event shall interest be imposed on the amount of any tax due under such chapter solely by reason of the enactment of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of this section for any period before the day after the date of the enactment of this act.

Changes in tax schedules

SEC. 202. (a) Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1401. Rate of tax.

"In addition to other taxes, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax as follows:

"(1) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, and before January 1, 1960, the tax shall be equal to 3¾ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1959, and before January 1, 1965, the tax shall be equal to 4½ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1964, and before January 1, 1970, the tax shall be equal to 5¼ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1975, the tax shall be equal to 6 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1974, the tax shall be equal to 6¾ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

(b) Section 3101 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3101. Rate of tax.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121 (a)) received by him with respect to reemployment (as defined in sec. 3121 (b))—

"(1) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1956 to 1959, both inclusive, the rate shall be 2½ percent;

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1960 to 1964, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1965 to 1969, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1970 to 1974, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1974, the rate shall be 4½ percent."

(c) Section 3111 of such code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3111. Rate of tax.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in sec. 3121 (a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121 (b))—

"(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1956 to 1959, both inclusive, the rate shall be 2½ percent;

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1960 to 1964, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during calendar years 1965 to 1969, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1970 to 1974, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4 percent;

"(5) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1974, the rate shall be 4½ percent."

(d) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955. The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Anfuso
Becker
Bentley
Brownson
Buchanan
Buckley
Celler
Chiperfield
Cole
Crumpacker
Davis, Tenn.
Deane
Dingell
Durham
Eberharter
Engle
Fernandez
Flynt
Gregory
Hardy
Hoffman, Ill.
Johnson, Calif.
Kee
Mumma
Phillips
Prouty
Reed, N. Y.
Short
Steed
Udall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 404 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955, would make several major improvements in the social security insurance system. In addition to extending coverage, the bill would remove inequities and shortcomings of the present system.

For years I have felt that a major shortcoming in the present insurance system is the lack of disability insurance benefits. It will be recalled that in 1949, the House passed a bill which would have provided such benefits. However, that provision did not become law. The pending bill would again provide such benefits.

The bill makes six changes in the old-age and survivors insurance program, and in addition contains certain technical amendments. I will now summarize the major provisions of the bill.

RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

The bill reduces from 65 to 62 the age at which all women may become eligible for benefits. This change would be effective for the month of January, 1956. Altogether, about 1,200,000 women would become eligible for benefits in January 1956. However, due to the fact that about 400,000 of these eligible women are working or are the wives of working men, about 800,000 will begin to draw benefits immediately. Of course, the 400,000 working women and wives of working men can draw benefits if their earnings or the earnings of their husbands should cease.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the Members' attention the fact that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, July 13, 1955, I inserted a summary of H. R. 7225, beginning at page 9009. This summary sets forth not only the number of persons who will be benefited immediately and for several years in the future by this bill, but also the dollar amounts of their benefits. At this time I will not again go into these details which are contained in that summary.

DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

The bill provides for the payment of disability insurance benefits to permanently and totally disabled workers. No benefits would be provided for dependents of such workers.

In order to be eligible for these benefits, a worker must have attained age 50, be fully and currently insured, and have 20 quarters of coverage in the last 40 quarters which end with the first quarter of disablement.

It will be recalled that the social security amendments of 1954 provided for a freeze of the wage record of permanently and totally disabled workers so as to preserve their insurance rights. The pending bill would go one step further and would provide for the payment of disability insurance benefits upon a worker's becoming permanently and totally disabled.

The definition of disability for the purpose of paying such benefits is the same as that in present law in the freeze provision, except that there would be no presumed disability for the blind. It will be recalled that under present law, disability is defined as inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which is expected to be of long continued and indefinite duration.

In the case where a worker is receiving State workmen's compensation or another Federal benefit based on disability, the disability benefit provided under the bill would be reduced by the amount of such benefit.

In order to promote the rehabilitation of a disabled worker, the bill provides that an individual who is performing services in the course of his rehabilitation under a rehabilitation program being carried out under an approved State plan would nevertheless be considered disabled for a year after the first rendered such services.

Disability insurance benefits would be payable for the month of January 1956.

CONTINUATION OF MONTHLY BENEFITS TO DISABLED CHILDREN AGE 18 AND OVER

Under present law, old-age and survivors insurance benefits for children cease upon their becoming age 18. The bill would provide for the continuation of benefits for permanently and totally disabled children after age 18 where they became so disabled before reaching age 18. The mothers of such children would also continue to be eligible for mother's benefits so long as they continue to have disabled children in their care.

In order to be eligible for benefits, a disabled child must have attained age 18 after December 1953, and must have been eligible for a child's benefit before reaching age 18.

These benefits would be payable for the first time for the month of January 1956.

About 1,000 disabled children would immediately become eligible for benefits, and each year in the future some 500 disabled children who attain age 18 would be continued on the rolls beyond age 18.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The bill would extend coverage to all the presently excluded self-employed groups except physicians—in other words, lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, and optometrists would be given coverage. About 200,000 persons are involved.

It will be recalled that the President in his message on social security to the last Congress recommended that all professional groups be included. The bill which passed the House last Congress did include these same professional groups, with the same exception in the case of physicians.

About 20,000 workers engaged in the production of turpentine and gum naval stores would be covered, as well as 200 employees of the Federal home loan banks and about 13,000 Tennessee Valley Authority employees. These three groups were also included in the bill which passed the House last year.

The bill also, by enacting regulations under the present law, clarifies the status of persons who operate farms with the owners or tenants of those farms, under share-farming arrangements. This would be done by embodying present regulations which specify that these individuals are not employees but self-employed persons.

In addition, the bill provides that the present exclusion from self-employment earnings of rentals from real estate for social security purposes would not apply to income derived by an owner or tenant of farmland from the operation of a farm by another individual under an arrangement which provides for material participation by the owner or tenant in the farm production.

The new coverage provisions would be effective January 1, 1956.

Certain technical changes which affect coverage would be made in the Internal Revenue Code.

Employees of nonprofit organizations who were on the payroll of such organizations when the organizations elected social-security coverage but who did not themselves elect coverage at that time would be given a limited time in which to elect coverage. Nonprofit organizations would be permitted to acquire coverage for the quarter in which coverage is elected. Under present law, coverage becomes effective on the first day of the calendar quarter following the quarter in which coverage is elected.

District of Columbia credit unions would be made subject to the social-security tax. Their employees are already subject to the tax. This is a correction in present law.

CHANGES IN TAX RATES

As in the past, the Committee on Ways and Means in recommending the above-described improvements in the social-security insurance laws, has also recommended that the tax rates be increased so as to keep the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund actuarially sound. The bill provides for an increase in the tax rate of one-half of 1 percent on each, the employer and employee, effective January 1, 1956. The increase for self-employed persons would be three-fourths of 1 percent, since the self-employment tax is one and one half times the employee tax.

The scheduled increases in the tax rates on employers and employees would be increased by the same amount on each of the dates scheduled for increase under present law.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL-SECURITY FINANCING

The bill provides for the periodic establishment of an Advisory Council on Social-Security Financing. The purpose of this council would be to review the status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the social-security program each time before a scheduled increase in the social security tax rates.

This council would consist of the Commissioner of Social Security as Chairman, plus 12 other members to be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, representing, to the extent possible, employers and employees, in equal numbers, and self-employed persons and the public.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

The bill would also make certain technical amendments. It would conform the Social Security Act with certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which changed the deadline date for filing income-tax returns from March 15 to April 15. It would put computations involving disability periods on an annual basis. It would also preserve the relationship between Railroad Retirement and Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in the same manner as past amendments to the social-security laws have done.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments contained in H. R. 7225 are not only sorely needed, but they are also sound. They remove inequities in the present system.

The most important improvement, in my opinion, is the provision of disability-insurance benefits for permanently and totally disabled workers. These workers are direly in need of protection.

The lowering of the eligibility age for women beneficiaries will help relieve the personal hardship encountered by older women who now have to wait until they are age 65 to receive benefits, since they will become entitled to them at age 62. It will also make it possible for working men to retire at an earlier age, since generally speaking, the wives of older working men are a few years younger than their husbands.

Providing for the continuation of monthly benefits to disabled children age 18 and over will recognize the fact that such children are just as dependent, and may indeed be more so, than children under age 18.

The extension of coverage provided in the bill will help close the gap in the protection of the system.

This is a very meritorious bill, and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about that relief for the growers of fruits and berries? Was it not possible to give them the same exemption they had previously?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman probably refers to a provision that was in the bill as passed by the House last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. It was modified by the other body. The law as it now stands is being administered and we have secured certain assurances from the Department with respect to that. I think the gentleman will be pleased to know that the committee has directed the Department to keep this matter under consideration and to report back to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the Record just prior to the vote on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to the strange Republican observation expressed in the last two sentences of the minority views as set forth in the committee report which accompanies the Social Security Amendments of 1955, H. R. 7225. These sentences appear on page 67 of the committee report and are as follows:

> The social-security system was created to give our people confidence and faith in their future. It should be above politics.

This platitudinous expression comes from the representatives of the Republican Party that, in the past, has denounced the social-security system as being a "cruel hoax," "socialistic," "the road to Federal bankrtuptcy," and "a fraud on our aged citizens."

It was gratifying to me in 1954 to see many of my Republican colleagues, after more than 20 years, vote for the first time in favor of legislation which would strengthen our social-security system. I thought at that time that perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle had seen the so-called light and that we could work together in the future to make further improvements in the old-age and survivors insurance program.

My hope for such bipartisan support of improvements in the social-security law was short lived. When the Committee on Ways and Means began work during this session of Congress on legislation to improve our social-security system, the Republican members of our committee reverted to the traditional Republican policy of obstructing in committee the favorable consideration of social-security legislation. These Republican members advocated delaying tactics which were designed to preclude the House from completing the consideration of legislation that would improve our social-security law during the present session of the 84th Congress. Fortunately, for the millions of people who will receive benefits and increased protection from the Social Security Amendments of 1955, these Republican obstructionist efforts were unsuccessful. However, it is significant to note that the Republican delaying tactics demonstrated that they were more interested in procedures than they were in humanitarianism.

One of the delaying tactics which the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means adopted was to join in writing a letter to the distinguished chairman of our committee the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable Jere Cooper, in which they proposed a list of 15 improvements in the social-security law that should be considered in public hearings by the committee. It seems ironical to me that almost without exception each of these improvements which the Republican members set forth in their hypocritical and obstructionist letter was a proposal which was embodied in the so-called Dingell-Lehman social-security bill which I introduced in June 1953. During the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, the Republican majority did nothing to give favorable consideration to my legislation. Now, in order to delay the modest improvements that H. R. 7225 would make in our social security law, the Republicans apparently for political expediency have embraced the principles for improving our social security system which I have advocated since the founding of the system in 1935 and which I presented to my Republican colleagues for their consideration at the time they were in the majority.

On behalf of the American people who have been denied social security protection which they should have, I expose the tongue-in-check attitude which the Republican Party has devoted to improvements in our social security law. If the Republican Party had joined with the Democratic Party in working together in improving our social-security system, we would have achieved much more rapid progress in arriving at a comprehensive, mature system of social insurance in America. We would have succeeded in removing many of the inequities and inadequacies that I believe still exist in our old-age and survivors insurance program. If our Republican colleagues are sincere in their expression of concern over the welfare of that outstanding American citizen, the common man, I call upon them to abandon their efforts to emasculate the social security system and to work constructively for its improvement.

As a program for improving our social-security system, I call upon my Republican colleagues to work with the Democratic Party to provide:

First. Expanded old-age and survivors insurance coverage so that all Americans could view the future with a feeling of self-confidence and security with the knowledge that their old-age and possible adversity will be provided for through contributions which they have made into the OASI trust fund:

Second. An increase in the wage base to $6,000 so that our middle-income families may obtain a more realistic replacement of earned income by social-security benefits at the time of retirement or in the event of the death of the family provider;

Third. Revision of the benefit formula to take into account 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage and 20 percent of the next $390 of annual monthly wage;

Fourth. The minimum primary insurance benefit should be increased. Similarly, the maximum family benefit should be realistically adjusted upward to assure an adequate benefit for widows with several minor children in her care;

Fifth. A delayed retirement credit should be provided so that an individual who postpones his retirement will receive an increase in benefit amount at the rate of 2 percent a year for each year after the age 65 that the individual does not go on the retirement rolls.

Sixth. The method of computing average monthly wage should be amended so that it would be based on the individual's best 10 consecutive years of covered earnings;

Seventh. Allowable earnings under the retirement test should be increased to permit earned income of $1,500 per year without loss of benefits;

Eighth. Temporarily disabled persons who are insured on the basis of recent employment before their disability should be eligible for cash benefits for upward to 26 weeks in a year. Provision should also be made for cushioning the cost of medical services during such period of temporary disability;

Ninth. The disability-benefit provisions of H. R. 7225 should be reviewed with a view to reducing or eliminating the requirement that a totally and permanently disabled worker must be age 50 before being eligible for benefits. Consideration should also be given to making benefits available to dependents of insured workers who become totally and permanently disabled; and

Tenth. Increasing the percentage of primary insurance benefit now received by wives of retired workers and survivors of insured individuals.

The above enumeration of matters for consideration in connection with improving our social-security law is cited to highlight some of the more obvious shortcomings in the present system. It would be helpful if the Republican Party would work with the Democratic Party to give effect to these and the many other improvements that are needed in the old-age and survivors insurance system. I also call upon the Republican Members of the House to work with the Democratic Members in making our public assistance program more adequately serve its intended purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the modest prediction that the improvements which I have set forth above will be enacted into law. The timing of such enactment can be hastened if the Republican Party would give its support to these meritorious changes.

My confidence that these improvements will become a part of the social-security system is based on the record of the past which clearly points out the fact that the amendments that I have suggested have been eventually included as a part of our social-security system. I would modestly point out that the expanded coverage that presently exists in our social-security program was originally a Dingell proposal. Similarly, the liberalization of the retirement test for determining benefit eligibility was first proposed by myself. Benefit levels have been revised upward following my recommendation that the OASI system not only could but should provide a more realistic benefit level. I believe that benefits should be made more liberal, but the Democratic Party has done the best it could in the face of solid Republican opposition.

I was among the first to urge that the social-security program be amended to provide disability benefits for our totally and permanently disabled. The legislation which is before the House today will finally make such benefits available.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the record clearly indicates that I have been privileged to be one of the architects and principal advocates of improving our social-security program. It will not be my purpose to describe in detail the many improvements that H. R. 7225 will make in our old-age and survivors insurance system. Our distinguished chairman has already given a most lucid and understandable explanation of the legislation that is before us today.

The inclusion of the professionals such as lawyers and dentists, are classifications which I sought for years, under more liberal provisions and at an earlier date, to cover by the protective social-security umbrella. It seems that at long last we are going to pay some attention to the needs and the sentiments of the dentists and lawyers who were excluded either by the Senate or in conference through the bullyragging of the reactionaries within the American Medical Association. Those days are over. It seems that the Medical Association cannot bluff its own members let alone speak for the dentists and lawyers who feel they are quite capable of speaking for themselves.

The lowering of the benefit age for women to 62 years of age is a step in the right direction, but 10 years ago I advocated the lowering of this age requirement for women's benefit eligibility to 60 years. But it takes time to drag the reactionaries up the hill. It seems almost impossible to enlighten with intelligence and understanding the musty, dusty cranial cavities of some of the powerful forces which have always been opposed to social security as a matter of principle, and at least would hold back acting as a drag if they cannot prevent advancement.

This bill is sadly deficient in that it still fails to provide for total and permanent disability at the time when it occurs. We still place a limitation on when a beneficiary can actually receive total and permanent disability benefits and set the limit at 50 years. Well, that is a gain of 15 years in waiting but it does little good for a man or a woman who becomes so disabled 10 years earlier, say at the age of 40. If we are to have total and permanent disability, if it means what it says, if it is worth considering at all, total and permanent disability should be made effective for all those covered by social security at the time it occurs, be it age 50, 40, or 35 years. Then, and only then, we shall have real disability insurance. I have advocated this sort of provision in several of my prior bills and have even gone so far as to request the social security people during the 82d Congress to seek the aid of a Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means in this and other respects.

Another and important amendment which I have been sponsoring over the years, and which will eventually become law, provides 60 days of free hospitalization annually for all recipients of social-security benefits. There is enough money coming in to take care of that special, select, and ultraneedy group of deserving old folk who need this kind of coverage and could have it without additional taxes or premiums for anybody. But this, too, has met stubborn resistance, and while we had some halfhearted, halfway moves in the 83d Congress sponsored by a Republican at my request through the Social Security Commission, we did not get very far because of the coalition of reactionaries which opposed it. It is a painful, near-discouraging experience, as I have noted over the past 21 years, because of the slow progress we are making. But when you realize that in the 83d Congress the Republicans absorbed some of our Democratic ideas and through Democratic cooperation made them a part of the law, I have confidence that ultimately we will have a lowered eligibility age for men and women, together with limited hospitalization of 60 days per calendar year and full and automatic coverage on total and permanent disability simultaneously with its occurrrence.

I will predict that when the vote is taken today it will be the Democratic Members of the House who have assured the enactment of this legislation, just as it was the Democratic vote in the 83d Congress and all the previous Congresses that made improvements in the social-security law possible.

I admonish my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle that the American people want the social-security program. The protection the system affords to our citizenry is essential. I call upon my Republican colleagues to atone for their past grievous errors in judgment and support the enactment of H. R. 7225.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend our distinguished chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, for the very clear explanation he has given of the meritorious provisions of H. R. 7225, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1955.

This legislation is designed to effect long-overdue improvements in our old-age and survivors insurance program and to remedy certain inadequacies in the present system. Because of the very able explanation of the bill presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], I will not undertake to present any analysis of the proposed amendments. Instead, I would like to dwell on the humanitarian aspects of this important legislation.

With respect to the provision of the bill providing monthly insurance benefits at or after age 50 to workers who are totally and permanently disabled, it is estimated that in the first year, disability insurance benefits would be payable to about 250,000 workers amounting to $200 million in annual benefits. In about 25 years it is expected that 1 million workers will be receiving disability benefits amounting to about $850 million in benefits a year. People who will derive direct benefit from this provision are in large measure the individuals who have suffered the adversity of a crippling risability and who are without resources other than the income they could derive from employment prior to their disability.

Therefore, in the absence of these disability benefits, until now such individuals have been compelled to seek public assistance despite the fact many of such individuals have had a record of contributing toward old-age and survivors insurance protection since the inception of the program in 1935.

We are all aware that eligibility for public assistance requires that a person meet a needs test. It has, therefore, become necessary for an individual to be eligible for public assistance to first render himself destitute. With the enactment of an amendment to the social-security law providing for monthly disability insurance benefits, it will no longer be necessary for a disabled insured worker to sacrifice his self-respect and the well-being of his family in order to obtain some regular monthly income during the period of his disability.

It is also my view that by providing for disability insurance benefits we will have made a significant contribution to the greater success in the rehabilitation of disabled individuals. By establishing insurance protection for disabled workers, we have adopted an amendment to the social-security law which will provide an incentive to disabled workers to undergo rehabilitation. This will hasten the return to the labor market of workers who have sustained a crippling disability. It will reduce the cost of the public-assistance program and the addition of these individuals to the labor force will provide increased productivity to our national economy.

The bill also would amend the social-security law so as to continue monthly benefits to children who have passed their 18th birthday and who have become totally and permanently disabled before age 18. It will be recalled that under present law a child's benefit is payable to a child under age 18 if he is the survivor of an insured worker or the child of a retired worker. However, present law provides that when that child attains age 18 he loses his benefit entitlement. During the careful consideration of H. R. 7225 by our committee, I believe it is proper to state that every member of our committee was concerned over the hardship that was imposed on the parents and on the children by the abrupt termination of benefits because of age when such children through physical or mental disability were unable to contribute to their own care. A child who is past age 18 is as much in need of OASI protection if he is disabled as is a younger child who has not reached his 18th birthday. For that reason, our committee has included in this legislation a provision which would continue benefits in the case of disabled children.

The bill also lowers the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years. I doubt that there is any group more urgently in need of OASI protection than the woman who reaches the middle years of life without any employable skill or without recent experience in the labor market and who is forced to provide for herself because of the death of the family provider.

I do not represent that we have completely met the problem of such women by reducing the eligibility age to 62. However, it is my opinion that we have made significant progress toward solving this problem with the amendments herein contained. It is my hope that further progress can be made in this area in the not too distant future.

It is estimated that about 1.2 million women will derive immediate protection from this provision of the bill; 800,000 of these women may become eligible to draw monthly benefits beginning in January 1956. It is further estimated that in about 25 years 1.8 million additional women will be receiving benefits amounting to $1.3 billion. The logic and statistics that relate to this liberalization of the Social Security Act are convincing testimony to the merit and need for this liberalization.

Mr. Speaker, another important provision of the bill includes the expanded coverage that would be accomplished through the enactment of this legislation. For the first time the protection for survivorship and retirement purposes that is contained in our old-age and survivors insurance program would be available to certain self-employed professional people who are presently excluded from participation in the program. The groups to whom coverage would be extended are lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, and optometrists. Unfortunately, the families of professional people who will benefit from this expanded coverage are not any more immune from adversity than are other American families. For that reason it is my view that the discrimination against self-employed professional people contained in our present social-security law must be ended by the enactment of this measure.

Another important aspect of this meritorious legislation that is designed to benefit everyone who is under social security today and everyone who will be protected by social security in the future is the provision which would establish an advisory council on social-security financing. This advisory council will make periodic review of the status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the program. This council study will be in addition to the continuing evaluation of the system that is made by the Board of Trustees of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the studies periodically made by the interested committees of Congress.

While the changes to our social security law which would be made by this bill are modest in character they do, nevertheless, eliminate certain inadequacies contained in the present system. The increased protection that would be provided by this legislation is protection that would go to groups of Americans who are most urgently in need of old-age and survivor's insurance benefits. For that reason I view these amendments as constituting some of the most humanitarian changes in our social security law that it has been the privilege of the Committee on Ways and Means to present to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it will perhaps be recalled that during the debate on the social security amendments of 1954 I carefully documented the Republican record on social security. This will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 6, page 7448. I modestly call the attention of my colleagues to my remarks at that time in the event they are interested in a review of the Republican attitude on social-security legislation.

It is my hope that the Republican Members of the House will join with the Democratic Members in supporting the enactment of these meritorious improvements in the social security law.

The 2.8 million additional beneficiaries that will eventually become eligible for benefits under these liberalizing amendments warrant the support of the Republican Members of the House, as well as the Democratic Members. The Republican record of opposition to improvements in our social security system should be abandoned. I view the coming vote on this legislation as an opportunity for the Republican Party and particularly the Republican Members present today to cast aside their traditional opposition to social security legislation and to join with the Democratic Members in supporting the enactment of the social security amendments of 1955.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation, H. R. 7225, and in this connection want to say President Eisenhower is to be commended for, and our country is to be congratulated upon the appointment of a native Georgian to succeed Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Marion Folsom and I were friends at the University of Georgia although he is a few years younger than I. While at the university, Marion made a wonderful record graduating with honors and won a membership in Phi Beta Kappa, America's greatest scholastic fraternity. Leaving the university, Mr. Folsom attended the school of business administration at Harvard where he likewise made a splendid record. After leaving Harvard, he associated himself with the Eastman Kodak Co. and rose to the important position of treasurer of that great corporation.

Mr. Folsom is steeped in the philosophy of private enterprise but at the same time realizes fully the social and civic responsibility that rests upon the great business organizations of our country. As the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee Mr. JERE COOPER, has said, Mr. Folsom knows more about social security than almost anyone else in America, having set up such a plan for the Eastman Kodak Co.

His self-effacing role as Under Secretary of the Treasury is well known and his accomplishments in that field speak for themselves.

In my opinion, the President could not have made a better appointment and I am sure that Mr. Folsom will, with his conservative but humanitarian viewpoint, lead us forward in the fields of health, education, and social welfare.

We Georgians are proud of Marion Folsom and I personally am delighted that I will again have the privilege of contacts with him since I am a member of the subcommittee headed by our distinguished colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, which makes appropriations for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the philosophy of government expressed by our great President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with people be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy or their form of government, be conservative.

I believe that these criteria admirably fit the purposes and aims of H. R. 4472, commonly referred to as the Townsend bill.

Can we be otherwise than liberal and human when it comes to dealing with our senior citizens, men and women who have contributed richly to the life and prosperity of our Nation during the best years of their lives, and who now are seeking no other reward than the right to live out their lives in peace while younger generations take over where they have left off? I believe that H. R. 4472 would accomplish this human aim.

This great and pressing task of providing for our senior citizens naturally involves substantial amounts of money, the people's money, and in matters affecting the people's money I am conservative. As a conservative I endorse the principle embodied in H. R. 4472, because it is a pay-as-you-go method of financing, the soundest and safest method of financing known.

H. R. 4472 is geared to the cost of living, and by today's standards this is conservative, because it allows for the decline of pensions if the cost of living drops, while it automatically provides for increased pensions if the cost of living should rise.

Finally, as a conservative I endorse the Townsend bill because it is a national plan which recognizes a national problem instead of looking the other way at State lines. Its benefits and liabilities will be participated in and borne by all States, thus easing the excess burden now falling on the taxpayers in some of our States. In my own State of California our people are paying heavy taxes to support a pension system which is enjoyed not only by retired Californians but by many who have contributed in other States during the most productive years of their lives, and who, attracted by the superb climate, have gone to California to retire. A national plan equalizes burdens and benefits and is fair. It is, therefore, conservative.

Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of the Townsend bill I am not contending that it cannot be improved. On the contrary, I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means, in its wisdom, may find many features which can be improved upon after thorough hearings have been held and the bill has been debated. I urge that the Townsend plan, after due consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, be presented to this House so that the Members may debate it, and by voting may exercise their will in the American way.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that this, one of the most important bills that we have or will consider in this session, has to be considered under suspension of the rules. At least a half dozen of the most prominent Members of the House have come to me in the last few minutes and asked me to give them time in which to speak on this important measure. I cannot give you the time. I only have 20 minutes to allot and I am alloting only 2½ minutes for myself. This bill, I repeat, is one of the most important bills that we will consider because it touches nearly every family in the Nation. It touches millions of people and involves billions of dollars. It is a gigantic business. I remember, I was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means back 15 years ago when we started this social security system. In several of the States we had at that time old age pension systems, and the first social security law was nothing more or less than a national old age pension law. But it has expanded until the fund itself now amounts to $20 billion. If we keep it up for the next 20 years, as we have up to now, in 1975 the amount of money paid in yearly will be over $20 billion. I repeat it is a gigantic business. The thing was so small when we started. I remember I made a motion before the Ways and Means Committee to take in the poor, indigent blind, but the Committee on Ways and Means rejected my motion. I then came on the floor of the House when the bill was being considered and made a motion to include the indigent blind in the bill. I made a speech and said all the fine things I could about the poor, little blind woman holding out her tin cup for dimes but my eloquence was not convincing enough. But I persisted and the Senate showed some compassion and amended the bill to include the "poor little old blind woman" with all of the other indigent blind. I have always been glad for that.

Now, just look where the social security movement has progressed and we have to decide these important questions with only 20 minutes for each side. It is not right, it is a gross usurpation of legislative procedure, it is not even politically proper and I am opposed to that sort of procedure, but I cannot help it because the bill itself has many fine features, and as far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for it. But, I am sorry we do not have a chance to give you a chance to understand it because the committee itself declined to have public hearings before we started our executive sessions. Then the committee would not have anything like a fair and complete hearing when the committee was meeting in executive session. So here we are bringing you something that you have not had time to consider. There is no doubt that the principal motive for this procedure was that it would be a fine political move on the part of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish under leave to extend my remarks to give you a few of many important facts concerning this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means voted to report this bill favorably. Even among those who did not, there is recognition that some of the bill's provisions are desirable and many of its objectives are praiseworthy. Nevertheless, I am impelled to express my concern over certain aspects of this vital legislation.

The social security system is fast reaching maturity. Under Republican leadership, practically universal coverage was finally achieved last year. The system is no longer an experimental innovation but has become an integral part of our economy. Even minor changes in the program can have a profound and far-reaching effect on American life. To millions of our people, the system represents the basic foundation for their own retirement security as well as for the survivorship protection of their dependents. The old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund today approximates $20 billion, and almost every American has a stake in the soundness and stability of that fund. The Committee on Ways and Means is charged by law with responsibility for initiating all legislation affecting the social security system, and, in a very real sense, therefore, the members of our committee are trustees of the public interest in this program. This trusteeship imposes upon us an obligation not only to current social security beneficiaries but also to succeeding generations of beneficiaries.

The proposals contained in this bill will involve increased benefit payments from the trust fund of about $2 billion a year, on the average. Moreover, these proposals will have an unpredictable but far-reaching impact not only upon the old-age and survivors insurance system but also upon private pension plans to which millions of American workers look for their security, upon State and local retirement plans, upon private insurance, and upon the public-assistance program. The ultimate social and economic implications of these proposals are tremendous. In the face of these facts, it was unthinkable that public hearings not be held. However, the majority voted not to hold public hearings and to proceed entirely in executive session. The Republican members voted to open consideration of these vital issues to the public but were turned down by a strict party-line vote.

As a result, this bill, containing multibillion dollar provisions which will affect the lives of millions of Americans for many years in the future, is entirely the product of a few closed-door sessions by this committee. Thus, the far-reaching implications of the proposals contained in this bill have been explored in what can only be described as a cursory and casual fashion.

Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cooperated fully with the members of our committee. To the best of their ability, they presented all available information which bear upon the complex problems involved. Yet they themselves were the first to suggest that such information as they could provide was in many instances second-hand information at best, that the committee should develop first-hand information by soliciting direct testimony from qualified sources, and that in several areas there was insufficient experience upon which to base intelligent legislation. Nevertheless, the administration conscientiously brought to the attention of our committee the many difficult problems which these proposals involve.

Mr. Speaker, in order to finance the multi-billion-dollar increase in benefits contained in this bill, a higher tax schedule is provided. An almost immediate increase to 2½ percent each on employees and employer, respectively, is provided effective January 1, 1956. Each of the subsequent periodic increases provided under existing law is also increased by one-half of 1 percent. As a result, the ultimate tax rate projected under the bill, effective in 1975, is 9 percent, shared equally by employees and their employers. The self-employment tax, applicable to professional individuals, proprietors, farmers, and other self-employed individuals, will become 6¾ percent at that time.

As high as these future rates are, the rates themselves do not convey a complete picture of the true burden which they involve. The tax on wages is a tax on gross wages, without any allowance for personal exemptions, dependents, or other deductions. The tax on self-employment income only permits certain business deductions, such as depreciation. It is, in effect, a tax on adjusted gross income. Therefore, unlike the income tax, the social-security tax is not limited to net income. As a result, that tax, as a percentage of net income, is substantially higher than the actual rates would indicate. In fact, the eventual 6¾-percent rate on the self-employed would be the equivalent of a net income tax in the neighborhood of 20 percent and higher in many cases.

Let us take the example of a farmer with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming that he has a wife and two children and uses the standard deduction, his Federal income tax will be $276. His social-security tax, on the other hand, will be $283.50. In this example, which is a completely average case, the social-security tax, as a percentage of net income, would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had three children, his income tax would be cut to $156, but his social-security tax would still amount to $283.50. In such a case the latter tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. I again point out that this would be an ordinary case and not at all an unusual one.

It is estimated that in 1975 the total social security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually, a colossal sum. Moreover, this estimate assumes continuation of existing wage levels and makes no allowance for the increase in those levels which past experience indicates will occur. The $20 billion estimate is, therefore, extremely conservative.

I point out these facts concerning future social-security tax rates and tax collections in order to show both the ultimate individual tax burdens and the total burden on the economy which are projected under this program. Mr. Speaker, I believe that realism requires us to face the cold fact that these projected tax burdens are so high as to effectively preclude any significant social security liberalizations in the future.

I am deeply concerned over this fact because our committee made no effort to determine what the true priorities for present action are. The Republican Members suggested that public hearings be held on other proposals, such as liberalization of the so-called "work clause," in order that we could decide intelligently exactly which liberalizations were most needed at this time. This recommendation was rejected, again by a straight party vote.

I am concerned over this fact, moreover, because by their very nature, the liberalizations contained in this bill will create demands for additional changes involving further costs. For example, the bill provides benefits for the disabled children of a deceased worker. This liberalization is, in itself, highly desirable. Once enacted, however, how long can the Congress deny equivalent benefits to a widow who is likewise permanently and totally disabled? The bill provides for the payment of cash disability payments to workers once they have reached the age of 50. How long can Congress deny equal treatment to permanently and totally disabled workers who are 49, 45, or younger? The bill provides retirement benefits to women on attaining age 62 even though the statistics show that women retire only slightly earlier than men. How long can Congress refuse to lower the retirement age for men?

I do not cite these problems as criticisms of the provisions of the bill. One cannot deny the serious need of many disabled people or elderly women. On the other hand, I have pointed out that the costs projected under the provisions of the bill are so great as to preclude serious additions to those costs in the future. At the same time we have created the basis for further liberalizations which it will be almost impossible to refuse. That is the dilemma which we are creating for ourselves.

I am further concerned over these ultimate costs because of the danger that they may eventually weaken or even destroy public acceptance of the social security system. A social insurance program cannot be expected to provide against all insurable risks. It must be designed to provide a basic protection at a cost within the reach of all, especially those in the lower income brackets who are most in need of that protection. Despite this fact, we are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax.

In the past few years we have brought into the system on a compulsory basis millions of self-employed individuals. We now propose in this bill to extend coverage on the same basis to many other self-employed, such as lawyers and dentists. Many of these people have felt that the benefits of coverage are conjectural at best. I raise the question of whether future social security tax rates may not entirely undermine the attractiveness of the system to them.

Finally, insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the cost by shifting most of the burden to the future. At that time, the high tax rates may make it very difficult to retain the contributory principle which we believe so essential to the program. However, we would be deluding ourselves should we believe that the general revenue could be depended upon to support the system. I have already pointed out that, under the present schedule, social security tax collections in 1975 will amount to about $20 billion. To finance such a vast sum out of general revenues would necessitate approximately a 50-percent across-the-board increase in our already burdensome individual income tax. These figures show clearly the magnitude of the problem we are so casually creating.

CASH DISABILITY BENEFITS

There are several aspects of the disability benefit provisions which received little or no serious study by our committee and which I believe deserve the most careful consideration. These are, among others—

First, what should the relationship be between a cash disability payment program and the rehabilitation program? To what extent may disability payments interfere with the objective of rehabilitation?

Second, have we had sufficient experience under the disability "freeze" program to provide a sound basis for intelligent legislation in this area?

Third, what are the implications of charging the States with responsibility for administering Federal benefit payments?

Fourth, the cost of the disability program has not been fully analyzed by the committee.

A very serious question raised by the payment of cash disability benefits involves its relation to rehabilitation. Committee Republicans suggested that the committee seek the advice of rehabilitation experts but this recommendation was turned down. I believe that a primary goal of any disability program should be to encourage disabled individuals to regain their position as useful, self-supporting members of society. This goal is a reflection of our faith in the value of individual effort and initiative. I believe that every disabled worker is a potential for such rehabilitation. However, many sincere students of the problem feel that cash disability payments may discourage individual incentives for rehabilitation.

I do not believe that a cash disability program need necessarily operate to the disadvantage of rehabilitation. On the other hand, I do believe that our committee has failed completely to face up to the problem. Many other approaches to the question should have been explored. For example, a number of people believe that cash disability payments should take the form of maintenance payments during the period in which a disabled person is undergoing rehabilitation. Because of the committee's failure to go into this matter, we may have lost an opportunity to develop a really constructive program of great social value.

Only last year we enacted the so-called "disability freeze." The provision protects the benefit rights of workers who become permanently and totally disabled. This program has only just gotten under way, and there is a serious question of whether there has been sufficient experience upon which to base the payment of actual disability benefits.

As was done with respect to the disability freeze, this bill provides that the determination of total and permanent disability shall be made by the States. However, there are substantial differences between the two programs. For purposes of the freeze, the State determination simply protects benefit rights to which individuals may become entitled at some time in the future. Under the disability benefit program, however, the State determination will provide the basis for the payment of immediate cash benefits out of the OASI trust fund. In many cases, such a determination will make it possible for the State to reduce or eliminate its own benefit payments, entirely at the expense of the Federal program. This fact raises a serious question of whether the administration of this program may not be subject to abuse. I believe, at the very least, that our committee should have considered the problem carefully and received testimony from State officials on the matter. This the majority refused to do.

The cost of the disability program is at best conjectural. The actuary of the Social Security Administration, in whom our committee has always had great confidence, admitted that his actuarial estimate of the cost could be subject to wide variation. Insurance actuaries have generally testified to their conviction that the cost would be substantially in excess of that estimated by the committee for this portion of the bill. The Republican members of the committee suggested that it would be the part of wisdom to invite such independent actuaries to testify on the matter, but our motion was rejected.

The bill lowers the age of eligibility for all women beneficiaries—widows, wives, and women workers—from 65 to 62. There has been widespread demand over the years for lowering the eligibility age both for retirement and survivors' benefits. The major interest in this question has been with respect to women beneficiaries. Such a proposal was rejected by this committee in 1949 as being too costly.

Many favor the principle of creating more liberal eligibility requirements for women. Here again, however, there are a number of questions which our committee either failed to explore completely or did so only in a cursory and inconclusive manner. I do not, therefore, raise these questions as objections to the merits of the proposal contained in this bill. I do believe, however, that these matters should have been studied carefully in order to prevent the creation of new discriminations, to determine the areas of greatest need, and to avoid any possible detriment to other objections of great social importance.

The longevity of the American people is increasing at a significant rate. The proportion of people over 65 is very large and becoming larger all the time. As a result of this situation, one of the most encouraging trends in the country has been the effort toward creating a favorable climate for the employment of older workers. Many businesses are actively engaged in promoting this program. While 11 percent of the private plans established in the period 1948–50 provided for normal retirement of women before age 65, only 7 percent of the plans established in 1950–52 do so. The success of this program is important both to our overall economic strength and to maintaining the self-respect of our older citizens as useful members of the community. Certainly, those who wish to work beyond 65, or any other age for that matter, should be afforded an opportunity to do so and should not arbitrarily be forced out of employment.

There is a serious question in the minds of many as to whether the reduction of the statutory social security eligibility age for women, desirable as such action is in many individual cases, may not run counter to this major social and economic objective of wider employment opportunity.

Private industrial pension plans are generally geared to the social-security system. This fact has led most such plans to adopt age 65 as the compulsory retirement age for both men and women. It must be expected that, if age 62 is established for social-security purposes, the same pattern will be adopted by private industry. Our committee made no effort to appraise the implications of its action in this regard.

Lowering the retirement age for women workers is supported on the ground that they typically retire at an earlier age than men. However, the statistics indicate that this is true only to a slight extent. In 1953, the average age was 68 for men and 67.6 years for women. I do believe that a serious hardship exists under present law with respect to women who are widowed before age 65. I question whether making benefits available to this group at age 62 will make any significant improvement in the situation. A number of the Republican members of the committee supported an amendment offered by Representative SADLAK to make benefits available to women at age 60, but this was rejected by the majority.

I repeat again that a majority of the Republican members of the committee voted to report this bill favorably. I agree that several of its provisions have great merit. I certainly recognize the undoubted political attractiveness of all of its proposals.

I do not, however, believe that our committee has discharged its obligation to either the Congress or to the American people by its brief and closed-door consideration of this vital legislation. I have sought to point out the grave social and economic implications of the bill. I have dwelt at some length upon the staggering ultimate costs of this developing program because I do not believe that either the Congress or the public has any conception of its magnitude.

It is my earnest hope that the questions I have raised will lead thoughtful citizens everywhere to search for the answers. The social-security system was created to give our people confidence and faith in their future. It should be above politics.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], not exceeding 2 minutes, however.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when this subject was first brought before our committee in executive session, and as you have been told, there were no public hearings, no mention was made with respect to taxation and with respect to the money to pay for the costs which are extremely heavy on this bill. On the contrary, the initial stories went out to the press implying that there would be no taxes connected with the bill. I am very happy to say that the committee in executive session while liberalizing the provisions of the law have provided the money which is necessary to meet the costs. The committee recognizes its responsibility in that respect and has imposed new taxes. That the taxes are heavy and will become heavier is a very important matter for every individual Member of the Congress to remember because your constituents, the workers of the country, are the individuals from whom this money is being taken. There is a limit above which we dare not go. I think this bill and these taxes levied herein just about measure the limit to which we dare increase social security taxes upon the individual. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, I have been a believer and strong proponent of our contributory social-security system. Though I am going to vote for this bill because in it are some improvements which I have long favored, it troubles me greatly. It seems that we are casually passing legislation which may in future wreck the whole contributory OASI system.

Many of the objectives in this bill are worthy. We all know of many individuals whose cases are appealing who will benefit by its provisions. But no individual can afford to insure himself against all the hazards of human existence; nor can the Federal Government do so either by taxing him for this protection.

Under this bill the tax rate 20 years from now will rise to 4½ percent on employer and 4½ percent on employee.

Under this bill the social-security tax rate on self-employed will then be 6¾ percent or $283.50 for the individual who is earning $4,200 a year. This will be more than he will pay in Federal income tax if he is the average citizen with a wife and 2 children.

Two items in this bill are the costly ones. These will take $2 billion on the average every year out of the pockets of workers and their employers over the next half century.

This tax will be so high that it may well result in precluding the possibility in future of making other needed improvements in the system.

We should have evaluated these proposals with all others in extensive public hearings and made a decision at to which had priority.

The most expensive proposal in this bill is that which reduces the retirement age of all women to 62. Is this the most important change that should be made in the system? Public hearings might have determined this.

Reducing the age at which widows receive benefits—yes. Those whose husbands died after their wives had reached a mature age. They cannot get a job at 60 and this is an improvement I have long advocated. But, with the growth of the life span and improvement in the health of our population, is it wise to discourage those who wish to work after the age of 62? If this age is established for social-security purposes, will not the same pattern be adopted by private industry?

The second expensive proposal—granting social-security benefits to those who become totally disabled—a worthy objective—also will cost at least a billion dollars a year on the average. Insurance actuaries say it will cost a great deal more. Should we not experiment with this radical departure very gradually—start say at 60 instead of 50 as provided in the bill—and see if the actuaries of the Social Security Administration or those from the insurance companies are right as to its cost?

Should we not also experiment, gain experience and try to develop satisfactory sound administrative procedures for deciding who is permanently disabled? Unfortunately there will be a few who would rather rely on these payments than work toward their own rehabilitation.

By their action in refusing to have public hearings, by their action in turning down my motion to invite insurance actuaries to estimate the cost, by their action in turning down my motion to invite doctors to testify as to possible means of determining disability, the Ways and Means Committee has abdicated its responsibility, and the Senate will write the bill.

We can only pray that the Senate Finance Committee will recognize its responsibilities to the 140 million Americans—the covered workers and their families who will be vitally affected by this legislation—and will handle the matter in a more responsible manner.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, any impression that this bill has not been thoroughly and adequately considered is simply not a statement of fact. This bill was considered in executive sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means, with the experts of the Social Security Board present every day in at least 15 to 20 meetings. It was considered by the members of this committee who time and time again have conducted public hearings on the issues involved in the legislation now before this body.

If what we have done was so bad, then it is difficult for me to understand why the committee voted 21 to 3 with only 1 member not voting—who is now ill, unfortunately, our distinguished former chairman—to report this bill favorably. The members who voted to report the bill favorably are now finding fault with the fact that we did not reinstitute hearings upon these very matters on which we have held hearings in the past. Take the disability section, take the other provisions: In 1949 for 6 months the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives sat and listened to witnesses from all over the United States of America on those and other issues as well as spending a considerable amount of this time in executive sessions. Nothing new has developed. The Senate in 1947 appointed an advisory council and that council in the other body voted unanimously to reduce the age for women and also recommended the adoption of disability benefits, both of which would be accomplished by this bill.

We had some other recommendations later on. The former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, appointed a committee, which found that the present system is sound, and last year we, by and large, carried out the recommendations of her committee that the social-security system should be maintained on its present basis with the greatest increase in coverage that could be given.

So we are not confronted with anything new, we are not confronted with any radical departure; we are confronted with a measure which was approved by 21 out of 24 members of the Ways and Means Committee who voted.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. I am very glad to welcome him as a supporter of the social-security system; as a matter of fact, he only saw the light last year. My recollection is that prior to 1954 he voted against improvements every time, but now he is a convert, he believes in the system.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman, having referred to him.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say that the gentleman is wrong, as usual.

Mr. BOGGS. We will look at the record, and I think it will demonstrate that the gentleman from Louisiana is correct, as usual. Just take a look at the minority reports and the motions to recommit.

The gentleman from Ohio talks about this vast sum of money we are collecting. Do you not know what the gentleman from Ohio would be doing if we had not made this system actuarially sound? We voted to impose these increased taxes on a graduated basis so nobody would stand here in the well of the House of Representatives or anywhere else and say that we were voting something and not providing the money for it. That is what we have done. As a matter of fact, we have done a little better than that. We had figures before the Ways and Means Committee from the Social Security Administration's actuary, Mr. Myers, to the effect that we could make this tax effective on January 1, 1957, and that it would still be actuarially sound and we would still have a surplus of about $200 million; but to be doubly sure—and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], was very helpful in this respect—we provided that it should be effective on January 1, 1956, next January 1, so that there could be no question but what we were providing the funds to make this added protection possible on a sound basis.

Finally, let us look at what the benefits are: No. 1, if you have a child 18 years of age and that child is blind, crippled, or mentally retarded, or disabled, instead of being dropped from the rolls when he become 18, as he is today, this bill would keep him on.

No. 2: If you are 50 years of age and have cancer, heart disease, or whatever and cannot work, you are given some disability benefits.

No. 3: If you are a woman 62 years of age you can qualify for benefits. Why? Because in most instances men marry women who are 3 or 4 years younger than they, and that adjustment balances the system.

This is a sound bill; it has been thoroughly considered, and it should be passed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge prompt and favorable action on the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1955.

The bill before us contains five major provisions. In the first place, it provides disability benefits for insured workers. Secondly, it lowers the retirement age for women from age 65 to age 62. Thirdly, it continues monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before age 18. Fourthly, it extends social-security coverage to certain self-employed, professional groups. Finally, it makes the necessary adjustment in the contribution schedule, so as to provide revenue for the additional benefits and to safeguard the integrity of the social-security fund.

I have advocated most of these changes for the past 3 years, and I support them now. They are sound and necessary. I would like to say a few words about each one of these proposals.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

During the last Congress, I sponsored H. R. 3554 which proposed a disability-insurance program for workers insured by the social-security system. I reintroduced this legislation in the present Congress, in the form of my bill H. R. 5057.

Now the bill before us contains the proposal outlined in H. R. 5057, at least in its essential features. It provides disability insurance for workers who have attained age 50. My bill would have gone a step further: It called for the payment of disability benefits to insured workers regardless of age, as well as for the payment of supplemental benefits to the wife and the minor children of the disabled worker. These, in my opinion, are very important provisions. They are not included in the bill which we are debating. Nevertheless, the bill before us represents a step in the right direction, and for that reason merits our support.

At this point, I would like to read a portion of a memorandum which I prepared some months ago, describing the need for disability insurance. While the memorandum applied specifically to my bill H. R. 5057, the arguments contained therein are equally applicable to the legislation under consideration.

Memorandum on H. R. 5057, a Bill To Provide Disability Insurance

THE DIRE NEED FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE

The problem of total disability is a serious problem to the thousands of disabled persons all over the country who write to their Representatives in Congress for help that cannot be given to them under our present law.

Each year, many thousands of our workers meet with physical disasters which rob them of their earning capacity. The majority of those workers cannot depend on any income during the period of their disability. As a result, their families must suffer privation and hardship, and frequently look to local, State, and Federal agencies for relief dole.

For almost two decades, this problem has been noted in practically every serious study made of the problems of disability. These studies recognized the need for Government action to protect workers and their families against this risk—against the financial drain which is even more serious than that of unemployment, old age, and death.

As early as 1938, the Advisory Council on Social Security agreed unanimously on the desirability of providing social insurance for permanently and totally disabled persons, and for their dependents. By 1948, the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance recommended immediate incorporation of disability protection into the social-security system. The Council said this:

"There can be no question concerning the need for such protection. On an average day the number of persons kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months is about 2 million. The economic hardship resulting from permanent and total disability is frequently even greater than that created by old age or death. The family must not only face the loss of the breadwinner's earnings, but must meet the cost of medical care. As a rule, savings and other personal resources are exhausted. The problem of the disabled younger worker is particularly difficult because he is likely to have young children and not to have had an opportunity to acquire any significant savings."

More recently, other groups and study commissions further stressed this need, recommending the enactment of legislation to provide social insurance against the hazard of permanent and total disability.

EXISTING PROVISIONS FOR THE DISABLED

At present, we have a multiplicity of programs which provide limited and selective insurance against the risk of disability.

The fact remains, however, that existing Government programs, industry, union, and private insurance plans protect only a minority of the working population. The majority of the people are still without protection—short of the ultimate resort to public relief—once prolonged disability has brought destitution and hardship to them and to their families.

This is due to the fact that the hodgepodge of programs in this field provides only partial and selective protection to given groups, and to the fact that our basic Social Security System does not as yet provide for disability insurance for the population at large.

PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY AND RETIREMENT

It has long been widely recognized that physical old age is not always closely related to chronological age. While many workers may be able and willing to work past age 65, others are compelled to stop working at a much earlier age because of incurable diseases such as inoperable cancer, advanced heart condition, tuberculosis, arthritis, and so on. For all practical purposes, these individuals are prematurely retired from the labor market.

Unless disability insurance is provided for persons in this category, this lack may create pressures which may have serious effect on the old-age and survivors insurance program. We may be gradually forced to adopt a considerable lowering of the retirement age. If this happens, it will not be because people in general wish to retire earlier, but due to the pressure of an increasing number of disabled persons—particularly those in the upper age group—who are in dire need of assistance.

If we try to meet this very real need by enabling all persons to retire at an early age, it will cost us much more than a direct approach of providing disability benefits only to those who are totally disabled and who can therefore qualify for them.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF DISABILITY

Many income studies conducted during recent years point out that disability and low income go hand in hand in many instances. These studies point out that among the urban families in the low-income class one of the chief causes of poverty was traced to the disability of the head of the family.

Other studies also show that disability accounts for a very large portion of public relief expenditures. This also applies to private charity which helps an additional number of disabled persons.

By providing a systematic program of social insurance against disability, such as the program outlined in H. R. 5057, it would be possible in time to reduce the need for relief and public dole.

THE SOCIAL-INSURANCE APPROACH

The enactment of the proposals contained in H. R. 5057 will not eliminate the economic cost of disability. However, this proposal would provide a systematic contributory method for workers to help meet those costs before they occur. It would also sharply reduce the present financial burden of relief and public assistance.

The risks of disability can be made a budgetable expense for workers, just as the risks of old age and death have been made budgetable expense through the old-age and survivors insurance program. This social-insurance method is applicable to this problem, and should be adopted.

Social insurance, geared to the workers' earnings, would afford protection as a matter of right to those insured workers who become totally and perhaps permanently disabled. The benefits would make it possible for them to live on an income they had previously helped to purchase. It would prevent them from being forced into destitution and from turning to charity and public relief.

LOWERING THE RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

Mr. Speaker, the second major proposal contained in the bill before us would lower the retirement age for women to age 62. This proposal is similar to the suggestions contained in bills which I introduced in the last Congress, and in the present one.

Again, I should like to read from a memorandum which I drafted some time ago, listing the reasons why the retirement age for women ought to be reduced without further delay:

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI ON H. R. 1635, A BILL TO LOWER THE RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN TO AGE 60

In both the 83d and the 84th Congresses, I sponsored legislation to lower the retirement age for women under the social-security program to age 60. The number of my earlier bill was H. R. 3554, 83d Congress, and of the later one, H. R. 1635, 84th Congress. This proposal is important for the following reasons:

The average age at which workers are retiring at the present time is 69. This includes both married and single workers. The average age of a wife, in the case of older men, is 5 years less than that of their husbands. Under the present law, with the retirement age at 65, this means that supplemental wife's benefits are not payable until the husband reaches age 70.

Less than one-fifth of married men who attain age 65 have a wife of the same age or older, and more than one-half of such men have a wife who has reached age 60. Reducing the age for a wife to become eligible for benefits at age 60 will permit the wives of about three-fourths of the married men who claim retirement benefits to receive wife's benefits as soon as they retire.

The bill which I introduced would lower the retirement age for all women, including women workers who are entitled to benefits on their own wage record, to age 60.

In the case of women workers who are entitled to social-security insurance benefits in their own right, the present retirement age of 65 creates a hardship. Women are generally considered as retiring earlier than men. As proof of this, many companies have pension plans which provide a retirement age of 60 for women. It is necessary to lower the age of insured women workers also because it would be discriminatory and inconsistent to pay a wife's benefit at age 60 and not to lower the retirement age for insured women workers to 60, since the wife in such a case would get benefits at an earlier age and for a longer life expectancy than a woman worker who has contributed to the Social Security System.

Widows should also be eligible for benefits at age 60 because it would certainly be inconsistent to start paying benefits to a wife at age 60 and upon her husband's death—before she is age 65—to require her to go off the rolls and wait until she is 65 to begin drawing benefits again. In the case of widows of insured workers, a reduction to age 60 will make about two-fifths of them immediately eligible for benefits.

We all know that it is practically impossible for women aged 60 and over to secure employment. Reducing the retirement age for women would meet a pressing social need.

I have worked on behalf of this legislation in the past, and I shall continue in these efforts. It is my hope that this proposal will be considered favorably during this 1st session of the 84th Congress. It merits our support and ought to be enacted into law.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 1955*.

CHILDREN'S DISABILITY BENEFITS

The third major provision of the social security amendments of 1955 bill proposes to continue the payment of monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before age 18.

This is a constructive and needed change in our social security law. A child who is either physically or mentally disabled is dependent upon his family whether he is 18 years of age or over. Yet under our present law, the payments which are made for his support cease when the child becomes 18. This inequity should have been corrected long ago.

The Committee on Ways and Means has reported that the proposed change will eventually benefit some 5,000 children and their mothers. While the number of beneficiaries is relatively small, this does not alter the need for amending the law. I am fully in favor of this provision.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The fourth proposal calls for the extension of social security coverage to lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed professional groups now excluded—except physicians—and to certain other limited groups.

In conjunction with this subject, I would like to refer to a survey which I had recently conducted among physicians, dentists, and lawyers who reside or practice in the Fourth District of Wisconsin. I described the results of this survey on an earlier occasion. My remarks are included in the CONGESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1955.

It is not my purpose to repeat and review the results of that survey. I merely want to point out that 82 percent of the dentists who replied favored social security coverage for their group. Similarly, 80 percent of the lawyers sending in their replies went on record favoring coverage.

It appears, then, that the legislation before us meets with the approval—active and wholehearted approval—of the people concerned. The amendment ought to receive favorable consideration.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONTRIBUTION SCHEDULE

Finally, it has been proposed that the present schedule of contributions be revised so as to provide the revenue for the additional benefits and to safeguard the integrity of the social-security fund.

The proposed increase in contribution rates is moderate and sensible. We should not expect to authorize additional benefits without making some provision for meeting the additional costs involved. We ought not to shift that burden to future generations.

Because I feel very strongly on this point, I support the Ways and Means Committee's recommendation for an upward revision of the contribution schedule. This recommendation is far-sighted and equitable, and should receive wholehearted approval.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the legislation before us will receive prompt and overwhelming approval.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday Dean Manion called me on the long distance phone and said: "Noah, I want you to prepare a brief specific telegram giving your opinion of these new amendments to the Social Security Act and send me that telegram so that I can use it in my radio address."

The following is the telegram I sent him:

JULY 15, 1955.

H. R. 7225, covering proposed amendments to our Federal social-security law, proposes to liberalize benefits, lower the age requirements, and extend coverage to all citizens with the exception of doctors. Our present social-security setup is already actuarially unsound. These proposed amendments will make it more unsound. Twenty years from now it will require taxes amounting to $20 billion per year to meet its obligations, a tax load superimposed upon our already backbreaking tax load.

In a speech on the House floor in 1950 I said, "our social-security setup is an unsound, dishonest, inequitable system which proposes to tax our children and grandchildren to meet the obligations that the present generation supposedly have already paid for. It is a dishonest and immoral program that has been sold to the American people as a plan to provide security in old age. It is a Ponzi-type shellgame that is bound to collapse when the load becomes too heavy to carry."

N. M. MASON.

That is what went out over the air as my opinion of this pending bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the American people were not given a better opportunity to express their views before the House Ways and Means Committee. It is also to be regretted that there is not more than 20 minutes on a side to debate this subject, which so vitally affects every single individual in the United States. If these opportunities as well as the right to offer amendments had been given we might have been better able to secure legislation that would more fully meet the needs of the aged people.

Denied these opportunities we have only two alternatives. We could vote against the suspension of the rules and that would leave legislation with a commendable purpose high and dry or we can vote for the legislation and send the measure along to the Senate, where I am sure it will be more carefully considered. I dislike to be forced to yield to the Senate but I see no other course.

The 83d Congress enlisted the services of a group of highly skilled, nonpartisan experts to make a thorough study of our social-security system. As a result of lengthy, intensive studies, they made recommendations as a result of which the 83d Congress adopted far-reaching improvements in the social security system. This included increased benefits all along the line and extended coverage to 10 million additional people. This is the proper, efficient way to legislate on such an important subject. Consideration of such a matter, affecting every individual in the Nation, should not be hasty or haphazard.

I believe in social security. I voted for it when it came into being in 1935 and I have observed the great contribution it has made to the country. It has brought stability to the country and no one could adequately express the comforts and happiness it has brought to millions of our countrymen.

Social security in the period when men and women because of age or disability are unable to earn a livelihood is a wonderful thing. It is a powerful check on communism.

This bill—imperfect as it is—means a step in the right direction. For that reason I shall vote for it and hope the Senate will give it the more careful consideration it merits.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one is not in an enviable position in opposing enlarged benefits in the social-security system or any other governmental system; but, Mr. Speaker, this matter of amending the old-age and survivors' insurance system is to me a very serious matter.

I do not suppose there is any Federal program which directly affects the future of so many of our people. Millions of people are dependent, so far as their future security is concerned, upon our old-age and survivors insurance system. In a sense we are the trustees of that insurance system. We have an obligation to make sure that in future days this system is going to be able to provide the benefits that the people are relying on. It would be tragic if at some future date the system could not meet its obligations because of some injudicious action taken today.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is preposterous that a bill of this nature containing important amendments and dealing with such an important subject should be considered in such a cursory fashion as the manner in which the committee handled the bill and the manner in which it is being considered today with only 40 minutes of debate. It is impossible to even properly explain the provisions of the bill in that short a time. Mr. Speaker, we must all recognize, of course, that the objectives sought by the legislation are praiseworthy and appealing. If they were not, I am sure there would not be the determination on the part of certain Members of the Congress to force it through and get it passed by this House during this session of the Congress.

I say in all earnestness, Mr. Speaker, we must know where we are going and what we are doing with a system that has such a tremendous impact upon our people. Yet we had no hearings, no advance study, no experts before the committee; in fact, the only people that appeared to assist us were from the Department, and they contended they could not properly advise us in many areas because they had not had the opportunity to give sufficient study to these programs so as to advise us properly.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must, in keeping with the responsibility which is mine, oppose this bill at the present time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the enactment of H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955. I served as a member of the Curtis subcommittee in the 83d Congress which was charged with the responsibility of conducting hearings on proposed improvements to the social-security system, including the actuarial soundness of the trust fund.

The 83d Congress widely extended coverage and enacted many liberalizing provisions and greatly improved the financing aspects of the system.

I am firmly convinced that upon enactment of the pending legislation, H. R. 7225, the social-security system will be actuarially sound. The tax increases proposed in this bill seem heavy to many people. They are substantial. Yet they are necessary to preserve the soundness of the trust fund, and where can anyone obtain so many benefits for so low a price?

The social-security tax is well below the railroad retirement payments.

The chairman and other members of the Ways and Means Committee have thoroughly explained this bill. The committee report is full and comprehensive. The bill provides disability benefits for covered workers who are aged 50, who have 1½ years of coverage in the 3-year period ending with disability plus 5 years of coverage in the 10-year period ending with such disability, and are fully insured.

Disability insurance benefits would be payable to 300,000 workers in the first year. Eventually 900,000 would receive disability benefits. The definition of "disability" under this bill is the same as that contained in the social security amendments enacted by the 83d Congress in respect to disability freeze; that is "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration."

The age of eligibility for all women beneficiaries—widows, wives, and women workers—would be lowered from 65 to 62. It is estimated that in the first year benefits would be paid to 800,000 additional women.

Under existing law disabled children are taken from the social-security rolls when they attain the age of 18 years. This bill continues payments to disabled children regardless of age. This provision will extend benefits to about 8,000 children. This is certainly humane and liberal legislation of which I am very proud.

Last year the Republican 83d Congress greatly liberalized social security and extended benefits to about 10 million additional persons. H. R. 7225 extends the benefits to virtually every worker and professional person in the United States except the medical profession, and apparently the physicians and surgeons or a majority of them do not want the benefits.

I urge immediate enactment of this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is impossible to discuss the proposed liberalization of the social security program and the proposed financing of it in the time allotted under suspension of the rules. The Speaker knows this and upon his shoulders rests the responsibility of proceeding in such a fashion.

Here I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to these procedures, and I have been given 3 minutes to try to explain to this House just how rotten—and I use that word advisedly—how rotten the procedures were that we have followed in considering this piece of proposed legislation. I could not possibly explain it to this body—the time allotted—I I trust the Members will give consideration to the procedures followed and determine for themselves whether they have the required soundness to produce good legislation.

Hereafter follows the speech I wanted to make so that this body would have some idea of the unsoundness of the proposed legislation as well as the procedures followed. The speech would have taken 10 minutes. As a matter of fact, less than 10 minutes was available to the 3 Members of the committee opposing the suspension of the rules.

The bill before us will cost around $2 billion a year for the next 20 years, after which it probably will cost $2.5 billion, assuming our present estimates are anywhere near correct. This is a gross assumption, I might add, because the very person making these assumptions warned the Ways and Means Committee in executive session that there was little to go on in making estimates concerning disability costs.

The matter before us today is just incidentally the subject of social security. The real matter before us is the reputation of the Ways and Means Committee and the reputation of the House of Representatives. Judging from the experience I have just gone through as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, where all tried and true methods of procedure required for properly and adequately considering legislation were shoved aside by the power of the majority caucus, I have just a slight hope that the House will be any more concerned than it was about proper procedures.

The issue facing the membership of this body is quite simple. Let me illustrate. A couple of days ago I was stopped outside the Chamber by two CIO leaders. One said: "Well, I see you voted against social security." I said, "No, I did not vote against social security and you know it." He said: "Well, you voted against passing the bill out of committee." I said: "I certainly did, and I will vote against the bill on the floor of the House. But I am not against social security." In fact, I believe I probably have done as much as any member of the committee to try to help the program and certainly have done considerably more than those Members of the majority—which was a majority of them—who attended no executive sessions, other than cursorily, to try to work out the problems as best we could under bad procedures.

Certainly, anyone voting against the suspension of the rules here today will be branded by a vicious group of politicians as being against social security. That is the whole plan of what has been going on. Everyone here in the House knows it. But the fact that will be done neither makes it the truth nor does it mean that the people of this country or the people of any given congressional district will believe it, if the Congressman of that district will explain the true picture.

Last year, my colleagues, certain members of the Democratic Party, including the Speaker, took the floor to object to certain remarks which they interpreted to mean that the Democratic Party had been called a party of treason or a party that coddled communism. I added my small voice to this discussion, by condemning the actions of anyone who so stated or so intimated, because I felt that patriotism was a feature of a man's integrity and that there was no basis at all for attacking the integrity of the Democratic Party or any individual in it by such generalities.

I took that position feeling deeply that for years certain leaders of the Democratic Party had been guilty of a grievious sin, for which they still do not apologize or desist from pursuing, the sin of attacking the Republican Party and members of it by alleging a defect in integrity, which transcends even the virtue of patriotism. I refer to the virtue which is the essence of all Christian religion and of the Jewish faith—love of one's fellow man.

Now here today, if you please, supposedly I am jockeyed into the position of either voting for this improperly conceived and studied bill in its entirety or of being branded as one not interested in the welfare of my fellow man. Now does anyone here deny that that is the essence of the procedures followed by our leftwing political element who have so long and too long, in my judgment, dominated American political thinking. Either you agree with their brand of government or you are against the people, against the little man.

Now briefly to the bill itself that comes before us without any committee hearings to guide us, without the committee itself having called either in executive session or public hearings experts and others familiar with the various facets of this complicated proposal.

What are the dangers and inadequacies? You can read the minority views in the committee report and get a brief résumé. I will only point up a few.

First, reducing the age of women workers from 65 to 62 will create pressures to force women workers to retire earlier than at the present when the advancements of medicine have been such that our people can be gainfully employed longer, not shorter. And, in fact, for their very health they should be permitted the feeling of being economically valuable to their society.

Both parties have endorsed the proposed equal rights for women provision for the Constitution. I am probably one of the few Members of this body who has refused to sign a resolution following out this endorsement, because I feel that men and women are different—not one superior over the other—just different and yet in the area of retirement from work I see no difference. We are doing the women a disfavor, not a favor in this provision. Mind you, I am not talking about widows or wives of retired workers—the problems are different, and in these fields there are differences between men and women.

Second, the proposed disability benefits have not been carefully considered. Our States and private enterprise, and, indeed, the Federal Government, have made tremendous strides in the field of rehabilitation. Any disability program must be carefully geared into the rehabilitation programs or else the rehabilitation programs can be seriously damaged. No person in the rehabilitation field was even called before our committee to discuss the matter. In fact, in our committee were lengthy academic discussions of what the term "totally disabled" meant. I suggested we call some people from the Labor Department and from the rehabilitation field to go over this matter with us, because the term "totally disabled" is a term we are today beginning to feel applies to very few people. But our committee procedures were to hear no one, record nothing, pass all previously decided in the know-nothing caucus of my Democrat friends of the committee.

Third. The proposal to make sharecroppers self-employed instead of employees as is now in the law. How did that little gimmick slip into this liberalization bill? What discussion was had on it? What testimony? What is its effect? Well, I'll tell you what its effect is—thousands of southern sharecroppers will probably no longer be included in social security. The owner running the operation will be relieved of his 2½-percent tax. The sharecropper will be responsible for a 3¾-percent tax. The owner will no longer be responsible for seeing that a return is made. The responsibility will rest on the sharecropper.

Yes, indeed; it is important that this bill be brought out under a gag rule with no chance of amending. I wonder who in the CIO and A. F. of L. is responsible for this being in the bill or is this something that was needed to cement a deal?

There are many good features in this bill. One of the best is the new fiscal responsibility. If we are going to increase benefits we must provide payment for the increase. But, as I said in debate last year on the extension of social security, do not let us kid the people about this program being either actuarilly sound, fiscally responsible, or something that the people are paying for. The actuarial soundness, the fiscal responsibility, such as it is, is all based upon our children and our grandchildren—when we are the beneficiaries of the program—being willing to tax themselves 9 percent of gross wages, 4½ for employer and 4½ for employee, 6¾ for the self-employed, as we so considerately say they shall in our present legislation.

But they are the ones who pay the bill. Not the people of today. We pay in our $1 and get out $3, our children and their children make up the $2 difference; that is, if the Congresses they elect go along with this program. I wonder if the Congresses they elect will have the courage to let these tax increases come about? Certainly judging by the recent Congresses since social security has been in effect the answer is an emphatic "No." And yet these Congresses have been representing people who got $10 for every $1 put in and more.

And, finally, and fortunately for the country in one sense, and tragic in another, what we do today will not become the law of the land. All we are engaged in today is making a mockery of the House of Representatives and confirming the mockery already made of itself by the Ways and Means Committee. The Senate leaders have already announced that they intend to hold hearings on this bill. They have already stated that they are not going to abandon, just yet, at any rate, the time-tested procedures that produce good legislation and protect against bad legislation.

I am hopeful that there are in this body at least one-third who feel the integrity of the House of Representatives and its committees is of sufficient importance to a free society that they will lay aside partisanship, will take their courage in their hands and vote against this gag procedure, and then take up the burden, and it is a burden, of explaining to their people just what the issues were on the floor today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker before proceeding, I want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to make a most welcome announcement.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the happy announcement that our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. REED] landed in New York yesterday and is expected to be in Washington in a couple of days.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman of the committee and other Members who have spoken in urging the Members of the House today to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 7225.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject to most of the Members of the House who have been here for any length of time. All of us, whether we are new or old Members in terms of seniority, have been impressed with the requests, I am certain, that have come to us from our own districts that the Congress make some provision to take care of people who become permanently and totally disabled before they reach the age of 65. I am satisfied that the same Members have had requests from their own constituency that the Congress do something about the problem of the widow, the problem of the wife of the retired worker, the problem of the single woman worker who wants to retire and all workers who may meet, or have met, some disability before reaching the age of 65.

I am sure the same Members also recall the many letters they have received from their districts calling attention to the pitiful situation that develops with respect to the disabled child, either physically disabled or mentally retarded, when that child reaches 18 years of age and the benefits under present law cease.

Of all the various proposals that have been suggested to the Congress by bills offered by members either of the Committee on Ways and Means or Members who are not on that committee, these three things have predominated in number. These three elements are the basis of this bill. The committee did extend some coverage to about 225,000 people, but do not lose track of the fact that this bill is before us today to do these three things primarily. I know of no more humane thing this Congress can do than make payments to those who are disabled at 50 years of age, to continue payments with respect to disabled children beyond their 18th birthday, and to make benefits available to women at age 62.

You have had some telegrams from certain people in opposition to this bill. Last year, as you have been told, we passed a bill which preserved the insurance rights of an individual when a determination is made by a State agency, usually the rehabilitation agency, that he is permanently and totally disabled within the definition of the law. That is existing law today. All we are saying in this bill in that connection is this: After the State rehabilitation agency has aided that individual and every effort has been made to rehabilitate him, and he reaches the age of 50 unrehabilitated and unemployed because of his disability, we are going to make a payment to him out of the social security trust fund into which he has paid. We are not going to make him wait until he attains age 65. He may not even be alive at that time. We are now proposing to pay him benefits at age 50 when he is disabled.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. To clarify a situation about which there is some doubt, will a woman of 62 have to retire when she reaches that age?

Mr. MILLS. A woman of 62 will not have to retire. The average retirement age for women as well as men at the present time is in excess of the retirement age prescribed in the social-security law. But they may retire if they want to at 62 years of age under the bill.

Now I want to discuss this question of the opposition to the disability benefit provision. There is no one who has greater regard or respect for our great medical profession than I have. Physicians deal with human misery to a greater extent than any of the rest of us. They should be and I am certain they are more cognizant of the problems of human suffering than any other group in the United States. Now they think that they find in these meritorious amendments to the social security law a ghost of socialized medicine or something else. We are not going to employ doctors at the Federal level to make this disability determination. Existing law provides for this determination to be made by the State rehabilitation or other State agencies. For the life of me, I think my good friends in the medical profession are seeing a ghost that is not there. It is imagination—a myth, perhaps. Knowing many of the members of the medical profession as I do, I am certain they would want this Congress to take care of these people who have contributed to the system and who are in the most dire economic circumstances. The only organized opposition to this amendment I know of comes from the physicians. Yet, they talked to us about hearings on this point. I call the attention of those who have spoken along that line that there has never been a study committee established for this purpose yet, that I know anything about, which has not made a report in favor of this provision. They want to go much further than we do. We are proposing disability benefits on a conservative basis.

The social-security system is a retirement system, and it is designed primarily to insure workers against the loss of earning power due to age and to protect their survivors in the event of the untimely death of the family provider.

Since the system in its retirement features is designed to protect workers against the loss of earning power due to age—which at present is age 65—this age to some extent gives recognition to the fact that there is a greater likelihood of disabilities later in a worker's life.

Our committee is proposing that disability insurance benefits be paid to workers aged 50 and who are demonstrably retired by reason of permanent and total disability, and who are otherwise qualified. This will close a serious gap in our social-security insurance system by providing benefits to these workers who are forced into premature retirement because of disability.

The subject of disability insurance benefits has been under active consideration for many years. The advisory council to the Senate Committee on Finance recommended a disability insurance program in 1948. In 1949, after extensive hearings and careful consideration, the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House a bill providing such benefits. This bill passed the House; however, the Senate version prevailed as the bill became law, with the disability benefits deleted.

The 1950 law did contain provisions for the establishment of a Federal-State program of aid to the needy permanently and totally disabled. This program has been in operation for 4½ years, and considerable experience has been gained under it. Also, as we know, for many years general assistance programs in the States have provided for the disabled.

The primary question now before us is the method of providing for the disabled. We are again recommending that eligible workers should be provided for through the method of contributory social insurance and not solely through the needs-test public assistance. Our committee report stated in 1949:

> The contributory system of old-age and survivors insurance, with benefits related to earnings and paid as a matter of right, should continue to be the basic method for preventing dependency. Insurance against wage loss due to permanent and total disability will round out the protection of the insurance system. The assistance program, with payments related to need, should continue to serve the function of filling the gaps left by the social-insurance program.

Disability insurance benefits will be paid to eligible workers as a matter of right, and they will not have to be virtually destitute before receiving benefits as they are under the assistance programs. In my opinion, there is just as great a need to protect the resources, the self-reliance, the dignity, and the self-respect of disabled workers as of any other group. As the Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance pointed out in 1948:

> The protection of the material and spiritual resources of the disabled worker is an important part of preserving his will to work and plays a positive role in his rehabilitation.

The disability insurance program proposed in the bill follows basically the disability "freeze" provision which was added to the law in the last Congress. The definition of disability is the same as under present law, except that there would be no presumed disability in the case of blindness. The administration of the program would be within the framework of the disability "freeze" provision—that is, the responsibility for determining who are the disabled would be made by State agencies. The disability insurance provision goes one step further than the "freeze" provision, and makes benefits payable to eligible workers upon their becoming permanently and totally disabled.

The disability insurance program is a conservative one. A worker must be aged 50, fully and currently insured, and must have 20 quarters of coverage in the 40-quarter period ending with his disablement in order to be eligible for benefits. The definition which is carried over from the "freeze" provision to the disability insurance provision is in itself very strict. A worker must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity, by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long continued and indefinite duration. A waiting period of 6 consecutive months is required before a worker would be eligible for disability insurance benefits. This period is sufficiently long to permit temporary conditions to clear up or to show definite signs of recovery.

The requirement that the disability can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration is more exacting than the disability provisions of commercial insurance policies now being issued, since these policies permit a total disability that has persisted for 6 months to be compensated for on the presumption that it is permanent until shown to be otherwise.

Another conservative feature of the program we are recommending is the fact that the benefits do not represent too large a replacement of previous earnings. For example, we are not recommending dependents' benefits. If another Federal disability benefit, or a State workmen's compensation benefit, is also payable to the disabled individual, the disability insurance benefit would be suspended if it is smaller than the other disability benefit; or, if larger, it would be reduced by the amount of the other benefit.

Under the bill, persons who become disabled in the future will receive disability benefits which represent on the average about 35 to 40 percent of their average monthly earnings. The conservativeness of the disability-insurance program is designed to prevent abuses which a more liberal program might be subject to.

In order to insure that there will be no barriers to vocational rehabilitation, the bill specifically provides that a worker who performs work while under a State rehabilitation program will not, solely by reason of this work, lose his benefit during the first 12 months while he is testing out a new earning capacity. On the other hand, the legislation contains as a special safeguard a provision which will stop the benefits of anyone who, without good cause, refuses rehabilitation.

There are some who argue that disability-insurance benefits, even though modest in amount, will prove detrimental to vocational rehabilitation. In my judgment, insecurity and fear of want are not the only, or even the most effective, motivations for rehabilitation. Americans strive also out of hope. The program which we are recommending will give the disabled hope, and also a chance to build their rehabilitation on a foundation, not of fear, but of confidence and self-respect.

The safeguards which I have referred to not only in and of themselves, in my opinion, will prevent abuses of the program, but also it is the intent of our committee, as set forth in our report, that "an individual who is able to engage in any substantial gainful activity will not be entitled to disability-insurance benefits even though he is, in fact, severely disabled." This means that we intend that the program be strictly and conservatively administered. To those who argue that all we need to do for the disabled is to rehabilitate them, I say that although I recognize that rehabilitation is to be desired in all cases, it cannot be a substitute for disability benefits.

Many persons, and particularly those aged 50 and over, cannot be vocationally rehabilitated, and even those persons who can be should receive benefits during rehabilitation. When it comes to rehabilitation there are certain practical problems involved. The question is not one solely of whether a job can be designed to fit the limitations of a person with a particular handicap of very serious proportions, but it is also one of whether such a job is in economic demand under the conditions and in the particular location so as to make it feasible to employ the disabled person involved. Another factor is that many disabilities are not sufficiently stabilized so that the individual can adjust to them and so that employment can be provided for him. Very common are the degenerative diseases that get progressively worse and may make people who have them poor employment prospects from the standpoint of investment in training. Other disabilities involve intermittent periods of intensified severity—such as greatly increased pain—so that they are, for all practical purposes, totally incapacitating. It is frequently impossible to locate economic demand for a job which has to be engineered for an individual whose condition permits him to do certain work, say, only 1 day out of a week.

Disability insurance benefits will provide protection for workers where there is now very little under any program, either public or private. A few employed groups have some protection through private pension plans. Employees disabled on the job may benefit from State workmen's compensation laws—but only about 5 percent of all permanent and total disability cases are work-connected. The coverage provided by private insurance is very limited in this area. Although a number of companies now sell monthly disability insurance they do so on a restricted basis, taking only people who are the least likely to become disabled. By and large, for the average worker, insurance protection against income loss due to disability is not, as a practical matter, available.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], in his additional views to the report on the pending bill, at pages 68 and 69, has pointed out the fact that, generally speaking, insurance companies do not provide protection of the kind which the bill proposes to provide. Of course, as I have pointed out, the insurance companies do not have the strict definition which this bill contains, and therefore there is a distinction.

With these facts in mind, our committee believes that it is particularly appropriate and indeed necessary, that the Congress should provide disability insurance protection under the social security insurance system.

PAYMENT OF MONTHLY BENEFITS TO WOMEN AT AGE 62

As the chairman stated, all women beneficiaries would be made eligible for benefits at age 62 rather than the present 65. In the case of wives of older workers, generally speaking, their age differential is 3 to 4 years younger than their husbands. The principle underlying wives benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system is that a married couple should not be compelled to get along on the same amount of benefit that is payable to a single retired individual. However, because of the age differential of 3 to 4 years between husbands and wives, it frequently occurs that retired couples receive only the husband's benefit during the early years of retirement.

With the age of eligibility for wives' benefits reduced to 62 about 400,000 wives would become immediately eligible for monthly benefits.

A particularly persuasive argument in favor of reducing the retirement age for women to 62 years relates to the problem of women who become widowed late in life. It is the usual experience that a woman who has attained middle age and is the widow of a deceased insured worker has had no recent experience in employment. For that reason the death of her husband has forced her to seek employment at a relatively advanced age without any particular qualifications for performing such work. By reducing the age for women to age 62 we have partially closed the gap that exists under present law between the age at which a woman may become, in fact, dependent upon old-age and survivors insurance benefits and the age at which she may become eligible to receive such benefits.

It is also frequently the case that a man who has retired and has begun to receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits upon attaining age 65 will have a wife who has not reached retirement age. In that case, the wife in the event of the death of the primary beneficiary, would under present law be left without any benefits until she reached age 65. This inadequacy of the present old-age and survivors insurance system would be remedied by the adoption of H. R. 7225.

By making benefits available to widows and dependent mothers of insured workers at age 65, we will have made benefits immediately available beginning January 1956 for approximately 175,000 survivors of insured workers. The reduction in the qualifying age for widows from 65 to 62 means the immediate addition of about $15 billion in survivor protection under the program for workers who are insured under the system.

CONTINUATION OF MONTHLY BENEFITS TO DISABLED CHILDREN, AGE 18 AND OVER

When a child is permanently and totally disabled he is as dependent on his family after age 18 as he was before. Similarly, the need for his family to provide care for the disabled child continues regardless of his age. For that reason, the committee has adopted an amendment to the social-security law which would continue old-age and survivors insurance benefits after the 18th birthday of his totally and permanently disabled child. H. R. 7225 would also make monthly benefits payable to the mother of a disabled child who reaches age 18 as long as the child is in her care. The surviving families of many insured workers that have disabled minor children have adjusted their entire pattern of living to reflect a monthly income they receive from the old-age and survivors insurance program. The attainment of age 18 by a dependent child who is totally disabled cannot result in any reduction in dependency by that child on his family. Therefore, the need for the continued payment of old-age and survivors insurance benefits in such cases is essential to the welfare of the families affected. To remedy this defect in the present social-security law, the Committee on Ways and Means adopted an amendment which would continue old-age and survivors insurance benefits with respect to children who are permanently and totally disabled and who have passed their 18th birthday. It is expected that in addition to making benefits available in such cases this legislation will also greatly improve the rehabilitation procedures and opportunities available in such cases.

COVERAGE PROVISIONS

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate for me to comment on the provisions of the bill that would extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage to self-employed lawyers. The Committee on Ways and Means gave careful consideration to this provision—as it did to all the provisions of the bill. The vast majority of the committee members had received convincing indications from the lawyers in their respective districts that the members of the legal profession did desire the coverage and the protection of the social-security system. It is true that many lawyers expressed a preference for voluntary coverage but if it could not be voluntary, then they desired it on a compulsory basis.

The committee members were impressed with the conclusion reached in 1949 that it would not be possible to maintain an actuarially sound system if coverage were made voluntary. Therefore, the committee, in keeping with the desires of the lawyers in their districts, voted to include lawyers in the old-age and survivors insurance system on a compulsory basis.

I believe that I can speak for the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in expressing appreciation to the many Members of the House who conducted polls among their lawyer groups and other professional groups and made the results of those polls available to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, for recognizing the work that I and other Members of Congress have performed in polling the lawyers, doctors, dentists, and veterinarians of our districts to determine their wishes. I also want to commend the Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], for the attention he has given me and others on the results of the polls we have taken. The action of the committee in reporting out this legislation shows that the Committee on Ways and Means is interested in what the professional people in the district really want. I am sorry that again the doctors are not included, but I understand that the American Medical Association claims the doctors of the country do not wish to be included. That is not the case in my district, as I will show later in my remarks. I want to further commend the committee for making provisions to provide payments to those who are permanently or totally disabled, even though they have not reached the age of 65 years. I and others talked to members of the House Committee on Ways and Means early in the session on the need for such provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee to liberalize the Social Security Act. I wish to compliment the committee for its action on the proposed amendments.

Before I comment further on my reasons for supporting the bill, I desire to point out that on June 14 I introduced two bills, H. R. 6811 and H. R. 6812. My bills—with a few exceptions—contain the same proposals as the recommendations contained in the committee bill to amend the Social Security Act.

My bill H. R. 6811 proposes to amend the Social Security Act to extend Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed physicians, lawyers, dentists, and veterinarians. The committee bill differs from mine in that it excludes self-employed physicians and it does not mention veterinarians by name. I presume that veterinarians are to be included under other professional people.

My second bill, H. R. 6812, reduces the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years. It also provides that any fully insured individual who becomes a totally and permanently disabled person shall be deemed to have reached the age of retirement. The committee bill is the same as mine on the retirement age of women. With respect to a fully insured person who becomes totally and permanently disabled the committee bill establishes the specific figure of 50 years at which the disabled person is eligible for retirement. At this time I have no quarrel with the committee's recommendation for I realize there must be a line of demarcation set up for eligibility.

I did not introduce my bills until after I had conducted a number of polls in my district. I have also received a substantial number of letters from my constituents interested in liberalizing the Social Security Act. The results of these polls have a direct bearing on my reasons for supporting the committee's bill. I should like to comment briefly on the results of my polls as evidence to support my reasons for voting for the committee's bill. I want to state at this time that my letters to all professions in no way gave any arguments for or against social security coverage for their professions, nor did we make any promises of voluntary coverage. Every ballot provided for either a vote against coverage, or for compulsory coverage.

The first group I polled in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin was the attorneys. This poll was started on January 27, 1955. A total of 194 ballots were sent out to attorneys in my district. I received 114 ballots from attorneys, which represents 59 percent of the ballots sent out. Ninety-two attorneys voted in the affirmative to bring members of the profession under social security. Sixteen attorneys voted "no," and six expressed no opinion or preferred a voluntary program. Thus, of the attorneys who expressed an opinion, 81 percent voted to come under the social security program.

My second poll was sent to 164 dentists in the district. A total of 95 dentists returned their ballots, or 58 percent of the ballots sent out. Sixty-six dentists voted "yes" to be included under social security. Twenty-eight dentists voted "no" and one expressed no opinion or favored a voluntary plan. This means that 69 percent of the dentists expressing an opinion voted "yes."

Incidentally I have a copy of a letter from the president of the Wisconsin State Dental Society, dated March 31, 1955, which summarizes the views of the Wisconsin organization on this matter. The statement, which is very short, is as follows:

> *To Whom It May Concern:*
>
> This is to advise that in the spring of 1954 a mail poll was taken of the entire membership of the Wisconsin State Dental Society relative to whether or not the dental profession should be included under OASI. The results of that poll were as follows: A total of 1,468 replies was received, approximately 71 percent of the membership at the time of the mailing. Those favoring inclusion of the dental profession in the OASI program numbered 956 and those who did not favor inclusion numbered 505. Seven of the replies were disqualified because the senders indicated neither "Yes" or "No."

This statement was signed and authorized by Mr. Melville W. Smith, president of the Wisconsin State Dental Society.

The third group I polled was the doctors. I note that the committee bill excludes self-employed physicians. I presume the committee's reasons for leaving out self-employed physicians in the bill is based on testimony received from the American Medical Association. At this point I wish to observe that apparently a substantial number of physicians in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin do not see eye to eye with their national organization on this question. At least that is what I gather from my poll. For this reason then I should like to announce the results of the physicians' poll for my district.

I sent out ballots to 176 doctors and received returns from 101 physicians, or 57 percent of the total polled. Sixty-four doctors voted "yes" and 31 voted "no." Six doctors expressed no opinion or preferred a voluntary system. As 63 percent of the doctors voting marked their ballots in the affirmative, I can only conclude that the majority of physicians in my district who have any views on the question are in favor of social-security coverage.

My fourth and last poll—which is incomplete—was taken among the veterinarians. A total of 72 ballots were sent out to this group. Twenty-six veterinarians voted in the affirmative and seven in the negative. On the basis of incomplete returns, I find that 76 percent of the veterinarians in my district are in favor of coming under social security.

It is on the results of these polls that I base my reasons for supporting the committee bill to include attorneys, dentists, and other professional people.

In closing I believe that the members of the committee have expressed very ably and very well the arguments for lowering the retirement age of women from 65 to 62 and for recommending the provision to deem as retired at the age of 50 years any fully insured individual who becomes totally and permanently disabled. All that I can say would be merely a repetition of what the members of the committee have said so much better.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means who have preceded me today have presented very able explanations of the provisions of the bill, H. R. 7225, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1955. They have carefully described the manner in which these amendments would liberalize our old-age and survivors insurance system. For that reason, I will not undertake to discuss the effect of the amendments other than to express my support of their enactment and to congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means for the outstanding work they have accomplished in presenting this meritorious legislation to the House.

I would like to discuss briefly with my colleagues in the House one very important aspect of the social security system. I refer to the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance program. I think it important that this matter be discussed in view of certain statements by the Secretary of the Treasury recently made before the Committee on Ways and Means to the effect that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund may be able to meet its current obligations but that it is questionable that the fund is sufficient to meet its full obligations if they are incurred. The Secretary of the Treasury made this statement despite the fact that he is the managing trustee of the board of trustees of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. On July 5, 1955, in the House I discussed this statement by the Secretary of the Treasury more fully than time will now permit me to do. My observations at that time appear on pages 9884 and 9945 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

In my remarks at that time I undertook to assure the American people that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund was, in fact, sound. I will go one step further and now assure the American people that with the enactment of H. R. 7225 the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund will be sounder from an actuarial standpoint than it was previous to the enactment of these important amendments.

Because of my interest in maintaining an actuarially sound social security system, I was more than somewhat interested by a statement contained in the supplemental views of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means which was printed on page 57 of the committee report accompanying this legislation. This expression of views is as follows:

> The Committee on Ways and Means is charged by law with responsibility for initiating all legislation affecting the social-security system, and, in a very real sense, therefore, the members of our committee are trustees of the public interest in this program. This trusteeship imposes upon us an obligation not only to current social-security beneficiaries but also to succeeding generations of beneficiaries.

That statement by the Republican Members of the Committee on Ways and Means prompted me to review the Republican record on social-security legislation. I would like to tell you a little bit about what I found on that Republican record. In the midthirties when a Democratic-controlled Congress was enacting for the first time social-security legislation, the Republican opposition predicted that such legislation would bring about the bankruptcy of our Federal Government. The Republican Party denounced the program as a cruel hoax on our aged citizens and predicted that it would enslave American labor. They also pronounced the system as actuarially unsound from its inception.

The Republican record also demonstrates that in the intervening years since the inception of the program that the Republican Members have repeatedly voted for retarding the prescribed increases in the tax contributions schedule. The Republican argument has always been that rates should be frozen so as to reduce pressures for liberalized and more realistic benefits.

This Republican effort to delay scheduled social-security tax increases has been the principal factor in preventing the Congress from providing a more equitable and more adequate old-age and survivors insurance program. The Republicans have consistently voted overwhelmingly in favor of freezing the social-security tax rate. In 1942 they voted 26–1 for a tax-rate freeze in the Senate. In the House in 1944 the Republican Members voted to adopt the freeze 165–6. Those statistics about the Republican position on the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund are but a few instances of a Republican record that is replete with evidence of Republican fiscal irresponsibility in connection with the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The President of the United States in his message to the Congress in May 1953 recommended that the social security tax rate be frozen at its then existing level—another instance of the Republican Party playing fast and loose with the interest of the American people in a soundly financed social-security program.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to reassure the American people that the social-security system is a sound system in which they may place their confidence. It is regrettable that irresponsible utterances and political maneuverings by the Republican Party have made such assurances necessary. It goes without saying that the actions of the Republican Party to emasculate the social-security program reveal the true Republican attitude toward old-age and survivors insurance protection. The Republican words on the subject remain merely words.

As the people must rely on and look to the Democratic Party for responsibility in all aspects of our national Government, so Mr. Speaker, the people must rely on the Democratic Party for improvements in our social-security system. We have promised the people improved social-security protection and today we are acting to deliver on that promise.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks the Members of the House of Representatives have been called upon to consider very important legislation under a closed rule commonly referred to as a gag rule because amendments are prohibited.

The bills which have been rushed to the floor of the House, in some instances without adequate hearings, are presented on the basis of "either take it—or leave it."

Only last week I voted reluctantly for a veterans bill on this basis and I intend to support H. R. 7225 on the same basis.

Mr. Speaker, since I came to Congress in 1939 I have advocated liberalization of the Social Security Act and have introduced many amendments, some of which have become law while others have been pending for several years before the House Ways and Means Committee. I am pleased that some of my amendments have been incorporated in H. R. 7225 now under consideration.

Frankly, it is encouraging to see the support being given to amendments that many of us have sponsored over a period of years.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the provisions of H. R. 7225 and especially those that continue benefits for retarded children after age 18 and which allow social-security benefits to disabled workers when they are over age 50 instead of having to wait until they reach 65 years of age. For several years I have had legislation pending in Congress to assist disabled workers and it is heartening that action is being taken to make them eligible for benefits.

I am also in favor of those provisions which lower the age from 65 to 62 of widows, wives, and women workers so that they may become eligible for social-security benefits. My bill would have reduced the age to 60 but the compromise age of 62 in H. R. 7225 is a step in the right direction.

Another provision in the pending legislation extends coverage to lawyers, dentists, and members of other professional groups except doctors. This provision is in accord with my bills to extend coverage to dentists and lawyers.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, all of these provisions liberalizing the Social Security Act cost money and for that reason I am supporting the revised payroll tax schedule that will increase employer-employee contributions to 2½ percent each beginning in 1959 and which will be further increased until 1975 when it will be 4½ percent on both the employer and employee.

This increase in payroll tax is necessary to pay for liberalized benefits and to keep the retirement fund in a solvent condition.

Mr. Speaker, I regret as I said before that the House Ways and Means Committee did not hold open hearings and that H. R. 7225 came to the floor under a closed rule prohibiting amendments.

If we had hearings and an open rule on the bill, I should have liked to have had full consideration of one of my bills H. R. 862 which prohibits any State from taking a lien on a person's home as a means of seeking reimbursement for moneys paid him in public-assistance benefits. In other words, in my congressional district better than 13 percent of the employables are unemployed because of depressed conditions in the coal, railroad, and related industries.

These unemployed Americans have exhausted their rights to unemployment insurance, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Mr. Speaker, before these people can obtain public assistance from the State of Pennsylvania they must give the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a lien on their homes. In my opinion this is too great a penalty to exact from American citizens who, through toil, taxes, and sacrifice, have helped build this Nation. For that reason, my bill H. R. 862 should have been incorporated in H. R. 7225 and thus prohibit any State from taking a lien on a person's home when he is forced to live on public-assistance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I am a firm believer that the eligibility age under the Social Security Act should be reduced to age 60. For several years I have had a bill pending in successive Congresses to reduce the age to 60 and I regret that a reduction in age for all recipients of social-security benefits is not included in H. R. 7225 which only reduces the age for women beneficiaries from 65 to 62 years. I respectfully urge that further consideration be given to liberalization of the Social Security Act so that a determined effort can be made to give favorable consideration to my proposal to reduce the age to 60 years for all beneficiaries including men and women.

In addition, we should not forget that the level of benefits under the Social Security Act has not kept pace with the increased cost of living. Therefore, every possible effort should be made to provide for an across-the-board increase in social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, step by step we are amending the Social Security Act which makes possible the prediction that the adequate security all Americans are entitled to in their declining years will become a reality within a relatively short period of time.

When the 2d session of the 84th Congress convenes I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule open hearings on social-security legislation so that the existing law may be further perfected in the overall effort to provide adequate security for all Americans.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words regarding the legislation before us today. This bill, which amends title II of the Social Security Act, goes a long way toward correcting certain inequities in the law which is currently in effect.

Social welfare legislation has taken a long time to become established in our country. Gradually, however, there has come the realization of the Government's duty to care for its people, particularly for those who are sick, elderly, and unemployable. The need for an adequate social security program, embracing all classes and all types of occupations, has been felt for a long time. It was not until last year that positive action along these lines was taken, when the Social Security Act of 1936 was amended to include farmers, clergymen, and many State and municipal employees.

Again, we are considering legislative steps to extend and liberalize the coverage of this act. The bill currently before the House includes all professional people except doctors. This is a long stride forward and there has been much criticism of it, both favorable and unfavorable. It is my belief that the benefits to be gained by this legislation far outweigh the disadvantages.

One of the most important features of the bill is the provision for monthly benefits to disabled workers who have reached the age of 50. At the present time it is believed that approximately 250,000 people will be eligible to receive such payments. This action is long overdue and will be greeted with heartfelt thanks by many, many people throughout the Nation.

I am very pleased to note, also, that under this legislation the eligibility age for women to receive benefits has been lowered to 62. This includes not only employed women but also the wives, widows, and dependent mothers of insured workers. Furthermore, totally and permanently disabled children who become so disabled before the age of 18 will continue to receive benefits after that age.

Surely, the small increase in contributions, to be divided equally by the employer and the employee, will not be resented by the insured. The benefits to be gained under the more liberal program will more than make up for the slightly higher cost to the individual.

I am pleased to vote in favor of this legislation and look for its enactment into law in the very near future.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to adopt this motion to suspend the rules of the House, with the result that debate on both sides will be limited to 40 minutes and no Member will be permitted to offer any amendment to the bill. It we suspend the rules, we will have to accept or reject the committee's idea of what amendments there should be to the social security law. We will be substituting the judgment and political views of a few Members of Congress for the 435 elected Representatives of the people. This is a great deal to ask of the House in view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee did not hold any hearings on this bill and there are admittedly serious questions about some of its provisions and consequences.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important bill. It will have a serious effect upon the social security system and the millions of people who depend upon that system for security in old age. If there was ever a bill to be considered care? fully and deliberately by a committee and by Congress, this is the bill. It should be presented to this House under an open rule, which would permit adequate discussion and full opportunity for amendments. The Congress has been in session since January. We have killed 50 percent of that time. In order to permit Members who live nearby to spend the weekends at home, we have actually worked only from Tuesday to Thursday. What possible excuse can there be to spend 40 minutes to consider a bill which will cost untold billions and affect so many Americans?

I realize that many Members hesitate to vote against this motion for fear it will be construed as a vote against some of the meritorious provisions of the bill.

I know that it would be easier to go along with the vast majority of Members and vote "Aye." This would be the course of least resistance. However, Mr. Speaker, I conceive it to be my duty as a Representative of the people of Texas to protest against this shocking travesty upon democratic processes. The only way I can register my opposition to the way in which this bill is being considered is to vote "no." If I vote "yes," it will be an endorsement and approval of the undemocratic procedure by which this important measure is considered in the House.

I realize, of course, that there are justifiable instances when bills can be considered under the suspension of the rules. In my opinion, this is not such a bill because of its far-reaching consequences to the American people.

Some of the Members justify their affirmative vote on the ground that when the bill goes to the Senate it will be adequately considered. It is true that the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate has promised extended hearings and an opportunity for all interested people to be heard. I am sure that this will happen, and that the bill will be improved or at least justified by hearings when it comes back to the House. We will then have an opportunity to consider this measure again, when there will be available to us competent testimony and reliable facts to enable us to pass upon the bill intelligently. A negative vote today does not mean that we oppose the meritorious provisions of this bill or that we will vote against it after it comes back from the Senate where we are assured it will be fully considered.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the benefits to be derived from this bill are unquestioned, insofar as they affect the disabled workers, disabled children, and as they reduce the age requirements for eligibility for women. And for the most part the extension of coverage to classifications of people not now covered is a good thing. For these beneficial reasons, I will support this measure as will most of my colleagues.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it doubly clear that there is much in the background and history of this present bill that is so characteristic of legislation by means of political and irresponsible expediency. Why were no public hearings permitted by the Democratic leadership of the Ways and Means Committee? The greatest safeguard our American system of government has is the opportunity for public hearings and the careful study of the full consequence of legislative proposals.

When important legislation comes before the Congress where free and open debate might clarify issues, and if errors exist, opportunity might be had for corrective amendment, why has this bill been brought up under suspension of rules where no amendment can be offered and where the total debate was limited to 40 minutes?

This is not cost-free legislation. It is beneficial, to be sure, but it is not free. These benefits will cost about $2 billion a year. Not $2 billion for 1 year, but $2 billion or more per year each year to the end of time and the $2 billion will be paid, not by the wealthy and privileged, but by the working people at the rate of about $20 each per year.

So, we vote for the benefit. But at the same time the Democratic leadership has determined that we must vote a tax of $2 billion without having an opportunity to learn through public hearings if $2 billion is enough or too much. Having entered upon the new legislative venture and finding the revenue is not enough, we may later be compelled to vote for additional funds. If, on the other hand, public hearings and debate had been permitted and disclosed that the cost would be greater, we might have determined, and those people who will pay the tax might have insisted, that the necessary tax is too great and the benefits not worth the cost.

I believe in the general philosophy and aims of the bill. But, Mr. Speaker, we are about to pass this legislation, ostrich fashion, with our heads in the sand. We are about to shirk our legislative responsibility of discovering the true facts and actual needs of our people through open and public hearings and free debate and opportunity for amendment. We will then send this bill to the Senate where hearings will be conducted and the measure studied and rewritten in conformity with facts about which the members of this House are unaware and, if we may judge from the attitude of the Democratic leadership here today, unconcerned. This is a shameful travesty on legislative processes. The manner in which this whole matter has been handled indicates to me a disinterest in the needs of our people and a cynical and clumsy attempt at political opportunism. We have indeed done a disservice to the principles of legislative accountability and responsibility to this country.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will support H. R. 7225 because I believe these proposed amendments to the Social Security Act are steps in the right direction toward a greater degree of economic security for our senior citizens.

Later this afternoon I intend to discuss the financial problems of the aged at greater length, under a special order which I have obtained.

I would have preferred to have seen the committee report amendments which would have reduced the retirement age to 62 for men and to age 60 for women, as provided for in my bill, H. R. 45.

Reduction of the age at which disability benefits may be received from 65 to 50 is a decided improvement on existing law. Again, however, it seems to me that this provision does not go far enough. The need for assistance is greatest for an individual and his family when the disability occurs. My bill, H. R. 700, would provide immediate disability payments for covered workers cut off from their jobs and income.

The provision which continues benefits for disabled children after 18 years of age is a humanitarian and much-needed amendment which should provoke little opposition.

The broadening of the coverage to include most professional groups is also a big step forward.

I am therefore hopeful that this bill may be promptly passed in this body and that the Senate may see fit to act on it during the remaining days of this session, so that the significant improvements can take effect as soon as possible.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7225 is one of the most important bills to come before Congress this session. It contains many desirable provisions and many of its objectives are most deserving of support.

I regret that the Ways and Means Committee did not see fit to conduct public hearings on this legislation and give an opportunity for certain of those affected herein to present their testimony for deliberation by the committee.

As is the case with many bills that come before this body, it contains many good features and some which, in my opinion, are not desirable. I would like to direct the House's attention to that part of the bill which extends the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance by bringing in certain self-employed professional people. Included in this coverage are lawyers.

There has been strong opposition to this provision in my State, and I would like to include herein a telegram received by me from Mr. William K. Woodburn, who is president of the Nevada State Bar Association:

> JULY 8, 1955.
>
> The State bar of Nevada is opposed to compulsory coverage under social security but favors voluntary coverage. We urge you to oppose compulsory coverage bill coming before the House next week.
>
> Kind personal regards.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> WM. K. WOODBURN,
> *President, State Bar of Nevada.*

It is my intention to vote for this measure, but I hope that when it gets to the other body there will be an opportunity for a more thorough consideration of the various features contained than has been possible here.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass this bill today. The provisions of the social-security law that H. R. 7225 seek to amend are not new problems. They are not matters which need further study to determine their merit. I am sure that most Members of this House have had considerable correspondence from their constituents asking for the relief that this bill grants. I am pleased to see that H. R. 7225 incorporates the provisions of H. R. 6783, a resolution filed by me. None can quarrel with these recommendations contained in this bill—at least none who believe in the system of social security that is now the law of the land. Of course, there are those who believe that the Government has no responsibility in this field and legislation of this kind is anathema to them. Fortunately, that kind of thinking is in the minority. Opposition to suspending the rules stems from the assertion that no public hearings have been held on this matter. Mr. Speaker, this matter has had considerable study by both branches of the Congress. Further delay in enacting these recommendations is not justified. Nothing new can be learned from long and protracted hearings. The effects that this legislation would produce are needed now.

Although I would desire to see the age eligibility reduced to 60 for women, I accept the committee recommendation of 62. I commend the committee for its recommendation calling for a continuation of monthly benefits for the retarded child—mentally or physically—after he reaches age 18. Relative to other recommendations, a spot check of the professional self-employed in my district clearly showed a desire on the part of the dentists and the lawyers to be included in the social-security program.

The other features of the bill as explained by the committee members deserve the support of this House. I trust that these recommendations amending the social-security law will be overwhelmingly adopted this afternoon.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the equal-rights amendment, House Joint Resolution 82, I, of course, cannot understand or approve the provision in this bill making a 3-year differential in the retirement age between men and women.

There is absolutely no valid excuse for a woman to retire at age 62 and a man at 65. All figures, as a matter of fact—and they must have been available to the committee—show that the life expectancy of women is about 5 years longer than that of men and that their physical strength is probably considerably greater. Their mental attributes are the same.

It may be that 62 should be the retirement age for women; if so, it should be the retirement age for men.

It is to be hoped that the other body will strike out this unfair and absurd provision, which must have been put in for rather obvious, and not very meritorious, political reasons.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the entire credit for the fact that the social-security law was enacted some years ago is due to the vision, courage, and leadership of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and of the Democratic Party. At that time, the great majority of the Republican Members of the Congress tried to defeat its effectiveness through damaging amendments. The bill, when originally considered in both branches of the Congress, received the bitter opposition of big business and was characterized by every sinister name possible, the least of which was socialism. The purpose of such attack was to try and turn the very people against the bill whom it would benefit. That is always the weapon of the blind opponent and the reactionary.

Some 20 years have passed and we now find the leader of the Republican Party, President Eisenhower, accepting and embracing this humanitarian law, as well as most of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. We even read and hear of Republicans stating that our country will never have another depression due to the cushions that exist in our laws, the most prominent of which is the social-security law, which includes unemployment compensation, earned annuities, and old-age assistance, as well as assistance to the sick and the blind. I might also say that the cushions that exist in the law that will stop another depression from occurring, were all put upon the statute books by the Democratic Party.

As the result of Democratic leadership, this great piece of legislation—known as the social-security law—exists on our statute books bringing benefits and a feeling of security to millions of our people. During the years it has been law, it has brought many billions of dollars of benefits to those covered by and included in this law.

The bill today is another evidence of the progressive leadership of the Democratic Party, which always has the interest of the people as a whole in mind.

In supporting this bill, I am happy to note that among its provisions is the continuation of benefits to disabled children after reaching the age of 18 years, who are disabled before they reach that age.

Enactment of those provisions into law will enable such children to receive benefits after they are 18 years old.

My interest in such children is best evidenced by the fact that on March 28, 1955, I introduced H. R. 5254, which is a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are incapable of self-support by reason of physical or mental disability.

The passage of the pending bill is another step of progress under the leadership of the Democratic Party.

UNWORKABLE PROVISIONS OF PRESENT LAW

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have been given an apportunity, in this session of the Congress, to make some of the much-needed changes in the Social Security Act that are included in H. R. 7225, but I cannot fail to express my intense disappointment in the failure of the committee to include amendments that would clarify the present unworkable provisions of the act relating to agricultural workers who are hired by the day during peak-work seasons.

The application of the Social Security Act to these transient workers has created an untenable situation for everyone. The workers themselves, who come and go, appearing one day and not appearing the next, are disinclined to have the tax taken from their wages at the end of each day. The recordkeeping that is imposed upon the farmers is an intolerable burden in the face of the fluctuation in the numbers and identities of these transient workers who are hired for such brief periods. The very nature of the employment makes the law virtually unenforceable and thus imposes burdensome and useless administrative processes upon the Government agencies concerned.

If the benefits to be derived by the workers from this coverage were in even a small way comparable to what is involved in the application of the tax, it would perhaps be a desirable part of the law, but it has been shown that they are not.

No effort to correct this deplorable situation is made in H. R. 7225, despite the fact that substantial agricultural groups all over the country have expressed themselves forcefully on the matter. I hope that prompt action will be taken, either by the Senate in this session or by the committee and the House in the coming session, to correct this unwise and hastily enacted provision of the act which does infinitely more to hamper the social security program than to enhance it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely unfortunate that consideration of the amendments to the Social Security Act should have been delayed until so late in the session.

These changes are so important and effect the lives of so many of our people that they should not be passed without public hearings and without adequate debate on the floor of the House.

There is, I am sure, little opposition to the inclusion of dentists and lawyers, nor the reduction of the retirement age for women to 62; but all of the new changes effecting disability benefits should have full and complete debate, and we should know whether the increased taxes are adequate to cover the additional benefits.

I have received the following telegram from my district, and I think the position taken by the doctors is more than justified:

> We deplore the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in voting on Democratic plans for new social-security cash disability benefits without public hearing. We want to register strong protest against this undemocratic procedure and ask that you express our disapproval to members of the committee. Action taken in closed and secret meeting leads us to believe that this subject cannot stand the light of public exposure. Would sincerely appreciate your help in correcting this situation.
>
> Ernest H. Sultan, M. D.; Neil K. White, M. D.; Edward W. Doherty, M. D.; Frederic P. Shidler, M. D.; Stanford B. Rossiter, M. D.; Anthony J. Thompson, M. D.; William J. Brown, M. D.; Joseph E. Welsh, M. D.; Erling W. Fredell, M. D.; Edward Havard, M. D.; Sheldon C. Woodward, M. D.; Arvin T. Henderson, M. D.; Peter S. Talbot, M. D.; Frank J. Novak, M. D.

These amendments are presented under suspension of the rules, so that the only way we can get the amendments which seem to be desirable is to accept those features about which we have grave doubts.

I certainly want to go on record as opposed to this method of legislating.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, all of whom are exceptionally busy Members of Congress, for taking the time this year to consider and report out further improvements in the social-security law. This bespeaks a very humanitarian outlook, for the social-security law is becoming more important each day to an increasingly larger portion of our population.

I am most impressed by the provision of H. R. 7225 which establishes for the first time the principle of disability insurance benefits. As you will recall, that is one of the things we tried to write into the law last year when the comprehensive amendments to the social-security program were enacted. This new provision applies to covered workers who have reached 50 years of age. At present they have to wait until age 65 to collect social security benefits, even though they are completely and permanently disabled. By lowering that age to 50 we add a quarter of a million workers to the benefit lists, and I would say that they were among the most meritorious of all people on social security.

LOWERING RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

I am supporting the provision of the bill which would lower to 62 from 65 the age when women covered under the social-security law, including women workers, widows eligible for survivorship benefits, and wives of retired beneficiaries, could begin to collect benefits. I would like to see the age for widows reduced to 60, as we did under the Railroad Retirement Act. A woman who is widowed, say, at the age of 60 and has never earned her living finds it almost impossible to earn money at that age if she is entering the working force for the first time.

I will have to admit that I do have some misgivings about the provision which reduces to 62 the age at which women workers can retire and collect benefits. My misgivings are based entirely on this one fear: That 62 might become a new compulsory retirement age for women workers—compulsory in the sense that employers would require women workers to retire upon becoming eligible for social security. We know that is happening now to many women at age 65—they are forced out of their jobs and into retirement regardless of their wishes in the matter.

Social security is a wonderful wonderful thing for the retired worker, but we do not want to see our senior citizens forced prematurely into retirement when they are perfectly capable and very willing to keep on working at productive employment and earning a whole lot more than they would receive under social security. So I hope there will be no deterioration of that situation under this provision to lower the retirement age for women from 65 to 62. I think we should keep our eye on that problem if this amendment is enacted.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill, not because it goes far enough in humanizing our social-security system, but because it represents a step in the right direction.

Since 1945, as a member of the New York State Senate and now as a member of this Congress, I have fought for legislation which would not only improve but liberalize our social-security system in many details.

I have, for the past 3 years, urged the 83d and 84th Congresses to lower the retirement age for social security benefits to 60 years for men and 55 years for women, instead of the present limitation which uses age 65 for both.

Ever since my first term in Congress I have sponsored legislation to provide benefits to wage earners who become totally and permanently disabled before age 65.

I have also brought to the attention of the Members of this House the fact that the present law is not broad enough in that it does not include brothers and sisters and other dependents of the wage earner under the protection and benefits of this act.

I have urged this Congress and the past Congress to eliminate the work clause for persons aged 65 and over; I sponsored measures to extend coverage to professional people.

Why have I proposed these liberal changes? Only because I have been convinced that these improvements in our social-security law are in line with the economic realities of our times.

While we did extend coverage to 10 million more persons, and while we did liberalize many features of the act, we have failed to go far enough so that the American worker can really enjoy the benefits of an old-age plan.

This bill proposes to cut the retirement age for women from 65 to 62. By the action of the Ways and Means Committee in lowering this age, we can safely say that the members of the committee were finally convinced that age 65 is an obsolete, outmoded eligibility age. But is age 62 a more realistic age? Of course not. And why lower the retirement age for women alone—why not men? Why cannot we bring our social-security system in line with the standards of other modern retirement plans. For example, the United Mine Workers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., General Motors, and DuPont, all set their retirement age at 60. Eastman Kodak Co. has an optional retirement age of 55 for all employees. In my own State of New York, as in several other States, the retirement age for State employees is age 60.

Are we not convinced that the facts of our time, as well as the best interests of the people of our country, call for the same consideration for all wage earners?

I have always felt that the retirement age for women should be 55 because we know that the opportunities for women widowed at age 55 or over to find jobs are extremely limited. Census figures show that most women employed in the age group 55 to 65 are working in retail trade or personal services which are among the lowest paid. Bear in mind that, under our present system, we say to a woman who is widowed or unable to work at age 55 that she must wait—yes, even under this bill she must wait 7 more years before she can receive the benefits she so desperately needs immediately. Are we providing adequate retirement security for the millions of women who have been prematurely retired from the labor force because of illness, job-displacement or mechanization of our industrial plants?

The facts of our time and considerations of humanity call for a revision of that age downward, not to 62 years, but down to 55 for women and 60 for men. In lowering the retirement age to a more realistic age, we will be creating new job opportunities for younger workers, decreasing the hardship of unemployment for older workers and modernizing our social-security system in a very important way.

I shall vote for this bill, not because I am satisfied with the new age requirement, but because it recognizes the fact that the retirement age of 65 is old fashioned and our social-security system needs remodeling. I shall vote for this measure because it recognizes the problem that exists and we are making an effort to solve it.

I wish to commend the committee for embodying in this bill a provision to help those wage earners who become permanently and totally disabled. The only objection I have is the age limitation imposed. There should be no age requirement. The bill I have introduced for the past 3 years provides for payment of benefits at the time of disability. Is it fair to tell a wage earner, disabled from work, to wait until he is 65 or even 50 under this bill, before he becomes entitled to benefits? The workman who suffers a permanent and total disability at age 40 is just as anxious and willing to work, except for his disability, as an able-bodied man. What is he to do between ages 40 and 50? Go on relief? Remember a crippling illness or injury does not wait until a 65th birthday—or a 50th birthday. It can strike any one of us at any time. When a wage earner becomes disabled, he and his family face a bleak future because not only do his earnings stop, but the expenses of the family become greatly increased due to the costs of his medical care.

Let us remember that this proposed amendment of the Social Security Act is not anything new or untried. Most existing public retirement plans provide disability benefits at the time of disability. Such protection is provided in the civil-service retirement system, the railroad retirement system, and in plans for employees of State and local governments.

I am willing to accept a half a loaf of bread and support this amendment, but I say to you that the only way to correct the inequity in the system is to make payments payable at the time of disability—regardless of age. In doing so, we will substantially improve the protection provided by our social-security system and meet a great need at times of tragedy in millions of American homes.

On October 20, 1952, in a speech at Norwalk, Conn., President Eisenhower said:

> We are going to extend and improve our social-security laws.

Well, now is the time to do it. While this bill describes a new 1955 model of social security which is admirable in most respects, it still uses the old 1935 model starter. If we are to improve and extend our law, let us go all the way now.

CONTINUAL MODERNIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to the fundamental soundness of the social-security program that a bill carrying out such far-reaching changes in the program as this one does, could be scheduled for House debate under the parliamentary procedure in effect here today. Under the suspension-of-the-rules procedure we are following in order to assure speedy action on this measure, a two-thirds vote of the membership is required. Thus a minority of one-third of the House plus a single additional Member, could block the bill.

Obviously, it would not be brought up before us in this manner if it appeared to be controversial enough to arouse much opposition. So, obviously, this bill will have virtually unanimous support; otherwise, as I said, it would not be brought up subject to what amounts to a minority vote.

It is remarkable, I think, that we can have such complete accord on the proposals of the bill this year when we had such a bitter fight last year over some of the very same provisions. The addition of new groups in the professional categories, to coverage under the act—lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, and optometrists, for example—could just have well been done last year, I would think, except that we had had some rumblings to indicate that perhaps they did not want coverage. Since then we have received much mail from rank-and-file members of these professional groups asking to be brought in under the act.

NEW DISABILITY BENEFITS

Further indication of the strides we have experienced in public and congressional thinking in regard to social security is the proposal in this bill to begin paying benefits to the totally and permanently disabled worker prior to his actually reaching 65. This bill reduces the minimum age for benefits for the totally permanently disabled worker to 50, providing he has 1½ years of coverage in the 3-year period ending with the disability plus 5 years of coverage in the 10-year period ending with the disability. It is estimated this will bring in immediately about 250,000 beneficiaries during the first year—disabled workers between 50 and 65, who would collect about $200 million a year in benefits.

We tried last year, as the Members will recall, to enact an amendment to pay benefits to the disabled, rather than make them wait until 65, but that was voted down on virtually straight party lines in the Ways and Means Committee. It is a very great step forward to extend benefits to the disabled; it should serve, also, as a stimulant to better private insurance coverage on disability benefits, because with social security the cost of such additional private insurance would be within reach of more people.

NEW RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

This bill today takes another almost revolutionary step in reducing for the first time the age at which women can become eligible for social-security benefits. It is the first time since the enactment of the original social-security law that a feminine worker, or widow, or wife of a retired beneficiary could be qualified to collect benefits before reaching 65. Many groups have been calling for a reduction in the minimum age for women to 60. This bill carries a compromise figure of 62.

This provision, and others in the new bill we are considering today, are in line with a conviction I have held for many years that we must continually restudy the social-security law in the light of current developments, so as to keep it continually abreast of economic conditions and of the needs of the people generally.

A great social advance like social security must continually be revised and improved, or it loses its meaning and its effectiveness. The fact that many worthwhile improvements were made last year is no reason not to improve the law again this year. It is a case only of determining what is best for the social-security system's own soundness as well as what is best for the people covered by it.

TRAGIC SITUATIONS CAN BE RELIEVED

Personally, I think the disability improvement is one of the greatest steps forward since the original act was passed. For this deals with one of the most tragic situations in our society—when the breadwinner is disabled and cannot work. Retraining through vocational rehabilitation is a fine thing, and an excellent program, but many disabled persons are unable to participate because of the nature of their illness or disability, and for them there has been no place to turn except to public assistance until they reach 65. Now, under this bill, there will be a rebirth of hope for the disabled and self-respecting, self-earned, insurance-type source of income through social security for these people, beginning at age 50.

Since disability is no respecter of ages, I should like to see that age requirement steadily lowered, in the process of continually improving this great law.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the social-security bill which we are considering today is a step in the right direction. In lowering the retirement age for women to age 62 it recognizes the special problems created for so many Americans because of an arbitrarily shortened working life. As you know I believe we should take a longer step forward in this regard, as proposed in my bill, H. R. 6898, which would lower the retirement age for all women to age 60 and provide for disability benefits at any age. It is a striking fact of our times that we have shortened the workday and the workweek during a period of unparalleled productiveness, but we have made no change in the arbitrary retirement age of 65 which was set 20 years ago when the Social Security Act was first passed. And a worker forced to retire from his job prematurely because of crippling illness or accident must wait until he is 65 before he receives any benefits.

I wish that this bill included a provision which, as proposed in my bill, H. R. 27, would remove entirely the so-called retirement wage test. For I have never been able to understand the justification for this provision which penalizes people for working by cutting off their social-security benefits if those earnings exceed a given amount. And I have never understood what is right about allowing persons with unearned income to continue to receive benefits regardless of the amount of their income while cutting off benefits for those less fortunate people who must work to supplement their social security income.

But I am glad to support these amendments because they will add important protections to our social-security system. For in providing disability benefits for those older workers who are the victims of a crippling illness or injury prior to their 65th birthday we will be recognizing that such a disability is a form of enforced and premature retirement from the labor force which requires retirement benefits. In lowering the retirement age for women to age 62 we will be taking a first step toward bringing the system up to date with respect to the retirement age. In providing for the continuation of children's benefits beyond age 18 in the case of severely handicapped children—also contained in my bill H. R. 6898—we will be incorporating a humane measure now used in other Federal retirement systems and in veterans programs. And we will be rounding out the coverage of the social-security system so that, in the future, practically all Americans can look forward to its protection as a matter of right, on the basis of the contributions they have made to the system during their working years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. R. 7225 and add a few remarks of my own regarding this bill which contains much-needed amendments to the Federal Social Security Act.

This measure will afford some relief to the workers disabled at age 50, disabled children over 18, and women too young to get a pension and too old to get a job. They could apply at age 62.

Those who oppose giving the people of this country further social-security benefits have protested that the Committee on Ways and Means should have held public hearings so that their protests could have been registered. It is my candid opinion that such a hearing would have been a farce.

Congress and the Senate, in the past 10 years, have spent several hundreds of thousands of dollars appointing advisory councils, conducting investigations, and holding public hearings regarding social security and the broadening of the Social Security Act.

Even the President, a few years ago, held a nationwide conference on the country's aging population, seeking a solution to this problem. Many governors and legislatures of the various States have made similar research.

I would venture to say that if you put these findings and documents together it would fill one wing of the Capitol, or at least a large, comfortable-sized room.

The supplemental views as expressed in a minority report by some Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in the report on H. R. 7225, if followed, would require another 10 or 20 years of investigation alone on these few objectives sought by this most worthy bill, H. R. 7225.

The time has come when the American people are sick and tired of being stalled again and again where their social welfare and well-being are concerned—they want action and they want action now.

In the Committee on Ways and Means report, they point up very clearly that these amendments that they now recommend were not arrived at by a quick decision, but had been previously well-reviewed—deeply considered, and recommended by the Advisory Council appointed by the Senate in the 80th Congress.

The professional people that H. R. 7225 seeks to embrace under social-security coverage receive a small measure of security in their old age that they do not have, but need now.

What right-thinking person can argue against extending coverage to disabled children over 18 whose deceased parent has helped to pay for such coverage, or workers disabled at age 50?

Understanding the problem that women over 35 years of age have today, in seeking employment, how can anyone deny them old-age or survivors benefits at age 62? Any thought that women of this age would rather live on the benefits than seek employment is dispelled when you learn that the miserable average benefits paid today to those 65 years of age and over is only $59.14, and the spouse of a beneficiary receives only half of that amount.

It has been my hope and the prayer of millions of needy Americans that Congress would take some action this year in completely overhauling the public-assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act for the purpose of increasing the payments and easing the harsh mean steps that the aged and underprivileged who are applicants and recipients of aid under this act are subjected to.

I am sure that some 92 Members of the House, representing both parties, who have introduced social security and social welfare legislation at this session, feel as I do that some action should have been taken on their bills this year.

The Committee on Ways and Means in reporting H. R. 7225 has, I am happy to note, included many of the features of my bill, H. R. 5352. Therefore, I am not only happy to vote for H. R. 7225 in the House, but I hope it will be speedily considered and passed upon by the other body as well. I shall continue to work for a vastly improved social security system and especially its old-age assistance section.

ASSISTANCE FOR FAMILIES WITH DISABLED CHILDREN

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that H. R. 7225 contains an amendment to continue social-security benefits for disabled children beyond age 18, an amendment which is very similar to H. R. 2205 which I introduced earlier in this session. It is a desirable measure, and one which merits the support of each of us.

This amendment will help to correct an inequity that has long existed in the social security program. We are all well aware of the importance of ensuring that widows with children are provided with the means for caring for those children. By strengthening the family, we strengthen the Nation. However, the social-security system, while providing for this much-needed assistance to widows with children below age 18, has not provided for those instances where the dependency of the child continues after the age when he would normally be expected to achieve economic self-sufficiency. Mentally or physically disabled children are cut off from social security benefits regardless of their condition, as are their mothers when the children reach age 18. For the great majority, this is as it should be, but where disabled children are involved it is often a tragedy. The widow must then rely on public assistance or upon whatever meager assistance friends and family may be able to provide. Too often this results in the child's being separated from the mother, and institutionalized at public expense. Whichever alternative occurs, the keystone of our social structure—the family—is weakened, and the Nation suffers.

WEAK SPOT ELIMINATED

With the enactment of this amendment, this weak spot in the Social Security Act will be repaired. It is estimated that eventually more than 5,000 families will be helped by this provision. It is not only those who directly receive the assistance who will benefit, however. Many thousands of additional families whose wage earners are living and able to provide for them will gain a sense of security in the knowledge that the social-security taxes they pay will provide for their disabled children in the event death takes them. Welfare and institutional costs will drop, compensating to a large extent for the small increased cost to the social-security fund.

I mention the cost of the amendment because this is one of those rare instances where much good can be accomplished at extremely low cost. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the level premium cost of my bill, which is very similar to this amendment, would amount to much less than one-tenth of 1 percent of payroll. In terms of dollars and cents, the immediate cost would be about $2 million, and after many years of operation would rise to perhaps $5 million. If you compare this with the overall expenditures cf the social security program, nearly $6 billion annually—a figure which will be doubled or tripled by the time the cost of this amendment reaches its $5 million maximum level—it is easily evident that the dollar cost of these benefits is negligible.

Similar provisions are contained in almost every other major retirement and insurance plan of the Federal Government. It is only just that the social security system should provide the same security for the families of wage earners covered by the Social Security Act. The ease with which the amendment can be administered is time-tested and proven.

UNDESIRABLE RESTRICTION

There is a stipulation in the amendment in H. R. 7225, however, that was not contained in the legislation I introduced, and that I believe is neither necessary nor desirable. I refer to the provision which restricts the benefits only to those children who attain age 18 after 1953. This restriction would exclude a large number of disabled children and their widowed mothers who are no less needy or deserving than those made eligible by the amendment as contained in the bill. In view of the ease of administration that can be expected, and the extremely low cost of the amendment, there is no reason for restricting it in such a manner, and I hope that this stipulation will be eliminated from the amendment enacted by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the bill before us today because it incorporates improvements in our social security system which I have advocated for many years. This legislation, if enacted into law, would solve the special hardship existing in millions of homes today in that it will assure security at an earlier age instead of postponing it until the 65th birthday. It will be most beneficial to those citizens who are forcibly retired from their jobs in their fifties because of a disabling illness or injury.

During the past 50 years we have changed from a predominantly agricultural country to a Nation of wage earners. Therefore, we must recognize the new problems which have been created for older workers and enact into law legislation that will provide for them and carry them through the twilight years.

Recognizing the responsibility of the Federal Government to its own employees for facing up to these modern conditions, I have introduced legislation that would lower the retirement age for women to 55, which would bring our Federal retirement system into line with the standards of other modern retirement plans being utilized by private industry.

Because of my concern with these problems, I am happy to support the proposed amendment to our Social Security Act which would lower the retirement age for women to age 62. This is a step in the right direction for it means that at least 800,000 women would be entitled to benefits immediately instead of being forced to subsist somehow until they attain their 65th birthday.

These elderly women, previously married and for the most part supported by their husbands, are now forced to find an independent source of income and to adjust not only to the problems of old age and inadequate income, but to the problems of widowhood as well. We know that the opportunities for women widowed at that age to find jobs are extremely limited. Usually they cannot find work, and even if they are able to find a job, they receive only marginal wages because their time and their skills have been devoted to the vital business of raising a family.

Moreover, an age differential for men and women is a recognition of family needs. For, under our present system, no wife's benefits are payable until the wife of a retired worker reaches age 65. Yet the figures tell us that more than half of such workers have a wife who is 5 or less years younger than her husband. And we know that the single retirement benefit the husband receives until his wife reaches age 65 is not enough, even with other family resources, to maintain the family. By reducing the age requirement for a wife's benefit to age 62 we will be helping to bring the retirement income of thousands of American families up to a reasonable amount.

The provision in the bill for paying benefits to those workers aged 50 and over who have the misfortune of losing their jobs because of a severe illness or injury which makes it impossible for them to work is another important adjustment to modern conditions. Here, again, the figures tell us the reason why this legislation is vital. For they show that the risk of such long-term or total disability increases with age. In the current population survey made in February 1949 by the Bureau of the Census, the percentage of people disabled for 7 months or more was 1 percent among those under age 35 and more than 6 percent among those aged 55 to 65. The percentage rate increased slowly up through the age group 35 to 44 and then began to rise sharply at age 45 and over. And, in the top age group—55 to 64—almost 98 percent were working when they became disabled. It is, then, with the plight of these older workers that the total and permanent disability program outlined in this bill is chiefly concerned. For, in essence, it views total and permanent disability as a form of enforced and premature retirement.

By providing disability benefits, we will meet some of the inequities produced when an arbitrary retirement age is used. We will be recognizing the fact that it is unreal to assume that every worker is able to work until he is aged 65. For under our present law if a worker aged 50 or over is forced to leave his job because he is unable to work, he is subject to a double-penalty:

First, he loses his job and the wages it brought in, at a time when medical expense is increased; and, second, he must wait 15 years—or until he is age 65—before he is entitled to any benefits. In effect, therefore, the system of total and permanent disability outlined in this bill may be said to reach down below the arbitrary retirement age of 65 to award benefits to those unfortunate workers who cannot continue in their jobs because of a crippling illness or injury which makes them unable to work.

The bill meets another special problem which deserves our support in recognizing that those handicapped children who will never be able to work should be entitled to continue to receive dependent's benefits beyond the age of 18. Under present law, a child's benefits are discontinued at age 18 regardless of the circumstances. The assumption here, of course, is that children have reached an age where they are no longer dependent and can support themselves. But in the case of those unfortunate children who, because of a physical or mental handicap, never work, this arbitrary age limit clearly should not apply. Again our social-security system will be more realistic—and more humane—when we recognize that dependency, in such circumstances, is not related to age and that the mother and her handicapped child should continue to receive the benefits they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 20 years our social-security system has demonstrated its effectiveness in bringing security to millions of American homes. With the increases in the coverage of the system which has been made since 1950, it will be possible, in the future, for practically all Americans to look forward to a reasonable minimum of security from these payments. They will have earned that right because, during their working life, they and their employers made regular contributions into the social-security fund.

The improvements contained in the bill presently before the House will add to the security of those millions of Americans who are now contributing to the system. For it recognizes the special and heartrending needs of older Americans who are not fortunate enough to retain their health and strength and earning power until their 65th birthday. It recognizes the special problems of women in this age group in maintaining a source of income. All of us can take great pride in the fact that, by voting for these amendments, we will be voting for a stronger, a better, and a more equitable social-security system.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without commending Dr. Earl H. McGonagle, of Royalton, Minn., for his tireless efforts over the years to obtain social-security coverage for dentists.

Dr. McGonagle is vice president of the Congress of American Dentists for OASI and I am personally familiar with the tremendous amount of work he has done to keep the Congress informed as to the wishes of dentists in this regard.

The polls he conducted in various States and the information he presented to the Committee on Ways and Means were largely responsible for the inclusion of dentists by the House last year. It will be recalled that our provision was eliminated in the other body.

According to a report from Dr. McGonagle, 85.9 percent of the dentists of Minnesota have voted in favor of old-age and survivors insurance coverage. The vote was 1,423 for and 232 against. Other studies by Dr. McGonagle indicate that this same sentiment prevails throughout the country among the majority of dentists.

The mail from my district and State has been overwhelmingly in support of the committee's action in including dentists in the bill before us today. Not a single letter of opposition has been received from the dentists of my district in contrast to the number of letters and telegrams supporting this provision.

The Committee on Ways and Means is to be congratulated for responding so promptly to the expressed wishes of the profession itself and I am glad the provision was included in this special bill. As Dr. McGonagle has pointed out, it will assist younger men in the profession to establish a balanced security program and obtain protection for their survivors.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion has occurred as to the merits of these 1955 changes to the social-security law, and as to the procedure under which it has been presented to the House. It is indeed unfortunate that full debate and discussion has not been permitted.

There should have been time given to discuss what kind of security we are voting on. What I mean is best illustrated by the fact that a man who put a dollar into social security in 1942 received back only 61 cents when he reached age 65 and retired in 1952. His dollar lost almost 4 cents per year during those 10 years.

Fortunately, for the past 2½ years under the Eisenhower administration, the dollar has varied less than ½ of 1 cent in value and during this time Americans have been getting full-value security rather than cut-rate security in their planning for the future.

We can guarantee full-value security to the 55 million and more Americans who have social security, the 90 million who have life insurance and the over 40 million who have Government savings bonds, only if the wise fiscal policies of the Republican Eisenhower administration are continued.

I hope we will all reflect on that fact when future votes come up that would imperil the continuation of such policies by involving us in unwise and inflationary spending or tax policies.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I introduced a bill to lower the age limit for the payment of social-security benefits from 65 to 60 years of age. I am still of the opinion that this is what we should be doing today.

The latter part of May I was advised by the chief actuary, Social Security Administration, that to lower the age limit to 60 years would cost, first year, approximately $1½ to $2 billion. He stated further that the average cost over the next 40 or 50 years would be about $4½ billion per year. This, you must remember, includes men and women.

The bill we are discussing today will bring the yearly cost in 25 years to more than $2 billion. The increased benefits to our citizens who are covered by social security would far outweigh the cost, and contributions to the social security fund could easily take care of the increased cost without undue hardship upon the employees and employers.

House Report No. 1189 makes reference to the concern of the committee for widows who are not many years below age 65 and faced with earning a living until they reach the age of 65. I wonder if the members of the committee are aware of the problem of the man who must look for a job after he reaches even 45 years of age, not to mention 60 years.

Reluctant as I am to support this bill which, in my opinion, is not adequate, I must vote for it as I realize that it is better than nothing at all.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration is most commendable. It will strengthen the old-age and survivors insurance program by providing—

First. Disability benefits: Payment of monthly benefits at or after age 50 to workers who are totally and permanently disabled and who meet tests as to duration and recentness of old-age and survivors insurance coverage. It is estimated that in the first year disability insurance benefits would be payable to about 250,000 workers, amounting to $200 million in benefits.

Second. Lowering of retirement age for women: Payment of monthly benefits at age 62 for women who are insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers. It is estimated that in the first year benefits would be paid to almost 800,000 additional women, amounting to about $400 million in benefits.

Third. Children's disability benefits: Continuation of monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before age 18. It is estimated that eventually 5,000 children and their mothers would be receiving benefits totaling $2 to $3 million per year.

Fourth. Expanded old-age and survivors insurance coverage: Extension of coverage to the self-employed professional groups now excluded—except physicians—to certain farm owners who receive income under share-farming agreements, and various other classes. It is expected that this extension of coverage will provide old-age and survivors insurance protection to an estimated additional 250,000 individuals and their families.

Fifth. Adjustment of contribution schedule: Increases in the present schedule of contributions of one-half percent each on employers and employees and three-fourths percent on the self-employed, effective simultaneously with the improvement in the benefit provisions on January 1, 1956. The amendments, including the revised contribution schedule, will place the system in a stronger actuarial position than it is under present law.

I believe that these changes are of fundamental importance to the welfare of our citizens and should have approval of the House.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the social security amendments of 1955 as I feel these benefits are long overdue in our efforts to develop an adequate social-security program. Earlier this year, I introduced legislation to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable under the Social Security Act to all participants, as I felt our citizens should be eligible to retire while they are still physically able to enjoy a few years of leisure life. While the entire provisions of my bill, H. R. 6799, could not be incorporated in the social-security amendments of 1955, it is encouraging to see a trend in the right direction by the inclusion in the amendments of a provision to reduce the benefit eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years. Since in the average married couple, the wife is usually 2 or 3 years younger than the husband, the wife should be entitled to benefits at approximately the same time the husband becomes eligible.

The extension of coverage to certain self-employed professional groups, except physicians, is most encouraging, as I feel that the social-security program should be for all of our working people. Many attorneys and dentists in my district have contacted me during the past year, urging that they be brought under the provisions of the Social Security Act. In my home State of Illinois, the State Dental Society voted overwhelmingly for compulsory inclusion of the members of their association. I am pleased dentists have been included in the new amendments, inasmuch as earlier this year I introduced a bill (H. R. 5431) to extend coverage to dentists.

It is heartening to see that a disability-retirement provision has been included in these amendments so that disabled workers may qualify for a small payment after attaining the age of 50. It is also encouraging that a disabled-children's provision has been included so that disabled children can continue to receive their monthly benefits after they have reached the age of 18.

I strongly favor the passage of these amendments, as I believe this is a big stride forward in offering our citizens a sound social-security system.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the House is considering this bill today. I have for 5 years introduced a bill to lower the age for social-security retirement to 60 years. I have worked long and hard to give our people social security that will be fair and equitable.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before to this House, most employees and employers in my district favor lowering the age to 60. The greatest industry in the Third District is the textile industry. Many employees have worked for 45 or 50 years in this industry and have not yet reached the age of 65. With unemployment and an ever-increasing population, we must in the near future consider lowering the age limit.

I personally contacted most of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and wish to commend them for their splendid work in bringing the bill out before adjournment. This bill is a step in the right direction. It does lower the age for those disabled from 65 to 50. It lowers the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62. It extends coverage to dentists and attorneys. I polled the dentists and attorneys in my district this year and found them overwhelmingly in favor of this coverage. It liberalizes coverage for dependent children to include those disabled even though they might be past the age of 18.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I hope that it will be passed today by an overwhelming majority. I also hope that at the next session of this Congress extensive hearings can be held on the proposal to lower the retirement age from 65 to 60. It would be wise to hold these hearings early in the session, so that all can be heard and the whole question of social security fully discussed. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has, ever since becoming a Member of Congress, consistently advocated and voted for improvements in and expansion of our social-security laws, the basic legislative program providing economic protection for American families against financial loss from retirement or death of the family head, I am very pleased to support and urge unanimous approval of the liberalizing amendments presented in this bill, H. R. 7225.

While the improving amendments contained herein, especially the proposals to grant disability benefits to disabled eligibles at the age of 50 and provide assistance eligibility to women at the age of 62, do not go far enough in my judgment, they are nevertheless another forward step in our continuing study and effort to progressively enact more equitable changes in the present social security and survivors insurance benefits system.

We must all admit that challenging questions yet remain to be justly solved. For instance, although we are here extending benefits to disabled workers at the age of 50, what is a younger man of 30 or thereabouts, particularly with dependents, supposed to do before he reaches the required age? Also, although we are lowering the eligibility age of women to 62, we all realize that the disparity of age between wife and husband in a multitude of cases is even now visiting most severe financial hardships upon a great number of widows with children, as well as couples where the husband has been forced to retire, and we must yet find just ways to render them reasonable help. I trust and hope that these problems, together with many other inequities, including the raising of minimum benefits in accord with ever-advancing living costs, will be given the conscientious attention of the Congress as early as possible in the next session.

As I stated before, the changes offered in this bill, while not by any means completely sufficient to the needs, represent a progressive measure of improvement in the current social-security structure. Briefly and substantially, this bill provides (a) monthly benefit payments, under qualifying conditions, to workers who are totally and permanently disabled at or after the age of 50; (b) payment of monthly benefits at the age of 62 to women who are insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers; (c) continuation of monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before the age of 18; (d) coverage extension to the self-employed professional groups now excluded—except physicians—to certain farm owners, and others; and (e) increases in the present schedule of contributions of one-half percent each on employers and employees and three-fourths percent on the self-employed.

No one can reasonably doubt that these liberalizing advancements in our present social-security pattern are in accord with the fundamental Christian principles and philosophy of American political and economic life, as opposed to the atheistic concept of a Communist slave state. I urge you all, therefore, to approve the amendments embodied in this bill without further delay, while we look forward to the enactment of even more equitable and liberalizing provisions of our social-security system in the near future.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I favor H. R. 7225, the bill before us to amend the Social Security Act. Each time that we have amended the Social Security Act, we have made it more valuable to the people of this Nation.

The first year after this bill becomes law, disability insurance benefits will be payable to 250,000 workers drawing some $200 million annually. Within 25 years, or by 1980, one million workers will be receiving disability benefits, and the payments will run in the neighborhood of $1 billion annually.

The proposition of lowering the retirement age from 65 to 62 for women will, within 1 year, enable 800,000 to start drawing benefits totaling $400 million annually.

Wives are generally a few years younger than their husbands, thus when the husband has to retire many couples only have the husband's benefits until the wife reaches 65.

With the age of eligibility for the wife's benefits reduced to 62, about 400,000 would become immediately eligible for monthly benefits. The bill would also make some 650,000 women workers now between the age of 62 and 65 years immediately eligible for benefits.

Then, too, it will extend coverage to about 200,000 in the professions, excluding doctors, but including lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, optometrists and naturopaths.

The bill also covers sharecroppers, and the bill extends coverage to some 13,000 employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, some of whom live in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, particularly in Franklin and Cullman Counties.

I have just recently had the opportunity to look into the value of the social-security program to the counties of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

As of December 31, 1954, in Blount County, 441 persons drew benefit checks totaling $15,655.

In Cullman County, 958 persons drew benefit checks totaling $34,461.

In Fayette County, 460 persons drew benefit checks totaling $16,511.

In Franklin County, 701 persons drew benefit checks totaling $23,814.

In Lamar County, 299 persons drew benefit checks totaling $9,321.

In Marion County, 591 persons drew benefit checks totaling $20,681.

In Pickens County, 419 persons drew benefit checks totaling $14,148.

In Walker County, 3,333 persons drew benefit checks totaling $127,079.

In Winston County, 470 persons drew benefit checks totaling $16,251.

For the entire Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, the monthly payments for the month of December 1954 amounted to $277,921. This was paid to 7,672 persons.

The program is growing. A year previous, December 1953, the total benefit payments in the Seventh Congressional District amounted to $204,781, while in June 1948, the total benefit payments were only $31,686.

It has been my privilege to support the expansion of the social-security program since I have been in the Congress, and I am particularly happy that so many of the people in the Seventh Congressional District are able to participate in the program. I hope that eventually social security will insure a retirement income for all our people.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the enactment of H. R. 7225. This bill will amend the Social Security Act to provide monthly benefits for disabled insured individuals who have attained age 50, it will reduce the benefit eligibility age for women to 62 years, and it will continue monthly benefits to disabled children after they have attained the age of 18.

When I first came to Congress in 1953, I introduced bills which would have lowered the eligibility age from 65 to 60 years for recipients of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system and which would have provided benefits for individuals who become totally and permanently disabled before attaining the normal retirement age. Action was not taken upon these bills by the 83d Congress, and I, therefore, reintroduced bills early this year to provide benefits to disabled individuals, to lower the age from 65 to 60 years for recipients of benefits, generally speaking, and to lower the age of eligibility to 55 years in the case of widows. Other Members have introduced similar measures, and the bill before us today embodies, in varying degrees, many of the proposals offered in the bills introduced by me and my colleagues and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

I wish to compliment the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means and its able chairman for making it possible for the House to consider this bill which, in my opinion, is a great step forward on the path of humanitarian progress. In providing benefits for disabled workers, we are correcting one of the major deficiencies in the present social security system. Total disability is a triple threat to family income. First of all—and unlike retirement—it is unpredictable and may strike at any age without warning. Secondly, the wages upon which the family was living and planning for the future stop almost immediately. And finally, at the time those wages stop, a large medical bill is probably added to the family budget.

Not until we have provided for these exigencies will we have achieved a truly protective system of social security in the United States.

I am glad that the committee has given careful attention to lowering the eligibility age for women who are insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and disabled mothers of deceased insured workers. It is imperative that we take cognizance of the personal hardship encountered by older women who are forced to wait until age 65 to receive monthly benefits. Many of these are widows who have not had recent work experience and who find that production processes or sales methods have changed so much that it is practically impossible to locate employment. We must think, too, of elderly couples who, under the present law, may be confronted with the problem of having to get along on the same amount that is provided for a single person. Wives are generally from 2 to 4 years younger than their husbands, and, when the husband has to retire, many couples have only the husband's benefits until the wife also reaches age 65. The bill would correct this to make it possible for about 400,000 wives to become immediately eligible for monthly benefits.

This bill is a great step forward in another respect. Under the present law, children's benefits cease when the child attains the age of 18. The bill before us would continue the payment of benefits to such children after the age of 18, and the mother of such a child would also be eligible for such benefits as long as the disabled child must remain in her care. Where a child is permanently and totally disabled, he is as dependent on his family after the age of 18 as before, and this legislation recognizes this fact, and it also foresees the eventuality that the mother may be unable to go to work to support her family when she has this kind of responsibility. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the foregoing changes are of such fundamental importance to the welfare of our citizens, I sincerely hope that this House will act quickly and favorably upon the bill before us. I am proud that I have actively supported this kind of legislation since I first came to Congress, and I am happy to cast my vote in behalf of this bill today.

TWENTY YEARS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago in 1935 the social-security bill had passed the House on April 19; the Senate on June 19; and became a law on August 14. Since that time we have seen it expanded and its coverage widely extended until at the present time we find some 15 million American citizens included within its scope.

Social security as we know it today has met a need in our American way of life. The element of security which it provides is in keeping with the wish and desire of the average citizen to be independent and self-supporting when faced with old age and unable to continue in productive activity.

While I am not in accord with all of the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and as in operation today, I feel we have a basic program on which we can improve the economic plight of our senior citizens. After 20 years of trial and error, experiments and tests, I am convinced that any and all changes within the foreseeable future will come within the framework of our present social-security system.

For the past two decades we have accepted the 65-year age requirement for retirement. While that may have been proper and justified 20 years ago, I feel that changed economic and social conditions, together with the impact of our ever-increasing population, make it necessary to reduce the retirement age limit particularly in certain groups.

I have from time to time on the floor of this House urged that the age limit for widows' participation be reduced to 62 years. Perhaps other groups should be so reduced. The reasons for this social improvement are so obvious that I do not deem it necessary to make an explanation.

In the amendments to the Social Security Act before us today I note that all the proposed changes come within title II of the act. I regret that the committee—Ways and Means—did not in its wisdom give consideration to our destitute and needy old folks coming under the old-age assistance provision. There are about 2½ million of them, and they are getting an average throughout the country of approximately $52 a month. This is under the Federal-State matching system. This is slightly more than $10 a week. Certainly it is only with great difficulty that anyone can exist on such a pitiful allowance. We have been most liberal in our appropriations for every other conceivable program that has come before this House, especially in our aid to foreign countries. Why is it not possible to provide a decent standard of living for our own needy, destitute, old people, who need our assistance in the declining years of their lives?

I foresee in the not-too-far-distant future changes in our social security which will recognize permanent total disability, retirement age for wives of retired workers, for widows and for working women at 62 years. Pressure is great for these changes and public opinion will demand these modern revisions.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the vote which we will be required to make this afternoon is whether the rules of this House will be suspended and H. R. 7225, amending title 2 of the Social Security Act, will be approved by the House without amendment and without full debate.

One of the most important committees of this Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee, is charged by law with the responsibility for initiating all legislation affecting the social-security system. This committee acts as trustee of the public interest over this program. To millions of our people the social-security system represents the basic foundation for their own retirement security and for the survivorship protection of their dependents.

I have carefully read over the report of the House Ways and Means Committee and I find that in the rush to get this bill to the floor of the House for action, no public hearings were held and actuaries were denied an opportunity to appear even before the committee in executive session to discuss the merits of the many and varied amendments to the basic Social Security Act which are included in H. R. 7225. Nowhere can a Member of Congress receive definite information as to the net effect of these amendments upon the social security trust fund. It seems to me that the House Ways and Means Committee has not properly discharged its duties and responsibilities by reporting this bill without proper consideration. If we suspend the rules of the House of Representatives in considering this bill today, it will be the entire House of Representatives which must share the responsibility for not properly safeguarding the public interest.

Under the procedure which is being used this afternoon this bill can be debated only 40 minutes. The leadership explains this procedure by stating that it is late in the session and time is of great importance. Certainly this is not a legitimate reason as every Member of this House realizes that the House of Representatives did not even have a session last Friday and could have spent the entire day fully considering this legislation. The proposals contained in this bill involve an expense in excess of $2 billion per year. We will be spending the taxpayers dollars at a rate in excess of $50 million a minute this afternoon. During this session of Congress we have considered other legislation and have been allowed to discuss the pros and cons of the legislation involving sums of less than $300,000 for 3 and 4 hours. These bills were brought to the floor only after thorough and exhaustive legislative hearings. The public interest cannot be properly protected by acting upon H. R.

7225, which I consider the most important piece of legislation to be acted upon in this session of Congress, by not following the rules of this House and allowing for full, fair, and complete consideration and debate.

I have long been an advocate of many of the provisions contained in this bill and on past occasions have voted for many of these provisions, such as extending coverage to self-employed professional groups. I have always favored universal coverage. I have also favored reducing the age limit to qualify for monthly payments for women as insured workers, wives of insured workers and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers. This bill, however, is much broader than any social-security amendments ever considered by the House of Representatives since the social-security program was first enacted. I believe that the membership of this House is entitled to a full and complete discussion of all of these proposed amendments.

This legislation will have a far-reaching effect upon the future lives of all our people. I do not quarrel with improving the progam as I will always support improvements but I do quarrel with tampering with the program when we do not know exactly what we are doing and what the net effect will be not only upon the social-security fund but upon the whole economy of our Nation.

In my congressional district there are a great many people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. As I have studied this bill I have tried to determine what the net effect of the tax program included in this bill will be upon my constituents. Today we are levying social-security taxes for many years into the future and the tax rates are specifically written into this bill with the effective dates of each increase. Let us take the example of a very successful farmer in my congressional district, with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming this farmer has a wife and two children and uses the standard deductions, his Federal income tax under present income-tax rates would be $276. Under the bill which we are acting upon here today, his social-security tax will be $283.50. The social-security tax as a percentage of net taxable income would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had 3 children, his income tax would be cut to $156, but his social-security tax would still amount to $283.50. In the latter case the social-security tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. I point out the effect of this tax structure merely to call to the attention of the House the importance of the decision which we are making here today without adequate advice, knowledge, debate, or consideration.

It has been said here on the floor this afternoon that we should go ahead and vote for this bill as it is the politically wise vote to make, because the Senate will have to rewrite this legislation anyway. It has been stated that the Senate Finance Committee has already announced that it will conduct exhaustive public hearings, take testimony from expert witnesses and for that reason, it is not necessary for the House to give full consideration to these amendments. Certainly this argument is not sound. The House of Representatives by our Federal Constitution is charged with the responsibility for intiating tax measures. If one follows the suggestions made today that the political thing to do is to vote for the bill and let the Senate rewrite the bill, one merely becomes an advocate of a unicameral legislature. I believe in the need and necessity for a bicameral legislative system with each House working its will after thorough and deliberate consideration. I shall vote against suspending the rules of the House on this bill because of the absence of thorough and deliberate consideration by the House, which I shall always maintain has an important function in the bicameral legislative branch of our Federal Government. I may be accused of standing on principle by some political demagogues, but I sincerely hope that I will not stand alone.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the splendid remarks that have been made by Chairman JERE COOPER and the other distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means who urged the passage of H. R. 7225. No other legislation before this Congress is of greater importance.

In my Congressional District, there are thousands of senior citizens who are enjoying the benefits of social security. While these social-security payments are inadequate to keep up with the ever-rising cost of living, they have provided a means of at least partial support for a large segment of our population. The proposal to reduce the retirement age for women to age 62 brings the retirement age for women in a more realistic relationship to the retirement age for men. This wise amendment will in innumerable cases provide the opportunity for our senior citizens to retire together.

Although this is only a moderate adjustment of our social-security laws, it will have a far-reaching effect upon our entire economy. Retirement is generally a voluntary act. The conditions of retirement must be such as to provide an incentive for decent retirement. The lowered age for women who are insured workers, wives or widows of deceased workers will undoubtedly become a tremendous incentive for the retirement of women as well as for men who have continued their employment simply because the lady of the household was not able to enjoy her social-security benefits. The increase in the numbers of our retired and their consequent displacement from employment or from the lists of those seeking employment will create innumerable job opportunities for those below retirement age. As a matter of fact, this may create job opportunities for a large segment of our unemployed working forces of middle age who will be the most eligible candidates for the positions in industry which will be vacated by the increasing number of our retiring citizens.

Retirement is not only a reward for gainful employment throughout the years—it is a recognized condition in our economy in which the retired citizen creates a job opportunity or promotion for the next person in line. The improvement of our social-security laws which encourage retirement will help meet the problem created by the displacement of workers through mechanization.

Nothing is of greater importance in our American way of life than to permit our senior citizens to retire in dignity. The retirement income should be sufficient to permit them to live at a level which is in some measure commensurate with the level they enjoyed throughout the employable years. Retirement should not force them to move from a home to a hovel. Nor should it force them to substitute no medical care for the inadequate medical care which they received during their employment years. Our retirement program should permit our retired families to live in comfort, to buy the medical and hospital care which they need and to enjoy benefits and the conveniences of our times in good measure.

The need for providing for the disabled worker, particularly the disabled worker over 50 years of age, should need no further explanation. Such a worker, whose employble years are cut short by accident, should not be faced with a lifetime of destitution and despair. The misfortune which afflicted his life is one which by chance we may have missed. Certainly the workers of America who will all be entitled to the privilege of this benefit, if a disability should strike them, should have no objection to assume in some way the cost of providing for the less fortunate members of our working society.

The self-employed professional groups, including dentists and lawyers, have through their representative organization indicated a desire for social security coverage which this bill will provide. The doctors are practically the only holdouts against this vital American legislation. Their objection is based more on stubborn pride than to principle. It simply cannot be that everyone else is out of step.

Several weeks ago the U. S. News & World Report commented on the strength and stability of our society, pointing out the things we now have which we did not have in the years which preceded the depression to cushion the Nation against adversity if unpleasant conditions should again develop. The cornerstone of American stability is its system of free enterprise amplified by its laws to bring about social justice and minimum standards of security for periods of unemployment and for later periods of retirement age.

The entire American economy will rejoice and appreciate this moderate effort to make a good body of law better—to serve increasing numbers of our people.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to commend the members of the the House Ways and Means Committee for their action in reporting a bill containing much needed amendments to the social-security laws.

During the past 5 years substantial improvements have been made in the coverage of the social-security system and in upward adjustments of the benefits it pays. Prior to the 1950 amendments only about 3 out of 5 of the people earning their living were covered by the system and the average benefit payment was around $27 per month. Today practically all of the working population has social-security protection and the amount of its benefits has more than doubled.

But there are several respects in which no change at all has been made in the original law, passed back in 1935. We still have, for instance, the same eligibility age of 65 years for both men and women. And we have not yet provided benefits for those unfortunate persons who are forcibly retired from their jobs at any age because of a crippling disability.

Because I believe these fields represent the next essential steps forward in the improvement of our social-security system, I introduced amendments designed to accomplish the necessary changes.

My bill, H. R. 6919, would reduce the eligiblity age for women from 65 to 60 years, thus recognizing the special needs of wives, widows, and workingwomen in their later years.

My companion bill, H. R. 6920, would provide benefits for fully insured workers who have, through no fault of their own, become permanently and totally disabled prior to age 65, thus facing the reality of the fact that such a disability is, in effect, a form of involuntary retirement.

One other change which should certainly be made at this time, in my mind, is outlined in my bill, H. R. 6943, which would continue the payments made to surviving children beyond the age of 18 for those children who are incapable of self-support by reason of physical or mental disability.

Mr. Speaker, some 2½ million people in this country are directly concerned with the enactment of this legislation, and they are people who are most in need of social-security protection.

All of us know of the serious problem faced by older women in today's world. We know of women widowed in their early sixties who are told that they will not be entitled to any social-security benefits until they have reached their 65th birthday. We know of other women who have been retired from their jobs at age 60—and then must wait for the long and harrowing 5-year period for their social-security benefits to begin.

Moreover, the fact that existing law sets the same eligibility age for women as for men seems to me an arbitrary and unrealistic practice in view of the fact that the average wife is several years younger than her husband. Statistics show that only one-fifth of the married men who reach age 65 have a wife who is the same age or older—and therefore entitled to the wife's benefit. By lowering the eligibility age to 60 for women, therefore, we will be providing very vital protection for the many women widowed in their early 60's, and those working women who have been forced to retire prior to age 65. We will also increase the retirement income of many retired couples by adding the wife's benefit at age 60, instead of age 65.

In providing benefits for those fully-insured workers who are forced to retire from their work by a crippling illness or injury, at the time they are disabled, we will be making another very vital improvement in the protection offered by our social-security system. In this country today there are thousands of working men and women who have been contributing to the social-security fund for many years. They have looked forward to the day when they could retire from their job with a reasonably comfortable income. And then, often at the height of their earning power, a crippling illness strikes.

In addition to the loss of wage income upon which the family depends for its needs there is, almost inevitably, heavy medical expenses. Under our present social-security system, the family must be told that no benefits can be paid until the father reaches age 65.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that families in such circumstances are entitled to the kind of protection now furnished to retired individuals. In providing disability benefits for fully-insured workers we will be recognizing human need at a time of tragedy in the family and we will be relieving the tax load of States and local communities who now are bearing the burden of support for thousands of families so victimized. Our concern in the past has been to provide social security to adjust to the wage loss caused by retirement or death of the wage-earner. Certainly the wage-loss caused by a totally disabled condition should equally entitle the family to the protection of a social-security benefit.

The need for continuing to pay benefits beyond the age of 18 for those children who will never be able to support themselves because of a physical or mental disability seems to me to be equally clear. In such instances the age 18 limitation cannot justifiably be applied because it is clear that the mother will continue to have the care of the unfortunate child. This special problem has been recognized in our Civil Service System, the Railroad Retirement System, and in most veterans' programs. I am convinced, therefore, that it is essential that we make this important change in our social security system at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments reported by the Ways and Means Committee should be approved by the House. The committee has not reduced the eligibility age for women to 60 as one of my bills recommended, nor have the disability benefits for insured workers been made available immediately upon the occurrence of a disability. However, I am gratified over the bill as reported from committee; this is a step in the right direction.

I also wish to state my approval of the amendment to extend coverage to dentists, lawyers, and other professions. I have contacted the dentists and lawyers of my district and find the majority favor being included in the program. I am certain the other professions to be included will appreciate the action of the committee and the Congress in approving these amendments.

I believe the amendments which I proposed and those which have been approved by our Ways and Means Committee are in line with the basic purposes of the social-security program. I urge the support for these measures which will add so substantially to the basic protection which our social-security system provides.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I protest the practice of voting out a bill which calls for an expenditure of $2 billion per year, under conditions which allow just 40 minutes of general debate and admit no possibility of amendment. This, Mr. Speaker, after the Committee on Ways and Means has held no public hearings on the measure.

I am convinced that nowhere near enough time was spent in working out or anticipating the great administrative problems which are bound to arise incident to establishing the eligibility of disabled persons 50 years of age or over to disability funds. I am also convinced that little or no testimony has been considered regarding the effects this would have on State disability programs.

Nevertheless, the extension of benefits to totally and permanently disabled persons beyond the age of 18, and also the extension of benefits to new widows at the age of 62, are of such merit that I feel I must support the bill. I only regret that an adequate opportunity is not available to this House to correct what might be serious defects. I intend to support and vote for the bill in the hope that the Senate committee which has expressed the admirable intention to hold full and complete hearings on the subject, will follow through on that expressed intention and will correct any defects which appear in the course of such hearings.

In the interest of expediting this legislation and getting it before the House and Senate conference, I urge an aye vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Smith of Virginia) there were—ayes 232, noes 18.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 31, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—372

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Burnside
Bush

Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—31

Alger
Bell
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Chase
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Dies
Fjare
Gwinn
Hiestand
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson
Johansen
Kilburn
Kilgore
Laird
Mason
Phillips
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Tex.
Scherer
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Thompson, Mich.
Tuck
Utt
Wainwright
Wharton

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gentry
King, Pa.

NOT VOTING—29

Anfuso
Becker
Blatnik
Brownson
Buchanan
Buckley
Chiperfield
Cole
Crumpacker
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Dingell
Durham
Eberharter
Fernandez
Flynt
Gregory
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Hoffman, Ill.
Johnson, Calif.
Kee
Mumma
Reed, N. Y.
Short
Thompson, La.
Udall
Willis

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Crumpacker.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Short.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. BELL, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. HIESTAND changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4904. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; and

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass S. 1855, to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (3) of section 2 (a) of the Federal Airport Act (49 U. S. C. 1101–1119) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) 'Airport development' means (A) any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport passenger or freight terminal buildings and other airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, and (B) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in air space, which is necessary to permit any such work or to remove or mitigate or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards; but such term does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars."

SEC. 2. The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 3 of such act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) At least 3 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Such plan shall specify, in terms of general location and type of development, the projects considered by the Secretary to be necessary to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticpate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics, which projects shall include all types of airport development eligible for Federal aid under this act and shall not be limited to any classes or categories of public airports."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. In order to bring about, in conformity with the national airport plan prepared and from time to time revised as provided in this act, the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, within the limits of the obligation authority provided in section 5, to make grants of funds to sponsors for airport development as hereinafter provided."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this act with respect to projects in the several States, there are hereby authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this act with respect to projects in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, there are hereby authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 the sum of $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated. Of each of the amounts authorized by this subsection, 45 percent shall be available for projects in the Territory of Alaska, 25 percent for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, 20 percent for projects in Puerto

Rico, and 10 percent for projects in the Virgin Islands.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts of money as may be necessary to liquidate obligations incurred as authorized by subsections (a) and (b).

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts of money as may be necessary for planning and research and for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this act. As used in this section, the term 'administrative expenses' includes expenses under this act of the character specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 424)."

SEC. 5. Section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) As soon as possible after July 1 of each fiscal year for which an amount is authorized to be obligated by section 5 (a), 75 percent of the amount made available for that year shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. Each amount so apportioned for a State shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the fiscal year immediately following, be available only for grants for approved projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, and thereafter any portion of such amount which remains unobligated shall be redistributed and reapportioned as provided in subsection (c) of this section. Upon making an apportionment as provided in this subsection, the Secretary shall inform the executive head of each State, and any public agency which has requested such information, as to the amounts apportioned for each State. As used in this subsection the term 'population' means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States and the term 'area' includes both land and water.

"(b) (1) Twenty-five percent of all amounts authorized to be obligated by section 5 (a) shall, as such amounts become available, constitute a discretionary fund.

"(2) Such discretionary fund shall be available for such approved projects in the several States as the Secretary may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan, regardless of the States in which they are located. The Secretary shall give consideration, in determining the projects for which such fund is to be so used, to the existing airport facilities in the several States and to the need for or lack of development of airport facilities in the several States.

"(3) Such discretionary fund shall also be available for such approved projects in national parks and national recreation areas, national monuments, and national forests, sponsored by the United States or any agency thereof, as the Secretary may deem appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan; but no other funds authorized under authority of this act shall be available for such purpose. The sponsor's share of the project costs of any such approved project shall be paid only out of funds contributed to the sponsor for the purpose of paying such costs (receipt of which funds and their use for this purpose is hereby authorized) or appropriations specifically authorized therefor.

"(c) Seventy-five percent of any amount apportioned for projects in a State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section which has not been obligated by grant agreement at the expiration of the two fiscal years for which such amount was so apportioned shall be reapportioned among the respective States in the manner of apportionment of the original authorization under subsection (a) and the remaining 25 percent of such amount shall be added to the discretionary fund established by subsection (b), and at the expiration of each succeeding fiscal year any of the amount so reapportioned for a State that still remains unobligated shall again be reapportioned and redistributed in the same manner."

SEC. 6. Section 8 of such act is repealed.

SEC. 7. The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows: "All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, which approval shall be given only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, that sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project costs which is not to be paid by the United States under this act, that the project will be completed without undue delay, that the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed, and that all project sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this act have been or will be met.".

SEC. 8. The third sentence of section 12 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States payable from funds authorized by this act, and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the sponsor or sponsors of the project.".

SEC. 9. All amounts authorized by section 4 of this act to be obligated for grants under the Federal Airport Act shall be additional to all amounts previously appropriated or authorized to be obligated for such purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the balances of such previously appropriated or authorized funds which are unexpended and unobligated on the effective date of this act shall remain available for obligation and expenditure as originally appropriated or authorized.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings this bill to the House to amend the Airport Construction Act to provide for contractural authority to the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the sponsors of localities and States on a 50–50 basis, for the improvement and expansion of airports to provide the needs of commercial air transportation.

Our committee held hearings for 3 days, during which time we heard Members of Congress, the Department of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, representatives of municipalities, States, and aviation organizations.

We received many reports, including the Bureau of the Budget and other interested parties. The committee heard everyone who requested to be heard and who expressed an interest in this program.

Mr. Speaker, we are bringing this to the House under suspension of the rules because of the urgency of the program. Particularly so, in view of the fact that Congress will adjourn this session in a few days.

This bill comes from our committee almost unanimously, and, in fact, with only a single objection. I believe it is a good bill. Although, generally speaking, I prefer these important bills to be brought up under a rule and sufficient time provided for debate, I do think that under the circumstances, with Congress about to adjourn and the imperative need for the airport program that our committee is justified in bringing this to you under suspension today.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is really no objection to the program. The objection raised thus far by only a few, including the gentleman from Michigan, who is the most outstanding objector to this bill, is largely due to a local situation in his State. We do not believe this important program should be held up because of some local controversy as has been presented to us in this instance.

This bill is strongly urged and supported by the American Municipal Association, the Airport Operators Council, and the National Association of State Aviation Officials. Certainly with this group joining together in behalf of this program, and with the record that has been made by this committee, the Congress should approve this kind of a program before it adjourns.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word about the bill:

It may be remembered that the airport construction program was provided by this Congress in 1946. We authorized $520 million for a period of 7 years at that time. Limitation was placed on the authorization that not more than $100 million could be appropriated in any 1 year. During the first year of that program $45 million was appropriated. That was the highest amount during these 9 years since the authorization of the program that has been provided for airport construction and expansion. A total of about $256 million has been appropriated since 1946 for this program. This is only one-half of the amount considered to be the minimum needs in 1946. The need has increased since then.

Everyone is aware of the phenomenal progress in air development and transportation in this country. You go to any airport, particularly in the larger cities, and you will find the facilities there far short of the need. In view of the fact that in the last few years we have had very little funds for the construction and the expansion of airport facilities to meet the phenomenal growth, the municipalities and the States, and most of them have aeronautical agencies, have come to the Congress with this program in order to meet these serious needs.

The primary purpose of the pending legislation is to stabilize the national airport program. It would do this by authorizing the Department of Commerce to make contract obligations in making grants of Federal aid to sponsors of civil airports.

S. 1855, as originally introduced, was a companion bill to H. R. 6260 which I introduced in the House. In reporting S. 1855, the Senate committee recommended certain amendments which were adopted. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House concurred in these amendments, but felt that the authorization for the first fiscal year should be reduced. The committee also recommends one minor, clarifying amendment.

As the bill was passed by the Senate, it provided contract authority of $63 million for the 1956 fiscal year and a like sum for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Of this $60 million annually would be for the various States and $3 million for Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The committee proposes to cut this authorization for the first year to $42,500,000, of which $40 million would be for the States and $2,500,000 for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The committee took this action in view of the fact that the contract authority would be in addition to appropriations heretofore made. The appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, recently enacted, carries an appropriation of $20 million for Federal aid under the Federal Airport Act. Thus, the $20 million appropriation heretofore made, plus the $42,500,000 proposed by the House committee, would give the Department $62,500,000 in appropriations and contract authority for fiscal year 1956. The largest appropriation made heretofore for any one fiscal year was $45 million.

The Federal-aid airport program, launched in 1946 when Congress enacted the Federal Airport Act, has never really had a chance to accomplish its purpose of establishing a well integrated, national system of civil airports adequate to meet the civil air needs of the country. That is because the Federal Government has never provided its share of the funds needed to complete the program.

The Federal Airport Act authorized a total Federal contribution of $520 million, with a maximum of $100 million in any 1 year. Congress has appropriated $256,221,000. The largest appropriation was $45 million for the first year. For 1954, nothing was appropriated.

From that record, it is easy enough to see that sponsors were never able to anticipate what cooperation they could expect from Washington. They were never able to make any plans with assurance that the Federal Government would come through with its share of the cost.

Enactment of the pending legislation will remedy this situation.

A survey made by three interested national organizations indicates that $468,353,000 will be required to complete the program envisioned by States and local communities at this time. The survey indicated that the States and local communities now have approximately $173,130,000 available, which would indicate the need for far more Federal aid during the current fiscal year than is proposed under the pending bill.

Representatives of State and local agencies involved, as well as the airlines and other aviation interests appeared before the committee and all supported the pending legislation.

The proposal to provide contract authority to the Department of Commerce was received enthusiastically as a sound method of stabilizing the program.

The plan is not an innovation. It has been used throughout the years with great success in the Federal highway program.

Due to the problems of local sponsorship, the need for this method of financing is even greater in the airport program than in the highway program.

When this bill was originally considered by the Senate committee, the Department of Commerce opposed the method of financing proposed in this legislation. But by the time the legislation came up for consideration before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Department had revised its position. The Honorable Louis S. Rothschild, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, urged that the amount of annual authority be cut to $40 million and limited to 2 years and that the Department be allowed discretion regarding the type of projects to be approved. With these modifications, he said, the Department would favor enactment of the legislation.

In view of the urgency of the situation and the fact that the program has been so long neglected, the committee felt, however, that a 4-year program was necessary. The committee, however, did cut the authorization for the first fiscal year by $20,500,000.

The situation is urgent. We are entering upon the jet age. We are already in a period in our national history where aviation is of the utmost importance. Our very national existence may depend on the continued development of aviation. Air power and air transportation are one and inseparable. You cannot have air power without air transportation. In the jet age, you cannot have a fully developed national economy without air transportation.

The committee was told that there are only seven civil airports in the United States capable of handling commercial jet traffic. Yet, all of those qualified to speak tell us that within the next few years, civilian jet transportation will be flying the airways. If we are going to be prepared for jet air transportation, we must begin planning now. We must begin building as soon as possible. We have been working at the job of building a national system of civil airports for a long time and we are far from through with the job. We may not have too much time remaining if we are not to lag and fall behind in the most spectacular race of economic supremacy the world has ever seen.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to be sure there is no prohibition in this legislation or in your report which would prevent the National Government from constructing a national airport similar to the present National Airport, but another one, in the present metropolitan area exclusively with national funds.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no prohibition against it. That usually is another program that must be provided for on a special basis for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. FLOOD. I am clear about that, but I would just like to be sure that if and when this bill becomes law there is nothing to prevent the Government of the United States exclusively with Federal funds from building another national airport somewhere in this area.

Mr. HARRIS. No, this does not. The Government of the United States can provide for an airport any time it wants to or any place it wants to.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This is for commercial operation, as the gentleman knows.

The bill provides that on a matching basis under the airport construction program the municipalities and the sponsors—it might be municipalities, it might be a county, it might be through the State organization setup—may enter into this program for airport construction.

If time would permit, I would explain for the RECORD the criteria that have been adopted by the Department of Commerce on airport construction. We say in this bill the Department cannot limit this program to any particular classes or categories of airports. All eligible projects may be considered in this airport construction program, and allocations made to the States under the airport construction plan are available to the sponsors of those States for participation in the airport construction program.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 120]

Anfuso
Becker
Brownson
Buchanan
Buckley
Chiperfield
Cole
Crumpacker
Davis, Tenn.
Deane
Dingell
Donovan
Durham
Eberharter
Fallon
Fernandez
Flynt
George
Gregory
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Hoffman, Ill.
Hope
Jackson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Kearney
Klein
Krueger
Mumma
Powell
Preston
Prouty
Reed, N. Y.
Schwengel
Short
Taylor
Thompson, N. J.
Thomson, Wyo.
Udall
Weaver

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to a Federal-aid airport program. I think it is a very desirable program and one that, with proper protective provisions so far as the States and localities are concerned, is most desirable in connection with the development of the air transportation program of the United States.

This bill does two things that amount to a departure of the heretofore existing policy in respect to Federal assistance in the airport program. No. 1: It sets up a 4-year program, bypassing the Committee on Appropriations and providing for contractual authority on the part of the Secretary of Commerce which, in effect, binds the Congress without any hearings by the Committee on Appropriations or without any consideration by the Congress itself.

The amount of money involved over this 4-year period is $272 million. Now, this money is handed over in the form of a blank check to the Secretary of Commerce, and he can spend it as he sees fit without any sanction or approval by the Congress or without any sanction or approval by any other person or agency of the Federal Government or of the State governments. Now, I think we can have a Federal airport program without vesting that type of autocratic power in one official. We have other Federal-aid programs where the Federal Government shares with the States in this type of endeavor, but so far as I know there is no other program except as it concerns the military where such complete discretion is vested in one Federal official.

It means this, that States, and localities must come to Washington with hat in hand and ask the Secretary of Commerce whether or not they may have assistance under this program. And if he says "Yes" they get it. If he says "No" that is final. There are no standards to guide the Secretary of Commerce laid down in this bill. There are no criteria which he must follow either for his own information or for the information of the States and localities that are seeking this aid. Therefore, it amounts simply to this. The Secretary of Commerce, judged by what has happened during the past few years, will devote by far the major part of this program to large city airports. Members of the House who represent districts that have cities from ten to fifty thousand people in them, where they have a small airport that is on a feeder scheduled airline, better look at this bill carefully. Because there is nothing in it that would give any assurance whatsoever that they will get any assistance.

In the case of the State of Michigan, for example, since the Federal program was started, seven-million-odd dollars was given to the State as its share of this program. Four million dollars, or better than 52 percent of the entire amount that Michigan has gotten under this program, has been spent on one single airport in the area of the city of Detroit. I know that this situation is not peculiar to Michigan. It is occurring in other States.

If you pass this bill without amendment, it will become more widespread because in this program you are adding for the first time money for terminal facilities, passenger facilities, and freight facilities at airports. So that the Secretary of Commerce, if he wants to, could spend 90 percent of this entire amount to build fancy passenger and terminal facilities at some of the Nation's large city airports, at the expense of people in small localities who are without necessary runways, essential to the safe handling of air passenger traffic in those communities.

Let me read just a line or two from the committee report. The Secretary of Commerce a year or two ago set up some criteria for Federal assistance under this program. Do you know what those criteria were? They had to have 3,000 enplaned passengers per year at their airport. They had to have 30 aircraft based at their airport. That restriction, according to the committee report, would mean this. Out of 3,000 eligible airports throughout the United States only 800 were eligible to receive any aid whatsoever under this program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As I understand it, if I am not badly mistaken, that is one of the purposes of this bill; that is one of the things that this bill seeks to correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It does not correct it. There is nothing in this bill that would correct or prevent that kind of thing from happening. As a matter of fact it assures its continuance. The sky is the limit so far as the authority of the Secretary of Commerce is concerned. He does not have to allocate one dime to any airport unless he desires to do so, regardless of the need or justification.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the most important observation made by my friend from Michigan who just finished his remarks was as to the delegation of power to the Secretary of Commerce. This carries out legislation which was previously enacted by the Congress along similar lines.

I know Sinclair Weeks. His views on public questions and mine radically differ, but he honestly entertains his views. I may say that I have confidence that the present Secretary of Commerce will perform his duties under this bill in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think that we have people in the several States that know something about this program? I am not criticizing Mr. Weeks as an individual. I am just talking about concentrating this power in one Federal official and not giving the States or localities one single thing to say. They do not have a prayer under this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Every part of the country cannot be taken care of within the amount appropriated, but I certainly think that within the amount appropriated the Secretary of Commerce will exercise his judgment wisely in accordance with the provisions of the bill. This carries out previous legislation. Sharply disagreeing with Sinclair Weeks as I do on public questions, I have confidence that as far as this bill is concerned he will carry it out in the proper way.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a delegation of the authority of the Congress in connection with the airport construction program, to arrange for contracting for their building without any review by the Congress whatever. The only review there would be would be whatever review might be made by the General Accounting Office on the expenditure of funds. We would have no authority whatever to check the thing over to see that the things that should be provided for were provided for and to see that things that should not be done were not done.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact this is the same procedure as under the highway construction program?

Mr. TABER. No; it is not.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that when the bureau comes before you, you have an opportunity to resurvey and look into all the projects?

Mr. TABER. No; that is not so. We do not have the authority in the committee to review the projects, or pass on them, or anything of that character.

This goes further than the highway bill. It is a little more of an abdication on the part of the Congress of its responsibilities. I do not know whether the Members of Congress want us to abdicate completely this authority. For my own part, I have always tried to meet my obligations as a Member of this body, and I hope the Congress will not in this bill go further into that abdication. If we do that, the power of the purse ceases to reside in the Congress. We have too much trouble already with the airports that have already been constructed, indicating that in the early stages there was not the proper review by the agency. We have many of them coming from all over and wanting all sorts of special consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will not pass this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hinshaw].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hinshaw].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of their aisle for their great courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I want in the first place to call your attention to the fact that this is a Senate bill, S. 1855. If memory serves me correctly, it passed the other body by something like 75 or 76 to 4—a practically unanimous vote. It passed our committee without a dissenting vote that I remember. The gentleman from Michigan did not dissent from the bill being passed out of the committee. When it left the committee, it was not anticipated that much trouble would be had on the floor of the House. Certainly, some of the questions which the gentleman brings up were not brought up in the committee as objections to the bill. Some of the points such as matters of appropriations, for example, which he mentioned were not brought up in the committee, as objections to the bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman will recall that in the committee meeting I wanted to offer an amendment to give the States some rights here and take a little bit of this authority away from the Secretary of Commerce. I was assured that that was taken care of in the committee report, but I found upon investigation that it was not taken care of in the committee report and that it had to be done in the bill. When I found that out, I was opposed to the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman's statement does not change what I originally said that he did not allude to the appropriation angle as an objection to the bill. It was a matter with him of alluding to the treatment of small airports. I would like to say this about that question. There is hardly a Member of the House of Representatives who has not had a project in his district which has been completely financed and has been ready to go, and yet for which there have been no funds. This bill by making a project which is agreed upon by the sponsor and by the Secretary of Commerce a contractual obligation permits them to go ahead and construct the project and carry it to completion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that it requires planning in the municipalities throughout the country and this permits that planning to get underway and be completed, and then they can go ahead with the construction program?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true with reference to this question of the Secretary of Commerce being all powerful that none of these projects come to the Secretary of Commerce except as they are sponsored by a local municipality, a county or through a State agency?

Mr. HINSHAW. Why, of course, that is true. As far as the power is concerned, the power of allocation has resided in the Secretary of Commerce up to now, and we propose that it shall continue to reside in the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is it not also true that there are many municipalities in this country that have gone ahead and bonded themselves and built their own airport administration building in cities such as Cleveland, Ohio, for example?

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is it also not true that these municipalities or counties that would be coming to the Secretary of Commerce for this aid are, in fact, the processing authority and the owner of the municipal fields?

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe I heard the gentleman over and above the conversation directly in front of him, and I think you are correct, if I heard you correctly.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In view of the fact the gentleman feels that this program would take care of the small fields as well as the big fields, is it his opinion that the committee may put in an amendment which would limit the expenditure to fields of a certain size so that those of us who represent small communities would be sure that the smaller communities would get some of this money?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think I can carry on the balance of my speech now without the gentleman's assistance.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I still think I can carry on with my speech.

Mr. HARRIS. But I do think the gentleman should answer the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why certainly, he can answer it himself.

I would like to point out this fact. That this bill has been approved by not only the League of Cities, if I remember the name correctly, and the airport officials, but has been approved by practically everybody in the field of aviation including the feeder airline people and the Airport Transport Association. The private fliers certainly raised no objection to the bill. I think they were for it. Practically everybody in the aviation field has been for it, and in the municipal field as well. As has been said, we authorized the expenditure of a considerable sum of money after World War II, in 1946 in the 80th Congress. That money was not utilized, largely because they were not able to make contractual authority such as proposed here and because sufficient time was not permitted to elapse from the time of the authorization until its completion.

I see no objection to this bill whatsoever, and I cannot see why it should not be passed unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this bill is merely an amendment to an existing law which continues in force and effect until 1958.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] has raised some rather pertinent questions with regard to it, particularly as to the extent to which local officials should make final determinations regarding the allocation of the funds provided in this bill. In that respect I must say I am in complete accord with what the gentleman is seeking to do. I realize that he has a local situation that he feels this bill fails to meet. We have situations in Mississippi in the same category. However, the people who are most vitally interested in gaining the maximum of local control over the allocation of these funds would appear to me to be the Council of State Aviation Officials.

The other day, just before the committee was to go into executive session to consider this legislation, I contacted the office of the Association of State Aviation Officials, and found that they would prefer that a bill be reported which would put final authority in the hands of State officials. However, they realized, as we did, that to place such an amendment in this legislation would probably tie up this bill in conference between the House and Senate, and consequently not get any legislation passed at this session. As a result, they are adding their wholehearted endorsement to this legislation.

I think if we should send this bill back to committee and seek to amend it along the lines advocated by my friend from Michigan, we had might as well give up for this session on the problem of strengthening the Airport Act.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the gentleman that I am supporting the bill, but I think that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should get its house in order in reference to the cooperation which is due by that administration with the Reserve program in flying.

It has come to my attention that the Fort Worth office, for instance, and perhaps other offices of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, has not been cooperating with the military program on Reserve flying throughout the country. I think we should get that straightened out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not certain whether the question raised by my good friend from Louisiana is one which will be affected by this legislation. However, permit me to say that I know of many instances, as he does, in which the CAA has appeared to act arbitrarily with regard to airports and flying programs. He has raised an issue which Congress might do well to explore.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a bill which will authorize $272 million of appropriations is given but 20 minutes of debate and only 2 minutes allotted to me to raise a number of questions that I think are of a great deal of importance to this body in the consideration of this bill.

The gentleman from California said something about funds not being appropriated and not being able to get money for these airports. I should like to call your attention to the fact that you are turning this over to the executive branch of the Government where they will make the determination of what will be spent and where it will be spent.

Let me point out also that 3 years ago the same authority you are going to send this down to now had no money in the budget for airports. When the next bill came up the Subcommittee on Commerce increased the amount of the budget. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] offered an amendment and the House appropriated more money for airports. Then again this year when the budget came up there was $11 million in the budget for airports, and your committee of the Congress increased that to $20 million. So the House in the last few years has actually gone over the budget in trying to do the job that has to be done. Do not fool yourself by sending this money down here to be distributed; that is not going to help, because they have neglected this program in the past; it has been the House itself that has increased it.

Let me point out at least one other thing about this, how we are abrogating the power of Congress. Another point is to eliminate the present requirement that the Secretary of Commerce submit to the Congress each year a list of proposed projects for the development of these airports. The fact of the matter is that this bill even takes away the requirement that the Secretary report to the Congress. Not only are we abrogating our rights of appropriation, but we are telling him that he need no longer report to us. Is that what you want to do?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the hearings on this bill are not available in printed form at this time; and it is unfortunate, perhaps, that this measure comes before us under a suspension of the rules. I suppose these circumstances are due to the fact that we are approaching the end of the session and therefore time did not permit.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply wanted the gentleman from Iowa to yield so it would be understood that when I called the committee together on last Thursday afternoon I announced at the beginning of the session that if the bill was reported with anything like a unanimous vote we would try to bring it up under suspension. I do not want it to appear that the committee was not aware of that intent on the part of the chairman.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is precisely correct, and I have every respect for the decision of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to bring out this bill in the manner he has done.

I want to say that I attended the hearings on this bill along with the other members of the subcommittee.

The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BENNETT, who is in opposition to the bill, did not attend the hearings and did not hear the witnesses. I think those of the subcommittee who did attend the hearings and heard the witnesses are unanious in support of this measure.

In addition, there was no witness who appeared before us, who opposed the bill. The people who are interested in airports are strongly in favor.

I do have some misgivings about this bill. I come from an area or a district which is rural in character. There are no huge concentrations of population in the Sixth Iowa District. Many of the smaller communities want airports, but I have been unable to obtain them. I have been very much disturbed by the set of criteria that have been formulated by the Department of Commerce with reference to the eligibility for airports.

I questioned one of the witnesses, Mr. Rothschild, rather sharply with respect to the criteria which have been set up, namely, 3,000 passengers or 30 base airports—not both of them together but one or the other. He told the committee that was listening to his testimony that the Department of Commerce was seriously, indeed they were sure to consider some revision in the criteria that had been set up. With that reassurance on his part I think that this measure should be passed because it does provide additional funds.

I agree with our colleague from Ohio [Mr. BOW] who said that the Department and the Bureau of the Budget have been rather hanging back in their requests for funds from Congress to carry out this airport program. I believe the authorization that is given in this measure will assist very greatly in that respect.

The further development of a national system of civil airports is essential to the enlargement and extension of air transportation. Especially is such development essential to the smaller communities of our country. They do not have the resources necessary for such construction—and ultimately, if they can have appropriate Federal aid, they will constitute an important segment of the Federal airport system.

This measure is not the final answer, but it certainly is a partial answer to the problem. It is a step in the right direction.

I urge passage of S. 1855.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent from the remarks of those who have spoken both for and against the motion to suspend the rules that this legislation bears such an important relationship to the future air transportation of our country that it should never be considered by this shortcut parliamentary procedure. Over a quarter of a billion dollars of money is authorized to be appropriated and committed, vast authority is being vested in the Secretary of Commerce, and the bill fails to contain some safeguards which many members of the committee thought should be incorporated in this bill and the appropriation committees of the Congress are being bypassed. These considerations should convince anyone that this motion should be defeated and the bill be considered in the normal parliamentary fashion. I think this bill should be open to amendment.

The subcommittee, on which it happens the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] was not a member and, therefore, did not sit at the subcommittee's hearings, was kind enough to permit me to testify. I suggested an amendment which I thought was an important one. My proposal grew out of my study of a situation existing between two airports in my locality.

In formulating a national airport program the Secretary ought to take into account, among the things already specified in the act, the need for minimizing interference between military and civilian aviation operation. I do not believe the committee thought the Secretary should disregard that need. Anyone who is aware of the increasing congestion of the airways, particularly around metropolitan areas, the crowding of the air space and the approaches to airports, realizes that we must in our national planning take into account the need for making the airways as safe as possible.

The situation in my locality illustrates that fact. Willow Run Airport in my district is only 5 miles from Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. They are, in fact, one airport for purposes of approaches and safety in flying. To avoid that kind of a situation where one airport is built on top of another is a matter that should be taken into account in the formulation of national plans. My amendment was not accepted by the committee and cannot be offered on the floor under the motion to suspend the rules.

I favor expansion of our airport system but I oppose the use of a legislative shortcut on a measure of this magnitude where it is perfectly apparent that the legislation needs improvement.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7122 similar to the bill under consideration which is a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, which in effect provides for a 4-year Federal aid-to-airport construction fund in the amount of $63 million per year. This is a continuation of the program on an accelerated basis that was dropped last year but originally provided for in the Federal Aid to Airport Act of 1946.

This bill is similar to the Monroney bill, S. 1855, although it contains an additional provision of special importance to the State of Florida and that being that all classes of public airports and all eligible types of projects can now qualify.

Previously only the larger airports that are in the minority in number could qualify. Under previous legislation only some 800 out of the 3,000 eligible airports could receive aid. The bill I introduced qualifies all airports and is, therefore, more consistent with the spirit and intent of the original Federal Airport Act. This legislation is of particular importance to Pinellas International Airport serving Pinellas County, Fla., which has under way plans for improvement at this time. It is hoped that, should this bill pass, the Pinellas International Airport will be able to qualify for some of the available funds. There will be available to Florida under this act for the coming fiscal year $851,856, plus $283,952 already approved in the Commerce Department budget, making a total of $1,135,808 for the coming year. At this time, when Congress is considering billions for roads, it certainly should give consideration to this measure which will help provide adequate airport-terminal buildings for our air transportation both for the many thousands of private flyers as well as the millions of people who travel by air.

The bill further provides for advance contract authorization similar to that used in the Federal highway program in order that adequate planning might take place in advance and thus place the program on a more stable basis.

I join many others of my colleagues in the House who have introduced legislation for greater Federal aid-to-airport construction by introducing this measure in the hope that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House would act immediately upon these bills in order that funds might be available as soon in fiscal 1956 as possible and in the hope that the bill will be favorably reported early enough for Pinellas International Airport, as well as other Florida airport projects, to take advantage of it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues here today in support of this legislation. I think it is one bill that we can all agree was thoroughly considered in our committee. Everyone had an opportunity to offer amendments if they cared to do so. We had only a limited number of amendments offered, and there was hardly any debate or discussion about the amendments except on the amendment that I understand was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. It was a question of policy rather than something having to do with the construction of airports, and therefore it was not favorably acted upon.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] involved a policy matter with the military?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is entirely correct. It was a question of air policy and did involve the military, and therefore we could not act favorably on the amendment.

The balance of the amendments that were offered and that were included in the bill were agreed upon unanimously. Also the amendments that were offered in the Senate, in the original bill introduced in the House, and the bill as it passed the Senate, were considered again by the members of our committee and we wholeheartedly supported the amendments that were offered.

I want to say this afternoon that I share the concern of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] about the smaller airports. I have been one who has always supported larger appropriations for the smaller airports, because I felt that they made a major contribution in our country. They have been developed to assist the local feeder airlines service which has carried our passengers into the principal terminals. I have been interested in encouraging and expanding these facilities, and I would like to see legislation definitely drawn out so that they would get their fair share. If you notice, in the bill as it passed the Senate there was an amendment added on the second page to give consideration to all classes of airports, and we hope that that takes in that category.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, none of those who are sponsoring this bill so vigorously have said that it would be undesirable to give the States and localities some rights in this matter. They just pass that off and say that this is a desirable program; that somehow or other the Secretary of Commerce will administer it to everyone's satisfaction. One of the biggest Federal-aid programs we ever had, in a civilian sense, is the hospital construction program. Everybody in this House knows how well that program has worked. Under it the States are permitted to file what are known as State plans. The criteria and the standards of eligibility of hospital construction are written into the law, and if a State submits plans and specifications which meet these standards and designates that a hospital be built in city X, the Federal Government cannot say no. But, in the case of this program the State aeronautics board or the responsible aviation people of the State concerned can submit a plan to the Secretary of Commerce, and he can put it in the wastebasket. As a matter of fact, that is what he did with the plan in Michigan last year. That is what he has done in respect to other projects approved by State and local authorities.

Now, all I am asking for is that some standards and some criteria be written into this law which will give the States and the localities the right, if they have met those criteria, to require the Secretary of Commerce to go along with them. My purpose in doing that is the fear, judged by what has happened in the past, that the major part of this money will not go to the important smaller airports around the Nation which supply the feeder lines and greatly aid our air transportation development but will go, like they have in Michigan and elsewhere, to a few of the large city airports. Now, I am not prejudiced against large city airports. All I would like to see is that the smaller airports get a fair break, and in order that they may get a fair break I would like to have the standards written into the law. It could be done in a very simple way. This bill could be brought back here, so that it could be amended. It would take about half an hour of debate, and it could pass.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The State of Michigan has an aeronautics agency, does it not?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. All projects in the State of Michigan must be presented to that aeronautical agency, which would submit it to the CAA; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And consequently the sponsors of any airport project in Michigan must put up its share, 50 percent of the cost of the program, submit it to the State agency which must approve it. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And that approval is submitted to the regional CAA office and if it is there approved it finally comes to the Washington office for final approval. Is not that the procedure?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is the procedure, but the authority down here is vested in the Civil Aeronautics Administrator or the Secretary of Commerce, and gives him the right to throw the State plans and specifications in the wastebasket, if he does not like them, no matter how desirable they may be.

Further, this bill goes upon the assumption that the people in the States and localities do not know anything about aeronautics, they do not know where an airport should be located. There was an official down in the Department of Commerce last year who in my judgment did not know an airport from a cow pasture, who was the author of all these fancy criteria. They got rid of him but his criteria are still there. Are the people in the Department of Commerce smarter than the people in Michigan when it comes to developing an airport program? Are they any smarter than the people of Arkansas, represented by the distinguished gentleman?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think we have had any trouble in Arkansas, and I do not think the gentleman would find trouble anywhere else in the United States, except this objection to which he refers in Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. If the gentleman will look beyond the end of his nose, he will find that there is plenty of trouble with this program. All he has to do is to read the committee report.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman cite one airport outside of Michigan where there has been trouble?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes. I refer the gentleman to the committee report which says that out of 3,000 eligible airports only 800 could be assisted under the criteria established by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Is not that because we had no appropriations whatsoever?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. In my book that means that 2,200 airports were ineligible, whether there were appropriations or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 2½ minutes remaining to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in these 2½ minutes I want to make 1 or 2 points clear about this proposed legislation.

First of all, when I, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, learned last Thursday morning that the subcommittee had unanimously reported this bill, I called the committee together for an afternoon executive session. I explained to the committee that it was a bill passed in the other body and that I believed we could get it up under suspension on Monday if the bill was reported by the committee. The bill was reported that day without a dissenting vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that this bill is sponsored by and has the support of the American Municipal Association, the Airport Operators Council of America, and the National Association of State Aviation Officials?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is correct. The hearings will show that.

I want to state further that we are dealing here with a national airport program. I am in sympathy with the feelings of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] as he has expressed them. He is a hardworking member of that committee. I concede to him full sincerity in the position he has taken. I do not believe we can write into this law criteria that will take care of every little airport in the country that somebody might want to be taken care of, because we must remember that first of all this is a national airport program, a program devised to develop an airport system capable of handling the commerce of the Nation and lending itself to the defense of the Nation.

I want to say this, that our airport system in the country has been greatly outgrown by the industry itself. Increasing speeds of planes daily are making obsolete runways that were good a few years ago. I think in the next 5 years, with more and more turboprop planes in use in commercial aviation and with military planes jet-propelled and gaining speed year by year, unless we proceed to develop a national airport program, as is intended by this legislation, we will find ourselves facing very serious situations insofar as commercial aviation and military aviation are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will suspend the rules and pass this bill. I believe it is urgent and important.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of S. 1855, as amended by the committee, is to give to the Secretary of Commerce, for use in making grants under the Federal Airport Act, annual contract authority in the amount of $42,500,000 for the fiscal year 1956 and $63 million for each of the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959.

In addition, the bill has four other purposes, as set forth in the report, as follows:

First. To make it clear that the Department of Commerce is not to consider ineligible for Federal aid the development of any class of public airport, the construction, alteration, or repair of airport-terminal buildings, or the accomplishment of any other type of airport development legally eligible under the Federal Airport Act but instead is expected to make grants, within the limits of available authorized funds, for all legally eligible types of projects to the extent that they are determined to be necessary to meet the needs of civil aviation, on a case-by-case basis.

Second. To extend to 2 fiscal years the period of time within which apportioned funds shall remain available for use only in the States for which they are apportioned.

Third. To prescribe a deadline of March 31 for the preparation and adoption of each annual revision of the national airport plan.

Fourth. To eliminate the present requirement that the Secretary of Commerce submit to the Congress each year a list of proposed projects for the development of large airports.

According to the testimony and communications received by the committee it appears that all interested agencies, including particularly the States and their political subdivisions, the scheduled airlines, and both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Department of Commerce, are in accord with the objectives of the bill insofar as it seeks to place the Federal-aid airport program on a more stable basis and make available larger amounts for airport projects than have been appropriated in the past. In addition, it appears that all agencies concerned are in agreement that within the limit of available Federal funds, Federal aid is desirable for the construction and repair of airport terminal buildings and for the development of all classes and public airports.

There is need for advance authorizations. The fact that the annual appropriations made for airport projects under the Federal Airport Act have varied considerably in amount from year to year and have always been much smaller than those contemplated by the original act has had several serious consequences.

Of these, certainly the most serious are to be found in the resulting failure to accomplish more than a small fraction of the public-airport development required to serve the needs of civil aviation, of which more will be said in discussing the size of contract authorizations needed. However, the extreme fluctuations in the airport-appropriation level have also had the unfortunate effect of shaking if not destroying the confidence of the States and their political subdivisions in their Federal partner in the airport program.

There have been cases in which public agencies have issued, and sometimes sold, general obligation bonds for us in matching Federal funds for airport development, and have then been unable to obtain Federal grants, due to the limited amount of the appropriations made for that purpose during ensuing years.

There is considerable feeling that the Federal Government has not kept faith with the States and their political subdivisions. It appears that public agencies generally are becoming more and more reluctant to make the financial, engineering, and other plans and arrangements required for needed airport development unless and until grant agreements for such work have been entered into, contractually obligating the Government to pay the prescribed Federal share of the project costs involved.

It is my belief that public agencies cannot be criticized for this attitude in the light of past experience and that an entirely new approach to the problem, such as that contemplated by this bill, is essential to restore the confidence of prospective project sponsors and thus make it possible to carry out the Federal-aid airport program in such a way as to accomplish the purposes of the Federal Airport Act.

I trust the bill will have the approval of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1855, as amended?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that, in his opinion, two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan demanded a division.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 145, noes 32.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted. The Chair cannot tell whether all Members in the House when the House was counted voted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of developing as speedily as possible the use of nuclear transportation power in peaceful pursuits of domestic and foreign commerce there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sum as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered merchant vessel of such type, size, and speed as the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, may determine to be most appropriate. Such construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, shall be subject to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. The Maritime Administration in carrying on activities and functions under this act may employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by the Administration in carrying on such activities and functions, and may with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, officers, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof, in carrying on such activities and functions.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is any member of the committee opposed to the bill? [After a pause.] If not the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is plain and understandable in every respect. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House is directed to maintain a strong American merchant marine and to keep it abreast of the advancements in science, construction and engineering. Our Nation has been the pioneer in all scientific advancement in engineering during the past 100 years. We pioneered the utilization of gasoline-powered engines in aviation and other forms of energy. Now, Mr. Speaker, this new-found energy has come into being and it has been demonstrated clearly that it is possible to use it both for peaceful purposes and for national defense. Already engineers and scientists have made it possible to propel undersea warcraft by the use of atomic energy. This craft has proved successful in its trial runs in every respect. It is my understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission is today constructing reactors to be used in larger warcraft. So, in a Nation with our responsibilities, why not apply our knowledge and our energy in this development which we have brought into existence for the purpose of commerce and the enjoyment of men and women. The bill before you today was introduced some time ago, it contemplates a practicable and serviceable vessel. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries immediately called on the two top scientists or leaders in this field, Rear Admiral Rickover, of the Navy, and Dr. Davis, of the Atomic Energy Commission. Both testified as to the possibility of this development. Both stated that the field should be entered into for maritime purposes Rear Admiral Rickover stated that immediate steps should be taken by the Maritime Administration to develop nuclear propulsion for merchant ships. Dr. Davis also testified that unless we began the study of the utilization of nuclear energy for powering ships, the longer it would be before it came into use for that purpose. He forecast that in all probability it would be 5 years at the most.

In addition to authorizing the Maritime Administration to go into this field under the 1936 Act, it is necessary that the Maritime Administration be given authority to enter the field, because the construction is necessary in a different way than the construction under which we now build merchant ships through Government subsidy and the Maritime Administration direction.

Also, it is necessary to begin preparation for the training of crews or a crew to handle a vessel of this type. I understand, and we have been told, that the crew on the *Nautilus* was assembled and trained for a year or 18 months before they were placed aboard the ship to operate it.

This bill likewise gives the Maritime Administration authority to train a crew for the operation of nuclear ships. It also gives the Maritime Administration authority and direction to make application for a permit to build reactors for the propulsion of ships of this type.

There was no opposition to the bill in the committee, Mr. Speaker, nor have I heard any opposition to the bill elsewhere.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman state what the cost of this bill would be?

Mr. BONNER. It is estimated that the cost of this ship, the reactor and the ship, would be around $30 million. That sounds like a large figure. That is the beginning. Naturally, we hope that these things will come down as other scientific advancements have decreased in price as our engineers, physicists, and so forth bring them into a possibly more economic field.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes a combination passenger and cargo ship not an exhibit vessel. This is a practical ship and will keep us abreast of the world in commerce and maritime development. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman insists, of course the Chair is compelled to state there is no quorum present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Andrews
Anfuso
Becker
Bell
Buchanan
Buckley
Burleson
Celler
Cole
Cooley
Crumpacker
Davis, Tenn.
Deane
Dingell
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Fascell
Fernandez
Flynt
Gregory
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Hillings
Hoffman, Ill.
Johnson, Calif.
Kee
Krueger
McDowell
McMillan
Mumma
Phillips
Powell
Prouty
Reed, N. Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Short
Smith, Wis.
Udall
Velde

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 7252.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I come before you as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as the sometimes chairman of its Subcommittee on Research and Development. The subject of reactors for driving this and that, from submarines to airplanes to ships and other considerations such as powerplants, reactors for all kinds of purposes, has come before this subcommittee since its inception in 1947 when the act was passed.

The subject of ship reactors has been high on the list of priorities. The submarine reactor, as you know, was very high. The *Nautilus* reactor was built to go into the *Nautilus* submarine. It was built and tested at Arco, Idaho, in a stationary test and driven the equivalent of several times around the world on its test bed standing still, before its duplicate was put into the *Nautilus*.

Now at the Knolls Laboratory at Schenectady and again at Arco is being built another type of reactor which is intended to go into the *Sea Wolf*, which will be launched next Thursday by the wife of the distinguished former chairman of our committee, Mrs. W. Sterling Cole.

In the recent act authorizing projects for the construction of this and that by the Atomic Energy Commission is $25 million for a large surface-ship-type reactor.

This is quite a complicated subject, Mr. Speaker. I hope my colleagues will fully understand it when I get through.

Mr. Speaker, the number of persons who have the ability to design a reactor for a power purpose is very, very limited, indeed. The number of persons who are qualified in that field is so small that you could put all of them in a room about half this size and still have some space left over. We are in a peculiar position. My committee is not jealous, particularly, of its jurisdiction. We are delighted that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has gone ahead with this project and sees that it may be a good thing. When we had the atomic energy authorization bill before you a few weeks ago, you will remember the project for a large surface ship reactor. That reactor, when it is built, must first be built as a land based prototype. It will have to be tested at Arco, Idaho. When it is built, it will be suitable for any kind of surface ship. It will be suitable for a battleship, a carrier or a merchant vessel or troop ship or any other kind of vessel of large size. As a matter of fact, you might use 8 of them to run a carrier. You might use 4 of them to run the *Queen Elizabeth,* for example. You might use 2 of them to run a merchant ship. That is, 2 of the same kind and so on. But such a reactor has never been built. Such a reactor is only in the "think" stage. It has never been designed. We do not know whether it will be an economical thing. I would like to point out that up to now we have not been able to build a reactor or even much more than think of a reactor which is anywhere near economical so far as cost of operation is concerned. You must remember that a reactor is a source of heat. It is a source of heat in large quantity and can be used for the purpose of driving a generator turbine. It can provide steam. In that sense, it is a replacement for a boiler on a ship a replacement for the heat box. I do not think we should go ahead and do this now. I think it is premature. I think it is very much premature. I think it may be premature by 5 years even to think about it. Certainly, the reactor that was put into the *Nautilus* is not an economical thing. It will not drive a merchant ship at anything like the cost of coal or oil. It may cost 10 times as much and maybe more. The most convincing argument that I can think of is that this small group of reactor technologists that we have in the country working principally on military projects, certainly so far as ship reactors are concerned, is going to be materially reduced if we go into this project.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that a very prominent member of the military testified in executive session before our committee that if the merchant service was given this authority to build that or go into the reactor field, that his staff would be cannibalized and when we asked him what effect it would have on the military, he said that it would slow down the development of reactors for military ships.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is correct. It would cannibalize the program now being carried on for the military and slow down the entire program.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think it is also fair to state that every member of the military who has ever testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has emphasized the fact that the American merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, that is quite correct. The gentleman is correct. Also, aviation is our third arm. They all are arms of the military; the railroads, trucks, and everything else. That is quite true. And we are for the American merchant marine. But I think this is entirely premature.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to read a statement from Dr. W. Kenneth Davis, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission in the hearing on the Federal replacement program before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I want to read to you what he said.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will it take very long? The gentleman may yield me additional time.

Mr. BONNER. I have promised all my time.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sorry, but I cannot yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill which is presently before the House was considered by our committee and voted out unanimously. No witness appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill. The report does carry a copy of the letter sent to the chairman by the general manager of the United States Atomic Energy Commission in which he indicates opposition to the bill, but if you will read the letter you will find that the opposition was based upon the presumption that there would be another atomic ship built, and he had reference, of course, to the so-called President's peace ship. On the basis of that ship being built, he said that our ship would be premature.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will this bill provide the type of ship that President Eisenhower has asked for?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It probably is not exactly the same ship that he has in mind, but our committee—and I think I speak for the committee when I say this—believes that this bill will largely accomplish the purposes for which the President intended his ship to be built. At this point I might ask the minority leader if he has any views of the administration with reference to this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. The President is very deeply interested in having an atomic ship. He had his own proposal, which was not favored in committee. He still believes we should have an atomic ship. While I have no information about his ideas with reference to this particular bill, I would think he might want it passed so that it could go to the Senate and be further considered there.

I would certainly vote for this legislation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The reason I asked the gentleman is that we had a conversation just a moment ago, and I told him I would ask about this. I have talked to the representatives of the administration and they inform me they have no objection to this bill. Some of them want it. I know of no objection except the objection that has been voiced by members of the Committee on Atomic Energy. I feel very definitely that we should approve this bill so that the Maritime Administration can go on with this business of building a nuclear-powered vessel. Mention was made of the fact that the American merchant marine was the fourth arm of our defense. We mean that when we say it. I would like to quote from a gentleman who appeared before our committee, Admiral Rickover, who is the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] made reference.

Here is what he said:

> The thing I would like to say is that, as far as the Navy is concerned, I can assure you that not only myself but everyone in the Navy realizes that we could not function without a merchant marine.

If you are going to confine your nuclear power development to the Navy then you are only going to be doing just half the job, because the Navy cannot function without an American merchant marine. That was true in World War I and in World War II. Every representative of the Navy who has ever come before our committee has asserted time and time again that they never could have performed their obligation in World War I and World War II without an adequate merchant marine. If we are not going to develop a nuclear powered merchant vessel, we are going to come out second best in this matter of strengthening our national defense.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. What would be a better advertisement of atoms for peace than an American ship carrying American goods to all ports in the world, a ship driven by peacetime atomic power?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There is no better propaganda, if I may use that word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can we be assured that this ship will not be built by the British under some offshore procurement program?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. You can rest assured that it will not be.

Our committee will see that it will be built in American yards by American workmen.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. In line with the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, has the gentleman any idea how these ships are going to be built? Or where this ship is to be built? Will they use the facilities, for instance, of my area in Connecticut, Mystic, or New London? How is this going to be done.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Exactly how the contracts will be let I could not tell the gentleman, except that it will be done in American yards and will be built in the usual manner that the Maritime Administration uses when building ships for Government account.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will our area in Connecticut have a chance to bid?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I would certainly hope that every competent shipyard in the United States would be given consideration.

Will the gentleman from California yield me the 2 minutes he promised?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that several foreign nations are already engaged in programs for the development of nuclear-powered vessels: Great Britain, Norway, and Sweden. What Russia is doing we do not know, but we are behind the others in this type of program. Let me say also that several shipbuilding yards in this country are already giving and have been giving considerable study to the matter of nuclear-powered vessels. Some tentative plans have been drawn.

I would like to quote a statement from the Engineering Research Institute of the University of Michigan. They state:

> Analyses point to the desirability for the immediate construction of a nuclear-powered ship. Although it is not possible to compare approximate economic advantages at the present time for a nuclear-powered merchant ship, the construction and operation of such ship is the only means by which reliable, competitive, economic, and performance data can be obtained.

They recommended that we go ahead with this program immediately.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the estimated cost of the ship?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The hull would cost about $12 million. The atomic reactor would cost $20 million or $21 million.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the gentleman, being a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and everything pertaining to it, that I have heard considerable testimony regarding this atomic shipbuilding program. I am greatly interested and I want to agree with the gentlemen that now is the time to get going.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Now, Mr. Speaker, and in further support of H. R. 6243 I should like to submit an outline of the basic points concerning the proposal to authorize the construction of a nuclear powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy.

AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION

The merchant-marine policy of the United States is embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which is administered by the Federal Maritime Administration within the Department of Commerce. It is the responsibility of the Martime Administration to encourage, foster, and develop an adequate American merchant marine for the dual purpose of peaceful commerce and national defense.

The authority contained in the Merchant Marine Act is broad, and includes full authority and direction to keep abreast of the latest developments in the maritime field. However, there is reasonable doubt that such authority would extend to the actual construction of a nuclear power vessel.

H. R. 6243 spells out in positive terms authority for "the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel of a nuclear-powered merchant vessel of such type, size, and speed as the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, may determine to be most appropriate."

The bill specifically permits the Maritime Administration to avail itself of specialized services from competent outside sources and authorizes it to avail itself of "the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government" in carrying out the project. This latter provision makes the services of the Atomic Energy Commission available to the Maritime Administration, and will permit the closest and most expeditious cooperation between Maritime, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Navy. It was such teamwork between Navy and AEC that made the *Nautilus* and the *Sea Wolf* such great successes.

But, it in no way infringes upon the provisions or conditions of the Atomic Energy Act which sets forth the Commission's responsibilities and governs its operations.

NEED FOR A PRACTICAL VESSEL

The President has made a proposal for the installation of an existing type of reactor, such as used in the submarine *Nautilus*, in a newly constructed cargo-type vessel modified as a floating exhibition ship with display arrangements and a special auditorium.

This purpose is laudable and desirable and would clearly serve in the interests of dissemination of information to the people of the free world as well as be a vehicle of American good will.

However, we on the Merchant Marine Committee feel that there are larger objectives which can be obtained through proper planning and coordination.

Therefore, while urging the prompt passage of this bill, I sincerely hope that when it is enacted, the President and the Secretary of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Secretary of Defense will work together to design and build a vessel which will not only be the means of carrying out the splendid program inherent in the President's proposal, but also a vessel which will be a practical merchant ship the construction and operation of which will serve to further our merchant marine in the interest of commerce and defense. In this way, I am convinced that our Government will get the greatest return on its investment and still be able to have the vessel in operation in the shortest possible time.

CHOICE OF TYPES OF VESSEL

While we, on the Merchant Marine Committee, feel that the type of vessel, including the reactor, best suited to begin a practical development of nuclear power for merchant shipping should be determined by experts, we also think it is well to call attention to our belief—as stated in the committee report—that "consideration should be given to the possibility of building a combination vessel so that, in addition to carrying freight a limited number of passengers could also be transported. It may well be that the future of atomic power in vessel construction is more imminent and more practical for large passenger vessels than it is for ordinary cargo vessels."

The passenger vessels operate on a quick turnaround basis. Therefore, the ratio of capital cost to vessel utility would be far less than in the case of a cargo vessel which must spend much time in port.

From a strategic standpoint, passenger vessels form the backbone of our peacetime nucleus of vessels susceptible for quick conversion for troop transport in time of war. Long cruising range is an essential defense feature of all passenger ships.

We are presently seriously deficient in passenger ships in our merchant marine. Therefore, in view of the longer period of time necessary for passenger-ship construction as against that for a cargo vessel, it would be a strategic advantage to have the ship constructed under this bill—a passenger ship which would be readily available for immediate conversion in the event of military emergency. This would not be inconsistent with the projected peaceful purpose of the ship, but on the contrary, would be wholly consistent with our policy of peace and strength.

While vessels such as tankers, ore carriers, and roll-on roll-off types, having high turnaround characteristics, would seem more feasible than an ordinary cargo ship for installation of nuclear power, the passenger ship would be vastly more adaptable to the President's program of demonstrating peaceful application of atomic energy and invite more widespread interest and attention from the peoples of the world.

COST

Estimates made in connection with the President's proposal contemplate a total cost not in excess of $33 million, of which (a) $12,650,000 would be the cost of the hull, outfitting, and equipment, exclusive of reactor and main propulsion machinery, but including the cost of plans and specifications and for necessary training of personnel; and (b) approximately $21 million for the reactor and the rest of the main propulsion machinery and equipment.

In the event the application were made to a combination passenger ship, informal estimates would indicate not more than another seven or eight million dollars for building the hull and outfitting the ship for passenger and display arrangements.

All experts appearing before the committee freely state that economic use of atomic power in ships is 5 to 10 years in the future. At the same time, however, they emphasize that work must begin immediately in order to approach the goal of an economic powerplant within the shortest possible time. In other words, failure to move now with the application of all available information may mean longer and costlier delay.

Private industry cannot afford to indulge to any great extent in the initial experimentation with atomic-powered merchant ships. The cost at this stage should be borne by the Government because of its great stake in a modern and adequate merchant marine for defense and commerce.

TIME OF CONSTRUCTION

In order to avoid great delay, this bill should be favorably acted upon immediately so that the necessary working arrangements between Maritime, Atomic Energy, and the Navy, and work on plans and specifications and the training of personnel can begin at once.

It is estimated that even if work begins immediately it will take from 24 to 30 months to complete the project. The construction and installation of the reactors are the limiting factors as to time.

It is not true that the construction of a new vessel, whether it be dry cargo, tanker, or passenger ship, will delay the project in any respect. The bids opened last week for the construction of two new combination cargo-passenger ships for Moore-McCormack Lines call for completion well within the time estimated for construction of the reactor. Thus, the executive departments will be able to conduct a realistic and practical program for the construction of a vessel well suited to carry out the President's proposal and, at the same time, be of continuing value to the Government after its display function has been performed.

PROGRESS BY AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Even though, as has been stated elsewhere, the cost of experimentation with nuclear powered merchant ships cannot be borne solely by private industry at this time, our committee was gratified to learn that much preliminary work has already been done by several of our leading shipbuilding companies—Bethlehem Shipbuilding division and News Shipbuilding & Drydock—and leading shipping companies in whose operations atomic power will in the foreseeable future be usable—American President Lines, United States Lines, and Cities Service Co.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. has made progress in the design of a nuclear powered combination passenger-cargo ship to carry 500 passengers.

In view of the progress made by American shipping and shipbuilding industry to date, plus the great advances made by the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission, we are now ready to proceed with the first major step to bring our merchant marine into the atomic age.

PROGRESS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We cannot delay the passage of this bill. Other countries, namely Norway, Sweden and England, are known to be actively working on the application of atomic energy to merchant ships. Testimony before the Merchant Marine Committee brought out that even though these countries have started work ahead of us, we still have the advantage on our side because of extensive development in naval vessels and other fields. But, we cannot afford to wait because we will surely lose such advantage as we now have.

Moreover, while we do not have evidence of progress made by Russia in this field, we do know that their advances in the application of atomic power in peacetime as well as military uses have been very great.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ASPECTS

The Navy is carrying on full scale experimental and production work with the application of atomic energy to naval vessels. Notwithstanding our peaceful desires and a peaceful program to present information on practical uses of atomic energy to all the peoples of the free world, we must not overlook the national defense aspects of the merchant marine.

Adm. H. G. Rickover, head of the Nuclear Power Division of the Bureau of Ships, Navy Department, testified before our committee as follows:

> The thing I would like to say is that, as far as the Navy is concerned, I can assure you that not only myself but everyone in the Navy realizes that we could not function without a merchant marine. And I am sure that you know that throughout all the years anyone who has any sense or responsibility in the Navy has always advocated a strong merchant marine. I would like that to be on the record.

In this proposal we have the opportunity to begin to bring our merchant marine in line with our modern Navy which it must accompany and serve in time of war.

In this connection, I must point out that testimony repeated several times in the past 2 years shows that we are seriously deficient in actual numbers of ships in certain major categories, such as passenger ships—for potential troop use—and in tankers and dry cargo vessels. Thus, the construction of the most suitable type of new vessel under this bill will not only serve the purpose of the President's proposal, but will also materially add to our knowledge of the shipbuilding art and strengthen our posture of readiness by the addition of a valuable new unit to our available merchant fleet.

FEASIBILITY AND SAFETY

Testimony before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee by people of the highest qualifications in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department, such as Dr. W. K. Davis, Director of the Reactor Development Division of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Adm. H. G. Rickover, head of the Nuclear Power Division of the Navy Department, have convincingly demonstrated that the application of a nuclear reactor to the merchant ship is not only practical but both feasible and safe. The experience of the Atomic Energy Commission in the development of the great atomic production plants and of the Navy in the development and production of the submarines *Nautilus* and *Sea Wolf* have shown the way and established the procedures necessary to proceed both promptly and with the fullest degree of safety with the program contemplated in this bill.

This position has been supported by an independent evaluation of nuclear energy to marine applications by a special study group at the University of Michigan financed by three leading American steamship companies.

The engineering research institute of the University of Michigan says:

> Analyses point to the desirability for the immediate construction of a nuclear-powered ship. * * * Although it is not possible to compare approximate economic advantages at the present time for a nuclear-powered merchant ship, the construction and operation of such a ship is the only means by which reliable, competitive, economic, and performance data can be obtained.

NECESSITY FOR TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

While agreeing that prompt steps should be taken toward the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship, Admiral Rickover cautions against a program which would result in a waste of manpower and a drain on trained personnel which are needed in existing programs. Therefore, this bill specifically provides authorization for training of qualified personnel as a means of building up at the earliest time an additional pool of experts needed for the earliest development of a truly economic application of nuclear power to merchant ships. The development of this pool of trained personnel can only come about through the actual construction of such a ship as is contemplated by H. R. 6243.

In this connection testimony before the Merchant Marine Committee showed that much of the criticism directed at the original proposal to use a reactor similar to that installed in the submarine *Nautilus* is either unjustified or exaggerated. It is clear from testimony presented to the committee that much adaptation would have to be made to the *Nautilus* reactor to make it suitable for a merchant ship. For instance problems of screening for safety purposes would be vastly simplified to suit the reactor to a merchant vessel. Other modifications would have to be made together with advances resulting from experience in the operation of the *Nautilus* and in the construction of the *Sea Wolf*. My point is that when we speak of using the *Nautilus* type of reactor we are not speaking in terms of taking an obsolete piece of machinery off of the shelf and using it without regard to advances which have been made and the experience which must be gained for a modern merchant ship application. It is the purpose of this bill and the hope of those of us supporting it that the fullest effort will be made by all concerned to design and install a nuclear reactor of the most advanced design and most suitable type which can be produced in the shortest reasonable period of time.

PEACEFUL COMMERCE—THE FIRST ARM OF FREEDOM

The only objections which have been made to the President's proposal for the construction of an atomic-powered ship have been to the effect that its sole purpose would be a floating showboat. I must confess that if that were the only purpose I would also have some reservations about giving such a proposal my wholehearted support.

This bill would make possible all that was contemplated in the President's proposal and in addition give the United States the greatest return on its investment and would be a great forward step toward the modernization of our merchant marine.

In fact, even without the display aspects of the original proposal, the construction by the United States of a modern practical merchant ship as a prototype in the peaceful commerce of the United States would provide proof to the peoples of the world of our desire to develop and to share the great potentialities of atomic energy.

Our merchant marine traveling and sailing all the seas of the world and carrying commerce to and from the United States is as surely our first arm of freedom as that same merchant marine is our fourth arm of defense in time of emergency.

REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

The Merchant Marine Committee has been concerned this year with the fact that 85 percent of our merchant fleet will be obsolete within the next 10 years. Many witnesses from Government and industry have been heard on the subject of developing ways and means of keeping our fleet modern and abreast of the times. We feel that on the strength of hearings held this year that industry is prepared to proceed promptly with replacement of their existing aging vessels with the most suitable modern types.

Passage of this bill will in no way impede those plans. On the contrary, experience gained during the construction of the atomic ship contemplated by this bill and future developments may be expected to go hand in hand with an orderly long-range shipbuilding and replacement program.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and as the Representative of eastern Connecticut, from whose ports, in days gone by, famed Yankee clipper ships sailed forth for the seven seas, I rise today to support this bill H. R. 6243, which has been so carefully considered by our committee.

I have listened with the greatest interest at the hearings before our committee, when every witness, representing labor, management, the Department of Defense, the Marine Administration, and the public, stressed the importance of the American merchant marine as the fourth arm of our national defense.

The passage of this bill wlil give our merchant marine the foothold which it needs and must have in the atomic age.

I do not think there is any Member of this House who will dispute that our country must act now, to profit by the woeful and costly experience following World War I and World War II, when we let our merchant marine go to pot. We spent literally billions to provide the shipping without which winning either of those great conflicts would not have been possible; and, in each case, it seems hostilities had scarcely ceased before the policy of neglect and disuse of our merchant marine was invoked. It must not be allowed to happen again.

Our national security will suffer no less if we are to be short-sighted about our merchant marine, than it will if we fail to keep ahead of all others with our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

As our Government strives, in the name of the American people, to help inaugurate for ourselves and for all the world, an era of peace and prosperity, we are counting upon expanding world trade to buttress peace and prosperity. Let us here realize that, for our country, an expanding world trade, carried in American ships, is certainly of vital importance to our domestic economy as well as to our national security.

On February 12, 1955, in addressing the 19th annual banquet of local No. 1417, of the International Longshoremen's Association at New London, in my district, I remarked that the tragic irony in planning which puts the United States in 12th place among the maritime nations of the world in volume of shipbuilding this year, is being changed by the Eisenhower administration, and I said that the merchant marine budget submitted to this Congress is going to be the "stitch in time" that will keep the American flag on the seven seas.

The State of Connecticut, and particularly my own district of eastern Connecticut, has played and is continuing to play an especially significant part in the development of atomic power. I am proud of the contribution which it has been possible for me, as a Member of Congress, to make to this continuing development.

We have seen the building and launching and the commissioning, in my district, of the submarine *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-powered vessel. The bill which we are considering today, authorizing the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, has its antecedents in the astounding success which has been had with the *Nautilus*. This week, again in my district, the world's second nuclear-powered submarine is to be launched, and soon others will be on the way.

Elsewhere in my district, a laboratory is being constructed at Middletown, to push forward with all possible dispatch, the perfection of the world's first nuclear-powered aircraft engine.

Although these developments are foremost achievements for the national defense, they are prime achievements of atoms for peace.

From the already successful experiment of the *Nautilus* we have learned much, that we can and will adapt to numerous peaceful uses of nuclear power, not the least of which is the propelling of a proud American merchant ship, that well may make obsolete even the proudest of the great ships of other lands now sailing the seas.

As we proceed with our Government's noble and practical "atoms for peace" program, I am sure that there could be no feature of that program that would be more effective than American goods, carried in an American ship, powered by atoms.

Such a development, we propose to authorize in this bill. I am for it, because I believe that here is our opportunity to take action on the peaceful development of atomic energy, rather than just talk.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], I, too, am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and over a period of years have become familiar with the efforts of physicists, engineers, and others in the field of reactors for power purposes whether for submarines, surface ships, or airplanes. I am disturbed about this bill because of the fact that the No. 1 reactor builder of the Nation, if not the world, stated very frankly before our committee that if the maritime services enter the reactor field as provided for in this bill he will lose his best men, his best talent, and it will slow down the construction or the building of the reactors for not alone submarines but all other craft.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. That statement was made before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries also and assurance was given that the Maritime Administration will not pilferage or rob any other agency.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. With all due respect to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, may I say that the statement I referred to was made before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In addition the subcommittee hearing the witness committed itself to protect his staff if the maritime service tried to cannibalize it. Frankly the subcommittee as a whole indicated great concern over the threat of this legislation.

The President's request involves a ship, an existing hull, the conversion of it and the installation of a *Nautilus* type reactor. The hull can be converted and the reactor installed over a period of 18 months to 2 years. The ship will then be ready to sail around the world as evidence to the people of our efforts and our success in the development of a power reactor.

The gentleman from North Carolina made the statement in the well of the House a few moments ago that it will be impossible to put a ship on the surface of the waters of the seven seas of the world in less than 5 years. What the President wants is a ship, that he can immediately send around the world to spread good will by dramatizing our efforts in the field of atomic energy.

Mr. BONNER. I think the gentleman misquoted me. I said that it was probable that it would take 5 years to build this type of ship.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You are correct in such a statement because last week in executive session the Joint Committee was told it would be about 5 years.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the atoms-for-peace ship proposed by the President on April 25 is not authorized by this Congress, we will permit the Soviet Union and its satellites to score a major diplomatic victory over the United States.

The Chinese Communist radio on May 2 broadcast the text of a People's Daily editorial on Soviet efforts to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and concluded with this reference to the President's ship in a paragraph attacking what they called United States atommongering:

> For the purpose of deceiving the people, the United States is attempting to use the building of an atomic ship to tour the world to show that it has also thought of the peaceful use of atomic energy. However, the facts are clear. Since 1945, when the United States dropped atomic bombs to kill thousands of Japanese people, what we have seen are regular announcements of the possession of hundreds of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs, and strong opposition to the banning of atomic weapons. We have never seen the application of atomic energy in any enterprise for peace.

Radio Moscow ignored the President's peace ship project until May 17, when the Soviet European service referred to it in a broadcast. The commentary was in Finnish and was patently timed to offset the effect on the Finnish people of the United States peaceful-uses-of-the atom exhibit being shown at the time in Helsinki.

In this broadcast, Radio Moscow declared:

> American propaganda has been advertising United States achievements in the peaceful utilization of atomic energy. For example, it was recently publicized in the United States that an atomic-powered ship was to be constructed to sail around the world to illustrate the peaceful utilization of atomic energy. The atomic ship exists only in dreams of those who are talking about it.
>
> Thus, while the atomic ship sails only in advertising campaigns, American exhibitions advertising the imaginary achievements of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the United States are already being organized in several European capitals. The Polish Government considered such an advertising exhibition as nonsensical. As is known, the Soviet Union, which is the leading country of the world in this field, gives Poland and some other countries all essential scientific, technical and productive aid.

Continuing, Radio Moscow said:

> In actual fact the United States has not even tackled the problem of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy, but has concentrated entirely on atomic armaments.

The Red Radio then quotes Collier's as saying "that of the $12 billion which previously had been used for the United States atomic program, only 5 percent had been used for nonmilitary general research," and adds:

> The advertising campaign started by them is necessary for the ruling circles in order to conceal the fact that the United States lags behind in the field of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy.

Concluding its propaganda blast, the Reds said:

> If the United States sincerely hopes that others might learn from it the peaceful utilization of atomic energy, then it must really prove that it has done something useful in this field.

The story, Mr. Speaker, is in these last few words of the Russian broadcast.

The Communists have held up to ridicule the idea that the United States is genuinely interested in using the atom for peaceful purposes. Their radio propagandists have blared out that the President's atoms-for-peace program is a myth; that his atomic ship exists only in dreams of those who are talking about it, and that if we wish others to believe that we are genuinely interested in the peaceful utilization of atomic energy, we must prove that we have done something useful in this field.

These are the words of the Communists. They are directed to people we need to convince of our peaceful purposes. They say to the peoples of the world: "Come with Russia. Russia and its friends are the road to peace. The United States has spent for peaceful purposes only 5 percent of the twelve billions it has spent for atomic and hydrogen weapons. Russia and its satellites are far ahead of the United States in the peacetime uses of the atom. America is interested only in nuclear weapons."

We must remember that we are engaged with the Communists in a new atomic race. This is not a race to develop some new superbomb. It is a world battle for atomic supremacy in the field of the peaceful uses of the atom. The atomic reactor has taken the place of the bomb as a weapon in the field of power politics. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the nation that brings the atomic reactor, the isotope and the remainder of the vast atoms-for-peace storehouse to the peoples who do not possess these blessings, that nation will win this new race for world supremacy.

The Communists have made the President's peace-ship project a symbol of our peaceful intentions in the atomic field. They have told the nations of the world that this is just another American advertising scheme, that we are still warmongers, and that our whole atoms-for-peace program is a dream that will not be fulfilled.

Therefore, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that because the Communists have made of the President's ship a symbol of our peaceful intentions in the atomic field, this Congress cannot afford to scuttle this ship so that the Communists can tell the world "We told you so." Congress cannot afford to hand to the Communists a propaganda weapon they would use to prove America is interested only in nuclear weapons and that the President's atoms-for-peace ship was never anything but a publicity gag.

We are engaged in a battle, Mr. Speaker, that will be fought on the soil of many nations in every corner of the world. We will not fight it here on the floor of Congress, though we could lose it here. It will be a battle for supremacy in the peaceful use of the atom, but because it will be economic warfare let us not forget that it will be no less deadly than if fought with nuclear weapons.

We will fight it in Afghanistan where Russia has an economic mission. We will wage it at the great national fairs of many nations such as those of Turkey and Belgium where the Russian exhibits overshadowed those of the United States. It will be fought in all the lands where the Russians have negotiated trade agreements; in any place where the Communists can use the peacetime atom to win friends and influence people against the United States and its allies.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the United States cannot afford to lose this diplomatic and economic battle. We cannot afford to turn down the President's request for a ship to demonstrate to the world our peaceful intentions in the atomic field; to give the lie to the Communists that nuclear weapons are our only interest.

We cannot afford to abdicate to Russia the lead in this new battle of the atom. We are ahead of the Reds in the field of atomic and hydrogen bombs. We must remain ahead of them in the field of the atom-for-peace.

The President has expressed himself on this subject many times, but never more eloquently, I believe, than in his letter to me of July 11, which I take the liberty of quoting:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, July 11, 1955.*
>
> Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I appreciate your June 29 letter informing me of your bill to authorize appropriations for the atomic-powered merchant ship proposed on April 25.
>
> The reasons underlying our plan for such a ship are no less impelling now than when it was first announced. The world, by and large, today considers atomic science as having a destructive purpose, and as being of primary importance only to two great world centers — Washington and Moscow. We simply must demonstrate convincingly to the world, in as many ways as we can, and to as many peoples as we can, that we are determined to utilize atomic science to improve the lot of man. Our pursuits in this field are already paving the way to the betterment of human welfare everywhere.
>
> I deeply believe that the atoms-for-peace ship would dramatize these efforts all over the world. It would help generate a moral force to turn atomic energy more and more into peaceful uses and away from destructive channels. I conceive of it as an important step in our progress toward peace.
>
> For these reasons, I assure you that legislation to serve these purposes has my strong endorsement, and I warmly appreciate the step forward that you have taken.
>
> With cordial regard,
> Sincerely,
> DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Originally, when the President first proposed his ship I was disposed to be against it; but during the course of the hearings I was informed the ship now under consideration will be constructed under the Maritime Administration and from the testimony of Admiral Rickover it would seem that we should get started soon or we will have no ship at all.

Admiral Rickover said in part:

> I have learned since I have been in Washington that about 90 percent of the stuff that I read about atomic energy is a lot of hogwash.

After listening to the debate today I can understand why he would make such a statement. This is not an argument as to whether or not a ship shall be built, but, rather, under what committee the baby shall be baptized. Certainly we should have an atomic ship. The merchant marine is an essential part of our national defense.

I have great respect for the Atomic Energy Commission, but I am quite sure it will follow all the events and I am sure they will agree with Admiral Rickover who urged that we get started on it. As he said, in answer to Mr. GARMATZ:

> I think, in approaching it for the merchant ship, you should not consider the economics at the beginning. You should say "we have got to develop an atomic powerplant for a merchant ship."

It seems to me we should lay aside our partisan attitude on this subject. We need the ship. The merchant marine must be brought up to date. An atomic ship developed in the next 5 or 10 years certainly will be something as modern as the dynaflow is in automobiles.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does not the gentleman agree that the sooner we can get this ship going around the world the better it is for the United States as a whole, especially during these most critical days?

Mr. TUMULTY. I agree.

Mr. PATTERSON. And that can be done only by using a hull that is now in existence.

Mr. TUMULTY. It seems to me you cannot send a ship around the world until you first build it. This will enable you to build the ship, and the arguments now developing may prevent the construction of the ship.

Mr. PATTERSON. But the way you people are approaching it, you have to build the hull along with the reactor.

Mr. TUMULTY. The way we approach it is the way we derive results. Mr. Rickover further said:

> I think that if you want to have atomic-powered merchant ships, you are going to have to set up a group, and it will have to be developed in a group in the Maritime Administration that knows something about it. Otherwise you are going to be at the mercy of a lot of people.

So, it seems to me we should resolve the problem. Is the ship needed? The answer is "Yes." Are we going to work on it? The answer is "Yes." Should the Maritime Administration develop the program? The answer is "Yes."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Hr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let us get this clear in our minds. This bill authorizes two things: a nuclear powered merchant ship; and authorizes undetermined and apparently unlimited sums of money to implement the program. I realize it has to go to the Committee on Appropriations to set the sum, for there is no sum set in the bill. The Under Secretary of Commerce, who is over the Maritime Commission, testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in favor of the President's peace ship, but he did not testify in favor of this particular ship.

Admiral Rickover's name has been mentioned here. Let us look at the hearings on page 3. Here is what Admiral Rickover said:

> I urged the committee to be enthusiastic, lest the project die for lack of initiative, but to be realistic in its approach, since while nuclear power is here today, economic nuclear power is still some distance away. I said "Be careful that you do it in a way that gets it the fastest and where you get the most for your money." Moreover, I urged that all such projects ought to be carefully considered from the point of view of husbanding our available technical manpower. "The United States is a very rich country," I said. "We can afford to make many mistakes. But sometimes in making these mistakes we waste not only money, but we also waste talent."

So, his fear on this proposal was the same as his fear on the President's nuclear ship; the power of transferring the number of technicians, nuclear physicists, and nuclear engineers from the present programs over to a program which would be futile.

Now, what are the present programs? Well, we are trying to build nuclear aircraft engines. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has been plugging on this theme for years. We appropriated not only $25 million recently, but we have provided many more millions of dollars to the science of reactor development. So, this work is being done. If it was not, I would not be on the floor today. But the research and development work is being done; adequate money has been appropriated already or authorized already for the purpose of carrying on the research and development just as quickly as we have enough qualified men to do the job. There is close to $75 or $100 million in the whole reactor-development program. All of these scientific techniques are involved in making this purpose of Mr. BONNER'S possible. And, I am sorry that I have to be against the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] on this particular thing, but I opposed the President's atomic ship. Why? Because its timing was wrong. The expense of construction was between $34 million and $47 million as testified before our committee. Its cost of operation was from 5 to 10 times as much a year as other types of vessels, and it would not go one knot faster or carry one more ton of cargo than a regular merchant ship.

The timing was premature. It is now premature. I read to you what the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Fields, said in his letter, which is in the report. He said:

> For reasons set forth above, we believe the construction of a second nuclear-propelled ship is premature, and we would therefore recommend against favorable consideration of H. R. 6243. We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it has no objection to our submission of this report.

So you have the Atomic Energy Commission against this; you have Mr. Louis Rothschild, of Maritime Administration, against it; you have the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission against it; and you have Admiral Rickover against it, as it proven by the testimony.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman know that Mr. Rothschild came to me confidentially and wanted me to include the President's ship in this bill and advocated this bill, and then came before the committee and testified adversely to all of them?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All I know is what is in the testimony. I call attention to the hearings which I have here. There are 22 pages of hearings. That comes to about a million and a half dollars a page. And all the testimony is against this bill. There is no one who unqualifiedly has come out for it. I am not against our having an atomic-powered ship. I want it. But I say that the expense of one at this time is fantastic. The expense to operate it would be fantastic. It is impractical, from the standpoint of utility.

Close to $75 million is already available for experimentation in this and directly related fields of getting us a feasible atomic reactor.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] told you that this money will go to build multiple reactors for ship propulsion. If we develop one reactor that is feasible, we can put one or two into a merchant ship. We can put four into a bigger ship. We can put 6 or 8 into a carrier type ship. So the job is being done.

I respectfully request this House to take into consideration the real facts in this case and to look at this from the standpoint of its practicability and from the standpoint of the fact that it will take away from vital defense projects, such as nuclear aircraft, such as carrier ship propulsion, such as power reactor development, vitally needed technologists, physicists, and nuclear engineers whom we cannot afford to spare from those projects.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that we were told by naval engineers that the reactors we are now building at Schenectady, N. Y., can be installed not alone in a carrier or a battleship, but in the steamship *United States*, or the *Queen Elizabeth*, or the *Queen Mary*?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. We are spending millions of dollars to do this job right now, so why duplicate it with a bunch of amateurs who know nothing about it and who will have to pull these top class scientists off the projects on which they are working now and put them on this project, or else they have to use second-class or third-class or fourth-class scientists who are not capable of doing the original development work needed in this new field.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I appreciate the gentleman's concern over the lack of qualified scientists in this field. But I would say that there is nothing in the bill as it is written that would conflict with the major thesis the gentleman has developed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. An authorization is made, and then money is made available. They must have the men to do the job and there is only one place they can get them. That is from those on nuclear development work which is going on at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to be passed. It seems to me that the Maritime Administration, on legislation coming from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, should be in charge of the ultimate construction of merchant ships, whether powered by nuclear devices or not.

We have been told that when the Navy started to work on its device for its ship it found it very necessary to have a team of men in its own office to work with the Atomic Energy Commission. I think we should immediately set up such a team in the Maritime Commission and begin to develop a group of men who could work upon the problem of ships powered by nuclear devices against the time that they come. I see no reason to conflict with the efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission but I do see an immediate need to set up a group in the Maritime Administration to begin to study this problem in an orderly fashion and ultimately to supply the men and the technical people to operate such a ship.

It is very necessary now that there be someone to advise the merchant-marine industry. We have noted that we have a replacement program amounting to 300 ships. Even now that program is being delayed because of the lack of information as to when atomic energy will be available. We know it will take 5, 10, maybe 15 years to make this type of energy economically feasible in merchant ships, but that does not alleviate the necessity of having a group immediately who will begin to study the question and have the facts and information so that they may give them to the proper people and the proper committees of Congress.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not anticipate the fight on this bill that has developed. Before I even went into the situation, I spoke to 2 or 3 people on the Atomic Energy Committee. I did not know until recently it was such a closed corporation. I respect these fine men, and it is an interesting subject, but it is apparent here that nobody else should even mention the utilization of atomic energy but members of the Atomic Energy Committee.

I want that committee to know that I respect all of them and know they are fine men, and know they know more about the subject than I do, but the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has a little standing in this House, and we are interested in the subject. We are interested in ships. If the *Nautilus* has been so successful, and I think somebody is selling electricity up here developed by atomic energy, and if they are doing this, and if it is contemplated that they will do that, and if Dr. Rickover writes me a letter and says, "I urged the committee to be enthusiastic lest the project die for lack of initiative," then there is something going on around here. Then Mr. John Jay Hopkins, whose shipyard built the *Nautilus*, says, "What has been achieved with the *Nautilus* can, I am confident, be achieved in short order for all major types of marine transportation."

I did not finish quoting the statement of Dr. Davis just now, but he said:

> The quicker you get started on it, the sooner you are going to get there, and also I might point out that it is desirable to build something at a fairly early stage even though you may not feel that it is necessary or economic.

I do not want to take away any of the prerogatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I do think that we ought not stand still in our tracks and not let the Maritime Commission just look into this field. We desire they just be prepared to enter the field. They do not expect to build the reactors. They get a permit from the Atomic Energy Commission to have a reactor built for them by private industry. That is the way the thing would be done. If that is not fair, if that is not all right, certainly they are not going to cannibalize the Atomic Energy Committee staff nor that of the Commission. They will go out and get people themselves. All the brains are not confined to a few people in this world. We are here today for progress. This committee is only appealing to the House to give the Merchant Marine Committee authority to look into this matter and to do something about it. Neither did I want to get mixed up with the President's peace ship. But I do think the ship here contemplated is the answer to the top scientists' advice. It is a combination passenger ship for the purpose of studying both angles of the matter. When the ship is constructed it will be necessary to have trial and test runs and voyages. On one or more of these voyages let the ship be loaded with 5-pound or larger packages of food and sent to needy individuals of the world. There distribute the packages, plainly marked, "Not atomic energy for destruction but friendly gifts delivered by atomic energy for peace from the United States of America." The ship should be named "Tidings of Peace."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Virgina, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 308, Rept. No. 1202), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7214) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments proposing to increase or decrease the hourly wage rate specified in line 7 therein and except amendments proposing to change the effective date provided in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7201) relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies, with amendments which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Revision of formulas for taxing income of life insurance companies

Part I of subchapter L of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"PART I—LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

"Subpart A. 1955 formula.
"Subpart B. 1942 formula.
"Subpart C. Miscellaneous provisions.

Subpart A—1955 formula

"Sec. 801. Definition of life insurance company.
"Sec. 802. Tax imposed for 1955.
"Sec. 803. Income and deductions.
"Sec. 804. Reserve and other policy liability deduction.
"Sec. 805. Special interest deduction.

"SEC. 801. Definition of life insurance company.

"(a) Life insurance company defined: For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'life insurance company' means an insurance company which is engaged in the business of issuing life insurance and annuity contracts (either separately or combined with health and accident insurance), or noncancellable contracts of health and accident insurance, if—

"(1) its life insurance reserves (as defined in subsection (b)), plus

"(2) unearned premiums and unpaid losses on noncancellable life, health, or accident policies not included in life insurance reserves,

comprise more than 50 percent of its total reserves (as defined in subsection (c)).

"(b) Life insurance reserves defined:

"(1) In general: For purposes of this part, the term 'life insurance reserves' means amounts—

"(A) which are computed or estimated on the basis of recognized mortality or morbidity tables and assumed rates of interest, and

"(B) which are set aside to mature or liquidate, either by payment or reinsurance, future unaccrued claims arising from life insurance, annuity, and noncancellable health and accident insurance contracts (including life insurance or annuity contracts combined with noncancellable health and accident insurance) involving, at the time with respect to which the reserve is computed, life, health, or accident contingencies.

"(2) Reserves must be required by law: Except—

"(A) in the case of policies covering life, health, and accident insurance combined in one policy issued on the weekly premium payment plan, continuing for life and not subject to cancellation, and

"(B) as provided in paragraph (3), in addition to the requirements set forth in paragraph (1), life insurance reserves must be required by law.

"(3) Assessment companies: In the case of an assessment life insurance company or association, the term 'life insurance reserves' includes—

"(A) sums actually deposited by such company or association with State or Territorial officers pursuant to law as guaranty or reserve funds, and

"(B) any funds maintained, under the charter or articles of incorporation or association (or bylaws approved by a State insurance commissioner) of such company or association, exclusively for the payment of claims arising under certificates of membership or policies issued on the assessment plan and not subject to any other use.

"(4) Amount of reserve: For purposes of this subsection, subsection (a), and subsection (c), the amount of any reserve (or portion thereof) for any taxable year shall be the mean of such reserve (or portion thereof) at the beginning and end of the taxable year.

"(c) Total reserves defined: For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'total reserves' means—

"(1) life insurance reserves,

"(2) unearned premiums and unpaid losses not included in life insurance reserves, and

"(3) all other insurance reserves required by law.

"(d) Adjustments in reserves for policy loans: For purposes only of determining under subsection (a) whether or not an insurance company is a life insurance company, the life insurance reserves, and the total reserves, shall each be reduced by an amount equal to the mean of the aggregates, at the beginning and end of the taxable year, of the policy loans outstanding with respect to contracts for which life insurance reserves are maintained.

"(e) Burial and funeral benefit insurance companies: A burial or funeral benefit insurance company engaged directly in the manufacture of funeral supplies or the performance of funeral services shall not be taxable under this part but shall be taxable under section 821 or section 831.

"Sec. 802. Tax imposed for 1955

"(a) Tax imposed: A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning in 1955 on the income of every life insurance company. Except as provided in subsection (c), such tax shall consist of a normal tax (computed under sec. 11 (b)) and a surtax (computed under sec. 11 (c)) on the sum of—

"(1) the life insurance taxable income (as defined in subsec. (b)), plus

"(2) the non-life-insurance taxable income (as defined in subsec. (f)).

"(b) Life insurance taxable income defined: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'life insurance taxable income' means the net investment income (as defined in sec. 803 (c)), minus the sum of—

"(1) the net investment income allocable to non-life-insurance reserves (determined under sec. 804 (g)),

"(2) the reserve and other policy liability deduction (determined under sec. 804), and

"(3) the special interest deduction, if any, allowed by section 805.

"(c) Alternative tax in the case of companies having non-life-insurance reserves:

"(1) In general: In the case of a life insurance company which has non-life-insurance reserves, the tax imposed by subsection (a) of this section for any taxable year beginning in 1955 shall be the tax computed under such subsection (or under sec. 1201 (a) if applicable) or the tax computed under paragraph (2) of this subsection, whichever is the greater.

"(2) Alternative 1-percent tax on non-life-insurance business: The tax referred to in paragraph (1) is a tax equal to the sum of the following:

"(A) A partial tax consisting of a normal tax (computed under sec. 11 (b)) and a surtax (computed under sec. 11 (c)) on the life insurance taxable income.

"(B) A partial tax consisting of—

"(i) 1 percent of the amount which bears the same ratio to the gross investment income (reduced by the deduction for wholly-exempt interest allowed by sec. 803 (c) (1)) as the non-life-insurance reserves bear to the qualified reserves (determined under sec. 804 (d)), plus

"(ii) 1 percent of the excess of the amount by which the net premiums on contracts meeting the requirements of section 804 (g) (2) (A) exceed the dividends to policyholders on such contracts. For purposes of this clause net premiums, and dividends to policyholders, shall be computed in the manner provided in section 823.

"(d) Deductions for partially tax-exempt interest:

"(1) Computations under subsection (a): For purposes of computing the normal tax under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of the deduction provided by section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest as (A) the sum of the life insurance taxable income and the net investment income allocable to non-life insurance reserves bears to (B) the net investment income.

"(2) Computations under subsection (c) (2) (A): In computing the normal tax for purposes of subsection (c) (2) (A), there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of the deduction provided by section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest as (A) the life insurance taxable income bears to (B) the net investment income.

"(e) Alternative tax on capital gains: In the case of a life insurance company which has non-life insurance reserves, the term 'excess' used in section 1201 (a) (relating to alternative tax on capital gains of corporations) means, for purposes of section 1201 (a), an amount which bears the same ratio to the excess described in such section as the non-life insurance reserves (determined under section 804 (g)) bear to the qualified reserves (determined under section 804 (d)). For purposes of any such computation, a net capital loss for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1955, shall not be taken into account.

"(f) Non-life-insurance-taxable income defined: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'non-life-insurance-taxable income' means the net investment income allocable to non-life insurance reserves (determined under section 804 (g))—

"(1) increased by an amount which bears the same ratio to the net capital gain as the non-life insurance reserves bear to the qualified reserves; and

"(2) decreased by an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of the deductions provided in sections 243, 244, and 245 as the nonlife insurance reserves bear to the qualified reserves.

In computing a net capital gain for purposes of this paragraph, a net capital loss for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1955, shall not be taken into account.

"Sec. 803. Income and deductions

"(a) Application of section: The definitions and rules contained in this section shall apply only in the case of life insurance companies.

"(b) Gross investment income: For purposes of this part, the term 'gross investment income' means the sum of the following:

"(1) The gross amount of income received or accrued from—

"(A) interest, dividends, rents, and royalties,

"(B) the entering into of any lease, mortgage, or other instrument or agreement from which the life insurance company derives interest, rents, or royalties, and

"(C) the alteration or termination of any instrument or agreement described in subparagraph (B).

"(2) The gross income from any trade or business (other than an insurance business) carried on by the life insurance company, or by a partnership of which the life insurance company is a partner. In computing gross income under this paragraph, there shall be excluded any item described in paragraph (1).

In computing gross investment income under this subsection, there shall be excluded any gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset, and any gain considered as gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset.

"(c) Net investment income defined: The term 'net investment income' means the gross investment income less the following deductions:

"(1) Tax-free interest: The amount of interest received or accrued during the taxable year which under section 103 is excluded from gross income.

"(2) Investment expenses:

"(A) Investment expenses paid or accrued during the taxable year.

"(B) If any general expenses are in part assigned to or included in the investment expenses, the total deduction under this paragraph shall not exceed—

"(i) one-fourth of 1 percent of the mean of the book value of the invested assets held at the beginning and end of the taxable year, plus

"(ii) one-fourth of the amount by which the net investment income (computed without any deduction for investment expenses allowed by this paragraph, or for tax-free interest allowed by paragraph (1)) exceeds 3¾ percent of the book value of the mean of the invested assets held at the beginning and end of the taxable year.

"(3) Real estate expenses: Taxes (as provided in section 164), and other expenses, paid or accrued during the taxable year exclusively on or with respect to the real estate owned by the company. No deduction shall be allowed under this paragraph for any amount paid out for new buildings, or for permanent improvements or betterments made to increase the value of any property.

"(4) Depreciation: The depreciation deduction allowed by section 167.

"(5) Depletion: The deduction allowed by section 611 (relating to depletion).

"(6) Trade or business deductions: The deductions allowed by this subtitle (without regard to this part) which are attributable to any trade or business (other than an insurance business) carried on by the life insurance company, or by a partnership of which the life insurance company is a partner; except that for purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) There shall be excluded losses from—

"(i) sales or exchanges of capital assets,

"(ii) sales or exchanges of property used in the trade or business (as defined in section 1231 (b)), and

"(iii) the compulsory or involuntary conversion (as a result of destruction, in whole or in part, theft or seizure, or an exercise of the power of requisition or condemnation or the threat or imminence thereof) of property used in the trade or business (as so defined).

"(B) Any item, to the extent attributable to the carrying on of the insurance business, shall not be taken into account.

"(C) The deduction for net operating losses provided in section 172, and the special deductions for corporations provided in part VIII of subchapter B, shall not be allowed.

"(d) Rental value of real estate: The deduction under subsection (c) (3) and (4) on account of any real estate owned and occupied in whole or in part by a life insurance company shall be limited to an amount which bears the same ratio to such deduction (computed without regard to this subsection) as the rental value of the space not so occupied bears to the rental value of the entire property.

"(e) Amortization of premium and accrual of discount: The gross investment income, the deduction for wholly-exempt interest allowed by subsection (c) (1), and the deduction allowed by section 242 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest) shall each be decreased to reflect the appropriate amortization of premium and increased to reflect the appropriate accrual of discount attributable to the taxable year on bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness held by a life insurance company. Such amortization and accrual shall be determined—

"(1) in accordance with the method regularly employed by such company, if such method is reasonable, and

"(2) in all other cases, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"SEC. 804. Reserve and other policy liability deduction.

"(a) General rule: Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), for purposes of this subpart the term 'reserve and other policy liability deduction' means the sum of the following:

"(1) 100 percent of the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves (determined under subsection (e));

"(2) 95 percent of the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits (determined under subsection (f)); and

"(3) 85 percent of the amount by which the net investment income exceeds the sum of—

"(A) the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves,

"(B) the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits, and

"(C) the amount of the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves (determined under subsection (g)).

"(b) Reduced percentages during initial period: In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1960, the reserve and other policy liability deduction shall be computed by substituting for the percentages stated in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) the percentages determined from the following table:

If the taxable year begins in—	The percentage shall be	
	Paragraph (1)	Paragraph (2)
	Percent	*Percent*
1955	92.5	90
1956	94	91
1957	95.5	92
1958	97	93
1959	98.5	94

In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1956, 1957, 1958, or 1959, this subsection shall apply only if the tax imposed by section 802 shall have been made applicable with respect to such a taxable year.

"(c) Maximum deduction:

"(1) In general: The reserve and other policy liability deduction shall in no case exceed that amount which is equal to the sum of the following:

"(A) the amount equal to 2 times the amount determined under paragraph (1) of section 805 (c) (relating to required interest ble to life insurance reserves.

"(B) the amount determined under paragraph (2) of section 805 (c) (relating to required interest on reserves for deferred dividends);

"(C) the amount of the interest paid (as defined in section 805 (d)); and

"(D) the dividends to policyholders paid or declared (other than dividends on contracts meeting the requirements of section 804 (g) (2) (A)),

reduced by the amount of the adjustment for policy loans provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection. For purposes of subparagraph (D) of the preceding sentence, the term 'paid or declared' shall be construed according to the method of accounting regularly employed in keeping the books of the insurance company.

"(2) Reduction for certain policy loans: The adjustment described in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be an amount equal to—

"(A) the mean of the aggregates, at the beginning and end of the taxable year, of the outstanding policy loans with respect to contracts for which life insurance reserves are maintained, multiplied by

"(B) the average rate of interest applicable to life-insurance reserves.

For purposes of subparagraph (B) of the preceding sentence, the term 'average rate of interest applicable to life insurance reserves' means the ratio obtained by dividing the sum obtained under paragraph (1) of section 805 (c) by the sum of the means described in paragraph (1) (B) of section 805 (c).

"(3) Dividends received deduction where maximum limit applies.—

"(A) If paragraph (1) of this subsection reduces the reserve and other policy liability deduction allowed by this section or section 812 for the taxable year, then in computing life insurance taxable income under section 802 (b), and in computing life insurance company taxable income under section 811 (b), there shall be allowed an additional deduction in an amount determined under subparagraph (B).

"(B) The amount of the additional deduction referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the total of the deductions provided in sections 243, 244, and 245 as the net investment income reduced by the sum of—

"(i) the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves (or, for purposes of section 811 (b), the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813), and

"(ii) 100/85 of the maximum limitation determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection,

bears to the net investment income.

"(d) Qualified reserves defined: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'qualified reserves' means the sum of the following:

"(1) The life insurance reserves (as defined in section 801 (b)), plus 7 percent of that portion of such reserves as are computed on a preliminary term basis.

"(2) The nonlife insurance reserves (as defined in subsection (g) (2)).

"(3) The amounts (discounted at the rates of interest assumed by the company) necessary to satisfy the obligations under insurance and annuity contracts (including contracts supplementary thereto), but only if (A) such obligations when satisfied will reflect an increment in the nature of interest, and (B) such obligations do not involve (at the time with respect to which the computation is made under this paragraph) life, health, or accident contingencies.

"(4) The amounts held at the end of the taxable year as reserves for dividends to policyholders, the payment of which dividends is referred for a period which expires not earlier than 5 years from the date of the policy contract. This paragraph does not apply to dividends payable during the year following the taxable year.

"(5) Dividend accumulations, and other amounts, held at interest in connection with insurance or annuity contracts (including contracts supplementary thereto).

"(6) Premiums received in advance, and liabilities for premium deposit funds.

In applying this subsection, or in applying subsection (a), the same item shall be counted only once. For purposes of this section (other than paragraph (4) of this subsection), the amount of any reserve (or portion thereof) for any taxable year shall be the mean of such reserve (or portion thereof) at the beginning and end of the taxable year.

"(e) Allocation of net investment income to pension plan reserves:

"(1) Allocation ratio: For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the net investment income allocable to pension plan reserves is that amount which bears the same ratio to—

"(A) the net investment income, as

"(B) the amount of such reserves bears to the mean (as of the beginning and end of taxable year) of the book value of all the assets, other than real property occupied by the insurance company and furniture, fixtures, and equipment (to the extent such real or personal property is used in carrying on the insurance business).

"(2) Pension plan reserves defined: For purposes of this section, the term 'pension plan reserves' means that portion of the qualified reserves (other than items described in paragraph (2), (4), (5), or (6) of subsection (d)) which is allocable to contracts—

"(A) purchased under contracts entered into with trusts which (as of the time the contracts were entered into) were deemed to be (i) trusts described in section 401 (a) and exempt from tax under section 501 (a), or (ii) trusts exempt from tax under section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or the corrresponding provisions of prior revenue laws;

"(B) purchased under contracts entered into under plans which (as of the time the contracts were entered into) were deemed to be plans meeting the requirements of section 401 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6), or the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; or

"(C) provided for employees of the life insurance company under a plan which, for the taxable year, meets the requirements of section 401 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6).

"(f) Net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits:

"(1) Allocation ratio: For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the net investment income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits is that amount which bears the same ratio to the net investment income as such reserves bear to the qualified reserves (as defined in subsection (d)).

"(2) Reserves for annuity contracts and deposits.—

"(A) In general: For purposes of this subpart, the amount of the reserves for annuity contracts and deposits is the sum of the following:

"(i) that portion of the qualified reserves which is allocable to annuity contracts; and

"(ii) the amounts described in subsection (d) (5).

"(B) Certain items excluded: Any item which (but for this subparagraph) would be within the application of subparagraph (A) shall be excluded from such application—

"(i) if it is allocable to a pension plan reserve,

"(ii) if it is an amount described in paragraph (2), (4), or (6) of subsection (d), or

"(iii) if it is allocable to a contract entered into before July 1, 1955, or to a contract the terms of which are dependent on terms of a contract entered into before July 1, 1955. This clause shall not apply if (as of July 1, 1955) such contract (or the predecessor contract in effect on such date) provided for participation in surplus earnings of the insurance company.

"(3) Annuity contract defined: For purposes of paragraph (2) (A) (i), the term 'annuity contract' means any agreement (whether arising under a life insurance, annuity, or endowment contract, or a contract supplementary thereto) if (as of the time the computation is being made under this subsection)—

"(A) such agreement provides for payments in installments and during the life of one or more annuitants or for a period certain;

"(B) in case any amount (other than dividends) is payable other than as described in subparagraph (A), the value of such amount, computed as of the earliest time when such amount (or any portion thereof) may become payable, cannot exceed the excess of (i) the sum of the consideration theretofore paid for such agreement (or the amount otherwise invested in such agreement) plus accrued interest, over (ii) the aggregate of the amounts (other than dividends) theretofore received under such agreements; and

"(C) in the case of an agreement arising under a life insurance or endowment contract, or a contract supplementary thereto, payments described in subparagraph (A) have become due and payable under such agreement.

"(g) Net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves:

"(1) Allocation ratio: For purposes of this subpart, the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves is that amount which bears the same ratio to the net investment income as such reserves bear to the qualified reserves.

"(2) Nonlife insurance reserves defined: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'nonlife insurance reserves' means the sum of the unearned premiums and the unpaid losses (whether or not ascertained)—

"(A) on contracts other than life insurance, annuity, and noncancellable health and accident insurance contracts (including life insurance or annuity contracts combined with noncancellable health and accident insurance); and

"(B) which are not included in life insurance reserves (as defined in section 801 (b)). For purposes of this paragraph, such unearned premiums shall not be considered to be less than 25 percent of the net premiums written during the taxable year on such other contracts.

"(3) Adjustments with respect to certain nonlife insurance contracts. For purposes of this subpart, if—

"(A) a computation under this subpart is made by reference to a contract meeting the requirements of paragraph (2) (A) of this subsection, and

"(B) part of the reserves for such contract are life insurance reserves,

then, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, proper adjustment shall be made in the amount taken into account with respect to such contract for purposes of such computation.

"SEC. 805. Special interest deduction

"(a) Special interest deduction: For purposes of the tax imposed by section 802 (and the tax imposed by sec. 811), there shall be allowed a special interest deduction determined as follows:

"(1) Divide the amount of the adjusted net investment income (as defined in subsection (b)) by the amount of the required interest (as defined in subsection (c)).

"(2) If the quotient obtained in paragraph (1) is 1.05 or more, the special interest deduction shall be zero.

"(3) If the quotient obtained in paragraph (1) is 1.00 or less, the special interest deduction shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount by which—

"(A) the net investment income (reduced by the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves) exceeds

"(B) the reserve and other policy liability deduction for the taxable year.

"(4) If the quotient obtained in paragraph (1) is more than 1.00 but less than 1.05, the special interest deduction shall be the amount obtained by multiplying—

"(A) the amount by which (i) the net investment income (reduced by the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves) exceeds (ii) the reserve and other policy liability deduction for the taxable year, by

"(B) 10 times the difference between the figure 1.05 and the quotient obtained in paragraph (1).

"(b) Adjusted net investment income: For purposes of subsection (a) (1), the term 'adjusted net investment income' means—

"(1) the net investment income (computed without the deduction for wholly-exempt interest allowed by section 803 (c) (1)), minus

"(2) 50 percent of the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves.

"(c) Required interest: For purposes of subsection (a) (1), the term 'required interest' means the total of—

"(1) the sum of the amounts obtained by multiplying—

"(A) each rate of interest assumed in computing the taxpayer's life insurance reserves, by

"(B) the means of the amounts of the taxpayer's life insurance reserves computed at such rate at the beginning and end of the taxable year, plus 7 percent of the portion of such reserves at such rate as are computed on a preliminary term basis;

"(2) the sum of the amounts obtained by multiplying—

"(A) each rate of interest assumed in computing the taxpayer's reserves for deferred dividends described in section 804 (d) (4), by

"(B) the means of the amounts of such reserves computed at such rate at the end of the taxable year; and

"(3) interest paid.

"(d) Interest paid: For purposes of subsection (c) (3), the term 'interest paid' means—

"(1) all interest paid or accrued within the taxable year on indebtedness, except on indebtedness incurred or continued to purchase or carry obligations (other than obligations of the United States issued after September 24, 1917, and originally subscribed for by the taxpayer) the interest on which is wholly exempt from taxation under this chapter; and

"(2) all amounts in the nature of interest, whether or not guaranteed, paid or accrued within the taxable year on insurance or annuity contracts (or contracts arising out of insurance or annuity contracts, which do not involve, at the time of payment or accrual, life, health, or accident contingencies.

"Subpart B—1942 Formula

"Sec. 811. Tax imposed.

"Sec. 812. Reserve and other policy liability deduction.

"Sec. 813. Adjustment for certain reserves.

"SEC. 811. Tax imposed

"(a) Tax imposed: A tax is hereby imposed, on the life insurance company taxable income of every life insurance company, for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955 (other than taxable years with respect to which a tax is imposed by section 802). Such tax shall consist of—

"(1) a normal tax on such income computed under section 11 (b), and

"(2) a surtax on such income computed under section 11 (c).

"(b) Life insurance company taxable income defined: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'life insurance company taxable income' means the net investment income (as defined in section 803 (c))—

"(1) minus the reserve and other policy liability deduction allowed by section 812,

"(2) minus the special interest deduction, if any, allowed by section 805, and

"(3) plus the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813. For purposes of the normal tax, the life insurance company taxable income shall be reduced by the deduction provided in section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest.

"(c) Rules for computation of special interest deduction: In computing the special interest deduction under section 805 in the case of any taxable year with respect to which a tax is imposed under this section, in lieu of the reduction for the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves provided in paragraphs (3) (A) and (4) (A) of section 805 (a), and in paragraph (2) of section 805 (b), the net investment income shall be reduced by an amount which equals the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813.

"SEC. 812. Reserve and other policy liability deduction

"(a) General rule: For purposes of this subpart, the term 'reserve and other policy liability deduction' means an amount computed by multiplying the net investment income by a figure, to be determined and proclaimed by the Secretary or his delegate for each taxable year with respect to which a tax is imposed by section 811. This figure shall be based on such data with respect to life insurance companies for the preceding taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate considers representative and shall be computed in accordance with the following formula: The ratio which a numerator comprised of the aggregate of the sums of—

"(1) 2 percent of the reserves for deferred dividends,

"(2) interest paid, and

"(3) the product of—

"(A) the mean of the adjusted reserves at the beginning and end of the taxable year, and

"(B) the reserve earnings rate,

bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of net investment incomes (computed without the deduction for wholly-exempt interest allowed by section 803 (c) (1)) over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813.

"(b) Definitions: For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) Reserves for deferred dividends: The term 'reserves for deferred dividends' has the same meaning as when used in section 804 (d) (4).

"(2) Interest paid: The term 'interest paid' has the meaning given to such term by section 805 (d).

"(3) Adjusted reserves: The term 'adjusted reserves' means the life insurance reserves (as defined in section 801 (b)), plus 7 percent of that portion of such reserves as are computed on a preliminary term basis.

"(4) Reserve earnings rate: The term 'reserve earnings rate' means a rate computed by adding 2.1125 percent (65 percent of 3¼ percent) to 35 percent of the average rate of interest assumed in computing life insurance reserves. Such average rate shall be calculated by multiplying each assumed rate of interest by the means of the amounts of the adjusted reserves computed at that rate at the beginning and end of the taxable year and dividing the sum of the products by the mean of the total adjusted reserves at the beginning and end of the taxable year.

"(c) Maximum deduction: The reserve and other policy liability deduction allowed by subsection (a) of this section shall in no case exceed an amount equal to the amount which would be determined under subsection (c) of section 804 if such subsection applied with respect to the taxable year.

"Sec. 813. Adjustment for certain reserves

"In the case of a life insurance company writing contracts other than life insurance, annuity, and noncancellable health and accident insurance contracts (including life insurance or annuity contracts combined with noncancellable health and accident insurance), the term 'adjustment for certain reserves' means, for purposes of this subpart, an amount equal to 3¼ percent of the unearned premiums and unpaid losses on such other contracts which are not included in life insurance reserves (as defined in section 801 (b)). For purposes of this section, such unearned premiums shall not be considered to be less than 25 percent of the net premiums written during the taxable year on such other contracts.

"Subpart C—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec. 816. Foreign life insurance companies.
"Sec. 817. Denial of double deductions.
"Sec. 818. Certain new insurance companies.

"Sec. 816. Foreign life-insurance companies.

"(a) Carrying on United States insurance business: A foreign life insurance company carrying on a life insurance business within the United States, if with respect to its United States business it would qualify as a life insurance company under section 801, shall be taxable in the same manner as a domestic life insurance company; except that the determinations necessary for purposes of this subtitle shall be made on the basis of the income, disbursements, assets, and liabilities reported in the annual statement for the taxable year of the United States business of such company on the form approved for life insurance companies by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

"(b) No United States insurance business: Foreign life insurance companies not carrying on an insurance business within the United States shall not be taxable under this part but shall be taxable as other foreign corporations.

"Sec. 817. Denial of double reductions

"Nothing in this part shall permit the same item to be deducted more than once.

"Sec. 818. Certain new insurance companies

"(a) General rule: If the taxpayer was authorized to do business in any State or Territory as an insurance company before July 1, 1955, and if the taxable year begins not more than 4 years after the first day on which the taxpayer was authorized to do such business, then—

"(1) for purposes of subpart A, the life insurance taxable income shall not exceed (A) the amount of the net gain from operations after dividends to policyholders, reduced by (B) the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves; or

"(2) for purposes of subpart B, the life insurance company taxable income shall not exceed the amount of the net gain from operations after dividends to policyholders.

For purposes of this subsection, the net gain from operations after dividends to policyholders shall be computed in the manner required for purposes of the annual statement approved by the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, except that no reduction shall be made for any Federal income tax.

"(b) Limitation: This section shall not reduce the tax for any taxable year below the amount which (but for this section) would be imposed by section 802 or section 811, as the case may be, computed without the applicable limitation on the reserve and other policy liability deduction contained in section 804 (c) or section 812 (c).

"(c) Special rule for additional dividends received deduction: If the taxpayer's tax for the taxable year is reduced by subsection (a), and if the limitation contained in subsection (b) does not apply, then the maximum limitation referred to in section 804 (c) (3) (B) (ii) shall be—

"(1) in the case of a taxable year with respect to which tax is imposed by section 802, the amount by which (A) the net investment income (reduced by the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves), exceeds (B) the life insurance taxable income; or

"(2) in the case of a taxable year with respect to which tax is imposed by section 811, the amount by which (A) the sum of the net investment income and the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813, exceeds (B) the life insurance company taxable income."

Sec. 3. Adjustments to investment income of insurance companies other than life

(a) Mutual insurance companies (other than life): The following provisions of part II of subchapter L of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 821 (a) is amended by striking out "interest, dividends, rents," and inserting in lieu thereof "the items described in section 822 (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof)."

(2) Section 821 (c) is amended by striking out "interest, dividends, rents," and inserting in lieu thereof "the items described in section 822 (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof)."

(3) Section 822 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Gross investment income: For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'gross investment income' means the sum of the following:

"(1) The gross amount of income during the taxable year from—

"(A) interest, dividends, rents, and royalties,

"(B) the entering into of any lease, mortgage, or other instrument or agreement from which the insurance company derives interest, rents, or royalties,

"(C) the alteration or termination of any instrument or agreement described in subparagraph (B), and

"(D) gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets to the extent provided in subchapter P (sec. 1201 and following, relating to capital gains and losses).

"(2) The gross income during the taxable year from any trade or business (other than an insurance business) carried on by the insurance company, or by a partnership of which the insurance company is a partner. In computing gross income under this paragraph, there shall be excluded any item described in paragraph (1)."

(4) Paragraph (3) of section 822 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Real estate expenses: Taxes (as provided in section 164), and other expenses, paid or accrued during the taxable year exclusively on or with respect to the real estate owned by the company. No deduction shall be allowed under this paragraph for any amount paid out for new buildings, or for permanent improvements or betterments made to increase the value of any property."

(5) Paragraph (6) of section 822 (c) is amended by striking out "the sum of interest, dividends, rents, and net premiums received. In the application of section 1211" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of the items described in subsection (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof) and net premiums received. In the application of section 1212".

(6) Section 822 (c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(8) Trade or business deductions: The deductions allowed by this subtitle (without regard to this part) which are attributable to any trade or business (other than an insurance business) carried on by the insurance company, or by a partnership of which the insurance company is a partner; except that for purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) any item, to the extent attributable to the carrying on of the insurance business, shall not be taken into account, and

"(B) the deduction for net operating losses provided in section 172 shall not be allowed.

"(9) Depletion: The deduction allowed by section 611 (relating to depletion)."

(7) Section 822 (d) (1) is amended by striking out "subsection (e) (3) or (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c) (3) or (4)."

(8) Section 822 (e) is amended by striking out "interest, dividends, rents," and inserting in lieu thereof "items described in subsection (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof)".

(b) Stock companies (other than life): The following provisions of section 832 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) is amended by striking out "section 806" and inserting "section 801 (b)".

(2) Paragraph (5) of subsection (c) is amended by striking out "interest, dividends, rents, and net premiums received. In the application of section 1211" and inserting in lieu thereof "the items described in section 822 (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof) and net premiums received. In the application of section 1212".

(3) Paragraph (8) of subsection (c) is amended by inserting after "section 167" the following: "and the deduction allowed by section 611 (relating to depletion)".

Sec. 4. Annual accounting period of insurance companies to be the calendar year

(a) Part IV of subchapter L of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to provisions of general application with respect to insurance companies) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 843. Annual accounting period

"For purposes of this subtitle, the annual accounting period for each insurance company subject to a tax imposed by this subchapter shall be the calendar year."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 843. Annual accounting period."

SEC. 5. Technical amendments

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Section 316 (b) (1) (relating to definition of dividends) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Certain insurance company dividends: The definition in subsection (a) shall not apply to the term 'dividend' as used in subchapter L in any case where the reference is to dividends of insurance companies paid to policyholders as such."

(2) Section 501 (c) (15) (relating to certain exempt mutual insurance companies) is amended by striking out "interest, dividends, rents," and inserting in lieu thereof "the items described in section 822 (b) (other than paragraph (1) (D) thereof)".

(3) Section 594 (a) (2) is amended by striking out "the taxable income (as defined in section 803)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the income".

(4) The first sentence of section 841 (relating to credit for foreign taxes) is amended by inserting "811," after "802,". Paragraph (1) of the second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(1) in the case of the tax imposed by section 802 or 811, the net investment income (as defined in section 803 (c)),".

(5) Section 842 (relating to computation of gross income) is amended by striking out "802 or 831" and inserting in lieu thereof "802; 811, or 831".

(6) Section 891 (relating to doubling of rates of tax in case of discrimination by a foreign country) is amended by inserting "811," after "802,".

(7) Section 1201 (a) (relating to alternative tax on capital gains) is amended by inserting "802 (a)," after "511,".

(8) Section 1504 (b) (2) (relating to exceptions from consolidated return provisions) is amended by striking out "802 or 821" and inserting in lieu thereof "802, 811, or 821".

(9) Paragraph (2) of section 4371 (relating to tax on policies issued by foreign insurers) is amended by striking out "807" and inserting in lieu thereof "816".

SEC. 6. Effective date

The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow the minimum-wage bill will come up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Cooper].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the background circumstances that have led the Committee on Ways and Means to recommend that the House pass H. R. 7201. In 1942 a complicated formula was enacted to provide for the calculation of the taxable income of life insurance companies. The formula had in it an assumed interest rate which became steadily more unrealistic as average interest rates fell in the period during and immediately after World War II. The lack of realism of this formula produced the result that no Federal income tax at all was imposed upon life insurance operations in 1947 and 1948. In 1950 the Congress imposed a stopgap formula that would produce some taxes from the industry for the years 1949 and 1950. In 1951 the formula was modified and applied to that year. Since then, in various legislation, the stopgap has been applied to 1952, 1953, and 1954, always on a 1-year basis and always leaving the 1942 provisions as the basic provisions in the law to come into automatic operation if the stopgap were not reimposed.

The Committee on Ways and Means has for some time been seeking a permanent formula for taxing life insurance companies. The problem is particularly acute at the present time because circumstances have changed since 1947 and 1948 so that the 1942 formula has bounced back from the point of providing no revenue to the point where it would produce more revenue in 1955 than the stopgap formula imposed in 1954. The committee does not wish to rely upon this unrealistic fluctuation in its tax formula.

In 1954 the Committee on Ways and Means appointed a subcommittee on the taxation of life insurance companies. This subcommittee conducted extensive studies which resulted in a published staff analysis of the basic problems, published hearings relating to these problems, and finally a subcommittee report. During this year the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], who were members of that subcommittee, have developed a plan for the taxation of life insurance companies which carries out, in substance, the recommendations of the subcommittee report. This is contained in H. R. 7201.

The provisions for life insurance taxation contained in the bill, H. R. 7201, can be divided into two classes. A number of these provisions correct defects in the prior law relating to such things as the definition of life insurance companies and the definition of investment income. H. R. 7201 would make these new provisions a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code. Certain other provisions of H. R. 7201 deal with the problem of a life insurance tax formula which is the problem that has caused the greatest trouble in this field.

I leave to my colleagues the explanation of the provisions of the bill. I do wish to explain to the House at this point the peculiar tentative character of this second group of provisions which I will call, for convenience, the formula provisions. The difficulty that is inherent in this formula problem is that a life insurance company is somewhat like a bank and at the same time somewhat different. A bank receives deposits and repays these deposits on demand. One would not consider the deposits as a part of the taxable income of the bank. To a large extent, a life insurance company receives deposits in the form of premiums and repays them on the occurrence of certain specified events. Some people will get more than they have deposited and some people will get less. From the standpoint of the insurance companies this excess of deposits over benefits, or over amounts expected, from actuarial tables, to be paid in benefits, could be called underwriting income. One problem is to decide whether or not life insurance companies should be taxed on this underwriting income. The mutual companies, which dominate the field, assert that in the long run there is no underwriting income because all of the deposits less expenses are returned to the beneficiaries of the policyholder.

To carry this analogy further, both the bank and the insurance company invest the proceeds of the deposits to earn income. The bank credits some of this income to depositor accounts periodically for which it properly takes a deduction as interest paid. The insurance company uses its investment income to fulfill its obligations to pay policyholders and to some extent makes the interest available to policyholders currently. Here again the principle is clear that the insurance company is entitled to some deduction for this interest obligation, but again, due to the contingent nature of its obligations, it is a difficult problem to determine what the deduction should be.

The new provisions in this bill relating to this basic life insurance formula are made effective only for the year 1955. Between now and next year our committee will continue to study the problem of how to tax life insurance companies, and we have been assured that we will receive the full cooperation of the Treasury Department in this project. At the request of the Treasury Department, we will examine the possibility of taxing life insurance companies like other businesses, on the basis of their entire income from all sources. This is the question of whether or not to include the underwriting income or loss. As it has in the past, our committee will be concerned with the special situation of life insurance companies and their responsibilities to policyholders and will not impose a tax burden that will interfere with the ability of insurance companies to carry out these responsibilities.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sure that it is the feeling of the House that we should get through with this matter as soon as possible. And I shall not take any time except to say that this committee, consisting of Mr. Mills, of Arkansas, and Mr. Curtis, of Missouri, who were given the task of resolving the many difficulties in connection with taxing the insurance companies brought back to us what I thought was one of the finest reports that I have ever heard made by any of the subcommittees appointed by the Ways and Means Committee. I want to compliment them most heartily. These two men will know all about this legislation, and you can depend upon what they say. The Ways and Means Committee unanimously approved their report. You can safely follow their advice, and vote for the bill. With that, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take a full 5 minutes to call to the attention of the House the various documents that are available on this very complicated subject, and tell the Members what has been done.

Last year, when we went into this field, the subcommittee immediately held seminar sessions, so to speak, to inform ourselves about the subject, with the insurance industry, representatives of the State insurance commissioners, the Treasury Department, as well as the staff of the joint Tax Committee. As a result of those studies the staff prepared a very excellent report to our committee on the taxation of life insurance companies, pointing out the detailed problems that are involved in the consideration of such taxation.

On the basis of this report which was made available about a month ahead of time, the subcommittee held hearings on December 13 and 14, 1954, and then made particular recommendations in its report.

After those hearings, when this Congress convened, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and myself continued our conferences with the Treasury Department and the life insurance industry to try to work out the further details of this particular bill.

I am happy to say that the entire industry with one exception seems to be, in fact is, in accord with this. There have been a lot of things they have not liked; nonetheless, they felt that the overall job was good, and they approved it along with the Treasury Department. I do want to mention the one company that is not in agreement with this particular bill; as a matter of fact, they sat in on our seminar and attended our hearings. In our report the subcommittee set out its viewpoint. The reason this company did not go along is that they have always felt that taxation of stock life insurance companies should be different from taxation of mutual life insurance companies.

As we dug into the field we found that most of the new growth in the life insurance field comes from the stock companies. They are the small companies, and inasmuch as the industry is dominated by the mutuals we felt we would be making a serious error if we taxed the stock companies on a different basis; that we might well be stunting the new growth of the industry. For that reason we did not accept Acacia's viewpoint.

As the chairman of the committee [Mr. COOPER] has stated, we are not done with this problem. We think we have made great progress in the bill we are recommending; perhaps some of us think we have actually found the formula. But we have agreed with the Secretary of the Treasury to put it into effect for a year, if the House and the Senate agree, and then next year we will restudy it to make sure that we have got a permanent formula for the taxation of life insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, in order to complete the record on the life insurance taxation bill I am inserting two letters received by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee from Secretary of the Treasury G. M. Humphrey in regard to the bill for the taxation of life insurance companies:

JULY 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I attach a copy of the letter which we originally had intended to send to you on the proposed bill on taxation of life insurance companies. Since the letter was prepared, the bill has been limited to 1 year only and I have discussed it with Mr. MILLS and Mr. CURTIS who assure me of their concurrence with our view that the whole problem should have further study, and that further legislation should be developed for enactment next year.

Since the bill contains substantial improvements over the law in effect last year, and since the suggestions embodied in the attached letter will have your careful study in connection with next year's legislation, we withdraw our objection to H. R. 7201 and 7202 and approve its enactment.

Sincerely yours,
G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

JULY 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret that the Treasury Department cannot unqualifiedly endorse H. R. 7201, which provides a new method for the taxation of life insurance companies, even though it will be effective only for the years 1955 and 1956.

The bill would make desirable improvements in the definition of income. It would limit abuses by investment companies which do a small amount of insurance business, and by certain casualty companies which inflate their life insurance business by means of policy loans, to qualify for favorable tax treatment. The bill would be fairer than the present law because it would treat the group annuity business of the life insurance companies more like tax-exempt qualified pension trusts with which they compete. It also properly would eliminate duplication of the 85-percent intercorporate dividend credit and the proposed 85 and other percentage credits for reserve and other policy interest. The proposed segregation and separate taxation of their cancellable health and accident business, on a basis comparable to mutual fire and casualty companies in the same line of business, seems sound, though the wisdom of not taxing substantial amounts of the profits of some of the companies should have further study.

However, the proposed exclusion from the tax base of a flat 85 percent of investment income for ordinary life insurance business does not appear to be justified. The resulting tax currently seems inadequate.

Our estimates indicate that, on the basis of present earnings and contracts with policyholders, the life insurance companies will need only slightly over 75 percent of their 1955 investment income to meet their required reserve and policy interest, as compared with the 85-percent allowance in the bill. On these facts, it does not seem fair to the Government to adopt a formula which will permit the companies to go untaxed on investment income which is not needed under their contracts with their own policyholders. The total annual investment income of life insurance companies now exceeds $3 billion. The corporate tax on almost 10 percent of that total is a very large sum.

Since 1921, life insurance companies have been taxed only on their "free investment income," that is, their investment income in excess of the amounts they were committed or required to set aside as reserves under their policy contracts. Their income from other sources has gone untaxed.

The 1942 law assumed that the companies would be required to earn 3¼ percent on a major part of their investments to meet their policy requirements, and determined their taxable free investment income on that assumption. As the companies wrote policies on the basis of lower interest rates, this high assumption of required earnings was so unrealistic that the companies would not have been required to pay any tax at all for several years, even though they actually had very substantial investment income over their contractual needs.

In 1950, a taxing method was adopted under which the tax was based on the actual free investment income for each year. Though probably not ideal (other income continued untaxed; the individual companies were taxed on an industry average of their investment income), this method at least provided a logical basis for taxation. The life insurance industry accepted this method, and even urged its adoption on a long-range basis.

In 1951, the policy requirements were about 87½ percent of actual earnings, which left a free investment income of 12½ percent. The 52 percent corporate tax on 12½ percent of earnings was about equal to 6½ percent on the entire investment income. A 6½ percent tax was imposed on all investment income, and was successively extended through 1954. This taxing method had no logical basis of its own, other than as a shortcut method of computation.

In the years since 1951, the companies' actual free investment income has increased steadily. It is estimated that for 1955 they need only 75.5 percent of their investment income to meet their policy requirements. If determined in the same way as was done in 1951, the comparable tax rate on all investment income would have to be almost doubled (increased to 12.7 percent) in 1955.

The Treasury Department has reviewed carefully the history and problems of taxation of life insurance companies. The valuable material in the hearings and the staff studies of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, published last year and earlier this year, have been examined. On the basis of our review and examination, I suggest that an attempt be made to develop a method of taxing life insurance companies like other business on the basis of their entire income from all sources, with appropriate deductions for their expenses and additions to their reserves against their policy contracts. The reliance on free investment income alone ignores income and losses from mortality experience, the relation between loading charges and operating costs, and capital gains—which may be quite substantial.

Life insurance companies were taxed like other corporations on the basis of their entire net income until 1921, when the tax base was confined to free-investment income. At that time, income taxation was still so new and undeveloped that it was found to be extremely difficult to deal adequately with the specialized problems of the life insurance industry. Substantial advances have been made since that time in tax administration, and the methods and techniques of income measurement. It should now be possible to develop a fairer basis for taxation which will include all of the income and deduction items which properly reflect the earnings position of a life insurance company.

The development of a satisfactory formula for taxing insurance companies on a comprehensive concept of income will take time. In the meantime, the 1950 formula (taxation of actual free-investment income) gives a logical standard for measuring free-investment income and the industries' capacity to pay. We estimate that this formula would produce revenue of $368 million for this year, as against $189 million under the 6½-percent rate in effect from 1951 through 1954, and $215 million under H. R. 7201. In the absence of any legislation this year, the 1942 formula will become applicable again and produce revenue estimated at $274 million, as compared to $215 million under H. R. 7201 and $368 million under the 1950 formula.

The Treasury is impressed with the need for a fair and sound approach to the taxation of life insurance companies. A satisfactory solution must recognize the special situation of the life insurance industry and its responsibilities to policyholders. At the same time, it should impose a tax which is fairly distributed among the companies and fair in relation to the tax burdens of other savings institutions and taxpayers generally.

I and the Treasury Department staffs will be glad to be of such assistance as we can to your committee and staffs in any further examination of this subject which you choose to undertake.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. Humphrey,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, but do not expect to take that much time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee that was established during the last Congress by the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reed], and which has been referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Cooper] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jenkins].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is entitled to as much credit in the development of the bill before us as anyone; in fact, there are many people whose efforts have gone into this bill. It involves a very technical subject. The gentleman from Missouri and I introduced companion bills the same day, after we had conferred finally with the Secretary of the Treasury and others to obtain their comments on and endorsement of legislation and the terms of the bill.

As the gentleman from Missouri has pointed out, we conducted actually a seminar so that we on the subcommittee could begin to learn a little bit about the details of the insurance business. In the process of learning those few details about the insurance business which we were able to absorb we hoped that we could reach an understanding of the needs of the industry as well as the interest of the policyholder and the Treasury from the viewpoint of taxation. We think, by and large, we have found a reasonably sound basis for taxation of insurance companies in this bill.

It will be my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks and to include therein a detailed analysis of the bill. I doubt that there will be any great merit in my taking some 10 or 15 minutes time of the House at this hour to explain those technical details orally.

Frankly, I know of no bill our committee has considered, I know of no bill the Congress has had before it during the time I have been a Member of this body that is more complicated than this one relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, because perhaps there is no business operated in the United States that has so many ramifications and is so complicated itself.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. As one who comes from a district wherein a number of small companies are just beginning to stir, I can appreciate what the gentleman is striving to do. I think this bill is a start in the right direction. Having consulted with members of this committee concerning one amendment they did accept, I want to ask the gentleman if it is his assurance that a further review and study of the effect of this law, assuming it is enacted, will be undertaken next year with a view to straightening out any possible inequities that may have arisen from the imposition of the new requirements?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly the gentleman from Missouri and I together with the Secretary of the Treasury were in the position of assuring that it was our thought the new formula applicable to taxing life insurance companies should not go into extended effect without an opportunity by the Congress to re-evaluate its actual operations. The Treasury thinks that we may not have raised enough revenue from the insurance companies, frankly. There are some in the insurance industry that think we are taking too much under the bill.

At first we thought of extending this tax formula for a period of 2 years. The Secretary of the Treasury thought it would be better if we looked at it after it had been operating for 1 year. We readily agreed to that position taken by the Secretary. So that this provision cannot operate for longer than 1 year by the very terms of the bill itself. In order for it to continue beyond the year 1955, this year, it will be necessary for the Congress to take some action next year, either to continue this act, revise it or to write a new formula of some sort.

Mr. WRIGHT. My reason for asking the question is that a number of the insurance companies which are just beginning in my State had some qualms about its effect, yet they did assure me and others of us that they thought the intent of it was very, very good from the overall standpoint of the industry and with that assurance they support this measure.

Mr. MILLS. Two situations came to the attention of the committee after the bill was reported. In an effort to guarantee and to assure the intent of the committee not to harm any branch of this industry, we adopted two amendments that are made a part of the bill. I think the gentleman can be sure this matter will be reconsidered by the committee next year and that we will go into all facets of it again. We will have at that time the benefit of 1 year's experience in the operation of this formula and on the basis of that, the fact that the tax committee of the insurance industry itself is in support of it, the Secretary of the Treasury is for it and that it comes out of the Ways and Means Committee by unanimous vote, I am hoping that we can enact this bill for 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to explain in greater detail the provisions of the bill, H. R. 7201.

As was explained by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill proposes to continue to tax life insurance companies on investment income only. This means that the bill will continue to ignore premium income, the cost of insurance benefits, and the expenses of operating the insurance departments. As in the past, the bill will allow life insurance companies a flat deduction, which I shall hereafter refer to as the life-insurance deduction, against investment income in lieu of specific deductions for interest paid and interest credited to life-insurance reserves. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Cooper] explained the general logic of this deduction as analogous to the deduction that a bank takes for interest credited to depositors' accounts.

1. PENSION AND ANNUITY BUSINESS

For the first time, under this bill the percentage of net investment income allowable as the life-insurance deduction will vary with the type of life-insurance business for which the reserves are held.

Under this bill for 1955, life insurance companies can deduct 92½ percent of the investment income on reserves held for qualified employer pension plans and also 90 percent of the net investment income on reserves held for individual annuity policies and for certain policyholder deposits.

As we have explained, these formula provisions apply only for 1 year, but future legislation is actually contained in the bill although specific legislation will be required to make it applicable after the year 1955. This plan would carry out the investment-income approach with the life-insurance deduction varying according to the type of business done. The deduction against investment income would ultimately include 100 percent of the income of qualified employer pension plan reserves and 95 percent of the investment income allocable to individual annuities and to certain policyholder deposits. Actually, these 2 categories of the life-insurance deduction would go up gradually from the 92½ and 90 percent level provided in 1955 and would reach the ultimate level of 100 percent and 95 percent, respectively, in 1960.

The objective envisioned in raising the life-insurance deduction against investment income related to pension plan business to a level of 100 percent is equal treatment of pension plan reserves between an insurance company and a qualified trust. Under present law, if an employer finances his pension plan by accumulating funds in a qualified trust the interest income on those funds is completely tax free. However, if he finances his plan by buying insurance policies designed to provide annuities for his employees, the interest income on the reserves thereby created is subject to some tax in the hands of the insurance company. This means inevitably that an insured pension plan will be more expensive to an employer than a trusteed plan. This deters insurance companies somewhat in going after this business compared to the banks which provide trust services, but more important, it is particularly objectionable because small companies cannot generally manage a trusteed plan. The result of the present law is that a pension plan by a small employer must inevitably be more expensive than a similar pension plan undertaken by a large employer. This situation should be, and is, corrected by this bill.

The point of raising the life-insurance deduction against interest allocable to annuity and deposit reserves to 95 percent lies in the fact that, in general, this interest will be taxable to individuals when the annuity benefits are paid out. Nevertheless, there is still a tax advantage to individual annuitants from the fact that this interest will not be taxed to them when earned by the insurance company and is, in fact, delayed until it is paid out. This situation justifies a small tax on the investment income when it is earned by the life insurance company. It also appears desirable that some advantage should be given to individual annuitants corresponding to the favorable tax treatment on reserve interest which is available for those whose annuities are financed through an employer pension plan.

2. REGULAR BUSINESS

This bill provides a life insurance deduction of 85 percent of the net investment income allocable to the regular life insurance business. Since the general objective of this deduction has been explained, our concern at this point is simply with the figure itself. As a starting point for the evaluation of this figure it should be pointed out that the stopgap tax imposed on life insurance companies from 1951 to 1954 was equivalent to regular corporate rates applied to net investment income as an 87½ percent deduction. Under the terms of the bill, the life insurance deduction with respect to the two smaller segments of the business previously mentioned will be higher than this and the basic deduction will be lower. In overall revenue terms, the continuation of the 87½ percent life insurance deduction which was equivalent to the 1954 law would produce a total of $190 million of revenue from the life insurance companies. The combination of life insurance deductions in the bill will produce revenue of $215 million from life insurance companies. But, by and large, the combinations of deductions of 92½ percent for pension plans, 90 percent for annuities and deposits, and 85 percent for basis life insurance provides a slightly lower deduction than was provided by the 1954 rule. The increase in revenue for 1955 over what would have been provided by the 1954 formula is due to certain other changes discussed below.

If, instead of continuing the 1954 rule for another year, the Congress is content to let the 1942 formula come back into operation for 1955, and that will be the result automatically unless the stopgap is extended or this bill is adopted, the revenue from life insurance companies will be $274 million, contrasted with the $215 million expected under the plan here proposed. The difference in these two figures is largely attributable to the fact that this bill proposes to introduce special treatment in the annuity and pension trust area. Beyond the relatively modest increase in the tax proposed by the bill, the committee did not see clear justification for a major increase of taxes on life insurance companies in this year when no major tax increase is imposed upon any other taxpayer.

3. ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Life insurance companies frequently sell accident and health insurance. This is the same sort of business done by many casualty insurance companies. The bill takes a long step toward imposing the same tax on income from this business, whether done by a casualty insurance or a life insurance company. This is done by taxing life insurance companies on their income from accident and health insurance business as if they were mutual casualty insurance companies. This rule will apply to both stock and mutual life insurance companies. In the casualty insurance field, where stock companies predominate, the stock companies are subjected to a different tax computation from mutuals, one that usually results in a higher tax. However, it is feared that if this treatment were applied to the accident and health field of the life-insurance industry, where mutuals predominate, serious competitive difficulties would result for the stock companies.

4. 1942 FORMULA

The bill provides that this new approach on life insurance and accident and health insurance taxation will operate only for the year 1955 and that in the absence of further specific legislation in 1956 the formula provisions of the 1942 law will come back into operation. This device has been employed to give assurance that the subject of life insurance company income taxation will be carefully reexamined by the Congress during the next year. The Committee does not intend to give approval to the 1942 formula provisions but has simply continued those since they are the basic law in the Internal Revenue Code at the present time.

5. DEFINITION OF INCOME

All of the foregoing changes are contained in what we have called the formula provisions of H. R. 7201 which would be enacted for the single year 1955. In addition to these formula provisions the bill contains a number of basic improvements in the definition of investment income and also provides several changes intended to prevent abuse of the life insurance provisions by companies that are not primarily life insurance companies. These changes are intended to be permanent improvements in the tax law.

The first group of permanent improvements looks toward the definition of the net investment income of life insurance companies. The present definition includes rents in net investment income but this language has been held by the courts not to include royalties. The bill specifically adds royalties to the definition and allows the deduction for depletion appropriate to this income. Another defect in the present definition of net investment income is the omission of net income or net deficits arising from the operation of a noninsurance business. This situation most frequently occurs when the insurance company takes over a business under a mortgage foreclosure and temporarily operates it while looking for a favorable opportunity to sell the property. This bill provides that insurance companies will be taxed on the income derived from such business and allowed the deduction related thereto.

The definition of net investment income is also changed to deny any deduction for dividends received on corporate stock held for the life insurance business. This deduction is denied because, with respect to investment income on life insurance reserves, the company already gets at least an 85-percent deduction.

Where appropriate these changes in the definition of investment income have been applied to noninsurance companies. For the most part, these changes would affect mutual fire and casualty insurance companies.

6. ABUSE OF LIFE INSURANCE PROVISIONS

Among the permanent improvements are provisions designed to deal with cases of abuse of the life insurance provisions. One of these goes to the situation where an overcapitalized life insurance company has far more investment income than would be needed to meet its life insurance reserves and policy obligations. In such cases it is provided that instead of deducting 85 percent—or a larger percentage—of their net investment income as a measurement of their reserve obligations this life insurance deduction will be limited to not more than twice the amount needed for reserves as shown by their own books.

Another provision dealing with abuse cases amends the rule provided in present law for distinguishing between life and other insurance companies. The present law requirement is that 50 percent of total reserves must be life insurance reserves. The new provision prevents use of the device of creating life insurance reserves by issuing single premium policies and simultaneously extending policy loans to the policyholder for the amount of the reserves held on the policy by providing that such life insurance reserves shall be ignored in computing life insurance reserves.

7. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Committee on Ways and Means has adopted one committee amendment which is contained in the printed bill, H. R. 7201, as reported. This is a technical amendment to avoid a possible confusion of wording. It is explained in the committee report.

8. AMENDMENT DEALING WITH THE DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION IN CERTAIN CASES

We are offering at this time two other amendments. These were discussed in committee and no objection to their adoption has been expressed by the Ways and Means Committee. Both amendments deal with the provision that I described earlier which will restrict the basic life-insurance deduction of any company to an amount not greater than two times the amount needed for reserves as shown on the company books.

This limitation has the effect of taxing the remaining portion of the life-insurance-company-investment income like the income of any ordinary investment company. The first amendment provides that with respect to the portion of the income taxed, because of the limitation, as the income of an oridinary investment company a dividends received deduction will be allowed. This is the same intercorporate dividends received deduction allowed ordinary corporations. In one particular case this amendment is of great importance because an operating life-insurance company has another life-insurance company as a subsidiary. It receives a great deal of dividend income from the subsidiary. The absence of a dividends received deduction to be applied against this income would result in double taxation of the same income in the same organization.

9. AMENDMENT DEALING WITH CERTAIN NEWLY ORGANIZED COMPANIES

The second amendment deals with the effect of this new limitation on the amount of the life insurance deduction on companies first authorized to do insurance business prior to July 1, 1955. Typically, a new insurance company must incur with respect to its insurance operations an excess of expenses over premiums in the early years. Several companies may have been organized under a financial plan that assumed continuation of the prior law. Specifically in these cases there may have been invested initially a large amount of capital beyond the regular insurance needs. It may be expected that the net investment income on this large amount of capital after the modest tax imposed under prior law would be available to meet the excess of operating expenses and benefit payments over premiums in these early years. Although it is the intention of the committee that the full corporate rates should be imposed upon such investment income in the case of heavily overcapitalized companies it is recognized that severe results could occur if this new rule were applied to companies which could not know that it would operate when they started business.

In substance it is provided that the life insurance taxable income for these companies shall not be greater than the amount required to be shown on their life insurance statements as the net gain from operations. This is substantially the net profit shown on the published income statement required of life insurance companies and reflects the total income from all sources. Two limitations are provided in this connection. One specifies that the tax cannot be lower than it would have been under the method of computation followed by an ordinary life insurance company.

The other provides that this treatment will apply only in the first 5 years of the company's existence.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very technical subject. A considerable amount of time was spent in working out this bill. All interested persons are in general agreement on its provisions.

I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the end of my remarks two letters from the Secretary of the Treasury addressed to the chairman of the committee, Mr. COOPER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE AT THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the opening of the so-called summit talks between the free world and the totalitarian world. Today may well be a day that will go down in history as marking the glorious fulfillment of the dreams and aspirations of all those who wish to be free, or a day which shall record for posterity the rejection and defeat of the sacred principle of self-determination and self-government.

It can be understood, therefore, why our Nation and our free allies, distinguished from the current totalitarianism preeminently by their belief in a supreme being, are today turning their thoughts and their fervent prayers toward Geneva beseeching the Almighty to bring successful results to the Conference.

We should recognize in the first instance that faith without good works to support and implement it is not enough to turn the tide in favor of freedom and that pious words without specific deeds to give them actual effect will be of no avail.

I have spoken at length in the past about the plight of subject and oppressed peoples—the iniquity of their unconscionable enslavement—the urgency of their liberation before any real lasting peace can ever come to this afflicted world. The American people appreciate the expressions of faith in democracy and justice that are on the lips of our leaders because they wholeheartedly support the proposition that freedom shall be protected and enjoyed by our own and all the nations. But the American people will never compromise their faith in freedom and never barter away their rights as free men and women.

There can be no compromise of the question of human freedom. If we believe as we do that all men and women are born free and have a natural God-given right to be free, then it follows as the night the day that we abhor and despise any and all systems of tyranny based on servitude and bondage which deny any people basic democratic rights.

Tyranny is based on force and not on free choice. It is imposed by the mailed fist, the star chamber, when necessary by persecution and torture. It rejects the faith that each human being has a soul. Instead it may brutally consign the individual to the rack, the concentration camp, the gallows, the firing squad or the common grave of a Katyn. Freedom cannot live in such an atmosphere. Free nations cannot exist decently in such a world. In the end, this kind of a system once it becomes strong enough moves to carry out its malignant design to conquer and enslave the world.

These are considerations that our leaders and representatives should have in their minds at Geneva. The time to test the sincerity of the Soviet has arrived. The time for social niceties and pious generalities is passed. The time has come to find out whether the Soviet seeks peace or war, whether it proposes further delay, compromise, appeasement, and vacillation toward fundamental human questions of freedom and tyranny and preparation for war, or whether in a sincere spirit of brotherhood and a sense of its obligations toward the peoples of the world, and its own people, and all those behind the Iron Curtain, it is now prepared to fulfill its previous commitments and henceforth demonstrate good faith in its relationships with all other nations.

It is stated by some of our leaders that we cannot hope for too much from this Conference, that it is just a beginning, and I can understand fully this point of view. But on the other hand, I earnestly believe that the time is at hand to lay all our cards on the conference table and ask the Soviet to do likewise. German unification is a vital issue. Disarmament and control of A–H energy and weapons are of great consequence. These and other matters should be considered and settled if possible.

But there are still other great questions that are of gravest relationship to lasting peace. Foremost among these are the discussion of ways and means and agreement upon the discontinuance and cessation of the worldwide conspiracy being conducted in many nations by world communism directed by Moscow, and of greatest interest and concern to Americans is the liberation of dominated and enslaved nations inside and outside the Iron Curtain. If real peace is to be achieved, this issue of liberation of all oppressed people from Poland to Korea and back again, victims of imperialism and colonialism, is basic, is essential, is absolutely necessary to be approached and settled. If it is settled in the free way, as it should be, the world of the free and of the enslaved alike will rejoice and thus an enduring peace will be closer at hand.

Every true American hopes and prays today, therefore, for the success of the Conference and for the guidance of the Almighty for our great President and his associates as they approach their great tasks. They contend against skilled negotiators and against the strong, resourceful force of organized world communism. They face almost insoluble problems in striving to settle all these very difficult and overwhelming questions. But if they are inspired by the great principles and great heritage of America and of freedom which they represent at the Conference, if they will be firm and uncompromising in the right even as they strive earnestly for conciliation and understanding, if they persist in devotion to the cause of humanity and liberty and the great inarticulate peoples they speak for, in that course will be their best chance for success. And in that event, if they do their best to uphold our cause and fail because of the bad faith, chicanery, and evil aggressive designs of others, there will be no real defeat, but a great moral victory shall be gained because they shall be true to their American faith and true to their great trust to the American people. In a spirit of utmost humility I pray that the good Lord may bring successful results at Geneva and install lasting peace in the world.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

REAFFIRMING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 386 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the basic strength of this Nation is a spiritual strength, based upon faith in God and grounded in the principles of freedom of worship and freedom of religious expression; and

Whereas all races, nationalities, and religious faiths have contributed to the basic strength of the free world; and

Whereas the international Communist movement seeks to distort, restrict, and destroy the rights of people of all nations to speak, act, and worship in accordance with their own spiritual beliefs: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the people of the United States reaffirm their devotion to God and to these principles of religious freedom and call upon the people of the world to join in protecting their continued right to worship and to practice their own spiritual beliefs.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPPOSITION TO COLONIALISM AND COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Con. Res. 149) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Lines 4 and 5, strike out "through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations."

Lines 6 and 7, strike out "self-government" and insert "self-determination."

Line 8, after "assume" insert "and maintain."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] please explain the changes?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to.

The amendments made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to House Concurrent Resolution 149, which I introduced, are acceptable. These changes are to delete "through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations"; to substitute "self-government"; and to insert "and maintain" after the word "assume" in line 8. So that the resolutory part of the resolution as amended by the Senate committee will read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-determination or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume and maintain an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Upon reflection, the deletion of the words "through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations" as stated in my original resolution, in my opinion, broadens the scope of the resolution so that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence without limiting it only through one agency such as the United Nations, or only through other international organizations. It was so stated in the other branch, and I agree with such views. This means that our Government can exercise its influence to support other peoples to achieve their freedom not only through any particular international organization or group of international organizations but through other and all legitimate means. It makes my resolution more comprehensive and therefore more effective.

Regarding the change of "self-government" to "self-determination" I agree with and accept it because self-determination better expresses the ideal of nationhood and freedom and it is the goal for peoples aspiring for their liberty which is generally paired with independence, thusly self-determination or independence. It was that great American statesman, Woodrow Wilson, who really first gave "self-determination" its dynamic meaning and which subject peoples have accepted as the proper expression of their ideal of freedom.

The other amendment, while implied in the word "assume" in the resolution as it passed the House, will make clear, and bolster the resolution since it is as important for nations to maintain their freedom after they have gained it. And it is this idea that was intended when I introduced the resolution and the Committee on Foreign Relations in reporting it, is clearly and unmistakingly brought out by the insertion of these two words.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that this concurrent resolution will have nothing but moral force. This, however, is the strongest argument in support of it. The most vital expressions made for human freedom started by having nothing behind them but moral force. We did not have might or power when our forefathers first proclaimed our Declaration of Independence. It was the moral force behind that Declaration as expressed in that immortal document that gave it the vitality that welded us into one Nation and that later served as the rallying point for all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

With all the emphasis that I can command, I say that it is the moral force behind this resolution that will enhance America's prestige in Asia, in Africa, and all over the earth, because it is a vital reiteration at the proper time, by the constitutional representatives of the American people of a fundamental principle which because of exigencies of world politics our policy molders have either overlooked or ignored.

We are not only "resoluting." I did not introduce this resolution just to "resolute." This is in response to a crying need of the hour. When we are misunderstood in Asia and Africa, and elsewhere, misunderstood because our foreign policy has been equivocal in supporting the legitimate national aspirations of subject peoples. I believe it is high time that Congress should come out forthrightly and in a formal resolution such as this one, remind our leaders that the only traditional policy that can command the support of the American people is that which is a full-fledged backing of the inalienable rights of all peoples to their "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

It also serves notice to the world that our Congress, keeping faith with our true libertarian history, wants our foreign policy to be in consonance with the wishes of the American people and that this Nation, under God, will continue to fight for freedom not only for itself but for other peoples as well. It underscores for our allies that we are ready and willing to go all the way with them provided they do not run counter to our basic national philosophy which is based on justice for all peoples and the recognition of the right of any nation to achieve self-determination or independence.

We are engaged in a battle for men's minds. The present struggle is not for strategic areas or territories. In this contest it is paramount that America should hold aloft the standard of freedom for all peoples and this is the one and only purpose of my resolution.

The adoption of this resolution by both branches of the Congress will have great significance in many areas of the world. The importance of this resolution will be its effect abroad—in the ability of leaders of nations on the battlefront of the cold war to use it with effectiveness among their own people in combating in an affirmative manner the destructive efforts of the Communists. For there are millions of persons in various lands throughout the world who know of and believe in the Declaration of Independence just as well as we do. To them, its contents and meaning are living and dynamic, not merely academic or traditional.

The passage of this resolution is a message to them that to America of today, the Declaration of Independence in the application of its truths to other peoples is just as much alive as it was to the fathers of our country.

There is no greater force once aroused than moral force. That is the primary reason why Communists fight God in the minds of people on earth to believe in America and His Word.

The Communists realize that until they destroy the moral force on earth, that no matter how many battles they may win, they will never win their war of world revolution and world domination.

For there is no greater power in the minds of men and women than the influence and force in their lives and in the lives of nations than the moral law.

And the Communists well know that fact.

Truth is eternal. Truth may be suppressed from time to time, but it can never be destroyed.

And the principles contained in the Declaration of Independence are based on truth and they are based on the moral law.

As they animated and inspired our forefathers to gain self-determination and independence, as those truths gave hope and inspiration to peoples of many lands in the succeeding years, so at this particular time, with millions of persons on the march away from colonialism and millions of others who are praying for the day of deliverance from Communist imperialism, our rededication by this resolution to the faith of our fathers will be a clarion call to millions of persons elsewhere in their desire and determination to be free men and women under a government of law of their own.

Yes, this is just a resolution, as some say, but what is contained in this resolution represents truth in the minds of countless millions who want to enjoy freedom.

And I might say that when the Declaration of Independence was promulgated by those brave men who drafted and signed it, that there were some in those days who said that it was just another resolution.

The results of this resolution, which is based upon and follows the moral law, can be of great advantage in stopping and defeating the efforts of Communists in many areas of the world.

Mr. MARTIN. In other words, it makes it much broader?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, much broader. It strikes out "self-government" and substitutes "self-determination," which is acceptable because they are both synonymous. Furthermore, "self-determination" is just a phrase more identified with the national aspirations of people and more identified with the United States of America.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, the other branch had to make some kind of a change, anyhow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Probably that is so. But, in any event, those two amendments broaden it.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand that this strikes out all reference to the United Nations and its so-called influence?

Mr. McCORMACK. It strikes out "through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations," so that it will read "the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts—"

Mr. GROSS. But it strikes out all reference to the United Nations and its influence; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to take this opportunity to commend the other body for that action.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that the language is acceptable to me because it broadens the resolution and makes its effect more pronounced.

Mr. GROSS. In that respect, I think it limits it, and very properly so, to an expression of what Congress thinks on this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. It does not have reference to the United Nations, but it does not limit it to that.

Mr. GROSS. It limits it in this respect, that it limits it to what we think instead of what a conglomeration in the United Nations think about colonialism and Communist imperialism.

I was somewhat surprised, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, to have him raise a point of order against my amendment this morning, which was directed particularly against colonialism. The gentleman has a good resolution here but I hope in the future he will not object to my amendments which seek to put teeth into that which he is attempting to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to my friend from Iowa, I think the situation earlier in the day and the situation we have now before us are in no way comparable. May I say for the information of my friend—I like to be frank—I did not at the moment notice any members of the Committee on Armed Services on the floor. I made the point of order so that I might have the opportunity to find out if some member of the committee was present. I later learned that the chairman was here. So I am perfectly frank in stating to my friend that my effort was just to have a little pause.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] whether the other body—the gentleman understands what I mean—has now put into the bill what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] wanted in the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not say that. I would say the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has interposed no objection. The amendments included in the other body are certainly timely. When the United States exercises its influence to support other peoples, it may do so through the United Nations and other international agencies, if desired. But I think the amendment is broader than that. It broadens the resolution and makes it more effective.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. Is it not also true that the gentleman from Massachusetts, after examining these amendments by the other body, consulted many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so that there was agreement all along the line that these amendments broadened and if anything strengthened the resolution as it came out of our committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 7227

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the latest figures released by the Government reveal that equipment and property for which taxpayers paid more than $1 billion is annually being declared surplus by Federal agencies. Much of this equipment is being dumped to junk dealers for less than 10 cents on the dollar.

At the same time, more than 4 million volunteers in our country are unselfishly giving their time and ability toward the civil defense program set up by Congress in 1950. Many of these volunteers have already seen considerable action as relief forces following floods and other disasters in many parts of the country. However, these civil defense organizations are suffering from an acute shortage of equipment and they lack funds with which to get needed equipment.

In an effort to more fully utilize the taxpayers' investment in this tremendous amount of property which is being declared surplus each year, I have introduced a proposal, H. R. 7227, to make the civil-defense organizations eligible to receive equipment which is needed for their operation. Such items as helmets, fire-fighting equipment, communications gear, cots, carpenter tools, and medical supplies would be included.

Hearings on H. R. 7227 will begin Tuesday morning before the Subcommittee on Special Government Activities. Mr. Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. William McGill, president of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors, and Mr. Joseph Malone, president of the National Association of City and County Defense Directors, are among those who are expected to appear in support of the bill.

More than 50 Members of Congress have already evidenced their interest by calling me or the subcommittee, and I have received a tremendous response from every section of the country on behalf of H. R. 7227. I would like to invite any of my colleagues who have not already done so to give me their ideas on this bill and to appear or submit statements if they so desire.

ANOTHER REASON FOR NOT BUILDING THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the building of the upper Colorado River project would critically impair the quantity and quality of water to which the lower Colorado Basin States, particularly southern California, have prior rights.

A football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the project is built as now planned.

This is true because the multi-billion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California. Thereafter, the dams would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by the 11 irrigation components recommended by the Bureau.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these 7 States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

That is why billions from the United States Treasury should not be spent to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result, and California demands that they do so.

Additionally, the project threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalis and salts before use in homes and factories. Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject. Based on it, they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre. Just how long soil could continue growing crops in fact of this is speculative.

The effect would be similar in home and industrial water systems, to say nothing of the already irritated digestive tracts of almost 6 million southern Californians.

Mr. Speaker, the project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose $187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

During the 25-year period of filling the dams contemplated by the bill, firm power output at Hoover Dam would be reduced by 25 percent. Secondary energy would be wiped out entirely. This shortage would cost the lower basin about 200 additional millions of dollars for replacement power and cost the Federal Treasury about $187 million in lost revenues.

To say the least, this is a strange power policy for the Federal Government to follow. First it builds Hoover Dam on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. The power can be produced very cheaply so the Secretary of the Interior enters into contracts to sell certain quantities of power at rates of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour and less. Then the Federal Government builds additional dams upstream. Here power cannot be produced so cheaply. But in order to generate power at these upstream dams to be sold at 6 mills, it cuts back the production of 2-mill power at Hoover Dam, which is already constructed and operating efficiently. This is Government waste with a vengeance.

Essentially, the Colorado River storage project implies the destruction or impairment of 25 percent of the value of the Boulder Canyon project to help make possible the construction of a new project upstream, to furnish power at over twice the cost and water at several times the cost of that which would be taken away from the lower basin, in violation of the covenant of the Government in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and in the power and water contracts made under that act.

Moreover, the Federal Government will be in breach of solemn contractual obligations if it curtails energy output at Hoover by intercepting water for creating power heads at the upstream dams. The project may not legally impound water for power purposes if needed to generate electrical energy at the lower basin dams. If the Federal Government breaches its contracts with power contractees in the lower basin by cutting back power deliveries at Hoover Dam, it will be subject to suit for hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 60 minutes on July 26, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE NEED FOR TOWNSEND PLAN LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to set forth certain data which in part explains the need for the enactment of legislation to give to the retired citizens of our country an adequate income so that they can enjoy with dignity and comfort their twilight years. H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 introduced this session by our colleagues, Representatives BLATNIK and GUBSER, is bipartisan legislation which would make this possible. They have been joined by 58 of our colleagues, acting as cosponsors of the Townsend plan bill.

Mr. Speaker, the list of cosponsors is inserted at this point in the Record, as follows:

Names of Congressmen Who Have Signed as Cosponsors of H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472

John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Charles S. Gubser, California; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Leonor K. (Mrs. John) Sullivan, Missouri; Gracie Pfost, Idaho; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Katherine St. George, New York; James G. Polk, Ohio; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Coya Knutson, Minnesota; Charles G. Vanik, Ohio; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Michigan; Chet Holifield, California; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; Lee Metcalf, Montana; Adam C. Powell, New York; Cecil R. King, California; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Earl Wilson, Indiana; James Roosevelt, California; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Don Hayworth, Michigan; Robert H. Mollohan, West Virginia; Craig Hosmer, California; Wayne Hays, Ohio; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; William S. Hill, Colorado; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Alvin M. Bentley, Michigan; George P. Miller, California; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; Melvin Price, Illinois; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; William J. Green, Pennsylvania; John Phillips, California; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; Bernard W. Kearney, New York; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; James M. Quigley, Pennsylvania; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Leroy Johnson, California.

Our bills would strengthen the Nation's economy through increased consumption and purchasing power which this proposed legislation would make possible.

It is most timely to have this opportunity of addressing ourselves to the problems of our senior citizens, on a day when certain improvements to the Social Security Act, have been approved by the House. My statements here today are not intended to minimize or belittle the significance of the reduction of retirement age of women from 65 to 62 years of age or of the provision permitting covered workers to draw disability benefits at age 50, instead of the present age 65, or the increase in coverage to include most professional groups. These are steps in the right direction, even though they do not go as far as many of us feel are necessary and desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I want no one to misunderstand my statements here today. I am not attacking the present social security system, or attempting to undermine it in any way. Millions of our old folks have been exceedingly fortunate to be eligible for coverage and benefits under the social security system that was initiated 20 years ago. The plight of our senior citizens would be much more desperate today if this had not been done.

What I am attempting to do is to emphasize some of the deficiencies in the present social-security law which the Congress must face up to.

The severe inferiority of the income position of the aged is one of the primary reasons that Congress committed our Nation to the principle of social security. This inadequate income of aged persons might be regarded with some complacency, bad as it is, if it were steadily improving as our standard of living has been improving for many decades. But the facts show that the income position of old folks is not improving. On the contrary it is worsening to an alarming degree. The evidence is clear and unmistakable.

Let us take a good hard look at the Census Bureau figures showing income by age groups. Analysis of the latest data from the Census Bureau which shows the distribution of money income among the population of the United States, contained in Current Population Reports, Series P–60, No. 16, issued in May 1955, reveals the following information:

Comparison by age of income groups having under $1,500 in 1953[1]

PERSONS WITH INCOME HAVING UNDER $1,500 BY PERCENT OF PERSONS WITH INCOME

	Persons 65 and over	Persons 55–64	Persons 25–64
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Men	59.3	20.7	12.3
Women	84.1	58.9	48.9
Combined sexes	70	31.6	24.1

PERSONS WITHOUT INCOME, BY PERCENT OF TOTAL PERSONS IN THE AGE GROUP

	Persons 65 and over	Persons 55–64	Persons 25–64
Men	8.3	3.5	2
Women	41.2	57.7	45.4
Combined sexes	25.9	31.2	29.3

[1] All income from social security, public assistance, and all other sources is included.

The per capita income for persons in the age group of 65 years and older was $1,228 in 1953 for both sexes; women in this age group had an income of only $608.

More than 25 percent of all persons 65 years and over had no money-income at all from any source. Think of it, Mr. Speaker, in this, the richest country in the world, having surpluses bulging from our warehouses and storage bins, we have a situation where 1 of every 4 persons, aged 65 years and over, has no money-income at their disposal. These are the people whose toil and effort in the past half-century have lifted the United States to its exalted position of industrial and agricultural leadership in the world. Is there any logical excuse for denying these senior citizens a fair share of the abundance which they have helped to create with their sweat, toil, and devotion to American ideals?

No, Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for ignoring the clearly demonstrated needs of these senior partners of our Nation. We have not kept faith with our old folks in their legitimate desire for a fair and rightful share of the good things in life to enjoy in their remaining years.

The tragically inferior income position of our aged population is not improving, but, rather, is worsening. An article entitled "Postwar Changes in the Income Position of the Aged" appeared in the February 1954 issue of the Social Security Bulletin, published monthly by the Social Security Administration of our Government. This article shows that from 1947 to 1952, the United States population aged 65 and over, increased by 17 percent, while the total population aged 14 and over increased by only 5 percent. The article pointed out that the share in personal income received by the 65-years-and-over-age group, percentagewise, remained virtually the same—7 percent in 1947, and only 8 percent in 1952.

Thus, we see that this age group has actually lost ground. Remember that during this 1947–52 period we experienced the post-World War II and Korean war inflationary conditions which reduced the purchasing power of the dollar. Remember also that during this same period the 1950 Social Security Act amendments enacted by Congress increased old-age and survivors insurance benefits by an average of 70 percent while dramatic changes were taking place in retirement and pension programs in private industry. Despite all of these factors, persons aged 65 and over received only a 1-percent increase in their share of total personal income over this 6-year period.

However, this is not the entire story. The entire money income going to all persons 14 years of age and over increased by $15 billion in 1953, when compared to the 1952 level. But of this $15 billion increase, the group aged 65 and over received only slightly more than one-half of $1 million—practically nothing when divided on a per capita basis.

Mr. Speaker, what is the magnitude of the problem of our aged citizens? Just how many persons are involved? The number of persons over 65 years of age is increasing at the rate of more than 1,000 persons a day. According to the latest available figures, there are 13,707,000 persons now over 65 years of age in the United States. Of this number 8,452,000 of them are over 70. People in the over-65 age group make up about 8 percent of our total population and it is rapidly increasing as medical science makes new discoveries which prolong our life expectancy. If we add the 6,580,000 men and women between the ages of 60 and 64, this brings the total of our senior citizens to more than 20 million, or about 11½ percent of our total population.

What about the ability of these aged persons to earn income by holding a job. Of the 13,707,000 persons aged 65 or over, only 2,233,000 of them are in the labor force. Even this does not necessarily mean that these aged persons are working full or even parttime with any degree of certainty of income.

In the light of these statistics can anyone doubt the fact that our efforts in Congress thus far to solve the problem of the income and living standard inferiority endured by aged persons have been woefully inadequate. The facts show, Mr. Speaker, that despite our efforts, publicly and in private industry, the income situation of the aged has actually deteriorated at a rapid rate since World War II.

Many of us have come to realize that we need a far more serious and realistic approach to the problems of our growing numbers of aged citizens. Our past efforts, however well intended, have not been successful in solving the problems. The time has come for a new approach.

We who are sponsoring H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 are convinced that in this legislation we have an answer to the problems of the aged.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a brief summary of how the Townsend plan would work in practice:

I. How the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, would work:

A. The gross income tax (defined in H. R. 4471 in secs. 101 and 201) would be collected by the Treasury of the United States as follows:

1. On the basis of the total gross income (gross receipts) of all companies and of all personal gross incomes above $250 a month, the tax would be computed (at the rate of 2 percent) for each calendar month at the end of each calendar month.

A. Each and every taxpayer would file a complete return with the Secretary of the Treasury before the 20th day of the calendar month immediately following the month in which the tax would have accrued; and each taxpayer would pay such taxes on, or before, the 20th day of the second month following the month in which the tax would have accrued. See sections 205 and 206 of H. R. 4471.

B. As provided in section 302 of H. R. 4471, the Secretary of the Treasury would deduct from each month's revenue the amounts estimated to be necessary for administration of the entire program.

C. After deduction of the necessary administrative costs and after the complete administration of each month's revenues, the remaining balance of each successive month's revenues would be distributed in equal sums to each and every beneficiary of the program. Beneficiaries would receive their monthly payments on, or as closely following as possible, the 1st day of each month.

1. The actual administrative period between the collection of taxes accruing during the first operating month under the plan and the distribution of benefits resulting from that first month's revenues would be the actual time necessary to qualify and certify beneficiaries and to accomplish complete administration of the taxes accrued from that first operating month. Thereafter, the program would collect revenues every month and distribute benefits every month, regularly.

The probability is that benefits received in a given calendar month would relate to taxes that had accrued about 3 months previously.

This system would thus establish and maintain a close relationship between actual economic conditions and the value of the benefits provided, operating on a meticulously pay-as-you-go basis.

II. The monetary benefits provided for by H. R. 4471:

A. H. R. 4471, Section 201, provides that the gross income tax be levied at the rate of 2 percent in order to provide benefits which would at all times approach the current value of per capita income. The tax rate is, of course, dependent upon the benefit level required and upon the classes of beneficiaries to be provided for. A higher or lower benefit rate, or a lessening or increasing of the classes of beneficiaries would alter the tax rate up or down accordingly.

Business and Census statistics indicate that as of 1953 benefits averaging close to $140 monthly—or between $1,600 and $1,700 for the year—would have been paid to the following beneficiaries, had H. R. 4471 been in operation:

	Million
1. All citizens 60 years of age and over retired	14.5
2. Disabled citizens aged 18 through 59, inclusive	2.2
3. Citizens who are widows with one or more dependent children under 18	1.175
Total	17.875

Data available to date indicate that economic levels in 1954 were, on the whole, closely comparable to those of 1953. Accordingly, benefit estimates for 1954 are about equal to those for 1953.

Month-by-month calculations of benefit rates for the years 1952 and 1953 are to be found on the 13th page of the Analysis of the Townsend Plan filed with the Committee on Ways and Means in the 83d Congress under testimony presented on April 10, 1954, by the Townsend organization.

Analysis of Census data, on which estimates of the number of beneficiaries to be expected under this program are based, is to be found on pages 10, 11 and 12 of that same analysis. (Note: New survey data from the Bureau of the Census on income distribution, which should be available in the near future, will indicate an increase in the number of aged beneficiaries to be expected.)

B. The above benefit rates are designed to eliminate the gap between the average, adult standards of living and income and the drastically inferior standards of the aged. This inferiority in respect to the living and income standards of the great majority of the American people, upon reaching old age, is the very essence of the social-security problem. The elimination of this economic failure in old age is the only justification for any social-security system.

Regardless of the means by which this problem of social security might be solved, the economic results achieved would have to be the same—the same approximate benefits for the same approximate number of beneficiaries. Furthermore, in order to constitute anything more than a very temporary solution of the problem, benefits would have to vary as such economic factors as standards of living and prices might vary.

In terms of the above-designated classes of beneficiaries, H. R. 4471 meets precisely these requirements by means of the gross income tax at the rate of 2 percent, on a long term, automatic basis. No other financial device offers this automatically geared-to-actual-economic-conditions feature.

Had the Townsend plan been law, every aged United States citizen would had a pension in 1953 amounting to about $1,600 to $1,700. Its method of financing benefits through the gross income tax, would permanently keep benefits in step with general changes in our economy and retain the real value of benefits paid under the program.

We who are cosponsoring this legislation urge that the House of Representatives, through the Ways and Means Committee, undertake a complete study of H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 with a view of setting out a new and practical approach to the Social Security problem of the aged and to permit a decision to be made on the floor of Congress.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, a man who more than any other has contributed so much to improving the lot of the senior citizens of our great country.

Dr. Townsend has always been in the forefront of the fight for security and justice for the old folks. His efforts have meant much in bringing to elderly citizens a better opportunity for a decent livelihood in their twilight years.

I know that the pages of history will duly record his tremendous contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. His perseverance and courage against overwhelming obstacles serve as inspiration to all of us and to those who will follow along the path toward social and economic justice which he has so clearly marked. The improvements in social security made today is something that Dr. Townsend proposed long ago, and to him goes much credit for the advances that were made in social security over the past generation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a statement made by President Eisenhower a few weeks ago—on June 8 to be exact. Speaking on economic stability, he said:

> That stability * * * is not any particular favor to rich and wealthy people and to great corporations.

The facts, however, show that our retired citizens did not share in the Nation's increased productivity and prosperity.

For example, here is what happened between the first 3 months of 1954 and the first 3 months of 1955:

Corporation income is up 16 percent. Stockholders' income up 8 percent. Food processors' profits up 17 percent.

Despite this prosperity at the top, the lot of the old folks has not improved.

Distribution of goods and services in the United States depends much on what Congress does or does not do.

Congress fails in its duty and responsibility when millions of people are without adequate means of support in a time of abundance, record production, and tremendous surpluses.

The legislation proposed by Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. GUBSER points the way to a just solution to this problem.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, today in the House we took action to extend social security coverage, and to make survivors and disability insurance available to those who need it at the time they need it. I wholeheartedly supported this action. To my mind the social-security program is one of the greatest social achievements of our era—if not the greatest—and I glory each time it is strengthened and expanded. Though the Democrats conceived and launched the social security program, it is satisfying to know that support for it is now almost bipartisan.

For many people, however, social security is still too little and too late. It is estimated that of the 18 million people who should be beneficiaries of a fully developed social-security system only about half of that number are actually receiving benefits. Millions of our citizens have never had the privilege of contributing to the old age insurance program. Millions of others have been under the program for such a short time that the payments they receive are too small to be of any real assistance.

For those of our citizens who were literally "born 30 years too soon" we need another program. We also need some assurance of care in future years for those still in their prime but not eligible to participate in the old-age and survivors insurance program.

To fill this gap, we need the Townsend plan.

My support of the Townsend plan is deep-seated and long-lived. I was one of the charter members of the Townsend Club in my home town of Nampa, Idaho, back in the thirties, and I have been active in the organization ever since. There are now some 10 Townsend Clubs in Idaho, with over 1,500 members. In addition, there are many other Townsend supporters in my State who do not belong to any organized group.

This year I accepted membership on the Townsend National Steering Committee in hope I could work more effectively for the plan. In my opinion, it offers our senior citizens their best hope of approaching the standard of living maintained by most other Americans. For example, the average monthly payment under the Townsend plan would be in the neighborhood of $140 as compared with the average social-security benefit of $55. The Townsend plan also sets qualification for its benefits as "the age of incapacity"—at whatever age that may be. This is practical, as we know that many people can—and are determined to—work beyond a set 60 or 65 retirement age, while others, due to illness or accident, may have to stop work long before that time.

Many senior citizens see in the Townsend plan their only hope of securing the necessities of life—and a few of the comforts. It is not that these people were not provident in their productive years—they saved during the years they worked so they would have a backlog in the years when they could no longer work. But you and I all know that what looked like ample security a few years ago is little more than pin money today. We all know that with the high cost of living and the high cost of new wonder drugs and other medical care, savings and small incomes are soon eaten up. Many, many of our citizens seriously need more assistance, and in my opinion, they deserve it.

The Townsend plan has never been debated by the Congress. Its merits should be aired. Airing its merits would also help crystalize the many problems still faced by our senior citizens—despite the fine action on the social-security program taken today.

There is no doubt in my mind that Townsend plan activity and publicity helped motivate the social-security program in the thirties. There is also no doubt that it has played a vital role in the many changes and adjustments that have been made in the social security program down through the years.

I sincerely hope this Congress will give full consideration to the Townsend plan. I think we owe such consideration to those Americans who do not have social security and have no way of getting it.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Patterson], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend their own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many words have been said on the floor of the House about the serious plight facing retired Americans. But, in my opinion, far too few words have been said about the one proposal which would guarantee security and dignity for their last years of life. I refer to the Townsend plan which recognizes that senior citizens must have their share of rising prosperity because, as Dr. Townsend has said:

> The present generation of workers inherited the productive capacities of the Nation from those who are now old.

First of all, I am in favor of the Townsend program because it treats everybody alike. No one would receive more or less than his neighbor, and all payments would be large enough to insure a comfortable standard of living. Moreover, they would be paid as a matter of right, without recourse to the odious means test which, in too many States, exacts a pauper's oath before paying meager old-age assistance payments.

Secondly, I am convinced this country needs the Townsend plan because it is, in principle, a program of mutual insurance, operated by the Federal Government, in which every citizen will participate by paying a small tax on his earnings during his productive years so that he will receive an adequate pension when he is no longer able to work.

Finally, I am convinced that we should enact the Townsend plan into law because of the contribution which members of the Townsend clubs of America have made to our social consciousness. For the idea conceived some 20 years ago by Dr. Francis Townsend, as he watched three haggard and very old women seeking food in garbage cans during the middle of a depression, has already borne fruit. In their untiring efforts to increase security in old age, Townsendites have participated actively in every improvement which has been made in our social-security system.

In my considered opinion, we cannot continue to step forward inch by inch, on behalf of our aged, as we have done in the past. The time has come to take the big and inevitable step forward by enacting the Townsend plan on behalf of all Americans.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to join in this afternoon's discussion of the Townsend plan. Particularly so because the Townsend plan was conceived in my own home congressional district in the city of Long Beach, Calif.

Since its inception the Townsend plan has had a magnificent appeal because it is directed to the very vital needs of a segment of our population that has been neglected time and again.

That is not to say that older people at any time in America's history have been turned out of shelter and allowed to go hungry and unclothed. But in most instances and at most times the help they may need has been, at best, sporadic, unorganized, and inadequate.

The time has come for a sound, consistent, organized, and effective sustained program for their help and assistance.

Upon first entering politics I made a thorough study of the economics of the proposition for a sound, national, pay-as-you-go pension plan. Considering the terrific overhead involved in 48 separate State old-age plans, I found that a national plan not only would handle the problem better, but it also would handle the problem more cheaply.

A national plan has other and sturdy advantages. It would permit a mobility on the part of our elder citizens they do not now possess. Many of them would like to move from the harsher climates to areas of the country, like my own State of California, to enjoy in their twilight years, its hospitable climate. Unless they have resources to sustain them while awaiting the 5 years' residence requirement for old-age pensions under California law, they must remain in their own home State for all of their final years.

A national plan also would remove the very considerable tax burdens that are imposed upon some States—more attractive for elderly people to live in—and not upon others. At least three-fourths of the taxes imposed by my home county of Los Angeles are devoted to paying pensions to the elderly. Many of these folks have spent their entire working lives in other States of the Union, where their work and industry have contributed greatly to the development and progress of those other States.

The States of their origin, to whom they have given so much, are the logical States to return this consideration by making contribution to their pensions when they reach the retirement age. Yet under the helter-skelter system of 48 different State plans, this is not possible. Only the enactment of a national pay-as-you-go pension system will correct this inequity amongst people and amongst States.

I urge, therefore, that the Townsend plan receive a thorough hearing. If in any respect its provisions are not the most wise that could be enacted into law, that fact will be made apparent during the hearing, and improvements can be made. This cannot be done unless there are hearings. It must be done if we are to handle a difficult problem wisely and in the best traditions of our free land.

It is a matter of great personal pride that I was one of the small group who worked diligently and obtained, for the first time in the history of any political party, a plank in the 1952 Republican Party platform calling for the institution of a sound national pay-as-you-go pension plan in America.

Not only, however, are there problems of the aged to consider, but also problems of those who are aging. I have asked that a commission be established to study the problems of both the aged and the aging and have introduced H. R. 5095 to that end. A commission, such as this bill calls for, could do much toward speeding enactment of a sound national pay-as-you-go pension plan, as well as solving other problems of the aged, such as housing, medical care, and recreation.

It is heartening to know that the Department of Labor is already making a beginning on this study, but more must be done.

In this connection, these are the facts:

Aid to the older worker does not mean just sending him to pasture with a pension. It means keeping him employed and active, serving his country usefully as long as possible. The Federal Government takes a direct interest in his problems and welfare through two of its major departments—the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The whole social-security program and its expansion is aimed at easing the financial problems of the worker as he reaches retirement age.

The new phase of this development is the increasing effort to keep the older worker "in business" as long as possible—that is, to help remove discriminations and obstacles that often force premature retirement of vigorous, able workers with a lot still to contribute to the economy. The Department of Labor is moving ahead rapidly with studies to ascertain the capabilities of the older worker and plans for an educational campaign to "sell" his services to industry.

The Department of Labor begins to take an active interest in the worker of around 45, for it is at this age that many employers begin to look askance at the jobhunter and question his capability.

With a number of older people in the population rapidly increasing, the Department is stepping up its efforts to explode the old bogey that a man's best effort is behind him at 45. It is also planning to explore some method of pension adjustment so that the very pension plans designed to aid him do not operate as a bar to employment on the ground of higher pension costs in the later age groups.

The urgency of these studies is obvious in a count of noses which shows that the proportion of the population 45 and over rose from 18 percent in 1900 to 29 percent in 1953. By 1975 it is anticipated that these people will comprise 34 percent of the total population, and jump to 43 percent in 1985.

If discrimination against the older workers and other obstacles to his continued employment are not removed, the country will have a growing load of unemployment as time goes on.

With a weather-eye on this problem, the Department of Labor has just developed a six-point plan of attack, under a recent $173,000 appropriation. The department sees this situation not only from the standpoint of the able worker without a job, but from the standpoint of a Nation deprived of one of its most valuable natural resources—potential manpower.

Studies already made, although fragmentary, show that "arbitrary age barriers are no longer justified by experience or by physiological fact," according to Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson.

Moreover, technological progress may be giving the older worker just the break he needs. Automation is rapidly removing requirements for physical strength in certain lines of industry; at the same time it is creating a demand for qualities generally associated with maturity, such as dependability, responsibility, judgment, experience, and so on.

Workers themselves today are more rugged at 45 than they used to be, indicating their own shedding of shackles with respect to age limitations. They are better educated, more flexible in their thinking, according to these same studies.

The Labor Department study will include an analysis of the performance, productivity, absenteeism, accident record, dependability, attitudes and faithfulness of older workers.

> What we are hoping—

According to Mr. Larson—

> is that we will be able to make a study of this scope and authority that, added to existing studies, will carry real conviction.

This newly authorized survey will also go into the problems posed by the growth of the private pension system. The premium paid by employers rises with the entry age of the worker. The Department will seek to learn how much of a roadblock this really is, and if it is a roadblock, how it may be removed or bypassed.

The Department will confer with both unions and employers on this problem of age discrimination and how it is handled in wage contracts. Department authorities will examine the experience of employers with respect to the hiring, retention, and laying off of older workers.

Out of this will be compiled a casebook of good hiring and utilization practices for distribution to employers throughout the country. Government placement services will also be expanded in this intensified effort to eliminate outmoded discriminations and make the older worker a national asset instead of a liability.

The work of a Presidential Commission, such as I have asked for, would not only go hand in hand with the work already underway by the Labor Department, but would augment it materially in areas that are not under the Department's program.

Thus I close with this dual appeal: Let us have a sound national pay-as-you-go pension plan; and let us have the Commission to make a detailed study of the problems of the aging and aged.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 83d Congress I had the honor to join with many of my distinguished colleagues in signing Discharge Petition No. 2 to remove H. R. 2446, known as the Townsend-plan bill, from consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

The House now has before it similar legislation embodied in two bills, H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, introduced by Representatives BLATNIK and GUBSER.

Giant strides are being made by medical science each year, Mr. Speaker, in increasing the longevity of the people of our country, and as each of these advances is reported it is increasingly evident to all of us that ours is fast becoming an aging nation.

Not only is the number of oldsters becoming more numerous each year, but the financial position of these older persons is becoming increasingly precarious. This situation is highlighted in an article, Postwar Changes in the Income Position of the Aged, by Jacob Fisher, of the Social Security Administration, published in the February 1954 issue of the Social Security Bulletin.

Our elderly population, aged 65 and over, increased 17 percent from 1947 to 1952, but their share of our total personal income increased from 7 percent to only 8 percent in the same period.

When we consider that the purchasing power of the consumer dollar, based on the Consumer Price Index as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, decreased from $1.05 in 1947 to 88 cents in 1952, it is plain for all to see that our aged actually slipped from their pitifully inferior income position in 1947 to an even more inferior position in 1952.

This took place despite the action of Congress in 1950 increasing old-age and survivors insurance benefits by 70 percent.

Thus, it is apparent that we have at best barely prevented the comparative income position of the elderly from becoming worse.

When the highest authorities of our Nation are increasingly concerned with the problem of keeping buying power abreast of our ever-expanding ability to produce, it is plain to me that we must put a stop to the deterioration of the average American's buying power upon his reaching old age.

We must find some way to end poverty and dependence in old age by adding adequately to what the American people can do privately to provide for retirement.

In the light of this need, I believe it is time for us to make a major revision of our old-age and survivors insurance, and, toward this end, that we should give the most careful consideration to the bills in question.

THERE IS AN IMPERATIVE NEED FOR AN ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM OLD-AGE PENSION FOR ALL CITIZENS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join those colleagues who are addressing the House today on the Townsend bill under a special order.

Since a bill in the House, unlike the Senate, contains only the name of the Representative introducing it, many of us have introduced the Townsend bill individually; therefore, in principle we are actual cosponsors of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my active interest in Townsend legislation is not mere lip-service, for it had its inception when I was elected to the 76th Congress and took my seat in 1939. During that Congress a vote was cast in the House on the Townsend bill. Because of my vote in favor of the bill I was designated by Dr. Francis E. Townsend as being among the "101 immortals of the 76th Congress in the House of Representatives" who stood up and were actually counted in favor of the legislation.

Since the 76th Congress the Townsend bill has been improved upon and introduced in successive Congresses, but we have never been able to secure hearings on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues recall the active campaigns to secure the necessary 218 signatures on a discharge petition. These campaigns have been directed each Congress by congressional steering committees, of which I have been a member down through the years.

These campaigns in support of a discharge petition were the result of the inability to secure consideration of the Townsend bill by the House Ways and Means Committee. Many of the older Members of the House recall that tax legislation incident to the war was for years the annual excuse, followed by repeated statements that the whole structure of the Social Security Act was being made the subject of a congressional study, and therefore, it was not timely or feasible to hold hearings on the Townsend bill.

Meanwhile, our efforts to reach our worthwhile goal, or finding some means of making fundamental changes in social-security legislation, so as to deal more humanely with our aged citizens, have been hampered and defeated.

This praiseworthy objective had the endorsement of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt back in 1940 when he said in an address in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., September 11, 1940:

> Our old-age pension system must be improved and extended. The amount of the pension should be increased and above all, these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation.

Continuing he said:

> It is my hope that soon the United States will have a national system under which no needy man or woman within our borders will lack a minimum old age pension which will provide adequate food, clothing, and lodging at the end of the road without having to go to the poorhouse to get it, and I look forward to a system which in addition to this bare minimum will enable those who have faithfully toiled in any occupation to build up additional security for their old age which will allow them to live in comfort and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Act was approved in 1935 providing earned benefits for those working in positions covered by that act. The law had been in effect 5 years when President Roosevelt, as I have just quoted him, committed himself in favor of a national pension system. Nearly 15 years have elapsed and while Congress has amended the Social Security Act on various occasions, it has not yet squarely faced the problem of solving the plight of our elderly citizens, who never had the opportunity during their productive years to be covered by the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that these senior citizens receive public assistance benefits under the Social Security Act through a program administered by the several States, but the amount of their benefits are hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together.

In addition, in my home State of Pennsylvania a recipient of public assistance benefits is required to give a lien on his home to the State as assurance that repayments of the amount of benefits will be guaranteed. Surely this requirement by the State cannot be said to be in harmony with the hope expressed in 1940 by the late President Roosevelt that "these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation."

My opposition to any State requiring a recipient of public assistance benefits to give the State a lien on his home has caused me to introduce in this Congress and previous Congresses H. R. 862 which would prohibit the State from exacting such a requirement.

As I stated previously, from 1940 down through the years Congress has given annually the excuse that tax legislation incident to the war and a comprehensive study of the Social Security Act were the compelling factors that have pigeonholed the Townsend bill which is designed to provide every adult citizen at age 60, or earlier if totally disabled, with equal basic Federal insurance permitting retirement.

Mr. Speaker, let me state at this point, in tribute to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, that whether or not there is absolute agreement with his economic philosophy, the fact cannot be denied, that since 1932—3 years before the Social Security Act was approved—he has continued his crusade to make this Nation conscious of the plight of our elderly citizens. Therefore, it follows that Dr. Townsend is in a large measure responsible for awakening Americans to the imperative need of solving this distressing problem.

Mr. Speaker, today we considered amendments to the Social Security Act, but as usual under a closed rule which prohibited any amendments. The bill considered was reported in the closing days of this session of Congress without any public hearings, and under a gag rule that tied the hands of Members of Congress who sincerely desire to aid those receiving public-assistance benefits, in their desire to maintain their dignity as American citizens who through toil, sacrifices, and taxes built this great Nation.

It is indeed appropriate, that those of us who are actively interested in a uniform and adequate Federal old-age pension, should on the occasion of amending the Social Security Act, take the opportunity under the special order obtained, to call our colleagues attention to the need for an adequate old-age pension for all senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, I think that the Townsend bill which represents the sentiments of millions of American citizens is entitled to public hearings. It is unthinkable that such legislation which has the interest and attention of millions should remain bottled up in the House Ways and Means Committee from one Congress after another. Certainly the Townsend bill in simple justice to the aged of the Nation is entitled to its day in court so that the subject of an adequate old-age pension for every adult citizen can be fully debated in the halls of Congress.

I realize that adjournment of this Congress is scheduled for July 31 but I sincerely hope that when the second session convenes next January the Townsend bill will receive attention in order that Congress can consider it and thereby reinforce the faith our elderly citizens have, that the Congress of the United States is not turning a deaf ear to their plight.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress discards the threadbare excuses that have been given the Townsendites and other pension groups in pigeonholing the Townsend bill or similar bills that would provide an adequate and uniform Federal old age pension.

NOMINATION OF H. CHAPMAN ROSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's nomination of H. Chapman Rose, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury is recognition of a fine record of accomplishment by one of the administration's junior officials.

Mr. Rose in his 2½ years as Assistant Secretary has come to enjoy the confidence and esteem not only of his Treasury associates but also of his fellow officials throughout the Government, of the Members of Congress and their staffs, and of the public.

Some of his most effective work in the Treasury has been in the broad field of simplification and better administration of the customs laws, and in this respect every American business concern interested in world trade has reason to feel indebted to him.

Supervision of the Bureau of Customs was one of the initial Treasury responsibilities assigned to Mr. Rose when Secretary Humphrey organized a new "Treasury team" in January 1953. Mr. Rose quickly found the responsibility a challenging one.

The first reports to him established that the Customs Service suffered from both administrative and legislative deficiencies. There were big backlogs of unfinished business in customs offices throughout the country. Upwards of a million customs entries awaited liquidation. Business as well as government suffered from burdensome paperwork requirements. Customs classification questions could not be answered promptly. Awkward valuation methods were in use.

Foreign exporters and American importers alike were victims of these and other frustrating conditions affecting the Customs Service and imposing severe handicaps on world trade.

Thanks in considerable measure to Assistant Secretary Rose's energetic leadership, much has been accomplished to remedy these conditions.

In the legislative area he gave valuable advice in connection with the passage by Congress of the Customs Simplification Acts of 1953 and 1954, which disposed of some of the pressing customs problems, and in the preparation of the pending Customs Simplification Act of 1955, which will effect some further vital improvements, particularly as to the statutory provisions covering valuation methods.

Less widely advertised, perhaps, than the legislative changes, but equally if not more important to exporters and importers, are the administrative changes which have been brought about in the Customs Service under Mr. Rose's guidance.

Mr. Rose in mapping a program of administrative improvements for the Customs Service acted on the premise that good customs administration means speed, certainty, and fairness. Tied in with the legislative program have been customs administrative steps which provide those three things to a substantially greater degree than had been true before Assistant Secretary Rose came along with his vigor, keen insight, and his faculty for getting things done.

The backlogs are now steadily being reduced. The number of unliquidated customs entries was 900,000 in September 1953; now it is far below that figure.

There is better, faster service to the traveling public at docks and international airports.

Paperwork requirements have been examined critically and the needless ones have been eliminated.

As a matter of fairness the Customs Service confines itself strictly to interpreting the Tariff Act as it stands, leaving policy to the Congress.

These steps, and others yet to be taken, such as the improvement of valuation methods and the completion of a study by the Tariff Commission looking to better classification descriptions, will be contributions of vital importance to the maintenance of high world trade levels.

It should be mentioned that the administrative accomplishments of the Customs Service under Mr. Rose's supervision have been brought about with fewer people than before he took office. So the Customs Bureau record under Mr. Rose has been one of more economical as well as more efficient operation.

That is equally true of the other Treasury activities which he has supervised, notably the operations of the United States Coast Guard and of the Bureau of the Mint.

Reporting to Mr. Rose are such Treasury law-enforcement agencies as the United States Secret Service and the Bureau of Narcotics, and he is justly proud of the excellent reputation which they enjoy.

To those who knew Mr. Rose before he came to the Treasury the accomplishments which he has to his credit in his post as Assistant Secretary have not been surprising.

At Princeton University, where he was graduated in 1928, he served as chairman of the Daily Princetonian and as chairman of the undergraduate council.

He went from Princeton to Harvard Law School, where he was a magna cum laude graduate in 1931.

The late Associate Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the Supreme Court, recognized the talents of this young graduate and appointed him his secretary. He served in this capacity through 1932. Then his home State of Ohio called, and Mr. Rose went to Cleveland to join a prominent law firm.

Entering the Army as a captain in July 1942, he served in the Office of the Under Secretary of War, and later was assigned by the War Department as an assistant to Bernard Baruch and John M. Hancock, then consultants to the Director of War Mobilization, James F. Byrnes.

Mr. Rose's work with them on postwar reconversion and contract termination problems was followed by his assignment to the Office of Contract Settlement. He left the Army in December 1945 as a colonel to become a director of contract settlements.

Mr. Rose returned to his Cleveland law firm in 1946. In 1948–49 he acted as counsel to the Industrial Advisory Committee of the Economic Cooperation Administration for a study of reparations problems.

Civic activities received much of his attention in his home city of Cleveland, where he has been a trustee of the Cleveland Orchestra, the Cleveland Area Park Society, and the Cleveland Bureau of Governmental Research.

Upon his acceptance of the post as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rose resigned his law-firm partnership and all of his corporation connections.

To his work at the Treasury, Mr. Rose gives long hours and endless vitality. His Treasury associates know him as being extraordinarily capable; people outside the Treasury find him the possessor of a pleasant, engaging personality; audiences find him a speaker who wastes few words.

No two Federal officials work together more closely than Treasury Secretary Humphrey and Under Secretary-designate Rose. Their presence on the Treasury team, together with that of Under Secretary W. Randolph Burgess and the various subordinate Treasury officials, should be a source of great satisfaction to the American public.

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR ROCCO C. SICILIANO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously impressed at the very fine speech made by Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco C. Siciliano before the Disabled American Veterans at their convention in Boston, July 16.

The address follows:

Congresswoman ROGERS, members of the Disabled American Veterans and Auxiliary, ladies, and gentlemen, I very much appreciate this opportunity to talk to you about a few things of mutual interest and to appear on the same platform with Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. In her 30 years in the House of Representatives, Mrs. ROGERS has become our most outstanding legislator in the fields of veterans affairs, and all of us who have served in the Armed Forces owe to her a tremendous debt of gratitude for the constructive leadership that she has given with regards to such legislation.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has asked me to convey his very sincere wish for a successful convention, and to express to this group his high esteem of Mrs. ROGERS.

We in the Labor Department have been looking afresh at our role in Government. The basic mission of the United States Department of Labor, as directed by the Congress, is "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." What do we mean by wage earners? The definition covers the work that man does for his sustenance. In other words, most of us, whether we work in the field, at a bench, or behind a desk are in one sense or another wage earners. To carry out this congressional mandate, then, is a difficult and important task.

My duties as Assistant Secretary of Labor involve supervision of those activities in the Department in which you of the DAV are most directly interested. In a very real sense our ability to produce the implements of war, as well as to enjoy the fruits of peace, stems from the work of millions of Americans as they go about their daily tasks. Truly the base of our economic strength is people—people working at jobs.

Almost from our beginning as a Nation, the Federal Government has recognized an obligation to those called upon to defend our National Security on the field of battle and to their widows and orphans. You have heard from others about the splendid programs carried on by the Farmers Home Administration, the Civil Service Commission, and particularly the Veterans' Administration, which is the primary and the largest agency concerned directly with veterans.

Upon entering the Department of Labor, I was surprised to find how much of its activity is concerned with advancing the welfare of veterans. The Department's Bureau of Employment Security is responsible for the nationwide network of State and local employment services. It administers the unemployment compensation program, and of particular interest to you, the program of unemployment compensation for Korean veterans. In this bureau is the Veterans Employment Service, concerned primarily with seeing that veterans are referred to jobs which become available. The Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship concerns itself with the training of the skilled manpower which our complicated industrial machine requires; apprentice training is an important avenue for many young veterans. Getting his job back is always important to the released veteran. The Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights is charged solely with the assisting of veterans to get back into the jobs they left to enter military service. We are particularly concerned that all veterans who had jobs before they entered service have an opportunity to get the information and assistance they need to exercise their reemployment rights.

Also in the Department is the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which administers certain death and injury benefits for reservists as well as for veterans employed by the Federal Government.

All of these services, and others—the employment service, unemployment insurance, apprenticeship, and veterans' reemployment rights—are of deep concern to veterans, for they touch the vital area of gainful employment.

But there is another activity of particular interest to you who are here today: the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, which physically and for administrative purposes is located in the Department of Labor. Under the inspiring leadership of Marine Maj. Gen. Melvin Maas, it is doing an outstanding job not only for disabled veterans, but for all those who are physically handicapped. I am aware not only of the support you have given to this program, but also of the financial assistance you have given in connection with its essay contests.

I would like to use this occasion for a brief review of the greatly expanded program the Government has undertaken in the field of rehabilitation of handicapped workers. The Federal-State system of employment services last year reviewed its experience during 10 years of special attention to the placement of handicapped workers. During that period something like 3 million job placements of handicapped persons have been reported by the State employment services. During the latter part of this period some 60,000 handicapped workers have been rehabilitated and made employable each year. Needless to say this has proven to be good business from the point of view of the Nation's economy. More important, its social value has been incalculable.

Nevertheless it has been abundantly clear that this rate of rehabilitation has been too low. There is evidence that some 2 million individuals unemployed because of severe disabilities could be restored to productive employment if resources were devoted to the necessary rehabilitation services. A rehabilitation rate of 60,000 per year has apparently accomplished little more than to keep up with the occurrence of new disabilities, leaving untouched the tremendous backlog of individuals who could be restored to gainful employment.

It was on the basis of such calculations that President Eisenhower requested sharp expansion in governmental and private rehabilitation efforts. As you all know, one result was the 1954 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This legislation established a schedule for expansion of these services so that by the end of 1959 the annual rate will reach at least 200,000. The revised act calls for an increase in grants-in-aid to the State vocational rehabilitation agencies and increased research into more effective ways of overcoming disability. It provides specifically that the Employment Service provide employment counseling and placement services for handicapped persons and undertake the task of promotion and development of employment opportunities for such individuals.

It is this further task of the Federal-State system of employment services on which I would like to comment.

The almost 12 months since establishment of the expanded program has been a period of tooling up, of extensive personnel training, and of the perfecting of agreements for the coordination of local placement and counseling work with the work of the agencies concerned with the physical aspects of rehabilitation. Employment Service personnel have been trained or retrained in the provision of individualized service. Individualized service starts with the determination of specific abilities and ends with the location of the particular job which best utilizes those specific abilities.

Although we have considered this first year to be a period of tooling up, I do not wish to appear unduly modest. We are very pleased to be able to report that during May of 1955 (the latest month for which figures are available) the number of placements of handicapped individuals was approximately 45 percent over the number placed in the corresponding month of May 1954. This was not merely a reflection of the increased job opportunities this year; total placements had increased only 14 percent between the same 2 periods. We are very hopeful that this improved service may yield even more striking returns as the months go by.

I would not wish to leave the impression that we are concerned only with the Government's ability to find employment for disabled workers. Over the years the Employment Service has encouraged and aided industrial plants to adopt the same principles of individualized placement of individuals. Many private establishments have trained key personnel. Technical assistance to business and industry in analyzing the physical requirements of jobs and in advising on employment procedures for hiring the handicapped has become a routine service provided by many State empoyment services.

Let me say emphatically at this point that the Employment Service and the Department of Labor are not seeking to monopolize the credit for the striking improvements which we believe are being made in the employment of handicapped people. Basically this has been and must be a community job with the various local organizations, business establishments, and key individuals lending their efforts to the opening up of new employment opportunities. The communities in which the employ-the-handicapped record is best are almost unfailingly those in which the community has best organized itself and its resources to further this cause. Herein lies an opportunity for expanded local service that you of the DAV have long been familiar with. As you well know, your continued leadership in this field is most important.

Before closing I would like to outline briefly a new Department of Labor activity which has numerous points of similarity to the problems we have just discussed. This is the problem of employment opportunities for the older worker. The unthinking and often completely irrational discrimination in hiring against people who are beyond their 40th year of age is well known. But the proportion of older people in our population is steadily growing and will continue to grow for years ahead. Thus, this discrimination in employment, which has always been unfair from the individual's point of view, is also becoming a matter of concern from the point of view of the Nation's economy and security. We simply cannot afford prematurely to give up the services of individuals who in many cases are just in the midst of their useful productive lives.

We believe that we can begin to do something about it. The Congress has this year provided a special appropriation for intensive study and development of programs to deal with this problem. First of all we plan to marshal the facts; those who have studied the problem know that the older worker is on the average a better worker for many jobs. We plan to gather together these facts and to make them widely known; we shall seek out any other obstacles which may deter the hiring of older workers—obstacles such as the greater annual cost of pension rights or greater accident hazards—and attempt to point out ways by which they may be overcome. We hope to expand for this group the type of individualized placement attention that has been pioneered in the physically handicapped program.

I mention this interest in the older worker because the problems are not unlike those with which we have gained experience in the field of physical disability. The older worker is not incompetent with regard to most jobs; neither is the disabled worker. In both cases correction involves the techniques of finding the proper job for the particular capabilities involved, and in both cases the overriding obstacle is the widely held conception that such workers are "second rate." I believe that as we get more and more into the older worker problem—as we inevitably will in the years ahead—that we will find that we can borrow much from the techniques developed over a long period and which are proving increasingly successful, in the placement of handicapped workers.

It has become increasingly clear that this Nation is having difficulty in expanding its supply of technical personnel in step with the ever faster development of modern technology. This is strikingly true as regards engineers and scientists but is also true of the highly skilled workers used in the construction and maintenance of modern production processes. These shortages are obviously of particular concern from the standpoint of our national security.

In a day in which our supply of technicians and of highly skilled workers can be important to our very survival, it becomes doubly urgent that we not waste our skill resources because of employment discrimination, whether it be discrimination on the basis of color, of age, or of partial disability. Thus it is that I am able to report that governmental programs aimed at rehabilitation and placement of handicapped workers and of older workers are now recognized to touch the very center of our national manpower policy.

Before I close I would like to say a word about the fine relationship and cooperation we in Washington have with your headquarters there. Roland Jensen, your assistant national adjutant, Major Clark, your national director of legislation, Charlie Foster, assistant national legislative director, and John Burris, national director of employment, keep in close touch with us on all the programs in which you have a special interest.

In the enactment of much of this important legislation, Congresswoman ROGERS has had an important and principal part to play. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to attend your convention, to discuss these matters of mutual concern, and to participate in the honoring of your distinguished legislator, Congresswoman EDITH N. ROGERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FJARE.

Mr. DORN of New York (at the request of Mr. RAY).

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. HESELTON in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEAVER and to include some editorials.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. ARENDS and to include a speech by Mr. VURSELL of Illinois.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. WICKERSHAM) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. GORDON).

Mr. THORNBERRY (at the request of Mr. GORDON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request or Mr. GORDON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming in two instances.

Mr. DEROUNIAN and to include a statement.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI).

Mr. CANNON.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEANE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today and tomorrow, on account of death in the family.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communicatitons were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

993. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

994. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to purchase blanket or schedule bonds and pay bond premiums for employees"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

995. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

996. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and for sector headquarters for the immigration border patrol, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

997. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8. U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

998. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

999. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to resubmitting six cases on aliens which were rejected by the 83d Congress and requesting that they be reexamined with a view toward placing them on a joint resolution granting such aliens permanent adjustment of their status, pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1000. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1001. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title I of the act entitled 'An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1002. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1003. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of the Navy for the period July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 2672 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 14, 1955, the following bill was reported on July 15, 1955:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1855. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 18, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOPER: Committee of conference. H. R. 5559. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad (Rept. No. 1191). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1167. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4093. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4734. A bill to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5337. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6101. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River; with amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5280. A bill to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7236. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5649. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7416. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 308. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7214, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7252. A bill to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stock of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7415. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7416. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 7417. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer casein from the dutiable list to the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 7418. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHASE:

H. R. 7419. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7420. A bill establishing certain offices within the Department of Defense and defining the functions thereof, and creating a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7421. A bill to improve legal services in the executive branch of the Government by establishing certain offices within the Department of Justice and defining the functions thereof, creating a legal career service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7422. A bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an Administrative Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 7423. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7424. A bill to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85 degrees 54 minutes 43.5 seconds east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers harbor line system are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80 a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 7425. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for air medical service to remote areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7426. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 7427. A bill to prohibit the transmission through the mails of communications intended to incite hostility among individuals and classes and groups of individuals on account of differences in race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 7428. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7429. A bill to provide for the apportionment of education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7430. A bill to amend paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to substitutes for jewels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7431. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7432. A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota and to facilitate the orderly termination of Federal supervision and control over Indians and Indian property in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7433. A bill to provide assistance for certain landless Indians in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7434. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7435. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7436. A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 7437. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 7438. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7439. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 7440. A bill to equalize and adjust certain salaries in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 7441. A bill to increase the public use and benefit from Oregon Caves National Monument, Oreg., by revising the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7442. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the joint or cooperative purchasing of alcoholic beverages and advertising for the sale of such beverages by licensees holding a retailer's license class A; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7443. A bill to provide that the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $20,000 each per annum; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7444. A bill to amend section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to include flight attendants within the definition of "airman"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 307. Resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for construction of a new veterans hospital at Wood, Wis.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 7445. A bill for the relief of Yaeko Nishizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7446. A bill for the relief of Berta Reitberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7447. A bill for the relief of Su-Ying Wong Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 7448. A bill for the relief of John E. Doyle, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7449. A bill for the relief of Jen-Pu Cheng and Mrs. Chuan-huan Wu Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7450. A bill for the relief of Kwan-Ting Shen and Mrs. Nai-hsuan Chang Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 7451. A bill for the relief of Isac Judenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 7452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna C. Pirro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 7453. A bill for the relief of Richard M. Taylor and Lydia Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7454. A bill for the relief of Fong Way Chong (also known as Freddie Fong) and his wife Chu Lau Hing (also known as Lana Fong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 7455. A bill for the relief of William H. Lowery, executor of the estate of Minnie A. Lowery, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 7456. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

353. Mr. HAYS of Arkansas presented a petition of Mr. M. M. Erion, 1004 Denison, Little Rock, Ark., and others urging approval of legislation amending the Railroad Retirement Act so as to provide retirement at age 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age, annuities to be based on one or more of one's highest year's earnings, also that railroad retirement annuities and pensions be increased by 15 percent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Lyndon Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader of the United States Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, became ill from a heart attack 2 weeks ago. Since that time, practically every long-distance telephone call I received from Texas, the person calling asked how Senator JOHNSON was getting along. It has pleased me very much that I have been in a position to tell them every time that he is getting along better as he has constantly improved.

Senator JOHNSON is very much missed on Capitol Hill, and while we want to see him back as soon as possible, we want him to take the time necessary to fully restore his health. He is too valuable in too many ways for any risk to be run about his recovery.

I do not believe any person in public life in the United States has caused so much concern of the people throughout the Nation than the sudden attack and illness of Senator JOHNSON.

The Marshall News-Messenger, published in the district I have the honor to represent, and in the hometown of Senator JOHNSON'S popular and charming wife, had an editorial July 14, 1955, as follows:

JOHNSON ILLNESS ELECTION FACTOR

Texans are not the only ones concerned because of the serious illness of their senior Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Likewise, leaders of the Democratic Party face important implications with respect to the entire system of American Government.

Prayers of the Nation are that the Texan will recover, and current reports from his bedside indicate his return to usefulness. Temporarily, however, his influence is lost; and his illness well could be a factor in next year's presidential elections.

His condition recalls the loss of Senator Robert Taft as a GOP leader 2 years ago. At the time there were differences between sections of his party and the President that needed to be reconciled if effective work was to be done by the new administration and Congress. Despite the fact that Taft had been a rival candidate for the Presidency he was displaying a fine spirit of cooperation as majority leader of the Senate at the moment he was struck down.

Senator JOHNSON has shown remarkable ability in holding together the diverse elements of his party in its work with a Republican administration. He has remained a loyal Democrat but has not favored mere partisan obstruction of worthy proposals. He has kept in mind the sort of record that his party should be able to submit in a national contest for control of the Government.

For nearly 100 years 2 parties of varying strength have been the mainstay of the American system. Neither has been free from divisions within itself at numerous times but, regardless of occasional third parties and the like, this country has not been afflicted with the splinter organizations or the political factionism that has weakened European nations with France as an outstanding example.

At strategic moments there has been the leadership to prevent such harmful developments. Its absence for any considerable period would have grave consequences. It is an essential of both parties. Republicans and Democrats alike should strive to find and retain it for the continued well-being of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting the following article published in the Dallas Morning News recently:

ILL WIND BLOWS GOOD FOR JOHNSON

(By Ruth Schumm)

The heart attack which almost cost the life of Senate Democratic leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON has served to publicize his beliefs and accomplishments more spectacularly than anything else could have, short of an obituary. After he was stricken, every newspaper and news broadcast brought the work of the Texas Senator dramatically and simultaneously to the attention of the whole Nation.

Although JOHNSON'S name recently had been mentioned more frequently and prominently as a possible presidential candidate because of his Senate record, observers had pointed out that this record was not well known outside Washington.

JOHNSON'S success as majority leader has been based largely on his smooth-working tactics behind the scenes, personal contacts and private phone calls which don't make headlines. This solved problems, but did not produce the colorful conflict that attracts publicity.

JOHNSON was getting the job done in remarkable, some thought unprecedented, fashion. But he was getting it done in a way that would bring him credit only among those who know the inside workings of the Senate.

Now his unique success in achieving party unity and such a notable record is being praised on every hand and called to the attention of the man in the street by editorial writers, columnists and commentators.

Conservatives who have shied away from JOHNSON as Democratic standard bearer because they remember him as a young idealistic Roosevelt-idolizing Congressman from New Deal days are now being reminded of JOHNSON'S achievements by compromise as a feet-on-the-ground progressive.

Liberals who could not warm up to the idea of having JOHNSON as their candidate because they thought of him as a typical southern conservative are now hearing about progressive measures which passed the Senate due largely to his work.

Independents are hearing of JOHNSON'S determination to make the Democratic opposition in the Senate a responsible one—a philosophy particularly appealing to the voter who wants to cast his ballot for the good of the country, regardless of party lines.

Even though Democratic leaders may believe now that a national convention would never nominate a man for President who had had a heart attack, JOHNSON'S complete recovery, combined with a continuation of his successful policies of Senate leadership, may change their minds.

A clue to some of the thinking along this line comes from JOHNSON'S Senate colleague, PRICE DANIEL. DANIEL, who supported President Eisenhower in 1952, made the following observation about JOHNSON this week in his newsletter to Texas papers:

"It is he more than anyone else who has been able to bring together for the good of the country a majority in the Senate on many important issues. It is he more than anyone else who might be able to help restore unity and confidence in the Democratic Party, both in Texas and in the Nation."

And the following article from the Associated Press:

AFTER HEART ATTACK—SENATOR JOHNSON AGAIN ABLE TO WATCH ACTION IN SENATE

WASHINGTON.—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, a heart attack only 11 days behind him, is again beginning to keep in close touch with developments in the Senate, where he normally serves as Democratic leader.

JOHNSON is still confined to bed at the Naval Medical Center in suburban Bethesda, Md. Whatever activity he undertakes is under the careful eye of doctors treating him for a heart attack they have termed moderately severe.

But through members of his immediate family, a few aids; and 1 or 2 Senate colleagues who are permitted to visit him, the Texas Senator keeps abreast of developments.

He reads the newspapers and some selected correspondence previously checked over by assistants. A television set has been placed in his room. A kind of censorship over it, as well as the newspapers, is exercised by his wife Lady Bird.

She has been near him constantly since he entered the hospital, and sleeps in an adjoining room.

The women secretaries of JOHNSON's office staff have set up shop in a room near JOHNSON's own 16th floor suite. They are on duty in turns during the day, alternating between the hospital and the Capitol.

Their job at the hospital is largely to handle the telephone calls, letters, telegrams, and flowers.

The Senator's brother, Sam Houston Johnson, says LYNDON JOHNSON is "doing what the doctors tell him to," adding:

"They keep an hourly check on him, and make sure that he is not taxing his strength. If he's feeling good they'll let him see someone, and they watch to see that he doesn't get tired out."

One of the attending doctors said if JOHNSON continues to progress, he may be able ot leave the hospital in about 3 weeks, and then spend another month or so in Washington before returning to Texas.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings last week on the vital civil rights bills which have been introduced by a number of the Members this year. I appeared before the subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. With your permission, I would like to place in the RECORD at this time the text of the remarks which I made in the committee. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will act favorably and promptly on these measures.

The remarks follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear here today concerning these vital civil rights bills. I thank you for this opportunity.

As you know there are a great many measures pending which deal with this question. Many are identical and serve as evidence of the great interest in and need for the legislation proposed. There seems to be several basic groups into which these bills fall.

There are two groups of omnibus bills: The first of these, introduced by Congressmen POWELL, ADDONIZIO, RODINO, and BARRATT O'HARA, contain much that the other proposals embody, but adds the so-called FEPC provisions. This I wholeheartedly support as I do the other measures designed to ensure equality of oportunity for all.

The second group of omnibus bill, includes my own, H. R. 3423. These also include much that a number of the other bills propose and provide for the prohibition of discrimination in interstate transportation. It seems to me that in this area of Federal jurisdiction the enactment of such basic legislation is long overdue. The public shame of forcing certain American citizens to ride in designated areas of public conveyances and to accept inferior accommodations is abhorrent to every concept of freedom we cherish and degrades not only the person discriminated against, but the entire Nation for allowing the practice to survive. The concept of segregation remains with us in defiance of the Supreme Court and the Constitution.

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning this bill contains the very clear statement that since the present law (sec. 3 (1) Interstate Commerce Act) "neither require nor prohibits segregation of the races" the Commission "has limited its inquiry to the question whether equal accommodations and facilities are provided for members of the two races." Discrimination is inherent in that statement. The Supreme Court ruled in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 343, 1954), "Separate * * * facilities are inherently unequal." The Court, to its everlasting credit has discarded the ancient mockery of freedom called "separate but equal." Shall we do less? I am told that we received the best international press we have had since the Marshal plan, as a result of the Supreme Court decision. If we were to act now to eliminate this shameful condition on the eve of the Four Power Conference at Geneva, it would, I am sure, be most helpful to the President, and to the cause of freedom which we so earnestly espouse.

The Interstate Commerce Commission declined to openly take a position on this proposal in view of certain cases now pending before it, where the precise question at issue is involved. It is my understanding that the two cases which are cited have been pending for some time. In view of this reluctance or hestancy on the part of the Commission and the emphatic decision of the Supreme Court, it would seem all the more urgent for Congress to act now and prevent any further delay in eliminating finally this rejected doctrine.

The next group of bills generally deal with a form of murder some times called "lynching." That such legislation outawing mob violence and granting the injured the opportunity to recover damages has not been previously enacted is most surprising to me.

Similarly, the next group of bills relating to activities which can be characterized as Ku Klux Klan marauding would certainly appear as appropriate in reaffirmance of constitutional guarantees upon which our society is based. Lest it be thought that such activity no longer plagues us, I have here a small clipping from a magazine published this week reporting such an incident near Chicago there was gunfire.

The fourth group of bills would authorize the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government. We are all most conscious of the war being waged around the world for the minds and hearts of men. The Communists use every trick in the book to picture themselves as the champions of the downtrodden. We spend millions of dollars annually throughout the world to combat this falsehood and to promote the true concept of freedom and democracy which is our heritage. We delude ourselves if we think that excessive security safeguards can prevent Communist propaganda from influencing minds which are constantly subjected to injustice and intolerance. The Supreme Court pointed this out in the Brown case (supra) when they held that the impact of segregation is greater when it has the sanction of the law.

The next group of bills is intended to strengthen the law relating to the right of qualified citizens to vote freely for candidates of their own choice. Intimidation of voters and discrimination against certain otherwise eligible citizens is the mark of dictatorship. The violation of these rights in this free Nation should be made the subject of stringent penalties, both civil and criminal, as these bills propose.

The next to last group provides for the reorganization of the Department of Justice by the creation of a new Civil Rights Division. This Division coupled with an augmented FBI, as these bills propose, would do much for the preservation and enforcement of the civil rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Finally, H. R. 3420, and the other bills in the last group, would prohibit attempts to (1) hold another in peonage; (2) entice another into slavery; and (3) sell another into involuntary servitude. The prohibition against what is commonly called "shanghai" attempts is extended to cover all modes of transportation rather than vessels only.

It is significant to note that in connection with this proposal the Department of Justice has reported that it would have no objection to its enactment. These bills make criminal the various acts now merely proscribed by the law. Penalties imposing fines of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both are provided for all such violations. I do not believe there can be any objection whatever to the enactment of these amendments.

There are other proposals I know, which merit your consideration. I hope that I have not taken too much of your valuable time or delayed any other Members. My own interest in this legislation and the urgent need for its enactment has prompted me to make this appeal to you. I earnestly hope you will act favorably on these bills. Thank you.

Will Automation Become Our Servant or Our Master?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, July 16, 1955:

A strange, new word has come into our language.

Its name is "automation."

It refers to automatically controlled machines that do the work once done by human beings. The machines that seem to have a brain.

In time automation will be as common as the automobile.

At the present, however, this approaching technique is not altogether welcome.

Some people fear that it will throw millions out of work.

Others naturally suspect and dislike any machine that seldom gets tired, never makes a mistake, and has the uncanny faculty of being smarter in its fashion than many people.

We stand on the threshhold of a great revolution in human affairs. A bloodless one, that will make the standard of living that we enjoy in 1955 seem primitive to the people inhabiting this earth in the year 2000.

We must make certain adjustments in our own way of thinking and arrive at controls over the controling automatic machines, either by law or collective bargaining, to make these mechanical servants work for the benefit of all.

The manifold possibilities of nuclear energy, linked to automation, will open up the greatest forward movement in history.

Assuming, of course, that the Communists are made to behave.

Already, the United States has too much of one commodity, food. Automation will undoubtedly bring a surplus of some industrial goods, unless we spread our distribution.

It is fantastic, in one way, that we should have an excess of food, while hundreds of millions of people in Africa, China, India, and parts of Soviet Russia do not get enough to eat.

It has been suggested that we give some of our superabundance to help the less fortunate in other lands, thereby promoting trust and friendship and cooperation among the peoples of this world. I believe that we should do this, out of the goodness of the American heart. At the same time it would serve as a guide and encouragement to other peoples, as proof that only under freedom can man enjoy the harvest of his own skill, and effort, and enterprise.

In the United States we have over $7 billion worth of surplus food. The Commodity Credit Corporation of our Government buys up the extra corn, wheat, rice, cheese, butter, and dry milk that the farmers cannot sell without depressing the market price. It costs $700,000 every day, just to keep this surplus stored in grain elevators, warehouses. In addition, much of it is held in the holds of hundreds of ships of the reserve fleet at more expense.

The CCC tries to fight its way out of this surplus by giving some of it away to schools, charitable institutions, and to persons in need. But still the flood of grain piles up.

Because not enough storage space is available, the Government has been forced to build storage bins in more than half the States.

The Congress has cut the wheat-acreage allotment in an effort to control overproduction, but this doesn't seem to do much good, for improved methods make it possible to grow more wheat per acre as time goes on.

We can understand the position of the farmers, and we realize that their income and purchasing power must be maintained, as a prop to our national economy. It does seem strange, however, that the farmers who were always considered to be the exponents of self-reliance and self-sufficiency, should insist upon such expensive and wasteful subsidies for themselves.

The whole price-support program points up the great dilemma: "How to control, or manage, or distribute, the overproduction in agriculture?"

Unless we find the right formula for this, we shall have two problems on our hands when automation brings overproduction of industrial goods.

In the recent session of Congress, a strong effort was made to repeal flexible price supports, replacing them with rigid, and higher subsidies. Congressmen from the industrial States were obliged to oppose this move, to save consumers from the higher prices that would result from higher supports.

Farm surpluses pose a very serious problem.

The Government, for various reasons, cannot dispose of the excess.

If we try to sell them at cut prices abroad, such a move would have a harmful effect on foreign economies. The corner grocer would strenuously object if we tried to give them away to the consumers of our own country.

Back in the 1930's, people were outraged by a Government policy that encouraged farmers to plow over their crops, and to slaughter hogs rather than send them to market in order to prevent the complete collapse of farm prices and farm incomes.

Today, we are appalled by any suggestion that extra food be destroyed in order to keep farm prices up.

How to control overproduction on the farms, is a question that is difficult to answer. Farmers, like other people, do not change their accustomed ways easily. A farmer who has spent years in raising wheat or cotton, is not easily convinced that he should change to some other crop, that might be useful to industry; or assured that there will be a market for it.

The convenient way, for the present, is for the Government to bail him out.

The whole program is unmanageable.

We must find a better method and soon.

From this experience, we must also anticipate a similar problem arising out of the forthcoming industrial overproduction so that we may make the adjustments that will prevent unemployment and waste.

Before the industrial revolution in the last century, the production of food and clothing and housing and durable goods depended to a large extent upon the brute strength of men and horses.

Then we fitted man to the machines, by making him a cog on the assembly lines.

Now we are beginning to substitute automatic electronic controls that will produce for him, and protect him even in his sleep.

Where one man, checking the dials, can superintend a huge machine that takes a raw material and carries it through all the steps to the finished product with a negligible expenditure of his own physical energy and with little strain upon his nervous system.

One man doing the work that once required hundreds of hands.

What happens to the millions of workers who would be displaced as automation takes over?

Although our population will be increasing, the number of those available for work will not keep pace.

At the beginning, more and more of our children are going to college, which means that they will start their lifework at a later age.

At the other end of the cycle, thanks to old-age and survivors insurance, and various private retirement plans, more people will be leaving the ranks of the employed at an earlier age.

While these factors will reduce the demand for jobs, they will not eliminate the unemployment that will be the immediate result of increasing automation.

Labor leaders are beginning to worry about the workers who will be displaced by the new labor-saving machines.

To offset this, there is a movement to reduce the workweek from 40 hours to 35 hours; to discourage people from holding two jobs; and to bargain for a guaranteed annual wage in the largest industries.

It is my guess, based on adjustments made to similar challenges in our economic history, that we will accommodate ourselves to progress without any severe dislocations.

Shortly after the turn of the century there was fear that technology would throw many people out of work. But new products and new services came after the machines so that today we have a far better distribution of jobs and income than we ever had before.

Automation, by reducing labor costs, will mean larger profits that must circulate to create new enterprises and new jobs.

We should not be afraid of having too much, as long as we diversify.

Take the case of such giants as Dupont and Union Carbide. Through research development they have doubled the number of items that they manufacture today in comparison with their product line of 1925. Thanks to their ability in creating new products, that contribute to our rising standard of living by opening up expanding markets.

Only those who feel comfortable with things as they are distrust the changes that are the inevitable partners of progress.

We who believe in the American future, knowing that it can never be static, welcome any improvements that are capable of producing widespread abundance and a shorter workweek. Because we believe that people will have greater pride and satisfaction in their work once they are liberated from the drone-like repetition of the assembly line and will recover their dignity as craftsmen. When man becomes not the slave of the machine but its master, a new era in human development will arrive.

For greater leisure will bring to all people the opportunity to enlarge their own horizons.

This is the good that will come of automation, if we put it to use for the general welfare.

This is not to minimize the adjustments that must be made, and the unique problems that must be solved.

There could be trouble, instead of harmony, if out-of-date thinking mismanages the electronic brains, failing to harness them to social and economic progress.

History proves that we are a flexible people, able to adapt ourselves to changing conditions, without sacrificing our essential freedoms, and without throwing our economy out of balance.

Whenever a revolutionary product or method is developed there is usually a branching out.

For instance, who could ever foresee that for every job created by the manufacture of automobiles many more would come into being through the auxiliary industries and satellite services that accompany tens of millions of motorcars from design, manufacture, sale, use, maintenance, etc.

In order that automation, the new wonder, shall be of benefit to all I believe we should give some thought now as to how it should be regulated.

The Congress should investigate automation, to set up those safeguards that will insure the best and wisest use of this amazing technology.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, beginning in 1939, I have regularly conducted polls of public thinking on vital national issues in my congressional district. These polls have been in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers, mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of political affiliation.

Responses to these questionnaires have always been excellent. The tabulated results, which virtually constitute a referendum of the district, have proved of enormous value to myself and, I hope, to my colleagues in the Congress.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has the wealthy, the poor, and the middle class. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries, and some of the finest farmlands found anywhere. It includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small residential towns in northern Allegheny County.

The percentage tabulation of the answers on this latest poll are included below without comment, along with the results of the poll concluded last February 3, 1955.

I trust they will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

The polls follow:

POLL RESULTS, JULY 1955

1. Should minimum wages be increased to at least $1 per hour? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

2. Do you favor farm-price supports at a rigid 90 percent of parity instead of the administration's flexible price support program? Yes, 11 percent; no, 89 percent.

3. Would you favor using our armed services to defend the Chinese Nationalist islands of Quemoy and Matsu in the event of Red aggression? Yes, 46 percent; no, 54 percent.

4. Should we continue the foreign aid program for at least 2 more years? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

5. Do you favor the President's highway program over the Senate-passed Gore plan? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

6. Do you believe that satisfactory progress is being made toward balancing the Federal budget? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

7. If income taxes are cut next year, should relief be evenly distributed at all income levels, rather than granting greater relief to low-income groups? Yes, 60 percent; no, 40 percent.

8. Should the armed services be permitted to draft men into the Reserves? Yes, 52 percent; no, 48 percent.

9. (On the State level.) Would you prefer an adequate sales tax rather than Governor Leader's income tax plan? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

10. Do you want the House to approve the Senate-passed bill permitting the construction of a maximum of 135,000 low-rent housing units in each of the next 4 years? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

11. Do you favor free distribution of surplus food to the certified needy? Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

12. Do you believe that President Eisenhower is doing a satisfactory job? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

POLL RESULTS, FEBRUARY 1955

1. Do you approve of Eisenhower's program in general? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

2. Should the budget be balanced prior to any important tax cut? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

3. Do you believe that our expenditures for national defense are adequate? Yes, 76 percent; no, 24 percent.

4. Should the Federal Government encourage and guarantee private health-insurance programs? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

5. Should tariffs be selectively lowered through reciprocal trade agreements? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

6. Should the draft law be renewed? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

8. Eisenhower says a salary raise for Members of Congress is long overdue. Do you agree? Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

9. Should the incentives for men to remain in the military service be increased and the incentives to be discharged be reduced? Yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

10. Should the voting age be lowered from 21 to 18 years? Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percent.

11. Do you agree that the flexible price-support program is a marked improvement? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

12. Eisenhower said: "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

13. Do you think the Eisenhower administration is making satisfactory progress in securing world peace? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

Illness Called Boost to Johnson Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, I publicly stated my belief that the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, is the best-qualified man in public life for the office of President of the United States. Nothing that has happened has changed my conviction.

I was very pleased to learn that there are others who share my belief. One of those is Holmes Alexander, the noted newspaper commentator who is highly regarded throughout our country for his excellent judgment and his perceptive insight into the political forces of our times.

On Sunday, July 10, 1955, the Dallas Times Herald carried an article by Mr. Alexander outlining his views.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that Members of Congress may have the benefit of the thinking of this highly informed and highly regarded commentator:

ILLNESS CALLED BOOST TO JOHNSON CAREER

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 9.—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S career, far from being ended by his illness, has been given a new beginning.

I am able to report from an intimate source that the Senator's closest political and personal associates now look upon his heart attack as a benign stroke of fate.

One or more Democrats in town who were associated with Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration are comparing JOHNSON'S illness with the former President's polio stroke in the summer of 1921. But JOHNSON'S recovery, his physicians now believe, will be rapid and complete, whereas Mr. Roosevelt was bedridden for many years and a cripple the remainder of his life.

At 46 JOHNSON may look forward to full and normal activities.

Contrary to loose reports, there seems to be no probability that JOHNSON will relinquish his post as Democratic floor leader of the Senate. Even if he should offer to do so, his Democratic friends and colleagues would not allow the resignation except under medical insistence.

PRESSURE SEEN

Although JOHNSON has repeatedly declared himself out as a national candidate in 1956, he may be under more pressure by his friends than formerly. Some of his backers are saying that JOHNSON will benefit both by the country's warm-hearted concern for his recovery and by the opportunity which he is afforded to sit down and allow people to come to him for discussion of national affairs.

From my close observation of his career and of his processes of thought, it seems as certain as such things can be that JOHNSON will be in inevitable demand by his party for a national nomination in 1956.

The Senator's plans are fairly well set for the immediate future. Circumstances will force him to revise his methods of work and as a strategist of political events he has always proceeded on an energetic but logical plan. It may be reported that he is overseeing his own recovery in exactly this manner. That is to say, he is changing the emphasis from strict attention to all details to emphasis on big affairs only.

Even at the life-and-death phase of his illness, which struck him down on July 2, JOHNSON insisted on receiving informal digests on the state of national events. His doctors, at first reluctant, later agreed with the Senator's intimates that politics is his breath of life and must not be shut off.

REST AT RANCH

JOHNSON'S schedule calls for leaving the Bethesda Naval Hospital at the end of this month and returning home for a rest on his cattle ranch near Johnson City, Tex.

In the autumn he will be examined by a picked staff of physicians who will prescribe the nature and amount of work he can do. JOHNSON will strictly abide by this regime, whatever it is. Present diagnosis already indicates that his heart will not be impaired once he recuperates from the present attack.

In January he will be back in Washington with a staff of assistants to whom he will leave the myriad details which he formerly made his own responsibility.

JOHNSON'S friends believe that the attack this month might have killed him if it had come a year later, but coming as it did, it was a warning and an opportunity for him to make a change of pace which, in and by itself, is necessary for the kind of campaigning and political leadership which lies ahead.

The Status of Forces Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement which I had made a part of the record of testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee on House Joint Resolution 309, the Status of Forces Treaty:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of the committee for being permitted to appear and to submit a statement on behalf of House Joint Resolution 309, which provides for revision of the Status of Forces Treaty and other agreements, or withdrawal of the United States from the treaty, so that foreign courts will not have criminal jurisdiction over American military forces serving within their boundaries.

Under the Status of Forces Treaty, ratified by the Senate last year by a vote of 72 to 15, the courts of foreign countries are vested with jurisdiction to try American servicemen for offenses committed against the laws of those countries.

Because of this treaty, which obtains with NATO countries and certain others, namely Japan, Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Iceland, procedural and substantive rights of the members of our United States military forces have been given away. This is something we in Congress could not do, even if we were so compelled, by internal legislation by the Congress. It is only because of the interpretation of language in our Constitution that treaties are the "supreme law of the land" and need not conform to the Constitution that this is possible.

Several able and conscientious efforts have been made in this session to accomplish what is proposed by House Joint Resolution

309, and I believe it is the overwhelming sense of the Congress that it must be done.

The objections raised did not go to the merits of this resolution, but rather to the procedures by which it was suggested.

We are informed by the Department of the Army that from January 1, 1954, through November 30, 1954, a total of 7,416 persons subject to military law of the United States were accused of offenses subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts throughout the world. Jurisdiction was waived in 5,424 cases, and 793 cases were tried.

What happened to these American servicemen who were tried in foreign courts? The complaints were dismissed as to 255 individuals, and 123 were acquitted. The balance were fined, given suspended sentences, or incarcerated in foreign jails or prisons. As of February 10, 1955, the same source informs us, 58 United States citizens subject to military law are serving time in foreign institutions pursuant to sentences by foreign courts.

The numbers in themselves are not startling. While I do not have the record at hand and cannot quote the actual statistics, I would not be surprised if a comparison of the number of crimes and punishments at home was proportionately comparable. But what is involved is a principle, as deep-rooted as our form of government.

It was always my understanding that the Constitution follows the flag. Wherever our American servicemen go, wherever the flag is carried, the rights, privileges and guaranties of the Constitution go also. We have a Constitution that is unique. We have a concept of criminal law that has been evolved by our people, our legislatures and our courts such as is found nowhere else in the world.

Several procedural and substantive guaranties written into the Bill of Rights are peculiar to American law. One is the right to trial by jury. This right obtains in England, but in few other countries. Some criticism has been leveled at our jury system, and possibly with some merit, but no more eminently fair system has been developed anywhere, and trial by jury is a right our people expect and are entitled to. Even if this right were granted and the jury system installed in all of these treaty countries, how difficult it would be for an American serviceman to get a fair trial in a Japanese court, before a Japanese judge and a Japanese jury. How improbable it would be that an unbiased, impartial jury could be selected to try an American serviceman for an offense committed against a native of the forum. And, with the language barrier that exists, it would be nearly impossible for an American to conduct an examination of the jury panel to determine qualifications, bias, and other matters that go into the selection of a jury.

Other practical considerations are involved. According to the treaties, the accused American must be accorded by foreign courts such rights as a prompt and speedy trial; to be confronted with the charges against him; to subpena witnesses in his behalf; to be represented by counsel; to have an interpreter; to confront the accusing witnesses; and to communicate with his government. In theory, then, it would seem that many concepts of American justice are being followed. In practice, however, it is much different. Japan, for example, provides for court-appointed lawyers, but in many cases the Japanese lawyer cannot speak our language and cannot adequately communicate with the defendant. He is not given an opportunity to consult with the accused before trial, does not sit with the accused during trial, and does not prepare an adequate defense—which would be considered by most courts in our country as reversible error. I can conceive of many other practices that exist in foreign tribunals which would deny the American serviceman "due process of law" as measured by our standards.

There are certain matters of substance, matters of punishment that violate our constitutional prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment." They are shocking. I am advised that the penal codes of France and Belgium still contemplate the use of the guillotine, and those of Italy and Luxembourg command the firing squad for execution of the death penalty—outlawed in the United States for many, many years. The Dutch criminal code provides that sentences for periods not exceeding 15 years shall be served in solitary confinement, a practice followed in America for short periods of time only and then as an extreme disciplinary measure, a punishment for flagrant violation of prison regulations. Under the codes of several other countries, convicts are permanently deprived of civil, paternal and marital rights for committing relatively minor felonies.

These are but a few examples in which the letter and spirit of the American concept of justice is violated. I am sure a careful examination of the criminal laws of these countries will yield many more.

We are assured by many able legislators and lawyers that by the terms of these treaties an accused is accorded all the rights to which a citizen of the country in question is entitled. That is not enough. We did not send our Armed Forces to Germany to make German citizens of them. They should go there with the assurance that in return for the protection they are giving us we at least will safeguard their rights. We should not be prepared to accept these treaties until these questions are answered satisfactorily: Do these treaty countries recognize a defendant's right not to be twice placed in jeopardy for the same offense? Do these treaty countries respect a defendant's right to refrain from testifying against himself? Do these treaty countries require that criminal prosecution shall be by presentment, indictment, or information in the manner prescribed by our Constitution or other law? Do these treaty countries accord appeal, habeas corpus, and other review proceedings that are guaranteed to our citizens—or, for that matter—to their citizens in the United States? Do these treaty countries permit bail or prohibit excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment? Do these treaty countries presume a defendant innocent until he has been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

Unless all of these questions can be given an affirmative answer, substantial rights of our American military are being denied. A great injustice will continue to exist unless we take prompt action to reexamine and revise the Status of Forces Treaty.

Orchids to Mr. Norblad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to point out that the people of Nebraska, as those in every State of the Union, want value received when they designate us as trustees to conserve or spend their money.

The American people are entitled to an attitude of good judgment on our part as their elected representatives.

The included editorial comment substantiates the consideration that the able Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, has given to the taxpayers' dollar through his commendation of the Post Office Department. And I might add that since January 1955, three post offices in the First District of Nebraska have been closed at a net saving to the American taxpayers, based on actual operating expenses and income, of approximately $5,000.

The editorial follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of June 15, 1955]

ORCHIDS TO MR. NORBLAD

Representative NORBLAD (Republican, Oregon) stood up in the House the other day to praise the Post Office Department for closing the post office at Keasey, Oreg., which is in his district.

The Keasey post office was closed because its operating expenses were $1,550 last year, while it took in only $418.

Mr. NORBLAD evidently was impressed by these figures. We can think of a good many politicians who might profit from his example.

Meeting at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes, on the subject of the forthcoming meeting at the summit. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Unlike Mount Everest and other mountain heights which withstood the efforts over many centuries of mere men to reach their pinnacles, the summit at which the heads of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union are meeting in Geneva could have been reached at almost any day of any year since the unhappy Big Four meeting at Potsdam after World War II.

It required no great burst of human endurance as in scaling Everest; no great and superhuman courage. All it took—but that, indeed, was much—was an atmosphere of not necessarily good will but willingness to discuss explosive issues calmly.

If nothing comes of the Geneva Conference, the world will have been no worse off for its having occurred. If anything good comes of it in the reduction of tensions between peoples, and in the removal, even a little, of the constant danger of hydrogen warfare, then it will have been very worth while and a boon to humanity.

The world waits hopefully for the outcome of these conferences, but not in any state of suspended animation. We continue with our work of increasing the military strength of the free world. We assume the Soviets are busily engaged as ever in turning out new and more powerful weapons and in maintaining their overtight stranglehold over the peoples they hold in bondage.

Nevertheless, I find it reassuring that our President can go to Geneva to meet the crafty and unpredictable Russians without any partisan backbiting at home, without any divisive challenges to his sincerity, without any political suspicion-mongering. He truly has bipartisan support for his efforts to achieve a better basis for peaceful understanding.

In this connection, I am indeed most proud of the members and the leaders of the Democratic Party in the Congress, particularly such wise and patriotic men as Senator George, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who did so much to make this conference at Geneva a reality, Congressman RICHARDS, who succeeded Judge Kee as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Speaker RAYBURN, the now-ailing Senator JOHNSON, and others. They did not merely stop politics at the water's edge; they went far out of their way to make sure the President's leavetaking was backed up by the overwhelming confidence, support, good wishes and sincere cooperation of the Congress.

There have been times in our recent history when true bipartisanship such as this was impossible to achieve, even in foreign policy matters on which the fate of America and all humanity rested.

But we have learned much, and, I hope, profited from mistakes of earlier decades. Perhaps we have just become more aware of the shrinkage of the world since learning the meaning of such terms as fireball, fallout, obliteration of whole cities, and so on.

Geneva—a city long associated with man's hope for peace—has yet another chance to redeem past failures.

We'll just have to wait and see, and hope, and pray.

Harold "Pee Wee" Reese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the night of July 22 the people of Brooklyn will pay high honor to an adopted son. Thousands of grateful citizens will gather at Ebbets Field, home of one of the greatest baseball teams the Nation's popular pastime has ever known, to present their affectionate salute to a young man who has rendered exemplary service to youth, and the parents of our Nation.

I speak of Harold "Pee Wee" Reese, star shortstop of the Brooklyn Dodgers Baseball Club. "Pee Wee" Reese is an illustrious son of the great State of Kentucky, who, for almost twoscore years, has been an inspirational example of sports at its best.

"Pee Wee" Reese night at Brooklyn might well be observed in every hamlet and home throughout the Nation.

For "Pee Wee" stands as a symbol of all the fine and decent men who participate in the great sport of baseball and give our male youth the incentive to mold themselves into similar specimens of responsible manhood.

His inspirational stature transcends the field of sports.

Not only is he a model athlete and top competitor and sportsman, but he is a citizen who finds time to take part in the affairs of his community and gives of his energy to help those who cannot help themselves.

"Pee Wee" Reese has fulfilled a noble featured role in the contemporary drama of this generation. His contribution to our continuing battle to keep our youth from falling into the morass of delinquency is immeasurable.

On the occasion of his being honored with a civic testimonial of affection by the good people of Brooklyn, I am sure the Congress of the United States will want to join in presenting their very best wishes and appreciative accolade to "Pee Wee" Reese who wears No. 1 on his uniform and is No. 1 in the minds and hearts of many baseball fans throughout the world.

Salient Facts in Proposed Fort Sill Range Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the artillery and guided-missiles center at Fort Sill is one of the five key Army installations and schools in the Nation. The effectiveness of American artillery in World War II and Korea is recorded on the pages of history. As was true then, the fulfillment of the mission of artillery and guided-missiles center is today a vital necessity to the continued defense of the United States and the free world. With the development of longer-range artillery weapons and ground-to-ground missiles, expansion of Fort Sill range is absolutely necessary. Due to its favorable geographical location and excellent expanse of ideal and varied terrain, Fort Sill, with its tremendous physical investment, can pay much greater dividends to the Nation with the acquisition of this minimum amount of land, affecting a minimum number of people and costing a minimum amount of money to assure maximum results in artillery training.

FACTS

Present size of Fort Sill is 74,000 acres; it is the smallest of the five principal Army schools.

Number of additional acres sought is 31,020. Of this, 10,700 acres are now under Department of Interior control and 20,320 acres under private ownership.

Estimated cost of acquisition is $2,216,000.

Acquisition will displace 45 farm families, 2 storekeepers, 1 small school, 1 rural church, and 1 amusement park.

TYPES OF LAND

Private: Low to fair grade agricultural, predominantly for grazing.

Public: Low-grade land, predominantly rough, mountainous country, mostly inaccessible to public, with meager improvements, lying along extreme southern edge of Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

Proposed acquisition will neither affect public use of principal recreational areas in refuge nor refuge's principal mission of propagation and perpetuation of wildlife.

INVESTMENTS MUST PAY DIVIDENDS

Physical investment: It is conservatively estimated that the investment in facilities for national defense at Fort Sill since 1911 would exceed $250 million. Maximum dividends from this huge investment can be realized by expenditure of slightly more than $2 million for additional rangeland.

MILITARY REQUIREMENTS

The Fort Sill Reservation was adequate before World War II when weapons of that period usually fired from 2,000 to 5,000 yards. Today the range of modern artillery weapons is measured in terms of miles, not yards. Some weapons, like the 280-millimeter cannon, the Honest John rocket, and newly developed and classified electronic projectiles, are extremely long-ranged—beyond the capabilities of the existing Fort Sill Reservation, allowing for maximum safety zones.

MANEUVER AREAS VITAL

Teaching of modern tactics and techniques as developed at artillery and guided-missile centers for the Nation and free world requires dispersion, coupled with high mobility quite beyond the capabilities of the present reservation to support. Acquisition of this 31,020 acres will assure adequate areas for maneuvering and training, not only for the present but the foreseeable future.

No atomic projectiles will be fired on the Fort Sill range, but the artillerymen who man the weapons which launch these projectiles must be trained. They must learn to maneuver these weapons, firing conventional shells in tactical situation which parallel the combat situations they may face, and to do this they must have greater range facilities.

TESTED AREAS NEEDED

An additional vital national-defense role is conducted by Continental Army Command Board No. 1 at Fort Sill, which field tests all new developments in artillery weapons, many of which are known to be extremely long-ranged and still remain on the classified list.

The closely integrated functions of this board and the artillery and guided missile center in the perfecting of new weapons and techniques could better serve the interests of national defense if additional testing and training areas are acquired.

ANSWERS TO OPPOSITION

As is historically true in any plan to secure privately held land for the common good, certain opposition has arisen to the proposed Fort Sill land acquisition. Principal opposition in this case stems from a handful of affected land owners who have enlisted the support of many wildlife and sportmen's groups who are wholly unfamiliar with and generally misinformed on the vital defense issue involved. These groups have magnified beyond all reason the effect of the proposed acquisition and have tried to alarm the public with a cleverly conducted campaign based on half-truths. Basically, the answer to this opposition can be found in the fact that the defense of the Nation must be rated far above the value of a few picnic spots and the dedicated principles of a few bird-lovers.

Some of the issues raised by the opposition are answered below:

First. Why acquire additional range land when Fort Sill is leasing some range now?

Answer: Land at Fort Sill under lease.

A. Hay cutting: Nine lessors, of these 4 are permitted to plant alfalfa on parts of their leased tracts.

Explanation: These leases are for fire prevention on the artillery ranges. Without them the post engineer would be required to cut the hay at great expense to the Government and loss of the hay to the economy of this section. The alfalfa clause is inserted in some leases to make the lease more attractive on poorer tracts. The contracts provide that the lessor cannot interfere with the full military use of this land.

B. Sheep grazing: Two lessors of small tracts.

Explanation: For fire prevention. Controlled grazing within the ordnance ammunition inclosure and on an adjacent close-in training area. These leases also provide that lessor will not interfere in any way with full military use of the land.

C. There are no other leases of land at Fort Sill and no crops are raised other than hay—alfalfa with hay in four instances. Military requirements for land long ago put an end to cattle grazing which used to be permitted in some areas.

Second. Why not take all of the wildlife reservation and no private land?

Answer: The wildlife reservation is a unique facility of great value and interest locally and nationally from a conservationist's point of view. Its recreational facilities are unsurpassed in this section of the country and are a contributing factor in the traditionally high morale of Fort Sill troops. The small part requested in the Fort Sill acquisition program is of little value to wildlife conservation and contains practically no recreational facilities. The private lands involved, on the other hand, are of value only to the few landowners involved.

Third. Why not to the north?

Answer: This land is valuable, expensive farmland, well watered by Cache Creek and its tributary streams. To get required continuous range, a much larger acquisition would be required.

Fourth. Why not to the east?

Answer: This land is also more valuable farmland. In addition, most of it is potential oil land with producing wells throughout and extending to the present east boundary of the reservation. It is open, rolling country, not well suited to military training. Here again it would be necessary to make a much larger acquisition to obtain the required continuous range.

Fifth. Why not to the south?

Answer: This comprises the city of Lawton and town of Cache, with a relatively dense urban and suburban population. Lawton is built up to the reservation south boundary fence.

Sixth. Can the existing water supply support Lawton and Fort Sill?

Answer: Yes; with proper conservation the water supply is sufficient for present and foreseeable needs.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the $1½ billion upper Colorado storage project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing.

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects the only difference between the bills is this: The Senate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as the Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to mention Echo Park and Juniper, although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these three projects. Chief among them, of course, would be Echo Park.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference. In view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52 to 30, let no Member be deluded that Echo Park is not in this legislation.

White House Conference on Education Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of the action by the Committee on Appropriations in cutting the funds for travel of delegates to the White House Conference on Education is that this amounts to ignoring a directive of the 83d Congress.

That Congress required, and I repeat, required, that the White House Conference on Education be "broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation."

This cannot be done for the $50,000 which the committee included in the bill. Travel costs money and it is not right that public-spirited citizens be asked to participate in such a worthwhile conference, which is one of the greatest educational programs in this Nation's history, without paying for a minimum of travel. No one is asking that we give these fine citizens money for food or lodging—merely a seat on a train.

For the amount which the committee included, we could invite back the delegates of just five States. The travel funds needed for California, Illinois, New York, Texas, and Washington alone amount to a little more than $50,000. Are we to ask the other 43 States to leave their delegates home or perhaps every State to trim its delegation and penalize these citizens who have labored so diligently?

Certainly with all the money we have appropriated for foreign aid, we can allow this important educational conference $170,000 for travel expenses. Otherwise, we are deliberately eliminating the delegates of at least 26 States, where funds are either prohibited or will not be authorized or are unavailable. And the total will probably run higher, unless we ignore the requirement of the 83d Congress and fail to get a broadly representative group.

Participation in the White House Conference must not be hinged on ability to pay travel expenses.

I was proud to join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in a statement to the Committee on Appropriations urging that the full amount be granted for the White House conference, and I again urge that these funds be restored in conference with the Senate.

Brotherhood: The Cornerstone of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, entitled "Brotherhood: The Cornerstone of Democracy." Secretary Mitchell delivered this excellent speech concerning brotherhood at the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America at Fallsburg, N. Y., on July 11, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD: THE CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRACY

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America, July 11, 1955, Fallsburg, N. Y.)

It is a special pleasure to meet with you because it gives me an opportunity to express some views about which I feel strongly. Our jobs have much in common. It is my job to try to improve the condition of the wage earners of our great country. You and those who have preceded you have always championed the cause of justice for those who toil.

In recent years, orthodoxy and traditionalism have too often tended to fall into popular disrepute. While reform is essential to progress, traditionalism and orthodoxy are also essential to real and lasting progress.

Our moral and ethical traditions provide the anchor that keeps us from slipping away from what is good while we move ahead to a better way of life. They provide the guidepost by which we can judge whether we are on the right road. They are part of the heritage and background of which we should be proud. They are the embodiment of the sound and abiding principles to which we must ever remain true.

To see the truth of these statements, we need look no further than the present world struggle between communism and democracy. Communism rejects traditionalism and orthodoxy. It rejects religion and the moral and ethical principles on which all religions are based. It sets up its own credo to take the place of faith in God.

By remaining true to our religious heritage, whatever it may be, we can make a contribution toward strengthening democracy and preventing the spread of communism.

As leaders and teachers in the Jewish faith, you are able to make a significant contribution to the fight against communism, and to the preservation and improvement of the American way of life.

I hardly need tell you that social justice, which some economic and political reformers think they invented, actually has its roots in the Bible. Perhaps that is why rabbis, ministers, and priests are able to make such a valuable contribution toward the preservation of social and spiritual values, and the promotion of social justice.

The Jew has always recognized the dignity of labor. The Jewish sages have always taught that work was noble and idleness disgraceful. They actually earned their daily bread by working as tailors, carpenters, masons and in similar occupations.

The Ten Commandments contained one of the first attempts to prohibit excessive hours of labor. They not only prohibited work by the Jew on the Sabbath but also forbade him from employing his servant on that day. The servant, a fellow human being, was also entitled to a day of rest.

As you know better than I, justice to the laborer pervades much of Jewish literature. The Book of Leviticus requires that the wages of a hired servant shall not be retained overnight. He is entitled to his pay when it is due.

The Prophet Malachi preaches eloquently against those who oppress a worker in his wages.

I could go on and on, but you are more familiar with these eloquent passages than I.

Justice to labor has become part and parcel of our religious tradition.

The popes have given voice to the same sentiments. The Protestant clergy has eloquently preached the same ideals.

These ideals are the ideals of free men who know that every man is created in God's image. As long as we maintain them and carry them into effect, we need not fear the Communist threat against individual dignity and freedom.

There is a synagogue in Washington, D. C., which bears these words: "To the glory of God and the brotherhood of man." All of us—regardless of our religion—would do well to dedicate our lives in this fashion.

The very discovery of America contains lessons in brotherly cooperation for all of us. In fact, the brotherhood of the New World was quite literally the result of unbrotherly acts in the Old World.

We are all familiar with the fact that many of those who first settled in America were motivated by a yearning for religious freedom. And the great diversity of groups settling in our country was apparent from the very beginning. We had the English settlement, at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, the Dutch at New Amsterdam in 1614, the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the Jews who landed in New York in 1655.

These were among the forerunners of the mass migrations to our shores for 3 centuries. Here millions of people have found the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, brotherhood, and opportunity.

Here we have built a country in which the highest and best aspirations of individual human beings can be realized and rewarded. Here we have everything necessary for people to lead their lives in freedom, with dignity and with charity and brotherhood toward their fellow man.

We can be proud of what we have accomplished, but we cannot be satisfied, even today, with the conditions within our own land.

It would be nice if we could say that from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, and from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate, all Americans were brothers, and prejudice, discrimination, and intolerance were nonexistent.

Unfortunately, however, despite all the progress of 350 years, we still have far to go. A leading public opinion analyst has estimated that "discrimination in employment wastes $10 out of every $75 pay check on the phony luxury of indulgence in our prejudices." He estimated that the annual cost of discrimination to American business and industry is $30 billion annually.

We all know of persons who preach brotherhood but do not practice it. Covert quotas still exist in some colleges and prep schools. Some businesses drastically restrict the level to which persons from minority groups may rise. One manufacturer will not have a Negro in a secretarial position; a law firm will not permit a Catholic to become a partner; an industrial enterprise will not promote Jews to executive positions; a financial institution will hire only native-born Americans. Some private employment services accept job orders that say "gentiles only," "white only," or "no non-Caucasians."

These forms of discrimination are still prevalent today. Unfortunately they sometimes occur even in firms whose officers or owners claim to practice brotherhood. They protest with indignant self-righteousness that some of their best friends are Jews, or that they have nothing against Negroes, but—.

We may properly ask: How come all this at this late date? What is stopping us as a people, individually and collectively, from living up to the principles we profess? Why aren't we translating into daily living those basic tenets which are the foundation of every religion?

In a country in which persons of various races and creeds have served in the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal, State and local Governments, how can we afford to reject any man, upon the basis of his race or religion or national origin? Have we not seen persons of every type make invaluable contributions to the national wellbeing, both in public and private life? Have not business, the arts, the sciences, the professions, labor and public service benefited from the contributions of all the highly diversified population of our country? Who can stand before God and say that he is better than his neighbor because of the color of his skin, the way he worships God, or the country from which his ancestors came?

In a world that is one-third yellow, one-third brown, and one-third white, how can America maintain its position of leadership if we consider inferior the non-white two-thirds of the world's people?

To ask these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that there is neither excuse nor justification for prejudice and discrimination. It is clear that as a Nation, both domestically and internationally, we are injured by prejudice and intolerance.

We have the words and actions of our leaders to teach us the need for brotherhood and love of our fellow man.

When George Washington visited the Hebrew Congregation at Newport, R. I., Moses Seixas, the warden of the synagogue, referred with a great sense of gratitude to the privilege of living under "a government which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance; but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming everyone, of whatever nation, tongue, or language, equal parts of the great government machine."

President Washington set the theme and direction of our national aims when he replied, "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoy the exercise of their inherent natural right, for happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Thomas Jefferson expressed the epitome of brotherhood when he said, "All men are created equal."

It was for Abraham Lincoln to emancipate the slaves and officially remove this stain upon our democracy. In his life and literature, Lincoln left us a heritage of brotherly love, "with malice toward none; with charity for all."

President Jackson to President Eisenhower, our Chief Executives have shown that people can be appointed to high office regardless of religion or race.

Since Lincoln's day the Negro has made steady progress. One occupies today a sub-Cabinet position in the United States Department of Labor, and another has for several years sat on the Federal Circuit Court of

Appeals. Segregation has been eliminated in the Armed Forces.

It was in 1948 that the Supreme Court struck down the restrictive covenant on real estate; and it was in 1950 that the Court opened the doors of white universities and colleges to Negroes who could not get equal facilities everywhere.

In 1954 the Supreme Court found that segregation in the public-school system is repugnant to our Constitution.

The clause in Government procurement contracts which prohibits racial and religious discrimination in employment is being enforced vigorously through the work of the President's Government Contracts Committee.

You can see that there is no one person, no one party, and no one era that can claim credit for all that has been done. Sometimes our progress has been greater, sometimes less. The fact that we have moved constantly forward, however, speaks well for the American people. It denotes their determination to take those steps necessary to make our democracy grow and to strengthen our institutions and our people.

If the progress of the past is any key to the future, it is safe to predict that in the lifetimes of many of those now sitting in this room, the last traces of discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin will be swept away.

The America free of prejudice which I foresee will not come by itself. It will require the continued efforts and determination of all of us. It will require patience, understanding, cooperation, and good will. It will require the translation into our daily living—at work, in our schools, and at our places of worship—of all the principles of brotherhood.

We are all aware of the fact that children of every race, color and creed can play together without difficulties. They even overcome barriers imposed by language differences, and by disparity in age. It is only from their elders that they learn the prejudice which corrodes and warps their spirits and hardens their hearts.

We have shown in many of our houses of worship, in hundreds of thousands of businesses across the land and in the Armed Forces that there is no more reason for adults to discriminate against their fellow human beings than there is for children to do so. We have shown that persons of all races, creeds, and national origins can work and live together in the military forces, in peace and war. Numerous employers and workers attest to the ease with which all types of persons can work together smoothly, efficiently and profitably. And in thousands of communities across the land, persons of different races can pray together.

So far I have discussed only the discrimination based upon race, religion or national origin. Other types of prejudice are equally costly and equally unjustified.

We are faced with a growing problem of discrimination against those of mature and advanced age. The extreme accent on youth which seems to be a part of our current national philosophy is not justified by the facts. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that older workers, properly placed, are more steady, more reliable, and at least as productive as their younger fellows. In safety and attendance the records they compile set examples for younger workers to follow to advantage. Management's investment in training them is amply justified by the lower turnover rate among mature and older workers.

As a Nation, we are growing older, both with respect to the population as a whole and our labor force. There are 42 percent more workers over 45 today than there were in 1940. There are 40 percent more workers over 65 than there were 15 years ago. This trend seems certain to be accelerated in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1970 almost half of our people of voting age will be 45 or over.

In addition to the moral wrong involved, we cannot afford the waste that is caused by discrimination against older workers. It is far more profitable to have them productive than on public assistance.

This is another area in which we must work to break down prejudice and promote understanding.

There is still one other form of prejudice which is worth studying, and that is on the basis of sex. While women are accepted as the boss in the home, they are not always accorded the status of equals in the labor market. The affection which we feel for mothers, wives and daughters is not always translated into an equal break for women workers at the employment office when, through economic or other reasons, women must work. In addition, we too often pay women less money for the same work than we would pay to a man who did that job.

The increasing acceptance of women in all phases of this country's activities is evidence of the progress being made in the achievement of the goals for which we are working. Both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Eisenhower named a woman as a member of their Cabinet. Women have served our Nation as Ambassadors—our present Ambassadors to Italy and Switzerland are women. Women are Members of the Congress and of State legislatures, and a number of them are serving as judges. Large numbers of women hold important posts in State, county, and local governments. And business and industry depend in large measure upon women workers. The total number of women workers, as of the latest estimate, approached 19 million. This was close to a third of the total working population of the Nation.

We in America have far less manpower than do the Communists. In numbers we stand no chance of matching them. Our effectiveness must be based upon the training and skill of our workers and the utilization we make of the talents they acquire. Those prejudices we still have based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, or sex hamper us in the effective utilization of our manpower. As individuals and as a Nation, we cannot afford the cost of this prejudice.

I am glad to see that there seems to be a growing awareness of this fact. There seems to be a real determination on the part of millions of Americans to throw off the blinders of discrimination and prejudice. There seems to be a growing realization that each man and woman is entitled to be judged upon the basis of his or her merits.

If we are to achieve our goals in the field of brotherhood, all of us must—

1. Practice brotherhood in our daily lives.

2. Teach and train and hire and promote upon the basis of ability alone, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

3. Urge others with whom we work, study, pray, or socialize to practice and promote brotherhood.

4. Be positive and courageous in our attitude toward brotherhood.

If we will all follow these general rules every day of the year, we shall succeed in making a real contribution toward the strengthening and improvement of our great democracy.

In this atomic age, a little more brotherhood could be helpful in the international field also. President Eisenhower has taken several significant steps in this direction which, I believe, have and deserve the support of the American people.

You will recall that in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, the President made proposals for peaceful uses of the atom and stated that we must find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

On March 19, 1955, President Eisenhower established a position in his office, with Cabinet rank, to develop the studies and conclusions on this Nation's basic policy toward the question of disarmament. This position has been designated in the press as Secretary of Peace. It is the first time that any country has ever given this kind of attention to the promotion of peace.

President Eisenhower has also made a dramatic proposal for an atomic-powered merchant ship as part of the program for peaceful uses of atomic energy. Such a ship could touch at every port in the world and demonstrate in terms that all could understand the sincerity of America's determination to harness the atom for the service of mankind rather than his destruction. Such a ship would be further evidence of America's belief in brotherhood.

We who are interested in brotherhood ought to support these proposals of the President.

Leadership of Hon. Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we miss the wonderful leadership and the presence of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], but I think we all feel that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is doing a very splendid job under difficult circumstances.

I read a most complimentary statement with regard to the Senator from Kentucky, which was published in the Washington Star of July 10, 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARLE CLEMENTS IS WELL QUALIFIED TO FILL LYNDON JOHNSON'S SHOES

(By Joseph F. McCaffrey)

For a man who has shunned publicity all his life Kentucky's EARLE CLEMENTS finds himself in an embarrassing spot as the ninth-inning replacement for the stricken Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

Although Senator CLEMENTS has served 32 consecutive years in public life, he still refers to himself as being "not very good copy." He professes not to think anything he says or does is worth recording. As a result, his office scrapbook is slim.

This self-effacing quality has cost the Kentuckian a certain amount of fame. A Kentucky friend says:

"If a good man would only keep track of his work in the Senate and get notices out to the papers, EARLE would be one of the most famous men in the Senate."

But Senator CLEMENTS has never found modesty a political handicap. Historians say only 90 men have served in the House, the Senate, and as State governor. EARLE CLEMENTS is one of the 90.

"I think he's solved the riddle of politics," one Republican Senator said recently, "Most of us stand in front of the curtains so we can take the bows. Earle stands in the back of the curtain so he never gets the blame."

JOHNSON'S BACKSTAGE

Most observers credit him with as much responsibility for the smoothness of the Senate's operations in the 84th Congress as Senator Johnson, who was in front of the curtain.

For a relative junior, Senator Clements has had a rather spectacular Senate career. A year after joining that body in 1951, he was chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. A year and a half later, at the 1952 Democratic national convention, he worked behind the scenes to heal the North-South split.

Says Minnesota's Senator Hubert Humphrey of Mr. Clements' Chicago role:

"I knew who Earle Clements was, of course before the convention started. But after it was over I knew why he had come so far. There is a man who has more horsesense than any man I have met in politics."

Mr. Clements is—as a Kentuckian would say—"right proud" of the Democratic 84th Congress.

"I don't believe that to be successful there must always be cannons booming and rockets firing. Just because there is no deep, emotional conflict doesn't mean this session hasn't been productive."

HARD WORKER

Senator Clements works hard at whatever job confronts him, and has little use for emotional debates. When the time for action comes, he has the reputation of acting fast and hard—some say ruthlessly.

As governor of Kentucky he cleaned up the State park system in iron-fisted fashion. He improved State roads by the rather unpopular means of adding 2 cents to the gas tax. In a Dixie-oriented State he opened hospitals in Louisville in 1948 to postgraduate study by Negro doctors and nurses; in 1950, he allowed State-controlled schools to admit Negroes on action by the board of trustees.

Most important, he balanced the Kentucky budget, and says he'd like to see the same thing happen here.

ATTRIBUTES FOR JOB

Senator Clements brings with him in his move up from Democrtic whip to acting majority leader many of the same attributes that made Senator Johnson so effective: Organizational ability, a built-in card index file in his mind and a burning desire to get things done as quickly, yet as neatly as possible.

To Mr. Clements' organizational ability goes credit for the health of the Kentucky Democratic Party today. He took over its leadership in the midforties, after the Republicans had elected their first Governor in more than 20 years. Not only did he heal deep splits, but also headed the ticket which swept the State back to Democratic control.

Recently, while on a trip back home to Morganfield, the Senator took a visitor on a tour of Union County.

"Darndest thing I ever saw," said the visitor when he returned to Washington, "the Senator was county judge back in the days of WPA and all during the tour of the county he named every road and culvert that was put in with Federal money. Why, he even gave me the dates and the costs, as well as the rights-of-way involved."

All of these things contribute to Senator Clements' feeling so much "at home" in politics. During the final year of his term of Governor, in 1951, he was made attractive business offers ranging in salary from $35,000 to $50,000 a year. He turned them down to continue in politics.

Politics, after all, comes as natural to a Kentuckian as a love for blue grass and fine horses. The Senator's father had been active in local politics, so it was natural that after coming back from World War I as an infantry captain the younger Clements should run for sheriff of Union County.

After that came county clerk, county judge, a seat in the Kentucky State Senate, where he eventually served as majority leader, the House of Representatives, then Governor, and, finally, the Senate.

At 58, Senator Clements is young enough to be a vigorous and effective Senate leader, yet old enough so—under present conditions—he probably will not be the object of a Presidential boom. His advice to the young, therefore, can be taken as coming from a man at the pinnacle of both his power and his ambition.

"I'd say," says Earle Clements, "that young men interested in public life should realize that good government is the best politics. It's been my observation that the electorate, when convinced of one's good performance, will stand by him whenever he goes before them again."

Are American Boys Expendable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing remarks made on the floor with reference to defense against foreign attack, I am including an article from yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald by Joseph Alsop:

Russia's Airpower Shames Ours

Despite the strictly phoney talk in Washington, the Soviet delegation will go to the summit meeting at Geneva with more military strength behind them than the Soviet Union has ever before possessed. That, no doubt, was the real fact behind Nikita Khrushchev's warning at the July 4 party in Moscow, that the Soviets were not going to Geneva to negotiate from weakness.

From the straight military viewpoint, in truth, the American negotiators are the ones who should feel a bit nervous. For the one great trump this country has always held since the end of the last war—a wide air-atomic lead over the Soviet Union—is now being snatched away by a massive Russian effort.

On the other hand, the superior American stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons are ceasing to matter very much because the Soviets are now accumulating sufficient stocks of their own to wreak total destruction on the United States.

On the other hand, the Soviets are now beginning to lead the United States in quality as well as quantity of aircraft production.

The change in the bomb balance has been going on for a long time. The truly revolutionary development of the last 12 months has been the change in the air balance. A series of reports in this space in the last week have touched on some aspects of that change. Overall, it can be summarized as follows:

The Soviet air program first began to catch up with the American air program in the field of fighter production. Here the United States has been altogether outclassed.

The Soviets have produced about 4,000 supersonic MIG–17's, while we have produced a few scores of the F–100 fighters which is comparable to the MIG–17 in all ways except in its inferior altitude characteristics.

The Soviets have already gone into full production with their still newer, still faster "Farmer" fighter, whereas we have produced two prototypes of the comparable F–104. The Soviets are now starting production of a first-class, jet-powered, all-weather fighter, while we have nothing comparable that is anywhere near real quantity production.

Second, as far as current output is concerned, the Soviets have now passed the United States in the field of long-range jet bombers. They are now producing their T–37 bomber at a considerably higher rate than we are producing the comparable B–52 in this country, and their monthly output will still be 4 or 5 bombers per month higher than ours when the recently ordered increase in B–52 production finally takes effect.

They also are producing their T–39 bomber comparable to our B–47, at a rate of 20 to 30 per month, and this rate is expected to rise. And whereas the output of fast tankers suitable to air refuel the B–47 is extremely unsatisfactory, the Soviets have in quantity production a four-engine turboaircraft well suited for air refueling the T–39.

Third, the Soviets have achieved certain technical successes of a distinctly alarming character. The new Russian air engine with 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust, which powers the T–37's and T–39's, was ready for use at least 2 years before the comparable jet engine, the J–75, which is just emerging from the experimental stage.

And Soviet air-lead time—the time from the conception of an aircraft until the beginning of quantity production—now appears to be only one-half of American air-lead time.

Fourth, because of Soviet air gains already achieved, our one existing advantage is being quite largely neutralized. This advantage is the Strategic Air Command's large force-in-being of B–47 bombers.

But the B–47, being a short-range aircraft, depends on overseas bases to reach Russian targets. And the allies who control these overseas bases are more and more reluctant to allow the bases to be used when the chips are down—because they are being more and more intimidated by the combination of growing Soviet air power and growing Soviet stocks of H-bombs.

Fifth and finally, there also are excellent reasons to believe that the Soviet effort to produce the true ultimate weapon, the high-speed guided missile of intercontinental range, is well ahead of the American long-range missile effort, which is on a strictly business-as-usual basis.

That is the true balance sheet.

Maybe President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin will make real progress in the disarmament talks in Geneva. But until disarmament is a solid reality, this kind of air-balance sheet is a national scandal, made all the more shocking by the tremendous cover-up that is going on at the Pentagon.

While the cold war continues, the Soviet capture of the traditional American lead in the air constitutes a national emergency. It should be treated as such, instead of being hidden behind huckstering phrases.

Mr. Speaker, this article corroborates information from many dependable sources. If we permit ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security—if we lower our guard—the enemy is in position to deliver a blow which the President has intimated may devastate 53 American cities, including Washington.

Such an attack would be airborne. We must be prepared to meet it in the air. Why shackle TVA which provided both the bomb and the carrier which ended the last war? TVA products saved hundreds of thousands of American boys in the last World War. With TVA crippled, how will we save American boys in the next world war? We could not have saved them without TVA. With TVA crippled by Dixon-Yates how will we save American boys in the next world war? And how will we save the 53 American cities to which the President referred in his directions to Attorney General Brownell?

It is an unpleasant subject but burying our heads ostrich-like in the sand will not protect us against superior Russian armament. Let us face the situation and utilize every agency at our command to strengthen and improve national defense. And as a part of that program let us keep TVA—Dixon-Yates to the contrary notwithstanding.

Area of Production Definitions and the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, before the House takes under consideration the various proposals to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, specifically pertaining to an increase in the minimum wage levels, I wish to call to the attention of the membership the close association of such legislation with the administrative definitions imposed by the Secretary of Labor on "areas of production" as carried in the act.

Too, I wish to insert in the Record at this point a letter received from Mr. Lon Mann, of Marianna, Ark., which will give the Congress a first-hand account of how these definitions operate to impose discriminatory burdens on a part of our economy.

Mr. Mann's letter reads as follows:

Mann's Gin, Inc.,
Marianna, Ark., July 11, 1955.

Mr. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Gathings: I am the manager and a stockholder of Mann's Gin, Inc., a cotton gin located inside the city limits of Marianna, Ark., which has a population of 4,500. Due to the location of this gin we are classified as being "out of the area of production" and are subject to minimum wage laws.

At the present time there are 22 active gins in Lee County. They all gin cotton grown in this county, haul the bales to the same compress in Marianna, and haul the cottonseed to the same choice of oil mills in eastern Arkansas and Memphis, Tenn. However, only six of these gins are subject to minimum wage laws. Sixteen are not. Needless to say, this places the six gins located in the city limits of Marianna at a tremendously unfair advantage in trying to compete with the other 16 gins, some of which are only 2 miles outside the city limits.

The Marianna ginners have no desire to see every gin in the country placed under minimum wage laws because we realize that the man who will foot the bill will be the farmer, who is already caught between rising costs and declining income. However, we do not feel that it was the intent of Congress to give any particular group of ginners an advantage over their neighbors and realize that the situation that has developed is the result of a technical, rather than a practical, definition of "Area of Production" in section 536.2, title 29, chapter V, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mann's Gin, Inc., is located less than 2 blocks from cotton fields which are out of the area of production, technically speaking, because they are also inside the city limits. Farmers Gin Co., operated by A. C. Mahan and James Burkett, is just across a gravel street from a cotton field. The HYL Gin, operated by Charles Yancey, Jr., is just across a drainage ditch from a field of cotton. This situation is not unusual. Every country town in the cotton country has cotton gins and cotton fields well within the city limits.

The solution to this situation in my humble opinion is merely to recognize the facts and to either delete ginning from the group of industries covered by minimum wage laws or change the definition of Area of Production to mean any county in which cotton is grown as a major crop.

Any assistance that you can give me and the rest of the ginners in this same situation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Mann's Gin, Inc.,
Lon Mann.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by a cotton ginner clearly illustrates the inequity under the definition of the Secretary of Labor. To carry this matter one step further, I would like to include in the Record at this point a news release I issued on July 8, 1955, which shows in some detail the operations of this law under this definition and its effect on our farmers:

AREA OF PRODUCTION DEFINITIONS AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

(By Hon. E. C. "Took" Gathings, of Arkansas)

The farmer goes to the marketplace and asks "What am I offered?" for the American farmer must sell his product in the market and pay, in great part, for the processing of that product for the market. The cotton farmer's price for his cotton must absorb the cost of ginning. The farmer cannot pass on to the consumer any increase in his cost of production.

There are many complex reasons why farm net income has declined in recent years, but certainly one of the principal reasons is the increased cost of marketing farm products, and the increased cost of production from higher farm labor and equipment costs. The following information, taken from official Government sources, shows graphically what has been happening to our farmers:

[Billions of dollars]

Year	Gross farm income	Production expense	Net farm income	Labor cost of distributing farm products
1947	34.0	17.2	16.8	10.6
1948	34.5	18.9	15.6	11.5
1949	31.8	18.2	13.6	12.1
1950	32.1	19.7	12.4	12.7
1951	36.9	22.4	14.5	13.9
1952	36.8	23.2	13.6	14.7
1953	35.4	22.2	13.3	15.5
1954	34.0	21.5	12.5	(1)

[1] Not available.

These figures show that in agriculture, since 1949, costs have gone up 11 percent while the farmers' net income has fallen 8 percent. To increase the minimum-wage level, as has been proposed in legislation now before the Congress, will have a most serious effect on American agriculture.

When the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938, the Congress realized the need for exempting agricultural workers and, in addition, the exemption of operations and processes involved in preparing for market and handling agricultural commodities.

The Congress was advised by representatives from the Cotton Belt that the cotton farmer pays the cost of his ginning, and that to increase the cost of ginning would result in reductions in the farmers' income. Accordingly, the Congress placed in the law an exemption of such agricultural handling operations within the area of production.

However, despite the clear intent of Congress, the Secretary of Labor, through the definition of "area of production," has virtually nullified this exemption. So well have they drawn their definition that only 14 percent of the cotton gins in the Nation are exempt under the bureaucratic decree, and only 4 percent of the cotton compresses are eliminated from the provisions of the minimum wage and maximum-hours law. Now that these proposals are before the Congress to increase the minimum wage, these definitions imposed by the Secretary of Labor pose an increasing threat to the farmer.

Under the present departmental definition, and it will be remembered that earlier definitions issued by the Secretary have been condemned and nullified by the Federal courts, a cotton gin in a rural county of Arkansas is not considered as being in the area where cotton is raised if (1) more than 5 percent of the cotton received at the gin in any month was transported more than 10 miles from the farm, or (2) if the cotton gin was within 1 mile of a village having a population in excess or 2,500, or 3 miles of a city having a population of 50,000.

Another example to indicate the extent to which this definition has nullified the intent of the Congress to exempt operations and processes involved in handling and preparing for market of agricultural commodities is the fact that cotton warehouses in the Cotton Belt which handle 94 percent of the cotton crop are not considered by the Department as being in the area where cotton is produced.

And, in the case of poultry, the Department of Labor has ruled that it is not an agricultural commodity and, therefore, dressing and preparing poultry for market is not exempt.

Nor does the Department of Labor take into consideration new processes and techniques in preparing food for the market. Canning of fruit and vegetables is exempt but the freezing of foodstuff is not. Today, great savings to the consumer have been effected by packing some vegetables in the field and hauling them to the packing sheds for precooling prior to shipment. Yet, this new technique is penalized by the Department which has ruled that since the packing is done in the field the cooling operation is not exempt.

It is apparent that action should be taken to eliminate the Department of Labor's authority to restrict and nullify the intent of Congress and that careful study must be given to any proposal to increase the minimum wage level in order to protect the farm economy. To increase the minimum wage 33⅓ percent, as has been adopted by the Senate, together with a continuation of the Department of Labor's definition of "area of production," would result in great damage to our farm population and to the Nation's welfare.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, 50 years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the upper Colorado River project.

Example 1: Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill—

(a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years.

(b) The municipal-water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit.

(c) The irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law.

Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2: Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3: Present law requires interest at not less than 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4: Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an economic feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

Greed for Water Prompts California Opposition to Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, having replied in full to the attack the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] made against the Colorado River project on May 19, 1955, I intend today, or I indicated at the close of my remarks yesterday, to explore some aspect of the subject: Southern California's Opposition to the Colorado River Project.

Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this problem of agricultural surpluses that does relate to the upper Colorado River storage project but it has nothing to do with agriculture in the upper basin States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. That is the matter of the growth of the cotton industry in southern California and its dependence upon water directed from the Colorado River which belongs to the four upper basin States. As you will recall from my earlier remarks, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of May 31, 1955, had $1,113,018,141 invested in some 6,512,142 bales of upland cotton. More significant, however, is the fact that as of May 31, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 1,727,725 bales of upland cotton valued at $302,175,455.

Along with this increase in CCC holdings of cotton, we also note, Mr. Speaker, that the production of cotton in California has skyrocketed. The cotton acreage for the State of California over the past 9 years is as follows, Mr. Speaker, according to the Cotton Branch of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the United States Department of Agriculture:

[Acres]

Year	Imperial County	Riverside County	San Joaquin County	All other counties	California
1945	9	1,091	317,900	----------	319,000
1946	9	829	358,162	----------	359,000
1947	9	2,891	533,100	----------	536,000
1948	80	3,660	806,220	40	810,000
1949	395	7,725	922,830	50	931,000
1950	725	4,018	578,257	----------	583,000
1951	31,300	26,385	1,255,965	1,350	1,315,000
1952	90,800	33,720	1,266,400	2,080	1,393,000
1953	116,630	46,500	1,182,750	2,120	1,348,000
1954	68,655	26,387	848,875	2,075	945,992

Statistics alone, Mr. Speaker, cannot adequately describe the tremendous size of the California cotton industry, but the following statement from an article entitled "Cotton-Circa, 1955: The Cotton Belt Moves Westward" in the magazine Tideways for May 1955, which is published by the Port of Stockton, Calif., describes this tremendous growth as follows:

> The word "cotton" might conjure up pictures of moss-draped Savannah plantations, darkies singing "Tote that barge," or southern colonels riding horseback through their Mississippi Delta acres. This is cotton in the tradition; it's business—a gigantic business. Since the curtain rang down on the second war to end all wars, cotton growers in California have added some startling chapters to the cotton story.
>
> Here sharecroppers became multimillionaires. Here huge groaning earth-moving machines scraped the valley floor level as a sheet of glass. Here miles and miles of irrigation canals brought water to the thirsty fields.
>
> Cotton is big in California—the State's most valuable crop. * * * With the added productivity of Imperial and Riverside Counties, about 1½ million bales of cotton are grown on a million California acres (pp. 8–10).

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that in 1953 California farmers derived 16 percent of their income from the sale of basic commodities, all of which are in surplus today, with the possible exception of peanuts. But, and this is important, Mr. Speaker, of this 16 percent, 13 percent of California farmers' income in 1953 was derived from the sale of cotton.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the history of California does indeed add some interesting chapters, not only to the cotton story but the upper Colorado River storage project as well.

For example, the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has never told the Members of this body that the increase of cotton acreage from 9 acres in 1945 to 116,630 acres by 1953 in the Imperial Valley was made possible by diverting Colorado River water onto that land. The same is true of the increase from 1,091 acres in 1945 to 46,500 acres in 1953 in the Palo Verde and Coachella Valleys in Riverside County.

Why was it, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from southern California was quick at the outset of his attack upon the Colorado River storage project on May 19 to point out that his "remarks must not be construed as an attack on all reclamation policies"—RECORD, May 19, page 6681? Because he knows as well as I do that California has become the great diversified agricultural State it has, only because of water. He knows that its future will be greater if California can get more water. For example, the gentleman from southern California voted for the Trinity River diversion Central Valley project in California, nor is it likely that he will oppose any project that will benefit his State of California. He did not raise the question of surpluses in connection with the Trinity project although he did with respect to the Colorado River project. His inconsistency with respect to reclamation, Mr. Speaker, was clearly evident in the colloquy between himself and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], following the address on May 23, of my colleague from Utah [Mr. DAWSON]. Since it is so appropriate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read Mr. MILLER's remarks:

> I notice the gentleman from California attacks the project [Colorado River] because it would add to crop surpluses. One of the first places in the record as being opposed to irrigation, is the Imperial Irrigation District in California. I wonder what the Imperial Irrigation District would be if they did not have water to put on that great valley? It is a little amazing when he finally boils it down that he is opposed to two projects, namely the upper Colorado, and the Arkansas-Fryingpan. His arguments in the RECORD are not very consistent when they are based against an irrigation project because of surpluses; as a matter of fact, the crops produced under irrigation projects [Colorado] do not add to the surplus. (RECORD, May 23, p. 6827.)

He is opposed to the upper Colorado River project not because of the intrinsic worth of any of the special arguments he has presented but because southern California agriculture as well as southern California municipalities and industry want all of the Colorado River including that which belongs to the four upper-basin States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. This is water which by default goes to southern California unless the proposed storage projects are built. Let no one "kid" themselves about this.

Put in a few words, as my colleague from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], did so well in his talk on May 23:

> It is not irrigating acreage in Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah some 10 to

> 15 years from now that threatens to add to our surplus. We need not fear that. But if southern California could steal this water it would be added to the other Colorado River water now being used to grow cotton on vast irrigated tracts of land. Here is a commodity not in short supply and one not needed to feed our expanding population. (RECORD, May 23, p. 6826.)

Here is the crux of the matter. You Representatives from the great cotton-producing States of the South ought to be able to see the "cloth of which this southern California argument against the upper Colorado River storage project is made of."

The gentleman from southern California complained or asked why we should put land into production when acreage allotments are being cut, although this, as I have pointed out, in previous remarks on this subject, is not related to the Colorado River storage project. You ought to ask him why the cotton-acreage allotments were cut so drastically in 1954 and 1955. Why? Because between new California acreage competing for allotments and a decline in the cotton export market, cotton-acreage allotments in the Southern States have taken great cuts as you know. And you can bet that they will be cut further if California continues to bring new acres into production with the help of Colorado River water which belongs to Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado.

Is there little wonder why the gentleman from southern California was able to put a list of some 205 California public and private organizations in the RECORD which opposed the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project? Let us examine a few of them. He lists the Imperial Irrigation District as No. 29. Why is it against this project? Because its farmers want Colorado River water to grow more cotton. He lists as No. 72 the Caleot, Ltd., of Bakersfield, Calif. This is a cooperative organization of some 3,000 farmers who grow cotton. He lists as No. 44, the Imperial County Farm Bureau. Why is it opposed? Because its members grow cotton on new acreage with upper basin States water from the Colorado River.

Some 35 to 40 agricultural organizations in California were listed as opposing this project. Why? They want all the water from the Colorado River whether it legally belongs to them or not. The California power and water lobby likewise is not really concerned about Dinosaur National Monument or the claim of invasion. Since Senator WATKINS exploded that myth several weeks ago, their attack has shifted to this one of agricultural surpluses which I have discussed on several occasions. Yet it didn't bother California Representatives when they voted for the Trinity project on June 31, 1955.

Nor do they really think that increased agricultural production in the four upper basin States as a result of the construction of this project will add to our agricultural surpluses.

These are but red herrings which southern Californians used to hide the real reason why they are opposed to the upper Colorado River project. Simply put, they want all the water they can get from the Colorado River whether it belongs to them or not. Mr. Speaker, this concludes my remarks.

Exemption of Natural Gas Rates From Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I recently prepared for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch an article analyzing the proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act and outlining some of the reasons why exemption from Federal regulation of the gas producers' interstate sales is against the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that this article of mine from the June 26, 1955, issue of the Post-Dispatch be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS ASSAILS $600-MILLION-A-YEAR GRAB TO EXEMPT NATURAL-GAS RATES FROM FEDERAL CONTROL—ILLINOIS SENATOR SPELLS OUT OPPOSITION TO FULBRIGHT BILL IN SENATE AND HARRIS BILL IN HOUSE

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator, Democrat, Illinois)

Consumers' gas bills—residential, industrial, and commercial—are bound to increase by 8 to 25 million dollars a year in Missouri, by 14 to 44 million dollars a year in Illinois, by 11 to 33 million dollars a year in Arkansas, and by comparable amounts elsewhere if the powerful oil industry has its way in the present Congress.

At issue is a bill (the Harris bill in the House, the Fulbright bill in the Senate) to exempt from Federal regulations the interstate sales of nontransporting natural-gas producers, and to fix up the interstate pipelines with highly inflated cost allowances, as attempted in the Moore-Rizley bill in 1948.

The effect of the bill, if passed, would be to let producers of this excellent and much-sought-after fuel charge all that the traffic will bear, and to give the interstate pipelines an enormous handout also. Reasonable estimates disclose that this may add as much as $600 million a year to the Nation's present gas bills.

The interests which would get the biggest part of this bonanza are not the sturdy and struggling little independents and wildcatters in dirty overalls, in whose name the legislative attack on the captive consumers is being made by the big interests. Ninety percent of the gas sold in interstate commerce is produced by about 175 producers.

Of the 29 largest producers, who produce nearly two-thirds of the natural gas, 20 are major oil companies or their subsidiaries; Phillips Petroleum, Stanolind Oil & Gas (Standard of Indiana), Humble Oil & Refining (Standard Oil of New Jersey), Magnolia Petroleum (Socony-Vacuum), Shell Oil, Gulf Oil, Atlantic Refining, Shamrock Oil, Skelly Oil, Sun Oil, the Texas Co., Sunray Oil, Union Oil, Pure Oil, Sinclair Oil, etc. They read like the "who's who" of America's oil industry and are not exactly a needy or penniless group—or a neglected one, if we recall their 27½ percent depletion allowances.

OIL MEN'S WAR CHEST

With such enormous sums at stake, it is no wonder that the oil, gas, and pipeline companies have gathered a "public relations" war chest for this exemption bill which the Wall Street Journal estimated at $1.5 million—or that we in Congress are receiving lots of inspired mail, identically worded resolutions from chambers of commerce and an occasional misinformed city council, slick literature and editorials with the industry slant clearly showing beneath alleged consumer appeals, plausible economic analyses to show how little of the consumer's dollar the poor little gas producer gets, snide attacks on opponents of exemption as "socialists," etc.

Standard Oil of Indiana, whose subsidiary, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., is the second biggest gas producer in the country, has singled me out for special attention with 1 three-page letter to employees in Illinois, and 1 nine-page memorandum seeking to refute some of the arguments I have made for fair regulation.

The company tactfully urges letters—not form letters, though—to show me the light. I suppose I should feel complimented by such attention from this $2 billion enterprise, which has also loaned its top economist to head up the big brain trust of the American Petroleum Institute, mobilizing the forces for exemption.

FIGHT FOR THE CONSUMERS

In the face of this concerted drive, it is fortunate that a growing number of Members of Congress, mayors, and law officers of scores of the Nation's biggest cities, and a few civic and union groups, State utility commissioners, and distribution companies have taken up the battle for the consumers.

The narrow margin (16–15) by which the Harris bill was voted out of committee in the House and the window-dressing of apparent, but actually useless, Federal controls ("reasonable market price") included in the bill, show that there is a good chance to beat the exemption drive if the people understand the issues.

In conformity with its great traditions, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has consistently done more than any other paper I know to explain these issues to its readers.

Historically, the efforts to win exemption for these producers' sales began with the Moore-Rizley bill in 1947–48. This was too raw even for the 80th Republican Congress. An exemption measure (the Kerr bill) was unfortunately passed in 1950, but President Truman courageously vetoed it.

The increasingly industry-minded Federal Power Commission gave the producers exemption in 1951, only to be reversed by the Supreme Court in the Phillips case in 1954. The court held that the Natural Gas Act gave the commission power to regulate those interstate rates, and that it should get on with the job.

So now the industry is back again seeking "clarification"— or more buntly, exemption.

ARGUMENT AGAINST EXEMPTION

The basic argument against exemption is simply this:

Competition does not and cannot operate between gas producers to keep the field prices "just and reasonable."

In the absence of such competition, only fair regulation can protect the consumers of this essential commodity.

Since the sales transactions between producers and pipeline companies are in interstate commerce only the Federal Government can do the job.

Natural gas can be distributed only by a system of pipelines and gas mains that tie the city users inextricably to utilities, the utilities to the pipelines, and the pipelines to the producers, so that neither pipelines nor consumers can "shop around" for better prices.

With expensive cooking and heating appliances bought (about $10,000,000,000 worth for the Nation), the gas used is caught. With expensive big lines laid ($40,000 to $100,000 a mile), the pipeline company is caught.

With a desirable fuel that is in great demand, the producer now has the upper hand, and he has started acting that way in jacking up his prices. He has the pipelines and the consumers over a barrel.

NOT LIKE COAL, COPPER, IRON, ETC.

These marketing relationships differentiate the natural gas industry completely from coal, copper, oil, iron ore and the other commodities with which the oil industry publicists mistakenly try to compare it. Barges, trucks and railroads can haul those other materials. Competition among producers is possible.

But with natural gas the testimony is conclusive to the opposite effect: the transportation is monopolistic, and now that demand is outstripping the supply, the only effective competition in the field is between pipelines bidding up the price. These higher prices then get passed along the chain to the consumers. Clearly this situation requires utility-type regulation.

It is illuminating to see what has already been happening to field prices of gas while the Federal Power Commission has followed its hands-off policy.

From 1946 to 1954, the average cost of gas to the 17 pipelines that bought 96 per cent of the gas sold interstate by the non-transporting producers increased from 4.4 cents a thousand cubic feet (M c. f.) to 9.7 cents per thousand cubic feet, or by 120.8 percent.

In aggregate terms, this means the increase in the cost of gas to these pipelines is running at the rate of over $196 million a year. This may be chickenfeed in Texas, but it is big money in Illinois and Missouri.

Moreover, I introduced into the Senate committee's record tables showing gas-purchase contracts in the Southwest running as high as 20 cents and 22 cents per thousand cubic feet. New contracts at 14 cents are common. A May 27 prospectus of People's Gas in Chicago states that it expects the average cost of gas purchased by its affiliate natural-gas pipeline to be 13 cents in 1955.

The upward movement is thus rapid and getting faster, and most-favored nation clauses and renegotiations, which hike the prices under existing contracts whenever another producer in the area gets a higher price, speed the spiral upward.

INCREASES PASSED ON

These higher costs are being steadily passed through to consumers. The 14 principal pipelines transporting gas from the Southwest, whose sales are regulated by the FPC, have since 1949 either been granted or have pending rate increases totaling $251 million a year, a great part of which is due to higher field prices.

The utilities, in turn, have been passing these increases on to their customers. Recent rate increases for People's Gas in Chicago, for instance, have been $4,657,000 in 1953, $5 million in 1954, and $3,716,000 thus far in 1955.

In consequence, the unit costs of gas to consumers have been going up, while the unit costs of electricity, the principal competitor to gas for residential use, have been declining.

Higher gas costs have disappointed the New England consumers and already jeopardized the success of the recent pipeline projects there. Distributors in Oklahoma and elsewhere are also complaining that higher prices for natural gas may price it out of the market for industrial users or else saddle the major burden of all increases on the captive residential users, who cannot transfer to coal or oil as easily as industries with alternative facilities.

The lobbyists for the exemption bill try to minimize the impact of these higher prices on consumers by saying it will only mean a few pennies a day to each. But 2 cents a day—which is far too low an estimate—is over $131 million a year for the 18 million residential customers.

This is the way all utility regulation works, saving modest sums per day for the small users. It is a shocking concept that pennies extracted from the many which mean millions for a few are a trifling matter.

COMPETITION PREVENTIVE

I have already pointed out how the physical arrangements of the gas-distribution system—pipelines and gas mains—and the various escalator provisions in purchase contracts prevent competition from being effective to keep prices down.

Other factors also obstruct competition among producers:

(A) Gas reserves, according to the American Gas Association, are not building up as rapidly as before in relation to gas consumption. If an exhaustible resource faces a demand that is rising faster than supply, the situation is made to order for price gouging.

(B) All available statistics show that the major oil producers dominate the interstate gas sales markets and the ownership of known gas reserves.

(C) There is much evidence that the only competition is between gas purchasers. The Messrs. De Golyer and McNaughton, noted geologists and petroleum engineers of Dallas, recently advised Natural Gas Pipeline Co.: "The availability of this gas to Natural depends upon its aggressiveness in obtaining such gas in competition with other pipelines." And I understand Natural is bidding 5 cents per M c. f. more than the highest present field price to try to get gas in Jack and Wise Counties in Texas.

(D) State conservation rules and laws for minimum wellhead prices likewise reduce competition.

(E) And finally, the pipeline companies, under regulation, can pass on all increased costs to their customers. Furthermore, under an inexcusable ruling of the FPC, they get a bigger allowance for the gas they themselves produce if the market price goes up. Thus the pipelines lack any real incentives to bargain with the producers for a low price.

A PUBLIC UTILITY SITUATION

All of these factors reinforce the conclusion that this is a public utility situation, that competition does not operate to keep prices fair, and that regulation is the only possible answer.

The inevitable high costs to the consumers in the absense of regulations are made quite clear in the statements of industry spokesmen about proper field prices.

Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, seems to believe a 5-cents-per-M c. f. increase over present field prices would be fair. That means $200 million a year more from consumers. Dr. Richard J. Gonzales, economist for Humble Oil, declared that 20 cents per M c. f. might be right—a rise of 10 cents over present averages. If this became the average, gas consumers would pay over $400 million more each year. Others suggest 25 cents per M c. f., which means over $600 million a year more from consumers.

AN ATROCIOUS DECISION

Obviously, the producers stand to collect billions in added profits if the exemption bill is enacted. For example, a 10-cent increase in price would bring Humble Oil & Refining Co. $1,600,000,000 of additional profits from its presently owned gas reserves.

Another feature of the proposed legislation which will eventually add several billion dollars more to gas consumers' costs is the provision to allow the pipelines to charge as an operating expense the "reasonable market price" of the gas which they themselves produce. This would write into law the basic principle of the FPC's atrocious decision in the Panhandle Eastern case which reversed, for pipeline-produced gas, the longstanding "cost" or prudent investment method of ratemaking.

This may be legal gobbledegook to the casual reader, but it means millions of dollars more to the pipelines and it persuaded them to enlist as stanch and contributing allies of the big oil companies in the drive for this legislation.

What it means in simple terms is this: It is costing Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. an average of 2.35 cents per thousand cubic foot to produce gas from its wells, including a fair return on its investment. But Panhandle is now claiming the "weighted average field price" of 10.42 cents per thousand cubic feet, or 8 cents more than its real cost. Or take Colorado Interstate Gas Co.: It claims a field price of 9.4 cents per thousand cubic feet while its actual cost of production is 2.23 cents, and the consumers must pay the difference.

Increased profits thus handed to the pipelines through the back door already total over $40 million a year, according to data from the FPC.

The standard in the new bill, "reasonable market price," is even looser and higher than the method applied by the FPC. On the basis of 1953 gas production by the pipelines, if the difference between actual cost of production and market price is 10 cents per thousand cubic feet—and that may be a conservative estimate if regulation is killed—the additional profit to the pipelines would be $100 million annually.

Obviously the enactment of the proposed legislation would be a gold mine for the pipelines as well as the nontransporting producers.

My bill, S. 1248, would, on the contrary, compel the FPC to go back to legitimate cost of prudent investment as a basis for rate regulation. It would stop this pipeline raid on the consumer, which the FPC and the Harris and Fulbright bills seek to legalize.

SPUR TO EXPLORATION THEORY

It is sometimes claimed that regulation has stifled exploration, and only by allowing the pipelines these phantom costs can they be induced to find new reserves of natural gas, but the facts are to the contrary. The pipeline companies and their producing affiliates in the Southwest produced 50 percent more gas in 1953 than in 1947. From 1950 to 1953, pipeline funds spent for exploration and development rose from $7,500,000 to nearly $15 million. Obviously, regulation was fair and did not stifle new development.

It is said by the proponents of the exemption legislation that the producers could not exist on the 6-percent return generally allowed utilities, but only the proponents have suggested that they be limited to 6 percent. I would expect, from the nature of the producing business, that the rates of return allowed would be somewhat higher than those normally granted to gas and electric distribution utilities. I am sure the FPC can be counted upon to be more than fair to the producers in this matter.

It is often claimed that regulation of nontransporting producers' interstate sales is just too complicated and difficult to be feasible, but the short answer to this is that for 16 years the FPC has regulated natural-gas transporters who are also engaged in extensive exploration, development, and production of natural gas. These companies have prospered and grown under regulation, and at the same time, down to 1952, the FPC ordered rate reductions totaling $43 million on an annual basis.

The FPC can do the job of protecting both consumers and producers, if it only will. The Congress should leave it with the authority and direct it to proceed.

EXPERT ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By Post-Dispatch)

A deep rooted concern for humanity and a burning opposition to injustice and exploitation probably are the best explanation of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' great interest in consumer protection.

Going beyond his teaching and general studies of economics and welfare legislation while a professor at the University of Chicago in 1929 and 1930 he delved into the specific utility manipulations of a prominent Chicagoan—Samuel Insull.

DOUGLAS' revelations and his drive against exorbitant traction, electric and gas rates in Chicago were not popular with those in power. Some tried to get him fired from the university, but history soon vindicated his judgment.

Ever since, in State legislative battles, in commission hearings, in election campaigns, in the Chicago City Council and in the United States Senate, DOUGLAS has championed the cause of the unorganized and usually politically weak consumers.

In Senate debates he has fought for competition as a defense for both consumers and small business. Where competition fails in a utility situation, DOUGLAS has supported what he believes to be fair regulation. He is generally credited with the main legislative fight which made the Kerr bill to exempt gas producers from Federal regulation a national issue in 1950 and led to its veto by President Truman.

DOUGLAS unsuccessfully fought the Hinshaw bill in 1954 which exempted from Federal regulation pipelines operating wholly within a State but, nevertheless, completing interstate transit of gas.

Now he is on the warpath again against the Harris and Fulbright bills to free the interstate sales of gas producers from Federal regulation.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday it was my privilege to address a large civic gathering in the city of Chicago. I discussed various problems of American foreign policy and preparedness. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM" FOR THE BIG FOUR MEETING AT THE SUMMIT: MEANWHILE "GREATER AIRMINDEDNESS NEEDED FOR AMERICA"

It is a great privilege for me to join with you at this outstanding patriotic celebration.

It is most appropriate that the courage and pioneering of Capt. Stephen Darius and Lt. Stanley Girenas be marked once again, as you have achieved so well today, by this great rededication on the part of civic, veterans, church, business, labor, and fraternal groups.

THREE SYMBOLS POINTED UP BY THESE HEROES

Today, we take renewed inspiration from the unforgettable deed of these two unforgettable, outstanding World War I veterans.

There is a real and varied meaning—direct and symbolic—in the goal which they sought 22 years ago, in embarking on a nonstop flight from New York to Kaunas, Lithuania.

Let me mention three of the meanings, as I see them, of their epic undertaking.

AMERICA'S FRIENDSHIP WITH LITHUANIA

1. The most direct symbolism was, of course, the uniting of the people of the United States with the people of Lithuania—a country relatively small in population, small in size, but big in heart and large in meaning to mankind.

For Lithuania, like her other Baltic neighbors, represented the welcome rebirth after World War I, of the sovereignty of proud peoples who had long aspired for it.

Lithuania proved that the hunger in the human heart to be free, to be independent, to forge one's own destiny voluntarily through one's own leaders, rather than in slavery and under alien-imposed leaders, is one of the deepest hungers in the human breast.

LITHUANIA'S UNHAPPY FATE AT RED HANDS

As we all know, 6 years after the 1933 flight, came World War II, with the onrushing Nazis, and then Soviet armies, blotting out the freedom of whole peoples.

The trend of World War II changed when, 2 years later, the Nazi aggressor turned on its former ally—Red Russia.

This attack failed, due in major part to the tremendous lend-lease aid given by the people of the United States, and then due to the opening of the victorious second front.

But when the guns ceased firing in World War II, Lithuania, far from being reborn remained shackled—the subject of monstrous, atheistic persecution, heartless mass deportations and liquidations.

Today, nonetheless, the spirit of Darius-Girenas, the spirit of Lithuanian-American friendship is stronger than ever before.

Not all the darkness imposed by the tyrants of the Kremlin can extinguish the flame and hope in the hearts of the Lithuanian people, nor in the hearts of Lithuanian-Americans here, or of Lithuanian descendants elsewhere in the world. The flame, the hope for what? For liberation.

SENATE RESOLUTION SOUNDLY REAFFIRMS UNITED STATES LIBERATION FEELINGS

Yes; we pledge to this valiant country our continued friendship, our continued efforts toward that day when Lithuania shall yet be free and independent. We shall never acquiesce to her slavery. We shall never abandon her, nor other enslaved peoples.

That is the purpose of Senate Resolution 127 which I have been pleased to cosponsor with Senators GEORGE, CLEMENTS and KNOWLAND. This resolution is no empty gesture, but a dramatic, meaningful reaffirmation of America's deepest feelings.

TRAILBLAZING BY AIR PIONEERS

2. But there is a second symbolism of the 1933 flight.

It is a symbolism of the Eagles of America, the intrepid trailblazers into the "wild blue yonder" of the sky.

Six years earlier, Charles Augustus Lindbergh, in his "Spirit of St. Louis," had made his memorable "lone eagle" nonstop flight across the Atlantic to Paris.

The Lindbergh flight, then, the Darius-Girenas flight and similar intrepid adventures, represented man's soaring into the unknown. They represented his courageous ascent through the vast ocean of air, above the vast ocean of water to far distant places.

Today, we are truly living in an air age—one so breathtakingly new that not even these immortal air pioneers might have been able completely to imagine it.

This air age involves travel at supersonic speed. But not only has the sound barrier already been broken, but the successive barriers of heat, barriers in which most airplane metals would ordinarily melt under terrific pressures, these barriers are being conquered.

TOO MANY HORSE AND BUGGY CONCEPTS IN AIR AGE

And yet, it is a pity, indeed it may almost be a tragedy that our laymen's thinking and doing have not caught up with the achievements of our aeronautical engineers, our inventors, our scientists.

In spite of the fact that the aerial highway is today the most important, the speediest means of national and international travel, we still are hobbling along with "horse and buggy" concepts and "horse and buggy" accommodations for air travel.

UNITED STATES AIRPORTS INADEQUATE TO CURRENT, FUTURE TRAFFIC

In spite of often heroic efforts, the airports of this Nation, almost without exception, particularly around our major cities, are usually obsolete and choked with ever-mounting traffic.

The streets and highways to and from airports are invariably congested with so many slow-moving vehicles as to make us think we are living not in the air age but in the "snail's age."

And problems of jet aircraft noise, problems of safety of airport environs, these and other diverse technical problems require far more intensive teamwork and research than we as a Nation have thus far given to them.

DEFICIENCIES IN MILITARY AVIATION SERIOUS

Meanwhile, the problems of military aviation are even more ominous.

For example, the reenlistment rate of the United States Air Force itself is appallingly low. We are losing United States Air Force pilots, navigators and other technicians at a rate which is shocking and intolerable. We have simply failed to provide sufficient incentive for young and middle-aged men (and their families) to remain in the Air Force as a career.

But there are other disturbing aspects as well—aspects which make even the historic warning of a great air pioneer of my own State—Gen. Billy Mitchell—seem mild indeed.

We have, to be sure, a great and well deserved pride in American aviation progress. But the fact of the matter is, that in the design of aircraft, and particularly air engines, we Americans have often been left behind by superior technical developments in Allied countries, and, yes occasionally in Soviet Russia itself.

Time after time the Russians have permitted foreign observers to glimpse only a portion of their modern, intercontinental air fleet.

But that series of glimpses has devastated the superoptimism, the haughtiness of some Americans who may have thought that, because we are Americans and because we are free, we would automatically be preeminent in aviation development.

The fact of the matter is, that while in an overall sense we still fortunately retain air superiority, our margin seems to be fast shrinking. So a speeding up toward the end of widening our advantage is essential.

WE MUST TRAIN MORE ENGINEERS, TECHNICIANS

Meanwhile consider the problem of our inadequate reservoir of aircraft engineers and other technicians. These men are indispensable for blueprinting and carrying out the construction of the planes of 1958, 1960, and 1965. But the existing reservoir is not being replenished by sizable enough "waves" of new graduates from our colleges and schools—men absolutely vital if this Nation is to survive.

What we need is action now to remedy these conditions, not mere studies of the problem. We have had commissions and commissions pointing out the problems of the air age time and again. Great organizations like the American Legion and the Air Force Association and other fine groups have sounded the warning signals again and again. But we still have not come around to acting with indispensable national teamwork for all-around air development. It is such active teamwork and planning which alone will provide the recipe for national military survival and national civilian progress.

HELP STRENGTHEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AIRLINES

As vital parts of both goals we must have the healthiest, strongest possible aviation industry—every single phase of it.

We need the strongest, healthiest possible domestic and international airline system. Time after time in emergencies our commercial airline crews, equipment, and staffs have helped to contribute to a crucial military margin, as in the early days of the Korean conflict.

The aircraft and airline industries are not a luxury for America. They are not simply another business which we may blithely watch lagging or encountering difficulties.

America's free enterprise airline industry today requires enormous stockholder and bondholder investments, simply for necessary constant modernization, let alone for expansion. Every effort to encourage sound modernization and sound expansion needs be made.

Meanwhile, we can ill afford an arbitrary "stop and go" military aircraft production system, alternately expanding overnight, then being slashed overnight. I realize that as the world situation changes, our military plans change, but surely we can provide greater continuity in our planning. Similarly, mass inductions of our cadets and then mass release of trained pilots doesn't make sense. Meanwhile, the mighty civilian aircraft and airline industries remain as mainstays—mainstays of the very life of this Nation in an age strewn with peril.

ULTIMATE DANGERS OF THE MISSILE AGE

But now we are moving from the air age to the missile age.

Today, missile experts visualize an intercontinental-guided or ballistic missile, capable of traveling half way round the world at a possible speed of 10,000 miles per hour.

Thus, we here in Chicago today may in the not too distant future be but 30 minutes away—by missile—I repeat 30 minutes away—from a rocket launching site in Soviet Siberia.

These facts—the facts of a contracted world—utterly change many of our concepts about defense and about foreign policy.

Meanwhile, with this fantastic new capability of speed, has come the even more fantastic capability of weapons of mass destruction.

You are all familiar with the grimly unfolding developments in fission and fusion weapons. It is a subject necesarily shrouded with secrecy.

But this we do know: Fallout from one type thermonuclear explosion has already been proven to make an area of 7,000 square miles, downward from the detonation unsafe for human habitation.

The scientists are constantly expanding the potentialities for the mass obliteration, not simply of cities, but of entire regions of nations. Yes, some scientists say, depending on the bomb's and country's size, the possible blotting out of entire nations themselves, is possible.

Some civil defense experts have estimated that the nature of lingering radioactivity may be so deadly and lasting, that some cities or regions, if struck by particular weapons, may never again be entered by man.

And there are other ominous guesses by genetic experts as regards the possible effects of radioactivity, not simply on bomb target victims, but on whole generations of peoples thousands and thousands of miles away, but subject nonetheless to wandering clouds of radioactivity.

THE UNENDING QUEST FOR PEACE

3. This, then, is the background of the third symbolism to which I shall refer. It is the symbolism of peace, the unending quest for peace.

No one knows better than the veterans and the veterans organizations represented at this occasion, how absolutely important it is that we leave no stone unturned in our efforts to avert war.

Stephen Darius and Stanley Girenas had known war at firsthand, as innumerable members of this audience have known it at firsthand.

They were men of peace even though they had to take up arms in defense.

OUR SINCERE EFFORT AT GENEVA

Tomorrow July 18, at Geneva commences a historic conference at which once again American leaders in good faith, in absolute sincerity, will try anew to help banish war from this planet. So will Prime Minister Eden of the United Kingdom and Faure of France.

I know that I voice your own feelings when I say that the hopes and prayers of mankind are with the President of the United States as he undertakes this effort in conjunction with our allies.

Yet, there is a sense of cautious vigilance in the heart and mind of Dwight D. Eisenhower, his associates and allied counterparts and in your heart and mine.

THE DARK RECORD OF SOVIET TREACHERY

In 1933, the very same year of the flight of Darius and Girenas, we, as a Nation, recognized the U. S. S. R. In the 23 years which have elapsed, we have learned to our regret time and again, that the Soviets invariably make agreements in order later to break them at their convenience. They sign documents in order later, at their convenience, to make shreds of paper of them.

They adopt zig-zag tactics, now soft, now tough, now compromising, now uncompromising, in order to confuse, to deceive, to lull.

This has been the unbroken record of Soviet duplicity since 1933, and indeed since the Soviet counter-revolution of 1917.

No thinking person could possibly ignore this dark record. And that certainly includes the alert President of the United States who is well aware of that record and who, after all, has had abundant experiences with the Reds.

It is obvious, therefore, that any agreement reached at Geneva or anywhere else must be viewed against this background. It must be viewed against the background of the outrageous Communist violations occurring at this very minute against the letter and spirit of the Korean and Indochinese armistice agreements.

WE MUST NOT SLAM THE DOOR TO CONFERRING

And, yet, it is a hard fact that if in angry reaction to these and other flagrant Communist abuses, if we were mistakenly to abandon all effort in attempting to speak to and negotiate with the Soviet Union—if we were to do that—we would not be serving the cause of peace.

For us to make the mistake of slamming the door angrily against all further discussion, against all East-West conferences, would only be to blunder into strengthening Soviet lying propaganda throughout the world.

That propaganda has falsely asserted that the United States is a "reckless, war-mongering power, eager to explode its atomic bombs, unwilling to talk about peace or negotiate for peace."

That Red propaganda is, of course, utterly false. No one desires peace more than we do. No one realizes that world war III could mean mass slaughter for victor and vanquished alike.

We are willing and eager therefore to talk, to confer at Geneva or anywhere else—at any appropriate time—to try to resolve East-West tensions.

WE WILL NOT APPEASE

But we are not willing to close our eyes to the tragic record of the past.

We are definitely not willing to experiment in appeasement, because history confirms that there is nothing more suicidal than an attempt to appease an aggressor.

Dwight D. Eisenhower will not appease. He will not abandon principle. He will not abandon Lithuania or the other enslaved people. He will speak in the cause and spirit of freedom. We have faith and confidence in him and in the able team which accompanies him.

CONCLUSION

Thus we have seen the three symbols of the Darius-Girenas flight which we observe today.

The symbol of American friendship for the Lithuanian people.

The symbol of the contracted world, contracted by aviation-missile progress.

The symbol of man's unending quest for peace.

May we go forth refreshed and inspired in this threefold tradition which they left for us.

And, in the years which are up ahead, as we pause again to remember the flight—may we be further along toward each of these three great objectives.

Another Example of Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the United States should know about the statement made by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, upon completion of House action upon the supplemental appropriations bill, July 14, 1955. It is as follows:

Never in my long legislative experience have I ever witnessed such irresponsibility and lack of appreciation of obligations to the country as was the performance today of the leadership of the Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee.

Piqued because the Rules Committee failed to give them a rule to trespass upon the legislative jurisdiction of other committees, they recklessly of their own accord destroyed their own studies and findings requiring several weeks of effort.

Because they could not have their own way, these men killed appropriations to keep going wage-and-hour enforcement, highly essential defense appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Nation's intelligence system; the administration of farmers' home loans; the Small Business Administration; seriously handicapped civilian defense and health services; and greatly restricted functions of the Justice and Labor Departments.

For the information of the country, I just want to outline the facts. The supplemental appropriation bill was approved and reported to the House by a Democratic-controlled committee. The request to waive all points of order was submitted to a Democratic Rules Committee.

This Democratic committee refused the request. Then the chairman of this Democratic-controlled subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee personally made points of order against these worthy items in this bill.

In each and every instance the Democratic chairman of the committee quickly conceded the points of order and these necessary appropriations were stricken from the bill.

Human Dignity and the Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the meeting at the summit, that is now underway at Geneva, was uppermost in my mind on July 3, when I gave an address before a sacred patriotic assembly at Provo, Utah, the county seat of my home county.

In view of the interest in this historic meeting and of the significant forces underlying American participation in any effort for contributing to freedom and peace, I hereby request unanimous consent to reproduce the text of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN DIGNITY AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

It is indeed an honor to be invited to speak to you in this assembly on the Lord's Day. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity.

In this place, and with the thousands who are gathered here, many of them personal friends and neighbors with whom I have labored for many years, I feel a kindred spirit that is uplifting and inspiring. Truly, it is good to be here even under the heavy responsibilities that rest upon me on this occasion.

It is an encouraging and hopeful sign when a community will plan, as a part of its Independence Day celebration, a sacred and patriotic assembly devoted to worship of God, with emphasis upon the part He has had in the birth of this Nation and its preservation to this time. If all the peoples of the world would sincerely and prayerfully follow the example in spirituality which you have set, and if their governments would be guided by the same high principles, I am sure the dark clouds of war and aggression would soon disappear. I extend to you my heartiest congratulations upon this occasion.

Years ago I viewed a motion picture which made a deep impression upon me. This documentary picture dealt with the great Jewish family of financiers, the Rothschilds, which had played, and to some extent continues to play, such an important part in the history of Europe, and by way of Europe, throughout the world.

A DYING FATHER'S COUNSEL

The story portrayed the early life of the family in a German community confined, as it was, to the ghetto, a restricted, depressed part of the city assigned to the then hated, unwanted, and persecuted Jew.

The father gives advice from his deathbed to his five sons who are about to leave home to seek and attain fame and fortune elsewhere. Incidentally, 3 of these sons later headed 3 great branches of this powerful European family.

I paraphrase the counsel of this dying father to his sons: Remember your heritage my sons. So prepare and conduct yourselves always, that you can walk the earth with dignity.

Walk the earth with dignity.

What prompted such advice, I asked myself.

Then I remembered what God had revealed to the ancient prophets of Israel concerning the beginning of the human race upon this planet, and the dignity of man as the son of God. Immediately it was clear to me that this father had in his heart a deep-seated conviction which no adverse circumstances could alter.

The thought came to me that this paraphrased admonition of a dying father to his sons could well be the rallying cry of those who today are striving for a better world—a peaceful world in which it will be possible for all men everywhere to walk the earth with dignity. Because it is only in a peaceful world where men are free that it is possible for man to achieve his highest destiny.

PRESIDENT STRESSES HUMAN DIGNITY

This need for a recognition of human dignity was stressed by President Eisenhower in a 1954 address at the American-Jewish Tercentenary Dinner. He stated:

"Of all religious concepts this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic. In this faith in human dignity is the major difference between our own concept of life and that of enemies of freedom."

These views of a simple German-Jewish father and the President of the most powerful nation upon the face of the earth suggested to me the theme of my remarks this evening. Time is extremely limited to deal with such a large subject, but I hope at least to outline it and bring out a few highlights during the time allotted to me.

However, before I review the steps by which our forefathers constructed the "framework of our Republic" upon an abiding faith in human worth and dignity, I should like to take you back a few weeks from the present. At that time a nationwide civil defense operation was conducted in our larger cities, including our Capital City of Washington.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE TESTED

President Eisenhower, and a select group of officials and some civilians, were, upon a given signal, to depart for secret rendezvous points from which they were to carry on their functions under emergency conditions. An enemy air attack with atomic and hydrogen bombs was simulated.

Notwithstanding the fact that this operation was officially described as "successful" in accomplishing its objectives, there was much to justify the tag "Operation Confusion," a name given to it by some outspoken critics. Whether the program demonstrated the adequacies or inadequacies of civil defense is still under debate.

This minor operation, however, serves to point up in a small but dramatic way the confusion of our times. Events of the past two decades have left the people of this country and the world at large completely bewildered. As we talk of peace, we prepare for war.

Former allies are now our enemies, and our opponents of yesterday are now our friends and allies. Those we were taught to hate, we are now courting as friends. We are now spending billions of dollars to prepare erstwhile enemies to fight on our side in defense of the free world, which some of them were trying to destroy only a little more than a decade ago.

MEETING AT THE SUMMIT

On the 18th of this month there will be a meeting of the Chief Executives of Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States for the purpose of finding a way to ease tensions, to stop the cold war, and, we hope, to bring about a peaceful world.

There is an abundance of hope that out of this conference will come at least a lessening of the tensions which are now threatening to erupt into a worldwide contest that might well end civilization.

But while there is hope, there is little actual confidence of success. The President and Secretary of State are warning us not to expect too much.

Here in America we have, as well, complex domestic problems, a welter of controversies over labor-management relations, agricultural price supports, segregation, and other major issues. And to complicate matters, hanging over our heads is the threat of an atomic war that may reduce our civilization and our material accumulations to rubble in a matter of days.

Out of this domestic and international maze of troubles, trials, and tensions, there should grow an irresistible demand for permanent world peace. If peace does not soon come, all of our discoveries and advances, which could make this the Golden Age of all time, may go for naught.

WILSON AND MACARTHUR

Statesmen and other leaders of the world have considered this confusion, this challenging dilemma of 20th century civilization and have come up with some conclusions remarkably similar.

The late President Woodrow Wilson, for example, in his justly famous essay, The Road Away From Revolution, declared:

"The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

"Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country."

A quarter century later, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, on the battleship *Missouri* following the Japanese surrender in 1945, spoke these words:

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recredescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

In the quarter century that separated those two remarkably similar utterances, the world experienced some tremendous upheavals. Depression. The rise of dictators and new aggression. World War II—the greatest blood bath in world history.

COLD WAR AND HOT PEACE

In 1945, the worldwide military conflict ended, and a new era of peace seemed assured. A new international organization, the United Nations was formed as a successor to the ill-fated League of Nations.

Then came more tension, new conflict—Greece; Palestine; Korea; Indochina; Formosa. Cold war and hot peace.

Today, great armies are not marching. Fighting on a large scale has ceased. But the dove of peace, if it is prudent, will not stray far from a bomb-proof shelter. Even though formally proclaimed in many treaties, peace appears to have eluded the nations that fought for it so long and desperately.

That elusive peace, which was not achieved by the military efforts of War II, is today the focus of world attention, and the subject of fierce international debate. Furthermore, the nations who are parties to that debate, are backing up their words with large arrays of military forces, armed with the most powerful and destructive weapons ever known to mankind. In their quest for peace they are prepared to blast and burn their opponents from the face of the earth.

Grave as were the problems which prompted the late President Wilson to issue his warning, which I have just quoted, his times could well be described as an era of peaceful existence compared with the conditions that face the world today.

WILSON'S WARNING AND TODAY

If that warning of our World War I President was justified when it was written, and I believe it was, it should thunder in our ears today.

But our day is not the only period in our country's history when it has faced grave crises brought about by the breaking up of a coalition which had been successful on the field of battle, and also when greedy, power-mad despots were trying to make slaves of the peoples of the world.

Let us take a look at the beginning of our country's history when a similar situation existed. From this vantage point we may get help to sustain us in our present troubles, and we may find some guideposts to a way out of the complex and frightening problems of our times.

Immediately following the War of Independence, there arose a political crisis which threatened to end in disaster for the victorious Colonists.

Indeed, it was generally believed by the political philosophers of that day that the loose federation of American colonies could not possibly survive after the common danger which had held them together was removed.

What influence, what power, they reasoned, could possibly unite the English, the French, the Dutch, the Germans, the Swedes, the Irish—nationalities which, in Europe, had been at war intermittently with each other for over a thousand years? Religious differences also were regarded as a major divisive factor.

A NEW FORCE FOR PEACE

However, it is now clear that the political prophets of those days were not adequately aware of a force that was making itself felt in the New World—a force which was believed to be new, but which we now know grew out of a great truth which is as eternal as time itself.

This truth, and the power that came from it, was revealed by the Creator of this earth to Moses and recorded in Genesis:

"God created man in His own image, male and female created He them."

All the great events hailed as epochs in man's quest for liberty are small, indeed, when compared with the sublime event of man's entry upon this earth.

Here on American soil in the New World, the dignity of man as the child of God, as revealed in Genesis, was recognized in these words, immortalized in the Declaration of Independence.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

There can be no mistake about the purpose of our Founding Fathers in making these declarations on that historic Fourth of July in 1776.

"AUTHOR OF LIBERTY"

These early American patriots were strongly influenced by the noblest teachings of the Old and New Testaments, comprising the Bible. To them, they were the word of God, and He was reverently accepted as the Creator and the author of man's rights and liberties. To them a government without God was unthinkable.

They accepted, in toto, the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and its corrollary, the brotherhood of man, even though they may not have seen clearly all its implications.

It was self-evident to them that all men were created equal before God, because the God they worshipped was a universal God and a just God. Man, His offspring, therefore, was entitled to justice and equality of treatment from Government and before the law.

It also was self-evident to the Founding Fathers that with God as the foundation of all rightful government, man, in all his dignity as a son of God, should have certain rights that are unalienable; that should never be taken away, nor circumscribed, not even by the highest authority of any government established by man.

MAN'S UNALIENABLE RIGHTS

First of these unalienable rights of man was the right to life itself, which was God given. To this right was added the "rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness," without which the right to life becomes meaningless.

At this point, I feel impelled to interpolate a quotation from the prophet Lehi, who declared on this continent centuries before that "men are that they might have joy." There seems to me to be a striking similarity between this statement of doctrine and the thoughts expressed in the language "the pursuit of happiness." The prophet and the Declaration of Independence seem to be in harmony on this point.

Having laid down in general terms what rights man was entitled to as a child of God, the authors of the Declaration proceeded to announce another great principle which was new to the world of that time:

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

GAINS FOR HUMAN DIGNITY

Once again the dignity of man was recognized in this monumental document. As a child of God, man instituted governments, the chief purpose of which was not to rule or master men, but to secure and protect the God-given rights of men.

Government was to be man's servant, his protector; not his master. In order to end despotism from which they suffered, they made it clear that there was no room here for the recognition of the divine right of kings, of dictators, or of statism—the concept of the supreme state which is the basic element of Hitler's national socialism and Lenin's Russian communism.

Under the Declaration of Independence, no leader or government can reign supreme. The document recognizes and implies that man, the offspring of God, was placed on the world, organized for his use, for a definite purpose; that man himself is the source of the powers that government is entitled to assume in the role of his servant and protector. As the preamble to the Constitution puts it, "We the people" are sovereign.

CONTINUING THE STRUGGLE

Upon the premise of human dignity under God, the framers of the Declaration of Independence created a political enumeration of human rights that is still without equal in world history. As much as they had accomplished, however, their work did not end there. In fact, their work had only begun.

Confronted as they were with the rapid disintegration of the loose federation which had fought the war against the mother country, the leaders of the American independence movement put themselves to the task of creating that government which would secure the rights they had declared were the birthright of man, and for which they had made heavy sacrifices of blood and treasure through 8 long years of cruel warfare.

THE MAYFLOWER COMPACT

They had before them no written constitutions of other countries which they could adopt as a pattern for a new government in a lew land.

They undoubtedly were profoundly impressed by the Mayflower Compact, which had been adopted on November 11, 1620, and which has been described as the first constitution for the complete government of the people under its jurisdiction on the North American Continent.

But the Mayflower Compact set up no governmental structure to carry out its simple and solemn affirmation of the moral law, which, in essence, was the Christian religion.

But even with this inspiring document before them, the framers of the Constitution were plowing virgin soil in drafting a written Constitution, providing for a representative form of government. How brilliantly they performed their task is now a matter of history.

The Constitution, together with the government provided under it, has been one of the great milestones in the history of human liberty and of nations.

PRINCIPLES UNDER ATTACK

In spite of the fact that the principles, set forth in the Declaration of Independence and translated into action in the Constitution, seemed to be the cement which held the coalition of colonists together during the trying days following the victorious conclusion of the Revolutionary War; in spite of the fact that the Government set up under the provisions of the Constitution has survived a bitter Civil War and has been the chief defender of the liberties of the world in two world wars; and in spite of the fact, let me repeat, that America is one of the mightest nations in existence, in spite of all these demonstrated achievements, to which many more can be added, there are Americans who attack the Constitution and our form of Government as being outmoded, and inefficient. Others, including Communists and their sympathizers, have joined in the attack, on other grounds.

These critics, sometimes unwittingly, have urged upon us strange doctrines and practices of totalitarianism which they believe will enable us to be more efficient and to better meet the needs of an atomic age. They have a feeling that we cannot act fast enough. They chafe at delays resulting from the checks and balances built into the Constitution to prevent despotism. They become unduly alarmed when demagogs appear to have achieved success in putting into temporary eclipse the Bill of Rights.

Is there merit to these criticisms?

RIGHTS OF MAN FOREMOST

Let us, first of all, recall the principle objective of the Constitution. It was to provide a Government which would protect or secure the rights of man as stated in the Declaration of Independence.

It was to protect the ordinary citizen against despotism, either of kings, emperors, dictators, or of statism.

In order to accomplish this high objective, the Constitution not only had to designate the officials and the framework to carry out the ordinary functions of government for the common welfare, but it also had to protect man against the possible invasion of his rights by his own Government.

It did that in the division of powers into three coordinate branches of Government, each to be a check upon the other two.

To make doubly sure that a citizen's inalienable rights would be fully protected, the Bill of Rights was added in the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment made it clear that the only powers the Federal Government had were those which were expressly delegated in the Constitution. All the remaining powers were to belong either to the States or the people.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The Bill of Rights also listed the freedoms that belong to the individual citizen no matter how humble his station in life—rights that no one, not even the Government itself, could take away or abridge.

It began that impressive list with the statement that no law "respecting an establishment of religion; or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," could be passed by Congress.

Other rights were enumerated and, again to make sure that nothing had been overlooked, the ninth amendment declared: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Implicit in the Constitution is the important right of a citizen to own property and to enjoy the fruits of his own labor. The Bill of Rights protects this right, important to each of us.

PROTECTS AGAINST DESPOTISM

The Constitution is the only written basic law of long duration that has been able to protect the people against the despotism of their own Government. In this field it has been eminently successful.

Even in so-called democracies where the parliamentary system exists, parliaments are supreme and there are few rights of the individual citizen which parliament cannot abridge or take away.

Tonight I have touched upon a few of the highlights of the American story—a story that has been a great inspiration to oppressed and enslaved peoples throughout the world.

I have purposely ignored our great progress in the field of the material. While that progress is important as a part of the story, to me it is not nearly so significant a phase in our development as the great spiritual forces that were set in motion in the beginning of the history of this country.

I have tried to emphasize principles and causes rather than results, for the reason that the material results speak largely for themselves.

THE TRUTH OF AMERICA'S POWER

The story of the great truth of America's power, and what was done about putting the force generated by that truth to work for the good of man, has been one of mankind's most uplifting achievements. It has proved its worth in making this country great, strong, and peace-loving, and it provides a sound and effective base for any diplomatic conferences or negotiations in which we may become involved in our positive efforts to attain peace throughout the world.

In man's long quest for permanent peace—a just peace wherein man may enjoy to the fullest the freedoms under which he can make the greatest progress both spiritually and materially—it has been, and can continue to be, one of the world's strongest forces.

The concept that man is a child of God, entitled to "walk in dignity" upon the earth, and endowed with unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, is a highly volatile force in human and governmental relations. This force, developed in righteousness is our strongest weapon in the fight for permanent peace in the current worldwide conflict of competing ideologies.

A MESSAGE FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLES

Our biggest problem is to get this phase of the story, this complete picture of whatever true greatness America has achieved, through the iron curtains erected by despotisms, to the people behind them. These enslaved and long-suffering people are God's children, entitled to walk in dignity before their fellow men and to enjoy the God-given rights that many of us here in America take so much for granted.

The oppressed and enslaved people of the world must be reached by us and shown, by our teaching and above all, by our example, that this Christian-American approach to government heals and blesses, instead of bringing sorrow and destruction. It seeks no power to enslave men. It does not covet their material possessions. It is motivated by love instead of hatred. Under its benign influence, we become more than ever our brother's keeper.

If we appreciate these truths, and if we believe in our hearts that they are true, then it is up to each of us to embark upon a personal crusade to live the kind of a life that our inspired Government demands of us, and to communicate these ideals to the other peoples of the earth who can profit from them.

THE NEED FOR A MORAL CRUSADE

The need for such a moral crusade was very effectively described by President Eisenhower in a 1954 speech before the World Christian Endeavor Convention. In the course of this remarkable address, he made this ringing declaration:

"Because, my friends, though today we must remain strong, we must remain strong in all the economic and the scientific affairs of the world, we must remain strong militarily tor the protection of our firesides and our rights to prevent domination by those who would seek to enthrall us, yet bullets and guns, and planes, and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace.

"Only a great moral crusade, to determine that men shall rise above this conception of materialism, rise above it and live as people who attempt to express in some faint and feeble way their conceptions of what the Almighty would have us do, that is the force that will win through to victory, and the world will have prosperity and peace—prosperity beyond all imaginings of the past. And science will be developed and devoted to the happiness, the welfare of man, and not to his destruction, and all of us can live together peacefully and happily."

This is a monumental philosophy of the spiritual forces of our Republic that our President will carry with him into the forthcoming conference at the summit with other world leaders.

PRESIDENT NEEDS OUR PRAYERS

He and the others who sit in council with him will need the benefit of our personal interest and the support of our prayers. Yes, we should pray that God will bless and inspire those whom we believe to be our enemies.

The quest for peace is not easy. The road is tortuous and long. But the goal is worth all the effort required, worth working for everlastingly and unstintingly. God grant that the avenue of action, the principles of sound human relations, based upon Christian ideals and philosophy, and so clearly charted by our forefathers nearly two centuries ago, will guide us to that glorious goal, when all of God's children can walk the earth with dignity.

Power for Development of Metallurgical Industry in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to the development of power for the advancement of the metallurgical industry, and a nearby supply of dolomite in the so-called Inland Empire of the State of Washington, together with a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Availability of power in the Pacific Northwest coupled with a nearby supply of dolomite caused the War Production Board to select Spokane, Wash. for the production of magnesium to further the war effort. This action in 1943, during World War II, was followed by the Defense Plant Corporation's constructing a metallurgical plant in Spokane with electrical furnaces of unique design, using 10 kilowatts for each pound of aluminum produced.

The source of power for this new industry was the Grand Coulee Dam where construction costs are being repaid to the Federal Government with interest.

Many uninformed have considered the benefits of Grand Coulee Dam as regional rather than national in scope. Nevertheless, the power generated has played its part in winning World War II, in the Korean conflict, and has started new industries such as this one.

The plant has since been leased to a private firm, the Pacific Northwest Alloys, Inc., for the production of ferro-silicon and low ferro-chrome alloys.

Last fall, the Emergency Procurement Service of GSA made a major contribution to the advancement of the ferro-chrome industry by contracting with the Spokane magnesium plant for the conversion, purification, and concentration of low grade Government-owned chrome from Montana and Oregon for the Government stockpile. This initial contract for 73,000 tons has resulted in a very successful operation and has brought the approbation of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce as evinced by the following letter from them to the Administrator of GSA.

I join the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane in thanking the Emergency Procurement Service and General Services Administration for their foresight in recognizing and making a success of this operation.

SPOKANE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Spokane, Wash., June 6, 1955.

Hon. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator, General Services Administration, General Services Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: The Spokane Chamber of Commerce has been prone to ask favors from Government officials and to criticize them on occasion, but unfortunately has not been equally prone to commend the same officials. This letter is an exception.

We of the chamber of commerce wish to express to you our gratification over the outcome of the contract between the Emergency Procurement Service of the General Services Administration and the Pacific Northwest Alloys Co., which was negotiated in August 1954.

The contract has meant a great deal to Spokane and to the company, and I believe, to the Government as well. We believe you can take a great deal of pride in your planning which made the contract possible. Prior to this contract period sizable quantities of low-grade chrome ores produced in Montana and Oregon were considered to be economically unusable and not acceptable for movement to stockpiles due to their low chrome content. In fact, at the time this contract was entered into by the General Services Administration there was question in some quarters that the Government had contracted for a product that could not be produced, or if produced, would not be of economic use by the steel making industry.

The successful beneficiating, converting and concentrating of these low grade chrome ores into low carbon ferrochrome for the defense stockpile by the Pacific Northwest Alloys definitely demonstrates that the action of the General Services Administration in entering into the purchase contract for these ores was in the Government's interest. We believe that the results can now be definitely evaluated and we are taking this occasion to list them as we see them, both those for the Spokane area and for the Government. The contract has benefited Spokane and the Inland Empire by:

1. Keeping the Mead, Wash. plant in operation: At the time this contract was received there existed a strong possibility that the company, due to a continuing low in commercial ferrochrome purchasing, might be forced not only to terminate production, but even to return the plant to the Government.

The receipt of this contract permitted the company to not only continue operations, but also to bridge the period of low commercial buying so it is now operating at full capacity. This activity has resulted in continuing work for 150 people and the employment of 337 new workers, for a present total of 487 employees, who spend a monthly payroll of $200,000 in the Spokane area.

2. Firmly establishing new type ferrochrome industry in the Spokane area: Parallel with its Government contract the company has, by using purchased low chrome content ores, developed a sizable production of its new low carbon ferrochrome for commercial use. The steel industry reports the company's new product is giving excellent results in making of stainless steels, due to ease of handling, low product loss during addition, and reduction in steel costs due to iron content gains by its use.

3. Opening up new potential market for Montana and Oregon low chrome ore production: Prior to the company developing its new process and receipt of the present Government contract which proved desirable low carbon ferrochrome could be produced economically from low chrome content ores, Northwest low chrome ores were "begging" on the market. This was due to the excessive high cost of upgrading the ores to produce an acceptable and usable ferrochrome under existent processing methods.

The Government has benefited from the contract by:

1. Effecting conversion of materials generally considered to be valueless into stockpile product: Prior to signing of this contract, low grade chrome ores were generally considered valueless. Negotiation of contract with Pacific Northwest Alloys permitted conversion of this material into a stockpile product which can be put into immediate use by the steel industry in case of national emergency.

2. Increasing national stockpile of low carbon ferrochrome: By astute negotiation of terms and prices for the current contract, national stockpile of low-carbon ferrochrome has been increased at an economically attractive market price.

3. Assisting in establishment of manufacture of new metallurgical product: Through volume required by the Government contract the economic and feasible manufacture of a new metallurgical product, which has now proven to be cost saving to the steel industry, has been established.

We wish to thank you and your deputy, Commissioner A. J. Walsh, of the Emergency Procurement Service, for your foresight in recognizing the responsibility of converting these ores by Pacific Northwest Alloys, and negotiating the contract with the company. The success of the operation has certainly vindicated your judgment.

Yours sincerely,
L. W. Markham, *General Manager.*

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, three physical and geological difficulties in addition to Echo Park make the project unreasonable and impractical.

(a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam. In October 1954 Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were quite concerned as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between October 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before your Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of the other.

The minority members of your committee are not satisfied that the Bureau of Reclamation officials have proved their case sufficiently that a 700-foot dam can be safely constructed at the Glen Canyon site without costly additional safety features.

(b) The construction of Glen Canyon Dam will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge. Rainbow Natural Bridge is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. Dynamite will be exploded within a mile on either side of the bridge, thus jeopardizing a rare natural wonder. In addition, seepage from the Glen Canyon Reservoir may back up under Rainbow Arch. If the sandstone of Rainbow Bridge gets wet and soaked up with water, it will be reduced in strength and may crumble.

(c) Large quantities of water may be absorbed and lost in the walls of Glen Canyon. Bureau officials concede that at least 3 million acre-feet of water will seep into the porous sandstone walls of Glen Canyon, but they failed to make studies to determine the exact quantity of water that may be lost in this way. However, it has been independently calculated, assuming 250 miles of canyon wall and an average depth of 200 feet, that 32 million acre-feet would be absorbed by the porous sandstone walls. This is more than the storage capacity of the entire Glen Canyon Reservoir. Stacked on a football field, this amount of water would tower over 6,000 miles into the sky. It would be taken out of use forever in this highly arid region that so badly needs every available drop of water.

Toledo Doctors, Dentists, Lawyers Ask Social Security Coverage for Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a bill which would make important amendments to the Social Security Act. One measure would make women eligible for social-security benefits at 62 years of age instead of 65. Another amendment permits totally disabled workers to receive payments at 50 instead of 65. A third proposal, one which I sponsored, continues for life, if necessary, payments of benefits for mentally or physically handicapped children.

The final provision which we consider today extends social-security coverage to all self-employed professional groups except doctors. Because I wanted to know the views of those most directly affected by such a law, I wrote to all members of the interested professions in Lucas County to ask if they wanted coverage for themselves. Of a total of 1,507 questionnaires sent, 517 replies have been received. Here is a tabulation of answers to the question, "Do you favor extension of the present Social Security Act to include members of your profession in its coverage?"

	Yes	No	On voluntary basis	Keogh plan
Lawyers	134	22	35	9
Physicians	85	60	28	19
Dentists	69	13	4	0
Optometrists	15	2	0	3
Chiropractors	3	0	0	2
Chiropodists	3	1	0	0
Veterinarians	1	3	0	0
Total	310	101	67	33

(Six persons gave no opinion or expressed views not included above.)

If the results of this questionnaire in the Toledo, Ohio, area are similar to attitudes in other parts of the United States, self-employed professional persons emphatically believe that the benefits of our social-security system should be theirs, also. A number of professionals indicated their support of the plan sponsored by our colleague, Mr. KEOGH, which would make deductible from Federal income taxes payments to specified types of private retirement plans by professionals and other self-employed persons. I believe that Congress should support this proposal also in order to encourage those persons who have their own business or profession to set up their own retirement programs. This measure, as well as the important social-security amendments we are voting on today, will do much to strengthen the stability of the American economy while at the same time reinforcing the widespread purchasing power which is the basis of our Nation's economic greatness.

Livestock Sold on Account of Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, if the parliamentary situation permitted, I would offer the following amendment to H. R. 7201:

> Page 38, line 3, after "SEC. 6," strike out "effective date" and insert "Livestock sold on account of drought.
>
> "Section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (f) thereof as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) of such section the following new subsection:
>
> "'(f) Livestock sold on account of drought: The sale of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock—
>
> "'(1) are so held in an area in respect of which the President determines under the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, that a major disaster exists because of drought, and
>
> "'(2) are sold (whether before or after such determination) by such taxpayer solely on account of such drought.'
>
> "SEC. 7. Effective date."

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 83d Congress, with the extreme drought conditions covering much of the livestock-producing areas of this country, an amendment was proposed to section 1033, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amendment to H. R. 6440, 83d Congress, which passed this House on July 29, 1953. This was known as the Millikin amendment. As I understand the situation, it had been studied by the Department and accepted as a sound and necessary revision to the code, if our livestock men, already in distressed conditions, were to be given fair treatment under our tax laws. The Members of this House are more familiar than I with the situation that prevailed in the closing days of the 83d Congress in the other body. As it was reported to me, this was one of the bills that everyone thought would pass but which got lost in the shuffle.

In the first days of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 207 to accomplish the purpose. In fact, it went a little farther. Everyone with whom I have talked on the committee, or in the Department, seemed to appreciate the necessity of solving this problem if we are to be fair taxwise to the rancher in his hour of distress, and also in the best interests of the Government who collects large sums from our ranchers in Federal income taxes. There, however, seems to be reluctance on the part of both the Department, and members of the committee, to open up the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in this session of Congress. In all fairness, I think that this is something that needs to be taken care of now.

Under present law, a livestock man who is forced, because of drought conditions, to convert his breeding herd, or a substantial part thereof, into cash rather than see them starve, is subject to taxes on his gain. Because of supply and demand, when everyone over a large area sells the price is low. When the drought is broken and he tries to get back into the business, he is left, after paying his capital-gain tax, with only 74-cent dollars with which to buy higher priced cows than he originally sold. This simply means that the economic disaster to our area is strung out over an unreasonably long period of time. To the Government it means that the rancher cannot readily get back on a profitable basis, where the Government will be sharing 20 percent or more of his income by reason of our progressive income tax on ordinary income. Therefore, the Government stands to lose large sums of money from income taxes unless this amendment is enacted into law.

This amendment would simply give the livestock man who is forced to sell breeding stock because of drought conditions the same treatment as any other business man who suffers a loss because of an act of God, such as fire, and so forth. I urge its consideration and adoption at the earliest possible moment.

Gas Bill Gyrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is difficult, if not impossible, for almost anyone to understand the many and complicated maneuvers which have characterized the handling of the controversial natural-gas bill since it was reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 8 by a vote of 16–15.

However, one able, objective and highly competent reporter made a significant statement on television last Sunday evening. I refer to Joseph F. McCaffrey, representing McCaffrey reports and one of those entitled to admission to the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries of Commerce.

He said:

> Let's take a look now at the newsmakers of next week * * * and the weeks to come.
>
> The highly controversial natural gas bill, which has been lying dormant in the House of Representatives, may be a newsmaker either this week or the week after.
>
> A sudden move will be made to bring it up for a floor vote before this session adjourns. Its supporters figure it has a better chance of getting through this session than next year. Next year is an election year and many eastern and midwestern Members will be a lot more sensitive to the consumer pressure against the bill in 1956 than they may be today.

The events of the last 2 days and particularly of the last few hours bear out completely the accuracy of his statement.

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, Before the San Francisco Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I was privileged to deliver before the San Francisco Labor Council dinner on the occasion of the ceremonies in San Francisco, commemorating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL, JUNE 24, 1955

It is a pleasure and a privilege to join with you today in a discussion of the United Nations, and the role of organized labor in international organizations dedicated to the fulfillment of the objectives of the United Nations Charter.

We are all aware of the vital role which labor plays in a democracy. We are also aware of the fact that in a totalitarian society the trade unions are among the first casualties when the dictators take over. Labor plays an equally vital role in the conduct of our foreign policy, because no matter how well conceived our foreign policy may be, its success is dependent in large measure on our internal strength. And we are proud in the knowledge that American labor is a vital component of this strength and provides an indispensable source of vigor and support which enables our Government to conduct its relations with other nations to the best advantage of our people.

It is, perhaps, startling to realize that 10 years have passed since the representatives of 50 nations assembled in this beautiful and historic city to draft an instrument which was intended to represent the culmination of man's eternal search for peace and security. This instrument was, of course, the

Charter of the United Nations. By adhering to it, the original 50 states, together with the 10 additional states which subsequently joined the Organization, solemnly pledged themselves to repudiate war and aggression forever after. Equally important was the fact that they established the most promising and potentially effective international organization ever created in the history of the world.

Ordinary men and women everywhere in the world do not demand too much of life. What they seek and yearn for is a just peace, a recognition of the dignity and worth of man and his right to the fundamental freedoms and decent standards of living for themselves and their children. It is these needs—so simple to enumerate—yet sometimes so difficult to achieve—which led to the establishment of the United Nations 10 years ago.

As set forth in its charter, the major purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of world peace, security, and economic stability by means of international cooperation and understanding. Underlying this objective is the proposition that if the causes of international tension and disunity can be removed or reduced, these basic demands of mankind can be met.

By what specific means did the founders of the United Nations expect to accomplish these fundamental objectives?

First, by removing the causes of war through the creation of conditions necessary to peace and friendly relations among people everywhere—higher standards of living, improved health conditions, increased food production and adequate distribution, the improvement and expansion of commerce, and a broader acceptance of fundamental human rights.

Second, by providing a mechanism for the adjustment of differences which endanger international peace, and security when normal diplomatic intercourse has failed; and

Third, by providing the means for building collective security against acts of aggression, threats to and breaches of the peace, and for using diplomatic, economic, and, ultimately, military measures when it became necessary to prevent the outbreak or spread of hostilities.

The United Nations is not a superstate. It is composed of sovereign states which have given it only limited powers, under which the U. N. Organization may impinge upon the sovereignty of its members only to the extent that they have voluntarily permitted by their adherence to the charter. Since the United Nations is not a superstate, it cannot, without the cooperation of member nations, settle dispute, safeguard collective security, maintain peace, or launch economic and social programs and projects designed to eliminate the tensions and unrest which often lead to war. A further consideration is the fact that the United Nations was not designed to make the peace following World War II, but rather to maintain the peace once it was established.

The United States supports the United Nations because the charter expresses our fundamental principles and objectives in this very difficult and complicated world. Fulfillment of the aims declared in the charter will best advance the interests of the United States—for these aims—peace founded on justice; freedom, economic and social progress for ourselves and for all peoples—represent and summarize the domestic and foreign policy goals of the United States. It is because realization of the aims expressed in the United Nations Charter will materially advance United States interests that support of the United Nations is a fundamental element in our foreign policy.

Let us examine briefly the machinery which was created to enable the United Nations to accomplish its objectives.

The United Nations was established with six principal organs: (1) the General Assembly; (2) the Security Council; (3) the Economic and Social Council; (4) the Trusteeship Council; (5) the International Court of Justice; and (6) the Secretariat. Each of these performs important functions.

The General Assembly, consisting of all of the members of the United Nations, was designed as the center or core. Although the General Assembly was originally designed as a forum or town meeting of the world, it has developed very considerably following the paralysis of the Security Council by the Soviets.

In any event, I believe that the greatest value and importance of the General Assembly lies in the fact that any point of trouble or discord in the international scene may be brought out into the open. The Assembly is not paralyzed by the veto power. Because in the limelight of public opinion, even the most powerful States do pay heed to the conclusions reached in such public discussions, the General Assembly has assumed far greater importance than was originally envisioned by the founders of the United Nations. In fact, it may be said that it has assumed an entirely new role.

The Security Council has, as its basic function, the maintenance of international peace and security, including the regulation of armaments. It is concerned primarily, according to the charter, with disputes or situations which may endanger peace and security, or which actually result in the occurrence of violence. In the first circumstance, its function is to conciliate differences; in the second, to repress or check any resort to force. It also exercises a watchful eye over international relations for any evidence of a dangerous situation, and was designed, under certain circumstances, to be the enforcement arm of the General Assembly.

The inclusion within the United Nations structure of its third organ, the Economic and Social Council, is a recognition of the fact that conditions of stability and well-being are necessary for friendly relations among nations and that the achievement of these conditions is conducive to peace. Within its orbit are the promotion of higher standards of living; full employment, conditions of economic and social progress and development, solutions of international economic, social, and health problems; and universal respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without discrimination as to race, sex, language, and religion.

Because international economic and social problems are so complex, 10 agencies and a number of functional and regional commissions were established, charged with important duties in the social and economic fields. Of the remaining principal organs—the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat—their titles indicate their functions.

It is indeed unfortunate that until the Korean conflict, the efforts of the United Nations in pioneering for peace have not been as well known as the Great Power disagreements.

International disunity and conflict inevitably receive greater attention and publicity than do harmony, unity, and cooperation. As a result, the East-West conflicts and disagreements over political and security matters have monopolized public attention and have tended to obscure the many important, but unspectacular, United Nations achievements which have done much to promote peace and stability in the world.

When one considers the deep antagonisms which rend this world, it is remarkable that the U. N. exists at all. But what is even more remarkable is that it not only exists—it lives, it thrives as a positive, creative force.

Looking backward, we cannot fail to be impressed by the ability which the U. N. has shown to adapt itself to changing, unforeseen circumstances. It has demonstrated to a marked degree the flexibility which is characteristic of the most valuable and enduring human institutions. It has likewise shown a high quality of courage and a remarkable singleness of purpose.

The United Nations is in fact a declaration of interdependency. The charter of the U. N., conceived and written in the United States under the auspices of our Government, is the 20th century proclamation of peace, freedom, and security. It represents for the world what our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution mean to America.

But liberty and justice are not attained by their mere proclamation. Surely we Americans know that freedom and security represent the continuing challenge to liberty-loving people in every generation. We Americans should be proud of our role in the U. N., and our active participation within its councils. Our traditions, our history, have uniquely prepared us for a role of leadership in creating a world order based on the enduring principles of freedom, justice, and equality. It is to these principles that the United Nations is dedicated.

Rather than withdraw from the responsibilities and task of achieving the hopes and aspirations of the United Nations Charter, we should declare to the world, day in and day out, that the United States will proceed with confidence, with determination, and with perseverance to the end of strengthening the U. N. and all of its agencies. We are people of peace. Ours is a government of law. Ours is a society of equal opportunity. Surely these credentials qualify us as an active participant in the greatest international organization the world has ever known.

The singleness of purpose of the U. N. is worth emphasizing. The discordant clatter of the Soviet bloc sometimes tends to drown out, but never to destroy, the underlying harmony of the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations. This underlying harmony, this fundamental singleness of purpose, has been demonstrated time after time on crucial votes which have seen 45 or 50 or 55 nations of the world alined on one side and the 5 Soviet bloc members braying to themselves on the other.

It is this singleness of purpose, I believe, which has enabled the U. N. not only to hold together but to grow in stature and prestige despite the trying events of the last 10 years—events which no one could have possibly foreseen 10 years ago.

The fundamental difficulty which the U. N. has had to survive and which its founders did not foresee has been the cold war. The U. N. was founded on the premise of Big Five unanimity. Rarely, perhaps never, in the history of human affairs has an institution built on such a shaky premise flourished so mightily.

The fact that the U. N. has flourished is in itself the most eloquent and impressive testimony to the need for the U. N. and to the determination of the people of the world to make it work.

It is important to recognize that in its fight to survive during the cold war, the UN has gone through structural and institutional changes which make it something different from what it was 10 years ago. As the Security Council has been frustrated by Soviet abuse of the veto, for example, the General Assembly has gradually and of necessity assumed certain functions which the Charter contemplates should be performed by the Security Council. The uniting for peace resolution which the Assembly adopted in 1950 established a procedure whereby if the Security Council is unable, because of a veto, to act on a threat to the peace, the Assembly itself may take the matter up immediately—in emergency session on 24 hours' notice if necessary—and recommend collective measures, including the use of armed force.

Let it be noted that the word "recommend" is used. The Assembly cannot compel action. But the action will be taken if the governments of the world want it to be taken. An Assembly recommendation can be effective to the extent that the U. N.'s members are willing and able to make it so.

This is just another way of saying that the United Nations is what its members make it. Those members are all sovereign nations in their own right, and they lose none of their sovereign capacities by participating in U. N. proceedings.

There are some people who profess alarm over the changes which have taken place in the U. N. as a result of the cold war. In my judgment, the changes, on the contrary, are cause of satisfaction. What sort of human institution is it that does not change in the course of time to adapt itself to changes in its environment? The fact that the U. N. has changed has nothing to do with any imaginary, Machiavellian plot to subvert the sovereignty of the United States; it is, instead, indicative of a healthy vitality on the part of the U. N. And we should all rejoice that this is so.

The member nations of the U. N. have had the courage and the wisdom to meet collectively a series of crises and challenges which in their gravity and complexity far surpass the events which led to the failure of the League of Nations. The list of accomplishments of the U. N. in keeping the peace is impressive. I shall name only a few of the most outstanding.

The U. N. was scarcely a year old when it was confronted with the refusal of the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Iran. The U. N. met this challenge to its authority and Soviet troops were withdrawn.

The second major problem involved Syria and Lebanon. Both of these countries requested the immediate withdrawal of British and French troops from their territory. Although the Soviet Union blocked by the veto the Council's proposal for a gradual withdrawal of these troops, both France and Great Britain announced that they would abide by the expressed desire of the majority of the Council and the troops were withdrawn.

When Greece complained that her independence and territorial integrity were being threatened by neighboring States the Security Council appointed a commission to make an on-the-spot investigation and to report back to the Council. When the Commission reported that the Greek complaints were justified, the Council's efforts to carry out the recommendations of the Commission were frustrated by Soviet vetoes. The matter was ultimately transferred to the General Assembly on the proposal of the United States. The Assembly adopted a resolution calling on Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to cease their activities, and then established a Special Committee to keep the situation under continuing surveillance and to keep the General Assembly informed of all developments. The moral pressure of this action by the rest of the organized world, acting in concert gave strength to the Greek Government.

In Indonesia, the United Nations first succeeded in obtaining a cease-fire in the fighting between the Dutch and Indonesian forces. Through the efforts of the Security Council, a truce was secured and agreements were made terminating hostilities and affording full independence to the 76 million people inhabiting Indonesia.

In India, large-scale war was averted as a result of the efforts of the Security Council with respect to the Kashmir question which involved a dispute between India and Pakistan. The Council established an on-the-spot commission and obtained a cooling-off period. Ultimately a cease-fire was arranged and open warfare was terminated.

In 1948, when the Soviets engaged in their unlawful blockade of Berlin, war clouds gathered rapidly and ominously and it began to appear that armed conflagration would break out at any moment. As a result of a meeting of the parties in the forum of the United Nations, a truce was worked out and the matter was ultimately settled without armed conflict.

In Palestine, when full-scale war broke out between the Arabs and the Jews, the United Nations stepped in, obtained a cease-fire and ultimately an armistice, supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission. Two years later, again as a result of the United Nations action, the new state of Israel was born and a serious threat to the peace of the Middle East was averted.

In Korea due to the failure of Soviet-American negotiations concerning the establishment of an independent government for Korea in 1947 and 1948, the United States submitted the problem to the General Assembly. Under United Nations auspices, elections were held and an independent democratic government was established in South Korea.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea during the summer of 1950 put the United Nations to its first real test. Lacking the armed force which was envisioned by the charter, as a result of Soviet refusal to cooperate in its creation, the Security Council, in the absence of Russia, immediately took the only action possible under the circumstances. It adopted resolutions declaring North Korea's invasion of South Korea to be a breach of the peace and called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel. This action was based not only upon the complaint of the United States, but upon the report of the United Nations on-the-spot Commision on Korea. The resolution also called upon members to lend every assistance to the United Nations and to refrain from giving any assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The subsequent events are now history. We all know that the United States carried a greater part of the burden. However, we also know that armed forces of 16 other member nations fought with our forces and that never before had the principle of collective security been so firmly established; never have so many nations acted together in defense of that principle; never have the rights of the weak against the strong been so stoutly protected.

For one reason or another, some people in the United States have sought to distort history on this point. Let us keep the record straight.

The United States did not fight the Korean war under either the compulsion or the direction of the United Nations. The truth of the matter is that United States forces had already been ordered into Korea before the United Nations intervened. And despite all the hue and cry which we heard later—after the going got tough—no voice was raised in serious protest at the time of the decision to fight in Korea.

The principle of collective security was at stake in Korea, and both the United States and the United Nations rose to meet the challenge. But also at stake in Korea were the vital interests of the United States—to a greater extent than those of any other U. N. member and so much so, in fact, that no less an authority than Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in regard to our intervention in Korea:

"I believe that the vital interests of the United States would have justified our taking this action alone, if we had had to."

After all, it was United States forces in Japan which would have been threatened by a Soviet-dominated Korea. It was the United States defense line in the Western Pacific which would have been breached.

Nor is there any basis for the complaint that American troops were sent to fight in Korea under United Nations command. There was a United Nations command, true; but from the beginning to the end of the Korean fighting, an American general was at the head of it, and he got his orders, not from U. N. headquarters in New York, but from the Pentagon in Washington.

Now, it is fashionable to criticize other members of the United Nations for not putting more troops into Korea. We all hope they will do more in the unhappy event that such a situation arises again. But the constant repetition of this complaint, like a broken phonograph record, obscures the contribution which other U. N. members did make to the Korean action. Ambassador Lodge has estimated that if it had not been for these contributions, the United States would have had to put two additional divisions of its own in the field. American casualties in Korea were tragically high; but if it had not been for the U. N., they would have been even higher.

It seems to me that the real significance of this action is, first, that it constituted the first collective international force and action in support of United Nations principles; second, it stimulated the United Nations to develop new machinery and better methods for meeting future threats; third, it aroused the free peoples of the world to the necessity of mobilizing their strength for defense; and fourth, it strengthened the will of small nations to resist by proving that they will not have to stand alone against aggression.

Important and impressive as it is, peacemaking is only one of the accomplishments of the United Nations. The flexibility with which the U. N. has met the demands of Asia and Africa for political independence and economic development is only slightly less remarkable than the manner in which it has coped with the exigencies of the cold war. And in the long run, this phase of U. N. activities may be even more significant and productive of international peace and prosperity.

The United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program is perhaps the best known of these activities, but it is only one of many things the U. N. is doing to promote human welfare and economic development. There is, in addition, the whole area of specialized agencies—the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labor Organization, the Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the Universal Postal Union, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

But apart from these efforts, vast progress has been made in a number of fields, particularly in regard to technical assistance. In this country, for instance, where many of us are inclined to take our living standard for granted, not many realize that out of the world's 2,400 million inhabitants about 1 out of every 2 persons lives where there is generally not enough food. That his daily diet is only 400 calories above starvation level and 750 below that enjoyed by the more fortunate one-third of mankind. Every day there are an additional 80,000 new mouths to feed in a world whose farmlands have not yielded enough food to keep pace with population growth.

One person in eight suffers from malaria. More than 8,000 a day die from it, on the average. Even more suffer and die from tuberculosis. In many sections of quite a number of countries, 250 or more children out of every 1,000 die before they reach the age of 1 year. Sometimes this infant death rate may be as high as 400 per 1,000 a year.

About 50 percent of mankind can neither read nor write. Earnings are also extremely low. Two out of every 3 people earn, on the average, less than $200 a year, or its equivalent. Of these half earn less than $50 a year.

These are ugly, indeed dangerous, facts about the Twentieth Century, which so often has been called an age of progress. These deplorable facts represent the urgency of our challenge and responsibility.

In large part following American leadership and inspiration, the members of the U. N. in 1950 put in motion an action program to send experts from the U. N. and its family of specialized agencies into farms, homes, hospitals, schools, workshops, and government offices in the less-developed countries throughout the world to help peoples to help themselves. It also sends young men and women to study and to be trained abroad.

The UNETAP in 1954 sent more than 1,500 experts of 63 nationalities to 71 countries and territories and awarded more than 1,500 fellowships or scholarships to nationals of 86 countries and territories.

The problems of the less developed countries are by their very nature slow to resolve. There are no miracles that can be wrought. It takes time and patience to train teachers, doctors, fishermen, foresters, farmers, and technicians to grow more food, to produce more goods, to use natural resources more efficiently. It obviously takes time to teach people who cannot read or write how to grow more food or to use modern machinery. This is a long-term job. It must be tackled vigorously and supported with capital investment to make a lasting impression against age-old primitive conditions and inertia. The U. N. technical-assistance program offers one of the best ways in which nations can work together to help people help themselves.

Through labor, agricultural, commercial attaché specialists and other officers in our Foreign Service, through economic aid and our mutual-security program, through the technical-assistance program, through assisting the development of international labor standards, and in many other ways our Government is constantly seeking to aid our friends and allies to develop conditions within which accelerated progress for all elements of their populations will be possible.

Let us examine briefly at this time, the vital mission and wonderful record of accomplishment of the International Labor Organization which is one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, although it antedates that organization by some 26 years.

In its original statement of purpose, contained in the preamble of its constitution, the ILO was to deal with the regulation of hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week; the regulation of the labor supply; the prevention of unemployment; the provision of an adequate living wage; the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment; and many other matters which today are commonplace in many countries of the world.

In 1944, after a quarter of a century of successful operation, the International Labor Organization, meeting in Philadelphia, reaffirmed its program for peace in what became known as the Declaration of Philadelphia.

Among the ringing statements included in this declaration was the statement that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere." This declaration was said by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt to sum up "the aspirations of an epoch which has known two world wars" and "may well acquire" a historical significance similar to that of the Declaration of Independence of the United States.

The declaration reaffirmed the fundamental principles upon which the International Labor Organization was founded, citing in particular the following:

That labor is not a commodity.

That freedom of expression and of association are essential to sustained progress.

That poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere.

The basic aim of the International Labor Organization is to promote social justice in all countries, and to this end it collects and disseminates information about labor and social conditions, formulates international standards, and supervises their national application. It also provides technical assistance in carrying out social and economic development programs.

The record of the International Labor Organization in steady, solid achievement and progress toward the accomplishment of its basic aims and objectives is truly outstanding. In fact, I believe that any objective appraisal must lead to the conclusion that of all the organized international cooperative efforts now going on, the ILO has clearly traveled the greatest distance in the achievement of its goals.

Of course, we know that in social and economic affairs the ultimate goals are never fully achieved. However, we know and recognize solid progress when we see it, and I am proud of the fine record of this great organization in improving conditions of labor and labor's status throughout the world, and I am proud of the role which organized labor, in general, and American organized labor, in particular, has played in the achievement of this great progress.

We know that our great labor federations and international unions have long been in the vanguard of those who understand the strategic importance and implications of the labor factor in the struggle against Soviet communism. Through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and personal representatives abroad, American labor has been active in helping free unions around the world to gain in strength and responsibility. In this task it has not only stressed to brother workers the treachery of communism to the workingman and the emptiness of its promises, but has also proved an effective proponent of democracy and the ideals of human dignity and freedom on which our Nation was founded.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, The dams are needed only to subsidize the irrigation projects. The sole purpose for including the giant power dams in the bill is to provide power revenues to subsidize 88 percent of the cost of the participating irrigation projects. The dams are first and foremost big "cash registers" for the landowners to be served by the irrigation projects. Their revenues would not benefit the whole Nation, but only these favored few residents of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Glen Canyon Dam, by far the largest in the chain of four, is located so far downstream that none of the water to be stored in it will be used to irrigate the participating projects.

The Interior Department admits that for at least 25 years the dams will not be needed for river regulation. The facts show that upper basin development will not require these storage units for river regulation for up to 50 years and probably longer.

The dams cannot be justified because of a need for power in the upper Colorado region. Steam power could be produced more cheaply by using the region's vast coal reserves.

The sole function of the dams for at least 50 years will be to provide revenues from the sale of power to pay for the participating projects, if, in fact, the power can be sold at the contemplated 6-mill rate, which is doubtful.

Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a radio address, recently given by my colleague, CHARLES W. VURSELL, entitled "Peace and Prosperity."

The address follows:

PEACE AND PROSPERITY

My friends, today, in the 30th month of the Eisenhower administration, I would like to speak to you about the present condition of our country, which so intimately affects you, and me, and our 160 million people of this, the greatest government of liberty, freedom and opportunity in the world.

How the policies of Government we have followed have brought about such a great change, for today, throughout the length and breath of our Nation, we have peace and prosperity. We have made the transition from war to peace, when most people, a few years ago, felt that when war ended and peace came, we would be plunged into a depression. Many thought it was unavoidable, but, through our policies of Government, we are moving forward—with peace and prosperity—that no longer has to be maintained through the terrible destruction and sacrifice of war. We have obtained the two great objectives our people for years have sought—peace and prosperity.

In 30 months, a remarkable change has come over the people of our Nation. The national blood pressure and temperature have gone down. The future is more promising. Nerves are less frayed. War tension has been eased, and this new tone of thinking of the people can be described, I believe, to a considerable extent in one word—confidence.

Confidence and faith in the honesty, in the high purpose, and in the wisdom and leadership of President Eisenhower, who has so unselfishly dedicated his every effort to the service of our people. In assuming the reins of Government 30 months ago, the President followed these broad policies of Government:

First. To maintain justice and freedom among ourselves, and to champion them for others, so that we may work effectively for enduring peace, honesty, efficiency, and economy in Government;

Second. To keep our economy vigorous and expanded—thus sustaining our international strength, and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every American citizen; and

Third. To concern ourselves with the human problems of our own people, so that every American may have the opportunity to lead a healthy, and rewarding life.

To carry out this full program, we set about to strengthen our military power and productive capacity to discourage resort to war, and to protect our vital interest; to strengthen our national defense, and to build up our air power, our nuclear weapons, and at the same time, to encourage the peaceful use of atomic power; to continue to ferret out and destroy Communist subversion, and adopted sound policies for building up the economic power of our country—all of which were necessary to deter Russia from starting world war III.

On all of these fronts, the President, working with the Congress, has followed policies that have been crowned with success.

We have achieved peace and prosperity on the home front, so let's take a look at our foreign policy, and note a few accomplishments there: The Korean war has been stopped; the dangerous Trieste problem, affecting Italy and Yugoslavia has been solved. The Suez problem has been solved. Iran, with her great oil production, which 2 years was swinging in the balance, from day to day, threatened to collapse and go with the enemy, has been saved and brought into the western alliance.

In South America, in Central America, great agreements have been made, under which one foothold of international communism has been eliminated.

The great NATO pact of Western Europe, binding those nations together, building a wall against further expansion of communism to the West, has been ratified, and the powerful nation of Western Germany has been added to that alliance of defense against communism.

Through the Pacific, we have strengthened the free world by adoption of the Manila Pact, and the defense treaty with the Republic of China, and in addition, the Bandung Conference, affecting a number of Asian nations in the southwest Pacific, was brought into being—greatly expanding the strength of the free nations of the world.

As the strength of the free nations of the world has been built up under the leadership of President Eisenhower, Russia, apparently, has been convinced that she can no longer bluff or attempt to challenge the strength of the United States and her allies. With the result she is now in retreat, and her leaders are now talking peace, with the approach of the conference at the summit, which opens in Geneva, Switzerland, Tuesday, July 19.

When the President left by plane Friday to participate in the Big Four Conference at the summit in Geneva, with his great Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, where he will sit at the conference table with the heads of the Governments of England, France, and Russia, in the most important peace conference the world has ever witnessed, he must be comforted and encouraged with the thought of the great leadership and service he has rendered this country on the domestic front, and in the knowledge that he will be sustained by the confidence, the prayers of the people of America, in the great responsibility and task before him on the foreign front.

Now, let's return for a moment to conditions here on the home front: The year 1953 was the most prosperous to that date in peacetime in our history.

The year 1954 was threatened with the recession; employment was dropping, and business as well. Moving swiftly to prevent a depression, the Eisenhower administration quickly gave the people a reduction in taxes of $7.4 billion. This extra purchasing power, left in the pockets of the people, and the revision of our entire tax code brought about an upward turn in business, and in employment, that beat off a depression, and the year 1954 became the second most prosperous peacetime year in our history.

By reducing the budget by over $14 billion in the first year of the Eisenhower administration, which made this tax reduction possible, and the reduction by several billions in the budget for the second year, and when other policies of the administration had time to come into play, with the beginning of 1955, business continued to rapidly expand, employment increased 2 millions, and the economy of our country is roaring forward on a broad highway of prosperity to constantly higher levels, with over 64 million people now employed at the highest wages in the history of our Nation.

In addition, inflation has been stopped; the cost of living has turned downward, and the wage earners, because of the reduction of taxes, are taking home more net pay today than ever before in our history.

It is estimated that our national gross production, or national gross product, by the end of this year will reach the highest peak in history—$380 billion, or $20 billion more than it was in the previous year—1954, and we expect to balance our national budget next year.

Unfortunately, because of 2 years of drought in southern Illinois, our farmers are not fully enjoying the prosperity the people of the Nation generally are. And again, due to overproduction, and the piling up of a mountain of farm surpluses of billions of dollars over the years, these surpluses overhanging the market have depressed farm prices.

However, this administration has come to grips with the farm problem, and with the great progress we are making in reducing these Government-owned farm products, by increasing our exports, and by new legislation, I feel sure that within a reasonable time our farmers, generally, will be fully sharing in the prosperity of the country.

Stay the Execution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during his campaign in 1952, President Eisenhower said that he believed in action and not words in behalf of small business. He promised that if elected small business would get action. I wonder if the kind of action he had in mind was the recent action of the Civil Aeronautics Board revoking the operating authority of North American Airlines, a "small business" in the airline industry.

There was no question of safety involved in the Board's action. In fact, North American has had a perfect safety record. The action was based solely on Board allegations that North American had flown too regularly and too frequently. The Board charged that North American had violated the Board's economic regulations which were designed so that the small independent airline cannot possibly be a threat to the 13 favored carriers.

North American was started after World War II by a group of veterans. Even though it has been very successful, it is still a relatively small company. It has only 9 planes compared to the 1,200 owned by the 13 Board-favored airlines. You would think that such a small company would hardly be worthy of much of the Board's attention. But the Civil Aeronautics Board is an unusual Board. Last year when the Civil Aeronautics Board's appropriation was under consideration before the House it was brought out during the debate that almost half of the Board's budget for economic enforcement has been spent over the past few years in an unceasing effort to "get" North American. Why is the Board so intent on putting out of business this small airline?

Perhaps the basic reason for the Board's almost fanatical fight against North American has been that North American has displayed the all-important virtue that American small businesses have been displaying for generations. It had the ingenuity and the freshness of approach to develop a new idea—a new concept in air transportation that has been a smashing success—low-cost, air-coach service. North American decided after the war that the real future in aviation was in the mass market that could only be tapped with low fares. Hence, they developed air-tourist service. Just about all the officials of the major airlines scorned North American's idea of low-cost air service and said it was utterly impractical and impossible. Even as late as 1949, the rest of the airline industry was insisting that air-coach service could never succeed. But air coach, as developed by North American, did succeed. And North American achieved its success without a penny of Government subsidy.

The details of this story of North American and aircoach are unique, but is not the pattern the same as we have seen so many times in this country? Our industrial success has been the constantly repeated story of the innovator who has had the chance to try out a new idea. Philosophically, this opportunity for new ideas and new businesses is the basic reason for our concern in Congress over the welfare of small business. It is a realization that much of our industrial progress stems from this spurring challenge of the independent business.

For an example of benefits to all from the challenge of the newcomer, just look what North American's innovation has done to air transportation. Air coach which was so scorned just 5 years ago by most of the other airlines has now been adopted by almost all of them and amounts to more than 35 percent of total airline business. Indeed, air coach has accounted for two-thirds of the growth in air transportation over the past 5 years.

But North American's success is the cause of its downfall. Its success has embarrassed many people, most notably the Civil Aeronautics Board. It upsets the Board's pat picture that air transportation should be a carefully regulated monopoly whose development can be minutely plotted by an all-seeing Federal Board. The Board completely failed to see the potential of air coach. And it took a company from outside the Board's neat little chosen group of 13 airlines to prove to the Board the feasibility of air coach.

The Board has interpreted its mission to be the protection of the monopoly of the 13 grandfather carriers. Although aviation has grown 40 times since the Board was set up, the Board has never found reason to admit a single new carrier to compete with these chosen 13 airlines. Just how long is Congress going to tolerate this Government nurturing of what may turn out to be one of the largest monopolies. For certainly if aviation grows to anywhere near the extent competent experts predict, it will be one of our very largest industries. And it will have been given to a chosen 13 companies without any opportunity for a new company to enter and compete.

I do not believe Congress ever intended that the Civil Aeronautics Act should be interpreted to protect from substantial competition a company whose revenues are over $300 million a year. And I do not believe Congress intended that a Government board should treat air transportation as a complete monopoly for the lucky 13, particularly when most of those 13 are making higher profits than, for instance, any of the manufacturing industries surveyed by the Federal Trade Commission.

If there had been a board similar to the Civil Aeronautics Board governing the growth of the automobile industry, we would never have had the mass-produced car of today. Such a board, if it had followed the Civil Aeronautics Board's policies, would have put Henry Ford out of business for building too many cars too cheaply in the same manner the CAB is trying to put North American out of business for flying too many people too cheaply.

I believe the time has come when Congress must completely review our Nation's air-transportation program to reestablish the traditional role of at least a limited opportunity for the entry of new companies.

But, until this can be accomplished, it is vital that the present revocation order be stayed. The Board must not be permitted to make a mockery out of the efforts of Congress by destroying the very assets which we are seeking to preserve.

William M. Jardine and James T. Jardine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 6, 1955, in Logan, Utah, the mortal remains of two distinguished sons of Utah were laid to rest. William M. Jardine and James T. Jardine now rest in the soil of the State they loved so much, and within sight of the school they were graduated from—the Utah State Agricultural College. Both of these illustrious men enriched the tradition of the motto of the college "Labor Is Life" with their contributions in the national and international field.

Both men, for a number of years, were at the college and in Government service, and made significant contributors to irrigation, agriculture, and to forest and range science. William was president of Kansas State College, United States Secretary of Agriculture, Minister to Egypt, president of Wichita University and for a time Kansas State treasurer, called to that post to restore the confidence of the people of Kansas in the integrity of their State government (one of the highest tributes that could be paid to what we call character). A prominent Wichita, Kans., newspaper, upon his retirement from Wichita University, editorially remarked that "one of the finest figures in Kansas and national public life for the past 45 years was leaving" and recorded the admiration of Kansas for "keen and wise intelligence, bold and vigorous in action, a personality strong and attractive, and a spirit that was undaunted by difficulty."

James T., after a period of teaching at the college, was a distinguished investigator in the Forest Service. He is credited with the initiation of a number of the basic concepts of range management, through his research and a resulting series of publications. These pioneer concepts are still recognized as basic principles in what has since become the science of range management. Later he became Chief of Research for the United States Department of Agriculture, the largest research organization in the world. Previously he was director of the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station.

At the memorial exercises for the Jardine brothers, the alumni association of the Utah State Agricultural College presented, through its president, Dr. R. O. Porter, a tribute. I would like to make that tribute a part of the RECORD:

> A tribute to William and James Jardine. There were giants in the earth in those days—mighty men, men of renown. So it is recorded in Genesis. Since those recordings, history is replete with instances of mighty men of renown arising to the occasion and requirements of their times. History also records a close correlation between pioneering, hardship, and poverty and the men and women of great spiritual, moral, and intellectual fortitude, indomitable will, and physical courage.
>
> No greater heritage could be wanted than the influence of humble homes and worthy institutions inspired by the pioneering spirits of men and women whose lives are purposeful and devoted to the ideals of God and humanity.
>
> Such was the home into which these two brothers were born and reared to young manhood. Such was the school into whose care they were entrusted for the development of their mature and lasting philosophies, their cultural and technical skills.
>
> But in addition to home and school there must be a combination of intangible genetic influences to produce giants in the earth.
>
> In the persons and lives of these two distinguished brothers, William and James Jardine, we recognize the desirable hereditary and environmental factors for the production of nobility of charater, intellectual leadership, and physical fitness.
>
> We, the alumni of the Utah State Agricultural College, feel honored in having had the names of these men on our rolls for so many years. The college is honored in having had the privilege of directing their education during the formative years of their lives.
>
> I am sure the Jardine brothers felt great pride in the institution which during more than 60 years of pioneering liberal education for the masses of a high scholastic basis has turned out more than its share of giants of the earth.
>
> The alumni salute and pay their last respect to two of our cherished members.

The Colorado River Storage Project Pays Its Own Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River storage project has been attacked in some quarters on apparently economic grounds. The word "apparently" is used advisedly, because a thorough analysis proves that the attacks are not based on economic facts, but on misstatement, misinterpretation or misunderstanding.

I am sure that Leslie Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, is perfectly sincere in the stand he has taken about the Colorado River project. However, I would be less than frank if I did not point out to you that the position he has taken in his May Reader's Digest article, and elsewhere, is typical of that taken by critics who have attempted to discredit the project on economic grounds by giving only one side of the story. Governor Miller has tried to prove the project unfeasible by a set of figures which treat it entirely on a cost-per-acre basis for irrigated farm land.

This approach, while it can be made to appear fairly convincing when its proponent is not subject to questioning or to rebuttal, is neither honest nor realistic. The Colorado River storage project is a multipurpose project and can honestly be evaluated only by considering all of its purposes and not just one of them. Furthermore, the Colorado project—or any other—must be judged on a basis of net cost, not gross cost. If the resulting benefits are substantially greater than the original costs, any project is a sound investment.

When Mr. Miller appeared to testify before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee last March, he was subjected to cross examination, and a great many of the basic fallacies in his theories were clearly brought out.

Mr. Miller had made a great fuss in his direct testimony over the fact that the cost of putting water on an acre of land would be substantially more than the selling price of this land. This was the basic theme of his article in Reader's Digest magazine and of his attacks on the Colorado River storage project generally.

When I questioned Mr. Miller, however, he had to admit that the cost of putting water on land is not actually related to the market price of that land.

The reason is that the cost of putting water on land is not a capital investment, but an operating expense.

I cited him an example with which we were both thoroughly familiar, in our State of Wyoming. On the Powell project, the going price for land was $150 an acre with water available. But alfalfa hay was selling for $30 a ton and it was possible to raise 7 tons of hay on an acre of irrigated ground in 1 year—which brought a gross return of $210 an acre for 1 year, from which all operating costs, including that of putting water on the land, had of course to be deducted in figuring net profit.

This clearly shows how ridiculous it is to maintain that an operating cost—putting water on irrigated land—should be related to the market value of the land itself.

Each unit of the Colorado River storage project has been made the subject of a cost-benefit analysis as well as a feasibility analysis. The feasibility analysis, required by law, must prove that any proposed reclamation project will be self-liquidating. The cost-benefit analysis is not required by law, but is submitted to Congress as a matter of Reclamation Bureau policy; it compares costs with measurable benefits on a local, regional, and national basis.

Mr. E. O. Larson, director of the Bureau's region 4 with headquarters in Salt Lake City, introduced some very revealing evidence into the public hearings conducted by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on March 9 of this year. Mr. Larson and the agricultural economist from his office, Paul Sant, discussed the question of cost-benefit ratio at length and introduced an analysis of the Seedskadee project in Wyoming—one of the irrigation projects, called "participating projects" of the overall Colorado project.

The known costs of this unit were computed against the total benefits on a year-to-year basis over a 100-year period—considerably short of the expected life of the project. For purposes of the cost-benefit analysis, money allocated to irrigation—which is interest-free under irrigation law—was charged with 2½-percent interest, compounded annually.

Benefits which were taken into account included the direct increase in farm net income; the increases in profits to businesses handling, processing, and marketing farm products; and the increase in the supply of goods and services.

During the construction period, there would be no offsetting benefits to be computed against the $23,272,000 construction costs of the Seedskadee project, which would therefore accumulate $2,362,000 in — theoretical — interest charges. During the first 5 years of operation, following completion of the project, growing benefits would not offset interest on the unpaid balance of the investment, but by the sixth year benefits would total more than interest charges. Interest—which would reach a peak of $4,533,000 in the fifth year—would be systematically reduced until in the 18th year benefits would be large enough to cover all interest charges and leave a net profit.

Annual payments on the original capital investment would continue to the 60th year—50th year of operation after a 10-year construction period. After repayment on capital investment had been completed, total annual benefits of $1,443,000 would be a net profit to the Nation.

At the end of 100 years, the Seedskadee project would not only have paid for itself, but the Nation would show a net benefit—after allowing for compound interest charges during the repayment period—of $83,345,000.

This figure compares with a total cost of $33,376,000, which includes $10,140,000 assessed as the Seedskadee's prorata share of the costs of the basic Colorado River storage project. In the years following the first century of operation—and the estimated life of the project is more than double the 100-year period on which computations were based—the net benefits would continue to accrue to the national economy.

The same sort of analysis has been made of each unit of the overall project which has been approved by the Department of the Interior, and each of the units shows a cost-benefit ratio of greater than unity—that is to say, the measurable benefits exceed the costs.

It should be noted that the cost-benefit ratio does not take into account increased tax revenues which come from the increased land and crop values on an irrigation project. This broadened tax base is a very sizable item. A study of existing reclamation projects indicates that the return in increased taxes alone has, to the year 1953, been approximately 125 percent of the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed since the reclamation program was begun more than 50 years ago. Actually, this is a very conservative estimate, because many of the reclamation projects are not yet in full production, or not in production at all in some cases.

In 1952, individual-income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons of the neighboring towns and villages whose business or employment was affected by construction of 15 reclamation projects under special study, were estimated at $105 million. An appropriate share of corporation and excise tax revenues, directly attributable to reclamation development, was estimated at $75 million in 1952. Total tax collections attributable to the reclamation development since it was begun in 1916, calculated on the same basis, have been just 4½ times the total construction cost for the projects—$264 million.

These increased tax revenues go directly into the Treasury, for the benefit of all the taxpayers of the Nation, but they do not count toward repayment of the reclamation projects, nor are they used in computing any type of feasibility or cost-benefit analysis by which projects are justified.

Another important benefit to the national economy comes from the increased purchasing power which stems from the local prosperity which is created by a sound reclamation project. The farmers and their families, and the families who draw their livings from the supply and service industries in the farm communities, have more money which they spend for farm machinery, automobiles, household appliances, shoes, clothing, recreational equipment and many other things which are produced in other parts of the Nation. This is another very real benefit which is in addition to those used in determining the feasibility of a project, or its cost-benefit ratio.

So far, I have discussed only the irrigation side of the picture of the Colorado River storage project, meeting Mr. Miller on his own ground and showing that even in the restricted field of agriculture the project is economically sound and worth while. There are, however, other factors even more important to the national economy.

When I questioned him at the House hearings, Mr. Miller had to admit that water is vitally needed in Wyoming—and in the other upper basin States—for development of natural resources, for industry and for cities. A great deal of water developed by the Colorado River storage project will go for this purpose, but Mr. Miller had been conveniently forgetting this, and talking only of the cost of irrigating farmland.

A great deal of the water which will be put to use through the Colorado River storage project will go to cities and to industries—and industrial development holds the real key to the future of the upper Colorado River Basin.

In the basin lie more than 90 percent of our known uranium and vanadium ores, more than one-third of our bituminous coal, reserves of oil shale more than double all the petroleum so far produced in the world and triple the known reserves of liquid petroleum underground. There are vast deposits of phosphates, important quantities of titanium and many more important minerals and raw materials. These are strategic materials, vital to national security as well as to our economic future.

It is unthinkable that the Nation should let these vital resources go undeveloped, and is quite obvious that their full development must be achieved by developing the full industrial potential of the region in which they are located. This requires all of the water available, as well as substantial development of electric power.

An excellent example is at hand in the experience at the Geneva Steel Plant, constructed near Provo, Utah, during World War II. The plant is now an important unit of United States Steel Co., employs 5,000 people, and produces 1,800,000 tons of steel a year.

To achieve that production, the Geneva plant uses between 12 and 25 million gallons of water a day. To obtain that quantity of water, in a water scare area, every possible source has been utilized. The steel plant purchased water in Deer Creek reservoir—a reclamation project constructed prior and during World War II, by the way—and developed water from other sources—but the plant could not have been put into operation except for the fact that the land for the plant site was purchased complete with appurtenant water rights. The water which had been used to irrigate farmlands was converted, along with the farmlands themselves, to industry. The pattern will be repeated over and over again as this area develops.

This means that tremendous quantities of water which may originally be developed for irrigation of agriculture will eventually be used for industry—and paid for at industrial prices. Even so biased a critic as Raymond Moley admits that industrial and municipal prices for water would justify the Colorado development.

A good parallel may be found in the Yakima project in the Pacific Northwest. Originally developed solely as a reclamation project, for the purpose of putting irrigation water on good farmland, it contributed greatly to our atomic-age development—something never contemplated by the original planners. Some 7,000 acres of land—and the vital water rights which went with them—were taken out of the original project for the development of the Hanford Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission. If the water had not originally been developed for irrigation, it would not have been available at the critical time to be put to its present use.

One of the most damaging half-truths which has been widely used in the propaganda put out by opponents of the Colorado project has been in connection with project costs.

The figure generally quoted for basic construction cost is $1.6 billion, which is completely unrelated to the actual figure carried by H. R. 3383, or to S. 500 passed by the Senate.

H. R. 3383 has a total authorized construction cost of $760 million and the total authorized construction in S. 500 was just over $1 billion. Other projects might be authorized—if found fully feasible from every ecomonic viewpoint—over a period of 20 to 25 years.

Let us stick to consideration of the projects which would be authorized by H. R. 3383, which is what we shall be voting on. It is manifestly unfair to include unauthorized projects in a computation of costs, and then to confine attention to fully authorized projects only in looking at benefits—and our opponents have not presented anywhere near the full benefits even on this unbalanced basis.

A major factor in the overall importance of the Colorado River storage project is the production of hydroelectric power. Although secondary to the conservation and use of water, the production of power is highly important to this expanding and developing area. Furthermore, it is through production and sale of power that the entire project becomes economically feasible.

The multipurpose dams authorized by H. R. 3383 would have more than 800,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity. Sale of this power at a price of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour delivered at load centers would make the storage dams not only self-liquidating—including standard interest charges—but would assist in paying out the costs of the irrigation features of the overall project.

The 6-mill charge, while high in comparison with power costs in some areas of the Nation, is a competitive price in this area. Representatives of the 10 major privately owned utilities in the area have repeatedly testified that they would be willing to purchase the entire output of the storage project—provided the power potential is developed in an orderly manner, as it would be—at the 6-mill price, which is slightly less than the cost of producing power in the most modern coal-steam generating plants in the region.

The fact that the entire power output of the dams can be sold in the upper Colorado River basin is extremely important. It means that the same people benefiting from the water development will be directly paying for the project through their purchase of power. None of the direct costs of the Colorado project will be paid by people outside the area directly concerned. The fact that the power will be sold at a price substantially higher than that sold from, for example, Hoover Dam is meaningless in view of the fact that it will be purchased in the upper basin. The people of that area are ready and willing to pay the 6-mill price—which is, after all, a competitive price in that region—in order to purchase the combined waterpower development which is so vital to their future.

It is ironic that the major opposition to the Colorado project is coming from an area which has directly benefited to a fabulous degree from the full development of the lower basin of that same Colorado River system.

Southern California, which is spearheading the fight against upper Colorado River development, has perhaps gained more than any comparable area in the United States from reclamation development. The Hoover Dam complex and the Parker-Davis complex furnish southern California with more than 4 million acre feet of water a year, in addition to more than 3 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power at a rock-bottom price which in effect constitutes a power subsidy to the area. More than 16 percent of the total water controlled by the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles comes from the Colorado River via these projects. Two major reclamation projects in southern California—taking water from the Colorado River—in 1 current year produced crops with a gross value of more than $117 million, and over their comparatively short lifetime have produced crops with a gross value of more than a billion dollars. The tremendous municipal and industrial growth of southern California would have been literally impossible without the reclamation-developed water and power from the Colorado.

In the light of these facts, it is more than ever hard to understand California's dog-in-the-manger attitude toward development of the upper Colorado Basin—except on the theory that southern California wants to violate the Colorado River compact of 1922, prevent development by the upper basin of its share of the water, and eventually claim title to the water guaranteed to the upper basin States.

The 1922 compact divided the water on a fair basis between the upper and lower basins. The upper basin States have never disputed the compact, despite the fact that more than 90 percent of the water in the river originates within their boundaries. They intend to abide by the terms of that compact, solemnly and honestly entered into and approved by the Congress, and they expect California to do the same. There can be no other basis for harmony and cooperation between States—or between nations.

To my colleagues, who over many years have observed first hand the disastrous results of nations violating treaties and agreements—and, on the brighter side, the magnificent results which can be attained when nations join in equitable agreements and honestly adhere to them—the importance of this point must be more than obvious.

In the final analysis, our position can be summed up very simply. We feel that it is our water, guaranteed by compact, and our right to develop it. Without it, our four States cannot hope to grow and develop their potential for the security and prosperity of the Nation. With it, we can not only pay our own way, but provide a substantial boost to the economy—and the security—of the country as a whole.

Senator Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, is being helped greatly toward recovery from the heart attack he suffered recently by the laudatory editorials regarding him which have appeared in scores of Texas newspapers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert three of these editorials—from the Blanco County News, Blanco, Tex.; the Robstown (Tex.) Record; and the Canadian (Tex.) Record.

The editorials follow:

[From the Blanco County (Tex.) News of July 8, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON SUFFERS HEART ATTACK LAST SATURDAY

Blanco County, as well as the entire Nation, was shocked and worried last Saturday with the annuoncement from Washington that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON had suffered a severe heart attack and had been hospitalized. At present he is reported to be better, but will not be able to serve in the Senate in the remainder of this session.

Senator JOHNSON has been accorded the highest respect for the way in which he has conducted the affairs of the Democratic Party during this session where he has served as floor leader. Acclaim has come from all parts during the past weeks for the efficient way he has gotten the work done on the Senate floor. Much of this was accomplished by Senator JOHNSON himself, through endless hard work.

He was being mentioned in more than one quarter as a presidential prospect. Exactly what ultimate effect this illness will have is open to conjecture.

Home folk in Blanco County hope and pray for their native son's speedy recovery. Our Nation needs such men as Lyndon.

[From the Robstown (Tex.) Record of July 7, 1955]

Our Town

Texas, and the Nation generally, but more specifically Robstown and south Texas, have suffered an irreparable loss—at least temporarily—by the sudden and untimely illness of Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas. We say Robstown and south Texas particularly since it was in the 14th Congressional District as secretary to the late Richard Kleberg that Lyndon Johnson literally cut his political teeth. He has always held a special affection for this section and its people. Few, if any, will disagree with the appraisal that Senator Johnson has reflected credit not only on his home State as the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, but has realistically and courageously led the Democratic Party through the difficult years since the 1952 Republican victory. Under his leadership in the Senate, and that of Texas' beloved Sam Rayburn in the United States House of Representatives, the Democratic Party in fact has, even in defeat, become the "party of responsibility" so aptly called for by Adlai Stevenson following the 1952 election. As minority leader in the United States Senate, during the first days of the Eisenhower administration Lyndon Johnson started building a record of party responsibility for the Democrats. He demanded and received—as the youngest floor leader in the history of the upper Chamber of Congress—the support of his Democratic colleagues both right and left of center. The result has been a party legislative record unparalleled, perhaps, in the history of the country for its bypartisan approach. A controversial figure at times in his home State, Lyndon Johnson may have stepped on a few toes along the way, but his rise to national leadership is sufficient indication that his relentless drive to get the job done rates high in the annals of public service regardless of the level of interest. As a fledgling debate coach in a Houston high school where we first knew Lyndon Johnson, he took his teams to the State finals in the 2 years he served in that capacity. At that early stage in his career he quickly earned the reputation of a hard-driving, hard-working, and shrewd manager. He gave no quarter and asked none. From there he stepped on to the Texas political scene as secretary to the late Congressman Dick Kleberg, and throughout this south Texas district he not only became intimate with the people and their problems, but earned a reputation as the most able and hard-working administrative assistant on the Hill in Washington. He hardly had time to unpack his luggage in the National Capital when he was elected to the speakership of the "Little Congress," the most coveted spot in Washington among congressional employees. A year or so later, Lyndon Johnson came back to Texas to organize and set up the National Youth Administration during the postdepression days under the Roosevelt administration. Within a few months he had whipped together an organization that was held up over the Nation as an example of one of the most efficient and ably managed of Government agencies. From this beginning it was only a matter of time that he would be headed for a distinguished career of public service. He was elected to represent the Austin Congressional District when the late James Buchanan died, and he entered the House of Representatives as one of the youngest men ever to serve in that body. In the House his qualities of leadership, coupled with his relentless drive, quickly earned him the tag of a "comer" in national affairs. If he emerged quickly as a leader in the House, his career in the United States Senate in which he has served since 1948 has been phenomenal. He has earned the respect and admiration not only of his colleagues on the Democratic side, but the members of the opposition, both in and out of Congress, as well as that of the President. And all this has been packed in 46 short years. Significant of Lyndon Johnson's stature as a national leader is the fact that much of the metropolitan press which once fought him so hard and so bitterly has long since recognized his unusual qualities of leadership and political know-how. They—and not the known Johnson supporters—have been calling attention almost daily to his potential as the Democratic presidential nominee in either 1956 or 1960. But all that, it now seems, must await his complete recovery. In typically Lyndon Johnson style, he became ill while planning to work over the long holiday weekend. And in typically Lyndon Johnson style, we predict he will work just as diligently in recovering as he has at his career of public service. Texas and the Nation can ill afford to lose this young man's leadership and devotion to duty. We fervently hope, God willing, he will be able to assume his normal activities within a few months.

[From the Canadian (Tex.) Record]

Senator Lyndon Johnson Best Hope for Democrats

If the heart attack which struck down Texas Senator Lyndon Johnson last Saturday proves serious enough to keep him out of public life permanently, both Texas and the Nation will feel the blow in years to come—but the Democratic Party itself may be the hardest hit.

Both his political foes and his political friends must recognize in Texas Senator Lyndon Johnson a powerful and able leader, and one who has come to the front at a time when leadership has been woefully needed.

Lyndon Johnson, at 46, is relatively young in years but older than most of his fellow Senators in political experience and ability. He has been generally recognized as the man most likely to succeed in bringing the badly split Democratic Party back together as a working unit in government and, more important to many Democrats, as a man who could succeed in returning the party to some semblance of its former faith.

The editorial suggestion of a Florida newspaper that Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, be the next Democratic presidential nominee was hailed throughout the South and warmly welcomed by many northern Democrats. If any man can heal the present breach in the Democratic Party, Lyndon Johnson is probably that man.

Johnson would almost certainly rally the support of both warring Texas factions of the party as a presidential nominee and return to the party ranks hundreds of thousands of independently minded Democrats who voted in 1952 for a Republican nominee in preference to the leftwing candidate of the national convention.

Both his party and his Nation can well use the services of such a man, and we join millions of his friends in wishing for the Senator a speedy recovery and a return to the public service in which he has proved himself so well.

The Mess in the Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, after a long delay, on the 10th of June the President signed S. 2061, giving postal employees a pay increase. The proposal for an adequate pay increase was bitterly opposed by the administration. The Post Office Department insisted that any pay increase should carry with it a complete reclassification of postal positions. Finally, after much deliberation, the postal employees were given a pay increase much less than that desired by the majority of the Members of Congress. Previously a bill had been passed in 1954 to grant the postal employees a pay increase, but it was vetoed by the President. A second bill, S. 1, slightly more generous than the bill finally enacted, was passed during this session and was also vetoed by the President.

Realizing that, through no fault of the postal employees, the pay increase was long overdue, the Congress voted to make the increase retroactive to March 1, 1955. There were many of us in the Congress who thought that the retroactive provision should have dated back to August of 1954 when the pay bill was first vetoed. However, the Congress did make S. 2061 retroactive to March 1, 1955, insofar as the pay increase provisions were concerned. We felt that, by giving the postal employees a little back pay, we would make up to them in a small measure for the delay in getting the legislation enacted into law.

Accordingly, I was shocked and chagrined to learn that the benefit of the retroactive features of the law is being taken away from the postal employees by an administrative decision. The Post Office Department, under the present administration, has established a "deferred-payment" program. We passed a uniform allowance bill last August, but because of administrative delays, the benefits of the uniform allowance bill were not made available to the employees until April 22, 1955. The postal employees are being given their retroactive pay on the 15th of July. The retroactive pay amounts to only 6 percent of their salaries. For those in the lower pay levels, it is considerably less than their semimonthly pay check, but the benefits that might have accrued to the employees through the payment of this retroactive pay have been snatched away from them by departmental instructions that their regular semimonthly pay check, which is due on July 16 will be deferred until the 22d. The Department states that it is necessary to establish a 1-week pay lag to put into operation the biweekly paydays. Although they are establishing the pay lag during the month of July, they are not putting the biweekly program into effect until December of this year.

I do not know what the postal employees are going to do about their established obligations which fall due on the 16th of July. Their 6 percent retroactive paychecks will not be sufficient to meet those obligations, especially in the case of those employees in the lower pay levels. They have been underpaid for a long period of time and now they are going to have their pay periods pushed back an additional week. The Government is going to keep their week's pay, but, of course, they will pay no interest on this money. The employees will receive this pay only when they retire or leave the postal service.

Under the law that we passed, the Department was given up to 6 full months to put into effect the reclassification procedures. They are taking every bit of the 6 months allowed, which means that the readjustments to the employees under the new salary schedule will not be payable to them until some time in December. The adjustments in the case of many postmasters and supervisors are substantial. In the case of most of the clerks, letter carriers, and other employees in the lower pay levels, they amount to something like $100 a year—except in one glaring instance where the adjustment amounts to 80 cents. After 6 long months of waiting, the employee in step 4 of level 4 will receive approximately 3 cents a payday additional on his paycheck under reclassification.

Much has been made on the part of administration spokesmen over the fact that by providing 26 paydays, the employees will receive 1 additional day's pay a year. This again is an outstanding example of the "deferred payment" program of the Government, because it is quite likely that the employees may have to wait 12 years to get the additional day's pay. He will only benefit from the additional day's pay when there have been a sufficient number of days to provide an additional pay period. This could take as much as 12 years and, with the week's pay lag established administratively, it could probably take even more.

I am rather amazed, after reading the press releases from the Post Office Department, to learn that they have to delay the pay period for a week. When Postmaster General Summerfield took office, he roundly criticized the existing accounting system in the Post Office and established 15 accounting regional offices. We were told that greater efficiency and greater service to the individual post offices would result from the establishment of these regional offices. The postal employees have always received their pay within a period of 3 days (and in many instances within 1 day) following the close of the pay period, but now—with the improved techniques about which Mr. Summerfield has so proudly boasted; with the introduction of many accounting machines; with the introduction of the graduate accountants into the regional setup of the Post Office Department—we learn to our amazement that it takes 7 days to do what used to be done in 1 day. Perhaps we should look into the efficiency and the effectiveness of this much-vaunted regional setup.

I think it is outrageous that the pay periods of the postal employees are being delayed and that the benefits that they should have received from the retroactive pay provisions are being snatched away from them. I believe that when Congress returns for the next session—or perhaps even before this session closes—we should give consideration to granting a further salary increase to the postal employees in the lower-pay levels who have been so long denied an adequate pay increase and, when a modest pay increase is given to them by the Congress, have had the benefits of such an increase partially snatched away from them by faulty administration.

The President Declares That Freedom of the Arts Is a Basic Freedom, One of the Pillars of Liberty in Our Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in most of the New York newspapers an editorial signed by Huntington Hartford, heir to the A. & P. fortune under the title "The Public Be Damned?"

The advertisement attacked American art criticism, abstract art, the contemporary theater, art dealers and museum officials, and the public. Mr. Hartford's editorial reached millions of readers and cost some $25,000. In an interview with Paul Mocsanyi, art critic for the United Press, Mr. Hartford said:

> I'll deduct the money from my income tax.

He also told Mocsanyi regarding the advertisements that—

> They won't cost me anything, of course.

In an editorial in the Arts Digest for July 1955 the editor and publisher, Jonathan Marshall, attempts to answer Mr. Hartford's attack. Among other things, he says—

> Although we doubt whether the author wants to be a dictator or censor of art, he is calling for such a dictatorship. Perhaps we would be more accurate if we said that the demand appears to be for a vigilante group. This group might police studios, galleries, and museums—and, of course, the art schools—and would protect us from that which is obscure and from our own imaginations.
>
> There is no need to define art here or to take a stand behind any type of art. We believe that every artist has a right to create as he desires, for the market can be his judge and the public has a free choice. Mr. Hartford can look at whatever paintings he chooses, as can the clerk in an A. & P. store; as can you. But this does not give any of us the right to say artists must paint in this way or that, as if there were only one right way of doing it. "It must be understandable and beautiful to me to be good," is what Hartford erroneously implies.

In his message congratulating the Museum of Modern Art on its 25th anniversary, President Eisenhower declared that—

> There is an important principle which we should ever keep in mind—the principle that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land.

The position taken by the President is, indeed, basic to our freedoms. New ideas and experimentation are essential to art and to democracy. We must guard our freedoms jealously, for it is these very freedoms that differentiate our form of government from communism, naziism, and fascism. It can be doubted that Mr. Hartford has thought through to the inevitable conclusion the course which he is recommending.

The editor of the Arts Digest concludes his statement by asking the following question which also seems to me to go to the heart of the problem: "Can funds used for these purposes be truly called educational and remain tax exempt? We hope that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will look into the matter."

The editorial from the Arts Digest follows:

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED?"—NO

(By Jonathan Marshall)

While we were at press for the June issue a full-page advertisement, titled "The Public Be Damned?" appeared in most daily New York newspapers. Signed by Huntington Hartford, heir to the A. & P. fortune, the ad has created a great deal of misgiving and anxiety in art circles. We feel that Hartford's blast was an ill-disguised attack on artistic freedom and set a dangerous precedent.

In brief, the advertisement attacked American art criticism, abstract art, the contemporary theater, art dealers, and museum officials, and the public. Hartford said, "It is * * * unfortunate that the art-loving public is not required to pay * * * to spend an evening looking at paintings * * * their reaction might be fully as vociferous as that of theatergoers, and the art critics might wake up to the true value of their wares." In case the self-styled art critic does not know, we are delighted to inform him that one of his prime targets, the Museum of Modern Art, charges admission and its attendance has been steadily rising. Most museums have paying members, and memberships continue to grow. We might also point out that paintings sell for far more than the price of a theater admission.

Mr. Hartford carefully selected his out-of-context quotations, and his article, for that is what it was, reached millions of readers. It costs some $25,000 to reach the public which, in reality, he damns, but the A. & P. heir apparently is not worried. In an interview with Paul Mocsanyi, art critic for the United Press, he said, "I'll deduct the money from my income tax." Prior to that he had said to Mocsanyi, "They won't cost me anything, of course."

We feel that it is a dangerous precedent for wealthy individuals to attempt to buy public opinion. It is especially dangerous when they invade a field in which their experience is limited. This is not to say that either artists or critics are above criticism, for they usually welcome it. But when one man spends thousands of dollars to proclaim that "The purpose of great art * * * is a moral one" and tells us that unless a painting has easily recognizable beauty it is not art, we must question his motives.

We doubt whether Mr. Hartford was frightened by an abstract painting as a child. Instead we wonder whether he is merely afraid of that which he does not understand. This fear often underlies the attacks on creative freedom which have taken place since the days of primitive man. Unfortunately it is easier to ridicule through laughter, or attack with platitudes, than it is to study and be openminded.

Huntington Hartford reveals himself in several places in his article. First he says, "I am frankly bitter against those who encourage obscurity in painting." This is amplified by the statement that "recognizable subject matter is indispensable to painting." And finally he says, "I believe the diseases which infect the world of painting today—of obscurity, confusion, immorality, violence—are not confined either to this single art or even to the arts in general. These are the diseases which, if the disaster of dictatorship ever overtakes our fair country, will be a major cause of it, and since the germs exist in such a pure, unadulterated form in the realm of painting * * * I suggest that it is time we * * * do something about it." The latter statement is nothing less than a call for the censorship of art.

Although we doubt whether the author wants to be a dictator or censor of art, he is calling for such a dictatorship. Perhaps we would be more accurate if we said that the demand appears to be for a vigilante group. This group might police studios, galleries, and museums—and, of course, the art schools—and would protect us from that which is obscure and from our own imaginations.

There is no need to define art here or to take a stand behind any type of art. We believe that every artist has a right to create as he desires, for the market can be his judge and the public has a free choice. Mr. Hartford can look at whatever paintings he chooses, as can the clerk in an A. & P. store; as can you. But this does not give any of us the right to say artists must paint in this way or that, as if there were only one right way of doing it. "It must be understandable and beautiful to me to be good," is what Hartford erroneously implies.

New ideas and experimentation are essentials to both art and democracy. We wonder how Mr. Hartford can reconcile his professed love of democracy with his call for standardization of art and elimination of imagination. Those who desire to interpret from an artist's so-called obscure painting are entitled to do so, and we think that the real art enthusiast will continue to choose without Mr. Huntington Hartford.

Two questions remain that we cannot answer here. Why did the great New York newspapers accept this advertisement by an untrained critic attacking the integrity and competence of trained leaders in a professional field? And can funds used for these purposes be truly called educational and remain tax exempt? We hope that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will look into the matter and that the newspapers in question will have the courage to decline advertisements in future when they are in reality attacks on artistic freedom.

Violation of Treaties, Obligations, and Agreements by the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress I had the privilege, as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, to hear the testimony of former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover stated at one point that the Soviet Union between 1917 and the start of World War II had entered into 36 different nonaggression pacts or treaties with other nations. He pointed out that they had violated every one of them.

With the Summit Conference in Geneva before us, this testimony of a former President prompted me to investigate how well the rulers in the Kremlin had adhered to treaties, agreements, and understandings entered into with the United States and other nations during and after the war.

The record shows that the agreements entered into by the Soviet Union at Cairo, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam have been violated 65 times. In other words, the Soviet Union has nearly doubled its prewar record of never keeping any agreement they ever entered into. This appalling record of more than 100 violations of agreements supposedly designed to preserve peace should be carefully considered, no matter what the outcome at Geneva.

During the 38 years of Bolshevik rule in Russia, the Kremlin has not only violated 36 different nonaggression pacts but during this period of time 16 different, independent nations have been swallowed up by the Soviets. Ten of these nations had been recognized as independent and sovereign states by the Kremlin. Seven of them had, in good faith, actually signed nonaggression or mutual assistance pacts with Russia.

This most tragic story of our time began when the National Republic of Byelorussia was overrun by the Red army on December 30, 1917.

This was followed, in April of 1920, with the military seizure of the independent Republic of Azerbaijan, a country which had been recognized as independent by the major nations of Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East.

The independent Republic of Armenia, established in May 1918, was recognized by the United States, the Supreme Allied Council, and the major nations of Europe, including Russia. Armenia fought with us against the Germans during the First World War. The gangsters in the Kremlin signed a treaty guaranteeing Armenia's sovereignty and territorial integrity on December 2, 1920. Then they immediately took over the country.

Next came the independent democratic Republic of Georgia in February 1921. As in the case of Armenia, Georgia and Russia had concluded a nonaggression pact only a few months before the invasion.

Next on the list was the Ukranian National Republic, a government established on November 20, 1917, and recognized as independent by the major powers. Here again, as in Armenia, Russia endeavored to force the Ukraine into an agreement in the form of a treaty of recognition. When she refused, the Reds attacked and, after a bloody 3-year war, in 1920, the Ukraine joined the others behind the curtain of Soviet rule.

During this early period of aggression, the last independent nation to be taken over by the Reds was the Turkestanian Democratic Republic, a nation which the Kremlin has now divided into five parts.

Once Russia had consolidated these six independent nations in her orbit, she turned to the rest of the world with professions of good faith, and a desire for peace.

The now infamous Litvinoff Pacts of the 1930's were supposedly outward manifestations of the Kremlin's desire to maintain peace in the world. Yet in 1939 we learned that these pacts, some of which had been renewed only months before, were not worth the paper they were written on. Neither was the Russian declaration supporting the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Treaty of Paris.

Russia had a nonaggression pact with Georgia, back in 1921. It did not mean anything. Russia also had nonaggression pacts with Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Poland. They did not mean anything either.

And whatever agreements they had before the war with Albania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, they were forgotten when the time came for the Kremlin to drop the Iron Curtain around them.

In October of 1939 the three Baltic nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, signed mutual assistance pacts with the Russians. The Finns refused and precipitated the Russian-Finnish War. The League of Nations formally expelled Russia as an aggressor nation in 1940. But the Baltic nations signed, even though Poland, which also had a nonaggression pact with Russia, was then in the process of being taken over by the Red Army and the Nazis.

The following June in 1940 the Baltic States suffered the same fate as Poland. In less than 72 hours, in spite of the nonaggression pacts which they signed in 1933 and renewed 5 years later, more than 5 million people were swept into the framework of the Soviet Union. Along with them went Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina.

Czechoslovakia was the next to suffer. This tragedy began in 1943 when President Benes went to Moscow and signed a treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation. This, too, was proven to be worthless for 5 years later, on May 18, 1948, the Communists took over Czechoslovakia.

Hungary received different treatment. Here the Armistice Agreement entered into by the Russians and the Hungarians proved to be as false as all the other agreements the Reds had ever entered into. Hungary, true to her word, declared war on Germany on January 20, 1945. But the Reds forgot about their promises to arm the Hungarians so they could defend themselves. Instead, they turned to subverting the government to their own purposes.

Of the 16 independent nations now under Red rule, only 2 of them ever had any effective native Communist Party. Eleven of the governments were deposed by force, and 4 were ousted by ultimatum.

These examples of bad faith which occurred before World War II have been completely overshadowed by the treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Union since the war. For most of these agreements were made with the United States.

Specifically, they include the Yalta agreement, the Potsdam agreement, the agreement on the Allied Control Commission which was set up to operate in Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania; peace treaties with these three nations; the Cairo Declaration, which was also reaffirmed at the Potsdam Conference; the Declaration of Teheran, the China-Soviet Union Treaty of 1945, and even the Soviet-Iranian friendship agreement of 1921.

Iran was forced to go to the United Nations Security Council to protest against the Soviet Union's violation of her territorial integrity. This basically was a violation of the United Nations Charter itself.

It should be obvious today, on the basis of their record that any proposal made by the Soviets at Geneva will be broken when the Kremlin feels it expedient to do so.

During the 1930's, when Hitler was gathering strength, the Kremlin encircled Germany with a pattern of nonaggression and mutual security pacts. Every one of them were broken, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are now behind the Iron Curtain. As a matter of fact, so is Korea above the 38th parallel.

Since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has violated treaties, obligations and agreements 14 times in Germany, 12 times in Hungary, 10 times in Rumania, 7 times in Austria, 6 times in Iran, 5 times in Korea, 3 times in Manchuria, once in Japan, and another time in Poland.

Every one of these violations affected the lives, well-being, and freedom of millions of people. It is a cruel and heartless record. It is a record which we should not only study carefully but well remember.

The American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, 1953, volume 99, part 9, page A1064, I made some remarks in respect to the need for more affirmative methods for dealing with communism and particularly on the intellectual level. I inserted a paper prepared by a student of this matter, Sam Lambert, entitled "Needed: A Coordinated Offensive Against the Philosophy of Communism."

I also inserted a UP news item dated February 26, 1953, entitled "Ford Foundation Sets Up Fund for Survey of Dangers in Method Used in Combating Communism." I did not point up the purpose of inserting the reference to the Ford fund. It was twofold: First, it is certainly true that by pursuing improper methods for combating communism we can damage our cause; second, how unfortunate it was that the Ford Foundation set up $15 million for a negative approach, instead of appropriating $15 million to figure out good and proper methods for combating communism.

With that background, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of our country a group of citizens who have moved ahead in affirmative manner to effectively combat communism, using proper methods and appealing to intellectual groups to a large degree, I trust, and this is my own observation, because it is among the intellectual groups that the surface appeal of communism has been most effective; the appeal being against social injustices—of which there are always many.

The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism has been so effective in its short life that it has been singled out for special attention by the rulers of the Kremlin. I have in my possession a translation from an article from Izvestia, Moscow, April 17, 1955, headed "Press Conference of the 'Committee for Return to the Homeland.' " It is a diatribe directed against the American committee and reading between the lines exhibits a tremendous fear and concern about the effect the American committee is having behind the Iron Curtain. The establishment of the Committee for Return to the Homeland is a tribute to the fine work being done.

So I want to commend the efforts of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism and the people who have worked so hard to realize its aims and objectives. The accomplishments of the Committee in the fight against communism constitute a worthy example of what can be achieved through cooperative efforts of private citizens. Through one of its major undertakings—Radio Liberation—the committee is enabling the anti-Communist emigration from the Soviet Union to deliver daily through the Iron Curtain to the peoples of the Soviet Union a message which encourages them to hope for eventual liberation and which fosters a spirit of resistance to the dictatorship which oppresses them. In order to acquaint the Members and the American people generally with the fine work being performed by the committee, I would like to take this opportunity to summarize briefly the background, history, objectives, program, and accomplishments of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism.

It was in 1950 that a group of Americans actively interested in combating the Bolshevist doctrines being forced on the Soviet peoples by their leaders began a study to see how best this might be attempted. What they had in mind originally was to bring together emigres from all parts of the Soviet Union who would participate in the effort to weaken the hold of the Bolshevik rulers over the Soviet peoples. It was apparent at the outset that certain policy decision would have to be made and adhered to if the attempt to coordinate emigres of different nationalities and different views into an effective working unit was to be successful. After careful study, the organizing committee concluded that its efforts to create a coordinating center could be utilized for propaganda purposes only if they were based on a fundamental and involate principle. This was:

> No group would be acceptable which was unwilling to agree that the political or geographic framework of a future Soviet Union can be decided only by the peoples of the Soviet Union themselves.

In other words, the committee decided on a principle of "equal assistance to, equal cooperation with, all emigre groups whether great Russians or non-Russians who desire to carry on an active struggle against bolshevism and who recognize the unconditional right of all the peoples inhabiting the territory of the Soviet Union to determine their own fate on the basis of a democratic expression of the will of the peoples." Emigre groups who participated in the center were to be free to continue their separate organizational status and carry on activities of their own choosing so long as they did not conflict with the platform of the center. Furthermore, it was decided to support only one political center.

The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, which was informally organized late in the fall of 1950, was formally incorporated in the State of Delaware in January 1951, under the chairmanship of Eugene Lyons. Mr. Lyons continued in this post until the spring of 1952, when former United States Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., Adm. Alan C. Kirk, took over. In September 1952 Admiral Kirk accepted the position of Chairman of the Psychological Strategy Board in Washington, and was succeeded by Vice Adm. Leslie C. Stevens, United States Navy, retired. Admiral Stevens headed the organization for the two following busy years during its initial experimental stages. In September 1954, upon the resignation of Admiral Stevens, Howland H. Sargent, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, was elected president. Other officers of the committee are as follows: Reginald T. Townsend, vice president and director of public relations; Andre D. Yedigaroff, assistant to the president; B. Eric Kuniholm, director of political affairs division; S. Y. McGiffert, director of radio liberation network; Robert H. Dreher, director of radio programing support division; and Spencer Williams, director of press and publications. Trustees are: Mrs. Oscar Ahlgren; John R. Burton; William Henry Chamberlin; Hon. Charles Edison; J. Peter Grace, Jr.; Allen Grover; H. J. Heinz II; Isaac Don Levine; Eugene Lyons; Henry V. Poor, counsel; Howland H. Sargent; Theodore M. Steele; Vice Adm. Leslie C. Stevens, United States Navy, retired; Dr. John W. Studebaker; Reginald T. Townsend; William L. White; and Philip H. Willkie. The committee's headquarters are located at 6 East 45th Street, New York, and serves principally as a support base for the European operations. Robert F. Kelley is the European deputy to the president. He is assisted by Isaac Patch, Jr., emigre relations adviser; Manning H. Williams, director of radio division, Rolf Hartmann, chief of radio engineering; and Prof. Oliver J. Fredericksen, adviser to the institute.

For a summary of the aims and objectives of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, I turn to a statement of November 21, 1954, by the committee's president, Howland Sargeant:

> The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism was conceived and exists today as a tangible expression of the friendship of the American people for the peoples of the Soviet Union. The very existence of

the partnership of the committee and of the emigration is a signal to the world that a great chasm divides the peoples of the Soviet Union from their oppressors. At the same time, it is a source of hope to those oppressed peoples that their deliverance from the dictatorship is of deep concern to the freedom-loving people of the United States. * * * The American Committee has been completely and unswervingly dedicated to the cause of liberation of all mankind from the source of Soviet power.

The objectives of the American committee, simply stated, they seemed to me to be to work in partnership with all dedicated elements of the emigration which are willing to work cooperatively with other democratic elements in conducting activities designed to weaken the power of the Soviet dictatorship, primarily within the U. S. S. R., to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with conditions as they actually exist in the world, and to increase the spirit of resistance of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the Soviet Union by letting them know that they and their plight have not been forgotten. Finally, to find increasingly effective ways to cooperate in carrying out practical projects to weaken and ultimately to crush and stamp out Bolshevism, thus helping to provide the climate in which the American committee's most important goal can be achieved—the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

One of the committee's original aims—to create a united front of exile political organizations, excluding procommunism, and Fascist groups—has not been fully realized because it has not yet been possible to coordinate the widely differing philosophies of the various groups. The committee, however, has left the door open to cooperation with Russian and non-Russian anti-Communist groups at such time as a working agreement between them can be reached.

Nevertheless, a review of the accomplishments of the American committee during its 4 years of existence reveals an impressive contribution to the anti-Bolshevist cause. This contribution is revealed in the work of the two major undertakings supported by the committee, both located in Munich, Germany—Radio Liberation, and the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the U. S. S. R.

Radio Liberation—Osvobozhdenye—Russian for "liberation"—went on the air on March 1, 1953, with Russian emigrees broadcasting anti-Communist messages and uncensored news to the Soviet Union and to Soviet forces in the occupation areas. From the early broadcasts in Russian at the rate of 12 hours per day, the facilities of the station have been expanded until it is presently on a 24-hour-a-day schedule of broadcasts in 17 different languages comprising many of the nationalities now under Bolshevik domination. Nine transmitters beam the broadcasts to the vast area behind the Iron Curtain. The staff consists of about 300 persons—primarily of former Soviet citizens, and German and American technicians, all working under American policy guidance. The programs are carefully prepared by former Soviet citizens who tailor them to appeal specifically to various segments of the population. There are two main indications that the programs are getting results. The Soviet Union is expending considerable resources in attacking the broadcasts in the Soviet press, and intense Soviet jamming efforts began 10 minutes after Radio Liberation went on the air and have increased continuously. Despite these efforts, the testimony of the continual flow of escapees is evidence that the message is getting through.

The other major undertaking of the committee is support of the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the U. S. S. R. which was founded early in 1950 by a group of Soviet emigree scholars with the encouragement of the Russian Research Center of Harvard University.

The purpose of the institute is twofold:

First. To provide an opportunity for emigree scholars from the Soviet Union to engage in continued study in their fields of specialization.

Second. To elicit from the academic forces of the emigration valuable information concerning conditions within the Soviet Union.

The capacities of the institute have been steadily expanded, particularly its facilities for research on Soviet problems. From a start in 1951 with about 100 volumes and a few scanty files of Soviet periodicals, the library of the institute has now grown to 23,000 volumes with an extensive collection of earlier Soviet periodicals and a virtually complete file of current major Soviet publications. Western scholars have pronounced it the most useful collection of materials for research on Soviet problems in Europe. The institute possesses a unique advantage among institutions devoted to research in the same field: It is staffed with men and women of professional qualifications who have had first-hand knowledge and experience of life within the Soviet Union and who can interpret and evaluate Soviet policies and developments against this background. The free world, particularly the neutralist areas where there is an inadequate understanding of Soviet policies, practices, and intentions, has much to learn from these persons whose scholarly and scientific careers in Soviet institutions lend a rare authority to their appraisals, and the institute serves as the channel through which their output can be disseminated effectively. The institute has won recognition from the West German Government as an academic institution, meeting standards prescribed by German law, and its publications in English, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Turkish, and German are being increasingly consulted by free world circles concerned with questions of Soviet policies and practices.

The American committee also devotes its attention and resources to special projects under which the anti-Communist emigration is enabled to counter effectively Soviet designs against the free world, particularly in the psychological and propaganda fields. An example of such a project was the participation in 1954 of the two Moslem emigres from different parts of the Soviet Union in the annual pilgrimage to Mecca where they exposed the hypocrisy of the team of so-called pilgrims sent in by special plane from Moscow. The American committee assisted these anti-Communist Moslems in making this trip which had a profound influence on the Moslem world.

This record of accomplishment and those who are engaged in this worthwhile cause which shows sympathy for the suffering of the oppressed, friendship for other peoples, and passionate conviction that freedom is the birthright of all humanity deserve the commendation and appreciation of free peoples everywhere.

Following is a list of the publications made by this institute. I am certain anyone interested in this program will find these publications of great interest:

1. The World's Dilemma and a Way Out (liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union), 1952.
2. Two Sides of the Coin (a demonstration of the need for objectivity), 1953.
3. A Free Voice at the Moscow University Bicentennial (messages of emigre scholars and scientists), 1955.
4. A Free Voice at the Soviet Writers Congress (radio liberation speaks to the peoples of the Soviet Union), 1955.
5. Anniversary Selection of Radio Liberation Broadcasts.
6. Current Publications of Radio Liberation.

Another Reason For Not Building The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam and power facilities will be unavoidable if the bill passes.

Your committee voted to strike the controversial Echo Park Dam from the bill. But this action was a sham; Echo Park Dam is still in the bill, and the House must be realistic and treat it accordingly.

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible $1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole projects as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it more palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

The Trojan-horse strategy of the proponents of the bill is only too obvious. They voted to remove Echo Park Dam from the House bill to facilitate its passage. However, the proponents know full well that Echo Park Dam will be restored by the conference committee or by legislation in future Congresses. Backers of the bill have been so brazen about this strategy that they discussed it freely with the press. The Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, which has been campaigning hard for the project, on June 9, 1955, reported from Washington on the action by the committee:

> Backers of the river bill and Echo Park were not dismayed by the Thursday vote. It has long been a part of upper Basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope that it will be restored by a joint House-Senate conference committee. Otherwise, House leaders said it would be impossible to get the project bill through the Rules Committee and past the House.

On July 1, 1955, the same newspaper carried an interview with Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, in which he was quoted as saying:

> If we can get a bill through this session, we can amend it later. * * *

Echo Park is still in the bill because the project will not work without it. Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the 83d Congress that taking Echo Park out of the upper Colorado storage project would be like taking the pistons out of the engine of an automobile. The project will not function without Echo Park Dam.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer testified before your committee this year that the project would not be economically feasible without Echo Park Dam. He stated that the economic feasibility of the project might be established without Echo Park if some of the participating projects also were deleted. However, this was not done by your committee. It deleted—temporarily—Echo Park, but retained all of the participating projects. In other words, the committee sends to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation conceded would be economically infeasible.

Echo Park no more can be taken out of this project than history can be abolished by taking out and destroying the page of the history book upon which it is recorded. This is a total project, and the maneuvering through the committee and through the House will not succeed in convincing the people that Echo Park Dam is not in the bill, because it is. Even if Echo Park is not restored in conference, which is unlikely, backers of the project will come back to Congress in the future and say, "We have spent billions of the taxpayers' money on the upper Colorado storage project. Now we have to have Echo Park to make it work. Give us the pistons for the engine."

In the famous words of the Supreme Court:

> All others can see and understand this. How can we properly shut our minds to it?

Who Stands To Benefit From H. R. 6645 (the Natural Gas Exemption Bill) and Who Would Pay for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have asked me if I could advise them of who stands to profit if H. R. 6645, which would repeal the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case and would exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, should become law.

I have told them that the hearing before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee contained uncontradicted evidence that as of the end of 1954 there was slightly over 211.1 trillion cubic feet of known recoverable reserves of natural gas.

I have further told them that the best information I could obtain indicated that 30 of the largest and most prosperous gas and oil companies in the country controlled approximately 63 percent of these reserves. The following is the best information I have of the companies involved, and their gas reserves, stated in trillion cubic feet:

1.	Humble	18.0
2.	Phillips	17.9
3.	Texaco	10.5
4.	Standard of Indiana	9.9
5.	Socony-Vacuum	7.5
6.	Shell	7.0
7.	Cities Service	6.3
8.	El Paso Natural Gas Co	4.5
9.	Standard of California	4.0
10.	Gulf	4.0
11.	Continental	3.8
12.	Sun	3.8
13.	Pure Oil Co	3.7
14.	Panhandle Eastern	3.5
15.	Colorado Interstate	3.3
16.	Chicago Corp	2.5
17.	Skelly	2.4
18.	Atlantic	2.2
19.	Ohio Oil	2.1
20.	Republic Natural	2.1
21.	Cities Service Gas Co	2.0
22.	Tidewater Association	1.8
23.	Sinclair	1.7
24.	Union Oil	1.6
25.	Superior	1.5
26.	Sunray	1.5
27.	Natural Gas Pipeline	1.5
28.	Southern Production	1.3
29.	Pan America Petroleum and Transportation	1.3
30.	Arkansas-Louisiana	1.1

It should be obvious if these companies are able to secure the benefits of H. R. 6645, which they have been vigorously supporting for months, they will then concentrate upon obtaining higher prices for their gas.

This would add immediately as much as $30 billion to the value of the known proven reserves.

If an increase of only 15 cents per thousand cubic feet could be secured, this would add to the cost annually, at the 1953 rate of use, $806,500,500, and, of course, the gas consumer would foot the annual bill.

Some of my colleagues have also asked me who would bear the burden of these increased prices. It is obvious that the consumers of natural gas throughout the United States would have to pay for any increase in price reflected in rates. According to the American Gas Association, there were 24,649,900 residential gas consumers in the United States in 1953. There is no doubt but that this number has increased substantially since that time.

They will pay for any windfall involved in this legislation or for any give-away program which is foisted upon them. While I hope that the few fundamental and uncontradictable facts will lead the House to reject this bill, I have no doubt whatever but that these gas consumers and their families will exercise their right of approval or disapproval of any action taken here in this matter.

A Stone Curtain Threatens Park Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, for years members of the southern California water lobby have thoughtfully held the coats of conservationists who would fight the Echo Dam phase of the Colorado River storage project. Now that the Echo Park feature of the project, the target of the conservation groups, has been eliminated from the House bill, the southern California water lobby is using every device to incite these same conservation groups into a battle against the entire project.

The reason advanced for these tactics is that proponents might somehow "sneak" the Echo Park unit into the bill. This is ridiculous, because nothing can be added to a House bill without knowledge and approval from the House.

Unfortunately a few conservationist leaders—chiefly the professional paid secretary—have, for some reason, gone along with the strategy of the southern California water lobby.

I use the word "unfortunately" advisedly, because by doing this—by attacking the entire project—these few conservationists are showing an inconsistent attitude, a lack of good faith, and lending credence to what some of us have charged all along—that these groups have been and are the tools, unwitting or otherwise, of the southern California water lobby.

More than that, by casting stones against the entire project because they once objected to a single unit, these few conservationists are building a barrier that will jeopardize expansion of our park and monument system in the future. I predict that the "barrier of stone" built as a result of these tactics will prove detrimental in the long run to the conservationists and their goals.

Specifically what do you think will happen when we have proposals in the future for expansion of a national park or monument, or when someone proposes a new park or monument in the West? I will tell you what will happen. The people of the area concerned will rise up in wrath to oppose such a proposal.

If a few professional "conservationists" can recklessly and willfully oppose the development of an entire region—one-twelfth of the United States—on an issue which no longer exists, the people of that region may easily be prejudiced against the entire conservationist movement.

When the conservationists opposed building Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument, we could respect their views and their principles, even though we differed with their interpretation of the facts. But when the conservationists succeed in their campaign to have Echo Park Dam eliminated from the over-all project, and then turn to attack the entire project, we can only interpret it as a headstrong determination to impose their will on the Nation. The few professional spokesmen who are doing this are thus threatening to defeat the legitimate and laudable aims of all the genuine conservationists in the Nation.

These are the questions that will be asked whenever a park or monument expansion is proposed. The tactics of a few today will jeopardize true conservation in the future.

I might add that there are many areas in the West that will be great new recreation areas for the entire Nation to enjoy, areas that will be the new monuments and parks of the future as our Nation grows in size, ability to travel and in desire to see and appreciate the wonders of our great land. There are a number of such areas in the upper basin States, but the people concerned will rightfully ask, what will happen 20 years from now in that very "preserved" area?

The stone curtain has been erected so high, the sanctity so absolute, that all perspective has been lost. When an entire vital project is opposed because of one controversial unit which has in fact been deleted, then the people of the West naturally fear for their future.

My constituents point with scorn at the tactic of opposing an entire four-State development that will aid millions of people, including the entire Navaho tribe, because some conservationists once saw something they didn't like in one phase of that development.

As a sincere advocate of conservation, I urge these groups to support the Colorado River storage project. As it is outlined in the House bill, it is a conservation measure of the greatest magnitude.

Let's have no more of these feeble excuses, as manufactured by the southern California water lobby, that Congressmen should vote against this bill because something might be added without their knowledge. Let's face the facts, not the phantoms.

True conservation is embodied in every paragraph of H. R. 3383, and I sincerely urge your support of it.

Better Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the social security changes that are before us today.

It is gratifying indeed that the House of Representatives will have an opportunity today to vote to improve the social-security law. These good and much needed changes in the law are very important to the people that I represent. As evidence that the people are four-square behind these proposals, I want to tell you of some of the results of the annual questionnaire I send out to secure the views of my constituents on matters before us. Unfortunately, this year, space limitations did not permit a question on social security. Despite this fact, a great number of people brought up the subject themselves by writing comments on the back of the questionnaire. Those who wrote in unanimously approved last year's passage of the Eisenhower social-security program, and they strongly suggested the same additional amendments now being proposed to the House and which I have urged in past years.

This is another example of the good commonsense of the American people. We often hear that personal thrift should be encouraged. Isn't social security an excellent example of national thrift, saving now in prosperous times to ease the retired years for all of us?

I have always been a strong supporter of our social-security system and during my years in the Congress I have made every effort to improve these benefits for our older people. I believe so strongly in this because it is only through the efforts of the people who are now in their late fifties and in their sixties that America has become so great and prosperous a nation. Who are more entitled to good social-security benefits than today's oldsters whose hard work put this country in the position today to pay them the old-age benefits they so richly deserve?

The bill before us does the following:

First. Extends coverage to all professional workers except doctors.

Second. Provides social-security benefits to eligible women at the age of 62, rather than 65.

Third. Pays the equivalent of full retirement benefits to disabled workers after the age of 50.

Fourth. Continues benefits for disabled children after the age of 18.

All of these steps are natural extensions of the Eisenhower social-security program which we adopted in the last session of Congress, and it is for this reason I am confident that if we in the Congress adopt these improvements, the President will sign the bill and give our deserving older people these added benefits to which they are justly entitled.

I have a great deal of respect for the members of the great medical profession who deal in grave problems of human misery. I know, too, that the rank and file of our doctors and dentists are sympathetic to the bill before us—as a matter of fact, they themselves want to be a part of the social-security program, but the ivory-tower leaders of the American Medical Association object.

I know that many of you have been asked to vote against this bill by the American Medical Association, and I cannot for the life of me understand their most unreasonable opposition to a program that is for the good and well-being of our American people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members of this House to disregard the selfish objections of the American Medical Association, and I urge you to vote for this bill and enact these good improvements in our excellent program for the older people of America.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, endue with Thy wisdom, we beseech Thee, our fallible minds. The call to prayer from the lips of the President of the Republic finds its ready response in the hearts of untold millions of his fellow citizens in this free land which bows in reverence at the altar of Thy sovereignty.

Through those who speak for us and our allies in preserving liberty of conscience and speech, we face the tangled tragedy of a world where deluded men have substituted the low ceiling of mere things for the infinite sky of the Divine Presence and purpose. These days of destiny are forcing decisions that concern fearful forces of nature which, if not harnessed by mutual good will, may destroy us utterly. Give those who deliberate at the summit of authority greatness of soul that the keys of awesome new power may be used to open doors not of peril, but of plenty for the whole earth.

God the all-righteous One, man hath
  defied Thee,
Yet to eternity standeth Thy word;
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry be-
  side Thee,
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon while the Senate is in session in order to consider an emergency matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour any statement made in connection with the presentation of any petition or memorial, the introduction of any bill, or the transaction of other routine business be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEREXPENDITURE OF AN APPROPRIATION ALLOTMENT

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overexpenditure of an appropriation allotment within the Federal Housing Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of West Covina, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the construction of the Walnut Creek system of the comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Don O. Rehm, president, Guaranty Cycle Co., St. Louis, Mo., relating to the tariff on imported bicycles; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 2277. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for park and recreational purposes, for an amount equal to the cost to the United States of acquiring such land from the city; with amendments (Rept. No. 1020).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 133. Resolution increasing funds for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations of technical assistance and related programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1021).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2049. A bill to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1022).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 605. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1025).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5893. A bill to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1023).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 2866. A bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet, Mass., a nonnavigable stream (Rept. No. 1026); and

H. R. 4362. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954 (Rept. No. 1027).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1851. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to Mary Ann Aust (Rept. No. 1028);

S. 1899. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries (Rept. No. 1029); and

S. 2260. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries (Rept. No. 1030).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2029. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hulah Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively (Rept. No. 1031); and

S. 2093. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to undertake certain public works and grant compensation for certain property damages as a result of the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects, Missouri River (Rept. No. 1032).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 8, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Edward P. Guinane (to Jan. 31), investigator	11,646.00	970.50
Cotys M. Mouser, chief clerk	9,404.83	4,674.48
James M. Kendall, assistant chief clerk	9,155.98	4,564.11
Sam A. Thompson (from Mar. 17), clerical assistant	6,481.67	1,872.45
Betty M. Mason, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,129.56
Blanche M. O'Berg, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Therese R. Lepine (to Jan. 2), clerical assistant	4,091.85	22.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	3,469.51
Balance unexpended	6,530.49

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June

30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, staff member	$11, 646. 00	$5, 823. 00
Gardner C. Turner, staff member	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Leonard E. Edwards, agent (to May 31)	10, 068. 45	4, 195. 15
Alan J. Kraft, agent (to Mar. 31)	9, 073. 03	2, 268. 24
Leo C. Nulty, agent (to Feb 28)	10, 068. 45	1, 678. 06
Louis C. Prell, staff member (from May 15)	9, 902. 55	1, 265. 32
William V. Sinnott, agent (to Feb. 28)	10, 732. 07	1, 788. 66
Paul J. Tierney, agent (to Feb. 28)	10, 068. 45	1, 678. 06
Paul A. Toussaint, agent (to Mar. 31)	9, 073. 03	2, 268. 24
Alice S. Dearborn, clerical assistant (to Feb. 28)	3, 996. 26	666. 04
Angela M. Novello, clerical assistant (to Feb. 28)	4, 378. 64	729. 76
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant (to May 31)	4, 569. 81	1, 904. 05
REGULAR EMPLOYEES		
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Francis S. Hewitt, assistant clerk	10, 732. 07	5, 365. 98
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	10, 732. 07	5, 365. 98
Kenneth J. Bousquet, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 355. 61
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 365. 98
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 365. 98
Leonard E. Edwards, professional staff member (from June 1)	10, 068. 45	839. 03
Richard W. Eddy, professional staff member	10, 068. 45	5, 034. 18
John J. Gaines, professional staff member (to Jan. 16)	10, 068. 45	447. 48
Joe E. Gonzales, professional staff member (from Feb. 12)	9, 902. 55	3, 823. 47
H. Maurice Joyce, professional staff member (to Mar. 15)	10, 068. 45	2, 097. 57
G. E. Johnson, professional staff member	8, 990. 07	4, 495. 02
William J. Kennedy, Jr., professional staff member	10, 068. 45	5, 034. 18
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 283. 02
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 365. 98
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member (to Apr. 24)	10, 732. 07	3, 315. 50
Robert E. O'Hara, professional staff member (from Mar. 5)	10, 732. 07	3, 458. 08
Vorley M. Rexroad, professional staff member (from Mar. 1)	9, 902. 55	3, 300. 84
Raymond L. Schafer, professional staff member (from Feb. 16)	10, 068. 45	3, 775. 63
William W. Woodruff, professional staff member	10, 732. 07	5, 283. 02
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member (to Feb. 15)	10, 732. 07	1, 341. 49
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	5, 047. 77	2, 324. 69
Pauline T. Connell, clerical assistant (to Mar. 13)	4, 569. 81	926. 64
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant	4, 378. 64	2, 189. 28
Mary G. Gatton, clerical assistant (from Apr. 1)	4, 761. 00	1, 158. 37
Elva Glaser, clerical assistant (to Mar. 31)	4, 569. 81	1, 142. 43
Lois A. Glines, clerical assistant (to Mar. 15)	4, 569. 81	952. 02
Laura A. Hawley, clerical assistant (to Mar. 13)	4, 569. 81	926. 64
Mary F. Holloway, clerical assistant (from Apr. 1)	4, 761. 00	1, 158. 37
Carolyn Macy, clerical assistant (from Apr. 1)	4, 569. 81	1, 142. 43
E. Marea Marshall, clerical assistant (to Jan. 2)	4, 569. 81	25. 38
Mamie L. Mizen, assistant clerk (from Feb. 16)	6, 959. 63	2, 609. 82
Rebul H. Nichols, clerical assistant (from Mar. 1)	4, 761. 00	1, 539. 18
Mary T. Savage, clerical assistant (to Jan. 2)	4, 569. 81	25. 38

Carl Hayden,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Dec. 31, 1954	$24, 151. 49
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1955	0
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	24, 151. 49
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 121, 153, 243, and 279 as of Dec. 31, 1954	15, 021. 05
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1955	195. 40
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	14, 825. 65
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, as of Dec. 31, 1954	346, 416. 21
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1955	29, 698. 54
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	316, 717. 67
Amount authorized by Reorganization Act	10, 000. 00
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1955	1, 531. 30
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	8, 468. 70

Carl Hayden,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Allen, Philip K.,[1] chief clerk	$11, 646. 00	$2, 967. 26
Atkinson, Herbert S., assistant chief clerk	8, 187. 86	3, 923. 48
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr., professional staff member	11, 646. 00	5, 589. 95
Dantzic, Maurine E., clerical assistant	4, 856. 61	2, 337. 10
Darden, William H., professional staff member	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Johnson, Edna E., clerical assistant	4, 569. 81	2, 284. 90
Mudge, Verne D., professional staff member	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Schweigert, Esther N., clerical assistant	4, 378. 64	2, 189. 32
Welker, Mary M., clerical assistant	4, 378. 64	2, 100. 45

[1] Services terminated Apr. 3, 1955.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10, 000
Amount expended	6, 157
Balance unexpended	3, 843

Richard B. Russell,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anton, James, special counsel	$9, 404. 83	$4, 702. 38
Canaday, Alyce D., clerical assistant	4, 378. 64	2, 189. 28
Cooper, Genevieve, secretary	4, 665. 41	2, 332. 68
Engle, Wallace L., investigator	6, 003. 71	3, 001. 80
Gilleas, Benjamin J., attorney	$7, 819. 96	$3, 909. 96
Hiller, Vera M., stenographer [1]	4, 091. 85	1, 136. 60
Jeffries, Jo Ann, clerk-typist [2]	3, 613. 89	110. 42
Kelly, E. Russel, assistant chief counsel [3]	10, 483. 21	407. 68
McGillicuddy, Daniel F. Jr., attorney	7, 819. 96	3, 909. 96
Neal, Robert M., attorney [4]	6, 003. 71	133. 41
Rhodes, Fred B., chief counsel [5]	11, 646. 00	4, 367. 25
Sircom, Edith M., stenographer	4, 187. 45	2, 093. 70
Waldron, Glenn S., accountant	6, 672. 26	3, 336. 42
Walters, Jeri Lynne, stenographer [6]	3, 422. 72	104. 58

[1] As of Mar. 21, 1955.
[2] As of June 20, 1955.
[3] As of June 17, 1955.
[4] As of June 23, 1955.
[5] Services terminated May 15, 1955.
[6] As of June 20, 1955.

Funds authorized under S. Res. 185, agreed to Jan. 26, 1954	$150, 000. 00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	68, 955. 67
Amount expended	5, 498. 33
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 31, 1955	64, 476. 47
Funds authorized for committee expenditures under S. Res. 28, agreed to Feb. 4, 1955	64, 476. 47
Amount expended to June 30, 1955	11, 000. 02
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	53, 376. 45
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures under S. Res. 72, agreed to Mar. 28, 1955	$160, 000. 00
Amount expended to June 30, 1955	18, 206. 75
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1955	141, 793. 25

Richard B. Russell,
Chairman.
Lyndon B. Johnson,
Chairman,
Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John H. Yingling (from Mar. 1), chief clerk	$11, 646. 00	$3, 882. 00
Robert A. Wallace (from Jan. 15), staff director	11, 646. 00	5, 337. 75
Paul Cyr (Jan. 1 to Jan. 14), professional staff member	11, 646. 00	485. 25
Paul Cyr (from Apr. 1), assistant clerk	11, 646. 00	2, 911. 50
William F. McKenna, counsel	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
James B. Cash, Jr. (from Feb. 16), professional staff member	11, 646. 00	4, 367. 25
Donald L. Rogers (from Apr. 1), counsel	11, 646. 00	2, 911. 50
A. Lee Parsons (to Feb. 28), chief clerk	11, 646. 00	1, 941. 00
Ray S. Donaldson (to Mar. 31), counsel	11, 646. 00	2, 911. 50
John R. Hancock (to Mar. 31), assistant clerk	11, 646. 00	2, 911. 50
Norman W. Stevenson (to Feb. 15), counsel	11, 646. 00	1, 455. 75
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	6, 386. 08	2, 973. 95
Florence Barr, clerical assistant	5, 908. 12	2, 954. 06
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5, 812. 53	2, 687. 15
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5, 812. 53	2, 687. 15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10, 000. 00
Amount expended through June 30, 1955	5, 427. 17
Balance unexpended	4, 572. 83

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 289 (83d Cong.), Investigation of the Federal Housing Administration)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to January 31, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Thomas T. Kenney, assistant counsel	$11, 646. 00	$970. 50
Clarence M. Dinkins, assistant counsel	8, 644. 09	720. 34
Dean F. Cromer, investigator	8, 644 09	720. 34
Arthur J. Wilson, staff assistant	8, 644. 09	720. 34
Morris W. Bush, staff assistant	8, 644. 09	720. 34
James H. Walter, staff assistant	6, 003. 71	500. 30
Janet D. Wiebler, clerical assistant	4, 283. 04	356. 92
Doris I. Thomas, clerical assistant	4, 283. 04	356. 92
Margaret F. Anderson, clerical assistant (from Jan. 5 to 19)	4, 283. 04	178. 45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Jan. 1, 1955	$47, 414. 43
Amount expended Jan. 1 through 31, 1955	7, 551. 30
Balance unexpended	39, 863. 13

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 23, Economic Stabilization and Mobilization)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 4, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
James B. Cash, Jr., professional staff member, to Feb. 15	$11, 646. 00	$485. 25
Paul Cyr, staff assistant, to Mar. 31	11, 646. 00	1, 941. 00
John H. Yingling, counsel, to Feb. 28	11, 646. 00	970. 50
A. Lee Parsons, staff member, from Mar. 1 to 31	11, 646. 00	970. 50
John R. Hancock, staff member, from Apr. 1 to 15	11, 646. 00	485. 25
Ray S. Donaldson, staff member, from Apr. 1 to 30	11, 646. 00	970. 50
Matthew Hale, assistant counsel, from Apr. 20	11, 646. 00	2, 296. 85
E. Wayles Browne, Jr., professional staff member, from May 27	11, 646. 00	1, 099. 90
Clarence M. Dinkins, assistant counsel, to Mar. 17	8, 644. 09	1, 128. 53
Arthur J. Wilson, staff assistant	8, 644. 09	3, 601. 70
Charlie W. Jones, staff assistant, to Mar. 10	8, 644. 09	960. 45
John L. Douglas, staff assistant, to Apr. 15	8, 644. 09	1, 800. 84
James H. Walter, staff assistant, to Mar. 31	6, 003. 71	1, 000. 60
Nancy Platt, research assistant, to Apr. 30	6, 003. 71	1, 500. 90
Frances K. Topping, economist, from Mar. 7	6, 003. 71	1, 643. 05
Dorothy L. McCaffrey, clerical assistant	4, 665. 41	1, 943. 90
Barbara H. Spencer, clerical assistant, to Mar. 31	4, 474. 23	745. 70
Vella Mae Orndorff, clerical assistant, from Apr. 1	4, 474. 23	1, 118. 55
Doris I. Thomas, clerical assistant, to Mar. 17	4, 283. 04	559. 17
Jacqueline D. Winstead, clerical assistant, from Feb. 25	4, 283. 04	1, 499. 06
Irwin Friend, consultant, per diem	32. 35	32. 35
Mark E. Stroock, consultant, per diem	32. 35	129. 40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$100, 000. 00
Amount expended through June 30, 1955	39, 400. 00
Balance unexpended	60, 599. 60

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 57, Public and Private Housing)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from March 18, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jack Carter, staff director (from Apr. 5)	$11, 646. 00	$2, 782. 10
Clarence M. Dinkins, assistant counsel	9, 073. 03	2, 526. 76
Robert R. Poston, assistant counsel (from May 16)	9, 073. 03	1, 134. 12
Olin Cavness, staff assistant (from Apr. 8)	8, 005. 36	1, 845. 67
John L. Douglas, staff assistant (Apr. 16 to May 7)	8, 461. 59	517. 09
Valerie A. Earle, research assistant (from May 16)	7, 055. 23	881. 89
Clarence R. Jacobs, accountant (from Apr. 11)	6, 194. 89	1, 376. 64
James H. Walter, staff assistant (from Apr. 1)	6, 003. 71	1, 500. 90
Mildred Mitchel, clerical assistant (from Apr. 11)	4, 474. 23	994. 26
Doris I. Thomas, clerical assistant	4, 283. 04	1, 225. 42
Dixie J. Thomas, clerical assistant (from May 16)	4, 283. 04	535. 37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$100, 000. 00
Amount expended through June 30, 1955	15, 579. 17
Balance unexpended	84, 420. 83

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 183 (83d Cong.), Study of Export-Import Bank and International Bank)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to January 31, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dorothy L. McCaffrey, clerical assistant	$4, 665. 41	$388. 78
Betty Jo Morgan, clerical assistant	4, 283. 04	356. 92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Jan. 1, 1955	$74, 317. 43
Amount expended, Jan. 1 through Jan. 31, 1955	833. 65
Balance unexpended	73, 483. 78

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 182 (83d Cong.), Economic Stabilization and Mobilization)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to January 31, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John H. Yingling, counsel	$11, 646. 00	$970. 50
Paul Cyr, staff assistant (from Jan. 16)	11, 646. 00	485. 25
James B. Cash, Jr., professional staff member (from Jan. 29)	11, 646. 00	64. 70
Charlie W. Jones, staff assistant	8, 644. 09	720. 34
Carl H. Wilken, analyst (to Jan. 15)	8, 644. 09	360. 16
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	8, 644. 09	720. 34
Nancy Platt, research assistant (from Jan. 24)	6, 003. 71	116. 73
Barbara H. Spencer, clerical assistant	4, 474. 23	372. 85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Jan. 1, 1955	$20, 434. 72
Amount expended, Jan. 1 through Jan. 31, 1955	4, 545. 38
Balance unexpended	15, 889. 32

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Leo A. Casey, chief clerk (from Jan. 6)	$11, 646. 00	$5, 661. 25
William P. Gulledge, professional staff member (from Jan. 18)	11, 646. 00	5, 823. 00
Murray W. Weight, professional staff member	9, 653. 69	4, 370. 95
Ruth W. Bryant, clerical assistant	6, 481. 67	3, 236. 26
Arlene B. Williams, clerical assistant	6, 481. 67	3, 240. 78
Leland D. Case, chief clerk (to Jan. 15)	11, 646. 00	485. 25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$10, 000. 00
Amount expended, 84th Cong., Jan. 1 to June 30, 1955	673. 34
Balance unexpended	9, 326. 66

M. M. NEELY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10, 649. 11	$5, 324. 52
Betty Mae Tapy, clerical assistant	6, 003. 71	3, 001. 80
Evelyn R. Thompson, clerical assistant	4, 952. 20	2, 476. 08
Jesse R. Nichols, clerical assistant	4, 856. 61	2, 428. 26

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Serge N. Benson, professional staff (Mar. 15 to Mar. 28)	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ronald Ward, clerical assistant (Apr. 28 to May 4)	2,040.00	221.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,033.53
Balance expended	4,966.47

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Carl M. Macy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Julius N. Cahn, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Alwyn V. Freeman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
C. C. O'Day, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Pat M. Hold, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Emmett M. O'Grady, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, clerical assistant (through Feb. 15)	6,194.89	774.36
June C. Pitts, clerical assistant (through Feb. 15; from Feb. 16)	5,525.75 6,290.49	690.70 2,358.90
Mary A. Sames, clerical assistant (through Feb. 15; from Feb. 16)	4,761.00 5,525.75	595.12 2,072.11
Doris B. Covington, clerical assistant (through Feb. 15; from Feb. 16) [1]	5,047.77 5,525.75	630.96 2,072.11
Robert C. Dolan, clerical assistant (to Feb. 16) [1]	4,856.61	607.06
Orrin E. Cressey, clerical assistant (from Mar. 1) [1]	5,430.16	1,810.04

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 29, agreed to Jan. 18, 1955.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	2,057.90
Balance unexpended	7,942.10

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Subcommittee making a full and complete study of foreign technical-assistance programs, under authority of Senate Resolution 36, section A, agreed to February 4, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Emily J. Butler, assistant clerk	$3,805.08	$1,585.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$24,000.00
Amount expended	6,436.51
Balance unexpended	17,563.49

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Subcommittee on Review of the United Nations Charter, under authority of Senate Resolution 36, section B, agreed to February 4, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Morella R. Hansen, clerk (from Feb. 16, 1955)	$7,150.81	$2,681.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$28,000.00
Amount expended	18,790.52
Balance unexpended	9,209.48

NOTE.—The detail of certain personnel of the Library of Congress on a reimbursable basis, was authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for services rendered this subcommittee.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Richard J. O'Melia, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Harold P. Green, professional staff member (from Feb. 3, 1955 to June 17, 1955)	11,646.00	4,367.25
Miles Scull, Jr., professional staff member (from June 18, 1955)	11,646.00	420.55
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	7,437.59	3,718.74
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,715.06
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Vivien McConnell, clerical assistant (from Feb. 14, 1955)	4,952.20	1,884.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	1,820.09
Balance unexpended	8,179.91

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Alderman, Jerome S., assistant counsel (from May 16)	$11,646.00	$1,455.75
Anastos, C. George, assistant counsel (to Feb. 28)	8,552.84	1,425.46
Anderson, Edith H., staff editor	6,003.71	3,001.80
Buckley, Daniel G., assistant counsel (to Feb. 28)	8,096.60	1,349.42
Buffalohide, Maxine B., assistant clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Calabrese, Alphonse F., investigator (from Feb. 28)	10,068.45	3,440.02
Dearborn, Alice S., assistant clerk (from Mar. 2)	4,091.85	1,352.55
Duckett, Margaret W., assistant clerk	4,856.61	2,380.46
Duffy, LaVerne J., investigator	6,099.30	3,049.62
Engel, Rosemary, assistant clerk (to Mar. 15)	4,474.23	932.12
Juliana, James N., chief counsel to minority	11,646.00	5,823.00
Kennedy, Robert F., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Kraus, Teresa C., assistant clerk (from Feb. 24)	4,378.64	1,544.65
LaVenia, Thomas W., assistant counsel (to Feb. 28)	10,151.40	1,691.90
Mann, H. Michael, messenger (from May 3)	3,237.76	521.63
McClerkin, J. Fred, research analyst (from Mar. 1)	6,099.30	2,033.08
McElroy, Robert J., investigator (to Apr. 24)	6,864.04	2,173.60
Novella, Angela M., assistant clerk (from Mar. 1)	4,378.64	1,459.52
Nulty, Leo C., investigator (from Mar. 1)	10,068.45	3,356.12
O'Donnell, Donald F., assistant chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Roman, Regina R., research assistant (to Feb. 28)	5,047.77	841.28
Sutton, Nina W., assistant clerk (to Jan. 31)	5,334.57	444.54
Tierney, Paul J., assistant counsel (from Mar. 1)	10,068.45	3,356.12
Tracy, Charles A., investigator (to Feb. 28)	7,533.19	1,255.52
Watt, Ruth Young, chief clerk	7,246.41	3,623.16

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$212,865.76
Amount expended	91,468.93
Balance unexpended	121,396.83

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Callaghan, Richard L., chief clerk	$11,646.00	$4,852.50
Coburn, William H., attorney	11,646.00	4,852.50
Davis, Dorothy, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Donnelley, Rosemary, clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,699.12
French, Stewart, general counsel and staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Gamble, James H., professional staff member	9,570.74	3,648.48
Gillette, Margaret G., clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,201.35
Grorud, Albert A., professional staff member (to Feb. 15)	11,646.11	1,455.75
Hand, Elizabeth J., clerical assistant (Jan. 17–May 15)	5,047.77	1,668.54
Holderer, Geo. B., professional staff member (to Jan. 31)	10,649.11	887.42
Lineweaver, Goodrich W., professional staff member	11,646.00	4,367.25
Mathew, Marie, clerical staff (to Jan. 9)	5,238.97	130.97
McSherry, Nellie D., assistant chief clerk	10,317.31	5,113.58
Nelson, Elmer K., professional staff member (to Jan. 31)	11,646.00	970.50
Yates, Mary Jo, clerical staff	5,047.77	630.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	12,144.64
Balance unexpended	7,855.36

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

(Subcommittee investigating the availability and accessibility of critical raw materials, under authority of Senate Resolution 37, agreed to February 4, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S., professional staff member (to May 15)	$11,646.00	$3,396.75
Callaghan, Marcie M., clerical assistant (from Apr. 25)	4,952.20	907.89
Harrington, Joan M., clerical assistant	4,761.00	1,983.75
Hoban, Cecelia A., clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,063.40
Holderer, Geo. B., professional staff member	11,646.00	4,852.50
O'Connor, Adele R., clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,063.40
Redwine, Robert W., professional staff member (from Feb. 16)	10,068.45	3,526.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$70,000.00
Amount expended	24,112.75
Balance unexpended	45,887.25

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

(Holding investigations under authority of Senate Resolution 39, agreed to February 4, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Chambers, Edward T., professional staff member (from Mar. 1)	$9,487.79	$3,162.56
Heany, Rita, clerical assistant (from Apr. 11)	4,952.20	1,100.48
Mapes, Milton C., Jr., professional staff member (from Feb. 9)	10,068.45	3,971.41
Murphy, Margaret M., clerical assistant (Feb. 21 to Apr. 10)	4,952.20	687.80
Nelson, Elmer K., professional staff member	11,646.00	4,852.50
Todd, Pauline B., clerical assistant (from Mar. 14)	5,334.57	1,585.52
Wilson, Platt, professional staff member (from Feb. 9)	9,985.50	4,160.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$60,000.00
Amount expended	23,010.73
Balance unexpended	36,989.27

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Baynton, Harold I., staff member, from Apr. 1	$11,646.00	$2,911.50
Chamberlin, Louise I., clerical assistant, from Feb. 16	3,805.08	1,902.54
Gray, Harriet S., clerical assistant, through Feb. 15	5,716.93	714.61
Jarrett, Edward S., chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Jelsma, Edward R., staff member, through Feb. 8	11,646.00	1,229.30
Knudson, Lois M., clerical assistant, from Feb. 16	4,665.41	2,332.68
L'Heureux, Robert D., staff member, through Feb. 8	11,646.00	1,229.30
Pellegrini, Frank, chief counsel, from Feb. 9	11,646.00	4,173.15
Rudolph, Vera B., clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.25
Shaffer, Martha P., clerical assistant, through Feb. 15	5,716.93	714.61
Smigen, Cecelia M., clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Sweeney, Edward C., staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wissman, Bertram O., assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Zapple, Nicholas, staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,244.63
Balance unexpended	4,755.37

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Senate Resolution 13, agreed to February 4, 1955, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (84th Cong., 1st sess.))

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 4, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Black, John W., staff member, from Apr. 4	$6,481.67	$1,566.38
Bowers, Joan A., clerical assistant, from May 9	4,187.45	604.84
Bourbon, August J., staff member:		
Through May 16	9,238.93	3,981.33
From May 17	10,317.31	
Busby, R. David, staff member, from Mar. 14	8,990.07	2,672.04
Butz, John R., clerical assistant	6,003.71	2,501.50
Davis, Sidney M., staff member, from Apr 1	11,646.00	2,911.50
Dill, Clarence C., consultant (per day)	25.00	541.64
Drake, Robin, staff member, from Feb. 7	6,481.67	2,592.63
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant	4,569.81	1,904.05
Geissinger, Wayne T., assistant chief counsel, from Mar. 25	11,646.00	3,105.60
Gray, Harriet S., clerical assistant, Feb. 16–May 15	5,716.93	1,429.22
Huse, Harry C., staff member, from Feb. 7	9,902.55	3,161.00
Jelsma, Edward R., staff member, Feb. 9–28	11,646.00	711.70
Kohler, William L., staff member, from May 4	$8,005.36	$1,267.51
Murphy, Margaret M., clerical assistant to Feb. 20	4,187.45	232.63
L'Heureux, Robert D., staff member, from Feb. 9	11,646.00	4,593.70
Monk, Jane E., clerical assistant, from Apr. 1	4,665.41	1,166.34
Moore, Milo, staff member, from May 18	11,646.00	1,391.05
Rogers, Kathryn B., clerical assistant	4,474.23	1,864.25
Shaffer, Martha P., clerical assistant, from Feb. 16	5,716.93	2,143.84
Stern, Edward A., staff member, from Feb. 8	9,238.93	3,669.90
Teeter, John H., consultant (per day)	25.00	388.20
Tucker, Ernest C., staff member, from, June 1	8,096.60	674.71
Watkins, Charles D., staff member, from Apr. 20	7,246.41	1,429.13

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$200,000.00
Amount expended	48,557.82
Balance unexpended	151,442.18

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Senate Resolution 173, agreed to January 26, 1954, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to January 31, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bourbon, August J., staff member	$9,238.93	$769.91
Butz, John R., clerical assistant	6,003.71	500.30
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant	4,569.81	380.81
Jones, Robert F., staff member	11,646.00	970.50
Murphy, Margaret M., clerical assistant	4,187.45	348.95
Plotkin, Harry M., staff member	11,646.00	970.50
Rogers, Kathryn B., clerical assistant	4,474.23	372.85
Thompson, Helen A., clerical assistant	5,334.57	444.54
Webster, Donald D., special counsel	11,646.00	970.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure. 83d Cong., Jan. 26, 1954, $115,000. Balance Dec. 31, 1954	$60,564.42
Amount expended Jan. 1–31, 1955	9,474.29
Balance unexpended	51,090.13

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June

30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Francis Rosenberger, assistant chief clerk (from Mar. 18)	11,646.00	3,396.75
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member (to Jan. 31)	11,646.00	970.50
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
James L. Miller, professional staff member (to May 31)	11,646.00	4,852.50
Robert B. Young, professional staff member (from June 1)	11,646.00	970.50
Mary I. Rogers, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,459.85
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant (to Jan. 31)	6,481.67	540.13
Carrie Lee Conner, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Naomi Hankins, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Katharine M. Ellis, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Richard F. Wambach, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,478.23
Balance unexpended	5,521.77

Harley M. Kilgore,
Chairman.

July 14, 1955.

Committee on the Judiciary

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 58, agreed to March 18, 1955; Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; and Senate Resolution 172, 83d Congress)

To the Secretary of the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, associate counsel (from Feb. 1, 1955)	$11,646.00	$4,852.50
Arens, William H., investigator (from Feb. 1, 1955)	8,990.07	3,745.85
Baker, Dorothy C., records control clerk	6,481.67	3,240.78
Beaird, Peggy S., clerk	4,091.85	2,045.88
Brown, James M., legal assistant	8,644.09	4,322.04
Buckley, Wilburn, investigator (from Feb. 3, 1955)	9,570.74	3,934.62
Cardiello, James A., legal investigator	3,709.49	1,854.72
Carpenter, Alva C., associate counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Colombo, Louis R., investigator	7,055.23	3,527.58
Duffy, Edward R., investigator	9,570.74	4,689.50
Dunn, Mary J., typist (from June 13 to 27, 1955)	3,613.89	150.57
Fisher, Herman E., clerk (to Feb. 15, 1955)	3,422.72	427.83
Fluegel, Edna R., research analyst	8,096.00	1,987.78
Fox, Miriam O., confidential secretary (from Feb. 1, 1955)	6,481.67	2,700.65
Franks, George W., clerk (to Mar. 15, 1955)	3,709.49	772.80
Gasque, Cecial A., investigator (from Feb. 3 to May 22, 1955)	9,570.74	2,924.37
Grefe, Charles A., clerk (from Apr. 7, to May 31, 1955)	5,334.57	800.17
Haaser, Stephen G., records manager	$8,644.09	$4,269.23
Halleck, Charles W., clerk (from Mar. 28, 1955)	5,334.57	1,378.07
Linebarger, Genevieve C., research specialist (w. a. e.)	9,073.03	37.80
Lowell, William E., editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
MacDevitt, Mary J., confidential secretary	6,481.67	3,102.70
Malaney, Elinor L., confidential secretary	6,481.67	3,240.78
Malaney, Ethel A., secretary (to Feb. 28, 1955)	5,525.75	920.94
Mandel, Benjamin, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
McDonnell, Yvonne G., secretary	5,525.75	2,762.82
McManus, Mary B., research specialist (w. a. e.)	9,073.03	756.07
McManus, Robert C., investigations analyst	11,395.68	5,697.84
McShan, Antoinette M., typist (from May 23, 1955)	5,812.53	517.94
Mercer, Doris L., secretary	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mitchell, Jonathan, temporary consultant (w. a. e.)	11,646.00	4,399.60
Richards, Ann E., stenographer (to Mar. 31, 1955)	5,525.75	1,381.41
Roberts, Marilyn H., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Schrider, F. Lois, typist (from (June 13, 1955)	3,613.89	180.69
Schroeder, Frank W., chief investigator (from Feb. 1, 1955)	11,395.68	4,656.94
Somes, Naomi W., clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Sourwine, J. G., chief counsel (from Feb. 1, 1955)	11,646.00	4,852.50
Spitzer, Hermann M., temporary research consultant (w. a. e.)	11,646.00	258.80
Stavropulos, Mary, clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 58	$260,000.00
Amount expended	83,214.09
Balance unexpended, June 30, 1955	176,785.91

Harley M. Kilgore,
Chairman.

James O. Eastland,
Subcommittee Chairman.

July 12, 1955.

Committee on the Judiciary

SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 61, agreed to March 18, 1955)

To the Secretary of the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Amidon, Robert H., attorney-investigator (from May 1)	$7,914.11	$1,319.00
Arnett, Lucy V., stenographer (from May 16)	4,856.61	607.06
Beath, Paul R., administrative assistant (from May 1)	6,864.04	1,144.00
Burns, Joseph W., chief counsel and staff director (from Apr. 20)	11,646.00	2,296.85
Burton, Irene, stenographer (from June 6)	4,856.61	337.26
Clifford, George E., attorney-investigator (from May 1)	7,914.11	1,319.00
Cobb, Julia S., stenographer (from May 23)	4,856.61	512.63
Cohen, Stanley L., research employee (from June 15)	3,518.30	156.36
Cook, Frances B., file clerk (from May 4)	5,047.77	827.89
Cutler, Robert G., research employee (from June 20)	3,518.30	107.50
Green, Paul S., hearing editor (from May 1)	9,073.03	1,512.16
Keeffe, Arthur J., assistant counsel (from June 6)	11,646.00	808.75
Keener, Katherine, research employee (from June 8)	$3,518.30	$224.77
Levien, Joy, research employee (from June 13)	3,518.30	175.91
McKee, Duncan O., research employee (from June 8)	3,518.30	224.77
Montier, Gladys E., clerk (from May 1)	6,003.71	1,000.60
Moore, James W., research employee (from June 21)	3,518.30	97.73
Moore, Stephen A., research employee (from June 24)	3,518.30	68.41
Neville, Gareth M., assistant counsel (from May 1)	11,646.00	1,821.49
Oliver, Mae, assistant clerk (from May 4)	5,908.12	971.29
Olshine, Lucille L., research assistant (from May 4)	5,047.77	813.56
Oppenheimer, Martin, research employee (from June 15)	3,518.30	156.36
Osswald, John, research employee (from June 15)	3,518.30	156.36
Protas, Robert B., research employee (from June 14)	3,518.30	166.14
Rosenman, Louis, research employee (from June 23)	3,518.30	78.18
Ryan, Mary, stenographer (from May 23)	5,047.77	532.81
Schwartz, Richard, research employee (from June 15)	3,518.30	156.36
Seeley, Joseph A., assistant counsel (from May 23)	11,646.00	1,184.30
Shea, John G., research employee (from June 13)	3,518.30	175.91
Stein, Gary S., research employee (from June 8)	3,518.30	224.77
Starr, Henry P., research employee (from June 22)	3,518.30	87.95
Wagner, Janet L., stenographer (from June 14)	3,237.76	152.89
Wiggins, Barbara, clerical assistant (from May 1 to 15)	5,047.77	210.32
Williams, Thomas C., research employee (from June 8)	3,996.26	255.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$200,000.00
Amount expended	23,747.92
Balance unexpended	176,252.08

Harley M. Kilgore,
Chairman.

Harley M. Kilgore,
Subcommittee Chairman.

July 15, 1955.

Committee on the Judiciary

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

(Under Senate Resolution 190 (83d Cong., 2d sess.), and Senate Resolution 49 and Senate Resolution 62 (84th Cong., 1st sess.))

To the Secretary of the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Beaser, Herbert W., chief counsel (to Feb. 15)	$11,646.00	$1,455.75
Beaumet, Charles T., clerical assistant (from Apr. 11)	2,979.60	662.13
Billings, Thomas E., investigator (from May 2)	8,005.36	1,311.98
Bobo, James H.:		
Assistant counsel (to Apr. 5)	10,566.16	--------
General counsel (from Apr. 6)	11,646.00	5,538.03
Caruthers, Gloria V., secretary (from June 14)	4,665.41	220.30
Chumbris, Peter N.:		
Assistant counsel-investigator (Apr. 5)	8,552.84	--------
Associate counsel (Apr. 6)	10,566.16	4,751.75
Clendenen, Richard, executive director (to Feb. 15)	11,646.00	1,455.75

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dailey, Helen B., secretary	$4,283.04	$749.53
Edmonds, Sadie E., clerical assistant (from May 1)	1,893.90	315.64
Fullmer, Marvin R., investigator (from Apr. 4)	7,437.59	1,797.39
Gaughan, Vincent M., special counsel (from May 5)	9,653.69	1,501.68
Gibbons, Richard M., files-clerical assistant	4,655.41	2,312.68
Haddad, Wm. F., research assistant (from Mar. 21)	5,525.75	1,534.90
Hammond, Janis, clerical assistant (from Mar. 21)	4,091.85	1,136.60
Hickey, Margaret B., chief clerk	6,684.04	1,716.00
Holloway, Mary F., clerical assistant	5,143.38	857.62
Jensen, Floyd A., investigator:		
To Apr. 5	6,864.04	3,477.13
From Apr. 6	7,055.23	
Johnson, M. Bernadine, assistant counsel from May 16)	8,005.36	1,000.66
Kovach, Don, investigator (from May 13 to June 7)	7,246.41	503.22
Kuhn, Kathleen D., secretary (from May 10)	4,474.23	633.84
McGill, Elizabeth T., secretary (from Apr. 14)	4,473.23	956.98
McLean, Edward Lee, editorial director (from Apr. 18 to June 15)	8,552.84	1,377.94
Mayes, Martin, consultant	7,055.23	3,527.58
Morris, Charles V., administrative assistant (to Mar. 31)	7,533.19	1,883.28
Minnoch, Donald A., messenger (from May 2)	1,080.00	398.59
Mitler, Ernest A., special counsel (from May 2)	7,914.11	1,297.02
Pappas, Constantine J., messenger (from June 17)	1,080.00	94.58
Perian, Carl L., research assistant (from Mar. 21)	6,003.71	2,732.00
Rowland, Martha A., clerical assistant (from May 1 to May 16)	6,290.49	279.57
Schonberger, Claude M., investigator-research assistant	6,386.08	3,193.02
Sears, Lillian F., clerical assistant (to Jan. 31)	4,856.61	404.71
Shawn, E. Luise, administrative secretary (to Feb. 28)	6,864.04	1,144.00
Strong, Harold F., social service consultant:		
From Mar. 21	10,068.45	3,610.74
From Apr. 5	11,146.83	
Thompson, Mary E., clerical assistant (to Jan. 31)	4,665.41	388.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 62	$125,000.00
Amount expended	59,431.03
Balance unexpended	65,568.97

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

JULY 12, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 63, agreed to March 18, 1955; Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; and Senate Resolution 227, 83d Congress)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harlan Wood, general counsel (from Mar. 16, 1955)	$11,646.00	$3,396.75
Jane E. Rideoutte, stenographer (from Mar. 21, 1955)	5,334.57	1,481.80
William A. Stevens, clerk	6,481.67	2,930.13

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 63	$58,000.00
Amount expended	7,121.96
Balance unexpended	51,378.04

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
OLIN B. JOHNSTON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 14, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH THE EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM THE WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 64, agreed to March 18, 1955; Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; and Senate Resolution 188, 83d Congress)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Beaton, Adel V., clerical assistant	$4,856.61	$1,618.84
Guthridge, Eleanor C., general counsel	10,068.45	3,356.12
Haugen, Marilyn, from Mar. 22, clerical assistant	3,613.89	993.79
Thompson, Patricia, from June 14, clerical assistant	3,327.12	157.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$36,500.00
Amount expended	7,159.97
Balance unexpended	29,340.03

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
WILLIAM LANGER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 65, agreed to March 18, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of eacb person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$8,672.79
Amount expended	82.45
Balance unexpended	8,590.34

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 9, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 49, agreed to February 4, 1955; and Senate Resolution 66, agreed to March 18, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director, to Jan. 31	$11,646.00	$970.50
Arens, William H., staff member, Jan. 31	8,990.07	749.17
Ashcraft, Ann, clerk	4,283.04	1,998.12
Blair, Drury H., staff member	11,395.68	5,241.60
Burton, Robert R., staff member	9,902.55	4,951.26
Cameron, Betty C., clerk, to Jan. 15	4,569.81	190.40
Carey, A. Carl, Jr., investigator, from Apr. 18	9,902.55	2,008.01
DeGooyer, Franzetta R., clerk	5,525.75	2,476.05
Lallemant, Donald P., investigator, from June 13	5,908.12	295.40
McCloskey, Mary J., clerk, from Apr. 1	5,525.75	1,381.41
Meenehan, Martin J., staff member, from Feb. 1 to Mar. 15	5,716.93	714.61
Mendelson, Martin, clerical assistant, from June 20	2,827.14	86.38
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	11,646.00	5,373.29
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator, to Jan. 31	9,902.55	825.21
Slayman, Charles H., Jr., staff member, from May 2	7,724.37	1,265.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$102,000.00
Amount expended	19,123.81
Balance unexpended	82,876.19

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NARCOTICS

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 67, agreed to March 18, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edwards, June, secretary, from June 6	$4,283.04	$297.43
Gasque, Cecial A., general counsel, from May 23	11,646.00	1,229.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$30,000.00
Amount expended	3,567.38
Balance unexpended	26,432.62

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.
PRICE DANIEL,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 15, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 92, agreed to May 11, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	none
Balance unexpended	50,000.00

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 11, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Under authority of Senate Resolution 94, agreed to May 11, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ginzburg, Benjamin, from May 20, research director	$11,646	$1,326.35
MacDuffie, Marshall, from May 20, chief counsel-staff director	11,646	1,326.35
Seham, Martin C, from June 17, legal assistant	1,260	104.01
Hand, Elisabeth J., from May 27, secretary	2,640	26.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	2,796.28
Balance unexpended	47,203.72

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

THOS. C. HENNINGS, JR.,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 13, 1955.

COMMITTEE OF LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Stewart E. McClure, staff director (from Jan. 3)	$11,646.00	$5,758.30
Roy E. James, minority staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Grover G. Smith, chief clerk (from Apr. 18)	7,533.19	1,527.55
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,197.77
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	6,290.49	2,621.00
Thelma Blankenship, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Marjorie Whittaker, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,794.73
Helen Papps, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,686.38
Alice H. Price, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Helyn Eagle, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
John S. Forsythe, professional staff member (from Jan. 21)	11,646.00	5,176.00
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Michael J. Bernstein, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member [1]	11,646.00	582.30
John D. Stringer, professional staff member [1]	9,073.03	453.65
Richard L. Callaghan, assistant chief clerk (to Jan. 2)	11,646.00	64.70
Loretta H. Gawenda, clerical assistant (to Jan. 15)	4,952.20	206.34

[1] Transferred to Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, Jan. 18, 1955.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	3,908.90
Balance unexpended	6,091.10

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WELFARE FUNDS AND PENSION PLANS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Callaghan, Richard L., investigator (from Jan. 1 to 31)	$11,646.00	$905.80
Cantwell, Frank V., professional staff member (from Mar. 3)	11,646.00	3,817.30
Coburn, William H., assistant chief counsel (to Jan. 31)	11,646.00	970.50
Cotter, Paul J., associate counsel (Mar. 8 to Apr. 6), chief counsel and staff director (Apr. 6)	11,646.00	3,655.55
Leece, William A., chief counsel and staff director (to Apr. 5)	11,646.00	3,073.25
Plant, Francis X., chief investigator	11,646.00	5,344.12
Reed, Louis S., director of research (from Apr. 22)	11,646.00	2,232.15
Sneed, Melvin W., staff member (from Jan. 19 to 31)	11,646.00	388.20
Imle, Albert R., investigator (from Mar. 14)	10,068.45	2,992.54
Sornson, Louis W., investigator	10,068.45	4,848.92
Turner, Blake E., investigator	10,068.45	4,848.92
Miller, William J., investigator (to Jan. 14)	9,653.69	375.42
Blum, Fred T., consultant (from Apr. 11)	9,073.03	2,016.21
MacIntyre, Duncan M., investigator (to Jan. 31)	9,073.03	756.08
Stringer, John D., assistant counsel (from Jan. 19 to Mar. 6)	9,073.03	1,209.72
Suss, Fredric T., investigator	9,073.03	4,536.48
Kuhl, Arthur M., investigator	8,552.84	3,643.17
Irwin, Mary A., chief clerk (from Mar. 14)	7,055.23	2,096.95
Montier, Gladys E., secretary (to Apr. 30)	4,952.20	1,650.72
Cerick, Ruth Aull, secretary (from May 11)	4,952.20	687.80
Gilmore, Scally, clerk-stenographer	4,856.61	2,428.26
Sornson, Betty D., stenographer (to Jan. 31)	4,856.61	404.71
Smith, Pearl E., clerk-stenographer (to Jan. 14)	4,761.00	185.15
Christofferson, Alice R., stenographer (to Apr. 30)	4,091.85	1,363.92
Carey, Marjorie L., clerk-stenographer	3,900.98	1,950.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, S. Res. 40	$190,000.00
Amount expended	61,611.55
Balance unexpended	128,388.45
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 225 and S. Res. 270	125,150.00
Amount unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1955	52,654.36
Amount expended, Jan. 1 through June 30, 1955	18,273.29
Balance unexpended	34,381.07

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Brawley, H. W., executive director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Kerlin, J. Don, professional staff member (from Feb. 16)	11,646.00	4,367.25
Johnson, R. W., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Faucette, Andrew McC., professional staff member (from Feb. 1)	11,646.00	4,852.50
Finzel, Hubert H., professional staff member (from Feb. 19)	11,646.00	4,270.20
Sisk, Elizabeth R., assistant clerk (from May 1) [1]	5,716.93	952.82
Bobo, Virginia, assistant chief clerk	6,481.67	3,177.06
Sutherland, Mary H., clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,464.10
McDonald, Innis E., clerical assistant (from Jan. 16)	5,334.57	2,430.15
McElroy, Marty, clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,571.66
McInroy, Joan M., clerical assistant (from Feb. 1)	5,716.93	2,382.05
Lanigan, Alice Y., clerical assistant (to Apr. 3) [2]	5,334.57	1,338.24
Homan, Colette E., clerical assistant (to Jan. 31)	6,481.67	540.13
Paramore, Mary Anne, clerical assistant (to Jan. 9)	5,334.57	133.36
Irwin, Mary, professional staff member (to Jan. 31)	11,646.00	970.50
Paschal, Frank A., chief clerk (to Jan. 31)	11,646.00	970.50

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 25, agreed to Feb. 4, 1955.

[2] Under authority of S. Res. 221, agreed to Apr. 7, 1954, and S. Res. 25, agreed to Feb. 4, 1955.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	2,374.91
Balance unexpended	7,625.09

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

(Senate Resolution 20, agreed to February 21, 1955)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Gillette, Guy M., special counsel (from Mar. 1)	$11,646.00	$3,654.00
Lawrence, Richard W., chief attorney (from Apr. 18)	10,068.45	2,041.64
Slear, John K., senior inspector (from May 16)	8,522.84	466.09
Chadwick, Thomas W., investigator (from Apr. 1)	7,246.41	1,811.58
Wilder, Roy E., Jr., investigator (from Mar. 16)	7,150.81	2,085.64
Humphrey, David J., investigator (from Mar. 1)	6,577.27	2,075.29

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Caldwell, James N., Jr., junior investigator (from May 1)	$6,577.27	$1,096.20
Walters, William R., junior investigator (from May 1)	6,577.27	1,096.20
Cole, Raymond C., Jr., junior inspector (from May 16)	6,577.27	822.15
Hadlick, Paul E., assistant attorney (from Apr. 18)	6,577.27	1,083.03
Hayes, Mary J., clerical assistant (from Feb. 21 to May 15)	4,665.41	1,101.54
Rideoutte, Jane, clerical assistant (from Mar. 1 to Mar. 20)	4,665.41	259.18
Sargent, Polly, clerk (from Mar. 16)	4,665.41	1,360.73
Anthony, Mary G., clerical assistant (from Mar. 26)	4,665.41	1,231.13
Goulart, Mary M., clerical assistant (from Mar. 3 to Apr. 30)	4,378.64	632.46
Downey, Mabel A., clerical assistant (from May 1)	4,378.64	729.76
Johnson, Claudine B., clerical assistant (from May 1 to May 15)	4,378.64	182.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,000.00
Amount expended	23,861.44
Balance unexpended	101,138.56

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

(Senate Resolution 33, agreed to May 11, 1955, investigation of the Civil Service Committee and the Post Office Department)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Miller, William W., investigator (from May 16)	$8,644.09	$1,080.50
Bryan, Louis C., investigator (from June 1)	7,533.19	627.76
Hawkins, Dorothy O., clerical assistant (from May 18-31)	5,047.77	182.27
Smith, Margaret Shanholtz, clerical assistant (from June 13)	4,856.61	242.82
Donovan, Winifred J., clerical assistant (from June 1)	4,761.00	396.75
Johnson, Claudine B., clerical assistant (from May 16)	4,378.64	547.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$75,000.00
Amount expended	3,138.63
Balance unexpended	71,861.37

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to July 1, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ellsworth W. Bassett, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Frances Ortiz, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
John L. Mutz, professional staff member	11,646.00	3,882.00
Filo M. Sedillo, chief clerk	11,646.00	3,882.00
Charles N. Kapnic, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas F. Fox, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.85
Frances T. Clark, clerical assistant	6,481.67	2,160.52
Ercilia E. Martinez, clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,715.08
Eloise Porter, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,400.10
Mary Luschyk, clerical assistant (to Jan. 18, 1955)	4,569.80	228.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$110,000.00
Amount expended	4,768.83
Balance unexpended	105,231.17

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harrison, Gordon F., chief clerk (from Jan. 15, 1955)	$11,646.00	$5,370.10
Bookwalter, William F., chief clerk (to Jan. 14, 1955), professional staff member (to Apr. 4, 1955)	11,646.00	3,040.90
St. Claire, Darrell, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Berkovitch, Boris S., professional staff member (to Feb. 20, 1955)	11,646.00	1,617.50
McCain, Robert S., professional staff member (from Mar. 1, 1955)	8,552.84	2,850.92
Ryan, Charles H., assistant chief clerk (from Mar. 1, 1955)	6,003.71	2,001.20
Moore, Marian G., clerical assistant (from Feb. 1, 1955)	6,003.71	2,501.50
Gavin, B. Floye, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Jackson, Elaine H., clerical assistant (to Feb. 28, 1955)	6,003.71	1,000.60
McLachlan, Ann E., clerical assistant (to Jan. 31, 1955)	6,003.71	500.30
Mitchell, Elizabeth S., clerical assistant (from Mar. 3, 1955)	5,430.16	1,779.87
Greene, Eleanor L., clerical assistant:		
To Feb. 28, 1955	4,474.23	745.70
From Mar. 1, 1955	5,047.77	1,682.56
Troiano, Thelma M., assistant chief clerk (to Feb. 28, 1955)	4,665.41	777.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955	233.67
Balance unexpended June 30, 1955	9,766.33

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittee:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kemp, L. Stanley, chief investigator, to Feb. 28, 1955	$8,990.07	$1,498.34
Dempsey, John T., consultant, from Mar. 9, 1955	[1] 8,990.07	1,348.50
Duffy, James H., counsel, from Feb. 14, 1955	8,552.84	3,254.80
Ryan, Charles H., assistant chief clerk, from Feb. 14 through 28, 1955	6,003.71	283.50
Jacobsen, Sue P., clerical assistant, from Mar. 21, 1955	4,856.61	1,349.03
Roberts, Catherine, clerical assistant, from Jan. 20–Apr. 14, 1955	4,856.61	1,146.67
Strain, Mary L., clerk, to Jan. 18, 1955	5,716.93	285.84
Fel'Dotto, Dolores, clerical assistant, from Jan. 19–31, 1955	4,474.23	149.14

[1] When actually employed.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure, S. Res. 234, May 21, 1954	$50,000.00
Amount available, Jan. 1, 1955	39,976.42
Amount expended Jan. 1–June 30, 1955	10,169.01
Balance unexpended June 30, 1955	29,807.41

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1955.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1955, to June 30, 1955, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Amis, William D., professional staff member	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Byrne, Elizabeth A., clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Forsythe, Robert A., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Humphrey, Katherine J., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Jehle, Philip F., professional staff member (Jan. 1 through May 20; from May 20)	9,321.88	4,363.96
Lasky, Sara Betty, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Novak, Gertrude C., clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
O'Connor, Blake, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Ruppert, Minna L., chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Stults, Walter B., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 84th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	1,141.15
Balance unexpended	8,858.85

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 2573. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. Johnson of Texas):

S. 2574. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, to provide authorization for organization and maintenance of volunteer State defense forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2575. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Langer, Mr. Morse, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Scott, Mr. Case of New Jersey, and Mr. Murray):

S. 2576. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. Bricker, and Mr. Bennett):

S. 2577. A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia*; and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey*; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

SALE OF STEAMSHIPS "LA GUARDIA" AND "MONTEREY"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamships *La Guardia* and *Monterey*. The proposed sales, and all details connected therewith, have been discussed by the prospective purchasers with the Maritime Administration, and the joint resolutions for the sale of the vessels have been drawn up in accordance with the requirements as laid down by that Administration:

Both vessels would be used by the prospective purchasers in the west coast-Hawaiian passenger service, to supply what is generally agreed to be a deficit in that service.

The *Monterey*, purchased for use as a transport, has been partially reconverted from wartime usage, and is now in the National Defense Fleet at a Pacific coast anchorage. Under the joint resolution it would be sold together with the uninstalled materials acquired by the United States in 1952 with the vessel.

The prospective purchaser of the vessel would, I am informed, spend $10 million or more in a domestic shipyard to recondition it for operation in the west coast-Hawaiian service, to supplement its present luxury service.

Under Public Law 757, 83d Congress, 2d session, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to charter the *La Guardia* to the Hawaiian Steamship Co., Ltd. That company now is seeking to buy the vessel, rather than operate it under charter. The joint resolution would authorize sale of this vessel and the materials and equipment heretofore removed from the vessel and held in storage by the Maritime Administration, together with, but at an additional price, such additional furnishings, furniture, and equipment now held by the Maritime Administration, as may be determined to be necessary to equip the vessel for the passenger trade.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point the letter from the Matson Navigation Co. outlining its plans for use of the *Monterey*.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia*; and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey*.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Matson Navigation Co.,
July 5, 1955.

Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Magnuson: Enclosed is a copy of a suggested joint resolution which we would sincerely appreciate your introducing in the Senate.

It provides authority for the Maritime Administration to sell the S. S. *Monterey* under competitive bidding procedure for reconditioining in a domestic shipyard and subsequent operation under the American flag.

The *Monterey* is now anchored in the national defense reserve fleet in Suisun Bay on the Pacific coast. When purchased by the Government, in 1952, for potential use as a transport in the event of a national emergency, she had been 30-percent reconverted from wartime service. No work has been done on the ship since that time.

The Matson Navigation Co. is interested in the possible acquisition of the *Monterey* to aid in development of the expanding tourist industry which is so important to the economy of the Hawaiian Islands. If acquired by Matson, she would be operated without Government aid alongside the *Lurline*, which is the only large passenger liner operated without subsidy under the American flag.

The joint resolution would provide the expenditure of a minimum of $10 million for reconditioning in a domestic shipyard. When in service she would provide approximately 400 steady additional jobs for American seamen.

The sale of this vessel would enable the Government to recover a fair value for the ship, would save maintenance costs in the Reserve fleet, and, most important, would have available in operating condition a valuable unit of proven value to the merchant marine. In addition, under existing statutes, the Government would receive approximately $750,000 of revenue on a yearly basis through payment of the 10-percent transportation tax in the domestic trade.

As written, the joint resolution has the concurrence of the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board in all respects except for the basis of computinng depreciation to the vessel that has occurred since acquired by the Government in 1952. In view of her age at that time, the joint resolution proposes that depreciation since date of acquisition—August 6, 1952—be calculated on the basis of 10 years of remaining life. The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board has expressed the view that perhaps that should be calculated over a longer term of years. On this point the staff of the Maritime Administration recommended retention of the 10-year depreciated life.

In view of the possibility that the Congress may adjourn at an early date, your prompt consideration of this legislation will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

A. J. Pessel.

AMENDMENT OF DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1953—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 922) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1806) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association", approved May 31, 1920, as amended, so as to permit the corporation to consolidate with the Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc., and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], on January 6, 1955, introduced an identical bill, S. 113, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That Committee considered the original measure in 1920, and believes that it should now consider the proposed amendment to it. Neither the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia nor the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary has any objection to this request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON MILK RIVER, GLASGOW, MONT. (S. DOC. NO. 70)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a reported dated July 22, 1954, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Milk River, Glasgow, Mont., requested by a resolution of the Committee on

Public Works, adopted March 9, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS (S. DOC. NO. 71)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 9, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, adopted September 27, 1951, June 24, 1953, and March 25, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter addressed to him by the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization, together with copy of testimony of the Director before the Armed Services Committee earlier this year, and a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, on the problem of industrial dispersal.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be United States circuit judge, Fourth Circuit, vice Morris A. Soper, retired; and

Joe Ewing Estes, of Texas, to be United States district judge, northern district of Texas, vice William Hawley Atwell, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Welker].

THE SHIPBUILDING CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL FAVORING THE PACIFIC COAST YARDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Barkley in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on May 23, 1955, I introduced S. 2038, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids of the Pacific Coast shipbuilders. I did so because I believe the enactment of such a bill would be in the best interest of the Government and the taxpayers of this country. I did so because just recently that outmoded provision has cost the Government between one and one and one-half million dollars on one contract alone. I did so because I am convinced that the reason which impelled Congress in 1936 to grant the west coast yards this 6 percent advantage over their east coast competitors, no longer exists.

I think it can now be demonstrated that the west coast yards are—from the point of view of costs—competitively equal to their east coast counterparts. Admittedly, this is quite a concession for a Senator from the great shipbuilding center of Baltimore, Md., to make. However, in doing so, I am sure all will be convinced that I have not acted hastily or without having given careful study to this matter.

Senators will recall that in accordance with section 502 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, when a construction subsidy is applied for by a Pacific coast operator, to aid in constructing or reconditioning a vessel to be operated under the American flag in the foreign trade, if the amount of the bid of a responsible Pacific coast shipyard does not exceed by more than 6 percent the amount of the bid of a shipbuilder on the Atlantic coast, the Maritime Administration is now required to award the contract to the Pacific coast operator.

The main reason why I am speaking on the subject today is to do what I can to raise this important issue above the level of intersectional controversy. It is, I must concede, only natural for Members of Congress from the west coast to fight to keep in the law this 6 percent differential—even though its reasons for being have long since ceased. And, by the same token, it might be said that it is only natural for those of us from the Eastern States to strive to remove the differential or perhaps to gain an equivalent benefit for our own shipbuilding constituents.

But—and this I think should be the test—if the present 6-percent differential is not clearly in the best interest of all of the people of the country, it should be eliminated forthwith.

Now then, should we examine the subject and decide dispassionately and fairly whether the west coast yards still need this unique crutch? The answer is obvious. The appropriate committee—in this case the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—must, and I feel confident that it will, schedule the bill for fair, impartial, and complete hearings at the earliest possible date.

My good friend the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has indicated that no hearings will be held on the bill at this session in order to give the west coast builders ample time to prepare their defense of the 6-percent differential. I, for one, have no objection to this course, because I want this preferred group of shipbuilders to have every opportunity to justify their specialized treatment when they come before us, I hope, early next session.

However, let them bear in mind that the legislative history of this provision—section 502 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—clearly reveals that it was enacted only because of the express representations made by its proponents that the west coast yards would need it only temporarily. I submit, therefore, that the burden should now be on them to show us that they still need and deserve this subsidy 20 years later.

Let the west coast shipbuilders also be aware when they come before us seeking to justify a continuance of our largesse, that we are not interested in comparisons of "bid" prices. We want "cost" comparisons. Stated in another way, we want to know whether it costs an efficient shipbuilder on the west coast 6 percent more to build a vessel than it costs an equally efficient east coast shipbuilder to build the same vessel in an east coast yard. That is the only reliable test. It is my intention, if need be, to enlist the aid of the General Accounting Office to ascertain such cost comparisons.

Without trespassing further, Mr. President, on the valuable time of the Senate, particularly in these closing days of the session, I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks an historical analysis of section 502 (d).

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Shipbuilding Construction Differential Favoring the Pacific Coast Yards, Justified or Not?

Section 502 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 gives to shipyard operators located on the west coast a differential of 6 percent in contract awards for the construction of vessels. The section follows:[1]

"In case a construction subsidy is applied for under this title by an applicant who has as his principal place of business a place on the Pacific coast of the United States (but not including one who, having been in business on or before August 1, 1935, has changed his principal place of business to a place on the Pacific coast of the United States after such date) to aid in the construction or reconditioning of a vessel to be operated in foreign trade in a service, route, or line from ports on the Pacific coast of the United States, and the amount of the bid of the shipbuilder on the Pacific coast who is the lowest responsible bidder on such coast for such construction or reconditioning does not exceed the amount of the bid of the shipbuilder on the Atlantic coast of the United States who is the lowest responsible bidder therefor by more than 6 percent of the amount of the bid of such Atlantic coast shipbuilder, the Commission shall, except as provided in subsection (e), approve such Pacific coast bid, and in such case no payment shall be made to aid in such construction or reconditioning unless the applicant accepts the bid of such Pacific coast shipbuilder and agrees to designate and continue as the home port of the vessel to be constructed or reconditioned a port on the Pacific coast."

---

[1] 49 Stat. 1985.

Extensive hearings on merchant marine matters were held in 1935 by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, during which a proposal to grant a differential to Pacific coast shipbuilders was discussed. One of the limitations accepted by the proponents of the measure, which limitation is reflected in the present law, is that the differential would apply only to vessels which would be based on the Pacific coast. Congressman Charles J. Colden, of California, expressed it in this manner: [2]

"I also want to reemphasize the position that Mr. Welch (author of the bill being discussed) has taken, that we are not asking to compete with the Atlantic yards on Atlantic Ocean business; we are only asking that we may participate in the building of ships on the Pacific coast that are engaged in the coastwise and intercoastal and Pacific Ocean traffic."

There appears to have been three predominant factors which prompted the requests for special consideration for Pacific coast operators: Greater labor and bank interest costs and transportation costs for material supplied from distant sources of supply, with transportation costs being considered the principal factor involved. Congressman Richard J. Welch, of California, discussing the proposal, indicated that there were two Navy destroyers being built in west coast shipyards in 1936.[3]

"Ninety-five percent of all materials entering into these two destroyers is being produced and manufactured in the eastern part of the United States. All fabrication, the construction of engines, boilers, machinery, armament, and other materials is undertaken in other sections of the country and then shipped to the Pacific coast for assembly into a vessel. The long distance these materials must be transported is the principal factor in increasing the cost of construction on the Pacific coast."

Mrs. Florence P. Kahn, Congresswoman from California, narrowed the cause of the west coast's alleged dilemma to the lack of steel production facilities: [4]

"I feel we are entitled to this encouragement and we are not requiring too much when we ask that this differential be given us, because we have no steel supplies on the coast; they have to be brought from the East, and there is this extra freight or carriage charge that makes shipbuilding there a little more expensive."

Another witness introduced an entirely different view as to the cause of high freight charges to the west coast. Mr. V. B. Bendix, a ship broker, representing himself, indicated that the existing practice of using the basing point system for freight charges on steel was a primary factor in increasing costs to west coast shipbuilders.[5]

"The differential in the cost of building a ship on the Pacific coast as against the cost of building a ship on the Atlantic coast is due primarily to the fact that all steel products, including ship steel, are sold on what is known now, and has been known for many years, as the 'Pittsburgh-plus' basis. In other words, ship steel is sold on the basis of Pittsburgh, plus freight to destination, and this applies no matter where the steel may be manufactured, at least as far as the large producers are concerned."

It was reported that the steamship *Independence* required approximately 16,000 tons of steel when constructed, indicating that steel and steel products constitute the major material used in the construction of a modern ocean-going vessel. Thus, as pointed out above, steel was probably the key to any significant unbalance of geographical costs in shipbuilding. In this connection the geographical distribution of steel production capacity is of prime importance. The American Iron and Steel Institute reported the following rated capacity for steel in the Far Western States: As of 1935, a total of 1,724,800 tons, of which California accounted for 680,000 tons. As of January 1, 1955, the total capacity reported for the Western States was 7,028,470 tons, of which California accounted for 3,154,470 tons. Although the principal producers and fabricators still are located in the East, the claim that the Western States produce little or no steel is no longer valid.

At the time the proposal was being discussed, one of the questions which arose was whether the differential was considered to be temporary or permanent. Speaking of the future of the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast, Congressman Byron N. Scott, from California, stated: [6]

"I think that once having rehabilitated it and once having gotten the labor back out, or having developed the labor out there, the same amount of subsidy would not be necessary in the future."

Whereupon Congressman Melvin J. Mass, of Minnesota, asked: [7]

"Mr. Welch, do you agree with that, that the main factors to be compensated for now are temporary rather than permanent?

"Mr. Welch. I would say so. Of course, I cannot predict the future."

The original proposal for a differential was based on rates of interest for Government loans for ship construction, with the loans made to Pacific coast builders bearing three-quarters of 1 percent interest less than that on loans to eastern builders. This interest difference was considered to be the equivalent of a direct 6-percent differential; the bill was subsequently amended to reflect the direct 6-percent differential.[8]

Apparently the proposal to enact a differential favoring the west coast builders into law had been unpopular when presented on prior occasions. When asked if he would be willing to remove his bill from its place as a rider to the Merchant Marine Act proposal, Congressman Welch voiced his refusal in this manner: [9]

"Congressman Carter and Congressman McGrath, since they have been here, and I have been trying for years through a separate bill to get a differential provision in favor of Pacific coast ship construction. But we did not get to first base with it. And it was only when a comprehensive bill was before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and after every member of the west coast delegation, from Oregon, Washington, and California, appeared before that committee and by their presence and splendid statements which could not be contradicted, that we succeeded in getting the differential provision written into the bill referred to by me a few moments ago. And I am afraid, Mr. Drewry with all due respect to your suggestion, that if it is not contained in this bill, like Congressman McGrath's bill, Senator Johnson's bill, and my bill, which have all been turned down by the Navy Department, it will never come before Congress for consideration."

The attitude of the Navy Department was clearly indicated in a letter dated February 19, 1935, from Secretary of the Navy Claude A. Swanson to the Chairman, House Committee on Naval Affairs. Secretary Swanson's letter is reproduced in full.[10]

"The bill (H. R. 1382) to provide that in making awards under contracts for the construction of vessels in private shipyards, bids shall be accepted from shipyards located on the Pacific coast under certain conditions, was referred to the Navy Department by your committee on January 10, 1935, with a request for views and recommendations.

"The purpose of this bill is to amend the bill H. R. 6604 (enacted as Public Law No. 135, approved March 27, 1934, 48 Stat. 503) by inserting a proviso reading as follows: *Provided further,* That in making awards under contracts for the construction of vessels in private shipyards, awards shall be made to shipyards located on the Pacific coast, provided that the cost of construction on the Pacific coast, less the cost of transportation of necessary materials from points east of the Mississippi River to the Pacific, is no greater than the cost of construction on the Atlantic coast.

"In the opinion of the Navy Department the proposed legislation is unnecessary. Invariably, awards of shipbuilding contracts have been made without discrimination against any bidder because of geographical location. Experience since the World War has demonstrated that ships can be constructed in shipyards on the Pacific coast fully as economically as on the Atlantic coast. The differential in transportation rates for material used in the construction of vessels on the east coast and on the west coast is so small in comparison with the total cost of the vessels that it may be disregarded without prejudice to the west-coast shipyards.

"It is estimated that the percentage of the contract price or cost of a naval vessel built on the Pacific coast, representing the cost of transportation of necessary materials from points east of the Mississippi River to the Pacific coast, would not exceed 1 percent.

"The bill H. R. 1382, if enacted into law, would involve practically no additional cost to the Government.

"The Navy Department recommends against the enactment of the bill H. R. 1382."

During the investigation of shipyard wartime profits conducted in 1946 by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Maritime Commission submitted data showing a geographical distribution of costs incurred in the construction of 2,580 Liberty ships during World War II. The accompanying table shows the number of ships constructed at east coast and west coast shipyards, the builder's average cost for each vessel, and the total average cost to the Maritime Commission for each vessel.[11] Shipyards which produced 20 Liberty ships or less were disregarded. The total number of Liberty ships produced on the east and west coasts—1,001 and 1,125, respectively—is considered to be large enough to be a valid basis for comparison.

The table indicates that east coast builders were actually higher cost producers than were west coast builders, engaged in constructing virtually an identical vessel. Arithmetic averages of builder's costs at east coast shipyards were $1,055,181, compared to $862,908 for west coast shipyards, and $962,322 for the United States. Arithmetic averages of total average costs to the Maritime Commission show a corresponding difference: $1,876,301 for the east coast, $1,716,070 for the west coast, and $1,800,743 for the United States.

---

[2] U. S. Congress. House. Hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 74th Cong., 1st sess., H. R. 7521. To Develop an American Merchant Marine. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935, p. 764.

[3] Congressional Record, 74th Con., 2d sess. Jan. 28, 1936, p. 1098.

[4] Hearings on H. R. 7521, op. cit., p. 767.

[5] Ibid., p. 978. The basing point method is no longer permitted.

[6] Congressional Record, op. cit., p. 3789.

[7] Loc. cit.

[8] Ibid., p. 3786.

[9] Ibid., p. 3787.

[10] U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Naval Affairs. 74th Cong., 1st sess., Sundry Legislation Affecting the Naval Establishment, 1935, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935, p. 429.

[11] Average cost to the Commission includes, among other items, profit to the builder.

Liberty ship construction, World War II—average cost data—east coast and west coast shipyards

Shipyard	Number of ships	Builder's cost, average per vessel	Total average cost to Maritime Commission per vessel
EAST COAST			
Bethlehem-Fairfield	384	$895, 288	$1, 743, 043
Jones-Brunswick	85	1, 173, 129	1, 984, 640
New England	236	1, 070, 238	1, 881, 803
North Carolina	126	651, 793	1, 508, 906
Southeastern	88	1, 236, 438	2, 039, 110
St. Johns River	82	1, 304, 202	2, 100, 304
Total ships	1, 001		
WEST COAST			
California	306	968, 428	1, 811, 040
Oregon	330	766, 621	1, 621, 597
Permanente Metals	489	853, 674	1, 715, 573
Total ships	1, 125		
Total, United States	2, 580	962, 322	1, 800, 743

Source: U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 79th Cong., 2d sess. Investigation of Shipyard Profits, H. Res. 38, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1946, p. 298. Data supplied by the Maritime Commission.

PROPOSAL THAT THE CORN TASSEL BE ADOPTED AS THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in the country over the fact that the United States has no official national flower. I hold in my hand a little pamphlet which appeals very much to me. It is entitled "The Tassel of the Corn," and it suggests that the tassel of the corn be our national flower. The corn tassel is of American origin, has its roots in every State of the Union, and has served the Nation from the time of the landing on our shores of the first newcomers from Europe. There are many more reasons why the corn tassel should be adopted as the national flower. I ask unanimous consent that this document, entitled "The Tassel of the Corn" be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TASSEL OF THE CORN

It is so right that at long last an interest has been awakened in the United States in the need of selecting a national floral emblem. Nearly every other nation has made such a choice, a choice based upon reason—an historic event, a spiritual or religious inspiration, or from a deep sense of gratitude.

The shamrock of Ireland was a religious choice. St. Patrick used its three leaves to illustrate the unity of the Trinity. The thistle of Scotland, the leek of Wales, and the rose of England were based on historic events.

The lily of France, the iris, was a selection founded on gratitude. The pagan warrior, Clovis, the founder of France, thought defeat inevitable while waging a desperate battle. His wife, the good Queen Clotilda, was an early Christian convert. Clovis appealed to her to pray to her God for his deliverance.

While invoking divine guidance, Clotilda caught the vision of iris growing in a crossing of the river, indicating shallow water, hence a place to ford the otherwise swift stream. Clovis found the ford, made a surprise attack, routing the enemy. In gratitude for their deliverance Clovis accepted Christianity and placed three golden iris upon his shield. Later the iris was conventionalized to form the fleur-de-lis.

No flower has figured so prominently and continuously as the rose. Its history goes back to the dim days of very ancient Media. From Media it was taken by Nebuchadnezzar to adorn his famous hanging gardens. From there it became known as the Persian rose. It verily scents the pages of Persian poetry and prose.

However, the rose was never chosen as a national flower until after the War of Roses, the struggle between the rival houses of Lancaster and York, when England claimed it. The York rose is beloved in England and it appeared in poignant sentimentality and rare delicacy of needlework upon the wedding gown of Princess Elizabeth of York, now Queen Elizabeth.

Englishmen carried the York rose to the New World, planting it on their estates, later naming the State "New York" and selecting the rose as its floral emblem.

Three other States chose the rose.

When in 1897 a new battleship was named the *Iowa* the enthusiastic officials in the State office voted to present a silver service to the ship. Seeking an inspiration for an appropriate design they chose the native wild rose which covered the, as yet, unplowed lands of the young State. Two days later the wild rose became the State flower by a vote of the general assembly.

The prairie rose of North Dakota, beloved of the pioneers, gained the same distinction.

The development of the stately American Beauty rose led the District of Columbia to choose it as its emblem. However, the Better Times rose now usually replaces the very scarce American Beauty.

Beautiful as is the rose in all its forms, and dearly as I personally love it, it holds no significance as a possible choice as the national floral emblem.

My reasons upon which a national floral emblem should be based are these:

1. It must be of American origin, born in the Western World and found nowhere else.
2. It must have its roots in every State in the Union.
3. It must serve the Nation, and to have served it well from the first landings of settlers in New England and Virginia to the present moment.
4. It must not alone be a flower of prettiness, but possess the rare beauty of practicality, of productivity.
5. Its choice as a national floral emblem should be based on gratitude for what it has been, is, and always will be to the people of the United States—a veritable symbol of this Nation.

What flower can fill these ardent demands of reason? The tassel of the corn. It has proved itself a faithful friend to all of our land. In fading, the rose dies, but the flower of the corn in fading gives birth to the golden seed which has given sustenance, health, and infinite prosperity to the United States. Well may the vast harvests of the golden seed be called the key to Fort Knox.

Even as Clovis in his gratitude placed golden iris upon his shield, actually founding France or gratitude, so should we as a nation, etch the tassel of the corn on our national shield.

MARGO CAIRNS,
Minneapolis.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for some time I have been wondering why we do not take another vote on the so-called Bricker amendment, which at the last session failed by only one vote to receive the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Members of this body then present and voting. Somehow or other, it seems impossible to get the Bricker amendment out of the Judiciary Committee, so it can be voted on again by the Senate.

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "The Bricker Amendment," written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 13.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

It would seem now that this Congress may adjourn without taking any action on the Bricker amendment. That does not at all mean that this proposition is dead. President Eisenhower's personal popularity has had an hypnotic influence on the legislators of our country so that what he opposes is regarded as politically dangerous.

The Bricker amendment involves nothing that most countries do not practice. Its general principle, for instance, is binding upon the Government of Great Britain, which cannot by treaty affect the domestic law of the country. If a treaty calls for a change in domestic law, it would require an act of Parliament to make it effective. It could not be secret because it would be debated. It could not contain misunderstood or hidden or ambiguous clauses, because the government would feel called upon to explain the details in Parliament and the opposition would bring out the facts.

The opponents of the measure feel that it would give the appearance of a limitation upon the President, particularly upon President Eisenhower. Republicans who denounce both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman for Yalta and Potsdam, object to regularizing our treaty procedures during the administration of President Eisenhower, lest if reflect upon his popularity which seems so important to them. Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, commenting on this particular point, said:

"Opponents of my amendment say that it would tie the hands of the President. That is true in one sense, but untrue in the impression intended to be conveyed. The President's hands are tied by the Constitution, particularly by the wise restraints of the Bill of Rights. My amendment would also tie the President's hands, but only to the extent that he could not make international agreements in conflict with the Constitution nor make one-man law for the people of the United States by executive agreement. Why should the President have power to make treaties and other international agreements which conflict with the Constitution? What domestic laws should the President have power to make by international agreements not approved by either House of Congress? I have never heard a convincing answer to these questions."

As we approach the Geneva Conference, this question takes on the additional meaning that many Americans would like to be sure that Geneva is not another Yalta.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that before the end of this session, we may have an opportunity to vote on the Bricker amendment.

CRITICISM BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY OF THE TAX-WRITE-OFF SYSTEM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to have printed at this point in the body of the Record a dispatch appearing in today's Baltimore Sun. The dispatch purports to give an account of a statement on yesterday by the Secretary of the Treasury, when he referred to the system of tax writeoffs devised for business. I now read from the newspaper dispatch, which refers to the statement by the Secretary of the Treasury:

> The system, he said, served a useful purpose during the early phases of the Korean emergency.
>
> "However," added the Secretary, "the accelerated tax writeoff is an artificial stimulus of a dangerous character."

Mr. President, the article appears to leave the impression that this is a procedure or policy which was initiated during the Korean war and has continued since that time, and that all of a sudden the Secretary of the Treasury has discovered that it is an artificial stimulus of a dangerous character. This is the very point which was under consideration last year during the debate on the tax bill, and it was one of the principal reasons why I voted against the tax bill, and why I believe a number of other Senators voted against that bill.

The newspaper account leaves a very erroneous impression, in my opinion, because I think a year ago the Secretary of the Treasury was one of the principal proponents, if not the principal one, of this very policy, which he now, all of a sudden, has discovered to be of a dangerous character.

I read further from the article, which at this point quotes the Secretary of the Treasury:

> "Its indefinite continuance involves the danger that the interests receiving the benefits of it come to rely on it to the detriment of others who are not so favored."
>
> Humphrey said the system will cost the Treasury $880 million of revenue this year and $810 million next year. He indicated that in his judgment the "crash" defense program begun during the Korean war has been substantially completed and there is no reason for large-scale extension of the hurry-up tax write-offs.

Of course there was no reason for its extension. Last year there was no reason for its extension. This is the very essence of the difference which was developed during the debate on the tax bill, when the Democratic leadership sought to transfer some of these benefits to the lower income group, and away from big business and its fast writeoffs.

The point I wish to make is that it seems to me a strange thing that at this late day the Secretary of the Treasury suddenly discovers that the system is of a dangerous character, and in this statement seems to leave the impression that its origin was in the war. Of course its origin was in the war, when conditions warranted an entirely different tax program. The war justified many different programs in other fields, including defense production and other activities. But I think it is worthwhile to note this distinction, and invite the attention of the people to the fact that this provision appears in the tax bill passed last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full at this point in the Record the article to which I referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 19, 1955]

TAX WRITEOFF SYSTEM IS HIT—HUMPHREY SEES DANGER IN CONTINUING PLAN

Washington, July 18.—George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, today warned Congress that the system of tax writeoffs devised for business during the Korean war may bar tax cuts for all taxpayers in the future.

The system, he said, served a useful purpose during the early phases of the Korean emergency.

"However," added the Secretary, "the accelerated tax writeoff is an artificial stimulus of a dangerous character.

"Its indefinite continuances involves the danger that the interests receiving the benefits of it come to rely on it to the detriment of others who are not so favored."

Humphrey said the system will cost the Treasury $880 million of revenue this year and $810 million next year. He indicated that in his judgment the "crash" defense program begun during the Korean war has been substantially completed and there is no reason for large-scale extension of the hurry-up tax writeoffs.

In what he called speaking "very frankly," Humphrey denounced the use of the tax laws "to further special programs and accomplish purposes other than simply collecting taxes."

WARNS OF REVENUE LOSS

He pointed out that the allowing by Congress of tax reductions in special cases can reduce the net revenues and increase the deficits "without formal action or appropriations by Congress."

Without referring by name to the "summit" meeting now going on in Geneva the Treasury Secretary told the House Government Operations Committee that "some time the defense burden for the whole world is going to have to be reduced."

He said that the people of the world are "spending too much money, time, and effort making things for fighting each other that become rapidly obsolete. At some points it's going to be substantially reduced."

SERVING AMERICA'S MENTALLY ILL VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last weekend it was my privilege to attend the annual State convention of the great Wisconsin Department of the American Legion.

I reported to the veterans of Wisconsin and their families regarding up-to-the-minute legislative efforts in the Congress to assure justice for "him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan"—to quote the unforgettable description by Abraham Lincoln.

One of the important addresses at the State convention was that delivered by the able Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Wisconsin's own Harvey V. Higley.

Director Higley commented on one particular problem faced by VA in terms of the treatment of the 60,000 ex-servicemen who now occupy more than half the beds in the Nation's Veterans Hospitals because of mental and neurological diseases.

Attending to the needs of these ill veterans, achieving a more accurate understanding of their problem, helping to rehabilitate the 4 out of 5 new patients who will eventually be returned to their homes—these represent important challenges for the American people.

Not so long ago, I was pleased to read in the National Tribune the significant progress which has been made by the Veterans' Administration in coping with the problem of rehabilitation, a subject on which the Legion has always rendered great service.

Unfortunately, however, there has been somewhat of a tendency for some members of the public to regard previously disturbed veterans and, for that matter, nonveterans who have been returned from medical institutions, as though they were outcasts—as though they had not really recovered from a so-called incurable disease. Such concepts are of course absurd.

Yet, there has been an incredible amount of literal superstition and prejudice concerning mental illness. There has been a fog of misunderstanding, which should be dispelled by the facts.

Mental illness, like every other illness, can and will be conquered by our discovering the spiritual laws, the scientific laws, which we are now increasingly discovering.

Meanwhile, the effort for greater civilian mental health of our people continues. The National Committee for Mental Health in New York, the National Mental Health Committee here in Washington; the United States Government's own great National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda; the National Mental Health Conference, sponsored by the governors of the 48 States; Regional Mental Health Conferences, and other sources have all contributed splendidly toward progress.

Only yesterday, at the timely suggestion of the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], who has been a pioneer in this field, and with the support of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and other Senators, another landmark action was taken when the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 256 providing for a nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article from Saturday's July 16 Milwaukee Journal and from the June 16 National Tribune be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 16, 1955]

MENTAL CASES SEEN AS CHIEF VA PROBLEM—HARVEY HIGHLEY SETS TOTAL AT 60,000 IN HIS TALK TO LEGION, HOPES FOR CURES

About 60,000 of the 110,000 patients in veterans hospitals are mental patients and this illness has become the major problem of the Administration, Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Administration, told the annual State convention of the American Legion at the Auditorium Saturday.

As a past State commander of the Legion, Higley participated in a panel discussion of veterans rehabilitation. Higley is from Marinette, Wis.

"As a result of new techniques in treatment and the use of new drugs, we are making some remarkable progress in the care of our mental patients," Higley said. "We believe that among our new patients 4 out of 5 eventually will be returned to their homes and that of that number 3 out of 4 will be able to stay at home."

LEGION HELP IS WANTED

Highley pleaded with Legion posts to become more active in the rehabilitation of mental patients at the hometown level. Veterans posts can do excellent work in making the returning patient feel at ease, he said.

"If the mental patient slips after he is returned to his hometown, you often lose the whole battle," Higley said. "We prepare the men as best we can to return home. We move them into rooms with normal home furnishings, keep them in a section with other patients, who, like them, are about to be sent home and we give them money to make small purchases.

"Persons who have been institutionalized often lose their grip. They shrink from going back home to face the problems and decisions of society. That's where your local veterans' group can be a focal point in our whole rehabilitation program."

Higley also urged the Legion posts to aid in finding employment for physically handicapped veterans.

World War I gave rise "to the greatest array of veterans' programs and benefits any nation ever provided," T. O. Kraabel, Washington, D. C., director of the Legion's national rehabilitation commission, said. He outlined pending veterans' legislation and Government studies. The bulk of his commission's work is in assisting veterans to establish their eligibility to certain benefits and services.

SPENT 19 MILLIONS

Gordon Huseby, Madison, director of the State department of veterans' affairs, reported that Wisconsin had disbursed more than $19 million in rehabilitation funds since the department was created by the legislature in 1943. The department has also made available more than $38 million in housing loans. A total of 68,270 veterans have received benefits, he said.

Huseby explained that his work represented a stopgap program which helped a veteran over emergency periods by providing temporary assistance.

[From the National Tribune of June 16, 1955]

Mentally Disturbed Veterans Make Most of Rehabilitation

Veterans treated for mental and nervous illnesses have made an outstanding record of readjustment to gainful life through vocational training, a Veterans' Administration study reveals.

The study disclosed that 93 out of every 100 of these rehabilitated veterans hold jobs, and nearly all of them like the kind of work they are doing. Of the employed veterans, 84 out of 100 are using skills they learned during training.

The veterans, at the time of the survey, were earning an average of $70 a week—$15 above the weekly income of nonveterans in the same age group.

The VA study showed that of the 600,000 disabled World War II veterans who received vocational rehabilitation training over the past 12 years, approximately 150,000 had mental or nervous disorders. This constituted the second largest group of disabled trainees, surpassed in number only by those with orthopedic disabilities such as arm or leg amputations.

ACHIEVEMENTS REMARKABLE

The VA said the achievements of veterans with mental and neurological disorders are all the more remarkable, in light of the fact that they have, on the average, higher disability ratings than other handicapped veterans who have trained.

According to VA records, 65 percent of the veterans treated for mental illnesses had disability ratings of 20 percent or more. In other illness categories, only 50 percent were rated at 20 percent or higher.

The VA study took in a closer look at the 93 out of 100 rehabilitated former mental and neurological patients who were holding jobs and found that 12 percent were working part-time. About 39 percent had changed their jobs one or more times since completing training.

These percentages, the VA explained, do not differ appreciably from the experience of all disabled veterans who have taken vocational training. Overall, 9 percent were part-time workers and 37 percent had switched employment.

In the matter of job satisfaction, too, there was no marked difference in attitude between those with mental or nervous disorders and all other handicapped trainees. Of those with mental or nervous disorders, 64 percent stated they liked their work very much, and 30 percent fairly well. Of all other handicapped trainees, 71 percent said very much and 27 per cent fairly well.

There was only a slight difference between the two groups as to the use they were making of skills acquired through their training. Eighty-four out of 100 veterans with mental and nervous disabilities were using training skills on the job, compared with 87 out of 100 of all the disabled.

HIGHLIGHTS OF SURVEY

In spite of the fact that more veterans with previous mental or neurological ailments were working part time, they were averaging $70 a week, only $2 less than the $72 averaged by all the rest.

The study showed that 56 percent of veteran-trainees with mental and nervous ailments had completed their courses and officially were declared rehabilitated. Nevertheless, nearly half of those who had failed to go all the way through their rehabilitation training were able to get jobs utilizing the skills and knowledge acquired in the training they had received.

The rate of rehabilitation of all disabled veteran-trainees was appreciably higher—62 percent, the VA said.

Following are other highlights of the survey, as revealed by the agency:

Seven out of every 10 rehabilitated veterans with mental and neurological disabilities were between 20 and 30 years old. At the time they entered training 25 percent had never progressed beyond grade school, 60 percent had gone to high school and 15 percent had had some college training. At the time they finished training, 77 percent of the veterans had at least one dependent and family responsibilities that go along with dependency.

A far greater proportion of veterans with mental or nervous disorders attended college, than did veterans with other disabilities—nearly one-half of the former, compared with one-fourth of the rest.

The VA's followup study was undertaken to ascertain what happened to disabled veterans after they finished training and started making their own way in life.

TAXES ON NONHIGHWAY USE OF FUELS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my office receives much mail on proposed tax increases on gasoline, diesel fuel, tires. and tubes for a new road program. Much of this mail comes from farm organizations and farmers and others, who urging that should these taxes be increased for a new road program, Congress should provide a refund or credit for taxes paid on gasoline, diesel fuel, tires, and tubes that are used for nonhighway use.

On March 8 of this year, I introduced Senate bill 1336, which was cosponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye]. The bill provides for a refund or credit for taxes paid on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

Should it develop that we are going to increase these taxes for an expanded highway program, it will be my intention, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, to urge that such an amendment to the law be considered and passed by the Senate.

In 1932, Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax for the purpose of raising general revenue. Despite this fact, there has gradually evolved the concept that the purpose of the tax was to finance highway construction. While it is true that not all the moneys collected from gasoline tax are used for highway purposes, I think it is definite that Congress has, for all practical purposes, established the principle that the Federal gasoline tax is to provide revenue to build highways.

I think it can be clearly demonstrated that the tax is considered as a use tax, in that it is a tax for using the highways. Therefore, it is clearly inconsistent to use for nonhighway purposes the proceeds of the tax.

At a meeting of the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations, held in Topeka on Friday, July 15, the members of this organization unanimously adopted a resolution urging that nonhighway users be exempted from taxes on items which have become identified as a user's tax, for the purpose of participation by the Federal Government in an accelerated highway-building program. These farm organizations are representative of the thinking of the farmers of the State of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the names of the organizations sponsoring the amendment, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Committee of Kansas Farm
Organizations,
Topeka, Kans., June 18, 1955.

Senator Frank Carlson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Carlson: At a meeting of the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations held in Topeka, Friday, July 15, 1955, the following resolution was passed unanimously and I was requested by secretary-treasurer W. E. Boone to forward you a copy because of the urgency of getting the resolution before the Kansas delegation as soon as possible.

"Inasmuch as the Federal tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and excises on tires have become identified as a users tax for the purpose of participation by the Federal Government in an accelerated highway building program.

"*Be it resolved by the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations,* That nonhighway users be exempted from such taxes and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Kansas Members of the Congress.

"Kansas Farm Bureau, W. I. Boone, President, Manhattan; Kansas State Grange, Ray Teagarden, Master, La Cygne; Kansas Farmers Union, Martin Byrne, President, Topeka; the Kansas Farmers Service Association, C. R. Rock, Manager, Hutchinson; Farmers Union Jobbing Association, Roy Crawford, Manager, Board of Trade Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Consumers Cooperative Association, H. A. Cowden, President, Kansas City, Mo.; Equity Union Grain Co., Otto B. Pecha, Secretary-Manager, Board of Trade Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Kansas Cooperative Managers and Directors Association, Pat Ryan, President, Gem; Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., J. H. Dean, Manager, Hutchinson; Kansas Co-Op Dairy Products Association, Chet Freeby, Secretary, Erie; Kansas Livestock Association, Ralph Perkins, Tax Committee, Howard; Kansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc., L. J. Blythe, Vice President, White City; Kansas Wheat Growers Association, R. L. Patterson, President, Oxford."

Sincerely yours,
KANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, INC.
JOE JENNESS, *Executive Secretary*.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, since the Federal gasoline tax is considered as a use tax—that is, a tax for using the highways—it is clearly inconsistent to collect the tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

The major form of nonhighway use of gasoline is on farms. Gasoline used on a farm is one of a number of farm-production supplies—for instance, gasoline, farm machinery, insecticides, feed, fertilizer, and so on. There is no relationship whatsoever between these production supplies and the use of highways. It would be just as illogical to tax fertilizer and to use the proceeds of the tax for building highways as it would be to tax gasoline used on the farms for highway purposes. I do not know of any other industry in which a production supply is taxed to build highways.

Looked at in another way, gasoline used on a farm is a source of power. If power used on the farm is to be taxed to build highways, it would be just as equitable to tax power used in other industries to build highways. We might, for example, tax coal, or electricity, or oil, or natural gas, or diesel fuel, and use the money thus acquired to build highways. But it would not be logical to tax these sources of power for this purpose, nor is it equitable or logical to tax gasoline used on the farm to build highways.

The taxing of non-highway-used gasoline to build highways is, in my opinion, inequitable and illogical, and certainly it is discriminatory.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 677, Senate bill 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 59) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to insert "insofar as it relates to the amount of the reduction in the annuities of officers and employees who elect to receive reduced annuities under such section", and at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "retire" and insert "retired", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amendment approved September 30, 1949 (Public Law 310, 81st Cong.), to section 4 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, insofar as it relates to the amount of the reduction in the annuities of officers and employees who elect to receive reduced annuities under such section, shall take effect as of April 1, 1948, but no increase in annuity shall be payable by reason of such amendment, to those who retired on or after April 1, 1948, and prior to October 1, 1949, for any period prior to the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, has the minority leader been consulted with the regard to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to advise my friend from Indiana that the question of taking up the bill today was discussed with the minority leader several days ago, and it has his approval. It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee, [Mr. JOHNSTON] of South Carolina, who has handled this proposed legislation, will make the statement that it is also in accord with an understanding which he has with the ranking Republican Member of the committee [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CAPEHART. Exactly what does the bill do?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill affects only about 5,600 employees who have retired. In 1948 Congress enacted a bill which authorized a husband, at the time of his retirement, to elect a survivorship annuity payable to his widow equal to 50 percent of the annuity otherwise payable to him. To obtain the benefit of this provision, the husband was required to take a reduction of 10 percent in the annuity payable to him.

In September 1949, we reduced the deduction on the first $1,500 of the husband's annuity from 10 to 5 percent for those who retired after that date. We want them all placed in the same category.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he made it clear in the RECORD that this measure had the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My committee was unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I appreciate very much that statement on the part of the chairman of the committee. The reason I wish to have it appear in the RECORD is that the bill has been on the calendar for a considerable time. On several occasions consideration has been given to the question of taking up the bill. I thought that that statement should be placed in the RECORD because of the delay in bringing up the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. J. CROZAT, JR.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 865, Senate bill 1352, a bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1352) for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of" where it appears the first time, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000", and on page 2, line 3, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND D. BECKNER

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 866, Senate bill 1584, a bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1584) for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "States", to strike out "for hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred in the treatment of the said Lulu Stanley Beckner, who suffered a paralytic stroke and became totally disabled" and insert "arising out of a paralytic stroke suffered by said Lulu Stanley Beckner", and on page 2, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner, Fairmont, W. Va., the sum of $4,953.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Raymond D. Beckner and his wife, Lulu Stanley Beckner, against the United States arising out of a paralytic stroke suffered by said Lulu Stanley Beckner on November 5, 1943, as the result of furnishing blood to a blood bank operated in Fairmont under the wartime blood donor program which was conducted for the armed services by the American National Red Cross: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign and Diplomatic Service.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Marion B. Folsom, of New York, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

H. Chapman Rose, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Caleb M. Wright to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Mainelli to be United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 700, S. 2391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a new bill, S. 2391, which would extend the Defense Production Act for 2 years, to June 30, 1957.

As the earlier law, the 1953 amendments, expired June 30 of this year, a temporary extension to July 31, 1955, has been enacted.

Unless further action is taken, the powers remaining in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, will expire on July 31 of this year.

The Defense Production Act, as passed in 1950, was a major measure containing the powers needed to mobilize the entire economy in support of the national security.

It included allocation and priority powers, requisitioning, financial aids to expansion of capacity and supply, price and wage control, measures to help in settling labor disputes, and credit controls.

On the whole, the powers proved ample for the purpose. The military requirements were filled, and supply was increased so that the period of acute shortages and of rapidly increasing prices was fairly well over by 1953, when many of the powers were dropped, including price, wage, and credit controls.

Since that time the allocation and priority powers have been used, as provided in the act, almost exclusively for the purpose of channeling materials and equipment to the military and AEC.

In view of the huge continuing defense program, the committee had no question that the request of the Office of Defense Mobilization for extension of these allocation and priority powers should be granted, and the bill does so.

The committee adopted one amendment related to the allocation authority, the principal effect of which is to remove obsolete dates from the provisions concerning allocations in the civilian market. These provisions are now academic, because there are no such allocations. They would be important, of course, if such allocations were reimposed. The amendment is fully explained in the report.

The Office of Defense Mobilization requested two amendments relating particularly to its authority to provide financial assistance in the increase of productive capacity and supply. Both of these amendments, which are little more than clarifications of the existing authority, were approved and are included in the bill.

The first was an amendment to the declaration of policy, which emphasizes ODM's responsibility for preparing for a possible future full mobilization, particularly ODM's authority to use the financial devices in title III of the act to provide standby plant facilities and machine tools, and to procure and stockpile essential components which cannot be produced rapidly, turbines and gears, for example.

The second change would make specific ODM's authority to develop substitutes for scarce strategic and critical materials.

In order to avoid the possibility that money might be spent to develop substitutes for materials or commodities which are not scarce, the committee instructed ODM to obtain the advice of the responsible department or agency as to the scarcity of any material before undertaking any development program.

The declining share of procurement going to small business and the decreasing degree of subcontracting to small firms give grave concern to the committee because of the fundamental effect they may have on our competitive economy and our whole way of life. The Office of Defense Mobilization was, therefore, instructed to investigate all practicable means of increasing the small-business share of procurement, and to report back in 6 months, showing what had been done and what further action was needed.

The committee views this study and report as a matter of major importance, and one which has very great possibilities for constructive action.

ODM, and all the agencies it consults, must use energy and imagination in finding ways to solve the problem.

ODM requested that the present authority to exempt participants in voluntary agreements from the antitrust laws be extended for 2 years, and that, in addition, the President be authorized to grant such a waiver for as much as 20 years beyond the expiration date of the act. The section involved, section 708 of the Defense Production Act, is an exception to the antitrust law and policies of the United States, policies which the Committee on Banking and Currency has neither wish nor jurisdiction to handle under ordinary circumstances.

Section 708 was included in the Defense Production Act by the Banking and Currency Committee only because it was convinced that such a provision was essential to the full mobilization of the industrial economy. It is, of course, the intention of the committee to recommend extension of such an exception only so long as and so far as clearly necessary to the mobilization effort.

If permanent amendments to the antitrust laws, not a necessary part of the mobilization program, are desired, they should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which is familiar with and responsible for the antitrust laws.

Accordingly, the committee scrutinized ODM's requests carefully, to find out on the one hand how essential they were to the mobilization program, and on the other hand, how much danger to the competitive free enterprise system was involved.

The testimony in support of the voluntary agreements under which suppliers of an exclusively military product to the Defense Department could exchange production know-how led the committee to extend the authority to enter into and carry out such agreements for 2 years.

The committee, however, was not equally satisfied with the few remaining nonmilitary voluntary agreements, though it noted with satisfaction that most of the agreements were being promptly terminated as soon as their purpose had been served.

Two of these agreements seemed to be primarily information gathering devices, and there was no demonstration of inadequacy of section 705 of the act, under which ample information is obtained from most industries.

One agreement involved 5 of the defendants in the antitrust suit against the petroleum industry.

In view of the representations of the ODM and the Defense Department, the committee permitted these agreements to continue for 2 years, but required the Attorney General to review the agreements and the activities being carried on under them, and to terminate them if he found that the adverse effects on the competitive free enterprise system outweighed the benefit to the national defense.

The committee did not, however, extend the authority to enter into any new nonmilitary voluntary agreements, and it made specific the Attorney General's authority to withdraw his approval of any outstanding agreement.

As the report states, the committee looks to the Attorney General to protect the competitive economy of the country, and expects that he will not approve any new military agreements, and that he will withdraw his approval of outstanding agreements, unless he is satisfied that the defense benefits outweigh the adverse effects to the competitive economy.

The committee heard of no instances in which the proposed 20-year extension of the antitrust exemption would be helpful to the defense effort.

In the absence of a compelling statement of need, the committee did not approve this major amendment to the antitrust laws.

The ODM and the Department of Commerce urged a 2-year extension of the present authority to use w. o. c. employees, paid by their private employers under a waiver of the conflict of interest statutes, in policymaking positions.

The committee studied this matter carefully, and held an additional hearing so that Secretary Weeks and Dr. Flemming could give their views on the subcommittee amendment. The committee reached the conclusion that there was no compelling need, under present cricumstances, to extend the exception to the criminal laws provided by section 710 (b), in the case of persons serving in such policymaking positions as bureau, division, or section heads, or performing the functions of these positions.

While such an exception is considered necessary in time of war or full mobilization, in spite of the conflicts of interest it creates, it cannot be supported now, under quite different circumstances—circumstances which we may expect will last for years or decades.

These same men could still be used in subordinate positions, or in advisory and consultative positions, and they might also serve on industry advisory committees.

Thus their knowledge of industrial problems would still be available to the Government.

It was recognized that many of these men had performed valuable services to the Government during the emergency, and that in the event of full mobilization in the future the same exception would have to be granted again. For this reason, the committee approved a proposal made by ODM for an executive reserve, members of which would come to Washington for training or refresher courses for short periods, and would be available to fill executive positions during a period of full mobilization.

I think it would be appropriate to say, at this point, that most of these w. o. c. employees have performed a very valuable service to the country. No doubt there have been a few cases where they have not lived up to the trust imposed in them, but I am sure this is the rare exception. Many of them have come to Washington reluctantly, at considerable inconvenience to themselves. They have helped greatly in mobilizing the economy. I expect many of them have also learned to understand the workings of the Government, of democracy in action, much better than they would at home in their offices or plants.

I think most of them will appreciate the considerations which have led the committee to the conclusion that placing a man paid by a private firm in a position in a Government agency charged with the duty of regulating his firm's industry is hard on him and hard on his firm, and should only be done during a period of war or full mobilization.

The committee also inserted in the bill a number of provisions limiting the use of these industry-paid men and limiting the exemptions from the conflict-of-interest statutes.

These provisions are taken from Executive Order 10182.

They are included in the law to emphasize the requirements.

It is expected these requirements will be strictly observed, particularly the requirement that no industry paid employee may be employed unless it has proved impossible to find a qualified person who will serve on a full-time salaried basis subject to the conflict-of-interest laws.

Finally, the committee made two changes in the provision for the Joint Committee on Defense Production, which performs such valuable work in keeping the Congress informed of the day-to-day operations under the law.

The rate for stenographic services at joint committee hearings is increased to the standard rate of 40 cents a hundred words, and the ceiling on expenditures during a fiscal year is increased from $50,000 to $65,000.

The ODM, the Department of Defense, and the Commerce Department have urged the extension of the powers contained in the Defense Production Act.

With the changes in the law recommended by the committee, it will continue to assist in carrying out the current defense program and in carrying out plans to enable a rapid conversion to full mobilization.

I urge that S. 2391 be passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I have two amendments which I should like to offer. They were unanimously agreed to by the committee at its meeting on July 8, 1955.

The first amendment permits industry paid employees, appointed under section 710 (b) and exempted from the conflict-of-interest statutes, to serve as bureau, division or section directors or to perform the functions of these positions in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the President; it continues the prohibition on appointments to, or the performance of the functions of, such positions, pending war or a future declaration of national emergency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator have extra copies of those amendments?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I shall be happy to hand copies to the Senator.

The committee recognized that such appointments would be necessary during full mobilization, but had not included this provision in the bill, leaving the matter for further legislation at the time a subsequent emergency might arise. This amendment eliminates the need for subsequent action, putting this standby provision into the bill at this time.

Mr. President, I desire to offer a further amendment to the section which would be amended by the amendment to which I have just referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator offering his amendment at this time?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, line 3, after the word "and", to insert the following: "after October 31, 1955."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Were the amendments unanimously agreed to by the committee?

Mr. FREAR. The one which I first presented was unanimously agreed to. The second one amends the amendment which was first presented by extending the date to October 31, 1955, for the w. o. c.'s who are now with the Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. FREAR. To give them time to complete any business which they may have in motion, or to permit an orderly changeover to full-time salaried employees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Instead of being effective immediately, it gives them a little period of time to make an adjustment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I see no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the second amendment inserts the words "or his private employer" in two places in S. 2391. This eliminates the exception from the criminal statutes in cases where an industry-paid employee appointed under section 710 (b) negotiates or executes contracts with, or recommends or takes action on an application submitted by, a corporation or other entity in which his private employer is interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 25, after "(2)", it is proposed to strike out "Appointments" and insert "Except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the President, appointments."

On page 8, line 3, after the word "position", to strike out the comma, and in the same line, after the word "and", to insert "after October 31, 1955."

On page 8, line 17, after the word "appointee", to insert "or his private employer."

On page 9, line 1, after the word "appointee", to insert "or his private employer."

On page 9, line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "order" and insert "subsection."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have no objection to the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to call up my amendment to Senate bill 2391, and I send to the desk a corrected copy. I have made two slight technical changes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield the floor?

Mr. FREAR. I first wish to yield to the Senator from Indiana if he desires the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from West Virginia is offering an amendment to an amendment which the able Senator from Delaware offered, and which was accepted and has already become a part of the bill. If the Senator from West Virginia wishes to offer an amendment——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from West Virginia if he wishes to offer an amendment in his own right.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the length of the amendment, does the Senator from West Virginia desire to have his amendment read in full?

Mr. KILGORE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE was at the end of the bill, to insert the following:

SEC. 10. The Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 26. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 (a), the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Institute, W. Va., known as Plancor No. 980, shall not expire until the end of the 60-day period which begins on the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) If one or more proposals are received for the purchase of Plancor No. 980 within the time period specified in subsection (a), the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of the period for negotiation specified in section 7 (f), shall negotiate with those submitting the proposals for a period of not to exceed 75 days for the purpose and entering into a definite contract of sale.

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b) or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of Plancor No. 980, the information described in paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, and paragraph (8) of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 3 (c)) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration of such 30-day period. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after the expiration of the period for congressional review shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract for sale.

"(d) If, upon termination of the transfer period provided for in subsection (c), no contract for the sale of Plancor No. 980 has become effective, the operating agency last designated by the President shall continue to maintain said Plancor in adequate standby condition under the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953."

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") before submission to the Congress of its report relative to Plancor No. 980, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 14 and 22 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubbert Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby extended with respect to the rubber-producing facilities covered by this act, to the close of the day of transfer of possession of Plancor No. 980 to a purchaser in accordance with the provisions of section 26 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act.

SEC. 13. Nothwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 19, approved March 31, 1955 and notwithstanding the provisions of section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission established by the latter act shall cease to exist at the close of the 30th day following the termination of the transfer period provided for in section 26 (c) of that act, unless no sale of Plancor No. 980 is recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 26 (c) of that act, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 130th day following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 14. Except as otherwise provided in this act, disposal of Plancor No. 980 shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as have been established by the Commission in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber-producing facilities under that act: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 7 (j), 7 (k), 9 (d), 9 (f), 10, 11, 15, and 24 of that act shall not apply, to the disposal of Plancor No. 980. As promptly as practicable following the date of transfer of possession of Plancor No. 980 to a purchaser under this act, the operating agency last designated by the President shall offer for sale to such purchaser the end products at such plant and held in inventory for Government account on the day of such transfer of possession, together with the feedstocks then located at such plant or purchased by the operating agency for use at such plant. Sale of such end products shall be made at the Government sales price prevailing on the business day next preceding the date of transfer of possession of such plant. Sale of such feedstocks shall be made at not less than their cost to the Government. In the event the purchaser declines to purchase such end products or feedstocks when first offered to it by the operating agency, they may be thereafter disposed of in such manner as the operating agency deems advisable. In the event Plancor No. 980 is not sold under the provisions of this act, any end products at such plant and held in inventory for

Government account and any feedstocks located at such plant or purchased by the operating agency for use at such plant shall be disposed of in such manner as the operating agency deems advisable, at the prevailing market price for such end products and feedstocks.

Sec. 15. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to the disposal of any Government-owned rubber-producing facilities other than Plancor No. 980; and all action taken pursuant to the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, or the amendment thereto known as Public Law 19, enacted March 31, 1955, prior to the enactment of this act shall be governed by the provisions of that act as it existed prior to the enactment of this act and shall have the same force and effect as if this act had not been enacted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the amendment has been submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and has been studied by them. They are fully conversant with it. Only two technical changes are made in it, which do not appear in the amendment at the desk.

In section 13, on page 4, line 3, after the word "Notwithstanding", I propose to insert: "the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 19, approved March 31, 1955, and notwithstanding."

On page 4, line 5, I propose to strike out "that" and insert in lieu thereof "the latter."

These two technical changes in the amendment were made at the suggestion of the Treasury Department and have the approval of that Department.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment as modified.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to make a brief statement for the Record as to what the amendment is intended to do. It would amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 so as to permit the sale of Plancor No. 980, at Institute, W. Va.

To save time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement I have prepared relative to the amendment may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Kilgore

My amendment would amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 to permit the sale of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va.

This legislation is similar to a bill enacted into law by the Congress to permit the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission to reoffer for sale the synthetic rubber plant at Baytown, Tex.

After enactment of that legislation, the Baytown plant was sold to the United Rubber & Chemical Co., a newly formed subsidiary of the United Carbon Co. of Charleston.

During the life of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 the Government did not receive any bids on the Institute, W. Va., plant.

Recently I introduced in the Senate a bill to enable the Government to sell the Institute plant for uses other than the production of synthetic rubber.

The Office of Defense Mobilizaion and the Department of Defense objected to that proposal on the ground that the capacity of the Institute plant to produce synthetic rubber would be needed to meet full mobilization requirements.

At the same time, Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, advised me that he would support "every reasonable" effort to sell the plant for the production of GRS.

This amendment will enable the Government to reoffer this plant for sale. Any contract will contain all necessary safeguards including the national security clause.

My purpose in offering this amendment is to make certain that every effort is made to get this large industrial facility at Institute back into production at the earliest possible date.

Any sale approved by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission will be submitted to Congress, in conformity with the original rubber disposal act.

Any contract will be submitted to the Attorney General for a report on whether the sale would constitute a violation of the antitrust laws.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and he has expressed his approval. In addition I have been advised that the Treasury, the Department of Defense and the Office of Defense Mobilization favor this legislation.

The Government is amply protected in this legislation, which, in brief, will enable the Government to reoffer for sale as a synthetic rubber producing facility the plant at Institute, W. Va.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the old act no offers to purchase the Institute plant were made; but lately two companies have indicated a desire to buy the plant on the same terms and conditions under which other plants were sold, and as was done at Baytown. They have proposed to put the rubber production plant into operation immediately and do the same with it as was done with the other plants, and under the same terms and conditions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the amendment, which I support. But first I ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Fulbright

The final disposal of the Baytown synthetic rubber plant under Public Law 19 of this Congress offers an excellent illustration of the results of competition.

We all speak in praise of competition, as an important element in our economy, but all too often this is mere lip service, the votes go the other way. A few comparisons between the results of the genuine competitive bidding under Public Law 19 and the results under the original Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act will show what the minority had in mind when it opposed the original disposals on the ground that the program:

(1) Did not adequately assure small businesses of a fair share of synthetic rubber at fair prices;

(2) Did not best foster the development of a free, competitive, synthetic-rubber industry;

(3) Did not return to the Government "full fair value" for the facilities; and

(4) Did not adequately safeguard the national security.

I

The successful bidder for the Baytown plant, United Carbon Co., has committed itself to make available 40 percent of its output for small business. This is a larger share for small business than any of the commitments by the original purchasers of GRS plants, which were as follows: 10 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent, approximately 15,000 tons out of a capacity of 90,000 tons (i. e., 16⅔ percent), 10 percent, 10 percent, 4,000 to 15,000 tons out of a capactiy of 44,000 tons (i. e., 9 percent–34 percent), percentage in line with proportion they represent of total market, "major portion," 50 to 60 percent to small business and other users, and 20 percent. In addition, as the United Carbon Co. does not itself use the product of the plant, but expects to make its profits by selling the output, there is less danger of any attempt to escape from this commitment.

II

United Carbon Co., a newcomer to the field, should provide new and vigorous competition to the companies established in the synthetic rubber business.

Of the GRS and butyl plants sold under Public Law 205, 57 percent of the capacity went to the big 4 rubber companies, and 31 percent went to 3 large petroleum companies. Only 12 percent went to concerns which might be hoped to compete fully, though of course the entry of the petroleum concerns into the field enlarged the number of big competitors and thereby reduced the likelihood of agreements in restraint of trade.

III

The offer made under Public Law 19 resulted in 9 bids, 6 of which were increased during the negotiations. Under the original disposal, only 1 bid per plant was made for 10 of the GRS plants sold, and those single bidders were the operators for the Government or new corporations in which the operators participated. The successful bid for Baytown, $7,153,000, is almost 3 times the original bid. It represents a price of $163 per ton of annual capacity, compared to the selling figures under Public Law 205, which ranged from $53 to $144 per ton of capacity. If there had been this kind of competition in the original bidding, the total amount received might have been some $40 million more than the $260 million actually received for the plants under Public Law 205.

There is no question that competition, particularly competition from real competitors, can be effective in reaching "full fair value."

IV

United Carbon, as a newcomer and I believe a genuine competitor in the field, can be expected to increase the supply of GRS and to reduce the danger of restrictive practices and increased prices which are seriously detrimental to national security.

The sales under Public Law 205, largely to the big 4 rubber companies and 3 oil companies, are much more likely to result in restraints of trade and price fixing.

I realize fully the strength of the argument that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. At that time we did not have the evidence that the prices were too low which the Baytown sale gives us. And it may be that the final conclusion of the original sale provided additional incentives to prospective purchasers for Baytown.

I think the substantial improvements in the Baytown terms—the price, the provision for small business, the entrance of a genuine competitive newcomer in the field—all make it clear that the terms of the original sales could have been greatly improved, if the original sales had been disapproved and new bids had been asked for.

In short, I think there was real competition for Baytown, and I think there was not genuine competition, in most cases, on the original sales. The Baytown experience fully justifies disapproval of several Senators of the sales under Public Law 205.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the experience gained in the disposal of the plant at Baytown completely justifies the opposition which a number of the Members have expressed to the original disposal under Public Law 205.

The Government benefited tremendously by the delay in the case of the Baytown plant and the competition which developed for that plant. The price per ton of production is substantially larger, and the provisions with regard to the availability of the product for small business are far more favorable.

I think there is every reason why the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia should be agreed to, in order to give a fair opportunity to persons interested in the plant to come forward and submit their bids. I predict that they will offer much more favorable terms than was the case in the disposal of plants under Public Law 205, which I still think constituted an unjustified injury to the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to, reports have been received from the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Department of Defense, the Treasury Department, and the Disposal Commission. I ask uanimous consent that the text of the letters may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1955.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in reply to your request for our views on S. 2509, a bill "to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va."

As indicated in my letter of July 14 to your committee, the productive capacity of the institute plant would be needed to meet our requirements for GRS if full mobilization should become necessary under present conditions. In one way or another, its capacity should remain available for the production of rubber in such an event.

In its present standby status, the plant is available for emergency use but the interest of the United States would be better served if it could be disposed of to private interests with the safeguard of a national security clause. While no reasonable bid for the plant was submitted at the time of the first offering, I understand that there has recently been expressed some interest in the acquisition of the plant on terms which would insure the availability of its rubber-producing capacity for mobilization purposes. We would favor legislation which would make such a disposal possible and believe that the provisions of S. 2509 would provide all of the safeguards necessary to protect the national interest.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1955.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views of the Department of Defense on S. 2509, "to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va."

S. 2509 would permit the disposal of the Institute, W. Va., rubber-producing facility (Plancor No. 980) in the same manner as the Baytown, Tex., rubber-producing facility was disposed of under Public Law 19 of the 84th Congress. S. 2509 provides for the inclusion of the national security clause in the proposed sales contract.

The sale of the institute facility, as proposed in S. 2509, would add to the active synthetic rubber capacity available to the United States in the event of national emergency, and would relieve the Government the expenses of maintaining that plant in a standby condition.

Accordingly, the Department of Defense favors the enactment of S. 2509.

Enactment of this bill would not involve the expenditure of any Department of Defense funds.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
LORNE KENNEDY,
Deputy for Legislative Affairs.

RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES
DISPOSAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1955.

Mr. J. H. YINGLING,
Clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YINGLING: Your letter of July 14, 1955, to Mr. Pettibone, Chairman of this Commission, requested its opinion as to the merits of S. 2509, "A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va."

We have been in touch thereon with the members of the Commission, who have authorized me to make the following comments:

The bill in effect would subject the Institute copolymer plant to substantially the same handling as that accorded the Baytown, Tex., copolymer plant (Plancor 877) by Public Law 19, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved March 31, 1955. Neither the Institute plant nor the Baytown plant had been recommended for sale under the original program transmitted to the Congress by the Commission under date of January 24, 1955. Pursuant to Public Law 19, the Baytown plant was readvertised and sale thereof was consummated on July 15, 1955. Before passage of Public Law 19, the views of prior purchasers of copolymer facilities were elicited and no objections to the legislation as finally enacted were lodged with the Congress. The Commission believes that a similar procedure would be appropriate in regard to S. 2509.

In the case of the Baytown plant, it had been generally assumed by prospective purchasers that this plant would probably be purchased by General Tire & Rubber Co., which had bid thereon. Such prospective purchasers, however, were told by the Commission as of late November 1954 that the Commission had received no bids for the Institute copolymer plant, and accordingly they may well have contemplated that this particular facility would not be sold and would remain in standby for a 3-year period. This Commission cannot assess what effect this may have had on the final negotiated prices paid for the plants.

As the Commission stated in its report to your committee on S. 691, which became Public Law 19, the basic policy question of authorizing sale of this facility is beyond the purview of this Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD W. SHEEHAN,
General Counsel.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 18, 1955.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 2509, "To amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va."

The bill is patterned after Public Law 19, 84th Congress, approved March 31, 1955, and would authorize the disposal of the rubber-producing facility located at Institute, W. Va., in a manner similar to the disposal of the rubber-producing facility located at Baytown, Tex., pursuant to said Public Law 19.

It is suggested that the following technical changes be made in section 4 of the bill: (1) In line 1 insert "the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 19, approved March 31, 1955, and notwithstanding" after the word "nothwithstanding"; (2) in line 3, strike "that" and insert in lieu thereof "the latter."

The Treasury Department has no objection to enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,
W. RANDOLPH BURGESS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have discussed a proposed amendment with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It involves a very slight change, requiring the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of the development of substitutes. I should like to offer the amendment now and have it disposed of. I understand the Senator from Indiana has no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. One page 2, after line 13, it is proposed to strike out:

(g) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, the President may make provision for the development of substitutes for strategic and critical materials.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

(g) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, and upon a certification by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Interior that a particular strategic and critical material is likely to be in short supply in time of war or other national emergency, the President may make provision for the development of substitutes for such strategic and critical materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana to the text as amended.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 24, it is proposed to strike out:

(2) Except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the President, appointments under this subsection (b) shall not be made to the position of the director or head of a bureau, division, section, or other comparable policymaking or administrative position and, after October 31, 1955, a person appointed under this subsection shall not perform the functions of such a director or head.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(2) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has done a good job in framing the language which has been used in the bill now under consideration in respect to businessmen who come to Washington to serve the Government without compensation. However, it is my opinion, as it is the opinion of many other persons, especially those in the administration, that on page 13 of the report, under paragraph (b) of section 710, the committee went entirely too far.

We have been using the w. o. c. or the so-called dollar-a-year men or businessmen, to help in advising the Government for many years—20 years or more. I believe everyone will agree that such persons have served a very useful purpose and have given in practically 100 percent of the instances, honest, conscientious, sincere service to the Government.

Frankly, the amendment I have offered will, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other persons in the administration, permit a continuance of the use of businessmen in Government without compensation. Unless the bill shall be amended to accomplish this purpose, by such an amendment as I have proposed, or one along similar lines, we will simply be eliminating the opportunity to obtain the benefit of the advice, consultation, and experience of such businessmen.

I had hoped very much that my amendment would be accepted by the manager of the bill; but I understand that he will not accept the amendment and that it will be necessary to have a vote upon it. Is that a correct statement of the Senator's position?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly think that is the position of the committee, and it is my position. I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. I feel certain there are other members of the committee who wish to be heard on the subject. The matter was discussed before the committee last week, when we heard the Comptroller General.

I wish to make a short statement with regard to this question, when the Senator from Indiana has completed his statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read the amendment:

Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

How much further can one go? The amendment simply eliminates such persons from taking any part in policymaking decisions. If the Senator cannot agree to that, what can he agree to?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Indiana will yield, I may say that I agree to the language of the bill, which I think is quite clear. It simply provides that such persons shall not be employed in policymaking positions. I think there are good reasons for that. They are reasons which I will try to develop as soon as the Senator from Indiana has relinquished the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the use of bringing such persons into the Government unless it is to get the benefit of their advice, counsel, and experience?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I think.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of bringing them into the Government is to ask for and receive the benefit of their experience and their recommendations. The amendment would make certain that they themselves could not adopt any policies; but that their recommendations as to policies must be submitted to salaried Government officials who are responsible for policy decisions. If the language in the bill is to be used, we might as well not have such persons.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The language of the bill does not prevent consultation with the w. o. c.'s; in fact, it states that they will be consulted. But they are not to be employed as the heads of divisions.

I think the Senator from Indiana is well enough acquainted with the practices in business and in Government to know that the person who is at the head of a bureau or division has considerable influence upon his underlings, without having to draw pictures.

Mr. CAPEHART. The appointees would serve only for 6-month periods. In this instance, under the bill, they would deal only with matters of defense and with arriving at policies, decisions, and actions which would be taken in time of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can say, in answer to the Senator's remarks, that the 6 months' period only adds to their irresponsibility, in my opinion, and that they do deal with such products as aluminum. I can cite the Senator a decision, handed down only a short time ago, with respect to the expansion of the production of aluminum, which is one of the most important metals. That matter has come up 2 or 3 times. If my memory serves me correctly, each time the industry representatives were opposed to the extension, because they were afraid of overproduction.

I do not in any cases attribute to the persons involved any malfeasance or any wicked motive. I think it is a matter of judgment. If a man has spent his life in a certain industry, I do not think he can in 6 months dissociate himself from the viewpoint he has obtained over a lifetime in that activity. I do not believe a person is capable of doing it.

In wartime the motive which inspires a person to override his tendencies is the all-out effort to maintain our national security. At least, we think so. Or I will put it this way: We are willing to accept the risk because of the necessities of war.

Mr. CAPEHART. So long as we are dealing with human beings, I think there is bound to be bad judgment exercised from time to time. There will be instances from time to time when some persons will be found to be downright dishonest. I know of no group of people in the world which has a monopoly on all the vices or all the virtues. I do not anticipate we will ever get together a group of people in which some persons will not exercise bad judgment, or will not make mistakes from time to time, or in which some will not be dishonest. But I do not know why we should want to give up the policy of using businessmen, when that policy has been followed for years. The bill says that in case of emergency or war such persons may be used in any capacity. Is it not more important to get such persons to Washington in advance, so that they may figure out exactly what should be done if a war should come, and enable us to know what we should do the first day, and not wait until the war breaks out, and then bring to Washington 100 or 200 or 500 persons, and spend weeks and weeks deciding what we are going to do?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wish to make the point that neither of the proposals turns on the question of crookedness, dishonesty, or engaging in transactions with a view to furthering one's private interests. That is not the issue as between the language of the committee bill and the language of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

It seems to me, from what I have learned, that the importance of the amendment is that, based on the testimony of persons familiar with the program, incentives should be continued to make it attractive for industry to send its best people to Washington. The objective should not be to destroy the possibility of expanding our program in an emergency by not having the aid of persons who have been trained in Government operation.

It seems to me the amendment is most desirable. First I should like to have the Senator from Indiana confirm what I have stated as to the feeling that the question does not turn on the question of crookedness.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point I wish to make is that so long as we are dealing with human beings, no law can be enacted and no policy can be pursued which will eliminate the possibility of a person's using bad judgment or making mistakes, because our jails and penitentiaries are filled with people who previously were honest, but something happened and they violated the law.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It seems to me that to have persons come into the service of the Government and take positions where their responsibility is fixed will make it easier to trace any collusive work on their part.

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee has done an excellent job in every respect except this one, where it eliminates the possibility of getting the benefit of the services of such competent persons.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to confirm the statement of the Senator from New Jersey that the committee action is not based on the premise that w. o. c.'s are dishonest or crooked. I think the action is based more on the idea which Mr. Charlie Wilson expressed so felicitously when he said, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." I do not happen to agree with that statement, and I do not think the committee agrees with it. I am sure he made the statement in all honesty. I am sure he is convinced that when the Government deals with General Motors, the Government gets a better bargain than it could if it dealt with another company. I am sure he believes his company is the best one, and that may very well be. We do not charge him with dishonesty when he says his company is the best in the world. It is a laudable opinion for him to have. But we on the committee do not agree that we should turn over the Government operation in peacetime to people who have spent their lives in business. There is no attack involved at all upon the motives of such persons; it is simply a question whether they are capable of exercising unbiased judgment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is misconstruing what Mr. Wilson said when he made the statement. I think many honest men will say that what is good for them is good for the country, and what is good for the country is good for them, in carrying on a business. I think Mr. Wilson was sincere, objective, and honest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think he was sincere too. The Senator has stated that we cannot eliminate every possibility of bad judgment. Of course not. All the committee proposal seeks to do is minimize such a contingency. We do not say the measure will prevent such instances absolutely. The intent is to minimize the number. The conflict-of-interests statutes have been on the books for a long time. If the Senator wishes to be logical, he will undertake to repeal them altogether. He does not go that far. So long as we have such statutes, they should be operative in peacetime.

Mr. CAPEHART. Previous administrations have been using businessmen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But only in wartime.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is being proposed by the Senator from Akansas and other Senators is that, after such businessmen have been used for years, all at once it is decided to dispense with their services, when an administration of a different party has the responsibility of preparing the country for war and emergencies. The Senator is saying that the practice followed by officials of his own party is no longer correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is incorrect. We did use them in wartime, when a suspension of the conflict-of-interests laws was required.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to make a point which seems to me to be important. I can fully agree that a very logical argument can be made that the proper operation of a Government organization cannot be squared exactly with the idea of having certain persons come into the Government temporarily and take over administrative responsibilities; but it seems to me there is an overriding consideration in the fact that the program operates in a very limited area. The important consideration is how are we going to get the services of the best persons, and to keep them interested. I should like to emphasize the point that it seems to me better to have persons in certain positions so that responsibility for action can be traced to them.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly what my amendment would accomplish.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That is why I believe that, insofar as the conflict-of-interests law is concerned, we would be better off if we keep responsible persons in positions where they could be watched.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the amendment which I have offered is accepted, it will permit the administration to bring to Washington a group of persons from a given industry, permit them to organize themselves, have a chairman and vice chairman, and to work in a way which will be to the best interests of the Nation in an emergency or in war.

So by means of this amendment and other language used in the bill, we say to them, "You men cannot make any policy. But after your committee has a chairman or vice chairman, and comes to make certain decisions, you will be subject to the following provision:

> When policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials, who are responsible for making policy decisions.

Under the language of the bill as it is written at the moment, none of these gentlemen can at any time, in trying to work out what will be done in case of war or other emergency, be the chairman or vice chairman of a committee. They simply can come into the Government service and serve under a chairman who is a full-time Government employee. I think it is much better to say to them, "Go into your conference room and decide on what you believe to be in the best interests of the Nation in case of war, and bring back your recommendations to the salaried Government employee who is responsible for making that policy decision, and present all the facts to him, and let him be the judge."

I think that is much the best procedure, and is the proper way to handle the matter. In that way I believe we shall get qualified men to work for the Government, under those conditions, but not under any other conditions, because the very fact that we are having this debate throws some suspicion upon such gentlemen who are now serving in Washington; and those who will be invited to serve in the future will question whether they are wanted and whether they will be under suspicion at all times.

Let me say that I think the business men of the United States are just as honest as are any other group of men. I repeat that I am not unmindful of the fact that once in a while one of them will make a bad decision, and neither am I unmindful of the fact that once in a while one of them will be downright dishonest. But there will always be men who will make bad deicsions from time to time; and there will always be men, after having been honest all their lives, suddenly will do something dishonest.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not a fact that sometimes Senators make bad decisions?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course they do, and of course all groups do. As I have said, I know of no group that has a monopoly on honesty or a monopoly on dishonesty or a monopoly on being right or a monopoly on being wrong. According to my observation, all of us are prone to make mistakes once in a while, and occasionally it is true of all of us that our judgment is not too good.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know how many other Members of the Senate have served as a dollar-a-year man. But during World War II, I served as a dollar-a-year man; and during my service it was quite evident to me that if the War Production Board, for instance, had not had in its organization men skilled and acquainted with all the details of the various industries which were being knitted together into the war effort, the war would not have been won by us. So the proposition is just that simple; otherwise, the war would not have been won by us.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would be very sorry, indeed, to see anything done now which would make it impossible to duplicate the factors which enabled us to win the war on the industrial front. That was not the only front; but without success on the industrial front, the war could not have been won by us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that the amended language makes an exception for war time, and does not prevent, in other words, exactly what the Senator from Vermont is advocating. We recognize the need for such men in war time, and the language permits them to be employed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. President, if I may proceed a little further, with the permission of the Senator who has the floor——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to continue a little further on that point. There was very great difficulty in getting the skill of these men effectively applied during the first months of the war; that was so simply because those who were brought in from the outside had had no experience with Government operations, and the administrative officials of the Government had had no experience in dealing with such men.

On the basis of my experience, I conceive it to be necessary that there be a continuing experience and liaison between men from industry and men in Government. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that it seems to me that his amendment as it is worded affords the maximum of protection without putting a stop to meeting the need for acquaintance and relationship between men in Government administration and men in business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], as well as the attention of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the debate, Senators are confusing the two programs covered by this bill, namely, the so-called Reserve training program and the program which will result in having so-called w. o. c. brought into the Government and placed in key positions.

Our bill does not change the Reserve training program one iota. Let me invite attention to page 10, in line 1, where we find the following:

> (e) The President is further authorized to provide for the establishment and training of a nucleus executive reserve for employment in executive positions in Government during periods of emergency. Members of this executive reserve who are not full-time Government employees may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business for the purpose of participating in the executive reserve training program. The President is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons who are not full-time Government employees from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

These sections are the so-called conflict-of-interest statutes.

Mr. President, if Senators will turn to the hearings, and will study the testimony of Dr. Flemming, they will find that he made perfectly clear the difference between the Reserve training program, which is not at all covered by the section of the bill involved in this amendment, and the other program, which brings the dollar-a-year men into the Government service and places them in administrative positions, over paid Government employees, for a period of 6 months. Those two programs are separate and distinct. We are not proposing to interfere in any way with the training program; we are entirely in favor of the training program. But we propose the adoption of language which will completely eliminate the conflict-of-interest danger.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to turn to page 7 of the bill, where I read the following, beginning in line 5:

> This authority—

Referring to the authority we propose to give to the President to hire w. o. c.'s—meaning persons serving the Government without compensation—

> may be delegated to heads of departments of agencies delegated or assigned functions under this act but may not be redelegated by them. In order to carry out the policy of the Congress that, so far as possible, operations under this act shall be carried on by full-time, salaried employees of the Government, heads of departments and agencies in making appointments under this subsection shall certify to the following with respect to each such appointment.

Mr. President, I want all Senators to pay particularly close attention to this language. It means, in other words, that w. o. c.'s cannot be appointed unless the following conditions have been complied with:

> (A) That the appointment is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act.

That is the Defense Production Act, by means of which we shall prepare for war.

I read further:

> (B) That the duties of the position to which the appointment is being made require outstanding experience and ability;
>
> (C) That the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position; and
>
> (D) That the department or agency head has been unable to obtain a person with qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time salaried basis.

Then it says:

> (2) Appointments under this subsection (b) shall not be made to the position of the director or head of a bureau, division, section, or other comparable policymaking or administrative position, and a person appointed under this subsection shall not perform the functions of such a director or head.

This is the paragraph we wish to amend.

I could go on and on. We have written all the safeguards which I think language can express, to protect the Government. We do not wish to write such language as would surround these gentlemen with so many laws, rules, and regulations that we would not get the benefit of their services.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The language which the Senator has cited, on page 7 of the bill, refers to a program quite different from the reserve program referred to on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. As to the language on page 7, it has already been amended by the amendments recommended by the Comptroller General and accepted by the committee. Under the amendments recommended by the Comptroller General we provide the great protection that this provision shall not apply in times of war or emergency. However, it is provided that in peacetime the w. o. c.'s shall not be brought into the Government service and placed in an administrative capacity over Government employees for a 6-month period, because it was pointed out by the Comptroller General that that would result in great confusion in administration.

Mr. CAPEHART. The portion of the bill to which my amendment applies has to do with businessmen, professional men, heads of universities, and others, who may come to Washington to help devise policies, plans, and procedures if and when we have a war. They are to help in determining the policies, but they cannot put any policy into effect without the approval of a full-time salaried employee of the Government. The reserves which are mentioned in another section of the bill, to which the able Senator from Oregon referred, are made up of people who are brought to Washington, not to determine plans or policies, but to learn the art of the policies and plans which have already been worked out. They are like soldiers. After someone has laid out a training course, they will go through the training course.

So there are two entirely different groups of people. One is a group which will follow out the established policies, in case of war or emergency. The other group will help the Government devise the policies which the reservists will carry out in case of war.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment which the Senator from Indiana has offered is applicable only in time of war?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wished to make sure of that.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill provides that in time of war this amendment shall not apply, nor would any of the other restrictions which we wrote into the bill. That provision is a part of the bill. This amendment would apply only in time of peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont clearly understand that the provision of the bill in regard to the w. o. c.'s applies only in time of peace? In time of war the exemption from the conflict-of-interest statute will prevail. The Comptroller General proposed some language which the committee accepted, which made it very clear that in time of peace these men should not be given policy making positions or administrative positions over full-time Government employees. It should be pointed out that under our bill all the advisers and consultants that the Government needs may be brought in. I am strongly in favor of that provision. If Senators will consult the committee hearings, they will find that I made that statement over and over during the hearings.

Mr. CAPEHART. There can be no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. These men ought to be brought in as consultants and advisers; but I refuse to accept the notion that we must put them in administrative positions in order to give them the so-called prestige which will cause them to come to Washington and make available their advice for 6 months. I think it would be a mistake to put them over full-time Government employees.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I stated a moment ago, I am only using this situation as an example. A group of persons who have had experience in a given industry get together and devise plans and policies which will be put into effect in case of war. Then, under the language of my amendment and other language which the committee placed in the bill, they submit such policies to some full-time salaried employee of the Government, who says yes or no. I do not think we can induce such men to come to Washington if we deny them the right to organize and work together, and enjoy the benefit of one another's viewpoint.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. Does the Senator wish to ask the question of me or of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will ask the Senator from Arkansas a question with regard to the bill.

Does the bill limit the dollar-a-year-man, or whatever he is called—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The w. o. c. "W. o. c." means "without compensation."

Mr. FLANDERS. I presume there are a dozen other w. o. c.'s in the alphabetical list, but today that is the one with which we are concerned. The initials mean "without compensation." Is it the idea of those who are supporting the bill as reported that these men will come to Washington without compensation, strictly as individuals, to advise, and not to determine policies which they have no authority to impose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, let me say that the expression "without compensation" does not mean strictly without compensation. They are paid by their own employers. They are not paid by the Government.

Mr. FLANDERS. Not even a dollar a year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In most cases they receive handsome salaries from their own companies. That is well known, and accepted.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have had such an experience.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill contemplates that in peacetime they would be brought in only as advisers. They would not have the responsibility of making policy decisions and submitting them to the heads of departments for approval.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is there not the possibility of a group of them being assigned to devise policies, without enforcing them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They certainly could give advice to the regular employees, but it is contemplated that the heads of agencies, as named in the bill, would be regular full-time employees of the Government, whose primary responsibility would be to the Government itself, and not to a private employer. That is the difference. Perhaps it is too subtle a difference to be easily explained. It does not lend itself to concrete illustration; but I think there is a very important distinction between the attitude of the person whose primary responsibility is to his Government, rather than to a private employer, on the one hand, and, on the other, a person whose primary responsibility is to a private employer.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that I had the experience of being not only what was then called a "dollar-a-year man," rather than a "w. o. c.," but I was on a number of advisory boards during the Roosevelt administration, the most important of which was assignment to a certain board, the initials of which I forget, but it was supposed to be the top economic board of the Government. It was under the chairmanship, first of the then Senator Byrnes, and later of the late Judge Vinson.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is referring to the Board of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. FLANDERS. It was the Board of Economic Stabilization.

There is nothing more forlorn, more hopeless, more discouraging, than to be an advisory member of a group in Washington which does not have a definite commission to decide upon and recommend policy; and to the extent that there is anything in this bill which does not give authority to the w. o. c.'s to make recommendations as to policy, to that extent the Government is being ill served in peacetime. It seems to me that the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Indiana gives more leeway than the language of the bill, as I read it, for such men to perform their useful services. The amendments provide the limitation that they shall be restricted to advising the officials who are responsible for making policy decisions. I wish them to be able to take definite assignments to work on and to report on, and I wish them to be able to organize for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield so that I may point out something to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to call the Senator's attention to pages 35 and 36 of the hearings. I wish to make perfectly clear that there is nothing in the bill as reported by the committee which would prevent a department from calling in leaders of industry to work out plans and programs to be recommended for use by the Government in time of war or emergency. There is nothing in the bill which would prevent it. What the bill would prevent, on the recommendation of the Comptroller General, would be granting a w. o. c. the administrative authority that is listed on pages 35 and 36.

For example, the Aluminum and Magnesium Division has as its director a w. o. c. As was brought out in our hearings, it is not possible for a man to fill that position without at the same time making a great many administrative decisions. The men are placed over a staff of career Government employees for 6 months. At the end of that 6-month period a new director would be appointed. It seemed to the Comptroller General that that would lead to inefficiency and confusion. We can almost take judicial notice of that fact.

Let us look at some of the other assignments. The Automotive Division has as a director a w. o. c. The Containers and Packaging Division has as its head a w. o. c. The same is true of the Electrical Equipment Division. Pages 35 and 36 show other divisions of the Department of Commerce which are headed by w. o. c.'s, who exercise administrative power.

Of course, the great danger is that it leads to a conflict of interest. That situation, of course, is different from the situation in time of war or emergency, when all of us, in all walks of life, place patriotic impulses first, and the conflict-of-interest problem really becomes minimal.

Mr. FLANDERS. From a reading of the Capehart amendment it does not seem that it would permit the appointment of a w. o. c. as an administrative officer. Does the Senator from Oregon conceive that that would be possible under the Capehart amendment?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, it would be possible under the Capehart amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not read the words that way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is clear to me that a w. o. c. would be the head of the division, but that when it came to a policy matter he would step aside and would let his assistant, or whoever might be under him, make the policy decision. I say that that is an unrealistic way of looking at the matter. I do not believe it would work out satisfactorily. The one who is the administrative head should actually make the policy decisions.

Mr. MORSE. If all that the Senator from Vermont wants is that these men be placed in positions where they can recommend programs of policy which shall be followed by the Government in time of emergency or war—and I understand that this is all that the Senator wants—that can be done under the discretion of the Comptroller General.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In time of war or emergency there is no restriction. Conflict-of-interest statutes do not affect conditions during such an emergency. The Senator from Vermont described an incident from his own experience. The only difference is that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], wishes that what is in effect during an emergency shall be normal in peacetime. In other words, he wishes the procedure to be normal at all times, so that these men would be free from the restrictions of the conflict-of-interest statute. That is the real difference between the two situations.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not read in that way the words of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. Of course, I must vote on what seems to be the plain wording of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The wording leaves the impression that a man can be the head of a division and exercise all the power and prerogatives of the office of the director of the division, but that when a matter which is called a policy matter comes up, he steps aside.

In the first place, I believe it is quite difficult to say when a matter is a policy matter and when it is not a policy matter. If one is the actual administrative head, I would say that in all practical situations he should make the decision, whether it was called an administrative decision or a policy decision.

Mr. FLANDERS. Again referring to the Capehart amendment, does the Senator from Arkansas conceive that a full-time, salaried Government official, responsible for making policy decisions, would be an underling in a division of which a w. o. c. was the chairman?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, that could certainly be the situation, or it could be the Secretary of Commerce who would make the decision.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Secretary of Commerce can make the decision. However, as I understood the suggestions which had been made, it would be possible for a full time, responsible, policy-making official to be an underling of a w. o. c. I cannot conceive of such a situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is the clear intent of the amendment, namely, that the w. o. c.'s will be the head men. It would be done to give them prestige, so as to attract them to the positions. I do not believe that would be a very important element, if they were to serve for only 6 months. I do not believe the prestige of being a head of a division would be sufficient attraction to bring into the service the type of men the Government has in mind, or that it would attract them, without any other inducements. However, I believe the clear intent of the amendment is to permit such men to be the heads of divisions, and that under them there would be full-time employees of the Government.

Mr. FLANDERS. Under them there would be full-time Government employees who would be responsible for making policy decisions. Is that the view of the Senator?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is where we differ. It is difficult to put the difference in words. It is quite difficult to define just what is a policy and what is not a policy. We had some difficulty in committee in deciding whether the application should be to wartime or peacetime. In deciding whether the production of aluminum metal should be expanded, because there is a shortage of it, as there is now, is the making of such a decision a policy decision, and are we at peace or at war? Of course, a little bit of both is involved. The real reason for the shortage of the metal is that we have vastly increased the use of aluminum for both peace and war purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to complete my statement on the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to compliment the able chairman, the Senator from Arkansas, on his ingenuity in reading into the words of the Capehart amendment what seems to me to be a very unlikely situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I have stated is my impression after having heard in committee a great deal of discussion of the different points of view, and after having heard last Friday an extensive report by the Comptroller General. I may point out that the present Comptroller General approves of the committee action. As the Senator well knows, he is an appointee of the present administration. His view is on all fours with the view of the committee. He was asked by the committee whether his views were the same as those of his predecessor in office, Mr. Lindsay Warren. Both gentlemen have the same views with regard to this matter. They are the men who are responsible, as the Senator knows, for supervising and checking on these matters and making sure that the policy decisions of the various departments of the Government are in accord with the best interests of the country, in accord with the law, and so on. I think such opinions deserve great weight in this matter. My interpretation would be exactly like that of Mr. Campbell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the testimony of the Comptroller General in opposition to the Capehart amendment, and his testimony in support of the language of the bill, is what really determined the majority vote in the committee. Am I not correct in stating that the Comptroller General pointed out that the language of the bill will avoid the danger of abuse from which he is seeking to protect the Government, whereas, in his opinion, the language of the Capehart amendment will not accomplish that end?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has stated the situation precisely, according to my understanding. I might review the situation for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont by saying that prior to the letter which I received from the Comptroller General, we were considering making some concessions along this line, but after having heard his testimony, and going into it to a great extent, I, along with other members of the committee, determined not to make any change, because the Comptroller General made such a compelling case for the retention of the language in the committee bill that we were unable to accept any such amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate why I am convinced that the bill as reported, with the committee amendments, should be passed by the Senate, and why I am convinced the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana should be rejected.

The United States has for many years had on the books a group of statutes, mostly criminal laws, dealing with the problem of conflicting interests. There has been much discussion of these laws in recent years. Many thoughtful people think they should be strengthened. No doubt others think they are too harsh. But, however unsatisfactory or however deficient they may be, they are the laws of the United States, and express the policy of the United States.

These conflict-of-interest laws are an attempt to write into the law the concept that public office is a public trust, an attempt to express in law the principle that no man can serve two masters.

One of the most obvious conflicts of interest which can be imagined occurs when a man employed and paid by a private firm is employed by a Government agency which is charged with the duty of regulating the industry of which the man's employer is a part. In order to prevent this, sections 434 and 1914 of the criminal laws were enacted. So far as I know, these statutes are considered generally as desirable provisions, and I am aware of no effort to repeal them.

In time of war or full mobilization, however, there has been general agreement that the interests of the national security compel an exception to the policy expressed in these laws. This was so in 1917, in 1941, and in 1950. In each case, industry-paid employees—dollar-a-year men or w. o. c.'s—have been found necessary and have been used.

The reason is not hard to find. Full mobilization of the entire economy in support of the armed services necessarily includes the most detailed regulation and control over the distribution of materials and equipment, and over prices and wages. This necessarily requires large staffs of skilled, experienced, and capable men. The Government could not afford to keep such staffs on hand except under emergency conditions, and even if it could afford it, very few of the kind of men needed would be willing to sit around waiting for the emergency to arrive. And even if they were willing to sit around waiting, they would soon lose their up-to-date knowledge of industrial and commercial practices.

Consequently, in time of full mobilization the Government has no practical alternative to calling upon business and industry to provide much of the staff needed to carry out the industrial mobilization program. And no practical alternative has been found to permitting most of these men to continue to receive their salaries from their private employers. I agree it might be desirable for them to give up their private salaries, and live on the Government salary for the position, but many of them have commitments which make this virtually impossible. And even if they did, their futures are so bound up with their private employers that the conflict of interest would be almost as great.

In time of war or full mobilization, patriotic incentives reduce this danger of conflicting interests to the minimum. Industry-paid employees are just as anxious to win a war as full-time salaried Government employees. Their sons or brothers are in the armed services too, and their homes and families are equally subject to bombing.

Consequently, in time of war or full mobilization, when the very life of the Nation is in imminent and immediate peril, the country has found it necessary to use industry-paid employees in all kinds of positions in Government, and has considered the costs, in terms of whatever improper and undesirable actions may have resulted in a small proportion of the cases, far outbalanced by the real necessity of using them.

I should add that I do not think there are many cases where industry-paid employees have misconducted themselves. Of course there have been some cases, as there have been some cases where full-time salaried employees have misbehaved. The remarkable thing, I think, is that there have been so few cases where the conflicting interests necessarily involved in such situations have in fact had undesirable results.

Having said all this in favor of industry-paid employees in time of war or full mobilization, I now wish to draw a sharp distinction between 1941 or 1950 and the present situation. This distinction is so clear and so sharp that, in my judgment, we would not be well advised to grant the administration's request that the waiver of these criminal laws be continued for 2 more years, to permit the administration to continue using these industry-paid employees in policymaking positions such as division directors. I think this conclusion is sound, even if we were to forbid them to act on "policy matters," whatever that phrase may mean.

In 1941 or 1950, conditions demanded use of industry paid employees. In 1955, we are in a very different situation, and incidentally a situation which may last for 10 or 20 years.

I do not wish to underemphasize the importance of the current defense programs, or the current planning and preparation against a period of full mobilization which may come in the future. But we are not now in a shooting war, we do not have price and wage controls, very few materials are being allocated, and then only in a limited way for the benefit of the military. As a result, the staffs handling these programs are small, their work is of less immediate and vital urgency. They can take time to consult with industry through advisory committees, they can wait for a consultant to come in next week and discuss a matter. The very smallness of the staffs means that the relatively few experienced full-time employees can be spread around to handle the programs. And the fact that there is not now a shooting war has removed much of the patriotic incentive to disregard personal interests and place the public interest foremost.

In other words, the need for these industry-paid employees is reduced to a minimum, and the danger that private interests will outweigh the public interest is greatly increased. Accordingly, in my judgment, the time has come to let the conflict-of-interest statutes apply again, to use regular full-time salaried employees subject to the conflict-of-interest statutes in the policymaking and administrative positions, and to rely on advisers, consultants, industry advisory committees, and trade associations to give the agencies the information they need about industrial operations and practices.

I would be more hesitant to ask the Senate to follow the committee's action, if it were not the fact that the committee's action has the support of the present Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, his predecessor, Mr. Warren, and a number of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Mr. Campbell's statement before the committee last Friday in support of the action taken by the committee was particularly strong and convincing.

When and if a new emergency arises, and full mobilization is necessary, then the industry-paid employees will have to be used again freely. But not this year or next year or the next 10 or 20 years, or however long the present state of affairs continues.

I urge that the Senate reject the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. My opposition rests on the fact that I do not favor industry-paid employees serving in policymaking positions even if, when policy matters are concerned, they are limited to merely giving advice to full-time salaried employees. Let the record be clear that I do not oppose the use of w. o. c.'s, that is, industry-paid men who are serving the Government without compensation, from serving in consultant positions so that their expert technical knowledge can be made available to full-time salaried Government employees. The bill the Senate is considering, S. 2391, permits these w. o. c.'s to serve as consultants.

We are faced with a fundamental and simple issue. Does the interest of our national security compel us to extend for another 2 years the waiver of certain criminal laws under which the Government has been employing men paid by industry men who are employed by the very industries which these men in their position as w. o. c.'s are supposed to regulate?

The decision is not, I will agree as simple as the issue. There are pro and con factors of great weight on both sides of the problem, and in coming to my decision to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Indiana I have considered the matter thoroughly.

I agreed with the decision to put the original w. o. c. clause in the Defense Production Act of 1950, even though President Truman had not asked the Congress for that provision. It was my thought that the situation warranted the enactment of such a clause in spite of the problems it created. Despite the fact that these very real problems existed, I think the decision to continue the w. o. c. program in 1951 and 1952 was correct. Our country was in a time of great crisis, and we needed to mobilize our resources, material and human.

In 1953, the world situation was still such that I could support the continuation of the program, even though I was aware of the fact that the balance had shifted somewhat.

But today I think that the balance has clearly shifted and that these industry-paid employees should not be continued any longer in policymaking jobs. And, Mr. President, I must stress that I am only voicing opposition at this time to the continuation of w. o. c.'s in policymaking jobs. The committee, in its bill, did not intend to deny our Government the services of these individuals. We sought to move these men from positions where their decisions would in effect be making policy for the United States Government.

We are dealing with the general problem of conflict of interests in this matter. It is a problem that has long been with the world, especially in the legal profession and in Government service. Almost 2,000 years ago it was said:

> No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. (Matthew 6: 24.)

I could not put the problem any more succinctly than does this scriptural passage. The very great importance of avoiding conflict interests is thoroughly recognized by the Canons of Legal Ethics. The legal profession has attempted to draw up a code of conduct to guide the steps of lawyers along the path of undivided loyalty to their clients. By and large the legal profession has done very well in this area, but at the price of a constant surveillance intended to prevent the practice of lawyers representing conflicting interests. The problem is no less real for employees, compensated or uncompensated, of Government. I would say that it is perhaps even more vital in Government than it is in the practice of law because of the very likely possibility that placing a Government employee in a position where he is representing conflicting interests can do harm over a so much greater sphere. His decisions may well affect us all.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. President, that I am talking about a situation in which honest and upright men are attempting to perform in their most competent manner duties assigned to them. There is no canon, no rule, that can keep the dishonest man in line. What I am concerned with here today is the fact that we are calling upon honest men to try to satisfy 2 masters under circumstances when the wishes of the 2 masters may well be incompatible. I am of the opinion that this is unfair to them and dangerous to the people of the United States.

The specific problem of industry-paid employees in Government seems to have arisen first in World War I. It arose again in World War II, and again in 1950.

In each of these cases the necessity of full mobilization of the industrial economy made it imperative for the Government to bring in top industrial leaders and experts in industrial operations. In the first place there simply were not enough Government employees, skilled or unskilled, to handle the task. More important, however, there were not enough people outside of business available with the knowledge of industrial processes and operations to run a full mobilization program, involving restrictions on all kinds of materials and allocations to all kinds of industry. Without this knowledge and ability, the entire mobilization program might well have done more harm than good.

Mr. President, let me make it very clear that I advocate the application of the committee bill to all w. o. c.'s, including business leaders and labor leaders. During the war, some labor leaders were brought into the Government. They were paid by their unions; yet they were placed in policymaking positions in the Department of Labor and elsewhere in the Government.

I am just as much opposed to labor leaders coming into the Government on a w. o. c. basis in time of peace and in nonemergency periods as I am to businessmen being placed in the same position of potential conflict of interests.

The employment of industry-paid employees brought considerable criticism. The Truman committee report of January 15, 1942, contained an illuminating discussion of dollar-a-year men. I shall therefore read a few paragraphs on this subject from the report:

Dollar-a-Year Men

> The principal positions of the Office of Production Management were assigned to persons holding important positions with large companies who were willing and anxious to serve on a dollar per year, or without compensation (w. o. c.) basis. They usually did not sever their business connections, but instead obtained leaves of absence. In many instances they continued to act for their companies, publicly announcing that their Government work was part-time work only. Their companies continued to pay their salaries. In some cases their compensation was even increased.
>
> As of January 5, 1942, there were 255 dollar-a-year men and 631 w. o. c. men employed in the Office of Production Management.
>
> The Office of Production Management has had a rule that such men cannot pass upon contracts to their own companies, and the committee believes that the rule has been strictly observed. To have done otherwise would have been to violate principles of agency law which have been settled for centuries. This exclusion from working on matters in which their companies were interested does mean, however, that the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men were generally assigned to tasks materially different from those in which they had engaged in private life and raises a question as to whether we can even say that in utilizing such men we gained the experience of big business. This generality is, however, subject to the qualification that many of the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men are professional men who unquestionably had experience in the same fields in which they are now working for the Office of Production Management. They, however, are dealing with matters involving the welfare of the class of clients by whom they were formerly employed and by whom they naturally expect to be employed in the future.
>
> Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the services of dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.
>
> These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice, and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small- and intermediate-business men attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have inside information and friends on the inside who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration for contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men can be termed "lobbyists." This does not mean that either they or their companies are engaged in any illegal conduct, for lobbying as such is not illegal, but it does mean that human nature being what it is, there is a very real opportunity for the favoritism and other abuses which has led the public to condemn lobbying and the Congress to consider corrective legislation.
>
> In addition to the above benefits, the companies loaning the services of dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men obtain other and less tangible, but perhaps even more important benefits. All important procurement contracts must be approved by these dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men, which means that contracts must conform to their theories of business. Since they represent the largest companies, this means that the defense program in all its ramifications must obtain the approval of the large companies. This does not mean that the boards of directors of the large companies are requested to determine the defense program, nor does it even mean that the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men consciously favor their companies or their companies' methods of doing business. On the contrary, the committee believes that most dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men are honest and conscientious, and that they would not intentionally favor big business. However, it is not their intentional acts that the committee fears, but their subconscious tendency, without which they would hardly be human, to judge all matters before them in the light of their past experiences and convictions.
>
> It is only natural that such men should believe that only companies of the size and type with which they were associated have the ability to perform defense contracts; that small and intermediate companies ought not to be given prime contracts; that the urgencies of the defense program are such that they have no time to consider small companies for defense contracts; that the large companies ought not to be required to subcontract items which they could profitably manufacture and as to which they express lack of confidence in the productive facilities of smaller concerns; that the producers of strategic materials should not be expected or required to increase their capacities, even at Government expense, where that might result in excess capacity after the war and adversely affect their postwar profits; and that large companies should not be expected or required to convert their existing facilities into defense plants, where they prefer to use their plants to make the profits from their civilian business and, at the same time, to have additional plants directly or indirectly paid for by the Government, which they can operate profitably on terms dictated by themselves. The dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests with respect to Government competition, with respect to taxation and amortization, with respect to the financing of new plant expansion, and with respect to the margin of profit which should be allowed on war contracts. For a more detailed discussion of some of the effects of such subconscious thinking, the committee refers to its previous report on Priorities and the Utilization of Existing Manufacturing Facilities, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix II.
>
> The committee has been trying for months to force a greater use of our existing facilities, of both large and small plants, and believes that a belated but serious effort has been made to make progress in this direction. The peak cannot be undone, but it is vitally important that the same mistakes should not be repeated in the future.
>
> The committee is opposed to a policy of taking free services from persons with axes to grind, and the committee believes that the Government should not continue to accept the loan of dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men by companies with so large a stake in the defense program. The committee, therefore, suggests that steps should be taken by the Office of Production Management to offer Government salaries to the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men within the range which the Government has paid for positions of similar responsibility in other departments, and that such persons should be required during the duration of their employment by the Government to disassociate themselves from any employment by or payment from companies which have obtained large defense contracts. This does not mean that they should not have an expectancy of returning to their companies after the Government has no further need for their services, but the committee does believe that they should have no commitments for reemployment, and that they should not receive compensation for services which they cannot properly render to their companies during their employment. No man can honestly serve two masters.
>
> The propriety of such a recommendation was recognized by John Lord O'Brien, General Counsel of the Office of Production Management, when he required lawyers who were being appointed to his staff to sever connection with the firms with which they were associated. If such action was desirable with respect to lawyers, whose firms were not obtaining any defense contracts, it is all the more proper and desirable with respect to those dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men whose companies are directly obtaining the great bulk of the defense contracts.

This is what the Truman committee had to say about the problem even in time of war. Yet in time of war it is important that the Government have the patriotic services of w. o. c. men. But if the implications of the Truman report on this problem existed in time of war, I respectfully submit the danger is much greater in time of peace. Therefore, I think the language of the committee bill is much preferable to the language of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana because it makes perfectly clear that these men will have to be brought in by the Government on a purely consultative and advisory basis and not on any administrative or policymaking basis whatsoever.

Mr. President, when the Truman report was issued, Donald Nelson asked to be heard by the Truman committee in order to urge the continued use of w. o. c.'s?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has read from the Truman report, issued when Mr. Truman was a United States Senator, but does the Senator have any record that Mr. Truman, when he became President, at any time proposed any legislation or any rules and regulations which would prohibit the use of w. o. c.'s.

On the contrary, is it not true that Mr. Truman, as President, asked for legislation such as we are now considering? Was not he the President who issued Executive Order No. 10182, under which such persons could be used?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. W. o. c.'s were used under Executive orders for the war and emergency periods.

Mr. CAPEHART. President Truman is the man who used them.

Mr. MORSE. The use of such persons does not in any way lessen the soundness of the Truman report as to the potential dangers which had to be guarded against by the use of w. o. c.'s. They happen to be the present dangers which the Comptroller General is warning the Senate about today, and about which the previous Comptroller General warned the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are all aware of the dangers, and the Truman committee was aware of them. My point is that in spite of those dangers, President Truman issued Executive Order No. 10182, which is still in effect. At no time did Truman recommend doing what the able Senator is now recommending, which is, for all practical purposes, eliminating w. o. c.'s. If the use of them was as bad as the Truman report indicated, why did President Truman use them? Why did he not eliminate them? Since we have been using such persons for so many years, when has it suddenly become so bad to take advantage of their services?

Mr. MORSE. I have two replies to make. First let me point out that it was Secretary Sawyer who asked for the w. o. c.'s during the war. President Truman did not initiate the request, but he issued the order which made such persons available to his Cabinet officer. However, making use of w. o. c.'s in time of war in no way removes the soundness of the argument of the potential dangers which the Truman committee report pointed out, and the Truman committee report was of great service in this matter, in that it had a preventive effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. The debate taking place in the Senate today is helpful.

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish, and then I shall yield. I think the report caused the administrative officers who had supervision over the w. o. c.'s to use extra vigilance in seeing to it that the possible dangers pointed out in the Truman committee report were avoided.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no doubt about it. I think the debate in the Senate today is helpful. I think what has been said in the past has been of value. My point is that since the Government has been using w. o. c.'s during all these years, what has happened at this moment, or in the last 10 days, or in the last 30 days, to make it necessary to eliminate their use?

Mr. MORSE. The simple reason is that we are not at war, we are not in an emergency that justifies placing such persons in administrative positions. We need such persons for consultation and advice. When we are not at war, there does not exist the same patriotic check upon selfish motives of men to protect the public. That is what the Comptroller General is warning us about in his testimony. That is also what the previous Comptroller General warned us about.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have a new philosophy at the moment, which I think is 100 percent correct, and which has been endorsed by the Congress, by former President Truman, and by President Eisenhower, namely, that we ought to prepare in advance of a war, that we ought to know exactly what we are going to do when a war strikes, that we ought not to lose valuable days, weeks, and months after war starts.

Mr. MORSE. Not a word in the committee bill would prevent the use of the services of w. o. c.'s for that purpose. The bill merely provides that they cannot be brought into policymaking and administrative positions. A Secretary of a Department can bring in all the consultants he wants. Secretary Weeks can get the advice of such men and have them draft a master plan to be used in case of war. Nothing in the bill would prevent obtaining such advice.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read my amendment:

> Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

In effect we would be saying to w. o. c.'s, "You may become chairmen of committees or heads of agencies, working out plans and policies in case of war, but when you decide what you think ought to be done, you must submit the plans to a salaried Government officer, who will make the decisions."

What more can one do?

Mr. MORSE. Under the amendment, w. o. c.'s would be placed in administrative positions over a staff of career employees. As the Comptroller General testified, that would lead to great confusion and maladministration.

Mr. CAPEHART. They would not be placed over the employees. Salaried employees would be furnished to do the clerical and detailed work. Help would be given to the w. o. c.'s along that line. Nothing more than that would be done. I do not see how we can go any further than to say, "You cannot make policy. You must leave it to a salaried Government employee to do that." The pending bill would prevent their doing that.

Mr. MORSE. If that is the objective of the Senator from Indiana, then he ought to take the bill, because, under the bill, w. o. c.'s can be brought in as consultants and advisers to draft recommendations for future plans to be used in time of war, but such persons cannot be used in any administrative positions.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by "administrative positions"?

Mr. MORSE. There is nothing in the Senator's amendment which would prevent filling of the positions referred to on pages 35 and 36 of the committee report.

Mr. CAPEHART. My amendment says in effect, "You can continue in those capacities, you cannot make any policy, but can advise fully salaried Government employees."

Mr. MORSE. The testimony of Dr. Flemming and Secretary Weeks pointed out that when w. o. c.'s are put into such positions, they are necessarily placed in administrative and policymaking positions. If a w. o. c. is placed in the Aluminum Division, and if he is the only one in that Division in the Department of Commerce, he is bound to be the only one to be able to make a policy.

Mr. CAPEHART. That may be true under the old law, but that will not be possible under the proposal made, if my amendment is accepted, because my amendment provides that w. o. c.'s must submit policy decisions to full-time salaried Government employees.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully that the record on this point speaks for itself, and that their functions would be administrative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the Record the list of Business and Defense Services Administration w. o. c. employees as of June 13, 1955, beginning on page 35, and continuing on page 36 of the hearings, together with the list of the Government positions and the corresponding positions in private industry in the case of the respective w. o. c.

men. I point out that all we have to do is read the list, and from it we see that the Secretary of Commerce and Dr. Flemming are quite correct in their testimony as to the really administrative nature of these positions.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Business and Defense Services Administration—w. o. c. employees, June 13, 1955

Position	Incumbent	Position in private industry
Office of the Administrator:		
Assistant Administrator	Damkroger, Stanley F	General commercial manager, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., Seattle, Wash.
Assistant Administrator	Flom, Russell C	Director of pulp, paper and paperboard sales, Marathon Corp., Menasha, Wis.
Assistant Administrator	Winston, Arthur W	Assistant manager, magnesium department, Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.
Aluminum and Magnesium Division:		
Director	Erskine, Harold C	Assistant general manager, castings division, Aluminum Corporation of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Deputy Director	Frutig, Henry A	Vice president and assistant general manager, Aluminum & Magnesium, Inc., Sandusky, Ohio.
Automotive Division: Director	Eskridge, Joseph W	Vice president in charge of manufacturing, Hudson special products division, American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
Chemical and Rubber Division: Director	Bertine, Herbert W	Assistant to president, General Chemical Division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., New York, N. Y.
Communication Equipment Division: Director	Barnhart, Hugh A	President, Rochester Telephone Co., Rochester, Ind.; Barnhart VanTrump Co., Rochester, Ind., and director, Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc., Plainfield, Ind.
Containers and Packaging Division: Deputy Director	Postweiler, Norval W	Special assistant to manager (sales engineer), Riegel Paper Co., New York, N. Y.
Copper Division: Director	Peterson, George E	Assistant to president, Simplex Wire & Cable Co., Cambridge, Mass.
Electrical Equipment Division: Director	Bell, Raymond O	Manager, substation section, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Food Industries Division: Director	Vander Heide, John S	President, Holland-American Wafer Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Forest Products Division: Director	Talbot, Frederick C., Jr	Assistant Atlantic coast manager, lumber division, Pope & Talbot, Inc., New York, N. Y.
General Components Division: Director	Vacancy	
General Industrial Equipment Division: Director	Thomas, William H	Manager, Government sales, Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa.
Iron and Steel Division:		
Director	Moore, Thomas J., Jr	General manager, Brainard Steel Division, Sharon Steel Corp., Warren, Ohio.
Chief, Ferro-Alloys Branch	Floyd, Paul E	Consultant, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. of Pittsburgh, Pa., Ferndale, Mich.
Commodity Industry Specialist (Metals-Ferro-Alloys).	German, Howard M	Metallurgical assistant to president, Driver Harris Co., Harrison, N. J.
Chief, Carbon and Alloy Semifinished Rail, Structural Bars, Wire and Forgings Branch.	Graves, Roger E	Sales representative, Bethlehem Steel Co., Detroit, Mich.
Chief, Castings Branch	Hughes, Glenn R	Assistant sales manager, Ohio Steel Foundry Co., Springfield, Ohio.
Chief, Stainless, Hi-Temperature and Tool Steel Branch.	La Grelius, Elmer L	Research metallurgist, Eastern Stainless Steel Corp., Baltimore, Md.
Chief, Business Research and Analysis Branch	Hunter, John A., Jr	Manager, commercial research, Tennessee Coal & Iron Division, United States Steel Corp., Fairfield, Ala.
Chief, Carbon and Alloy Flat Rolled and Tubular Products Branch.	Wisner, Benjamin G	Assistant manager, tinplate sales, Kaiser Steel Corp., Oakland, Calif.
Metalworking Equipment Division:		
Director	Baldenhofer, Ralph R	Executive vice president and treasurer, Thompson Grinder Co., Springfield, Ohio.
Chief, Facilities, Distribution and Inventory Branch.	Polk, Albert F	Vice chairman, the Sheffield Corp., Dayton, Ohio.
Power Equipment Division: Director	Firshing, William M	Executive assistant, Babcock & Wilcox Co., New York, N. Y.
Scientific, Motion Picture and Photographic Products Division: Deputy Director.	Mohr, Thomas S	Administrative assistant to president, Taylor Instrument Companies, Rochester, N. Y.
Shipbuilding, Railroad, Ordnance and Aircraft Division: Director.	Curley, Walter J	Vice president, General American Transportation Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Water and Sewerage Industry and Utilities Division: Director.	Krause, Charles W	New York City district manager, Neptune Meter Co., New York, N. Y.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for us to use, as the Capehart amendment would have us do, language which would permit these men to continue to hold those positions would not, in my opinion, change the smell of the rose; its smell would be exactly the same.

What we seek to do under the committee bill is to make certain that in time of peace these persons can be used only as consultants and advisers. Of course, in time of war we return to what the Comptroller General recommended, namely, the situation which existed during both World War II and the Korean war.

Mr. President, when this report was issued, Donald Nelson asked, as I said previously, to be heard by the Truman Committee, in order to urge their continued use. The chairman introduced the discussion with the following statement:

> The CHAIRMAN. May I say to you, Mr. Nelson, at this point that the committee has some very definite ideas, which were expressed in our report on the dollar-a-year situation. And we want you to understand, before you go any further, that we want the war won as quickly as possible. If you have to have dollar-a-year men to win the war, this committee is not going to interfere with that procedure on your part, because we want the war won, but we still have some ideas on dollar-a-year men and the ethics and things that are brought to bear on that subject. But this committee does not want to hamper you in carrying out your job. That comes first. (77th Cong., 1st sess., hearings, S. Res. 7, pt. 10, pp. 4025–6.)

Let me say, Mr. President, that I think the majority of our committee made perfectly clear that we hold to that point of view now, and that is why we have provided in the bill language which permits the w. o. c. men to continue in the Government service in time of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With further regard to the exchange which occurred between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Indiana, let me say that unless we were to have two complete organizations of personnel—which would be fantastic, and which we would not tolerate—there would be a situation in which the headman of a division would be expected to step down when a matter of important policy was to be decided, and to let his subordinate make the decision. As a practical, human matter, that is just a fantastic assumption, and simply could not occur. Is not that true?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and that was brought out in the hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. Any headman cannot be expected to step down and let an inferior step up and take his place and make the decisions. If the headman is any good at all, the career man will turn over more and more authority to him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course. And if the headman should attempt to do any such thing, the underling who, let us say, would return to the role of underling as soon as the decision was made, would be very careful not to cross the headman; would he not?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So it seems to me that such a proposal would be unworkable as a practical matter.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Arkansas sets forth very clearly the point of view of the majority of the committee.

Mr. President, in the summer of 1950, when full mobilization of the industrial economy was again necessary, the Congress inserted in the Defense Production Act this section 710 (b), thinking it was necessary, although President Truman had not requested it.

In 1951, the Special Subcommittee on Establishment of a Commission on Ethics in Government of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee held hearings at which a number of prominent public and private citizens appeared. Many of them had occasion to comment on these industry-paid employees.

Lindsay Warren, then Comptroller General, said he had always been opposed to their use; and he went on to say:

> I am not making any reflection on many of the fine men who come down here, top men in industry to serve the Government, because most of them, or a large percentage of them, come with highly patriotic motives. But I just do not think that anybody, no matter who he is, should be put on the Federal payroll at a dollar a year for their services. They should be paid a salary that Congress should fix for such a position. (Hearings on Establishment of Commission on Ethics in Government, Special Subcommittee of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pp. 24–25.)

On the other hand, David Lilienthal, another able public servant, was strongly in favor of using w. o. c. employees under the conditions prevailing in 1951, although he recognized the problems involved. I cite his views to demonstrate that capable men hold differing views on this subject—page 137, subcommittee hearings on ethics in Government.

The special subcommittee reached the following conclusions:

> While this problem seems unavoidable in an emergency of short duration, it is not one which should be allowed to continue. It highlights the importance of further developing the Federal personnel program to make sure that the Government has an ample supply of competent administrators at high levels as well as the middle and lower ranks. Similarly, the political parties must regularly draw into public affairs more men with managerial competence and integrity. There is a danger of overplaying the "emergency psychology" at the cost of not developing political leaders and civil servants who can deal with new problems which are in fact of a continuing character. On the other hand, civil servants in a large percentage of cases lack the drive and boldness required for a great national effort. (P. 21, subcommittee report on ethics in Government.)

Mr. President, I digress long enough to say, as I pointed out in the committee hearings, that I believe it very important that the Government have in its service, career men who have business backgrounds and have the experience and the expert knowledge which go along with management and ability in the field of industry. There are in the country many men who are competent to fill those Government positions. Many of them have been retired from business at relatively young ages—for instance, in their late fifties or early sixties—and they can really bring to career jobs in the Government service the experience which should be available in these particular jobs.

But, Mr. President, I agree with Lindsay Warren and with the present Comptroller General that, wherever possible, these men should be on the payroll of the Government when they are performing public service; and when they are supposed to be performing Government service, they should not be on the payroll of some corporation or labor union. I think it is simply one of the elementary truths that men should not be placed in positions—particularly when there is not a national emergency or war on our hands—which produce the temptation that a conflict of interests always produces.

The present Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, who recently testified before the Banking and Currency Committee in executive session, made it clear that he agreed with his predecessor in opposing the use of industry-paid employees in administrative posts. On the basis of his experience and that of the General Accounting Office, Mr. Campbell strongly supported the provision reported by the committee, though he also agreed that in time of war or national emergency it would be necessary to use them notwithstanding the conflict of interest.

I digress to say this word about our expert witness on this point: I would have the Senate remember that he is our agent. I would have the Senate remember that he is our officer. Under our laws we have made the Comptroller General the officer of the Congress of the United States. He sits there, really, in the capacity of a watchdog, to advise the Congress of policies and courses of action connected with the administration of the funds of our Government that we ought to know about in order to check potential abuses as they arise.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The congressional watchdog comes before a Senate committee and urges the adoption of the language which is found in the bill as reported by the committee. I think that opinion evidence, that expert testimony, from a man who is constantly in a position to observe how these policies of Government operate in the fiscal field, is evidence to which the Senate should give great weight when it comes to vote on the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Campbell has been Comptroller General for only some 4 months. I cannot see that he has become too great an expert in 4 months' time.

I should also like to invite the attention of Senators to a case the details of which I shall place in the RECORD later. If Mr. Campbell's judgment is no better than some of the allegations and figures he used in condemning a man named Young, I personally have very little respect for him.

One of the allegations of Mr. Campbell's department against a man by the name of Young was that his company, the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., had sold $60,000 worth of machinery to the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. to which the Government had loaned $325,000. In the executive session of the joint committee the General Accounting Office had to admit that that was a mistake, that the Mid-Continent Co. did not buy $60,000 worth of machinery. The General Accounting Office had to admit that it was a mistake. The letter from which the General Accounting Office took the information to the effect that the Mid-Continent Co. bought $60,000 worth of machinery from the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. was the most flimsy thing I have ever read. I shall place in the RECORD, before the session is concluded, other instances in which Mr. Campbell and his boys, in condemning Mr. Young, were absolutely wrong in their facts. It was proved that they were wrong. If his judgment is no better than his facts and allegations against Mr. Young, I do not intend to follow him.

I suggest that what we ought to do, if Mr. Campbell's department is to be no better from now on than it was in the Young case, is to investigate Mr. Campbell and his department, and those making up the records for him in the case of the General Accounting Office against Young. In my opinion, it was a very sorry affair. Frankly, the Congress ought to do something about it, if we are to depend upon Mr. Campbell and his boys for guidance and advice, as the able Senator suggested a moment ago.

When the able Senator from Oregon reads the RECORD and gets all the facts, he will be the first to rise on the floor of the Senate and say to Mr. Campbell, "You had better be careful in the future whom you attack, and whose reputations you smear, without knowing all the facts. You had better be careful in the future about accusing a businessman of benefiting to the extent of $60,000, and then finding later that it was not true at all, and having to apologize for it."

So let us be very careful whose recommendations we follow in this instance, because before we are through with the Young case there will be some very red faces.

Mr. MORSE. Let me reply to the Senator from Indiana by saying, in the first place, that I have complete confidence in the Comptroller General. He brings to his job a great record of expertness in the field of comptroller work. He was an excellent comptroller of Columbia University. He has demonstrated that he is a man of great courage and integrity. I have not studied the complete record in the Young case. I wish to say, however, that we did not give the Young case a full hearing in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Joint Committee on Defense Production did accord a full hearing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not yield at this point, until I conclude my statement.

We did not give the Comptroller General a full hearing in the Banking and Currency Committee because we decided that the material being presented in connection with the Young case was not controlling on our decision as to the language which should go into this bill, so we stopped the presentation of the full record in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Unfortunately I was tied up in a little local matter, as a "Councilman" of the District of Columbia. The transit strike was occupying our attention at that time, and I was unable to attend the joint committee hearings the other day.

I do not know to what extent a judicial hearing was had in the joint committee which offered the Comptroller General the opportunity to present the full case which he may have had regarding the investigation of the Young matter. I hope I am a good enough lawyer to know that when we get into a complicated case such as that involved in the investigation of the activities of Mr. Young, it may be that some of the allegations do not hold up. But I am not in a position to say that the Comptroller General does not have a case against Mr. Young. I should not only wish to see the total record, but to make sure that a full record on the subject had been made, and a full hearing accorded the Comptroller General.

I wish to restate my complete confidence in the Comptroller General. He is still our officer. The fact that he has been in office for only 4 months does not disqualify him as an expert, because I think in those 4 months he has made it clear to our committee that he has observed enough to justify his recommendation against the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was the Comptroller General who wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and asked that the bill we are now considering be set aside a week ago on the ground that he had uncovered certain misconduct on the part of a Mr. Young when he was a w. o. c. The Senate did set aside the bill a week ago, as the Senator well knows, and we went into the question in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. The Joint Committee on Defense Production went into the case very thoroughly. What I am saying is a matter of record. In my opinion, the allegations which Mr. Campbell made against Mr. Young did not stand up. I invite attention to one specific circumstance. Let me show how unfair the allegation was.

It was alleged that a company called the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. had been loaned $325,000 by the Government, and that the Government had lost it; also, that $60,000 of the $325,000 was spent with the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., Mr. Young's company; and that, therefore, the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. benefited by $60,000, and Mr. Young, as president of the company, benefited by $60,000 of the $325,000 which the Government lost.

But when we went into the case the officials of the agency themselves had to admit that the American Lead, Zinc & Smelting Co. never did sell the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. $60,000 worth of machinery, never did receive the $60,000; and that it was a mistake. I ask the able Senator, who tries to be fair and who is a great liberal, if he believes in that sort of character assassination. That is exactly what it amounted to. The record of the transaction was placed in the Congressional Record even before we held our hearings and the Comptroller General gave out the information.

I am amazed that anyone would take that kind of record from which the information was obtained without checking into it thoroughly. Did the Senator also note that the General Accounting Office through Mr. Campbell did not once consult with Mr. Young? Not once did Mr. Campbell consult with Mr. Young and ask him whether he did or did not sell $60,000 worth of machinery.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to reply to several comments of the Senator from Indiana, but I shall reply first to the last comment by saying that we must not forget that Mr. Campbell presented material before the committee entirely on a preliminary and tentative basis. He made very clear to us that he had not completed his investigation. He made it clear that his office was in the process of conducting an investigation, but that his office was satisfied that it had found enough questionable things in the operations of Mr. Young, with respect to various business transactions, which warranted our going into the matter slowly. That is why Mr. Campbell asked permission to present this material before us. The reason he asked for an executive session was that he wanted us to understand that his office was still in the process of checking up on this subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. First I should like to answer the Senator's comment; then I shall yield to him again.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely want the Senator to be factual and to keep the record straight.

Mr. MORSE. I listened to the Senator from Indiana make his statement, as he was entitled to make it, and I shall now proceed to make my statement without interruption.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that it was not the expectation of Mr. Campbell on the day his office made the presentation of its material to our committee that the material would be made a matter of public knowledge until his office had finished its investigation.

The Senator knows that because of the fault of no one some information did get out to the public and to the newspapers. Therefore we were placed in such a position that, in fairness to Mr. Young, we felt that he ought to be given an opportunity to present his statement before the joint committee in an executive session.

The Senator from Indiana knows that when it comes to a matter of procedural rights of any person, I join with him in taking the position that such an opportunity to appear should be afforded. That was my position in Mr. Young's case.

Subsequently there was more newspaper discussion of the subject. Then the question arose as to whether the record we had made in an executive session of the Committee on Banking and Currency should be released. I felt under the circumstances that we could do nothing but release it.

The fact still remains, however, that all this material was released before Mr. Campbell and his investigators had completed their investigations. I believe in fairness to Mr. Campbell, that the comment I have made had to be made. His office was not given time to carry through and to find out whether all the allegations could stand up. In the hearings I believe it was the Senator from Indiana himself who asked Mr. Campbell if anyone from his office had talked with Mr. Young. He said, "No, we have not reached that point, because we have not completed our investigation." That was the situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the Senator from Oregon is not a member of the joint committee, and he did not attend the hearings. The facts are that the Comptroller General published four volumes on Mr. Young. I have them before me. These four volumes contain allegations. One of them was that Mr. Young's company sold to the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. $60,000 worth of machinery and was paid out of the $325,000 the Government had loaned to the Mid-Continent company. That was one of the allegations. It was placed in the Congressional Record. All the other allegations were also placed in the Congressional Record. When representatives of the General Accounting Office were brought before the joint committee, they had to admit that they were mistaken, and that Mr. Young's company had not received $60,000. They had to admit that they were mistaken about other allegations, also.

Mr. MORSE. On all allegations?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall place all this information in the Record. They had sufficient time to make their investigation. If they had not had sufficient time, why did they print these volumes? Why did they give us half the facts or half the figures? For what reason should they try to give us half truths or half the facts?

Mr. MORSE. Did they admit that they were mistaken on all the allegations against Mr. Young's company?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether they admitted that. However, I believe the committee pretty well came to the conclusion that they were mistaken. They did admit they were mistaken on the $60,000 matter.

Mr. MORSE. On one allegation they admitted an error. Did the Comptroller General take the position that his office was mistaken on all the other allegations?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether they did. However, they did admit their mistake in this instance. I believe they did on others also. I shall put the information in the Record. First, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he is in favor of making even one mistake like that. How can a great liberal be willing to assassinate the character of a man or make the allegation that a man benefited to the extent of $60,000 when there is absolutely no truth to the allegation?

Mr. MORSE. I am always amused——

Mr. CAPEHART. The story was spread all over the newspapers and it was put into the Congressional Record. Then Mr. Campbell had to admit that there was no truth to it.

Mr. MORSE. I am always amused by the diversionary tactics of the Senator from Indiana when he attempts to divert us from a pending issue by imputing to others in the Senate that they have views of one kind or another and put words in their mouths. Let us hold ourselves to the issue.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am a great believer in defending the rights of the individual.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield until I have finished my statement. I do not yield to the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator in protecting the procedural rights of the individual. Certainly I shall not let the Senator from Indiana put me in the position that when there is a long list of allegations——

Mr. CAPEHART. There were only four allegations.

Mr. MORSE. There was a long list of them.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; not a long list.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to look at the evidence under the allegations. There are multiple allegations.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; only four allegations.

Mr. MORSE. There are a great many ramifications in the business world in which Mr. Young operated.

Mr. President, if it is true that a mistake was made by the Comptroller General in respect to one allegation, I do not propose to let the Senator from Indiana put me in the position of being some kind of character assassin.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Oregon ought to get as much excited when a businessman's character is assassinated as when the character of any other individual is assassinated.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's statement is based on the assumption that the Senator from Oregon does not have concern when the character of a businessman is attacked.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the Senator is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator makes it necessary for me to answer his argument. Otherwise, my silence would put me in the position of agreeing with the Senator's unwarranted and false assumptions that it is all right to assassinate the character of a businessman. To the contrary, it is not right or justifiable to violate the rights or to assassinate the character of any American, businessman or any other man, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know that is the feeling of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Why do we not keep the discussion to the issue of whether the Comptroller General's complaints in executive session warranted the action which the Committee on Banking and Currency took?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one reason why the Comptroller General, in a sense, jumped the gun. He wished to present his material to the committee before his investigation was completed because the bill now under debate was on the floor of the Senate and was about to be acted on. It is my understanding he wrote his letter in order that the committee might have the benefit of his observations before the Senate took final action.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the first observation. The next observation is that the great office of the Comptroller General is an institution which goes on over the years. It so happens that the present Comptroller General's opinion is exactly on all four with the views of his predecessor, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who was Comptroller General for many years, and with whom all the Members of the Senate are well acquainted. I believe most Members of the Senate have a very high opinion of his integrity.

This is not something new by a newcomer to the office. It is the continuing view of the office of the Comptroller General, and has been the view for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I had something to do with putting this case in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Certainly I will not apologize for doing it. I have read the report in its entirely. I received the information in an official way, and I proceeded to discuss it. I have discussed such matters in the past, and I shall continue to do so in the future, with or without the consent of the Senator from Indiana or anyone else. I want that to be perfectly clear.

As recently as yesterday I talked to the Comptroller General, and I find that he has not backed down on his basic conclusions as contained in the report. It is true that there may be some minor discrepancies. In a 4-volume report we will find discrepancies. We find discrepancies in statements made on the floor. But the basic facts behind the criticism of the contract, as I understand from the Comptroller General, stand. In the particular contract which the Senator from Indiana discussed, the payment of $60,000 for a piece of machinery for the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. was only a minor item of the report.

What the Comptroller General criticized was: That there was a company formed in 1951 with practically no initial capital. The company initially asked for $600,000 from the Government who finally gave it $325,000 with the proviso—and this is in the committee's records—that the company show that it could put up an additional $75,000 if the $325,000 were not sufficient to get the plant into operation. In order to assure the Government that they could put up $75,000, they submitted with their application a letter signed by the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of which Mr. Young was formerly president and from which at that time he was drawing $80,000 a year. This letter of July 21, 1952, stated that after the company, the Mid-Continent Mining Corp., had spent the $325,000, if it were not sufficient, they would, in turn, advance the company an additional $75,000. The American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. was to have the right to smelt and to process the zinc produced under the Government contract. That letter appears as exhibit 3, part 1, of the Comptroller General's report.

The fact remains that they received $325,000 from the Government and still did not get into operation; yet the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. did not put up the $75,000 as they had agreed. On the contrary, they unloaded this obligation, too, on the Government.

Throughout all these negotiations Mr. Young took an active part, as the Comptroller General's report shows.

There are letters signed by the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., letters signed by Mid-Continent Mining Corp., and agency correspondence mentioning Mr. Young's part in these negotiations. Ultimately the Government lost all of its money.

I think it is unfortunate that we should have this discussion, because I agree fully with the Senator from Oregon that the amendment has nothing to do with Mr. Young. We are dealing with a policy, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out. But the question is before us, and I think the facts should certainly be made straight. I reserve to Mr. Young the courtesy of giving him his day in court; but since when can we not discuss cases on the floor without having to call a man before a Senate committee? That has not previously been the policy of the Senate, and, so far as I am concerned, it will not be the policy in the future.

Mr. Young in his official capacity as Deputy Administrator of DMPA negotiated contracts. He negotiated contracts involving his own company. That may be proper in the opinion of the Senator from Indiana but not in mine. The Comptroller General has urged that we spell out in the law the proper safeguards and accordingly has endorsed the committee amendment.

Mr. Young did not sign any of these contracts in his official capacity, but as deputy administrator to Mr. Larson, his chief, Mr. Young did negotiate contracts and he did take an active part in negotiating them. The only reason that he did not actually sign the contracts was that as a dollar-a-year man it was necessary that Mr. Larson do the actual signing. At the same time he was working for the Government at a salary of a dollar a year he was drawing approximately $80,000 a year from his company. Unquestionably these contracts would result in some additional earnings, and unquestionably he had a practical interest. The question we are discussing today is whether we approve of that type of operation as correct. I think not and therefore shall support the committee and the Comptroller General's recommendations. That is all there is to the question. I am not trying to pass a verdict on Mr. Young as to whether what he did was legal or illegal, but so far as I am concerned it was unethical to say the least. The only question before us now is how we are going to operate in the future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I surmise that honest and sincere men can differ in their interpretation of what is presented by the Comptroller General and by the joint committee in regard to the Young case. The statement of the Senator from Delaware shows a diversion from the point of view of the Senator from Indiana. The Senator from Indiana has said several times in the course of the debate that, in his judgment, the allegations of the Comptroller General did not stand up. He is certainly entitled to that judgment. I have no judgment about it until I have studied the record. Not being a member of the committee, I have not studied the record.

The Senator from Delaware says that he agrees that Mr. Young should have his day in court. In my judgment, that is where his case should be, and not in the United States Senate. In court he will be protected by the rules of evidence and the rules of procedure so that he can present his proof in an orderly fashion. But the Young case, in and of itself, in my judgment, has only a rather indirect connection with the subject matter under discussion, only to the extent that it happened to be one of the cases which the Comptroller General cited as partly supporting his point of view that the policy of using w. o. c.'s in peacetime should not be followed.

I turn to page 50 of the transcript of the joint committee hearing in which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the chairman, said:

> Mr. Campbell, are there any other cases that are under study in this general field pertaining to conflict of interests?
>
> Mr. Campbell. We have some.
>
> The Chairman. You have some others?
>
> Mr. Campbell. Yes, sir.
>
> The Chairman. Is it fair to say that your judgment in favor of the bill as it passed out of the committee is based upon your general knowledge and other cases under study?
>
> Mr. Campbell. That is a fair statement.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, the Comptroller General is one of the most able administrators within the Eisenhower administration. The Comptroller General is our agent, whose opinion should be given great weight by the Senate of the United States in the consideration of this issue.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the director of Mr. Young's department was Mr. Larson. Mr. Larson testified before the joint committee that he and he alone passed upon all contracts; that he and he alone accepted full and complete responsibility for all the acts of Mr. Young; that he knew what was going on at all times.

The point I made a moment ago was that one of the allegations which Mr. Campbell made against Mr. Young was that his company sold to the Mid-Continent Mining Corp. $60,000 worth of machinery, thereby receiving $60,000 of the $325,000 referred to, which was later admitted to be absolutely an error. I made that statement. The able Senator from Delaware gets into the act. He is not a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and is not a member of the Joint Committee on Defense. The Comptroller General presented these documents originally to the Joint Committee on Defense Production. Representative Brown is the chairman of that committee. He called an executive session and summoned Mr. Campbell and his assistants before the committee. The committee voted to call Mr. Young to get his side of the story. The next day the Comptroller General wrote the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee calling his attention to it and suggesting that action on the defense production bill be held up.

The next day, or the day following that, the joint committee held a hearing in which they invited Mr. Young to be a witness. But prior to doing that, the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], took it upon himself, without waiting until the committee could make its findings, without waiting until he got Mr. Young's story, to print the whole matter in the Record.

My point is that we in Congress, whether in the Senate or the House, ought not at any time place in the Record and thereby make public allegations against persons until we at least have heard their side of the story. That is particularly true when a committee of Congress, in this case the Defense Production Joint Committee, was considering a matter.

I want the Senator from Delaware to know that I had all the information, but I was under an obligation not to disclose it, because we had agreed in executive session not to do so while the matter was being considered. That was the understanding of all the members of the committee.

But the Senator from Delaware telephoned to the General Accounting Office and asked for a copy of the report; and, as he is a Senator, it was given to him. He then proceeded to place it in the Record while our committee was considering the matter in executive session and was under an obligation not to print it.

I do not mind telling the Senator from Delaware that I do not like that sort of procedure. I do not care who knows it. I am telling him on the floor of the Senate that I think it is unwarranted and unjustified.

I think the Senate ought not permit businessmen or any other persons in the United States to have their characters assassinated by the making of allegations on the floor of the Senate until at least the person concerned has had his day in court. That is the way I feel about it, and I want the Senator from Delaware to know it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I intended to reply to the Senator from Indiana, but I yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out that not only has the Senator from Indiana made the charge that the Senator from Delaware has assassinated the character of Mr. Young, but he has also made the same charge against the Comptroller General, because I only quoted his language as written in his report. As to the argument that it would have been better had I called him before the committee, I wish that it had been possible but unfortunately I had no investigating committee nor am I a member of the Senator's committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator knew he was before our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1953, when our party was in control of Congress, one of my first requests of our party was that we create a committee through which we might proceed to make some of the investigations on which I had been working. With the vote of the senior Senator from Indiana, I was refused that permission. Therefore, I have continued to operate as I have in the past—as an individual.

There is nothing in the rules of the Senate which provides that I must go to the Senator from Indiana and ask him if I may make a speech on the floor of the Senate; and I am not going to start such a procedure.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is nothing in the rules of the Senate, but there are some rules among men. A Senator does not rise on the floor and deliver an address on a subject when a committee is considering the matter in executive session, and the members of the committee are under an obligation, because of the executive session, not to release the information to the newspapers. I do not think a Senator, under such circumstances, has the right to rush into print and give such information to the public.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not yield further.

I do not believe the Senator from Delaware has violated any trust. I do not think there is a scintilla of evidence before the Senate that he has violated any trust. He was not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. He had no knowledge of what was going on in an executive session of that committee.

The senior Senator from Delaware has for the past several years made a record in the Senate of investigating wrongdoing within the Government. As I understand the situation, he was led to believe there was something which was not right about the transactions conducted by this particular company head, Mr. Young. The Senator from Delaware in his individual capacity as a United States Senator, talked to the Comptroller General. That had nothing to do with the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Senator from Delaware brought to the Senate documents which he thought supported his allegations. Not only do I think he acted properly in doing so, but I shall never support in the Senate the proposition that we shall have some kind of censorship imposed on us as to what we shall say on the floor of the Senate, when we are performing what we believe to be a duty in the public interest, or when we place in the Record what we think is necessary to support the position we take in connection with the public interest.

I wanted to make this statement before the Senator from Delaware made any reply, because I do not think the Senator from Indiana meant to imply, as his language in cold type will imply tomorrow, when he reads it, that the great Senator from Delaware was guilty of any misconduct on the floor of the Senate or was guilty of violating any trust.

I think the senior Senator from Delaware has demonstrated very clearly his personal courage and willingness to stand up and take the heat in doing what he thinks is necessary to protect the public interest in regard to transactions within the operations of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that I did not discuss the matter with any member of his committee. I did not know of his interest until I read of it in the newspapers. I was not the least bit interested in what was going on in his committee. I did not discuss it with the staff. I did not get this information in any backhanded manner. I got it in the same manner as I have obtained statements with respect to 3 or 4 previous reports concerning the stockpiling agency. I have made such investigations before. I confirmed every one of them with the Comptroller General or other agencies involved, as I did in this case. I have always confirmed my statements with the agency involved or with the Comptroller General, not with the Senator from Indiana.

To my knowledge, the Senator from Indiana was not in the least bit interested in the other reports. Therefore, I did not go to the Senator and ask him for his opinion, nor did he come to me.

If the Senator from Indiana had something he wanted to keep secret, why did he not come around to the Members of the Senate and say, "We are going to work on something, and we want it kept secret"? But we cannot do that. The Members of the Senate have a right to operate individually. No Senator nor group of Senators can prohibit another Senator from speaking his opinion. There have been many scandals exposed in the last 2 years. The only interest which the Senator from Indiana has taken was when he voted against my proposal to have the necessary authority provided to establish a committee to continue the investigations which had already been started.

Moreover, I remind the Senator from Indiana that every statement which I have made in regard to Mr. Young's operations was and still is fully supported by the Comptroller General.

Mr. CAPEHART. I personally discussed the matter with the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not until after I had put the matter in the Record.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was before the Senator placed the matter in the Record. He knew the joint committee was investigating the matter. He knew we intended to have Mr. Young before the committee as a witness, because he and I discussed the subject.

The point I am trying to make is that I do not like the idea of the able Senator from Oregon and the able Senator from Delaware, one on each side of the aisle—they can condemn me all they please—rising in the Senate or at any other place and condemning a man without giving him a hearing, without hearing his side of the story, or at least without putting into the Record his side of the story, as well as the other side.

The Senator from Delaware has had 3 or 4 days in which to place Mr. Young's side of the story in the Record, but he has not seen fit to do so. I shall place it in the Record before the day is over.

The Senator from Delaware should not have acted as he did. I remember the consure which the Senate visited upon a Member for doing that sort of thing—for condemning persons and not giving them an opportunity to be heard, and for sending such information throughout the United States, not knowing whether it was true or was not true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I am wrong in having this sort of philosophy, or this sort of thinking, namely, that we must insist upon honesty in Government, then let the Senator from Indiana object.

Mr. MORSE. That sort of thinking is perfectly proper, as to the application which the Senator is making in this instance.

I want to find out from the Senator from Indiana if, either directly or indirectly, he is accusing me of following a course of action which he is condemning, namely, of making charges without having any foundation in fact for the charges.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply quoted the Comptroller General. One of the three allegations against Mr. Young was that his company benefited to the extent of $60,000, which it was later discovered was false. Yet the allegation that his company benefited by the $60,000 is a part of the record. It was published in every newspaper in the United States because it was placed in the Congressional Record. Now it develops that the allegation is not true and was not true. That is what I am objecting to. I shall continue to object to such disclosures as long as I live, because I do not think it is fair or honest to make them. I was under the impression that it was for that sort of tactics that a certain Member of this body was criticized and censured.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from Indiana is saying, in effect, is that no indictment can be filed until there shall first be a conviction; and the question is as to whether the Comptroller General, in the allegations which he made, which constitute an indictment, had probable cause to believe that the allegations were sound.

The senior Senator from Delaware has told us that he has made that charge stand up. There are some minor assertions or mistakes——

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Delaware is not a member of the committee; he did not hear the testimony.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Delaware says he still stands by his allegations, and the record will show that the Comptroller General can support his allegations. Certainly, the Senator from Indiana is not going to suggest that no charges can be made by a Senator unless he has proof to establish them, is he?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Comptroller General has already admitted he was wrong about the $60,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I spoke with the Comptroller General last night. I think there is a misunderstanding. Some member of the committee should have a statement from the Comptroller General to put in the Record to clear up the difference, but I was advised that he was not withdrawing the basic conclusions he reached in the report. He admitted there may have been some technical differences. So far as the $60,000 is concerned, about which such a great hullabaloo is being made, I do not recall that particular item. That was an insignificant part of the overall report.

I point out that, rightly or wrongly, the same procedure of presenting such cases has been followed during the last 2 years. It was followed without any support from the Senator from Indiana.

As a result of the exposures of recent scandals there have been 214 indictments and 101 convictions in one agency alone.

If the Senator will read the remarks which I made a few days ago, he will find that I said I was putting into the Record a history of certain contracts as they were reported by the Comptroller General. Certainly they were subject to challenge by the man affected. I did not make any charge against Mr. Young except as the contract and history of the case would constitute a charge. If the Senator from Indiana states that was a smear on Mr. Young, I say the only reason it would smear him would be because the facts were dirty. If the Senator from Indiana claims that Mr. Young in his official capacity did not negotiate a contract involving a company, which in turn negotiated a contract with his own company; if the Senator from Indiana claims that he did not receive $80,000 from his company while he was negotiating these contracts; if the Senator from Indiana claims that the company of which Mr. Young was president did not promise in a letter filed with the Defense Production Administration, "If the Government will advance $325,000, we will advance $75,000 if that is not enough"; if the Senator from Indiana in his defense of Mr. Young wishes to deny these allegations as contained in the Comptroller General's report, he should say so.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to yield any further.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Silence is golden.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to yield any further for a discussion of the Young case. If the Senator from Indiana wants to discuss the Young case, he can do so on his own time. I have always made it a practice to be generous in yielding during the course of my own speech, but I think the Senator will have to agree that it is becoming such a diversionary matter and so far removed from the general thesis that I would still not be violating courtesy if I did not yield further on the Young matter.

In fact, I am going to summarize my speech and put the remainder of it into the Record, as though it had been read, but first I should like to make a few brief comments.

There are two statutes which are primarily involved: Section 434 and section 1914 of the Criminal Code. Section 434 imposes a fine and jail sentence on a Government employee who acts as an agent of the United States for the transaction of business with a firm of which he is an officer or agent or in whose pecuniary profits he is directly or indirectly interested. Section 1914 prohibits a Government employee from receiving a salary for his work for the Government from any outside source. In addition, other statutes relating to the prosecution of claims and handling other matters in which the Government is interested are also involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the conflict of interest provisions not applicable to w. o. c.'s appointed under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Conflict of interest provisions not applicable to w. o. c.'s appointed under Defense Production Act of 1950

Statute	To whom applied	Acts prohibited	Period	Penalty
5 U. S. C., sec. 99 (R. S. sec. 190)	Person employed as officer, clerk, or employee in any of the departments.	To act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim versus United States pending in either of the departments while he was such officer, clerk, or employee, or to aid in prosecution of any such claim.	Employment and 2 years thereafter.	Declared "unlawful."
18 U. S. C., sec. 281 (old secs. 203, 113 C. C.).	Head of department, or other officer or employee of United States (except certain retired officers).	Directly or indirectly receives or agrees to receive any compensation for services rendered or to be rendered by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which United States is a party or interested, before any department, agency, court-martial, officer, or any civil, military or naval commission.	Employment	Fine, prison, and disqualification.
18 U. S. C., sec. 283 (old secs. 198, 109 C. C.).	Officer or employee of United States.	Act as attorney or agent for prosecuting any claim versus United States or aid or assist in prosecution or support of any claim otherwise than in proper discharge of official duties, or receive any gratuity, or share or interest in claim in consideration of assistance in prosecution.	do	Fine and prison.
18 U. S. C., sec. 284 (old sec. 19 (e) Contract Settlement Act).	"Whoever, having been employed in any agency" (former employee).	Prosecute or act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim versus United States involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed or performed duty.	2 years after cessation	Do.
18 U. S. C., sec. 434 (old secs. 93, 41 C. C.).	Officer, agent, member, or interested in profits or contracts of firm.	Employed or acts as officer or agent of United States for transaction of business with such firm.	Employment	Do.
18 U. S. C., sec. 1914 (former 5 U. S. C., sec. 66).	Government official or employee, or person paying	Receive salary in connection with services as such official or employee from any source other than Federal, State, or local Governments, or contribute to or supplement salary of Government official or employee for services performed by him for the United States.	do	Do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these statutes have been considered at length in connection with the confirmation of a number of officials, and special bills which would grant exceptions for other officials.

The most recent case was the confirmation of Secretary Wilson, and Deputy Secretary Kyes, and Secretary Stevens. Secretary Wilson, you will remember Mr. President, had resigned from his position at GM, had arranged to have the pension he had earned paid in cash, and agreed to sell most of his stock and to give the rest to his family, irrevocably.

The senior Senator from Virginia discussed section 434 at the time Secretary Wilson's confirmation was being considered. I should like to read from his statement:

> Among other applicable statutes, I would say section 434, title 18, United States Code, headed 'Interested persons acting as Government agents' is descriptive of the general policy of the United States Government with respect to this subject of conflict of interest.
>
> It seems to me that that law lays down clearly, concisely, and simply the fundamental questions involved in this very vital public matter.

After pointing out that this act was originally passed almost 100 years ago, he continued:

> As in the beginning, section 434 still, in plain and simple terms, constitutes a code of ethics for Government officials.
>
> It is not an antiquated law, as some have said. It states a solid and sound principle and, in substance, it says that no officer or agent of the United States shall transact business with a business entity in which such officer has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest. This is good Americanism, as I see it. * * *
>
> I am in favor of that law. I would resist to the utmost of my capacity any effort to change or weaken it, regardless of the source of such an effort. It is, as I said, a code of ethics with relation to the question of conflict of interest.

In connection with a bill to exempt an employee of a Senate committee from these conflict-of-interest laws to permit him to continue his legal practices, a bill which was enacted, the senior Senator from Utah made the following statement in opposition to the bill in a letter of July 11, 1951, which was inserted in the Record:

> The conflict-of-interest laws are an attempt to write into the law the concept that public office is a public trust. They seek to express in law the principle that no man can serve two masters. To that end they provide that no public officer or employee of the Federal Government may engage in activities which are incompatible with the duties of his public office.
>
> In my view, the conflict-of-interest laws should be upheld and strictly enforced in all their ramifications. They should not be weakened and eaten away by exceptions and waivers. I personally hold these views as a matter of principle and shall continue to stand by them now and in the future.

These conflict-of-interest statutes are waived by the provision in the Defense Production Act in order to make it possible for the Government to employ these men without fear of later prosecution. The statutes prohibiting direct bribery are not waived.

Mr. President, may I say by way of summary that the material contained in the remainder of my speech emphasizes the following points:

No. 1: The pending bill permits the use of business executives from industry, labor, or any other walk of life in an advisory and consulting capacity in peacetime.

No. 2: The pending bill in no way restricts the power of the Government to use representatives of industry and labor and other economic groups in wartime in administrative and policymaking positions.

No. 3: We have a long line of expert testimony by such men as the former Comptroller General and the present Comptroller General which makes it very clear that, from every standpoint of Government administration, it is desirable to have the bill in its present form. I have to modify that statement by saying that Mr. Lindsay Warren was not afforded an opportunity to testify on the pending bill, but the committee had inserted in the record statements which Mr. Lindsay Warren had made when he was Comptroller General, which showed unequivocally his support of the principles of the bill as reported by the committee.

Fourth, this bill in no way whatsoever modifies or affects the reserve training program for business executives. That program is separate and distinct from the provisions of the bill which deal with the w. o. c.'s who are brought into the Government service and are placed in administrative or directorship positions.

If Senators wish to know the nature of these positions, I call their attention again to pages 35 and 36 of the committee hearings which are on our desks. Senators cannot read the description of those positions and escape the soundness of the conclusion which Mr. Campbell presented, namely, that the very nature of these positions carries with them administrative and policymaking duties. That was also the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, and of his assistant, Mr. McCoy. From the hearings, Senators will find that I asked Mr. McCoy whether these jobs carry with them policymaking and administrative duties. He testified that they did. Senators also will find the testimony of Dr. Flemming, to the same effect.

So, Mr. President, we have before us, in my judgment, a matter of most important policy, namely, whether we are to write into the law a safeguard which will remove businessmen and labor leaders called into the service of the Government from the realm of suspicion, because we cannot escape the fact that in time of peace, when they are serving in these administrative positions and have administrative control over a staff of full-time, Government career employees, they are going to subject themselves to suspicion. Here is a case with respect to which the old saying is sound, namely, that when there is a procedure which tempts abuse, it is the duty of the Congress, in the public interest, to pass a law which will remove the danger of the abuse.

We do not propose to take away from Secretary Weeks or from Dr. Flemming or from any other administrative officer the opportunity to have the benefit of the advice of these experts and of being able to consult with them; but we are saying that, as a matter of sound, governmental policy, in time of peace there shall not be placed in administrative, policymaking positions dollar-a-year men, or so-called w. o. c.'s.

Mr. President, I believe we should use such men as advisers and consultants; and then we should build up a staff of career servants—using, for example, some of the retired business executives in the United States, who should be brought into the Government service when they still have much to contribute to their country; and we should have them serve the Government on a full-time basis, so they will not at the same time be receiving pay from a private corporation or a labor union. That is the position of the committee; and I think the committee deserves the support of the Senate by means of a vote in favor of passage of the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. MORSE's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the Defense Production Act was passed, President Truman issued Executive Order 10182, in accordance with the act. This placed limits on the activities of these employees. In particular these industry-paid men were not permitted to negotiate or execute contracts with their private employers or to make recommendations or approve individual applications under the act submitted by their private employers. And the order established the policy of using them only where full-time salaried employees, subject to the conflict of interest laws, could not be found, and directed that their duties should avoid as much as possible any conflict of interest.

The testimony of Mr. Di Salle, of OPS, and Mr. Fleischmann, of NPA, at the hearings held by Representative CELLER in 1951 was entirely favorable to these w. o. c.'s, though both officials recognized the problems inherent in the situation and used great precautions to prevent any harmful results. Both Mr. Di Salle and Mr. Fleischmann testified that the w. o. c.'s had performed a valuable, if not indispensable, service in the mobilization program.

But there have been two changes since the days of 1950, 1951, and 1952. In the first place, the mobilization program has changed in scope and in character. It those days our soldiers were fighting in Korea, and the entire industrial system was mobilized to support their efforts and to prepare against a further spread of the fighting. Prices, wages, and rents were controlled, and practically all materials were being allocated. Now there are no price or wage controls, and only a small amount of material is being allocated, and that only to the military and AEC. The size of the operation is infinitely smaller, and the emphasis is now on building up stockpiles and productive capacity, to be ready for a quick conversion to full mobilization at some time in the future. Fewer employees in the agencies are needed, and less immediate knowledge of industrial operations is required by the employees themselves. Those needs can be more adequately filled now by advice from consultants and advisory committees.

In the second place, the indications are that the w. o. c. industry-paid employees are being used for general purposes, as a matter of policy and not of need for defense purposes, and this by officials less sensitive than Dr. Flemming to the central conflict of interest problem.

Secretary Weeks, in establishing the Business and Defense Services Administration is quoted as saying:

"We propose * * * to establish approximately 20 main industry divisions with key advisors, recommended by various industries to represent them, and staffed for operation purposes by industrial experts from the career services * * * the functions of the proposed business services agency will be to * * * see to it that, while private business, of course, cannot dictate Government policy and plans, it be placed in a position where it can effectively approve or disapprove of the implementation of such policy and plans from the standpoint of their practical workability in every day industrial operation."

And again:

"The chairman of each commodity division will be an outstanding industrialist recommended by his industry, and serving full time without pay on a 6-month rotating basis."

I call your attention particularly to two phrases Mr. Weeks used, which I think show a complete misapprehension of the purpose for which section 710 (b) was enacted (p. 134, hearings before Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 2163 and 2165).

Mr. Weeks says that key advisers—the division directors—are employed to represent industries. Industry advisory committees and trade associations may properly represent industries. Government officials should represent the people of the United States and no one else.

Mr. Weeks says business, presumably in the persons of these industry-paid division directors, should be placed in a position where it can effectively approve or disapprove of the implementation of policies and plans from the standpoint of their workability. Business should certainly be consulted and should certainly give advice, but it should have no veto power over the implementation of a governmental policy.

The Business and Defense Service Administration (BDSA) is not limited to mobilization functions. It also carries on functions under the Department of Commerce basic statutes such as:

"Except as otherwise provided by law or Executive order, establish the Business and Defense Services Administration as the logical point in Government for representation of the domestic interests of business and industry in their relations with other governmental agencies;

"Provide other departments and agencies of the executive branch and the Congress with required information and judgment concerning the viewpoints and interests of business and industry;

"Cooperate in assuring consideration of the domestic needs of small-business enterprises with the view to strengthening their position in the national economy;

"Obtain the views and advice of business through the establishment of, and consultation with, industry councils and industry advisory committees, and through cooperation with trade associations;

"Encourage efficient and effective domestic distribution of goods and services to further the expansion of domestic markets necessary for optimum utilization of the Nation's productive capacity;

"Act as a clearinghouse for Government technological information of interest to business and assist industry in the voluntary standardization of products; and

"Cooperate with other agencies of Government in programs to achieve economic stability and growth and with industry in the development of industrial and business programs having as their purpose a sound, prosperous, and expanding economy." (P. 111, Fourth Annual Report, Joint Committee on Defense Production.)

While Secretary Weeks and Mr. McCoy testified that the industry-paid employees spent most of their time on mobilization activities, and, of course, refrained from personally handling priority or tax-amortization applications submitted by their companies, they conceded that the w. o. c.'s did participate in nonmobilization matters at times, and, of course, they are the supervisors of the civil-service employees who handle these matters and who are dependent on the division directors for promotions and efficiency ratings.

It seems clear that Secretary Weeks has gone far beyond the spirit of section 710 (b) and Executive Order 10182. Perhaps this is because he is not as sensitive to the conflict of problems as Dr. Flemming. Secretary Weeks made the following statement at the hearing:

"There has I think been some suggestion that there possibly could be a conflict of interest. We think there cannot be any conflict of interest. The WOC comes in and, to be sure, he continues on the payroll of the company from whom he is borrowed, so to speak, but he comes in and he is a Government man. He takes the same oath that any of the rest of us takes. He does not in all respects operate even as head of an industry division. He does not operate, in my opinion, as a policymaking individual. I and the Assistant Secretary, the head and deputy head of the Business and Defense Services Administration, consider ourselves the policy people, and these people implement the policymaking suggestions as they go along."

This quotation, in addition to displaying a distressing lack of appreciation of the conflict of interest problem, also points up a real problem in the proposed amendment—the use of the completely meaningless phrase "policy matters." Mr. Weeks obviously thinks that he and Mr. Honeywell decide all policy matters in the Commerce Department, and these industry paid division directors—men of outstanding experience and ability—are merely messenger boys, or are merely there to represent their industries and effectively disapprove of policies determined on by Mr. Weeks or Mr. Honeywell.

The term policy is, in my view, a relative matter. Many governmental policies are established by the Constitution and statutes, but I am sure the amendment does not refer to this kind of policy. Other policies are established by the President or by ODM, but again the amendment undoubtedly does not use the word policy in this sense. Then there are lesser policies estalished by the Commerce Department within the framework of constitutional, statutory, Presidential, and ODM policies. The establishment of policies does not stop with Mr. Weeks and Mr. Honeywell. The division directors and section chiefs in BDSA also, as I see it, establish policies—perhaps of a lesser order, as Mr. Weeks' policies are of a lesser order than the President's policies—but still major policies of vital importance to industry and the public.

With this kind of a basic disagreement as to the phrase policy matters, it seems most undesirable to write a law based on this phrase. This is particularly true, as we are considering a provision making an exemption from a number of criminal laws. Exemptions from criminal laws, like the criminal laws themselves, should be reasonably clear and precise.

In order to show how the conflict of interest problem arises, even under the limitations imposed by President Truman under Executive Order 10182, let me cite a specific case.

The Director of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of BDSA is now a man from the Aluminum Company of America. His predecessor, under the 6-months' rotation system was a man from Reynolds Metals Co. In the summer of 1954, the proposal for a third round expansion of the aluminum-producing industry came up. The issue was whether aluminum capacity was sufficient to take care of future needs of business, including particularly small business, and of the stockpile.

The man from Reynolds, at the head of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division, was in charge of the initial recommendation, including the preparation of the statistics and estimates as to future supply and demand. The Division found no need for the expansion, Commerce convinced ODM that there was no need for the expansion, and the third round expansion did not go through.

By January small business found it could no longer get the aluminum it needed, and the shortage is now so great that deliveries to the national security stockpile have been stopped for the third quarter of 1954, and may be stopped for the fourth quarter.

Small business and the stockpile have been hurt.

What about Reynolds Metals? Their quarterly sales have risen as follows: in the 4 quarters of 1954 and the first quarter of 1955, $65.7, $77.3, $78.1, 85.7, and for the first quarter of 1955, $87.2 million. Over the same period their earnings per share have risen even faster: $2.19, $2.66, $2.61, $2.63, and for the first quarter of 1955, $3.54. The decision has certainly not hurt Reynolds.

The man from Reynolds who participated in this decision was certainly violating no laws; they had been waived. He was no doubt acting entirely on the basis of the facts as he saw them. And it is entirely possible that a full-time salaried civil-service employee would have made the same decision and recommendation in the summer of 1954. The higher officials in Commerce and ODM accepted the recommendation, and to that extent the responsibility of the Division Director is shared, though I think those familiar with the methods of reaching decisions of this sort will agree that the man in charge of the statistics on supply and demand can have an influence on the result disproportionate to his civil-service grade. It is also possible that the sales and earnings of Reynolds Metals would have increased just as fast even if the decision had been to go ahead with the third round expansion in the aluminum industry.

The fact remains, however, that this decision seems to have hurt small business and the defense effort, and Reynolds has not been hurt.

This situation is undesirable—undesirable for the man from Reynolds Metals, undesirable for Reynolds Metals, and particularly undesirable for small business and the stockpile.

These same men can come here as consultants, or as members of industry advisory committees, to give the Government the benefit of their experience and knowledge of industrial problems. Or, like Mr. Wilson, they can sever their relations with their companies and subject themselves to the conflict of interest statutes.

I am glad when such men can sever their connections with private industry like Mr. Wilson, though even he has not escaped all criticism or suspicion of some vestiges of sentimental affection for his old friends. And I am willing enough under present circumstances to have them come as consultants or advisers, with full-time salaried employees—subject to the conflict of interest laws—making the decision, though I note that conflict of interest problems arise in the Budget Bureau over the use of even consultants. Mr. Wenzell's role in Dixon-Yates contract.)

The present cold war situation may last for 10 or 20 years or even longer. Over this long period, the Government should not have to reply on these industry-paid employees. The time has now come to return to the normal practices of government, and to terminate these exceptions to the criminal laws of the United States.

Before closing, Mr. President, I want to discuss a subject that is not applicable just to the bill before the Senate, but which is really the basic problem that we are dealing with in this situation. At some future date I intend to devote a considerable amount of time to discussing the problem that I would only touch upon now. That problem is whether or not the Congress of the United States, the people of the United States, will face up to the fact that it is in the public interest to have an adequate and competent professional staff available to the Congress and to the executive branch of the Government. The fact that we have to go to industry for the services of men with special technical competence cannot ever be completely avoided in situations of national emergency. But in the course of what we call normal times, it seems to me that the best interests of the United States will be served by providing the funds with which we can hire the career people able to handle these problems. In peacetime they can do almost all the job by themselves, and in times of emergency they can serve as the supervisors of individuals brought in on a temporary basis because of need.

Let us examine this issue from the view of the career public servant. One of the chief incentives, if not the central incentive, that spurs a career employee into doing his best possible work is the fact that if he shows ability that he will be promoted. Now suppose yourself as a career servant of some 20 years' service, with the degree of skill gained in 20 years of service, suddenly confronted with the situation of a rank outsider being brought in and placed in the very supervisory position that you felt your service qualified you for. What would it do to your morale? I think the answer is fairly obvious and the issue does not have to be dwelt upon. If the position is so important to the public interest that we must have a special individual to man it, then it warrants our providing a full-time salaried Government employee to fill it. The price of good public service is always worth what we pay for it. A few thousand dollars more invested in one position or another may well return millions of dollars to the Government that would have been lost because of incompetent administration.

This whole matter of bringing w. o. c.'s, of whom a preponderance are businessmen, into Government raises another issue that we have to face, as I see it. The businessman, the farmer, the worker, the consumer—all of us—have a right to the type of Government that represents all our interests. This collectivity of interests we call "the public interest." It is a shorthand term for balance of conflicting interests. The role of our Government has traditionally been that of the balance wheel. The function of our Government, according to the thinking of our Founding Fathers, was to serve as an umpire in the conflicts between various factions. As the occasion may warrant, the Government, through regulation or providing certain services, should seek to offset the strength of one faction or another that has gained a position which makes it possible for that faction to deny the rights of other groups.

It is not a proper function of the Government to ally itself with one camp or another.

I fear that today we have an administration which has forgotten these thoughts that I have just expressed. It prides itself upon being a businessman's administration.

Without discussing the fallacy of the assumption that what is proper in business is proper in Government, and that a successful businessman can be a successful public servant, I want to bring this concept of an administration oriented toward business to bear upon this w. o. c. problem that we are discussing today.

It is but a truism that we all see the world through our own eyes—and I mean eyes in the broad philosophical, psychological sense. That is, we all have our point of view. This is the very danger of the w. o. c. program. A perfectly honest man connected with business or with a labor union or with any other economic group does, of necessity, see the problems he faces with a view influenced by the background of the interest he represents. He is part of that interest. I think that this is too obvious to bear further discussion. And this is why it is dangerous to have the public interest represented by men who are not public servants in the true sense, regardless of what their nongovernmental connection might be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on page 7, begining in line 25. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business, and is paired, on this vote, with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken
Allott
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Byrd
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Duff
Dworshak
Flanders
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Ives
Jenner
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
McCarthy
Millikin
Mundt
Payne
Potter
Purtell
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Wiley
Young

NAYS—45

Anderson
Barkley
Bible
Chavez
Clements
Daniel
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Frear
Fulbright
George
Gore
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilgore
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Murray
Neely
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Russell
Scott
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Johnson, Tex.
Kennedy
Malone
Schoeppel
Smathers

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Mr. Howard I. Young, president of the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co., before the Joint Committee on Defense Production on July 14, 1955, together with supplementary material submitted by Mr. Young.

There being no objection, the statement and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JULY 14, 1955, BY HOWARD I. YOUNG

First, let me express my sincere appreciation to the committee for affording this opportunity to appear in executive session.

I, of course, have been extremely concerned regarding the extensive newspaper publicity respecting certain reports concerning my activities while in Government service from September 1951 to May 1953. As the committee knows, these reports, in effect, question my integrity and good faith while functioning in the public service. I was, indeed, quite astonished to read in the press that the Comptroller General had found that "there appear to be established certain 'conflicts of interest'" on my part while serving as Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency (DMPA) without compensation. These conflicts of interest are alleged to arise by reason of the fact that the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co., of which I am president, was alleged "to be beneficially interested in the program of * * * three companies," who were awarded DMPA contracts while I was Deputy Administrator.

Gentlemen, I have now been in business in the United States for some 47 years ago tomorrow. I began many years ago in the capacity of a clerk with the company I now head. During these many years I have been honored with important assignments and responsibility in my company, my industry, and my Government; and through all these years I have never sought to conduct myself otherwise than honestly and honorably.

I tell you this in all humility merely to emphasize the indisputable fact that never before has any responsible person, whether in public or private capacity, called me a criminal nor, indeed, so much as implied that I might be one. Nor has it ever been suggested to my knowledge that I would do an unethical act. The members of the committee, I am sure, will pardon the human frailty which uncontrollably prompts my deep resentment over the recent allegations against my good name.

As a businessman primarily but also as a former Government official, I am unable to fully appreciate the justification for an investigation and report on my actions as a Government official without any contact whatsoever of me, either by the investigators involved or the responsible officials who presumably have approved and published the reports concerning me to this committee, to a number of other committees of Congress, and who have certified these reports to the Department of Justice. Nor can there be any question of my availability, for I am as of today special consultant to the General Services Administrator. I think that this committee and the American public will ultimately agree that I had much in the way of information, facts, and data to contribute to the accuracy and impartiality of such a report—if, indeed, accuracy and impartiality was intended by them.

It was not until the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 11 became available July 12 that I had any information as to the basis of the Comptroller General's charges against me. And this information, available to me—the party charged with wrongdoing—only as a result of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appear to be only a portion of the full report on my actions. Properly refuting the charges against me is thus most difficult, because I don't know all of the alleged facts and purported evidence on which they are based. This, coupled with failure of the Comptroller General to consult with me at all, violates, I believe, fundamental principles of fair play to which all citizens should be entitled. For these reasons I am especially grateful to this committee for affording me this opportunity to be heard and to present to you and to the public all of the facts on these matters of which I have knowledge.

Please do not misunderstand me. I want this committee, the American people, the Justice Department, and all others interested to be fully informed respecting all facts bearing on this situation of which I have knowledge. I assure you that since this situation became known to me for the first time last Friday when a newspaper reporter requested my views of the charges, of which I then had no knowledge, I have been bending every effort to insure receipt by this committee of full and complete information. While it is my judgment that I could be of maximum possible assistance to this committee if I knew the charges against me and the purported evidence upon which they are based, and was afforded full opportunity to refute them, we will do everything possible to satisfy the committee's requirements despite its refusal to disclose the charges to me. And as a consequence I'm sure the committee will understand why, under the circumstances, it may not be possible for me to furnish today all the information and documents in which the committee may be interested. But I assure the committee I will undertake to do so at the earliest possible date.

FULL DISCLOSURE ON ASSUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT POST

When I agreed to become Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, I made a full disclosure to the Administrator as to my corporate connections. I submit herewith copy of my letter dated September 10, 1951, to the Honorable Jess Larson for the record of the committee. As you will observe, in this letter I pointed out that I was president, director, and member of the executive committee of the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co. and each of its wholly owned subsidiaries which are listed. I also pointed out that since I would serve the Government without compensation, I would expect to continue to receive compensation from my private employers as listed.

I also listed six companies in which I am a director and small stockholder, and pointed out that as to these companies my compensation consisted only of directors' fees. I also attached a list of the companies in which I owned shares of stock. I further attached a list of organizations in which I was an officer or director, but served without compensation, such as the American Mining Congress, the Southern States Industrial Council, the American Zinc Institute, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturing Chemists Association, American Tariff Association, and others.

In this same letter I also stated:

"I will not take part in the consideration of or action on any application filed under the Defense Production Act by any company with which I am connected."

I have done my level best to keep this commitment and believe that I have succeeded in keeping it.

I also stated at that time:

"I would like to make it clear that I will make no recommendation about nor participate in the consideration or negotiation of any such application filed by any person or organization, as mentioned above."

I have done my level best to keep this commitment and believe that I have succeeded in keeping it.

It is my understanding from Mr. Larson that he filed a copy of the above letter with every Government agency and congressional committee that he thought was interested. These included, I understand, the Office of

Defense Mobilization, the Civil Service Commission, the Government Operations Committee of both Houses, the Interior Committee of both Houses of Congress, and with this Joint Committee on Defense Production. Mr. Larson also formally advised the Director of the Federal Register of my appointment and therein listed my employers and directorates. A copy of this notification is submitted for the committee record.

There was, therefore, the fullest possible disclosure of my directorships, of my stockholdings and of the industrial organizations or trade associations of which I was an officer or director.

My directors were reluctant to have me once again relinquish my executive responsibilities to the companies of which I am president to once again serve the Government, for during World War II, I had also served the Government in the capacity of Director, Mineral Resources Coordinating Division; Director, Mineral and Metals Division, WPB; and Deputy Vice Chairman, Minerals and Metals Division, WPB. I also had been Chairman, Zinc, Lead, and Cadmium Advisory Committee to the Munitions Board. My directors ultimately agreed, however, to permit me "to give such time as may be required to serve as Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, with the understanding that he will not relinquish all of his duties as president and director of this corporation and its subsidiaries."

A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the board of directors of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., held in New York City, September 18, 1951, reflecting this action is submitted herewith for record of the committee.

It will be observed that there is also incorporated into the minutes above referred to the reply dated September 13, 1951, of Mr. Jess Larson to my letter to him of September 10. Therein Mr. Larson states:

"I will not embarrass you by asking you to participate or make any decisions in connection with any negotiations that have to do with any of the companies in which you are interested."

MR. LARSON FULFILLED THIS COMMITMENT IN EVERY RESPECT

Nor can I say that L wasn't warned that I might find myself in the present situation, for a further passage of Mr. Larson's letter of September 10, 1951, borders upon the prophetic in light of the circumstances which brings me here today. He said:

"As I have told you in urging you to come into Government and assist me in administering this new agency, misguided people will read into our actions selfish and ulterior motives in spite of everything we can do. This is unfortunate and is the reason it is difficult to get men of your experience to make such a sacrifice."

I should further explain that upon my resumption of Government service I effected reassignments of my executive responsibilities to other subordinate executives in the management of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. and subsidiary companies. This included the delegation to my son, Richard A. Young, then a corporate vice president in charge of ore purchases at our plant at Dumas, Tex., of complete and sole responsibility for the operations of the ore purchases division of our company and subsidiaries. My assumption of Government service was not the only reason for this step. Such delegation in ordinary circumstances would have been extended to Mr. A. E. Stanton, who at the time was a senior vice president, generally responsible to me for ore and metal purchases. Mr. Stanton, however, was not well and, after a lengthy sickness, passed away on June 10, 1952. It was under these circumstances that Vice President R. A. Young assumed sole responsibility for all corporate actions in the field of ore purchases of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. and subsidiaries. At this time Howard Lee Young was in full charge of metal sales.

My purpose in thus realining executive responsibilities within my own company was not only to make possible my Government service, but also to insure that other officials of my company than I would handle company matters with the Government. And when they had occasion to do so as to DMPA, I, pursuant to the arrangement I had insisted upon with Mr. Larson, would consider myself disqualified.

NATURE OF MY DMPA AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

It is appropriate for the committee to keep in mind, I think, that my Government position from September 1951 to May 1953 was that of Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. As such, my authority and responsibility was definitely limited. While it is true that I had general authority to act for the Administrator (except as to matters involving those companies as to which I had advised the Administrator I would not act) the DMPA itself was subject to numerous authority restrictions. Thus, for example, DMPA was entirely dependent upon the Defense Procurement Administrator, and later the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, for broad policy-program determinations. This was particularly true as to all mineral programs, including the zinc procurement program.

Under Executive Order 10281, signed by President Truman on August 28, 1951, certain functions were conferred upon the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator. These functions such as (1) the purchasing and commitments to purchase minerals and metals for Government use or resale, (2) the encouragement of exploration, development and mining of critical and strategic metals, and (3) subsidy payments and the installation of additional equipment facilities or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities, were limited and restricted by section 307 of the aforementioned executive order which read as follows:

"SEC. 307. The functions conferred upon the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator by sections 303 to 306, inclusive, of this executive order, shall be carried out in accordance with programs certified to the said Administrator by the Defense Production Administrator."

Said executive order further provided that—

"SEC. 308. All functions provided for in sections 303 to 306, inclusive, of this executive order shall be carried out within such amounts of funds as may be made available pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

Accordingly, it was necessary for DMPA to have express DPA (later ODM) approval for each of its expansion programs whether or not it be for the purchase of metals or minerals; the encouragement of exploration, development and mining of critical and strategic metals; subsidy payments; or the installation of additional equipment facilities, processes, or improvements in Government-owned equipment in private facilities. Further, it was necessary for DMPA to have the express Bureau of the Budget approval for each of the aforementioned programs, since the Bureau had the responsibility of allocating the necessary funds made available under the Defense Production Act. This was true, for example, of the programs under which the contracts of primary interest to the committee were awarded.

I do not point out the limitations on DMPA authority for the purpose of shirking responsibility wtih respect to these three contracts. On the contrary, I stand shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Larson who but for my protest would assume full and entire responsibility for them.

If I were again in the Government confronted by the necessity for decisions on the same facts, I would not decide otherwise. I believe those decisions were sound when made and that they are sound now. Indeed, if I may be pardoned for saying so, I believe that developments subsequent to the dates of our decisions respecting the implementation of zinc expansion programs have more than justified their soundness.

THE NECESSITY FOR EXPANDING DOMESTIC ZINC PRODUCTION DURING 1951 TO 1953

The first item to which the committee counsel has requested me to testify is "as to the necessity to expand zinc production to the event such expansion was carried out from 1951 to 1953, or for the payment of subsidies."

This is a most important matter on which I have decidedly pronounced views. My views on this subject are a matter of public record in numerous places, not all of which I have been able to assemble for purposes of this hearing. They may be found, however, in speeches, press releases, congressional testimony, official Government reports, and internal governmental reports and recommendations. In a word, it has been my conviction for many years that—

1. So long as a prospect of war exists our governmental policy should be devoted to expanding domestic metals production to the fullest possible extent in order to make this country and this hemisphere not dependent upon foreign sources of supply for strategic and critical metals; and

2. I abhor Government subsidies to the mining industry, primarily because of the inevitable Government control and regulation which they necessarily entail.

In considering the necessity for expansion in domestic zinc production during the period 1951 to 1953, it is important for the committee to have in mind the particular facts as they existed at that time. This, however, is not a suggestion to obviate argument predicated upon hindsight in this instance because even when judged by hindsight full and complete justification for expanding domestic sources of zinc ores and concentrates during the period 1951 to 1953 is very clear.

The supply of zinc both from the standpoint of concentrates for the smelting plants and from the standpoint of stocks of metal in the hands of the smelters during the year had reached a critical situation. The stock of slab zinc at the end of 1950 was less than 4 days production, and by the end of 1951 had only been increased to the equivalent of approximately 9 days. The exports of slab zinc from United States smelters in 1951 had increased by 24,000 tons over 1950 and the stocks of available zinc for Government account had been reduced by 89,000 tons below 1950 shipments for stockpiling account.

The imports of slab zinc into the United States from foreign countries were 42 percent below the year 1950. This was primarily on account of the OPS ceiling price being substantially below the foreign price; so that large quantities of slab zinc that had been normally imported into the United States from Mexico, Canada, Belgium, Italy, Norway, and Peru went into the foreign field where prices were much above the OPS ceiling price. The concentrate imports from foreign countries into the United States during 1951 were approximately 10 percent above 1950.

Some smelters had even with this increase of foreign supplies of concentrates found it necessary to reduce their output on account of the scarcity of available zinc concentrates for smelting. At the close of 1951 the price of foreign zinc based on "London Ministry of Supply" delivery Pittsburgh, was approximately 25.66 cents per pound and in March 1952, this had been reduced to 24.96 cents per pound. This price compared with United States prime western price at Pittsburgh at approximately 20 cents per pound.

Inasmuch as I had for several years served as chairman of the Munitions Board Industry Advisory Committee on Zinc and Lead, I was familiar with the stockpile objectives as announced by the chairman of the Munitions Board. We had been informed of the stockpile objectives and the necessity for producing every ton possible for that purpose. On account of the extreme shortage of zinc that existed in 1950 and 1951, the defense authorities had requested a careful survey of stockpile objectives by competent advisors and the objective had been substantially reduced. This reduction, I understood, was primarily on account of the shortage of the probable supply over the nearby years and to make available more of the current production for domestic uses.

Consequently, when I became deputy administrator in the latter part of 1951, I felt then as I do now that the zinc supply was extremely serious when you looked at it against the policy of supplying not only the mobilization effort, but keeping the national economy going at the highest possible level as well. However, I might observe in passing that all of the background on which my program thinking was based may not have been understood by those within DMPA who are quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as disagreeing with me.

Therefore, in the latter part of 1951 and early 1952 the Defense Material Procurement Agency submitted to the DPA its program for expansion. It was emphasized in such a program that it would be the policy of DMPA to obtain zinc primarily from North American sources and from producers capable of supplying zinc at an early stage. As a result of this recommendation DPA independently on January 3, 1952, issued its expansion program order authorizing the expansion goal for the program of 1,320,000 tons of zinc production capacity, thereby increasing the American capacity by 242,000 tons. Evidently, those in DPA having the approval of the expansion program of minerals and metals agreed with the proposal submitted by DMPA and authorized the above-mentioned expansion.

The domestic price remained at 19½ cents per pound until the start of the steel strike in June 1952, at which time it was reduced to 17½ cents per pound on June 2, and 16 cents on June 5, and 15 cents on June 18. This drop was primarily on account of the steel strike, which industry is the largest individual consumer of slab zinc. The steel strike lasted for a period of approximately 60 days, and during this period the stocks of slab zinc in the hands of smelters was increased by approximately 64,000 tons, or the equivalent of approximately 35 days' production. At the end of 1952 the stock in the hands of the smelters stood at 37,000 tons, which was 65,000 tons above the stock at the end of 1951. In view of the responsibility of DMPA to provide adequate metals and minerals, with which program it was charged, the organization kept under continuous review the programs involving all of the important metals and minerals being produced either in the United States of America or foreign countries and the development of new mines in the United States. This involved not only zinc but also copper, iron ore, magnesium, fluorspar, and many other minerals and metals of importance to our defense needs and domestic economy.

It has been stated that during my tenure of office as Deputy Administrator of DMPA, I gave various reasons to justify the zinc-expansion program. It is said that in the early stages—late 1951 and 1952—I placed emphasis on the needs for defense production and civilian requirements when the market broke in the spring of 1952—prices declined some 19.5 to 15 cents—and the defense and civilian requirements had been met, expansion and maintenance of production was justified on the basis of hardship. Gentlemen, I say to you that my thinking in the matter has not changed, that the situation concerning zinc was not static, it was fluid, and because of the aforementioned changes various programs were necessitated. I think my recommendations were justified that the preservation of our domestic-mining industry was and still is of vital interest to this Nation, both from the standpoint of national defense and of civilian economy. In June 1953, some time after DMPA made the so-called various recommendations, a congressional committee, to wit, the Select Committee for the House of Representatives of Small Business, after making a complete study of the zinc and lead situation in this country, stated in its report (H. Rept. 688, dated June 1953, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) that,

"Some spokesmen within and without Government suggests that the present depressed price situation which prevails in the lead and zinc mining industry will be correct when the so-called marginal or high-cost producers are eliminated. * * *

"Such reasoning cannot be supported by the Select Committee on Small Business for it is the sound conviction of this committee that not merely the present but the future welfare of our great Nation must be carefully considered and unless we are determined to become a have-not Nation mineralwise, in fact as well as in theory, we must adopt policies both national and international in scope which will encourage the exploration, development, and production of minerals within our borders lest we become totally dependent in the future on foreign sources for our supplies of minerals."

The provisions of the DPA today being considered in the Senate will add a new provision to the declaration of policy under which we acted in 1951, in that it recognizes that the present international situation "also requires the development of preparedness programs and the expansion of productive capacity and supply beyond the level needed to meet the civilian demand, in order to reduce the time required for full mobilization in the event of an attack on the United States."

We just cannot accomplish any expansion program without governmental assistance in one form or another to so-called marginal producers. This is particularly true as to the zinc industry for it is a recognized fact that in the lead and zinc industry, we are dependent on both large and small producers (and Congress has established important responsibilities of the Government as to small business) for regular commercial and mobilization needs in these metals.

Now it is, of course, true and a matter of record that the price of zinc fell off in 1952 and 1953. This fact, however, did not tend to have and does not now have any bearing whatsoever upon the necessity for governmental inducements to encourage zinc production. On the contrary, it increases such necessity. When the commercial market price of supply zinc falls below the point of profitable return to the marginal producer—if the Government is dedicated to a policy of expanded productive capacity—the marginal producer may need, and I feel he is entitled to, governmental assistance in financing, floor price purchase agreements, etc.

AMERICAN ZINC AGREEMENTS WITH DMPA CONTRACTORS

The committee counsel's letter indicates that the committee is interested in securing information as to any agreement entered into between DMPA and companies having separate agreements with the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co., the American Zinc Co. of Illinois, or any other company in which Mr. Young was financially interested. Three specific Government contractors in this category were mentioned. They are Mid-Continent Mining Corp., the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., and W. M. & W. Mining Co., Inc.

First, let me state that I personally have absolutely no financial interest of any kind in any of these three companies.

Secondly, because I have not been provided with full information as to which of my actions have been questioned, I have had to speculate as to the phases of my conduct in connection with the DMPA contracts of these companies which has been brought into question. I, of course, recall the DMPA contracts and the circumstances attendant upon them very clearly.

These three contracts have the following elements in common:

1. All three contractors are marginal or high-cost producers.

2. All three contractors provided possibility of potential additional zinc production capacity.

3. All three contractors needed Government assistance in order to achieve or continue zinc production.

4. All three contractors had rights to all deposits but no smelting capacity for refining the metals, and

5. All three contractors effected zinc concentrate purchase contracts with American Zinc—in the one case (W. M. & W.) I made the contract for American Zinc but prior to my Government appointment and in the other two cases the contracts were made by our Vice President, Richard A. Young.

Since the zinc concentrate purchase agreements of these DMPA contractors with American Zinc or affiliated companies appear to provide a focal point of this committee's interest, I will deal with this subject in some detail.

ZINC CONCENTRATE PURCHASE CONTRACTS

The processes by which zinc in its natural state of deposit in the earth is reduced to usable metal involves for present purposes three major processing steps. These are:

1. Extraction of the ore from its natural deposit through mining.

2. Concentrating the metal content of the ore (which is of low, e. g., 2 percent to 5 percent) into so-called concentrates in which the proportion of metal in the material is increased to 48 percent to 60 percent zinc with 30 percent sulfur.

3. The concentrates must first be roasted to eliminate the sulfur and on account of the then sulfur shortage, it was highly desirable to treat all concentrates to get the sulfur for defense purposes. Then the roasted concentrate is converted to slab zinc metal by either a fire or electrolytic process. This produces a finished product which assays 98 percent to 99.99 percent zinc.

Whereas there are a relatively large number of producers of lead and zinc ores in the United States (approximately 900 in 1951, 800 in 1952, and 725 in 1953), the number of smelters for these minerals is decidedly limited. I submit for the committee record a list of primary zinc distillers, indicating those which are capable of producing the high grade, or electrolytic zinc which was required by Government stockpile purchase specifications.

It is immediately apparent from this tabulation that primary zinc smelting capacity for processing zinc concentrates is very limited as to number of smelters. But this becomes more critical as to those smelters capable of refining zinc concentrates to the degree of quality required in Government specifications—the electrolytic smelters—and this tabulation shows also the widespread locations of these available smelters.

It will also be observed that American Zinc operates and has operated since 1943 1 of the 5 smelters which are capable through electrolytic processes to refine zinc concentrates to Government specifications for munitions. The St. Joseph electrothermic plant and the two vertical-retort plants of New Jersey Zinc could also have produced the same grade of metal.

Since 1905, American Zinc has been one of the large buyers of zinc concentrates in the so-called Tri-State District, which consists of adjacent portions of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. There is attached hereto a statement of Tri-State District zinc concentrate production showing percentage produced and purchased by American Zinc Co. It will be observed that for these 17 years, our purchases and company production from our own mines of the total zinc concentrates produced in the Tri-State District ranged from 17 to 44 percent and averaged over this long period 21.81 percent.

PERCENTAGE OF SMELTING BUSINESS FROM DMPA CONTRACTORS

The committee counsel has requested information as to the percentage of smelting (or other business) which the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. or subsidiaries received in the ordinary course of business as distinguished from the percentage received from companies which entered into contracts with DMPA from 1951 to 1953.

There is attached hereto a tabulation entitled "statement showing total tonnage of concentrates treated by American Zinc and subsidiaries and percent supplied from DMPA contracts whether of American Zinc Co. or purchased from DMPA contractors," which provides this information.

It will be observed that American Zinc and subsidiary companies received only the following percentages of zinc concentrates from DMPA contractors:

	DMPA contractors including American zinc (percent)	DMPA contractors excluding American zinc (percent)
1952	2.33	0.77
1953	4.61	.77
1954	3.47	
Total	1.75	.36

Thus, when the DMPA contracts of American Zinc itself are excluded, the percentage of smelting business received by American Zinc during this 3-year period was only thiry-six one hundredths of 1 percent of our total smelting business.

NO BENEFIT FROM ZINC CONCENTRATE PURCHASE CONTRACTS

The core of the charge made against me insofar as zinc concentrate purcase contracts of our companies are concerned, appears to be that by utilizing the position of Deputy Administrator of DMPA I benefited my company through its acquisition of zinc concentrate purchase agreements from DMPA contractors.

I earnestly and sincerely deny that such was the case nor that such was my purpose or intention in any respect while in Government service. And I earnestly submit that the record does not support such a conclusion for reasons which include the following:

1. As pointed out above, upon entering the Government service I made a full and complete disclosure of all companies from which I received compensation, all companies of which I was an officer or director and all organizations of which I was an officer or a director. The three contractors involved were not included in the lists involved in that disclosure, for I have, of course, no financial interest in them. And specifically I arranged for other executives than myself to handle all American Zinc concentrate purhases.

2. DMPA records should reveal that at no time was there a failure to disclose that the concentrates of the DMPA contractors would be processed by American Zinc. On the contrary, there was a full formal and official disclosure of this fact at all times.

3. No financial advantage accrued to American Zinc by reason of its processing of zinc concentrates of these three companies. This is so because under the historical practice of the smelting industry a custom smelter, such as American Zinc, realizes only "toll" (or processing) charges and the value of by-products recovered from processing concentrates. Any price advantage available as to slab zinc when smelted is passed back to the producer by the terms of the concentrate purchase contract. This was true as to contracts here involved, including any price advantage to the producer resulting from a Government guaranteed price to him.

4. Actually, in agreeing to accept the concentrates of these producers and to supply the metal to the Government under the given contract conditions, American Zinc would be forced to curtail its regular commercial business. This is so beause its smelters were operating at capacity and to divert capacity to the processing of concentrates of the DMPA contractors would require rejection of the concentrates of our regular commercial customers.

5. During the period involved, American Zinc smelters were operating at capacity without DMPA contractor concentrates. We did not need DMPA contractors as a source of supply or "feed" of concentrates.

6. The total zinc concentrates which would have been yielded by these 3 contracts, if fully performed, range from a low of 3,000 tons for 1952 to 7,700 tons for 1954. American Zinc smelters processed from a low of 333,000 tons to a high of 343,500 tons. The concentrates yielded by these three contracts would have, therefore, ranged from a low of .78 percent to a high of 2.72 percent of our production.

In other words, whereas American Zinc was treating approximately 27,500 tons per month, these contracts would have added but a maximum average of 650 tons per month.

Not only do the American Zinc concentrate purchases from DMPA contractors yield no benefit—but rather a disadvantage—to American Zinc. But if zinc concentrates produced by DMPA contractors were excluded from American Zinc smelters, such action would be to the financial disadvantage of the United States. This is so because:

The only other smelters capable of producing high quality zinc are located in Texas, northern Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Idaho, and Montana. Shipping tri-state (where the contractors' mines were) concentrates to these locations would not only involve increased Government costs for freight but would also result in higher per pound or per ton of prices of the finished metal. And when refined, the finished metal would have to be again shipped substantial distances to the delivery point.

To have required these small marginal producers to ship their concentrates to any other smelter would have been further penalizing them and would have required even greater Government assistance to them.

The act under which we operated required us to encourage small business concerns to make the greatest possible contribution to the objectives of the act. Furthermore, the Administrator has informed me that at the time of our work together he was not only aware of these arrangements for shipping concentrates to the nearest smelter with appropriate refining facilities, but that he insisted that such a procedure be followed. He further recalls to me that in the case of the Mid-Continent contract he personally suggested such an arrangement.

AMERICAN ZINC LOANS TO ZINC PRODUCERS

As is quite customary in the mining and smelting industry, American Zinc for years has followed the practice of making funds available to producers of satisfactory potential which take the form of a loan or advance against and repayable out of future production.

In making advance loans of this nature, the smelter operator realizes that its repayment is entirely dependent upon the ability of the producer to show an operating profit. The producer's ability to show a profit in turn is most importantly influenced by the market price for which the resulting zinc metal can be sold. When the market is high, the producer will show a profit and will be able to repay on his loan. When the market is low, he will make little or no profit and will be unable to make loan payments.

This then is the practical industrial framework in which advances are made to producers by smelters. This is also the identical framework in which American Zinc made advance loan commitments to 2 of the 3 DMPA contractors in which the committee is primarily interested. This has been a custom of the trade since the first custom smelter was operated.

In the case of Mid-Continent, my son Richard A. Young as vice president of the American Zinc Company of Illinois on the date of July 21, 1952 agreed to advance $75,000 to be used for capital investment or working capital after Mid-Continent had fully expended for capital investment the $325,000 received from the Government. Mr. Larson, who had assumed primary responsibility for the negotiations of this contract, added his approval of this arrangement early in the negotiations leading to the contract which he signed. This is formally reflected and confirmed by amendment No. 1 to this contract which he also signed. American Zinc did not make this advance to Mid-Continent.

In the case of W. M. & W., I personally arranged for advances totaling $70,000. My negotiations as to these advances began on December 12, 1950 long before my Government service and were completed prior to this company's application to DMPA for Government assistance. $34,000 of this amount is still unpaid and doubtless will remain unpaid until this company can operate at a profit.

ALLEGED SALE OF EQUIPMENT BY AMERICAN ZINC TO MID-CONTINENT

The committee counsel has requested information respecting equipment apparently alleged to have been sold to Mid-Continent Mining Corp. by American Zinc or one of its subsidiary corporations. I am advised that our company has no record of any such transaction. Under date of July 12, 1955 my assistant treasurer advised:

"As requested I checked through the St. Louis office cash books and through the Joplin office remittance reports and find that we did not receive any money for equipment sold during the period March 1952 through December 1953 from any of the following companies: W. M. & W. Mining Co., MacArthur Mining Co., Mid-Continent Mining Co.

The Joplin office did receive $900 on April 28, 1952, from the W. M. & W. Mining Co. covering a 200-horsepower motor which Harold Michel tells me was sold to them by the Nellie B. Mining Co. in 1951.

PARTIAL LIST OF ERRONEOUS OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Since the detailed evidence upon which the Comptroller General's charges are based became available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only 2 days ago when I was in attendance at a stockholder's meeting at Portland, Maine, the committee will, of course, recognize that I have not had adequate time to study the voluminous data and records of 3 or 4 years ago. My initial review of this material, however, has satisfied me that it contains numerous erroneous statements of fact or statements providing misleading and unfavorable implications as to me. Not all of these are reflected in the body of this statement. There is submitted herewith for the committee's record a partial list of such statements. I have every reason to believe that upon more thorough examination and study, this list can be enlarged. I request full opportunity to do so and again request that in order that I might do so, copies of the Comptroller General's reports be made available to me.

Since the nature of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material indicates that Government investigators may have spent at least a year and considerable Government funds to effect its extensively documented compilation, I also request that we be accorded at least 45 days, and preferably 60 days within which to prepare and file our detailed refutation. I am also prepared to secure and offer to the committee the certification of our certified public accountants, Price, Waterhouse & Co., as to any facts or figures desired from our company books and records covering the years here in question.

CONCLUSION

I earnestly beseech the committee to consider its future course and particularly its conclusions on this matter with unusual care and caution. It appears fashionable these days to attack businessmen in Government. This concerns me not so much for myself—for my days of private and public service are nearing their end—but it does seriously concern me from the point of view of the welfare of our Government, our country, and the people. For I am definitely satisfied that the Government needs experienced and competent men from industry and business. They should not be encouraged to believe, as Mr. Larson forecasted in my case, that coming to Washington necessarily involves a risk of personal attack on their honesty, integrity, and their very personal welfare.

I am also 100 percent satisfied if these charges against me can, by even the widest application of reason, be considered to be supportable in the sense that I have ever, at any time, knowingly performed an illegal or unethical act, that no businessman in Government will be able to hereafter consider himself immune from this type of personal persecution. Again I wish to express my sincere appreciation for permitting me to appear before your committee.

I now welcome submitting to the committee's questioning.

ATTACHMENT A

The Honorable JESS LARSON,
Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARSON: You have asked me to become your deputy administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Administration, and I have consented to serve. Before assuming the duties of that office, I would like to state that as I will serve the Government without compensation, I shall expect to continue to receive compensation from the private employers listed below, and that as a Government official, I will take no part in the consideration of or action on any application filed under the Defense Production Act by any company with which I am connected.

I am now president, a director, and a member of the executive committee of the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co., and each of its wholly owned subsidiaries and affiliate companies, which are as follows: American Zinc Company of Tennessee, American Limestone Co., American Zinc Oxide Co., American Zinc Sales Co., American Zinc Company of Illinois, American Zinc Company of Arkansas, American Zinc Company of Oklahoma, Watauga Stone Co., Wisconsin Zinc Co., Aravaipa Leasing Co.

The address of the foregoing companies is 1600 Paul Brown Building, St. Louis, Mo.

I am a director and a small stockholder in the following companies: Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., General American Life Insurance Co., Mercantile Trust Co., Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Scullin Steel Co., Minerals Beneficiation, Inc.

My compensation from the foregoing listed companies consists only of directors' fees.

I shall expect the present compensation from the above to continue during my Government service.

A list of the companies in which I have a stock ownership is attached.

Also attached is a list of the organizations in which I am an officer or director and serve without compensation.

As you know, some of the companies with which I am connected have filed applications with the Government under the Defense Production Act. Some of these applications require approval by DPMA. I had hoped all of these applications would be acted on prior to my becoming your deputy, but this now appears improbable. Accordingly, I would like to make it clear that I will make no recommendation about nor participate in the consideration or negotiation of any such application filed by any person or organization as mentioned above.

I hope that I may be of material assistance to you and the Government in carrying out the defense program.

Very truly yours,

——— ———,
President.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1951.

ATTACHMENT B

Mr. HOWARD I. YOUNG,
President, American Zinc Lead & Smelting Co., St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: I am in receipt of your letter of September 10, 1951 wherein you set forth the conditions under which you will serve as my deputy in the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. You also set forth the companies with whom you are now associated in executive, directorship and stockholder capacities.

As I have told you in urging you to come into the Government and assist me in administering this new agency, misguided people will read into our actions selfish and ulterior motives in spite of everything we can do. This is unfortunate and is the reason it is difficult to get men of your experience to make such a sacrifice.

I have talked with you at great length and I find you in complete sympathy with my own objectives and the objectives of this administration in solving this problem of making available raw materials to fulfill our needs for national defense and maintenance of our own free economy. I have found your views and your actions completely unselfish and altogether courageous in keeping this goal constantly before you. I will not embarrass you by asking you to participate or make any decision in connection with any negotiations that have to do with the companies in which you are interested.

Your record during World War II of unselfish and patriotic devotion, speaks for itself. I need you, but more important than that, your country needs you and I feel that both are fortunate in your having accepted my urgent request that you join me in this operation.

Sincerely,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

ATTACHMENT C

DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1951.

Mr. BERNARD R. KENNEDY,
Director, Division of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: In accordance with the requirements of section 302 of Executive Order 10182,issued November 21, 1950, this will constitute notification of the appointment, effective August 13, 1951, of Mr. Howard I. Young as Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, to serve without compensation, pursuant to section 101 (a) of Executive Order 10182.

Mr. Young in private life is employed as the president, director, and a member of the executive committee of the American Zinc, Lead, and Smelting Co. and each of its wholly owned subsidiaries and affiliate companies, which are as follows: American Zinc Company of Tennessee, American Limestone Co., American Zinc Oxide Co., American Zinc Sales Co., American Zinc Company of Illinois, American Zinc Company of Arkansas, American Zinc Company of Oklahoma, Wautauga Stone Co., Wisconsin Zinc Co., Aravapia Leasing Co.

He is also a director in the following companies: Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., General American Life Insurance Co., Mercantile Trust Co., Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Scullin Steel Co., Minerals Beneficiation, Inc.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

ATTACHMENT D

PRIMARY ZINC DISTILLERS

HORIZONTAL-RETORT PLANTS

Arkansas: Fort Smith—Athletic Mining & Smelting Co.[1]

Illinois:

Fairmont City—American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

La Salle—Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co.

Oklahoma:

Bartlesville—National Zinc Co., Inc.

Blackwell—Blackwell Zinc Co.

Henryetta—Eagle-Picher Mining & Smelting Co.

Pennsylvania: Donora—American Steel & Wire Co.

Texas:

Amarillo—American Smelting & Refining Co.

Dumas—American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

VERTICAL-RETORT PLANTS

Illinois: Depue—The New Jersey Zinc Co.

Pennsylvania:

Josephtown—St. Joseph Lead Co.[2]

Palmerton—The New Jersey Zinc Co. of Pennsylvania.

West Virginia: Meadowbrook—E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.[3]

ELECTROLYTIC PLANTS

Idaho: Kellogg—Sullivan Mining Co.

Illinois: Monsanto—American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

Montana:

Anaconda—Anaconda Copper Mining Co.

Great Falls—Anaconda Copper Mining Co.

Texas: Corpus Christi—American Smelting & Refining Co.

Source: Minerals Yearbook 1950, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, page 1289.

---

[1] Operated since 1935 under contract for the American Zinc Co. of Illinois.

[2] Electrothermic plant.

[3] Now M. & H. Zinc Co., La Salle, Ill.

ATTACHMENT E

Statement of Tri-State district zinc concentrate production showing percentage produced and purchased by American Zinc Co.

	Total tons produced	Purchased and produced by American Zinc Co.	Percent purchased and produced by American Zinc Co.
1938	384, 426	68, 376	17. 79
1939	396, 633	70, 991	17. 90
1940	431, 238	70, 710	16. 40
1941	486, 042	79, 000	16. 25
1942	443, 858	85, 497	19. 26
1943	376, 751	87, 143	23. 13
1944	353, 385	89, 184	25. 24
1945	258, 010	59, 495	23. 06
1946	258, 153	50, 798	19. 68
1947	203, 898	34, 897	71. 11
1948	158, 432	37, 552	23. 70

ATTACHMENT E

Statement of Tri-State district zinc concentrate production showing percentage produced and purchased by American Zinc Co.—Continued

	Total tons produced	Purchased and produced by American Zinc Co.	Percent purchased and produced by American Zinc Co.
1949	146, 711	44, 113	30. 07
1950	148, 631	56, 183	37. 80
1951	167, 045	45, 064	26. 98
1952	169, 900	42, 537	25. 04
1953	99, 323	43, 651	43. 95
1954	110, 450	36, 494	33. 04
Total	4, 592, 886	1, 001, 685	21. 81

ATTACHMENT F

Statement showing total tonnage of concentrates treated by American zinc and subsidiaries and percent supplied from DMPA contracts whether of American Zinc Co. or purchased from DMPA contractors

	1951	1952	1953	1954	Total
Total tons treated	343, 479	332, 949	332, 959	262, 934	1, 272, 373
Total DMPA tons treated	----------	7, 770	15, 354	9, 146	32, 270
DMPA tons treated percent	----------	2. 33	4. 61	3. 47	2. 54
Total DMPA tons treated, excluding AZ DMPA tons	----------	2, 563	1, 261	60	3, 389
DMPA tons treated, excluding AZ DMPA tons percent	----------	0. 77	0. 77	----------	0. 36
Total tons if 3 DMPA contracts performed	----------	432	6, 500	7, 500	14, 432
3-contract tonnage percent	----------	0. 01	1. 95	2. 85	1. 13

ATTACHMENT G

PARTIAL LIST OF ERRONEOUS OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR JULY 11, 1955, PP. 10183 TO 10192

I. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10186:

"In August 1952, when the zinc market was 14 cents a pound, the General Services Administration purchased from the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., 1,167 tons at 15½ cents a pound, or 1½ cents above the market price. This was at a time when Mr. Young held his official position as Deputy Administrator to Mr. Larson. At the same time other purchases were made from domestic surplus and foreign producers."

The facts are:

A. American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. sold no zinc to the General Services Administration during August 1952.

B. When any sale is made of special high grade zinc the price is 1½ cents over the quoted market price of prime western metal.

C. Mr. Young was Deputy Administrator for DMPA and had no authority from or responsibility to GSA.

II. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10190:

"The contract provided for a concentrating mill of the capacity of approximately 400 tons per day, but Mr. Clough purchased equipment from Mr. Young's company for a mill of 1,200 tons capacity at an additional cost of approximately $60,000."

The facts are:

A. Neither Mr. Clough nor his company purchased any equipment from American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. or subsidiaries.

B. Mid-Continent's concentrating equipment provides for a capacity of 400 tons of "feed" a day. The mine and crushing department provided for a capacity of 1,200 tons per day. The plan was to eliminate barren rock between the crushing department and the concentrating plant thereby materially reducing milling costs.

III. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10186:

"Of the total domestic zinc tonnage to be generated under expansion contracts, American Zinc alone was to smelt 47 percent of the concentrates. That company controls approximately 10 percent of the domestic zinc-smelting capacity."

The fact is:

The figures on which the percentages are based are not shown. But the 47 percent at best is misleading and misrepresentative because the DMPA tonnage on which it is based is so very small. It approximates 123,000 tons of concentrates over 3 years and of this tonnage, production from American Zinc prime contracts (effected before Mr. Young came to Washington) was 47,400 tons.

IV. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10190:

"The contract between DMPA and Mid-Continent was amended October 2, 1952, to provide for a Government advance of $325,000. No explanation has been found to justify a Government advance under the Defense Production Act of 1950 where Government-guaranteed private financing was available."

The fact is:

As the formal release of the First National Bank of St. Paul dated October 1, 1952, states, the issuance of a 100 percent guaranty of the loan agreement, which was a condition precedent to its taking effect, had been refused by the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2391) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was agreed to, the title of the bill will be appropriately amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 350. An act for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig; and

S. 824. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 34. An act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

S. 614. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross; and

S. 1177. An act for the relief of desert-land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 741. An act to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years; and

S. 1855. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

H. R. 1044. An act for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos; and

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following concurrent resolutions of the House:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence of certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 482. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 727. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school;

H. R. 1599. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

H. R. 2149. An act to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2559. An act to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers;

H. R. 2889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah;

H. R. 3235. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4672. An act to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 4280. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College, of South Carolina, so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 4729. An act to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 6066. An act authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California;

H. R. 6243. An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6417. An act to revive and reenact the act authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., approved May 17, 1939;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6590. An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6621. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the Vice President-elect and to authorize Secret Service protection for the Vice President-elect;

H. R. 6727. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.;

H. R. 6991. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics";

H. R. 7028. An act to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps;

H. R. 7034. An act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7035. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720);

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel;

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution reaffirming the rights of the people of the world to freedom of religion.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 482. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah;

H. R. 7034. An act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7035. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720); and

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy;

H. R. 2149. An act to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2559. An act to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4672. An act to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 7028. An act to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps; and

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 727. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school;

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1599. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla., and Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 3235. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 4729. An act to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer;

H. R. 6066. An act authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California; and

H. R. 6417. An act to revive and reenact the act authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4230. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College, of South Carolina, so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 6727. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.;

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; and

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; and

H. R. 6590. An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6243. An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6621. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the Vice President-elect and to authorize Secret Service protection for the Vice President-elect; and

H. R. 6991. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution reaffirming the rights of the people of the world to freedom of religion; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CITATION OF EUGENE C. JAMES FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 879, Senate Resolution 135, citing Eugene C. James for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Eugene C. James to answer a series of questions and to produce documents and records before the said committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Eugene C. James may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER ACTION BY SENATE ON S. 1352 AND S. 1584

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar yesterday two bills reported from the Judiciary Committee, namely, Calendar No. 865, for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr., and Calendar No. 866, for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner, were objected to when they were called. Each of these bills undertakes to authorize a payment to certain claimants by virtue of injuries alleged to have been suffered from voluntary donations of blood to the Red Cross. I understand that today the two bills were brought before the Senate again and were passed. I desire at this time to enter a motion to reconsider the votes by which those bills were passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

PROPOSED DEACTIVATION OF THE 96TH INFANTRY DIVISION (RESERVE)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a resolution just received from almost 500 officers and men of the 96th Infantry Division—Reserve. The resolution calls for retaining the 96th as one of the most effective units of its type in the Nation.

As many of my colleagues well know, the 96th is made up of men from Utah, Montana, Idaho, and Arizona. Since 1948 the division has compiled an outstanding record for enlistments and recruiting of new personnel as well as vigorous reactivation of former reservists and other veterans. To those of us who have watched with pride and interest the toughening-up of the 96th, the unit represents our finest example of what a civilian component can do against the odds of indifference and an overall lack of funds and equipment.

To date, Mr. President, we have only semiofficial evidence that the Army plans to deactivate the 96th. I am certain that the Army is aware of the esprit de corps in the 96th and would agree with me and my colleagues from the States concerned that all possible steps should be taken to preserve the identity and mission of the 96th Infantry Division.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY 96TH INFANTRY DIVISION ASSOCIATION

> Whereas the 96th Infantry Division comprises residents and citizens of the Rocky Mountain States; and
>
> Whereas the 96th Infantry Division has repeatedly been the strongest of the 25 Reserve divisions in the United States; and
>
> Whereas thousands of officers and men of the Mountain States have contributed their time and talents to organizing and training a Reserve division representing their community of States; and
>
> Whereas the Rocky Mountain States provide a natural defense line for the American continent which is relatively free from atomic attack, and for which there should be provided a Reserve division composed of and commanded by citizens of the Mountain States; and
>
> Whereas in the imminent reorganization of the Reserve divisions of the United States Army there is danger that the Mountain States may be ignored and set aside in the allowance of a fully constituted Reserve division for this important community of States: Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and the great and essential needs for the defense of our Nation and community, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That we, the undersigned citizens of the Mountain States of Montana, Utah, Idaho, and Arizona, do urgently request that the 96th Infantry Division, as now constituted be retained as one of the principal Reserve divisions of the United States Army and that no emasculation of the important defenses of the Nation at the western bastion of the Mountain States be permitted or tolerated.
>
> In witness whereof, we the undersigned have below set our names in expression of our urgent purpose and desire.
>
> (Signed by about 500 reservists.)

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on my desk in my office there is a resolution signed by hundreds and hundreds of the active members of the 96th Infantry Division along the lines of the resolution just presented by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that Arizona's portion of the 96th Reserve Division received a rating of superior, which is higher than that which any regular Army unit received in the West.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the value of the men from Arizona. It brings them into the same group as the men from Idaho, Montana, and Utah.

I am sure my colleagues join with me in the hope that the expressions on the floor of the Senate have alerted our friends in the Department of Defense to the grave mistake which would be made if this unit were deactivated. We hope that the unit will be allowed to continue in the new Reserve program.

SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Senate should consider at this session the very worthy and humanitarian changes enacted by the House in the field of social-security legislation. These advances are sufficiently important to many millions of Americans to justify prolonging the present session, if necessary, in order to avoid putting off their consideration until next year. As the sponsor of the first Senate bill this session to lower the social-security qualifying age for women, I think the House has made a long forward step in this type of legislation, although it did not go quite as far as I would like. I suggested reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 60—the House has begun by lowering it from 65 to 62.

But I wish to compliment the Honorable JERE COOPER and other House committee members who sponsored the social-security changes dealing with women's retirement age, with disability benefits and other needed legislation. I urge the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to consider the advisability of beginning public hearings on the House bill as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I now desire to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor, and may proceed.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the April 22 issue of that influential magazine, Commonweal, appeared an article entitled, "Trade, Aid, and the Farmer," by Martin E. Schirber and Emerson Hynes, of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. This article was very critical of the domestic parity plan. In the few paragraphs of the article devoted to that particular subject, the authors said:

> A two-price plan is a seductively simple way out of our difficulties. Under such a plan as it appears in the House draft of the 1955 Agricultural Act, the Secretary of Agriculture would, before planting time, determine the quantity of wheat which will be consumed as food in the United States during the coming marketing year. For the past 10 years domestic consumption has been highly stable and has averaged about 500 million bushels a year, or roughly half the annual output. This domestic food quota would be apportioned among the States, counties, and farms in accordance with their production in the preceding 5 years.
>
> The Secretary would issue marketing certificates aggregating the total domestic food quota, e. g., 500 million bushels. He would then determine the value of the certificates as equal to the difference between 100 percent of parity and the estimated actual farm price per bushel. Each farmer would harvest his crop and sell his marketing certificates to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to a wheat processor, or to some intermediary. The proceeds therefrom when added to the market price for the wheat sold for food would result in full parity price on his share of the domestic food quota.
>
> Flour millers and other processors would be obliged to purchase enough certificates to equal the volume of wheat processed for food for domestic consumption. The resulting increase in their costs of production would presumably be passed on in whole or in part to the consumer in the form of higher prices. Wheat produced in excess of the domestic food quota would not entitle the grower to wheat certificates but could be sold for feed or export at the going world price.
>
> Space does not permit an extended discussion of the pros and cons of the two-price system. It is essentially a form of dumping, which is defined as selling abroad at prices below the domestic price. Secondly, if the blended price received by the farmer is anywhere near present levels, it will result in a continuation of the present high levels of production (unless acreage controls even more drastic than those now in effect are forced upon farmers), and a large proportion of that supply will seek foreign outlets. Here it will run up against the traditionally inelastic supply of other exporting countries. The increased exports will therefore tend to force down world prices, and will be met by antidumping measures on the part of importing countries, and by various countermeasures on the part of importing countries, and by various countermeasures, ranging from multiple exchange rates to outright price war on the part of exporting countries in whose balance of trade wheat is an important item.

Mr. Joe Spiruta, wheat market analyst for the Oregon Wheat Commission, has prepared what I believe is a very reasoned, complete and sound answer to the criticisms leveled against the domestic parity plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Spiruta's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,
Pendleton, Oreg., July 11, 1955.

Prof. MARTIN E. SCHIRBER,
Chairman, Department of Economics,
St. John's University,
Collegeville, Minn.

DEAR PROFESSOR SCHIRBER: Careful study of your treatise entitled, "Trade, Aid and the Farmer," appearing in the April 22 issue of Commonwealth brought forth numerous incongruous observations on your part. The members of this organization, representing Oregon wheat producers, are concerned about the misunderstanding and misinterpretations in your article and feel the necessity of bringing them to your attention and the attention of others who have been, and are, using your article as a basis for continuing dissertations on the subject.

We do agree that America has the most productive agriculture of all nations—a land blessed with abundance. Our people are the best fed and best clothed. American farmers have stocked the Nation's storehouses overabundantly as security in a troubled world. And we have food and fiber to share with people of other countries, on the basis of mutually beneficial world trade. With this you cannot argue.

Yet, many of our farmers, in the midst of this abundance, are suffering severe hardships. They have accepted sharp reductions in income through voluntary restrictions on their crops in an effort to bring production into line with demand. These hardships are being aggravated by unwise and unfair attacks by scholars, economists, and others who apparently are either uninformed or prefer to close their eyes to many aspects of the total picture.

Let's face the facts: The average of farm prices is down 22 percent since Februry 1951; farm operating costs remain near record high; net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below 1947 and 10 percent below 1953; farm debt is increasing; farmers' purchasing power, in terms of 1935–39 dollars, is the lowest since 1940.

Since wheat was particularly singled out in your systematic exposition, Trade, Aid, and the Farmer, let us critically examine several statements made in your narration, and especially those referring to the two-price plan, or more correctly labeled the domestic parity plan.

Your discourse on page 73 referring to the two-price system as "essentially a form of dumping," leads us to believe that there is lack of understanding of the full significance of this plan. As far as the export market is concerned, no one supporting this plan would favor a dumping program. We all desire to maintain a world market for our wheat. No one interested in solving the wheat problem would want to see the international wheat market demoralized. Any threat of dumping would be avoided, as presently, by the wise use of export quotas.

It should be pointed out that while the United States is curtailing wheat production, other countries are increasing their wheat plantings. Also, our share of the world market has decreased faster than the market itself. While the United States is selling less in the world market, competitive exporters are selling more.

In order to sell wheat at any time, any place, the price must be competitive. Experience has shown that fractions of a cent per bushel may often determine a sale. It is anticipated that under a domestic parity type of program, there would be more aggressive merchandising than at present when our competitive position depends entirely upon the amount of subsidy our Government is willing to pay. This subsidy is publicly announced from time to time which, naturally, provides opportunity for other exporting countries to come into the market under our price umbrella.

It seems ironical that on page 72 you decry the wheat export subsidy paid under the International Wheat Agreement and almost in the same breath decry the domestic-parity plan which is designed to eliminate necessity of export subsidies.

Current estimated exports for wheat are at the lowest levels they have been since World War II. It is certainly time to become realistic and come to grips with the issue. The domestic-parity plan provides a system whereby American wheat farmers would receive for their product moving into the domestic food channels, prices which bear a fair relation to the things they must buy; and at the same time permit them to produce for the export market at competitive prices.

It is indeed perplexing to find economists vigorously supporting the Agricultural Act of 1954 without realizing the inadequacies of the act as related to certain commodities. It is our conviction that flexible supports, which in reality mean progressively lower supports for wheat, are effecting a drifting back toward the economic unbalance that pauperized American agriculture in the years preceding the last great depression.

The philosophy behind the flexible program is fraught with jeopardy to the whole economy. Theory of the legislation is based on the assumption that lower price-support levels would encourage consumption and discourage production. While this may be true for some commodities, supply and demand for wheat foods are inelastic and show little response to price. Even though wheat supports are flexed downward more than other basic commodities, it is doubtful if the program will increase domestic consumption or decrease production.

Statistics show that as wheat prices declined drastically in the early thirties, the acres planted to wheat did not decline. Also, that production control programs have had more to do with acreage planted than has price. The principle of flexibility in a price-support program may be sound as related to areas where producers have an opportunity to diversify. In those areas, farmers might be influenced through lower price supports to switch from surplus commodities to those in greater demand.

However, a great part of the Nation's wheat production which is on a commercial basis is in areas where there is not a great deal of diversification possible. The flexible support program will flex downward the price on all wheat produced, not just the surplus portion, even though the major part of the Nation's wheat production is used domestically and is entitled to a price comparable to the domestic prices of the things purchased for producing that wheat.

You state that our agricultural commodities are being supported at levels entirely unrelated to cost of production and the realities of world markets. In the case of wheat, our studies have shown production costs vary tremendously. Certainly, individual cases can be pointed to which show cost of production far below average. These individual cases should not be used as a basis for lowering price supports to a level where many producers cannot survive.

It is unfair to suggest that all of the wheat produced in the United States with high-cost machinery, tractor fuel, and labor should go at world prices when less than 20 percent of the crop has traditionally been sold to foreign consumers with their lower income. We realize it will take some time to make the necessary adjustments but they will occur much faster with the domestic parity plan. We need to recognize wheat quality, take marginal land out of wheat production, sell wheat for foreign currency, and work with other countries to expand the total world demand for wheat.

Sincerely yours,

JOE SPIRUTA,
Wheat Market Analyst.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that I believe it is a distinct service to the farmers in particular, and to the public in general, to make public the information and points of view expressed on this controversial subject. Only by having extensive discussion and consideration of this subject can we have confidence in the final actions which must be taken to provide the wheat farmers with an answer to the dilemma of being caught between the scylla of falling wheat prices and the charybdis of rising operating costs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BUREAU OF MINES LABORATORY IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Rowland R. Hughes. The letter relates to the consideration and approval of the establishment of a Bureau of Mines laboratory in Minnesota. As the letter reveals, at one time, back in 1950, this project was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was deleted later on, due to the change of administration. We are now asking for reconsideration because of the urgent necessity for further mineral exploration of what are believed to be very rich and profitable deposits of minerals in the northern and central portions of the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 13, 1955.

ROWLAND R. HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: I am writing this letter to urge the administration to give its most serious and careful consideration and approval to the establishment of a Bureau of Mines laboratory in Minnesota. The establishment of such a laboratory is in the national interest and is urgently needed for metallurgical and mining research. The decision of the Budget Bureau a few years ago to postpone this program is in my judgment an example of false economy.

There is no question as to the need for an intensive national program of research to improve the domestic mineral position of our Nation. Such a program requires adequate facilities. It is also clear that those facilities are grossly inadequate for serving an area of major significance in the North Central United States. The need for an intensive research program in our area is very apparent:

1. The Lake Superior region is the largest iron-ore producing area in the United States and provides over 80 percent of the ore required for domestic production. Although very large tonnages of potentially valuable low-grade iron ores occur throughout the Lake Superior district, little or no research has been done on the benefaction of these ores.

2. Manganese has been and is a major national commodity problem. Every ton of steel made requires about 13 pounds of manganese. Domestic production is only sufficient for 10 percent of our Nation's steel requirements, although an estimated reserve of nearly 500 million tons of low-grade manganese-bearing material occurs on the Cuyuna range of central Minnesota. The Bureau of Mines undertook a study of this tremendous reserve about 4 years ago and today has a fair idea of the great technological problems involved in its utilization as a source of manganese. A metallurgical process has been discovered by the small staff at the Bureau of Mines station at Minneapolis, but a great deal of research and experimental work is necessary before definite results and conclusions can be reached. The manganese shortage continues to plague United States production despite the fact that it is obviously necessary to release our steel industry from its dependence on foreign sources in a national emergency.

3. As you of course know, titanium is one of the new and more promising structural metals. It is lightweight, has a high melting point, and is highly corrosion-resistant. This metal is vital to the further development of new ship and aircraft design, yet little research has been done on its production since 1948, although large reserves of it do exist in Lake and Cook Counties of Minnesota.

4. In recent years private industry has devoted much time and money to the development of magnetic taconite as a substitute for scarce high-grade ores. However, the exploitation of the fine-grained, nonmagnetic taconite has been neglected, little or no experimental work is being done, and no commercial method of extraction has thus far been developed. The Bureau of Mines initiated a long term field investigation of these nonmagnetic taconites this year. Limited metallurgical research is just now barely getting underway and should be stepped up as mining activity field work progresses to a point where material can be furnished the metallurgical division.

The foregoing items are only a partial list of the tremendous mineral resources awaiting development in Minnesota and the adjacent States. The industrial and security interests of the Nation as a whole as well as the future welfare of the upper midwest depend on the proper development of these resources, especially of the lower grade and presently less valuable ores. The Government alone is able to sponsor the research that could prevent unnecessary waste and lead to a greater development of the many ores found in the upper midwest and particularly in the Cuyuna range in Minnesota. In future years, much of America's heavy industry will sorely need new sources from which to draw essential raw materials. This region is a veritable treasure chest of mineral resources which we can ill afford not to exploit to the limit.

It is my feeling that a laboratory to conduct such research most logically should be located in the Twin Cities area of Minnesota for the following reasons: (1) Minnesota does possess a very large share of the minerals under consideration; (2) any Government laboratory for this purpose should be located so as to be able to take best advantage of existing facilities such as those at the University of Minnesota Mines Experiment Station which are the best in the State; (3) if the laboratory is placed in an area concentrating on coal, its facilities may be largely occupied with coal research to the exclusion of necessary iron, manganese, peat, titanium, and other minerals needing investigation. The coal research could be done in Minneapolis and there are other Bureau of Mines laboratories which are capable of doing this work. (4) The Bureau of Mines has acquired from the Veterans' Administration a 43-acre tract of land at Fort Snelling, Minn. The site already has a number of facilities useful for metallurgical research. An experimental building at this location, adequate to conduct necessary metallurgical and mining research, would cost in the neighborhood of $1.5 million and would require a staff of about 100 people. The Bureau of Mines probably could not finance from its regular budget either the building or the required personnel. Therefore, capital and operation requirements should be over and above present appropriations and provision should be made for an increase in the annual allotment for staffing.

I look forward to hearing from you, and I again urge favorable consideration by the Budget Bureau for this matter.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DONATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 614) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended by renumbering subsections (l), (m), and (n) of section 203 as subsections "(m)", "(n)", and "o)", respectively, and adding subsection (l) as follows:

"(l) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate to the American National Red Cross, for charitable purposes, such property, which was processed, produced, or donated by the American National Red Cross, as shall have been determined to be surplus property."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the clerk of the Committee on Government Operations spoke to me earlier today in reference to the bill, and asked me in behalf of the chairman, to handle it, so to speak, on the floor when it was called to the attention of the Senate.

I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House, since the amendment is merely technical, as a result of the passage of Public Law 61, which requires some renumbering of the sections and subsections in S. 614 as passed by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the Senator's explanation, I do not expect to object to the motion, but I may say that in conformity with the general understanding across the aisle between the acting majority leader and the minority leader, I think it would be helpful if such matters could be brought to our attention a little in advance of their being called up. Then a check could be made with the minority members.

Am I to understand that no change at all is made in the bill except technical amendments made necessary by a renumbering of the sections?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. First, I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I was unaware that clearance with the minority had not been obtained. I agree that that is the normal procedure and should be followed meticulously.

In reply to the Senator's query, the memorandum I have received from the staff director of the Committee on Government Operations reads as follows:

> All the House amendment does is to change the subsection designations in section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to conform with the amendments previously adopted by Congress.

So it is strictly a technical provision, and does not affect the substance of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. Under those considerations, I have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the minority leader for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

DEFECTIVE GRAIN STORAGE BINS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an administrative problem in the Department of Agriculture. It involves what I would term to be, if not malfeasance, at least maladministration.

A little more than a year ago the Department of Agriculture contracted for the construction of a large number of grain bins for the purpose of storage. I have called to the attention of the Senate on several occasions the fact that approximately 8,960 of the bins were defective. At least, they have been termed defective by a report which was made available to the House Committee on Appropriations. The Department of Agriculture itself now confesses that the bins are defective.

It so happened that the time the bins were erected, the Department of Agriculture called upon the Department of the Navy for inspectional services, and the Department of the Navy assigned two or more inspectors to the task of ascertaining whether the grain bins met Federal specifications.

It appears from a cursory examination of the record that on several occasions the Department of Agriculture engineers noted that the bins were defective. Now I find, after having discussed the subject on several occasions, and having referred the question to the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, that the Navy again has sent out its inspectors to inspect the work of the inspectors.

Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, the two men whom the Navy recently sent to inspect the work of the original naval inspectors were the same two men who made the original inspection. So there has been a return trip. The original inspectors, having made an inspection report that has subsequently proved to be unworthy and not in line with what the facts prove to be, are now being reinspected. And by whom? By the same inspectors who did the original inspecting. I do not know whether this could be called administrative gobbledygook; but I certainly would say it is anything but administrative competence.

I bring the matter to the attention of the Senate again because I have personally brought it to the attention of the Committee on Government Operations, and the staff of the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has already made a preliminary study of the matter. It is my understanding that hearings will be held and an investigation will be made into this very difficult and serious problem of the misuse of Government funds, wherein a Department of the Government, relying on another department, has contracted for the erection of more than 8,900 grain bins, and those bins have been found to be defective, and much of the grain has been destroyed or polluted or adulterated.

The Navy has endeavored to cover up the situation. I wish to read from a feature article published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, written by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, who, by the way, is the same gentleman who brought the Wolf Ladejinsky case to light. Mr. Mollenhoff states as follows:

> A Navy investigation of "defective" grain bins purchased by the Government is being conducted by two of the men responsible for the inspections of materials used in the bins.
>
> Rear Adm. George C. Weaver, vice chief of the Office of Navy Material, confirmed that the Navy assigned the two inspectors to conduct an inquiry into their own work.
>
> He said these men were assigned to the job by the Office of Navy Personnel. They will report on the procedures followed on the original inspection of the grain bins and on the condition of the bins erected.
>
> Their reports will be used in presenting the Navy case in the dispute over the responsibility for "defective" grain bins erected last year.

I shall not read all of the article into the Record, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Navy Men Inspect Own Inspections

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D. C.—A Navy investigation of defective grain bins purchased by the Government is being conducted by two of the men responsible for the inspections of materials used in the bins.

Rear Adm. George C. Weaver, vice chief of the Office of Naval Material, confirmed that the Navy assigned the two inspectors to conduct an inquiry into their own work.

He said these men were assigned to the job by the Office of Naval Personnel. They will report on the procedures followed in the original inspection of the grain bins and on the condition of the bins erected.

Their reports will be used in presenting the Navy case in the dispute over the responsibility for defective grain bins erected last year.

Senator Hubert Humphrey (Democrat, Minnesota) declared the information that has come to him from persons familiar with the defective grain bins indicates there is "gross negligence, incompetence, and perhaps malfeasance" involved on the part of some Government officials.

Humphrey said he will insist on a full-scale investigation of the purchase of defective grain bins, "and of the fact that the Navy is assigning men the duty of investigating themselves."

The Department of Agriculture claimed Thursday the Navy Department was responsible for delivery of thousands of defective grain bins last year.

Marvin McLain, head of the Grain Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service, said the defects in the grain bin bought by the Agriculture Department were due to the failure of inspection by Navy inspectors in the plant of Black, Sivalls & Bryson, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.

"We hired the Navy to make inspections of the material at the manufacturing plant," McLain said. "We were to get a competent inspection. The Agriculture Department paid the Navy for this inspection, and it is obvious now that we didn't get it."

The Agriculture Department purchased 8,960 of the grain bins from the Black, Sivalls & Bryson firm last year. It was estimated the repaid job indicated by a survey of the Agriculture Department would cost $1 million. This survey indicates the foundation pads and the foundation rings on all of the bins were smaller than specifications and resulted in structural defects, or constitute potential structural defects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Mollenhoff has been doing excellent work in trying to ascertain the facts. He has had some difficulty.

I believe it is nothing short of outrageous that two departments of the Government, working, supposedly, in the public interest, now find themselves in direct conflict. I can only say to the Navy Department that the results of the inspection by inspectors examining their own inspection may very well prejudice the case of the Department of Agriculture as it seeks to obtain compensation in a civil suit for the defective bins.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator from Minnesota inform the Senate of the total cost of the bins, numbering almost 9,000, which were found to be defective?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I regret that that figure is not at my fingertips; but it runs into the millions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator from Minnesota inform us of the name of the contractor or contractors who built the defective bins?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it is in the article to which I referred. The name of the company which made the materials for the bins is Black, Sivalls, and Bryson, Inc., of Kansas City, Mo.

There is much other information surrounding the grain storage bins, such as the cost of the bins, and the failure to use competitive bidding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was about to ask the Senator whether competitive bidding was employed in letting contracts for the bins.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In all instances, it was not. That practice was not pursued, so far as I have been able to ascertain. I have presented to the Committee on Government Operations a rather substantial preliminary investigative report which was made by representatives of staff members employed by Congress. Rather than to prejudice the record by any statement I might make, I have only asked that the whole matter be looked into.

The Department of Agriculture has now readily admitted that the bins were defective, and that the materials used were not up to Government specifications, or at least up to the specifications laid down by the Department of Agriculture. The excuse of the Department of Agriculture is that they relied upon naval inspectors. In its effort to prove that the reports of the naval inspectors were correct, the Navy Department sent out the same inspectors to inspect the reports which the same inspectors had made in the first instance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without prejudicing the case, which is still under investigation, does the Senator from Minnesota feel that the bins were sufficiently standardized so that competitive bidding would normally have been the proper procedure?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, I do. I may say further to the Senator, at the time the bins were erected—and I have seen photographic evidence of it—there was report after report from the field on the part of contractors and on the part of officials of the Department of Agriculture, or those associated with the Department of Agriculture, that the bins were defective; that the rings or bases upon which the bins were set were too small. I have seen photographs of bins bulging at the sides, of holes in the bins, and of grain coming out on the ground, rodent-infested grain, grain saturated with moisture, grain that was deteriorating. It is estimated that even to repair the bins would cost $1 million, and that would not guarantee any future good use for the bins at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Minnesota inform this body, through the record, of any effort which was made by the Department of Agriculture to recover damages for the defective bins?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only say that what effort has been made has been belated, after the junior Senator from Minnesota started to speak in the Senate Chamber and bring it to the attention of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and after Mr. Mollenhoff, as a competent reporter, had started his inquiry into the situation.

I further point out that the section which the Department is taking seems to be rather tame in light of the dimensions or proportions of this malfeasance in office. I do not want to say "corruption," because if one says "corruption," it looks as if collusion is involved. But I can say somebody was not on the alert and did not pay any attention to the reports coming in that bins were being hurriedly erected. I want the record quite clear that many thousand more bins are to be built, and the junior Senator from Minnesota wants to make sure that the bins do not bulge at the sides like a Munich beer barrel. The only difference is that a Munich beer barrel holds beer, and the bins under discussion do not hold grain.

While I am on the subject of agriculture, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an article I read this morning in the New York Times. The headline reads, "Russians in Iowa Eye Farm Profits. Get First Glimpse of Corn and Show Great Interest in Owner's Income."

It appears to me that the Russians have some normal instincts. They are interested in the income of our farmers. So am I. I only wish the Department of Agriculture and the administration would be a little more interested in it. It appears to me that while the delegation from the Soviet Union is visiting some of the greatest farmland in the world, it might be a good time for a reappraisal of what we are doing and what we have not been doing. I am hopeful that the Russians do not ask too many questions about farm income in the United States, because if they do, we shall have to tell them the truth. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I had that committee look up certain economic data for me bearing on the facts relating to farm income. I have that information at hand, and want to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

For example, according to the Department of Agriculture, in the first 4 months of 1955 farm income was down 5 percent from last year. Farm income is not expected to get better.

According to the business letter of the First National Bank of New York on June 1955, agriculture has not been responding as have other sectors in the economy, and that the best guess is that income this year will be 5 percent less than last year. Furthermore, farm purchasing power is at the lowest point in several years. Parity is 86 as against 100 in 1952, 92 in 1953, and 89 in 1954.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is that under the old formula, or under the new streamlined formula?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall have to accept the figures for what they are. I hope the formula has not been changed in midstream. I gather it is the same formula which has been used for calculating parity. In 1952 parity was 100. On June 30 of this year it was 86.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes, does he not, that there is a new parity formula in existence, and the principal difference is that under the new formula the farmer gets less?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The new formula is another way to explain the drop in farm income.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the Government has seen fit to permit the delegates from the Soviet Union to visit the agricultural Midwest. They are presently in Iowa. They will go into South Dakota, Minnesota, California, and I understand other States.

I think it is important to note that the Soviet delegation is not only interested in the quality of our corn and grain, and the abundance of our production, but is also interested in farm economics. I submit we likewise had better be interested in the economics, profit and loss statements, gross and net income, as well as income from production as it relates to the prices paid by American farmers.

Of course, it is encouraging to note that in the great struggle between East and West, the one field in which we have surpassed all other countries is the field of agriculture. I think it is significant that when Russia wanted to send delegates to this country to see something, they did not ask to see atomic-energy plants or the Ford Motor Co. or General Motors, but they asked to see the farms in the great breadbasket of America. Russia's agriculture is in dire trouble, and American agriculture, because of the will of the American farmer to work and to produce, has come forth with amazingly bountiful crops.

It seems to me the American Government might well be concerned by the interest of the visiting delegates. I hope we will not have it written on the records of this generation that it was only the Soviet delegates who were interested in farm income. I hope the Congress is interested in farm income. I hope the President is interested in farm income. I hope the Department of Agriculture is interested in farm income. I hope Secretary Benson is interested in farm income. I am very dubious about that, but I hope he is. Hope springs eternal in my breast, and I am glad that is so, because the farm situation is anything but encouraging, in light of what I read into the RECORD and the farm economic facts of this year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, has the Senator from Minnesota concluded his speech?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to discuss the grain bins to which the Senator from Minnesota was referring.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to discuss that subject with the Senator from North Dakota in a few moments, after I yield to the acting majority leader.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT BILLS AND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the several standing committees be authorized to report bills and file reports thereon, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR OF UNOBJECTED-TO BILLS ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, July 22, at the conclusion of the morning business, there may be a call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills, beginning with Calendar No. 880.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I should like to state the program for the Senate tomorrow. It is the acting majority leader's intention to ask that Calendar No. 774, S. 2253, a bill to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, be made the pending business, and that it be the first order of business on tomorrow after the morning hour.

It is also intended to include the following measures in the list of those to be considered tomorrow, if time permits:

Calendar No. 869, H. R. 6095, the Philippines trade bill.

Three resolutions which were scheduled for today, but not acted upon, Calendar No. 830, Senate Resolution 129, a resolution to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Calendar No. 831, Senate Resolution 130, a resolution to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

And Calendar No. 832, Senate Resolution 131, a resolution relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee.

I also wish to announce that it is important that the foreign-aid bill or some comparable measure be acted upon by the Senate on Friday.

Consent of the Senate will be requested that the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection be called on Saturday, rather than on Friday, the time for which Senate gave consent today to have the calendar called.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me call the attention of the acting majority leader to the Calendar No. 774, Senate bill 2253, to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. I wish to ask whether the Magnuson amendment to that measure is acceptable to the leadership.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is my understanding that not only is it acceptable to the leadership, but it is also acceptable to the sponsors of the bill. I have no firm commitment from all the sponsors of the bill; but I can assure my friend, the Senator from Maryland, that the amendment is acceptable to me.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky that the amendment will be acceptable to the sponsors of the bill, and that the bill as thus amended will be passed by the Senate?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can not speak for all the sponsors of the bill. But as one of the sponsors of the bill, I can say that the amendment is satisfactory to me.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business for today, it stand adjourned until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 774, Senate bill 2253, to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title 1 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. It is desired to make the bill the unfinished business, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2253), to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title 1 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

VISIT OF SOVIET AGRICULTURAL DELEGATION, AND AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago, I was referring to the visit of the Soviet agricultural delegation. I now ask unanimous consent that the article to which I previously called attention—one which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times—be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIANS IN IOWA EYE FARM PROFITS—GET FIRST GLIMPSE OF CORN AND SHOW GREAT INTEREST IN OWNER'S INCOME

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

DES MOINES, July 18.—A 12-man Russian agricultural delegation got its first glimpse of Iowa's tall corn and fat hogs today and immediately started popping questions about the profit side of successful corn-hog economy.

For a group of Soviet officials and farm specialists dedicated to the principles of collective farming and a socialist state they displayed a surprising interest in the profit-and-loss side of midwestern agriculture.

Acting Agriculture Minister Vladimir V. Matskevich said, in reply to a direct question, that the Russians were very much interested in the effects the profit motive has on agriculture.

"We are looking at crops in terms of income from crops as well as at the crops themselves," he said. However, he declined to be drawn into a comparison of the relative merits of the capitalist and Socialist systems.

The Russians are here to study farming techniques, with particular stress on corn-hay production. An American group, simultaneously, is touring Russia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Reds Buy Grain in West as Farm Output Falters," which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on July 5, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STASSEN REPORTS: REDS BUY GRAIN IN WEST AS FARM OUTPUT FALTERS

(By Jack Tait)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—East-West trade figures for 1954 reflect a faltering farm output in the Soviet bloc which forced Russia and its satellites for the first time to import grain on a large scale from the West.

This and other evidences of a strained economy within the Communist world and of the Soviet failure so far to gain an economic grip on underdeveloped areas were presented today in the sixth semiannual report to Congress of operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. The report was made public by Harold E. Stassen, who retired as director of the Foreign Operations Administration on Friday when the FOA was succeeded by the International Cooperation Administration.

The report, entitled "Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in the Free World," shows that in 1954 East-West trade in terms of value increased 15 percent over 1953. But this rise occurred principally during the first six months, and since restrictions on trade in strategic materials were eased in August 1954, there has been no spectacular expansion in East-West commerce.

In a letter of transmittal to Congress, Mr. Stassen said the Soviet bloc so far has failed "to divide free nations which are cooperating in the control of strategic materials." He said: "These nations, although willing to trade in peaceful wares, have not only refused to ship strategic materials but have strengthened their controls over war-potential items." The control program was tightened up last January.

> The extent of Soviet economic activity in underdeveloped areas is grossly exaggerated by propaganda devices, the report said.
>
> The report said that in the Soviet bloc last year domestic production was inadequate (and) chronic and acute problems plagued agriculture. Despite sizable increases in food imports, including a spectacular increase in meat imports by Russia, the Soviet consumer, the report said, is left pretty much where he was before—with lots of propaganda and not very much to eat or wear.
>
> The big problem of the Soviet group, the report said, is to find enough exports to offset increased food and capital goods imports. Traditional exports in the past have been gathered from farm, forest, and mine. But now these products are being consumed at home.
>
> Grain exports dropped from 2,875,000 tons in the 1952–1953 season to 1,256,000 tons in the 1953–1954 season, and, the report said, prospects for the 1954–1955 season are no better.
>
> One of the most interesting of all changes in the pattern of Soviet bloc imports, the report said, is the recent influx of bread grains from the free world. This is especially interesting because eastern Europe has traditionally relied upon grain as its leading export.
>
> The Soviet Union has become the world's third largest meat buyer and the world's second largest butter buyer.
>
> Agriculture has been "sick" in Russia and has fallen off badly in the satellites, the report said. The difficulty in the satellites, it said, has been caused by imposition of a Communist-collectivization program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in showing the Soviet farm leaders around our farms in the Midwest, and in demonstrating to them our modern farm methods of producing corn, hogs, cattle, feed grains, and all the other products of diversified modern American farming, I respectfully suggest that someone point out to them what is one of the most important features of farm life in the United States of America, namely, the farm home. I refer particularly to the farm home on the Midwest American farm.

I regret that among the members of the Russian agricultural delegation there is no woman member to see the homes of American farmers and to visit with American farm housewives. But these Russian agricultural leaders should be given the real picture inside our farm homes. They should be give an opportunity to see the labor-saving equipment and the comforts which, as a result of rural electrification, are enjoyed by the typical Midwest farm family. I hope that will be one of the projects which will be stressed during the visit of the Russian agricultural delegation, because the blessings of rural electrification to the farm families of the United States are of the greatest importance, and of course they have had a great and a constructive effect upon farm production and farm income.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me suggest that when the Soviet farm delegation is in Minnesota, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota see to it that the members of the delegation cross the Red River, into North Dakota, and see the churches there. Some time ago the Saturday Evening Post published an article about the churches in our agricultural areas; and in the article it is stated that in Traill County, N. Dak., which is directly across the Red River from Minnesota, in 3 townships there are 12 churches; and attention was called to the fact that among all the counties in the entire United States, this county constitutes a striking example of Christianity. So I think it will be well to see to it that when the Russian visitors are in Minnesota, whoever is in charge of the delegation take them across the Red River, at Halstad, Minn. I think the Senator from Minnesota knows that community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, I do; it is a very fine community.

Mr. LANGER. So I suggest that the delegation of Russian agricultural leaders be taken across the river there, and shown what a Christian people do in those rural areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for the suggestion. I am happy to report to him that Dr. J. O. Christiansen, of the University of Minnesota, College of Agriculture, who is well known by many Members of the Senate, including, I am sure, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, and also by our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconson [Mr. Wiley], will be in charge of the visit of the delegation to the State of Minnesota. I can think of no finer place for them to go than into the Red River Valley area—a great, beautiful, productive area—to see the homes, the churches, the rural communities, and the splendid farms.

Mr. WILEY. I suggest that the delegation also be taken across the St. Croix.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I mention this matter because I believe this is our opportunity to demonstrate, in a spirit of good will, something not generally understood in regard to the overall picture of the United States, as others hear about us and read about us. The simple things, the down-to-earth things, the developments which relate to family life and the home, will make a tremendous impression on the visiting delegation, if anything at all can make an impression on them; and I am confident that a favorable impression will be left with them.

GENERAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. President, at this time I wish to mention some economic facts relating to the overall situation. Some time ago I was asked whether I felt that if employment continues and if economic conditions in the United States improve, that situation will be beneficial to the President and this Administration. I answered that question in the affirmative, and I am sure that any person who wishes to be honest would have to answer the question in that way. But later I became a little inquisitive regarding the economic facts. It seemed to me that we were glossing over the situation, by means of rosy reports, and that we were letting those reports be issued in a manner which did not indicate the making of a careful economic analysis. So I asked the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to look into the situation.

I report to the Senate as follows, in order that we may have both sides of the coin. We ought not to delude ourselves or fool ourselves. We ought not to be unduly optimistic or unduly pessimistic. Let the facts speak for themselves. The facts with respect to our economy are relatively good, but I point out that there are some very serious soft spots.

Business failures, according to the latest monthly figures from Dun and Bradstreet, continue above 1954, and 1954 was above 1953. In May of 1953 there were 697 business failures; in May 1954, 943; in May 1955, 955.

Dun and Bradstreet weekly figures on business failures in June and July are also high.

I have before me a table of the number of business failures. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, showing the number of failures from June 2, through July 7.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Number of business failures
June 2	203
June 9	230
June 16	214
June 23	205
June 30	231
July 7	204

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be noted that the peak was 231, and the low point was 203.

Inasmuch as I discussed farm income a few moments ago, I shall not repeat the figures. I think it is important to note, however, that private housing starts, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have been slipping for some months. In December 1954, there were 1,478,000 private housing starts; in January 1955, 1,419,000; in June of 1955, 1,300,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing these figures be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Housing starts by months at annual rates
December 1954	1, 478, 000
January 1955	1, 419, 000
February 1955	1, 370, 000
March 1955	1, 407, 000
April 1955	1, 309, 000
May 1955	1, 306, 000
June 1955	1, 300, 000

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be noted that every month there has been a drop in the number of housing starts.

The joint committee gives me further information, as follows:

Unemployment rose in June to 2.7 million—an increase of 200,000 over May, according to the Department of Commerce. It could be pointed out that this is less than what might be expected seasonally. Nonetheless, it is an increase.

Consumer debt is large and growing at an increasing rate. Installment debt at the end of May was over $24 billion—about one-half in automobiles. Total consumer credit rose by more than $900 million during May to another record level of $31.6 billion. Increased installment financing of automobiles accounted for most of the rise. The source of this information is the Federal Reserve Board's figures on consumer credit.

Installment debt is high compared to income. It now equals 9.2 percent of income after taxes as against 7.9 percent in 1952 and 6.4 percent in 1939. The source of these figures is the Report on the Business Outlook for July 7 of the Bureau of National Affairs.

With easy credit, automobile sales may have outrun the market. According to Ward's Automotive Reports, dealers' inventories of new cars were estimated at 720,000 units in mid-June.

Business Week for July 19, on page 18, says that "By the time the current model year is over, output will have run perhaps 60 percent above normal junkings plus allowance for market growth."

The Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor still reports 16 labor market areas with 9 percent or more of the labor force unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the distribution of 149 labor market areas, by employment, taken from the Department of Labor report, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of 149 labor market areas by employment:	*Percent unemployment is of total labor force*
A–0	1.5 or less.
B–28	1.5–2.9.
C–86	3.0–5.9.
D–19	6.0–8.9.
E–8	9.0–11.9.
F–8	12 or over.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have made this economic survey and brief report on the economic condition because I have a feeling that somehow or other we are prone to consider the overall picture, and not look at the picture in its parts.

There are serious problems in the coal-producing areas of the country. There is a growing serious problem in the agricultural areas of the country. We cannot ignore these soft spots in our economy, nor should we. I point them out in order that we may have a clear picture of what is developing, and of what the general figures reveal when they are broken down into their parts.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

HANDLING OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as of yesterday it was my intention to bring to the attention of the Senate a comment on the part of the Secretary of Defense. In view of the activity of the Senate yesterday, I did not find it within my time or the time of the Senate to do so. Therefore, at this time I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, concerning his reasons for withholding from the public the letter from Gen. Matthew Ridgway criticising the reduction in the size of the Army. I contend that Secretary Wilson's remarks in this instance typify an attitude that has been growing in the administration and which threatens the very basis of our democratic Government.

Members of the Senate will recall the Ridgway report was released only after its contents had been revealed in a newspaper article written by Anthony Leviero and appearing in the New York Times of Friday, July 15. Upon its release officially on Friday, the following explanation was made by Defense Department Director of Information:

> Mr. Wilson has authorized me to say that he received a letter from General Ridgway, in the nature of a final report on his retirement as Army Chief of Staff. In order to permit opportunity for study and review, Mr. Wilson asked Secretary of the Army Stevens to appropriately and temporarily classify the letter.
>
> The Army subsequently advised him that the letter had been classified "confidential," with all copies accounted for. With open publication of the letter today copies will be made available on request at the Defense newsroom in the Pentagon.

If Secretary Wilson had stood on this explanation of the delay in releasing General Ridgway's report, I do not think anyone would have found too much fault—though there is some question raised whether it would have required from June 27 until July 16 to study and review a letter of only a few thousand words, which it is now clear, contained no secret information.

But the Secretary of Defense did not leave well enough alone, he did not stand on this explanation. Today the New York Times reports—and I have every faith in the responsibility and accuracy of the New York Times—that Secretary Wilson stated yesterday:

> He had ordered the Army to put a "confidential" stamp on the nonsecret document because he did not wish to add in any way to the problems of President Eisenhower and of Secretary of State Dulles at the Geneva Conference.

This is just the sort of misuse of the confidential classification about which I have protested here on the floor of the Senate in the past. It is a most extraordinarily frank example of this administration—and especially the Department of Defense—classifying matters which are neither secret, nor should they be. It is a use of secrecy to keep from the American people information which they have every right to know and which they must have if they are to be the informed electorate that is necessary for the proper functioning of a democracy.

Secretary Wilson, in admitting that he had classified General Ridgway's report "because he did not wish to add in any way to the problems of President Eisenhower and of Secretary of State Dulles at the Geneva Conference" has given us a prize example of how this administration is keeping from the American people the unpleasant facts so that all that shows is the nice gloss with which the public-relations men are coating this administration.

We have had many previous examples of this unnecessary secrecy. I have already pointed out here how the nature of fallout of radioactive material was kept from the American people for a very long time, though it was certainly no secret to the Soviets. We have been receiving continual and mounting complaints from responsible members of the working press here in Washington that they are finding it increasingly difficult to get the facts from this administration—that the public relations, Madison Avenue treatment is more and more standing between them and the information—in no way secret—that should be public knowledge.

Not the least of these concealments is now being revealed in the matter of the Dixon-Yates transaction. We all know the lengths the administration has gone to, to keep from the Congress and from the people the full story of just how this transaction was engineered and the improper ways in which important members of the administration intervened to make this shady deal possible.

But a more serious matter is raised in connection with the covering up of matters in the executive branch even than these instances. If the charges recently made by the Alsop Brothers in their columns and also in a magazine article have foundation—and we have every reason to trust and believe these highly capable and responsible reporters—then undue and improper pressure has been brought upon newspapermen to prevent them from pursuing the proper performance of their job, namely, getting information to the American people about matters which are in no way secret.

The Alsops tell of investigations that have been made of themselves and their friends in an apparent attempt to intimidate them from reporting matters which the administration would rather have hushed up.

They also tell of how friends employed in the executive branch have been likewise intimidated and subjected to pressure as a result of their friendship with these reporters. If these charges are true—and, as I—have said, I have every confidence in the Alsops and do not doubt for a moment the veracity of their charges—then this is a most disgraceful matter which should not be allowed to continue. Newspapermen, radio, and TV reporters should not be intimidated or subjected to investigation and harassment for pursuing the proper duty of a reporter—getting the facts. I intend to pursue this matter further, Mr. President, but wish to bring it to the attention of the Senate once again, as I have done before.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the articles by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15 of this year, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to reiterate once again that the extraordinary statement by Secretary of Defense Wilson yesterday gives us a most revealing insight into the administration's attitude toward the right of the people to have information that is in no way secret. I am not here suggesting that there are not technical matters that are rightly classifiable as secret and must not be revealed. But it is perfectly clear that this administration, especially the Department of Defense, has taken increasingly to classifying or hiding information which in no way requires secrecy but which might be embarrassing or unpleasant to the administration.

I have in the past called for fewer executive meetings on the part of congressional committees, as I believe the American people are entitled to know the nature of the public business that concerns them. And I will continue to call for less secrecy in all matters in which there is no need for secrecy except to conceal what some bureaucrat would rather not have revealed. The American people have a right to be informed, and the members of the press who serve the American public have a right of access to nonsecret information and should not be blocked in their news-reporting activities nor should they be intimidated in the faithful performance of their duties. I intend to speak further on this subject in the near future, Mr. President, but I ask that my fellow Senators give serious consideration to this growing threat to our freedom and our right to information.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 9, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

CENSORSHIP WARNING

For a great many years, American correspondents in Moscow have wisely warned that their own dispatches are slanted, because of the Soviet censorship. In the opinion of these reporters, it is now time for Washington correspondents to send out a similar warning.

This being peacetime, the Eisenhower administration is not yet using the conventional blue pencils. Yet this administration is practicing a widespread censorship, which is no less effective in slanting the news because it is insidiously indirect.

The censor's pressure is felt by every Washington reporter who still bothers to wear out his shoe leather to do his real job—which is to transmit facts of vital national meaning to the American public.

Facts of really vital meaning are precisely the facts that are now under interdict. And the stage has now been reached where honest reporters really have a duty to confess this novel pressure.

As an example of the sort of thing that is now a matter of course, consider the curious episode that led these reporters to the rather grave decision to give a censorship warning. It happened not very long ago, when one of us had just returned from a 6 months' trip in Asia.

After this long absence, two of these reporters' best and oldest friends in Washington proposed a happy family reunion. The ladies of the three families laid agreeable plans. The logistics of the party, although somewhat elaborate, were smoothly completed. And then, on the very eve of the reunion, there was a somewhat embarrassed telephone call.

Messrs. A and B, as we may call our two old friends, both hold high posts in the same Government agency. They had been bluntly told that their official positions would be compromised if the party were held as planned.

Behind this extraordinary episode there was another no less extraordinary. During that week we had published a report on the problem of an American satellite. The Soviets have already announced their intention to build an earth satellite, and have placed their leading physicist, Peter Kapitza, in charge of the project. For this and other obvious reasons, the satellite problem seemed to us reasonably fateful, and therefore we felt it was in the public domain.

This view was not held, however, by the National Security Council. That Thursday's NSC's meeting turned, apparently into a prolonged outburst of righteous indignation. Here, once again, the American people were being told facts of the utmost national importance—but facts which the NSC wanted to cover up.

It did not matter, of course, that these reporters had had no access whatever to classified information. That point was not even tested. The chief of the agency that employs Messrs. A and B had been at the NSC meeting. Without further ado, he returned to his office and issued the edict that led, in turn, to the embarrassed telephoned call already noted. He did this, moreover, with a full understanding of the rules that have always governed our friendship with Messrs. A and B.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or indeed, about any sensitive matters. This has always been understood between us. In present-day Washington, which is more zoo than metropolis, wise men keep business and friendship strictly separated. If any official is your friend and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

You do not talk business at family reunions. And you do not talk business, either, with very old and valued friends whose official duties are genuinely not in the public domain.

The agency chief knew of these rules. He told Messrs. A and B, and he later told these reporters, that he was confident the rules had always been and would always be strictly enforced. He did not fear any improper disclosure. But he greatly feared the attack that would develop on his agency, if it became known that important subordinates of his dared to continue an old friendship with persons who dared to write about facts of the highest national importance.

No doubt he was right. He had observed the scene at the NSC meeting. He is one of the finest men in Washington. He and Messrs. A and B had no course open to them, in the circumstances, except to put the welfare of their agency first.

What is not right, however, is the mephitic, the almost psychotic atmosphere that forces this kind of invasion of private life, to carry out reprisals against reporters who are doing what they conceive to be their public duty. What is not right, either, is this indirect censorship by reprisal which is now being carried so far that reporters who still do their jobs must expect any kind of harassment, from old-fashioned security investigations to separation from their oldest friends and quite probably wiretapping and bug planting.

What is involved here, in fact, is a radical change in the American political system, and very nearly an amendment to the American Constitution, that is being shoved through behind the backs of the American people. And this is so serious a matter that it will be the subject of several subsequent reports.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 10, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WHEN CENSORSHIP FAILS

Consider the following moral problem. A widow lady is told by her trustees that she has a nice little oil well down in Texas. Then competing interests prove a more valid lease, so she does not have an oil well after all. Do the trustees warn the widow lady that maybe she had better not buy that yacht, or do they spare her feelings by suppressing the bad news?

The little problem has important current meaning. It bears very directly, in fact, on the much larger moral problem of the Eisenhower administration's attempt to enforce peacetime censorship, by more and more stringent security rules, by more and more flagrant harassment of working reporters, and by other methods new to the American system.

Here, for instance, is the bizarre and rather frightening inside story of the administration's handling of a recent piece of news of the very highest national importance.

For 2 years the Eisenhower administration has based both its world strategy and its defense programs on America's assumed air superiority over the Soviet Union. For 2 years the country has been told that we were unchallengeably stronger than the Russians in the air. At one point Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson even assured the American public that the Soviet air program was purely "defensive in character"—no threat to us, in short, and shaped entirely by our threat to them. These assurances were pleasing and the country believed them.

Then, just before and after May 1, the Soviets showed their true air power. Planes equal to ours in all categories, from heavy bombers to supersonic fighters, were ostentatiously displayed in the famous Moscow overflights.

In some vital categories, it was made clear that the Soviets were far ahead of us; in others, it was proved that they were rapidly catching up. Secretary Wilson's defensive theory of Soviet airpower was shown to be mere wishful drivel.

After this, of course, the American public was in the exact position of the widow lady after she lost her oil well. But public trustees, evidently, are permitted to do things which would be regarded as very shocking if done by private trustees.

There was a determined effort to suppress the news in Washington which was street-corner talk in Moscow. Secretary of Defense Wilson, particularly, fought long and hard against the slightest hint to the American public about the Moscow overflights and their revolutionary meaning.

In the end, Wilson had to give ground a little because word was received that an announcement about the overflights would be made on May 13 in Britain. A brief colorless announcement was approved by the President, saying only that the overflights had occurred, and had shown certain Russian technical progress. It was like the trustees telling the lady, not that she had lost her oil well, but that maybe production had dropped a bit.

It was enough, however, to break the story. Under the usual threat of reprisal by security investigation and in other ways, one of these reporters obtained and published a large part of the relevant facts. Shortly thereafter, the complete, ugly truth was printed by Aviation Week in a brilliant and detailed article.

At this point, on May 24, Secretary Wilson held one of his inimitable press conferences. He made the laughably phony suggestion that the Russians, not having General Motors production know-how, of course, were just hand-making all these new airplanes. With his usual endearing complacency, he further insisted that he saw no need for any stepup in our own air production effort. Curiously enough, it is authoritatively reported that the Secretary of Defense really meant everything he said on this occasion.

Meanwhile, however, the dreary old democratic process which had been suspended while the censorship still worked, had now been set in motion again by the failure of the censorship. Senators SYMINGTON and JACKSON pointed out the shocking danger of letting Soviet air power surpass American air power. Large segments of the press took up the theme. The widow lady, having heard the whole of the bad news at last, became extremely peevish; and that made the trustees a bit nervous.

There was another sharp debate inside the administration. It briefly appeared that Secretary Wilson might be supported in his desire to stand pat. But in the end, Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott declared he could no longer defend a failure to do what should have been done long before; and Talbott's arguments won the day.

Therefore Congress has just been asked to authorize expenditure of $356 million extra, to stepup production of our B-52 heavy bomber. Production of our F-100 flighters is probably to be increased, too, these moves are the direct result of the failure of censorship. It took just about 6 weeks, and a barrage of public criticism, to force the obviously necessary action. Even now, what is being done looks too little and too late. But what would have happened if the censorship had worked?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 12, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

SYMPTOMS OF CENSORSHIP MALADY

In the language of the psychiatrists, the Eisenhower administration is now suffering from a severe censorship syndrome. The worst sufferer seems to be the President himself. The resulting loss of contact with democratic reality is only too easy to prove.

Not long ago, for instance, the President complained long and loudly at a National Security Council meeting because the Defense Department had published pictures of launching sites of the Nike guided missile. Yet any kid with a Brownie camera can go out to Arlington and take the same pictures.

Again, the President has told the able Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Trevor Gardner, to go and stand in a corner because of a speech about the Air Force's Falcon missile. Yet the speech contained no fact that had not been previously published, and it had even been given the most elaborate clearance by the new American chief censor, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson.

Or again, the Civil Defense agency was shockingly obstructed and the American people were kept in dangerous ignorance for more than a year by Adm. Lewis E. Strauss' suppression of the facts concerning radioactive fallout from the H-bomb. Yet, all these facts were fully known to the Soviets even before they were learned by Admiral Strauss.

In a remarkable piece for the New York Herald Tribune, Walter Kerr has tried hard to explain this seemingly inexplicable urge to keep from the American people even those facts that the enemy quite surely knows.

Explanations were sought from Defense Department Information Chief Herschel Schooley; from United States Information Agency Chief Theodore Streibert; and from R. C. Honami, the new Assistant Secretary of Defense who has the special task of hiding the life-and-death facts of their national situation from the American people.

The official rationalization of the President's desire to keep the people in the dark was summarized as follows by Kerr:

"The President recognizes (that) many items of military information * * * become known to the military tacticians of other countries—of Russia for example. He believes, however, that these technicians are unable to influence their country's top officials. (Their information) is buried in a report and forgotten. * * *

"Then, the reasoning goes, the same information * * * is released to the American press. It is widely published. It is commented on at length. * * * Soon the item which was originally technical is no longer technical. It has political significance. It comes to the attention of political leaders. Then, and perhaps only then, the Soviet leader * * * translates into action a technical proposal that had been safely buried."

According to those who have worked intimately with the President on the censorship problem, these interesting statements genuinely represent the Eisenhower viewpoint. As a description of Soviet planning methods, they are of course inaccurate to the point of being downright alarming.

They are directly refuted, in fact, by the whole history of Soviet military technology from the T-34 tank to the new heavy bomber.

In the last 20 years, all-out development of all the brilliantly successful Soviet new weapons produced in this period was quite certainly started before readers of the American press or any other press had heard about such weapons. The fact is proved by the development times, unless you prefer to assume that Soviet engineers are 10 times quicker than American engineers.

On the other hand, the President's theory of Soviet behavior is highly applicable to the behavior of his own administration. As so often happens when syndromes are serious, there has been a transference of symptoms.

The Eisenhower Administration, not the Soviet government, has the habit of ignoring technicians' warnings until they cease to be technical and become political because of publicity.

That was most recently proven by the true story of the Moscow overflights, previously told in this space. Long before the overflights, the technicians had been warning that we were lagging behind the Soviets in air development. But the warnings were ignored until the overflights occurred, the attempted censorship failed, and the facts became known.

After that, our lag in air development was a political issue, and corrective action was taken.

Such incidents, in turn, reveal the roots of the censorship syndrome. It is rooted, obviously, in the administration's eagerness to cut taxes, balance the budget and do other popular things. The people are not to be told the life-and-death facts because the facts would stir up the people to demand necessary Defense Department spending, which would in turn make the Treasury Department program harder to carry out.

Unfortunately, however, the diagnosis of the disease does not make the symptoms more attractive or the disease less dangerous.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 13, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

HOW THE CENSORSHIP WORKS

In free societies great political changes at least deserve to be publicly debated. But the Eisenhower administration has been trying to introduce a strict peacetime censorship in America by methods that are neither forthright nor above ground.

The thing hardly came into the open at all, in fact, until Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's extraordinary "batten-all-hatches" order at the Pentagon. But long before Secretary Wilson told his generals and admirals they must never give the American people any uncomfortable life-and-death facts, the effort to keep those facts from the people already was in full swing.

The reason why the effort has got and is getting so little notice is extremely simple. Reporters are rightly taught not to write about themselves. And the main point of impact of this novel American censorship is in the sensitive area of the relations between newspapermen and Government officials.

How the thing works is simple enough. A reporter obtains and publishes nationally significant information about, say, the grave lag of the American air program behind the Soviet air program. He has seen no secret papers. He has written nothing which was not already fully known to the Soviet intelligence. He has merely posed a major public issue, with a vital bearing on the Nation's future.

Nowadays, however, even the most trivial information has been classified by someone or other, in some dim Pentagon corner or other. Furthermore, the reporter has given no pleasure whatever in high quarters, by posing this major public issue which the leaders of the administration had been hoping to keep under the rug. So a security investigation is ordered.

The fact that a reporter is the subject of one of these security investigations does not mean for one moment that he has broken the law. Even less does it mean there is the slightest danger of prosecution. Attorney General Herbert Brownell has sometimes had the crude gall to hint of prosecutions at cocktail parties, but he has far too much worldly sense to carry out his threats. The security investigation, in truth, is nothing but a kind of indirect reprisal against the reporter who shows inconvenient curiosity about facts of national interest.

The reprisal takes 3 forms. First, while the investigation goes on the reporter must assume that his telehpones are tapped and that listening devices may be planted in his house and office. The Federal flatfeet deny that they indulge in these Gestapo-like practices, but the denials are singularly unconvincing.

Second, the reporter's official acquaintances and friends are subjected to the most shameless harassment. It does not matter whether there is a tittle of evidence that they are the sources of the reporter's information. It does not even matter if it is well known that they have never discussed the subject in question with the offending reporter. The real object is not to locate the reporter's source, but simply to strike at the reporter through the men he knows in Government.

Then third and finally, the word is passed in Government that the offending reporter through the men he knows in Government, lies under the grave displeasure of the powers that be; and that it is therefore a risky thing to see him. Thus the attempt is made to prevent the reporter from doing his job as a reporter thereafter.

The attempt has never yet been absolutely successful. These reporters have had at least 5, and it may now be 6 of these security investigations. But we think we still get our fair share of the news. So do James Reston of the New York Times, Chalmers M. Roberts of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the other well-known Washington correspondents who have experienced the same charming attentions from their Government.

But while individual reporters can still barely manage to do their jobs in Washington, the new censorship is already successful in the larger sense there are good reasons to believe, for example, that Secretary Wilson's 1953 defense cuts actually crippled the development of our more advanced aircraft models; and so these cuts left the United States with no adequate answer to the new planes the Soviets have just shown.

But whether this is true or not, is an inordinately complicated question involving many different factors. The fate of America may perhaps depend upon the truth. It is quite possible that a real crash program is now needed, to repair the 1953 mistakes; and such a program will certainly not be ordered without public pressure. And since the question is so complicated, and the whole present aim of the administration is to cover up the facts, the full facts that are needed to convince the public may be all but impossible to obtain.

Then again, no sensible reporter enjoys the highly unpleasant experience of having the local Gestapo on his trail. He thinks twice, he hesitates, and sometimes he decides not to publish, when he knows the publication of a piece of news will anger the powers that be. And so these reporters have issued to their readers a censorship warning, meaning that the news from Washington is now seriously slanted by the administration's effort to conceal life-and-death facts.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 15, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

SECURITY VERSUS DEMOCRACY

Until very recently, the American people's right to know the basic facts of their national situation was never questioned for an instant. The people's right to know was properly regarded as the mainspring of our democracy.

Now, however, no one seems to doubt the American Government's right to bamboozle people by the concealing of the life-and-death facts. The Eisenhower Administration is actively seeking to install a peacetime censorship in America. The censorship has as yet aroused very little opposition. And there was no word of protest, or even comment, when the thinking behind that censorship was unblushingly confessed a few weeks ago.

The confession was made by the former secretary of the National Security Council, Robert Cutler, in a speech to the Associated Harvard Clubs. The Cutler views on the measure of truth that ought to be told the people have been specially commended to the White House staff by the President himself. This incredible speech, then, can be taken as accurately reflecting the official White House line.

In a morass of somewhat self-satisfied verbiage, Cutler makes two central points. First, he declares that the people should be told no fact included in any document classified confidential or above and should be especially kept from knowing any facts about thermonuclear or other weapons; the status of our own defense effort; intelligence from the rest of the world which, of course, includes the status of the enemy defense effort and enemy intentions, and the reasons for our national security policies and character of our current diplomacy.

In short, all facts of real significance—all the vast paraphernalia that goes into executive decision-making—are to be kept from the American people. This is because of Cutler's second point. Theirs is not to reason why, he in effect says of the American people. According to Cutler, national decision should be made, not by the people, but by the President alone. At best, the Nation is to have a sort of pale privilege of post-audit on the President's decisions. "The people," Cutler generously says, "may always call [him] to an accounting, for [his] acts and omissions to act."

The brackets are Cutler's, and if you read his speech, you will wonder why he did not also capitalize the words "him" and "his." He has need to believe that the President possesses divine attributes; for none but a president-deity could accommodate the Cutler system and the American system.

Our system, although Cutler forgets it, happens to be a democracy. In a democracy, the people are the masters; and even such high officials as the Secretary of the Security Council and the President, himself, are the people's servants. And any democratic government will surely fail if its masters, the people, are successfully kept in the dark about the national situation.

The facts that Cutler would withhold from the people, on the ground that they are classified, are almost all the facts which define the national situation of this Republic. Such problems as the relative status of our own defense effort and the Soviet defense effort now have as much bearing on our national situation as the existence of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and maybe they have more bearing. And if the Cutler recipe is followed in a free society—and the administration is going to any lengths to follow that system—three things automatically happen.

First, the society is automatically crippled because the people do not know the challenges that confront them, and therefore do not rise to meet those challenges.

Second, the society is crippled in another way, too. The official leadership starts whining that the "people won't stand for" doing the necessary things, whose necessity they, themselves, have hidden from the people.

Third, the temptation to cover up failures, instead of correcting them, becomes altogether irresistible to the leaders. For it is ridiculous to talk to the people about "holding the President accountable for his acts and omissions to act" when the people are being thoroughly and continuously bamboozled, and bamboozlement is established high policy.

All three of these results of the Cutler system are already beginning to appear in America. They must inevitably add up, in the end, to a kind of creeping national paralysis in the face of the deadly dangers of our times. And for what purpose, one asks, are we risking national paralysis by withholding the truth from our people?

For no purpose whatever, is the ironical answer. For even Cutler has not dared to suggest that we sacrifice the outward trappings of a free society, our budget is still public. The locations of our war plants, the patterns of our urban centers, all our new starts in industry, are not yet hidden matters. A great flood of technical publications will tell any subscriber who wishes to purchase them the current state of our military-industrial progress. And from these and other public sources, the Soviet intelligence is able to deduce with ease all those facts Cutler and others like him would hide from our people.

In short, the Cutler system, which is also the Eisenhower administration system, is not merely antidemocratic. Worse still, it is plain silly, unless its real purpose is to prevent those political embarrassments which officials of all governments have always wished to avoid.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I am very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on grain bins.

Of course, I understand thoroughly why there should be certain criticisms made, and I join in them. Nevertheless, as acting leader of the minority and in protecting the Republican Party, I wish to say that the action of the opposition in connection with grain bins was absolutely scandalous during the years when the opposition was in charge of the construction of grain bins.

Five or six or seven years ago, under the Democratic administration, thousands of grain bins were scattered all over the great Northwest. Steel bins were built by the Butler Co. and by some other companies. In addition to that, wooden bins also were constructed, in the form of houses which held 3,000, 3,500, or 4,000 bushels of grain each. We needed all of them. I speak now as a member of the Republican Party faction of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris, and I want it understood that I am also speaking as acting minority leader. During all the time the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was a member of the Senate, the truth is that that was the situation in his own State, in North Dakota and South Dakota, and in Montana and eastern Idaho.

With reference to getting $2.24 a bushel for wheat, that is a joke so far as the small farmer was concerned. If he hauled his grain to one of those elevators, what was he told? The small farmer was told that the elevator was full and that he could not store his grain. He was told he could not get a loan. The result was that the small farmer never received $2.24 a bushel.

As a consequence, the grain was sold on a cash basis. It was probably loaded and shipped into the Twin Cities in Minnesota. People there grew rich and waxed fat on the grain which was shipped from South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

What happened to all the grain bins? Under the Democratic administration they were sold, and in some instances almost given away. If my distinguished friend from Minnesota will come with me to North Dakota I will show him one of the greatest motels anywhere in the great Northwest. How was that motel created? It was built of grain bins which at one time were owned by the United States Government. Some of those little buildings held from 3,000 to 4,000 bushels of grain, and for them the Government had paid up to $750 apiece. The buildings were sold for as little as $200 and $250. Some people bought them from the Government and moved them to another location and made motels out of them. The result is that there are not enough grain bins in the Northwest.

The Government also sold the steel bins, but it did not receive $600 or $700 for them. They were sold for as little as $300 apiece. Instead of having the ever-normal granaries which were promised by the Democratic administration, we now find that the grain bins—both steel and wooden bins—are all gone.

Therefore, speaking in behalf of the Republican Party and in defending the administration, I wish to say that for some months now the administration has been putting up new grain bins all over the great Northwest. If in building thousands of such grain bins, in order to protect the farmer, it happens that a few of them are built of a somewhat soft cement, and if it happens that some of the foundations are not exactly solid, with the result that they break in places and the grain runs out, as was explained by the acting Democratic leader, that will be just an incident, which is bound to happen sometimes when cement is not allowed to set good and hard.

However, the picture, taken as a whole, shows that a great effort is being made by the administration to protect the small farmer. The administration is not particularly concerned with the large farmer. It is concerned more or less with the small farmer, because the large farmer has his own big granaries in which he can store 30,000 or 40,000 bushels.

In that connection, I should like to say that I listened with some apprehension to what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was saying, particularly in view of the fact that one of the greatest grain monopolies exists in the State of Minnesota. It was only a short time ago that the Heffelfingers bought out the Russell Miller Milling Co., with 134 elevators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield until I have concluded my statement. The Heffelfingers do not belong to my faction of the Republican Party. No, Mr. President; they belong to the other faction of the Republican Party. They do not belong to the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Robert La Follette-Senator George Norris faction. Every once in a while I find the Senator from Minnesota voting to the contrary, so I wish to extend to him an invitation to join the progressive faction of the Republican Party. Only a few years ago he was a member of the Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota. He made a fine record as mayor of Minneapolis. He succeeded Floyd Olson. Floyd Olson was a great man and made a fine record. I think it is too bad to see my friend contaminated by the old reactionary Democrats about who he talks—or used to talk, until a few years ago.

So I wish to invite the Senator from Minnesota to join the faction of the Republican Party to which I belong. I am going to speak at Pipestone, Minn., on the 6th of August. I intend to pay a generous compliment to the Senator, because I think he has made a good Senator in Washington. I do not wish to be too critical of the wing of the Republican Party which I do not represent, because there is a difference between the wing in Minnesota and the wing in North Dakota.

In the whole State of Minnesota, Mr. President, Mr. Floyd Olson could not find anyone to regulate certain pine lands, and he telephoned me, when I was Governor of North Dakota, saying, "I have a million and a half acres of pine land, and I do not know what to do with it. There is no one in the State of Minnesota who is smart enough to regulate it."

I told him that we had a man who could take care of the situation, a man named Harry Dunbar. So Harry Dunbar went to the State of Minnesota and was appointed to take charge of that pineland. A little later Floyd Olson called me again and said, "There is a lot of bootlegging of gasoline going on here." He said that the farmers in the field used one color of gasoline in the farm machinery, and that another color was used in passenger cars. There was no one in the whole State of Minnesota who could take care of that situation, so I said, "We have a man, George Griffith, who can take care of it." So George Griffith went there and helped them out.

A little bit later Floyd Olson called me again and said, "You know, Governor, I have a big tax problem here, and I cannot solve it, and there seems to be no one in the State of Minnesota who can handle it. Do you not have some tax expert in the State of North Dakota who can solve our tax problem?" I said, "Yes. We have George Wallace." So George Wallace went to the State of Minnesota, to the capital at St. Paul, and helped to solve Minnesota's tax problem. Governor Olson felt so thankful that he said, "I need a secretary, someone to answer by mail, someone who is sober, honest, and industrious."

So I sent him a man who became Governor Olson's secretary. He was so good that in due course of time he was appointed a judge in the State of Minnesota.

About the same time, Governor Olson said he needed a good man on the Minnesota Industrial Commission. I sent to him William A. Anderson. He went on the payroll of Minnesota and did such an outstanding job that not only was he elected mayor of Minneapolis, but was later elected a judge in the State of Minnesota. He died only recently.

That is not all, Mr. President. Governor Floyd Olson needed a bank examiner. In Minnesota there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of banks, and in all the State of Minnesota Governor Olson could not find a man whom he could trust to regulate the banks. He asked me to send him someone who could take charge of the banks in his State, someone who could not be controlled by chain banks, someone who would give an honest administration. I said, "We have the very man for you—Robert D. Berry." So Robert Berry went to the State of Minnesota and became bank examiner in that State, and did an excellent job as bank examiner.

Governor Olson needed a man to drive his automobile and not wreck it, so that the Governor, after making a speech, could lie down in the back of the automobile and go to sleep. He wanted a man who could drive his car while the Governor read his mail. He said he could not find anyone in Minnesota to fill such a position. He said, "Can you find me such a man?"

I said, "Of course. We have many men in North Dakota who can do that for you." I recommended Moses Rosenberg, who became known as Morris Rose, and he made such an outstanding record in taking care of the Governor's car, so that the Governor could have more time for his duties, that he named him head of all the liquor industry in the State of Minnesota, because he could trust him, because he knew he could rely upon him.

Mr. President, I have other illustrations. I could name other persons who went to the State of Minnesota at the request of Governor Olson. I know the distinguished Senator from Minnesota agrees with me that the men whom I have named performed excellent service. They were reliable men.

The men of North Dakota are highly efficient. When I became Governor of the State I found that a certain man had been sent to the penitentiary for murder, and I ascertained that he had escaped. He was found in the State of Arkansas. He had been appointed public printer by the Governor of the State of Arkansas. He was the best man they could find in the State of Arkansas for that duty.

I mention these cases to show the high type of citizenship we have in the State of North Dakota.

I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for bringing up the matter of grain bins, because grain bins to which he referred were not built by North Dakota concerns. They were not insured by a North Dakota insurance company. Minnesota contractors built them and Minnesota insurance companies insured them.

Mr. President, if we in North Dakota want anything from the FHA, we have to go to Minneapolis to get it. The people of North Dakota and of Montana have to go to Minneapolis or to St. Paul to get what they want along that line. If a man in the western part of Montana wants a small business loan he has to travel 1,000 miles to Minneapolis in order to get the money. The regional office should be located at Bismarck, N. Dak., because that is the center of that area, Mr. President. That is where Fort Lincoln is located. It is unoccupied. There are some sixty buildings there for which the Government would not have to pay any rent. Rents are high in Minneapolis and St. Paul, and they are getting higher every day. Every time a new office is located there, the rents go up. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the Government offices, many of the buildings there would be vacant.

But Fort Lincoln, N. Dak, can be used for all Government purposes without the payment of rent. It stands idle and vacant. If a person in Montana, Minnesota, or South Dakota wishes to make a loan, he now has to travel a thousand miles to make the arrangement.

I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota believes in economy. I have heard him speak of economy many times. I hope he will join with me in attempting to have the regional offices moved from Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., to Bismarck, N. Dak., where they really belong geographically. That would save the Government a large amount of money. It would not be necessary to have the great number of employees who operate at St. Paul and Minneapolis travel hundreds and hundreds of miles, sometimes up to a thousand miles, to examine the grain bins and make certain that they are properly inspected. That is what the Senator from Minnesota has been speaking about.

If the grain bins were built in North Dakota, and if the main office were in that State, it would be much simpler to inspect them because the inspectors would have to travel only two or three hundred miles. At present, if a man wishes to inspect a grain bin in Montana, he must travel a thousand miles.

It can readily be seen what this amounts to in money, with mileage costs of 7 cents a mile. Now that the per diem rate has been raised to $12, it will cost the Government more and more for travel of inspectors.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, now acting majority leader, will join with me in trying to have the regional offices moved to Bismarck, N. Dak., which is the geographical center of that particular area, as the Senator well knows.

I might say further that when the regional offices were established in Minnesota there was no appointment of anyone from North Dakota to man them. I challenge the Senator from Minnesota to name one North Dakota citizen who has been placed in charge of those regional offices. He cannot name one. I will yield to the Senator, if he can name a North Dakota man who has held that position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my delightful friend from North Dakota that since I have no influence with the personnel office of the Eisenhower administration because that office is a part of the administration, and also since the wing of the Republican Party to which the senior Senator from North Dakota belongs is not a part of the administration, neither of us can name a man for the position because we do not have any influence.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the Senator has had some influence in naming judges.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was back in the days when Mr. Truman was President. We did much better then. At that time the Senator from North Dakota was successful in having an ambassador named from his State.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. I have heard about that ambassador ever since. I have heard about him so much that at night, when I am sound asleep, I can hear in my ears, "Ambassador, ambassador, ambassador." That is all I have been able to obtain for North Dakota to date.

But I am not pleading only for North Dakota. I am pleading for seven States—Florida, Arizona, Nevada, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and, as the very last, North Dakota. From not one of those States, except North Dakota has an ambassador ever been named—not one of them. Not one of those States ever has had one of its citizens as a member of the Cabinet.

It must be 8 or 9 months since the distinguished Vice President called the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and me and said he hoped an ambassador would be named from Idaho. He asked that names be submitted. The junior Senator from Idaho submitted the names of citizens of Idaho. But the only ones who have been appointed have been from the East, and more from Washington, D. C. Why they are appointed from Washington is beyond me.

It is a curious thing that when men are appointed as ambassadors, almost invariably they are millionaires, or men who have made a mint of money. When one investigates, as I did a few years ago, he is told that it is necessary to appoint wealthy men; that to be an ambassador, one must be wealthy.

I call attention to the fact that to eliminate that very requirement Congress appropriated more than $100 million to make it possible for the State Department to avoid the necessity of having only millionaires represent the United States Government in the foreign capitals.

So far as the gentleman from North Dakota who is an Ambassador is concerned, he is not a millionaire. He is Tom Whelan, of St. Thomas, N. Dak. He is comfortably fixed. He was a potato farmer in North Dakota. As Ambassador to Nicaragua he has done outstanding work. He is the outstanding Ambassador in the Central American area, one who was chosen only recently to represent all the other Ambassadors. We are proud of Tom Whelan, the Ambassador from North Dakota. But I have not the least doubt that in Florida, Nevada, and some of the other States there are also men who are competent to be the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior. But we have never had one from our State.

Every once in a while someone back home will write to me and ask, "Why don't we get industry in the Northwest?" The Senator from Minnesota will agree with me, I am sure, that industry has not come to Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, or Idaho. Is not that true?

In a previous administration a man named Jesse Jones, from Texas, was named to the Cabinet, and industry immediately flowed down to Texas. In one year 4,400 new industries went to Texas. They were not all industries which necessarily required technical skill, but they were businesses which were not in Texas the year previously.

I have not the least doubt that if there could be a Secretary of Agriculture or a Secretary of the Interior who came from the breadbasket of the world, as my friend described it a few minutes ago—North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, and possibly Wisconsin—someone who was interested in the development of those States, those States would also get some new industries.

Now that Garrison Dam has been completed, and we have the hope of getting cheap electric power, it is all the more important that a Secretary of Agriculture or a Secretary of the Interior come from that great breadbasket of the world.

If the Democrats win the next election I hope that my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota, will be selected to head the Department of Agriculture, unless he should be chosen to hold some higher office. If he does not want the position himself, I hope he will be permitted to name the Secretary of Agriculture, and that he will use his influence to have chosen as the Secretary of Agriculture someone from North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, or possibly Idaho, because that area of the country has been neglected, so far as selections for the Cabinet are concerned.

Having listened to the Senator speak about grain bins, I simply wish to say, in conclusion, that the grain bin matter is being solved. The administration, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, is building thousands of them, and the farmers are now beginning to use them. The grain bin problem will be solved, just as I hope the boxcar situation, which is now so troublesome, will be solved.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably H. R. 6382, a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may file its report on H. R. 6382 before midnight tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN PUBLIC POWER AND THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in January 1954, 1 year after the Eisenhower administration took office, my late distinguished colleague, Burnet R. Maybank, made a speech in which he warned the Nation that the Eisenhower administration was attempting to destroy the public-power program from the bottom to the top. At that time, it was not as popular to disagree with the Eisenhower administration as it is today. But in his profound wisdom, the late Senator Maybank foresaw the attack, and in his address before the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association's annual convention at Miami, he laid the cards on the table.

When he spoke, he outlined the stumbling blocks and the raw deals which lay ahead for public power. Following his talk, there were mutterings in the rabid anti-public-power press about socialism and all the other hogwash that private utility monopolies feed them.

After his address, we advocates of public power went through many a battle, as he predicted, to hold back the administration's surge against public power. One of the running fights, which I would not say we have won completely yet, was in the struggle to provide adequate funds for the expansion of rural electric cooperatives and rural telephone cooperatives, so as to enable them to meet their added load requirements and to provide generation facilities with which to handle the increased requirements.

The struggle between public power and the Eisenhower administration went on through many a minor skirmish here in Congress, and also within the executive branch conducting the public power program. It looked like a running losing fight, with us doing most of the losing.

But then came the Dixon-Yates contract. This deal—or scandal, as I prefer to refer to it—brought to a head the fight between public power advocates and the Eisenhower administration. It brought the conflict into the open. By last December, the deal had been set, and the contract tentatively agreed to. At that time the Republicans were in control of Congress.

In January of 1955, following the election, and with the Democrats again in control of Congress, the struggle against the Dixon-Yates contract and the anti-public-power forces took on new vigor and life. At that time an anti-public-power newspaper in my State published an editorial urging the President not to back down on the Dixon-Yates contract. Because the editorial typifies the attempts by anti-public-power forces to brain wash the public into believing that public power is socialistic and something evil, I wish to read the editorial to the Senate at this time. It is rather an ironic editorial, for it leaves a few persons out on a limb, and I do not refer to those of us who are public power enthusiasts.

The editorial is dated February 4, 1955, and is from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C. It reads as follows:

DON'T BACK DOWN NOW

It would be foolish for anyone to suppose that there could now be anything illegal or unethical in the Dixon-Yates power contract. The contract has been debated, examined, reexamined, and revised. It has been the subject of scores of hearings by 5 or 6 governmental boards. If there had even been anything wrong with the contract in the first place—and there wasn't—that error would have long since been brought to light by gloating Fair Dealers.

The Dealers keep up their opposition, just the same, for two reasons: They want to socialize all power in the United States; and they believe that if they keep shouting loud enough, Dixon-Yates will become a synonym for what they call the giveaway policies of the Eisenhower administration.

Actually, Dixon-Yates simply reaffirms a basic American principle—that free enterprise industry should be allowed to fill the productive needs of the Nation. If there is anything wrong with Dixon-Yates, there is something wrong with that basic principle. The Dealers, who deny that they are socialists, nevertheless want nationalized industry to fill the productive needs of the country.

The News and Courier hopes that Mr. Eisenhower will stick by his guns with Dixon-Yates. To back down now would be to surrender to the underhanded smear campaign conducted by the socialistic Dealers.

In retrospect, Mr. President, this editorial demonstrates how ridiculous the chantings of anti-public-power voices have been. The President canceled the contract. In canceling the contract, he merely withdrew his official sanction from the biggest raid on public power ever attempted by the utility monopolies. Contrary to the editorial, just because the Dixon-Yates contract was wrong, does not mean there is anything wrong with America's basic principles. The Dixon-Yates contract was wrong because it was an example of an attempt of a huge utility combine to get a Government subsidy by collusion and conspiracy. It was wrong because it was not for the purpose of providing anything for the people. Instead, it was designed to destroy the TVA, which has done and is doing for the people what the private utilities refused and failed to do years ago. In short, the Eisenhower administration was used as a tool to strike against public power.

Mr. President, the people of the United States canceled the Dixon-Yates contract. Last year the people were fed up with the drive against public power, and they elected a Democratic Congress.

Had the Democrats not been in power, the Dixon-Yates scandal would never have been exposed, and the contract would never have been broken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that it was a Republican committee that discovered the Dixon-Yates contract, and not a Democratic committee? The Democrats were doing nothing about it. It was a Republican Judiciary Committee, of which the Senator is a member, that first dug up Dixon-Yates.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator will find that since the Democrats have come back in control of the Congress, they have been at it ever since, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman, has been working on the question practically all this year. Is that not true?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, yes, but the Senator from New Mexico, over the radio, not once, but at least three times, has referred to the matter and has said that Dixon-Yates had nothing to do with public power, that the attempt to involve Dixon-Yates in public power is wrong, and that the Democratic Party is not for public power.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as getting public power for the people is concerned, the Democratic Party is the party that has done so. Is that not true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from South Carolina should include the Senator from North Dakota in the fight, because the Senator from North Dakota is speaking for that wing of the Republican Party which is a wing of real strength, but which is not large in numbers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is a wing of the Republican Party, I am glad to say, which is on the same side as is the Senator from North Dakota, and which has fought for the rights of the people, and the senior Senator from North Dakota is one of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is not only in that wing of the Republican Party, but he is the fuselage, the jet engines, and the entire aircraft.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as the Senator from South Carolina is concerned, I am willing to give him all the power and momentum he wants in this fight for the rights of the people.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there are 3 wings or 3 divisions of the Democratic Party?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, but I thank the Lord that some of those wings are small.

Mr. LANGER. There are 3 wings of the Democratic Party and only 2 wings of the Republican Party.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; but the two wings of the Republican Party are equally divided, and that is where the trouble is.

Mr. President, the election of a Democratic Congress cancelled the Dixon-Yates contract, and put the brakes, we hope, on the drive to destroy public power and other public programs.

I wish my beloved and distinguished late colleague, Burnet R. Maybank, were here today to know that we have turned the tide, and that soon another great multipurpose dam will be built between South Carolina and Georgia to serve his people. He fought long and hard in this body for public power and the Hartwell Dam; and today I should like to credit him for having helped as much as any man I ever knew to keep the Hartwell Dam alive and to keep the spark of public power glowing through the past 2 dark years.

Mr. President, we must not stop here in our fight for public power, for multipurpose dams, and for other public programs. Such dams not only provide low cost electricity for rural electric cooperatives, but they also hold back our precious water, prevent farmlands from turning into deserts, prevent floods, help prevent droughts, provide navigation, preserve wildlife, and provide public recreation facilities for our expanding population.

Mr. President, in a sense the term "public power" is a misnomer, when applied to our multipurpose dam systems. Certainly they generate electricity, but that is only one benefit. Of course, that one benefit alone, the lighting up of rural America, would justify the systems. But there is so much more to them.

For example, in my State we have a multipurpose project called the Santee-Cooper. The Santee-Cooper, like all public power projects, is under fire from the private utility lobbies. But that project, I think, is an example of what can be done for the people, despite the roadblocks, attacks, and falsely labeled criticisms.

By the way, I noticed that the Senator from North Dakota a few moments ago mentioned industry moving into certain areas. When more public power, at cheaper rates, is made available to States in those areas, more industries will move into them. I have found that to be true in South Carolina.

Among its many beneficial functions, it is providing electricity for approximately 80,000 farm homes. With an average of four persons to the farm home, that represents 320,000 people or almost one-seventh of my State's population. This was made possible by the creation of rural electric cooperatives which deliver this electricity to the farmers, who are the owners of the cooperatives.

Today, these cooperatives are paying off their obligations on schedule, and in many cases ahead of schedule. The Government has never lost a single cent through its loans to these cooperatives. In 15 years of operation, the cooperatives in my State have paid back $10,996,011 in interest and principal on loans totaling $65,663,210. The first cooperative sales of electricity to their members in 1941 amounted to $207,943. Last year the electricity sales had increased to $2,154,050. They have built 30,309 miles of lines, and have increased the number of consumers from 26,143 families, in 1941, to 121,707, in 1954, and nearly all these customers were without electricity prior to the development of the cooperatives. These people wanted to have electricity all during that time; but the Dixon-Yates of that day said such a program would not work. So the farmers came to the Government, borrowed the money, and built their own systems.

Mr. President, this is not socialism. It is nothing evil. It is American enterprise at work. It is not a Dixon-Yates deal. It is one of America's basic principles at work.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the rural electric cooperatives, and, most of all, the hard-working, enterprising members of these cooperatives. I want to give them and all other public-power backers encouragement for the future. Congress will not let them down—not a Democratic Congress, at least.

We, I believe, have turned the tide in the fight for survival of public power, rural cooperatives, multipurpose dams, and similar programs.

By stopping the Dixon-Yates contract, we have applied the brakes to speeding monopolism, and we have exposed the ugly scheme of things to the entire country. In the future there should be no doubt as to who are sincerely the friends of the cooperative, the friends of public power, the promoters of conservation, and the builders of multipurpose projects which will work for all the people.

Mr. President, I think this Democratic Congress will be recorded as the one which saved public power from sabotage and destruction, and which, as I said before, turned the tide.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very happy that I am acting Republican leader on this occasion, when I have an opportunity to pay tribute to one of the great men from the South, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. Whenever there is a fight in which the people are on one side and the large, greedy, selfish corporations are on the other, we can always count on the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina to be on the side of the people.

Mr. President, the fight on public power has clearly demonstrated—as has been shown in the past 2 years, during which the Dixon-Yates contract was before the committee of which I was the chairman—the keen interest the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has had in behalf of the rank and file of the people, particularly the small farmers of South Carolina.

Today, I appeal to all the Republican Members of the Senate to go, if necessary, to South Carolina and get the Republicans of that State to vote for my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] when he comes up for reelection. I understand that he will be up for reelection in the next election, and that there are a considerable number of Republican voters in the State of South Carolina. I understand that the Republicans in South Carolina cannot possibly win the election, because they are in a hopeless minority. But I hope that in the forthcoming election, all the Republican voters of South Carolina who believe in public power and the REA, and who believe that the Dixon-Yates contract is not a good one, will rush to the support of my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], because he is entitled to their support. His entire record has shown that he thoroughly understands the problems of a poor boy and the problems of a poor man, when trying to get along in the world. Mr. President, in public life in the Government of the United States, we have too few men of that type.

I cannot find adequate words to express how happy I am that today, when I happen to be sitting in the minority leader's seat, serving as acting minority leader, I have this opportunity to pay tribute to my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I am sure that the longer he serves in the Senate, the more effectively he will be able to act and to vote and to work in behalf of the rank and file of the people who need such a champion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks concerning me.

I also wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that during the 2 preceding years, the Senator from North Dakota was chairman of the Antimonopoly Subcommittee. At that time he dug down into the Dixon-Yates contract. I happened to serve on the same subcommittee with him. I know how faithfully and how hard he worked to bring out the facts which were later developed. He stated at that time that the Dixon-Yates contract was wrong. It has proved to be wrong. He should receive a great deal of the credit for being a starter in having the Dixon-Yates contract set aside.

THE LATE SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am sure that Members of the Senate will be pleased to have the junior Senator from Kansas invite attention to an editorial which was published in the Topeka Daily Capital of Thursday, July 14, entitled "In Remembrance." It is written in remembrance of a man who in part represented Kansas State in the United States Senate for 30 full years, the late Senator Arthur Capper. The editorial states that had he been alive on Thursday, July 14, he would have been 90 years of age.

I know that Members of the Senate who knew him personally and served with him in this body recall that he was one of the kindliest, friendliest, most truly Christian gentleman the State of Kansas has produced. He had hosts of friends, not only in our State, but throughout all the States represented so ably by Members on both sides of the aisle in the United States Senate.

Senator Capper was a very close personal friend of mine. I have always been proud of the fact that I think I can honestly state that the very last words he ever spoke on this earth were spoken to me. I visited with him when he was on his deathbed. He roused from a coma when my name was mentioned and it was called to his attention that I was visiting him, and said, "Frank, I am glad you came in. You are doing a good job in the United States Senate." Those were about the last words he uttered on this earth.

He was a very close personal friend of mine, and I did not wish to allow this opportunity to pass without inviting the attention of Senators to this editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Remembrance

This would have been the 90th birthday of Arthur Capper, were he still with us.

We hope readers of the Daily Capital will bear with us for remembering the man who founded Capper Publications, Inc., of which this daily newspaper is an integral part. Indeed, it was the beginning of what we believe is one of the country's greatest publishing concerns.

It was 71 years ago this last June when the young graduate of the Garnett High School came to Topeka looking for a job. He knew how to set type and started in the Daily Capital's composing room. Later he transferred to the news department as a reporter, and was on his way toward becoming a publisher, first native-born Governor of Kansas, and for 30 years the United States Senator from his State.

The story of how Arthur Capper rose from humble beginnings to the top in his chosen business-profession has been told many times. We folks who have worked with him during most of our active careers love to think, modestly enough, that Arthur Capper knew how to choose his associates (he never called us the hired help), train them, and give them wide responsibility. It was this trait that enabled him to give so much of his time to public service, meanwhile building up the Capper Publications to the foremost position in farm publications.

The story has often been told of how a small boy out in the State wrote Editor Capper a terse request: "Please help me buy a pig." He got his pig, and so did hundreds of other boys and girls get their start through the "Capper Pig and Calf Clubs."

That was the beginning of the present 4-H Clubs, which Senator Capper helped to organize on a national basis in the early 1920's. The Senator loved children, though he had none of his own. His annual birthday picnics became nationally famous. Two generations of Kansans recall those affairs with fond remembrance.

No matter how engaged he was with political life, Arthur Capper never forgot the business which was his first and chief love. Although he turned over responsibility to those he trusted, it was his keen mind and knowledge of business affairs that piloted Capper Publications through good and bad years—and some years were pretty bad.

Today the Capper Publications organization is carrying on, as he wanted the organization to endure. The foundations he laid through his long and useful life support the far-flung structure, comprised of farm magazines, daily newspapers, and radio and TV stations. Those of us who served our apprenticeship under him value our memories of his concern for our own welfare. And for the love he had for his State of Kansas and its people, particularly those who lived on the farms and in the small towns.

Clif Stratton, the Capital's Washington correspondent who spent many years with the late Senator Capper, recalled this incident in the closing days of the Senator's long, useful and interesting life.

"One of the nurses remarked to him that the day marked my 40th anniversary with him—few of us 'old timers' ever thought we were employees of Arthur Capper, we were just 'with him.'

"He sent out for a birthday card and wrote in his own hand in ink, 'Congratulations on 40th anniversary'—and signed it 'Arthur Capper.'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the tribute to the late Senator Arthur Capper. He was one of the first men I ever had the privilege of meeting in the United States Senate. He was truly a great public servant.

Let me add that Senator Capper paid an appropriate tribute to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, speaking from this side of the aisle as acting minority leader, I wish to associate myself with the very fine tribute paid by the Senator from Kansas to the late Senator Arthur Capper.

Senator Capper made an outstanding record. He was beloved by people all over the country. I had the privilege, only a few short months ago when I was in Topeka, of visiting his grave, accompanied by the present editors of the Topeka Daily Capital.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the fine comments on the part of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I know that those who knew the late Senator Capper as we did very much appreciate these tributes.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4727) to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1024) thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business before the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 19, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Caleb M. Wright, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island, for a term of 4 years.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, daily we are drawn unto Thee by blessed memories of Thy goodness and by needs which Thou alone canst supply, but above all by Thy love, which will never let us go.

May our minds and hearts be filled with noble desires and pure aspirations and inspired to make Thy wiser will our own.

Grant that, as we go in and out among our fellow men, we may be the messengers of kindness and considerateness of generosity and good will.

Help us to cultivate a finer spirit of appreciation and understanding, of sympathy and service.

Show us how justice and righteousness may be organized and made effective in building a social order in which nations live together in unity and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 65. An act to revise the boundary between the second and fourth judicial divisions of Alaska;

H. R. 1245. An act for the relief of Marianne Anita Zelinka;

H. R. 1275. An act for the relief of Gennaro Savarese;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Rudolfo M. Gomez (Capaz);

H. R. 1538. An act for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts;

H. R. 1540. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joan Craig Newell;

H. R. 1541. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Dicran Simon;

H. R. 1549. An act for the relief of Salvacion Carbon;

H. R. 1551. An act for the relief of Gualberto Estralla Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino;

H. R. 1661. An act for the relief of Kim Dong Su;

H. R. 1693. An act for the relief of Barbara Knape;

H. R. 1750. An act for the relief of Elena Gigliotti;

H. R. 1801. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Margarete Gartner;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eufemia Bencich;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Ingrid Samson;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Bengt Wikstam;

H. R. 2274. An act for the relief of Alejandro Florentino Munoz;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of John Odabashian, doctor of medicine;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 2495. An act for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski;

H. R. 2721. An act for the relief of Mihai Indig;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin;

H. R. 2756. An act for the relief of Frank Scriver;

H. R. 2911. An act for the relief of Max Steinsapir;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald;

H. R. 2929. An act for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy;

H. R. 3123. An act to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn.;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters;

H. R. 3560. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta);

H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;

H. R. 4225. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark.;

H. R. 6331. An act authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell, or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights; and

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill;

H. R. 3253. An act to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe;

H. R. 4367. An act to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6086. An act for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens;

H. R. 6796. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used; and

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Krysko;

S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst;

S. 141. An act for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin;

S. 239. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas;

S. 240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek;

S. 253. An act for the relief of Sumie Legasse;

S. 314. An act for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland;

S. 358. An act for the relief of Domenico Bompiani;

S. 379. An act for the relief of Gerassimo Troianos;

S. 410. An act for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball;

S. 535. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried;

S. 602. An act for the relief of Gordon Thompson Brown;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos;

S. 698. An act for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose;

S. 768. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

S. 849. An act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis, and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular distrophy, and for other purposes;

S. 878. An act to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1218. An act for the relief of Luigi Cardone;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Coone;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton;

S. 1368. An act for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac;

S. 1540. An act for the relief of Edith Kahler;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel;

S. 1745. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran;

S. 1906. An act to authorize the pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1986. An act for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr.;

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes;

S. 2198. An act to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2280. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes;

S. 2403. An act to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2427. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency;

S. 2428. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes; and

S. 2501. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ESTATE OF CARLO DE LUCA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6158) for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the bars or defenses of res judicata, lapse of time, laches, deficiency or mistake in pleading, proof of argument, waiver, payment and satisfaction of judgment, or any settlement or adjustment heretofore made, a petition by the personal representatives of the estate of Carlo de Luca, deceased, to modify and amend a judgment of the Court of Claims rendered on December 7, 1936, upon the ground that the arithmetical method used by the Court of Claims to compute the damages in said judgment resulted in an inequitable benefit to, and an unjust enrichment of, the United States, and a judgment in favor of Carlo de Luca for less than full and complete just compensation; and the Court of Claims is directed to enter judgment in favor of the personal representatives of the estate of Carlo de Luca, deceased, for the amount, if any, by which the United States has been unjustly enriched, and by which Carlo de Luca in his lifetime received less than full and complete just compensation: *Provided,* That any recomputation of just compensation and any modification or amendment of said judgment shall be made as of December 7, 1936, and shall not allow interest in favor of the personal representatives of the estate of Carlo de Luca, deceased, beyond December 7, 1936.

The court shall have such jurisdiction if a petition to modify or amend the judgment if filed within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the bar or defenses of res judicata, lapse of time, laches, or any settlement or adjustment heretofore made, the claim of Carlo de Luca, deceased, arising out of an error alleged to have been by the Court of Claims in computing the amount of damages awarded him in a judgment rendered on December 7, 1936. The court shall have such jurisdition if suit is instituted within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMONDE ROUXEL WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Raymonde Rouxel Williams may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUD MARIA SCHURHOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1878) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to rceonsider was laid on the table.

SIGFRIED OLSEN SHIPPING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $62,120.25 to Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., of San Francisco, Calif. Such sum represents losses on contracts numbered W–35077, R–27745–A, entered into the 17th day of February 1941, between the United States by B. F. Burdick, general purchasing officer of the Panama Canal, and Sigfried Olsen, an individual trading as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$62,120.25" and insert "$46,136.62."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "act", strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ZELLA K. THISSELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3373) for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Zella K. Thissell, of Belleville, Ill., the sum of $10,000 as a gratuity for the death of her husband, Lt. Ralph D. Thissell, United States Naval Reserve, who was killed in line of duty in an air crash on January 15, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "act", strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH GANGEMI AND ANTHONY GANGEMI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,656, to Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi, of Philadelphia, Pa. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi for personal injuries and property damages, arising out of a collision between a Navy ambulance and an automobile operated by Joseph Gangemi and owned by Anthony Gangemi. Such claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,656" and insert "$956."

Page 1, line 10, after "collision", insert "on June 21, 1949."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDITH HOLLYWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 898) to provide for the issuance of an unrestricted deed to Mrs. Edith Hollywood, of Sitka, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to issue an unrestricted deed to Mrs. Edith Hollywood, of Sitka, Alaska, to the land embraced in the certificate of allotment issued to Anna Hollywood Fickz and approved by the Department of the Interior on June 3, 1935, under the provisions of the act of May 17, 1906 (34 Stat. 197), Anchorage serial 08054, containing four and ninety-seven one-hundredths acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, beginning with the word "issue" on line 3, strike all of line 4 through the words "Alaska, to" on line 5, inserting in lieu thereof the following: "approve deeds executed by the heirs of Anna Hollywood Fickz conveying to Mrs. Edith Hollywood or to Mr. John Hollywood, of Sitka, Alaska, an interest in."

Page 1, line 10, strike the period, insert in lieu thereof a comma, and add the following: "subject to the right-of-way covered by the quitclaim deed dated October 29, 1951, executed by John and Edith Hollywood, conveying to the Territory of Alaska a right-of-way across such land, which quitclaim deed is hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "a bill to provide for the approval of deeds executed by the heirs of Anna Hollywood Fickz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN EKONOMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 910) to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks Precinct, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks Precinct, Alaska, is hereby authorized, for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act, to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to John Ekonomos the following-described land situated in Alaska:

Southwest quarter of northwest quarter, section 28, township 2 south, range 3 east, Fairbanks meridian, Alaska, containing 40 acres: *Provided,* That the purchase price for the land shall be the reasonable value thereof without improvements, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, but not less than $1.25 per acre.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 through 9; strike the "comma" (,) at the end of line 5, and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, inserting in lieu thereof the following: "all or any part of the unsurveyed public lands in Alaska described in this section, and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to convey the lands applied for. The area subject to application and sale under this act is that public land which when surveyed will constitute the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, section 28."

Page 2, line 3; strike the "period" (.), insert in lieu thereof a "colon" (:) and add the following proviso: "*Provided further,* That in the deed conveying said lands, there shall be reserved to the United States and/or the Territory of Alaska the right to flood such lands intermittently in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Tanana River and Chena Slough flood-control project."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK T. McCORMICK

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 280) providing that the bill H. R. 5385 and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5385) entitled "A bill for the relief of Frank T. McCormick," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. & M. SCHAEFER BREWING CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 287) for the relief of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 6982) entitled "A bill for the relief of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE HOUSE, INC.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 290) providing that the bill H. R. 6987 and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 6987) entitled "For the relief of the State House, Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. RUTHE GRAVES MESSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 (N–602 7561) granted to the late Alexander C. Johnson III, who died on January 2, 1943, shall be held and considered to have been in effect at the time of his death. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, except that any payments made as a result of enactment of this act shall be made directly from the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM H. RAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in full satisfaction of the claim of Sam H. Ray, a fullblood Navaho Indian, against the United States for the loss of his right arm suffered by him at the age of 8, in the United States Government laundry at the Ute Mountain Indian School at Towaoc, Colo., in 1923, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, of which $3,000 shall be paid to Sam H. Ray and the remainder of $7,000 shall be paid to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to be expended on behalf of Sam H. Ray in such manner as in the judgment of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or his designee, will best assist in the physical and economic rehabilitation of Sam H. Ray: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "of which $3,000 shall be paid."

On page 1, line 11, strike out "and the remainder of $7,000 shall be paid."

On page 2, strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4.

On page 2, line 5, strike out "Sam H. Ray."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARTLETT SPRINGS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3063) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co. and certain others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co., a corporation, C. A. Kuenzell, G. Elizabeth Kuenzell, and H. C. Nead, individually or doing business under the firm name and style of Nead Lumber Co., arising out of the controversy concerning some 640 acres of land, as such claims are partly set forth in a proceeding entitled "United States of America, plaintiff, against Bartlett Springs Co., a corporation, C. A. Kuenzell, G. Elizabeth Kuenzell, and H. C. Nead, individually or doing business under the firm name and style of Nead Lumber Co., defendants," and numbered civil No. 7034 in the records of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing in this act shall be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after word "Company", insert "against the United States."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "concerning", strike out the bill through line 9, and insert "certain lands in sections 32 and 33, township 16 north, range 8 west, Mount Diablo meridian, in Lake County, Calif."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY T. QUISENBERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4508) for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Henry T. Quisenberry, Oxnard, Calif., and his claim for compensation for disability from an injury to his spine and head allegedly incurred on December 8, 1943, while in the performance of duty as a security guard at the United States naval base at Port Hueneme, Calif., is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELMUTH S. HEYL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4867) for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helmuth S. Heyl, 270 Woodcrest Boulevard, Kenmore 23, N. Y., the sum of $1,149.24, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for a refund of income tax for the year 1922 erroneously collected: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALISON MACBRIDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6078) for the relief of Alison MacBride.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $276.74 to Alison MacBride, of Honolulu, T. H., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement of excessive payment of custom tax on household and personal effects shipped from China in 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA K. McQUILKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Anna K. McQuilkin against the United States for the proceeds of yearly renewable term insurance in the sum of $10,000 allegedly obtained by Elmer K. Kersey (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC–4904) during World War I. All defenses of the United States with respect to such claim which are based upon laches, lapse of time, and any statute of limitations are hereby waived.

Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS ERRONEOUSLY CONVEYED TO THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 824) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed in accordance with the following sections of this act all of the right, title, and interest of the United States, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, in and to the lands described in such sections, which were erroneously conveyed to the United States.

(b) Such conveyances shall be subject to the following donation easements and releases:

(1) Donation easement and release from Walter McAviney and Gertrude H. McAviney, his wife, to the United States of America, dated March 2, 1954, and recorded in book 151 of deeds, pages 130 and 133, records of Stevens County, Wash.;

(2) Donation easement and release from Walter Thomas McAviney and Winifred Joyce McAviney, his wife, to the United States of America, dated March 2, 1954, and recorded in book 151 of deeds, page 131, records of Stevens County, Wash.; and

(3) Donation easement and release from Cull A. White and Katherine M. White, his wife, to the United States of America, dated March 1, 1954, but not recorded in the Ferry County records.

Sec. 2. The following-described lands shall be conveyed to Walter McAviney and Gertrude H. McAviney, husband and wife, of Gifford, Wash.:

(a) A parcel of land containing 11.81 acres, more or less, being all that portion of the following-described tract of land lying in lot 3 less the northerly 375.0 feet thereof, of section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian: Beginning at the southeast corner of said lot 3 (which corner is identical to the quarter section corner on the east line of said section 4) and running thence north 89 degrees 52 minutes 8 seconds west along the south line of said lot 3 for a distance of 582.52 feet; thence north 8 degrees 52 minutes 00 seconds west 337.28 feet; thence north 16 degrees 53 minutes 00 seconds east 175.0 feet; thence south 64 degrees 57 minutes 00 seconds east 70.03 feet; thence north 13 degrees 36 minutes 00 seconds east 63.79 feet; thence north 33 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds west 85.18 feet; thence north 20 degrees 29 minutes 40 seconds east 491.71 feet; thence north 55 degrees 10 minutes 20 seconds east 239.34 feet; thence north 17 degrees 21 minutes 50 seconds east 122.85 feet to a point on the north line of said lot 3; thence south 89 degrees 52 minutes 11 seconds east 114.43 feet along the north line of said lot 3 to the northeast corner thereof; thence south 1 degree 24 minutes 52 seconds east along the east line of said lot 3 for a distance of 1,320.07 feet to the point of beginning; said parcel of land also being described as all that portion of lot 3 of said section 4, less the northerly 375.0 feet thereof, lying easterly of the boundary traverse of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as the Columbia River Reservoir); and

(b) A tract of land containing 0.36 of an acre, more or less, being that portion of lot 1, section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian, described by metes and bounds as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 1 of said section 4 and running thence north 89 degrees 52 minutes 11 seconds west along the south line of said lot 1 a distance of 114.43 feet; thence north 17 degrees 21 minutes 50 seconds east 156.08 feet; thence north 38 degrees 11 minutes 50 seconds east 100.59 feet to a point on the east line of said lot 1; thence south 1 degree 24 minutes 52 seconds east along the east line of said lot 1 a distance of 228.35 feet to the point of beginning; said tract of land also being described as that portion of lot 1 of said section 4 lying easterly of the boundary traverses of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as the Columbia River Reservoir).

Sec. 3. The following-described land shall be conveyed to Walter T. McAviney and Winifred McAviney, husband and wife, of Gifford, Wash.: A tract of land containing 2.20 acres, more or less, being all that portion of the north 375.0 feet of lot 3 of section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian, lying easterly of the easterly line of the right-of-way for abandoned Primary State Highway No. 22, excepting therefrom that portion heretofore conveyed to the United States of America by warranty deed from Ollie Winings (sometimes known as Ollie Winnings), as guardian of the estate of Verva Yeager (nee Gifford) and Roland Gifford, minors, dated, November 21, 1938, and recorded in book 103 of deeds, at page 619 under auditor's file No. 170217, records of Stevens County, Wash., and by warranty deed from Elmer J. Gifford and others, dated August 1, 1938, and recorded in book 103 of deeds, at page 435 under auditor's file No. 168052, records of Stevens County, Wash.; said tract of land also being described as that portion of the north 375.0 feet of lot 3 of said section 4 lying easterly of the boundary of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as the Columbia River Reservoir).

Sec. 4. The following-described land shall be conveyed to Cull A. White and Katherine M. White, husband and wife, of Quincy, Wash.: The east half of the west half of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 9, township 28 north, range 32 east, Willamette meridian.

Sec. 5. The following-described land containing 39.84 acres, more or less, shall be conveyed to Harvey F. Jones and Joan E.

Jones, husband and wife, of Wilbur, Wash.: All that portion of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 28 north, range 33 east, Willamette meridian, lying southerly of a line described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 09 minutes 30 seconds west 1,268.17 feet from the quarter section corner on the south line of said section 14 and running thence north 75 degrees 29 minutes 15 seconds east 180.91 feet, thence north 89 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds east 1,214.93 feet; thence north 85 degrees 49 minutes 39 seconds east 1,240.11 feet to a point on the east line of said section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 13 minutes 58 seconds west 1,404.31 feet from the southeast corner of said section 14.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURITH SPIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 999) for the relief of Nurith Spier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3), and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nurith Spier, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Walter and Edith Spier, lawfully resident aliens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ANDREA CHITATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1022) for the relief of Antonio Andrea Chitato.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Andrea Chitato shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA WIESNETH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1159) for the relief of Anna Wiesneth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Wiesneth, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Wiesneth" and substitute in lieu thereof "Histed, nee Wiesneth."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Anna Histed, nee Wiesneth."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALDOMERO R. GARCIA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1183) for the relief of Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERTO FANTUZZI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1877) for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roberto Fantuzzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1907) for the relief of James Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That James Wilson, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said James Wilson shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIEGFRIED ROSENZWEIG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 350) for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Siegfried Rosenzweig shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIGI TOMASELLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1976) for the relief of Luigi Tomasella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luigi Tomasella may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DER CHUCK YEE AND WU MEI ON

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 2273) for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINO AND GISELDA PRONI

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 2466) for the relief of Marino and Giselda Proni.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marino and Giselda Proni shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVO AND ELIA MONARI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2467) for the relief of Ivo and Elia Monari.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivo and Elia Monari shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADIROS KEBABJIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2525) for the relief of Madiros Kebabjian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Madiros Kebabjian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOAN FRANCES FEELEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2945) for the relief of Joan Frances Feeley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joan Frances Feeley shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee", strike out the colon and insert the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSAMU IKEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3349) for the relief of Osamu Ikeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Osamu Ikeda shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NISAN SARKIS GIRITLIYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3501) for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan" add the following: "and Virgin Giritliyan."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "fee" and substitute the word "fees."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "alien" and substitute the word aliens."

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "one number" and substitute the words "two numbers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUILLERMO PEDRAZA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3845) for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guillermo Pedraza shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEOPOLDINE SIMONETTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3856) for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leopoldine Simonetti may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH ROTICS WHITNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3956) for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elizabeth Rotics Whitney may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and substitute "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after "section 212 (a)", insert "(9) and."

On page 1, line 7, after the words "*Provided,* That", strike out "this" and substitute the word "these."

On page 1, line 8, strike out "exemption" and substitute the word "exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

On page 1, line 10, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDELTRAUDT MARGOT HACKELBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Edeltraudt Margot Hackelberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edeltraudt Margot Hackelberg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and substitute "provisions."

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Hackelberg" and substitute "Gallagher, nee Hackelberg."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute the words "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Edeltraudt Margot Gallagher, nee Hackelberg."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENTINE KINTZEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6036) for the relief of Mrs. Florentine Kintzel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Florentine Kintzel may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VITTORIO CAPANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Vittorio Capano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be enacted, etc., That section 101 (b) (1) (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered to be applicable to Vittorio Capano; and that Pietro Capano, a former citizen of the United States and a disabled veteran of World War I, shall be eligible to file petition prescribed by section 205 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vittorio Capano, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Capano, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MOLI (MALI) SOBEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1544) for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSUELO CALDERON DE VILLARREAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2278) for the relief of Consuelo Calderon de Villarreal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Consuelo Caledron de Villarreal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCISCA ALEMANY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Francisca Alemany.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provisions of sections 201, 202, and 203 of Public Law 414, 82d Congress, otherwise known as the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francisca Alemany may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the following language: "Public Law 414, 82d Congress, otherwise known as."

On page 1, line 6, after the words "may be" insert the following: "issued a special nonquota immigrant visa and be."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALLY S. SHULMAN OR ZELI SHOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISA GUIDI MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6896) for the relief of Luisa Guidi Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Luisa Guidi Miller, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Charles Carroll Miller, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEN. KEARIE L. BERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6794) to authorize Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry, United States Army, retired, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry, United States Army, retired, is authorized to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines on May 21, 1955, and the Secretary of State shall deliver such decoration and supporting documents to the said Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the following-named members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States are authorized to accept and wear the decorations set forth opposite their names, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines, and the Secretary of State shall deliver such decorations and supporting documents to the individuals so named:

"ARMY

"Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, O2624, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Maj. Gen. Jonathan W. Anderson, O3196, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry, O7220, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Maj. Gen. Leland S. Hobbs, O3809, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Maj. Gen. Albert M. Jones, O3186, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Maj. Gen. Albert Pierson, O11838, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Col. John F. Arfman, O42802, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Wray B. Avera, O12861, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Elliott J. Barnette, O28847, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. William H. Bertsch, Jr., O15759, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. James E. Bousch, O10525, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Paul Burns, O38733, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Ralph E. Doty, O16905, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Malcolm V. Fortier, O5604, United States Army, retired, Gold Cross Medal;

"Col. Marcus E. Jones, O10291, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of chief commander;

"Col. William F. Maher, O3747, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. William T. Medford, O128641, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Nelson A. Myll, O4165, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Benjamin L. Pickett, O42099, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Raymond G. Sherman, O7609, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Daniel E. Smalle, O41576, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Simpson R. Stribling, O6746, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Ernest E. Voss, O165135, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Howard R. Whittaker, O29408, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Richard L. Borndahl, O338260, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Thomas R. Cross, O24610, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. John T. Dawson, O39534, United States Army, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. William J. Evans, O30025, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Raymond T. Eyestone, O438054, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Hampton L. Green, O269907, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. William L. Nash, O43587, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Charles A. Newlin, O32983, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. William L. Osborne, O32154, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Hubert G. Schenck, O523083, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Lt. Col. Elmer Schmierer, O24531, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Murray E. Sparks, O21374, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Edward L. White, O39885, United States Army, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Maj. George H. Hedebeck, O140907, Military Merit Medal;

"Maj. George C. Hunt, O466119, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Maj. Michael A. Rivisto, O359048, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Maj. David S. Ross, O242977, Military Merit Medal;

"1st Lt. Daniel F. Resendes, O942990, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"M. Sgt. Raymund R. Combs, RA-37223438, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire:

M. Sgt. Raul De Luna, RA-6951885, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire;

"M. Sgt. Jake H. Terry, RA-6359527, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire;

"M. Sgt. Kenneth L. Withey, RA-16284402, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire, Armed Forces of the Philippines Parachutist Badge;

"Sfc. Ralph E. Hankins, RA-37621658, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire, Armed Forces of the Philippine Parachutist Badge;

"Sfc. John A. Renninger, RA-13264974, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire, Armed Forces of the Philippines Parachutist Badge:

"Sgt. Henry E. Ambrose, RA-34686907, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire, Armed Forces of the Philippines Parachutist Badge:

"Sgt. James N. McElroy, RA-14236320, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire, Armed Forces of the Philippines Parachutist Badge.

"NAVY

"Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, 3182, United States Navy, retired, Legion of Honor;

"Rear Adm. Richard H. Cruzen, 20220, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., 20393, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Rear Adm. John H. Keatley, 62653, United States Navy, retired, Military Merit Medal;

"Rear Adm. Francis P. Old, 20468, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Rear Adm. Carroll D. Reynolds, 59466, United States Navy, retired, Military Medal of Merit;

"Capt. William A. Dolan, Jr., 60352, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. Rex B. Little, 71342, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. Harold V. Nerney, 66281, United States Naval Reserve, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. George A. Sharp, 62676, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. James E. Van Zandt, 109170, United States Naval Reserve, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. Rintoul T. Whitney, 17614, United States Navy, retired, Legion of Honor;

"Cmdr. Lloyd G. Benson, 147904, United States Naval Reserve, Legion of Honor;

"Comdr. Olaf K. Amdahl, 74003, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Comdr. Martin S. Buehler, 99388, United States Naval Reserve, Legion of Honor;

"Comdr. Albert S. Freedman, Jr., 78650, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Comdr. Charles M. Keyes, 71572, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Lieut. Comdr. James F. Hill, 118428, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Lieut. Leighton J. Brunson, 203824, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"Lieut. Harvey J. Woods, 284050, United States Naval Reserve, Legion of Honor;

"Lieut. (jg.) Orville B. Karge, 378120, United States Navy, Legion of Honor;

"GM1c Royal G. Hartong, 2834184, United States Navy, Legion of Honor.

"MARINE CORPS

"Sgt. John H. Bland, 657382, Legion of Honor, degree of legionnaire.

"AIR FORCE

"Maj. Gen. Ernest Moore, 586A, Legion of Honor;

"Brig. Gen. Robert C. Oliver, 228A, retired, Legion of Honor, degree of commander;

"Col. Ned B. Chase, 1101A, Air Force Senior Pilot Aeronautical Badge;

"Col. Edward G. Lansdale, 2534A, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Col. Lloyd H. Watnee, 482A, Command Pilot Badge;

"Lt. Col. Malcolm E. Musler, 2181A, Legion of Honor, degree of officer;

"Lt. Col. Marlen E. Rebar, 8455A, Legion of Honor;

"Maj. Earl A. Butts, 8577A, Honorary Air Force Pilot Badge;

"Maj. Russell A. Downey, 14747A, Senior Pilot Badge;

"Maj. Leland D. Embrey, 8972A, Legion of Honor, Senior Pilot Badge;

"Maj. Linn E. Wilde, Jr., 7780A, Legion of Honor, Air Force Senior Pilot, Aeronautical Badge;

"Capt. Allan P. Charak, A0588299, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. Alger C. Ellis, Jr., A0867682, Legion of Honor;

"Capt. Jesse F. Jory, 8639A, Air Force Pilot Badge;

"S. Sgt. James Limun, AF6613982, Military Merit Medal."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRENE C. (KARL) BEHRMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 92) for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HAROLD SWARTHOUT AND L. R. SWARTHOUT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 476) for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELKAY MANUFACTURING CO., CHICAGO, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 135) for the relief of Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANN ARBOR CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1033) for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Ann Arbor Construction Co., a construction supplies corporation, of Ann Arbor, Mich., the sum of $8,953.73 in accordance with the opinion and the findings of fact certified by the Court of Claims to the Congress pursuant to Senate Resolution 224, 82d Congress, first session: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS: On page 1, line 11, after the word "Act", insert "not in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Senator CHARLES E. POTTER in connection with the attorney's fee in this case be considered at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Re S. 1033, for the relief of the Ann Arbor Construction Co.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with the subject bill, which has passed the Senate and is now pending before your committee, it is my opinion that appropriate provisions should be made for reasonable attorney's fees, particularly since the case was litigated before the Court of Claims.

It is my understanding that the Senate committee does not agree, but had in mind as matter of procedure transmittal of a memorandum concerning the legal services rendered.

Enclosed is a memorandum of counsel for the company, Mr. Harold Leventhal, reviewing the legal services involved in vindication of this claim.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. POTTER,
United States Senate.

JULY 7, 1955.

Memorandum: Legal services rendered in connection with claim of Ann Arbor Construction Co. (involved in S. 1033).

1. The company's claim is for damages due to its eviction, by Army officers, from land it held under rightful possession as a lessee of the State of Michigan. The decision of the court of claims upon a Senate reference (Congressional No. 17, 871) recommended a payment to plaintiff of $8,953.73.

2. The necessity for extensive legal services on behalf of claimant arose, first, out of various contentions successively advanced by the Government; and second, the Government's new policy determination of the Department of Justice that it would not consider settlements in congressional reference cases.

(a) The Comptroller General denied the claim on December 22, 1947, on one theory. After extensive research, counsel for the company showed this theory was unsound. It was not accepted by the Court of Claims.

(b) On July 5, 1951, the Secretary of the Army recommended against a private bill on another theory, that the lease to the company had terminated prior to the eviction. This depended on when construction of the Willow Run bomber plant was completed. Although the relevant facts were peculiarly in the possession of the Government, plaintiff was able to unearth enough evidence to convince the Court of Claims that this theory was unsound.

(c) Other theories were advanced by the Department of Justice in the course of litigation.

(d) At a posttrial conference, the Commissioner of the Court of Claims suggested that the parties try to reach a settlement. On July 1, 1953, the company made a formal offer of settlement in an amount which received the tentative approval of defense counsel, subject to approval by his superiors. Acceptance of the settlement was recommended by Department of the Army, but was rejected by Department of Justice on December 18, 1953. The Department of Justice had established a new policy direction against settlements in congressional reference cases.

3. There were many conferences, briefs and submissions made to the Department of the Army, the Department of Justice, Public Roads Administration, and the Comptroller General during 1944–1951. Three sets of briefs were filed with the Judiciary Committees, considering the successive Government contentions. These briefs were filed with both House and Senate Judiciary Committees—in October 1949, in March 1950, and in April 1951. These efforts alone involve literally weeks of work.

4. Extensive services were rendered in the Court of Claims litigation. The claim, which was the subject of S. 122, 82 Cong., 1st Sess., was referred to the Court of Claims after the Secretary of the Army filed objection. (S. Rept. No. 962, 82d Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 16, 1951.) The proceedings in the Court of Claims were:

(a) Petition was filed Jan. 16, 1952.

(b) Preliminary hearing was held June 25, 1952, before Commissioner who requested additional information and evidence. The Commissioner stated that in his judgment the record should be more complete than in the case of an ordinary suit against the Government because the case was one of congressional reference.

(c) December 13, 1952: Both parties submitted proposed statements of facts.

(d) January 5, 1953: Both parties submitted responses to proposed statements of facts.

(e) May 22, 1953: Hearing held in Detroit and Ypsilanti.

(f) May 29, 1953: Post-trial conference held by Commissioner, concerning documentary exhibits, etc.

(g) July 1, 1953: Plaintiff submitted offer of settlement.

(h) December 18, 1953: Department rejected offer of settlement.

(i) February 11, 1954: Plaintiff filed requested findings of fact.

(j) March 25, 1954: Plaintiff filed objections to defendant's requested findings of fact.

(k) April 21, 1954: Commissioner filed report.

(l) July 1, 1954: Plaintiff filed brief with Court of Claims.

(m) August 27, 1954: Government filed brief with Court of Claims.

(n) November 1, 1954: Argument before Court of Claims.

(o) November 30, 1954: Decision of Court of Claims.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD LEVENTHAL,
Counsel to Ann Arbor Construction Co., 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Of counsel:
BURKE, BURKE & SMITH,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

AMERICAN BARREL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1161) for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $29,292.10 to the American Barrel Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the purchase of surplus steel drums from the Department of State, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, under contracts numbered W–ANL (ETO–II) 3831 and W–ANL (ETO–II) 4125, dated October 30, 1947, and February 12, 1948. Such reimbursement is due to erroneous representations made that the said steel drums were in usable condition and it was determined that they were worthless: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEZSO SZILAGYI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of Dezso Szilagyi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dezso Szilagyi, who was admitted to the United States for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States, for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the first available immigration quota for Denmark.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dezso Szilagyi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TSI AU LI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "quota control."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "number of visas authorized to be issued under the provision of section 4 (a) (13) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIGUEL SANDOVAL-MICHEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2788) for the relief of Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Ridriguez-Gomez).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez-Gomez) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez-Gomez) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENA RAPP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6002) for the relief of Helena Rapp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 353 (5) (B) shall be held to have been and to be applicable to Helena Rapp.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "been", insert "and to be."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Helena" and insert "Helene."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Helene Rapp."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6532) for the relief of John William Scholtes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John William Scholtes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT B. COOPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2342) for the relief of Robert B. Cooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert B. Cooper, Morro Bay, Calif., the sum of $75,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert B. Cooper against the United States arising out of personal injuries inflicted upon him by an officer of the United States Navy on March 15, 1944, while said Robert B. Cooper was serving as a conductor on train No. 75 of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$10,000."

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT W. RETHERFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4718) to authorize and direct the issuance of patent to Robert W. Retherford of Anchorage, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent to Robert W. Retherford, of Anchorage, Alaska, to the northwest quarter of section 35, township 19 north, range 1 east, Seward meridian, Alaska, in connection with homestead entry Anchorage serial 021660: *Provided,* That final proof as required by law is filed, such filing to be considered as having been made by April 27, 1953, thus restoring the entry to its status prior to the April 28, 1953, decision vacating the allowance of August 29, 1952, as amended by decision of December 16, 1952.

SEC. 2. Application for patent under this act must be filed within 1 year after the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "That", strike the remainder of line 8, and all of lines 9 and 10. Strike all of lines 1 and 2 and all of section 2 on page 2, inserting in lieu thereof the following: "within 1 year after the effective date of this act, satisfactory final proof is filed as required by law and regulations in effect on August 21, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts by members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1191)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend for a period of two years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad."

JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill proposed to make permanent the provisions of the act of December 5, 1942, granting the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. Senate amendment numbered 1 provided that the privilege be extended until July 1, 1957, in lieu of being made permanent. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Senate amendment numbered 2 added a new section to the House bill which proposed to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to specifically provide for hardboard in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act. The Senate recedes.

Amendment to title: Under the conference agreement, the title to the bill is conformed to the action taken on amendments numbered 1 and 2.

JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 5559 passed the House it provided for making the privilege of the free importation of bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces in amounts up to $50 permanent. This privilege has been in the law on a temporary basis since 1942.

The Defense Department requested that the privilege be made permanent and the Committee on Ways and Means reported a bill carrying out that recommendation. As the bill passed the Senate, it provided for a 2-year extension of this privilege from June 30, 1955, through June 30, 1957.

In addition, the Senate added an amendment which would have reclassified hardboard for customs purposes from a pulpboard classification to a wood classification. This reclassification also involved increases in the rates of duties on hardboard.

The Senate receded on the hardboard amendment and the House receded on the amendment relating to gifts from servicemen. In conference the House conferees agreed to recommend to the Committee on Ways and Means that hearings be held on H. R. 264, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, which is similar to the Senate amendment reclassifying hardboard. The Committee on Ways and Means agreed to hold public hearings beginning next Monday, July 25, and not to exceed 2 days. We have scheduled as the lead-off witnesses representatives from the interested Government departments who will be followed by the proponents of the bill and last we will hear opponents of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5559, as amended by the other body, provided a reclassification of hardboard for tariff purposes. This same amendment was favorably reported by our committee and passed the House in the last Congress. However, it has been pointed out that the amendment might conflict with some of our reciprocal trade agreements. It has also been pointed out that the Committee on Ways and Means has not held public hearings at any time on this legislation which, it now appears, is somewhat controversial. At two meetings of the conference committee, we strove diligently to reach a conclusion which would be satisfactory to all parties. However, it was finally agreed to delete the hardboard amendment with the understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means would hold hearings in the immediate future on the problem. These hearings have been announced to commence next Monday. At that time, both the proponents and the opponents of the hardboard amendment will have ample opportunity to present their cases.

LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 5046) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE TODAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MARIA LOUISE ANDREIS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 3, strike out "101 (a) (27) (A)" and insert "203 (a) (3)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERESA ALICE TOWNSEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1044) for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Line 6, strike out "her admission" and insert "the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON WIESEL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of Solomon Wiesel, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EBOLYA WOLF

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Ebolya Wolf, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST TOMASSICH AND YOKO MATSUO TOMASSICH

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Line 12, after "available" insert ": *Provided,* That in the case of Yoko Matsuo Tomassich, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR RAMOS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Eleanor Ramos, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ESTHER RODRIGUEZ DE URIBE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (17), and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS OR LAWFULLY RESIDENT ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 2, line 4, after "Almeida", insert "Theresa Andriopoulos."
>
> Page 2, lines 4 and 5, after "Armstrong", insert "Maria Bagley."
>
> Page 2, line 5, after "Bakmazian", insert "Josef G. Balzina."
>
> Page 2, line 6, after "Bratsis", insert "Helen Nazareno Brewbaker."
>
> Page 2, line 11, after "Ciccone", insert "Joan K. Cooper."
>
> Page 2, line 11, after "Ciccone", insert "Erika J. S. Culbertson."
>
> Page 2, line 13, after "Demos", insert "Tilde Di Pietro."
>
> Page 2, line 17, after "Gould", insert "Antonios Gounaris."
>
> Page 2, line 19, after "Hawkins", insert "Rose K. Hedrick."
>
> Page 2, line 20, after "Hendrix", insert "Elfriede A. C. Higgins."
>
> Page 2, line 20, after "Hood", insert "Antonio Imbruglia."
>
> Page 2, line 24, strike out "Ramon Martin Lopez" and insert "Sin Hey Louie."
>
> Page 3, line 1, after "McPherson", insert "Margot Mentick."
>
> Page 3, line 2, after "Pane", insert "Mavis C. Paxton."
>
> Page 3, line 3, strike out "Pereira" and insert "Verdi (nee Pereira)."
>
> Page 3, line 5, after "Redding", insert "Frieda Richardson."
>
> Page 3, line 5, after "Ritchie", insert "Sylvia H. K. Roberts."
>
> Page 3, line 7, after "Skipp", insert "Dora C. Sorre."
>
> Page 3, line 7, strike out "Sternberger" and insert "Steinberger."
>
> Page 3, line 9, after "Tsoukalas", insert "Elise M. G. Van Bergen."
>
> Page 3, line 11, after "Walther", insert "Patricia A. M. West."
>
> Page 3, line 13, strike out "Charlotte S. Zornow" and insert "Yue-Pin Yee."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Concurrent Resolution 98 approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 3, after line 17, insert:
> "A–7210454, Ciundziewicki, Stefan.
> "0200–126849, Franges, Oton.
> "0300–463178, Lee, Marcelle Chang.
> "A–6953081, Lin, Shao-chi.
> "E–7314, Muzayin, Sion.
> "E–7316, Muzayin, Violette.
> "E–7318, Muzayin, Widad.
> "0300–446252, Muzayin, Larine.
> "0300–446254, Muzayin, Josef.
> "A–7298030, Negulescu, Paul.
> "A–7383367, Sepsy, Hajna, formerly Ruttkay.
> "A–6937543, Tang, Lloyd Wei-Zing, Chi-Cheong.
> "A–6534328, Yang, Georgiana Hwei-Ying.
> "0500–42757, Yeh, Chien-Kuan."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 6, strike out line 11.

Page 19, after line 20, insert:

"A-6903941, Dinces, Aleksander.
"A-9799528, Fook, Shum Hang.
"A-9708071, Hing Chung.
"A-7073962, Sipajlo, Ema.
"A-7073963, Sipajlo, Josef.
"A-9533332, Woo, Sueh Dao."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 122]

Anfuso
Becker
Buchanan
Chiperfield
Clevenger
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Deane
Dingell
Eberharter
Gregory
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Hinshaw
Holifield
Johnson, Calif.
McDowell
Mumma
Phillips
Pillion
Powell
Prouty
Rains
Reed, N. Y.
Short
Sikes
Udall

The SPEAKER. Four hundred and four Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be privileged to sit tomorrow and the rest of the week during general debate in the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7214) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments proposing to increase or decrease the hourly wage rate specified in line 7 therein and except amendments proposing to change the effective date provided in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself 15 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the so-called amendments to the wage-hour law. The rule is a closed rule except as to the 2 provisions of this bill, 1 raising the minimum wage to $1 per hour, and the other fixing the effective date of the bill. Amendments will be in order as to either one of these features of the bill, but no other amendments will be in order.

I do not know of any objection or contest as to the rule itself. There will, of course, be considerable controversy about the merits of the bill. I think the rule will be adopted without any controversy. It provides for 3 hours of general debate on the subject and then amendments to these two sections will be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I asked permission to speak out of order this morning because I was unfortunately not on the floor Thursday when the Rules Committee got its kicking around by the Appropriations Committee. We have had a good many brickbats thrown at the Rules Committee, but I am not mad at anybody about that. I realize that the time of the session has come when nobody loves the Rules Committee, and particularly when they do not get just exactly what they want from the Rules Committee. I am also cognizant of the philosophy around here on the part of some Members that the Rules Committee is just a traffic cop and supposed to joyfully and gladly give everybody a rule who asks for one. But my people did not elect me to Congress to be a traffic cop, and I think that is true of the other members of the Rules Committee. I think that committee feels they have some functions of a discretionary nature to perform.

While I am not at all angered about it and do not feel badly about it and still want to be friends with everybody, nevertheless, I think we had better set the record clear on this thing and state just what happened about the rule the Appropriations Committee asked for in the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill.

To begin with when the Committee on Appropriations appeared before us they told us they had a bill of 38 pages and that all but 4 pages was in violation of the rules of the House. Of course everybody set up and took notice about that time. A great many questions were asked about it.

Since I have been chairman of the Rules Committee there has been much complaint from legislative committees that the Appropriations Committee invades their field and then goes to the Rules Committee and gets a rule waiving points of order. So I made the rule that when that occurred in any appropriation bill we would do the chairman of the Legislative Committee the courtesy of letting him know and giving him an opportunity to be heard. It appeared that there were at least three instances there that I thought the chairman of the respective legislative committees ought to be heard on. One of them involved matters of a legislative character with respect to the Agricultural Committee; another one was with respect to the House Administration Committee; also the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs appeared in opposition to the rule on the ground that the bill invaded the jurisdiction of that committee.

The Rules Committee did not refuse anybody a rule. The committee just adjourned without acting on it. This seemed to create some resentment. The Speaker spoke to me about it in the presence of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I told him we would call a meeting of the committee again to see if we could iron out the difficulties. But that invitation was not accepted.

So the next day the bill was emasculated, not by the Rules Committee but by the Appropriations Committee. The Rules Committee did not commit murder or mayhem or even assault and battery on the bill. It was the Appropriations Committee which murdered its own offspring. I do not know why that was done. Perhaps it was to teach the Rules Committee a lesson that it should not refuse any rule when it is requested by the Appropriations Committee. If that was the purpose of the proposition I want to say that I do not think the Rules Committee or any member of it has any apologies to offer about what happened. We were pursuing our policy and we were under the impression that the same rules applied to the Appropriations Committee as to any other committee in the House. We expect to pursue the same policy in the future that we have in the past. I think I can speak for the entire committee when I make that statement. This infant prodigy that came before the Rules Committee was the offspring of the Appropriations Committee.

I want to make it perfectly clear that the Rules Committee had nothing to do with what happened on the floor the next day. I think I may say with some assurance that if the Appropriations Committee had not seen fit to murder its own offspring 90 percent of that bill would have gone through without anybody having raised a point of order.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As the gentleman stated, I did appear before the Rules Committee and requested that a rule not be granted waiving points of order because certainly I believed there were things in that bill that should not be in there. For instance, there was an appropriation in the bill that had been refused by the House, also by the other body, then it was put in this bill. I want to compliment the Rules Committee on the job it did.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there was a good deal of preaching around here on Thursday about the sins of the Rules Committee. I think I might do a little preaching myself this morning. A little sermon is sometimes good for the soul.

Let us look at the Appropriations Committee for a minute and see if it was without sin in its application for a rule. We all have our faults around here, and I do not think the Appropriations Committee is entirely free of fault in these matters. I might take as my text this morning a passage from the Bible which says that "he who is without sin, let him cast the first stone." The Appropriations Committee threw around a lot of brickbats the other day and I just wonder whether they are entirely within sin. Of course, there is another passage from the Bible that might be an appropriate part of the sermon, and that is: "Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?"

In that connection there happens to be a rule of the House with respect to the procedure of committees and it does not make any exception in favor of the Appropriations Committee. That is rule XI (g).

It says:

> All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public except executive sessions for marking up bills or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Notwithstanding this rule no public hearings are ever held by the Committee on Appropriations. When a legislative committee is considering legislative matters within its jurisdiction, any citizen may come in and sit and listen. Any citizen who has a complaint against the bill or is in favor of the bill is afforded the opportunity to come in and say he is for it or against it. That does not apply in the Committee on Appropriations. It does not even apply to Members of the Congress. When that committee is holding a hearing, the doors are closed, and if you, as a Member of the Congress, representing the people of your district, are interested in that bill, and you go around there, you cannot get in and listen to what is going on. It is a star chamber proceeding. If you happen to be a witness, now, the door is open for a little crack and you are permitted to slide in and say your little piece and slide out, but there are no public hearings.

The reason I raise that point is in connection with the invasion of the power of legislative committees by the Committee on Appropriations, because they do not operate the same way. So, they may hold a star chamber proceeding and decide that the Committee on Agriculture should have reported certain legislation which they have not reported, and they do not consult anybody about it. They close the doors. Nobody hears it except the committee, and then they report out a bill that has not been the subject of any discussion by those who are most primarily concerned with that kind of legislation.

Now, I say this all in good humor. I am not mad at anybody about it. The Committee on Appropriations has been doing it all the time. The Republicans do it when they are in power, and the Democrats do it when they are in power. But, they ought not to do that in secret sessions in a star chamber, behind locked doors, permitting nobody to be heard and violating the rules of the House with respect not only to holding an executive session but with respect to invading the legislative powers of those committees. I think as long as the Committee on Rules is composed of its present membership, that the committee will proceed and continue to use the same policy, that when the Committee on Appropriations wants to enact legislation the Committee on Rules will do the chairman of the appropriate legislative committee the courtesy to at least let him be heard. Now, what we will do about it after we hear them is another thing, but at least we will give everybody an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman knows very well that every single Member of this House loves and approves of the action of the Committee on Rules when they protect us from going on record on some bill that is not sound or where we do not want to be on record.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I fully subscribe to what my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has stated in regard to the procedure relative to the appropriation bill of last week. The gentleman from Virginia has fully stated the provisions of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill for many reasons, chief among them being the harm and the hardship that would come about to over one million people of this country who are now working, according to my best information.

The most reliable figures that I have is that there are about 1,200,000 subnormals either mentally or physically handicapped working under the present minimum hourly wage. What would it mean to many of these people in the event we raised the present rate 33⅓ percent? Would it not mean that they would be forced upon relief?

We all have them in our respective communities. They want to work, but many of them will not be hired at an $8-a-day figure because the employer naturally will prefer some young, alert man or woman for $8 a day. Many are receiving a smaller amount than that. They are probably getting other benefits from their employment. But there are not only these 1,200,000 unfortunate people, many of whom would be thrown out of employment, but there are, Mr. Speaker, probably a like number of elderly people who are presently employed, both men and women, working in different capacities. Many of them have worked for 40 or more odd years. Probably their life depends upon their continuing to work there. They would not know what to do if they found themselves forced out of employment. Many just tinker around. They are there. They do not want to go on relief or social security. They want to work.

So I say, when we talk about raising the rate to $1 an hour, we should take into consideration these 2.5 million of subnormals and elderly people who do not want to go on relief. They do not want to take social security. They just want to tinker around in the factory where they are working, the place where they have spent the greatest number of years of their life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us what he means by subnormals?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We have them in every community. These people are sincere and honest. I am sure the gentleman has them in his community. But when the question comes up about whether the employer is going to have to pay them $8 a day, the employer would prefer hiring some young, alert. high-school young man or young woman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I would suggest the gentleman probably means the handicapped, those who are physically handicapped, who cannot earn a full day's pay.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Also the mentally handicapped.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering if a better term would not be those who are not well qualified, instead of subnormal.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I gladly accept your characterization. Practically all of them, I repeat, are honest and sincere people.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Under the present act, is not provision made for what the gentleman calls subnormal people? Aged people, people who are physically handicapped, may get a certificate from the Secretary of Labor, providing for a lower wage.

The gentleman made another statement, that there were over 2 million of these people. There are only 1,850,000 people who would be affected by this proposed $1 rate. They are not all handicapped, they are not all old people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman that it is true that they can get a certificate from the Secretary of Labor. And the law provides for apprenticeships, and so forth. But the practical fact is that there are going to be many employers who will not pay $8 per day to these people, or to many of the elderly people. Those are the people who will be affected.

Mention was made before the Rules Committee of the family budget.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not at the present moment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I asked the gentleman to yield to ask him if he thought that all of the support for his position is represented on this side and that there is no other point of view. There are many over here who favor $1 an hour minimum wage and I am one of them. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that 2,100,000 people will be handicapped if they are denied this $1-an-hour minimum wage, because they do not get it now?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not speaking for anyone by myself, but in my opinion I am stating facts.

It will come up during the debate on this bill that the family budget should be $4,000 or $5,000 per year. I would ask those who expound that argument whether these millions of people I have mentioned will be receiving $4,000 or $5,000 a year with regard to this family budget when they go on relief or social security? I think not.

Another point I wish to mention is this: In my opinion, it is harmful to small business. There is no question that big business is doing all right. For many years there has been in this Congress a committee to try to help small business. In my opinion, small business cannot absorb this 33⅓ percent increase in the hourly wage. I do not think small business can absorb it or can pay for it. Business now is excellent, prosperity is excellent, employment is at an all-time high and unemployment is very low. I am just wondering what we are trying to do here? To disrupt prosperity? I hope we do not do so.

I know that the textile industry, the pottery industry and the coal industry are having problems, but I have found no one who would say that in the event this hourly wage is increased by 33⅓ percent that will solve the problem of the coal, pottery, and textile industries.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it not correct that the Committee on Rules supported a $1-an-hour minimum wage?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It reported out a bill providing for a $1 minimum wage which is open to amendment.

I want to talk on the problem of agriculture.

When we start talking about the problems of certain segments of our people, probably the one now in the worst condition, at least so far as the greater number is concerned, is agriculture. For the past 5 years the prices that farmers have been receiving for their products have been gradually going down, while the prices of the things they need to operate their farms have gradually been going higher and higher.

That is something we should consider here today. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Education and Labor came before the Committee on Rules. There was not one member there who stated that the business people, the employers, from an economic standpoint and from the standpoint of feasibility could absorb this 33⅓-percent increase. To the best of my knowledge, there is no businessman, small or large, who has come out and said that the employers can absorb this 33⅓-percent increase.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and this has been in my mind for several years, there is the question of constitutionality involved. I ask this question, and I will yield to anyone to answer the question: If Congress or the Supreme Court has the right and the authority to hold that a person cannot work for less than $1 an hour, then does not the Congress or the Supreme Court have an equal right and equal authority to hold that no person can receive more than $1 per hour for working? I yield to anyone to answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now under consideration, calls up the minimum wage legislation for action by the Congress. It is indeed unfortunate that this legislation has been so long delayed and that the House is asked to consider the same on the closing days of this session. This rule limits the consideration of the House to raising or lowering the $1.00 minimum figure and also the effective date which the Committee on Education and Labor reported last week. There have been a great number of bills filed by Members of the House calling for an increase of the minimum wage base from 75 cents to 90 cents, $1.10, $1.25, and $1.35 per hour. The attention of the Members need not be called to the fact that the cost of living has gone up greatly since 1949 when the minimum wage was increased by the Congress to 75 cents an hour. In fact, in 1949 a great number of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor argued that the minimum wage should have been set at $1.00 instead of 75 cents which the Congress enacted 6 years ago. In 1949 a great percentage of the Members of the House were of the opinion that a 75 cent minimum was too low considering the increased and high cost of living in 1949.

Testimony was presented before the Education and Labor Committee that an estimated annual wage of $1.25 for 8 hours a day and 5 days a week would bring in an approximate income of $2,500. It was also estimated that a 90 cent an hour minimum wage for a full time worker would amount to approximately $2,000 a year. On pages 29 and 30 of the printed copies of the hearings held by the Education and Labor Committee, there is set out the cost of living statistics for approximately 30 cities throughout the country, north, east, south, and west. It is surprising to know that these figures gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that in the year 1955, the requirement for the average family budget for the necessities of life runs slightly over $4,000 per year. From these figures, it is very easy for the membership to realize the difficulty the average family, living in or adjacent to these metropolitan cities endures in trying to exist on a minimum wage of $1.00, considering the present high cost of life's necessities. On the basis of these figures, the average family living in Detroit; Atlanta, Ga; Houston, Tex.; Memphis, Tenn.; Los Angeles, and about 28 other metropolitan areas, would require a wage of between $2.00 and $2.20 per hour.

I noticed in reading some of the testimony contained in the hearings that representatives of the A. F. of L., CIO, and other labor organizations, testified that their membership would not in any way be affected by the increase in minimum wage legislation. Their testimony revealed that these organizations were fighting for the great mass of unorganized in various localities throughout the country, who are today trying to live on a subnormal income. All labor groups, including others who testified for $1.25 an hour minimum wage, revealed that substandard wages go hand in hand with poor housing conditions, slums, juvenile delinquency and crime expansion in various degrees. The testimony of Selma Borchardt, Washington representative of the American Federation of Teachers, on page 921 of the hearings, said she was appealing for a family income that would give our country a better return on its richest and most precious investment—our children. She pleaded for a wage that would give greater family stability. She pleaded for a family income that would provide a home so that children could sit around the dining room table and enjoy a family life and not be compelled to go into the streets and alleys for entertainment and pastimes because of the lack of home facilities. When you consider the actual expenditures in treating the juvenile delinquent and in the prevention of such delinquency, we would find that the raising of the wages in terms of the total economy of the Nation, would be a real investment. She made the startling statement that in over 20 States of the United States, children are exempt from compulsory school attendance laws if their family is too poor to attend.

It is estimated that the present minimum wage law, considering exemptions, covers approximately 24 million workers. It is further estimated that an increase from 75 cents to 90 cents per hour would affect approximately 691,000 workers. An increase to $1 minimum would affect approximately 1,271,000. It is estimated that an increase to $1.10 minimum would affect approximately 2,137,000, and an increase to $1.25 an hour would affect approximately 3,560,000 as compared to the total of now covered of 24 million. We should not lose sight of the fact that the worker under the minimum wage bracket cannot enjoy sick leave, paid vacations, welfare, and pension plans.

It is indeed unfortunate that the membership of the House did not have an opportunity to vote and consider the expansion of coverage so that millions of workers who are not now eligible to minimum wage protection, could be given some relief. The presidential candidates and the leadership of both political parties, during their campaign, advocated a substantial increase of minimum wage and also to extend the coverage.

Beside the above facts which I have mentioned, one of the greatest results of a substantial increase in minimum wage would be the increasing of the buying power throughout our whole economic structure. We have learned from past experiences during the last 50 years that prosperity both for the farmer and urban areas can be maintained only through a substantial buying power. Let us profit by experiences from the past. On last Sunday, the Washington Star, in its special column under the subtitle "Fifty Years Ago in Washington," set out an interesting paragraph from the edition of the Star of July 4, 1905, which applies to our wage problem today the same as it did 50 years ago. I am going to read the paragraph from the Star of July 4, 1905, as it was printed:

> If labor can get an increase of wages large enough to overcome the higher prices of the necessities of life, it may be said to enjoy much prosperity in addition to the largely increased chance of steady employment for more men. But for a large class of the community prosperity has a hollow sound and may actually mean increased hardship. The laborers may, in certain trades, by means of unions, force up their wages artificially and maintain them for a long time, but that vast army of persons who may be fairly well described as salary workers, as distinguished from wage earners, have no such recourse. * * * To this great army must be added the persons of small fixed income derived from investments in mortgages, bonds, annuities, and other funds. These people are at a great disadvantage, because, with the development of the country and the increase of stored capital, their incomes actually tend to shrink because of the falling rate of interest. What is to be done about it? Nobody knows.

That paragraph from the Star of 1905, to my mind, exposes the reason why, during the early years of the 20th century, the country endured panics every 5 or 6 years. In those days they called economic depressions financial panics. It was only 2 years, in 1907, after this article was in the Star that the country suffered a serious panic. In 1913 another money panic visited our country. In 1921 and 1922 our country endured another minor panic. Then we went into the lush 1920 period when the real-estate, stock-market, and land speculators became rich and our Government and everybody else forgot about the wage income of millions of workers throughout the land. Finally, when the buying power was completely drained, we went into the depression of 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 which ruined our economy and almost our governmental system itself. After the early 1930 depression, our Government woke up to the fact that wages and working conditions for millions throughout the country must be improved. The administration in the 1930's assumed this responsibility and our economy was brought from the dark dungeons up to the peak of prosperity because we established sufficient buying power. In the last few years, we are gradually forgetting the startling lesson that we should have learned 25 years ago and that lesson is "ample buying power for the American worker and American farmer is essential for continued prosperity."

I do hope this Congress today will raise the minimum wage to a figure between $1.10 and $1.25 an hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am for an increase in the minimum wage, so I am for this rule, and I trust it will be adopted.

I am electing to speak at this time because I want to make my position clear, and as best I can, to make clear the position of the administration and to have it understood as early as possible.

There is another reason also. Under this rule which in many ways is a closed rule, it probably would be determined under the rules of the House when an amendment is offered to change the $1 figure that pro forma amendments would not be in order; hence there would be 5 minutes for the amendment and 5 minutes against.

I say I would like to speak of my position and the position of the administration. In respect to the latter, of course, we all understand that the President after very careful consideration of all factors involved, recommended an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to 90 cents. He also made certain recommendations in respect to the extension of coverage, but that matter of coverage is not dealt with in this bill. So I trust that when the time arrives an amendment will be offered to reduce the figure that is carried in the bill from $1 to 90 cents, and I hope that amendment will prevail.

Let us not make the mistake here today of doing more harm than good.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman explain the vote of the Senate on $1? And why the House should be put on the spot for 90 cents?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, under the rules of the House it is not proper to refer to the actions of the other body. I have an important responsibility here and I am quite certain that other Members feel that way about it. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania does, too. If we take a different position from the other body, it would not be the first time that has happened, and I certainly hope it will not be the last time.

Let us not make the mistake here today of doing more harm than good.

Through the years since the establishment of the basic Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, the Congress has shown an appreciation of the very real problems which grow out of our efforts to improve the economic standards of workers covered by this legislation.

We have kept in mind that, as originally conceived, the act called for the elimination of living standards detrimental to the health, efficiency and well-being of workers, as rapidly as practicable, but without substantially curtailing employment or earning power.

This note of caution—that Congress be careful not to go faster in the establishment of minimum-wage levels than the economy can stand—has been heeded in years past and it should be heeded now.

When the 25-cent minimum was set in 1938, provision was made that the floor be raised to not more than 40 cents within the next 7 years.

Not until 1950 did we increase the minimum again, this time to the present 75-cent level.

In each case careful consideration was given to the extent of changes in economic conditions, and the Congress acted accordingly.

We must continue to bear in mind that we are dealing here with a minority area in the national economy that by its very nature deserves our sympathy and our understanding.

Our goal must be to help the workers in this area to obtain higher living standards, but we must also give the most careful consideration to the problems of the small operators who are giving employment to these people.

The biggest problem faced by these small-business owners is the problem of adjusting to the action of the Congress in raising the minimum wage.

A parallel has been cited between the action of 1950 in raising the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents and the step we are considering here today.

It should be remembered that following that increase the Nation moved into a period of inflation which had two effects:

First. It made the adjustment easier for the employers.

Second. It wiped out the gains made by labor.

We are seeking now, consistent with objectives of the Fair Labor Standards Act, to correct the inequities for this segment of our working population which resulted from the inflationary period of the Korean war.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the increase in the cost of living has amounted to approximately 13 percent since the last hike in the minimum wage.

Thus, in terms of purchasing power, the man or woman who was making 75 cents in 1950 would have to make about 85 cents today.

In proposing a 90-cent-minimum wage we are adding 5 cents an hour to improve the economic condition of those covered by the act.

I would like to point out to those who want to increase the ceiling to a dollar that all of us wish that every working American could be guaranteed a substantial increase in his take-home pay.

There is no question among us on that score.

But I would also like to point out something else.

This Nation has been moving through a difficult transition period from an economy based on war to one based on peace.

Such transitions are historically the most difficult economic adjustments a country can make and it is to the everlasting credit of the Eisenhower administration that we are moving through this one with a minimum of maladjustments and dislocations.

Our memories need not be very long to recall that just a year ago we were hearing predictions from certain quarters that the country was heading for some sort of economic disaster.

We were not talking about raising the minimum wage then; we were hearing cries of alarm that the unemployment situation was bad and getting worse.

Well, the predictions did not come to pass—for which we are all thankful.

But it was not just an accident that we did not have a recession.

It was the result of sound, careful planning by the Eisenhower administration.

Thanks to that program, we have been able to halt inflation.

We are protecting the dollar of these people for whom we are now showing concern, and who were hit hardest by the steady increase in living costs from 1950 to 1953.

At this time, may I also point out, the heads of four great governments are meeting to seek avenues that may lead us to an easing of the cold-war tensions and perhaps relief from the crushing burden of our military-preparedness program.

I do not know what successes these leaders may achieve. I hope they will be substantial.

By the same token, none of us knows what further adjustments may be necessary in our economy during the years ahead.

But I do know that if we are to continue with the successes we have enjoyed in working out our postwar problems we must follow a sane, reasonable course, avoiding extremes as we work out our overall program.

Such a course is not easy. It has not been.

We have made substantial budget cuts—but may I point out that there are some who think the cuts should have been even greater.

We have made substantial tax cuts. Here, again, there were many who thought the cuts should have been deeper.

We have made improvements in the social-security law—and some would go further than we have gone.

We have provided pay increases for the postal workers and other classified employees. Some wanted bigger pay hikes.

But as we look at the whole picture of accomplishment today we must realize that the prosperity we are enjoying has not come about by accident, but rather is the result of thorough planning, with a careful handling of the many complex factors of our economic life.

Minimum wage legislation is a vital part of this overall picture.

The President has made clear his position on this matter.

He is for the 90-cent figure.

The danger we face in going beyond that figure is real.

We must not subject these small-business men to unreasonable strain.

We must not endanger the livelihood of many workers by raising wage minimums overnight to a level which hard-pressed employers cannot meet.

Real friends of labor must be concerned lest we destroy jobs instead of improving conditions in this area.

An increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to 90 cents is a 20 percent boost. That is substantial.

It will have an impact on the small business covered by the act.

In the best judgment of those who have studied this matter, an increase at this time to a dollar would virtually double that impact. According to information I have obtained 90 cents would affect 1.3 million workers; $1 would affect 2.1 million.

Time and again we have expressed our solicitude for the problems of small business. Here is a chance to demonstrate our understanding of the situation by taking a step forward which will benefit labor without destroying the source of livelihood of many. Let us give small business a chance to adjust to a 90-cent level. That is a good, substantial increase. Then, as conditions warrant, we can move forward again in orderly fashion toward the higher standards of living all of us want, and want very much to see for every American worker and every American family.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, and if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I should like to say this: The gentleman stated that under this rule there would be probably only 5 minutes on a side for debate on these amendments. I want to say that was not the purpose of the Committee on Rules. When we write a rule of that kind we prohibit expressly any amendments to an amendment. Under this rule, there would be free discussion on amendments under the 5-minute rule, and of substantive amendments to any amendment that may be offered under the rule. I have verified that with the parliamentarian.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was not undertaking to be critical of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, I did not take it that the gentleman was. But, I did not want the House to be under a misapprehension as to their right to debate this bill fully.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, I think during the course of debate the issue will be pretty well drawn and everyone will be informed as to what is before us.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Anfuso
Becker
Buchanan
Celler
Chiperfield
Crumpacker
Deane
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Durham
Eberharter
Fogarty
Gary
Hardy
Hays, Ohio
Johnson, Calif.
McCarthy
Morrison
Mumma
Phillips
Pillion
Reed, N. Y.
Short
Sikes
Thomson, Wyo.
Udall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have heard something about the Rules Committee being just a traffic cop. Down here at any of these busy intersections a traffic cop is a necessity. Call it a necessary evil if you wish.

If it were not for the Rules Committee to do the sifting—and Members each introduced 10, 12, or more bills—should each be given the right to demand and get a hearing and consideration by the House we would have confusion complete and we would get nowhere with a legislative program.

Experience has demonstrated that we must have a Rules Committee if either the administration or the party in power is to have and put into effect a program. That serving on that committee is not a pleasant job.

As has been said before, there is not a Member of this House who is not obligated to the Rules Committee which has on some occasion saved him from voting on an unsound measure in a situation that might have been embarrassing to him. To bring up this bill, that bill, and the other bill, as each Member or committee might desire, well, we never would get anywhere legislatively.

Today while we are praising the Rules Committee with faint words, let us not forget the real good they so often do for each of us, for the House and the country as a whole.

Unfortunately for myself, I was not here all the time last Thursday. That was a good thing for the House, because I certainly would have had something to say about the absurd, ridiculous situation which developed just because, apparently, two Members were displeased. There was the Appropriations Committee with a bill which it had written and brought to the floor.

Who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee? Why, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], author of Cannon's Precedents. As for the rules of the House, he probably knows as much as, more than, any Member and probably as much as our Parliamentarian about the rules. He was sitting as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The chairman of the subcommittee is the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who likewise is familiar with the rules. Each has had a long experience here.

They brought out of the Appropriations Committee a bill that was subject to points of order from the floor. They knew that and each knew that provisions of the bill which they sponsored were subject to points of order and they, acting together, raised those points of order and scuttled their own bill. I did not do it. No other Member of the House did it; they did it, then they cried about it.

Why did they not send up a bill written in accordance with the rules of the House, with which they both are familiar?

And then after they sent out that bill, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said, they did not stand by their baby; they came in here and stripped it practically naked, and there was nothing left to send over to the other body except maybe a pair of shoes or something of little moment. Their baby was dead.

I just cannot understand it; it is even beyond the realm of understanding, certainly beyond my limited capacity to understand, just why they should make such a hullabaloo over their own lack of restraint. The rules of the House should be obeyed.

Look at what was done yesterday, called up that airport bill under suspension. I know of the desire to adjourn and get away from here.

Does that desire on the part of each and every one of us justify our shirking the duty that is upon us? The duty to give full, careful, deliberate consideration to appropriations? Let me withdraw that and say—in reaching the conclusion that we can ignore the provisions of the Constitution and the usual, ordinary procedure of the House?

When the Declaration of Independence was written there were set forth some very good objectives. When the Constitution was promulgated certain principles were voiced and adopted that have worked out very well over the years, or at least I think they have.

What are the first 15 words in the Constitution? Those words vest the legislative power in the Congress. Then section 7 of article I, as I recall it, provides that appropriation bills shall originate in the House. Sure we can act through committees. But the House has never authorized the Appropriation Committee to write legislation—as it did—nor has the House ever empowered the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to write an appropriation bill.

We followed constitutional procedure by adopting certain rules. The second committee on the list of committees established by the Congress is the Committee on Appropriations.

We also have our legislative committees, but we have authorized and instructed the Committee on Appropriations to bring in bills calling for appropriations, which is their function. But the other day we bypassed that committee when we considered the airport bill which called for the expenditure of some $225,500,000. The Appropriations Committee never had a look at that bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman ever so much.

Where did that airport bill originate? It originated in a legislative committee. It was written by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have no fault to find with that committee, but can we not follow the rules of the House and let our great Appropriations Committee consisting of 50 members perform its duty? Why do we cry and kick because something at the moment just does not suit us and so ask the whole House to disregard the functions of the Appropriations Committee and the rules of the House; permit a legislative committee to act in the place and stead of the Committee on Appropriations?

Of course, the Constitution does not seem to some to mean very much any more. There are only a few of us left who appear to care much about some of its provisions. The Ten Commandments are good, the Constitution is good. But often we seem to ignore the latter if not the former.

So yesterday we had 20 minutes on a side, 40 minutes in all, to give consideration to an appropriation of $225,500,000 that was not considered by the Appropriations Committee.

Let me ask that question again: How far will our desire to get home cause us to disregard orderly, constructive procedure? Procedure which the wisdom of the House and more than a hundred years of experience has shown to be necessary if the welfare of our people, the national security, is to be protected?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I am for this rule and I am for the $1-an-hour rate.

I have asked permission to speak out of order in order to make reply to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Rules Committee. I am not going to quote scripture as he did, but am going to say that I opened my remarks last Thursday with these words:

> With malice toward nobody but with determination to do my duty as I see it. I want to report to this House that yesterday I appeared before the Committee on Rules, as was the request of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, further I said:

> Past history always allowed a rule.

Further I said:

> Twelve subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations worked on this bill, practically the entire membership of 50; the hearings comprise several volumes, yet under the situation the House will not be able to work its will as to accepting or rejecting the many provisions and amounts in this bill before us because a point of order would lie in most instances.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules said that I said—and I did say it and he is correct when he quotes me—"perhaps only four pages of this bill are not subject to a point of order." Are they criticizing me for going before them and making known the truth? I went to them to tell them the truth, to have nothing hidden in the bill. I wanted them to see the honesty of conviction that I was trying to give to them before their committee. I wanted them to know that the bill was filled with language and paragraphs that were subject to a point of order.

Now, I did not mind the debate here on the floor, but I did mind the attack upon me in the press by the minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], because if anybody was in an odd position, those Members of the minority, who were opposed to the rule and said they did not need a rule, were, while the Democrats were there seeking a rule to protect the bill, which contained the request for money and certain items of policy of the President of the United States. We were there for the protection of the House and the business before the House. The Republicans were there saying "We do not need a rule." So, I proceeded as only was the best way to proceed to convince the House just what I was for and just what, by omission of a rule, they were for, and as a result you find this bill reduced from $1,648,000,000 to $224,000,000. For what reason? For the reason that by the lack of action of the Committee on Rules to protect even such portions of the bill as they might have protected in their discretion, the very thing happened here to prove the point. I am not finding fault with the Committee on Rules. I am just saying I think the Committee on Rules should have used more thought and consideration in their approach to this very important bill. The demonstration proved just what could happen to the bill. What I did to that bill was the privilege of every Member in this room. Had the Committee on Rules objected to certain parts of the bill which they felt were undesirable the privilege was theirs to have granted a rule protecting other portions of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7214) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour, effective March 1, 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7214, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the condition of low-income families has been a burning question for years.

The purpose of the Wage and Hour Act was to raise the standard of the low-income families of this country. It was recognized that outside of the Government, a large group of people in this country, especially among the unorganized workers, could get no aid or assistance in raising their standard of living.

The question today is whether or not we should raise the minimum to $1, or less. We have had a long series of hearings very ably conducted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], with a great deal of patience. Much information was gathered which proved to many of us that a $1 minimum was not too much. It might be argued that it is not enough, certainly when we consider the fact that the dollar today is worth 52 cents.

When the minimum was raised from 40 cents to 75 cents, as far as purchasing power was concerned, the increase was eliminated. Today the purchasing power of the 75-cent minimum wage is just about 40 cents, which is where it was when we started. That is the premise on which I approach this matter, not how much we are raising it if we raise it from 75 cents to 90 cents, but the fact that the purchasing power today of 75 cents is 40 cents. If you raise it to a dollar it is only 52 cents in purchasing power.

There have been many investigations and reports made as to what it takes to support a family in decency—a family of four. There have been many reports, ranging anywhere from $3,700 a year to $5,300. So, if the dollar-an-hour rate is adopted as a minimum, that will come to $2,080 per year. That is approximately half of what it has been estimated it would take for a family of four.

The problem of the low-income families is a serious one. According to the testimony we received in the committee, there are many areas in the country where there are small businesses that are in a state of nonprogression. It does not appear that they will ever expand or be able to improve their economic condition. That means that the companies themselves, the small-business men, and the employees are in trouble. The problem is to give them some impetus to raise the standard of living of those employees. I am convinced for one that small business can absorb that increase. It irritates me no end when the question arises, as it always does, that if we raise the wages the businesses will be in trouble. We should never approach the problem from the viewpoint that in order to save money for a business or a concern we must cut the salaries or the wages of the workingman. There are many other ways to do it. The ingenuity of the American businessman is such that if he wishes to he can reduce his costs by better and more efficient management, by better buying practices, by the introduction of machinery. This is the day of mechanization and automation.

The problem of the low-income families is one that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has periodically been studying. It recognizes the fact that there must be something done to raise the standard of living of the low-income people who cannot help themselves.

Some of these small-business concerns remind me of the situation in the coal industry some years ago. To use an adjective, it was deplorable. The coal operators were in difficulty economically. Many of them were failing. Certainly the plight of the miners was tragic. Their living conditions were bad because their wages were very, very low. The only help and assistance they got was by the Federal Government's writing the Coal Act so that the producer of coal could not sell his product below the cost of production. Then unionization came along, and those two things together put the coal industry back on an economically sound basis.

I envision that many of these small businesses that have come in before our committee are in the same plight today. Some outside help must be given to them in order for them to improve their economic condition.

There is another grave problem in connection with the low-income families that sometimes is overlooked, and that is the incidence of sickness and death among the low-income groups. It is quite easy to follow that because with the low income they have they cannot afford proper medical care, nursing care, hospitalization, proper housing, proper sanitation, proper clothes for themselves and their children, and most important of all, sufficient food and the right kind of food, lack of which leads to the debilitation of those people. I think that is one thing which should recommend itself to most of us if not all of us as to why the wages should be raised for the low-income groups. They have no way to help themselves. That was pointed out, I believe, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. They are not unionized. This applies to the unorganized groups largely. So I recommend the $1 provision.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] pointed out that the people who are physically handicapped or have reached an age where they are not so efficient might lose their jobs. I do not believe that. In the first place, there is a provision in the present act to exempt the employer from paying the high minimum. I also cannot understand why these employers should discharge older men because they have to pay them a dollar. Are they not good employees at 75 cents an hour? It occurs to me that if they are worth anything at 75 cents an hour, they would still be worth something at $1 an hour. I cannot believe that they would be discharged simply because we are going to raise the minimum wage to $1 an hour. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] also made a statement which I want to refute, that there are over 2 million older people who might lose their jobs because of this minimum wage. This bill will not even affect 2 million workers. If his argument is true, then all of these people who are older people must be handicapped. So that argument falls on its own face as far as logic is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 17 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the most complex, probably the most controversial, and potentially the most significant of all labor legislation to the economic well-being of employees and employers is the Fair Labor Standards Act. More has been written and spoken concerning the Taft-Hartley law, but its possible effects are not as far-reaching as the Fair Labor Standards Act, frequently referred to as the Wage and Hour law.

The bill, H. R. 7214, before us today, deals only with a part of that law, namely, the minimum wage rate and the effective date. Because of that fact, some of the complexities and the heat will be eliminated, but do not be deceived, there will develop some emotional differences of opinion, and some intricacies not suspected at first.

Congress in 1938 enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act for the purpose of achieving a "minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency and general well-being of workers." This was to be accomplished as "rapidly as practicable without substantially curtailing employment or earning power."

In considering this bill today it is necessary to always keep in mind these two objectives—to achieve a minimum standard of living, and to accomplish that goal as rapidly as practicable without causing unemployment or serious loss of earning power.

I do not know a single Member of Congress who does not sincerely want to see workers paid good wages, no unemployment, and adequate earnings for an employer. The problems occur when we attempt by legislative action to achieve those ideal objectives.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, and in the subsequent economic report and other statements, advocated an increase in the minimum-wage rate from 75 cents to 90 cents per hour, and an expansion of the coverage, after consideration by the appropriate committees of Congress.

The other body passed a bill to increase the rate from 75 cents to $1 per hour, effective January 1, 1956, and with no change in the coverage. The House Education and Labor Committee heard witnesses who advocated either no change or increases ranging from 75 cents to $1.35 per hour. After defeating a motion to increase the rate to 90 cents by a tie vote of 15 to 15, it then reported out a bill to increase the rate to $1 per hour, effective March 1, 1956, with no expansion of the coverage, and that is the bill before the House today.

Amendments will be offered to change the rate and the effective date. In order to acquaint you with various aspects of the legislation, I wish to emphasize certain points.

The Fair Labor Standards Act applies to all employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce subject to specific exceptions and exemptions. While diligent efforts have to be made to find an exact method to determine a proper minimum-wage rate, no scientific method or formula has been developed. A large majority of us would like to see workers paid a minimum rate even higher than the $1.25 advocated by some witnesses. Low wages are not wholesome for the economy. However, there are some factors to consider which must, of necessity, limit that desire of the heart. As background material, I will discuss some of them.

First. Changes in cost of living since the last adjustment of the rate: Cost of living is the most frequently mentioned factor by all persons advocating an upward revision of the rate. Since the act's objective deals with a minimum standard of living, the cost of living factor is important. That is best represented by the Consumers Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows a rise since January 1950, when the 75-cent rate became effective, of about 14 percent, which would bring the increase to 85½ cents per hour.

Second. Effect on employers and employees, particularly in small and marginal businesses, of a change in the rate: In determining the amount of the increase the ability to absorb the change by the small and marginal employers, without causing unemployment, must be considered. A delicate balance is vital, for of what value is an increased rate which results in business failures and unemployment? To obtain that balance, the number of affected employees, the internal operations, and the extent to which the burden can be shifted in the form of higher prices by the affected companies must be studied. A few cents change in the price of a product may mean loss of business to some firms.

Third. Earnings of companies: Profit statistics of all businesses are not as significant as particular segments. Wage rates are not paid from some common pool of all earnings, but from those of each employer.

Fourth. Productivity changes: The long-term upward trend for all manufacturing is 3 percent, and for the whole economy 2 percent, but here again the productivity gain of small and marginal employers is the significant factor.

Fifth. Effect on wage differentials: Various categories of workers (skilled and unskilled) have traditionally maintained percentage differences in wages. Any change in the minimum rate tends to cause a demand from the higher skilled workers for increases in order to maintain those proportional spreads in wage returns.

Sixth. The minimum-wage rate and regular rates: Care must be exercised to avoid moving the minimum into the area of the collectively bargained regular rates. The majority of us do not wish to see regular wage rates fixed by legislation, with the probable demand for price-fixing also.

Seventh. Indirect effects: The 90-cent rate would directly affect about 1,300,000 workers who are paid wages less than that amount; the $1 rate about 2,100,000 workers; and the $1.25 rate about 5 million workers. In terms of the present economic situation, as compared with January–March 1950, the indicated direct wage impact of 90 cents is as equal in effect as was the 75-cent rate in 1950. The indirect effect would be much greater, since any change permeates all business. Employers, whether covered or not, all compete in the general labor market for employees. An exempt retailer in the same town as a covered wholesaler must secure his employees from that same area.

Eighth. Rigidity or inflexibility of the act:

In my judgment the most serious defect in the act is its rigidity. Once a minimum rate is set there is no opportunity for any type of appeal by an employer if a serious legitimate hardship occurs. An employer must pay the legislated fixed rate, or go out of business, or lay off employees, or both. Therefore, since any wage rate change affects business and employment, and since the act permits no flexibility or hardship appeal, the only way Congress can give some slight help is to allow time for a small or marginal employer to adjust to the new rate, by care in determining the date when the change becomes effective.

I have tried to give you some of the practical problems involved in setting a minimum wage rate. It is not as simple a matter as some think. Many things have to be considered. It would be most helpful if we had reliable experiences under normal conditions of the effects of changes in the minimum wage rate. Actually the act has not been in operation during what might be described as normal times. Shortly after its passage, World War II began, and subsequently, when the rate was raised to 75 cents effective in 1950, the Korean war broke out. These wars, with their tremendous demands for goods, services and workers, accompanied by sharp inflationary trends, obscured an accurate appraisal of the operations of the act under normal conditions. For these reasons, we are obliged to operate somewhat by guesswork after considering the factors which I have enumerated above. We do know that a change in the minimum rate, above the figure advocated by President Eisenhower, will have its greatest impact on the small and marginal businesses and on the farmers who, although not covered, must compete for workers in a general labor market, and must purchase products from higher labor cost industries.

I favor an increase in the minimum wage law. After an analysis of the factors I have mentioned, and because of my regard for the President, and my knowledge of his sincere desire to do that which is right for the welfare of all the people, I will support his recommendation of 90 cents.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all I want to commend the gentleman for the very fair and able statement that he is making on this very difficult matter. In connection with his suggestion about the rigidity and lack of flexibility in the Federal law I thought it might be helpful to point out that in the States where there is law in respect to intrastate operation fixing a minimum wage, generally they provide for flexibility and for relief from that rigidity to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. And may I make this further observation? That the very fact of rigidity imposes upon those of us who have to pass on the question of the figure and the time of its application a greater responsibility that we not impose undue hardship or damage to the economy.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is quite correct. The rate has to be determined with care, and certainly the effective date has to be arrived at in such way that the small and marginal employers have an opportunity to adjust, which is necessitated by the increase of the rate.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have any greater authority in the Congress on this matter than is my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL]. He has devoted much time to this matter of minimum wages. I was going to make a point of order that a quorum was not present, for I think everybody should be here to listen to the gentleman's remarks because his message is a very valuable one.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor brings before you the pending bill. I do not believe it would be news to any Member of this body when I say I have never embraced the underlying philosophy of minimum wage legislation. But, it is the policy of my Government and your Government, and one that has been established for some time. Since it is the policy of the Government, then, in my opinion, the responsibility rests on every Member of this body to see to it that the right minimum is established; not a minimum that would be a maximum; not a minimum that would result in price fixing, but a minimum wage in line with the established spirit of the act from the very beginning; not a minimum that would destroy small business; not a minimum that would create misery in some places.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is more subject to emotions and emotional speeches than any legislation that will come before you during this session. The question is often asked "Do you think so and so is too much for a family to live on?" Well, of course, in America, in the land of freedom and free competitive enterprise, we do not like to say how much a man should have to live on. The thing that has made America great has been that freedom of action, with no pressure from above to hold men down, freedom to grow and improve ourselves and our families.

We in committee were considering a school construction bill. Then all at once the pressure broke out to switch from the school construction bill to the minimum wage bill. At the same time in committee—and this is no news to the House—there was tremendous pressure upon me to act on this bill and vote it out within 5 days, which obviously meant that it would not even have a sham hearing. My position was that this bill affected the whole economy. Any piece of legislation that affected that many people was entitled to more consideration than 5 meetings of 2 hours each. Due process, in my view, demands substance as well as form. I do not have to tell you how much was written about me in the press, and about the charges made against me in the press. Somebody would go to one of these under-the-table writers and out would come various rumors. But, I have never required more than one thing to stand fast, and that was a sincere, honest belief that I was right. I knew I was right in this instance, and I stood by the position taken. I say now I do not believe there is a single member of that committee who is not proud that we gave thorough and complete hearings to this very controversial and important subject with which we were dealing. You probably want to know why I did not open the debate. I will be perfectly frank and answer that question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] introduced the bill providing for the $1 rate. I did not approve the $1 rate. I was in favor of 90 cents as the minimum wage. I arrived at that conclusion after listening to witness after witness from small businesses and medium sized businesses. They presented an unanswerable argument. I was unwilling to reach into the air and under the guise of wanting to help somebody, whom it might ruin, to adopt the dollar rate.

But this was the action of the committee majority. On the 90-cent figure the vote was 15–15. On the $1 rate the committee voted 21 to 9. That was the committee action. I went before the Committee on Rules as directed by the legislative committee and requested a rule for the bill. The rule was granted and has now been adopted by this House.

As I was unwilling to sponsor the $1 rate, I felt the fair thing for me to do, fair to the committee majority, was to let the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], who represented the majority opinion of the committee, present the bill first to the House. Possibly some Members may feel I should take every possible advantage of my status as chairman. However, in the long run I do not believe such a policy is one of which I would be very proud.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of this committee, has had brought to his attention a rather difficult situation existing especially in agricultural sections of the country with respect to the so-called area of production provision in the present law. I would like to ask the gentleman what consideration his committee gave to that question.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I am quite familiar with the area of production provision, having originated it before the Committee on Labor many years ago. But when we started hearings on this minimum-wage bill, the committee unanimously adopted a motion to confine itself to 2 propositions in the bill; 1, the minimum wage, and 2, the effective date. At that time we decided not to get into coverage because every member of the committee knew if we did we could not complete consideration of the matter this year. The coverage question was to remain until a later time. The area of production provision is definitely in the field of coverage.

Much as I am in accord with the suggestion of the gentleman, much as I would like to put the Department of Labor in its place on that issue, it is not germane here. The Labor Department has, in my opinion, evaded the intent of Congress by approximately 95 percent. It has virtually nullified the provision, and denied its benefits to those for whom Congress provided them. The situation should be remedied, but, I regret to say to the gentleman, it cannot be remedied in this legislation.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I should like to agree with the gentleman that perhaps many of us would like to have seen a 90-cent minimum reported out of our committee. But regardless of our individual stand on the amount of the rate increase, I think we are all agreed that the chairman of our committee has done a very fine job and a very fair job, and that certainly at no time has he sought to take advantage of his position in the committee. I want to commend the gentleman for the way in which he has handled the legislation which has been before our committee in this session.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am quite interested in what the gentleman said about the problem of coverage. As I understand it, the committee has given consideration to making a survey of the whole problem of extending coverage and perhaps narrowing coverage if that should be in order upon presentation of testimony. Is there anything in the decisions that have already been made by the committee that can enlighten us on that point? I say that as a preface, if the gentleman will yield further, for this observation, because I believe it would be much wiser as a national policy to have a conservative minimum, scientifically arrived at, that would fit our economy and then a broad coverage than to go so high with the minimum that the pressures for further exemptions increase. I have an idea the gentleman would agree with me on that, and that it would mean much to our section of the country, where we are struggling to avoid exploitation on the one hand and an uneconomic minimum on the other.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Someone in the committee suggested I ought to say we were going to do something immediately to provide more exemptions. But I shall not be a party to any sham; I shall not be a party to holding out any such false hopes. I am just frank enough to say to you that the few exemptions which are now in the law were put there with great difficulty. If you get any more, they will come the same way.

I know the impact is coming. Those who are in line know it is going to hit them. There can be no question about that.

When we started the hearings I said time and time again that I favored a fair increase in the minimum; that I wanted it to be as much as the traffic would bear; but that in my opinion we could do great damage to our economy if we stepped it up too far and too fast. For that reason, I said we should have good and persuasive evidence to support whatever we reported out of committee.

We heard many witnesses, and many, many reasons for setting the minimum anywhere from 90 cents to $1.25. Except for Members of Congress and spokesmen for the big labor unions, only one witness personally appeared before the committee to advocate a minimum rate of $1. He is a former Member of this House who spoke for 12 textile mills. After he gave his reasons for the $1 figure he was asked whether any of his clients were paying less than that amount. He said, "No." However, some of their competitors were. So you can see it was quite a sacrifice for him and his clients to ask that a $1 rate be fixed for all.

I do not care to stir up any row with the labor unions. I deal with them as men, not a preferred group, nor a superpowerful group. But I look at their leaders as advocates; I do not blame them for asking Congress for anything they want. But Congress must not be fool enough to supinely give them or any other private group everything they ask for without first examining all the evidence. We must have some sound, sensible answer to justify the action we take. There were calls for $1.25. I could not see the justification for $1.25. And I want to say this to you—big business is not interested in this bill, except for a few among them who would like to see small business crushed out. And the fewer small businesses you have, the more big business you will have. It is small business that is now shaking in its shoes because last year many of them made from two-tenths of 1 percent profit on their operations to perhaps 3 or 4 or 10 percent.

The small-business man has very little to do with fixing the price of the product he offers for sale. Did Big Steel have any worries when they raised their wages recently? Not a bit. They just turned the ledger page over and added $7.50 a ton to the price of steel. Do you think Mr. Ford will have any trouble with his brand new wage agreement? Not a particle. He will turn the ledger page over and raise the price of Fords. Do you know of anyone else in America who makes Ford automobiles? What will General Motors do? Identically the same thing. But what will the man do who is producing lumber at a small sawmill? What will the crate factory man do, and what will the small cotton mill do? Each must come out and say, "What will you pay me for my product?" What will the cotton ginner do? When you think of business in America, remember this one thing. Big business is not the foremost employer in America. Small businesses employ infinitely greater numbers than big business. Think of your own community—go around and look at the small operators.

On the one hand, we are told they can absorb this increase by mechanization. If the employer is financially able to do that, yes. But who then will take the brunt of it? If a machine takes the place of 8 men, it may solve the employer's problem—if he had money enough to put in that machine—but it creates 8 or 10 problems in the families of the men who have been displaced.

Now I want to tell you about the witnesses who testified for small business. They came before the committee and discussed their own cases. They showed their books and presented their records; they showed their profits and their expenses. Each one presented an argument which was irrefutable. The inescapable conclusion was that they could take a chance and jeopardize their home and the security of their family, or go out of business and turn their employees loose to join the unemployment roles—which at best presented an unplesant choice.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. ASHLEY. Is the gentleman speaking of small business that presently pays wages of 75 to 90 cents an hour?

Mr. BARDEN. Many of them do.

Mr. ASHLEY. I wonder about that, sir. The gentleman has been indicating, at least his position appears to indicate that small business is vehemently opposed to increasing the minimum wage to $1 or $1.25 an hour, and that certainly is not the experience that I have encountered in my industrial community.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know what kind of an industrial community the gentleman comes from, but every witness who represented small business before the committee gave the story I have just related here. They know what a 90-cent or $1 rate will do to them. I do not come from a high-smokestack industrial area. And it has been my observation that those who look at skyscrapers seldom lower their eyes to see the rest of the Nation or its problems. I come from an area where we have to dig for what we get, and dig hard for it. We do not depend on the Government handing things out to us or protecting us. If you will just give my section of the country a little time and less trouble, we will come back. Do not worry about that.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am speaking about the broad segment of small businesses throughout the country. Their position is that they are in favor of the increase because of the unfair competitive position which exists at the present time.

Mr. BARDEN. Where is the gentleman from?

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman is from Ohio.

Mr. BARDEN. What part of Ohio?

Mr. ASHLEY. Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. BARDEN. I have never been there, and I do not know what it looks like. I do not think the gentleman has ever been in my section or knows what it looks like, but we do not have the kind of industry down in my area that you have up there.

Mr. ASHLEY. That is exactly the point I am trying to make; that and no more.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman may be convinced that his section wants $2; mine does not. Perhaps you have established that to your own satisfaction, but not to mine; because I know and you know that small business cannot finance the mechanization such a rate would mean.

Another thing—you know it is the trend to mold business together; and when business gets together, it gets big and then tends to forget its responsibility.

Mr. ASHLEY. May I say to the gentleman that it is not big business which is posing the only threat to small business. Another threat comes from the areas which are not paying any kind of competitive wage.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, we always hear about areas not paying a competitive wage. The hard fact in this case is that you do not know enough of what you are talking about. Someone always comes in here saying, "What about the South? They ought to do this, or they ought to do that." I want to tell you one thing. The last depression started when farm mortgages were nailed up on the courthouse doors. It came when farmers began to fall by the wayside, when small business began to waver, and when small banks began to crumble.

Now, if you want to start some real trouble, you just take on this area which is the biggest customer of the folks in your area. Then you will have the same machinery in motion.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Is it not true that the only segment of society in America where we are today experiencing trouble is in the agricultural sections of the United States, where the price squeeze is on? The average farmer is not complaining too bitterly about the prices he is receiving for his commodities, but is to a degree complaining the prices farmers are forced to pay for the finished articles which they have to buy, such as those that are manufactured in Toledo, Ohio, for which the gentleman from Toledo has pledged. A consequence, aggravated by the continuing rise in prices for the things the farmer must buy is going to bring about the very thing the gentleman from North Carolina is talking about, because my farmers are getting to the point where they are becoming more and more limited in buying additional trucks, more of this and more of that of the implements used on the farm. Restrictive buying by farmers is where the trouble can start.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman has never been more right in his life. In agricultural areas they must buy tractors made at wages that even the owner of the farm cannot earn.

They must buy trucks, fertilizer, crates—they must buy everything made at higher wage levels.

Now, when you squeeze the farmer to where he cannot buy your trucks, your supplies, your clothes, your shoes, and the rest, you can look out; and they are on the downward grade now.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I hope the gentleman from Ohio who has just interrogated the gentleman from North Carolina did not mean to confirm the rumor that has been going around that one of the things back of this was an effort to put that little fellow down in your section out of business.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I have heard people tell us that men who could not pay some fixed rates for labor were not good Americans, and that they should not be in business.

We have also been told that workers in some other areas might turn to communism unless this Government guarantees a minimum wage to their liking. Well, I want to tell you this is one brand we do not have down in our section, thank God. I believe that if a Communist should show up in my district every hound dog in town would take after him. We just do not have them. When we have hard times and hard luck, we do not turn on our Government either. It does not take a full pocketbook for us to be loyal to America.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks concerning area production legislation which the gentleman always did sponsor, probably originated. From the answer I got from the gentleman am I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that any exceptions were mightly hard to get; and am I correct in feeling from what the gentleman has said that we might as well understand we are not going to get any legislation regarding area production, that the farmers are not going to get any help now or later?

Mr. BARDEN. They certainly are not going to get any in this bill, and the gentleman is perhaps better than I at guessing what the future may bring.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, many witnesses came before the committee. Each tried to justify the minimum rate he advocated. The Department of Labor came before us and it seemed to me they presented a sound and sensible basis for the figure of 90 cents an hour. They told us the cost of living had increased 13 percent since the 75 cent wage was fixed in 1949. By adding this 13 percent, the 75 cents figure is increased to about 85 cents. Then they considered the production factor as well as the fact that inflation is not yet stopped. Adding all these things together, they recommended 90 cents as a figure which would be the most that employers could absorb, and which at the same time would be a figure to permit some improvement in the position of workers affected by this minimum-wage law.

I want workingmen to earn a good living. I know I do. I have worked as hard as any man ever worked in his life—and for 8 cents an hour. I know what work is. But I want the worker's dollar to have some value and when we set a minimum wage too high, we start handing out inflation and the value of the dollar goes down so that the workers are worse off than before.

Much has been said about various budget figures. The suggestion is often made that we should raise the minimum because this or that budget estimate shows the need for so many dollars a year to care for a man and his family. These budgets are useful as background information. They emphasize the need for reviewing the minimum wage. But they do not offer a formula for determining how much the minimum can be raised. They were never intended to offer such a formula.

Statutory minimum wages are not determined on budgets. They must be based on economic realities. For instance, one type of budget we hear about is the so-called city worker's family budget. This was prepared by the Bureau of Labor statistics a few years ago. It was never intended as a minimum budget on which Federal minimum wage laws should be based. Some witnesses estimated this city worker's budget at $4,500 a year.

This is a rate of about $2.25 an hour. This is more than the majority of American workers now receive. Obviously the majority of American employers could not pay any such minimum figure.

Even the old WPA emergency budget has been used in discussing the minimum wage. It applied to one wage earner with three dependents—a small minority of all householders. In 1949 this budget was priced at $1,800.

The wide range in these budget estimates shows their lack of relation to a minimum hourly rate required by law. Fixing such a minimum is an economic question, based on the ability of employers to pay. If the rate is fixed so high that an employer is forced out of business, then we have the tragic situation where the workers' budgets become the amount which public welfare agencies can pay to keep them alive.

Different States have used various budget estimates, but none have set minimum wages even close to those budgets. The Congress might properly have the same confidence in these State budgets that the States themselves have shown. For example, in 1953 New York estimated $1.26 for the hourly rate needed to meet this average budget. Then they established State minimums far below that. In 1954, Massachusetts estimated its annual budget needs at $1,900 a year. Then it set State minimums well below that figure.

These States do not keep the minimums low just because the Federal rate is 75 cents an hour. The decision rests on other grounds—economic realities. For example, in 1954 Massachusetts set a minimum of 80 cents per hour for cleaning and laundry establishments. About 5,000 employees were subject to this 80-cent figure. On the other hand, a 70 cent rate was fixed for approximately 218,000 mercantile workers. Obviously, these State minimums were based on what the employers could pay—not on the Federal minimum.

Likewise in 1953 New York State set an 80-cent figure for laundries in New York. This applied to about 18,000 workers throughout the State. At the same time rates of 65, 70, and 75 cents were fixed around the State for 640,000 retail store employees.

These two illustrations should prove beyond question that State minimums are not held down just to conform with Federal rates; and that minimum wages are a matter of ability to pay rather than a matter of the workers' family budget.

Mr. Chairman, where are we now? In 1939 we had the minimum wage. Then we had World War II and everybody forgot about the minimum wage. It was easy to comply with when World War II was on. Everybody had money and plenty of it. There was plenty of money in the banks. Then we moved on. In January 1950, when the 75-cent rate went into effect, people were disturbed. But what happened? The Korean war came along and absorbed that shock and everybody forgot about the raise.

What have we to offer now to small business? It is their cause I plead for here more than anything else. What have we to offer them now? Another war? God forbid that this will come to absorb the shock of the raise from 75 cents to wherever it may wind up. No, we do not want another war.

We have had only one clear illustration of how minimum wages can affect our so-called marginal industries in a peacetime economy. When we first passed this law in 1938 we made the minimum apply to Puerto Rico just as it did to the States. But while the States promptly absorbed the effect in the wartime inflation, Puerto Rico could not. The island had no industry to speak of, and so it had no wartime boom. Industries shut down and unemployment spread—just as it can in some areas of our own country if this rate is now fixed too high.

The situation was so bad in Puerto Rico by 1940 that Congress repealed the minimum-wage law as it applied to the islands. We replaced the fixed minimum rate with an industry committee arrangement. In an effort to repair the damage which had already been done, this committee, under our Secretary of Labor, set its first minimum rate for Puerto Rico at 12½ cents an hour.

This is the only experience we have had where the first impact of minimum wages was not helped by wartime inflation. We could very well learn a lesson from the experience Puerto Rico had with a rate its industries could not absorb. What will become of the people and the communities around this Nation who may very well be hurt by too high a minimum wage, just as Puerto Rico was hurt when it had no war to help absorb the wage impact?

Are we never going to prepare for life in a peacetime economy again? We have talked about it many times. We have the summit conference now with the leaders of the great nations of the earth. We earnestly hope we can soon bring down the cost of national defense. We hope the Government can lower defense expenditures—and incidentally lower taxes. But we have learned that our economy goes up and down with Government spending in wartime. Suppose we adopt the $1 rate and then find that Government and defense spending are reduced. Where would we be then?

Our economy is a sensitive mechanism, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot see a minimum beyond 90 cents at this time. I think it should be 90 cents. I am convinced that 90 cents is a fair figure.

I have said in committee that when we tinker with our economy, without knowing what we are doing, we are very much like the man who goes into a factory and begins to turn machinery on and off to see what will happen. Our economy is more complicated than the machinery in any factory. If a man goes in and turns some valves he may let steam off, he may make an engine run faster, but again he may blow the whole thing up. I am not interested in that kind of experiment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for a very fair and able statement.

Mr. BARDEN. I worked hard at it.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been interesting, it has been helpful, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman for his able presentation of views that I know so far as the amount here involved is concerned and the question of the impact on the economy and the maintenance of our high level of prosperity through the years to come is in direct support of the position taken by President Eisenhower and his advisers who have made this recommendation.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this time in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on January 21, 1955, I introduced H. R. 3294 in the House to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.35 because I firmly believe a higher minimum wage is good Americanism and sound business. I am extremely pleased that the minimum wage bill is under consideration by this body today since our country is morally and legally committed to the elimination of substandard wages. To achieve this end Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act 17 years ago. The belief in this goal was reaffirmed 6 years ago when Congress revised and increased the minimum wage. The act stated that it is the policy of the United States "to eliminate as rapidly as practicable labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary to health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers."

The 75 cents minimum hourly wage that was established in 1950 represented a compromise and I believe that it was too low even 5 years ago. By now it is completely outmoded and without effect. Cost of living has increased since the 75 cent hourly rate became effective by about a sixth, and the productivity of our free enterprise economy has continued to rise at an unprecedented rate. Since Congress voted the last minimum wage increase, the total value of goods and services produced in the United States has increased by almost half as much. Average hourly rates in manufacturing rose by more than 50 cents. Other sectors of the economy have shared in the wage increases enjoyed by manufacturing workers.

If we are to pursue fairly and energetically the goal of eliminating substandard wages, we should increase minimum hourly rates by at least as much as the average hourly rate rose in manufacturing and establish a minimum of at least $1.25. Congress must help those at the bottom of the economic ladder to achieve the same gains that the more fortunate workers have succeeded in achieving through collective bargaining.

According to the United States Department of Labor it costs between $3,800 and $4,500 a year to provide an urban family of 4 with a modest standard of living. In Philadelphia the cost is between $4,000 and $4,200 a year. This means that the wage earner in the family must earn more than $2 an hour if he is to provide a minimum decent support for his family. This rate assumes that the provider continues to work regularly 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year without any layoffs. And we must bear in mind that the budget does not allow for any frills. It does not provide for steaks and champagne; it is strictly a hamburger budget where every penny must be tightly squeezed. The budget allows, for instance, only less than $4 a day to feed the 4 mouths in the family, and an occasional meal or snack out must be taken from these $4.

There are about 2.5 million production workers in manufacturing whose hourly wages today are below $1.25 and the Southern States alone account for about half of these employees. Hourly rates in manufacturing in the Keystone State are now over $1.90 or about half as high again as in some of the less fortunate States.

The low-minimum wage rates make it impossible for millions of Americans to share in the blessings of the American standard of living. The low wages also present a constant threat to the very livelihood of unionized millions of workers who succeeded through organization and our unsurpassed productive system to attain a decent standard of living.

Some unscrupulous employers have taken advantage of the low wages in some cases by moving their business to these sections. This migration of industry is in large part responsible for some of our most depressed areas.

I yield to no one in my deep conviction and wholehearted support of the free American competitive system. But I do not believe that substandard wages are a proper factor in the operations of our dynamic free enterprise system.

Unfortunately some misguided persons in authority in the low-paying areas believe that the economic future of their regions is dependent upon low wages. Nothing could be further from the truth. Careful studies have indicated that growing markets resulting from high wages, availability of resources and skilled manpower are the major factors for attracting new and expanding industry to an area. Witness the fact that the most rapidly expanding region of our country in the last decade has been the Far West which is also the highest wage region in the country.

A substantial increase in the minimum wage will therefore benefit the country by increasing the purchasing power of millions of American families and will particularly help low wage areas.

The prophets of doom predict that dire consequences will follow an increase in the minimum wage. But these doubting Thomases have always been with us. They predicted collapse when Congress enacted the 25-cent minimum in 1938 and the 75-cent minimum 11 years later. But our country continued to expand and prosper. As a matter of fact, those areas which were most directly affected by the increased minimum wage showed better than average growth.

Careful studies conducted by the Department of Labor show that the imposition of minimum wages in the past has not reduced employment even in the lowest paid industries and that their overall effect has been beneficial. According to these studies the effects of minimum-wage legislation has been "to improve the position of the employees involved in the affected industries, and that the relative improvement was substantially maintained."

An increased minimum wage will expand the purchasing power of millions of families and will, therefore, help the growth of the economy. This will help all of us. It will also help millions of American families to share a bit more widely in the American standard of living, which we all agree should be the birthright of every American.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gwinn].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I think our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Barden], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McConnell], have given you the facts and the principles showing that it is absolutely impossible to fix by decree and by fiat of Government what a minimum wage should be, or the price of a commodity, or rent, or any other element in our economy. There was no substantial evidence before our committee to show that the economy could stand a raise of more than 90 cents. The Department of Labor, through its Assistant Secretary, Mr. Larson, came forward with a most careful study to give us the benefit of the Department's own judgment in the matter. They showed that the economy was already approaching a point between 75 and 90 cents an hour and up to 90 cents an hour in some areas. In their judgment the economy might absorb 90 cents but not $1. The evidence of the Department of Labor itself was strongly against a minimum of $1.

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say has to do with the 90-cent figure as the figure, if this House is determined to carry on a bill that was bad when it was conceived. It has been bad ever since. It is worse, because the Republicans ought to know in principle that you cannot manage the economy of this country by laws and the whole business of legislative and administrative management of our economy ought to be scrapped and set aside.

Where did Congress ever get its power, except to seize that power, to say to a workingman in America, "You shall not work for less than 75 or 90 cents an hour." That is the way this statute reads, in effect. It is not just that the employer must not pay less than 90; the employee must not work for less than 90.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman said that this bill was bad when it was conceived and is still bad. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell us for whom it was bad?

Mr. GWINN. It was bad for the man I am describing; the man that it put out of business; the man to whom it said thou shalt not work, when the Constitution said to him long ago that he had a right to be let alone; that he had a right to be self-governing and employ himself as he pleased. The reason we cannot come to any sensible blanket wage or price laid down by law across this marvelously diversified country of ours is that the economy of the country is ruled by a law that is higher than mere man can put on the books. It cannot be overruled or set aside by Congress. That law is that if you raise artificially the wage of the worker, the industry itself must absorb that increase or the consumer must absorb it in an increased price. Many low profit industries cannot do that. That means raising prices to all concerned which defeats the benefits of the rise in wages, or the worker must become unemployed. There is no alternative to that law. It is an absolute law. You cannot change it. It is not written in any book. It is not something you read about. It comes from nature itself and cannot be flaunted.

To show you further how impossible this whole business of fixing wages for all is—and I think our chairman did well to set it out. The bill itself starts off by fixing a wage and then exempting executive, administrative, professional, local persons in retail services of all kinds, irrigation systems, agricultural undertakings, fishing. If you go fishing you do not have to abide by this law. You cannot be put in jail if you do not pay your companions on the adventure 90 cents an hour. But if you are building the boat to go fishing in, the boatbuilder can be put in jail and assessed $10,000 in fines if he pays less than 90 cents.

So you have that division among us one group of Americans are free from criminal penalties exempt from the law, living in the same town, going to the same church, living under the same economy. They may pay less than 90 cents an hour. Another group is subject to the penalty of jail and fines and double wages if he pays less than 90 cents.

What kind of law is it that divides us up into little businesses, into farm businesses, milking and dairying businesses, fishing businesses and exempts us from the working of the law. The policeman says to them: "You fellows cannot be put in jail, you are all free from the law." While to another he warns them that they are subject to law and threatens them with jail. That is class legislation of the worst possible sort and carries with it sectionalism, too. Sectionalism uses the power of the State to compel one group to pay wages that will help another group maintain their competition. So we have a kind of half and half arrangement by which some who willfully violate one of the provisions, section 15, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 and imprisonment for 6 months, while others are not similarly treated.

The economy of our country has been steadily deteriorating in certain small industries in spite of all the propaganda to the contrary. It shows that this artificial fixing of prices and wages by compulsions, either from groups or from the Government destructive of the best interests of the country.

The Department of Commerce has put out these rather startling facts, and they appeared in the testimony before our committee.

The hourly earnings in manufacturing between 1950 and 1954, when the 75-cent law became effective, were up 23.5 percent. The profits from manufacturing were down 22 percent. So the evidence is rather interesting to show that while wages went up 23.5 percent manufacturing to a large extent absorbed the increase but paid in a reduction of profits by 22 percent.

How about the investors in manufacturing? Dividends paid during this period by all corporations in manufacturing were down 2 percent, that is from 1950 to 1954. The dividends in billions were $4.8, $4.6, $4.6, $4.6, and $4.7. When we artificially shove up the minimum wage we endanger the capacity of industry itself to make enough money to expand its business, to expand its plants, and to invent and produce in order to make the real basis for increased wages, that is increased productivity.

When industry has to borrow on bonds or notes and cannot induce their stockholders to reinvest, that indicates the evil pressure of government on prices and wages. I would like to summarize the evil consequences of government interference, by John W. Burgess, one of our greatest modern students on the Constitution and the proper function of government:

> The whole history of the world's political development shows beyond any question or cavil that a republic with unlimited government cannot stand, that a republic which makes the government the arbiter of business is of all forms of state the most universally corrupt, and that a republic which undertakes to do its cultural work through governmental force is of all forms of state the most demoralizing. * * * In the face of this consideration it is time, high time, for us to call a halt to our present course of increasing the sphere of government and decreasing that of liberty.

Mr. Chairman, the bill ought to be wiped off the books, but if you must do something, do not go beyond 90 cents.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kelley bill in direct opposition to the remarks expressed by my colleague and neighbor, the gentleman from New York. I would like to present, however, a few things concerning the entire minimum wage picture which, perhaps, some of us are not aware of and I am sure many of the American people are not conscious of.

It is my opinion that this bill is woefully inadequate. It is my opinion that it does not meet the problem of minimum wages for the American worker as that problem should be met.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the present action of the Congress in amending the Fair Labor Standards Act, particularly in relation to the minimum wage, does not bring it up to present-day requirements.

I shall continue to fight for the following: First, a raise in the minimum wage to $1.25; second, to revise the provisions of the law relating to workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, raising the rates to better their standard of living and to protect them and the mainland workers; third, to increase the coverage of the act, to bring in the many thousands of underpaid workers who need the protection of the act.

When all this is accomplished, the American wage earner will be able to work and live in the American way.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I consider this a piecemeal approach to the bigger problem that we must face up to as soon as possible, and that is the basic problem that one-half of the working people in the United States are not at all helped by the former act and the new act that we are voting on today to increase the minimum wage to $1. There are no actual statistics on this, but as close as we can gather information through our committee counsel and the Department of Labor, about one-half of the workers of America are not affected. This is definitely not a minimum wage for all working people. It sets up a privileged class of workers. One-half of the working class of America has a minimum wage and one-half does not have a minimum wage and does not have coverage. Sooner or later, we have to meet that problem because if we do not, we are going to build up a class system within the ranks of workers. I introduced a bill for $1.25 an hour. I introduced a bill to extend the coverage. I happened to be privileged to be one of the conferees who wrote the present legislation.

Now, may I point out the people today who are not covered in the United States of America, with our high standard of living, despite the statements that we are putting into effect a minimum-wage increase for the working people of America.

I have attempted here to outline as briefly as I can the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the exemptions from it.

Nobody knows with any real certainty how many workers are now covered. However, last week the Labor Department estimated that about 55 percent of the country's wage and salary workers are subject to the act.

The basic provisions of the law apply to all workers "engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce." Unlike Taft-Hartley, the work performed by the individual employee, not the business of the employer, generally determines whether the act applies. Thus, some workers in a plant may be covered while others in the same building may not be.

Beyond that, there is a set of specific exemptions written into the law. These vary in many different ways. Some apply automatically, others require administrative certification. Some suspend both the minimum wage and overtime provisions. Others provide only an overtime, a partial overtime, or a minimum wage exemption. Some apply to an entire business. Others apply only to specific employees.

The courts have taken the position that since the statute is a remedial one, the exemptions must be strictly construed. Further, the burden of proof rests on the employer who claims the exemption.

The following tabulation lists the exemptions, and outlines the manner in which they apply:

I. Agricultural employees: Both the minimum and overtime requirements are suspended for "any employee employed in agriculture," as well as for certain operations in connection with the maintenance of ditches, canals, etc.

II. Agricultural processing, canning of fruits, etc.: Exemptions under this heading fall into several categories. First, the minimum wage and overtime sections do not apply to any employee within the "area of production" in the handling, ginning, pasteurizing, etc., of agricultural commodities for market, or in the making of dairy products. Second, it exempts from the overtime requirements only (on a year-round basis) the "first processing" of dairy products, the ginning and compressing of cotton, processing cottonseed; or the processing of beets, molasses, sugarcane, or maple sap into sugar or sirup. Third, it suspends the overtime requirements only for 14 weeks in the "first processing" of perishable fruits or vegetables. Fourth, it suspends only the overtime requirements for 14 weeks in the "first processing" of any agricultural or horticultural commodity; or in the slaughtering or dressing of poultry or livestock.

* * * * *

IV. Fishery employees: Both minimum wage and overtime provisions are exempt for anyone engaged in the catching of all types of fish. A separate exemption from the overtime requirements only is provided for those engaged in related canning operations.

V. Forestry or lumber operations: There is an exemption from the minimum wage and overtime requirements for small scale forestry and logging operations.

VI. Laundries and dry cleaners:

Both minimum wage and overtime provisions are suspended for establishments in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothes.

To qualify for this exemption, the employer must meet specified annual dollar volume standards of business within his own State.

VII. Learners, handicapped workers, etc.: The Labor Department may permit the employment of learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped workers at wage rates below the minimum. When such permission is granted, the overtime provisions are also suspended.

* * * * *

IX. Newsboys: There is a complete exemption from the minimum wage, overtime, and child-labor provisions, for anyone employed to deliver newspapers "to the consumer."

X. Small newspapers: Both minimum wage and overtime requirements are suspended for daily, weekly, or smiweekly publications with circulations up to 4,000. This exemption applies regardless of whether the circulation is all within a single State—it might extend to adjoining counties across the State line.

* * * * *

XII. Retail and service establishments:

This is a minimum-wage and overtime exemption. It covers probably as many employees as all other exemptions combined. To qualify for the exemption a majority of the sales must be intrastate, and up to 25 percent of the sales may be nonretail.

Under this section practically the entire retail industry and the hotel industry are exempt, with the exception of some large interstate mail-order houses, and the central offices and warehouses of chainstore systems. The exemption does not apply to banks, insurance companies, telephone companies, utility companies, or newspapers.

XIII. Manufacturing establishments: A retail store which makes or processes the goods it sells can be exempt if it meets six special requirements. These are keyed to annual dollar volume of sales, and established practices in the industries.

* * * * *

XV. Seasonal industries: There is a partial exemption (14 weeks) from the overtime provisions in any industry which the Labor Department finds to be seasonal. In these cases, overtime must be paid for work in excess of 12 hours in 1 day or 56 hours in 1 week.

XVI. Taxicab companies: Both minimum wage and overtime requirements are suspended for all employees of any taxicab company.

XVII. Telegraph agencies: Both minimum wage and overtime requirements are suspended for so-called contract telegraph agencies. To qualify for this exemption, the business must first satisfy the requirements for exemption as either a retail or a service business. In addition, its message revenue must not exceed $500 monthly, and it must be operating under a contract arrangement with a telegraph company.

XVIII. Small telephone exchange: Both minimum wage and overtime provisions are suspended for switchboard operators on public telephone exchanges serving up to 750 stations.

XIX. Local transportation: Neither the minimum wage nor overtime sections apply to local street car, trolley, or motor bus employees.

XX. White collar employees: There is a complete exemption from the act for executive, professional, and administrative employees as well as for outside salesmen. However, these so-called white collar employees must meet the definitions for their occupations as set up by the Labor Department.

XXI. Child labor: The act prohibits employment of "oppressive child labor" either in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. It prohibits parents from employing their own children in hazardous work if they are under 16 years of age. An exemption from the child labor provisions is provided for performers in movies, theaters, and radio and television shows. There is also a "child labor" exemption for agricultural work performed outside of school hours for the district where the child is living.

XXII. All domestic servants.

And, also, what about the problem of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands? The problem of Puerto Rico must be met head on immediately, and it has to be met with special action. We, the Government, have created artificial unemployment in Puerto Rico. We have kept their sugar quota down to the 1936 level. We have refused to let them refine 50 percent of what they produce. Yet, on the other hand, we have taken money from the Department of Labor and brought them into the United States and thrown them into the unfriendly environments of new ghettos, worse than any other ghettoes in America. This is our fault and our responsibility. We have let the sugar lobby of Cuba, especially, force the Puerto Ricans into this artificial unemployment. It is an everlasting shame upon our name that hundreds of thousands of people who come from that island where they have little tuberculosis and no juvenile delinquency live under such conditions here that they have developed tuberculosis and produced juvenile delinquency. They have the highest tuberculosis of any group within the United States. It is not our fault. We made criminals of them. We made them carriers of disease. We must meet that problem, meet it head on, immediately. I regret the rule of this bill prevented us so acting today.

I had a group of labor people come to me about this. They sat around my desk—executive officers of various labor unions—and told me what they wanted for the Puerto Ricans. When they finished I said, "Is there a Puerto Rican here to speak?" There was not one. We should not legislate on the basis of absentee trade unionism. So we should go there and investigate this and bring it before the Congress. The labor unions should go there and organize them. We should stop the people who are thriving on unemployment in Puerto Rico, through runaway shops. We must increase the wages in the textile industries at least 50 percent. All this requires legislation and that should be our target for 1956.

James Russell Lowell wrote in the Bigelow Papers:

> Laborin' man an' laborin' woman
> Hev one glory an' one shame;
> Ev'y thin' thet's done inhuman
> Injers all on 'em the same.

Walt Whitman in Song of Myself wrote:

> In the faces of men and women I see God.

May we bring ourselves to see that the faces of our laboring men and women are happy, not just half of them, piecemeal, but let us help them all. Let us bring back to this Congress in the United States a coverage that will lift up from second-class labor men and women so that they will have first-class rates.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Relative to the Puerto Rican problem, in addition to what the gentleman has said, there is also a condition there which damages a very distressed economic portion of this country. In my coalfields of Pennsylvania we have lost other industries to this condition of Puerto Rico. I refer particularly to the textiles and cigar manufacturers. It has become a very serious problem in certain sections of New England, and particularly in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania.

Mr. POWELL. That is due basically to our fault in creating unemployment there; in letting them have a low standard of living. It is primarily due to the Secretary of Agriculture—not in this administration only—but ever since 1936. Artificially we have kept them unemployed. We have forced this situation on them. We ought to break the back of this harsh burden of unemployment which the Secretary of Agriculture has imposed upon them. Stop artificial unemployment, stop runaway shops, lift up more minimum wages and then, and only then, they will return.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I agree with the gentleman, but is the gentleman in accord with the basic proposition that the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution is the basis upon which we have any jurisdiction in the field at all?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I agree with that, but there are implications and there are interpretations, as we know, which have allowed us to consider some workers as indirectly in interstate commerce.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of New York. How would the gentleman justify controlling, for instance, wages in the case of taxicabs that operate only in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., as far as interstate commerce goes, or a laundry?

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman in that instance. But what about taxis here that operate between the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been thoroughly debated this afternoon, I know, but I have a few points to bring up which perhaps have not been covered.

I have a great deal of difficulty in talking on any subject unless I am able to define the subject. As long as we have been talking about a minimum wage I still have not been able to come up with a good definition of what a minimum wage is or what a minimum wage should be.

To begin with, the first minimum wage was supposed to have been based upon the WPA emergency budget which would allow 1 worker with 3 dependents to keep himself and his dependents off of relief. We do not know whether that budget was right. I am told that if that budget had been projected to 1949, that in that year a proper minimum wage would have produced $1,800 a year. Instead of this figure, Congress fixed the 75-cent minimum, and figuring 2,000 hours of employment in the year it produced only $1,500.

I am told that since 1949 the cost of living has gone up something like 13 percent. If that be true, then the proper minimum wage would be somewhere between 90 cents and a dollar; but I do not know whether that is the situation or not; in other words, what are we trying to accomplish by minimum-wage legislation?

I think one of the things we are trying to do is to keep the average individual off of relief; in other words, we are dealing then with an average, an average wage originated by the Congress to apply throughout the country. Dealing with an average in a country which is as large as the United States, is in itself a great fallacy, because obviously if an area's cost of living is below average, then in order to raise the minimum wage you will put certain hardships on industry and business in that area which it possibly cannot meet and which may, in that area, actually cause unemployment and may actually result in a detriment to the worker instead of helping him.

On the other hand, in the other parts of the country where the cost of living and wages are above average, the minimum wage obviously means nothing.

We have heard talk today indicating that we are dealing with some kind of prevailing wage. That is not the situation. The prevailing wage is the thesis of the Walsh-Healy Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, and other laws this Congress has passed; so it is not that. We are dealing, I think, with a concept which will put the most people to work at the highest possible wage; in other words, to create the most employment, to make that climate which will cause business people to invest more money to make more wages and to be able to pay the highest possible wage to the greatest number of workers.

Whenever we deal with wages we have to consider just exactly who is going to pay a wage increase. The only proper, the only economic way to increase wages is by an increase in production. If you could increase production, then, obviously, you could increase wages. We have, of course, increased production in this country. We have increased it by a rather amazing volume since the last minimum-wage law was enacted, and many people say that in itself is enough reason to raise the minimum wage.

However, I would like to point out to you when you bring in the increase in production as a factor in determining a minimum wage you are probably selling the process of collective bargaining down the river. Where does the concept of a minimum wage end and where does the concept of collective bargaining begin? In my mind, and I am only one Member of this Congress and one member of the committee, a minimum wage would not take into consideration an increase in production. It would take into consideration an increase in the cost of living only, because to do otherwise would be to attempt to standardize efficiency in all businesses. This is obviously impossible.

We have great labor unions in this country. We have a labor movement that has grown up very considerably in the last few years. I think that the labor movement is perfectly capable by the process of collective bargaining of making absolutely certain that the workers of this country receive a just share of the fruits of their own labor as evidenced by any increase in production. I do not want to sell that process short. I think that the average worker who is not unionized will be able to go to the boss if he has increased his production and negotiate a wage. If he is not able to go to the boss and negotiate a wage, then, certainly, one of the unions which is applicable to that particular trade should come in and immediately organize that plant. I daresay they would find a very fertile field for organization.

The minimum wage may also be an inflationary factor, as far as the country itself is concerned. In other words, if you increase wages artificially you increase the cost of living, and the spiral goes around and around, so that pretty soon the people who got the increased wage artificially will have lost enough purchasing power so that they have not in fact received a real increase in wages.

We have to watch the inflationary spiral very carfully. We have to watch it not only for the workers who are covered by the minimum wage but also especially for those workers who are not covered, the ones who cannot protect themselves. In other words, the worker who is not covered probably will get a benefit by an increased wage from an increase in the minimum-wage law, but it will come slowly. It will come as a result of the fact that the labor market itself will make it necessary for his own employer to raise his wages to command his services. Obviously, the person who is working will sell his services to the person who will pay the highest amount of money for it. So the labor market, being a free market, will enable him to benefit slightly by this increase in wage, but it will come slowly.

If a man is getting 95 cents an hour and we raise the minimum wage to a dollar, then, of course, we should raise his wages to $1.20. Otherwise we have a telescoping of the wage structure and we find that the man who is a little bit better worker, is a little bit more capable of commanding a higher wage, will be hurt in actually purchasing power by the fact his wages did not go up as fast as the man at the bottom. Such raises will undoubtedly occur, but not as suddenly as it will come to those whose services are such as to command only a minimum wage.

I would like to dwell for a moment also on a point which was covered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. That is the fact that there is no escape from this law. It is a self-executing act. If you are in an industry the employees of which are covered by the law, you either pay the wage or you go out of business. We had people come before our committee and testify that in their particular business they felt that an increase even to 90 cents would be harmful and that an increase to a dollar would put them out of business. We had the Department of Labor come before the committee and state that the 90-cent wage would probably be comparable in economic impact to the increase from 40 cents to 75 cents in 1949, but that an increase to a dollar would have twice the impact of an increase to 90 cents. They said in no uncertain terms that beyond 90 cents we are fishing, we do not know what will happen.

I am not one to raise specters or to view with alarm. However I think the worst thing that could happen to this country would be to have 5 or 6 million people unemployed. I suggest to you that that is a very distinct possibility if we tamper with this economy of ours too much. As the gentleman from North Carolina said, this is a very good economy, we do not have a great number of unemployed people. We have more than we want, but the number is going down. This is not time to tinker with the valves. It might be that instead of helping people we will be actually hurting a lot of people by legislating them out of a job, by putting them on the unemployed rolls and by depriving them of the ability to make a living. It may be, in other words, a lot like taking medicine upon which the prescribed dose is one teaspoonful. If you take a tablespoonful, it might kill you. This is dangerous medicine; let us not be taking an overdose. A little of it, I think, is good. I do not know very many people who do not think that the minimum wage should be increased. I personally feel that if our hearings before the committee had justified $1 to $1.25 increase I would have been for it. To my mind, the hearings do not show that. They showed that only an increase of 90 cents is justified.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the minimum wage is one of the most important problems confronting this session of the Congress, and closely related to it is an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, July 18, to which I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House.

Taking note of the article in which the assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee suggested to members of her party that the way to build an organization and win elections is to "reach the voter at the lowest level," we, the Democratic women Members of Congress would like to address an open letter in reply:

Miss Bertha Adkins,
Assistant to the Chairman of the
Republican National Committee.

My Dear Miss Adkins: Our generosity impels us to assume that by the "voter at the lowest level" you do not refer to the lowest intelligence level or the lowest ethical level. Consequently, we assume you mean the lowest economic level.

May we point out that this is an unusual group for the Republican Party to appeal to. In view of the fact that 20 years of Democratic administrations successfully raised the standard of living of that one-third of a nation that was ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed in 1933; and in view of the fact that this was done through programs initiated and enacted by Democrats; and in view of the fact that it was accomplished in the face of violent opposition from the Republican Party, we wish to go on record as opposed to any present-day establishment of a caste system among the American electorate.

We wish to make clear to both the Republican Party and the American electorate that we of the Democratic Party are pledged to raising the economic level of all segments of the population; that we, in turn, shall appeal to the American electorate across the board on the basis of our program for the welfare of all the people. We do not recognize class warfare for political (or any other) purposes.

We would like to remind the Republican Party of such Democratically inspired efforts to abolish poverty as social security, minimum wage, unemployment compensation, FHA, rural electrification, public power, guaranteed bank deposits, slum clearance, parity for farmers—to name only a few. Now that these programs have become an accepted part of the American scene—accepted even by the Republican Party—we would like to ask the Republican Party to join us in moving forward to provide a program for an even richer, more prosperous life for all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

Edna F. Kelly, Member of Congress (New York); Vera Buchanan, Member of Congress (Pennsylvania); Gracie Pfost, Member of Congress (Idaho); Leonor K. Sullivan, Member of Congress (Missouri); Iris F. Blitch, Member of Congress (Georgia); Martha W. Griffiths, Member of Congress (Michigan); Coya Knutson, Member of Congress (Minnesota); Edith Green, Member of Congress (Oregon).

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentlewoman whether she voted for that amendment in the Committee on Labor which limited consideration of the minimum wage to an amount rather than, as the lady, I believe, has pointed out in her speech, to that broadening of the scope which is so necessary for the American people.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman that at the time that amendment was offered, I made a statement before the committee that I was in favor of extended coverage. And, as a matter of fact, I have two bills before this House providing extended coverage.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, how did the lady vote? That is the question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I voted for the bill. I was anxious to get a bill before this House, which I am sure the gentleman agrees and we all agree was limited at this point to an increase in the amount.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to ask the lady from Oregon a question. In her statement she gave as one of the projects initiated by the Democrats that of public power.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is right.

Mr. YOUNGER. Did the Democrats authorize the Hoover Dam?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I think the Hoover Dam was built under a Democratic administration. The entire public power program has been developed by the Democrats.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is not the question I asked the lady. The question I asked, was the Hoover Dam authorized by a Democratic Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say it was developed by a Democratic Congress and would not have been developed——

Mr. YOUNGER. That is not an answer to the question—the question, Was the Hoover Dam authorized by a Democratic Congress? The lady can just answer yes or no.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The public power program and the REA program, would be dead today if it were not for the Democrats.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does not the lady know the meaning of the words "yes" or "no"? She can answer the question yes or no. It was authorized by a Republican Congress, and the lady knows it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in very kindly spirit and also in no sense to answer for Miss Bertha Adkins who is perfectly capable at all times of answering for herself. I would say to the gentlewoman from Oregon, however, that this is the first time since I have been in Congress or watched Congress, that any group of women Members has taken occasion to sign a document together; and I only wish that for their own sakes they had consulted the Republican women Members before they did so, in order to have saved themselves from what I am sure was certainly an unintentional mistake.

It is of course common parlance with us to speak in the highest terms of the lowest level, not referring to any difference in status or condition. Of course not. We Republicans never think in such terms, or ever attempt to break down the American people into class groups. When we speak of carrying on at the lowest level, we mean, of course, the lowest level of party organization: we mean getting below the party officials and getting below the officeholders; getting below the county chairmen; going from door to door, as we shall go, to tell our simple but compelling Republican story. And I think, although in this 2 minutes I cannot begin to portray it, that we have a story to tell.

I will say to my good sisters on the other side of the aisle that what Miss Adkins is meaning to do is what every Republican woman means to do, to go from door to door, to ring doorbells, to ring telephones, to remind every woman and every man who will listen, even children old enough to understand, what it has meant to our country to live under the Eisenhower administration, where more people are employed than ever before; where more money is earned and more usefully spent; and where furthermore every American woman can go to bed at night, not having to wonder in what foreign land her husband, son, or father is being shot at in a Democratic war.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, the bill under discussion was one which came before my committee, Education and Labor. We held extensive hearings in connection with this legislation, and at our meeting to vote it out of the committee the first vote was 15 to 15 for following the recommendations of President Eisenhower and raising the minimum wage to 90 cents. The motion failed, and on the final vote the $1 minimum carried. I voted for the 90 cents recommended by the President.

In my district this question of the minimum wage raise to $1 is of little, if any, importance, for in the Second District of Oregon practically everyone makes at least a dollar an hour. However this minimum wage law was not enacted in the first place because of necessity in districts such as mine. It was enacted in order to protect the low-income worker in various communities in the United States where they were actually receiving a small pittance for their labor.

Raising the wage minimum to $1 will defeat the very purpose for which the minimum wage law was first written: for it will destroy many small businesses and thereby throw out of employment these fringe workers who depend on the small businessman for their jobs.

There are many areas in our great country where employment is not on the level of prosperity it enjoys in the Second District of Oregon. However my district is becoming highly industrialized and for that reason I wanted to serve on the Committee on Education and Labor, to familiarize myself with the problems of the laboring man and woman. During this past session I have learned a great deal about conditions in other parts of the Nation, and when I cast my vote against the $1 minimum wage, I want to emphasize the fact that in my district we have always paid high wages, there has never been a need for the protection of a minimum wage law. However the economy in my district is the economy in the rest of the Nation, and if we drive small businessmen out of business and throw these low income workers out of employment, the repercussion is bound to hit my area sooner or later. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I vote against raising the minimum wage to $1.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many sensible remarks on the floor of the House today by various Members. As an aside, I should like to say that I had hoped that the gentlewoman from Oregon, a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, was going to talk on the subject of the minimum wage. I do hope that her remarks do not indicate that although the Democrats are not in favor of class warfare they are in favor of putting their sex on the line.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the ladies are putting sex on the line, I might say that all of us on this side of the House are extremely proud of what we have over here, as we think, with all due respect to your lovely ladies, that ours are lovelier.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We can be proud of the women on both sides of the aisle, but I think it might be appropriate that they stick to the subject at hand.

The subject on which we have attempted to throw some light today, and I admit there has been some heat as well, is the subject of how big an increase in the minimum wage there should be. As one of the speakers said, the subject has a high emotional content. Today, however, that has not been to the forefront. I doubt that anything has been said or will be which is going to change a great many votes at this stage of the proceedings.

As the chairman of our committee pointed out, the basic question before us is, What is the right minimum wage? How much of an increase should we have? I think without any doubt both Republicans and Democrats generally are agreed that some increase is warranted and justified at this time. There is obviously no magic in any specific recommendation regarding an increase.

Of course, the problem arises because there are no facts upon which we can depend without any hesitation as to the correct amount of that increase. In a situation of this kind there is no certainty regarding the outcome of any rate increase. Inevitably legislation of this kind, in some degree, is legislating in the dark. For that reason I think we should proceed cautiously, as a number of our colleagues have said, and should proceed with care.

For that reason we might well take a look at what the administration's position is and why a great many of us are reluctant to go beyond the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

First of all, perhaps, I might start with the President's State of the Union message, in which he pointed out that—

> In the past 5 years we have had economic growth which will support an increase in the Federal minimum wage. In the light of present economic conditions, I recommend its increase to 90 cents an hour. I also recommend that many others, at present excluded, be given the protection of a minimum wage.

We have had mention of the fact that there is no consideration today in the bill before us of the possibility of extending coverage to those not now protected by the minimum-wage laws. I should point out the fact that that is an important part of the over-all problem before us in this field, even though today we are confined to discussing the rate of increase and the effective date on that increase.

Now, if I may, I should like to quote the President again in his Economic Report transmitted to the Congress on January 28 of this year. I will start with the section on coverage, even though that is not strictly before us at the present time. The President's statement is:

> ### COVERAGE
>
> Neither the Federal nor the State laws now include the lowest-paid workers. Yet a floor that does not support the poorest worker may compound his miseries in two ways: it may force him to pay higher prices as a customer of the covered industries whose costs have risen; and it may push down his own wages by obliging him to compete for jobs with persons whom the covered industries have let go, because they are unable to pay the higher minimum. An effective minimum-wage program should cover millions of low-paid workers now exempted.
>
> ### SIZE OF THE MINIMUM
>
> A minimum does not protect the inadequately rewarded worker if it is too low. On the other hand, it may not benefit him if it is so high as to push up the whole scaffolding of wages and of costs of doing business, thus leading either to inflation of prices and the worker's own living costs, or to elimination of the less efficient employers and workers. Yet the ability of the employer to absorb a high minimum wage is limited. Indeed, the low-pay industries of today are often those earning modest profits, having limited opportunities to increase productivity, and containing firms easily squeezed out of business by rising costs.
>
> ### THE SELF-EMPLOYED WORKER
>
> It is important to recognize that the economic condition of the wage earner cannot be set off sharply from that of the person who provides his own employment. The Census has revealed that one in four of the families with income under $1,500 in 1950 had the major source of their earnings in self-employment. A minimum that would benefit the wage earner materially may put a heavy burden on the small farmer or small business operator, not only of higher prices for what he—like the uncovered wage earner—buys, but also of the higher wages he must pay if he hires assistance. Protection to the wage earner must be considered with full regard to the complexities of our society.
>
> ### BASIC MEANS OF REDUCING POVERTY
>
> A minimum wage fixed by law helps to protect wage earners against unjustifiably low compensation. But a minimum wage program is an expedient of limited value for dealing with low incomes. The best help for the lowest earner is to enhance his usefulness as a worker, and to improve his knowledge and mobility. Some individuals manage to attain economic success with little formal learning; but, on the average, there is a close relation between earnings and education. Fortunately, education is being steadily and rapidly extended. Already, the average American worker under 35 years of age is a graduate of high school.
>
> It is also important to keep in mind that, although some low-wage firms are lucrative, the firms that skimp on rewards to their workers are, not infrequently, those in which profits are also small, owing in part to inefficient management. Improvements in efficiency of worker and employer will take time; but it cannot be doubted that they—rather than a minimum wage—provide the major escape from poverty.

There, I think, we have one of the basic expressions of how the administration feels on the question of the minimum wage. I think that statement outlines in brief just what it is that makes this a very difficult problem, even though we are confining ourselves only to an increase in the rate.

I would like to point out another reason why I feel very strongly that there should be caution in what we do in raising this present Federal minimum wage rate.

I should now like to quote, and I apologize for such extended quoting, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in its report for this year. There, again, I think the Joint Committee on the Economic Report points out a very reasonable course of action which we should consider here in voting on this legislation:

> We support the President's recommendation for an increase in the Federal minimum wage to 90 cents an hour. We would look with favor on an increase to $1 an hour if the legislative committees found this economically feasible. (Representatives KELLEY and BOLLING urge enactment of a $1.25 minimum.)

As an aside at this point, I would like to point out that in spite of comprehensive hearings on this subject, I would say that the economic feasibility of an increase of this kind is not easy for any committee to determine. It is for that reason that we wavered between a 90-cent figure and a $1 figure. Many of us preferred to see the 90-cent figure; and many of us felt we should use the $1 figure. On the basis of evidence submitted to the Department of Labor, the smaller 15-cent increase is comparable in impact to the increase 5 years ago to 75 cents. Anything over that will be a substantially greater burden to the employers who have to pay the bill.

Now I continue quoting from the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

> Some industries and areas of the country could afford a minimum wage substantially higher than either of these figures. But care must be taken in thus raising standards of our economy lest a sudden increase should do more damage than good.

That, in effect, is what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] pointed out earlier.

The report continues:

> Industries and areas now paying wages at or below the prospective higher minimum wages certainly can make adjustments if the change is not too great at any one time.
>
> Perhaps one fault in our past policy in regard to minimum wages has been postponement of change until conditions make it obvious a big increase is needed. The executive branch, the Congress, and the State governments might well give consideration to development of a program of small but regularly scheduled increases in minimum wages, which would approximate increases in productivity. Then, readjustments in minimum wages would not be large or sudden, and would not be inflationary since each increase would be no greater or faster than technological advance would enable industry to absorb readily.
>
> We look with favor also upon the extension of coverage of the minimum wage laws, both by the Federal and State Governments, to workers not now covered, if the facts warrant it. Since the ability to adjust to higher minimum wages from time to time is a characteristic that varies from industry to industry and region to region, perhaps some investigation should be made by Congress and the States as to what advantage might accrue from establishing certain higher minimums for selected areas and industries, perhaps on the basis of determinations by wage boards.

In conclusion, I would like to discuss briefly a topic already discussed briefly this afternoon. Much has been said about various budget figures. The suggestion is often made that we must raise the minimum because this or that budget estimate shows the need for so many dollars a year to care for a man and his family.

These budgets are extremely useful as background information. They emphasize the need for reviewing the minimum wage.

But they do not offer a formula for determining how much the minimum can be raised. They were never intended to offer such a formula.

States have established various budget estimates. Then they set different minimum-wage rates—averaging about half the estimated budget under which lower income families in the States are found to be living.

Statutory minimum wages are not determined on budgets. They must be based on economic realities. For instance, one type of budget we hear about is the so-called city-workers family budget. This was prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics a few years ago. It was never intended for a minimum budget on which Federal minimum-wage laws should be based. Some witnesses estimated this city-workers budget at $4,500 a year.

This is a rate of about $2.25 an hour. This is more than the majority of American workers now receive. Obviously the majority of American employers could not pay any such minimum figure.

Even the old WPA emergency budget has been used in discussing the minimum wage. This budget applied to 1 wage earner with 3 dependents—a small minority of all householders. In 1949 this budget was priced at $1,800. If it was changed to reflect price increases since then it would now be roughly $2,000.

The wide range in these budget estimates shows their lack of relation to a minimum hourly rate required by law. Fixing such a minimum is an economic question based on the ability of employers to pay. If the rate is fixed so high that an employer is forced out of business, then we have the tragic situation where the worker's budget too often becomes the amount which public welfare agencies can pay to keep them alive.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of raising the minimum wage to at least $1.

Mr. Chairman, during the last session of Congress and again at this session I introduced a bill to increase the statutory minimum wage to $1 per hour. This bill was introduced by me with the encouragement of all of the governors of the New England States and also with the encouragement of the New England Textile Committee, which is a committee created by the governors of the New England States, and consists of representatives of management, labor, and the public. All are agreed that the present minimum wage is completely unrealistic and ineffective and that it should be set at at least $1 per hour.

The national minimum wage in its origin, as we all know, was essentially a depression remedy designed to increase the wages of low-pay employees and to spread employment by placing financial pressure upon employers through overtime pay requirements. Such a statute, representing an exercise of the commerce power, has been held to be within constitutional limits.

Today the statutory minimum wage has a far broader purpose than that. It is essentially a device to prevent certain specially placed employers from exploiting immobile, timid, and unorganized workers from receiving as good a wage as is received by others doing the same work. In brief, it is a salutary and excellent device to prevent competition between States or sections of this country based upon the payment of low wages. It is or should be a well-established national policy that whereas competition in an industry is good if based on improved management, machinery, or economies, yet competition based solely on the payment of low wages should not be tolerated.

In the report on the New England textile industry by committee appointed by the Conference of New England Governors, published in 1953, the following conclusion was reached:

> We find the major explanation of New England's decline in textiles is the large differential between wage costs here and those in the South.

In the Southeast, where only 14 percent of southern cotton and manmade fiber textile workers are represented by labor unions, average straight-time earnings are currently 14 cents per hour less than the average in New England mills. An additional competitive handicap has been placed on the New England mills because of the fringe benefits extended by these mills but not granted by southern mills. This adds an average of 7 to 9 cents per hour to the wage differential. Although this committee is concerned now only with the issue of a minimum hourly wage, these fringe differentials and the fact that over 70 percent of the workers in the industry are not represented by unions make Federal action all the more necessary.

In the cotton and manmade fiber textile industry the existence of regional wage differentials permits those mills which pay the lower wages to prosper at the expense of producers with higher wages. This has encouraged the shift of the industry with consequent hardship and loss to many thousands of New England textile workers. A situation of this type tends to act as a depressant rather than a stimulant to the national economy.

The effect of basing competition on wage inequities is now being felt even in the South where wage differentials exist between States and areas. Once again the mills with higher wage scales are suffering in the competitive struggle. According to a wage study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for a payroll period in November 1954, average straight-time hourly earnings in cotton textile mills in Virginia were $1.24, in North Carolina $1.17, in Georgia $1.13, and Texas $1.02. These figures may be compared with average straight-time hourly earnings of $1.32 in New England cotton textile mills at the same time.

On the basis of average gross hourly earnings in the textile industry, published by the departments of labor of the individual States, for February 1955, wage differences among Southern States were as follows: Virginia, $1.36; South Carolina, $1.30; Alabama, $1.22; Georgia, $1.21; and Texas, $1.10. During this same month average gross hourly earnings in northern cotton and synthetic textile mills amounted to $1.42 per hour, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The present Federal minimum wage of 75 cents per hour, established in January 1950, has become obsolete and mills with higher wage levels continue to be forced out of business with a consequent loss to the national economy. It is in the national interest as well as in regional interests for the Congress to carry forward the fundamental purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act and increase the minimum rate of pay to not less than $1 per hour.

The Committee on Education and Labor which reported this bill has had the advantage of voluminous and expert testimony with regard to the hourly rate which should be set, including, I know, detailed and accurate testimony from representatives of the CIO and the American Federation of Labor indicating that the rate should be set at $1.25. I would not attempt to try to tell you what rate would be the most realistic. I am, however, convinced in my own mind that the rate should be at least $1 per hour in order to accomplish the purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I would like to suggest to you that if some Northern textile mills can pay a minimum wage of $1.06 an hour, together with all the fringe benefits paid under their collective-bargaining contracts and still remain competitive, then this might justly be one of the criteria which might be used in determining the minimum wage. Certainly if they can do this, then mills in other sections of the country can accomplish the same thing without having to depend upon low wages paid to their workingmen in order to remain competitive.

I strongly urge that the minimum wage be set at a figure that would be effective and realistic. The direct results of not having a minimum wage which has these qualities are:

First. It encourages the suppression of collective bargaining and antiunion policies. The right to collective bargaining is one that we have fully recognized by law. Its denial in certain States or certain sections of this country operates to completely negative the advantages gained by workmen through collective bargaining in other States and other sections of the country.

Second. By encouraging competition at the expense of low wages, it drags down our whole economy and penalizes or kills those employers who wish to and do pay an adequate wage.

Third. It penalizes the employer who brings into his industry industrial ingenuity and progressive ideas. This employer who reduces his cost of production and still pays an adequate wage has to compete with an employer who is paying low wages and perhaps doing nothing to increase the efficiency of his plant.

In conclusion, may I strongly urge this Congress to set a national minimum wage of at least $1.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of an increase in the minimum wage to $1.

In my district, the women's clothing industry which formerly numbered 106 thriving, full-employed plants, is down to 60, and those 60 plants, textile, hosiery, and such—most of the hosiery is gone now—those mills are threatened with the necessity of closing down or seeing their plants moved to other sections of the country.

The going rate paid in the garment industry in Philadelphia is $1.53 an hour. Some higher skills are receiving $2 an hour. There are 6,000 Philadelphia employees who are making sweaters. The competition results from the present minimum wage situation and is also considerably influenced by the Puerto Rican situation which, unfortunately, is not cured by this bill.

I have a letter from the Young Women's Christian Association in Philadelphia on behalf of the Metropolitan Young Adult Committee of the Philadelphia YWCA, which states:

> The Metropolitan Young Adult Committee of the Philadelphia YWCA meeting on June 1, 1955, passed unanimously a resolution to urge their elected representatives to vote for passage of a minimum wage bill raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

The members of this committee are representatives from six branches of the Philadelphia YWCA and from the community at large. They are chosen for their interest in their work and contact with young adults, especially young employed women. They are well acquainted with the financial problems now faced by many young employed women who are those most affected by the current 75-cents-per-hour minimum. They know this minimum to be inadequate to maintain decent standards of health and well-being and they strongly believe that a minimum of $1.25 is essential and that it can be easily provided by our prosperous economy. The resulting increase in purchasing power will strengthen our economic life, especially as it is well known that such increases go immediately into the purchase of goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good many stories in the 13 years I have been here of the fact that the country is going to the dogs, that the economy is slipping, and that we cannot support various proposals which are advanced. Then I find, not to my amazement, but it must be to the amazement of some of these predictors, that the country is more prosperous than it ever has been. Under the present administration more people have been employed than have ever been employed before in peacetime. We are making and buying more goods and services than ever before. This has happened in spite of the raise in the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents, and if it were raised to a dollar, in my judgment the economy of the country would not be less sound but would be more sound.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by saying that this talk of the country's going to the dogs reminds me of an old verse my father used to recite:

> My father said, as he tended hogs,
> "The country's going to the dogs."
> My father's father as he hewed down logs, said
> "The country's going to the dogs."
> His father's father's father deep down in the Flemish bogs, said
> "The country's going to the dogs."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that we never had it better in this country, and we can afford a generous and substantial and decent provision for the working people of this country.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wainwright].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult after the oratory on both sides here this afternoon and the broad range of the subjects covered, to add anything new to this debate. However, with some amount of temerity I would like to point out certain facts to the House and particularly to those who take the attitude that the administration has not put forward a positive program.

I would like to point out to you that the Secretary of Labor—and as has already been pointed out to you, the President of the United States have proposed a positive increase to 90 cents. This increase represents an actual 20 percent increase in the minimum wage, a 20 percent increase.

Much of the testimony that was taken before the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, had to do with trying to arrive at a formula, some kind of formula by which we could arrive at a fixed figure. It did not take very long for us to come to the conclusion that no such formula was possible. There were only two formulas that made any sense at all. One was the formula for the increase in the minimum wage coincident with the increase in the cost of living. To what extent has the cost of living gone up since 1949, the last time the minimum wage bill was presented to this august body? Thirteen percent. The administration, however, has come along and proposed an increase of 20 percent, 7 percent more than the cost of living has increased. What is wrong with that?

How about the dollar? The dollar represents an increase of 33⅓ percent, 20 percent more than the increase in the cost of living.

Who is going to get the benefit of this? The vast majority who are going to receive the benefit of this are already ably protected and represented by large unions.

Who is not going to get the benefit of this? The so-called little guy we hear so much about who deserves protection.

With all due credit to my colleagues on the other side of the political aisle within the Committee on Education and Labor, there are a number of them who desire earnestly a broadening of the coverage of the minimum wage. I think if we made any mistake at all it was that we did not consider this broadening of the coverage rather than increasing the minimum wage.

The other suggestion was an examination of the philosophy under which we have a minimum wage. The philosophy of minimum wage is the philosophy of minimum standards, for example. At the suggestion of a distinguished Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON], there was proposed a formula that would coincide with a minimum budget approved by the Department of Labor. That formula was computed and figured out. We would have to increase the minimum wage somewhere in the neighborhood of $2 if we were to follow that formula, so that formula was rejected by the committee. Probably later on you will hear some presentation and maybe a motion that will be made in conformity with that formula to increase the minimum wage to $1.25. The one word of caution I would leave with you at this time for consideration is the fact that we came to one absolute conclusion, and that is that what we are doing here today and what we may do tomorrow is based solely and exclusively upon guesswork, possibly political guesswork, and nothing more or less than that. So if you are going to apply it to any formula, why is it not better to allow that guesswork to be an increase of 20 percent, 7 percent higher than the present cost of living since the last time we here in the House of Representatives raised the minimum wage?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is making a very thoughtful speech. To complete his figures, I wonder if it would not also be pertinent to put the difference in purchasing power of the dollar since 1945 up to the present time in the RECORD? I do not have the figures but I know it is less. If it is less it will, of course, affect this 20-percent increase in dollars and cents.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I think the gentleman has interjected a very pertinent thought.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not have the figures, but I believe they should be compared with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Possibly some of the other members of the committee may have that figure.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, which provides for an increase in the minimum wage to $1 an hour, is of vital interest to me and to the people of my congressional district.

In 1949 the statutory minimum wage was set at 75 cents an hour. Admittedly, this represented a great stride forward in democracy's efforts to provide its people with decent living conditions. Such conditions are impossible of attainment when a just and equitable living wage is not forthcoming from employers. It is a fact, sad but true, that many men, otherwise fulfilling the demands of Christian charity, fail to pay attention to the obligation imposed on employers to provide their workers with the salary necessary to maintain themselves. Thus, the Federal Government finds itself dutybound to enact legislation which will force such employers to carry out this obligation.

However, the machinery of our democracy is slow and today we are faced with the plight of many thousands of men and women who are being paid the statutory minimum wage and yet are unable to sustain themselves and their families. Legislation often lags behind progress and has again in this case.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere belief that the bill which we are considering does not go far enough. In these days of high living costs and increasing unemployment, a wage of $1.25 an hour is not unreasonable. On January 31, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3298, which would establish the minimum wage at this figure. No action was taken on this bill or on any similar bill introduced. Today, we are asked to vote on a bill which would set the minimum wage at $1 an hour. Since it is apparent that legislation establishing a higher minimum wage will not be acted upon during this session of Congress, I shall certainly vote in favor of this bill. However, let me stress the fact that I shall continue my efforts in behalf of a more liberal figure and hope for its enactment into law in the very near future.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the full time allotted me; however, there are some questions involved here that should be clarified and it will be my purpose to do so.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman from California asked a question a while ago. I am unable to find the answer to it right away in the hearings, but it was discussed in the committee. If you take the decreased purchasing power of the dollar since the last minimum wage increase and the 13-percent increase, you come out at around 102, 103, or 104.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That would make the figures meaningful if you compare it with that; otherwise they are meaningless.

Mr. METCALF. That was one of the formulas that were used.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that the value of the dollar would be reflected exactly in the increase in the cost of living as determined by the governmental agency. The increase in the cost of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor statistics since 1950 when the minimum was fixed at 75 cents would indicate that to compensate for that the minimum wage should go up to 84 cents.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that a dollar now is only worth 52 cents. The 75 cents was wiped out before the act went into effect.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone here on the floor recognizes that this body, like the Senate, is going to vote for a substantial increase in the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act along the lines recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor. The major opposition to a minimum of at least $1 an hour comes from a few who fear that some small businesses will not be able to adjust to such a minimum wage unless they get a substantial period of time in which to adjust to such a minimum. In my opinion, these fears are groundless.

The only other objection we hear is a political face saving one. They say the minimum should be 90 cents.

In the first place every increase in the minimum wage—when the first minimum of 25 cents an hour was approved by the Congress in 1938, when the 30-cent minimum became effective a year later, when the rates were raised through an industry committee in 1942, 2 years earlier than the date originally specified in the act, and finally when the 75-cent minimum was enacted in 1949—has been greeted with the same expressions of fear on the part of those who opposed such an increase. On none of these occasions was any such fear proven to be justified. Business adjusted to the higher minimums. Millions of workers received higher wages. And the Nation prospered as never before.

I am convinced that this time the same thing will happen. I refuse to join the chorus of those who sing the blues in the night to the effect business is unable or unwilling to pay its employees something less than a $1 minimum wage. There is nothing real or substantial in any of these fears.

Let us keep our sense of proportion. We are not talking about average wages for American workers here. We are not negotiating a collective bargaining agreement. We are talking about minimum wages—the wages that are paid at the bottom end of the pay scale, to the lowest paid, least organized worker.

Even if it is true that small businesses employ more of these workers than big businesses, there is no cause for genuine concern that their costs will be so increased that they will not be able to continue to operate or that they will have to lay off some or all of their employees.

The bill recommended by the committee already gives every employer, big and little, nearly 9 months to adjust his operations to absorb the higher minimum. Compare this with what we have done in the past in similar situations. When the act was passed in 1938, Congress gave industry 120 days to adjust to the 25-cent minimum. When the act was amended in 1949, the jump from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour went into effect 90 days after the amending act was enacted. Why is a longer period needed now? Is a $1 an hour minimum so much higher in terms of present-day levels of economic activity than the 75-cent minimum was in terms of business activity in 1949 that more than 9 months is needed now, when only 90 days were required in 1949, to enable business to adjust to such a minimum? I do not believe so, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe that many other Members seriously think so either.

An effort has been made to give the impression that the $1 an hour minimum is a figure plucked out of the blue, without foundation in fact or theory. No one should be fooled by such a contention. As a matter of fact, increasing the minimum to $1 an hour does little more than enable the lowest-paid of the Nation's workers to begin to enjoy some of the fruits of increased productivity since 1950, from which employers have been deriving substantial benefits for some time. Under the $1 minimum they will regain some of the purchasing power they have lost during this period as a result of increases in the cost of living.

Let me read to you from the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which contains an excellent brief summary of the factors it took into consideration in recommending a $1 minimum wage:

> In the committee's judgment there is a sound basis for the $1 minimum which it is recommending. The recommendation rests upon the following two simple and, in our judgment, uncontrovertible bases:
>
> 1. The cost-of-living increase since the effective date of the 75-cent minimum (January 1950) is at least 14 percent. For the purpose of this calculation the committee is ignoring the argument presented by several witnesses that for low-wage workers the cost-of-living increase is in fact even greater.
>
> 2. General productivity increases in the economy between the effective date of the minimum (January 1950) and the effective date of the proposed minimum (January 1956) can safely be estimated at at least 20 percent.
>
> The arithmetic calculations based upon the above follow:
>
> Adjustment for the cost-of-living increase alone would suggest that the 75-cent minimum be raised to 85.5 cents. This would provide the same real wages as did the 75-cent minimum in 1950 (75 cents times 114 percent equals 85.5 cents).
>
> Adjustment necessary to reflect the 20 percent productivity increase requires that 85.5 cents should be raised to $1.026 (85.5 cents times 120 percent equals $1.026).
>
> Thus it will be seen that merely reflecting changes in the cost of living and national productivity justifies a Federal minimum wage of more than $1. The committee's recommendation, therefore, is, if anything, on the conservative side.

As these facts clearly show, the $1 an hour minimum is justified now. Delay is not justified. As I have pointed out, we are already providing for a period of more than 8 months in which industry will have an opportunity to adjust its operations, since under the committee bill the $1 an hour minimum will not become effective until March 1, 1956.

It is clear to me, and it should be clear to every Member of this body, that any proposal to further delay the institution of the $1 an hour minimum beyond the period fixed in the bill reported by the committee, whatever guise such a proposal may take, is in reality designed to frustrate what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of this House, namely, that the $1 an hour minimum should be put into effect as soon as possible for the Nation's wage earners. There is no need for delay, Mr. Speaker. Let us act now. Let us approve the committee bill, so that the Fair Labor Standards Act, which has served as a tried and proven shield for the lowest paid and least organized of our workers for nearly 17 years now, can at last begin to achieve its objective of eliminating "labor conditions detrimental to health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

In this connection, I want to call your attention to the fact that while the distinguished chairman of our committee was making an impassioned plea and while the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] was protecting the Constitution, here is a little paragraph that came over the news ticker:

> A sharp rise in corporation profits is adding extra steam to the business boom, the Commerce Department reported today.

The Department's monthly magazine shows that after taxes for the first quarter of 1955 corporate earnings were $20.4 billion. If that continues throughout the year, you will have corporate earnings in excess of $100 billion after taxes. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that now is the time, it is opportune, that we increase the minimum wage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield for a question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to know on what basis, whether it is as the result of hearings before our committee or otherwise, you say the fears of our problems are groundless if we should have an increase over 90 cents. Just how does the gentleman arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I listened to the arguments of those who suggested no increase at all. I listened to those who suggested 90 cents increase. I listened to those who said that they would be willing to settle for $1. I listened to the arguments of those who said $1.25 an hour.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Did the gentleman turn a deaf ear to all those arguments, is what I am asking.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I suggested before those 6 or 7 weeks of hearings started that we could get together on a basis of $1 minimum, and after all those weeks of hearings, when the committee finally got a chance to vote on it, they voted 21 to 9 for the $1 minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the minimum wage bill of $1 per hour as reported to the House by the Education and Labor Committee. I believe it is of the utmost importance that recognition be given the increase in the cost of living prior to 1953 and a fair living wage accorded low-paid employees in the United States. My regret is that the committee did not broaden coverage of employees as recommended by the President.

I have generally been against controls since becoming a Member of the House. However, I do believe that from time to time we should inventory our economy and determine a floor for wages that will fully recognize the purchasing power of the dollar and basic needs for subsistence of an employee. With the standard of living prevalent in America today and the opportunities we wish to afford our people, there are still some areas where the wage level does not reward the worker for the contribution that he makes to the economy.

A very high percentage of our workers today receive substantially more than $1 per hour and the institution of the new base of $1 should not only help to lift the living standard of the low-paid worker, but effect an evening up of our economy in a way that should be healthy for the overall picture.

Any change from the status quo always invited opposition and criticism. The very arguments that are used sincerely and quite effectively by today's opponents of the $1 minimum have been raised with much the same reasoning in the past against prior proposals.

Our economy appears to be in a healthy state and we look with optimism toward the future. It is time that the benefits that have accrued to so many millions in our country, during the unprecedented prosperity that is now taking place, be passed along to include those who have been in the low-income bracket.

Specific problems will be presented in some areas, mostly indirectly rather than directly, but I am convinced that even in those areas impetus given to purchasing power will provide a better living for all concerned.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] a question. The gentleman made some statements about the economic conditions that existed directly after the raising of the minimum wage by this body. Was the gentleman referring to the fact that a great war arose first in 1941 and then again in 1950?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, let me inform the gentleman——

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I asked the gentleman a question.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall answer the question as I please. Let me inform the gentleman——

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I should inform the gentleman that I have the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me inform the gentleman that as a member of the committee in 1949 I was the author of the motion that brought that legislation out of the committee. I am the author of the motion that brought the present dollar minimum legislation out.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman is to be commended, but he has not answered the question.

Mr. BAILEY. I brought the legislation out 5 years ago. Certainly we have made some progress in the last 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, a bill to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage of the act to workers not now protected by a minimum-wage floor and the provisions for time and a half for overtime work will continue to enlist my complete support. However, it is apparent that the bill, as reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor, providing for a minimum of $1 per hour has the best hope of passage in this session and resultingly I will support the dollar figure.

An increase in the minimum wage is not only a family necessity, but it is a national economic necessity as well. We must think in terms of increasing the purchasing power of the low-income earner. A clear analysis compels us to regard the worker as a consumer whose increased purchasing power could stimulate a lagging economy, rather than thinking of him as an economic liability to his employer whose wages, if increased, will either drive his employer out of business or raise prices for all of us.

Opponents of the $1.25 minimum wage repeatedly say that this would increase unemployment and many firms would be forced to reduce their payrolls or even go out of business. This is the same argument that was used when the minimum wage was set at 30 cents in 1939 and again when it was set at 75 cents in 1950. This grim prophecy simply has not been borne out by facts.

In 1950 when the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents an hour, there were practically no plant shutdowns or layoffs resulting from this measure. Opponents of the measure then, as now, had predicted economic disaster.

In fact, the Department of Labor studies revealed that in five low-wage industries—southern sawmills, men's dress shirts and nightwear, fertilizer, men's seamless hosiery, and wood furniture—even though the higher minimum wage required increased wages for a substantial proportion of the workers in those industries the adjustment to the higher wage scale was made with only minor determinable effects.

At that time the Secretary of Labor said in his annual report:

> Prices for products of low-wage industries affected substantially by the necessity for the payment of higher wages do not seem to have risen as a group any higher than prices of other products. * * * Increased efficiency of production, particularly through mechanization and high volume operations, apparently absorbed much of the increased cost.

It is self-evident that every American worker is entitled to a decent standard of living. It is also axiomatic that no worker can enjoy what we like to refer to as the American way of life on less than $1 per hour.

In 1951, the Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a minimum-income chart for an average family of four based on living costs in 34 cities throughout the United States. The budget required for a basic minimum standard of living varied from $3,812 to $4,454. It would require a minimum wage of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest income requirements for a decent standard of living as defined by this study. The lowest budget figure was $3,812, the minimum necessary to live in New Orleans.

A minimum wage of $1 an hour does not sound unreasonable to me. I do not know of a single area in the United States where you could provide your family with decent housing, clothes, adequate food, and even minimum medical and dental care on an income of $1. And this includes no allowance for recreation or luxuries.

The administration proposal to scale down to 90 cents an hour what already appears to be a barely adequate increase in the minimum wage to $1 an hour is sheer ignorance of the basic facts of the living costs in today's economy.

The consumer-price index rose 14 percent between January 1950 and November 1954, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wages have been raised five times since 1950 in major American industries. The minimum wage was set at 75 cents an hour in 1950. Today, 5 years later, it is still 75 cents. It is totally inadequate and unrealistic in view of the economic picture today to increase the minimum wage to anything less than $1 per hour.

The administration proposal to increase the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour will not improve the living standard of 3 million workers who earn more than 90 cents an hour, but are still existing on a substandard level. The 3 million workers who earn 95 cents or perhaps $1.04 an hour would receive no benefit from such legislation. They will continue to exist on a powdered milk and dried meat diet. They will still be unable to afford adequate housing and even modest conveniences.

In addition to increasing the minimum wage to $1 an hour, I sincerely hope that coverage will be extended to many groups not currently protected by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to recent estimates there are approximately 44 million people engaged in private employment, exclusive of proprietors, self-employed persons, unpaid family labor, and executive, administrative and professional employees.

Of these 44 million employees, 13.6 million were not covered because they were engaged in intrastate activities and 6.4 million were specifically exempted from the minimum wage and overtime provisions.

The present Fair Labor Standards Act provides more limited coverage and contains more exemptions from the wage and hour provisions than the original act of 1938 did.

Coverage should certainly be extended and many of the groups now exempted should be protected under this law.

An inadequate minimum wage is responsible for unbalanced diets, the inability to afford medical and dental care, and poor housing. These conditions foster malnutrition, sickness, slums, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency and crime. The entire community and the Nation as a whole suffers when our most valuable asset—our citizens—are forced to live on a substandard level.

For these reasons, the majority of the constituents of the 12th District of Illinois favor, and I shall support, at least a $1 an hour minimum wage and continued extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to comment on the statement of my friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] when he reported to the House that the corporations' earnings had reached $20 billion and things were well with the corporations. I want to thank him for being on my side again today. He did not include the partnerships, the individuals, the small operators, the small business.

Mr. BAILEY. It was not to my advantage to do that.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish he could have added $20 billion for them, but it so happens they again are left out. It is for them I have done my best to plead. I think this Congress should be sympathetic toward small business.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would the gentleman care to answer the question I asked the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia as to the economic conditions that prevailed immediately after the raising of the minimum wage?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not believe I will go into that, but I will say this. It is a pretty well known fact that we did have World War II, and I think the economic conditions following it are pretty well known. We did have a Korean war, and certain conditions arose from that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman very much for answering.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to see so many Members from the other side of the aisle rise and compliment our good chairman on the manner in which these hearings have been conducted before the committee. I would like to join with them in saying that while many times during the course of the hearings, perhaps, we did not see eye to eye, I think our chairman gave everybody a full chance to be heard. I am sure as a result of that hearing the record of this committee is very complete on this bill. I would, too, like to take this opportunity of saying that as a result of those hearings I came out of the entire proceedings with a great deal of admiration, particularly for one gentleman from the minority side of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], who so steadfastly believed in his fundamental principle that at least $1, and I am sure he believed more than $1, was advantageous to the working people of this country. In spite of, perhaps, such difficulties as he might have had from his fellow colleagues, he stood by his principle—and I think it should be well noted we would not be voting on the bill today, as a result of that tie, were it not for the courage shown by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. I would like an explanation as to what the gentleman means by difficulties from his fellow colleagues.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman knows what I mean full well.

Mr. HOLT. I do not believe I do. I asked the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the fact that he was the only Republican who voted against the 90-cent raise is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You mention that the gentleman from Pennsylvania felt that $1 or something more would be advantageous. Is it your feeling that all the members of the committee do not feel that $1 or something more would be advantageous to the workers? Do you think the reason, perhaps, that we advised something under $1, if we could persuade the full membership of the committee to recommend that, was because we did not want the workers to get more—or was it because of the other reasons that have already been brought out—the possible inflationary problem or the unemployment of those low wage workers about whom we are all concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey knows I am not impugning his motives. I am sure he thoroughly believes that anything over 90 cents is inflationary.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I did not say that. I might remind the gentleman I asked him if he believed the reason we advised something under $1 was because of the possible inflationary problem and the unemployment of these low wage workers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thought you gave that as one of the reasons.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We all think something more than $1 would be advantageous to the workers, but that is not the question at issue today, as I understand it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sorry—the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, of course.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence presented to the committee overwhelmingly supports the opinion that industry generally can absorb a minimum wage of $1 without any difficulty whatsoever. By the time the new minimum wage goes into effect, average wages of American industry will be just about double that of the proposed $1 minimum. Recent wage developments in the auto and steel industries are undoubtedly giving impetus to a general rise in wages.

It is argued, however, that although industry generally can absorb a higher minimum, there are many individual firms and industries which cannot. It is especially contended that small businesses cannot absorb the increase. This is seemingly a fair observation and flows from our universal concern for the welfare of small and middle-sized businesses.

From the record of the detailed hearings which have just concluded, however, and from my general investigation into the matter, Mr. Chairman, I am persuaded that the fears and the doubts which have been expressed are not well founded. The record shows that every improvement in minimum wage, as in fact every step taken in the field of social and economic legislation, has been accompanied by fears and doubts as to the ability of small business to accommodate itself. The record also shows, however, that the dire consequences have not materialized and moreover, that the general health of all businesses, including small business, has invariably improved after the establishment of higher minimum wages. The record is available for those who would look at it. The "gloom and doom" philosophy is theoretical and not based upon the record.

Theoretically, of course, any increase in the minimum could conceivably affect some individual employers. Even a 76-cent minimum would mean an increased labor bill for an employer who pays exactly 75 cents to each of his employees—no more, no less. Such an employer might contend that he is having difficulty today with a 75-cent minimum and that any increase spells disaster. But the facts are that small business is bound to gain much more than it is likely to lose from the proposed $1 minimum. Let me cite just a few reasons why I think so.

First. There are tens of thousands of small businesses where the employer knows intimately each of his employees and where he wishes to pay the highest possible wages. Yet such employers are not able to do what they would like to do, or to do better than they are doing, because of the tough competition which they get from others who insist upon paying no more than the legal minimum. Our concern for small business should include the thousands of apparel manufacturers, for example, whose average labor force consists of no more than 40 or 50 employees. They find it difficult to maintain decent wage levels because of some manufacturers—frequently much larger than the average—who pay the bare legal minimum wage.

Second. As we raise the wage of the lowest-income group throughout the country their increased purchasing power will flow right back into the tens of thousands of small businesses throughout America who depend upon the income of their neighbors in the community.

Third. I was much impressed with the argument of the southern sawmill industry, the industry which will probably have the greatest adjustment to make, until I learned that several months after the 75-cent minimum went into effect, but before the Korean war started, there were more rather than fewer southern sawmills in operation. A few had gone out of business, but this was characteristic of the normal turnover in this industry.

I have great confidence in the genius of American business—large, small, or medium size. Once again our American economy is going to demonstrate its ability to march ever forward. Part of that march has always included, and will continue to include, an ever-rising wage level. The Congress must do its part. A $1 minimum on the evidence is fully justified, less would be substandard. I truly hope this committee and the House will uphold the decision of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The fact of the matter is all of us really know that most of the people in these industries are unable at the present time to be organized and to get the advantages of bargaining. I for one, of course, think if we could do away with the Taft-Hartley law, which I wish the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] would help me to do, it is possible we might have some way of getting the kind of union organization that would help these people.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am afraid the gentleman is dreaming dreams if he thinks I would ever do that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I am very sure of it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman in what way organization is not possible in these industries. It seems to me we have unions which are capable of going into these industries and organizing them. I would hope they would do so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think you know they have been trying to do so, but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] will tell you that in many industries, particularly in the lumber industry in North Carolina, it would be almost an impossibility to get those people together and organize them into a union, which is possible in a more closely knit and integrated industrial area.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking minority member for yielding me this time so that I might record my support of the committee bill, which I understand was approved in the committee by a vote of 21 to 9. It raises the hourly wage from 75 cents to $1. That would mean additional annual income of about $500 a year for each individual worker affected. Assuming that there are 1½ million workers affected, it would mean additional annual purchasing power of three-quarters of a billion dollars in our economy. I would support a higher hourly increase but this is a compromise measure and I shall vote for it.

The bill does not, to my knowledge, affect many, if any, workers in my congressional district. I come from an area where the average hourly wage is probably closer to $2 than $1. As a matter of fact, more than 10 years ago the ordinary domestic who came to the house to do the housework was paid a minimum of a dollar an hour.

My interest in the bill stems from the fact that some of the industries in my area are affected by competition from areas where the hourly wage is lower. For instance, in my city we have a garment industry. It has been there for a considerable number of years and has grown and has employed a large number of our people. Until recent times it contributed greatly to our economy. In fact, it still does. But it is running into difficulty now from competition from similar garment factories in other areas where the wage rate is much lower. I have received long-distance calls and communications from the owners of the factory urging support of the bill now before the House. As a matter of fact, their preference would have been for an even larger figure.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I wonder if your garment folks up there are not suffering from the Japanese competition that is now beginning to flow in pretty strongly, just as the veneer is against the veneer mills and the lumber industry from the west coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is possible, but I have received no information from the garment factory operators to that effect. What the gentleman says is true about imports of veneer. We are being affected and affected considerably by imports of Japanese veneer products.

Mr. BARDEN. I believe the average earnings of veneer mills last year was two-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is probably more familiar with that detailed information than I; but I was going to point out that what I have said about the garment industry is true also with the lumber industry and products of the lumber industry.

Mr. BARDEN. I expect the gentleman has never laid eyes on a piece of North Carolina pine in the State of Oregon.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. This gentleman does not know anything about North Carolina pine in Oregon, but certainly he has not seen one in the State of Washington.

Mr. BARDEN. I should have said Washington. I do know, however, we have seen many millions of feet of western lumber coming into the State of North Carolina and into east coast cities.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There is no doubt about that and I hope we are able to continue sending millions of feet of lumber to the eastern cities of the country.

Mr. BARDEN. Let us both hope for a little luck.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. At one time I was a representative of the Northwest Chair Co. in the city of Tacoma. We sold their products, but we found we were in competition with chairs and other merchandise which was made in lower-cost areas that were underselling us, so I think the gentleman is quite correct in what he says about trying to protect the high standards in his area.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from the State of Washington. So I am not only expressing my own views but also the views of others, including both management and labor representatives in my area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment further with respect to the pending measure.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, by what the bill leaves out. In its report the committee tells us that it dealt with two items—"the minimum hourly rate prescribed by section 6 (a) (1), and the effective date of any change in that rate." It has, indeed, given us a recommendation calling for an increase in the national minimum wage in effect under section 6 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. But it has given us no recommendation for simultaneous increases in minimum wage rates in effect in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands pursuant to section 6 (c) of the act.

Now, I can understand, Mr. Chairman, why the committee decided to limit itself to consideration of the minimum wage question at this time. What I cannot understand, however, is how the committee could reasonably decide to do nothing about minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands at the same time that it was making a recommendation for a 25-cent increase in the minimum wage on the mainland and why it has failed to give us any recommendation as to what should be done to increase minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as on the mainland.

Possibly, Mr. Chairman, I should amend that statement slightly. It is not strictly correct to say that the committee has given us no recommendation as to what to do about minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In point of fact, the committee has, by its silence on this question, given us two recommendations on this subject: First, that we make no change in the rates now in effect in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands but leave this to be done by the special industry committee procedure which the Congress established in 1949; and, second, that, by leaving the island rates unchanged while we increase the minimum on the mainland by 25 cents an hour, we add another 25 cents to the already wide and spreading differential in wages which already exists in many industries that operate on both the mainland and in Puerto Rico.

The existing differential, Mr. Chairman, is a very important factor in competitive relationships in a substantial and growing number of industries. To see how it has grown, let us look for a moment at the figures for average wages in manufacturing in Puerto Rico and the mainland for the years 1939 and 1954. In 1939, when average wages in manufacturing in Puerto Rico were only 19 cents an hour, average wages on the mainland amounted to 63 cents an hour, and the differential was 44 cents an hour. In 1954—last fall—the differential had grown to $1.31 an hour; average wages in Puerto Rico had risen to approximately 50 cents an hour, but average wages on the mainland stood at $1.81 an hour.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that all of us welcome the great strides that Puerto Rico has been making toward more extensive, diversified, and stable industrial development under the enlightened administration of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín. We all, I know, respect and share his sympathy and devotion to the welfare of the Puerto Rican people. We here in the Congress of the United States, however, must legislate in the interest of all the people of the United States, and not of just one group, one interest, one segment of our population.

A healthy and stable foundation for sound and durable economic prosperity in Puerto Rico can be built only if the economy of other parts of the United States is not damaged in the process. Today, businesses are being forced by Puerto Rican competition to curtail or close their operations and to reduce or lay off their staff of workers. This is happening not alone in New York, New Jersey, the New England States and in Pennsylvania, but in the Midwest and in the South as well. It is a development, Mr. Chairman, that can do the United States as a whole, and Puerto Rico itself, no good in the long run. It is a development we should not encourage, but which we are encouraging when we raise the minimum wage on the mainland but take no action at the same time to raise the rates that are now in effect in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

What are these rates, Mr. Speaker? I doubt if many Members of Congress are aware that even today in a part of the United States, namely, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, it is still legal under the Fair Labor Standards Act to pay an employee as little as 22½ cents an hour in certain industries—before June 6, 1955, it would have been legal to pay him as little as 17½ cents an hour; on that date a new administrative wage order of the Secretary of Labor went into effect which increased the 17½-cent rate to 22½ cents. It is still legal, Mr. Speaker, for many employees to be paid no more than $9 a week, assuming they work a full 40-hour week. Most workers there receive much less than what the law requires as a minimum on the mainland.

Yet, the cost of living in Puerto Rico is no lower than it is on the mainland. It is, if anything, higher even than the cost of living here in Washington where living costs are as high as they are anywhere else in the continental United States. The productivity of the average worker in Puerto Rico is no lower than that of the worker on the mainland. We know this from the fact that many Puerto Ricans migrate to the mainland and become fully as productive and efficient workers as any others.

Puerto Rico has its problems, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to try to minimize them. Its resources are limited, its population large, its living standards are low, there is chronic unemployment affecting 10 to 15 percent of the labor force at all times, and there is a steady stream of migration to the mainland in the search for work, for better pay, and better living standards.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that these problems can be solved by a policy of keeping wages low. Industrialization is essential to Puerto Rico, as its Commonwealth Government has clearly recognized, but equally, if not more important, is the raising of the living standards of its people, the building up of the island purchasing power, and the elimination of unfair competitive advantage based on low wages. Puerto Rico needs fair minimum wages for its own sake, as well as to avoid unfair competitive advantage as against the mainland.

In the light of the available facts, it seems to me that we most certainly should take action, as the Senate has already done, to provide for adjustments in the minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, to take effect at the same time as the mainland increase becomes effective, which will bring those rates more closely into line with the rate on the mainland and will enable the Fair Labor Standards Act to realize more fully in these islands as well as on the mainland, its objective of eliminating "labor conditions detrimental to health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

Because the committee has given us no recommendation on this subject, the only way we can remedy this deficiency is here on the floor of the House.

It may not be possible to work out an amendment providing for satisfactory adjustments in Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands wage rates, here on the floor of the House, but I, at least, as one Member of this body, wish to express my hope, and I know I speak for many Members of this body, that when this bill goes to conference, provisions will be agreed upon that will be fair to all concerned. I understand that this was the thinking of a number of members of the committee in agreeing to make no recommendation for changes in the rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I am sure that the membership of this body will wholeheartedly endorse any reasonable approach to this problem which may be worked out in the joint conference between the Senate and the House on this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, for the past several weeks, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have listened to a great deal of testimony regarding the legislation which we have under consideration here this afternoon. At the beginning of the session I introduced a bill H. R. 3237 which, if adopted, would have established the minimum wage at $1.25. As far as the workers in my own district are concerned, this still seems to me to be a reasonable and moderate figure. However, during the hearings it was brought out that this rate might work an undue hardship on small businesses in other sections of the country, though, as the committee report stated, we "tried without success to determine accurately the extent to which employers might adjust to a new rate without creating hardship or unemployment."

As a result of these considerations the committee decided to adopt the figure of $1 per hour as the new rate. I agree that for the present at least, this is probably the best compromise that we could reach. It is undeniable that wages and the cost of living have increased considerably throughout the Nation since the last increase in the minimum wage. Unfortunately, at least for our purposes, they have not risen at an equal rate for all areas. The administration has proposed a figure of 90 cents an hour as adequte for the present time. To this I cannot agree. Nor can I agree with the position taken by the senior Senator from New Jersey that the 90 cent rate be adopted now and increased to $1 in the future by an escalator clause. It appeared to be quite clear from the testimony before our committee that the lowest rate on which we could agree for the present was $1. Any lower figure would be completely out of line with reality for large sections of the country. It is my hope that once this figure has been agreed upon, it will then be possible to raise this figure still further in the next few years as conditions warrant this change. Once the $1 rate has been adopted, we will be in a position to see the reaction among the small businesses of the country and we will then be able to predict with considerable accuracy what the result of further increases will be.

For this reason I hope the House will adopt the minimum-wage bill as reported by the committee. It is unquestionably in the best interests of all the people of the United States.

Much has been said by the proponents of the 90-cent figure in support of that figure. The hearing record will disclose an interesting fact, namely that the chief witness for the administration, Hon. Arthur Larson, Under Secretary of Labor, agreed that there is no mathematical precision in that sacred figure. When questioned by me regarding the factors used in arriving at the 90-cent figure Mr. Larson stated that the percent of increase in the cost of living would lead to the logical conclusion that the increase should be to 85 or 86 cents. For all other factors, including general productivity, general wage increases, economic prosperity and growth of the Nation they have ascribed only 4 or 5 cents—making their figure 90 cents. I do not know the reasons of the administration for arriving at their figure, but I think I do know why so many of my friends across the aisle have embraced it so tenderly. They have accepted the Eisenhower figure—unscientific though it is—because he named it.

I favor the $1 figure for the reasons which I set forth earlier. I sincerely feel that this amount considers more fairly and scientifically the factors which the administration ignored in such a cavalier fashion.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not true, as Mr. Larson pointed out, that the reason that figure was arrived at was because it represents roughly an amount equivalent to the increase in the cost of living since the last Federal minimum wage was established 5 years before.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes," but I say to him that Mr. Larson attributed the rise, except 4 or 5 cents of it, entirely to the cost of living, ignoring economic prosperity, growth, wage changes and other factors which he applied only generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not true that the increased productivity of the Nation does not affect the low-wage industries with which we were concerned? As a result of extensive testimony, which the gentleman listened to with much interest and I am sure he got something out of it, we have learned there is a serious problem if any drastic increase in the minimum wage is legislated by us. It would be of no help, would it, for that particular industry if there was an increase in productivity to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I must confess the gentleman lost me about halfway through his question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am saying, what good would it be to those low-wage employees if that industry does not benefit from an increase in national productivity?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I saw nothing in the testimony which would indicate any danger there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We had competent witnesses testify to that fact. The gentleman has failed to answer the question. What value would it be to the low-wage industry and for the employees in that low-wage industry, if there is an increase in national productivity which does not affect them?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is limiting it to a specific interest.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is that not our obligation?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Our obligation, as I see it, is to the workers of America and to the American economy. I regret that I cannot yield any further unless I have time when I finish my statement.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish the gentleman would answer my question.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wish you would ask a question.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In support of what the gentleman from New Jersey who has the floor was saying, I think the testimony that the other gentleman from New Jersey is referring to was a very limited amount of testimony concerning a very small segment of the entire number of people affected. If you go into the food, the textile, the apparel and the leather products industries, they very definitely have increased their productivity and I think the testimony will show that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I was referring to that when I said this was limited in its scope. I do not know why so many of my friends across the aisle have embraced this 90-cent figure so tenderly except, of course, that this is the administration figure, which the chief spokesman for the administration admitted was founded on unscientific bases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I favor the enactment of legislation that will increase the minimum wage provided by the wages-and-hours law to $1.25 per hour. However, in view of the fact that it appears that I will not have an opportunity to vote in favor of such legislation, I support the pending legislation that will increase the minimum wage to $1 per hour.

In considering the question of an increase in the minimum wage, I think a great many of us direct our thoughts and arguments to the question of the feasibility of a minimum wage rather than its rate. I think such thinking is erroneous.

The question of whether or not we ought to have a minimum wage has already been established for the last 17 years. The minimum wage has been part and parcel of our legislative philosophy since Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938. At that time Congress most appropriately and in a great stride toward the economic strength and stability this country now enjoys, spelled out as part and parcel of our employer-and-employee philosophy and its relationship to the Federal Government, that it was necessary in the interest of the public welfare "to eliminate as rapidly as practicable labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary to health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers."

Having fixed and established the principle of the minimum wage over 17 years ago, the only problem to be considered by this Congress is the rate of the minimum wage.

I do not think that anyone could seriously contend that the present minimum of 75 cents an hour is an appropriate minimum wage under present circumstances.

As a matter of fact, the continued maintenance of the minimum wage at its present level is, in effect, the making of the laudable purposes of our Wages and Hours Act a national lie. Seventy-five cents as a minimum wage was insufficient as a minimum wage in 1949 when it was adopted. Today it is so inadequate as to make anyone who maintains that this country has a minimum wage law, look ridiculous.

If the 75-cent minimum wage which was inadequate at the time of its enactment was adjusted to meet the rising cost of living since that time, the new minimum wage would be about $1.05 an hour. However, when considering in 1955 the standard which we should establish, our sights should not be geared to just catching up to the inadequate 1949 standard—our sights ought to be aimed at establishing a minimum wage consistent with the laudable purpose of the law establishing it. One dollar and twenty-five cents would in my opinion achieve such goal.

I come from an urban district. In and about my district is one of the greatest—if not the greatest—industrial centers of the world. Although I reside in an area containing probably one of the greatest—if not the greatest—concentration of employees, I doubt that the establishment of a $1.25-an-hour wage provided in this bill, will increase the wage of over one-half of 1 percent of the workers in or about my district. The increase provided by this legislation, I seriously doubt will increase the wages of anyone employed in my district.

I would support a minimum wage legislation that would increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour. I will support this legislation—not because I feel it is adequate—but because it takes some sort of a step toward an adequate minimum wage.

I think that this Congress ought to reexamine its conscience and recognize that if this country is to keep its lead in the economic growth of the world that it ought to quickly establish a minimum wage consistent with the purposes of the wages and hours law.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I would like to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from New Jersey and say how refreshing it is to have this subject discussed on the merits and to say how much I appreciate the fact that he has discussed it as a national issue rather than a sectional issue.

I was most interested, Mr. Chairman, in the earlier remarks of our colleague [Mr. BARDEN] who is chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, in supporting a minimum wage of only 90 cents an hour. Chairman BARDEN stated frankly that he had come to this conclusion after listening to the testimony of representatives of small and medium business. I think the exchange between Mr. BARDEN and myself earlier this afternoon points up quite clearly that when Mr. BARDEN says "small business" he means small business south of the Mason-Dixon line. I think that it is most interesting, if true, that Mr. BARDEN's conclusions were based only on the testimony of small and medium business, for this would appear to exclude the very relevant testimony of a number of responsible union officials representing tens of millions of American working men and women.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the various amounts which have been proposed for a new minimum wage have not been arrived at in what can reasonably be called a scientific manner.

I, myself, introduced a bill earlier in this session calling for a new minimum wage of $1.25. This amount I determined by three factors: First, the depreciation in the value of the dollar since 1949; second, the increase in productivity since that date; and, third, the increase in cost of living since the last increase to 75 cents an hour.

I was further persuaded to the $1.25 figure by the fact that our minimum wage of 75 cents an hour amounts to only

$30 for a 40-hour week, and that the administration's proposal of 90 cents an hour only amounts to $36 a week and would directly affect only 1,300,000 American workers.

The minimum wage of $1 an hour proposed in the legislation under consideration will directly affect 2,100,000 working people in this country, and I support this legislation, not because I think that the amount is adequate or is in any sense a scientifically sound figure, but simply because it is the best that stands any real chance of being enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us is national in scope and must be considered apart from sectional interests and sectional prejudices. We would do well, I believe, to consider very carefully the meaning, in terms of a better life, which a minimum wage of $1 an hour will have on more than 2 million workingmen and women and their families.

And I should like also to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am opposed to the so-called escalator amendment which may be offered to this body. This amendment would fix the present minimum wage at 90 cents an hour and provide for a 5-cent increase per year for the next 2 years.

I view this as no more or less than a device to bridge the gap between those who favor 90 cents and those who favor a $1 per hour minimum wage or more, and my opposition is based on a belief that it is our obligation and responsibility at this time to establish a new minimum wage which is realistic in terms of the present economic circumstances which exist in the country today. I think we will be doing the Nation and ourselves a grave injustice if we consider an amendment which compromises at a 90-cent figure by holding out a 5 cent per year increase for the next 2 years. If there is honest disagreement as to the amount which should be passed today, well and good. But let's not try to legislate future wages, which may be unrealistic in terms of the situation a year or 2 years from now, simply in an effort to gain a compromise in the legislation which we are considering today.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, no one of us, however deep-seated our convictions and philosophies and feelings about the minimum wage and the Government's attempt to get into the field of minimum wage, would want the workingman, or any segment of our economy to make less than a living wage. No one of us, however, has been able to define exactly what we mean by a living wage, and therefore it becomes more and more difficult for us to really understand and comprehend and contemplate what we are doing here in trying to fix a so-called minimum wage, a standard for the unorganized workers of our country. Forty cents was fixed, and soon thereafter we had World War II. Seventy-five cents was fixed, and soon thereafter, less than 6 months, we had the Korean affair. The Secretary of Labor, in his report prepared in August of last year, deplores the fact that neither the 40-cent minimum nor the 75-cent minimum has ever had an opportunity to work in a so-called peacetime economy.

I would like to cite you one fact about Puerto Rico and the minimum wage, in reply to the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and others who have referred to Puerto Rico in their speeches here on the floor this afternoon. In 1938 Puerto Rico was made subject to the first minimum wage just as the mainland was. The mainland experienced the wartime boom that followed, but Puerto Rico did not. While the mainland with its wartime economy experienced this boom, Puerto Rico immediately commenced to go downward and downward and downward, and their whole industry, the whole island, was faced with bankruptcy. So, what did they do? They came to the Congress, and in 1940 this Congress repealed the minimum wage law insofar as it applied to Puerto Rico and established an industry committee to set the wage standards for Puerto Rico. What did they do then? They set the first minimum wage at 12½ cents, and from that the industry committee has moved up gradually as time and circumstances would permit, and now we have a wage scale in Puerto Rico of about 35 cents. This is the only clear illustration we have of the impact of minimum wages which were not aided by wartime inflation. True, Puerto Rican standards then were much lower than our own. But we might learn a lesson from the experience Puerto Rico had with a rate its industries could not absorb. Suppose some of our own low-wage and low-profit industries are forced out of business by the increase we are now considering. Where will the money come from to support the people and the communities which can be hurt by too high a wage—just as Puerto Rico was badly hurt when it had no war to help take off the slack.

Now let us look for just a minute at what we are doing here to the marginal employee. Those who would argue that a high minimum wage is the key to prosperity overlook what is really the key to prosperity. Production is the key to prosperity. How do you think these factories determine the wage which they pay their employees? They determine it on the basis of what employees can produce and what they can market. When we have a wage fixed on that basis, we simply cannot pull a figure out of the air, as some of these advocates of a $1 and $1.25 have done and are doing here today, and say, "This will make a more prosperous economy." You have got to key up your production if you are going to key up your prosperity.

I should like to cite you, if I may, a personal example of something that happened to me on the Sunday prior to the 4th of July, which emphasized that very thing. I was visited by a neighbor in her fifties, with 2 or 3 children in her family. She said to me, "I need your help." That is not an unusual thing for a Congressman to hear. She said, "I need your help in regaining my employment at the garment factory in such and such a town."

I said, "I do not know how I can help you, but I shall try."

So on the Tuesday following the 4th, I had occasion to visit that plant manager and I said to him, "Why can't you help Mrs. so-and-so? I wish you would as she so badly needs the money." His reply to me was this: "Why, Phil, she cannot produce at 70 cents much less 75 cents." I said, "What is your minimum here?" And he said, "Well, we have a minimum of 75 cents with an incentive scale under which our employees earn up to $1.25 and produce an average of 96 cents per hour."

That is a plant in my congressional district in Georgia. I said, "What are you going to do then when you are faced with this proposed increase to 90 cents or to $1 or $1.25 that we are going to debate and pass up in Washington in about 10 days?"

And his answer was this: "Well, if we go to 90 cents we can stand it maybe. But about 7 percent of the employees we now have will have to produce more than they are producing or we will have to cut them off the payroll."

I said then, "What is going to happen if we go to $1?"

And he said, "Frankly, if we go to $1 we do not have more than 10 percent of our present employees who can produce on the level that our engineers say is required to warrant a $1 an hour."

So there you go. I said to this committee when they voted down the proposal which I support, 90 cents, a reasonable increase, "In this action you are precipitating here today, you are sounding the death knell of the marginal employee. You are making it impossible for that employee who needs that $35, $40 or $45 a week to earn that living that she needs to earn, to supplement what her husband is able to earn."

I was interested in the colloquy between my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and the gentleman from Ohio who apparently does not really understand what small business is. I want to read something from the hearings. On page 883 of the hearings is a statement of Mr. John D. Stallworth of Pine Apple, Ala. This is what we find. Mr. Stallworth is a sawmill man, a Southern sawmill man, and a farmer and he offers employment to about 15 to 20 men. He said:

> The mill I operate is a small one but it has been a factor in the economy of my community for 35 years, having been established by an uncle. The mill has a present payroll of approximately $100 a day to 16 men.
>
> My mill is what is referred to as a portable, rough-green operation. I purchase stumpage by the thousand feet, and do my own logging. I have never separated my logging operation from the mill operation to take advantage of the 12-man exemption in the Fair Labor Standards Act that applies only to men engaged in logging. All of my employees, therefore, are covered by this act's provisions.
>
> I have invested in my mill about $8,000. In logging equipment, including trucks, my investment is about $15,000. At the mill I employ 7 men. A sawyer-foreman is paid $1.50 an hour. The man on the log deck, the log turner, the block setter, the edger-

man, and 2 offbearers receive 75 cents an hour. The mill payroll is approximately $42 a day and average production is 9-thousand board feet. Thus, my labor cost at the mill is $4.64 per thousand board feet.

My logging crew consists of a woods foreman who receives $1.25 an hour; and the following at 75 cents an hour: 3 members of a cutting crew, a skidder, 2 mule drivers, a tractor operator, and a truckdriver. The daily payroll is $58, or about that. This force delivers about 7,000 feet, log scale, to the mill deck.

My equipment is set up for 5-year depreciation. This amounts to $3.10 per thousand board-feet.

Presently I am paying $38 a thousand for stumpage. My overrun on this timber is about 15 percent.

Here is the breakdown of my costs per thousand board-feet produced:

Stumpage	$38.00
Labor	12.92
Depreciation	3.10
Maintenance	2.50
Total	56.52

Currently my rough green lumber is selling for an average of $58 a thousand. This shows a net of $1.48 per thousand board-feet.

Actually, I figure my profit at slightly more because of the overrun which is not taken into account in the above. The discrepancy comes in through this factor. Seven thousand feet of logs will saw into 8,000 feet of lumber.

Now consider this. My labor cost per thousand is $12.92. If the minimum wage should be raised to $1 an hour, my labor cost would rise by one-third. This would amount to $4.30 a thousand feet which would wipe out my present small profit and throw my operation into the red. I would be left with but one option. That would be to liquidate.

Remember, I do not control stumpage costs and I do not set prices on lumber. The squeeze would push me out of the sawmill business.

I would survive. I have a farm and can make a living on it. The 16 men I employ would be in a less favorable position. It is doubtful that they could find employment in the community where we live. For 35 years our sawmill has been their bread and butter. They live, rent free, in houses on our land They live comfortably on the wages they receive. They are satisfied. When they have troubles they bring them to me and I see them through. I can't say I like it, but it is established custom.

If we should be forced to close our mill, 16 families in our small community would be immediately without income. Some might pull up and move elsewhere, but most, I suspect, would draw unemployment compensation as long as possible and then go on relief.

Pine Apple, Ala., is a small community. The John D. Stallworth Saw Mill Co. is a very small operation, although it is like thousands of others all over the South which account for 75 percent of the region's lumber production. An arbitrary increase in the statutory wage would close it down. Many of the others likewise would be closed and if you think this is a wild statement, all you need do is tour the South with me and see hundreds of abandoned mills where the going became too rough at present wage levels.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that is small business. They are the people who employ 16 men, 75 men, or 50 men in a small community in Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, or any one of many States and furnish them purchasing power to buy the very things you manufacture and ship to us from Toledo. That is small business. When you see and understand that kind of small business, then you will begin to realize what it means to us and what small business means to America.

I hesitate to speak about a section. I know we are supposed to think in national terms. But when we are doing something that is shaking the very industrial growth, the very agricultural progress, the very economy we have in the South, when we are doing something that I fear is going to put more people out of employment than it gives employment to, then I want to say to the gentleman and to the committee that this is the kind of small business he needs to become acquainted with.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wanted to make the remark for the enlightenment of the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman from Georgia is referring to what we call a pecker-wood sawmill. Is that right?

Mr. LANDRUM. A pecker-wood sawmill; right.

In my district of Georgia we have a great farming area that grew approximately $145 million worth of broilers last year. These broilers are raised out on the farm, where a man maybe sometimes is not able to pay 75 cents. But if he does, the statistics show that where he has paid 75 cents he earns only 61 cents in return himself. So even though this $145 million sounds big in terms of money, we look at it from the processor's standpoint and the business standpoint, and they tell us that three-fourths of 1 percent is looked upon as a good, reasonable profit. That is small business. Small business is the anchor of our American free enterprise.

Let us not, therefore, in our haste to make political hay go contrary to what every small-business man who testified in our hearings, told us they could absorb. Let us establish a fair, reasonable increase justified by the evidence of record and forego the gamble to win votes at the possible cost of serious unemployment, and displacement to thousands of workers in our great Southland; and, with a possible loss, also, of the desire of our small-business men to continue to cultivate in America what no other country in the world has, real freedom.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in recommending to this body that it pass H. R. 7214 to increase the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, from 75 cents to $1 an hour, effective March 1, 1956, the Committee on Education and Labor has failed to give us any recommendation for dealing with what is clearly a very important part of the minimum-wage problem under the act. Under the bill reported by the committee no changes would be made in the minimum wage rates presently in effect in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands under administrative wage orders of the Secretary of Labor.

Adjustment of these rates, Mr. Chairman, should be a matter of concern to all of us. It is obvious that by leaving these rates unchanged while raising the minimum on the mainland by 25 cents an hour, we will, on the one hand, be continuing in effect rates that in some cases are still as low as 22½ cents an hour for employees in Puerto Rico who are doing work that can be done on the mainland only by paying not less than $1 an hour. On the other hand, if we do nothing about the rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, we will be giving employers in these islands an additional competitive advantage amounting to nearly 25 cents an hour in a growing number of industries in which Puerto Rican competition with the mainland is becoming an increasingly serious factor.

The wide and constantly spreading differential between average wages in Puerto Rico and on the mainland is already a significant competitive factor in a number of industries, particularly in the fields of traditionally low wages and little organization under the present 75-cent minimum. Under the committee bill, I fear, the threat of competitive advantage for Puerto Rican industry will become even more serious in these, and very likely, other industries that are not now substantially affected.

Why has the committee, in the face of these facts, done nothing about the present low minimum-wages rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands? Unfortunately, it has not told us in its report, so we can only surmise what its reasons were.

The committee has, of course, said that it decided to confine itself to the study of the minimum wage under section 6 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the effective date of any changes in the rate fixed by that section of the act. Did the committee regard the subject of the minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as not being within the scope of its investigation as thus defined?

It is true that minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are fixed under administrative wage orders of the Secretary of Labor. It is also true that these orders are issued under sections 5 and 8 of the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, they take the place of the minimum fixed in section 6 (a) (1), which is now 75 cents an hour, but which will be raised by the committee bill to $1 an hour, for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, only by virtue of authority provided for in section 6 (c) of the act. Does this mean that adjustment of the present minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands presents any less of a minimum wage problem than does the rate on the mainland? Clearly not, Mr. Chairman.

In order to deal with minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, it is not necessary to deal with any section of the Fair Labor Standards Act except section 6. It is not necessary to change the method of appointment or composition of special industry committees as specified in section 5. Nor do we have to deal with the procedures for the issuance of wage orders based on the recommendations of such committees as set forth in section 8 of the act.

Changing the minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will not bring under the minimum-wage provisions any employees who are exempt from such provisions under section 13. It will not affect in any way the coverage of the act, which will continue to apply to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands only when they are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, just the same as on the mainland.

Another explanation that could be offered as to why the committtee has given us no recommendations for adjustments in the minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is that the committee did not study this problem in detail and that an exhaustive, on-the-spot study should be made before any such recommendation can be formulated.

It should be pointed out that, however, the committee had before it, and there is before this body, the bill which has been passed by the Senate and which contains carefully thought-out provisions dealing with minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. There is also available to Members of this body, the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as the additional evidence received by the Committee on Education and Labor in the course of its hearings.

More than a dozen witnesses testified before the Senate subcommittee on conditions affecting minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and on measures that should be taken to assure higher standards of living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands without substantially curtailing employment there and to prevent unfair competitive advantage for industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands over industries on the mainland. I have prepared a list of the testimony, communications, and exhibits pertaining to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands which were submitted in the course of the subcommittee hearings on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have this list inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

TESTIMONY, COMMUNICATIONS, AND EXHIBITS PERTAINING TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS IN THE PRINTED RECORD OF THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, UNITED STATES SENATE, IN RE AMENDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Pages 59–61: James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor.

Page 108: George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor.

Pages 122–126: George Meany.

Pages 153–155: Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.

Pages 225–230: David Dubinski, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL.

Pages 234–251: David Dubinsky.

Pages 255–264: David Dubinsky.

Page 282: James B. Carey, president, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO.

Pages 284–286: James B. Carey.

Pages 518–519: Marx Lewis, general secretary-treasurer, United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL.

Pages 555–556: Tobacco Workers International Union, AFL.

Pages 1251–1252: James P. Mitchell.

Pages 1252–1258: A. Fernós-Isern, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Pages 1258–1285: Fernando Sierra Berdecia, Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico.

Pages 1285–1286: David Dubinsky.

Pages 1286–1287: Stuart Rothman, solicitor of labor.

Pages 1287–1296: Fernando Sierra Berdecia.

Pages 1296–1299: Louis Brown, Wage and Compensation Officer, Department of Agriculture and Labor, Virgin Islands.

Page 1323: Morton Epstein, South Jersey Men's Clothing Manufacturing and Contractors' Association.

Page 1572: Albert Gilman, executive secretary, National Hand Embroidery and Novelty Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

Pages 1576–1578: Miguel A. Garcia Mendes, chairman, and Luis A. Ferre, vice chairman, Republican Party of Puerto Rico.

Pages 1761–1763: United States Department of Labor Exhibit F.

Pages 1847–1855: Stuart Rothman.

The data which were received in the course of the subcommittee's investigation of economic and competitive conditions involved in determining realistic levels for minimum wages under the Fair Labor Standards Act were carefully analyzed in a staff report made following the hearings. Part V of this study deals with the question of minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico. It contains a summary of relevant factual material on this question and a careful and thorough explanation of the considerations which support the various provisions dealing with minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands which were included in the bill passed by the Senate. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I ask that part V of this report, consisting of pages 52 through 61, be included in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

V. PUERTO RICO

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Puerto Rico

The economic situation of Puerto Rico is fundamentally different from that of other parts of the United States. While the mainland has ample resources and a relatively low density of population, Puerto Rico has much more limited resources and an extremely high density of population (Puerto Rico: about 650 people per square mile; continental United States: about 50). Furthermore the death rate has declined sharply (from 18.4 per 1,000 in 1940 to 7.7 per 1,000 in 1954) while the birthrate has remained approximately the same. As a result there is a continuous and continuing pressure of the population with resulting low standards of living, migration, and unemployment.

Without industrialization Puerto Rico is not able to solve the economic problems arising out of this situation. During the past 15 years Puerto Rico has made great strides in that direction. It has been successful in attracting industry and has constantly increased wages from unbelievably low levels amounting in some cases to 5 cents and less an hour.

It has thus been able to create greater employment and earning opportunities.

Table 24 gives an indication of employment in manufacturing industries in Puerto Rico: Of the 65,000 workers in manufacturing, almost 40 percent are in food and kindred products and about 25 percent are in apparel and other finished products. Tobacco manufacturing follows after a long interval with a little over 5 percent. All other industries have a smaller relative share in manufacturing.

However, these figures do not give a fully representative picture of the industrial situation in Puerto Rico since they exclude over 30,000 homeworkers in the needle trades. Including these homeworkers, the needle trades are the most important branch of industry on the island.

TABLE 24.—*Employment in manufacturing industries*[1] *in Puerto Rico by major industry groups: Mid-March 1951*

MAJOR INDUSTRY GROUP	*Number of employees*
Manufacturing, total	65,642
Food and kindred products	26,469
Tobacco manufactures	3,632
Textile mill products	2,675
Apparel and other finished products made from fabrics and similiar materials	17,474
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	277
Furniture and fixtures	1,692
Paper and allied products	309
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	1,407
Chemicals and allied products	2,042
Leather and leather products	1,267
Stone, clay, and glass products	3,200
Primary metal industries	69
Fabricated metal products (except ordnance, machinery, and transportation equipment)	370
Machinery (except electrical)	614
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	209
Transportation equipment	1,093
Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments; photographic and optical goods; watches and clocks	230
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	2,713

[1] Excludes 34,000 homeworkers.

Source: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, OASI Coverage Statistics, first quarter, 1951.

Table 25 gives more detailed information about employment and wages in various industrial groups.

Wages range in the needle trades from 22½ cents to 57½ cents, in food and related product industries from 35 to 42½ cents, in tobacco from 31 to 36 cents. The highest rate, namely 75 cents, is paid in the following industries: banking, insurance, and finance; cement; and in some divisions of the chemical, the communications, and the metal industries. There are also some sections of the plastic industry, of the stone, glass, etc., industry, and of the textile industry which have 75-cent rates. This rate is paid, furthermore, in sugar manufacturing and in shipping. Lumber and wood products are at the lower end with a range from 38 to 42 cents.

TABLE 25.—*Minimum wage rates for Puerto Rico showing changes subsequent to the 1949 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act and the impact of the proposed legislation*

Industry and division	Minimum wage (cents per hour)					Increase of 33.3 percent would amount to—	Increase would bring rate to—	Employment	Number of people who received wage increases in 1955	Number of people in industries for which Industry Committee nominated	Number of people receiving 75 cents per hour
	Rate in 1949	Rate as of June 1953	Changes between June 1953 and Dec. 31, 1954	Rates effective in 1955	Percent increase since 1949						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
						Cents	*Cents*				
Alcoholic beverage and industrial alcohol								1,515		1,515	
Beer division	30	53			77	17½	70½	1,714			
General division	40	60			50	20	80	801			
Artificial flower	33	43			30	14½	57½	657			
Bakery products	20	35			75	11½	46½	91			
Banking, insurance, and finance	40	[1] 75			88	25	100	1,629			1,629
Button, buckle, and jewelry								1,204			
Pearl button and buckle division	37½	46	54		44	18	72				
Leather and fabric button and buckle division	20-30	40	53		165-77	17½	70½				
Button and buckle (other than pearl, leather, or fabric) and bead division	20-28	48			140-71	16	64				
Rosary and native-jewelry division	15-28	33			120-18	11	44				
Costume jewelry, general division	[2] 20-40	30-45	36		80-(−15)	12	48				
Costume jewelry, hair-ornament division	35-40	45	50		43-25	16½	66½				
Precious-jewelry division	40	55			38	18½	73½				
Metal expansion watch band division	40	60			50	20	80				
Cement	40	[1] 75			88	25	100	637			637
Chemical, petroleum, and related products industries								696			
Fertilizer division	40	75			88	25	100	446			[4] 446
Hormones, antibiotics, and related products division	32	75			134	25	100	[3] 250			
General division	25-40	51			10-28	17	68				
Cigar and cigarette	30	36			20	12	48	559		559	
Clay and clay products								533			
Structural clay and miscellaneous clay products division	25	40			60	13½	53½	177			
Semivitreous and vitreous china food utensils division	25	40			60	13½	53½	362			
Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous transportation industries								(4)			
Airline division	40	75			88	25	100	305			305
Cable and radiotelephone division	40	75			88	25	100	128			128
Tourist bureau and ticket-agency division	40	75			88	25	100	36			36
Telephone division	40	70			75	23½	93½	1,087		1,087	(4)
Gas utility division	40	65			63	21½	86½	156		156	
Radio broadcasting division	40	55			38	18½	73½	411		411	
Miscellaneous division	40	75				25	100				(4)
Construction, business service, motion-picture and miscellaneous industries								739			
Construction division	32	50			56	16½	66½	531			
Motion-picture division	40	55			38	18½	73½	109			
Business service and miscellaneous industries division	40	65			63	21½	86½	99			
Corsets, brassieres, and allied garments division	24	33	55		129	11	44	2,898			
Decorations and party favors	[2] 25-40	30			20-(−25)	10	40	200			
Electrical, instrument and related manufacturing industries								2,002	2,002		
Lens and thermometer division	35	45		[5] 60	71	20	80	596			
Resistance-type household appliance division	40	45		[5] 65	63	21½	86½	24			
General division	35-40	30, 45, 58		[5] 70	100-75	23½	93½	1,382			
Foods, beverages, and related products industries								1,208		1,208	
Beverage division	30	42½			42	14	56½				
General division	30	35			17	11½	46½				
Hairnet [6]	27½	40	42½		55	14	56½	80			
Handicraft products industry	15-25	26			73-4	8½	34½	58			
Hooked rug								649			
Hand-hooked-rug division	18-27	33			83-22	11	44	352			
Machine-hooked-rug division	40	40			0	13½	53½	297			
Hosiery	25-33	40	50		100-52	16½	66½	407			
Jewel cutting and polishing								324			
Gem stone division	40	50			25	16½	66½	290			
Industrial jewel division	30	42½			42	14	56½	34			
Leaf tobacco								6,871		6,871	
General division	27	31			15	10½	41½				
Machine processing division:											
Feeding, operating, or tending machines which shred, chop, thresh, or stem leaf tobacco, and operations immediately industrial thereto	27	36			33	12	48				
Other operations	27	31			15	10½	41½				
Leather, leather goods, and related products								463			
Hide curing division	20	50	65		225	21½	86½	6			
Leather tanning and processing division	20	27	40		100	13½	53½	86			
Small leather goods, baseball and softball division	17-27	23-32	32		88-19	10½	42½	95			
General division	17-30	23-35	40		135-33	13½	53½	276			
Lumber and wood products								2,215			
Lumber and millwork division	32	42			31	14	56	327			
Furniture, woodenware, and miscellaneous wood products division	25-32	38			52-19	12½	50½	1,888			
Men's and boys' clothing and related products								2,648	2,648		
Suits, coats and jackets division	24	35		[7] 55	129	18½	73½				
Neckties	24	35		[7] 55	129	18½	73½				
Hat and cap	24	35		[7] 55	129	18½	73½				
General division	24	35		[7] 47½	98	16	63½				
Metal, machinery, transportation equipment and related manufacturing industries								1,736	1,736		
Drydock	40	53	75		88	25	100			(4)	(4)
Fabricated wire products, steel spring and slide fastener division	40	45, 58	65	65	63	21½	86½			(4)	(4)
General division	35-40	45, 58, 68		75	114-88	25	100				
Needlework and fabricated textile products								39,750	39,750		
Woven- and knitted-fabric glove division								15,200			
Hand-sewing operations	18	21		22½	25	7½	30				
Machine operations and any operations known to the industry as cutting, laying off, sizing, banding, and boxing	35	45		57½	64	19	76½				
Other operations	24	29		40	67	13½	53½				
Leather-glove division								1,000			
Hand-sewing operations	22	25		30	36	10	40				
Machine operations and any operations known to the industry as cutting, laying off, sizing, banding, and boxing	40	52		57½	44	19	76½				
Other operations	24	29		40	67	13½	53½				

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 25.—*Minimum wage rates for Puerto Rico showing changes subsequent to the 1949 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act and the impact of the proposed legislation*—Continued

Industry and division	Minimum wage (cents per hour)					Increase of 33.3 percent would amount to—	Increase would bring rate to—	Employment	Number of people who received wage increases in 1955	Number of people in industries for which Industry Committee nominated	Number of people receiving 75 cents per hour
	Rate in 1949	Rate as of June 1953	Changes between June 1953 and Dec. 31, 1954	Rates effective in 1955	Percent increase since 1949						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Woven- and knitted-fabric glove division—Continued						*Cents*	*Cents*				
Silk, rayon, and nylon underwear division [8]								1,200			
Hand-sewing operations	18	21		26	44	8½	34½				
Other operations	27	34		45	67	15	60				
Cotton underwear and infants' underwear division								1,000			
Hand-sewing operations	15	17½		22½	50	7½	30				
Other operations	24	30		40	67	13½	53½				
Infants' wear division								1,500			
Hand-sewing operations	15	17½		25	67	8½	33½				
Other operations	24	30		40	67	13½	53½				
Needlepoint division:											
Hand-sewing operations	15	17½		22½	50	7½	30				
Other operations	24	30		40	67	13½	53½				
Household art linen division:											
Hand-sewing operations	15	17½		22½	50	7½	30				
Other operations	24	30		40	67	13½	53½				
Handkerchief and square-scarf division								10,000			
Hand-sewing operations	15	17½		22½	50	7½	30				
Other operations	24	30		40	67	13½	53½				
Children's and doll's wear division								2,000			
Hand-sewing operations	15–24	21–28		35	133–46	11½	46½				
Other operations	24	30–31		40	67	13½	53½				
Crochet slipper division	25	32		45	80	15	60	1,200			
Crochet beading division	24	35		47½	98	16	63½				
Bullion embroidery division	24	35		47½	98	16	63½				
Corde and bonnaz embroidery and corde handbag division [8]	25	36		51	104	17	68	200			
Women's blouses, dresses, and neckwear division								3,000			
Hand-sewing operations	24	28		35	46	11½	46½				
Other operations	24	35		45	46	15	60				
Fur garment division	30	45		45	50	15	60				
Dungarees, slacks, and related products division								700			
Hand-sewing operations	15	21		47½	217	16	63½				
Other operations	24	30			—88	10	40				
Sweater and bathing suit division								400			
Hand-sewing operations	15	21		50	233	16½	66½				
Other operations	24	30			98						
Hat body division								100			
Hand-sewing operations	15	30		57½	283	19	76½				
Other operations	24				140						
Millinery division [8]								0			
Hand-sewing operations	15	21		50	233	16½	66½				
Other operations	24	30			108						
Crocheted hats and infants' booties division								100			
Hand-sewing operations	15	21		35	133	11½	46½				
Other operations	24	30		45	88	15	60				
Handbag (except corde) division [8]								50			
Hand-sewing operations	15	21		45	200	7	28				
Other operations	24	30			88	15	60				
Miscellaneous division: [8]											
Hand-sewing operations	[2] 15–28	21		45	200–(—25)	15	60				
Other operations	15–28	30		45	200–7	15	60				
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing, and related industries						20	80				
Daily newspaper division	35	60			71	18½					
Paper-box division	40	55			38		73½	68			
Paperboard division	25	40			60	13½	53½	133			
Paper-bag division	28	45			61	15	60	75			
General division	28–35	40			43–14	13½	53½	387			
Plastic products industry								849	849		
Sprayer and vaporizer division	35	45		[5] 75	114	25	100				
Wall tile, dinnerware and phonograph records division	35	45		[5] 60	171	20	80				
General division	35	30–45		[5] 53	52	17½	70½				
Railroad, railway express, and property motor transport								1,546			
Railroad division	25	33			32	11	44	1,047			
Railway express and property motor transport division	35	60			71	20	80	499			
Rubber, straw, hair, and related products								178			
Rubber products division	40	60			50	20	80	129			
Straw, hair, and related products division	25	[6] 37			48	12½	49½	49			
Shipping	40	75			88	25	100	5,347			5,347
Shoe manufacturing and allied industries	30	35	40		33	13½	53½	536			
Stone, glass, and related products								1,135			
Glass and glass products division	35	60			71	20	80				
Glass decorating division	35	42			20	14	56				
Mica division	35	42			20	14	56				
Concrete pipe division	35	60			71	20	80				(4)
Hot asphaltic plant mix division	35	75			114	25	100				
General division	30–35	50			67–43	16½	66½				
Sugar manufacturing	40	75			88	25	100	13,000			13,000
Textile and textile products								1,500			
Mattress and pillow division	25	50	75		200	25	100	89			89
Cotton ginning and compressing division	25	30	40		60	13½	53½	21			
Hard fiber products division	25	32½	37½		50	12½	50	115			
General division	15–25	25–30	42½		183–70	14	56½	1,160			
Vegetable, fruit, and nut packing and processing	15–18	30			100–67	10	40	[9] 2,000			
Wholesaling, warehousing, and other distribution	40	65			63	21½	86½	5,000			
Total								104,259	46,136	11,807	[10] 21,617

---

[1] The wage order establishing this rate was issued in June 1953 and the rate became effective in July 1953.

[2] At the time of the committee recommendation no employees were actually producing articles to which the higher of these rates was applicable.

[3] Other.

[4] (No copy sumitted.)

[5] July 21, 1955.

[6] As a part of general division of textile and textile products industries.

[7] Mar. 14, 1955.

[8] Rejected by Administrator.

[9] About; during peak.

[10] This total does not include workers earning 75 cents in the following industrial divisions, for which no employment figures were available: Miscellaneous division, communications industry; drydock and general division, metal, etc., industries; sprayer and vaporizer division, plastics industry; hot asphaltic plant mix division, stone, glass, and related products industry.

These figures can be fully understood only if we realize that the minimum wage in Puerto Rico has a tendency to be the prevailing wage. This is not literally true in all cases. Here are some examples of a smaller relative increase in payrolls than the relative increase in the minimum wage—a situation which proves that there is a wage structure over and above the minimum:

Mattress, quilts, and pillows, August 23, 1954—increase in minimum, 50.1 percent; increase in payrolls, 13.6 percent;

Shoe manufacturing and allied products, January 4, 1954—increase in minimums, 14.2 percent; in payrolls, 3.1 percent;

Rubber, straw, hair, and related products, October 13, 1952—increase in minimum, 50 percent; in payrolls, 13.0 percent. Similar examples could be given for railroads, railway express, and property motor transport (May 4, 1953); construction, business service, etc. (August 11, 1952); hooked rugs (July 21, 1952); chemicals, petroleum, and related products (July 14, 1952); leather, leather goods, etc. (September 14, 1953); cement (July 14, 1953); corsets, brassieres, etc. (November 8, 1954).

These are significant instances but in no way do they change the basic situation, which may be formulated as follows; minimum wages tend to be prevailing wages. This tendency is strongest in the lowest paid industries and becomes less pronounced in the higher paid industries.

Under such circumstances a change in the minimum wage has a significant influence on the whole wage structure. This factor should be taken into consideration by the subcommittee in proposing graduated increases.

However, there were other factors which should be considered in an extremely complex situation which is due to the fact that Puerto Rico, while being at a different stage of economic development from the mainland, is in an intimate competitive relationship with various mainland industries, particularly in the needle trades.

As table 25 shows, Puerto Rico has made considerable strides in raising its wage level. From an average hourly wage of 44.3 cents in manufacturing in 1950, wages increased to an average of 55.4 cents in April 1954, respectively 50.2 cents in October 1954. (April is the seasonally high month, October the low month.) This is an increase of 5.9 respectively 11.1 cents—or an average increase of 8.5 cents—and of 13.3 percent respectively 25.3 percent or an average of 19.3 percent. In individual industries the absolute and relative increases were considerably higher, yet the large number of low-paid needle workers who did not get major increases until June 1955 kept the overall manufacturing average low.

These figures compare with a relative increase of over 30 percent in average hourly earnings in manufacturing (January 1950–October 1954) and an absolute increase of 41 cents on the mainland. While the relative increase in average hourly earnings amounted to about two-thirds of that in the mainland, the absolute differential between the mainland and Puerto Rico widened from 98 cents in January 1950 to $1.31 in October 1954.

These figures illustrate why an across-the-board increase of 25 cents equal to the increase on the mainland is necessary, fully realizing that it would be impossible for Puerto Rico to absorb such an increase immediately.

Before explaining the technical aspects of the suggested proposal, a few words about the underlying philosophy are appropriate. An effort has been made to find a compromise between the need to cushion a competitive advantage which was strongly felt by some mainland industries and Puerto Rico's need to grow industrially at the greatest possible rate. Realistically speaking, the rate of growth in Puerto Rico must be greater than the rate of growth of the mainland. Nobody can gain by slowing down this rate of growth because people who do not find employment opportunities in Puerto Rico will come to the mainland and look for work in New York and elsewhere.

The subcommittee should further recognize the value of a flexible adjustment through industry committees. These committees should be the basis of wage adjustments to be made in Puerto Rico in the future. But the subcommittee should be greatly influenced by the past shortcomings in the functioning of these committees. The time elapsed between the beginning of committee proceedings and the effective date of the wage order for all industry committees between October 1949 and May 1955 averaged 310 days or about 10 months. In important cases the proceedings took about 2 years. Besides cumbersome procedures the main reason for these delays was a shortage of funds which made it impossible to have enough industry committees. The Government of Puerto Rico has done its share to overcome these difficulties by appropriating $100,000 for industry committees. The subcommittee should strongly urge that Congress appropriate adequate funds for industry committees in Puerto Rico.

The significance which the subcommittee should attribute to industry committees will become clear as the technical aspects of the proposal are discussed:

(1) All rates which were not increased during 1955 should be increased by 33.3 percent on January 1, 1956.

(2) Also effective as of January 1, 1956, all rates which were increased during 1955 should be increased by 7½ cents over the rate in effect on July 1, 1955.

(3) Industry committees which function between now and the end of 1955 can further cushion the impact of the 33.3 percent increase if they increase rates between now and December 31, 1955. However, all industries should increase their rates by 33.3 percent within 1 year after the effective date of the last increase in their rates.

(4) By January 1, 1958, all rates should be increased by 25 cents over the rate prevailing on July 1, 1955. There are no definite steps provided to achieve this goal. Industry committees are to determine freely the pace of this adjustment.

(5) Since it is not possible to foresee exactly what is going to happen within the next 2½ years, the Secretary of Labor of the United States should be directed to submit a special report to Congress between January 1 and June 30, 1957, informing Congress about the progress made in achieving the 25-cent goal. The Secretary of Labor of the United States should consult with the secretary of labor in Puerto Rico in order to obtain his comments and recommendations. This provision is intended to give to the Government of Puerto Rico an immediate opportunity to express its views. There should not be any undue delays in industry committee procedures. Every effort should be made to avoid unforeseen hardship cases in the adjustment to a wage structure which is 25 cents higher than the one prevailing on July 1, 1955.

In order to make industry committees a more adequate means of wage adjustments than they were in the past, the subcommittee is urged to recommend a streamlining of administrative procedures and an elimination of the second hearing. It is hoped that industry committees will function so well that they can become again the major means of increasing wages in Puerto Rico. During an experimental period of 2½ years they will play a major role though there will be a need to set definite goals for this period.

Table 25 (col. 7–12) gives a general idea of the impact of the proposed legislation. The employment figures are not fully reliable since they are based on number of people included in certain surveys at different periods of time rather than on the total number of employees in various industries. In small industries this is not likely to make much difference but in larger industries it may very well be a major source of error. However, these were the only data which the Department of Labor had.

The total number of employees included in these surveys amount to approximately 104,000. All industries covered by minimum-wage legislation in Puerto Rico, however, employ about 125,000 people, according to recent estimates of the Wage and Hour Division. Of the 104,000 wage and salary earners surveyed, about 46,000 had wage increases during 1955. As a result, their rates will be increased by 7½ cents rather than by 33.3 percent as of January 1, 1956. It is true that there is no difference between 33.3 percent and 7½ cents in the lowest paid industries—those now paying 22½ cents. But for all industries paying more than 22½ cents, the 7½-cent adjustment is smaller than 33.3 percent and for all industries paying more than 35 cents, it is less than 20 percent. Over 21,000 among the 104,000 workers now receive 75 cents an hour. It seems to be agreed that these industries will have relatively little difficulty in making a 25-cent or 33.3-percent adjustment. For almost 12,000 workers industry committees will be functioning between now and the end of 1955.

These figures show that about one-half of the wage and salary earners in Puerto Rico will get wage increases of 33.3 percent in January 1, 1956. For another half the full impact of the 33.3 percent is postponed until 1 year after the date of their last 1955 wage adjustment. Columns 7 and 8 show the size of the adjustment to the 33.3 percent rate and the new rate in effect after the adjustment has been made. Since all industries make a 7½-cent adjustment on January 1, 1956, the remaining increase up to 33.3 percent varies between 2½ cents and 17½ cents effective 1 year after the 1955 rate change. The impact of the 33.3 percent is proportional but the first adjustment of 7½ cents implies a relatively higher adjustment for the lowest paid rates.

In view of the complexity of the Puerto Rico situation and the difficulty of finding a simple solution which is satisfactory from all points of view, the Department of Labor should be asked to make a careful study of the impact of the proposed changes in Puerto Rico. Should any layoffs occur the reasons should be investigated and alternative remedies should be explored. The adjustment of the wage structure in Puerto Rico should be further explored in connection with the overall development of the island.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its report on the bill, S. 2168, included a careful explanation of the provisions dealing with Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, I ask that these sections of this committee's report together with explanatory matter prepared by the Joint Minimum Wage Committee be included in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

IV. PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

When the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act was raised to 75 cents an hour in 1950, the committee pointed out in the report which accompanied the Senate bill that changes in the law would be required "with respect to the fixing of minimum wage rates through the medium of industry committee recommendations and administrative wage orders for employees subject to the act employed in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands industries" (S. Rept. 640, 81st

Cong., 1st sess., p. 4). The Congress at that time continued the procedure for use of industry committee recommendations and administrative wage orders as the means by which the rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands should be brought "as rapidly as is economically feasible," as required by the law, up to the 75-cent minimum-wage objective.

During the course of its hearings the committee received evidence that reliance upon industry committee proceedings and administrative wage orders has not provided effective machinery for bringing minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands into line with the mainland minimum in the absence of a specific provision in the law for increases of fixed amount such as are proposed in the committee bill. The committee recognizes that certain industries in Puerto Rico present a definite competitive problem for industries on the mainland, and it is concerned that the law should not become a means of providing a competitive advantage to either the mainland or the Puerto Rican branch of any industry.

The committee believes that this can best be accomplished by increasing the different minimum wage rates which now prevail in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by an amount which on a percentage basis in terms of these rates is the same as the increase provided for on the mainland. This the committee bill would do by increasing the rates prescribed under existing wage orders (which have been in effect for more than a year on January 1, 1956) applicable to employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by 33⅓ percent above present levels, effective January 1, 1956, which is the same date that the $1 minimum would become effective on the mainland. At the same time the committee believes that progress should be made toward narrowing existing differentials in the minimum wage rates which under the bill will still prevail as between Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands industries and those on the mainland. In addition to increasing minimum-wage rates in these islands by the same percentage as the increase in rate provided for on the mainland, the committee bill would require that all industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be required to pay minimum wages at least 25 cents above those in effect on July 1, 1955, after the expiration of 2 years from the effective date of the new law.

The committee is convinced that some provision must be made to assist certain industries to adjust to the higher minimum which would be put into effect over the next 2½ years. These are industries for which minimum wage orders have been or will be put into effect during the calendar year 1955. In these industries the 33⅓-percent increase would be postponed until 1 year from the date such wage order becomes effective but the Secretary of Labor would on January 1, 1956, put into effect a 7½-cent increase for such industry above the rate which is in effect in that industry on July 1, 1955.

The increases provided for in the law are not designed to preclude more rapid progress toward the objective of the $1 minimum wage through the medium of industry committee proceedings and administrative wage orders. On the contrary, the committee bill requires a review of the minimum wage rate in each industry in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands at least once each year so that a determination can be made as to whether further progress can be made toward the accomplishment of this objective. Furthermore, the bill requires the Secretary of Labor to report to Congress between January 1, 1957, and June 1, 1957, on the progress being made toward the achievement of higher minimum wages in Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands industries and particularly toward the achievement of the 25-cent increase in such wages which is to become effective on and after January 1, 1958. Finally, the committee has included in the bill a provision under which the existing industry committee proceedings would be expedited through the elimination of the present requirement of a hearing before the Secretary on industry committee recommendations and the substitution of simplified procedures in the nature of opportunity to interested parties to file statements and information with the Secretary as to why the committee recommendations should not be approved and carried into effect.

* * * * *

VI. MAJOR PROVISIONS

The bill reported from the committee has two major purposes: First, it would raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 and, second, it would provide that minimum-wage rates in the various industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would, by January 1, 1958, be at least 25 cents per hour higher than such rates were on July 1, 1955.

VII. SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

* * * * *

Wage orders for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

Section 4 contains a technical amendment to provide that wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be set either by a wage order of the Secretary based on the recommendations of an industry committee or by a special wage order of the Secretary issued pursuant to the requirements of section 7 of this act.

Annual review of wage orders

Section 5 provides that after July 1, 1956, wage rates established by wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands must be reviewed by an industry committee at least once each fiscal year.

The statute requires that industry committees shall recommend to the Secretary the highest minimum wage rates for the industry which it determines, having due regard to economic and competitive conditions, will not substantially curtail employment in the industry, and will not give any industry in Puerto Rico or in the Virgin Islands a competitive advantage over any industry on the mainland. A number of witnesses testified that the low wage level in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands was due in great measure to the fact that in the past industry committees have not been appointed in sufficient number or with sufficient frequency to insure that the minimum wages will be raised as promptly as the standards set forth in the act permit. Thus some wage orders have been in effect for a number of years without having been examined as to whether the wage rate was in fact being raised as rapidly as was economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment.

The committee hopes that by requiring an annual review of all the wage orders this situation will be clarified and minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will be raised according to the intent of the statute.

* * * * *

MANDATORY WAGE INCREASES IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Section 7 provides for a new subsection (e) in section 8 of the present law. The present subsections (e) and (f) would be relettered (f) and (g).

The new subsection (e) provides for the following increases in minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands:

Paragraph (1) provides that, effective January 1, 1956, all wage rates which have not been increased during the calendar year 1955 will be increased by 33⅓ percent respectively.

Paragraph (2) provides that, effective January 1, 1956, all wage rates which have been increased during the calendar year 1955 will be increased by such amount as may be necessary in order that the rate on January 1, 1956, shall be 7½ cents an hour greater than the rate in effect on July 1, 1955.

The paragraph also provides that all wage rates which have been increased during the calendar year 1955 will, 1 year after the effective date of such increase, be increased by 33⅓ percent of the rate in effect on July 1, 1955.

Paragraph (3) provides that, effective January 1, 1958, all wage rates will be increased by such amounts as may be necessary in order that such rate shall be 25 cents an hour greater than the rate effective on July 1, 1955.

It is the purpose of the committee to raise all wage rates which have been in effect more than a year on January 1, 1956, by 33⅓ percent effective on that date. On the other hand, if an industry has received a wage increase in 1955 the committee felt that it would be unfair to require an automatic one-third increase until the industry has had a year to adjust to the increase required by the 1955 wage order. At the same time, the committee felt that some increase should be required in such industry on January 1, 1956, and thus specified that such wage orders should be increased by whatever amount is necessary in order that such rate shall be 7½ cents an hour greater than the rate in effect on July 1, 1955. The committee also felt that within a period of 2½ years, by January 1, 1958, all industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands should be able to absorb a 25-cent increase over the rate in effect on July 1, 1955. This is the same increase as will be placed into effect automatically for the rest of the United States on January 1, 1956.

These provisions do not, of course, preclude industry committees from recommending, and the Secretary from approving, higher minimum rates than those provided for in the new subsection (e) during the 2-year period before the 25-cent increase over the July 1, 1955, rates become effective. On the contrary, it is the intention of the committee that the industry committee procedures should be utilized to raise the minimum wages in every industry where it is feasible as rapidly as possible toward the $1 minimum objective, both during the 2-year period and thereafter, in accordance with and subject to the conditions and standards provided for in the law.

Special report by the Secretary of Labor

Section 8 requires the Secretary of Labor to submit a special report to the Congress between January 1 and June 1, 1957, with respect to the operation of the amendments made by this act affecting the minimum-wage rate in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In preparing his appraisal of the progress being made toward achieving the 25-cent-per-hour increase required by January 1, 1958, the Secretary should consult all interested parties, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

JOINT MINIMUM WAGE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.

To Members of the Education and Labor Committee:

I enclose herewith a copy of the letter sent today to Mr. GRAHAM BARDEN, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

It is our hope that this letter will help clarify some of the questions which have been raised in connection with minimum wages in Puerto Rico.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Director, Joint Minimum Wage Committee.

JUNE 28, 1955.

Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARDEN: In his testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor on Tuesday, June 21, 1955, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico, urged that no action be taken at this time to raise the minimum wage rates presently in effect in Puerto Rico under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Because the Governor, in the course of his testimony, unwittingly created some impressions which we feel are erroneous, it is respectfully requested that, in the interest of keeping the record straight, this memorandum, which is designed to clarify these matters, be included in and made a part of the record of the committee hearings.

The question of the minimum wages to be required in Puerto Rico under the act is a matter of special interest to the four unions which have formed the Joint Minimum Wage Committee, namely, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL; Textile Workers Union of America, CIO; and United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL. The position which these unions took before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which gave a great deal of attention to the Puerto Rican minimum-wage problem, and before your committee has the wholehearted support and endorsement, as well, of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Moreover, it should be pointed out to the members of the committee that our position has the endorsement of both AFL and CIO affiliates in Puerto Rico. The Governor's implication that he spoke for the labor movement of the Commonwealth on this issue simply does not square with the facts.

The committee should not be misled by the fact that major testimony on the Puerto Rican minimum wage problem was given by a representative of only one of the principal labor organizations that appeared before it. This plan of presentation of the testimony on behalf of labor at the hearings was adopted solely in order to save the committee's time.

The course of action urged by Governor Muñoz is essentially the same as that which is now being followed under the Fair Labor Standards Act amendments enacted by the Congress in 1949. When the 40 cent minimum was raised at that time to 75 cents an hour on the mainland, the increase was not extended to Puerto Rico. Instead, reliance was placed on special industry committees and the Secretary of Labor to raise the then-existing rates on the island toward the 75 cent level "as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment" (Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, section 8 (a)). Each special industry committee was required to recommend, and the Secretary was required to approve, "the highest minimum wage rates for the industry which it determines, having due regard to economic and competitive conditions, will not substantially curtail employment in the industry, and will not give any industry in Puerto Rico or in the Virgin Islands a competitive advantage over any industry in the United States outside of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands" (Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, section 8 (b)).

It is precisely the failure of these provisions to accomplish the objectives that Congress had in mind that gives rise to the need for action at this time by Congress to provide for increases in the minimum wage rates presently in effect in Puerto Rico which will be comparable to whatever increase the Congress decides upon for the mainland. Since 1949, 11 special industry committees have held hearings in Puerto Rico, have deliberated, and have made recommendations for minimum wage increases in various Puerto Rican industries. Yet, today, the wage gap between Puerto Rico and the mainland is wider, not narrower, than it was in 1949, and Puerto Rico enjoys greater, not less, competitive advantages over the mainland.

Notwithstanding these developments, it has not been urged, contrary to the impression which some members of the committee may have got, that the special industry committee procedure for Puerto Rico be abandoned. It is being proposed simply that Congress increase, by a moderate amount, the existing rates in Puerto Rico in order to prevent the existing wage gap from being widened still further and to restore fair competitive relationships between Puerto Rican and mainland industries.

Contrary to the impression left by the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Senate bill, if adopted, will not create in Puerto Rico a rigid system of minimum wage rates. On January 1, 1956, minimum rates for Puerto Rican industries would range from 30 cents to $1 an hour. In addition to this, the Senate bill requires that every Puerto Rican rate shall be increased by at least 25 cents within the next 2½ years. On January 1, 1958, therefore, the range of rates could still be from 47½ cents to $1. It is to be hoped, of course, that before then economic conditions will permit the special industry committees, which will continue to operate under the regular committee procedures, to agree on rates substantially closer to the mainland rates.

The ultimate effect of the Senate bill is to maintain the same differentials, in cents per hour, between the minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and that for the States. Pending this achievement, 2½ years hence in order to enable Puerto Rico to prepare itself for these increases, the existing differentials in minimum wages between the island and Puerto Rico will actually widen, moneywise, although not as much as if nothing were to be done in the case of Puerto Rico.

The proposed adjustments are necessary to eliminate the backlog of inequities which has accumulated over the years. As the record before the committee shows, the average factory wages in manufacturing in Puerto Rico were 19 cents an hour in 1939 as against 63 cents on the mainland, a difference of 44 cents an hour. As of the latest available date for which figures for Puerto Rico are available, October 1954, the wage advantage in favor of Puerto Rico rose to $1.31 an hour, with the mainland paying $1.81 an hour and Puerto Rico only 50 cents. It is obvious that even if the full ultimate impact of the Senate proposal were to increase wages in Puerto Rico from an average of 50 cents to 75 cents (and we contend that this will not be the case in view of the fact that many industries in Puerto Rico presently pay to their workers in excess of the legally required minimum rates), the wage gap between the States and the island will remain sufficiently great so as not to hamper the insular industrial development.

The lack of proper wage advances in Puerto Rico constitutes an increasingly unfair threat to the mainland. This is a situation which cannot be left unchallenged by your committee and the House of Representatives. It is highly significant to note in this connection that while the Governor of Puerto Rico urged inactivity on the part of your committee with regard to the raising of minimum wages in Puerto Rico and tried to defer action by inviting the committee to study the problem, the fact remains that at no time did he offer any documentation to show the inability of Puerto Rico to absorb the adjustments called for under the Senate bill. We believe that no such demonstration can be made.

Should the Senate bill be adopted by the Congress, it is significant that actual labor costs in Puerto Rico will not rise anywhere near the proportion or the percentage by which the minimums will be increased there. This is self-evident from the economic data gathered by the Wage and Hour Division in connection with the various committee hearings in Puerto Rico. Thus, for example, when the minimum in cement manufacture was raised from 65 to 75 cents an hour in July 1953, although the rise in the minimum amounted to 15.3 percent, labor costs rose by only 1.8 percent because many workers were already receiving a higher rate. When the minimum for rubber products was raised by 50 percent, from 40 to 60 cents, in October 1952, the labor costs went up by only 13 percent. When the minimum for fertilizer workers was raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour in July 1952, although this was an 87½ percent rise in minimums, labor costs were affected by only 6.9 percent. These and similar figures demonstrate that the effect of the minimum-wage adjustments in Puerto Rico, under the Senate bill, will be nowhere near the same as the apparent rise in the legal minimums.

The unions joining in this communication are all friends of Puerto Rico. If we were unconcerned about the island's economic welfare we would be urging uniform minimum wages for Puerto Rico and the mainland. We are convinced, however, that Puerto Rico is not really befriended by a policy of do-nothingism. It is our considered judgment that a combination of some statutory requirements and improved industry committee operations will result in good for the Commonwealth itself and will help eliminate unfair competition with mainland industries.

We express the hope that the committee will be able to report out a bill very soon and that part of it will deal with provisions covering the Puerto Rico minimum wage rates.

Sincerely yours,

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL.

EMIL RIEVE,
President, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

ALEX ROSE,
President, United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL.

By ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Director, Joint Minimum Wage Committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out, the Committee on Education and Labor also heard testimony on the need for increasing minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands at the same time as the minimum on the mainland is raised. Members may argue that much more study should be given to the problem. I submit, however, that, whether we like it or not, in view of the fact that whatever we do, whether we do something or nothing, is going to have a serious effect on competitive relationships between Puerto Rico and the mainland, and there is already available to this body the carefully worked out provisions contained in the Senate bill, there is no reason why we cannot work out reasonable increases in the Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands minimums at the same time that we are raising the mainland minimum.

Whether we adopt the detailed provisions for increases in the present minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands included in the Senate bill, it is my hope, and I believe this hope is shared by many Members, that the conference committee which will have to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate bills will be able to reach agreement on satisfactory provisions dealing with this problem. It is my confident expectation, that they will be able to agree on provisions which will make the present minimum-wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands more realistic in terms of present-day cost of living and changes in productivity in these islands and will prevent further unfair competitive advantage for these islands in terms of present-day competitive relationships between these islands and the mainland.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in the three Pacific coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California about 600,000 men are employed in forest-product industries. These Pacific coast forest-product workers receive an average of $1.80 an hour.

The lumber, plywood, shingle, veneer, doors, and furniture which these Pacific coast workers produce must be sold in competition with similar products made by workers in the Southern States, tens of thousands of whom today are receiving wages of 75 cents or less an hour.

I want the 600,000 forest-product workers of the Pacific coast to know that it was the 81st Democratic Congress and the present 84th Democratic Congress which denied and continues to deny minimum wage coverage and protection to southern lumber workers. As a result of the low wages which Democrats keep in force in the lumber, plywood, veneer, and furniture industries of the South the South's costs are low. The southern manufactureres thereby have a competitive advantage over our west coast mills, where wages are higher.

The Democrats accomplished keeping wages low in the forest industries of the South in the 81st Democratic Congress in 1949 by inserting in their minimum wage law a provision that any forest-product operation employing 12 or fewer people would not come under minimum wage law provisions.

Most of the lumber camps and lumber mills in the South employ 12 or fewer people. These mills and camps under this Democratic proposal can pay any wage they wish and today to tens of thousands of workers are paying less than the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. When we here, today or tomorrow, enact a new law raising the minimum wages of practically all employees to $1 an hour, these southern lumber operators will be allowed by this Democratic Congress to continue paying 75 cents an hour or less to their workers.

I want responsibility for this unfair provision in the minimum wage law which discriminates against tens of thousands of low-paid southern lumber industry workers to be placed where it should rest and that is on the Democratic Party, for it was Democratic Congresses which exempted southern lumber workers from minimum wage coverage and protection in the law of 1949 and under a rule adopted by the present Democratic Congress prohibits any Member of Congress from offering any amendment to this bill that would grant a minimum wage of $1 to southern lumber workers.

Certainly if I had an opportunity to do so and were not prevented by the rules of this Democratic Congress from doing so, I would offer an amendment to require that southern lumber operators as well as the little merchant, laundryman and other manufacturers pay a minimum wage.

I tried to get such an amendment accepted in the Democratic Congress in 1949 when that Democratic Congress denied southern loggers, millworkers and plywood workers a minimum wage. As I recall, when I made that amendment, only Democrats talked against my amendment that would have given a minimum wage to the lumber workers of the South.

It is not fair that western producers of lumber, plywood, furniture and other forest products who pay an average wage of $1.80 an hour must compete with the southern lumber, plywood and furniture manufacturers who pay an average wage of only about 86 cents an hour. This unjust differential can be remedied by requiring that southern manufacturers pay at least a minimum wage of $1 an hour.

If the grocer, the butcher, the baker, the laundryman, and everyone else are required to pay a minimum wage of $1 an hour the lumber operators of the South should be required to do so also.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ASHLEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that there are certain lumber companies in the State of Washington paying a wage of $1.72 an hour?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Oh, they pay more than $1.72.

Mr. ASHLEY. Some small businesses in his State?

Mr. MACK of Washington. A worker whether he is employed by a company employing 4 or 5 people must receive a living wage just as much as the man who works for an employer with 100 on his payroll.

Mr. ASHLEY. Did not the gentleman hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] talk about the small businesses?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Wier].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to touch upon some subjects that have been lightly touched upon here this afternoon. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I support the bill which the committee has reported to the House with the recommendation that it be passed. While I believe that a $1 an hour wage is still far from adequate to enable the Fair Labor Standards Act to fulfill its objective of eliminating industries "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, labor conditions detrimental to health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers," enactment of such a minimum will be a step in the right direction and is an action that should be promptly taken by this body.

I had hoped that the bill might include provisions incorporating well-thought-out adjustments in the minimum wages currently in effect in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as on the mainland. Unfortunately, it does not. This does not mean, however, that the bill will not affect Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. On the contrary, the bill will give these islands an additional, substantial wage advantage over and above the wide and steadily widening differential in average wages which already exists. Because it may be possible to work this problem out in conference if the Members of this body clearly understand how this came about, I should like to take a few moments to discuss it at this time.

I raise this issue of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands because it is a part of the Senate bill. We discussed it in our committee and I regret very much to say there were two things which were important in my opinion, and I agree with the gentleman from Washington in that I would have liked to see coverage taken up and I would have liked to have seen the adoption of the Senate report. This is the only way I could get the Puerto Rican situation before the House here today.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to commend the gentleman on what he is saying. I had intended to cover the same subject and my time expired. I fully and wholeheartedly agree with what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I just want to ask the gentleman, since he feels this bill is inadequate, if any motion was made in committee to bring up any of the bills for $1.25 an hour. I think the gentleman introduced a bill for $1.25 an hour.

Mr. WIER. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Was any motion made in committee to bring out a bill for $1.25?

Mr. WIER. There was not.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder why that was since the gentleman feels that this bill is inadequate.

Mr. WIER. I think you have had the answer to that. We discussed the question of advisability there and also the extent to which this $1.25 might delay getting this bill out of our committee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, it was not convenient?

Mr. WIER. It is important, first, that the way in which minimum wages are fixed in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as compared with the mainland be kept in mind. There is no uniform, statutory minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, as there is on the mainland. The 75 cent minimum wage which is applicable on the mainland, serves in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands only as the objective toward which minimum wage rates there are to be raised as rapidly as is economically feasaible. In fact, this objective has been reached in the case of only a very few industries.

A 75 cent minimum is applicable in Puerto Rico in only the following industries: banking, insurance and finance; cement; and in some divisions of the chemical, the communications and the metal industries. Some sections of the plastics industry, the stone, glass, etc. industry, and the textile industry also have a 75 cent minimum, but the great majority of Puerto Rican workers are employed in industries for which substantially lower minimum wages are in effect. In the needle trade, for example, the minimum ranges from 22½ to 57½ cents an hour—prior to June 6, 1955, the lowest minimum was only 17½ cents an hour. In food and related products, it ranges from 35 to 42½ cents an hour; in tobacco, from 31 to 36 cents an hour; and in lumber and wood products, from 38 to 42 cents an hour.

Both the diversity in these rates and the comparatively low level at which most of them are fixed flow from the differential approach toward the fixing of minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands which was adopted by the Congress in 1949 as compared with the approach adopted for the mainland at that time. On the mainland, a uniform 75-cent minimum was adopted in 1949. With respect to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, however, the Congress decided that this rate should be superseded in the case of any employee who was covered by a wage order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act. From 1949, minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have been fixed under administrative wage orders issued by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of recommendations made by special industry committees.

The procedure is as follows: Special industry committees are appointed by the Secretary of Labor to study minimum wages in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands and to recommend the rates to be set in the industry or industries for which they are appointed. There may be a special industry committee for a particular industry or for several industries, or even a large group of different and varied industries. Each committee is tripartite in character. That is, it includes equal numbers of representatives of employers, employees, and the public, and it must include residents of the island or islands where the industry or industries with respect to which it is appointed are carried on, and residents of the mainland. In making its study, the special industry committees are guided by two principal statutory standards: First, they must recommend the highest minimum-wage rate or rates which they determine, having due regard to economic and competitive conditions, will not substantially curtail employment in the industry or industries for which their recommendations are made; and, second, the minimum-wage rate or rates which they recommend must not give any industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands a competitive advantage over any industry on the mainland.

Generally, a special industry committee holds a hearing in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, where interested parties may present facts and arguments bearing on the question of the minimum wage rate or rates to be recommended by the committee. Thereafter the committee makes its recommendation or recommendations to the Secretary of Labor. Under this act, the Secretary is then required to hold a hearing on the committee's recommendations at which all interested parties may again be heard. Based on the record of this hearing, he thereupon issues a proposed decision and order approving the committee's recommendations "if he finds that the recommendations are made in accordance with law, are supported by the evidence adduced at the hearing, and, taking into consideration the same factors as are required to be considered by the committee"—namely, their effect on employment in the industries involved and on competitive relationships with the mainland—will carry out the purposes of this section. Or he may disapprove the recomendations. The Secretary cannot vary a committee's recommendations nor substitute for the rates recommended by a committee other rates which he believes would be more satisfying; he can only approve or disapprove the committee's recommendations as submitted to him. When he approves the rates recommended by a committee only after the notice period set forth in his proposed decision has expired and interested parties have had a third opportunity to express their views—this time on his proposed action.

It can readily be seen from this brief account, Mr. Chairman, that many months can elapse between the time a committee is appointed and the time its recommendations are placed into effect by wage order of the Secretary of Labor. Between October 1949 and May 1955, the period averaged 310 days or 10 months. At the same time, it has not been possible for the Secretary to appoint a sufficient number of committees to keep the rates in all industries reasonably current due to insufficient appropriations for this purpose. As a result, wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have lagged substantially below what they should be, based on changes in the cost of living and in man-hour productivity and what is required to keep them from becoming a sigificant factor in giving industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the kind of competitive advantage that the law, the Fair Labor Standards Act, says they are not entitled to have.

This is what gives rise to the need for increases in the Puerto Rican and Virgin Island rates at this time. Such action is needed simply to bring these rates into line with the levels at which they should be set based on the cost of living and man-hour productivity today, let alone such further adjustments as are required to bring them into a more nearly sound relationship with the new rate to be put into effect on the mainland which will not permit any undue competitive advantage for industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands within the meaning of the act.

The provision of the Senate bill, Mr. Chairman, seemed to several of us on the Education and Labor Committee to furnish a sound framework for dealing with these problems. It is my firm conviction that the House, if it were to have a chance to consider, discuss and act upon these provisions would overwhelmingly endorse them. In the circumstances under which this bill is coming before us, I recognize that this may not be possible.

If that is the case, it is my belief, and this belief is shared by a number of my colleagues on the committee, that these provisions will serve as a most satisfactory basis for discussion by the conference committee which will have to reconcile the differences between the bill we are going to pass and that which the Senate has already passed.

It is my earnest hope that this will be the case, and that legislation substantially similar to that passed by the Senate will be passed by both Houses and signed by the President before this session adjourns.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining minute on this side to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, just 30 years ago this year I received my appointment to my first public office, assistant attorney general of my State, and among my first suits to defend was one involving the constitutionality of a State law providing a minimum wage of $1.25 a day. I lost the case, but that experience made me keenly aware of the need of statutory minimum standards for wages and working conditions. The minimum should be periodically reviewed and raised. I favor an increase this year, but I have become increasingly concerned about the possibility that there will be such a radical increase in the Federal minimum wage that certain parts of the country will lose precious job opportunities and thereby defeat the original purpose of this social legislation; namely, to help the people who work. The proposals of $1 an hour an even $1.25 an hour go far beyond the initial proposal of 90 cents an hour.

I want to point out that the impact of such increases as this would be greatest in the South, although certain other parts of the country would be affected too. I have just reviewed a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, made several months ago, which shows the extent of this impact. We have, in the South, about 20 percent of all the factory production workers in the United States, but we have 64 percent of the production workers earning less than 90 cents an hour. They numbered over half a million. We had 60 percent of factory production workers earning under $1 an hour. This concentration is attributable partly to the fact that a number of traditionally low-wage industries are located in our part of the country—southern pine lumber mills, many of them small mills; fertilizer plants; some apparel shops; and a number of food-processing plants.

Now let us look at the impact on the factories in the South. Take the higher rates first: Wages of almost one-half of the factory workers in the South would have to be raised if the minimum should go to $1.25; nearly one-third if it should go to $1; and one-fifth if it should go to 90 cents? If women workers are considered, nearly 30 percent of the women factory production workers in the South would be affected by a rate of 90 cents, 42 percent by $1; and 76 percent by $1.25. Of course these proportions would be much higher in the low-wage industries, many of whose workers are at the minimum or not far above it, and many of which employ a considerable number of women.

Any public spirited person would like to see our people earn higher wages and have more money to spend, but above all, we know that they need opportunities to work in industry, either in place of or, in addition to, their work in agriculture. You and I know that no enterprise can afford to adjust pay for so many of its workers by 15 cents an hour or 25 cents an hour, much less 50 cents an hour in one sudden joump without running the danger of being unable to compete pricewise with other mills and factories in other parts of the country where prices are already adjusted to higher wages—wages above the minimum. Those of us who have been looking toward improved standards of living for the South are especially concerned that industrialization should proceed in the South. We know that it takes time to train workers—to make experienced industrial workers out of agricultural workers. This is a long, slow process and if we force readjustments too rapidly, we will fail in this purpose.

Moreover, I am not at all sure that we have, at present, the kind of economic situation which will permit us to adjust suddenly to a higher minimum, as we were able to when this law was amended in 1949. We took several years to go from 25 cents to 40 cents an hour in slow stages up to 1944, but during that period we should not forget that we had a great war, and with it, wartime inflation, which raised all wages and all prices and every other dollar tag on practically everything. In 1949, when the minimum was raised from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, virtually the same thing happened. Within 6 months, the Korean war began, and as has been pointed out, with it came more inflation and more demand for goods. This made it possible to adjust to higher rates. In Arkansas, for example, gross hourly earnings in manufacturing—which include overtime and other special payments—went up from 94 cents an hour in April 1949—before the new rate became effective—to $1.28 in April 1955. In food processing, the rise was from 81 cents to $1.06 on the average; in apparel, from 70 cents to 99 cents. Yet, many plants and many workers are still near the 75-cents minimum in my State.

At present, we have a different situation than in 1950. We have a more stable economic situation, with stable prices, ample supplies of goods and highly competitive markets. If suddenly the costs of southern mills were raised, they might find themselves unable to compete, with resulting shutdowns and loss of jobs.

The original purpose of this legislation was to set a floor under wages, a low floor, a floor intended to prevent exploitation of unorganized workers who could not fend for themselves. I do not believe that minimum wages should be used for any other purpose. It is better to cover more workers in a modest way than to use this law as a means to try to jack up all wages, thus necessitating making more and more exemptions from the law. If we are to avoid unemployment, what will happen is that the very people who need most to be helped will be exempted. If this wage goes too high, I, for one, would have to press for more exemptions.

I recognize that since 1950 when the present minimum went into effect, the consumer price index has gone up by nearly 13.6 percent, and that this rise alone would account for a minimum rate of about 86 cents, as compared with the 75 cents of 1950, if we are to do no more than keep the buying power of the minimum wage in line with general price changes. Thus, the 90-cent figure does not appear unreasonable, even though we must recognize that it will affect the South with great severity in certain industries. However, I think that it is clear that $1 might be ruinous for some of these industries.

As an example of an industry which would be severely affected by a higher minimum, let us take sawmills in the South. I do not have statistics for the State of Arkansas alone, but a study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics gives figures for southern sawmills. This study, made in April 1953, indicates that a 90-cent minimum rate would affect 74 percent of the production workers and a rate of $1 would require higher wages for 84 percent. In work clothing, which we also make in Arkansas, 51 percent would be affected by 90 cents and 67 percent by $1. This is typical of the effect upon the low-wage industries, and I think we need to pay particular attention to them. We cannot expect, I believe, that the producers of southern lumber can anticipate a price rise to offset such a substantial wage increase. To be sure, construction is now at record levels, but we have no reason to believe the market is going to expand from this exceptionally high level in the near future. Rather, there may be a leveling off or some decline.

I understand that the Secretary of Labor testified to the Committee on Education and Labor that the effect of an increase from 75 cents to 90 cents in the minimum rate at the present time would be about the equivalent of the increase to 75 cents in 1949. I do not think that anything more than this should be considered by the House. I repeat that I think we should hold to our original concept of the minimum wage, namely, a low floor to protect against exploitation. We must maintain jobs and raise our standards gradually by use of improved technology, better organization, better management, better training. Let us not penalize one section of the country by means of this law. It is the section which, in the national interest, needs to be encouraged to share in the Nation's industrial growth, not to have its people forced out of work by law.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of increasing the minimum wage to at least the dollar-an-hour figure provided for in H. R. 7214. A minmum of $1.25 per hour would be even more realistic.

Since the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents an hour in 1949, the cost of living has increased 13 percent, and the productivity of the workingman has increased nearly 20 percent. The combined effect of these two factors, alone, justifies a wage minimum of $1 to $1.10 an hour.

However, at the time the minimum wage was fixed at 75 cents an hour, it was generally conceded that this was too low. The Department of Labor estimated in 1951 that the cost of living in an urban community such as Indianapolis of a man, his wife, and two children, was $4,044 a year. In Washington, it was estimated at nearly $4,500 a year. In Savannah, it was estimated at slightly more than $4,000 a year. The cost of living for a single woman would vary between $2,000 a year in Massachusetts and $2,700 a year in Washington. It will be seen from this that even a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for 2,000 hours a year would not be sufficient to sustain a married man and his family, and would just about sustain a single woman.

If an employer does not pay a minimum living wage, someone else must make it up. This minimum wage does not include any frills or luxuries, but only the bare necessities of life. A person must have these, and, if the employer does not pay enough to provide them, either the relatives of the employee or public or private charity must make up the difference. The man, then, who operates a sweatshop and pays substandard wages is being subsidized by either the Government, private charity, or relatives of the employee. We have heard a great deal lately about Government subsidies and the need for removing them. The sweatshop is our greatest subsidized employer, and I think this is one of the first places where we can remove the subsidization of business.

No one but the Federal Government can deal with this problem. If a minimum wage is adopted in one State and not in another, unscrupulous employers will move to the State that has weak, or no, minimum-wage laws. Unfortunately, at the present time there has been a movement of industry from one group of States to another group of States, because labor union efforts in the former group bring about higher wages.

This is unfair, of course, to the employers in those States from which industry has migrated, and is going to create a problem in the so-called runaway States, which I am sure they will regret later. I have been told by employers that runaway manufacturers have been very disappointed with the work performed by employees to whom they pay substandard wages.

In labor, as in everything else, a man gets just what he pays for, and I am afraid these runaway States that are encouraging sweatshop operators to come to their communities are going to find it is not an advantage to them, but will bring about a problem which will increase their relief rolls and cause them to pay ever-increasing taxes.

I served two terms as prosecutor in my home county in the heart of the depression. At that time, I found the sweatshops caused a prosecutor more trouble and grief than any dive. The low standard of living was conducive to crime, vice, and juvenile delinquency. There were continual fights at one plant over an attempt to organize it, and I can assure you I breathed a sigh of relief when one sweatshop I am thinking of moved to another community.

Low wages cause poverty, and poverty not only brings about crime and delinquency, but affects the very foundation of government. Unscrupulous politicians who attempt to buy votes and corrupt elections ply their trade in places where there is great poverty because they feel those are fertile fields for their nefarious operations. I have often said that if we could eliminate poverty and the conditions which it breeds, it would do more to insure fair elections than anything I can think of.

In conclusion, I advocate the enactment of adequate and realistic minimum-wage legislation, not only because it is fair, but because it is necessary to protect society itself, and because it will be a great step toward eliminating the subsidization of enterprise by the Government.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I shall support amendments to increase the minimum wage of American workers to the highest level possible of legislative attainment, a 90 cent minimum per hour would increase 1,192,000 workers an average of 9 cents per hour. A $1 minimum per hour would increase by an average of 13½ cents per hour and affect 1,825,000 workers. A $1.10 minimum per hour would increase by an average of 17 cents per hour and affect 2,846,000 workers. And an increase to $1.25 minimum per hour would grant an average hourly increase of 23 cents and affect 4,436,000 workers.

These figures have been computed by the Department of Labor and are generally accepted as factual.

I am supporting increased minimum wage legislation for two principal reasons.

I sincerely believe that our purchasing power must increase at a reasonably fair ratio to our power to produce or our whole free enterprise economy will collapse.

My second reason is that with equal sincerity I believe it is the humane thing to do, the right thing to do. If we are to give our American families a decent chance for even the bare necessities of life we must do all in our power to increase their purchasing power. I advance the following reasons for my position:

LOW WAGES PRODUCE SUBSTANDARD CITIZENS

Workers in the low-wage industries now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act constitute a substantial proportion of the Nation's wage and salary earners. Among the nonfarm, nonservice workers and non-self-employed, numbering 42.5 million persons, some 16.7 percent earned under $1,500 in 1952—7,125,000 persons—and a second group comprising 19.5 percent earned between $1,500 and $2,500—8,290,000 persons. Both groups included people whose income would be raised by the adoption of the $1.25 minimum. The current low wage rates have kept their earnings depressed with consequent unfortunate effects.

1. LOW INCOMES CUT DOWN NUTRITIONAL LEVEL BELOW REASONABLE STANDARDS

Studies of the way families at various income levels in cities and towns used their food money in 1948, which are as typical now as then, show the following:

> Low-income families use a much larger share of incomes for food than do high-income families. * * * Families with less than $2,000 income, about one-sixth of the total number, used 48 percent of their incomes for food; those with incomes of over $2,000 used 30 percent.
>
> The dollar amount spent by low-income families for food is less than that spent by higher income groups. * * * City families with incomes of less than $2,000 spent $16.42 per week ($5.82 per person) on the average for food at home and away from home—$11 less than families with incomes over $2,000. * * *
>
> * * * 1 of every 6 city families was spending less than $5 a week per person for food at home and away from home—a sum with which it was difficult to buy a nutritionally adequate diet without careful management. The burden of economizing fell particularly hard on the low-income families. Of those with incomes under $2,000 a third were spending less than $5 per person for food, a third between $5 and $7, and a third over $7. * * * About half of the low-income families with 4 or more persons spent less than $5 a person a week. It is probable that many of these families did not secure nutritionally adequate diets. * * *
>
> Low-income families use more grains, less milk, meat, vegetables, and fruits. Their homemakers spend less in actual dollars for major food groups—except flour and cereals—than those not so limited. * * *
>
> City households with incomes of less than $2,000 purchased about 20 percent less milk and vegetables and fruits, about 5 percent less eggs and meat, poultry and fish, and 10 percent less bakery products than households with incomes of $2,000 and over. * * *
>
> Low-income families have less nutritious diets. Differences in food used by high- and low-income families were reflected in the nutritive value of their diets. * * * Diets of city families with incomes under $2,000 contained about 10 percent less calcium and riboflavin—for which milk and milk products are the chief sources—than the selections of higher income families, and 12 percent less vitamin A value and ascorbic acid, contributed to the diet in largest quantities by fruits and vegetables. The protein content of diets of these low-income families was 7 percent less than in diets of higher income families.
>
> Among the dietary essentials, calcium was the nutrient most likely to be low in the food of low-income families. The average amount in diets of families with incomes below $2,000 in the spring of 1948 was less than the allowances recommended by the National Research Council. This meant that diets of about 50 percent of the families at this income level did not include foods which supply calcium in amounts recommended by nutrition scientists. (From Materials on the Problem of Low-Income Families.)

2. LOW INCOMES IMPAIR HEALTH OF WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

National Health Survey, 1935–36, findings for gainfully occupied persons aged 15 to 64 show that the low-income groups are a breeding ground for disablement. Nonrelief families with incomes under $1,000 had 9.1 average annual days of disability per worker compared to 5.2-5.8 days for families with higher incomes—Disability Among Gainfully Occupied Persons, Social Security Board, 1945.

According to a Social Security Board report:

> In the homes of the poor, sickness comes oftener and lasts longer than in the homes of the well-to-do, and death comes earlier. The chance for health and even for survival is far less among low-income groups than among families in moderate or comfortable circumstances. * * * Much of the cost of dependency which results from this association of sickness and poverty is borne by the whole population. (Need for Medical Care Insurance, Social Security Board, 1944.)

The death rates for gainfully employed male workers increase as we descend the occupational ladder toward the lowest paying nonagricultural jobs:

Death rates, 10 selected States, 1930 (per 1,000 gainfully occupied males, 15–64 years)

Professional men	7.00
Proprietors, managers, officials	7.38
Clerks and kindred workers	7.40
Skilled workers and foremen	8.12
Semiskilled workers	9.86
Unskilled workers	13.10

Source: Jessamine S. Whitney, Death Rates by Occupation, National Tuberculosis Association (1934).

After a full survey of the data the President's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation (1953) concludes:

> The health of the American worker has been improving steadily over the past several decades * * * (but) these gains have not been uniform throughout the labor force. Workers in less favored occupations still have a higher mortality rate than do more favored categories. Death rates increase as the socio-economic scale is descended. Studies by income level and by racial groups show significantly lower life expectancy and higher mortality rates for those groups from which the lower paid ranks of industrial employment are largely filled (vol. 2, p. 57).

The children of low-income families suffer the most from the lack of adequate medical care resulting from poverty. According to the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, 1952:

> One inescapable fact in regard to the health needs of children is that the lower the economic level, the greater the death rate * * *
>
> The importance of the relationship between income and various health deficiencies was forcefully emphasized in the recent comprehensive study of child health services conducted by the American Academy of Pediatrics with the cooperation of the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. The report of this study described the wide disparities in the amount of health facilities and services for children among differing economic groups and between urban and rural areas in various parts of the country.
>
> The major findings of the study are summarized graphically in relation to a grouping of States into four classes of descending per capita income. With respect to total volume of medical care, private practice, hospital facilities, or community health agencies, the wealthier States have rates above the national average and the States with lower per capita income have rates below the average. In this there is a dramatic consistency. Conversely in undesirable attributes, such as infant death rates, the poorer sections show an excess. In lowering death rates nothing seems quite as effective as raising the level of economic well-being.

Maternal deaths in childbirth are much higher in low-income than in higher-income areas. In 1949, the rate of maternal deaths per 10,000 live births was 15.7 in States with per capita income under $1,000, compared to 10.4 in $1,000 to $1,249 States, 6.4 in $1,250 to $1,499 States and 6.7 in States with income of $1,500 and over.

The draft rejection rates during World War II illustrate the relation between low income and poor health. Rejection rates were highest for North Carolina, South Carolina, and Arkansas, three States at or near the bottom of the States listed according to per capita income.

3. LOW INCOMES FORCE FAMILIES TO LIVE IN SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

In 1950, there were 1,645,000 nonfarm families with incomes of less than $1,999 who were occupying dilapidated dwelling units; these comprised 17 percent of the total number in this income bracket reporting on the condition of their housing—9,735,000. By comparison, there were 1,122,000 nonfarm families with incomes of $2,000 or more who lived in dilapidated units, or 4 percent of the total in these income classes—25,249,000.

The number of under $1,999 nonfarm families dwelling in units that were not dilapidated but were deficient in plumbing was 3,426,000, or 35 percent of the total in this income class; the number of $2,000 and above nonfarm families living in units deficient in plumbing was 4,072,000, or 16 percent of the total in these brackets.

The total number of dwelling units which were dilapidated or deficient in plumbing, or both, was 10,266,000, of which 5,071,000 were inhabited by families with under $1,999 income. The proportion of these low-income families living in substandard houses was 52 percent, compared to 21 percent for families with incomes of $2,000 or more—data are from United States Bureau of the Census.

The plight of the low-income groups has not been improved since 1950 for while the construction boom has resulted in the building of over 4 million new dwelling units for middle and higher income families, only 175,000 new units have been publicly financed for low-income families in the past 4 years. The latter cannot afford to live in the new houses being built by private interests. As a result, the disparity between the housing conditions of the poor and the rest of the population is rapidly widening.

In addition to suffering from dilapidated structures and lack of plumbing, the housing of low-income families is generally overcrowded and suffers from inadequate light and air. The low-income family simply cannot afford decent housing. An increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour would enable more workers to live in decent homes, offering a real stimulus to the construction of low-cost housing above the subsidy level.

4. LOW WAGES INCREASE PUBLIC EXPENDITURES AND INDUSTRIAL COST

The price which the community and the Nation pay by tolerating low incomes far exceeds the cost of providing decent wages.

The substandard housing which low-income families are forced to inhabit is the breeding ground for slums and blighted neighborhoods. As noted by the Subcommittee on Urban Redevelopment of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs:

> The huge cost of slums has been documented many times in terms of disease, crime, juvenile delinquency, waste, and erosion of the dignity and the character of our fellow citizens.

The report of the subcommittee, published in December 1953, goes on to recount the fearful economic cost of slums as follows:

> The fact is that our cities are caught in a descending spiral which leads to widespread municipal insolvency. The accumulated and continuing spread of blight eats away at the assessable base of the cities. As the blight spreads, it is inevitably followed by crime, fire, disease, and delinquency. Thus, does the need for city services increase. But the city's ability to meet the increased budget is automatically impaired by the very blight that creates the demand. More blight, more demand for services, less revenues to meet the demand—that is the downward spiral in American cities. Most often the cities with the greatest slum problem have the least capacity to deal with it. Hence, the call for Federal aid.

The following reports from various localities are indicative of the burdens placed on municipal finances by slum conditions:

Philadelphia: In 1947, revenues from a blighted area were $161,000 and expenditures, $271,000.

Newark, N. J.: In 1946, revenues from a slum area were $167,000 and expenditures, $534,000 while revenues from a superior residential neighborhood were $141,000 compared to expenditures of $65,141. Expenditures per capita were $129 in the slum area compared to $93 in the better area.

Baltimore: In 1948, blighted districts, 9½ percent of the city's area, received 40 percent of the budget. In 5 slum areas the revenues were $958,000 compared to expenditures of $2,212,000. Total deficit—due to excess expenditures in all blighted areas amounted to $14,300,000.

Detroit: In 1945, the Detroit News estimated that 20 percent of the city's residential and small business area had declined to the status of slums and 5 percent more had been blighted. The rest of the city's real property had to bear not only its own share of the city's taxes but make up for the shrinkage in property values in the slums and blighted areas.

Denver: 1950 series of articles in the Denver Post reported as follows:

> Denver's blighted area comprises less than 10 percent of the land in the city, about 6 percent of the population, and 6 percent of living units. * * * It receives 40 percent of all general relief funds—nearly seven times its share on a population basis. It receives 34 percent of all aid to dependent children money—nearly six times its share on a population basis. It accounts for 32 percent of all police calls—more than three times its share on a population basis. It produces 30 percent of Denver General Hospital's case loan—5 times its share on a population basis. It provides a third of the workload for the city sanitation department—five times its share on a living unit basis. * * * Assessment records show clearly that blighted property pays less taxes than standard areas. * * * Take a typical block in the substandard area. It contains 25 living units and 2 commercial developments. The entire block pays the city $1,300 a year in taxes. * * * It isn't hard to see where the money comes from—and where it goes.

Los Angeles: In 1947, blighted areas paid $4.25 per capita in taxes compared to $11.30 in nonblighted areas and the cost of the city for services was $7.11 per capita in blighted areas and $3.67 in nonblighted areas.

San Francisco: In 1946–47, a slum area provided $368,000 in revenues and cost $741,000 in services while a good area provided $556,000 in revenues and cost $87,000 in services.

These marked disparities are due to the demoralizing effects of poverty and slum conditions. The direct costs to the taxpayers in the form of local government deficits and State and Federal subsidies are great. But they are exceeded by the losses to society from the limited vigor and development of workers who received substandard wages.

Workers who suffer from inadequate nutrition are poor producers. They are more frequently ill than others and therefore absent from work more often. Persons in poor health and afflicted by financial concerns tend to be poor accident risks. Low wages minimize the worker's interest in the job.

It is a well-established maxim of American life that high wages produce a better worker and a more productive industrial citizen. The loss in productivity resulting from substandard wages is many times greater than the cost of raising wages to a minimum of $1.25 an hour.

5. LOW INCOMES DEPRIVE FAMILIES OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Comparison of families with incomes under $2,000 with those of $3,000 or more in 1946 shows that only 38 percent of the heads of the low-income families had gone beyond elementary school in their education while 60 percent of the heads of families with $3,000 or more income had more than elementary-school training. Moreover, only 6 percent of the low-income family heads had progressed beyond high school in their education while 20 percent of the $3,000-or-above family heads had one or more years of college—United States Bureau of the Census.

Various studies of the relation between parents' income and education of children and youth show that there arises a tremendous waste of human resources, in the abilities, skills, and vitality of youth in the lower-income groups who are defeated in their education careers. This conclusion and the following findings are from Materials on the Problem of Low-Income Families, assembled by the staff of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, 1949:

> College opportunities fell off rather abruptly when the family income was below $2,000. Chances of going to college were five times as great when parental income was $5,000 and over as they were when the income was less than $5,000. In the case of the lower income families, so large a proportion of the income must be spent for the bare necessities of life that there is little or nothing left for education, health, or recreation.
>
> * * * from 3 to 5 percent of our young people, or annually some 75,000 to 125,000 are of college caliber and would go to college if they could but are prevented by poverty * * * young people of average intelligence, though not suited for the traditional college, are also missing out on educational opportunities of a vocational nature offered by junior high schools and technical institutes.
>
> On the whole, there is a singular lack of evidence for any correlation between the ability to pay for a college education and the ability to benefit from it. Since the opportunity for college education depends so largely on income, millions of young people are not only denied the chance to develop their capacities, but the Nation is irreparably deprived of a vast amount of potential leadership and potential competence which it can ill afford wantonly to throw away.

Children born and brought up in families with substandard incomes are handicapped from the beginning. They are undernourished and deprived of the opportunity for education and training that would enable them to rise above the economic level of their origin. They are forced to go to work at an early age to help support the family. They tend to become the progenitors of the next generation of substandard citizens. Their families are generally larger than those of higher income groups and even with several members of the family working, their earnings are inadequate to provide them with decent standards of health and education.

6. LOW WAGES CREATE DEPRESSED AND UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

The areas of the country which are characterized by low wages are those in which average per capita income is low; the degree of industrialization and retail sales tend to be low. Thus, Mississippi, the lowest income State—$834 per capita in 1953 compared to $1,709 for the United States as a whole—also has one of the lowest proportions of its income from manufacturing payrolls—13.4 percent compared to 25.7 percent in the United States in 1953—and the lowest per capita retail sales—$486 in 1948 compared to $893 for the United States.

It is evident that low wages and industrial backwardness go together. Business enterprise does not flourish in a low-income economy. Local enterprise and industry find little encouragement in an area which doesn't furnish a ready market for their goods. Retail trade cannot prosper in a community with inadequate purchasing power.

The rise in the purchasing power in the Southern States, due in part to wage increases, has provided the base for much of the recent industrial expansion in that area. Many national companies have established branch plants to tap this growing market, which is expanding as wage income grows.

Such areas must depend upon outside capital as well as markets for their industrialization and, by so doing, often forfeit their economic well-being. The absentee stockholders have little interest in the welfare of the community of which they are not a part, or in the workers who are not their neighbors. Profits are drained from the area and are not used for local development.

A realistic minimum-wage law would protect workers employed by irresponsible absentee owners and would thus enhance the development of industry in our underdeveloped areas. Increased purchasing power in these areas can form the basis for beneficial industrialization by local enterprises. The regional problems of our national economy stem from inadequate buying power. An adequate wage floor would help overcome this deficiency.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge favorable consideration of H. R. 7214, a bill to increase the minimum wage standard to $1 per hour.

Shortly after the 84th Congress convened, I joined in supporting and cosponsoring the legislation which my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] introduced on January 5, 1955. That bill, H. R. 539, among other things called for an increase in the minimum wage standard to $1.25 per hour.

After lengthy hearings and deliberations, the Committee on Education and Labor had decided to recommend that the increase be limited to 25 cents, thereby establishing the minimum rate at $1 per hour. This is a moderate proposal, and it ought to be approved without delay.

Our minimum wage standards have not been altered since 1949, at which time Congress increased the rate to 75 cents. In the 6 years that followed, great changes took place in our economy. Average wages and incomes have increased throughout the land. There has been also an appreciable rise in our gross national product, in productivity, and in real wages. These and other equally important changes have rendered the 75 cent minimum wage rate both obsolete and inadequate, particularly in relation to the increased cost of living.

In testifying before the Education and Labor Committee, Labor Department officials reported that 10.2 percent of the Nation's factory workers are now being paid at straight-time hourly rates between 75 cents and $1. The $1 rate recommended in the bill before us would, therefore, require a direct wage increase for 10.2 percent of these workers. It would not have any effect upon the great majority of our industries in which the prevailing hourly rates are already above the proposed $1 minimum. On the other hand, it would definitely help that small minority of workers who are presently receiving submarginal wages, and aid them in attaining decent living conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the legislation before us will be approved promptly. It is a deserving and constructive measure which merits our full support.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and to urge approval of this bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the present minimum wage to $1 per hour. By all ethical and economic standards, I earnestly believe that the suggested figure should be even higher than the $1 proposed and that we should here also be directing conscientious attention to the hardships affecting so many different classes of underpaid workers who will not benefit by our action on this measure. Unfortunately, the bill is restricted to raising the minimum wage and setting an effective date, so unhappily that is all that we are permitted to vote upon at this time.

I am supporting this minimum hourly raise to $1 because it clearly is, in my judgment, simply another forward step toward fulfillment and attainment of the declared policy of the original Fair Labor Standards Act, which policy is, and I quote, "to correct and, as rapidly as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

The current minimum figure of 75 cents per hour was enacted in 1949 and even now, as many members here will recall from the debate and discussion taking place, a large number of us very seriously doubted that limited figure would be sufficient to maintain and improve the average American family standard of living. It seems certain that our doubts have now been fully confirmed. The statistics of the last 5 years of our national economic and industrial expansion and productivity demonstrate the 75 cents per hour figure has long been obsolete and that even this $1 figure may well prove inadequate.

The most cursory study of available authoritative data will show that a minimum of $1, while a little improvement over the present level, will still fall far below the barest budget requirements of an average family.

In 1951 the Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a minimum income chart for an average family of four based on living costs in 34 cities throughout the United States. The budget required for a basic minimum standard of living varied from $3,812 to $4,454. It would require a minimum wage of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest income requirements for a decent standard of living as defined by this study. The lowest budget figure in the chart was $3,812, the minimum necessary to live in New Orleans. It will be seen, then, that the raise proposed in this measure, although a step in the right direction, is merely a very short step toward what is required.

In our consideration of this problem, let us never forget the warning lesson of the great depression in the early 1930's that lack of increasing purchasing power in the hands of our lowest income families, who spend the most, brings about terrible unemployment hardships and economic stagnation. It profits us nothing to possess the greatest industrial production potential in the world if low wages and low consumer income prevent millions of Americans from buying these products.

I am also intensely concerned about another aspect of this minimum wage problem affecting so disastrously the textile workers and industries, and other groups, in my own home area of Massachusetts and New England. An increase in the minimum wage would tend to revitalize the textile industry, discriminated against as it is in our so-called reciprocal trade agreements, not only in the establishment of a decent wage structure, but also in market stability, as well as being a just and necessary rebuke to unfair competition. It would discourage the seducement of industry to cheap labor localities by subsidies. It would compensate the workers for increased productivity, thereby providing more purchasing power which would, of necessity, create a wider demand for textiles.

This minimum wage increase, minimum as it is, would serve to place at least a little hindrance upon unscrupulous employers moving their businesses into other areas and there setting up plants with the clear purpose of openly exploiting the local labor market, thus escaping their moral and economic responsibilities of providing decent wages and working conditions for American employees. Under our present inadequate minimum wage structure, it seems obvious that employers with the lowest moral standards and least integrity are the very ones who benefit the most. An employer with a social conscience who sincerely desires to treat his workers fairly and pay them an honest living wage is in a most difficult position. He finds himself, at great personal sacrifice, trying to compete with scheming employers who pay substandard wages and can therefore offer their products at reduced prices.

A clear distinction must be kept in mind between legitimate expansion of industry into new areas and the closing down of plants and relocation of industrial operations for the paramount objective of avoiding the decent working standards of Christian society. It is this latter situation which must be dealt with if we are to have increasingly higher standards of living in keeping with the Christian policy of our original Fair Labor Standards Act.

This $1 minimum wage will not, of course, solve all of the complex problems involved in the dispersal of industries in New England and the United States. However, it will prove of considerable help in preventing the inhuman exploitation of American workers and families now taking place in hundreds of runaway shops.

We are here obligated to enact laws designed to assist, not hinder, all those who are conscientious and trying to be honestly fair and decent. We are here obligated to enact laws primarily designed to advance the general welfare. In compliance with and in the spirit of that high obligation, I urge you to approve now this minimum wage of $1 per hour, while we at the same time pledge ourselves to be continuously and conscientiously concerned with the advancement of American living standards and national prosperity.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of H. R. 7214. Very few people in my district will receive any direct benefit from either a $1 or $1.25 minimum wage. This minimum wage legislation is for the worker who has no organization to speak for him, who cannot negotiate for higher wages, and who must support his family on the meager crumbs thrown his way unless Congress votes for this legislation.

The history of minimum wage legislation shows that few employers ever go out of business because they are compelled by law to pay higher wages according to the standards set by Congress. I am proud of the fact that employers from my district have written me asking my support for the $1.25 minimum wage because they do not want sweatshop competition.

Some of these letters from Milwaukee employers show a high level of social responsibility and business morality which I wish to quote for the Record:

SCHMITT-ORLOW,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 19, 1955.

Dear Congressman Reuss: This is to advise you that the Schmitt-Orlow Co. subscribes to the $1.25 minimum wage, as it will serve to bring closer the wage differentials between the low and high labor areas, and, we believe, will serve as a stimulus of business generally.

We, Wisconsin textile garment manufacturers, would then be placed on a better competitive basis.

Yours very truly,
ARTHUR J. SCHMITT,
Chairman of the Board.

APRIL 19, 1955.

Dear Congressman Reuss: As a small-business man I advocate the passing of the $1.25 per hour minimum wage 100 percent.

I would therefore ask that you give your fullest support to have this bill passed.

Yours truly,
HARRY W. KLEINSCHMIDT,
Milwaukee, Wis.

MORITZ & WINTER CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 19, 1955.

Dear Congressman Reuss: Relevant to the minimum wage hour law which is being brought before the House of Representatives and the Senate, we ask that you vote for same.

We hope that you will ask the legislators to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour as the lower rate causes inequities in our living standards in different parts of the country.

Thanking you in advance, we remain.

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE VEIT,
Secretary and Treasurer.

E. WEINSHEL & BROS. CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 20, 1955.

Dear Representative Reuss: In reference to the discussions on the minimum-wage determination of the Labor Department, we wish to record our feelings and urge the passing of a $1.25 minimum hourly wage.

As a Representative from our State, we feel that your support of this measure should be given. Raising the minimum wage to $1.25 not only would raise the standard of living of our people, but would eliminate some of the inequities now existing in variance of wages from one section of the country to another.

As a clothing manufacturer of 45 years in Wisconsin, we have always encouraged any raise in wages that raised standards of living, and have found this to be both beneficial to our employees as well as to management.

We sincerely urge you to support this measure of raising the standard minimum wage to $1.25 per hour.

Yours very truly,

E. WEINSHEL,
President.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied this legislation carefully before making up my mind. I have examined the arguments pro and con, and I am convinced that at least $1 per hour is needed as a national minimum wage to enable all Americans to maintain their homes in dignity and self-respect.

The Department of Labor's very statistics on what it takes to maintain a family of an average city worker show clearly why the present 75 cents is grossly inadequate, and why the 90 cents proposed by the administration is too little.

The cost of living is naturally different for every American community. However, in none of the 34 cities studied by the United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics can a father, mother, and two children live on $2,000 a year—which is all a breadwinner working at $1 an hour for 40 hours 50 weeks of the year would earn—except on an emergency budget much lower than what the BLS figures is a necessary minimum for health, efficiency, nurture of children, social participation, and the maintenance of self-respect and the respect of others.

In fact, the annual cost of maintaining a family of four with this BLS standard of living varied in the 34 cities studied between $3,812 to $4,454.

For 89.8 percent of America's factory workers, the $1 minimum wage will put no more money in their paychecks. But for the other 10.2 percent the $1 minimum wage will put a floor under their income that protects the living standards of all Americans.

Such a floor under America's standard of living is necessary for those who get less than $1 an hour, for those who are paid more than $1 an hour, and for those American employers who do not want sweatshops and want to pay good wages.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor of the House has held long and comprehensive hearings on the bills that have been presented at this session of Congress, providing for an increase in the present 75 cents per hour minimum-wage rate.

During my membership in the House it has been my privilege to vote for many measures that have had for their purpose the improving of the welfare of many differing classes of our people who might be properly termed underprivileged.

The legislation that was first passed in 1938, called the Fair Labor Standards Act, was a welfare measure that sought to overcome the depression by spreading employment and establishing a minimum wage. This wage, after several gradual increases between 1938 and 1949, reached the present rate of 75 cents per hour.

During this session of Congress upward of 71 bills have been introduced to increase the minimum rate in varying degrees. The bill now before us, reported favorably by the committee, seeks to increase the minimum wage to $1 per hour. The bill, in my opinion, deserves the support of the Congress. In fact, there are many of us who believe it could have been properly increased to a higher figure.

We are living in a time of great industrial activity. Accruing profits have been great. As a result, there have been increases in the wage rate in many, if not most, industries. This has contributed in no small measure to the upward spiral in the cost of living. It has been a terrific struggle on the part of our national administration to keep the cost of living from rising further. As it is, the low-income group has a desperately hard time to make ends meet. And, this being true, the workers who come within the minimum-wage rate are finding it impossible to obtain the necessary income to support themselves and their families.

There is a call for relief and a need that should not be ignored. We must be realistic. We must be considerate. We must give help to this unfortunate class without further delay. To increase the rate to $1 per hour will help even though it does not meet the situation as fully as it should.

The class for which we are legislating today needs our help to accomplish what is necessary for their proper existence. The fact is that this group is not, generally speaking, an organized labor group. Skilled workers are, in most instances, organized. Therefore, through their labor organizations they can accomplish much by reason of that organization. Thus, it can be readily seen that the workers in the minimum-wage group being unorganized cannot accomplish what otherwise would be possible. This creates an additional obligation to be helpful to them.

In conclusion, the increased cost of living that has occurred since 1949 justifies an increase in the minimum-wage rate. It would be unconscionable upon our part not to do so.

I supported the original bill that for the first time passed legislation to provide a minimum wage. I have supported each bill that in the meantime has increased the minimum-wage rate, and I give my support to the present bill that seeks to grant a further increase. I am glad of the opportunity to do so.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this will conclude the debate.

I was interested a moment ago in hearing the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] cry out about the fear of competition from the poor little struggling mills in the South, sawing 70-foot logs, with 9 or 10 people working, eking out a living, offering competition to the tremendous operations of the West and Northwest, sawing logs of a thousand feet, and now stamping out the last weak brothers of the little sawmills in the South. They are shipping more lumber into the South than the South is producing now.

So when the gentleman cries out at being hurt by these poor little fellows, it reminds me of the elephant walking across the bridge. He looked down and he saw a little mouse and he said, "Stop shaking this darned bridge."

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. No. I do not have time.

I say to you there has been injected a little bit of sectionalism here. There has been a little bit of unionism injected here. Let us disabuse our minds of it. We are dealing with human beings. We are dealing with the possibility of people having a job and with people making a living. It is not going to be any consolation to any gentleman if the stoppage of a small operation produces unemployment. It will not do any good to brag about that. Let us approach it fairly and treat Americans as Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments proposing to increase or decrease the hourly wage rates specified in line 7 therein, and except amendments proposing to change the effective date provided in the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7214) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may insert their remarks at the end of general debate today on the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONTINUED OPERATION OF CERTAIN SCHOOLS ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3253) to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "is" and insert "was."

Page 1, line 6, after "provided" insert "on January 1, 1955, or thereafter."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF CLARKSBURG, W. VA.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6796) to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 18, insert:

"(4) all mineral rights, including oil and gas, in such tract of land shall be reserved to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS OF CREEK NATION OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4367) to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after "purposes", insert "except the proceeds of any final judgment entered in Docket No. 21, pending before the Indian Claims Commission, in which the Creek Nation (Oklahoma) is plaintiff, and McGhee et al., on behalf of the Creek Nation East of the Mississippi are intervenors, and the United States is defendant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1953

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7029) to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise Fund (hereinafter referred to as the fund). There is hereby appropriated to the fund out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: (1) an amount equal to the sum credited to the account in the Treasury entitled, "Donations to the United States, Bequest of Oliver Wendell Holmes"; (2) an amount equal to interest on the amount referred to in (1) from the date of deposit in the Treasury to the end of the fiscal year prior to the date of the enactment of this act, compounded semiannually, calculated at a rate based on the market quotations for the longest term obligations of the United States outstanding at the time of deposit; and (3) an amount, at the end of each fiscal year after the date of the enactment of this act, equal to the interest calculated on the average daily balances in the fund during the fiscal year at a rate of 3½ percent per annum.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise (hereinafter referred to as the Committee), to be composed of five members, one of whom shall be the Librarian of Congress, ex officio, who shall act as chairman. The other 4 members shall be appointed by the President from 4 panels of 3 names each, 1 such panel to be submitted to him by each of the following: The Association of American Law Schools, the American Philosophical Society, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Universities. The members shalls serve 8-year terms, except that the initial appointees shall have terms of 8, 6, 4, and 2 years, respectively. Every appointment to fill a vacancy occurring whether by death, resignation, or expiration of a term shall be made in the same manner as the original appointments from such 4 panels submitted on each such occasion. No appointee may serve more than 1 term.

Sec. 3. The members of the committee shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Committee or in the alternative they may receive their transportation and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Sec. 4. The Committee shall devote the income and, to the extent the Committee deems it necessary and desirable, the principal of the fund to the first, and, in the discretion of the Committee, to the second and third, of the following objects:

(a) To employ one or more scholars of distinction (with any appropriate assistants) to prepare a history of the Supreme Court of the United States, to defray the appropriate expenses of such scholars and assistants, and to finance the publication of such history. The Committee may select a single scholar to carry the work to completion, or a number or succession of scholars to complete it; may make any necessary employment contracts with such scholars and assistants of such terms and length as it determines; and shall have general supervision of the preparation of the history of the Supreme Court, including discretion to adopt from time to time such arrangements as lend themselves best to the advancement of the preparation of such history and to the employment of distinguished scholars qualified to achieve the desired standards and independence in the work which they undertake.

(b) To finance an annual lecture or series of lectures, at times and places determined by the Committee, to be given each year at a different institution of higher learning in various parts of the country by a lecturer of distinction engaged by the Committee on a subject of his choice. The lectures shall be known as the Oliver Wendell Holmes Lectures.

(c) To finance the preparation and publication of the memorial volume contemplated by section 2 of the act of October 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 1206) containing Justice Holmes' writings and other material.

Sec. 5. The Committee is authorized to accept, receive, hold, and administer such gifts or bequests of money, securities, or other personal property as may be approved by the Committee, and it may sell or otherwise dispose of such securities or other personal property. All moneys received shall be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the fund.

Sec. 6. The Committee may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

Sec. 7. The Committee may accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and pay any such personnel when engaged in the work of the Committee necessary travel and subsistence expenses or in the alternative, transportation and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence; cooperate with legal, philosophical, and historical societies and institutions of learning; and call upon Federal agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out its functions. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance to the Committee may expend its own funds for this purpose, with or without reimbursement from the Committee as may be agreed upon by the Committee and the agency. The Committee, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws or procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure transportation, supplies, services and property, and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this act.

Sec. 8. The Chairman, with the approval of the Committee, is authorized to determine the character and necessity of expenditures from the fund and the manner in which such expenditures are incurred, allowed and paid. Disbursements from the fund shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department.

Sec. 9. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTION OF CHAIRMAN HOWREY OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the House Select Committee on Small Business has during hearing of the past 2 days heard some very startling testimony concerning the participation by the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in an important case in which Mr. Howrey as a private attorney represented the same client.

This morning I made a statement on the testimony on this case thus far. At the time of this statement Mr. Howrey's testimony had not been fully heard. His statement has now been heard. His only explanation for his participation was that he claimed that by so doing he was serving a laudable purpose by his action.

I desire that this statement be reproduced for the information of the membership:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AGENCIES, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, JULY 19, 1955

The hearings before this subcommittee yesterday developed some rather startling testimony.

Mr. Howrey's admission to having tried to influence the decision of the Solicitor General of the United States on the question whether the Solicitor General would or would not petition the Supreme Court to review a decision of an FTC antitrust case was, to say the least, most startling and surprising.

At the time Mr. Howrey was nominated to become a member of the FTC he was, as a private attorney, representing the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. in this very suit—an important suit brought under one of the antitrust laws. Certainly, it would appear that the conduct of both Chairman Howrey and Mr. Kintner, General Counsel for the Commission, raises, at a very minimum, a grave ethical question.

I appreciate that Mr. Howrey was man enough to stand up and admit that he had accompanied Mr. Kintner to a meeting with the Solicitor General to discuss this case, when Mr. Kintner's memory seemed to fail under oath on this question. This does not, however, relieve the gravity of the matter.

The unvarying ethical requirement placed upon a man entrusted with a judicial duty is to disqualify himself from participating in the decision on any matter in which he has had a private interest. Indeed, when Mr. Howrey testified before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee concerning the question of his confirmation as an FTC commissioner, Mr. Howrey assured that committee that he would disqualify himself from participating in this case and all other FTC cases in which he had been attorney for the defendants. Furthermore, as I understand the testimony yesterday, when the question whether the Solicitor General should be asked to petition the Supreme Court in this case was formally considered by the FTC, Mr. Howrey did with meticulous care disqualify himself from participating in the Commission's deliberations.

This makes his subsequent conduct even more puzzling. It appears that while he felt constrained to remove himself from deliberating with his fellow commissioners, where his position and his vote, if any, would have been a matter of record, Mr. Howrey nevertheless felt free to go behind the backs of the Commission and to lobby, as it were, in relative secrecy with the official whose duty it was to pass on the same question that had been before the Commission.

The decision which the Solicitor General actually did reach in the matter was not to petition. The result of this decision thus was precisely the same as Mr. Howrey had sought to obtain when he was representing the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. against the Commission.

Mr. Howrey told us yesterday that this was not the decision he urged the Solicitor General to reach, but on the contrary, his purpose in calling on the Solicitor General was to urge him to make a decision which would have been opposed to the interest of his former client, or a decision opposite to that which the Solicitor General did reach.

Without some reason for overthrowing the universally accepted rules on such matters it is beside the point. Disqualification would certainly imply complete disqualification and there is no justification which permits a tampering with the rules merely because the disqualified official considers that he is urging others to do right.

Indeed, the official who places himself in such a position lays himself open to question, if on no other ground than that a weak or improper argument may hurt a good cause more than it helps.

Furthermore, the matter revealed here yesterday appears to represent the second occasion on which Chairman Howrey has failed to disqualify himself from participating in matters involved in this same case. Chairman Wright Patman, of the House Small Business Committee, recently had occasion to call attention to Chairman Howrey's participation in the recommendation made by the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws that the section of the antitrust law under which this case was brought be repealed.

We do not wish to pass premature judgment on this matter. Chairman Howrey's explanation has not been fully heard. His brief remarks on this matter yesterday were impromptu and perhaps ill-considered. I trust that the overnight recess has given him an opportunity to collect his thoughts and arrive at a considered statement.

The committee will hear and give its respectful attention to Chairman Howrey's statement this morning.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the light of my views concerning the reciprocal trade treaties and New England industry, it is pertinent, I believe, to stress the marked decline in New England textile manufacturing employment in recent years.

Between the first quarter of 1947 and the first quarter of 1955, manufacturing employment in the region decreased by 141,000 workers of which 129,000 were textile jobs. At the same time, employment in other industries increased. Electrical machinery, transportation equipment, apparel, and miscellaneous industries showed gains, which, however, failed by a considerable margin to offset the loss of textile jobs.

In a recent article in Monthly Labor Review for June 1955, William H. Miernyk, director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass., not only presented the foregoing and other statistics, but carefully analyzed the problem of displaced workers in the region and proposed specific remedies.

Although it is generally believed that labor losses in the textile industry have been absorbed by new industries so-called, Mr. Miernyk in his comprehensive survey discounted this theory. He states that the displaced workers have not displayed impressive geographical and occupational mobility. Older workers are not disposed to move elsewhere and younger workers are better able to secure employment in nontextile industries.

His conclusion is that the continued loss of textile jobs has produced a high level of chronic unemployment in many New England towns since the end of World War II. Textile wages have tended to fall and the employment situation generally has deteriorated.

It is true, as Mr. Miernyk points out, that local industrial development commissions have been formed to create new jobs for displaced workers. The facts are, however, that broadly the younger workers have been benefited more than the older ones. It is stated that new industry growth has taken place outside the textile towns.

The national Government has made some feeble effort to cope with the problems of surplus labor areas in New England by tax amortization benefits for new defense facilities and special Government contracts. However, neither of these intended aids have been effective. The Federal Government falls back on the rather inadequate generality that the major contribution which it can make is to pursue policies that will promote a high stable level of employment in the Nation as a whole. Evidently, general national prosperity is of some help in relieving localized unemployment but it is doubtful that the distressed community can ever solve the unemployment problems entirely on its own. These communities are subject to national competition of many other sections and on the whole they have not been able to increase the mobility of the displaced textile workers or get them new jobs.

Mr. Miernyk was also unimpressed by other specific proposals including Government purchases of American textiles for shipment to needy people abroad. He poses a question of discouragement to new firms considering locating in these communities presented by the demands for special aid for the unemployed and the distressed. Retraining and assistance in job placement is also suggested but there is no validity in retraining textile workers for nonexistent jobs, although a national inventory of employment opportunities might be somewhat helpful, if hardly attractive to workers with homes and roots in a community.

Despite over a decade of experience with community efforts to solve local unemployment problems, the overall results have not been impressive. Mr. Miernyk concludes with the thought, which hardly holds out much hope for many workers and their families, that unemployed workers in surplus labor areas should be encouraged to move to other areas where job opportunities are more plentiful. That is a poor inadequate solution to the problem.

One cannot read this article without the feeling that unemployment conditions in New England are extremely serious, as we of that region so well know, and that the very methods used to date to alleviate them have been of little real lasting benefit. On the other hand, some government policies are making this unemployment worse, and this is particularly true of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties, which are permitting cheaply produced foreign goods to enter the American markets in competition with textile and other products of New England, resulting in the further undermining of industry and increase in unemployment and labor surpluses.

New England is an integral and vital part of the American economy. It is noted for the ingenuity of its enterprise, the skill of its workers, and the high patriotic spirit of its people. It contributes stupendous taxes annually to the Federal Government but in contrast with other sections of the country, it receives much less in return from Washington.

Professor Seymour Harris, famed Harvard economist, has recently completed a very penetrating study of the merger movement in textiles. This comprehensive survey deals with the effects of mergers, taxes and other Federal policies upon the shift of industry from North to South. This movement is fed, according to Professor Harris, by low wage standards, antitrade unionism, low standards of social security, large influx of Federal cash and other Federal favors.

Moreover, tax savings have been effected by textile industries operating primarily in the South by absorbing northern units and, as Professor Harris asserts, there is clearly something wrong with the tax system, which encourages such noneconomic movements of industry. For example, prior to the recent merger of Textron and the American Woolen Company, the stock of the company sold at $14 whereas it now sells for about $36 in spite of the fact that 8 million square feet of plant were sold by American Woolen at $.25 per square foot whereas the same space replaced would cost $10 to $12 per square foot.

A most tragic phase of this industrial migration is the apparent disregard and lack of interest shown by these industrial migrationists in the plight of the workers involved in these transferred plants. The figures are startling and indicate a shocking callousness. Four thousand five hundred jobs were speedily liquidated when the Burlington Mills closed the Goodall-Sanford plant at Sanford, Maine. Seven thousand five hundred jobs disappeared in Lawrence when the woolen companies closed three plants, leaving the great city, represented by our most able colleague, THOMAS J. LANE, in the throes of severe industrial depression with widespread unemployment and hardship, bringing misery to thousands of worthy individuals and their families. That this merger movement in textiles, resulting in migration to other sections of the country, particularly the South, has caused thousands of jobs to disappear is indisputable.

Another sad commentary on the lack of social responsibility on the part of financial and industrial leaders concerned in this migration is that much of the capital to finance the mergers comes from the northeast section itself. The statistics show this plainly that northern interests buy a very large proportion of the plants transferred to the South and Professor Harris' sound conclusion is that northern capital has accelerated the migration to the South and the development of the merger movement.

Thus, we have the unhappy economic picture of powerful financial interests, apparently unconcerned about the social effects upon their workers, actively promoting mergers and transfers of industry, which close down our New England plants and throw thousands out of work all with the idea that textile manufacturing can be transferred to other areas where "exploitation of low-wage standards, regressive taxes, and Federal aid" combine to create profit-making opportunities. That is the well considered view of Professor Harris and I agree with him.

When one attaches moral and social values to this situation, these operations are truly unbelievable. Is it not clear that they will inevitably lead to shattered faith on the part of the working classes of this Nation in our capitalistic free enterprise system and activate political forces that will give impetus either to dangerous revolutionary concepts or some form of socialistic regimentation? If those in charge of the private-enterprise system are lacking in social awareness and responsibility, that is one deplorable thing. But if they do not have analytical power and vision to look ahead and see that their present actions are tending to drive large segments of the American people away from faith in capitalism and into the arms of radical social doctrinaires and if profitmaking shall be so exalted that selfish, special interests can continue, by their shortsighted operations, to create widespread unemployment in certain areas of the Nation, there will be serious effects on the free system itself.

Admittedly, the Congress cannot remain unconcerned about these dangerous economic movements, which are displacing labor and causing jobs to disappear and which are developing radical sentiment among our workers. The revision of our tax laws to discourage these mergers on a sectional basis would be helpful and should be examined. Those Federal policies, which currently extend advantages to one area of the Nation at the expense of another, should not only be studied, but drastically revised. Federal spending as to these areas should be reevaluated and strong minimum-wage legislation enacted to insure decent standards and prevent exploitation of labor and preference in the national markets. Our Federal labor legislation should be reviewed and revised to install decent national standards, not only of pay, but of hours and conditions of work and social-security benefits, which are currently permitting some areas to reap great advantages and great profits at the expense of other areas which are maintaining high American standards. Our economic system can never survive if some sections are allowed to cannibalize the industries and workers of other sections.

The pathetic story of liquidation of textile markets in New England and Middle Atlantic States should give greatest concern to Members of Congress and friends of the free-enterprise system. According to Professor Harris, from 1946 to 1954, 200 textile mills were liquidated in New England and 287 in the Middle Atlantic States. In this period about 92,000 jobs were lost in New England—48,000 in Massachusetts alone—and over 51,000 jobs in the Middle Atlantic States, 25,000 of these in Pennsylvania, a State already gravely beset by depression in the coal industry. In cotton and synthetics alone, New England lost 107,000 jobs from 1951 to 1954 and many additional jobs in woolens. Mergers involving migration contributed largely to these losses.

Covert methods have been employed in some cases of industrial migration. Little notice has been given to the employees that their jobs were to be terminated. Mention of migration was carefully avoided except in a few instances and then there suddenly came wholesale shutdowns and sales of machinery to other areas, particularly the South.

Let me make it clear that I bear the friendliest feelings toward my friends in the South and I have had occasion to demonstrate that feeling many times. Some of the Southern Members are my warmest friends in this body. I greatly admire them for their ability and for their Americanism. I do not wish any of my remarks to be construed by anyone as indicating that I stand for provincialism or sectionalism. To the contrary I believe that the national interest is best served by striving to keep every section of the country prosperous. But I cannot remain supine while basic industries in my district, State, and region are raided, sacked, and finally shut down, merged, and moved away, leaving a trail of misery behind. These depredations are decimating the great New England textile industry.

If current differentials are projected into the future, it is my fear that other basic New England industries may follow the same path because these economic differentials, which put superior competitive bargaining power in the hands of the South based on lower standards, are bound in time to have the same effect on other industries as they have had on textiles.

Political factors have been very potent in building up these differentials and the large net expenditures by the Federal Government, tax favors, the location of military installations, Government orders in the South, all have contributed to create this economic Frankenstein.

The situation in the textile industry probably is just one phase—a very unfortunate one—of a trend that is taking place generally in American industry toward bigness and domination of the entire industrial and business field by huge corporations.

I shall not in this speech go into that subject in detail but it is a highly provocative one to which I hope to give later attention.

Is big business to be installed as a completely dominating force in American industrial and mercantile society? Is small business to be deprived of its opportunity to exist, gobbled up by large units? Will the avenues to success through individual effort and initiative be shut tight to aspiring Americans? Will selfish, financial and industrial trusts and combines, wielding astonishing power over colossal financial investments and over national and State political policies be permitted to convert American industry and business into a series of huge cartels? Will these Goliaths be allowed to stifle American opportunity?

Will these excesses of giant economic power lead our great enterprise system to perdition, ruin and destruction?

It is for the Congress to ponder these questions because the answers will determine whether this Nation will retain its basic freedom. These matters require our careful scrutiny. They must be settled with candor and fairness under our constitutional institutions in order that the free way of life shall be preserved and protected from the assaults against it from the right or from the left.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE BOYS CLUB

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Police Boys Club is one of the most useful organizations and one of the most helpful influences which has existed for civic betterment and community benefit in the District of Columbia.

This club was originally founded by former Chief of Police Ernest W. Brown, on George Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1934. The clubs have been in continuous operation since that date. They first opened in the basement of the Fifth Police Precinct Station House, at Fifth and E Streets SE. Approximately 200 boys joined the club on its first day, and its membership has continued to expand. Its present enrollment is approximately 22,000, of which some 8,000 of the boys are white and some 14,000 Negro.

All types of activities have been provided for the boys, and under their program each boy receives individual attention. The clubs operate crafts, libraries, game rooms, and furnish all types of recreation to the boys. One of the great objectives of these clubs is their program of teaching cleanliness to the boys. They furnish showers for them, and this is a facility widely used and greatly appreciated by the boys.

The clubs have conducted extensive social programs and seasonal parties, such as Halloween and Christmas. The Woman's Auxiliary of the Police Boys Clubs have cooperated most willingly, and have aided in the programs at Christmas time and on other special occasions. They have helped to collect books for the libraries, and have raised funds for linens at the camps. They have given wholehearted cooperation in the worthwhile programs of the clubs.

The clubs have provided splendid athletic programs. They have sponsored competitive games such as baseball, football, and basketball. In the basketball program, there have been 10 basketball leagues, 5 for white boys and 5 for Negroes. They have provided special events from time to time during both summer and winter to maintain the interest of the boys. One of these special events is the Metropolitan Police annual boxing tournament. They have provided identical programs in respect to the clubs for the boys of both races.

The clubs have endeavored through their programs to prevent idleness and any tendency on the part of boys to hang around street corners, to form gangs, and the clubs have discouraged through their programs other crime-breeding influences.

High-type citizens have served as leaders in these clubs. The clubs' activities have been such as to attract both men and women who are interested in training our youth in the principles of good citizenship. We have had a regrettable amount of juvenile delinquency in Washington, but these boys' clubs have undoubtedly held it down, and Washington has made a good record in combating juvenile delinquency in comparison with some of our larger cities, and when all the circumstances are considered.

All over this country, reports have been increasing from every section that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. The need is evident, as never before, that the youth of our crowded cities need year-round recreational facilities. They need club quarters to carry on their activities, and where adults can give them counsel and guidance. They need camps in the hot summer months where they can leave the crowded sidewalks of the cities, enjoy fresh air, athletics, water sports and games.

I do not need to recount to you the day-by-day reports of juvenile delinquency here in Washington, of such crimes of violence as mugging, purse-snatching, highway robbery, stabbings, rape, and assaults of every description, with which our papers are constantly filled. Kindhearted people and good citizens have sought to stem this tide of juvenile delinquency, through the Police Boys Clubs. They have sought to train the minds and characters of the boys in the District of Columbia away from hoodlumism and gangsterism, into the paths of industry, honesty, truthfulness, and good citizenship. They have done this, not only for white boys, but for Negro boys as well. In truth, nearly twice as many Negroes have benefited from the program of the Metropolitan Police Boys Clubs as white boys. There are now approximately 14,000 Negroes in these clubs, and only 8,000 white boys. One of the smallest, meanest, and most contemptible examples of littleness which I have ever seen is the purpose of the apostles of race mixing to mix whites and blacks in these boys clubs, and to destroy them if that is not possible. Those who read the papers are aware that a campaign and concerted effort is being carried on to turn these boys clubs into another race-mixing agency. It is not succeeding. The only thing that is being accomplished is the destruction of the Police Boys Clubs. It is hard to believe that any person, whether he be private citizen or public official, would be willing to destroy one of the finest influences we have had to combat gangsterism and juvenile delinquency in the effort to promote race mixing. Yet it is typical of these warped intellects and their screwy philosophies and crackpot theories that they demand that an institution of this kind be absolutely closed down and put out of business if it refuses to submit to the dictation of these advocates of race mixing. To them, it is a matter of secondary importance that our youth be provided with recreation, proper training and guidance in the principles of good citizenship. This campaign of busybodies and meddlers has resulted to date in the closing of three white boys' clubs.

All Souls' Unitarian Church has concluded that they are so much in favor of race-mixing that they can no longer extend the hand of fellowship to a club composed of white boys. They closed the doors of their property to Club No. 10 at 15th and Harvard Streets NW.

The Superintendent of National Capital Parks, pursuant to the policy of peanut politicians in the executive department, who jump when minority pressure groups crack the whip, has closed the doors of the Government-owned property at Fairlawn, Anacostia, to Club No. 11, another white boys' club.

The peanut politicians in the board of education, and the superintendent of schools, answering their master's voice, have taken similar action with reference to Club No. 12, at 12th and Monroe Streets NE.

These meddlers and busy-bodies are cutting off their noses to spite their faces. White people have contributed almost 100 percent of the funds needed to support and operate these clubs year by year. The annual cost of operation is more than $320,000. White people have realized the worth of this program to boys of both races, and have not complained that nearly twice as many Negro boys have benefited from their donations to the clubs. The clubs have thus been maintained without any cost to the boys or to their families. These clubs have taken boys off the streets and have given them an opportunity in winter as well as in summer to use their spare time in improving themselves, and in enjoyment of the facilities which these clubs have furnished.

The white people who have provided the finances for this great program will not continue to contribute if the clubs are turned into interracial clubs.

The operation of these clubs throughout the years has placed quite a burden upon the Metropolitan Police Department, but they, like other Washingtonians, have been willing to bear these burdens so long as the operation of the clubs was harmonious. I am informed, however, that now plans for withdrawal of the Police Department from the clubs' activities have been made, insofar as active participation in the future is concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the picture today. Race mixers, conniving with would-be liberals, do-gooders, and cheap politicians are in the act of destroying a fine organization and a great influence for good citizenship. It is an act which is typical of the crack-pots, fuzzy thinkers, and fanatics who have set their goal and chief objective as the mixing of the races.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon pointing up this horrible action. I said frankly to the gentleman that I did not know how much good it would do, but I sincerely hope the people will realize what this is doing to our people, before it is too late. I believe the gentleman agrees with me that 25 years ago this simply could not have happened in America, that this is simply the result of the do-gooders and these persons who are always talking tolerance.

I want to say to the gentleman that speaking to the American Legion Auxiliary State meeting in Macon, Ga., on Friday of last week, I made the statement that these do-gooders and these tolerance boys are actually the most intolerant people that have ever been spawned in this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There is no question about it. What I have just said illustrates that.

Mr. FORRESTER. They will tolerate you if you agree with them 100 percent. But if they ever get in power, and they now think they are in power, they are very arrogant, they are very bold. But if they had the power, they would crush anyone who opposed them with the same indifference that a person would crush an ant under his foot.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Their policy now, as I have just stated, is to demand that these clubs have the doors of the churches, the schools, and the public property in Washington closed in their faces unless they will submit to this demand that they mix the races in these boys' clubs. Let me say this also, that they do not intend to mix them, and this policy, if continued, is going to result in the closing not only of these white boys' clubs but of Negro boys' clubs, with their 14,000 membership.

THE WASHINGTON POLICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rogers] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my tribute to the police of Washington for the very fine service they have rendered during the distressing interruption of public transportation that has been going on. I am not going into whose fault it is, that of the management or the men who run the buses. However, certainly the police of Washington have rendered remarkably fine service. They have been courteous and efficient and very unselfish. They have come back from their vacations and worked extremely long hours. They deserve the highest praise.

May I also express my appreciation to the taxi drivers, whose services we use a good deal. Certainly no one could be more courteous and helpful than they.

I should also like to praise the public. I have seen a great deal of their fine conduct during this period. We can praise their gentleness and courtesy.

The people of Washington have set a wonderful example of helpfulness at a time of stress and great inconvenience during a terribly hot period. I admire them all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fernós-Isern (at the request of Mr. Bartlett).

Mr. Morano and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cole and to include an address by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Lipscomb in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts and to include a letter she has received from the President of United States.

Mr. Rivers and include a statement on the Charleston Naval Shipyard.

Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. Rabaut and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hinshaw (at the request of Mr. Martin) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gwinn and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Donohue in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Krysko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 141. An act for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 173. An act for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 239. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 253. An act for the relief of Sumie Legasse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. An act for the relief of Domenico Bompiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 379. An act for the relief of Gerassimo Troianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 410. An act for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 418. An act for the relief of Mervin Walter Ball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 535. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 602. An act for the relief of Gordon Thompson Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 698. An act for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 849. An act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis, and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 878. An act to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1218. An act for the relief of Luigi Cardone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Coone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1368. An act for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1540. An act for the relief of Edith Kahler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1745. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1906. An act to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1986. An act for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2280. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 2403. An act to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2427. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2428. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 18, 1955, present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1004. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 14th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted from January 1 through June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 219); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1005. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1006. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1007. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1008. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1009. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1010. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a copy of a report to the President with respect to an overexpenditure of an allotment of funds within the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, and of Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Supplemental report. H. R. 6373. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 665. An act to revise section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2176. An act to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2177. An act to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2237. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4229. A bill to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7061. A bill to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driver-training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7159. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department, of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7301. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2601. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; with amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5738. A bill to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4019. A bill to authorize mileage allowance of 10 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business; with amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 7440. A bill to equalize and adjust certain salaries in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 7029. A bill to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 593. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5046. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. 1272). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Alice Duckett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee); without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Guenther Kaschner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Harry John Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Moreno; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna; without amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2235. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur; with amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Monika Schefbanker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief William Joseph Perella; with amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 38. An act for the relief of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois); without amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 167. An act for the relief of Ernesto DeLeon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 176. An act for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 181. An act for the relief of Manhay Wong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 214. An act for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto); without amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 346. An act for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 352. An act for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 388. An act for the relief of Petre and Liubitza Ionescu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 394. An act for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 466. An act for the relief of Capt. George Gafos, Eugenia Gafos, and Adamantios George Gafos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 470. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 474. An act for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 503. An act for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 541. An act for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 606. An act for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 664. An act for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1126. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1155. An act for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic); without amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1159. An act for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1522. An act for the relief of Liesolette Brodzinski Gettman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1741. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A. National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1516. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7457. A bill to ameid section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7458. A bill to establish a commission and advisory committee on international rules of judicial procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7459. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7460. A bill to provide that communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which disclose information concerning such taxpayer's income or tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7461. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7462. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7463. A bill to designate the dam to be constructed in connection with the Eagle Gorge Reservoir project on the Green River, Wash., as the "Howard A. Hanson Dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7464. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7465. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 7466. A bill to amend paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which defines substitutes for jewels in imported watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7467. A bill to amend paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which defines substitutes for jewels in imported watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 7468. A bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7469. A bill relating to the deduction of taxes in computing section 102 net income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7470. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7471. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 7472. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7473. A bill to continue certain housing and urban renewal programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 7474. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 7475. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to provide for settlement of strikes and lockouts involving the Capital Transit Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that the Federal Soil Conservation Service, the Federal soil conservation program, and the organization, administration, and operation of said Service and program not be abolished, abridged, amended, altered, or in any way changed, but rather that they be allowed to remain and continue to operate as they now exist and operate and as has been their custom in the recent past; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 7476. A bill for the relief of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 7477. A bill for the relief of Paolina Agostini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 7478. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen-Hung (Carlos Joseph) Chao and Mrs. Julia (Shih-San Yu) Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 7479. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 7480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret W. Morgan McCracken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7481. A bill for the relief of Lum Tung, also known as Tung Lum, Lam Tung, Tung Lam, or Lum Tong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 7482. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Navarretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7483. A bill for the relief of Adel Kamal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 7484. A bill for the relief of Kwon In Joo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7485. A bill for the relief of Purificacion de Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 7486. A bill for the relief of Gianbattista Grosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7487. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7488. A bill for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer Dominique Gaudette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7489. A bill for the relief of Emilienne S. Yetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 7490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7491. A bill for the relief of Basa Alonso Dominguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7492. A bill for the relief of Phillipe Nedjaai Braxton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. Res. 309. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill H. R. 7453; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

354. By Mr. DIGGS: Petition of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians of Detroit to support a bill recommending continuance of work done by Congressman KERSTEN's investigating committee on methods and means employed by the Russians to occupy the Baltic States and the crimes committed by them in the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Eldora Curry Allman and other citizens of Lawrence and Barry Counties, protesting alcoholic-beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

356. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general manager, the port of Portland, Portland, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of H. R. 5789, relating to the John Day Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

357. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Guaranty Cycle Co., St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the President approve the Tariff Commission's recommendations for relief to the stricken American bicycle industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Charleston, S. C., Naval Shipyard Rewarded by the Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Charleston Naval Shipyard is one of the outstanding shipyards in the Nation. Records in the Bureau of Ships indicate that the efficiency and cost per unit of conversion and construction at the Charleston Naval Shipyard is more economical to the Government than any other yard in the Nation. This is a record of which we in South Carolina are indeed proud. The men and women in the Charleston Naval Shipyard, both military and civilian, have a tradition unexcelled in the Nation. Part and parcel of this tradition is pride of performance.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, recently the Charleston Naval Shipyard was the recipient of the Navy's three top safety awards for the last calendar year. One was the Secretary of the Navy's Industrial Award, another was the Secretary of the Navy's Motor Vehicle Award, and the last was a National Safety Council Award. The National Safety Award is a national distinction and was awarded over every other single naval shipyard in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for and on behalf of the great family of employees at the Charleston Naval Shipyard I express the pride in such singular accomplishments. I want the records of this Congress and future Congresses to know of what my people did in their day and generation for their Nation and the security of democracy everywhere in the world.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado River project has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects which are both economically and financially infeasible, first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits, while, second, at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: On one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only $2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are $41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find $638,500 of indirect benefits and $313,100 of public benefits to add to the finding of $614,500 in direct benefits—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The indirect-benefits category includes such nebulous factors as "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers," while the public-benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the “increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy.”

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

Atomic Power Is Born in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1955, for the first time in America, and perhaps in the world, electric energy of commercial quantity was generated from atomic energy. On that day, Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, threw the switch which closed the circuit and sent the electricity into the network of the Niagara-Hudson Power Corp. to be used in lighting homes and factories of the people in central New York. It was momentous and historic occasion which I was privileged to observe, and represented the culmination of many years of planning and effort on the part of thousands of persons directly and indirectly engaged in the atomic energy program. The address of Mr. Strauss is attached herewith:

> Looking ahead to this occasion during the past few days, I found myself thinking back to an event that preceded this one by 12½ years.
>
> I tried to create in my mind's eye what the scene must have been on that raw winter's afternoon of December 2, 1942, under the stands of Stagg Field Stadium at the University of Chicago. There, you will remember, Enrico Fermi and his small group of associates prepared to start the first atomic reactor.
>
> What were their emotions in that moment of eternity? Did any vision of the future reveal itself to them as the control rods were slowly inched out of the slots in that primitive pile of uranium and graphite?
>
> Of course, there could be no public celebration of that event. Another 2½ years were to pass before the secret could be told of man's success in mastering the energy of the invisible atom by means of a self-sustained chain reaction.
>
> Dr. Fermi and the other scientists who were guardians of that awesome secret foresaw even then just such a day as this when the energy they had brought under control would be used to light homes, provide propulsion and turn the wheels of industry.
>
> They knew that 1 pound of uranium—a piece no larger than a golf ball—if fissioned completely, could produce as much energy as 2½ million pounds of coal. The energy bound up in such a 1-pound ingot of natural uranium would represent about 3 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. Or to express it slightly differently, 400 to 500 pounds of natural uranium could provide all the electric power currently used in the United States, assuming that complete fission could be achieved. It was early recognized that, in a reactor designed for the purpose, the uranium could be so handled as to breed more fissionable material at the same time it was furnishing heat. In this respect, uranium has a potential which conventional fuels do not possess.
>
> However, on that December day in 1942, the men gathered around that first atomic reactor had little time to speculate on the future. Dreams of atomic power for man's peaceful pursuits had to be put aside. We were at war, and the goal was to win a deadly race to produce an atomic weapon. We had good reason to believe that the Germans were working on such a weapon, and it was clear that we had no recourse but to see that we were not bested and beaten to that goal.
>
> Once the war was over, we were compelled to continue the development of nuclear weapons, because no other prudent course lay open to us. On the strength of our defenses rested our hopes of escaping from another catastrophic war. Nevertheless, we were determined to move as rapidly as possible in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy in our own country, and to encourage similar development in other countries. As a Nation, we have good reason to be proud of the use we have made of the peaceful atom and of our cooperation with friendly nations abroad.
>
> Fermi's first pile of uranium and graphite bricks was but a primitive ancestor and bore hardly any resemblance to the SIR Mark A reactor housed here at West Milton in its huge shell of steel.
>
> Fermi's pile had a computed normal power level of one-half watt and, for a few minutes on that December day, it was allowed to rise to a level of 2 watts—barely enough to light a flashlight.
>
> Today, as the mere byproduct of a reactor designed, not to provide commercial power but to propel a submarine, we are met to turn over to the people, for their peaceful pursuits, up to 10 million watts of electricity—5 million times the power level of Fermi's pile of only 12½ years ago.
>
> Surely this is an exciting occasion, but even so, we must bear in mind that we are only now arrived at a point in the atomic age comparable perhaps to that reached by the caveman who discovered that he could make fire by rubbing two sticks together, and who went on to dig a pot hole in the floor of this cave and chisel out a smoke hole in the roof so he might warm himself and cook his food. It took thousands of years before his descendents learned to put that heat through engines to drive their trains, ships and planes and do all the multitude of things that we now perform with the relatively feeble energy derived from the chemical reaction we know as fire.
>
> We are just at the small beginning of trying to apply the great energy of atomic reaction, but our program should be vastly accelerated by our accumulated knowledge. Each forward step such as the one which is occurring here today, adds to that store of knowledge.
>
> In a matter of minutes now, the homes and industries of this part of the Nation are to receive several thousand kilowatts of atomic electric power.
>
> In 2 years or less our first full-scale plant to produce commercial electrical power from atomic energy will be supplying 60,000 kilowatts of electricity to the Pittsburgh area. That plant, for which President Eisenhower broke ground last Labor Day, is under construction at Shippingport, Pa.
>
> American companies, and groups of companies and cooperatives in various parts of the United States stand ready, as of now, to build 6 commercial atomic power plants with a total capacity of 765,000 kilowatts and have them completed within the next 5 years, at a total cost of nearly $250 million. Some of these groups are prepared to pay the entire cost out of their own pockets without any financial help from the Federal Government, even though atomic power plants are not yet a paying proposition, that is to say, they are not as yet economically competitive with conventional plants.
>
> American industry, large and small, is in the picture in an impressive way. In close partnership with the Federal Government under the new Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the role of industry will grow and grow.
>
> The feasibility of using the great heat generated in atomic fission to make steam, which is in turn used in turbo-generators to produce electricity (as is the process which we will see demonstrated here in a few moments) was given a practical demonstration by the Atomic Energy Commission as long ago as December 1951, although on a considerably smaller and more intimate scale than that we are now about to witness.
>
> On that earlier occasion, using a small pilot-type reactor of the experimental breeder design, we converted enough atomic energy into electricity to satisfy the needs of a good-sized commercial building. That was at the Commission's testing station in Idaho. That is to say, a 250-kilowatt generator added to the reactor supplied enough electricity to run the machinery and provide lighting for the reactor building.
>
> Again, in March of 1953, at the Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the same results were achieved with an entirely different type of reactor, a homogeneous experimental type.
>
> In each case, of course, the amount of electrical power produced was too small to be commercial. Not until today, has a sufficient amount of power been produced as the byproduct of an experimental reactor to make its commercial distribution practical.
>
> However, there can no longer be any question of the feasibility of atomic power. The atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, has provided impressive testimony of that.
>
> Our second atomic submarine, the *Sea Wolf*, is to be launched at Groton, Conn., on Thursday of this week. The reactor which will provide the electric power for today's event, is, as you know, the land-based prototype of the liquid metal-cooled reactor which will go into the *Sea Wolf*. It is the first full-scale reactor of this type.
>
> This prototype reactor for the *Sea Wolf* went “critical”—that is, it achieved sustaining nuclear chain reaction for the first time—on March 20. And just 2 months ago to the day, its first useful power turned its own turbines and propeller shaft.
>
> It is interesting to note that, since May 18, when this occurred, the Atomic Energy Commission has had three power reactors operating simultaneously—this one at West Milton, the land prototype of the *Nautilus* reactor at the commission's reactor testing station in Idaho, and the atomic power plant aboard the *Nautilus* herself.
>
> As I have said, this prototype reactor which stands ready now to release its power into waiting homes and industries, was not built with the intention of serving as a commercial power plant. It was conceived, built and operated on an experimental basis to provide design information and develop operating techniques for its “sister plant” to be installed aboard the *Sea Wolf*.
>
> Therefore, the submarine intermediate reactor which is sealed inside the large steel sphere here at West Milton might properly be regarded as a military device. Certainly

its prime purpose was to enable us to develop the most efficient power plant possible for one of our newest and most effective weapons of defense.

The capabilities of the *Sea Wolf*, the amount of power at her command and other details of her power plant and performance must be secret. And this prototype of her atomic power plant must likewise remain so classified, in the interest of our national security, even though that prototype is today being converted to the most benign purposes.

To my mind, this circumstance—that is to say, the fact that this plant was designed and built to serve a military function—is the most appealing aspect of this wholly peaceful occasion.

I find it appealing for this reason. All of you will surely recall President Eisenhower's stirring speech to the United Nations on December 8, 1953—when he launched his proposal which has since come to be generally known as "atoms for peace."

Let me briefly quote from that speech, which has inspired and lifted the hopes of men and women all over the world. They are words that deserve to be heard again and again:

"It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace. The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind."

The President went on to say:

"The United States pledges * * * to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Now today, this atomic powerplant designed and constructed for experimental military purposes is being consecrated—in the most convincing manner possible—to the benefit of man.

It is a moving demonstration that the atom can indeed be stripped of its military casing and adapted to the arts of peace.

What we are about to do may well stand as a symbol of our hopes and aspirations for the day when the atom will serve only as the servant of man, and never again as his destroyer.

Like this submarine prototype reactor, now converted to the production of civilian power, our atomic weapons stockpile also has another and happier potential. Conventional weapons such as shells, tanks, guns, and planes become obsolete with time and whatever is recoverable is by salvage at a fraction of their cost.

But when the day which we pray for finally comes,—when our atomic devices are no longer necessary to deter aggression, then the nuclear components can easily be converted into material, such as is in this reactor, to become great sources of beneficent power, providing the conveniences and blessings of peace to our people.

Beside me stands a large two-way switch. If I throw its blade in one direction it will turn the propellor shaft of a military weapon.

But when I throw it in the other direction, as I about to do, it will send atomic electric power surging through transmission lines to towns and villages, farms and factories—power not to burst bombs or propel submarines, but to make life easier, healthier and more abundant.

This switch is a symbol of the great dilemma of our age.

I throw it now to the side of the peaceful atom and by that choice we of the United States mark the beginning of a fulfillment of the scriptural injunction of Isaiah:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks."

Cuba Worries About Sugar Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant, the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in America. This editorial was published Saturday morning, July 16, 1955. It concerns the matter of the sugar quota for Cuba. It is an intelligently well-written editorial, with which I am in complete agreement.

Cuba is the gateway to Latin America. In some respects, United States relations with Cuba act as a barometer of United States-Latin American relations in general. Cuba is the fourth most important country in the world for United States private investment, which at the end of 1950 totaled $642,400,000. Forty-one of Cuba's active sugar mills are owned and operated by American interests and produce approximately 43 percent of Cuba's sugar crop. Any modification of the Sugar Act, based on legislation now being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, would have an immediate and adverse impact on the general economy of Cuba.

As this splendid editorial in the Hartford Courant points out, Cuba is our sixth largest market for exports from the United States. Products exported to Cuba are produced in every section of the United States. Rice growers and processors in Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, and California benefit. Farmers in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Minnesota derive income particularly in agricultural exports. Textile manufacturing States of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Massachusetts, and Connecticut find Cuba a good market. Large quantities of iron, steel, and other metal products are exported from Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

It is to our best interest, therefore, that we increase our sugar quota rather than cut it. If we increase our sugar quota from Cuba, thereby stabilizing Cuba's economy, this would also increase our export market to this neighborly country.

The editorial follows:

CUBA WORRIES ABOUT SUGAR LAWS

In Cuba, where sugar-growing is the bulwark of the economy, any changes in United States trade policies are anxiously viewed. Cubans cannot forget grim days of the 1920s and 1930s, when American tariff and quota barriers had disastrous effects on the island. Now the administration has recommended changes in sugar legislation to divide with domestic producers an expanded market. Some quick figuring has shown Cuba that, no matter how it works out, her sales will drop. When the island's largest industry suffers, her people will suffer.

Well, what are we to Cuba, and what's Cuba to us? There is a special relationship. We freed the island from Spanish domination in 1898, and in years thereafter our statesmen promised her independence and a chance to grow into a prosperous, modern nation. Over the years, despite fluctuations, Cuba has grown to be a strong neighbor and a good customer. Only five countries in the world bought more from us last year than Cuba. And, with prosperity, the island has been pushing a public-works program while private construction has been active. But it is all based on a sugar economy, and the prospects of American legislative action have alarmed the Cubans.

True, Cuba has been developing her outside markets. Demand from the so-called free-world market has been heavier than expected, but some of that has been via the Soviet Union. Cuba has received a large share of business from Russian buying in the world markets. But if stifling action is taken here, Cuba will find her progress checked. A low state of political and economic health may result. And that, Cuban leaders think, will be dangerous to us as well as them. For each American dollar used to buy Cuban sugar, President Batista has noted, $1.18 is spent on American goods, including agricultural products.

We have special reason to view with care any actions affecting our relations with good neighbors of the Western Hemisphere. The Cubans feel that any cut in the established sugar quota would bring immediate economic instability and cause serious consequences. The island is a respected and close friend of the United States. We should proceed cautiously in economic matters affecting that friendship.

The Proposed Falion Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the present confusion surrounding the proposed Fallon highway bill shows what happens when a congressional committee other than Ways and Means attempts to write a tax bill.

The original suggestion of the railroads that a tax of not less than 50 cents per pound of tire was so ridiculous that a counterproposal of 10 cents additional per pound of tire was soon suggested.

No consideration has been given to the scientific development of the rubber industry. In a few years innertubes may not be manufactured in any quantity at all and tires, in all probability, will wear longer and be lighter in weight. The anticipated revenue may not reach half the amount currently expected.

Under the rules of the House of Representatives, the Speaker is constrained to give precedent its proper influence. Precedent was broken when a major tax bill was not referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Since the Fallon Bill contains approximately $12 billion in additional taxes, if the Rules Committee follows precedent it would have to grant a closed rule. In this case, the House would not have an opportunity to correct the inequities in the present Fallon bill.

I suggest that Speaker RAYBURN reverse himself and assign the tax part of the Fallon bill to the Ways and Means Committee where an equitable nondiscriminatory pay-as-you-go tax bill can be written. Then the House can decide whether they want President Eisenhower's highway program or the Democratic highway proposal.

Upper Colorado River Project Freezes Up 323 Days a Year But Costs $5,000 an Acre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project lies at such high altitude that it would have a growing season of only 42 days a year.

It would cost the taxpayers of the Nation nearly $5,000 an acre to develop hay lands in this high, cold country where in some places it snows every month in the year, and where spring killing frosts come as late as July 11 and fall frosts as early as August 22.

A large part of the land to be irrigated in this inconceivable project lies at an altitude of 6,500 to 7,000 feet in the Wyoming counties of Lincoln, Sublette and Uinta.

In Lincoln County killing frosts come as late as June 30 on an average, and as early as August 22. The growing season runs between 53 and 73 days.

In Sublette County killing frosts come as late as July 11 and as early as August 22. The growing season runs between 42 and 62 days.

In Uinta County killing frosts come as late as June 11 and as early as September 7. The growing season runs between 88 and 92 days.

The upper Colorado River would cost the Nation's taxpayers $5,600,000,000 or more than $140 for each American family, and possibly much more. This does not include losses due to the tax exemption of the project. It would grow crops which are unneeded. So, on this reclamation project the taxpayers would pay for the land and then for the unneeded crops it grows.

That is, it would grow crops if frost and summertime snows did not kill everything. The whole thing is ridiculous, extravagant, and unnecessary. It constitutes an immoral taking of private property for Government socialism of desert mountain lands.

Congress is being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to bring these new farms into production in a country where there are as few as 42 days in which to grow even pasture grasses for dairy cows and sheep to graze on and to produce more surplus butter and wool.

It snows practically every month of the year in these 3 counties where it is proposed to develop 110,000 acres.

If more agricultural acreage is needed in this country there are millions of acres of first-class land awaiting development in humid, fast-growing sections.

We do not need to go to the top of the Rocky Mountains to create new farms on poor land at fantastic cost. It is indeed a proposition as absurd as growing bananas on Pikes Peak. This further extension of the absurdities of socialism which prevail in every country ought to be stopped right now in America.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico is unwarranted and unconscionable.

Under the proposed plans of financing the project, the concealed subsidy by way of accumulating interest on money borrowed to construct the project would be huge. Its burden would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers for generations to come.

Under the repayment provisions of the Senate-approved project bill the concealed Federal subsidy on only the projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior—Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and 11 participating projects—as estimated and admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation would be $1,153 million over the repayment period or $3,150 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated. If the four additional storage units and the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and Gooseberry participating reclamation projects authorized by the Senate bill are included, the corresponding Federal subsidy, based upon equivalent methods of computation, would amount to $4 billion or over $5,000 per acre on the 745,000 acres to be irrigated.

Under the repayment provisions of House project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on the minimum number of projects authorized by the bill—4 storage units and 11 participating projects—would amount to $1.6 billion at the end of the overall repayment period of 90 to 95 years, or $4,300 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated; but with the inclusion of additional projects contemplated for authorization, the subsidy would be substantially the same as under the Senate-approved bill, namely, $4 billion or $5,000 per acre.

As compared to Federal subsidies amounting to $3,000 to $5,000 per acre that would be involved in the project, the value of irrigated land in the area of the proposed reclamation projects averages only about $150 per acre.

In view of the fact that the crops that would be grown on the proposed project's high altitude marginal land would be largely hay, grain, and forage crops for livestock, and dairy products, which are now largely surplus and would in turn be resubsidized under the farm program, the huge Federal subsidy required for the proposed upper Colorado River project would be a totally unwarranted and unconscionable burden on the Nation's taxpayers for many generations hence.

There Can Be No Lasting Peace Without Russian Guaranties of Freedom to the Enslaved Peoples of Lithuania and the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert a copy of my letter of July 13, 1955, to the President requesting him to include, on the agenda of summit meeting discussion, a demand that the Kremlin representatives demonstrate the honesty of their loudly declared desire for a peaceful world by promising freedom to the persecuted peoples of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. The President acknowledged receipt of my request on July 14 and wrote in part:

> I can assure you that the matter will have our earnest consideration.

My letter to President Eisenhower follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of your departure for the historical summit meeting with other Western Power representatives and the Soviets, the full support of the Congress, the confidence of the American people, and the prayers of all the Christian world are combined for the success of your mission.

I am positive that the most intensive work has been devoted to the assembly of proposals to be advanced by you at the Conference in providing a foundation upon which all parties can agree to work together toward easing the tensions of threatening atomic war and cooperatively pursue the practically universal desire for world peace.

Among such basic proposals, may I most respectfully advocate the inclusion of a request for the Kremlin representatives to promptly exhibit the honesty of their declared desire for a peaceful world by announcing their intention to bestow freedom upon Lithuania and the other subjugated Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

As a premise to such a request, the Soviet representatives might well be reminded that they were among the signers of the Atlantic Charter which solemnly guaranteed, and I quote, "Every Nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable. Any Nation's attempt to dictate to another Nation their form of government is indefensible."

You and I well realize from the history of our own country, and I am sure the Soviet officials very well realize it also, that peace cannot be attained in either a nation or a world that is half slave and half free.

From personal knowledge of your own sentiments on this subject, I am certain you will exercise every persuasion to convince the Russians that the solution of this basic problem of enslaved peoples is essential to any progress toward a peaceful world and that without such solution the Conference could be productive of no lasting contribution to peace.

Praying God's blessing upon your mission, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
Harold D. Donohue.

The Problem of Industrial Dispersal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years I have been deeply interested in the problem of dispersal and decentralization for purposes of decreasing the dangerous vulnerability of the United States to enemy blitz attack.

Down through the years, I have been in contact with every Government agency working in this field.

I am frank to state that unfortunately we, as a Nation, have not achieved a fraction of the progress which we should have achieved by now, reducing the appalling overconcentration of industrial targets in this country.

During the past decade there has been a tremendous expansion of the factories of the American free-enterprise system. But we have lost to date a golden opportunity by not dispersing many of these factories. Instead, they have largely congregated in the already overcongested handful of major American urban centers.

I earnestly hope that legislation to establish a Hoover-type commission to make a full and complete study of the dispersal problem will be enacted before the end of this Congress.

Ordinarily, I am somewhat skeptical of leaving to commissions the making of more and more studies on subjects which already have been studied in detail. I do not believe that studies should become a substitute for action, but rather, simply a step prior to action.

It would appear, however, that a Hoover-type commission could bring this issue up to the proper level of governmental, industrial, labor, and public attention, and set a comprehensive policy which would thereafter be carried out.

I send to the desk three items indicative of this problem. The first is the text of a letter to me from Director Arthur S. Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization of the Executive Office of the President, together with a copy of his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year on this problem. Director Flemming commented upon a reference to the dispersal problem which I had made in an address in my State last month.

The second is a letter from the senior vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Kenneth R. Miller, likewise commenting on this subject.

And finally, as an indication of the actual status of dispersal, which is, I repeat, a very inadequate and disturbing status, I append an editorial feature from Time magazine's issue of June 27. I ask unanimous consent that all three of these items be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the several items referred to were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Office of the President,
Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1955.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wiley: Thank you for your letter of June 29, relative to accelerating plans for industrial dispersion in which you enclose a copy of your fine address recently delivered at Wisconsin State College.

On February 22, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Civil Defense of the Senate Armed Services Committee and suggested that the Congress authorize the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to study the problem of dispersion. This problem has become more complex since the advent of more powerful nuclear weapons, and its resolution, I firmly believe, requires the united action of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. It seems clear that the national dispersion policy, announced by President Truman in August 1951, is wholly inadequate in view of these recent nuclear-weapons developments and that a revision is essential.

I am pleased to see that a bill (S. 2215), to establish a civil defense commission to study dispersion, has been introduced jointly by Senator Kefauver, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, and Senator Jackson of that subcommittee. Other bills of a similar nature have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Congress will take favorable action on one of these at an early date.

You have indicated your interest with respect to the progress of industrial dispersion so far achieved as a result of rapid tax amortization. May I point out, in this connection, that since the dispersion criteria were made a part of the tax-amortization procedure, we have processed through February 15, 1955, 637 projects subject to the dispersion criteria, each costing $2 million or more. Their total estimated cost is $4.7 billion.

Of the 637 projects mentioned above, 546 were not located in congested urban areas or near major military installations; 86 were granted exceptions to the criteria through documented evidence that excessive losses or delays in production or unreasonable economic hardships would ensue due to a change of site; and 5 were denied certification for refusal to meet the dispersion criteria and failure to justify exception.

If you desire any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur S. Flemming,
Director.

Extracts From Remarks of Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, at Hearing Before Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services Committee on February 22, 1955

The nature of the problem of dispersal was summarized very effectively by those who participated in the project East River when they said:

"The problem, therefore, is one of achieving the best balance of dispersion or spacing within the practical limits of a properly functioning urban economy."

It is clear that this "best balance" is going to be obtained only as leaders in the fields of management and labor as well as representatives of our State and local governments search for the best possible solution for their specific problems. The Federal Government must be an active participant in the search for these solutions as it has the responsibility for pointing up the interests of the Nation as a whole as judged by the capability of Soviet Russia to launch an attack on continental United States.

This search for the best possible solutions to the problem of dispersal is not going to be pursued vigorously until the legislative branch unites with the executive branch of the Federal Government in expressing their joint conviction that such a search must be undertaken and likewise unite in establishing the broad framework of policies within which such a search must take place.

In order to expedite a united attack of this kind on the problem of dispersal it is suggested that the Congress authorize the immediate establishment of a commission to be appointed in a manner comparable to the appointment of the Hoover Commission by the President and by the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This commission should be charged with the responsibility of presenting a series of recommendations to the Congress on the problem of dispersal not later than May 15, so as to give the Congress the opportunity of acting on them before the adjournment of the present session. The technical information that would be needed by such a commission is available and as a result it should be able to complete its work within the time limits indicated.

This is the only way in which a solid foundation can be constructed on which a meaningful dispersal program can be erected.

In the meantime I feel that the problem should be approached along the lines of the following statement:

The executive branch of the Federal Government a few years ago recommended policies of dispersal and protective construction. Under the terms of the dispersal policy, new defense facilities were to be located not less than 10 miles beyond the perimeter of certain designated areas of industrial and population concentration. Adherence to this standard by many industrial concerns has reduced their vulnerability to attack.

The recent statement of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission on weapons effects makes it clear that it is still possible to reduce, by dispersal, the disastrous effects of blast and heat, when accompanied by protective measures against fallout. It is equally clear, however, that a mileage yardstick that would conform to the increases in weapons capabilities could not be applied in a practical manner to all situations in all parts of the country. Any effort to do so would disrupt the economy of some parts of the Nation and would fail to take into consideration differing geographic and other factors. Therefore, a revision of the dispersal policy is necessary that will take into consideration the practical problems that confront the States and cities and that will result in their being able to work out reasonable dispersal plans applicable to their situations.

State and local governments of each of our major target areas should develop plans, in cooperation with the Federal Government, to enhance our ability to withstand attack through dispersal of industrial facilities, protective construction and active participation in civil-defense programs. No hard and fast rule can be provided by the Federal Government that would be equally suitable in all situations and in all parts of the country. Criteria for measures which will lessen or minimize the damage which an attack might inflict must now take into account size of the cities, the relation of geography, terrain, economic, and other factors. Thus it can be seen that the situation in each area must be analyzed carefully in the light of numerous considerations. This has not been done. The Federal Government, however, has available some basic information to assist State and local governments in making such analyses with the Department of Commerce being the focal point through which such assistance will be given. Similar assistance will be available to industries through the Department of Commerce as the focal point.

In terms of new industrial construction, advice should be sought from the Department of Commerce or other appropriate Federal agency. In the case of new defense facilities where application is made to the Office of Defense Mobilization for a rapid tax amortization certificate, the certificate will not be granted unless such advice has been sought and adequately considered in the selection of the site.

The departments and agencies of the Federal Government will not move forward with the construction of new buildings unless the proposed location conforms to the advice given by the Federal Government to critical target areas and industrial concerns.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N. Y., July 13, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have read with great interest the very constructive address which you gave before the Wisconsin State College at Whitewater on June 29. We were indeed interested to note your comments on page 4 with respect to the business communities' interest in industrial dispersal—particularly the views of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Our association has long been interested in the problem of plant location and dispersal. However, it has recognized the many manifold problems incident thereto. Our various committees are concerned with the related problems of water supply, proximity of markets, transportation costs and, attendant to the latter, certain phases of the antitrust laws, availability of labor and other problems which must confront management in deciding where to locate or relocate their plants.

Questions of this nature have long been of interest to our association and its members. We greatly appreciate the encouragement given to American business outlined in your letter of June 30.

Of course in all of our deliberations, as in your own thinking I am sure, we are guided by the fundamental concepts of our free-enterprise system.

Sincerely,

KENNETH R. MILLER.

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL—BETTER DEFENSE AND BETTER BUSINESS

In last week's simulated H-bomb attack, Washington officials dispersed to 31 different hideouts. But for United States industry—the heart of the Nation's warmaking power—dispersal was not so easy. Had there been a real H-bomb attack, 15 accurately dropped bombs could have demolished two-fifths of America's industrial capacity.

The Pentagon is deeply worried over the small progress toward dispersing United States industry. Air Secretary Harold Talbott has already warned that the Air Force plans to discourage further expansion of plane and missile factories in southern California, where 25 percent of the region's payroll is devoted to military aircraft production.

So far, little has been done on purely military grounds to speed up industrial dispersal—partly because of the enormous cost. Not until 2 years after the Korean war began did Washington take its first—and only—significant step. It ruled that in the future all new plants seeking rapid tax amortization certificates would have to be located at least 10 miles outside "probable ground zero," i. e., defense industry and population centers. By that time, however, the Government had already granted fast tax writeoffs for $20 billion in defense construction. Moreover, even the belated rule has largely been ignored. Only 546 projects, costing $3.9 billion, have met dispersal requirements. Meanwhile, the requirements themselves are outdated, have not been changed to meet the greater threat of the H-bomb.

However, the situation is not as black as it looks. For purely economic reasons, United States industry has been doing a great deal of dispersing on its own. In the past year alone, the chance to save on shipping costs to the booming west coast market caused more than 35 national firms in the East and Midwest, e. g., Elgin, Borg-Warner, to set up branches in the southern California area. The need for sufficient labor at reasonable wages has forced many other corporations out of heavily industrialized regions into rural areas. Cleveland's Clevite Corp. (bearings and bushings), which has decentralized into 11 plants in the past 10 years, insisted that "with smaller plants * * * we achieve greater efficiency." Overall, since 1940 the proportion of United States industry concentrated in cities of 100,000 or more has declined from about one-half to one-third.

Industry has also gone to work in other ways. Twenty-four industry task forces have been formed, and the rubber, chemical, and iron and steel industries have each produced thick, detailed manuals on what to do if bombs drop. Typical topics: how to set up management succession lists in case the top echelon is wiped out; the collecting and storing of vital records in a safe place; arranging for alternate officers to sign emergency payrolls.

Some companies went to work on their own. Koppers picked a "reorganization point" outside Pittsburgh, stocked nearby bank vaults with microfilms of vital company records, and instructed key personnel to head for this emergency shelter at the first sign of attack. Standard Oil (New Jersey) set up an alternate office 60 to 75 miles outside New York City to feed, sleep, and serve as GHQ for 100 top executives. Curtiss-Wright bought 84 square miles in northcentral Pennsylvania to assemble jet engines and 5,000 acres in New Jersey's Ramapo Hills for a bombproof headquarters. The petroleum industry has set up five regional committees to run the natural-gas and oil industry in each area, and A. T. & T. arranged alternate toll-call routes and emergency generators. One company has even stocked its secret rendezvous with disaster paychecks printed on distinctive notepaper and made out in standard amounts.

But dispersal is not practical for all, can be both bad economics and bad defense. Some industries, e. g., automobiles and shipbuilding, require large concentrations of machinery, labor, and materials, and any attempt to break them down into small, easily dispersed units would be almost as damaging to war production as bombing itself. Nor is dispersal simply a matter of picking up a factory and transporting it to the middle of nowhere. While the factory might be safer in its new home, it might also produce next to nothing—for want of housing, skilled labor, and transportation facilities to get raw materials.

Nevertheless, from now on industry should incorporate military purpose in its economic thinking and keep dispersal firmly in mind as it plans further expansion. Dispersal and decentralization are as much considerations of forward-looking management as healthy labor relations or sound accounting practice. For many companies, dispersal will mean not only greater safety in war but greater efficiency in peace.

Minimum Wages in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, in taking up minimum wage amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the House Committee on Education and Labor wisely declined to go into the matter of minimum wages in Puerto Rico. The committee undoubtedly felt that the considerations involved were complex and that the effects would be far-reaching and critical to the future development of the island's economy, with particular reference to the vital industrialization program. It was indicated that before making any recommendations concerning minimum wages in Puerto Rico, it would first conduct a careful study of all important factors involved.

The commitee's action in this respect was entirely in accord with popular and official sentiment in Puerto Rico. I think the Education and Labor Committee is to be commended for its wise and realistic approach to the problem.

On July 11, 1955, the Secretary of Labor responded to a series of 10 questions which I submitted to him with regard to considerations affecting wages in Puerto Rico. Under unanimous leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the Secretary's memorandum for the information of all Members of Congress who might have interest in this question:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE HONORABLE A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

1. Have all wage orders for the various industries in Puerto Rico covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act been revised since the mainland legal minimum wage was increased from 40 cents to 75 cents in 1949?

Wage orders for all Puerto Rican industries have been revised upward at least once since the mainland legal minimum wage was increased from 40 cents to 75 cents in January 1950.

2. Has any determination for wages in any industry in Puerto Rico been revised since 1949 more than once? How many times?

Fifteen industries, constituting the vast bulk of all employment subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act in Puerto Rico, have had their wage orders revised upward more than once since the 75-cent rate went into effect on the mainland in January 1950. Fourteen were revised twice: One, the metal, machinery, transportation equipment and allied industries, has been revised three times. Among these industries are those having the greatest competitive relationship with industries in the States. These 15 industries are: Banking, insurance, and finance; button, buckle, and jewelry; cement; corsets, brassieres, and allied garments; hosiery; leather, leather goods and related products; men's and boys' clothing and related products; metal, machinery, transportation equipment, and allied industries; needlework and fabricated textile products (16 of 19 divisions); paper, paper products, printing, publishing, and related industries; plastic products; rubber, straw, hair, and related products; shoe manufacturing and allied industries; sugar manufacturing; textile and textile products.

3. Have all wage revisions since 1949 resulted in raises, or have there been cases where it has been found that no increase was possible?

As indicated previously, minimum wage rates for all industries in Puerto Rico have been increased at least once since 1949. There have been instances however, in which the recommendations of an industry committee for a particular industry or industry division have been rejected by the administrator of the wage and hour division as not being adequately substantiated by the evidence placed before him. In each of these instances the industry or industry division was subsequently referred to a new committee and in every instance in which action has been completed, some increase in the preexisting rates was approved by the administrator.

4. Why have not revisions been more frequent and how frequent should they be?

The frequency of revisions has been limited by the budget allowed for the industry committee program in Puerto Rico. During the last 2 years, for example, it has been possible to convene only 1 industry committee each year because of budgetary limitations. Although several industries have been assigned to each committee, it has not been possible to review the wage orders with the frequency needed.

As a general rule, wage orders should be revised on an average of once every 2 years. This is the frequency which was recommended by a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee which made a first-hand study of this problem in 1950. A certain flexibility is necessary, however. Newly emerging factors may in some industries require a review after a much shorter period of time to keep the minimum rates abreast of the economic conditions in a particular industry.

The budget approved by both the Senate and the House provides funds for 3 committees for the 1956 fiscal year but a supplemental submission of the President requests an increase to 6 committees which we estimate is required for a review of each wage order every 2 years.

5. What industries which operate in the mainland and in Puerto Rico will have actual increases in wages in the mainland as direct result of a 1956 increase in the legal minimum wage? In case there are any, will the increase in the mainland be uniform? Please give actual increases industry by industry.

The data presented by the Department to the House and Senate subcommittees show an extremely wide variation in the impact of the proposed minimum wage increase on mainland industries, both with respect to those which have Puerto Rican counterparts and those which do not. In many mainland industries there would be no direct impact whatever, or at most a very negligible one. The primary metal industries, the transportation equipment industries, the machine industries and most of the fabricated metal products industries are outstanding examples among this group. Thus while an increase in the minimum wage would have no real effect on members of such industries in the States, a direct percentage or cents-per-hour increase on similar Puerto Rican firms would result in a heavy impact.

Among the mainland industries which would be affected by an increase in the legal minimum rate, the impact both in terms of the number of employees directly affected and the direct wage bill increase would fluctuate widely. In work clothing, for example, 51 percent of the production workers would be affected by a 90-cent statutory minimum, with a resultant direct wage bill increase of 5 percent. In synthetic textiles, on the other hand, only 2 percent of the production workers would require increases with a labor bill increase of less than one-half of 1 percent. In contrast with this varying impact on mainland industries, a direct percentage or cents-per-hour increase for Puerto Rican industries would result in a uniformly heavy impact industry by industry.

6. Will the Department be in a position to revise wages in Puerto Rico in all industries which compete with those affected in the mainland within the next year?

The Department is prepared to schedule reconsideration by industry committees of all wage-order rates for industries which compete with industries on the mainland in order to achieve an appropriate adjustment in these rates at the same time, or soon thereafter, as any increase in the legal minimum wage applicable to the mainland. Pursant to a Department recommendation, the Senate has adopted a modification of the wage-order proceedings in order that final orders may be issued more promptly after receipt of committee recommendations than is possible under the present act.

7. Has the Department taken steps to cope with the situation that may evolve in Puerto Rico from an increase in the legal minimum in the mainland?

In line with the appropriation approved by both Houses of Congress, the Department is planning for three Puerto Rican committees during the fiscal year beginning this month. If the supplemental appropriation requested by the President is approved by the Congress, the Department will be ready for a program of six committees during this fiscal year. Six committees will be able to review all wage-order rates for the industries which compete with the mainland and also the rates applicable for a substantial segment of the remaining industries covered by the act.

8. Does the Department favor an immediate, indiscriminate, across-the-board increase in Puerto Rico, by percent or quantity, as a result of the mainland increases in the legal minimum, or would the Department recommend that whatever increases may be called for in Puerto Rico should be determined by the committee system as has been the case since 1949?

The Department recommended a flexible approach, as was noted in the departmental letter of May 18, 1955, to Senator DOUGLAS which is contained in the transcript of the Senate subcommittee hearings at page 1251. Industries in Puerto Rico have extremely wide variations in production costs and other competitive factors. These require the flexible system afforded by the industry committee procedure whereby adjustments in minimum rates may be made in conformance with the abilities of the individual industries to adjust without severe dislocation or cessation of their operations. In some very important industries, such as the hand-sewn needlework products, competition is not with the mainland but with foreign countries like the Philippines and Japan. Hence a mandatory percentage or specified cents-per-hour increase, based presumably upon the theory of equalizing competitive relationships with the mainland, would bear no relation to the ability of the industry to adjust.

Even in those industries which do compete with the mainland industries, extent of competition varies markedly and cannot be measured by any system of direct mandatory increases. The only method that appears to offer a satisfactory way of making practical minimum-wage adjustments in these industries is through the present committee system pursued with vigor. The law already requires minimum rates for Puerto Rican industries that are both (a) high enough to prevent any competitive advantage to Puerto Rican over mainland industry and (b) as high in relation to the mainland rate as possible without substantially curtailing employment in the Puerto Rican industry.

9. What would be the effect in Puerto Rico of a uniform raise to all industries percentagewise or by a fixed amount? Would all industries in Puerto Rico be equally able to stand this increase.

An immediate increase in island wages by a fixed percentage or absolute amount for all industries which is out of proportion to the current rate structure would seem likely to cause a substantial curtailment of employment on the island. Experience shortly after the passage of the original act in 1938 which led to the adoption by Congress of the present system of minimum-wage fixing for Puerto Rico reinforces this conclusion. Of course, the effect would not be the same on all industries. The impact of a fixed increase would seem to be particularly great on the Puerto Rican industries which compete primarily with low-wage foreign areas, producing handmade products such as hand-sewn needlework products.

A uniform increase in the wage rates for all industries may also affect seriously many of the Puerto Rican industries for which wage-order rates have already been adjusted to reflect actual minimum rates in the mainland higher than the present legal minimum rate of 75 cents. This is the situation, for example, in the metal and machinery industries for which minimum rates of 65 and 75 cents an hour became effective on June 27, 1955.

Even where the wage paying ability of the Puerto Rican industry would be improved by an increase in the legal minimum on the mainland, there is no fixed relationship between the wage rates on the mainland and in Puerto Rico. Moreover, some industries on the island have received recent increases in minimum-wage rates, whereas other industries have not received increases for periods up to 5 years.

10. In case some industries in Puerto Rico were so affected by a uniform increase as to have to discontinue operations, what chances are there that the other industries or newly established industries would rapidly absorb the unemployed resulting from the closing down of affected industries?

Historically, Puerto Rico has suffered from both unemployment and underemployment. While the situation has improved in recent years, lack of opportunities for employment is still a serious problem for a large part of the work force. In such a situation, it is extremely doubtful that workers from closed plants would readily be absorbed by other plants.

Who's Worrying About the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that somewhere along the line we have somehow lost sight of John Q. Consumer, the person who pays the bill despite what type of compromise is made here legislatively.

Much has been said about the plight of the oil and gas producer. The tremendous amount of money he must invest in order to realize a productive source of this fuel commodity which is now the major source of cooking and heating means of some 25 million consumers. The arguments of those who testified before the committee, if taken as a whole, are contradictory to say the least. Some say that a healty state of competition exists in the industry and that Federal control at the wellhead would jeopardize this competitive situation by driving the small producers out of business. While others contend that only a mere handfull of the large gas and oil companies market 90 percent of all the gas that was used in 1953. Possibly the entire question does hinge about the fact of competition. Does it or does it not exist at the producing end? If it does not, then we have a situation where a few companies are free to exploit a captive market. And if that is the case I am sure that I need not remind my able colleagues that this would not only violate the intent and spirit of the Natural Gas Act of 1936.

I do not believe in unduly controlling the activities of any form of economic enterprise where the ultimate consumer is not being victimized because of his total dependence upon that industry. This is not a question of manacling the producer; but, instead, protecting the hapless consumer who's interest we should have primarily at heart.

I feel that the question of competition and reasonable price should be thoroughly investigated by this body with a view to affording the captive consumer the protection that he would not enjoy, but which he is entitled to, under conditions which preclude an open market.

The President Is Requested To Demand Polish Freedom During the Meeting at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to include copy of the letter I addressed to the President, under date of July 13, 1955, urging him to demand, at the summit meeting, a Soviet guaranty of Polish liberation as evidence of the sincerity of the Russians to cooperate for world peace. President Eisenhower replied under date of July 14 and wrote in part:

> I assure you that the matter will have our earnest consideration.

My letter of July 13 to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you prepare for the coming meeting at Geneva, I am sure you must be inspired from the knowledge that the prayers and the trust and the hopes of all the American people are going with you on your most difficult mission.

I am equally certain that, while your heart is hopeful, you are most keenly aware that unless some understanding of the basic problems currently generating atomic war tensions and preventing full peaceful agreement is arrived at, the conference may accomplish little other than another manifestation of the good will and intentions of the United States.

In that concept, therefore, may I most respectfully but earnestly urge upon you the advisability of including a request at the Conference for the Kremlin leaders to reveal plans for the liberation of the enslaved peoples of Poland whose tragic fate is an ever-present blot upon the character and honor of this country and the United Nations.

If such a request is refused, it most certainly would have to be interpreted as clear evidence of the continuing insincerity of the new Russian technique of apparent peace seeking while still adamantly adhering to their historically recorded objective of eventual world enslavement.

I am sure you will agree that the granting of freedom to the brave and heroic Christian people of Poland is basic to any honest negotiations of the United States with the Russian Government, and such concession by the Kremlin is essential to the accomplishment of peace in the world today.

I realize full well that your own heart and efforts are devoted to the promotion of freedom for Poland and all the other subjugated nations, and I am confident you will do all that you can at this Conference to persuade the Russian representatives to permit the Polish people to regain their free self-government, while reminding them that the United States will never abandon either the Poles or any other nation suffering unjust subjugation by a despotic power.

May God bless you and be ever with you in your heavy responsibility.

Very sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
Member of Congress.

Still Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation authorization is misleading. Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act but not to exceed $760 million." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional $173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorize features, bringing the total sum to $933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over $1 billion.

In any event, it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of $760 million, the actual figure is $933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed—either is authorized by the bill—the cost would be $894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64–67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects	$304, 356, 300
Glen Canyon Dam	421, 270, 000
Flaming Gorge	82, 942, 000
Navaho (dam and reservoir only)	36, 400, 000
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet)	49, 305, 000
Total	894, 273, 300
Curecanti (modified plan)	88, 500, 000
Total	933, 468, 300

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document No. 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project, involving a construction cost of $1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of $760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the project repayment provisions of the upper Colorado River project are unrealistic and economically indefensible. The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness, E. O. Larson, stated—page 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383:

> With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But one disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the 100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The $1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence, and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

Letter From President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I addressed a letter to President Eisenhower wishing him Godspeed on his mission to Europe.

In response I have a letter from the President which is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 15, 1955.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am deeply touched by your kind letter of July 14, and shall carry in my mind its message as I leave this evening for Geneva. Thank you very much for taking the time to convey this message to me.

With best personal wishes,
Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.